U. S. Congress

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 91—PART 2

FEBRUARY 26, 1945, TO MARCH 26, 1945
(PAGES 1403 TO 2796)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1945

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NOV 16 '45

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 79th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1945

Rabbi Samuel Thurman, of the United Hebrew Temple, St. Louis, Mo., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Merciful God: Humbly we approach Thee, for Thou art mighty, yet also with abiding faith in Thy mercy. We offer Thee thanksgiving for all the bounty which Thou hast bestowed upon our blessed land, its fruitful fields, its lofty mountains, its richly flowing rivers, its peaceful valleys. All the more reason for our hearts being heavy laden with anxiety and sorrow that the flower of our youth, the strong and the brave, the free sons and daughters of America, must now be offering themselves in fierce and cruel combat against enemies that either do not know Thee or have forgotten Thee and Thy commandments. They scoff at Thy power and scorn Thy law of justice and righteousness.

Grant, O Lord, speedy victory to our brave fighting forces—a victory that shall bring in a new order of fellowship and faith and lasting justice and peace.

We ask Thy blessing on these the chosen representatives of sovereign States, assembled in earnest and devoted council to deliberate and legislate for the good and welfare of all the people of these United States. Guide them by Thy wisdom and sustain them by Thy power that they may act in unity of purpose. Preserve them from the pitfalls of discord which may arise from sincere and honest difference of opinion and native temperament. Strengthen in all of us the faith which is the common heritage of all Americans—the faith that Thou art the Father of all of us and that we are all brothers in Thee. Thou dost not deny the least of us. How then dare we deny one another? Make us more conscious of this bond of brotherhood which is the most sacred token of Thy fatherhood and is the genius of America and of our democracy.

Bless, O Lord, all those who guide and serve the destinies of our Nation—whom the people have set in authority: The President, his counselors and advisers. Bless this high assembly of chosen leaders. Lay Thy guiding hand upon him who presides over this supreme body of lawmakers, that he may direct its deliberations with a wisdom matched by his tried honesty, fairness, and loyalty. Thus may we at home pursue the tasks of priesthood, as keepers of the flame of truth and justice. Thus shall we keep the faith with those on the battle fronts across the seas—the faith of America which is the faith in the brotherhood of justice and righteousness and peace—the faith in Thee, our God and Father. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 22, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 25) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 340) to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 76. An act for the relief of John T. Cooper;

S. 210. An act to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of the old lighthouse keeper's residence in Manitowoc, Wis., to the Otto Oas Post, No. 659, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis.," approved June 16, 1938;

S. 213. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States Naval Ordnance Plant at Canton, Ohio;

S. 216. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain lands situated at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H.;

S. 218. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain lands situated in San Diego County, State of California;

S. 219. An act to amend section 1442, Revised Statutes, relating to furlough of officers by the Secretary of the Navy;

S. 221. An act to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil;

S. 315. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S. 317. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer for the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; and

S. 335. An act for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters and report, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 172 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective departments and agency for the quarter ending March 31, 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

A letter from the Acting Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Librarian of Congress for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944, and the annual report of the Register of Copyrights for the same period (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on the Library.

IMPROVEMENT OF SALARY AND WAGE ADMINISTRATION IN THE FEDERAL SERVICE

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve salary and wage administration in the Federal service; to provide pay for overtime and for night and holiday work; to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNTS WHICH MAY BE EXPENDED FOR TRAVEL BY CERTAIN AGENCIES

A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to the provisions of the National War Agency Appropriation Act of 1945, copies of letters addressed to the heads of the Selective Service System and the War Production Board, which established limitations on the amounts which may be expended for travel from sums set apart in appropriations to such agencies for special projects (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

A letter from the Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation for the third and fourth quarters of

the fiscal year 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF SMALLER WAR PLANTS CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, submitting, pursuant to section 5 of the act approved June 11, 1942 (Public Law 602, 77th Cong.), the sixteenth report on the operations of the Chairman of the War Production Board under that act, and transmitting a report rendered by the chairman and general manager of the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, covering the period from December 1, 1944, through January 31, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF NATIONAL PARK TRUST FUND BOARD

A letter from the Secretary of the National Park Trust Fund Board, submitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board covering the fiscal year 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

HARLAND BARTHOLOMEW AND ASSOCIATES VERSUS THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation concerning the claim of Harland Bartholomew and Associates against the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Claims.

REPORT OF THE AMERICAN WAR MOTHERS

The annual report of the American War Mothers for the period October 1, 1943, to October 1, 1944; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Four letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to investigate and alleviate the excessive prices upon, and shortage of, farm machinery

"Whereas the Government has heretofore limited the production and sale of farm machinery so that the maximum amount of iron and steel might be available for the manufacture of munitions; and

"Whereas available stocks of new farm machinery have been materially depleted and machinery in the hands of farmers is fast wearing out and a considerable portion thereof is beyond repair; and

"Whereas the shortage of farm labor makes it imperative that the most modern labor-saving machinery be made available to our farmers if the agricultural effort for war production is to be maintained; and

"Whereas it has been demonstrated that the labor cost in farm machinery is but a small proportion of the sale price to the farmer; and

"Whereas the sale prices of farm machinery to the farmer are unduly high and there is grave danger that in the post-war period the returning serviceman who decides to commence farming will not be able to purchase sufficient machinery at available prices with moneys made available to him by our Government, and should the price of farm commodities fall after the close of the war the average farmer will not be able to buy modern farm machinery at existing prices: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the President, through the responsible governmental agencies, and the Congress of the United States through the power invested therein, investigate the farm machinery situation as to shortages therein, and the prices thereof, to the end that the present shortage may be alleviated and that the prices charged to the farmer are reduced to make it possible to continue the agricultural effort during the war and to protect the interests of the farmers and the returning servicemen in the post-war period."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Finance:

"Joint memorial to the Congress of the United States petitioning Congress for a resurvey of the present old-age and survivors insurance system with a view to expanding coverage and increasing the benefit structure thereof

"Whereas after 8 years' operation the old-age and survivors insurance program, managed by the Social Security Board, grants to workers retired at the age of 65 years, average allowances of $25 per month; and

"Whereas any benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance program are limited to those retired persons who have had past employment in only certain industries; and

"Whereas cash reserves for old-age and survivors insurance now amount to $5,000,000,000, and $5 is now being collected from workers and their employers for each dollar paid in benefits to retired workers or their survivors: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Twenty-ninth Legislative Session of the State of Montana (the senate and house of representatives concurring)*, That we respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to cause to be made a resurvey of the present old-age and survivors insurance program, and the entire taxation structure applicable thereto, with a view to expanding coverage to include workers not presently covered; to increasing benefits to provide reasonable security to workers in their old age and extending coverage on a voluntary basis, for a minimum of protection, to the self-employed and local public employees willing to pay both employer and employee contributions, to join the system, meeting where desired all payments for past years to obtain greater protection; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives be directed to mail copies of this resolution to the Honorable BURTON K. WHEELER, Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, Senators from Montana; the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Representative in Congress; the Honorable President of the United States Senate and the Honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States; and to John J. Altmeyer, Chairman of the Social Security Board in Washington, D. C."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"Whereas the return to standard time will help increase food production and help win the war and mean more daylight working hours for agriculture; and

"Whereas daylight-saving time has proven a burden; and

"Whereas daylight-saving time has failed to save daylight or accomplish its purpose: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the house concurring)*:

"That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to immediately take the necessary steps to return the United States to standard time and abolish daylight-saving time by terminating the War Act of January 20, 1942, chapter 7, 56 Statute 9, said act providing that Congress has power by concurrent resolution to terminate said act.

"That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Iowa Members of the United States Senate and the Iowa Members of the House of Representives of Congress."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 8

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation protecting farm labor as critical in the war effort

"Whereas farm labor has not been placed on the critical list in the war effort; and

"Whereas local draft boards apparently do not have sufficient power to classify physically fit producing farmers between the ages of 18 and 26 as critical in the war effort, and to defer the drafing of men critically essential to the production of the food supply of the Nation and armed forces, but are obliged to meet their draft quotas; and

"Whereas with rationing and shortage of food supplies, it is vitally important that farm production be kept at the maximum, and it is short-sighted to imperil production of crops and livestock: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States is urged by the Michigan Legislature to enact legislation protecting farm labor as critical in the war effort, which action should be taken immediately to forestall a possible emergency, due to the recent ruling of Selec'ive Service; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

"Adopted by the house January 25, 1945.

"Adopted by the senate January 31, 1945."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 2

"To His Excellency, the Honorable President of the United States; and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Forty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in regular session assembled, respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas the post-war military policy and the character, composition, and size of the Military Establishment of the United States is a matter of vital importance to the States and Territories of the Union, as well as to the National Government; and

"Whereas the decisions which will be reached by the Congress in this matter will be predicated upon the powers granted to the Congress under the Militia clauses as well as the Army clauses of the Constitution, and will directly affect the military establishments of the several States, and the relation-

ship of these State forces to the Army of the United States; and

"Whereas many plans and suggestions as to the post-war military policy and the future Military Establishment have been proposed, some of which have already been presented to the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein):*

"That the Congress is respectfully urged to preserve in the post-war military organization insofar as it relates to the civilian components of the Army of the United States, and specifically to the National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves, the basic principles of the policies laid down in the National Defense Act of 1916 as amended, and in cogent acts, especially the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, relating to the status of the National Guard as an integral part of the first line of defense of the Nation.

"The contributions made by National Guard units and the Organized Reserves on the battlefields of World War No. 2 completely justify the wisdom of the Congress in making them a first-line component of the Army of the United States, and amply warrants their retention in that capacity; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we fully subscribe to and endorse the position taken by the Secretary of War, as to the future status of the National Guard, as announced on November 23, 1944, in which he states:

"'It would be the mission of this reserve component (the National Guard), in the event of a national emergency, to furnish units fit for service anywhere in the world.

"'This conception of the mission of the National Guard of the United States would interfere in no way with the traditional mission of the National Guard of the States and Territories to provide sufficient organizations in each State, Territory, and the District of Columbia, so trained and equipped as to enable them to function efficiently at existing strength in the protection of life and property and the preservation of peace, order, and public safety, under competent orders of the State authorities.

"'National Guard units have played a vital role in the mobilization of our present Army and they have made a brilliant record on every fighting front. We are counting on them as a bulwark of our future national security.'

"We also approve and endorse the statement of Gen. George Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, set forth in War Department Circular No. 347, August 25, 1944, to the effect that the post-war Military Establishment should consist of a professional peacetime army (no larger than necessary to meet normal peacetime requirements) to be reinforced in time of emergency by organized units drawn from the civilian components of the Army of the United States; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we advocate in the event that a system of universal military training be included in the post-war plan for the Military Establishment, that such training be integrated with the civilian components of the Army and specifically the National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That in the discussion of the post-war military policy and the form of the Military Establishment, the fullest opportunity, consistent with existing conditions, be accorded the officers and men of all components of the Army, who are or who have been serving with the armed forces in time of war, to express their views on this most important matter to the end that this Nation will adopt a sound military policy consistent with our traditions and which will afford the utmost security to the Nation."

A letter from Mrs. Maude M. Halley, R. N., stationed at the hospital, Camp Roberts, Calif., relating to her son, Corp. Richard Edward Halley, a wounded veteran who has served in three campaigns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREEN:

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Joint resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to give particular consideration to the pressing situation with relation to the plight of Rhode Island farmers

"Whereas although our Rhode Island farms are smaller in acreage than those of other parts of the country, still farming on a Rhode Island 50-acre farm is intensive and in some instances is equivalent to farming upon a 250-acre or larger farm in many other localities; and

"Whereas in recent years farmers have so modernized their techniques and mechanized their equipment that it is the younger man on the farm who has practically taken over because of the use of tractors, trucks, mechanical spreaders, sprayers, milking machines, refrigeration, deep-well pumping, and pertinent other farm equipment; and

"Whereas the older folks on these farms know farming by the horse and lumber-wagon method and they do not understand the operation and care of the present-day farm equipment; and

"Whereas our young farmers are being drafted to such an extent that our farmers are selling out or discontinuing operations at a time when food production is the backbone of all fronts; and

"Whereas General Hershey's interpretation of the Tydings amendment, so very disconcerting to the farmer, and the unsympathetic attitude of some of our local draft boards are causing a very unhappy and unnecessary situation which is leading to the end of many of our farm projects: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States are urgently requested to give consideration to the present plight of our Rhode Island farmers and their earnest need of immediate assistance; and the secretary of state is hereby authorized to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution."

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"Enrolled House Concurrent Resolution 17

"House concurrent resolution memorializing the Federal Government and its Veterans' Rehabilitation Administration to avail itself of the efficacy of mineral waters, known by the trade name of Radium Water, in the city of Claremore, Okla., in the treatment of our returning soldiers of this World War No. 2 who are returning as casualties of the conflict and who require hospitalization and treatment for wounds and nervous disorders

"*Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma (the Senate concurring therein)*, That:

"Whereas our returning soldiers from the present conflict in World War No. 2 brings to us a great number of casualties and a great number of men who are suffering from wounds of various and sundry kinds received in the service, and an enormous number suffering from nervous disorders on account of such service; and

"Whereas there is in the city of Claremore, Okla., a certain mineral water, the efficacy of which has been proven for nervous disorders and for the treatment of various and sundry disorders caused by long service and wounds received as a result thereof; and

"Whereas it has been established beyond the peradventure of a doubt that the use of such waters, together with such treatments as hydrotherapy and physiotherapy, would go far toward rehabilitating these men from the conditions which they have present; and

"Whereas the efficacy of such in such cases has gone beyond the speculative or experimental stages and are recognized by the leaders of the medical profession and are known to be a wonderful relief for such; and

"Whereas the said water at the said city of Claremore flows in abundance and would be available for such purposes; and

"Whereas the Federal Government already has located at the city of Claremore a fine hospital under Government control and supervision, known as the United States Indian Hospital, and around and near which is an abundance of room for many other units for the hospitalization of returned soldiers; and

"Whereas the city of Claremore is located at the intersection of two main trunk-line railroads, the Missouri-Pacific leading from Kansas City, Mo., to Little Rock, Ark., and the St. Louis & San Francisco leading from St. Louis, Mo., to Oklahoma City, Okla., and Texas, and located on the main street of America, U. S. Highway No. 66, and is easily accessible to all sections of the country: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma (the Senate concurring therein)*, That the Federal Government and its agencies having charge of such be and they are hereby memorialized to use such waters and their kindred treatments at the city of Claremore within the State of Oklahoma, and to erect and maintain suitable quarters for such purposes adjacent to the said city as will enable the use of such waters for such purposes; be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Veterans' Rehabilitation Administration of the Federal Government, to the War and Navy Departments of the United States, and a certified copy to each of the United States Senators and Congressmen of the State of Oklahoma at the Capitol of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Enrolled House Concurrent Resolution 4

"Resolution commending the policies and activities of President Roosevelt, as Commander in Chief, the General Staff, and the Congress of the United States, in the conduct of the war

"Whereas under section 2 of article 2 of the Federal Constitution, the President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy; and

"Whereas for more than 3 years Franklin Delano Roosevelt, in his capacity as Commander in Chief, has diligently and efficiently performed valuable services to the United States of America and to the Allied Nations in the prosecution of the war; and

"Whereas the General Staff of the military has, by the application of skillful strategy and noble leadership, performed like services under the command of their Chief; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, by introducing and supporting beneficial war legislation, has made a great contribution to the success of the Allies in the winning of the war against the Axis Powers: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, the honorable Senate concurring herein, do commend the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, the General Staff, and the Congress of the United States, for their part in bringing to a speedy end the aggression of Axis nations; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma hereby urge the Congress of the United States to devote a portion of their time to consideration of world peace plans, to the end that the work of the Commander in Chief, the General Staff, and itself will not be for naught; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the house of representatives to the President of the United States, to each member of the General Staff, and to each of the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Oklahoma.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 5th day of January 1945."

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred resolutions adopted at the forty-eighth annual convention of the American National Livestock Association held at Denver, Colo., on January 13, 1945.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American National Live Stock Association, meeting in Denver, Colo., January 11, 12, and 13, 1945, for its forty-eighth annual convention, representing members from 18 Western States and over 125 affiliated regional, State, and local associations, hereby adopts the resolutions that follow:

"For the fourth successive year we meet in annual convention at a time when our country is engaged in an all-out global war. The duration of the conflict is uncertain but of ultimate victory we are confident.

"In spite of the many difficulties under which our members have labored, they have responded by sending to slaughter during the past year approximately 34,000,000 head of cattle, an all-time record.

"We renew our pledge to continue our utmost efforts to supply our armed forces and our civilian population with that essential food commodity—beef.

"SUBSIDIES

"The initiation and growth of the meat subsidy program constitutes a grave threat to the livestock producer and feeder.

"We urge that at the earliest opportunity the beef ceilings be established on a basis commensurate with the prices which feeders and producers will receive January 29, 1945, under the amended Vinson cattle-stabilization order.

"CEILING ON LIVE CATTLE

"Whereas the revised Vinson cattle-stabilization order just issued for the first time establishes a ceiling on live cattle; and

"Whereas there is grave danger that this policy, once established, will be extended and will bring more confusion into livestock trading circles: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we strongly urge the removal of the ceiling and we also protest against the announced policy of rolling the price back on July 2, 1945.

"CONTROL OF MEAT AND MEAT PRICES

"Whereas the control of meat and meat prices is now in charge of two or more bureaus of government; and

"Whereas this duplication of control is confusing and harmful to the industry: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge upon the Congress that it put such control as is necessary in one agency only and that this agency be headed by someone who has a first-hand knowledge of range and farm problems.

"MANPOWER SHORTAGE

"Whereas the farmers and ranchmen have already lost to armed forces much of their skilled labor; and

"Whereas they are now threatened by further inroads by the draft of farm and ranch labor, apparently regardless of the Tydings amendment: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge upon the Congress that it eliminate so far as possible all agencies of government not necessary to the prosecution of the war and the barest essentials of government. Among those unnecessary we mention the proposed farm census and the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. These we know we can do without. We further urge that the War and Navy Department heads take notice of Congressman SABATH'S suggestion that they reduce the personnel of their own Departments by the discharge of unnecessary employees. We submit to the draft officials that there are no substitutes available for this ranch and farm labor and that if further inroads are made on the available supply it will result in decreased production.

"PACKINGHOUSE LABOR

"Whereas more than a year ago we urged upon various responsible Federal agencies the necessity for additional skilled manpower for service in the slaughtering and meat-packing plants which had been and now are operating considerably below the capacity of their facilities; and

"Whereas during the 1944 fall marketing season just past, slaughterers at times were unable promptly to process the cattle offered them for slaughter by producers and feeders: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we request the War Food Administration, the War Manpower Commission, and the Secretary of War to cooperate in giving the meat industry a higher labor priority and to take such additional steps as may be necessary to alleviate the condition described and to insure that henceforth sufficient manpower be available to slaughter all livestock available for that purpose up to the capacity of plant facilities."

"RESPONSIBILITY OF ORGANIZED LABOR

"Whereas some undemocratic practices have developed among certain groups and leaders of organized labor that are detrimental to the public good: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That it would serve the best interests of agriculture and industry, the rank and file of the labor unions themselves, and be for the public good to study, in conjunction with some groups of labor, ways and means of passing laws that would remedy the evil effects of those practices and require labor to assume responsibility commensurate with the privileges granted it in the last few years."

"TARIFF ADJUSTMENTS

"Whereas post-war rehabilitation of war-torn nations will greatly encourage the international exchange of goods, and the United States will be required to take an active part in rebuilding much of the world's economy; and

"Whereas bankrupt nations can only trade on an exchange of goods, and imports to the United States may, therefore, work to the disadvantage of American producers; and

"Whereas the high standards of living in the United States cannot be maintained in competition with the lower standards in some other countries, unless a protective tariff is maintained; and

"Whereas such a tariff is not a subsidy; it simply requires foreign importers to balance their low cost imports to our domestic costs: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we recommend that protective tariffs be maintained fully to protect our domestic American economy."

"SANITARY EMBARGO

"Whereas economic and political conditions in the post-war period may be conducive to renewed attempts to secure modification of this country's sanitary embargo which prohibits the importation of meats and meat products into this country from foreign countries wherein foot-and-mouth disease is known to exist; and

"Whereas the embargo does not discriminate against any country but simply operates to protect the American livestock industry and the public from the ruinous effects of foot-and-mouth disease outbreaks such as have occurred here in the past and frequently occur in those countries such as England which must import their meat supplies from infected countries: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we urge the continued vigilance and efforts of Congress and all responsible Federal officials to maintain the sanitary embargo in its present form."

"ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

"Whereas the American National Live Stock Association wishes to do everything in its power to preserve the freedom of the American people and the inalienable rights of the individual; and

"Whereas we believe that some of these rights have been sacrificed and lost by arbitrary action on the part of various administrative and fact-finding quasi-judicial Federal agencies and bureaus: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That as a means toward the correction of these evils, it is deemed necessary for the Congress of the United States to adopt uniform rules of practice and procedure under which the Government bureaus and agencies shall operate in the future; that the McCarran-Sumner bill introduced in the last Congress is the type of legislation tending to eliminate these abuses, and similar bills are being introduced in the present Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we respectfully urge that Senators and Congressmen use their best efforts to secure the early enactment of such legislation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the respective chairmen of the Judiciary Committees of the House of Representatives and of the Senate of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the livestock producing States."

PARTICIPATION OF EX-SERVICEMEN IN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in October 1943 I spoke on the floor of the Senate on behalf of the participation by ex-servicemen at the peace table. Last week this objective was well on its way to realization with the appointment of Commander Harold Stassen to be a member of the American delegation at the United Nations Conference at San Francisco.

Now, I urge again, as I did in 1943, that this principle of servicemen's participation be carried to its logical end. That logical end is that the men of the ranks—the enlisted men and noncommissioned officers—also have appropriate representation in the international meetings to come.

I do not urge this exclusively because of an emotional sentiment for the men of the ranks who have borne the brunt of the bleeding, the sweating, and the suffering from wounds. There are many realistic reasons for my proposal:

First. Within the lower ranks are some of America's finest brains, many men who have refused commissions and pro-

motions in order to be able to meet the foe at the closest possible hand.

Second. Since some 15,000,000 men and women will probably pass through the armed services before the end of hostilities, no peace settlement may be expected to satisfy them fully unless they have had a fair share in its preparation.

The enlisted men and noncommissioned officers, of course, overwhelmingly outnumber the men in the higher ranks, for example, in the Army, by a ratio of 10 to 1. Therefore just as an equitable ratio should be aimed at among the delegates between men and women who were civilians and men and women who were in the services during the war, so an equitable ratio should be aimed at between men and women who were in the lower ranks and those who were officers.

I do not, of course, mean to imply that we can choose our delegations with a slide rule, allotting representatives exactly in accordance with some mathematical formula. I do, however, ask that we bear in mind the principle of approximately proportionate representation and then strive to realize it in practice by choosing persons of ability from the various groups.

Third. In the years to come, the men of the ranks will rise to very high positions in civilian life, just as they did after the last war. Why cannot they make their contribution while they are still young? If they were to be allowed to do so, not only the principle of veterans' representation would be served but the principle of youth's representation.

Fourth. The selection of men from the ranks would go a long way to prevent a military caste spirit from pervading America after the war. It would serve notice that when a buck private, a corporal, a sergeant, or a lieutenant doffs his uniform, he must be considered fairly on his own ability alongside the men who wore gold braid. This notice would be in full keeping with American traditions of equality before the law and in public policy.

Fifth. Were the ex-servicemen to be selected, they would undoubtedly perform their duties with the same dispatch and directness which they displayed during the war. If in all the United Nations, the men who learned how to attain an objective in military combat could displace some of the old-line diplomats who have gone about their trade with slowness, indirectness, and false-facedness, America as well as the world would benefit greatly.

We want our ex-servicemen to receive the fullest responsibility in peace arrangements, and not merely to act as technical advisers.

We want them to write the peace in fact as well as in the fancy of editorial writers and song writers.

During the delivery of Mr. WILEY's remarks, the following occurred:

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin is out of order unless he obtains unanimous consent to make a speech in the morning hour.

Mr. WILEY. I ask unanimous consent to read for just 30 seconds longer. Under the rule, I could speak for 5 minutes, I understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. As a matter of fact, under the rule, a Senator cannot speak at all in the morning hour. No speeches of any length are in order in the morning hour. Senators sometimes proceed to speak by unanimous consent, but under the strict interpretation of the rule, no Senator can make a speech of 1 second in the morning hour.

Mr. WILEY. That is very interesting. I have heard the distinguished majority leader make what he called a speech for a lengthy period in the morning hour, and I have heard other Senators do the same. But regardless of that, I ask unanimous consent to conclude my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall not object, if it will take no longer than 5 minutes.

Mr. WILEY. It will take no more than 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may proceed, there being no objection.

(Mr. WILEY resumed and concluded his remarks.)

Mr. WILEY. Now, Mr. President, let me say that I recognize that the Presiding Officer was within his prerogative, but life itself is made up of exceptions, and the exceptions here on the floor of the Senate are so numerous that they make the rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is customary, in the morning hour, for a Senator to ask unanimous consent if he desires to speak for longer than 1 minute, and as the Senator from Wisconsin did not ask for unanimous consent, the Chair merely called him to order.

Mr. WILEY. I have no criticism of the rule.

ANNIE MADEOY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to report four resolutions for immediate consideration. The first is Senate Resolution 81, which, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, and which I ask to have read and considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 81) submitted by Mr. BILBO on February 19 instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the financial clerk of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Annie Madeoy, widow of Jack Madeoy, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE. I understand the four resolutions have been submitted to the minority members of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and that the request made by the Senator from Arizona is agreeable to them. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. HAYDEN. I believe so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION AND THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. HAYDEN. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, with amendments, Senate resolution 35, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution was submitted by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for the Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER] and at the request of the Florida Legislature, on January 18, 1945. I have inquired of the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and find that the legislature will meet on the 2d day of April. So, instead of allowing the investigation to continue through the entire Congress, the committee recommends that it be limited to the 2d day of April, and that the amount be reduced from $5,000 to $1,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that puts this resolution in the status of all the other resolutions similarly considered by the Senate, that at the end of the time specified those concerned will have to come before the Senate and ask for an appropriation if it is desired that the time be extended.

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution is even more drastic than the resolutions previously adopted of a similar nature.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated.

The amendments were, on page 2, line 2, after the word "practicable", to insert "and not later than April 2, 1945"; in line 8, after the name "Congress", to strike out "of the United States" and insert "until April 2, 1945"; and, in line 17, to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,000"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the activities of the Securities and Exchange Commission and Post Office Department, or any representative thereof, with a view of determining whether (a) the activities of said agencies, through their representatives, are crippling, hampering, or rendering ineffective the Municipal Bankruptcy Act, as amended, heretofore enacted by Congress; and (b) whether or not the activities of said agencies, through their representatives, are unfairly resulting in undermining the credit of the taxing units of the State of Florida.

The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable and not later than April 2, 1945, the result of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress until April 2, 1945, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses

and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, and make such investigations, to administer such oaths, to take such such testimony, and to incur such expenditures as it deems advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government. The expense of the Committee, which shall not exceed $1,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF AIRPLANE CRASHES

Mr. HAYDEN. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report favorably, with amendments, Senate Resolution 61, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported by Mr. BAILEY from the Committee on Commerce on January 29, 1945.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the same question concerning this resolution. The resolution would permit the committee to function until July of this year, at which time, if the committee wishes to continue, it will have to come to the Senate and ask for an appropriation.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate believe the resolution is a proper one. The investigation has been conducted for 4 years, but the committee has not made a report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be stated.

The amendments were, in line 6, after the word "to", to strike out "the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress" and insert "June 30, 1945"; in line 8, after the word "by", to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$2,000"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "In addition to authority conferred in such resolutions, the committee is authorized to investigate all airplane crashes in air commerce."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. As a member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I am interested in the resolution, since it asks for Senate funds, an also because the work in question represents an accumulation from investigations held for 3 or 4 years, which now apparently are to be wound up. The point I make is that every now and then the world, as well as this Nation, is jarred by the wrecking of a great airplane with the loss of 17 or 21 persons who are hurled to their death. Then we read in the newspapers the report that some investigation is being made by the C. A. B. or the C. A. A., and that is all we hear about the matter. We hear of no results of the investigation, and no report is made. And such accidents continue. I hope that as a result of the report proposed to be made by the committee the American people may have some understanding of what is happening to cause these accidents.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I should like to respond to that statement. The Subcommittee on Safety in the Air is authorized by statute, and was appointed under the Committee on Commerce. That subcommittee has been active for 4 years and has conducted investigations. The time provided for the investigation by the subcommittee expired the first of this month. There has been a great deal of matter accumulated by the committee. There have been many hearings. I think every airplane wreck has been investigated, but I do not think there has been anything definitive found out.

Mr. TOBEY. I did not quite catch that statement, Mr. President.

Mr. BAILEY. I said I do not think there has been anything of a definitive character ascertained. It is my judgment that the matter of investigating airplane wrecks is an executive rather than a legislative function.

Mr. TOBEY. I quite agree with the Senator, but as such the executive end never responds to the extent of advising the public anything respecting the causes of the wrecks.

Mr. BAILEY. I will say to the Senator that the Civil Aeronautics Administrator and the Civil Aeronautics Board have not only provided safety standards but have had investigations of every wreck carefully conducted by scientific men, and a full record is made. The difficulty is to determine just what causes wrecks in the air. Very frequently no one knows. Right now in the Army Transport Service wrecks occur and they are so complete that there is no trace of them. It is my judgment, and I express it to the Senate, that the investigation of airplane wrecks, except insofar as it is intended to develop legislation, is an executive or administrative function, and for that reason I suggested to the committee which has just reported that I thought the subcommittee which is operating as a committee on safety in the air should pass out of existence, and that only sufficient time and expense money be allowed to wind the thing up and really make a report. I intend to do that between now and the end of the year. I do not intend to press for any further extension of the life of the committee.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator. In going over the matter with the Senator from Arizona, I concurred in the disposition of the resolution. However, the public at large hears about these extremely sad accidents, and then hears nothing further about them. It seems to me that something should be done to give a feeling of security and reassurance to the people.

Mr. BAILEY. I assure the Senator that if he will make a request directly to the department, I will procure for him all the information that is available concerning any wreck occurring in the operations of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BAILEY. The amount involved in this instance is about $2,500, is it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is $2,000.

Mr. BAILEY. We shall be content to finish the work of the committee with that amount.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 61) as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority conferred by Senate Resolution 307, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to October 9, 1940; Senate Resolution 119, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to June 28, 1941; and Senate Resolution 60, Seventy-eighth Congress, agreed to February 4, 1943 (providing for an investigation of airplane crashes), is hereby continued from February 1, 1945, to June 30, 1945; and the limit of expenditures thereunder is hereby increased by $2,000.

PRODUCTION AND PURCHASE OF GOLD AND SILVER IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without additional amendment, Senate Resolution 20, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma on January 6, 1945, which had been previously reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "amended", to insert "and extended"; and in line 5, after the numerals "1942", to insert "and Senate Resolution 20, agreed to January 28, 1943", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 187, agreed to August 16, 1935, as amended by motion on January 16, 1939, increasing the membership of the committee to nine Senators instead of five, and as further amended and extended by Senate Resolution 261, agreed to June 29, 1942, and Senate Resolution 20, agreed to January 28, 1943, authorizing a special committee of nine Senators to confer with the Secretary of the Treasury relative to the administration, and the economic and commercial effect in the United States and abroad, of the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1178), and to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the production, or the lack of production, of gold and silver in the United States and its Territories, hereby is continued in full force and effect during the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The amendments of the Committee on Banking and Currency were agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this committee has been in existence for some time. It is very similar to the wool committee. It is a sort of liaison between those interested in the silver question and the Secretary of the Treasury. Expenditures of the committee have never amounted to more than $1,000 a year.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I was about to ask the number of personnel connected with the committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. I believe it has no personnel at the moment.

Mr. TOBEY. It is an intangible asset to the friends of silver in the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. As I understand, there is about $1,800 unexpended.

Mr. TOBEY. The committee is not very articulate, is it, except at certain times?

Mr. HAYDEN. Only at certain times.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 20) as amended was agreed to.

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES — CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a report and a statement of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. BYRD

I wish to present a report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the period November 1, 1944, through January 31, 1945.

The total number of paid employees for January 1945 is 3,045,710, excluding 327,000 employees of the War Department outside of continental United States as of September 30, 1944. The grand total for the month is 3,372,710.

The number of paid employees for January 1945 outside continental United States as reported by various departments and agencies is 126,018. This figure added to the 327,000 employees reported by the War Department gives a grand total of 453,018 outside continental United States.

Thirty-two departments and agencies have increased 23,689 between November 1, 1944, and January 31, 1945, while 31 departments and agencies have eliminated only 12,631 employees, making a net increase of 11,058 for the period.

Substantial increases were made by the following: Navy Department, 14,552; Post Office Department, 2,432; Treasury Department, 1,955; and Veterans' Administration, 1,235.

Greatest reductions were made by the following: Tennessee Valley Authority, 3,063; Agriculture Department, 1,761; War Department, 1,363; and Selective Service, 1,097.

It appears from the record that the drive to increase Federal employment has commenced once again. In December 1944, there were 3,016,010 Federal employees and on January 31, 1945, there were 3,045,710 employees. Both figures are exclusive of the War Department civilian employees outside the continental United States.

During the next few months the appropriation bills for all of these departments and agencies will be presented for the consideration of the Congress. The amount necessary for personnel on the present basis is approximately $7,000,000,000 a year. I call attention to the imperative necessity for a careful scrutinization, by all Members, of the requests of funds for personal services. I have complete confidence in the conscientiousness of the Appropriation Committees of both Houses and know that they will require complete explanation for the need of the millions of workers, and make cuts wherever possible, but I feel I must give warning that justifications for personal services need a very thorough study since it appears to be habitual with the agencies and departments to inflate requirements for personal services, which have resulted in the overmanning. I daresay, of practically every agency in the executive branch.

In October there was a slight decrease in the number of Federal personnel and I pointed out at the time that credit should not be taken until it was determined that there would be a steady decline in employment. My reason was that it has been our experience in the past that after a few months the pay rolls would begin to swell once again. The records now seem to bear out that contention.

Despite the fact that this committee has made repeated requests to reduce Federal personnel by 300,000 the January total represents an increase of 67,481 over the same period last year. An examination of the records discloses that, notwithstanding the many calls for reduction of nonessential expenditures during wartime and a reduction of personnel, a list of the agencies not directly connected with the war show a net reduction of only 7,096 over a period of a year (January 31, 1944–January 31, 1945).

If the committee's recommendation to reduce Federal personnel by 300,000 were followed it would release sufficient manpower to produce over 126 B–29 Fortresses every 24 hours or more than 39,410 of those planes in a year.

Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government by departments and agencies for the months of November and December 1944, and January 1945 showing the increases and decreases in number of paid employees

Department or agency	November 1944	December 1944	January 1945	Increase	Decrease
Executive Office of the President: Bureau of the Budget	578	578	589	11	
Departments:					
Agriculture Department	78,385	77,349	76,624		1,761
Commerce Department	28,730	30,214	29,283	553	
Interior Department	42,070	40,815	41,386		684
Justice Department	28,662	28,390	27,895		767
Labor Department	6,442	6,036	6,518	76	
Navy Department	754,079	751,055	768,631	14,552	
Post Office Department [1]	370,974	373,538	373,406	2,432	
State Department	9,417	9,491	9,674	257	
Treasury Department	94,100	94,871	96,055	1,955	
War Department [2]	1,210,320	1,196,534	1,208,957		1,363
National War Agencies:					
Committee on Fair Employment Practice	132	132	133	1	
Division of Central Administrative Services [3 4]	174				174
Foreign Economic Administration	6,016	5,984	6,254	238	
National War Labor Board	3,763	3,572	3,464		299
Office of Alien Property Custodian	834	801	793		41
Office of Censorship	10,069	9,879	9,692		377
Office of Civilian Defense	148	134	129		19
Office of Contract Settlements	45	45	49	4	
Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs	1,339	1,318	1,329		10
Office of Defense Transportation	3,828	3,620	3,586		242
Office of Economic Stabilization	12	12	12		
Office of Price Administration	61,645	61,592	61,643		2
Office of Scientific Research and Development	1,385	1,368	1,386	1	
Office of Strategic Services	2,525	2,648	2,635	110	
Office of War Information	10,008	10,028	9,625		383
Office of War Mobilization	74	100	126	52	
Petroleum Administration for War	1,106	1,068	1,024		82
Selective Service	20,823	20,245	19,726		1,097
Smaller War Plants Corporation	1,852	1,885	1,872	20	
War Manpower Commission	27,266	27,185	27,798	532	
War Production Board	13,645	13,196	12,822		823
War Shipping Administration	5,058	5,155	5,184	126	
Independent agencies:					
American Battle Monuments Commission	1	1	1		
Civil Aeronautics Board	362	358	348		14
Civil Service Commission	7,071	7,054	7,285	214	
Employees' Compensation Commission	511	519	521	10	
Export-Import Bank of Washington	58	56	59	1	
Federal Communications Commission	1,552	1,532	1,574	22	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,595	1,569	1,569		26
Federal Power Commission	660	661	667	7	
Federal Security Agency	31,011	30,823	30,976		35
Federal Trade Commission	433	436	443	10	
Federal Works Agency	21,112	21,029	21,032		80
General Accounting Office	12,702	12,770	12,972	270	
Government Printing Office	7,130	7,118	7,076		54
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,047	2,043	2,017		30
Maritime Commission	11,220	11,277	11,372	152	
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	6,638	6,572	6,578		60
National Archives	357	355	349		8

[1] Increase of personnel due principally to seasonal part-time workers, clerks, and carriers, working on an average of from1 to 3 hours daily.
[2] Does not include employees stationed outside the continental United States.
[3] In the process of liquidation.
[4] 101 employees transferred to Bureau of Accounts, Liquidating Division, of the Treasury Department, effective Dec. 1, 1944.

Civilian employment of the executive branch of the Federal Government by departments and agencies for the months of November and December 1944, and January 1945 showing the increases and decreases in number of paid employees—Continued

Department or agency	November 1944	December 1944	January 1945	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued.					
National Capital Housing Authority	223	228	220		3
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	25	21	22		3
National Gallery of Art	250	254	247		3
National Housing Agency	17,200	16,838	16,571		629
National Labor Relations Board	792	775	834	42	
National Mediation Board	93	97	107	14	
Panama Canal	29,416	29,429	28,918		498
Railroad Retirement Board	1,852	1,813	1,879	57	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	9,431	9,792	10,106	675	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,141	1,148	1,148	7	
Smithsonian Institute	426	426	428	2	
Tariff Commission	295	294	296	1	
Tax Court of the United States	122	122	121		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	17,396	15,613	14,333		3,063
Veterans' Administration	56,046	56,149	57,331	1,285	
Total	3,034,652	3,016,010	3,045,710	23,689	12,631
Net increase				11,058	
War Department employees stationed outside the continental United States [6 7]	262,281	262,281	[7] 327,000		
Grand total	3,296,933	3,278,291	3,372,710		

[5] Includes employees outside continental United States, reported by various departments and agencies; totals, November 1944, 115,697; December 1944, 124,685; and January 1945, 126,018, excluding the War Department employees.
[6] Reported quarterly as of June 30, 1944.
[7] Reported quarterly as of Sept. 30, 1944.

NOTE.—Employment figures now reported to the committee include dollar per annum, terminal leave, and without-compensation employees of the consultant expert type who are authorized to receive per diem in lieu of subsistence.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 612. A bill to amend the National Defense Act, as amended, so as to limit the application of provisions for retirement of wing commanders of the Air Corps; and

S. 613. A bill to provide for enlistments in the Regular Army during the period of the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON:

S. 614. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to cause to continue to completion the collecting, editing, and publishing of the official papers relating to the Territories of the United States; to the Committee on Printing.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY introduced Senate bill 615, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 616. A bill for the relief of Harry W. Robertson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 617. A bill authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I introduce a bill relating to the deductibility under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of expenses paid or incurred in determining Federal income-tax liability, and ask that it be appropriately referred. I may say that a similar bill is being introduced in the House of Representatives today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from West Virginia will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 618. A bill relating to the deductibility under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of expenses paid or incurred in determining Federal income-tax liability; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. GEORGE (for himself, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. HILL, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. ELLENDER) introduced Senate bill 619, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 620. A bill for the relief of the widow of Joseph C. Akin; and

S. 621. A bill for the relief of William W. McGregor, Perry Shilton, Louie Hess, Jack Wade, and Owen Busch; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 622. A bill for the relief of Margaret Barnes Shank; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 623. A bill to prohibit the paid advertising of alcoholic beverages by radio in certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

S. 624. A bill granting a pension to Amelia Esser; and

S. 625. A bill granting an increase of pension to Harvey L. Frame; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 626. A bill for the relief of William D. Warren;

S. 627. A bill computing retirement pay for certain disabled officers or warrant officers in the Army of the United States; and

S. 628. A bill relating to retirement pay for certain officers or warrant officers in the Regular Army and in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Idaho:

S. 629. A bill for the relief of Julian Uriarte; and

S. 630. A bill for the relief of Antonio Arguinzonis; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 631. A bill granting a pension to Mabel E. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 632. A bill to eliminate the practice by subcontractors, under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable contracts of the United States, of paying fees or kick-backs, or of granting gifts or gratuities to employees of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost reimbursable prime contractors or of higher tier subcontractors for the purpose of securing the award of subcontracts or orders; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 633. A bill to amend the Criminal Code so as to punish anyone injuring a party, witness, or juror on account of his having acted as such; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN (by request):

S. 634. A bill to require a witness seeking immunity from prosecution under certain acts to claim his privilege against self-incrimination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 635. A bill to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 636. A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act to prohibit financial transactions with any foreign government in default on its obligations to the United States," approved April 13, 1934; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(Mr. ELLENDER introduced Senate bill 637, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 638. A bill to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia by adding a new section 548a, and providing for the recording of veterans' discharge certificates; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution memorializing the name of Horace Wells; to the Committee on the Library.

AMENDMENT OF CLAYTON ACT TO PROTECT LITTLE BUSINESS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing law against unlawful restraint and monopolies and for other purposes," approved October 13, 1914, as amended, and I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask uanimous consent that I may say a word in explanation of the bill I have introduced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, over a long period of years many people have been talking about protecting little business but precious little has been done about it. The measure which I have in-

troduced today, and which is also being introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, proposes to do something tangible for little business by amending the Clayton Act, which was enacted in 1914 for the purpose of preventing monopolistic mergers. In simple language that law of 30 years ago prohibited combinations of corporations that were in substantial competition by prohibiting one corporation to purchase the capital stock of another corporation if the merger substantially eliminated competition.

The law has been more honored in the breach than in the observance, because it was found very easy to avoid the prohibition by purchasing the assets instead of the stock of competing corporations.

The Federal Trade Commission has recommended legislation of this character. The Temporary National Economic Committee, which studied this problem along with others, in its final report in March 1941 also recommended the amendment of the Clayton Act in the manner and form which is embodied in the bill introduced by me today. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the recommendation of the T. N. E. C. with respect to this proposed legislation may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the recommendation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The committee has given serious consideration to the problem of corporate mergers and consolidations, this process being recognized as one which has for years hastened the growth of the concentration of economic power and has contributed in major part toward the elimination of competition. Section 7 of the Clayton Act forbids the acquisition of stock in competing companies where the effect is or may be to lessen competition. That law has fallen far short of gaining its objective, in part because the law does not prohibit the acquisition of assets of competing corporations, thus affording a convenient way of circumventing the obvious intention of the law. The committee, in its preliminary report, recommended that section 7 of the Clayton Act be amended so as to include within its prohibitions the acquisition of assets of competitors under conditions applicable to stock under the existing law.

The committee again urged the enactment of such a law, but feels that additional legislation is indicated, its purpose being to halt the merger process in its inception, rather than to continue to attempt to do so through case by case litigation after the event. We propose that the Federal Trade Commission be given authority to be fixed by the Congress to forbid the acquisition of the assets and property of competing corporations of over a certain size unless it be made to appear that the purpose and apparent effect of such consolidation would be desirable. The authority given would, of course, relate to capital assets of competitors and not to inventory or stock in trade.

The standards which the administrative tribunal would be required to apply to each case should follow the general standards inherent in the existing antitrust laws, but should be made as precise and definite as possible.

The bill (S. 615) to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION AND RETRAINING

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I send forward a bill similar to one introduced at the last session of the Congress to provide vocational education and retraining. It is introduced on behalf of myself, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. In connection with the bill I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD a brief analysis.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 619) to provide vocational education and retraining including part-time training and work experience programs for the occupational adjustment and readjustment of youth and adults, including persons demobilized from essential war work or from the armed services, in order that individuals and the Nation may attain economic stability and security, introduced by Mr. GEORGE (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. ELLENDER), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The analysis presented by Mr. GEORGE in connection with the bill is as follows:

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED VOCATIONAL EDUCATION BILL

(Sponsor, Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia; cosponsors, Senators HILL, of Alabama, THOMAS, of Utah, LA FOLLETTE, of Wisconsin, AIKEN, of Vermont, ELLENDER, of Louisiana)

CHIEF OBJECTIVES OF BILL

To provide vocational education and retraining including part-time training and work experience programs for the occupational adjustment and readjustment of youth and adults, including persons demobilized from essential war work or from the armed services, in order that individuals and the Nation may attain economic stability and security.

1. Hundreds of thousands of demobilized war production workers will need vocational retraining to prepare them for civilian pursuits. In addition there will be many other thousands of dislocated workers needing this occupational adjustment program.

2. The public vocational schools will be called upon to vocationally train large numbers of veterans returning from military service. This bill provides Federal assistance to local communities for whom this would constitute too great a burden to be borne by themselves. The vocational retraining of these veterans is of national significance, in returning military men and women to civilian pursuits. The program provided in this bill will enable the public vocational schools to cooperate with the Veterans' Administration in this program.

3. With the return to civilian pursuits of veterans and war production workers, youth will find it more difficult to secure jobs and the entrance age for youth into employment will rise. To provide a stabilizing influence for youth as a preventative of an increase in juvenile delinquency and to assist youth with their occupational adjustment difficulties, the program of the public vocational schools of this country should be very widely extended into a much wider range of occupational training.

ADMINISTRATION OF VOCATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAM

This program will be in the hands of State and local educational authorities and is an extension of the present program of vocational education. It requires no new system of schools and no new administrative units. This bill makes no provision or authorization for any Federal funds for administration. These funds will be administered through the present channels operating the federally aided public vocational schools throughout the country.

A DECENTRALIZED PLAN

Because there are no additional funds authorized for Federal administration in this bill, and because the program will be in the hands of State and local educational authorities, the extension of the program of vocational education under this bill will be a decentralized plan of operation.

MATCHING FEATURES

Federal funds will be unmatched for 2 years. After 2 years 25 percent must be matched with State or local funds or both.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

The bill provides for a continuance of the use of advisory committees of employers and employees to assure sound vocational programs in accordance with occupational needs.

INDUSTRIAL-PLANT TRAINING PROGRAMS

Must be bona fide vocational-training programs and not a device to utilize the services of vocational trainees for private profit.

VOCATIONAL-TRAINING SERVICES AUTHORIZED WITH APPROPRIATION AMOUNTS

1. Area vocation schools: The extension of vocational-training opportunities in this country to both youth and adults must be general enough and broad enough in scope to meet the need. However, the extension should be very carefully planned in accordance with actual needs. The development of adequate area vocational schools will prevent a wild unjustified development in large numbers of communities where the cost of providing the instruction would be excessive. The designation of existing successful vocational schools and the developing of some new ones will be entirely in the hands of State educational authorities.

Appropriation authorized, $24,000,000.

2. Agricultural education: The sum authorized in this bill will permit of the extension of the service in agricultural education to thousands of farming communities not now receiving these services. Thousands of official requests from rural boards of education are already on file with State boards for vocational education awaiting additional funds for the purpose.

Appropriation authorized, $23,000,000.

3. Home economics education: This provides for an extension into communities not now being served, of the training in homemaking, including the conservation of food and other family resources.

Appropriation authorized, $16,000,000.

4. Industrial education: This provides for an extension of the present efficient program in industrial education and permits training for a wider range of occupations now requesting and needing such training. It will make possible vocational training for thousands who will be needed in connection with new developments in industry.

Appropriation authorized, $16,000,000.

5. Occupational information and vocational guidance: Because of the tremendous

numbers changing occupations and because youth must be given more definite job or occupational guidance, this provision for vocational guidance, has been included in the bill.

Appropriation authorized, $4,000,000.

6. Public service training: In response to demands from many groups, the States have already incorporated vocational programs for public-service occupations. The demand for an extension of the program has resulted in the inclusion of this item in the bill.

Appropriation authorized, $2,000,000.

7. Training for distributive occupations: One of the largest occupational groups in this country, and one of the poorest trained groups, is the group engaged in distributive occupations. Numerous large wholesale and retail organizations in this country are repeatedly requesting a development of this group. The public also has come to recognize the necessity for it.

Appropriation authorized, $7,000,000.

8. Advanced vocational business office education: Office managers and employers everywhere are demanding adequate provision for a training program for office personnel responsible for office procedures and efficiency. A small appropriation is authorized in this bill to meet this need.

Appropriation authorized, $5,000,000.

9. Industrial arts education: To stimulate a broad practical program of industrial arts education as a broad basis for specific trade training this bill provides a very small amount of Federal aid as aid to the States in setting up State programs in the field of industrial arts education. No money is provided for distribution to school districts, the appropriation authorized being a small one limited to necessary aid as a stimulation to the development of sound State programs under the direction of State boards for vocational education.

Appropriation authorized, $500,000.

10. Minimum allotments: In order to assure each State of a sufficient minimum appropriation to provide for an extension of the various vocational-training programs authorized in this bill, certain annual minimum appropriations to each State have been authorized, as follows:

(a) Area vocational schools	$90,000
(b) Agricultural education	80,000
(c) Home economics education	80,000
(d) Trade and industrial education	80,000
(e) Occupational information and vocational guidance	20,000
(f) Training for distributive trades	20,000
(g) Advanced vocational business office education	20,000
(h) Public service training	20,000
(i) Industrial arts education	5,000

FEBRUARY 24, 1945.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to submit a unanimous consent request with reference to the bill (H. R. 687) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions. The bill recently passed the House of Representatives and was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

I am authorized by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations to ask unanimous consent that that committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? The Chair hears none, and the Committee on Foreign Relations will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and it will be referred to the Committee on Claims.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSHFIELD, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. REVERCOMB each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT RELATING TO PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF RETIRED OFFICERS OF THE NAVY AND COAST GUARD

Mr. JOHNSON of California submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 473) relating to pay and allowances of officers of the retired list of the Regular Navy and Coast Guard performing active duty in the rank of rear admiral, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

CLARA M. REILLY

Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. LA FOLLETTE) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 85), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the financial clerk of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Clara M. Reilly, widow of James D. Reilly, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

EXPANSION OF THE SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I am glad to submit a resolution and ask that it be printed in the RECORD. This resolution is a recognition of the contribution which is being made by the World's Sunday School Association to bring about a restoration and expansion of the system of Christian education disrupted by the war.

As is stated in the body of the resolution, the World's Sunday School Association is a federation of the national religious education councils of 55 countries.

I am a stanch believer in the Sunday school. I was brought up by a Quaker father and mother. I wish it were possible for every boy and girl not only to have Sunday-school training but also to be a regular attendant at church. The church and Sunday school have done more to establish good citizenship and righteous government in America than any other influence.

The World's Sunday School Association began as a movement for the extension of Sunday schools, and the Sunday schools of the world retain a primary place in the program of all its constituent bodies. But increasingly the concern of all these bodies has broadened to take account of the entire range of factors and agencies involved in Christian religious education.

The stated purpose of the association is "to promote Christian education, including organized Sunday-school work, to encourage the study of the Bible, to assist in the spread of the Christian religion, and to develop Christian character throughout the world." Geographically the association's interest is in the entire world. The association has no standard program to be imposed upon all its constituent agencies. Rather it seeks to aid in developing in each country a program which is indigenous in character.

The resolution (S. Res. 86), submitted by Mr. CAPPER, was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as follows:

Whereas the world council of Christian education (known as the World's Sunday School Association) is a federation of the national religious education councils of 55 countries; and

Whereas the peace after the present war, if it is to be enduring, must rest on proper moral and spiritual foundations, especially in the hearts of children and youth; and

Whereas the World's Sunday School Association is devising means whereby the systems of Christian education which have been disrupted by the war may be restored and expanded and to that end has organized a great meeting to be held on March 18, 1945, in New York City, N. Y., among the sponsors of which is the Vice President of the United States and other distinguished national leaders: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the inculcation of proper moral and spiritual values through Christian education is indispensable to an enduring peace after the present war, and the Senate hereby recognizes the important contribution to this end which is being made by the World's Sunday School Association.

DISPOSAL OF THE GOVERNMENT'S INTEREST IN THE NASHVILLE TENNESSEEAN

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 87), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of the circumstances surrounding the transaction in January 1937 involving the disposal of the Government's interest in the Nashville Tennesseean, a newspaper published in Nashville, Tenn., with particular regard to the part played in such transaction by employees or former employees of the Government, and to report thereon to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, together with its recommendations, including recommendations for necessary legislation in connection with such transactions. If in the course of the investigation facts are disclosed which indicate that the interests of the United States were not properly protected or that any violation of law may have occurred, and the committee is of the opinion that the sale should be set aside or other legal proceedings instituted, it shall transmit its findings to the Attorney General with such recommendations for action as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of this investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable.

The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate Senate Resolution 83, submitted by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], coming over from a previous day. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 541) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, Senate bill 541 was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and my resolution provides for the discharge of that committee from further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Commerce Committee. After conference with the author of the bill, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], it was agreed that the resolution should be called up for consideration on Thursday of this week. The bill pertains to a very important matter. We cannot take up the resolution today by reason of that agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will go over until Thursday next.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to call attention to the fact that we have a special order for Thursday on the Executive Calendar. I do not know how much time it will take, but it might involve a considerable amount of debate.

Mr. BAILEY. We can take up my resolution in the morning hour, and I hope we can dispose of it then. I hope we can dispose of the other matter also on Thursday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well.

AMERICA'S WAR AND PEACE AIMS—TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR PROGRAM

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio program broadcast by the Town Meeting of the Air, entitled "What Should Be America's War and Peace Aims?" participated in by Senator PEPPER, Senator TOBEY, Senator CHAVEZ, and Senator ELLENDER, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DUTY OF AMERICANS TO WIN THE PEACE—ADDRESS BY J. H. BLUNDELL

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by J. H. Blundell, regional information executive of the O. P. A., before the Lions Club of St. Louis, Mo., November 15, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SEND MR. PELL BACK TO LONDON—ARTICLE BY EDGAR ANSEL MOWRER

[Mr. CHANDLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Send Mr. Pell Back to London," written by Edgar Ansel Mowrer and published in the York (Pa.) Gazette and Daily of February 6, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION 1945 PROGRAM

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the National Farmers Union 1945 program, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is concluded.

The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 1752.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I shall not oppose the motion; but is the Senator in a position to indicate whether he proposes to proceed with an explanation of the bill at this time, to be followed by debate on the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I have already told the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] that I would yield to him for the purpose of making a statement on another subject. Following that, if the motion is agreed to, I shall proceed with an explanation of the bill, and then the Senate can proceed in any way it wishes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) every individual is obligated to serve the Nation in that capacity for which he or she is best qualified, and to continue in such capacity so long as his or her services are required, to the end that the Nation may make the most effective use of its manpower resources in support of the war effort.

(b) The purposes of this act are to provide the most practicable and effective means to accomplish the fulfillment of such obligation and to provide for making the most effective use of the manpower resources of the Nation by the following means, among others: (1) By providing for the accurate determination of manpower requirements and supply, and of the relative urgency of the needs of employers for workers; (2) by reducing wasteful labor turn-over and unnecessary labor migration; (3) by channeling available manpower to employments in which workers will contribute most to the war effort; (4) by making available, for work in essential activities, workers presently employed in activities of relative unimportance to the war effort; and (5) by promoting the maximum utilization by employers of their available work force.

SEC. 2. (a) The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, an agency of the Government created pursuant to Executive Order No. 9139, dated April 18, 1942, as amended and supplemented (hereinafter referred to as the "Chairman"), shall perform the functions vested in him by this act under the direction and supervision of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

(b) The Chairman shall provide for the establishment of a national management-labor policy committee, regional management-labor committees, and State or local management-labor committees consisting in each case of representatives of labor, industrial management, and, where appropriate, agriculture, the members of which shall be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923. These committees shall be consulted on basic policy decisions made at their respective administrative levels in the course of the administration of the functions vested in the Chairman by this act.

(c) To the maximum degree consistent with this act and with its purposes, local initiative and cooperative efforts of management, labor, and agriculture shall be encouraged and utilized and use shall be made of existing hiring channels such as private employers, labor organizations, professional organizations, schools, colleges, technical institutions, and Government agencies.

SEC. 3. (a) The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall, subject to the direction of the President, provide for coordinating the activities of all departments and agencies of the Government responsible for production, procurement, or manpower in such manner as to carry out most effectively the purposes declared in the first section of this act. The Director shall provide, among other things, that manpower requirements and the availability of manpower shall be given due consideration in determining where production schedules shall be increased or decreased and where contracts shall be awarded, terminated, or permitted to expire, and that notice shall be given to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission at the earliest practicable time of all changes or anticipated changes in war-production schedules, all awards or anticipated awards of war contracts, and all terminations or anticipated terminations of war contracts, which are likely to result in any substantial increase or decrease of the manpower requirements of any employer or any area. All departments and agencies of the Government shall comply with orders and regulations issued by the Director under authority of this section.

(b) The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall make or cause to be made in-plant surveys and other investigations of the use of manpower by the War Department and the Navy Department, to determine the extent to which such Departments are making the most effective use, in activities relating to production, procurement, or repairs, of individuals in their employ or subject to their jurisdiction as members of the armed forces, and shall take or cause to be taken, appropriate measures to eliminate labor wastage and labor hoarding, and otherwise to promote the full utilization by such Departments of individuals in their employ or subject to their jurisdiction as members of the armed forces, and otherwise to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 4. (a) Except as to the cases covered by subsection (b) of section 3, the Chairman shall provide for such in-plant surveys and other investigations of activities and places of employment, as may be necessary to determine the extent to which such activities or places of employment are making the most effective use of individuals in their

employ, to the end that appropriate measures may be taken to eliminate labor wastage and labor hoarding, to promote full utilization for purposes essential to the war effort, by employers of their available work force, and otherwise to promote the purposes of this act.

(b) To the extent necessary to carry out the purposes and means declared in the first section of this act and also for the purpose of keeping activities and places of employment essential to the war effort in productive operation, the Chairman is authorized and directed, by regulation (1) to prescribe employment ceilings in designated areas, activities, or places of employment fixing the maximum number of workers, by age, sex, or occupational qualifications, who may be there employed and prohibiting the employment of workers beyond such maximum number, and (2) to prohibit or regulate the hiring, rehiring, solicitation, or recruitment of new workers by employers. No employer shall hire or retain in his employ any individual in violation of such regulations.

(c) In the case of any individual who, in response to the request of the Chairman, agrees to accept employment outside the locality where he is then residing, the Chairman, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, may furnish transportation to the location of such employment, and, if such individual complies thereafter with the requests and requirements made under this act with respect to his accepting and continuing in any employment or employments in the same locality until the Chairman determines that he is no longer needed in such locality for work essential to the war effort, may furnish transportation back to the locality from which transportation was originally furnished for such individual under this subsection, or to any other locality selected by the individual which is not farther distant. The cost of such transportation shall not exceed the amounts allowable for individual civilian employees in the executive branch of the Government and shall not include any per diem allowance. The Chairman shall exercise the authority conferred by this subsection only to the extent that he deems the exercise thereof necessary to aid in relieving manpower shortages which substantially impede the war effort.

SEC. 5. The Chairman shall by regulation provide an opportunity for a hearing before an impartial administrative tribunal to any person who claims that any action taken with respect to him under this act, or any regulation or order thereunder, is unreasonable as applied to him or is inconsistent with such act, regulation, or order. Subject to such further administrative review as may be provided in regulations under this section, the determination made after such hearing shall be final. To the extent practicable and appropriate, such regulations shall provide for such hearings to be accorded in local areas and for such hearing tribunals to be so constituted as to permit the ascertainment of the views of persons selected as representatives of management, labor, and agricultural interests in the locality.

SEC. 6. (a) The Chairman shall provide for the issuance of a certificate to any person with respect to whom he finds that such person (1) has been released by his employer from a position (other than a temporary position) pursuant to a request or requirement made under this act and (2) has complied thereafter with the requests and requirements made under this act with respect to his accepting and continuing in any employment or employments until section 4 (b) ceases to be in effect or the Chairman determines that he is no longer needed in work essential to the war effort, whichever first occurs. Any person to whom such a certificate is issued under this subsection shall be entitled to the benefits of section 8 (b) (except the last paragraph thereof and except that in lieu of the 90-day period therein specified, the time within which application for reemployment in his former position must be made shall be 30 days), 8 (c), and 8 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to the same extent as if he had left such position in order to be and had been inducted into the land or naval forces for training and service, had been relieved therefrom on the day on which such certificate is issued to him, and had been given the certificate referred to in section 8 (a) of such act: *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed to confer greater employment rights than the individual would have had if he had remained employed in such position during the period of the employment or employments accepted by him upon the request of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

(b) Section 8 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"If such person, within 90 days after having been relieved from such training and service or from such hospitalization, has become employed in an employment accepted by him at the request of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission under the War Manpower Act of 1945, any period (before section 4 (b) of such act ceases to be in effect) while he is employed in an employment so accepted by him (and any period, not exceeding 15 days between leaving one such employment and entering upon another such employment) shall be disregarded in computing the 90-day period within which application for reemployment in his former position must be made and shall be counted as training and service in the land or naval forces for the purposes of subsection (c)."

SEC. 7. Paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), as amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, shall be applicable with respect to this act to the same extent as such paragraphs are applicable with respect to such subsection (a), except that, for the purposes of this act, the word "President", wherever it occurs in such paragraphs, shall be deemed to refer to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

SEC. 8. No wage or other compensation paid for services rendered in any employment commenced or continued in violation of this act, or of any regulation or order of the Chairman thereunder, shall be allowed or allowable as a deduction from income, or as a cost or expense, for the purpose of computing the tax payable under any act of Congress or for the purpose of determining the amount to be paid to or recovered from any person with respect to the performance of any contract with the United States. The provisions of this section shall not be applicable with respect to any case of a violation of a regulation or order by any person unless such regulation or order has been published in the Federal Register, has been published in a newspaper of general circulation in the community for 3 consecutive days, or has been served upon such person by personal service or by registered mail. The Chairman shall transmit to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and other agencies of the Government responsible for the administration of any functions under this section copies of such regulations and orders issued under this act, and such additional information, as the Chairman deems will be useful to the Commissioner and such other agencies in administering their functions under this section.

SEC. 9. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall submit reports to the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives on the 1st days of January, April, July, and October, on the activities undertaken or contemplated by him under this act. Such reports shall summarize and appraise manpower mobilization activities and problems.

SEC. 10. (a) As used in this act, the terms "employment," "work," "hire," "rehire," "employ," or words of similar import shall include any contract, arrangement, undertaking, or relationship whereby or under which an individual undertakes to perform a service or services for another, irrespective of the resulting legal relationship between the parties.

(b) The provisions of this act shall not be applicable with respect to the employment of persons by any State or any political subdivision thereof, without its consent.

SEC. 11. Section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"In carrying out the provisions of this subsection (except the proviso of the foregoing paragraph) the selective-service local board in classifying the registrant shall base its findings solely and exclusively on whether the registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort and whether a satisfactory replacement can be obtained, without reference to the relative essentiality of the registrant to an agricultural occupation or endeavor as compared with any other occupation, service, or endeavor; and the foregoing provision of this sentence shall apply upon any appeal or review of a decision made thereunder by a selective-service local board. It shall be the duty of any registrant who is now or hereafter deferred under this subsection, and who has been found to be unacceptable to the land or naval forces for training and service, not to voluntarily leave or discontinue such agricultural occupation or endeavor unless his selective-service local board (subject to appeal in the same manner as is provided in section 10 (a) (2)) has determined that it is no longer necessary in the interest of the war effort for him to remain in such agricultural occupation or endeavor or that he has a justifiable reason for discontinuing such agricultural occupation or endeavor; and violations of this provision shall be considered an evasion of service in the land or naval forces."

SEC. 12. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances, other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 13. The provisions of section 2 (b) and section 4 (a) and (b) of this act, and all regulations, orders, or requirements thereunder, shall cease to be effective upon termination of hostilities in the present war, as declared by the President or by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, or upon December 31, 1946, whichever is the earlier.

SEC. 14. This act may be cited as the "War Manpower Act of 1945."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

INTERSTATE WHOLESALE RATES ON NATURAL GAS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Utah in yielding to me to permit me to make a brief statement on another subject.

On February 12, 1945, the United States Supreme Court rendered a 5-to-4 decision in the case of *Central States Electric Co.* v. *City of Muscatine* (No. 85, Oct. term, 1944) which is of far-reaching importance to millions of consumers of natural gas. This case involved the question of whether excessive interstate wholesale rates which have been charged by an interstate pipe-line company pending court review of an order of the Federal Power Commission

reducing such rates under the Natural Gas Act, should be refunded to the ultimate consumers or to the distributing companies which passed such excess charges on to the consumers. It was for the purpose of protecting the consumers from the necessity of bearing excessive interstate wholesale rates that Congress in 1938 passed the Natural Gas Act, vesting the Federal Power Commission with jurisdiction to regulate such rates, which are constitutionally beyond the authority of State commissions.

Shortly after the Natural Gas Act was passed, the Federal Power Commission, on complaint of the Illinois Commerce Commission, made an investigation of the interstate wholesale rates being charged by the Natural Gas Pipeline Co. of America to distributing companies in Chicago, Ill., as well as municipalities in Iowa and Nebraska. After a hearing, the Federal Power Commission ordered a $3,750,000 annual reduction in the pipeline company's rates.

The pipe-line company appealed the Commission's order to the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, which, on request of the company, stayed the Commission's order pending disposition of the appeal, thus permitting the pipe-line company to continue to charge its existing rates. On March 16, 1942, the Commission's rate reduction order was sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States (315 U. S. 575) and the reduced rates were then put into effect.

The pipe-line company then paid into the registry of the circuit court some $6,300,000, representing the difference between the rates prescribed by the Federal Power Commission and the higher pre-existing rates which the pipe-line company had been permitted to continue in effect under the court's stay of the Commission's rate order. The circuit court then had before it the question of distributing the impounded funds to the persons entitled thereto.

The Federal Power Commission and the Illinois Commerce Commission contended that the ultimate consumers were clearly entitled to the refunds since the distributing companies were merely conduits, having passed on to the consumers whatever rate they paid the pipeline company at the city gates. Almost all of the distributing companies, as well as the pipe-line company, agreed with this view, and the circuit court distributed more than 99 percent of the fund directly to the consumers. However, Central States Electric Co., a distributing company operating in the State of Iowa, where its rates are not subject to regulation by a State commission, contended that it was entitled to some $25,000 of the impounded funds, as against its consumers in four Iowa cities, because its retail rates, during the refund period, had not yielded a sufficient return. In making this claim, Central States admitted that its retail rates had been those prescribed in municipal ordinances in accordance with Iowa law and that it had not sought a rate increase from the municipal authorities.

The circuit court held that the consumers were entitled to the refunds, since it was for their benefit that the Natural Gas Act was passed and the Federal Power Commission had conducted its proceedings, and that the distributing company should not obtain a windfall at the expense of its consumers. The court, accordingly, ordered the $25,000 in dispute paid to the municipal representatives of the ultimate consumers in the four Iowa cities, without prejudice to Central States' assertion of its claim to the fund in any State proceeding.

In reversing this order, the Supreme Court held that the circuit court, in the circumstances, had no jurisdiction to determine the rights of the consumers in the disputed funds and that the most the circuit court could do would be to withhold distribution of the fund a reasonable time to permit the consumers to institute a State proceeding to establish their rights to the fund, and that if such a suit proved unsuccessful or was not instituted promptly or prosecuted with due diligence, the circuit court should pay the refunds to the distributing company.

Under this decision of the Supreme Court, it appears clear that, as a practical matter, the ultimate consumers, who actually pay the excessive rates, will be denied any benefit from a rate-reduction order of the Federal Power Commission so long as an appeal from such an order can be kept pending in the courts. While the Commission's order is stayed by the court pending review, the Pipeline Company can continue to charge its preexisting excessive wholesale rates, and the distributing companies paying such rates can continue to pass them on to the ultimate consumers in the "burner tip" rates. If, in accordance with the Supreme Court's decision, the refunds representing the excessive interstate charges collected during the period the Federal Power Commission's rate order is in litigation are paid to the distributing companies, such refunds will represent additional past profits to such companies. In fixing the local rates of the distributing companies, the State agencies can only fix rates prospectively, and in so doing they cannot consider past profits. Accordingly, the State agencies will not be in a position to require the distributing companies to pass on to the consumers the "windfall" which they have obtained at the expense of the consumers under the Supreme Court's decision. While the State commissions in a few States have limited authority to award reparations for excessive rates in the past, such proceedings present so many practical difficulties that they do not furnish an answer to the problem created by the Supreme Court's decision.

The effect of the decision of the Court is well summarized in the dissenting opinion which was written by Mr. Justice Black, as follows:

> So long as litigation can be kept pending in the courts as to the validity of a Federal Power Commission rate reduction order, the benefits of the Natural Gas Act will be suspended as to ultimate consumers, and will be largely, if not exclusively, restricted to retail distributors. Thus, by a strange quirk of statutory construction, the effort of Congress to protect consumers from excessive rates is transformed, where litigation is pending, into an act which exploits consumers and unjustly enriches distributing companies.

In order to ascertain the significance of this decision of the Supreme Court to the consumers, I inquired of the Federal Power Commission and learned that there is now some $30,000,000 impounded in various circuit courts of appeals in proceedings involving a review of rate-reduction orders of the Commission. Moreover, the amount of such impounded funds is increasing daily. For example, in one case more than $800,000 will be paid into the court during the month of February 1945.

Since the consumers who have borne the excessive rates making up this $30,000,000 of impounded funds reside in the States of Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee, Mississippi, Georgia, and Alabama, I believe that the opinion of the court merits our careful study.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the table showing the amount of reduction presently impounded by the courts and showing the reductions at present impounded as they affect various communities in various States.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amount of reduction presently impounded by courts

	Date of last report	Name of gas company	Amount impounded for service to Dec. 31, 1944
Docket No.—			
G-200	December 1944	Panhandle Eastern Pipe Line Co.	$17,532,026
G-124	do	Colorado-Interstate Gas Co.	5,606,320
G-124	do	Colorado-Wyoming Gas Co.	56,000
G-132, 149	do	Interstate Natural Gas Co. (Monroe Field sales)	845,291
G-141	do	Cities Service Gas Co.	5,927,812
G-124		Canadian River Gas Co.	(1)
Total			29,967,449

[1] Company was required to post surety bond for $561,000.

REDUCTIONS AT PRESENT IMPOUNDED

Docket No. G-141, Cities Service Gas Co.: Kansas City, Wichita, Topeka, Hutchinson, Pittsburg, Kans.; Kansas City, St. Joseph, Springfield, Joplin, Sedalia, Independence, Mo.; Bartlesville, Okla.

Docket No. G-124, Canadian River Gas Co.: Docket No. G-124, Colorado Interstate Gas Co.: Denver, Pueblo, Colorado Springs, Colo. (Also all communities in Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Illinois, and Indiana served directly or indirectly by Natural Gas Pipeline Co. of America.)

Docket No. G-124, Colorado-Wyoming Gas Co.: Cheyenne, Wyo.

Docket No. G-200, Panhandle Eastern Gas Co.: Jefferson City, Hannibal, Mo.; Peoria, Springfield, Decatur, Quincy, Champaign, Ill.; Fort Wayne, Muncie, Anderson, Richmond, Kokomo, Marion, La Fayette, Evansville, Ind.; Detroit, Flint, Pontiac, Dearborn, Kalamazoo, Highland Park, Hamtramck, Jackson, Battle Creek, Wyandotte, Ann Arbor, Royal Oak, Ferndale, Mich.; Cleveland, Akron, Youngstown, Canton, Lakewood, Cleveland Heights, Warren, East Cleveland, Massillon, Barberton, Columbus, Toledo, Dayton, Springfield, Lorain, Zanesville, Mansfield, Marion, Newark, Sandusky, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the majority opinion of Mr. Justice Roberts, the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Black, and the other dissenting opinions.

There being no objection, the opinions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO. 85, OCTOBER TERM, 1944, CENTRAL STATES ELECTRIC CO., PETITIONER, V. CITY OF MUSCATINE, IOWA, ET AL.—ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

(February 12, 1945)

Mr. Justice Roberts delivered the opinion of the Court.

We are concerned in this case with the nature and extent of the powers of a Federal court sitting to review an order of the Federal Power Commission.

The decision of the court below denied the petitioner's application for payment to it of a fund of some $25,000 deposited in court, and directed its payment to persons not privies to the transaction which created the fund. A detailed recitation of events is required to show how the question arises.

The Federal Power Commission (hereinafter called Commission), proceeding under the Natural Gas Act,[1] entered an order against the Natural Gas Pipeline Co. of America (hereinafter called Pipeline) requiring it to cut its rates on natural gas to effect an annual reduction in revenue of not less than $3,750,000, effective September 1, 1940.

The petitioner, Central States Electric Co. (hereinafter sometimes called Central), an Iowa corporation doing a public utility business in that State and elsewhere, purchased gas at wholesale from Pipeline and distributed it in Iowa.

Pipeline sought a review of the Commission's action by the circuit court of appeals. The court set aside the order but, on certiorari, we reversed and sustained it.[2] At the inception of the case Pipeline had petitioned for a temporary stay and the court below had granted a stay on condition that a bond be filed to secure the refund to purchasers at wholesale of the amounts respectively due them if the court should sustain the reduction of rates ordered by the Commission. On the dissolution of the temporary stay another was entered to continue until the further order of the court, conditioned that Pipeline should enter a second bond in the same terms. This was done.

When this court rendered its judgment sustaining the rate order Pipeline became liable to make refunds in accordance with the bond. The court below, prior to the payment of the amount due under the bond, filed an opinion holding that it was its duty to take exclusive control over the refund when made and to determine the rights of all claimants in the fund, and made an order enjoining claimants to the fund from further proceeding in any other court. This action was pursuant to a petition of Pipeline showing that suits were being filed against it in other courts by the ultimate consumers of the gas sold by Pipeline to the local distributing companies and alleging that unless the court retained jurisdiction of the fund Pipeline would be subjected to numerous similar suits. Illinois Commerce Commission, in an answer, stated that the rates charged by distributing companies in Illinois were fixed by it and reflected the prices paid by distributors to Pipeline and that the refund, representing excessive rates paid by distributors, had been collected from the ultimate consumers and was equitably due them. The Illinois local distributors then before the court agreed that the refund should be ratably paid to the ultimate consumers.

Central was not a party to the proceeding in the circuit court of appeals but, on June 29, 1942, it sent a letter to the clerk, in response to one from him, asserting that the portion of the refund representing excessive rates paid by Central during the refund period should be repaid to it and not to the ultimate consumers. June 30, 1942, the court rendered an opinion in which it discussed the relative rights and interests of local distributors and ultimate consumers. The court found that, since the rates charged to local consumers included the excess charges paid by distributors to Pipeline, the ultimate consumers were in equity entitled to receive the refund. July 1, 1942, Pipeline paid into court a sum representing that portion of the rates paid to it in excess of the rate permitted by the Commission's order. The court thereupon entered an order to show cause, which specified the refund period, determined that the amount paid into court was the property of the ultimate consumers, and allocated the fund to the customers of the local distributors, including Central's customers (to whom there was allocated $25,708.54), reserved jurisdiction of the fund for the protection of all persons having rights therein, and directed all claimants to the fund to show cause why the order should not be binding on them. Later the court entered an order in which it found that Central had raised an issue concerning the relative rights of itself and its customers to the amount in question. Central, which, as we have said, had not become a party to the proceedings, then filed a petition in intervention praying that the sum be paid to it, and leave to intervene was granted. Central's petition set forth that it purchased natural gas from Pipeline during the refund period, pursuant to a contract; that the sum in question represented amounts paid by Central during the refund period in excess of the rates fixed by the Commission's order; that Central sold more than 81 percent of the gas in question without profit to Iowa Electric Co., which resold the same to some 2,400 consumers in Muscatine, Iowa, and that Central sold the balance directly to some 320 consumers in Greenfield, Iowa, 597 in Knoxville, Iowa, and 366 in Pella, Iowa; that less than 12½ percent of the gas sold in Knoxville and Pella was natural gas; that Iowa Electric Co. had transferred all its rights in and to the fund to Central for the purpose of these proceedings; that by the law of Iowa, the power to fix rates for gas service is vested in its municipalities, and the utility rates in that State are not regulated by any State agency or commission; that rates to consumers had been voluntarily reduced to meet competitive conditions and that such rates had been approved by resolution of the Council of Muscatine; and that due to conditions in the communities serviced, the rates charged consumers were insufficient to produce a fair return.

Thereafter the court entered an order directing that the attorney general of Iowa and the purchasers of gas from Central, and their respective municipal representatives in Muscatine and Greenfield, be notified of Central's claim to the fund and that they show cause why the relief sought by Central should not be granted. No such order was made with respect to consumers in Knoxville and Pella nor to any officials of those cities. The city of Muscatine and the mayor of Greenfield, purporting to represent the consumers in those cities, filed separate pleadings in which they asserted that the fund in question belonged to the consumers.

The court, without hearing evidence, denied the relief prayed by Central by an order which was stated to be "without prejudice" to Central's "making claim of adjustment with the cities of Muscatine, Greenfield, Knoxville, and Pella * * * or with the consumers of gas furnished by it in said cities." The reason stated for making the order was that the court was without jurisdiction to hear Central's claim since it involved a determination of "the reasonableness of petitioner's rates" and further since the court had previously ruled that the refund belonged to the ultimate consumers. In a separate order entered the same day the court directed payment of the sum in question to the treasurers of the several cities in specified amounts. It fixed the amount allocated to Muscatine at 81 percent of the fund, apparently relying upon the allegation of the petition that more than 81 percent of the gas purchased from Pipeline was delivered to consumers in that city. It apparently failed to give consideration to the allegation that less than 12½ percent of the gas sold in Knoxville and Pella was natural gas. The order recited that the fund belonged to the ultimate consumers and that the court desired to pay it at the earliest possible time to "such parties as are entitled to the same, and to permit of a determination of said rights by a court or body having jurisdiction thereof." Thereafter Central filed a supplemental petition setting forth that, except for the stay order, Central would have retained the sum in question; that Central was the only party in privity with Pipeline and was, therefore, entitled to the benefit of the rate reduction, and that the bond filed pursuant to the court's order called for payment of the refund to purchasers at wholesale one of whom was Central. It further attacked the jurisdiction of the court to award the sum to Central's ultimate consumers since such an award amounted to a retroactive reduction of local rates to which the Natural Gas Act, by express terms, did not apply, and, finally, asserted that the court ought not to make the award based on a conclusion of fact unsupported by any evidence that the burden of the excessive rates had been passed on to the consumers whereas the court, at the same time, disclaimed jurisdiction to determine the reasonableness of local rates and, therefore, refused to hear evidence of Central's equitable right to the fund. Muscatine and the mayor of Greenfield responded. The court denied the petition without hearing or argument.

The court below was right in its views that as a Federal court it had no power, at least in the absence of Federal legislation purporting to confer such power upon it, to fix or adjust Central's rates, that being a legislative function of the State of Iowa. This would be so where the fund in dispute came into its possession in a proceeding to enjoin the operation of an order affecting State rates,[3] and must be equally true where the proceeding was one to enjoin collection of a rate for interstate service. This, because the court below had no power as a court of equity to fix rates, and as a Federal court had no power to adjudicate a matter within the legislative competence of Iowa. The court below so held

[1] 52 Stat. 821; 15 U. S. C. § 717.

[2] *Federal Power Commission* v. *Natural Gas Pipeline Co.* (315 U. S. 575).

[3] *Central Kentucky Natural Gas Co.* v. *Railroad Commission* (290 U. S. 264, 271, 272).

in this case, and has dealt with the matter more fully and to the same effect in another.[4]

The Natural Gas Act clearly discloses that, though its purpose may have been to protect the ultimate consumer at retail, the means adopted was limited to the regulation of sales in interstate commerce at wholesale, leaving to the States the function of regulating the intrastate distribution and sale of the commodity. That Congress intended to leave intrastate transactions to State regulation is clear, not only from the language of the act,[5] but from the exceptionally explicit legislative record,[6] and from this court's decisions.[7]

The showing made by the petitioner's pleadings, and not denied, is that in Iowa rates are set by municipal ordinance; that the rates collected from consumers during the refund period were the lawful rates, so fixed; and that the sums impounded were deducted from the payments to Pipeline by Central out of its own funds. The only reply made by the municipal authorities is that the fund belongs to the ultimate consumers. Whether this is so, whether under Iowa law reparation may be demanded for sums paid by consumers under a standing rate, we do not know. Nor do we know who are proper parties under Iowa law to any proceeding to determine the relative rights of petitioner and its customers. Certainly these are questions of Iowa, not of Federal law.

We are of opinion that the court below lacked jurisdiction to adjudicate the question of the consumers' rights in the fund in dispute. *United States* v. *Morgan* (307 U. S. 183), on which the respondents rely, is obviously distinguishable. There the fund impounded was part of the charges paid to the stockyard merchants by persons who had been charged the rates found by the Secretary of Agriculture to be excessive. Here, since the fund represents a portion of sums paid by Central to Pipeline out of Central's funds and pursuant to contract with Pipeline, the Morgan case would be authority for repayment to Central. This is true also of *Inland Steel Co.* v. *United States* (306 U. S. 153). Moreover, if Central had paid Pipeline the excessive rates, the latter could not have defended a suit by Central to recover the excess on the ground that Central had passed on the burden to its customers.[8]

The ultimate consumers' rights being such as the law of Iowa affords, there is no reason for the payment of the fund to municipalities or municipal officers under a quasi trust for those found ultimately entitled, thus placing the burden on Central to pursue the cities or their officers for its recovery. An order to this effect is certainly not within the court's jurisdiction as a Federal court of equity. The most the court below should do in view of the apparent controversy as to the consumers' right to a refund of rates heretofore paid to Central, is to order that the fund be held for a reasonable time to permit interested persons to litigate the issue in a tribunal having jurisdiction, the order to be conditioned that if such litigation is not instituted within a reasonable time, and prosecuted to final adjudication, the fund shall be paid over to Central, and that if it be adjudged, as a result of such litigation that Central is indebted to its consumers because of the reduction of wholesale rates in this proceeding, further application may be made to the court as to its disposition.

The judgment is reversed and the cause remanded for further proceedings in conformity to this opinion.

So ordered.

Mr. Justice Black, dissenting.

The primary purpose of Congress in passing the Natural Gas Act was to protect ultimate consumers of gas from excessive prices (*Federal Power Commission* v. *Hope Natural Gas Company* (320 U. S. 591, 610, 612)). The Court's decision today defeats that congressional purpose, for under its interpretation of the act the petitioner, a retail gas distributor, is awarded a windfall,[9] at the expense of the very consumers the act was designed to protect.

On September 23, 1938, a petition praying for reduction of the wholesale gas rates of the Natural Gas Pipeline Co. was filed with the Federal Power Commission. July 23, 1940, the Commission ordered the company to make reductions in its future rates. The circuit court of appeals, upon the company's petition, then granted a stay pending litigation. Later, it stayed enforcement of the order (120 F. 2d 625). As a condition of its stay, the circuit court of appeals required the company to execute a $1,000,000 bond running to the Federal Power Commission and the Illinois Commerce Commission. On March 16, 1942, this Court reversed the cause and sustained the Commission's order (315 U. S. 575).

Subsequently, $6,377,913.57 was paid into the court by the Pipeline Co., this being the amount it had collected, pending the litigation, from Illinois, Nebraska, and Iowa gas distributing companies, in excess of the rates fixed by the Commission.

The Pipeline Co. and all of the distributing companies except petitioner here and one small company in Nebraska,[10] acquiesced in the holding of the court below that the funds thus impounded properly belonged to the ultimate consumers, and should be refunded to them. All of this amount, $6,377,913.57, except for the $25,708.54 now ordered by this Court to be paid to the petitioner, has been distributed to the ultimate consumers.[11]

The court holds that the disposition of such funds must be made in accordance with State law and that the circuit court of appeals was without jurisdiction to dispose of them as it did. Until today this Court seems never to have doubted that "it is a power 'inherent in every court of justice so long as it retains control of the subject matter and of the parties, to correct that which has been wrongfully done by virtue of its process'" (*United States* v. *Morgan*, (307 U. S. 183, 197)). Here consumers of gas have been injured by a Federal court order staying the Federal Power Commission's 1940 rate cut. In 1942 this Court sustained the Commission's order (315 U. S. 575). At that time the Pipeline Co. contended before this Court that if the Commission's rate order should be sustained the fund accumulated as a result of the stay should be retained by it, and should not be turned over to the distributing companies because "the purpose of the rate regulation is the protection of consumers and * * * will not be effectuated by refunds to wholesalers" of their "profits for past business." Upon our remand of the cause for further proceedings the Pipeline Co. petitioned the court below to take jurisdiction of the excess funds. That court held, in impounding the fund here involved, that since it was authorized by sections 19 (b) and (c) of the act to issue a stay pending review of the Commission's rate order, it had a mandatory obligation as a court of equity "to determine to whom and in what amounts the distribution shall be made." This holding was in accord with "the governing principle that it is the duty of a court of equity granting injunctive relief to do so upon conditions that will protect all—including the public—whose interests the injunction may affect" (*Inland Steel Co.* v. *United States*, (306 U. S. 153, 157)).

The injury of the consumers here did not stem from State law or the action of a State court; it was the direct result of stay orders made by a Federal court. These orders, which permitted the pipe-line company to continue to charge rates which the Commission had determined to be excessive, to the detriment of ultimate consumers, were issued under the provisions of the Natural Gas Act. The injuries here were therefore occasioned by the application of Federal law in a Federal court, and raised Federal, and not State law questions. For a Federal court to remedy by this injury by affording that protection to consumers which the act contemplated, cannot, in my judgment, be said to amount to a regulation of local gas rates.

The Natural Gas Act contemplates that Federal reduction of wholesale gas rates to distributors will be reflected in reduction of retail rates to the ultimate consumers. Information before the Congress when it passed the Natural Gas Act showed that a large percentage of the retail cost of gas was attributable to the wholesale cost.[12] Thus, the wholesale cost is a critical element in a State proceeding to regulate retail cost. An effective order of the Federal Power Commission reducing wholesale costs affords local consumers a basis for a corresponding retail reduction. But a Federal rate reduction order cannot be utilized before State regulatory agencies where the Federal reduction order has been stayed by a Federal court. Thus, during the 3 years that the Power Commission's rate reduction was held in abeyance pursuant to the stay orders, the

[4] *Natural Gas Pipeline Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission* (141 F. 2d 27).

[5] See, e. g. sec. 2 (8). 15 U. S. C. sec. 717 (a) (8); sec. 5 (a), 15 U. S. C. sec. 717d (a); sec. 13, 15 U. S. C. sec 717l; sec. 14a, 15 U. S. C. sec. 717m (a); sec. 15a, 15 U. S. C. sec. 717n (a); sec. 17 (a), 15 U. S. C. sec. 717 (p).

[6] H. R. 709, 75th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 1–3.

[7] *Public Utilities Comm. of Ohio* v. *United Fuel Gas Co.* (317 U. S. 456, 467); *Federal Power Comm.* v. *Hope Natural Gas Co.* (320 U. S. 591, 609–610).

[8] *Southern Pacific Co.* v. *Darnell-Taenzer Lumber Co.* (245 U. S. 531).

[9] The court below refused to construe the Natural Gas Act so as to make this petitioner "the beneficiary of a windfall, to which it intends to hold on, once it can get possession of it."

[10] This company subsequently settled with its consumers by turning over to them approximately 70 percent of the funds allocable to its purchases.

[11] June 30, 1942, after a notice had been issued to petitioner Central, the Court held that all refunds "belong to the consumers, for whose benefit these proceedings were instituted." Central did not actually intervene until 14 months later. With reference to this delay of Central's, the court below said in its June 30, 1942, order that "Nebraska City and all other utilities stood by and accepted the situation as it was tendered by the pleadings and the parties. Now one or two of these utilities located where no State supervisory commission exists, are endeavoring to seize the fruits of the litigation brought for the consumers and retain the money for their own individual gain. It would be a gross travesty upon the proceedings, the outcome, if they were to succeed. With their efforts in this respect, we have no sympathy." Without going into a narration of what later occurred, I am of opinion that the court rightfully denied Central's intervention on the ground that it had long since decided the question. The importance of the rule announced by the court, however, prompts me to discuss it.

[12] See Final Report of the Federal Trade Commission to the Senate, S. Doc. 92, pt. 84–A. 70th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 611, 612; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 75th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 81, pp. 6723, 6725, 6728; Hearings before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 75th Cong., 1st sess., on H. R. 4008, pp. 27, 38–39, 56–57; Hearing on H. R. 11662, House Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 74th Cong., 2d sess., pp. 25, 34–35, 51.

Iowa consumers were deprived of the opportunity to obtain a reduction of their rates from the local regulatory agencies. The city of Muscatine, Iowa, promptly passed an ordinance reducing local gas rates after vacation of the orders staying enforcement of the Power Commission's rate reduction.

Ultimate consumers can secure benefits from a Federal rate reduction in two ways: (1) By using the order to get reduced rates before their local regulatory bodies; (2) by the impounding of funds for their benefit if a judicial stay of the Federal reduction order is granted. The stay deprived these local consumers of a chance to use the Commission's order to obtain a local rate reduction. The holding of this court partially, if not completely, deprives them of the benefits of the impounded funds.

To deny petitioner distributing company a refund of the impounded moneys would impose no deprivation upon it. Petitioner's local rates were fixed by a Muscatine city ordinance, to which rates the petitioner alleges it voluntarily agreed. That schedule of rates, petitioner argues, was "presumptively reasonable."[13] Petitioner admits that Iowa law requires the wholesale cost of gas to be one of the factors considered in determining the reasonableness of rates.[14] The petitioner's rates must therefore be considered reasonable on the basis of the old wholesale price of gas, and any increment above those rates is a windfall.

Furthermore, the petitioner says it was free under Iowa law to attack the rates at any time as too low. This, it never did. Instead, it refrained from doing so until this Court had sustained the Commission's order reducing wholesale rates, and until the circuit court of appeals had adjudged that the moneys belonged to the consumers. Not until then did it file its intervention claim for the impounded funds. The reason for this delay is not difficult to find. Petitioner, in arguing here that it should get this impounded fund, asserts that under Iowa law "municipalities may only fix rates prospectively." Iowa cases cited by the petitioner[15] seem to give some support to this contention, especially when considered with decisions of this Court dealing with analogous statutory situations.[16] I am therefore unable to see much likelihood of these consumers obtaining relief in the Iowa State courts for the injury they have suffered as a result of the Federal court's action in granting a stay of the Federal Power Commission's order.

If my previous analysis is correct, the rule announced by the Court today means simply this: So long as litigation can be kept pending in the courts as to the validity of a Federal Power Commission rate deduction order, the benefits of the Natural Gas Act will be suspended as to ultimate consumers, and will be largely, if not exclusively, restricted to retail distributors.[17] Thus, by a strange quirk of statutory construction, the effort of Congress to protect consumers from excessive rates is transformed, where litigation is pending, into an act which exploits consumers and unjustly enriches distributing companies. This company has already received a reasonable compensation for its services. It is entitled to no more under Iowa or Federal law.

Mr. Justice Murphy and Mr. Justice Rutledge concur in this dissent.

Mr. Justice Douglas, dissenting.

I think that the claims to the fund in possession of the court below are to be determined by State law. The Federal Power Commission has no authority to determine the rates which petitioner may charge in these Iowa cities. Under the Natural Gas Act that is for Iowa and Iowa alone to determine (*Public Utilities Commission* v. *United Fuel Gas Co.* (317 U. S. 456, 467); *Federal Power Commission* v. *Hope Natural Gas. Co.* (320 U. S. 591, 610)). In that respect this case differs markedly from *United States* v. *Morgan* (307 U. S. 183). If there had been no stay order entered and the interstate rate from the pipe-line company to petitioner had been reduced when the Federal Power Commission entered its order, it still would have taken action by the local authorities to reduce the rates in these Iowa cities.

But the Federal court which has this fund has considerable discretion in its management (*United States* v. *Morgan*, supra). I fail to see how it abused its discretion in handing the fund over to the local officials. It is only fair to assume that a reduction in the interstate rate would have been followed by a reduction in local rates.[18] That indeed was the primary objective of the Natural Gas Act (*Federal Power Commission* v. *Hope Natural Gas Co.*, supra). We are pointed to no provision of local law which raises any substantial question concerning the power of the local authorities to make a readjustment of rates through the distribution of funds impounded under a stay order.[19] And the claim of petitioner that local law would prevent a reduction in its rates for the period while the stay order was in effect is far too vague to acquire the dignity of a substantial question.[20] He who maintains that position has the distinct burden of overcoming the presumption that as a matter of local law the consumers were entitled to the benefits of this rate reduction. Petitioner fails to carry that burden. The record is void of any credible evidence that a reduction in the interstate rate would not have warranted a reduction in local rates.

Petitioner is adequately protected by the decree entered by the court below. That court did not undertake finally to determine the rights of the parties in the fund. It has turned the fund over to respondents without prejudice to petitioner's rights in it. Those rights are determinable under Iowa law. That procedure does not preclude petitioner from its day in an Iowa court if its claim to the fund turns out to be less frivolous and more substantial than it appears to be. I think the court below selected the most equitable and just method of rectifying the injury done by its stay order.

Perry M. Chadwick (Bert L. Klooster and Roscoe C. Nash with him on the brief), for petitioner; Charles V. Shannon, general counsel, Federal Power Commission (Charles Fahy, Solicitor General; Francis M. Shea, Assistant Attorney General; David L. Kreeger; Robert L. Stern; Jerome H. Simonds; and Stanley M. Morley with him on the brief), for respondent Federal Power Commission; submitted by Matthew Westrate for respondent city of Muscatine; submitted by Elmer E. Johnson, pro se.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator from Utah very much for yielding to me.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I think any questions should be very brief, because I do not think I should trespass too long on the time of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have no objection to having a brief question asked of the Senator, Mr. President.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Let me inquire whether the Senator from Wisconsin has any information as to whether the retail distributing companies which have passed on to the consumers the overcharges are in some cases controlled by the company which controls the wholesale group which sells the gas to them?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is a phase of the matter into which I have not had an opportunity to go.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield for 30 seconds?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Wisconsin has put his finger upon an outstanding weakness in our American life today; namely, the system by which certain matters are circumvented by some of our legal talent who are serving their clients faithfully according to their viewpoint. Let me also point out the delay which has occurred in such cases, horrible examples of which are to be found in various railroad receiverships where, as in the case of the New Haven Railroad, for 10 years or more railroads have been in receivership, and the persons affected have been forced to endure delay after delay, to their despair. In many cases while waiting during such delays, the persons interested have died.

What can be done about the situation I do not know; but I think it would be a public service to bring the urgency of the situation to the attention of the American people as well as to the attention of the Congress and all other public bodies, and I think something akin to what the Senator from Wisconsin has suggested should be enacted into law.

---

[13] Petitioner cites in support of its argument, *Iowa Railway and Light Co.* v. *Jones Auto Co.* (182 Iowa 982); *Town of Williams* v. *Iowa Falls Electric Co.* (185 Iowa 493); *Knotts* v. *Mallen* (206 Iowa 261); *Incorporated Town of Mapleton* v. *Iowa Public Service Co.* (57 N. Dak. 447).

[14] See *Cedar Rapids Gas Co.* v. *Cedar Rapids, 144 Iowa 426*, (affirmed 223 U. S. 655).

[15] See note 5, supra.

[16] Cf. *Public Utilities Commission of Ohio* v. *United States Fuel Gas Co.* (317 U. S. 456); *Arizona Grocery* v. *Atchison Ry.* (370 U. S. 370, 389).

[17] When a rate schedule embodying a proposed increase in wholesale rates becomes effective, pending a determination by the Commission of the reasonableness of such increase, the Commission is authorized to require appropriate guaranties by sec. 4 (a) of the act. The Commission may require the natural gas companies "* * * to furnish a bond, to be approved by the Commission, to refund any amounts ordered by the Commission, to keep accurate accounts in detail of all amounts received by reason of such increase, specifying by whom and in whose behalf such amounts were paid * * *." This would appear to be broad enough to protect consumers where the amounts were paid in their behalf. Surely the act gives no less power to a court.

[18] The city of Muscatine did in fact reduce the rates after the stay order had been vacated.

[19] Petitioner asserts, and I assume, that under the Iowa law rates can be made only prospectively. But it appears from *Town of Williams* v. *Iowa Falls Electric Co.* (185 Ia. 493, 500), that the Iowa courts under their "balance of convenience" rule will impound alleged excessive amounts collected by a utility company pending the outcome of rate litigation so as to protect the rights both of the utility and the consumers. If the rate increase is ultimately disallowed, the impounded funds will be returned to the customers; otherwise they will be turned over to the company. We are pointed to no authority which suggests that Iowa would not sanction the use of such a method of readjustment under the circumstances of this case.

[20] So far as appears, the rates which petitioner was charging during the period of the stay order had been voluntarily proposed by it.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	Pepper
Bailey	Hatch	Radcliffe
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Revercomb
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bilbo	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Butler	Kilgore	Taft
Byrd	La Follette	Taylor
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McKellar	Tobey
Cordon	McMahon	Tunnell
Donnell	Maybank	Tydings
Downey	Mead	Vandenberg
Eastland	Millikin	Wagner
Ellender	Moore	Walsh
Ferguson	Morse	Wheeler
Fulbright	Murdock	Wherry
George	Murray	White
Gerry	Myers	Wiley
Green	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gurney	Overton	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a delegate to the International Conference in Mexico and therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on official business as a delegate to the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I have no disposition to refrain from answering questions, or in any way to cut off debate on this important bill; I ask that I be allowed to proceed without interruption until I shall have completed my preliminary statement.

The question of a universal service act has been before us for a number of years. Extensive hearings were held on that subject from time to time during the entire period of the last Congress. Some of us were opposed to the extension of compulsion into the ordinary labor and industrial fields. There were also those of us who felt that the enactment of a universal service act would be a mistake. It has been said that since so much has been said about the proposed legislation, since many hearings were held, and since criticism has been made from time to time, there has been a tendency on the part of our committees to hold back the presentation of such legislation. That, Mr. President, is not the truth. The House bill reached the Senate on February 5. Since then the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate has been in almost constant session. We have considered not only the bill introduced in the Senate, but also the bill coming over from the House. We have held hearings in order that persons who wished to be heard could come before the committee and present whatever views they had to submit.

Mr. President, because of the position in which the committee finds itself in presenting the bill, I believe that I owe it to myself and to the Senate to say that I have been opposed to a national service act. I am still opposed to such an act. I have been as frank, open, and straightforward as any person could be in the position which I now hold. I believe, however, that each of us has more than one duty to perform in the United States Senate. Sometimes we find ourselves to be advocates for our committees, sometimes advocates for the administration, and sometimes advocates for our party. There are also times when such types of appeal cannot be denied. It seems to me that at this time, when our country and the world generally are in the condition which exists today, and at a time when our armies are in the circumstances which now prevail, it is perfectly proper and right for a Senator to be extremely impersonal, and at the same time stand by a declaration which Congress has made. Every Senator knows that the declarations of war which put us into war with Japan, Germany, and Italy called for the utmost sacrifice on the part of each and all of us. Every Senator knows that, while the voluntary method was not excluded, and while many of our soldiers and sailors are vo unteers in the armed forces, the passage of the Selective Service Act was made necessary in order that individuals would serve their country whether they wished to do so or not.

We also know that by other acts of Congress we have said to industry, for example, that they shall make articles which the Government asks them to make, and that they shall adjust the affairs of their business in whatever way the Government orders them to be adjusted. We have also said that they shall submit for renegotiation contracts which have already been signed. We have told industry to respond, and we have even gone so far as to tell them almost exactly what they shall pay for services.

It has been pointed out that a segment exists in our country which has not been put under work compulsion. That segment is represented in the bill now before the Senate; and the bill does not force certain compulsions even upon the segment to which I have referred.

Mr. President, at a meeting of the leaders of our country, the Chief of Staff of the Army, and the Admiral of the Fleet, there was a dissenting voice with regard to the wisdom of proceeding with the proposed legislation. I will say in all frankness that that voice was mine. I believed that the proposed legislation would be unwise, especially because of the complex nature of our Government. It must be remembered that most of the laws of our country dealing with labor and industry, with seniority, wages, tenure of employment, and industry-labor relations, are State laws, and that ours is a Federal Government. It should never be forgotten that individual contracts by the thousands have been entered into between industry and labor. It seemed, therefore, that in spite of an apparent need for such legislation as is being proposed the confusion incident to its consideration and passage might result in a detriment instead of an aid in passing a compulsory labor law.

Yet, Mr. President, as has been said many times, we are members of a team. There comes a time when the team cannot make headway unless everyone cooperates with it. There comes a time when the request of certain of our leaders cannot properly be denied especially when it is put upon the basis of increasing the morale and promoting the welfare of the boys and girls at the front who are facing the enemy and dying in such numbers as American boys and girls have never died before in our history for their country. That type of appeal, Mr. President, was too powerful for me to resist.

I have been a member of several teams in my life, and I know that that which is accomplished in the world is generally accomplished by united action. When it was decided that in this instance unity was necessary because of the uncertainty incident to the great military campaigns that are now under way, we all gave way, and accepted the theory of our leaders. It is in that spirit I am here today. I can only trust that the good nature, the common sense, and the ideas of practicability of the people of our country will be such that this bill will not be an invitation to litigation; that men will sink their differences, and not assume to stand too much upon their rights, realizing that many of us have had human rights taken away from us as a consequence of the war.

Since the bill is asked for as an aid to morale building, Mr. President, I trust that our generals and our admirals and other leaders in the war and in industry, including the head of the War Production Board, will feel assured, if the bill gives them what it is said it will give them, that the United States of America is more united than it has ever been before and that the people of America stand ready to sacrifice at every turn. That is my hope, that is my prayer, and that, I believe, will be the will of the Senate of the United States.

In spite of the fact that the Senate is a deliberative body and that differences of opinion always arise here I feel that my

remarks reflect the heart and soul of every Senator present and that when our people are made to give and give to the utmost those who are giving their all may know that their country is wholeheartedly behind them.

This bill, Mr. President, is in no sense a reflection upon the fine work which the men and women of the country have done in production. Every witness who appeared before the committee in executive session testified to the remarkable work that has been done.

The bill is not pointed at anybody in particular, it is not a punitive measure. It is a bill, above all, to make it certain that as these great culminating months—I hope not years—of war, are coming to an end, as we advance both in the east and in the west, in Europe and in Asia, there will be no let up in the reserves of men, no let up in the reserves of supplies, and that men and matériel, and materials will flow to the places where they are needed in such great abundance that there will never be a question in the minds of our commanding officers about the replacement of troops and the replacement of lost and used supplies. That is the aim, that is the ideal of the bill.

One more statement in general. If I may sum up what seems to me to be the consensus of opinion of practically all the witnesses whom we heard, it is this: We are in what everybody hopes are the final stages of the war. It is no time to relax our efforts, it is no time for anyone to stop. The uncertainty of the final stages is very much greater than the uncertainty of any of the elements in the battles which have preceded up to the present time. The enemy lines are shorter, the enemy's defenses are surely stronger. Our resources are better, our will power to fight is greater; but the uncertainty of tomorrow has made it essential for those who are in command to speak, and by the President of the United States and by our leading generals and leading admirals we have been asked for this manpower bill.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to speak about the development of the bill as it has been reported from the committee and about how the committee bill differs from the bill as it passed the House of Representatives. The Committee on Military Affairs began its study of this bill while it was still pending in the other House. The House bill was a compulsory service bill for men between the ages of 18 and 45. We were informed that management and labor were convinced that it was unwise and would actually hamper production and impede the war effort. I should point out here that the two elements of industrial life which are generally in opposition to one another, labor and management, were united in opposition to the bill as it came from the House of Representatives. Therefore, this bill has, in a sense, brought about a certain amount of opposition and a certain amount of unity in opposition at this time. Because of the opposition of the groups most vitally concerned, because of the fact that the bill imposes such stringent controls upon a large segment of our population, and because the consequences of unwise legislation in this case might prove to be disastrous, the committee felt compelled to call before it responsible representatives of all the principal groups representing management, labor, and agriculture, as well as the heads of the Government departments concerned, in an effort to determine the kind of legislation best suited at this time to meet the problems which confront us.

These men came before the committee and discussed the manpower problem freely and frankly with the committee. They gave us information of great value. After exploring the subject thoroughly with these men, the committee has become convinced that the House bill does not present a proper method for meeting the manpower requirements of our civilian economy. Its enactment at this critical period of the war might well introduce such turmoil and confusion that it would hamper rather than help war production.

As I have indicated, the House bill provided for compulsory service in civilian activities and employment for men between the ages of 18 and 45. It covered two fundamental features. The first of these was the "freeze" provision, which would prohibit men within this age group who are employed in essential activities from leaving their jobs without the approval of their selective-service local boards. The criminal penalties of the Selective Service Act were made applicable to violations of this prohibition. The second fundamental feature of the House bill was the provision for meeting manpower shortages by calling up men within the 18 to 45 age group to accept employment in essential activities. To the extent that voluntary response to such calls proved to be inadequate, selective-service local boards were authorized to select individual men and order them to apply for and accept employment in designated essential activities. Violations of these orders were likewise made subject to the criminal penalties of the Selective Service Act.

Mr. President, the committee had very sound reasons for concluding that the bill passed by the House would not work. In the first place, its basic philosophy of compelling individuals to serve in the employ of other persons in private business present innumerable difficulties. Even if we should assume that the Nation's needs is so extreme as to require and justify such a step, the practical problems involved in the application of such a philosophy are so great that it cannot achieve any large measure of success. Think but a moment of all the devices by which an unwilling worker could reduce his output or could bring about his "involuntary" discharge from his job. There would be no penalty for such tactics, under the House bill. I believe it is a fundamental tenet of American life that slave labor cannot match the output of freemen. To attempt to increase production by using direct compulsion upon the individual, to make him work in another's employ, is to fly in the face of this time-honored truth.

There is another respect in which the House bill is basically inadequate. It applies only to males between the ages of 18 and 45, failing altogether to make provision for mobilizing the larger part of our employable population, which is composed of men over 45 and women. The obligation to serve the Nation in time of war is not limited to men between the ages of 18 and 45. This group has been designated for liability for military service, because few persons qualified for military service may be found outside this group. Obviously, the same is not true in the case of service in civilian production.

Providing a new and radically different program for the mobilization of only a minority of the Nation's workers will not only fail to provide any means to better mobilize the larger group which is left untouched—it will actually disrupt and impede the operation of the program which we already have for that larger group.

The House bill, Mr. President, completely ignores the manpower programs, facilities, and experience that have been developed during the past 2 years. It vests in the Selective Service System tremendous new responsibilities in a field in which the Selective Service System has had no experience and for which it is not suited. Selectiye service local boards are not equipped to handle the infinite variety of problems growing out of the relationship between a private employer and a civilian worker—problems involving the worker's occupational skill, labor waste, plant working conditions, inequitable wages, and the multitude of other matters involved in the employment relationship between a private employer and a private employee.

Since it appeared to the committee that these basic defects were inherent in the fundamental features of the House bill, the committee felt that it could not recommend that bill to the Senate. However, the committee did feel that it should recommend to the Senate legislation which would provide the most logical, effective, and orderly program possible for mobilizing our manpower resources in support of the war effort. In the bill reported to the Senate, I feel that the committee has largely attained this objective.

Later, I shall speak in a little more detail as to the v rious provisions of the bill, but for a moment I should like to indicate some of its significant differences from the House bill. First, it provides a plan effective with respect to our whole working population—not just a segment of it. Second, so far as nonagricultural activities are concerned, it will not compel any individual against his will to work for another person in private employment. Third, it builds upon and strengthens the present manpower program. Being completely harmonious with the present program, it will result in the greater effectiveness of that program without disruption or undue confusion.

Now, what is this present program? Our committee found that there is in existence today a Nation-wide organization that has been functioning in the civilian manpower field, without whose efforts the magnificent production record of this country could not have been achieved. That organization has been administering a regulatory program, co-

operatively developed by management, labor, and Government, and administered on a voluntary basis in each local community. This job has been done cooperatively, in accordance with our highest democratic traditions, through local committees representing local management, labor, agriculture, and Government. For the past 2 years the Congress has been appropriating funds to finance these programs, which are concerned wholly with the recruitment, placement, and stabilization of industrial workers. The War Manpower Commission, the agency which has been functioning in this field and administering these programs, is today operating a Nation-wide system of public employment offices. It is operating a local employment office in every industrial area of the Nation. It has established and today has functioning in each industrial area in which manpower problems have arisen, local management-labor committees composed of the outstanding representatives in the locality of management and labor. Those committees have been operating for the past 2 years—have been considering policies, advising on administration, and deciding appeals from individual workers and employers, all in the field of recruitment, placement, and stabilization of the war workers needed for our war effort.

We found that facilities for determining the production and services which are most urgently needed for the war effort in each labor market area had been established through the cooperation of the interested Government agencies and management and labor. This machinery undertakes to evaluate the actual manpower needs of each plant and establishment; it determines, under principles developed by local management-labor committees and subject to appeals to those committees, whether workers employed in war or essential civilian activities should change jobs; it provides for the referral of workers to those jobs where they are most urgently needed for the war effort and where they will be employed at their highest skill.

The committee has become convinced that the most effective way of making certain that individuals will serve in the civilian economy, at the right places and at the right times, in support of the war effort, will be to enact a statutory basis for two basic types of regulations: First, employment ceilings under which employers could be required to release workers, and, second, hiring controls under which workers so released or otherwise available for new jobs could be channeled to suitable jobs where they were most needed. These are two controls which have grown out of 2 years of experience in the civilian manpower field—controls which have been recommended by management and labor itself and which management and labor have been applying on a voluntary basis. Those voluntary programs have not been completely successful because, in the final analysis, they have been dependent upon persuasion and indirect sanctions. Too frequently they have been ineffective as applied to the nonessential employer who profited by his noncompliance—at the expense of his competitors and other employers engaged in urgent war work. Both management and labor strongly recommended to our committee the enactment of legislation authorizing these two types of control, applicable to all employers.

In addition to this basic regulatory feature, the committee bill contains several provisions designed further to implement the manpower program. It provides for the closer coordination of production and procurement activities with manpower resources; it provides for in-plant surveys and other investigations with a view to the more effective utilization of manpower and the elimination of labor waste and labor hoarding; it provides for paying transportation costs for workers who voluntarily agree to move from one locality to another when such movement is necessary to aid in relieving labor shortages which substantially impede the war effort; it provides protection for the seniority rights of workers who leave their regular jobs in order to take war jobs; and it provides further protection for the reemployment rights of veterans who, upon their discharge from the armed forces, accept war jobs instead of returning directly to the jobs they had before entering the armed forces.

The bill also contains a special provision relating to agricultural workers. This provision amends the provision of the Selective Service Act, known as the Tydings amendment, which relates to the deferment from induction into the armed forces of men engaged in essential agricultural work. This provision in the bill also prohibits men who have been deferred from induction in the armed forces because they are engaged in essential agricultural work, and who are found to be unacceptable for service in the armed forces, from voluntarily leaving their agricultural work without the consent of their selective-service local boards.

I have indicated the salient features of the committee bill, and I think that I should now discuss its provisions in somewhat greater detail.

If Senators wish more closely to follow the statement they may refer to the bill itself, because I am about to discuss it a paragraph at a time and attempt to say in a few words what each paragraph provides.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator intend to compare the bill paragraph by paragraph with the House bill so that we may better understand the bill now before the Senate?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I will say, Mr. President, that such a comparison cannot be made. The comparison which has already been made between the Senate committee bill and the House bill is about all the comparison that can be made. It was necessary to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and rewrite it, because the theory and philosophy of the two bills are entirely different.

The first paragraph of the bill declares that every individual is obligated in time of war to serve the Nation in the capacity for which he is best qualified. That, Mr. President, is merely a reiteration of the general declaration at the beginning of the Selective Service Act, not in the same words, not in the same language, but the theory is identical in both cases. This is an important declaration of a fundamental obligation, but I wish to point out that it is not what I would term an operative provision of the bill. It authorizes no regulations or other methods of requiring compliance with the obligation which is declared. This section makes no requirements and authorizes no requirements with respect to which sanctions may be applied under the bill.

The next paragraph of the bill states the purposes of the act.

Section 2 gives statutory recognition to the War Manpower Commission, which was created as an agency of the Federal Government by Executive order on April 18, 1942, with its administrative authority vested in its Chairman. The functions vested in the Chairman by this bill are to be exercised under the direction and supervision of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, who is responsible for coordinating the work of all the executive agencies concerning the mobilization of the Nation for war.

Mr. President, in answer to the question asked by the Senator from Kentucky, I think it would be proper to state that in this provision the committee did follow the recommendation made by all the departments by adopting an amendment to the House bill so that the administration of the bill will be within the hands of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Does that mean that the regulations contained on page 15 and the top of page 16 must be approved by the Director of War Mobilization? It says:

> The Chairman is authorized * * * by regulation—

To do these things. Does this clause modify that language?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No. It is assumed that the Chairman would have power in case of difficulty to place the authority where it belongs in order properly to coordinate, which would be done through the larger organizations in case difficulty arose. But it is assumed that the Manpower Commission will proceed in the way in which it is now proceeding, although it also is directed by the coordinating authority at the present time. I think there is no lack of harmony between the two. In case of trouble each would support the other.

Mr. TAFT. If there were issued a regulation signed simply by the Chairman of the Manpower Commission without any reference to the Commission or without any reference to the Director of War Mobilization, would it be a valid regulation under this measure?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should assume so, Mr. President.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to ask the Senator what there is in the bill as reported by the committee that would even tend to solve the difficulties presented to the committee and to the Congress by the heads of our military forces from the President all the way down? The Senator is discussing some persuasive language, but where is there any compulsion?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If the Senator will look at section 4 (b) I think he will find the compulsion.

Mr. BAILEY. Is the section on page 12?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It is on pages 15 and 16. The compulsion, I may say to the Senator, is upon the employer, and not upon the employee. There is that difference, of course.

Mr. BAILEY. But we have great masses of people who are not employed at all, who are not working. What is being done with respect to such people?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The bill, frankly, does not touch the people who do not work, except in the agricultural section of the bill. It reaches out to those in agriculture.

Mr. BAILEY. It applies only to persons who are now employed?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Theoretically it only touches those who are now employed.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not want to interrupt the Senator, but it strikes me that the situation is one of such gravity and seriousness and such military necessity and moral obligation that I raise this question: The bill provides in the declaration of policy:

> That (a) every individual is obligated to serve the Nation in that capacity for which he or she is best qualified, and to continue in such capacity so long as his or her services are required, to the end that the Nation may make the most effective use of its manpower resources in support of the war effort.

That is a very fine statement. But what does the bill do to execute that statement? How does the bill implement that statement?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think, if the Senator from North Carolina would submit to the request I made when I began and permit me to finish the statement before we enter upon a general discussion of the provisions of the bill——

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I was not present when the Senator made that request. The Senator does not wish to be interrupted?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I asked not to be interrupted, and I asked also that I be permitted to review the bill first in order that Senators may understand the full program as it is outlined in the bill. I also made the statement that there would be no tendency to try to avoid answering questions, but I think it is fair to Senators who have been listening from the beginning of my statement that I should proceed with the statement, and then we can proceed to discuss and argue the various provisions of the bill. There will be no cutting off of debate.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the Senator need not give me an assurance of that sort. I asked the question wholly because I had not heard the Senator's request. I am thoroughly sympathetic with the Senator's request, and if the Senator does not care to answer the question now, I will not suspect that he wishes to evade the question.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I can answer the question now. I merely wish to proceed in order. At least, I can answer it to the satisfaction of some of us.

The manpower required for our war effort can best be mobilized through the cooperation of management and labor; and most of the manpower problems which confront the Nation at this time are local problems which can best be handled by local people at local levels. For these reasons, the bill provides for the establishment of management-labor committees at all levels of operation and provides that such committees—consisting in each case of representatives of labor, industrial management, and, where appropriate, agriculture—shall be consulted on basic policy decisions made at their respective administrative levels. This is in recognition of the fact that these committees have already proved their worth during their operations of the past 2 years and that, without their efforts, the magnificent production and manpower mobilization that has been accomplished could not have been attained.

This section also endorses the principle of making maximum use of local initiative and cooperative efforts of management, labor, and agriculture, and use of existing hiring channels.

Section 3 (a) reaffirms the responsibility of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, subject to the direction of the President, to provide for coordinating the activities of all departments and agencies of the Government responsible for production, procurement, or manpower. It is apparent that many of the manpower problems with which we are confronted today are a direct result of the failure of such coordination in the past. In order to assure that manpower requirements and the availability of manpower shall be given due consideration in determining where production schedules shall be increased or decreased and where contracts shall be awarded, terminated, or permitted to expire, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion is directed to take the steps necessary to attain that end. In addition, this section provides that the War Manpower Commission, as the agency responsible for the recruitment, placement, and stabilization of civilian workers, shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be notified in advance of changes in production schedules or contracts which are likely to result in manpower dislocations.

The Congress has for many months heard charges of mal-utilization of workers, of labor hoarding, and labor waste, both in establishments operated by the War and Navy Departments and in establishments operated by private contractors. We doubtless will hear more of such charges in the course of this debate. If, in fact, such mal-utilization of workers, labor hoarding, or labor waste exists in any such plants, the correction of such matters will reduce the demands for additional manpower, will release manpower for placement in urgent war work, and may relieve the necessity for bringing additional workers into already overcrowded communities. This bill provides for the discovery and elimination of these wasteful practices. With respect to production, repair, and maintenance activities of the War and Navy Departments, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion is required under section 3 (b) to take appropriate action to eliminate mal-utilization of workers, labor hoarding, or labor waste if such conditions exist. With respect to other establishments important to the war effort, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is responsible under section 4 (a) of the bill for discovering whether or not such conditions exist. In cases where he finds that they do exist, he can do much to remedy them, both by pointing out means for better labor utilization and by the use of his other powers, such as the imposition of ceilings on the number of employees.

The only regulatory provision of the bill, as applied to nonagricultural activities, occurs in section 4 (b) of the bill. That section authorizes the Chairman to regulate the number of individuals who may be employed and to regulate the hiring of new workers, to the extent necessary to carry out the purposes of the bill and to provide the manpower required for activities essential to the war effort. Employment ceilings may be prescribed for designated areas, activities, or places of employment; they may fix the maximum number of workers who may be employed by age, sex, or occupational qualifications. Through fixing employment ceilings, employers may be required to release workers found to be underutilized or unneeded. Workers employed in nonessential activities may similarly be required to be released. If the needs in a particular community are for additional workers possessing certain skills, employment ceilings on nonessential or less-urgent work may be limited to workers possessing the needed skills. If the needs in a particular community are for workers qualified for heavy work, employment ceilings in that community may be limited to male workers able to perform such heavy work; and if the needs in a particular community do not require additional workers, no employment ceilings will be applied.

Under the authority to regulate the hiring of new workers by employers, workers released through the application of employment ceilings, or otherwise available for work can be channeled to suitable jobs where they are most urgently needed for the war effort. Employers engaged in nonessential activities, or in less urgent activities, can be prohibited from hiring workers. Though the regulation applies only to employers, it indirectly limits the employment op-

portunities of workers and thereby channels such workers to the places where they are needed. The Chairman is directed to apply the employment ceiling and hiring regulations only to the extent necessary to carry out the purposes of the act. The regulations will therefore be adjusted to the needs of particular activities and particular communities.

I emphasize that these regulations are directly applicable to employers; they indirectly affect employees. The committee was convinced that the additional manpower needed for our war-production effort can be provided when and where needed through these two devices. Employment ceilings will make available additional workers of the types and numbers required; the hiring regulation will assure that workers so made available can be hired only for the jobs in which they are needed.

In order to implement and supplement the recruitment efforts of our public employment offices, the bill includes, in section 4 (c), provisions for furnishing transportation, in cases where that is necessary to relieve manpower shortages which substantially impede the war effort, and includes, in section 6 (a), provisions for protecting the reemployment rights of workers who leave their jobs to become employed in work essential to the war effort in response to requests, or requirements made under the bill. The reemployment rights so provided are substantially those provided for veterans in section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act, with two exceptions: First, the period within which application for reemployment in the former position must be filed is 30 days in lieu of the 90-day period provided for veterans; and, second, civilians accorded reemployment rights under this bill are not to secure greater employment rights than they would have had if they had remained in their original positions for the period during which they are employed in jobs accepted by them under the bill. The War Manpower Commission will issue certificates to persons entitled to reemployment rights under this section for the purpose of establishing the facts upon which the right to reemployment is dependent.

In order to enable discharged veterans entitled to reemployment rights under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act to accept war work without jeopardizing those rights, section 6 (b) of the bill provides that the period during which a veteran is employed in work accepted upon the request of the War Manpower Commission shall extend the period within which the veteran may apply for his old job.

Section 7 of the bill incorporates by reference paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of section 2 (a) of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act of 1942. Those sections, as incorporated in this bill, are set forth in full in the report of the committee on the bill. They provide for necessary investigatory and subpena powers, they authorize the Chairman to delegate the exercise of his authority under this bill, they define the jurisdiction of the courts, and they provide that willful violations of regulations under the act shall constitute a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of not more than $10,000 and by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both. The Senate knows that the inclusion of such penalties was a subject of marked differences of opinion in the committee. These penalties are applicable only to violations of regulations under section 4 (b) of the bill. They are applicable only to employers, because regulations under section 4 (b) of the bill are applied directly only to employers. In the opinion of the majority of the committee, compliance with those regulations would have been gravely endangered if, under the bill, their willful violation were not subject to criminal penalties. This matter is discussed at length in the committee's report.

The bill, in section 8, also provides an economic penalty for violation of employment-ceiling or hiring regulations prescribed under section 4 (b) of the bill. Any wage or other compensation paid for services rendered in an employment begun or continued in violation of those regulations, of which the employer had due notice, will not be allowed or allowable as a deduction from income, or as a cost or expense, for the purpose of computing taxes payable under any act of Congress or for the purpose of determining the amount to be paid to or recovered from any person with respect to any contract with the United States. This provision is somewhat similar to a provision contained in the Stabilization Act of October 2, 1942.

Section 9 of the bill requires the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to submit quarterly reports concerning his activities under the act.

Section 10 (a) defines the term "employment" and similar terms so that the application of the bill will not be limited to cases where the technical employer-employee relationship exists. This is done to prevent avoidance of the act by establishing arrangements under which an individual performing services for another is not technically his employee.

Section 10 (b) provides that the act shall not apply to States or their political subdivisions, except with their consent.

Section 11 amends section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act. It incorporates the substance of Senate Joint Resolution 33, recently introduced by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. The first respect in which it amends the existing law is by providing that in classifying registrants for the purpose of determining whether they shall be deferred from training and service in the land or naval forces because they are necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, such determinations shall be based exclusively on whether the registrants are necessary to and regularly engaged in such an occupation or endeavor, and whether a satisfactory replacement can be obtained, without reference to the relative essentiality of the registrants in some other occupation, service, or endeavor. This section also amends the existing law to provide that it shall be the duty of any registrant who is now or hereafter deferred under section 5 (k), and who has been found to be unacceptable to the land or naval forces for training and service, not voluntarily to leave or discontinue such agricultural occupation or endeavor unless his selective-service local board, subject to appeal, has determined that it is no longer necessary in the interest of the war effort for him to remain in such agricultural occupation or endeavor or that he has a justifiable reason for discontinuing such agricultural occupation or endeavor. Individuals who violate the duty thus imposed upon them will be subject to the penalties provided for violations of the Selective Training and Service Act.

Section 12 contains the ordinary separability clause.

Section 13 contains a termination date for the following provisions of the bill: Section 2 (b) of the bill, which provides for the establishment of management-labor committees; section 4 (a), which provides for in-plant surveys and other investigations of manpower utilization by the War Manpower Commission; and section 4 (b), which authorizes regulations fixing ceilings upon the number of employees who may be employed and regulating the hiring of new workers.

Section 14 provides that the act may be cited as the War Manpower Act of 1945.

Mr. President, I thank the Senate for allowing me to proceed in my own way.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a great portion of the Members of this body and, I believe, an equally great portion of the American people are viewing with increasing misgivings the foreign policy which is being followed by the American Government. Many of us suspect that the Government has no policy at all and is simply floundering in a gigantic maelstrom of events which is forcing our hand everywhere and making our policy for us.

It is my hope that this estimate is an incorrect one and that it will be proven, despite the disturbing circumstances with which we are now acquainted, that the Government of the United States does, indeed, have long-range goals and clearly defined views as to how these may be attained.

With few exceptions, the Members of both Houses of the Congress, without reference to party, have given the program of the President of the United States an unqualified loyalty and support. This has been so despite a major impediment the importance of which cannot be minimized. That impediment is the secrecy in which the discussions looking toward post-war security have been conducted.

By our election to the Congress, each one of us has been given a mandate by the people of America which obliges us to be fully informed as to all matters which will affect the national well-being and the future of the Nation. When in the interests of complete unity of command, we in this Congress have been willing to forego even this sacred trust, and thus to lay aside for the moment the usages of democracy, we are entitled to

feel that we have equipped the President of the United States up to the hilt with the powers which it has been claimed he required if he was to conduct successfully the negotiations by which we are to be led out of this wilderness of international hatred, fear, and distrust.

This mandate, however, did not constitute an abdication by the Congress as the supreme law-making body of the United States. Though the Congress has thus in the national interest given Mr. Roosevelt a free hand, it has not decided to become another Reichstag. We have now come to the point where it seems necessary for us to take stock and to know actually what is taking place in our foreign relations. We must know now actually what our foreign policy is.

If we have lost the game in Europe, or if we are being forced to forsake the policies and ideals to which we are pledged as a nation, I think it is time that we should know it. It is time, in short, that the veil of secrecy and the cover of ambiguous phrases behind which the entire scheme of negotiation is being concealed should be removed.

What is it that we fear, that we must again be committed to the dangerous wiles of secret diplomacy? Our enemies are retreating step by step. Certainly, no one questions that in the fullness of time they will be irrevocably beaten and forever rendered powerless if it is our intention to make them so. Is the situation between ourselves and our allies so delicate, then, that at this moment, on the very eve of victory, it would give comfort to the enemies of the American people if the curtain of secrecy were to be removed? I, for one, cannot believe so.

Mr. President, after surveying what has taken place, I think we now must ask that some accounting be given to the American people, that some inventory be made of the result of these long-continued negotiations.

On the surface, it would appear that the unparalleled strength of our early position has been dissipated; that in the councils of the world we have lost ground step by step; and that decisions with which we are vitally concerned, and which directly affect the future of this Nation, are being made almost totally independent of our consent.

Let us survey briefly the events in an effort to get at this concealed ledger of profit and loss in our foreign relationships. In October 1943 the First Moscow Conference was held. Here the powers pledged themselves to a world league. Perhaps it has been forgotten by some, but they also pledged themselves not to use their armies in the territories of other nations without joint agreement. They agreed thenceforward to consult each other on all issues which concerned their mutual affairs, and a joint committee was to be set up for this purpose.

Last year we and our allies again met in a series of solemn conferences, with a result which has come to be known as the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. Those deliberations had exactly the same purposes as those of the previous Moscow Conference.

Although a legal framework was not actually erected, it was announced that the nations had come to an agreement and that thenceforward the United Nations, at least, would be governed by certain definitely defined conceptions of international law.

Since that time the states whose agreement was to have formed the keystone for the new world of international law and justice have been taking the law into their own hands. They have been making the decisions which have to do with their individual security and future well-being, without reference to any other considerations than their own will.

I do not state this fact as a measure of criticism against any of our allies. Perhaps the criticism should as much be directed to us, and to the unfortunate lack of clarity which suffuses our own foreign policy and its objectives. It may very well be, and probably is a fact, that those actions of individual strong-arm politics have been the result of a total lack of faith in the sanctimonious phrases and the glittering abstractions which have been the product of the previous conferences. If men are known by what they do, rather than by what they say, I am entitled to point out that all those unilateral actions by which our allies have shown plainly their lack of confidence in world security, took place not before the First Moscow Conference, or even before the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, but since.

We were entitled to believe, too, that at this dangerously late hour when the very future destiny of our Nation may be written in events now taking place in Europe, some decision would be made at the Crimean Conference of a decisive nature in relation to permanent world order, world security, and peace. Instead, we are told that there is to be still another conference of the United Nations, which is to meet in San Francisco, and that there are to be further discussions on what is now vaguely described as "a charter" for a world league.

Aside from this vague and unsatisfactory pronouncement, the sole practical result of the Yalta Conference has been to countersign the unilateral actions of one of our allies, the Soviet Union, in respect to certain of its European neighbors. One of those, the Polish Republic, is to give up a third of its territory to the Soviet Union and, to judge by the declarations of the Polish Government in exile, the remainder is to become a puppet state under the complete domination of the Kremlin. The Yalta Conference declared that various democratic elements among the Polish people are now to be included in the Government. This would appear to be a mere face-saving gesture for the benefit of the western democracies that have been compelled to acquiesce in this procedure. The only democratic elements that could be incorporated in the Polish Cabinet are those that are now in exile whom Moscow calls the reactionaries. In Poland, itself, all democratic groups have been liquidated or suppressed. In the provisional government at least 10 of the 17 members are Communists. Some of those, including the president, are not even Polish citizens.

Premier Tomasz Arciszewski, of the Polish Government in exile, has bitterly assailed the occupation of his homeland and has stated for his Government that it will never accept the Big Three's decision for a new partition of Poland.

I shall not comment on this further than to remind the Senate that when Great Britain, with the warm approval of the entire free world, entered this war against Germany, it was for the declared purpose of adhering to a pledge to protect the territorial integrity of Poland. It is a pathetic fact of which I must remind Senators that the Polish Nation is not our enemy, but our ally.

It appears necessary, therefore, in the face of this violent objection on the part of our ally, Poland, that we take cognizance of what is a serious quarrel between nations allied to us. The mere fact that one is large and strong, the other weak and broken by the Nazi assault on its territories, does not alter any of the moral considerations involved.

If governments are to be guided only by expediency in their relationships with each other, there will be no base for a permanent foreign policy or an enduring peace. All that can result is the usual jockeying for position, covered by the usual insincere phrases, and the usual worthless treaties and assurances.

At no point where we have allowed pure and unalloyed expediency to govern our dealings with our allies and friends has the final result favored us. When we achieved what appeared to be a cheap and easy victory by throwing overboard the man who had been our friend and ally, Gen. Charles de Gaulle, and making a deal with the French Fascists of north Africa, in the end we paid a dear price. Our action in alienating the French resistance leaders resulted in building a suspicion of our methods and our motives which is observable all over Europe today. One of the results has been to throw de Gaulle directly into the arms of Stalin.

The same set of moral considerations which apply to our ally, Poland, must apply to the Greeks, the Serbs, the Czechs, and all others who have shed their blood with us on common battlefields.

Is it not a sad commentary upon the failure of our mutual policies that our ally, Greece, for example, should become a battleground in which the invader is not some enemy, but our other ally, Great Britain. The latter quite evidently was seeking to protect its own interests by guaranteeing by this invasion the security of its life line of empire, the route to India.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. As I understand the gist of the Senator's remarks, he is decrying political expediency in international affairs, and making a plea for international morality. Is that not the essence of his statement?

Mr. BUTLER. I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire that it is not my desire to lay down a particular and exact formula to be followed today, but to plead that we do away with the secrecy which has enveloped our international dealings up to date. I think that we have no more right to consider in secrecy important questions with re-

lation to our Nation and its future than to consider in secrecy any ordinary affairs involving the interests of our Nation.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, allow me to point out, with respect to the communique which came from Yalta, and which was received very favorably throughout the world, especially by this Nation, that one of the two tragic features of the communique was that it reaffirmed the principles of the Atlantic Charter by a definite system set forth therein, and a few lines later it set forth, on a very definite point, action entirely contrary to the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

Mr. BUTLER. I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I shall touch upon that point a little further on in my discourse.

Mr. President, I note in the declarations at Yalta what appears to be a cool recognition of the right of the larger states to protect their individual interests by the use of force, not only against our enemies but against our smaller allies. The three states meeting at Yalta have, in the circuitous language of the declaration which was issued, arrogated to themselves the full right of intervention in any liberated European state.

Wherever we look such intervention already has taken place. Certainly it exists in Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Hungary. In those countries our press is barred, although I understand, according to an Associated Press release of February 10 from Rome, that two Canadian correspondents and one official French press agency correspondent have recently been allowed to enter Belgrade, Yugoslavia, from Italy. What is going on there no one knows, but obviously it is not in the direction of a free, democratic expression of the will of those people.

I do not make reference to the three Baltic States—Estonia, Lithuania, and Latvia—whose independent existence is officially recognized by our Government and courts, although their demise is covertly acknowledged in our diplomatic dealings.

Now we are told that we can control the situation by a gigantic W. P. A., by which we will endeavor to support the balance of the world with loans and the export of our manufacturing machinery. This is obviously a dangerous and futile approach to our problem, and can result in not the slightest real value to the United States unless we know what our goals are and unless they are clearly outlined so that all may see.

I am satisfied that the world cannot safely return to the old business of power politics, or to the old isolationism in any guise. We must face the real fundamental issues, and at some point hold rigidly to the moral causes involved. Isolationism and bilateral bargaining, which once might have served this Nation, are now clearly valueless. At this moment we must have a world settlement of some kind in which all the primary issues are recognized and the major outlines of their solutions agreed upon.

The decision at the Yalta Conference, for example, to underwrite the four-way partition of Germany, is not a decision resulting from mutual understanding and faith, but is a worthless solution based on mutual distrusts. The partition of Germany is a silly and uneconomic proposal which could end badly for us.

I want a peace in which the Nazis will be severely punished and in which Germany will be held under rigid control, but to adopt any policy which would assure perpetual resentment among the eighty to ninety million people of German stock in central Europe would hand the world another irreconcilable problem.

I should point out, too, in this bewildering complexity of circumstance, that our Government pledged itself, together with the others, to an Atlantic Charter, which presumably was to apply to all nations in the final post-war settlement by which the peace was to be secured. Later we were informed that the Atlantic Charter never really existed because it was not formally signed. Now, as a result of the Yalta Conference, reference again is made to it, as if the Atlantic Charter once again is an accepted portion of the creed of the United Nations. Either the charter applies or it does not apply; and if it does apply, it applies universally to Latvia, Poland, Greece, and India, as well as to the Philippines. One cannot blow hot and cold on it, or reserve it for application only to certain selected cases.

We cannot win the peace based on such a cynical appraisal as this evidence implies, without running the risk of disillusioning our own citizens, and particularly the returning soldiers who will become the mightiest force in this Republic. We must keep faith with these men and women, both as to our aims and our faith in democratic institutions, as well as in some common-sense relationship of the United States to the world. Neither can we continue to dignify with a cover of pious phrases the present dangerous and unbecoming scramble among the larger states for the spoils.

It is a commonplace remark, but I nevertheless again make it, that Americans yearn with every fiber of their being today for a system of peace and security which will endure. We want no more war and no more of this fearful carnage and dissipation of our national assets, such as is now making every 25 years a tragic period of national blood letting. And, I venture to say, that the American people want no part in the creation of new antagonisms which would bleed the youth of our Nation for generations to come.

We believe that this is a world which is going to have to hold all of us, large and small. It also seems to us that since the United States has been, with the Soviet Union, the most important force in winning this war, it must be, together with the Soviet Union, the most important force in directing the peace. In particular, the United States cannot sit supinely by and let the physical conditions of tomorrow's existence be hammered and fashioned into shape by others without reference to prior mutual agreement or the usages of international law and order.

If the proof of the pudding is in the eating thereof, it is altogether possible that the present Dumbarton Oaks scheme for world organization is unfitted in its basic concepts to accomplish the objective to which the entire American Nation is committed—world peace and security. As presently constituted, the league would consist of a group of multilateral treaties, similar to the treaties which failed to protect Poland, and to that other whole succession of treaties which throughout history have been vacated wherever the immediate interests of the nations involved were no longer served by them.

It seems to me that in the present Dumbarton Oaks proposal we can see the creation of a grandiose supergovernment under the domination of three men who now, for good or for ill, hold the destines of the world in their hands. I say this advisedly because under the miscalled compromise agreement suggested by our President at Yalta, no check whatever can be placed in the way of future aggression which may be instituted by any one or all three of these men. Such a condition of affairs, if we allow our Government to become a party to it, would be the negation of every principle of freedom for which our ancestors fought and died on the battlefields of former wars.

Throughout the meetings since the Moscow Conference, has run this deplorable philosophy. The Russians, for example, have stated their unwillingness to be policed except with their own consent, a view which reduces the entire business of world organization to absurdity.

As a result of the Yalta Conference an effort is to be made to bridge this fundamental objection on the part of the Soviet Union. I understand that the agreement now will be that economic sanctions will be introduced against an aggressor, rather than military intervention. Economic sanctions are purely worthless, as was proved when Italy moved against Ethiopia. They cannot be introduced or implemented without final recourse to armed force, and will simply result in turning the world again into an armed camp.

I survey with profound anxiety the entire projected structure of the Dumbarton Oaks plan because I fear it not only to be faulty but also because I fear its adoption will be only the prelude to future and more terrible wars.

The new league is to contain, for example, a security council, which is frankly described by Mr. Stettinius as a power council. He states in an article in the current Reader's Digest, that since only the great powers possess the needed industrial capacity and other resources, wars "can be prevented and suppressed in the future only if the great powers employ their dominant, physical power justly and in unity of purpose to that end." In the future the world is to be policed by four or possibly five countries which are described as the great powers, and which will, in effect, control the destinies of the smaller states surrounding them. In the security council there are to be five permanent seats and six nonpermanent seats, representing the smaller nations.

Imagine the scramble on the part of the large nations to dominate the nonpermanent voting members. Let us imagine, for example, that one of these is to be Poland or Yugoslavia. How do Senators think the Lublin Committee would vote, for example, as a member of this council? Would it by any stretch of the imagination vote against the big boss in the Kremlin on any vital issue? Or could Iraq, Egypt, or a harassed and suppressed Greece vote against the interests of the British Empire?

Do we not see in Poland, Yugoslavia, and Greece the precise results of handing the small powers over to the mercies of the larger? How can anyone believe that overwhelming power and the right to use it can ever be handled unselfishly? Is it not certain to end with a big fish swallowing the small fish, with finally a deadly competition resulting between the big fish themselves?

We have made even a poorer beginning in the business of world organization than this estimate supposes. Three members of the proposed security council have met at Yalta, and have come to decisions, part of which are still on the secret list. They have met, deliberated, and concluded, with no more than lip service to the rights of any of the other nations or, indeed, without reference to the supreme lawmaking body of one of them, the Congress of the United States. They have laid down the shape of things to come. They have given factual recognition to situations and policies which, once having been set in motion, are almost impossible to change or reverse. They have, in short, countersigned and underwritten with legal sanction the unilateral actions and system of power politics to which I have referred. By so doing they have laid down the conditions of the future as surely as if it had been written in the classic laws of the Medes and Persians.

Despite executive approval of the Dumbarton Oaks program, there appears to be no actual unanimity of opinion among those in the Government itself who are dealing directly with this problem. Mr. Stettinius declares in his Reader's Digest article that the purpose of Dumbarton Oaks is to obtain:

> The progressive reduction of armaments, which in the modern world have become a crushing burden on the resources of all nations. If we—

He continues—

> in this country, for example, could have used for productive peacetime purposes only one-half of what we have devoted to arms for this war, we would have advanced beyond measure the standard of living of the American people.

Yet, despite this promise, at the identical moment we hear an equally distinguished and authoritative voice, that of the President's assistant, Harry Hopkins, saying in the current American Magazine that though we must go into the Dumbarton Oaks arrangement, we must also "accept a new and tough concept in world affairs—that the earth is not civilized enough to make world-wide disarmament practical for peace-loving nations."

He writes that it is not enough to form the world-wide security organization proposed by Dumbarton Oaks, but that—

> We can't take a chance. When this war ends we must immediately prepare to defend ourselves, particularly to make sure that our enemies realize that if they dare to strike again, they will lose again.

If Mr. Hopkins has painted a correct picture of the situation—and, be it noted, he is looked upon as a spokesman of our President—is it unreasonable for us to ask what possible good is going to come to the American people and the world at large from the international conference projected for April 25 in San Francisco?

All of this is extremely confusing, and is the self-evident result of muddled thinking and an unsound approach to our mutual problem. Whom is Mr. Hopkins talking about against whom we must immediately "defend ourselves" when the war is over? It cannot be the Germans and Japs—though he does refer to these nations—since they, it must be assumed, will have been beaten literally to a pulp, and will not be able to recover within the visible future.

What faith is this to offer to the American people, and what assurance to offer the war-weary peoples of the world.

At this moment I can say I am neither for nor against the Dumbarton Oaks solution. Frankly, I am in much doubt. I do not know, and I doubt whether any Member of Congress knows, in view of the lack of full information on this subject.

William B. Ziff's recent book, The Gentlemen Talk of Peace, presents strong evidence to show that an international league built on the basis of 70 independent sovereignties, or, as he terms them, 70 national egos, will not work. He maintains, as we have heard previously on this floor, that we must go a step further and regroup the world into great political federations capable of conforming to the demands of a modern manufacturing and distributing economy. This he believes to be the heart of the present dilemma.

At the moment I reserve judgment as to this or any other proposal. I am certain that we must create some type of world-security organization, but I do not think it will be done in the present atmosphere of secrecy. These propositions must be examined in the cold light of day, and not in the darkness of some hidden diplomatic convention. How far have our present leaders departed from President Wilson's great aspiration of open covenants openly arrived at?

What is at stake now is not some minor goal of statecraft, but the very lives of our sons and daughters and the very future of our Republic. It is not too much to expect that we have both the right and the duty to subject to critical scrutiny every proposition which would affect them.

Congress cannot continue to operate in the dark in reference to the details of our foreign policy. Certainly the Senate of the United States, by reason of its constitutional position in the framework of our Government, is entitled to light upon all the isues involved. No matter how able and enlightened our representatives may be, the responsibilities with which we are charged cannot be further laid aside. It is we as a body who must accept the task of determining the national future and the nature of the national commitments. We must do it, not as a rubber stamp after the fact; we must do it now, in full, free discussion of all the issues.

It appears to me that the hour has come when the President of the United States and our State Department must give a full accounting to the Congress of what is actually taking place and what may be expected from this difficult situation. We must know now, and not be referred again to some indeterminate future time at which further discussions and parleys are to take place. For the decisions which are making the future of the world, and hence the future of this Nation, are being made at this very moment. It is these decisions which will outlive the pacts, arrangements, and conversations which have so far been the major result of the conferences.

If the Government of the United States is indeed a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, they are entitled to be entrusted now with an opportunity to consider their own foreign policy.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks an article from the Washington Star of Sunday, February 25, 1945, written by Constantine Brown.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATORS SEEK MORE LIGHT ON AGREEMENTS AT YALTA—TRY TO PENETRATE SECRECY AROUND PARLEY TO DETERMINE WHETHER COMMITMENTS GO FURTHER THAN PUBLIC STATEMENT

(By Constantine Brown)

As far as official Washington disclosures are concerned, the Yalta Conference will not reach the front page of the newspapers until President Roosevelt returns to Washington and Secretary of State Stettinius is back from Mexico City to set the propaganda machinery in motion for the San Francisco conference on April 25.

But while the rank and file of the American people are giving little thought to the question, some Senators have turned their attention to the historical and dramatic decisions taken in the marble palace which once housed the Czars of Russia.

They are already trying to peer through the heavy curtain of secrecy which was drawn after the heads of the American, Russian, and British Governments adjourned and gave the world an exhaustive communique concerning only those points deemed advisable to reveal.

CONCERNED OVER COMMITMENTS

The communique issued at the end of the political conversations among President Roosevelt, Premier Stalin, and Prime Minister Churchill is believed to have been the handiwork of a former Associated Press reporter now President Roosevelt's press secretary, Stephen Early. The communique did not attempt to conceal in overvague diplomatic sentences the fact that the Polish and Yugoslav questions had been settled in accordance with the wishes and desires of Premier Stalin.

This was not news to the majority of the Washington officials and newspapermen who had known a few months after the end of the

Tehran Conference in 1943 that "the goose" of all the formerly sovereign states on Russia's borders extending as far as the Adriatic "had been cooked."

The legislators in the upper House, however, are concerned over what other commitments have been undertaken by President Roosevelt outside those already announced in Mr. Early's communique. The Golden Gate conference will provide for a world security organization patterned more after the recent Yalta decisions than after the outlines of Dumbarton Oaks.

ACCEPT SECRET DIPLOMACY

The people of the United States and their elected Representatives have been compelled to accept the principles of secret diplomacy. There was no way to force the administration to put the diplomatic cards on the table because it was said that in wartime a premature disclosure of what was happening in secret conclave might injure the war effort.

Consequently, the Members of the Senate have no means of learning, except through some "pipe line" and gossip what actually is happening to America's foreign relations which they eventually will be called to endorse in the form of a treaty. Members of the Foreign Relations Committee have made many attempts to find out what has happened at all the diplomatic parleys since Casablanca.

TOLD EXACTLY NOTHING

Witnesses such as former Secretary of State Hull, Gen. George C. Marshall, and other "insiders" have testified in executive session and told the Senators exactly nothing more than what the White House permitted to be told. And that was little more than had already been published in the daily newspapers and weekly and monthly magazines. Whenever some pertinent questions were directed at these high-ranking officials, the answer was "that is all we know" or "this is now in the realm of military security and cannot be disclosed."

In wartime it can be said by those who prefer the dark to the light that all diplomatic transactions have a military meaning and consequently must be kept secret. And there is no way to change this situation. Even first-hand gossip about the various conferences from what is conceded to be a reliable source never gets direct confirmation.

SEEK DIRECT INFORMATION

The Yalta Conference was shrouded in greater secrecy than the Teheran meeting. When President Roosevelt returns to the United States he may consent to give the treaty-making body of the legislative branch of the Government more details than were contained in the Early communique. But he does not have to go into detail since all the Yalta conversations and decisions are covered by military considerations and the Senators cannot learn definitely any more than is given them voluntarily by the Chief Executive or his agents.

But because the Yalta agreements and deals have a direct bearing on the world-security organization which must be approved by the Senate before it becomes final, a number of Senators who are thinking in terms of representing the American people rather than following the Chief Executive blindly, are now seeking more direct information on what has been decided by the Big Three. These men who share the desires of the entire Nation in having a lasting peace suspect that some of the deals entered into at Yalta do not fully answer the purpose for which we have gone to war.

FEAR USURPATION OF RIGHTS

The Senators also are afraid that the world security organization will be nothing but the establishment of a dictatorship of the Big Three over the rest of the world. They are afraid that the United States will become a party to the usurpation of the sovereign rights of the lesser nations and that American armed forces and economic strength might be used to keep the people of those countries in continual subservience and bondage.

Already there are indications that the Golden Gate conference will be mostly a show and will be called merely to confirm decisions reached in secret at Yalta.

One of the Government high officials, when asked whether it was worth while for some independent observer to proceed to San Francisco, answered: "I don't think so. All the decisions have already been taken and the conferees will only offer a make-believe discussion before ratifying an agreement which has already been reached."

STALIN COMMENT FRANK

A member of President Roosevelt's party gave a vague summary of what he said happened at Yalta concerning eastern Europe. He volunteered the information that President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill were endeavoring to save some of these countries' rights to independent life. Premier Stalin, who is a man of few words, let them talk. Then he turned to them and said in his blunt manner that since the representatives of the two English-speaking democracies knew they would not wage war on Russia for the sake of these minor states, they might as well reconcile themselves to the Russian thesis.

And, this high official added as an afterthought, "Stalin had a strong argument when he pointed out that Germany already has attacked Russia through this corridor twice. The U. S. S. R. has a right to demand a complete and unhampered control over these small countries."

This and other interesting bits of conversation among the Big Three will not be made public officially but the meaning of these discussions was translated into official words when the official communique announced what the fate of Poland and Yugoslavia would be. A diplomatic coating covers up the truth that the entire area from the Vistula to the Adriatic has been unreservedly handed over to Russia.

BALTIC STATES NOT MENTIONED

The fate of the Baltic States was not even discussed because these three republics were made a part and parcel of the Soviet Union in June 1940. The Yalta communique failed to mention Greece. Neither did it reveal anything in regard to Turkey, the Straits, Iran, nor Norway, where Russian troops already are in its northern portions and are expected to contribute to the final liberation of that kingdom. We know nothing about what has been discussed in regard to the Mediterranean Basin which could not have been overlooked since Russia today claims also to be a Mediterranean power. Neither did we learn of the fate of the Balkans and Central European areas which have been "liberated" by the Red armies.

REPORT ON AGENDA

We do not know whether the treatment of the American official and unofficial citizens in the countries, which have signed an armistice with us through the intermediary of the Russian Army commanders formed a topic of conversation, nor do we know whether commercial interests will be permitted to operate in those countries in the future without previous clearance from Moscow.

Without doubt these questions—which are far more important for the future than they appear today when the public mind is concentrated on the war—were discussed. They are said to have been on Mr. Roosevelt's agenda before he left Washington and there is no reason to believe they were removed after he reached Yalta unless Premier Stalin's temper was such that their removal might have been considered a diplomatic necessity.

RUSSIAN SECURITY FIXED

All these matters will have a tremendous bearing on the world-security organization which the Senate will be called on to ratify before it can become effective. Premier Stalin is described as having only a perfunctory interest in this new organization. The security of his empire already is assured in Europe by the territorial acquisitions in Europe. It may be further enhanced by what he will be able to obtain as a price for his intervention against the Japanese in the Far East.

Hence, it is easy to understand why he takes a lofty point of view and sums up the world's future security in a terse sentence which he is reported to have told his two colleagues: "So long as we three are friends, there can be no danger of another war."

Stalin can make war or peace according to his own lights. He does not have to consult his people if he wishes to extend the borders of his huge empire and orders a large army on the march again. He can command hundreds of thousands of Russian soldiers to go wherever he wishes and whenever he wishes. Thus the world-security organization to him is an academic matter so long as his own delegates can maintain Russia's right to remain and vote in the big council when decisions about an aggressor are taken.

SITUATION DIFFERENT HERE

With the United States the situation is different. The freely elected Members of the Senate are the only ones who can decide on the disposition of our armed forces. Their constituents are not diplomatic and they know only what they see in the press or hear over the radio. They know nothing about the intricacies of the diplomatic game.

They are expected to exert a certain pressure on their Senators to have a world organization to do away with wars. But it is on the elected men to decide whether this organization is really what the people of this country want.

In order to be better judges of what the world-security pact will actually contain they feel that they must have an intimate and detailed picture of the last momentous meeting of the Chief Executive and his foreign partners. Without this the new pact which they will be asked to ratify may be either meaningless or a trap for which eventually they will be held responsible by their electors.

This is why the Senators feel that they must find out the real truth about the Yalta discussions and agreements.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to compare the committee amendment as offered to the bill which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs for consideration, with the true state of facts.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. KILGORE. For what purpose?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. To ask a question about the bill we are now considering.

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I call the Senator's attention to page 16, lines 3 and 4, particularly the language starting on line 3, "or places of employment fixing the maximum number of workers, by age, sex, or occupational qualifications." What is the Senator's understanding of the

meaning of that particular language, insofar as the child-labor laws are concerned? It seems to me it does away with all the State labor laws.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not think it would do away with any law without specifically repealing it. Certainly a Federal act could not interfere with a State act fixing minimum ages for laboring people. It does apply, however, and was intended to apply, as was understood in the committee, to this matter, that young labor should not be held out of military service if older men could do the work; men should not be held out of service if women could do the work, in order to make the most effective use of the various classifications of labor. Also carpenters should not be put to work at jobs in which they have to learn to be machinists, we will say, nor should electricians be converted into sheet-metal workers. That was the purpose of the language, as I understand it.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator does not believe that the language gives the power to the administrative authority to fix the ages of the workers?

Mr. KILGORE. I do not see how it could if it conflicts with existing State laws. The Congress of the United States cannot transgress without special authority granted in the Constitution, and certainly, without special wording, the laws of the respective States under their police powers withheld by them in agreeing to the Constitution of the United States. I do not see how we could do that.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator. Will the Senator yield for the purpose of offering an amendment?

Mr. KILGORE. I will yield simply for the purpose of permitting the Senator to offer an amendment.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, line 17, in section 7, it is proposed to omit the "(5)" which would amend section 7 to read as follows:

SEC. 7. Paragraphs (3), (4), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), as amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, shall be applicable with respect to this act to the same extent as such paragraphs are applicable with respect to such subsection (a), except that, for the purposes of this act, the word "President," wherever it occurs in such paragraphs, shall be deemed to refer to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, a bill emanating from the House was presented to the Military Affairs Committee, which was considered, and the present amendment was brought back to the Senate by the Military Affairs Committee. The bill as presented to the committee was drafted purely from the military viewpoint and standard. When General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, was asked how the bill would operate, he well said, "We will push masses of men toward the job." That is good military mobilization psychology, because, in mobilizing men for military service, the first thing taken into consideration is that the men mobilized are going into an industry or into a job about which they know nothing. All are drafted on an equal basis. In peacetime we operate with a small armed force, and we operate on the theory that this armed force will be able to handle and train the necessary increases in personnel and implements which are made available in time of war, after war is declared. The basis of that bill was the pushing of masses of individual workers toward a job, without taking into consideration their special qualifications or their special lack of qualifications. In the military mobilization we pick up a million men, we put them through a basic training course of 17 weeks, and we say that they are basically soldiers in the United States Army. Then we put them through an organizational training period. When we pick them up, we furnish them with shelter, clothing, food, and it is generally considered that they will leave their families. That is the military idea.

The original bill, H. R. 1752, was based upon that idea and contained language in keeping with that idea. In addition, it affected only a very small segment of our working population. It affected that segment represented by males between the age of 18 and 45, after deducting the 12,000,000 or more men already inducted, and the additional men who will have to be inducted from that group. So it affected but a small segment of our working population in the United States. It imposed no methods of controlling the number of men held out by overemployment in plants which could not accommodate the men on the pay roll. It did not take into account any classification of special skills. It did not take into account the places where women could and, in many cases, do even better work than men. It provided only a punitive measure against the residue of the men from 18 to 45 who might not be engaged in essential labor.

In addition to that the bill violated the principle under which we have operated since the foundation of this country. It violated the principle against—shall we better say in legal language—exercising eminent domain over human beings for the benefit of private industry. It granted to the Government the right to exercise that right of eminent domain over human beings, and was purely a punitive bill. In other words they called it work or fight. It would better be called work, take a job and sit down, or go to jail. And to the types of men against whom it was particularly aimed the going to jail would not occasion much worry. That would be just an easier way of obtaining a living. The punitive law is addressed to the small percentage of the citizenry who are not law-abiding; it is never addressed to the large percentage who are law-abiding. Wherefore, a statute that reverses the sound philosophy of the law and applies to the 90 percent of the citizenry a principle that is applicable to only 10 percent of them is ignoring the basic psychology of all primitive statutory law. That was the problem with which we were faced.

We were also faced with another problem. A man would be considered rather foolish who would employ a lawyer to remove his appendix, or who would employ a doctor to defend him in a lawsuit. Yet the aim and purpose of the original bill is to run industry upon the basis of military policy and upon the advice of military men. In making that statement I do not cast any reflection upon the sponsors of the bill or those who drafted it. I am merely getting to the background of the bill which was brought to the committee. The committee brought out a bill in connection with which its members had consulted with industry, and labor, and as a matter of fact the foundation stones of that bill were contained in the statement of the President of the National Association of Manufacturers. In other words, the committee consulted the individuals who are manufacturing the munitions and obtained their advice as to what should be the basis for obtaining maximum production, because, say what we will, had we wanted merely to punish individuals within the 18 to 45 age bracket for not doing what we wanted them to do, or had be wanted to get them to serve in some capacities, we could have utilized the Selective Service Act, which implemented the powers of the Government in abundant capacity for getting those from 18 to 45 into work of some kind, if we were not particular about the kind of work into which we would get them, and were not particular with respect to selecting their skills.

So the amendment as it came out of the committee approaches the situation from an entirely different viewpoint than that of the House bill. The amendment seeks to do what the Commander in Chief, and what the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, have asked of the United States Congress to do, which is to obtain the maximum production of which this country is capable in the present emergency. It seeks to do it upon the advice of the men who manage the plants which produce this material, and the men who work in those plants. It follows a general pattern which has been successful, where cooperation was afforded, under a purely voluntary system, with no method of enforcement, and no method of getting results other than the powers of pure persuasion. In other words, it follows the method which the War Manpower Commission, with no method of enforcing its rulings, has been utilizing for 2½ years, or 3 years, and in the utilization of which it has been highly commended by the industrial leaders of this country as well as the leaders of labor, as well as by the logistics of war.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from Maryland for a question.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have been following the observation just made by the Senator from West Virginia, and I believe that basically his observation is sound; but I should like to ask him if he does not think that the situation which

existed a year ago, 2 years ago, or 3 years ago, when voluntary cooperation was employed to bring about maximum production, has been greatly altered by the fact that today the Army and Navy have taken about 12,000,000 people from the available pool of workers, and that more and more are being taken each month. We have reached the point where possibly we cannot afford the luxury of voluntary employment if we are to supply the men on the fighting fronts with the additional and greatly increased amount of material that they now need.

Mr. KILGORE. Is the question based upon the fact that the Senator from Maryland feels that there is an actual shortage of manpower in the United States to accomplish the job?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not say that there is a shortage of manpower in the country; but I do say that unless some system is devised to utilize that manpower efficiently, in succeeding months, should the war go adversely rather than favorably, as it now seems to be going, we may reach the point where the men who are dying will not have the things they need with which to fight.

Mr. KILGORE. I maintain that the committee amendment would produce efficient utilization of labor. I believe I can show the Senator from Marylind the method in which it would attain that end.

Let me say to the Senator from Maryland that the 12,000,000 or more persons who were taken out of the age group between 18 and 45, which is the only group that was touched by the May-Bailey bill and was thereby depleted, is still the group that the May-Bailey bill seeks to operate on. Everyone else, male or female, is absolutely free to do as he or she pleases. In the proposed amendment we believe that we have, with the advice of industrial leaders, devised a method which will produce efficient use, at the maximum efficiency of the individuals, by selective utilization of labor, and will result in the necessary production, which we do not believe would be attained under the other bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, it is problematical whether or not the amendment would produce the degree of efficiency which all of us desire. I am in no position to say that it would or that it would not. I am not a member of the committee. I take it to be the Senator's considered judgment that mere voluntary cooperation will get people into the necessary jobs, so that we will obtain the maximum of production.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me say to the Senator from Maryland that this is not mere voluntary cooperation. There is an abundance of sanctions contained in the bill, which will be more effective upon the loafer than jail sentences. All that man in jail can do is eat three meals a day.

Mr. TYDINGS. Suppose, for example, that 500 men are needed at city A, and the 500 men are not available. Under the mechanics of the bill, how would the 500 men be made available?

Mr. KILGORE. They could be recruited by skills, and transported to city A.

Mr. TYDINGS. Suppose the men did not want to be recruited and transported? What would we do then?

Mr. KILGORE. An area in which there was an abundance of manpower would have ceilings fixed for the plants in that area, which would make available the necessary 500 men. The additional advantage is that those 500 men would leave knowing that they could go back to their old jobs as soon as their wartime work was finished, which would tend to produce voluntary workers, something we have not had in the past.

Mr. TYDINGS. Suppose a ceiling were established, and 500 men were put out of their jobs. As I understand, the proposed law would compel them to leave the jobs at which they were employed. Am I correct?

Mr. KILGORE. Based upon the ceiling; yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. In other words, while we will not put a man in jail, we will compel him to give up the employment which he has been following.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Suppose, after a man leaves his original employment, he does not wish to go from Kansas City to New York, where he is needed. What do we do then?

Mr. KILGORE. If there is no job in his home town to which he can go, my experience tends to show me that he will voluntarily go to the job where he is needed. Let me cite an example. The other day in the city of Baltimore, 450 men from one plant went to another plant seeking jobs there.

Mr. TYDINGS. That situation was occasioned by the fact that one plant laid off employees, and another plant needed workers. However, in the case which I am supposing, I do not foresee——

Mr. KILGORE. In the case in Baltimore, the Government shut down one plant.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. That plant had been furnishing material to the other plant.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true.

Mr. KILGORE. No provision was made to transfer skilled labor from one plant to the other.

Mr. TYDINGS. In that case the problem largely solves itself. However, in the case which I am discussing, let us assume that 1,000 men are needed in Wheeling, W. Va., because of the need for some critical article manufactured there.

Mr. KILGORE. Let us turn the assumption around and assume that they are needed in Baltimore, because we have been furnishing the labor for Baltimore, instead of Baltimore furnishing the labor for us.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me state the case. Suppose the thousand men are not available. Let us assume that Minnesota is the area from which the recruitment and draft should take place. We ask for the men, and they do not come. Then we put 1,000 men out of employment, men who ought to come in answer to the demand; and after they are put out of employment they still refuse to come. What do we do from there on?

Mr. KILGORE. If ceilings have been fixed, and they have been certified out of their jobs, they will have a difficult time making a living.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; but I can tell the Senator something about such a situation. We had that condition in 1933 and 1934. Millions of people were out of employment in the State of New York. We appropriated a great deal of money for relief in the State of New York. Then a movement was set afoot to try to persuade those people to go into some employment elsewhere, on what would have been a self-sustaining basis. We showed them that instead of sitting down and waiting for their checks, if they would go over into New Jersey we could place them on homesteads, thereby reducing the ultimate bill until they could find jobs in New York again. The result of that campaign was that no one volunteered to take advantage of the homestead proposal.

Mr. KILGORE. Certainly; because at that time we were paying them for not working.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is true; but they were receiving a mere pittance—almost bare subsistence.

The point I make is that when a man's roots, friends, employment, and associations are established, and the Government tries to get him to leave to go to some place where he is needed to work, he does not wish to go. The very fact that we legislate him out of a job will not, in most cases, make him go. If he would go, in my judgment the Senator's solution of this problem would probably be workable. But if he simply sits down and refuses to go, the 5 or 6 months while we are finding that out will have been lost; and God knows how many thousands of men may be killed or wounded before we can repair the breach in the dike.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland a question. Has the Senator ever tried to manage a plant with unwilling labor in it?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I have not. I have tried to manage a farm; and usually I have had willing labor.

Mr. KILGORE. How many workers did the Senator have on his farm?

Mr. TYDINGS. As many as 8 or 10.

Mr. KILGORE. Did the Senator ever consider managing a plant with, say, 15,000 workers in it, half of whom did not want to work?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; but let me ask the Senator a question. I note from the press that a strike is in progress in Detroit because 8 men were discharged. They were said to have been discharged unfairly. The result, according to the press, was a strike of approximately 15,000 men, which gave promise of spreading to 100,000 men unless it were stopped. The situation is described in today's newspapers.

If these men will strike because eight men have been laid off for one reason or another, let me ask for the sake of this argument, without passing on the merits of the matter, whether it is not quite likely that the amount of labor unrest

occasioned by having men out of jobs—men who have their roots and their families and all that established in the communities where they used to work—will be likely to create greater labor troubles than those which the bill attempts to solve.

Mr. KILGORE. No.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one or two questions?

Mr. KILGORE. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In the first place, before this part of the discussion is left, I think we should point out for the sake of those who wish to read the record, and I think we should do so in reply to the question asked regarding manpower, that it was the testimony of practically every witness that a manpower shortage is not almost universal in the country. The testimony was that manpower shortages are very spotty.

Second, in order that the discussion between the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] may be fruitful in relation to the whole discussion, I think the question the Senator from Maryland omitted should now be asked, namely, what would happen if the May bill were the law?

Mr. KILGORE. I was coming to that.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should be glad to ask what the May bill would do in the circumstances I have pictured, because I am not a member of the committee, and I cannot be as familiar with the details as members of the committee may be.

Mr. KILGORE. It possibly would affect approximately 20 percent of the employees in a plant, but usually a great many less than that. But at the maximum it would affect 20 percent of the employees who could be touched under the May-Bailey bill, and from 80 to 85 to 90 percent would be left to do just as they pleased.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Following up the question asked by the Senator from Maryland, if those 500 men were out of work because of a ceiling placed in that city, and if they did not desire to go to another city to work, what about the fact that they may go on unemployment compensation in that city? That would be another reason why they would not go to another city to take jobs.

Mr. KILGORE. That is one of the problems which arise in the States. But I believe that a man first must apply to the United States Employment Service. The Senator may remember that under the reconversion bill we tried to obtain an amendment by which we would have handled that situation rather well. We tried to obtain provision for a universal system regarding the seeking of employment, so that such workers could not obtain unemployment compensation. In some of the States it would be impossible for them to obtain unemployment compensation if they were offered transportation to other places at which they could obtain work. In other States it would not be impossible for them to obtain unemployment compensation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know of a State in which such workers are required to go into another State?

Mr. KILGORE. No; I do not. That matter is handled under State law.

Mr. FERGUSON. So a man could receive unemployment compensation for the number of weeks provided under the State law; is that correct?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. No, Mr. President; I should like to develop another point.

Mr. TYDINGS. Before the Senator does so, I should like to say that I do not think any Senator on this floor wishes to employ more compulsion than it is necessary to employ during this war. But I do not think the argument adduced by the Senator, namely, that under the May bill only 25 or 30 percent would be affected——

Mr. KILGORE. I beg the Senator's pardon; I said 20 percent would be affected.

Mr. TYDINGS. Well, I do not think it is a good argument to say that only 20 percent would be affected and that the other 80 percent would be free to do as they chose, for the reason that under the selective service and training system great groups are called and only a percentage of them are taken. Under any system devised by human beings it is impossible to have exact equality in bearing the burdens of war.

Mr. KILGORE. Oh, no.

Mr. TYDINGS. Although that factor should be weighed as an element in the matter, it should not be decisive. The decisive element should be the question how can this country arrange its affairs so as to give to the men who are facing death on the battlefields the last full measure of devotion and support. That element, above all else, should be the governing factor in the formulation of this legislation.

Mr. KILGORE. With that statement I heartily agree. But I think the real objective is production, not toughness. The real goal is to get production and to get it efficiently.

Let me go back a little further. When we first entered the production program, Government agencies universally insisted upon maintaining their peacetime systems of procurement. As a result, procurement is divided among some 47 purchasing agencies. When we commenced building defense plants and allotting them to those agencies we found the beautiful situation in which each agency declined to give its plans to other agencies of Government, and we found the beautiful situation which existed at Elmira, N. Y., where a plant which was being operated by the Navy, with 3,200 skilled employees, was shut down without warning by the Navy, although at the time the Air Corps had planned and prepared all arrangements—but would not disclose them—for reopening the plant and having it make fuel pumps for airplanes, under a different management. All that labor could have been used. But the plant was permitted to be shut down for 2 weeks. Contrary to everyone's expectation, those employees left Elmira, to get jobs in war industries elsewhere. They went to other places. When the plant was reopened 2 weeks later, it was necessary to recruit and train 3,200 new workers.

Senators may remember that in October of last year the Ordnance Corps of the Army shut down shell-loading plants all over the country. For instance, one in St. Louis, with 22,000 employees, was shut down, and subsequently was reopened. No one realized that during the time when the plant was shut down the employees of the plant had drifted away. I received the impression that some persons think that in such cases the workers will stay where they are and will mark time. But the fact is that those who are worth employing will obtain employment somewhere else if the plant in which they have been employed is shut down. Of course, I admit that some few workers will loaf in pool halls or beer parlors, but I do not suppose very much use can be made of such persons.

However, in the face of that complicated and complex situation, the various Government agencies have continued to hold back information from each other. They are still doing it. There has been no method of policing a plant, no method of seeing whether a plant is overloaded with employees. The Senator from Michigan may remember that when he went to Dallas, Tex., he found that the American Aircraft Co. was demanding 6,000 additional workers a month, but 3 months later in its 6 plants it had laid off 14,000 workers after it really had made a survey of the plants, instead of demanding additional labor. Thus far no method by which such a survey may be required has been developed. The taxpayers of the United States, including the men and women in the armed forces, are going to have to pay for such oversupplies of labor in such plants.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I unterstand the bill, if the War Manpower Commission will place its ceilings in such a way as to obtain the skilled employees who are needed in a particular industry, the system will work. But if the War Manpower Commission places an over-all ceiling only on a plant or an industry or a certain community, the result may be that there will be thrown out of work many employees who would not be suitable for work in war industries. In such a case the ceiling would do more harm than good. It appears to me that the bill contemplates—and I hope that when the bill is passed the War Manpower Commission will see to it—that this job will be done on the basis of indivinual plants. It will be necessary to obtain skilled men. The number of skilled men compared to the total over-all employment is very small. The War Manpower Commission will be able to do the job if the regulations are put into proper shape and if it establishes regulations which will result in having skilled men obtained—men

whom they know will otherwise take jobs in other cities—rather than merely to make a cut and to put so many thousand men out of employment, with no place for them to go.

If the Senator will yield for just a moment further, let me say that I understand that recently in Chicago an over-all cut of 5 percent was made, and today many men are walking the streets there looking for work merely because that over-all cut was made, instead of saying "We need so many carpenters and we need plumbers and we need steamfitters," or whatever the case may be, and trying to get them by that kind of ceiling.

I anticipate that this bill will work if the regulations and rules are used on specific plants and are used to obtain particular employees.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Michigan.

Now, going back to where I left off when I was questioned, I said that we used at the outset and we are still using our peacetime methods of procurement. If we hope to balance that off and obtain efficiency, we must not only utilize manpower but utilize it at its best level of skill. In other words, we should not put a carpenter to doing the work of a tinsmith, and we should not try to make a mechanic out of a laborer if a mechanic is available.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator recall in approximate terms the testimony showing the manpower shortage in the country today in critical industries?

Mr. KILGORE. To be perfectly frank with the Senator, except in the testimony of Secretary Stimson, I recall no figures which would indicate to us any manpower shortage.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I wish first to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. TYDINGS. Before either Senator answers the question, I may state that my reason for asking it is quite obvious. Some of us would like to know what the problem is, as well as its solution. I have not yet heard the problem defined.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, there is no over-all shortage of manpower in this country. From the testimony of those who appeared for the bill and those who appeared against it, it would appear that between 170,000 and 200,000 workers are urgently needed in the war industries. Mr. Paul McNutt said that those workers could be obtained by using the present methods and procedures employed by the Manpower Commission.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If the Senator will continue and give us the statement of the military, we shall have it in the RECORD.

Mr. CHANDLER. I shall be glad to do so. The only argument which I recall being made by representatives of the military was to the effect that a morale factor would be gained. The Secretary of War said that passage of the bill would have a beneficial morale effect upon the men in the battle zones, that it would be felt by the men on the fighting fronts. Every Senator realizes that the effect of the passage of the bill, so far as production of essential war material is concerned, would not be felt on the war fronts for 6 or 7 months, if at all. A great deal of testimony was presented to the committee to the effect that passage of the bill might even tend to confuse the situation and result in a loss of time in the production of essential war material. I believe there is no doubt that all the testimony before the committee showed that whatever shortage may exist in this country in manpower, it is scattered and spotty. There is no over-all shortage of manpower in this country. The urgent need is for only between 170,000 and 200,000 men.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I believe that I should complete the figures, if the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from West Virginia will allow me to do so.

According to those who have been working on the problem, the scarcity of both military and essential war workers between now and the end of the summer will be approximately 1,200,000. That includes the military, industry, and all the remaining categories. As the Senator from Kentucky has said, the shortage in 8 essential industries is now between 170,000 and 200,000.

It is assumed that pressure in behalf of the military will be exerted upon industry, and that labor in essential industry can be regulated so as to result in greater manpower. But the objective is to provide approximately 1,200,000 men who will be needed in excess of what would ordinarily be required.

Mr. KILGORE. We should also take into consideration the fact that men returning from the armed forces will be desirous of securing jobs. Is that not true?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That, of course, is an unknown quantity.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Of course, we are dealing with unknown quantities in this bill. We must not overlook that fact.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not wish to trespass upon the Senator's time, but I should like to comment on the apparent reason for the pending bill.

All of us know that high officials of the Government, as well as high military officials, told the people last September and last October that the war would be over within a short time: Of course, they were mistaken. The Germans broke through the Belgian front, and every citizen of this country regretted what seemed for a time, at least, to be a great disaster. In fact, it amounted to a great disaster to our military men, who were apparently unwilling to confess that the enemy is smart and sometimes catches us in a weak moment and prevents us from winning a victory. But, as I have said, our military leaders apparently wished to take advantage of the conditions as they existed last fall, and horsewhip everyone into the consciousness that a war was being fought. They cited the fact that England had a law similar to the one which is being proposed. I invite attention to the fact that we repudiated the so-called May-Bailey bill by a vote of 12 to 6. On May 22, 1940, about the time of Dunkerque, England enacted a law providing for compulsory service in industry, and under that law in 5 years a million people were directed to go to work, 5,400 persons were prosecuted for failure to go to work, and 4,700 were put in jail. Last year England had a 16-percent higher strike record in connection with the production of materials and arms than we had in the United States. We lost only 700,000 man-hours a month, and we lost only about 7,000,000 man-hours for the whole year.

I hope that we will take into consideration the fact that under our voluntary system only one-tenth of 1 percent of the men working in war industries were absent on strike during 1944. In taking that into consideration I cannot agree with the Secretary of War in his statement that our methods have failed. He stated that our democracy had failed. If the morale factor alone is to be taken into consideration and the word goes out to the boys in the fighting front that democracy has failed, that we have not been able to do by democratic methods what we said we could do, and that we must adopt Fascist methods, I do not know what effect it may have on the boys at the front. During the past few tragic years our voluntary system has produced more and better things, and has broken the production records not only of this country but of all the combinations of countries for all previous time. It has been accomplished under democratic methods. The democratic methods have not failed and the American people have not failed.

Mr. President, I do not want the Congress to adopt a law which provides that a man shall be put into jail if he does not work. We were told by military men all over the world that the war was about to end. When those statements were made the workers of this country relied on them, and many of them returned to their homes. Thousands of them have returned to their homes. At the present time there is a relatively small shortage of manpower, but more men will be needed for the future because of increased schedules in anticipation of future war industry. No one can tell what the demand will be.

Mr. President, this is one of the most serious bills with which we have ever been confronted. It provides for a radical departure from the past conduct of our Government.

I was asked by one of my friends if I were opposed to the proposed legislation, and I said to him, "I am against all legislation of its kind which I have seen. I voted against the May-Bailey bill, and I voted against this bill." This bill has zero ceilings. A man can be put out of business under this bill, and matters can

be adjusted so that an employer cannot even get a new worker. An employer cannot solicit; there is an absolute prohibition against it. Some of those in the War Department think some men ought to be put out of business, and they gave a category of those they did not think ought to be in business at all. I do not claim they ought to be if boys are needed at the front or in the factories. But this is a most serious departure from democratic principles and practices that this country has ever undertaken, in my opinion, and it is not justified by the facts and circumstances that exist in the country today. If we were facing the same situation that England faced after Dunkerque in May 1940, then there might be some excuse for it, but I do not agree that that is our situation in America today.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope I have not trespassed on the Senator's time, but he knows how deeply I feel on this subject, notwithstanding the fact that the President's committee, that operates with Mr. Justice Byrnes, on the 10th of January, under pressure of the War Department, agreed to go along with this bill. There was going to be a general going along, in order to let the War Department, the Navy Department, and the other departments involved have their way. Then, gradually one by one, when they realized the situation, some of them came in and did an about-face. The War Manpower Commission said that the manpower situation on the 1st day of January 1945 was the best in all the history of this country. This bill is a sad commentary, it is a poor reward to those who have worked during these tragic years faithfully day by day and night after night in making war materials for this country.

Under this bill if a farmer boy leaves the farm before he is examined and is found to be IV–F, or if he knows he is going to be found IV–F or has reason to believe that he is, he is out from this bill altogether, but if he stays on the farm and is called up and examined and declared to be IV–F and is sent back to the farm, if he leaves the farm he is to be sentenced to 5 years in jail and fined $5,000, but if he was a worker in industry he is to get 1 year in jail and a $5,000 fine. That will come home to roost, Senators, one of these days.

I think the Tydings amendment should be considered on its merits outside this bill. It has great merit. The farm workers ought not to be affected in case the armed forces say they are essential to the production of the food this country needs.

I am disturbed about this sort of legislation. I have not heard any good reason for it and none has been given. The War Production Board and the Army and Navy say they are up to schedule, and then the people break the record. They come up to schedule again, and the people again break the record by voluntary work.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield in order that I may ask a question?

Mr. CHANDLER. I have trespassed on the time of my friend from West Virginia. I did not want to take him off the floor.

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] said that 200,000 men were needed to work in war plants and 1,000,000 men were neded for the military service this year. That makes 1,200,000 men. I imagine that as the 1,000,000 men are drawn into the armed service some of them will come out of industries, either partially or totally essential, and I am wondering, if that happens, whether the figure 200,000 will not have to be enlarged because of the men who have been drawn out of industry for military service. Am I correct or not in that assumption?

Mr. KILGORE. I may say in answer to the Senator from Maryland the figure 200,000 is an estimated total of scattering requests all over the country from places where it is said more men are needed. But let me say further to the Senator from Maryland I had 24 reports from plants in my State, each of which claimed a shortage of production based on shortage of manpower. I became somewhat nervous and asked the State director of manpower to investigate. He reported there was no such shortage. I then asked for a statement from the managers of the plants, in which there were service representatives, and I have statements from them from which I discover that those 24 shortages existed some because of the failure to get material on time, some because perhaps a boiler needed new flues, and others because of mechanical difficulties and mismanagement, and thus the war schedule was held back; but in not a single one of the 24 cases was there a shortage of manpower in each plant, where it was offered as an excuse to explain to the War Production Board why they had not met the schedule.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think the Senator has answered my question. I ask, assuming that from 175,000 to 200,000 would seem to be needed, whether that figure would not be increased by others needed for war production in this country when another million or a part of a million were drawn from the war plants to go into the armed services.

Mr. KILGORE. Certainly; they will have to be replaced, but if the Senator will let me finish, I will explain how the replacement is taken care of.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the Senator will give me the picture, because frankly I cannot see it all as yet. In addition to the 200,000, how many extra vacancies would be created, in his opinion, by men being taken from war industries to go into the military service? What would be the over-all annual need if you take 200,000 and add to those vacancies created by the workers called into the military service?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia permit me to answer the question?

Mr. KILGORE. If the Senator from Kentucky desires to answer the question, I yield to him.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will undertake to explain it. Of course, if men now engaged in war industries are taken for the Army every one thus taken from industry must be replaced, or production will not be kept up. So many young men are coming into the Army every year under the draft. My distinguished friend from Utah, the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, gave us a figure for the future but that was a guess, it was an estimate, for nobody can tell exactly and we must face the problem as it exists now. It was variously estimated that between 170,000 and 200,000 men are now needed to meet the present schedules. The Manpower Commissioner said he could get them using voluntary methods, the same procedure he has been using. The chairman of the committee said earlier today that nothing can be done without cooperation, and he pled for cooperation among Senators. The statement ought to be made that I do not think in the history of this country has cooperation between management and labor ever been as good as it is at this hour. Remember that I said that I do not think in the history of this country cooperation has ever been as good as it is at this hour. If we interrupt that by providing new rules and new regulations, harm will be done since they found out what is involved both management and labor have come here and protested against this bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator try to give us some figure, 3, 6, 9, or 12 months away, envisaging the withdrawal of a million men from the lines, indicating how many vacant jobs would be left in essential industry in the even the 200,000 now needed were taken.

Mr. KILGORE. Is the question hypothetical?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is hypothetical. I am not asking the Senator for an exact answer.

Mr. KILGORE. First of all, we do not know how many are going to be returned from the armed forces; we do not know how many are hidden away in plants, as in the case of the North American Aircraft Co.

Mr. TYDINGS. How many will be withdrawn in the course of a year or 6 months?

Mr. KILGORE. If we were 170,000 men short and a million went into the armed forces, 1,170,000 would be needed.

Mr. TYDINGS. More might be needed if any of them came from essential industries.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes. Some of them may come from the farm.

Mr. TYDINGS. How many does the Senator think become of draft age each year and therefore are subject to the draft?

Mr. KILGORE. I think 600,000 a year reach the age of 18 and are eligible for military service.

Mr. CHANDLER. The number is 900,000.

Mr. KILGORE. Very well, 900,000. As a normal percentage we should get from 500,000 to 600,000 from that group into the service, and we could place, I believe, 100,000 from that group in essential industry.

Mr. TYDINGS. And some of them will be dying, too; do not forget that.

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; but taking those who are living at the time, it must be realized that the million we are taking for the Army are to replace those who are injured and who die in action.

Mr. TYDINGS. I mean the boys just reaching 18, who are working in the war plants, are in large measure going to replace those who die. The people in the war plants do not live always.

Mr. KILGORE. They do not live always. I have referred to the normal increase we have been getting. It has been estimated at as low as 400,000, and as high as 700,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has given me a very fair answer. In other words, during the coming year between 400,000 and 700,000 civilians, somewhere in between those figures, are going to be needed to fill essential wartime jobs?

Mr. KILGORE Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I desire to ask the Senator one further question, and then I shall take my seat.

Mr. KILGORE. That is, out of a labor pool of 55,000,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has been very courteous, and we have adduced quite a little information. I wish to ask the Senator whether under his bill, considering the drafting of these million soldiers, with the 200,000 jobs which are now unfilled, plus the 200,000 to 500,000 new vacancies which will be created, making a total of from 400,000 to 700,000 all told, there can be through a voluntary system, a recruitment sufficient to keep up the production which the Army and the Navy must have.

Mr. KILGORE. Unquestionably. For instance, women have not been fully utilized. There are many women in the city of Detroit looking for jobs who could be employed. There is some aversion among certain manufacturers to using women to do certain work. Yet, in some types of employment they make the finest possible workers.

Mr. TYDINGS. Can they get them?

Mr. KILGORE. Certainly; they are looking for jobs, registering for them.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to go back to the original statement I made, that there is no over-all shortage of manpower in this country. The 400,000 to 700,000 are in the United States, but they are not in the place where they are needed. However, they can be put there, and the War Manpower Commission says they could do it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Why have they not done it?

Mr. CHANDLER. It is a question of "upping" schedules.

Mr. KILGORE. The War Manpower Commission has had no authority to do certain classes of things. They have no authority, for instance, to go into a plant and even make a survey of it to determine whether the plant is wasting manpower, or hoarding manpower. They have no authority to go into a defense plant owned by the United States Government, if it is operated by a private contractor, no authority to go into service plants, like navy yards, arsenals, and plants of that kind. They are purely a persuasive group. In cases where they have gone in, they have been able to unearth wastage and bring it out, and I think from those sources we may have an overage of manpower.

I wish to thank the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] for his remarks concerning England, and about the strike record there. There is another interesting feature about the compulsory law of England which we always have thrown in our teeth in favor of compulsion, and that is the absentee record, and anytime we go to a plant we have them telling us that the absentee situation worries them worse than strikes. In England, in the identical periods, compared with our voluntary record, their percentage of absenteeism is 10 percent as against 6 percent in the United States. So, under the voluntary method and no compulsion, we had a lower absentee rate. It must be realized that on medical records, the 3-percent absentee rate is based on sickness alone. In a plant there will be a 3-percent absentee rate. So, in the matter of questionable absenteeism, we had only 3 percent, compared with England's 7 percent.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Maryland to page 29 of the hearings, where it will be observed the War and Navy Departments advised us in the committee that there were 900,000 men needed, not this year, but during the first 6 months of this year. So 500,000, more or less, must come from essential war industry today. Adding that number to the 200,000 short now, we have 700,000, not for the year, but for the first 6 months.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is what the War and Navy Departments tell us.

Mr. KILGORE. Is this a species of filibuster? [Laughter.]

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not mean it that way. I would assume, from what the Senator from South Carolina has said, and his remark in the hearing, that if 900,000 are needed for 6 months, probably a million and a half or a million, eight hundred thousand would probably be needed for the whole year. It is proposed that we pass the pending bill for the whole year, as I take it, and I am wondering whether this figure would change the philosophy of the Senator, to wit, that we can fill the void through voluntary means with the added provisions of the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me say to the Senator from Maryland that I had the privilege of asking some of the questions about the very matter referred to, and some other points. The officials are figuring on the basis of replacements, replacements from turn-over, most of them, and "quits", and absenteeism. For example, those in charge of the Norfolk Navy Yard say, "We must have 4,000 additional employees to replace our 'quits', our turn-over." That is based largely upon the estimate of the turn-over. If we can stop the turn-over, and fix the ceiling, then I say we come down not even to the 700,000 or 400,000 a year, but I say we come down further.

Let me say to the Senator from Maryland that if there is a shortage of manpower, an actual shortage, the proposed legislation is not proper legislation, nor was the May-Bailey bill. Legislation increasing hours and getting more time out of each worker, or the importation of workers from some country not occupied in a war, would be the only solution. With an actual physical shortage, it is not possible to pull men out of the bushes by invoking the May-Bailey bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. What happens under the pending amendment, or substitute, to the 4,000 workers who might quit at plant "A"? How would we keep them there, under the bill?

Mr. KILGORE. Under the system at present in vogue, men can quit in Norfolk and come to Washington and get jobs. I know that from my State we shipped 15,000 shipyard and aircraft workers into the city of Baltimore to use in the plants there. Indeed, I am wrong; we shipped 22,000. More than half of them drifted to Philadelphia and New York, without certificates of any kind, and were employed without any clearance. It was that change around which caused this drift. Many plants would give a man a certificate of availability at any time he asked for it, whether he gave any real excuse for it or not.

Mr. TYDINGS. How do we stop that drift away?

Mr. KILGORE. Under the bill no man can get a job without a certificate issued by the United States Employment Service showing that he has honorably cleared his last job, it having been finished, or having good reason shown before an appeal board. No employer can employ him.

Mr. TYDINGS. Has the Senator considered—I have not, but perhaps he has—a situation in which a man may not desire to work at plant "A" and they will not give him a certificate of clearance to any other plant, and therefore he refuses to do anything, and there is one whole manpower year, we will say, if he is idle a year, gone for naught. How does the bill reach such a man?

Mr. KILGORE. In the industries in which the officials have been careful in handling that situation—for instance, in the coal industry in my State, where the operators have been very cooperative—that has all been handled by the appeal boards. If a man did not wish to work in a mine, he had a right of appeal, and if he could show good cause, if he could show he was in an unworkable condition, or if he could show some family condition requiring his moving to another job, he could get clearance, but otherwise not. But suppose we draft that man, we are in the same situation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator whether he has given

any thought as to how we may freeze certain workers so that we would not have these excessive "quits." The Senator mentioned 22,000 in Norfolk, and since Norfolk has been mentioned on many occasions——

Mr. KILGORE. I did not say 22,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. Four thousand.

Mr. KILGORE. Well, yes; for the year.

Mr. MAYBANK. The situation at Norfolk is no worse than it is elsewhere. According to what we have been told, at every navy yard and every shipbuilding plant the average total turn-over is around 7 percent a month. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. KILGORE. I think so; yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wonder if there is any thought given as to how those individuals can be taken care of.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me say something concerning that to the Senator from South Carolina. Workers are human beings just like we are. They are taken up on the top of a tall mountain and shown the green meadows of the promised land. That is what has been done to these workers. In my home State I have sat in the employment office and listened to a recruiter from the Norfolk Navy Yard who has spoken of the beauties of working for the Norfolk Navy Yard, although the West Virginia coal was just as essential to the war as ships, because without the coal the ships could not be produced. Then the recruiter would say to a man, "I am sorry, but you are a coal miner and we cannot take you." What happened? The man was disgusted. He would see that he was being terribly abused. So such an individual takes advantage of the 60-day rule which obtained in my State among the coal operators, and he quit his job for 60 days and then applied for a certificate.

Mr. President, we have to mix a little bit of psychology and a little bit of common ordinary horse sense in dealing with the men, in dealing with the labor problem. The individual who does not do so does not handle his labor problem properly.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from West Virginia. What he has just said occurs in many places. In South Carolina the highest type of priorities were given to the Charleston Navy Yard to recruit workers. The Senator said that the recruiters would carry workers up on the high mountain and show them the green valleys. Whereas the cotton-duck program in the textile mills was forgotten. I ask the Senator from West Virginia whether he has given any thought concerning how such matters can be adjusted?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; I may say to the Senator from South Carolina that I had given thought to that situation before Pearl Harbor. I joined with other Members of the Senate in introducing a bill on one occasion, the purpose of which was to try to get away from that situation by coordinating procurement and production, to cut out the business of one bureau fighting with another, but the Congress of the United States yielded to the siren song of the bureaus and declined to do anything to correct the situation. When we are all cussing labor and industry for not doing a good job. I still believe in the old Scriptural saying that we had better take the beam out of our own eye before starting to yank the mote out of the eye of another. Let us do that. If my colleagues will join in accepting the measure I propose we will be taking a step toward clearing up that situation.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has called attention to the turn-over of 4,000 a month in the Norfolk Navy Yard. I suppose a heavy turn-over does occur.

Mr. KILGORE. No, Mr. President; I did not call attention to a turn-over of 4,000 a month, I may say to the Senator from Vermont. I said the Navy said they needed 4,000 men a month in the Norfolk Navy Yard. I maintain that the turnover could be cut down. I believe 10,000 men could be released down there and the yard could operate efficiently. May I ask the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] if that is not about a correct estimate of the situation?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I agree with that statement. I think that is a fair estimate, from what we saw at the yard at the particular time we were there, and from the facts which have been given to us since that time.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I understood the Senator from West Virginia to say there was a turn-over of 4,000 men at the Norfolk Navy Yard.

Mr. KILGORE. No; I was giving the basis for the figures of 600,000 or 900,000; I said they were like the figure of 4,000 which the Navy said they need for replacement every month. The total of their turn-over during the 12 months was 22,000. If 4,000 is multiplied by 12 and the figure of 22,000 is obtained—well, it is peculiar arithmetic.

Mr. AIKEN. Was not one reason why the 22,000 men left the Norfolk Navy Yard due to the fact that they would not be covered by unemployment compensation after the war if they stayed at the Norfolk Navy Yard until the end of the war?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct with respect to some of them.

Mr. AIKEN. Would we induce more stability in the men at the navy yards if we enacted legislation to cover them as other employees in private industry are covered?

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that we have agreed with respect to that matter before, and we still agree.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] a question. The figures he gave respecting the situation in England were very impressive. Did the Senator from Kentucky or any member of the committee ask the Army and Navy officials their opinion with respect to the situation in England under the compulsory system?

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator from Connecticut that we do not have the full figures, but I believe the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] did ask a couple of embarrassing questions along that line. We did not procure the correct figures at our hearings.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I will give one example, if the Senator from West Virginia will permit me to do so. A compulsory law was enacted in Great Britain. Secretary of the Navy Forrestal was responsible for injecting that law into the hearings. I do not know why he cited the law, because it did not in any respect bolster up his case, but he did cite the law. The British enacted their law, as I said, on the 22d of May 1940, about the time of Dunkerque. I will give the Senate one example of how the law worked. The British strike rate was 16 percent higher than our strike rate last year. Our strike rate was one-tenth of 1 percent of all persons employed. Five hundred and fifty thousand coal miners in the United States last year dug 631,000,000 tons of coal. In making the comparison between the amount of coal produced in Great Britain and the United States I make allowance, of course, for the use of machinery in the United States, for the fact that we have mechanized mines. I do not mention that at all to indicate that if the British were just as well off in the matter of machines they would do just as well. But 700,000 coal miners in Britain mined 200,000,000 tons of coal last year.

As I stated a few moments ago, there was a loss of 3,600,000-odd man-hours in Great Britain under the compulsory system. Remember that we have two and a half times as many mine workers in the United States as they have in Great Britain. If we were to make the comparison on the basis of the British system we would have lost in excess of 9,000,000 man-hours last year. We lost actually 7,000,000 man-hours.

Mr. McMAHON. Did the Senator ask the Secretary of the Navy why our system worked better here than their system worked in England?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes; I did, and his answer was not satisfactory to me. Under the May-Bailey bill an American citizen could be directed to go from Boston to San Francisco to work, and he would have no choice. He would be obliged to comply with the Army's directive. In England the workers have been directed in the same way. If one who is directed to do a certain thing does not do it he is prosecuted. Out of 5,400 prosecutions, 4,700 individuals were put in jail. In Great Britain they do not do as well under the compulsory system as we do in the United States under the voluntary system, and I insist on that statement. They have not done as well in England as we have done in the United States by using our democratic methods and our voluntary system.

To my Republican brethren, who talk about free enterprise [illegible] right to work so much, I will say [illegible], if one of

you vote for this bill, I want to take a real good look at you. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, what has been done in the way of production during this war represents America at its best. When the history of this country is written and when our people find out what the American workingmen and women have done in these tragic years, they will never as long as they live cease to be grateful to them.

Mr. President, when we were overseas we would occasionally get a newspaper and could find almost nothing in the paper but reference to strikes. There was almost no other news in the newspapers—just news about strikes. Then in a corner would be found the statement that a hundred workers had gone out on strike. But to a boy in a fox hole it would seem that everyone in the United States had stopped working. In some areas there was a shortage of materials and men could not work for that reason. But the men overseas thought such stoppage of work was directly attributable to the fact that everyone had gone on strike.

Mr. President, no country in the world, no country in the history of man, ever made the record of production made by the American people in these war years under the voluntary system. Never were more and better materials made. Never was a better record set for transporting materials across the seas and putting them in the hands of American boys, who have made the best use of them ever known in the history of man. To tear down the system under which such great things have been accomplished and now to set up a compulsory system in this country is to me unthinkable. I am not supporting such a move.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me in order that I may supplement what the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has said?

Mr. KILGORE. I will yield briefly. I should like to finish what I have to say as soon as possible.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What I have to present is so important that I venture to trespass on the Senator's time.

UNCHALLENGEABLE PRODUCTION RECORD

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a pamphlet which was prepared by the War Manpower Commission. It is entitled "Statistics, No. 15," for February 1945. No one can look at the chart in this pamphlet without realizing that everything the Senator from Kentucky has said is true. The manpower of the United States has made a record of production that is beyond all imagination. Here is a chart which shows a graph for production and employment during 1942, 1943, and 1944. Senators can look at that chart and see that while production was rising in an almost vertical line in 1942, from an index of a little over 25 to an index of almost 90, employment was rising only from an index of 65 to an index of 94.

In 1943 production continued to rise almost vertically. Employment was rising only gradually. In 1944, when word was issued from the very highest military authorities that the war might be over in 1944, there was a slight diminution of the number employed. Workers were leaving the war factories at the rate of about 100,000 a month. But when Von Rundstedt's drive began in December 1944 the people began to go back into the war factories immediately. They went back at the rate of 50,000 in December and 50,000 in January. In 1943 production rose far beyond the rate of employment, and in 1944 it continued at that rate.

I have examined the rates for the year 1944 as compared with 1943, month by month. If we take the average employment for 1943 as 100, and the average production for 1943 as 100, we find this amazing story: In January 1944 employment was only 1 point above the average for 1943. That is, the index was 101. Production, however, was 114, or 14 points above the average for 1943. The rate of production was increasing faster than the rate of employment.

I could go through the list month by month. I shall not give the figures for all the months, because I wish to shorten the interruption of my good friend from West Virginia. However, in November 1944, the index of employment had fallen off 10 points from what it was in January 1944. That is to say, it was 9 points below the average of 1943. The index for November 1944 was 91, the average for 1943 being 100. Although employment had fallen off 10 points below the employment index of 1943, production was 10 points above the average of 1943.

EMPLOYMENT DOWN—PRODUCTION UP

The employment index for November 1944 was 91. The production index for November 1944 was 110. There can be no question, Mr. President, that the manpower situation with respect to efficiency and production is better now than it has been at any time in the history of the war effort.

We hear much talk about separations from the service, and about the tremendous turn-over and the falling off of employment. On page 33 of this pamphlet on statistics, I find the rate of separations, quits, and all other, for 1942, 1943, and 1944. I have compared the monthly rates for each month in 1944 for which figures are given, namely, 11 months, from January through November, with the rate of separation for each month of 1943. In all of 1944, Mr. President, there were only 2 months in which the rate of separations was greater than in the comparable months of the year before. For example, in January 1944 the rate of separation was 6.69. In January 1943 it was 7.11. In February 1944 it was 6.52. In February 1943 it was 7.04. So it goes, through every single month save only May and June, when the separation rate in 1944 was slightly in excess of the rate for the same months of the year before.

As the Senator from Kentucky has said, this country has outproduced the whole world. We have built the largest Navy, by three times, that exists upon the face of the globe. We have built a bridge of ships across the Atlantic Ocean and across the Pacific Ocean. We have equipped 12,000,000 men in our armed forces. We have done it all by the voluntary system—every single bit of it.

We have been asked to behold what is going on in Russia and in Britain. We are told that they have a compulsory labor system in those countries. We alone, said the Secretary of War, of all the nations do not have a system of forced labor. I am proud of it. I think the Secretary of War ought to be proud of it, because we have not only supplied our own forces, built our own Army and our own Navy and equipped them, but we have equipped the armies and navies of nations which have forced-labor systems. We have sent materials to Russia, which has forced labor. We have sent material to Britain, which has forced labor. Who is to tell us that the voluntary system is ineffective?

The reason for this bill, Mr. President, is not at all that the voluntary system has not worked; but there is a fear that when the war is over in Europe there will be a rush out of the war factories. I do not believe that that fear is justified. There was a slight withdrawal in 1944, but the rate of production was increasing all the time. Every responsible manufacturer or management official who appeared before our committee, and who knew anything at all about the production of war goods, said, "Do not load our plants with inexperienced men. Do not push masses of inexperienced persons, and persons who are not willing to respond to the call, into our factories, because if you do, you will reduce the rate of production."

What are we thinking about, Mr. President? Are we concerned about furnishing supplies to the men on the fighting fronts, or are we merely trying to vote a symbol for them?

What we need is a continuation of production. I am convinced by the record which is demonstrated here that we will do far better to continue to rely upon the voluntary system rather than to undertake to force recalcitrants and chiselers onto the production line.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia permit me to ask the Senator from Wyoming a question?

Mr. KILGORE. Gladly.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Wyoming has referred to the fact, which we all know, that last year there was a falling off of the number of men in war plants, due to the optimism which was engendered by one reason or another regarding the end of the war. There was a spurt of returning to war plants when legislation of this kind began to be agitated. There was a substantial return of men to war plants in December, let us say. Following the consideration of this bill in the House and the President's message on the bill, there was a further return in January.

What is the situation now? Has there been a falling off of that return, or has there been a resumption of the departure of men from factories, since the 1st day of February, let us say? Does the Senator have information on that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The best information I have is that workers are still going back to the factories. The trend away from factories has completely changed. It has been said that workers were returning to the factories because people

were talking about this legislation. On the contrary, I think they were going back because they heard the news from Europe.

Mr. BARKLEY. Probably that is true. I have been told that there has been a falling off since the last of January. I have no official figures in that connection. I do not know what the answer is.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. These are the latest statistics. They are for February 1945. They are the latest official figures I have.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is the publication from which the Senator has obtained the statistics a monthly publication of the War Manpower Commission?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is No. 15, and I rather fancy that it may be issued whenever the statistics are assembled. Whether it is a monthly publication, I do not know.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield once more, and then I wish to conclude what I have to say.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me ask whether the figures show the over-all picture, or merely the picture of the situation in war plants.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. These figures are for munitions production.

Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from West Virginia for yielding to me.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I desire to yield no further until I conclude my statement.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a very brief comment?

Mr. KILGORE. I will yield for one.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Before the Senator leaves the point of compulsion in Britain, I should like to have the Senator turn to page 304 of the hearings, to see what Capt. Harry Ward, Management Research Group, Manfield House, Strand, London, England, has to say about it, according to Clinton S. Golden, of the C. I. O., who testified before our committee. At the middle of page 304, we find that Mr. Golden, in referring to Captain Ward, said the following:

> He said that in England, mind you, with the buzz bombs still coming over, the greatest thing that could happen today in England would be a relaxation of those very controls that they put on after Dunkerque.

Then Mr. Golden said:

> Now, here is the voice of experience, I would say, in restrictive and compulsory legislation, saying that people need to have more freedom and that if they do they will do a better job than they will under compulsion.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude my remarks without yielding further.

In reply to what our very able floor leader said, I will say that I do not like to have our industries and our workers alone charged with overoptimism last fall. They were not the really overoptimistic ones. The Ordnance Corps was so overly optimistic that it curtailed the production of ordnance. The real source of the overoptimism at that time was in the armed forces, not in labor and industry, for labor and industry did not become overly optimistic until the armed forces set the example. The overoptimism heads up in General Eisenhower himself, unless the press misquoted him, and unless the contracting agencies misinterpreted him.

The workers are returning and have returned to the war plants. I thank the majority leader for bringing up the point that solely because of the desire of the workers in the plants to increase production, production has been increased. Because of the attitude of the workers there has been increased manpower. In the shipbuilding industry alone there has been a decrease in the number of man-hours required for the building of a Liberty ship. The number of man-hours required for building one Liberty ship has decreased from approximately 1,200,000 man-hours to approximately 400,000 man-hours. That shows what can be done with experience and with a desire to accomplish real results. I fear that such results will be nonexistent if compulsion is placed on certain segments of our workers.

I have been asked to state how the bill will operate. In the first place, it will give to the War Manpower Commission the very thing the Congress has consistently withheld from it, namely, the right to establish regulations and to enforce them. I often think that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission should have been called the persuader of manpower mobilization, because all he has had has been the power of persuasion, and that is all his officials have ever had. They have had the right to get people together, but not the right to arbitrate. They have had the right to get people together and to try to get them to iron out the problems as they arose. We have built up this gigantic production with only that means available.

The pending bill, as it is, without the two amendments which were added, and which I expect to move to have stricken out, embodies the same principle which has been operating successfully on a voluntary system, and the bill establishes it, together with the right to make regulations, and to procure the operation of the system. In other words, the fixing of ceilings gets rid of hoarded manpower. We—or shall I say all United States taxpayers?—are paying for the hoarded manpower. They are paying for it, no matter whether it is working or not. Some of the worst offenders are Government agents who are operating their plants on the basis of cost plus a fixed fee. But even when they do not operate on that basis, the cost of hoarded manpower is all too frequently figured into the cost of the articles produced, and in the long run the taxpayers pay for such hoarded manpower.

So, Mr. President, it is good economy to eliminate the hoarding of manpower. Not only is it good economy in connection with the manpower supply, but it is good economy in terms of dollars and cents. The bill aims at obtaining such economy. It aimed at it originally in a persuasive way. It said the Government should not reimburse an employer for the money paid in wages to an employee hired in violation of regulations, once those regulations had been established and his violation pointed out. For instance, an employer who hired in excess of the ceiling shown by the survey could not claim reimbursement from the Government, if he were a contractor operating on the basis of cost plus a fixed fee, for the wages paid men hired in excess of the ceiling. If he were not operating on that basis but were operating his own plant on a unit-cost basis, he could not claim exemption of such wages as a cost of operation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I would prefer not to yield now. I wish to conclude.

It was the general consensus of opinion among industrialists that this was the best possible method of enforcement, and that it will enable a private industrialist who is operating his own plant in competition with a defense plant operated on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis to have a weapon to shake loose employees when he badly needs them, if they are being hoarded and kept on a Government pay roll some place, and if he is perfectly willing to waive his income-tax exemption in order to get them.

As I have already said, the bill would procure the service of employees by providing for ceilings, plant surveys by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and surveys of Government installations. Any person who did not first procure a certificate from the Employment Service, which is a branch of the War Manpower Commission, would not be permitted to work.

In the section which was earlier discussed, the right would be given to fix ceilings. If there should be a shortage of a particular nonessential or less-essential skill, industry could have ceilings fixed upon certain skills, or upon certain types of employees in order that they might be freed for work in some essential industry. The right of the employee to select his boss would not be taken from him. He would have a right to select from among available employers the employer for whom he would work, but any employer who employed him improperly would be punishable for such employment.

As I have already said, Mr. President, that was the objective of the bill prior to the two amendments to which reference has been made. On the last day two amendments to the bill were made which, I think, departed from the general theory of the bill reported by the committee. The first amendment was to subsection 5 of title III. Under the language of that amendment, manpower would be thrown into the hopper, and provision would be made for a penalty in addition to the loss of money by the right to enjoin and shut down a plant by injunction. A person violating the regulations could be tried for a misdemeanor, and, if found guilty, he would be given not less than 1 year in jail and fined in the sum of $10,000, either or both at the discretion of the court.

Mr. President, that would be another penalty provision. It reverts to the old idea of threatening a child. We have

heard of the mother who said to her child, "Come in here or I will beat your head off. I will whip you if you do not come in," thereby threatening the child before even asking it to come in. We have heard of little Mary who, when saying her prayers, said: "O God, make all bad people good. O God, make all the good people easy to get along with." We become unreasonable, hard to get along with, sometimes, Mr. President. We feel that we must throw the jail into the picture if we can find a loophole big enough through which to put it.

There is another amendment which I think should be in the form of a separate bill. I shall not discuss the merits of the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] because it contains a strengthening clause of an amendment which he offered to the Selective Service Act and which was adopted. But his amendment was not an amendment to this bill. I think that the present amendment should be considered on its merits as an amendment to the Selective Service Act, and not with regard to the problem of draft evasion under this bill which we seek to handle in a different way for industry, and which would give equivalent protection to the farmer. For that reason, Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have treated as a corrective amendment, correcting the amendment of the Military Affairs Committtee on page 19, line 17, by striking out "(5)" and on pages 21 and 22 by striking out section 11 and renumbering the succeeding sections. I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the desk until it can be called up for appropriate action.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the desk.

Mr. KILGORE. I believe, Mr. President, that it would be well for us to ask ourselves, Should we destroy democracy by becoming penal in our methods? Should we destroy that which may later set a precedent and destroy the very thing for which we are fighting, particularly when there are willing workers in the United States who are desirous of employment. Mr. President, I have always maintained that a bum would not work in a pie factory. He would not be of any use in war production. The man about whom we have referred considerably, namely, the beer-hall loafer, will not help industry at all. He will not build it up because there is nothing worse than having a few loafers in a gang of workers. Let us punish him by not giving him a job rather than by giving him a comfortable jail in which he may eat and sleep, or, still worse, by giving him a comfortable place in which he may sit down on a stool by some airplane which is being built, and by his very carelessness unknowingly sabotage the plane by his inability to do the work correctly. Let us not risk the safety of the articles which are being made by use of drafted manpower. That, Mr. President, would approach the old system of farming prisoners out to work in coal mines. It would make of every worker between 18 and 45 years of age a felon and farm him out to private industry. Let us give to Manpower the right to mobilize and the right to require our own agencies—something which should have been done in 1941—to coordinate their work so that they will not shut a plant down in St. Louis, Mo., for example, on the first of the month and then claim that the workers will not work merely because when the plant was reopened 2 or 3 weeks later 22,000 workers were not waiting at the gates but, being like other workers, in the meantime had sought work in other industries. Let us coordinate our cancelations of contracts, our terminations, our endings of contracts with the beginning of new ones, and let us give the manpower organizations of the country, as well as industry and labor committees, a chance to plan the work of the workers so that they will fit into the picture. Let us not drive and herd them into a plant and spend from 3 to 6 months in training them for a new job every time a whim strikes some employer or bureaucrat.

Mr. President, I hope we will decide what we should do. We should have had an opportunity to study the effect of this bill, and ask ourselves, "Do we want to embrace a system which has not been successful in England and Russia, and substitute it for a system which has in the United States reduced the amount of work and at the same time improved the quality of the product which has been transported to the war front all over the world?"

Mr. President, the bill, with the suggested amendment which I have offered, will, I feel certain, accomplish the objective without tearing up the American way of life beyond the extent it becomes necessary to do so in order to win the war. I feel that it will tend to keep together the homes, because in the homes of workers are growing the future Americans, and we cannot just tear those homes apart and expect to have the next generation worth fighting for.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will consider the bill very very seriously.

DEFERMENT FROM MILITARY SERVICE OF STUDENTS OF MEDICINE AND DENTISTRY

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield in order that I may present a conference report on the insurance bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. How long will it take?

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot say, but I think it will take only a very short time.

Mr. ELLENDER. If it will not take more than 5 minutes, I will yield. If it will take more than that, I cannot yield. I desire only about 10 minutes myself.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am presenting a privileged matter, but, as a matter of fact, I cannot guarantee getting through in 5 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I refuse to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, out of order I send to the desk a bill for appropriate reference entitled "To authorize the release of persons from active military service, and the deferment of persons from military service, in order to aid in making possible the education and training of physicians and dentists to meet essential needs."

I ask that the bill be printed preceding the remarks I am about to make.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 637) to authorize the release of persons from active military service, and the deferment of persons from military service, in order to aid in making possible the education and training of physicians and dentists to meet essential needs; introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, to the extent that the President deems to be (1) feasible, (2) compatible with military operations, and (3) necessary or desirable in order to make possible the education and training as physicians and dentists of as many persons as are necessary to provide the minimum number of medical doctors and dentists required to meet the essential needs of the civilian population (especially in rural areas) and the armed forces for medical and dental services in the future, the President is authorized to provide for the release from active duty in the armed forces of men who have completed more than 1 year of honorable service in such forces during the present war and who have satisfactorily completed a substantial portion of the medical, dental, premedical, or predental education and training necessary to qualify them as physicians or dentists, in order to enable such persons to pursue further such education and training. The release of any person from active duty for the purposes of this section may be conditioned upon his acceptance by an accredited school and the pursuit of such education and training in a satisfactory manner.

SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(n) In order to make possible the education and training as physicians or dentists of as many persons as are necessary to provide the minimum number of medical doctors and dentists required to meet the essential needs of the civilian population (especially in rural areas) and the armed forces for medical or dental services in the future, the President shall, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of those men who are found in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) to be enrolled in the national medical and dental education program. The President shall provide for the enrollment, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, in a national medical and dental education program (hereinafter referred to as the "program") of such persons as he deems necessary to be enrolled in such program, in order that they may be deferred under this subsection from training and service under this act, subject to the following limitations:

"(1) (A) The number of men enrolled in the program for the purpose of permitting them to pursue first-year premedical education and training shall not exceed 8,000 at any one time.

"(B) The number of men enrolled in the program for the purpose of permitting them to pursue first-year predental education and training shall not exceed 3,500 at any one time.

"(2) (A) The number of men enrolled in the program for the purpose of permitting them to pursue second-year premedical education and training shall not exceed 8,000 at any one time prior to the end of the third

month of the academic year and shall not exceed 4,500 at any one time after the end of the third month of the academic year, and after the end of such third month shall not include anyone who has not been accepted for admission to the earliest subsequent entering class of an accredited medical school following the satisfactory completion of such second-year premedical education and training.

"(B) The number of men enrolled in the program for the purpose of permitting them to pursue second-year predental education and training shall not exceed 3,500 at any one time prior to the end of the third month of the academic year and shall not exceed 1,750 at any one time after the end of the third month of the academic year, and after the end of such third month shall not include anyone who has not been accepted for admission to the earliest subsequent entering class of an accredited dental school following the satisfactory completion of such second-year predental education and training.

"(3) No man shall be enrolled in the program for the purpose of permitting him to pursue premedical or predental education and training for more than 2 years.

"(4) (A) The number of men enrolled in the program for the purpose of permitting them to pursue first-year, second-year, third-year, or fourth-year medical education and training shall not exceed 4,500 in each of such classes at any one time.

"(B) The number of men enrolled in the program for the purpose of permitting them to pursue first-year, second-year, third-year, or fourth-year dental education and training shall not exceed 1,750 in each such classes at any one time."

In determining the number of men who may be enrolled in the program, the President shall take into consideration and make due allowances for the number of physicians or dentists who may be obtained through the education and training of other persons not enrolled in the program, including veterans of the armed forces, women, and persons not qualified for military service. The limitation on the number of men who may be enrolled in the program shall not be deemed to be a limitation on the total number of students who may be enrolled in medical, dental, premedical, or predental schools; but shall be deemed to be a limitation only on the number of men who may be deferred under this subsection who shall be in addition to students who may be obtained from other sources. Persons shall not be enrolled in the program for the purpose of permitting them to pursue medical or dental education and training at any schools except medical and dental schools whose graduates are acceptable to the armed forces for commissioning as medical doctors or dentists. The number of men who may be enrolled in the program for the purpose of permitting them to pursue each of the 2 respective years of premedical or predental education and training shall be allocated by the President among the several States on the basis of population, as determined by the 1940 census. The men to be enrolled in the program from each State for the purpose of permitting them to pursue such education and training shall be selected from among applicants within such State, in such manner as the President may prescribe. In making such selections, representatives of accredited schools which offer full-time medical, dental, premedical, or predental courses of instruction shall be consulted and their services may be utilized. No man who fails to make satisfactory progress in pursuing his education and training shall be permitted to continue to be enrolled in the program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, because of the discontinuance of the Army Specialized Training Program and the Navy V-12 programs for the training of medical, dental, premedical, and predental students, Congress is confronted with a most pressing problem. Except for a few students to be enrolled in the freshman classes of 1945 in the medical and the dental schools, these training programs have ceased to admit any new students. Therefore, the Congress must provide a method of enabling young men to be trained for the practice of medicine and of dentistry. This is a manpower problem of the present moment only, because a critical shortage of doctors and dentists after 1948 must be anticipated and can only be prevented by action taken now, before September 1945

The experience of the Selective Service System, which reported to the Senate Subcommittee on Wartime Health last July that 40 percent of our young men supposedly in the prime of young manhood were physically or mentally unfit for general military duty, shows that even before the war, our people were sadly lacking in medical care and treatment.

During the present war, the need for medical services has increased tremendously. This need will continue throughout the war, and should continue to demand our attention for a long time to come.

Every one of us is aware of the difficulty in obtaining the services of a doctor today. I have reason to believe that a similar condition will exist for several years before an appreciable improvement is in sight.

Let me call attention to this startling fact: Military requirements to provide the extraordinary medical care now given to our men in the Army and Navy today—care that has lowered our battle casualties and our disease casualties to an unbelievable minimum—set the present total of doctors in the Army and Navy at 60,000. The home front is carrying on with a number slightly in excess of 100,000, of whom about 40 percent are more than 55 years of age. These 100,000 must carry the burden which 140,000 practicing physicians carried before the war. Of that group, about 33 percent were more than 55 years of age.

The Army and Navy needed doctors in larger numbers than ever before. Quotas were set for each State in proportion to its medical population and to the ratio between the medical practitioners and the total population. Louisiana volunteered 206 percent of her quota. Doctors from other States were just as eager, and they gladly made this sacrifice.

It had always been assumed—because until now we could not begin to see even a short way ahead—that on the day of victory, or shortly thereafter, these doctors would come back to their communities. I feel sure that many of them will, but let us face the responsibilities of the Medical Corps in the next few years—responsibilities which are their part of the price we may have to pay for war and for the peace to follow.

For a post-war Army and Navy of considerably greater proportions than any peace-time defense force we have ever maintained, the Medical Corps must be manned at a ratio of about 6 doctors to 1,000 men. Eight or ten thousand doctors will be urgently needed by the Veterans' Administration. Six or seven thousand will be needed for the proper administration of a compulsory military training program, if that should be provided by Congress. An unknown number of doctors may be needed to provide the most basic needs of the occupied countries of Europe where no medical education has been possible for 5 or more years, and where many of the practicing doctors are severely limited in their capacity for work by the deprivations and food deficiencies and overwork of the war years. In short, there is little prospect of a great restoration of medical men to the practice of community medicine for many years to come. Meanwhile, the civilian group of practicing physicians is being depleted by about 4,000 deaths and an unknown number of retirements annually.

All of this adds up to a very serious situation unless a continuous flow of 6,000 medical graduations annually is maintained. Today the medical schools are filled. But the present first-year class will be graduated at the end of 1947. There is a very limited number of qualified young men now available for premedical training.

The entering class of 1945—September, 1945—must be filled in order to assure graduations in 1948. What are the prospects of filling this class under present conditions? In order to graduate 6,000 a year, there must be about 6,500 admissions to allow for scholastic failures and other unpredictable separations from training.

First. The Army specialized training program and the Navy V-12 program for premedical and medical students have been discontinued except in the case of those who have already been enrolled as of July 1944 for the A. S. T. P. and March 1945 for the Navy V-12. This decision for discontinuance was made because it was felt that all possible needs for Army and Navy Medical Corps assistants for this war were liberally anticipated. Thus, in the entering class of medical schools for 1945 there will be approximately 3,000 men under service training programs. In the entering class of September 1946 this number will have been reduced to a mere 620, the final group of premedical students in the training programs.

Second. IV-F's—statistically 4,500,000 men—might appear at first glance to be a very promising potential source. However, among the 21,000 men now enrolled in medical schools, only 640 are classified by Selective Service as IV-F. The recent reclassification of this group of men deferred for physical and mental reasons will undoubtedly skim the cream best fitted for medical enrollment and thereby make them ineligible for such an opportunity. From this source we might expect 250 a year at the most.

Third. Discharged servicemen: It is somewhat early to be able to give any definitive picture of the number of men who will take advantage of the G. I. bill for premedical and medical education. The best report I can obtain at this time would seem to indicate that approximately 350 men have applied for premedical studies and 210 for medical

school, and this group will probably cover the total enrollments to date.

Although the number of discharged veterans is approaching 2,000,000 men, it must be remembered that these men were discharged at the time when they were needed most and therefore, presumably in large part, the limitations which disqualified them for military duty would also restrict their availability for the practice of medicine, which requires intensive physical, mental, and moral stamina, to say the least. From this source we might obtain 300 veterans ready for the September 1945 freshman medical class. The most generous estimates for September 1946 would be only 800 students.

Fourth. Young women: Since women were first admitted to medical schools at the turn of the century, they have comprised between 4 and 5.5 percent of the classes. Until the second entering class of 1944, they have never gone over that top figure. But the most recent class boasts 7 percent or about 460 students. Perhaps this might be extended to 10 percent or 600 students.

These four groups complete the list of presently eligible students. For the entering medical class of September 1945, there may be at best some 4,100 students to fill 6,500 places.

There will be 2,400 vacancies in 1945.

For the entering medical class of September 1946, there may be at best some 2,250 students to fill 6,500 places.

This means 4,250 vacancies in 1946.

Where can we procure the men to fill these early vacancies—vacancies which will mean critical shortages in 1949 and perhaps a decade thereafter?

Fifth. Men in the armed services: There can be no question in anyone's mind as to the outstanding claim these men have over all others for the opportunity of studying medicine or studying in any other field of their choice. There can be no criticism of the proposition that the longer they have served, and the more action they have seen, the more justified they are in such a claim. Every effort should be made within the bounds of military expedience to enable these men to receive the training they so richly deserve; but we are compelled to face certain very unhappy but practical considerations.

The men most fitted by aptitude and by intellectual and moral character for the practice of medicine are the men who have demonstrated their essentiality in the command in which they are serving. It would be extremely difficult to expect any large-scale release of men, even in the small numbers needed for medical education, if such release in any way should incommode the military effort of any command. On the other hand, initiation of such releases might reasonably come not from the men themselves, but from the medical schools or premedical schools which are aware of their calibre and qualifications for medicine. This possibility is anticipated in the first section of the bill I am offering, but I feel constrained to warn that its implementation depends so necessarily on military considerations that it possibly will not result in the production of many candidates.

Demobilization plans after victory in Europe would, if carried out, produce almost no change in the picture. By the "credit" system accepted by both the Army and Navy, age would be the important factor in almost every case. No appreciable demobilization of medical corps personnel is contemplated in any case.

Sixth. Deferment of 18-year-olds: The training programs in the Army and the Navy have indicated very clearly the practicability of selecting men at the age of 18 for premedical and medical training. Inasmuch as the Army and Navy do not feel that this deferment is practical within the service, the Congress must provided for a special civilian status. This group provides the only large sources of men which can be tapped with reasonable facility and minimal threat to the war effort.

It must be understood that even though they remain in civilian status, they are essential to the entire effort of this Nation in war and in peace. Every possible effort must be made to see to it that these men thus deferred will not include among them any draft dodgers. This, of course, will be a very difficult selection to make. We cannot reasonably propose that more than 8,000 be deferred each year. The very best advice of competent medical educators indicates that in order to obtain a selection of high-quality men for medical graduation of 4,000 doctors, at least 8,000 must be deferred at the high-school age level. It seems to me this first selection of 8,000 men should be basically distributed among the 48 States in proportion to their population or to their contribution of men to the services. We will say that this means for one of the more highly populated States, a State quota of 350 men. These must be men who have first of all indicated their desire to study medicine. Perhaps they could indicate that preference by filling out a special form to be made available at every draft board within the State.

Possibly 10,000 applications might be made for these 350 deferments, and the problem of limiting those would rest first upon premedical school standards. By this method, the number of eligible applicants would probably be reduced to a point where personal interviews could be profitably employed either at the location of the premedical school or under the auspices of the State Selective Service Division.

At such interviews, I feel it is extremely important to have represented not only the selective service and the representative of premedical education but also a medical educator and possibly another interviewer.

Once admitted to premedical these 8,000 men would take the accelerated premedical course designed for use by the Army and Navy in their premedical training programs. Within the first 3 months of the second premedical year when application is made to medical schools for training, the 8,000 total may be reduced to approximately 4,500 who must have been accepted for admission to an accredited medical school. The other 3,500 will be reclassified 1A.

Insofar as humanly possible, I hope that these young men will be able to attend the medical school of their choice. Unfortunately, we are forced, however, by virtue of the limitations of class enrollments, to insist that a man's deferment depend upon the acceptance of the school to which he is assigned.

The nature of the emergency problem facing the dental profession in respect to dental education differs in certain essential points from that presented in respect to medical education.

There is no question but that a serious shortage of dentists exists; that this shortage will be increased in civilian practice by the failure of filling dental schools this year. The curtailment of the military service programs will reduce the classes of 1945 to less than 500 students, as compared to the enrollment of 2,400 freshmen this year.

In contrast to the situation in American medical schools, where endowment funds and State appropriations provide the greater part of school running expenses, dental education depends in large part upon tuition fees for its income. Hence the dentists' concern about deferment legislation is rather more directed toward the preservation of the dental schools themselves than the critical health needs of the population. However, they maintain very insistently that in this latter respect the practice of medicine and the practice of dentistry are inseparably bound together.

There are over 21,000 dentists in the Army and Navy today. Both services are adequately manned in their respective Dental Corps. There is no reason to expect that any more dentists need be drafted or that any more than those military training program students now enrolled in dental schools will be required for military duty.

There are about 52,000 practicing dentists in civilian life today. Approximately 2,000 are lost annually by death or retirement. There is little prospect that the number can be appreciably increased during the next 5 years except by dental school graduations.

It is estimated that no more than 500 dental students can be procured for the 1945 admitting class, from IV-F's, veterans, and women. As I previously indicated, 2,400 were enrolled this year. This means that at least 1,500 more must be procured from other sources. It is therefore provided that 1,750 students may be annually deferred. And this group shall be selected from not more than 3,500 who may be deferred for the predental training.

I am inclined to believe that the dentists will get a great many more candidates from the G. I. bill and other veterans benefits than will the doctors, at least for the first few years. I base this opinion upon two fairly reasonable assumptions:

First. That a veteran is more likely to take advantage of a 3- or 4-year training course at the end of which he is qualified to practice the profession of dentistry, in preference to a 4- or 5-year course requiring internship thereafter;

Second. For the past 20 years the requirements for admission to medical school have been very much more severe

and exacting than they have for dental education.

There is, perhaps, one other distinction between the dental and the medical problems, though this distinction cannot be supported by very clear-cut facts. The demand for medical care in the United States is determined by emergency needs. The real needs for medical care in the realms of disease and early diagnosis greatly exceed this demand, but today even the demands for emergency needs are not being met—and cannot be met—entirely. In dentistry the emergency needs are considerably and proportionately less demanding. Emergencies are generally such that medical men can meet them. The distinction is therefore proposed as between the critical shortage of physicians and the severe shortage of dentists.

I consider this shortage sufficiently severe to provide for dental education deferments in the bill I have introduced today.

Mr. President, I hope that the committee to which this bill will be referred will take immediate steps so as to bring this issue squarely before the Congress. As I indicated above, it is necessary that action be taken at once so that our medical and dental schools can obtain the minimum required number of students to enroll at the beginning of their September 1945 semester.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Utah a question. In the Senator's explanation of the bill, did he explain the effect and impact of the penalties on page 22, as applied to agriculture?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The penalties there refer to those in the Selective Training and Service Act, which are very heavy.

Mr. WHERRY. Many of us in the farm belt are interested in this question. As I understand, under the Tydings amendment, the draft boards have the right to determine whether or not a man is essential to agricultural production. The question I should like to ask is this: Would those exempted under the Tydings amendment still have the right, during the wintertime, or in the off-months on the farm, to take employment in a packing plant, for example, and help in the slaughter of cattle or hogs? Would they have the right to accept employment in garages or farm-equipment shops, doing mechanical work at times when their agricultural occupation would permit such employment? As I read the language on page 22, it places the full responsibility upon the registrant for leaving his agricultural occupation. The language in line 16 reads as follows: "or that he has a justifiable reason for discontinuing such agricultural occupation or endeavor."

Who determines that reason? My feeling is that in my section of the country—and I am sure it would be true in other sections—many farmers who come under the provisions of the Tydings amendment will be precluded from taking employment in other industry during an off-period of 50, 60, or 90 days, when they are not engaged in their farming occupation. That provision would have a tremendous impact upon farm registrants in my section of the country. Farmers who produce essential agricultural products would hesitate to go into a factory or a meat-packing plant for 2 or 3 months in the winter. They would hesitate to engage in road work, or to do anything besides farm work. In the South farmers might hesitate to cut logs in the mountains for paper, if the responsibility were entirely theirs for determining what is a justifiable reason for leaving the farm. Are they to determine it, or are the draft boards to determine it?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The draft board will be the determining factor; and the draft board can make its determinations only in accordance with the provisions of the act.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean the provisions of this bill, or the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The provisions of the Tydings amendment in the Selective Training and Service Act, plus the provisions of the proposed amendment.

The Senator from Nebraska knows that the purpose of this amendment is apparently to overcome an act of the administrative authorities in asking the Selective Service to review agricultural deferments and determine that agricultural necessity is the only factor which would justify the deferment of a farm worker.

The Senator from Nebraska has pointed out other things which may happen. In connection with agricultural deferment, there is this factor: Certain men who have been deferred because they were deemed essential to agriculture have remained on the farm for 2 or 3 weeks, and have then left the farm for more lucrative employment. The attempt to stop that sort of thing was one factor. However, the new Tydings amendment is merely an attempt to correct what has been a directive permitting only one factor to enter into consideration in determining whether or not men should stay on the farm.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the attention of the Senator from Nebraska should be called to the language beginning in line 12 on page 12. It is clear from that language that this provision makes it the duty of a registrant who has been deferred because of agricultural employment to remain on the farm "unless his selective service local board * * * has determined that it is no longer necessary in the interest of the war effort for him to remain in such agricultural occupation or endeavor or that he has a justifiable reason for discontinuing such agricultural occupation or endeavor."

It is clear that that places the responsibility where it now is. The reason why deferred farm workers have been taken from the farm is that local boards have been deciding that they are not essential there. Some of the boards have been acting because they felt they could not meet their quotas unless they took deferred farm workers; but they still have the power, the responsibility, and the jurisdiction to defer farm workers who are essential.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that a registrant would still come within the provisions of the Tydings amendment; and that under the provisions of this bill, if he left the farm without going to the draft board, he would be a violator, and subject to the penalty.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly, unless he went to his board.

Mr. WHERRY. He must go to his draft board, in other words.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the point I make.

Mr. WHERRY. The new arrangement provides that he must go to the draft board and must obtain its consent to go into part-time industry. But those who have complied with the provisions of the Tydings amendment and have been deferred are subject to the penalty unless they obtain such consent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Only if they are found unacceptable—in other words, if they are found to be properly classified as IV–F.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

PHOSPHATE AND THE LAND—LETTER AND PROPOSALS OF THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on last Thursday, I addressed the Senate on the subject of phosphate and the land, and the need for a national fertilizer policy and program. This morning I received the following letter from the National Farmers Union, addressed to me under date of February 24:

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
Washington, February 24, 1945.

Senator LISTER HILL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HILL: The National Farmers Union is wholeheartedly with you in your effort to develop national consciousness of the need for a genuinely representative fertilizer program and policy. We are particularly concerned that a program be developed for post-war use of nitrogen plants now being used for war purposes, and that a program for phosphates be developed both to use the great deposits of the West and to conserve those of the South.

Our views are embodied in the attached proposals for this kind of a program submitted to Members of Congress some weeks ago by President James G. Patton. We hope that you will feel it desirable to insert this program in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that Members of Congress may know that the Farmers Union for some time has been concerned with the problems you so eloquently discussed in your very provocative and sound speech of February 22.

We trust that early hearings may be had on your bill with a view to action by the Senate on it during this session.

Sincerely,

RUSSELL SMITH,
Legislative Secretary.

Of course, Mr. President, this letter from Mr. Smith, speaking for the National Farmers Union, is most gratifying. It is indeed pleasing to know that the National Farmers Union is so wholeheartedly behind the efforts to develop national consciousness of the need for a genuinely representative fertilizer program and policy. I hope that this forthright and strong position of the National Farmers Union will stimulate and challenge the other farm organizations to take a firm stand behind this effort, in order that we may have a national fertilizer policy and program for our country and in order that we may take the steps which should be taken at this time to conserve our great phosphate resources and put them to use and make them available to meet the national need. I believe that the conservation and protection of our land will, in the final analysis, prove to be the protection of the greatest resource we possess, with the exception of our human resources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, the proposals of James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union.

There being no objection, the proposals were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—A "yardstick" program for reducing fertilizer costs to farmers and expanding fertilizer consumption was proposed today by James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, in a letter to all Members of Congress.

Patton suggested a 5-point program for consideration. He also suggested that such a program be incorporated as an amendment to the pending "excellent" bill of Senator LISTER HILL, Alabama, S. 2055, "to provide for a national fertilizer policy and program." Patton urged farm State Senators to insist on early hearings on the Hill bill.

The five points advanced by Patton covered expanded production and use of potash, nitrogen, and phosphates, loans to cooperatives to establish mixing plants, and legislation providing for continuance and strengthening of Federal uniform fertilizer grades through Federal-State cooperation.

His letter is attached.

NATIONAL FARMERS UNION,
Washington, D. C., November 10, 1944.

To Members of the Senate and House of Representatives:

The war has given Congress the greatest opportunity in history to assure American farmers of abundant, low-cost fertilizer, and the tremendous demands of the peace will offer Congress its greatest challenge to meet the needs of the farmers and of the Nation.

Continuance of present levels of farm production and income will mean an active demand for at least double the amount of fertilizer bought by farmers in 1940. With additional stimulus, consumption would be far greater. Accordingly, I am taking the liberty herewith of suggesting to you a five-point national fertilizer program designed to—

(a) Increase farm income by cutting costs of fertilizer, reducing feed costs, and increasing crop yields;

(b) Reduce the back-breaking labor of farmers;

(c) Spread processing plants more uniformly over the country;

(d) Conserve the Nation's soil resources by increased yields that will enable more and more acres to be built up;

(e) Improve the Nation's diet by raising the nutritional content of its food;

(f) Reduce dependence on foreign supplies.

All of these results can be obtained from a comprehensive public yardstick program for fertilizer. The cost of such a program will be relatively low, commensurate with the cash benefits to farmers and to the Nation, and much of it can be a byproduct of the war effort. In brief, I propose:

1. Potash: Production of potash from public lands owned by the whole people should not result in private profit. At a minimum, potash produced from public land in New Mexico and California should be made available to farmers at cost either through publicly conducted operations or through negotiation of leases with farmer cooperatives. Moreover, Geological Survey investigations which resulted in location of present potash reserves should be stepped up in Utah and other States to locate additional sources.

2. Nitrogen: The nine synthetic-ammonia plants built by the Government should be made into "yardstick" plants, on the T. V. A. principle, for the production of fertilizer nitrogen. Some should be retained in Government ownership and operation for possible future military needs, but meanwhile they should be operated to the benefit of farmers. The others should be turned over to farmer cooperatives for their operation under Government supervision.

3. Superphosphates: A three-point superphosphate program is needed. (a) A program for Government production of sulfuric acid in peacetime should be developed now with a view to continuing and expanding the output now developed as a byproduct of explosive and other war plants, since the production of sulfuric acid is the limiting factor in the national production of superphosphates; (b) all power and resource development legislation in future should carry specific legislative provision for T. V. A.-type phosphate production and use, including provision for electric furnaces for fertilizer manufacture; (c) western phosphate sources should be developed now through loans to farmer cooperatives, so that the South may not be forced to depend on other sections through premature exhaustion of its deposits.

4. Mixing plants: Establishment of a revolving fund of, say, $100,000,000 for loans to cooperatives for small fertilizer-mixing plants in every State, and even for several in some States, should be authorized by Congress. Present haphazard practices of shipping some elements of mixed fertilizer far across the country, and then shipping them back as parts of mixed fertilizer, are absurd and have no economic reason.

5. Plant food content: Congress should enact legislation calling for Federal-State cooperation to eliminate as much "filler" as practicable from mixed fertilizer, to the end that farmers may receive more for their money, freight charges be cut, and food purchasers receive maximum nutritional value for their money.

But one-third of the farms of the United States now use chemical fertilizers. Thus, it may be said that effective demand for fertilizer is far below what it should be, since most farms would profit from such applications.

Moreover, the development of new crops, and the expansion of old crops, involved in new industrial uses for farm products, will mean that farmers who have never before used fertilizer in quantity, if at all, will need it after the war. This is particularly true in connection with the Middle West's expansion of hybrid corn acreage and resultant high yields, and it is the case to some degree in relation to peanuts and other crops elsewhere.

It is not generally recognized that lack of adequate plant food in the soil reduces the nutritive value of food, and this recognition is particularly lacking with respect to dairy and livestock products. Feed crops, both grass and forage, will not furnish animals with needed nutrients to be passed on to our people unless the required chemicals are put into the soil. This whole field is a greatly neglected field, and one to which we should turn our attention following the war. Much could be done to improve the average American's diet if it were possible, through the program suggested above, to make heavy applications of chemical fertilizer to every feed crop. Moreover, wider fertilizer use could make a big dent in the $2,000,000,000 annual feed bill paid by farmers, representing a tremendous earning.

Furthermore, the exigencies of war have given the Nation an opportunity it never had before to minimize its dependence on foreign supply of fertilizer ingredients. This does not mean that we should necessarily cease buying Chilean nitrates. Rather, it means increasing fertilizer use tremendously, so that if price and international trade factors indicate it, we can consume both a bigger domestic production and maintain imports.

The Nation has another large stake in such a program, and that is in the opportunities it offers for stepping up conservation of the soil. It has been estimated by the Department of Agriculture scientists that nearly 20 percent of our cotton production, 10 percent of our corn, 12 percent of our wheat, 22 percent of our potatoes, and 40 percent of our tobacco are the direct result of applying fertilizer.

A vastly increased use of fertilizer thus would make it possible for farmers to meet the Nation's food and fiber needs from fewer acres. This would mean less intensive cultivation of the total American cropland. More acres could be put into soil-building crops, more effective crop rotations could be used, and in general the soil could be given a better chance to recuperate than has been possible in the past.

Naturally, this would mean that farmers could not only meet the Nation's needs with less labor, but it means that they could also obtain the same or better income from less labor. If they had fewer acres to plant, cultivate, and harvest, then they would be relieved of just that much labor, assuming of course that adequate general farm legislation also is enacted.

The annual fertilizer bill of the American farmer is around $350,000,000, and a considerable part of that bill is spent for useless filler instead of vital plant food, for transshipment of fertilizer materials that could be mixed nearer the source, and for needless overhead. Under an adequate national fertilizer program, the cost of the individual farmers should be so lowered that every farmer will be able to have the supplies he needs. Such a program would mean that individual farmers now buying fertilizer could buy it for a great deal less, and those farmers now without it would be enabled to use it.

Each of the major points in the proposed program is amplified below.

1. Potash: During the present war the United States has avoided the near disaster of the last war, when we were almost wholly dependent on Germany for potash. Since then, however, potash sources more than sufficient to supply our needs have been located. These are mainly on public lands, owned by State and Federal Governments, in New Mexico and California. Other deposits of potassium are known to exist in Utah and elsewhere, however. Not only are the presently worked deposits on land owned by the public but they were located by a public agency, the Geological Survey. It is suggested therefore that the Government proceed with a program for expanded use of potash by building its own extraction and processing plants for utilization of existing

deposits, or by contracting with farmer-owned cooperatives for such development to be financed by Government loans. New sources of potash should be developed on the same principle. These developments need not interfere with present private operation if consumption should be sufficiently expanded to use the potash produced from both sources.

Most potash presently produced is shipped either through the Panama Canal from California or by rail from New Mexico to Gulf ports and thence to mixing plants. After it is mixed into mixed fertilizer, another long shipping haul is necessary to get it to farmers. This shipping cost must be cut down by location of plants near sources.

2. Nitrogen: The Department of Agriculture interbureau committee that recently reported on war ammonia plants says up to 1,200,000 tons of fixed nitrogen ought to be supplied for civilian consumption in the United States. This is a low estimate, if the Government undertakes the kind of program put forward here. Systematic promotion of fertilizer use, such as T. V. A. has encouraged, could well run consumption up to 1,500,000 or more tons, or double the capacity of the Government-owned nitrogen plants. This would leave a considerable market for private industry, larger than it now has, and even would leave room for such imports as are regarded as economically desirable, and as needed in the interest of international harmony.

These plants, like the T. V. A., are the property of the whole people and should be retained in their hands, either for direct Government operation or for operation by farmer-owned cooperatives under governmental supervision.

3. Superphosphates: The T. V. A. has shown both that phosphate consumption can be expanded tremendously, to the advantage of the farmer and the Nation, and that miraculous results can be achieved in restoring soil by use of phosphates. Fortunately, the United States has tremendous resources of phosphate. The limiting physical factor in full use of present superphosphate plant capacity has been a shortage of sulfuric acid. Present war plants are producing as by-products a considerable amount of sulfuric acid. A peacetime program for stand-by maintenance of these plants should provide for an expanded program of Government production of sulfuric acid, and such of the plants as are adaptable to the purpose without too great expense and as are not to be maintained for military eventualities, should be converted to uses that will produce additional quantities of sulfuric acid. The Government should use this supply to reduce the cost of commercial phosphates.

In addition, future programs for resources development such as T. V. A. should include specific authorization for bringing the T. V. A. fertilizer program to other areas. Wherever power development is authorized—in the proposed Arkansas, Missouri, Columbia, or other authorities—provision should be made for electric furnaces or other appropriate installations that will meet the regional needs of farmers for ever-expanding use of phosphates.

4. Mixing plants: All of the elements for which separate programs have been proposed here must be combined into mixed fertilizer, at least so far as most farmers are concerned. A major factor in limiting fertilizer use is the uneven distribution of mixing facilities over the country, adding to freight charges and making it difficult for farmers to obtain fertilizer at the precise time when they need it most. Fertilizer use not only is seasonal but must be timed almost to the day. Thus a governmental program of the kind put forward here should include provision for a $100,000,000 revolving fund for loans to farmers' cooperatives to establish small mixing plants as widely throughout the United States as possible, with at least one in each State and with several in those States with large farm population. These may be spaced so as to avoid serious competition with present plants, so far as possible, yet at the same time to provide a gage on charges by those plants.

5. Plant food content: It has been estimated that the inert matter presently used as "filler" in mixing with vital elements costs American farmers a minimum of $11,000,000 a year. It is probable that the actual cost is more than that sum, and it is certain that any great expansion of fertilizer use would require a uniform increase in plant-food content per ton and a corresponding reduction in filler if much more than $11,000,000 in costs is to be saved. A number of States now have laws governing the plant-food content of fertilizer. Some of these are inadequate, however, and the unevenness of State regulation works a hardship on the fertilizer industry and farmers alike. A Federal statute providing for continuing and strengthening the uniform wartime Federal grades is badly needed, and this law should require a far higher proportion of vital to inert matter than is now the case. Extension of the fertilizer program proposed here to any State should be contingent on enforcement by that State of uniform grades. Such a law could well take advantage of experience with the model Soil Conservation Districts Act. Plant-food content now averages about 20 percent. This is indefensibly low. The maximum consistent with farm practices and machinery should be prescribed, as determined by scientists. Such a change would call for changes in design of some farm machinery but if manufacturers were advised sufficiently far ahead of time, they could make such changes without too great strain.

The objective should be to establish such plants where they are most needed.

In conclusion, I should like to add that such a program calls for other subsidiary action, for instance a vigorous educational campaign through State and Federal agencies, and for a complementary program for liming acid land throughout the Nation. I have thought it best, however, not to attempt to spell out in detail here all that would be necessary.

What is needed now is thorough congressional exploration of the whole subject. To that end I suggest that farm State Members of Congress insist on early hearings on the bill S. 2055, sponsored by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama. His bill is excellent. The proposals made here could be readily incorporated in his measure "to provide for a national fertilizer policy and program." Many phases of this legislation ought to be in operation well before the end of the war.

I should appreciate your reaction to these proposals.

Sincerely,

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.

REGULATION OF THE BUSINESS OF INSURANCE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 340, to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). The question is on the adoption of the report.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. As I understand the conference report which is now before the Senate, it provides for a 3-year moratorium, which is fixed as ending on January 1, 1948, against the invoking of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, and it provides that they shall again be in force after that period without any affirmative action on the part of the Congress, except as regulatory matters have been enacted by the States relating to subjects covered by those acts——

Mr. McCARRAN. During the moratorium. Regulatory acts must be enacted by the several States in each of the several States. Otherwise the antitrust acts become effective after January 1, 1948.

Mr. MURDOCK. But is it not the purpose of the bill and does not the bill accomplish this——

Mr. McCARRAN. It accomplishes a moratorium for 3 years against the operation of the acts mentioned, namely, the Sherman Antitrust Act, the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act.

Mr. MURDOCK. So that during the moratorium it is intended, is it not, that the States shall affirmatively step into the regulation of the insurance business?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. And it is intended that on the expiration of the moratorium the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the other acts mentioned will again become effective except——

Mr. McCARRAN. Except as the States themselves have provided regulations.

Mr. MURDOCK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. At the end of the 3-year period will the taxing and regulatory powers of the States be in anywise affected should the Congress not take any action at all?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; they will not be affected.

Mr. ELLENDER. They will not be affected?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. President, let me make one statement which I think should be placed in the RECORD here. It should be stated here, as it was stated in the report which went to the House, from which I read that—

> It is not the intention of Congress in the enactment of this legislation to clothe the States with any power to regulate or tax the business of insurance beyond that which they had been held to possess prior to the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Southeastern Underwriters Association case. Briefly, your committee is of the opinion that we should provide for the continued regulation and taxation of insurance by the States, subject, always, however, to the limitations set out in the controlling decisions of the United States Supreme Court, as, for instance, in *Allgeyer* v. *Louisiana* (165 U. S. 578); *St. Louis Cotton Compress Co.* v. *Arkansas* (260 U. S. 346); and *Connecticut General Insurance Co.* v. *Johnson* (303 U. S. 77).

That expression should be made a part of this explanation. In other words, we give to the States no more powers than those they previously had, and we take none from them.

Mr. HATCH and Mr. WHITE addressed the Chair.

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I shall be glad to defer to my colleague the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Nevada whether the report represents a complete agreement on the part of the conferees.

Mr. McCARRAN. It does.

Mr. WHITE. Is the report signed by all the conferees on the part of the Senate?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; it is signed by all of them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was going to remark that, as I listened to the Senator when he read from the committee report, I noticed that he was reading from the report of the House Judiciary Committee to the House on the occasion when the bill was reported to the House.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the conference report has deviated from the bill which was reported by the House Judiciary Committee, so that the language the Senator has read does not in any way modify or alter any language in the conference report.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; I do not intend that it should be so implied.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the question I was going to propound to the Senator from Nevada arises in connection with subparagraph (b) on page 2 of the conference report, reading as follows:

(b) Nothing contained in this act shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement to boycott, coerce, or intimidate, or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

There is no moratorium at all as to those matters, is there?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; there is no moratorium at all as to them.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I have read hastily the conference report, but I am a little disturbed by what I have discovered in paragraph (b) of section 2. I read beginning with section 2 (a):

SEC. 2. (a) The business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business.

(b) No act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such act specifically relates to the business of insurance: *Provided*, That after January 1, 1948, the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, and the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, shall be applicable to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by State law.

Does that mean that after January 1, 1948, the States may determine whether or not the Sherman and the other acts become applicable to the business of insurance?

Mr. McCARRAN. The answer to that question is "Yes." During the 3-year moratorium the States may, if they see fit to do so, enact legislation for the purpose of regulation. If they do enact such legislation, to the extent that they regulate they will have taken the business of insurance in the respective States out from under the Sherman Anti-trust Act, the Clayton Act, and the other acts. If during the moratorium the States do not enact legislation for regulatory purposes, then on January 1, 1948, the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the other acts will become immediately applicable.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, does that not necessarily mean that we would give to the several State legislatures power, the character and outlines of which we do not define, to determine whether a Federal law enacted for the protection of all business and against all kinds of monopolies and restraints of trade shall be effective in the American Union?

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill does not go that far. The Senator will recall the Southeastern Underwriters case. The decision was startling. It created consternation in the insurance business because by previous decisions rendered during the past 50 years or more we were entitled to believe that the business of insurance was not to be classified as interstate commerce. The Supreme Court of the United States specifically, directly, and emphatically put it into the category of interstate commerce. It put it squarely under the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and other acts. The pending bill is for the purpose of creating a moratorium for 3 years in order that the business of insurance shall not be interfered with by any Federal power under either the Clayton Act or the Sherman Act. So during the period of moratorium the various States themselves may take steps to regulate the business of insurance.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have one further question. While I believe that the decision of the Supreme Court was eminently correct, and that it was an example of justice too long delayed, I do not wish to see anything done which will destroy the effectiveness of that decision. If there are reasons which make proper a moratorium for 3 years under the understanding that at the end of such a period of time the Clayton Act, the Sherman Act, and the other acts shall go into effect, well and good, but, so far as I am concerned, I shall not consent to postponing until January 1, 1948, the effective date of the law, and according to the States the privilege of enacting some mild form of legislation which they may call regulatory, thereby defeating the purpose of the Supreme Court decision and defeating the act itself. Apparently the conference report goes further than I had understood it to go. It does not stop with a moratorium at the end of 3 years. At the end of 3 years the moratorium would continue if in the meantime a State had regulated the business to any extent whatever. That would defeat the Supreme Court decision.

Mr. McCARRAN. The moratorium would not be continued; but if in the meantime the States themselves had regulated the business of insurance, the Sherman and Clayton Acts and the other acts would not become effective.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yeild?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe that a statement as to the fair construction of the act would add to the helpfulness of what the Senator from Nevada has said. There are certain things which a State cannot interfere with. It cannot interfere with the application of the Sherman Act to any agreement to boycott, coerce, or intimidate, or an act of boycotting, coercion, or intimidation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Not at any time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Not at any time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Nor is the control of those matters under the specified anti-trust acts removed at any time.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. After the moratorium has expired, if a State has not legislated on the subjects covered by the three acts to which reference has been made, those acts shall be applicable to the business of insurance. But insofar as the State is concerned which has specifically legislated on the subject, the three acts shall not apply.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe the Senator from Michigan went a little further than was his intention when he said that if the States have legislated certain things will take place. The bill says if the States have regulated.

Mr. FERGUSON. I had reference to legislation dealing with regulation and taxes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The bill attempts to provide for a moratorium. I ask for the attention of the Senator from Florida in order that I may give him my interpretation of the bill.

While the Southeastern Underwriters case was pending in the Supreme Court an effort was made to deprive the court of jurisdiction by passing a bill which, in effect, provided that the Sherman and the Clayton Acts should not apply to the business of insurance in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. PEPPER. Knowing how actively the insurance companies of my State fought me because I opposed the bill, I should remember it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That bill was not enacted. The pending bill provides for a moratorium. It contains a declaration that for a period of time the Sherman and Clayton Acts, as well as the other acts, shall not apply.

Section 4 specifically declares that the National Labor Relations Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the Merchant Marine Act shall apply. Nothing in the proposed act shall be construed to affect their application. In other words, there is a positive declaration that those three specific Federal laws which were enacted by Congress to apply to commerce apply also to insurance.

Then we have a clear recommendation of the principle of the Supreme Court decision in the Southeastern Underwriters case.

Now, with respect to the section to which the Senator himself refers, it follows the declaration in the very first section that "Congress hereby declares that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest." So now we endeavor to convey that power of regulation to the States—to recognize it, I should say, rather than convey it—to recognize as desirable the regulation.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does that mean that the States can by their own laws defeat the applicability and operation of the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Clayton Act?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the answer to that question will be clear when I point out that there are certain agreements which can normally be made in the insurance business which are in the public interest, but which might conceivably be a violation of the antitrust law, which prohibits combinations and agreements in restraint of trade.

Mr. PEPPER. Would it not be better that those agreements, if there are such that are legitimatized, be identified in the statute?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree with the Senator, and I endeavored to the very best of my ability to induce the committees of Congress to write into the law specific exemptions from the antitrust law, but I was unable to prevail in the Committee on the Judiciary and I was unable to prevail on the floor of the Senate. But now we have this declaration that with respect to these particular acts, the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, no act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate the law of any State passed for the regulation or the taxing of the business of insurance, and then the proviso.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator read the proviso?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It provides that after January 1, 1948, these several acts——

Mr. PEPPER. That is, the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. They "shall be applicable"—there is a positive declaration—"to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by State law," as was stated by one of the House Members of the conference committee. I interpret that to be a clear statement that if the States do not regulate, the power of Congress to regulate is clearly enunciated. I do not conceive this to be a grant of power to the States to authorize by permissive legislation obviously adverse combinations which would be against the public interest.

Mr. PEPPER. Am I correct in saying that under the proviso which the Senator has just read, if a State made it an offense, under the laws of the State, to engage in combinations in restraint of trade, the Sherman Antitrust Act could not apply to combinations and restraints of trade by companies engaged in business in that State? Is not that what it means?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I think that, for example, a rating bureau, formerly agreement among insurance companies, under the supervision and regulation of the State, would be permitted.

Mr. PEPPER. That may relate to the getting together and filing of proper data and obtaining certain statistical information and disseminating it, and all that, but the legal effect of the proviso which the Senator has just read is that a State can absolutely prevent the applicability of the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Clayton Act to insurance companies doing business in the State by passing a State act which will make combinations and restraints of trade unlawful in that State. As a practical matter, we know that the States cannot and will not enforce these laws against these insurance companies.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is it not perfectly clear that the force and effect of these Federal statutes may be applicable and shall be applicable to whatever extent the State law fails to occupy the ground and engage in regulation? As I take it, there are two jurisdictions.

Mr. McCARRAN. There always are.

Mr. WHITE. There is the State, authorized to act to whatever extent seems proper.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. Then the Federal Government can come in, and it does come in and may legislate beyond the limit of the State legislation.

Mr. McCARRAN. To the extent that the State does not regulate.

Mr. WHITE. To the extent that the State does not regulate.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, does the Senator from Maine take the position that, under the conference report, it becomes necessary for the Congress to act again affirmatively, subsequent to any State action taken?

Mr. WHITE. Not at all; that is not my view of the matter at all. My view is that the State may regulate. If, however, the State goes only to the point indicated, then these Federal statutes apply throughout the whole field beyond the scope of the State's activity.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is a correct statement.

Mr. MURDOCK. Without any subsequent action on the part of Congress?

Mr. WHITE. Without any subsequent action on the part of Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think that therein lies a very important feature of this whole matter. I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Maine that insofar as the States step into the picture affirmatively and act by regulation, they may do so. As the Senator from Wyoming has said, we convey no authority, we simply recognize their right to regulate. Insofar as they fail to cover the same ground covered by the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, those acts become effective again.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to ask, in this connection, whether, where States attempt to occupy the field—but do it inadequately—by going through the form of legislation so as to deprive the Clayton Act, the Sherman Act, and the other acts of their jurisdicion, it is the Senator's interpretation of the conference report that in a case of that kind, where the legislature fails adequately even to deal with the field it attempts to cover, these acts still would apply?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is my interpretation.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the report before it is acted on, and I should appreciate very much if it might be allowed to go over so that I would have that opportunity. At the present time I am not disposed to let the matter go through without addressing myself to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the subject, then, and I shall simply have to delay the Senate, because I wish to discuss the report. I shall be frank; I think the conference report bill practically destroys the effect of the Supreme Court decision, and I am against that. At least I wish to have time to go into it. I do not know of any emergency which requires that the report be agreed to this afternoon. I should appreciate the privilege of considering the matter a little.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct regarding the 3-year moratorium, but beyond that he is in error.

Mr. PEPPER. I would not expect Senators, even if they had the power, to change the report on the floor, and I am perfectly willing to have provided a 3 or 4 or 5 year moratorium, but I am not willing to see the decision of the Supreme Court emasculated. I wish to study the matter before I can give my consent to it. Otherwise, I certainly wish to address myself to it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Just one question to the Senator, then I shall yield and the conference report may go over, so far as I am concerned. Does the Senator oppose State regulation of insurance?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not oppose State regulation which is not inconsistent with the operation of the Sherman antitrust Act and the Clayton Act. On matters of taxation, general regulation, and all that sort of thing, I think the States should regulate, but I think that now that insurance has been brought, by the decision of the Supreme Court, up to the bar of the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act, we should not give the insurance companies immunity from the applicability of those acts.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am willing that the matter should go over, but I should like to call it up tomorrow.

Mr. PEPPER. That is all right. I appreciate the Senator's consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the consideration of the conference report will go over.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE (for Mr. CONNALLY), from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

George R. Merrell, of Missouri, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3, to act as Commissioner of the United States of America to India, with the rank of Minister.

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

Jewell W. Swofford, of Missouri, to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission for a term of 6 years from March 15, 1945 (reappointment).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

TREATY WITH MEXICO RELATING TO THE UTILIZATION OF CERTAIN WATERS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I submit a report for the Executive Calendar on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], on the treaty with Mexico relating to the utilization of the waters of certain rivers. (Ex. Rept. No. 2, 79th Cong., 1st sess.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 27, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 26, 1945:

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be second lieutenants, Infantry, with rank from December 1, 1944

Leonard Dillion Rogers
John Marion Shaw
Allen Grannis Wilson

To be second lieutenants, Field Artillery, with rank from December 1, 1944

James Edward Aud
John Anthony Chiment
Billy Sunday Clark

To be second lieutenants, Coast Artillery Corps, with rank from December 1, 1944

Roy Lindsay Baber, Jr.
Charles Alexander McLeod

To be second lieutenant, Corps of Engineers, with rank from December 1, 1944

Thomas Hagler

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Joseph James O'Hare, to be colonel, Infantry, with rank from January 3, 1945.

Maurice Levi Miller, to be colonel, Infantry, with rank from January 15, 1945.

Junius Henry Houghton to be colonel, Air Corps, with rank from February 1, 1945, subject to examination required by law.

Abram Vorhees Rinearson, Jr., to be colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.

Douglas Jenkins Page, to be colonel, Field Artillery.

James Nephew Caperton to be colonel, Cavalry.

Frank Clark Scofield to be colonel, Coast Artillery Corps.

Humbert Lewis Riva to be captain, Medical Corps, with rank from August 26, 1944.

Edward Shaw to be captain, Medical Corps, with rank from August 26, 1944.

Wayne Creekmore Pittman to be captain, Medical Corps, with rank from December 11, 1944.

Carlton Willard Sargent to be captain, Medical Corps, with rank from December 11, 1944.

William Joseph Adlington to be colonel, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 12, 1945.

Ernest Eugene Hodgson to be lieutenant colonel, Veterinary Corps, with rank from February 2, 1945.

Claud Dale La Fors to be captain, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from February 18, 1945.

Jesse Nichols Butler to be first lieutenant, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from February 21, 1945.

William John Walsh to be major, Chaplains, United States Army, with rank from February 13, 1945.

James Gordon De La Vergne to be major, Chaplains, United States Army, with rank from February 13, 1945.

Warren Earl Ferguson to be captain, Chaplains, United States Army, with rank from February 28, 1945, subject to examination required by law.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious and everlasting Father, we pray Thee to summon us today by the law of duty, by the law of self-sacrifice, and by the law of love. We are weak and sinful and would not indulge in the glimmerings of human speculation, but seek Thee to guide our wills. O remind us that life is too short and too sacred to hate, to bear resentment, or carry a grudge. As Thine arms were unfolded at the cross all for us, turn our self-centered lives into the unity and potency of brotherhood.

Thou who didst herald the renewal of humanity with the teaching that sinners, slaves, and outcasts are the children of God, O lead us to love one another with that love which gleamed from the hill of Calvary. Open Thou the self-clouded eyes of men that their hearts may be changed and their lives transformed. As the world is groping its way in the agony of heart and mind, fulfill its destiny; its coming redemption must come through the gateways of faith, repentance, and prayer. O God, the source of all our hopes and dreams and aspirations, intervene and send Thy cleansing streams over all lands and give us peace. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 23, 1945, was read and approved.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

CONDUCT OF MEMBERS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I introduced a resolution of censure growing out of the incident which happened on Thursday. I felt then and I feel now that the House cannot afford to permit language such as the Official Reporter indicated had been used to pass when uttered on the floor of this House without the House suffering in public respect and esteem. I think some official action should have been taken. However, I find myself in the minority, and there seems to be a sentiment in the House to close the incident. The fact that my resolution is pending prevents the incident from being officially closed. Therefore, bowing to what I believe to be the prevailing sentiment in the House, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for this afternoon. I ask unanimous consent at this time that it be vacated. However, I renew my request and ask unanimous consent that on Friday next I may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert an editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests. First, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Roy C. McKenna, of Latrobe, Pa., on America last, but I want the people to know that Roy McKenna is that kind of an American who wants America first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

DAVID ZABLODOWSKY

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am very much perturbed over the statement that was made in this morning's Times-Herald that we have a Communist by the name of David Zablodowsky in the Office of Strategic Services in the armed service, and that it was through this gentleman that we find we are going to permit Communists to enter the Army. The Committee on Military Affairs, I am sure, is going to investigate that. And I hope they will go to the bottom in this investigation.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I will say to the gentleman I have already appointed a special committee. They are meeting tomorrow morning on it.

Mr. RICH. I hope that you seek out this fellow David Zablodowsky and you take him out of the position he is in as senior economic editor and take him out of anything that pertains to this Government of ours. Anybody who wants to destroy this Government of ours ought to be locked up, and the quicker we lock them up the better. We want no Communists in our country or in our Army.

Zablodowsky's record with Communist organizations is a lengthy one. He was a contributor to the Daily Worker, official Communist daily; member of the editorial board of Fight, official organ of the American League Against War and Fascism, cited as subversive by Attorney General Biddle; endorser of the Memorial Day youth peace parade in 1938, a Communist movement; and president of the Book and Magazine Guild, Communist controlled.

I am also against the freedom of men who are as bold to injure our country or form of government, such as Browder, who was pardoned from the penitentiary, and Harry Bridges, who has been ordered deported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subject matters, in one to include an article from the Christian Science Monitor and in the other an article from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MIDNIGHT CURFEW IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HAVENNER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on March 6, one week from Tuesday, I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes on the subject Is Uncle Sam Again to Become a Financial Scapegoat for the World?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a statement by Ivan Wright, professor of economics, Brooklyn College.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have permission to address the House today for 10 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that that be vacated and that I be given permission to speak tomorrow for the same time, after any previous special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

WHAT IS THE BEST APPROACH TO OBTAIN MAXIMUM MILK PRODUCTION IN 1945?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter of transmittal and tables from the United States Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

GESTAPO WEAPONS

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, last week I received a package from a soldier overseas, containing a number of weapons. One of them was so repulsive that I thought the House would be interested in seeing it. The instrument that I want to exhibit to the House is a German Gestapo torture whip. This weapon is made from the tendons of the leg of a steer. You will note it is about two feet long and twisted. You could take this and beat a man to death. It shows signs of having been used. Evidently it has been used on the French people, on German people, and possibly on Americans. This was acquired at Metz.

I show you this that you may have a better understanding of the type of enemy we are fighting. It illustrates the mentality of a people that will contrive an instrument like that to beat people into subjection. Therefore, when we expect those people to surrender they are not likely to surrender with a gun in their back and facing a bludgeoning over the head with this Gestapo whip. This is the work of the Hun. This is a product of Himmler and his Gestapo gang. Those who write the peace should see to it that it will not be possible for such cruelty, such inhumanity, to again inflict itself upon the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

VIVISECTION

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. TALBOT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an article on reemployment.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain editorial comments.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article entitled "The Coast Guard Does Another Great Job."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a speech I delivered Saturday in my district.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 20 minutes today following the legislative business and other special orders.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

KIND OF MONEY USED TO PAY AMERICAN SOLDIERS IN FRANCE AND ITALY

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, many of us are becoming increasingly concerned over the daily comment that comes to our attention through the press and over the radio in connection with the bad deal that our boys in Europe are getting on the exchange rates in both France and Italy. With this in mind I recently addressed a communication to the War Department on the subject. I received a reply which contained this statement among others:

> United States troops, no matter where located, are paid the full amount approved by the Congress in United States dollars or the equivalent thereof in legal tender local currency.

Unless I am badly mistaken this business of paying our soldiers in the "equivalent thereof" is not in line with the provisions of the Pay Adjustment Act. Accordingly I am today introducing a resolution of inquiry which will go to the Committee on Military Affairs of this House; and I hope we will get prompt action. We do not want our boys getting the small end of the horn in Europe and that appears to be the situation at present.

In an article which appeared in the press not long ago Leslie Bain pointed out that "our senseless monetary policy in Europe is turning our boys into black marketeers in sheer self-defense." Why should our G. I. lose four-fifths of his pay because he is being paid in worthless francs instead of good dollars and being paid at the rate of 50 francs to the dollar instead of 250 francs which is the real value of the United States dollar on the open market?

It begins to look as though our soldiers, without being asked about it, have to underwrite the stabilization of French currency by sacrificing 80 cents out of every dollar they receive from this Nation for serving in the Army. Mr. Speaker, such a policy is wrong; it is unfair to our service men and women, and I am opposed to it.

I hope that my resolution of inquiry will develop enough facts to warrant a thorough investigation of this exchange policy.

THE CURFEW ON NIGHT CLUBS

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, in the midnight curfew order of Justice Byrnes he has overlooked the fact that in southern California his directive will save no coal because we use no coal for heat or lighting purposes. On the contrary the order will work a decided hardship on many thousands of people who are directly connected with the war effort in the manufacture of munitions. Because of the tremendous increase in population due to the war industries many of them find their only opportunity for recreation and relaxation is a motion picture show or the possibility of going to a bowling alley or cafe.

I have written a letter to Justice Byrnes asking that he give consideration to southern California for that reason and exclude it from his order. We have never been found wanting in our contribution to the war effort or in patriotic zeal. We do not want to appear so in this instance. We are definitely being unjustly penalized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a short article on aluminum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a memorial from the State Legislature of the State of Washington to Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

MIDNIGHT CURFEW

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, at 12 o'clock tonight the curfew order of Justice Byrnes goes into effect. I think it unfortunate that Justice Byrnes did not set the closing hour at 11 o'clock instead of 12 o'clock for owl-eyed lounge lizards, who find it inconvenient to cease their merrymaking at 12 o'clock and keep themselves in proper shape to do a day's work. I suggest the formation of a battalion of these people to operate in the fox holes on some of the battle fronts where they must stay awake and alert around the clock in order to defend their own lives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ENGLE of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by Rev. J. Hugh O'Donnell, president, University of Notre Dame, on compulsory military training.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial which recently appeared in the Waukesha (Wis.) Daily Freeman, also a letter which I received from one of my constituents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

THE TYDINGS AMENDMENT TO THE SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 29, Rept. No. 216), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in order that there may be no further misinterpretation of the will and the desire of the Congress in enacting subsection K, section 305, title 50, United States Code, commonly known as the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act, Congress reaffirms the necessity to our war effort of said subsection K and again expresses its will and desire that the local selective-service board, in classifying the registrant, observe subsection K, and concern itself solely with the registrant's essentiality to an agricultural occupation or endeavor, and to the question of whether or not a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be composed of three members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three members of the House Committee on Agriculture to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to determine who is responsible for the wholesale induction of essential farmers and farm workers where no replacements are available, in violation of the Tydings amendment, and to determine the effect of such induction upon agricultural production, and upon the war effort, and to return its findings to the Congress at the earliest possible date.

MANPOWER PROBLEM

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VURSELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter that I have written to the War Production Board.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 106

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the Committee on Rules has granted a rule which will be filed today for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 106, which deals with the deferment of farm workers. If that rule is filed today, that resolution will be called up tomorrow morning.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman really mean it?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; I would say to the gentleman that we do. We have a very important appropriation bill on the calendar for Wednesday and Thursday about which I understand there is considerable controversy, and it will be necessary to have some general debate on it.

Mr. BULWINKLE. May I call attention to the chairmen of these various committees, that Calendar Wednesday was set apart for them? If they want legislation called up, they have a chance when their committees are called on Calendar Wednesday. For years we have dispensed with Calendar Wednesday. I do not think it is right, and I think I am correct in saying that it is recognized as the people's day on the floor. I will not object this time, because there do not seem to be any chairmen ready with anything, but if they are ready, I am going to object.

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I shall not object this time, but if the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] is a member, will bring out a bill to wipe out discriminations in freight rates, I will help force a Calendar Wednesday so that we may pass that legislation and protect the people against these freight-rate discriminations.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Has the gentleman introduced such a bill?

Mr. RANKIN. I understand such a bill is now pending before the committee.

Mr. BULWINKLE. At the present time there is pending before the committee the railroad retirement bill, an amendment to the Securities Act, and the Vandenberg bill which deals with Mr. Petrillo.

Mr. RANKIN. I am willing to object and force a Calendar Wednesday here if you will just take the Petrillo bill up and put a stop to his racketeering. I think that would meet with the hearty approval of a vast majority of the American people. Next to wiping out these discriminatory freight rates, I know of nothing that would appeal more to the decent people of America than striking Petrillo's hands off the musical performances of the Nation. If the gentleman will just bring up that Petrillo resolution, I shall be glad to force a Calendar Wednesday for its consideration.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I may say to the gentleman that I will object when the time comes, if it is necessary. He need not bother with it. He should look after his own committee and get out some legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. We will get our legislation to the floor all right. We always do. But I am trying to help the gentleman from North Carolina get some necessary legislation from his committee considered.

Mr. COX. That is advice that the gentleman from North Carolina might himself take, because I know what he has in mind.

Mr. COCHRAN. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order has been demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. RICH. I am going to object, if I am not to be given a chance to be heard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania overlooks the fact, I am sure——

Mr. RICH. Then I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That when the regular order is demanded the Chair has to put the question. If the gentleman who demanded the regular order should withdraw it, the Chair would welcome such action.

Mr. COCHRAN. I withdraw my demand for the regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserves the right to object.

Mr. RICH. I was very much interested in the colloquy between these two Members of the House. The Members should remember that they voted to give the Chief Executive power to do all kinds of things by Executive order, and now we do not need to do very much here. All you need to do is to ask the President to give you an Executive order and you get almost anything accomplished. That is the way the New Deal operates. I did not vote such power to the President and I do not believe in legislation by Executive order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the legislative program of today, tomorrow, and Friday, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOFFMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a portion of the report of the manager of the Southern States Cooperative.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each a short excerpt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects and include in one a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is District day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

EMPLOYMENT OF FEMALES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2122) to extend to 6 months after the termination of hostilities the period during which females may be employed in the District of Columbia for more than 8 hours a day, or 48 hours a week, under temporary permits, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this legislation is now in effect and this is merely a continuance of the present law.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the observation of the distinguished minority leader is correct. During the Seventy-eighth Congress legislation was passed which became Public Law 63. That law, which has been in effect since June of 1943, allows employers in essential or war work within the District of Columbia to have female employees engaged for more than 48 hours a week. They can work as much as 54 hours a week with the understanding, of course, that time and a half is paid beyond the 48 hours. Also these permits for work must come before the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board and a case must be made in each instance.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When does that legislation expire?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It expires on June 30, 1945.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The original act just covered a period of 2 years?

Mr. RANDOLPH. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask this question: Why is it we have a 40-hour limit by law back in the States while in the District of Columbia we have a 48-hour law. Why is there that discrimination between the workers of the District and the workers in the respective States?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The District of Columbia is a Federal jurisdiction, and therefore is subject to a general regulation, whereas the States operate under various laws on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity, and I think the record should show that during the period from June 1, 1943, to February 1, 1945, 52,735 days of additional work by women has been carried forward in the mercantile, manufacturing, laundry, hotel, restaurant, telegraph, and transportation industries of the District of Columbia. There have been 1,977 women affected with a total of woman-days of 52,735. The number of 340 plants have been benefited. I might also add in conclusion that the Western Union, with 937 female employees, and the Washington Terminal, which we know as the Union Station, with 351, have been the business institutions, having a direct bearing on the war effort, that have received most benefit under this law. I can also add that both management and labor appear to be perfectly satisfied in the way in which it has been administered. This legislation would keep in effect until 6 months after the conclusion of the war the act which would expire on June 30 of this year.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has any showing been made as to any necessity for continuing these extra hours after the cessation of hostilities? It seems to me that when hostilities cease there will be plenty of labor available, including female labor. Unless some showing was made that it would be necessary to continue these long hours, I do not see why they should be.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Of course, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I remember his intense interest in this legislation on its original passage. Each and every request for overtime by an employer must stand a close inspection by the Minimum Wage and Industrial Safety Board authorities of the District of Columbia. We felt that rather than bring in a bill which gave the expiration date as of some specific time it was best to have it for 6 months after the conclusion of hostilities as that has been the practice in connection with other legislation of this type which has been proposed.

At the instance of the gentleman and others we inserted an amendment in the bill in the Seventy-eighth Congress, providing for time and one-half. The law is operating fairly and we would like to see it renewed in the manner in which we have presented it today.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the hours of employment and safeguard the health of females employed in the District of Columbia," approved February 24, 1914, as amended (D. C. Code, title 36, Supp. III, sec. 36-301), is amended by striking out "June 30, 1945" and inserting in lieu thereof "on the date 6 months after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President or as specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress, whichever is the earlier."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Committee on the District of Columbia has only the one measure which has now been passed, to bring before the House today.

AMENDING SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. BATES of Kentucky, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 149) for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 106) to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors essential to the war effort. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 54, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee,

is authorized and directed to make a study and investigation of the present system of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products, in their natural or processed form, from rural areas through the various marketing agencies to the ultimate consumer, as it affects farmers, the various types of middlemen, wholesalers, retailers, and consumers, with a view to ascertaining, among other things—

(a) The effectiveness of the present system of marketing, and the adequacy of present marketing facilities, with particular regard to the protection of farmers and consumers.

(b) The effect of transactions on the futures commodities exchanges upon such system and upon farmers and consumers.

(c) The existence of any practices in connection with the packing, packaging, grading, inspecting, storing, processing, transporting, distributing, or marketing of farm products, which adversely affect farmers and consumers.

(d) The existence of any practices in connection with the sale or distribution of insecticides and fungicides, fertilizer, farm machinery, and other farm supplies which adversely affect farmers.

(e) The adequacy of present facilities, local, State, and Federal, for (1) furnishing producers, distributors, and consumers with market reports and marketing information; (2) the development of standards and grades; (3) the inspection and certification of the quality and condition of farm products; (4) the development, analysis, and publication currently of information showing the costs of marketing farm products through the various channels of distribution; (5) the inspection of meat and meat products and the influence of such facilities on the marketing of livestock; (6) protecting producers, distributors, and consumers from unfair trade practices in the marketing of farm products.

(f) Assistance to producers and distributors in establishing improved systems of marketing.

(g) The present and prospective development of the types and methods of transportation for farm products, and the existence, if any, of discrimination in railway-freight or in motor-carrier rates on farm products in the various areas.

(h) The effect of price-support activities upon the marketing and distribution of farm products.

The committee shall report to the House from time to time the results of its studies and investigations, and in its reports the committee shall make such recommendations as it may deem proper, including recommendations with respect to any legislative action necessary to effectuate its recommendations.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, to take such testimony, to have such printing and binding done, and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman. Oaths or affirmations may be administered by the chairman or any member of the committee designated by him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BATES] for 1 hour.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this resolution if adopted would authorize the Committee on Agriculture to make investigations as to the marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products. This is just another one of those investigating committees that we seem so prolific in setting up, but this one I do believe has done and will continue to do a great deal of good.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], after which I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this is one of several resolutions that will be called up today continuing special committees that existed in the last Congress. In the last Congress we had 35 special or select committees. A great deal of criticism was directed at us last year because we were making Congress an investigating body. That was one of the reasons there was a general demand for revamping the Congress. They want us to put our house in order, to streamline the Congress, reduce the number of committees so the Members of the House would have an opportunity better to familiarize themselves with legislation and act more intelligently.

One of the duties of this select joint committee which has been established as a result of that demand is properly to staff the regular committees of the House and the Senate so they will be able to make investigations of this character without having special or select committees set up to do so.

It was rumored at the outset of this Congress that special and select committees would be held up until we get some kind of a report from this joint committee. We established this committee in the last Congress and later on continued it in this Congress, but already nine of these House committees have been authorized to continue their investigations during the present Congress and additional ones will be authorized today.

I desire to be consistent. I have asked for this time so that the RECORD will show that I am opposed to all of the select and joint committees at this time. I do not believe they are necessary. Then again, it is a duplication of work, because Senate committees are doing the same job that these committees are doing. I do not believe the House should deprive itself of the right to make investigations along lines the Senate may be investigating, but why duplicate the work?

In reference to this particular committee, back 5 or 6 years ago I believe it was, a resolution was sponsored in the House by the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Warren, and in the Senate by Senator WHEELER, of Montana. We passed proper legislation which required the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation of exactly what this resolution provides for. In addition to that, those of you who were here then, as I was, voted $300,000 to enable the Federal Trade Commission to do the job.

It did the job. The Federal Trade Commission made an exhaustive investigation and made voluminous reports to the Congress. The first report contained 1,100 pages, the second 900 pages, and there were other reports, including one on the implement and the machinery industry and another on distribution. The report on the implement and machinery industry contained 1,200 pages. I have some of them in my office.

As I say, the Commission investigated every phase of agriculture, even went into the chain-stores situation and made reports to Congress. What became of that investigation? Where is the legislation following that expenditure of $300,000?

This committee now being considered was set up in the last Congress and received an allowance of $50,000. As I recall, $5,000 of that was set aside to carry on the guayule investigation, investigation of a rubber substitute. According to the last report I received there is a balance of $43,000 remaining. I must admit this committee did not get started in the last Congress. However, the Agricultural Committee of the Senate is doing a similar job. The Federal Trade Commission has already done the job. Now, why come along and continue this committee?

Are we going to tell the public that we will streamline the Congress, then set up and extend all of these special and select committees that existed in the last Congress? Why not wait for a report from the Monroney committee?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 4 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, how can we tell the country that we will set our own House in order and then continue to create special and select committees?

Remember, every time you pass one of these resolutions, there will follow an appropriation to carry out the purposes of the resolution that we previously passed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If the Senate and the House are doing the same work, would it not be proper to have a concurrent resolution introduced creating a committee of the Senate and House so that we will stop duplication? If an investigation is needed at all, why do we not do it jointly and avoid duplication?

Mr. COCHRAN. We already have a joint committee set up, and that joint committee is supposed to come to some conclusion in reference to this problem of continuing investigations and providing for joint investigating committees.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman said he is opposed to these special committees and stated he is in favor of properly staffing the regular standing committees, as I understood him.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. I want the RECORD to show, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman is in favor of neither one, because he fought my resolution to give a Subcommittee on Appropriations an examining staff. The gentleman held that bill up in committee. I could not get it out because he froze it tight, and the gentleman knows that the only kind of staff that would do any good in reducing appropriations is an examining staff.

Mr. COCHRAN. Let me answer the gentleman by saying that my opposition to his resolution was due to the fact that the House of Representatives had already empowered the Appropriations Committee to make every investigation that it desired in regard to expenditures and on top of that we had appropriated $100,000 for his committee to do so.

The gentleman did come before the Accounts Committee and urged the passage of a resolution that he introduced. His resolution provided for an investigating or examining staff for every subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. It seemed that the gentleman did not approve of the set-up that the House had provided for the Appropriations Committee. He did not want the Appropriations Committee as a whole to dictate to any subcommittee whom they should employ or what they should investigate, but, Mr. Speaker, how foolish it would have been for the Accounts Committee to have approved the resolution of the gentleman from Iowa, because every Member of this House knows that if I would have brought such a resolution to the floor of the House it would have been defeated because of the action of the Rules Committee in setting up a special investigating committee in the Appropriations Committee as a whole. That committee is operating now. It has been extended by the House, and it has about $50,000 to carry on its investigations. When the continuing resolution was before the House the chairman of the gentleman's committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said every member of his committee was satisfied with what was going on. I saw the gentleman from Iowa on the floor, and he did not get up and challenge the chairman of his committee at that time. The House gave you $100,000, and you have $50,000 left. Does the gentleman feel we should give you more money for the same purpose?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to refer to the gentleman's remarks about the duplication of the investigation of the Federal Trade Commission. During the consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill I called attention to this same duplication and offered an amendment reducing from $100,000 to $30,000 the amount of money appropriated for the Federal Trade Commission for this general investigation. I was wondering what the gentleman's attitude was on that.

Mr. COCHRAN. I have always been in favor of the Federal Trade Commission making thorough investigations, because I believe it is one governmental agency that is actually serving the masses of this country. It is the people's representative.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I agree with the gentleman that there are too many investigating committees, but I would like to suggest this: Is it possible that some arrangement might be made with the Senate by which those investigations could be thrown into the House instead, because there are only 96 Members of the Senate? Here in the House we have a great many Members who are not on any committee of any importance at all, some of our ablest Members, and it seems to me that that work is not being properly delegated and that is the reason we are not getting proper results from some of these investigations.

Mr. COCHRAN. May I say to the gentlewoman from Illinois that the Maloney-Monroney Committee, so-called, was set up for that very purpose. They are supposed to do that job. They are expected to report to this House before April. If we can get the right kind of a report, and if the House will adopt it, we can properly staff our own committees, including the one the gentlewoman serves on, whose clerk does not get $3,000 a year. Still the Banking and Currency Committee handles legislation of great importance. It should be properly staffed with experts.

I want the RECORD to show that I am opposed to these resolutions. I am not going to force a roll call, because I know I could not win if I did. I am also opposed to the one that was reported from the Committee on Rules, the Lemke resolution, because that job can be done by either the Military Affairs Committee or the Smith committee; you have two committees that can make that investigation, still the Rules Committee brings in a resolution to set up a third committee.

You are going to hear about some tremendous savings that have resulted from the creation of some of these committees. Just wait until you hear what the chairmen of some of these committees will tell you. Not thousands or millions, but hundreds of millions of dollars they will tell you they have saved by their activities. I think the House is making a serious mistake in passing these resolutions today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to state that the bill coming up tomorrow is the Flannagan bill, reported out of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. COCHRAN. It is not the Lemke resolution?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is the bill reported out of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. COCHRAN. The Lemke resolution was reported out today, though; was it not?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes; but the bill reported out of the Committee on Military Affairs is the one that is coming up tomorrow.

Mr. COCHRAN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say that the issue involved here appears to be whether or not the Congress will make these investigations or whether some bureau downtown will make them. I am for this resolution because I think the Congress should preserve the right to make investigations of this kind and not leave them all to the executive branch of the Government. Only Congress can determine whether the laws we pass are accomplishing what Congress intended or are being carried out as Congress intended.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily agree with the gentleman from Missouri that this resolution will pass overwhelmingly. The Agricultural Committee has been doing a good job in the past 2 years trying to solve the problem of the farmer, and the continuation of this committee should be unanimous.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If we have duplication between the Senate and the House, does not the gentleman from Illinois believe we ought to work along with the Senate? Then when we got a final report we would have one that gave us the composite judgment of the Senate and House committees, so that we might economize a little in the operation of our Government. I think it is essential and very necessary that the Congress retain its powers within the two bodies. Certainly, if we are going to be a good legislative body, we ought to be able to cut out any duplication. I think that if the gentleman from Missouri was correct in his statement we ought to work in harmony with the Senate in order to cut out this duplication. If we do not do that, we are poor legislators.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. What makes the gentleman think there is duplication in the Senate?

Mr. RICH. The only reason I think that is that the gentleman from Missouri made that statement, and I have a right to believe that is the case.

Another thing, for some time more money has been squandered in the Department of Agriculture than any place else I know of in the way of subsidies that are granted to people who do not know what they are getting the subsidies for. If we are going to preserve the financial status of this Nation, we have to be just as frugal in the Agricultural Department as we are in any other department of the Government. Understand, I want to help the farmer, but I want the farmer to know what he is getting checks for. If he is getting money for producing, then I am for the farmer. But when this committee of the House pays the farmers of this country something just because it wants to get on the good side of the farmers, and the farmers do not know what their checks are for.

then I say it is time we have a proper investigation of these expenditures of the Government.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes it in order for the House Committee on Agriculture to conduct an investigation covering the marketing, transportation, and distribution of agricultural products. It is similar to a resolution which was introduced in the last Congress and adopted, and for which the Committee on Accounts authorized the expenditure of $50,000.

For reasons which I shall not take the time to go into here, the committee was not able to get the personnel and to start the investigation in the last Congress. It did, however, lay the groundwork. I can say now, as I am sure the chairman of the committee will say when he speaks, that the committee is now ready to go ahead and vigorously carry out this investigation.

If there was ever any question as to the ability of agriculture to meet one of its great problems, that of production, that question has certainly been answered during this war period, because the agricultural producers of this Nation, with less manpower, less machinery, less transportation, and less of everything than they have ever had before, have increased the production of agricultural commodities about 40 percent. It is a remarkable achievement. We know we can solve the problem of production as far as agriculture is concerned.

It is the problem of distribution and marketing which constitutes the real problem of the farmers today. I do not know whether this committee can solve that problem or not, but I believe it is time a committee of this House took some action to see what can be done toward arriving at a solution of it. As matters stand now, under our present marketing system, the farmer sells virtually everything which he produces at auction. I do not know of any other business which could be carried on successfully in that way. Every other business that I know of, subject to competition in some cases, of course, fixes the price at which it will sell its products. But the farmer up to this good hour has found it necessary to sell his products for what they will bring at auction. If this committee can do something to work out a better system of marketing and distribution of farm products than we have at the present time, it will do more for the farmer than all the Congresses we have ever had in the entire history of this country. The problem being what it is, I think this Congress would be negligent in its duty if it does not make that effort.

As to what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has said as to the desirability of having these investigations conducted by an executive department rather than Congress, I will simply say this, we expect legislation to come out of this investigation. I think that when matters of legislation are involved, the investigation should be made by the Congress. If the Federal Trade Commission, as a result of its investigation, has uncovered material and brought out facts that this committee can use, they will be used because the committee has already told the Federal Trade Commission that we want its cooperation, and that cooperation has been promised. The committee expects also to work with the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, and all other Government bureaus which deal with any part of this problem. If they have made investigations, we are going to get the benefit of those investigations. There will be no duplications because we are not going to do something that has already been done by a Government agency.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, of course, I agree with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] that the farmer sells his products wholesale and gets the lowest price. But I want to ask the gentleman from Kansas if under this resolution they could make an inquiry concerning, or go into an investigation of, the War Production Board for its discrimination against the wheat, cotton, corn, and barley farmers of the country on the proposition of extending rural-electrification lines.

As the situation stands today, the great bulk of the farming in this country is done by those four classes of farmers. Without them this country could not carry on this war. Without the wheat, cotton, corn, and barley farmers this country could not carry on this war or continue to prosper in time of peace. And yet the War Production Board outlaws them by confining the extension of these rural power lines to those farmers, or to those people in rural districts, who show a certain number of animal units. I want that order changed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question of the gentleman from Mississippi, I will say that I am in full sympathy with his position in this matter, but I do not believe that this resolution, although it is quite broad, is broad enough to cover that subject matter. It does not deal with the matter of supplies used in the production of agricultural products. It deals solely with the marketing, transportation, and distribution of those products.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOPE. I yield briefly.

Mr. RANKIN. We are preparing to provide $150,000,000, as I understand it, for rural electrification for the next fiscal year. Untold hundreds of thousands of farmers in the areas I have mentioned—the wheat, corn, barley, and cotton areas—are begging for these lines; yet the Rural Electrification Administration is forbidden to extend lines to them, and private power companies are forbidden to do so, because of this regulation established by the War Production Board. I think it is an outrage and should be corrected.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think that price fixing by the O. P. A. and the War Food Administration has made the need for this study much more necessary than ever before. When the Government itself can have a Government monopoly and still have a spread between the producer and consumer that is greater than the product brought before the war it shows there is a great field for study.

Mr. HOPE. I agree with the gentleman. Those are the matters that are authorized to be covered by this investigation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has again expired.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with many of the statements made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] with reference to the pending resolution. For that reason I think the House should have a clear statement of the object of the resolution now before the House.

This resolution has for its object reducing the spread between the farm and the table. As we all know, there is an enormous spread from the time a farm product leaves the farm until it gets on the dinner table in Washington or in some other city. I believe I am safe in stating that if industry had to operate under the same marketing system that agriculture has operated under during past years, and is now operating under, no industry in America could operate and remain in business 12 months.

Reference has been made to investigations made by the Federal Trade Commission and the Senate. As far as I know the Senate does not have a committee set up to investigate the problem of farm marketing. It is true the Federal Trade Commission made investigations touching certain phases covered by the pending resolution. The committee has already obtained copies of all of those hearings, and I assure the House that that work will not be duplicated. But I fear the investigations made by the Federal Trade Commission will be of very little service to the marketing committee. Never in the history of this country, so far as I know, has an honest-to-goodness effort been made to improve farm-marketing conditions. We have talked about it. We have referred this phase of the problem or that phase or the other phase to the Federal Trade Commission or this or that governmental agency, and the result has always been just another report to clutter up The Archives of this Republic.

By this resolution we are creating a marketing committee composed of the membership of this House, men who have given thought and study to the farm problem over the years, and who are not only familiar with the farm-marketing problems, but interested in something more than investigations. We want the

investigation and study followed by the necessary remedial legislation. We propose to take the investigation up in sections, so to speak, and as we work out certain phases of the problem to bring before the House corrective legislation in order to afford relief to the farmers of this country at the earliest moment possible.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Is it not true that the purpose of this investigation is to help the consumers of the country just as much as it is to help the farmers of the country?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I may say to the gentleman from Missouri that the consumers of this country, in my opinion, will be as much the beneficiaries of this investigation as the farmers. Under our system today this spread between the farm and the table results either in lowering the farm price or increasing the consumer price, and in most instances in both lowering the farm price and increasing the consumer price.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The charge has been made here that this bill will aid the farmers. The truth is that this resolution will enable this committee to help all the people of our country.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. With reference to the Federal Trade Commission studies, copies of which I have obtained and tried to study, it occurs to me that whereas the Federal Trade Commission or a body like that may be able to assemble, and have in the past assembled, certain facts, only a committee of Congress can take those facts and decide on the basis of them what remedial action should be taken.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is true; and may I say further to the gentleman from California that I do not believe the Federal Trade Commission can make the kind of investigation that is necessary. It is going to take someone familiar with farm problems, someone deeply interested in solving those problems, to work out the right kind of remedial legislation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yeild?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If by passing this resolution we could get money enough for the farmers so they would not ask to be given these subsidies we would be doing a wonderful thing for the country. Does the gentleman believe there is an opportunity by having this resolution passed whereby we can have the farmers paid for the things they raise a price proportionate to their cost so they will get earned money for their effort instead of a subsidy?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I believe that every member of the Committee on Agriculture is as anxious as is the gentleman to get rid of subsidies and give the farmer a fair price in the market place; and that is what I should like to see worked out. I believe in making this statement I express the sentiment of the membership of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans.

Mr. RICH. If we do not do that, I will say that the farmer will be the worst persecuted man after a while of any class of our society, because real estate will be the only place to get tax money and the farmer will have to pay the bill for all these things. He will be persecuted eventually unless Congress can do something about it.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I think so and I hope the day is not far distant when the farmer can get a fair price in the market place and will not have to come to Congress for subsidies.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. As I look at this matter the principal factor that causes this large spread between the price the farmer gets for his product and the price the consumer has to pay is taxation. Does this committee intend to look into the question of taxation?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I do not believe we are going into the question of taxation. We are not going to be diverted. If this committee is set up and I have anything to do with it we are not going to be diverted from the job we have in hand, which is, namely, to work out a sound, sane, and sensible marketing system for the farmers of America. If we succeed in doing that we will have solved one of the greatest problems that the American people are faced with today. Let us leave out taxation, rural electrification, this, that, and the other thing, and keep our eye on the real problem.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. But let us clarify this point. The gentleman was talking about the spread and the gentleman's discussion indicated to me that the committee intends to investigate the cause of the spread and do something about it. There is no question but what taxation is the biggest factor in causing that spread. All I want to know is, Will the committee go into the question of taxation?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Well, I cannot agree with the gentleman that taxation is the cause of the great spread between the farm and the table. We know pretty well what is causing it. It is somewhere—probably all along the line from the time that the farm product leaves the farm until it reaches the table.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. As I understand it from the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] who is a very practical man, he wants to get some usable information dealing with the question of the difference between the prices of farm commodities on the farm and what the consumers pay for them, is that right?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The gentleman is quite correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr Speaker, I address myself to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. The argument made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is the best possible evidence of the need of the pending resolution we have heard on the floor. Addressing myself to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH], the committee technically could take up the problem of taxation so far as it affected the spread between the producer and consumer, just as it might, I say to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], discuss the problem of rural electrification; yet the committee would be very seriously in error to spread itself so thinly over the field of investigation that it did not turn out the good job which the questions upon this floor indicate are desired by the Congress.

The reason I address myself to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is because it depends a great deal upon his committee whether or not this investigation is a success. There is no similar investigation being carried on in the other body, there is no similar investigation being carried on anywhere, and it is often a fact that a committee which is given an appropriation of $5,000 is a more expensive investigation than a committee which is given up to 10 times that amount, if we base our opinions on the relative results of the investigations.

The problem will be a problem in the United States just as long as the farmer can get but a few cents for his product and the consumer has to buy it in the market place for 10 or 20 times that amount. In the period of the depression in agriculture, one of the most unsatisfactory aspects of the handling of the problem was the fact that we did not treat it as a marketing problem but treated it instead as a production problem. Although there were areas of the United States where people needed food, the solution decided upon was to destroy food.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I ask the gentleman if he does not agree that perhaps the most fundamental job of the Committee on Agriculture, and through it the House as a body, is a determination of long-range policies with regard to agriculture in America, and whether he does not think it is quite out of the question to determine such long-range policies on a sound basis until a committee has collected the facts with regard to this very crucial phase of that problem?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I agree completely, and I thank the gentleman for that contribution, because it reminds me that I want to say before my time expires that this is not a committee that is going to

be created today and make a report tomorrow. It is not a committee that is going to do all this work at one session of Congress. It is a committee that can only be useful and valuable by the accumulation of records and facts, and then by decisions from them.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from California was referring to the destruction of food rather than to the distribution of it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I imagine he was referring to the killing of 7,000,000 pigs back in 1933, at which time we had an abundance of corn and other grain to feed those pigs, so that we might have distributed them to the people who were in need.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The same thing applies to deciduous fruit, citrus fruit, and other products.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Does this resolution take in enough scope to investigate freight rates?

Mr. PHILLIPS. It does, definitely, because in certain of our western areas the cost of transportation is equal to the amount returned to the producer, and is a very serious problem.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Is the gentleman aware of the situation in the State of Nebraska regarding corn?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am not.

Mr. STEFAN. We have 100,000,000 bushels of corn—wet corn—lying on the ground in the State of Nebraska. Much of it is in great danger of being spoiled because of lack of cars for transportation to the elevators.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. The elevators are filled. We have been endeavoring to get transportation equipment, but have been unable to.

Mr. PHILLIPS. In other words, the problem of getting it from the producer to the consumer is involved.

Mr. STEFAN. That is the problem, and it should be one of the committee's problems.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I favor this resolution and hope that it will pass as I believe that a great deal of good will come out of the investigation. I have been a member of the Committee on Agriculture for a good many years but this is the first time that our committee has been provided with funds with which to conduct an investigation. I feel that we should pursue policies in Congress so that the various committees would be provided with funds to make investigations in order to get information. Under the present procedure we invite different officials before our committees, and we have to work hard to get information out of them. We do not have staffs so that we can send out men to conduct proper investigations, and therefore we are often helpless. I found this situation to exist, as a general rule, that when we ask certain members of the executive departments to come up and testify before our committees, that they withhold the very thing we are trying to find out. We have to cross-examine them, and unless we have some advance information, we seldom get adequate information so as to legislate with understanding. Here in Congress we deal with billions of dollars every year.

I hope the committee that is being created to reorganize Congress will recommend that we are properly staffed so that Congress, as an independent agency of this Government, can go out and make the proper investigations and get the information we need to legislate intelligently upon the various problems that are presented to us. We should make the policies of this country and not leave everything to the Executive. I hope this resolution will pass because it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GILLIE. I think it was the chairman of our committee who asked a witness from Florida about the cost of production down there, and this gentleman told us that he got six-tenths of a cent a pound for head lettuce and when it reached New York this lettuce was being sold for 25, 30, and 35 cents a pound. If that is true, is it not about time that we have an investigation made?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of the pending resolution. I think that we would do very well to have a committee, particularly of the Committee on Agriculture, investigate the very important question of whether or not the farmer is getting a fair return for his product as compared with what the consumer has to pay. I think it is pretty well known that there is a very wide spread between the consumer and the producer. I am sure this resolution is going to result in some good work.

I remember some years ago we were having a lot of trouble about the marketing of tobacco. My distinguished colleague from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] offered a resolution to have Government inspection of tobacco. At that time the little farmer would bring his basket of tobacco in and he was at the mercy of the large tobacco buyers. That resolution was adopted. Some people thought it would not do any good. As a matter of fact, it has resulted in great good to the tobacco farmers.

I am glad to know that this investigation in behalf of the farmers is going to be carried on and headed by my distinguished colleague from Virginia, the chairman of the Committee of Agriculture [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

I did want to bring up another matter this morning. On last Monday the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] had some remarks to make about the Committee on Rules and its method of conducting its proceedings. That was occasioned by what had happened in the Committee on Rules in connection with the so-called George bill. I do not wish to get into any controversy with any Member of the House about the conduct of the Committee on Rules. It is subject to a lot of criticism, naturally, and everybody is entitled to his views, but I did think in view of the fact that we have a good many new Members this year it might be informative to them to know just how the Committee on Rules operates.

This particular criticism arose because the Committee on Rules had asked for certain information that was not disclosed by the legislative committee, and that question was, How were the directors of the Export-Import Bank appointed? The record evidence before us disclosed that they were appointed by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of State. Someone told us that they were not appointed that way, so we asked the man who knew, Mr. Crowley, to tell us. He very kindly came up and told the Committee on Rules that what our record disclosed was not true, that he himself appointed all the directors of the Export-Import Bank—a piece of very useful information to the House and to the Committee on Rules.

It is the practice of the Committee on Rules to hear only Members of Congress and officials from the various departments of the Government. We did not depart from that rule in that instance. As a result of the discussions which took place up there, the committee granted the legislative committee exactly the kind of a rule they asked for, so I do not know why there should have been any particular criticism in that respect.

The Committee on Rules does have a pretty difficult job. I have been on that committee for 12 years. That committee's conduct and procedure has not changed in that 12 years. We are acting now along the same lines we have always acted. We do not call outside witnesses. When a question arises that we are not clear about, we do sometimes ask someone from the executive departments to inform us.

The gentleman complained that he would like to see a resumption of the practice of having Calendar Wednesday. I am sure that would relieve the Committee on Rules of a great many difficult situations. As far as I am concerned, I think that is a matter for the leadership to determine. Certainly there will be no objection on the part of the Committee on Rules if the House resumes the con-

sideration of measures under the Calendar Wednesday rule.

I thought it might be appropriate to make this statement at this time because of the confusion that seems to have arisen about just what the functions of the Committee on Rules are. We regard the function of the Committee on Rules is to exercise some discretion as to whether a measure ought or ought not be brought to the House. That requires some inquiry. If we brought every measure to the House that every Member wanted, why, of course, that would be a very easy matter for the Committee on Rules; but the Committee on Rules would then not be performing any function and you would soon have your calendar so clogged up that you could not operate and consider the necessary legislation. So we regard the function of the Committee on Rules as being that of bringing to the House that legislation which is most desirable and most important and most desired by the Members of the House. In doing that we certainly have to hear a certain amount of testimony from Members of the Congress who are interested in the particular legislation. We do not think, however, that it is our function to merely operate without any consideration and grant everybody a rule who comes up and asks for one, because if we did you would not be able to operate at all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The gentleman from Virginia yields back 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just been reading the book by R. H. Howard entitled "Two Billion Acre Farm." Somebody has said concerning the book that the next time we begin berating the farm bloc please remember there are dairymen and poultrymen being forced into bankruptcy countrywide even during these boom times. Then he goes on to say that the rural citizen is already regulated almost out of existence which is true. As the author of the book reveals, the farmer is told what and when to plant; his soil-depleting crops are rigidly limited under severe penalties ad nauseam. Tight ceilings have been clamped upon the market price of the farmer's products while farm labor has skyrocketed and his cost of living has virtually doubled. Twelve- to sixteen-hour days for the farm laborer and owner are not unusual, particularly on dairy farms. Taxes are up. Farm machinery is unobtainable and repair parts are not to be had. On top of all this the farmer is currently denounced and berated by the ill-informed cosmopolites he is slaving to feed. What a situation!

I have an idea the picture is not overcolored and shall be for this resolution in order to find out what the facts are.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I favor the passage of this resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Agriculture to study and investigate the present system of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products. Any even partial solutions of these perplexing problems will justify this inquiry which has already been too long delayed.

I am especially concerned about the present predicament of corn farmers in Nebraska. In the belief that corn is essential to the war effort, they have just produced a crop of record size. Now, because of transportation deficiencies and shortage of cribbing facilities, an estimated 100,000,000 bushels of Nebraska corn are piled upon the ground. All of this corn is in danger of spoilage because it is of high moisture content, it is exposed to weather, and if it is still on the ground when the weather moderates, there will be further loss through germination. The productive farmers of Nebraska should not have to sustain such loss. Our national food and feed resources should not be depleted by loss of this kind.

When the committee undertakes its inquiry by authority of this resolution, I ask that attention be immediately turned to the Nebraska corn situation. Farm organizations in Nebraska are worried about the problem. The Nebraska delegation in Congress has been working on it for many weeks. We have tried to have more empty boxcars sent to the surplus corn producing areas. We have tried to get more materials for flooring and cribbing. We have tried to increase the quantities of corn processed into industrial alcohol—but the problem is persistent and unsolved.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the committee, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a letter that I have received from the managing secretary of the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation also copy of program approved at the regular monthly Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation board meeting, February 10, 1945.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

NEBRASKA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Lincoln, Nebr., February 10, 1945.

Representative KARL STEFAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STEFAN: The Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation board of directors has been in session the past 3 days working on some of the vital problems confronting the Nebraska farmer. Paramount among these is the wet corn problems in this State.

We had hoped that previous action in this matter in regard to railroad cars and action on the part of the various agencies of the War Food Administration in this State would alleviate the problem. However, we find that the corn is neither being taken to the market nor is it being placed in suitable cribs so that it will dry and not spoil when spring rains set in.

Action on this problem must be taken immediately. The Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation board of directors in their regular session today adopted the following statement and program, released by our president C. Y. Thompson:

"It has been estimated that 100,000,000 bushels of corn now piled on the ground is in danger of spoilage unless some organized effort is made to save it.

"This huge crop of corn was produced at the urgence of the W. F. A. and we feel that it is not the farmers' sole responsibility to go to the extra expense and labor necessary to save it.

"We believe it will take the organized efforts of all who can help to actually do the job because we know the shortage of cars, cribbing, labor, and lumber is acute in most areas of Nebraska.

"The Farm Bureau is ready and willing to accept its responsibility in sponsoring this important program and will do all in its power to accomplish the job which must be done."

Certainly we are not asking too much for the farmer in Nebraska when we say that we hope that the W. F. A. officials will not let the farmer down this time on a job they have done at their request. Farmers were let down on the hog program and they have been let down on several other programs of production after doing the best job in history. Should the same thing occur relative to corn, we are certain that only one thing can result and that is a tremendous let-down in corn production in this State in 1945. Rotting and decaying corn on any man's farm certainly will not be an incentive for him to meet a Government request.

We urge you to take immediate action on this program. Should any of your group question the importance and validity of these statements, we would be more than pleased to take any individual at our expense into the field to actually show him these conditions as they exist on Nebraska farms.

Most sincerely yours,
NEBRASKA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
HOWARD L. PETERSON,
Managing Secretary.

NO 10 PERCENT OR E FLAGS FOR THE FARMERS OF NEBRASKA WHO PRODUCED 130,000,000 BUSHELS OF CORN

Since corn is a vital war product necessary to the successful prosecution of the war; and

Whereas the continued need of corn has been repeatedly emphasized; and

Whereas the loss of a large portion of the 130,000,000 bushels will make the present Government purchase program of 50,000,000 bushels ineffective; and

Whereas equipment, labor, and finance has not been available to most farmers; and

Whereas the farmer should not be asked to fully assume cost involved in placing this corn in cribs since he did not pile it on the ground by choice; and

Whereas in the spring of 1944 the Government requisitioned 72,000,000 bushels of corn to keep war plants in operation—

The following five-point program is hereby adopted and recommended to avoid the loss of this large amount of corn:

1. W. F. A. inaugurate corn loan to provide for raising maximum moisture content 5 percent in corn in acceptable cribs.

2. W. F. A. provide a conservation payment of 10 cents per bushel to farmers for moving wet corn into acceptable cribs as recommended by the College of Agriculture and A. A. A.

3. Renew efforts to operate drying facilities of all terminal markets at 100-percent capacity.

4. Require all industrial processors to use wet corn 100-percent capacity of plant, by providing necessary grain cars, transportation, and labor.

5. Efforts of all groups be used to help accomplish jobs of cribbing corn on farms.

(a) Making available information to the farmers, location of cribbing, wide ear-corn scopes.

(b) Information and drawings on temporary types of cribs for high moisture content corn.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to endorse this resolution. I am glad to see some step is being taken in the investigation of marketing. The main reason for the plight of the dairy farmer today is the lack of a sympathetic market.

The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. FLANNAGAN] mentioned he was for seeing the farmer get a fair price in the market place. The dairy situation in up-State New York will be much worse after the 1st of April when the subsidies are cut from 80 cents per hundred to 35 cents. With hay $35 a ton, straw $20, hired men $150, and other costs rising in proportion any reduction in subsidies now is going to create a situation up there that will drive our dairymen out of business. There will not be any market place at all because there will not be any dairymen left to participate in a market. I hope that this investigating committee can search out the reasons for this unfair treatment that up-State New York is getting.

I, for one, am not for subsidies. I voted against this method of helping the farmer make ends meet. But the payment of subsidies seems to be the only way the War Food Administration will find to keep the farmer going.

Since this is true, it is no time to start cutting the heart out of subsidy payments to dairymen. They are doing a magnificent job in producing more milk than ever before. They have got to have these subsidies until the administration devises a more logical way for them to make their cost of production.

Rather than cut dairy subsidies from 80 cents to 35 cents, they ought to be raised to $1. This is the only action which can prevent a general exodus of dairymen from their business. Over 100,000 milk producers and their families in New York, Pennsylvania, and New England are affected. I want this committee to investigate the War Food Administration's decision of reducing subsidies and try to prevail upon the proper authority to change it.

I want to see a fair deal given the farmers of up-State New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I am for this resolution because I am satisfied it will remedy some abuses in the marketing of grain and other agricultural products. I am satisfied the time has come when the farmer who goes to market will not have to ask, "How much will you give me?" and then, when he buys a sack of flour from the same dealer, he will not have to ask, "How much are you going to charge me?" He is going to have something to say about it at one end or the other of that transaction. He at least should have something to say about the price he is going to get for his own commodity.

I am for this resolution because I am satisfied that, sooner or later, the Congress will have sufficient intelligence and sufficient courage to give the farmer cost of production for that part of the commodities that he produces that is consumed within the United States.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. While there are many causes for the distress of agriculture, the chief and outstanding cause is the lack of farm machinery and particularly manpower. If we would adopt the resolution which has been introduced by the gentleman from North Dakota, we would go far toward relieving agricultural distress.

Mr. LEMKE. I also hope that tomorrow we will have the courage to adopt that resolution. I am satisfied we are going to adopt it and that we are also going to adopt the Flannagan resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] such time as he may desire.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am for the Flannagan resolution. The farmer is worthy of something better than a mere subject of taxation. The following contains more truth than poetry:

Now he is a common man,
Tax him, tax him all you can,
Tax his house and tax his bed,
Tax the bald spot on his head.
Tax his bread, tax his meat,
Tax his shoes clean off his feet,
Tax his pipe and tax his smoke,
Teach him government is no joke.
Tax his "henry," tax his gas,
Tax the road that he must pass;
Tax the farmer, tax his fowl,
Tax the dog and tax his howl.
Tax his plow and tax his clothes,
Tax the rags that wipe his nose.
Tax his pig and tax his squeal,
Tax his boots run down at heel.
Tax his cow and tax his calf,
Tax him if he dares to laugh;
Tax his barns and tax his lands,
Tax the blisters on his hands.
Tax the water, tax the air,
Tax the sunlight if you dare.
Tax the living, tax the dead,
Tax the unborn 'fore they are fed.
Tax them all and tax them well
And do your best to make life h—ll.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 40 seconds to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I feel that under the capable leadership of our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], this committee will render a valuable service not only to this House but the farmers of this country, as well as the consumers and the public. This committee, as authorized under the provisions of this resolution, will function properly. It will have a competent staff.

This resolution is one of the most far-reaching resolutions and one of the most important to be passed by this House in many, many months.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Some observations have been made to the effect that that which is here proposed, seeking to discover how better to improve agricultural marketing conditions, is for the benefit of the farmers only. That is an unsound and a hurtful attitude on the part of the city people. I discovered that that was a wrong attitude on the part of nonfarmers a long time ago, when I was working on Saturdays in a village store. The village merchants had that attitude. But I observed that the business of the man I was working for was good or bad, depending upon the state of agricultural prosperity.

As I grew older I extended my examination of the relationship between agriculture and business—the businesses of the villages and towns and cities. As a lawyer, I was employed by Farm and Ranch, one of the greatest agricultural papers of this country. This gave me an opportunity for broad examination, both in this country and in Europe. It became evident to me that the whole policy, not only of the Government but of the other businesses and industries in this country, toward agriculture was shortsighted and hurtful. In one of the first speeches I made after I came to Congress some thirty-odd years ago, I discussed the subject The City Man's Interest in the Economic Problems of Agriculture. With the permission of the House, if I can find a copy of that speech, I am going to incorporate a part of it as a part of my remarks on this occasion. It was rather a new doctrine in this House, and in the country. Agriculture was not considered as a business, but as a sort of inexhaustible commissary to feed business. Considerable progress has been made since that time in standardization and better marketing methods, but the job is not yet finished.

I am not in favor of these committees and commissions being promiscuously created to accumulate a lot of statistics, figures, and unusable material which nobody will ever examine, but I am willing to trust that JOHN FLANNAGAN'S committee will accumulate some useful information and be instrumental in promoting substantial progress. I base this hope in no small degree upon JOHN FLANNAGAN himself. He comes out of the mountains of Virginia, from an environment where people accumulate usable information.

That is a broad initial interest of everybody in the welfare of the millions of unorganized farm people, people who buy at a price fixed by their sellers and sell at a price fixed by their buyers and continue to produce that which feeds and clothes the millions of us who live in the cities. These hundreds of thousands of returning farmer boys give emphasis to the importance of this phase of the general problem. These farmers cannot buy any more of the products of our factories or employ any more of the labor of the country than can be purchased with that part of the money which we pay to them for that which they produce. We of the city must not overlook the fact in dealing with these economic problems of agriculture that we must pay these farmers finally as much net profit as they and

their children can make in any other business if their children remain on the farm and continue to produce these things which we must have. Education has liberated these farmer children from the chains of ancestral vocation. Let us not forget the fact either that the farmers are at the end of the passing line. Every individual and every business which can present a bill for commodities or service based upon the cost of production plus a profit has a chance to avoid absorption of expenses in production costs. He has a chance to pass these on in the prices charged for that which he sells. The farmers selling to the highest bidder cannot do this. There is another viewpoint, and I am touching just a few high points: Every dollar the farmer gets begins to move commerce, clear debts, and give employment from the far end of the line where he is. In the community that dollar circulates, then moves up through the local merchants, up through the great arteries of transportation, commerce, employment, and finance, from the tip end of the economic circulatory system. What we give to the farmer moves, vitalizing and stimulating through the whole economic body. What is proposed here is not a farmer benefit measure only. We of the cities who depend upon the farmers' purchases and who pay the food bill are vitally concerned.

I am offering herewith to be printed as a part of these remarks rather extensive quotations from the address referred to and which was delivered in this Chamber a little more than 30 years ago. It should have at least some historical value. It does give a fairly accurate picture of the conditions which then obtained, and which still obtain to a definite degree, and the problems as they then presented themselves, and enables us to visualize some of the more important changes which have taken place since that time, both in the problems dealt with and the basic conditions out of which they grew:

THE CONSUMER'S INTEREST IN THE ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF THE FARMER AND THE DUTY OF THE GOVERNMENT TO AID IN THEIR SOLUTION

(Speech of Hon. Hatton W. Sumners, of Texas, in the House of Representatives, January 29, 1914)

From the remarks which I have heard from time to time since I have been a Member of this body it has become apparent that many Members consider agricultural problems as of concern only to those who produce. No doubt this is due largely to the fact that these matters have generally been discussed only from the standpoint of the farmer and the Government's obligation to him. Because I believe it not possible to deal properly with the situation while so restricted a notion is held as to the scope of concern involved, I shall endeavor to show the consumer's interest in this matter and to indicate the Government's duty to the whole people.

The thought and energy of the Nation has been so completely absorbed in city building, and agriculture has been so universally regarded as an inexhaustible commissary, useful only to feed business, that the importance to the whole people of its relative decline has not been appreciated. No general alarm has been felt, and no general understanding of the responsible causes is evidenced. I make no claim toward being an authority on this subject, but I hope to make some contribution toward an understanding of the situation, its causes, our duty in the premises, and at last to suggest some practical things which the Government should do. I shall not urge the just claims of the agricultural classes for economic justice. The time has come when the present vital need of all the people can be met only by giving to them that justice.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the fact that the world is consuming its surplus of agricultural products, and that the country is losing its producers, is of infinitely more concern to the millions in the cities who must eat to live than it is to those remaining on the farm who produce primarily to sell. The number of producers has become relatively so small, the current volume of production so small, the number of consumers so large, and the imperative demand so large that if we were to slip a cog in the machinery of production the problem would not be one of high cost of living merely, but this: Where at any price can we obtain the elements necessary to sustain life? When that time comes, as it must, unless we deal effectively with this situation, the people on the farms through whose hands these elements must pass can hold back enough for themselves and theirs, but what of the people in the cities with only a few days' supply?

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the world is eating its surplus. In the United States there were 9,840,239 less cattle, aside from dairy cows, in 1910 than in 1900, and in the 3 years from 1910 to 1913 there was a further loss of 10,249,000. In 1913, therefore, we had 20,000,000 less beef cattle than in 1900. During the 3 years last mentioned we also suffered a loss of 7,734,000 sheep; from 1911 to 1913 we lost 4,442,000 hogs. So much for the meat stuffs. Now, what of the grains? In 1898 we exported 41 percent of the wheat grown in the United States. Since that time our exportation has constantly decreased. In 1912 it was only 12.83. In that year our importation of wheat was greater than ever before. As for corn, our exportation of that staple for that year was 1.65. Now, the production of wheat throughout the world seems to have kept pace with the increase of population. But when the world's total of wheat, barley, rye, and corn is considered, I am certain it will be found that this total has not kept pace with the increase of population.

The estimate of these crops for last year, as made by the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, was 9,965,000,000 bushels, a total increase in bushels over the preceding year's crops of 51,000,000—In other words, a gain of only one-half of 1 percent. In this connection the constant loss of food animals should be borne in mind. A few years ago it was not unusual for the South American packing houses to receive steers 7 years old; now the limit is about 4 years. The agent of this Government who recently conducted an investigation in that country says that the herds are decreasing. According to good authority the sheep holdings of the world have in recent years also decreased 100,000,000. Another feature which adds to the gravity of the situation is that the world's population is becoming removed from the basis of supply. In the event of failure of the principal crops, the opportunities of each family to resort to some substitute are being lessened.

Here are some figures with references to the decrease in the agricultural populations of other nations: From 1895 to 1907 Germany lost almost one-fifth of its percentage of agricultural population. From 1890 to 1911 Denmark lost one-thirteenth; from 1890 to 1900, Norway, one-thirteenth; from 1890 to 1900, Sweden, one-twelfth; from 1888 to 1900, Switzerland, one-seventh.

I do not know the loss in the United Kingdom of Great Britain but, in 1907 I heard the statement made in the course of a debate in the House of Lords that during the preceding 25 years the number of rural laborers in England had decreased 25 percent. Between 1900 and 1910 our urban population increased 34.8 percent, our rural population only 11.2 percent. In this estimate of residence of population towns of less than 2,500 inhabitants are classed as rural territory.

It is not my purpose to go further into the agricultural conditions of other nations. I merely want to make clear that we cannot trust to any other country for a dependable supply for our people. It ought to be evident from what we know of our own condition that something must be done which has not heretofore been done. The poet, the orator, the publicists, and the efforts of the Government have all failed to turn back the tide sweeping in from the country upon the great centers of population. It is true that each individual who goes to your cities from the country adds one more name to some city directory; it is also true that he adds to the keenness of the struggle of those who live there, reduces the output of what they must have to sustain life, and adds his tax upon the diminishing production.

I grant, Mr. Speaker, that there was a time when the economic condition surrounding the business of agriculture did not greatly concern those who lived in the cities. Until comparatively recent times the children of those who farmed were as a general proposition likewise compelled to farm when they grew to maturity, because they did not know how to earn a living except by doing that which their parents had taught them as they assisted in the farm work. But the extension of educational advantages to the rural districts is liberating the farmers' children from an ancestral vocation, while the spread of democratic notions has opened to them every door of opportunity, and the modern cities are bidding for them. Those who do not farm should recognize that men are no longer compelled to farm through lack of opportunity to choose among the vocations of the country. Let us clearly understand now that they can be induced to farm only by the payment of as much net profit as a like investment of time, capital, and ability in any other business would bring. There is another phase which concerns the nonfarming classes. There can be no hope of reducing the cost of living by reducing the profits of the farmers, for the very evident reason that they are quitting at the present profit.

The only place where we can hope to make a reduction is in the charges upon production and distribution. The movement from the country to the town is not the cause with which we must deal; it is not a primary cause; it is a result. We must deal with the cause which is responsible for that movement. We read a good deal about the superior advantages offered by the country. Most of these articles are written by people who live in the cities or by people who have recently gone to the country, and who celebrated their change of residence by getting into the public prints. I have watched a number of such people, and almost without exception it takes only a few years for them to absorb all of the joys of the country, and, needless to say, they willingly go back to the hardships of the city. The scenes of the countryside and the lights of the silvery moon have mighty strong competitors in the moving-picture shows and the arc lights of the city, especially among people who have once been accustomed to them. But I recognize that these are not the sort of things which control the movements of the masses of the people, unless their civilization be in process of decay. Individuals make mistakes with reference to the change of residence, but the mass of population moves under the operation of irresistible economic law toward the centers of best opportunity. This law has controlled the migration of all ages, and will control it until the end of time. It is absurd to rely on this back-to-the-country

sentiment or on any other sentiment to establish and maintain balance of population as between the country and city. We had as well face the true situation and deal with it as it is. This matter is controlled by unyielding economic laws—laws as unyielding as the law of gravitation. The movement of the mass of population shows where the best opportunities are as unerringly as the current of a stream shows the direction in which the lower level is to be found. Agriculture and the vocations of the city have been bidding against each other for the capital, the brawn, and the brains of the Nation, and the vocations of the city have been outbidding agriculture.

If we would turn back the tide, we must help agriculture to raise the bid. That is all there is to it. We must ourselves pay more for what we consume, or we must help our farmers to get a larger part of what we pay. That is our only choice. The burden of high rates of interest, the loss of the thousands of carloads of food which rots in the fields and in the railroad yards while seeking a market, the robbery of the unscrupulous commission men, the amount of loss resulting from dumping crops upon an oversupplied market, are being shifted to consumers, and we are feeling this weight. We will feel it more. The time is at hand when we will pay every cent of these charges. The relative abandonment of agriculture and the corresponding decrease of the volume of production, and with the resultant increase in prices, will not cease until farming yields as much net profit as any other business would yield. To pay the net profit, insure the farmer this net profit, would, of course, necessitate the payment of all losses and charges connected with the business. In the price of the things we eat, therefore, we must pay for the food products which rot after production; we must pay the high interest charged to the farmers; we must pay the profit of the speculator who purchases from the farmers; we must pay for the wasted energy resulting from the unscientific, chaotic method of sale and distribution of farm products. If we want to reduce the cost of the table, here is the place to do some effective work.

This is a new condition which never before existed on the earth. While population has always moved toward the centers of best opportunity, it has before this time moved slowly and with great difficulty. The lack of opportunity to equip for any other business bound the members of each succeeding generation to the business of their respective ancestors. The bonds are being broken rapidly now, and if we will take the trouble to investigate, we will find the rule to be that when education liberates the country boy he goes to the city. Read the story of your last census report. Notice in the examination of your jury panels how many men now living in your towns and cities were born in the country and how few now living in the country were born in the cities. This is one of the far-reaching problems of modern society. It is of interest, Mr. Speaker, and should be profitable to examine somewhat into the development of this problem.

In the first half of the last century—notably between 1830 and 1840—the utilization of steam and of electricity brought about an industrial revolution upon the earth. The business of the country began to adjust itself to the changed conditions resulting from the application of these forces to the activities of men.

But agriculture was not able to move forward with the procession. The reason is clear, and does not reflect discredit upon the country. The industrial cities took many of its educated, ambitious young men. Those engaged in agriculture were widely scattered. Their duties confined them to their respective farms. The consumers of their products came to be strangers, living far away. Effective business organization of agriculture was impossible under these conditions, and it came to occupy the position of a commissary in the economic relations of the country. Its products are not now sold in the sense that the minds of the producers and consumers meet in agreement upon the price. Agriculture is at an economic disadvantage; other businesses feed upon it. That we may clearly understand the situation with which we must deal, it is well to recall that before the application of steam and electricity to transportation and to manufacturing and other industries there existed throughout the world a condition of relative 'ndependence in so far as the several communities as entities were concerned. Each community produced from necessity most of what it used and used most of what it produced. The wool, cotton, and flax raised in the several communities became, through the process of home manufacturing, the finished garments. The hides from the carcasses of home-grown animals went to the local tanner, then to the local leather workers, who were largely paid in barter. The local blacksmith and woodwork man made most of the farming implements. The miller ground the grain into meal and flour and took his pay in grain, and so on through the whole list of the simple requirements of that day. It is also worthy of notice that because of lack of transportation facilities each family carried a large surplus. Practically all of the people lived in the country. New York City, two centuries old, then h[illegible] only 200,000 people; Boston had 60,000. [illegible]y over one-half of our families live in [illegible] cities and towns. They carry no surplus and no one is carrying any for them. The surplus accumulated during those times is being consumed. The food level of the world is being lowered, and this can not be stopped under the economic conditions which now surround agriculture; the system of marketing agricultural products will not tolerate a surplus.

With the application of steam and electricity the manufacturing energy formerly distributed throughout the country became concentrated in the cities. The shoe cobbler, no longer able to compete with the equipped factory, with its cheapened modes of transportation, moved to such places as Boston. The spinning wheel and family loom became relics of a bygone industrial age and their operatives went to centers like Fall River. The ox-team driver, unable to compete with the railroads, left the country and became an engineer. Agriculture, unorganized, deserted by many of those equipped for leadership, was hurled into the vortex of an industrial revolution, one of the chief results of which was the organization of every other business, the producing end and the selling end as well—not only deserted but despised by public opinion, with the youth of the land taught that it was to be followed only as a last resort, when no other means of making a living could be found. When it goes to the market to buy it pays whatever price the other businesses ask, and when it takes its products to market to sell it accepts whatever price other businesses offer. It is compelled, by reason of its economic disadvantage, to do so. If anyone wants to unravel the mystery of the drift of wealth and of population from the country to the towns, let him swap horses a few times with the other fellow fixing the price of both horses. After a few trades he will be carrying his saddle home on his back, and the mystery will be solved.

This condition has had twofold influence upon the movement of population.

Before this revolution no employer had many employees, because the slowness and expense of transportation held him to a restricted market. With the opportunities for broader markets not only did the centers become successful bidders against agriculture for the labor to operate the industries of the cities, but the opportunity to trade with the country at such an enormous advantage turned the drift of the Nation's wealth to the centers. The cities could bid more to have their churches and schools erected and operated than the country could. They could bid more to have their streets constructed than the country could bid for the construction of its highways. Thus the cities' better advantages attracted many who might not have been attracted by their superior money-making opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I am not unminduful of the fact that the improvements of agricultural machinery released a part of the farming population. That was natural—a natural and beneficial result. We are not dealing with the result of that improvement. That improvement is not now giving motion to the stream of population from the fields of production which is flowing into the cities with increasing volume and momentum. We people of the cities must know that it is as necessary to have a surplus of gra[illegible] in the Nation's granary, as it is to have a surplus of gold in the Treasury, and we should know that there is no way under existing conditions to build up or maintain such a surplus. It is not humanly possible under existing conditions to preserve equilibrium of population as between the country and the cities. There must be equality of advantage if there is to be a balance of population. When the products of the cities go to market they have marked upon them a price which incorporates the cost of the material, the cost of production, maintenance of plant, and all other expenses, plus a profit. The farmer's products are sold at whatever price they will bring, regardless of cost of production, profit, or anything else. We hear a great deal about the law of supply and demand controlling prices. No such law exercises control over bargainers who are not equally advantageously situated. Would this law control the labor market as between organized railroad operators and disorganized railroad operatives? Under modern conditions this law has but a limited determining influence upon current sales. It cannot be depended upon to insure justice. If two men were upon an island and one had all of the water and the other all of the food, and if the necessity of one to have water in order to live was a present necessity, while the other's necessity of food was not a present necessity, this law would not insure a just bargain between them. How can farmers hope to be protected in the sale of their current products when they are forced by unavoidable circumstances to dump their crops upon the market in quantities in excess of the demand of the consuming market?

In this method of sale they cannot hope to receive the protection of that law; they violate its provisions and must receive its penalty. I do not deny that that law is coming into control, but when it does the consumer will pay the price which the law would now decree were it in control, and the law of retribution will force society to pay with interest the penalties which the farmer's economic disadvantage now compels him to bear. The scramble of a hungry world for what he produces will soon take care of his profit, but will not improve any feature of the present situation. The present increase of prices does not indicate improved economic conditions surrounding agriculture. It is the herald of coming hunger widespread. If we will not divide the benefits of a bountiful harvest with the producer, we are going to the cupboard one of these mornings and there will be nothing for breakfast. We are working toward a lower food-supply level, because a small crop brings more money to the producer than a big one, and just a little surplus knocks the bottom out of prices. In 1910 the southern farmers produced 12,000,000 bales of cotton. The world said that was not enough. The next year they produced 16,000,000 bales. They had to get up early and work late to raise and gather it. It cost

them millions of dollars more to respond to this demand. The world's appreciation was shown by penalizing them $125,000,000. Is it any wonder that the country boy quits in disgust when a 16,000,000-bale crop brings $125,000,000 less than a 12,000,000-bale crop. The corn crop of 1912 was considerably larger than that of the preceding year, yet it brought $50,000,000 less money. It is all right to reduce the price per unit when the number of units is larger, but to make the total price for the larger number of units less than the price for a smaller number of units is to bid for the smaller number of units, for a shortage of supply in the country. The thing which augments the danger of this situation is the uncertainty of the volume of any year's production. The insects or the drought may come and the brightest prospects be blighted. No one can guess when they will come. We must make it economically possible as it is physically possible to create and carry a surplus as a protection against the hazards of seasons and insects. This is the problem of all of the people. All of the people must eat to live, while the farmer's greatest profit is when the people are hungry. If we will remove the penalty now imposed for a bountiful harvest, the productive energy of the country, undiscouraged, will go on with its work, and when the years of low production come we can eat the surplus carried over from the more fruitful years. It is said that the man who makes two blades of grass grow where one grew is a public benefactor, but we are offering mighty poor encouragement for the two-blade production, if the two blades bring less money than the one would have brought. Farmers do not now produce primarily to feed their families, as they once did. They produce to sell for money.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to avoid the possibility of a bad harvest or a succession of bad harvests confronting us with an acute shortage of the elements necessary to sustain life, we must devise a system by which the farmer will be paid more upon the basis of value than now, and will not have to depend for a profit upon the nonexistence of a reasonable surplus and upon current production being so small as to result in sharp competition among consumers apprehensive that there is not enough for all. I want to call especial attention to the situation with reference to the sale and distribution of perishable products. As a rule these products go out into the dark to seek an unknown, unlocated purchaser. They may reach a profitable market or they may reach a glutted market and rot in the railroad yards, while somewhere equally accessible, if the conditions had been known, there is a need for these same products at a remunerative price. I speak more of the producing possibilities of the country, though the statement is true as to actual efforts to market, except in limited sections of the country, where the ability to specialize and other favorable features make it practical to form effective marketing agencies.

Frequently the intervening changes are so great that the producer cannot get a price which would justify harvesting his product, while the prices charged the consumer prohibits the general use of that same product. Year before last, when I was in east Texas, I saw thousands of bushels of vegetables rotting in the fields; fields of cantaloupes ungathered, because a price could not be had sufficient to pay for marketing. I bought them retailed at the stores at 10 cents a dozen. Thirty-six hours away by fast freight they were selling at 10 cents apiece. This price charged to the consumer denied this luxury to the average man. Under anything like a proper method of distribution these melons could have gone to the table of the average family at a price which would have given the farmer some reward for his labor. Another instance which is typical: In the lower Rio Grande section of my State a man produced 9 carloads of head lettuce; he was careful to bleach it; there was none better. He shipped two cars, and on one car he had to pay $9 freight above the price the lettuce brought, and for the other car the commission man drew on him for $13 above the price the car brought. The other seven cars rotted in the field. This was a loss to the farmer—a food and an economic loss to the country. Somebody wanted that lettuce, but the man down there on the Rio Grande did not know who wanted it. That man may have quit the country. He may not have been able to incorporate the value of the lettuce in the price of his products which reached the consumer, but as a general proposition these products which rot are being paid for in part, at least, in the price of products which are consumed.

Mr. Speaker, this is what the National Government should do. It should create that which for the purpose of designation we will call a sales department, perhaps a part of the Agricultural Department, but having close working relations with the Department of Commerce, the Consular Service, and the Treasury Department. Its duty should be to bring into coordination the Agricultural Department, and agricultural colleges of the several States, the cooperative organizations in the country and in the cities and towns, and all other agencies which might be utilized in bring system into the sale and distribution of farm products. Practically all the parts of the necessary machinery now exist. The remaining parts should be supplied, the machine assembled and put in motion without delay. It should be a clearing house of information available to the seller and to the buyer. It should afford a facility in making sales similar to that which a real produce exchange could afford. Through its agency these products could be standardized. Sales could then be effected at the point of origin, and the congestion of some markets, while others are unsupplied, could be avoided. It is indispensable to success that the facilities afforded be so valuable as to attract general patronage. The service, therefore, of this department should be free, just as the activities of the Agricultural Department in helping to improve cultural methods are free. If generally patronized, it could direct the distribution of farm products in compliance with the consuming demand. This would insure a dependable supply of fresh products during the shipping season, minimize fluctuations in prices, and avoid waste from decay in glutted markets.

With such a department in operation, in touch with and exercising great influence over every feature of crop movements and thoroughly advised as to prdouction and demand, a safe plan could be devised and put into successful operation by which during the marketing period of our staple crops, money could be loaned on them at a low rate of interest, and upon the surplus when the yield exceeds the necessities of the current year. I am not talking about any "corn-tassel" currency. I am not making any bid for the farmers' votes or having a wild dream. I know that with such an organization as I have partially outlined, working with an organization controlling rural credis, money could be advanced upon the staple crops while they are in process of being marketed without danger of loss, without violating any principle of economics, and in conformity with proven business principles. The advancing of this money during the marketing period would largely prevent the present dumping methods in the sales of these crops. By a more gradual system of marketing a larger part of what the consumer must pay would go to those who produce. The consumer therefore would not have to pay as high a price as under present and prospective conditions he must pay in order to induce the producer to continue his work. European speculators, who purchase two-thirds of our cotton crop now rushed upon the market, the bulk of it in 3 months, take from the American balance of trade between forty and eighty million dollars annually.

The movement of our crops in so limited a time is a severe tax upon our financial institutions and necessitates transportation facilities which during a large part of the year are not used. I remember in a cotton-rate hearing held in Texas a few years ago, in which I represented the proponents of reduced rates, the railroads established as against us that the movement of the cotton crop in a short time necessitated large expenditures at the various stations and at the seaboard terminals and much rolling stock which traffic did not require at any other time. This is a clear economic waste and an unnecessary strain upon the commercial aids of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will hear me at some later time for a more detailed discussion. I have not attempted even a complete outline.

My purpose upon this occasion has been to make clear, if possible, that these matters are of general concern, to the end that a united effort may be made by Members representing cities, as well as those representing country constituents, toward stopping the food and economic waste resulting from the present method of sale and distribution of farm products; that we might try to establish a system under which the farmer would receive enough profit to prevent the industries of the cities attracting him from the farm, while his remaining on the farm would make certain the food supply of the millions in our cities. There is no other food supply on the earth upon which we can depend, but if there were with our vast agricultural possibilities we must not confess inability to utilize them for the Nation's support and seek among other peoples for the bread to feed our own. The last thing which any Nation can afford to yield is the ability to feed its people.

As a representative of the people we must not confess our inability to grapple with this problem which in the evolution of time has come to challenge our genius. We are proud of our cities, but as patriots concerned for the future of our Nation we must recognize that great cities, though inevitable, do not add to a nation's strength, but are a tax upon its vitality. It is a fact proven by the history of every age, other things being equal, that nation is strongest the largest percent of whose population pursues the productive vocations of the country. In the great crises of the past, when Governments and civilization have withstood the supreme test, it was largely the conservative strength of the country people which saved from chaos and destruction. It is all right to build cities, but we must not sap the strength of the country to build them. We must not dig the stones from the foundation of our civilization and build them into fragile superstruction. The highest interests of the country, and of the city as well, cry out against this. These are matters which lift us above local consideration and partisan politics and challenge the best of thought and constructive action which this Congress can give.

I hope at some later time to have the indulgence of the House for a more detailed discussion of the necessary remedial legislation, both with reference to marketing and a practical system of farm credits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution I received from the Lithuanian Society at Baltimore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a remarkable editorial taken from the leading journal of conservative opinion in the Pacific Northwest, the Seattle Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Two-thirds Rule Repealed."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the Ohio State Grange on February 21, and my reply to Mr. Joseph Fletcher.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 20 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs acting as a whole or by subcommittee is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations of the progress of the war effort insofar as it relates to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee with a view to determining whether such effort is being carried forward efficiently, expeditiously, and economically.

The Committee on Military Affairs shall report to the House during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, and to take testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 50 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] to be used as he sees fit.

Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that the House during the last session adopted a resolution which was identical with the provisions of the pending resolution.

This resolution simply renews the power and direction given in the last session to the Military Affairs Committee to continue an investigation which, according to hearings had before the Rules Committee recently, it conducted with resultant savings to the people of the country.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Will this resolution empower the Committee on Military Affairs to investigate this proposition of the War Department's commissioning Communists in the United States Army?

Mr. COX. Frankly, I am not prepared to answer the gentleman's question. That is a matter for the determination of that committee, I may say, in the event this resolution is adopted. I hope the committee will find that that matter is within its jurisdiction and will make the investigation.

Mr. RANKIN. I make the inquiry for the reason that if this resolution does not empower the Committee on Military Affairs to investigate this proposition of commissioning Communists and putting them in positions to gather information that might be destructive to our war effort, then I want the resolution amended so that it will give the committee that power.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I understand this resolution is identical with one passed during the last session and that it continues the power of the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. COX. That is my recollection.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, before I enter upon a discussion of the pending resolution, I want to tell a story that I think should have been told in support of the Flannagan resolution. Down in my State, an ordinary one-gallus tobacco farmer drove into the city one day to the warehouse with a truckload of tobacco. The warehouseman received it and told him to come back in 10 days and he would be able to pay him for his tobacco. He went home and came back in 10 days, and the warehouseman said, "All right, John. I have sold your tobacco, checked up your account and you owe the warehouse 75 cents after all the charges and commissions have been deducted." John felt down in his pocket and he said, "I am sorry, but I do not have any money." The warehouseman said, "That will be all right. The next time you come back with a load of tobacco, bring in a chicken, and that will settle it." About 10 days later the farmer drove back to the warehouse and walked in to the same man, at the very same desk in the very same office, and handed him two chickens. The warehouseman said, "Why, John, there is an error here. You just owe me one chicken." John said, "Well, but I brought another load of tobacco to town today."

So I think the Committee on Agriculture ought to find out how the commissions operate on the farmer between the point of production and the marketing place.

With respect to the pending resolution, No. 20, as stated by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, it is verbatim, identical with the resolution under which the committee operated in the past Congress. It is merely a continuation of the same authority that we exercised during that period. I must say that I have had quite a good deal of pleasure in aiding my energetic and industrious committee in conducting the investigations that we made in the last 2 years.

There is one thing I want to say to begin with, and that is this. We do not find the higher officials of the War Department opposed to an investigation. We have had rather good cooperation from them in our efforts to stop waste and extravagance in the expenditure of money. But when I sat here on the floor of the House a few weeks ago and heard debate on a resolution to authorize the Committee on Appropriations to set up a staff to investigate, and to see whether we should appropriate money or not, I voted for it, because I think it is important, and I believe, as was suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] that it ought to be a permanent establishment and well staffed by experts. But I was just wondering then if the time would ever come when the House of Representatives would authorize an appropriation of $38,000,000,000 which they have just done in this Congress, to be expended by the War Department, and then say that we will not extend the arm of the Congress to see how it is expended. I thought that would be rather absurd to begin with.

Therefore I wish to say to the House that when we conduct the investigations that we shall conduct for the next 2 years, so far as I am able to have anything to do with it, it will be done on an impartial, high plane, and yet with a determination to see to it that the money of the taxpayers is properly accounted for and properly expended.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The resolution as read provides that the committee can investigate anything within its jurisdiction; is that correct?

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. COCHRAN. May I ask the gentleman if it is not true that the Commit-

tee on Military Affairs has jurisdiction or did have jurisdiction over the legislation that resulted in the passage of what is known as the Selective Service Act?

Mr. MAY. They did, because the Speaker referred it to that committee, and I think appropriately.

Mr. COCHRAN. If that be true, jurisdiction in reference to an investigation of the Selective Service Act lies with the Committee on Military Affairs; is that correct?

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. Now may I ask the gentleman this question? If that be true, can the gentleman conceive why it should be necessary for this House to pass the resolution that was reported by the Committee on Rules today, commonly called the Lemke resolution, to investigate the operation of the Selective Service Act, when jurisdiction lies with his committee?

Mr. MAY. I do not believe that is an appropriate question to be propounded in the discussion of this matter, but in view of the fact that it is relatively connected with it, I must confess that it would seem inappropriate to have two committees doing the same thing.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is not the question I want answered. What I want answered is, If the gentleman's committee has jurisdiction over selective-service legislation, then it has jurisdiction to investigate the operation of the Selective Service Act.

Mr. MAY. Certainly we do.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is all I want to know. Then why should you want to pass the Lemke resolution?

Mr. MAY. The Lemke resolution authorizes an investigation, as I understand. To that extent it is different from the Flannagan resolution, which merely puts a construction on what is known as the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am not talking about the Flannagan resolution at all.

Mr. MAY. I understand that.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I happen to come from a dairy section of the country. I am not going to make an argument in the gentleman's time, but the dairy farms are simply being stripped of labor. Farms of 250 acres, with large herds of cattle, are being stripped of help. It means they have to be sold, and sold on short notice and sacrificed. The purpose of the Lemke amendment is to get some prompt action to see that the Tydings amendment is observed by the draft boards, that and nothing more. We are not trying to impinge on the prerogatives of the gentleman's committee.

Mr. MAY. I will probably vote for the Flannagan resolution, and I would vote for the part of the Lemke resolution that puts a construction on the Tydings amendment, but I would not vote for the investigation feature of it because I do not think it is necessary. The Congress clearly intended that the amendment should be construed as specified in the Flannagan amendment, in my judgment. Every minority group engaged in almost every conceivable business is registering complaints about the depletion by Selective Service of their manpower and it is rather irregular and perhaps wrong to protect a single group and not all groups.

May I point out one thing that may seem rather insignificant in the light of the expenditure of billions of dollars, that our committee did during the last Congress, to show you just how effective it is to have merely in existence an investigating committee. We discovered that there was a racket in this country among what were called engineering firms. They were gathering in skilled laborers and selling the time of these laborers to war contractors. They would get a fellow who was an expert on something or a mechanic and pay him 65 cents an hour, and rent him out to a war concern for $2 an hour. It ran all the way from 65 cents an hour to $1.25 and $1.50 an hour, and then these firms would charge as high as $12 an hour for these same workers and pocket the difference. We found place after place, some 40 or 50 of them, that were doing that. In one or two places engineering firms that did not have a dollar invested were making large sums of money. One firm composed of a man and his wife made $440,000 on one war contract. We stopped that kind of business by our investigation, and the War Department canceled all of those contracts and refused to pay those firms.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. First, let me say to the gentleman from Kentucky that I am for these investigation resolutions. I want to ask the gentleman, who is chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, if under this resolution his committee would be authorized to investigate this proposition of the War Department's commissioning Communists in the United States Army?

Mr. MAY. The resolution is broad enough to authorize the committee to make any investigation to determine whether or not the prosecution of the war is being properly carried on and whether or not it is being effectively prosecuted. I think it is perfectly clear that under that broad language a reasonable construction would be that if there are Communists in the Army there is such an opportunity to interfere with the operations of the Army and the successful prosecution of the war that we would have a right to go into it. I would say to the gentleman that unless there were some preventing force it would certainly be investigated. When the matter was called to my attention last week I appointed a special committee headed by the distinguished and able gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]. They are starting hearings tomorrow morning on that very subject. I did that under what I conceived to be the authority of the Committee on Military Affairs, as an arm of the House of Representatives, without respect to this resolution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Some years ago the Communist Party made the statement, which they are now trying to suppress, that one of their main objects was to get rid of the United States Navy, which they said was a powerful instrument of imperialism. Now to place these Communists in the Army or the Navy as commissioned officers where they have access to all the information, or put them in charge of communications or information, or place them where they can get all the information necessary to help them sabotage this Government, to the destruction of which they have been dedicated for years, I think is one of the most dangerous steps I have ever known. It comes as close to being treason as anything that has been done during this war. I am glad this proposition is in the hands of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, because I am sure he will go to the bottom of it.

Mr. MAY. Well, the gentleman knows, of course, I know of only one "ism" that I adhere to, and that is Americanism.

Mr. RANKIN. Correct; and that is the one "ism" these Communists do not know.

Mr. MAY. All other "isms" are out so far as I am concerned.

Permit me to make a brief statement here. I may want, Mr. Speaker, to rather extensively revise my remarks, and I want to say here that I do not want to be understood as committing myself as to how I will vote either on the Flannagan resolution or the Lemke resolution. I want to wait until they are debated and until I hear what they actually do and see what they are when the House finally completes them. Some time you start out against something and maybe it is doctored up so that you can be for it. Sometimes you start out for something and sometimes it is doctored up so that you cannot be for it. So I am in the middle of the road on these things, for the present.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I think this committee has great possibilities. I think it will render service. I am wondering if it has sufficient power and authority. I have in mind this instance. Your committee investigated the Canol oil project when it had spent about thirty-some-million dollars and yet nothing was done about it. Now they have spent $134,000,000, and the War Department is canceling it. We could have saved that $100,000,000 I think, if we had taken the advice of this committee, if they had had some power and some force to stop it. I just wonder if not only in that situation but in many others the committee really could save us some money.

Mr. MAY. The way we have attempted to do in these investigations is to call it to the attention of the department and insist that things which are being done which ought not to be done be stopped and some remedy be applied to any situation where it is wrong. When the department don't respond and there are sufficient grounds we refer the matter to the Justice Department.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the resolution empower your committee to look into the matter of irregularities and laxities in the prisoner-of-war camps?

Mr. MAY. I think it does. At least we have assumed that it does and in the last Congress we made a rather extensive report on that subject and were in the midst of prosecuting it at the time when Congress adjourned, and our authority terminated.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman's committee investigating these Communists report on what we learned about in the papers this morning in reference to men giving orders in the Army, will the committee find out whose responsibility it is for permitting these Communists to get in these key positions?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Let me say I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania, just as I do, has the utmost confidence in the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

He has never failed to do his duty in anything yet and I am sure he will do it in this. I have no doubt that it will be properly handled.

Mr. RICH. We are going to get rid of these fellows and the quicker we get rid of them the better it will be for this Nation.

Mr. MAY. We will get rid of them as far as I am concerned.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of sympathy for the views of my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] concerning these special, select or investigating committees. I have never boiled over with enthusiasm in support of them. Sometimes I think perhaps they become puffed up with a sense of their own importance and consider themselves the end rather than as a means. Certainly they should not be used to build up an individual's personal popularity.

But I assure the gentleman from Missouri that the Committee on Military Affairs to investigate these war activities has done a most splendid job and I do not believe any money has been more wisely spent by the United States Congress than that spent by this committee. It has resulted in great savings to the taxpayers, promoted a better spirit of understanding and cooperation between the Government and the people and has been of tremendous help in the prosecution of the war.

Our chief cousel, Mr. Ralph Burton, is a modest man but he is an indefatigable worker. He is conscientious. He moves silently, smoothly, and efficiently. He seeks no publicity. He possesses courage and performs his duties well.

The investigations made on the two projects in our own State, one at Weldon Springs Ordnance Plant, St. Charles County, just across the river from the gentleman's native county of St. Louis, and at Camp Crowder, near Neosho, in my district, would justify the expenditure this committee has made.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Of course, the gentleman knows that we have had for several years what was known in the Senate as the Truman committee, now called the Mead committee.

Mr. SHORT. That is right.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman also knows that the Committee on Military Affairs in the Senate is likewise making investigations with reference to expenditures.

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. The other day there was printed in the RECORD the statement that 10 officials of the War Department were assigned to duty to the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, some of them drawing as high as $7,000 a year. Now, how about duplication of effort?

Mr. SHORT. Of course, we do have overlapping and duplication of effort. I think the special committee to consider the streamlining of Congress can work out some plan whereby Members of the House and the Senate can sit together on these investigations and prevent that duplication of effort and save the time of the Members of Congress and of officers in our executive departments. I know that the Mead committee or the Truman committee in the Senate has done a remarkable job. It is still doing good work and should be continued. It discovered certain things that our House committee had overlooked or missed. Likewise, I know that our House investigating committee has caught many things which the Senate committee had overlooked. So, after all, the duplication is a sort of check upon each other and it is not as bad as it would at first appear to be.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Is there not an understanding between the House and Senate that there will not be duplication of investigation involving the same complaint? I know of one instance specifically where we went into an investigation, and the Truman committee sent word to me that they were preparing to do it but if our committee intended to probe into the matter, the Truman committee would withdraw. It was done by comity of arrangement.

Mr. SHORT. Yes; the gentleman is correct. We avoid duplication wherever possible. In some instances it is inescapable.

Now, I ask the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] concerning the appointment of Communists as officers in the United States Army. I agree with him that this is little short of treason. I was shocked to read in this morning's edition of the Washington Times-Herald where one David Zablodowsky is acting as senior economic editor in the Office of Strategic Services, headed by Maj. Gen. William J. (Wild Bill) Donovan, that functions under the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Generals Marshall and Arnold and Admirals Leahy and King.

Let me tell you a little about Mr. Zablodowsky. These are some of his Communist connections and his record, and I quote from this morning's edition of the Washington Times-Herald:

> Zablodowsky's record with Communist organizations is a lengthy one. He was a contributor to the Daily Worker, official Communist daily; member of the editorial board of Fight, official organ of the American League Against War and Fascism, cited as subversive by Attorney General Biddle; indorser of the Memorial Day youth peace parade in 1938, a Communist movement, and president of the Book and Magazine Guild, Communist controlled.

That is just a part of Mr. Zablodowsky's Communist record, and that man occupies a key position in the most secretive agency of this Government, even more secretive than the F. B. I., that deals with the protection of our national security. Certainly I believe that if this Committee on Military Affairs does one thing it should have a searching, thorough, fearless investigation of the order that has been given by the War Department to commission Communists in the United States Army. Our committee is to investigate war activities and not communism. But when communism interferes with our war activities we cannot ignore it. Surely we do not want to communize the United States Army. Here is a job also for the gentleman's Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. When a man who had enough, from a communistic standpoint, for Attorney General Biddle to denounce him, is commissioned in the Army or Navy, it is time for the country to get alarmed.

Mr. SHORT. I agree with the gentleman 1,000 percent. I have been alarmed, and still am.

Mr. RANKIN. Within the last 2 weeks some terrible things have happened. Both Japs and Communists have been coddled, to our detriment. There was some kind of leak on the western front, probably caused by just such an individual that gave Von Rundstedt information which enabled him, as I said the other day, to hang crepe on the door knobs of thousands of American homes. Today our boys are dying by the thousands on Iwo Jima. Probably some Japs who pretended they had been converted from Shintoism were able to slip information to the Japs on that island or in Tokyo, as was done just before Pearl Harbor, that enabled them to more efficiently slaughter our men.

Mr. SHORT. I am absolutely convinced, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. And now, as I said, our marines are dying by the thousands as a result. For us to sit here and let them commission these Communists, such as the one whose name the gentleman from Missouri tried without success to pro-

nounce, if we are going to let them commission them and place them in key positions, I say it is time for the American people to rise up and demand that Congress do what we know to be our duty.

Mr. SHORT. I am very happy, Mr. Speaker, to have my position corroborated by the fighting gentleman from Mississippi. We move from turbulence to tranquillity. How sweet is our agreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, apparently there is no opposition to this resolution. Maybe that statement is a little too broad, because one Member has expressed his opposition to all investigating committees.

The Committee on Military Affairs is a legislative committee having jurisdiction over all legislation dealing entirely with the War Department; that is, so far as the military aspects are concerned. That committee is empowered to hold hearings for the purpose of ascertaining adequate information on which to base legislation. However, the committee does not have the power of subpena and is not provided with any inquisitorial staff other than the regular committee assistants.

After the Congress had authorized the expenditure of billions of dollars in the present war effort, complaints were heard throughout the country about waste and extravagance on the part of the War Department in spending this money. At this juncture the House in its wisdom supplemented the regular committee powers of the Military Affairs Committee by giving it the right to investigate, subpena witnesses, and so forth, and implemented the power given by adequate appropriations.

Not one word has been spoken in debate in complaint of the way in which this committee has performed its task or expended the money allocated to it. In short, it has justified the faith by seeing to it that the taxpayers' money was honestly, beneficially and judiciously spent in the war effort.

Some discussion has just been indulged in as to whether this resolution will give the committee power to investigate a recent order of the War Department concerning officers' commissions to Communists. There is no question but that legislation concerning the granting of commissions to officers in the War Department comes within the jurisdiction of the Military Affairs Committee. Therefore, the answer to the question is "Yes." The chairman of the Military Affairs Committee has advised us that he has already appointed a subcommittee assigned to the specific task of making the investigation in which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and others have expressed interest.

If there is no opposition to this resolution, then it is futile to continue to debate it, and I hope that the House will proceed to a vote at once.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much interested in the remarks here today. I am wholly in favor of this investigation being made. I am just as alarmed as the other Members of the House in regard to disclosures that appeared in the Times-Herald this morning in regard to the Communists.

One thing I think is very important, and that is when the investigation is made it should be followed up, it should be carried clear through.

I do not know how many Members on the floor of the House have been here long enough to remember that away back in the early 20's the Attorney General's Department carried on an investigation. I believe that our present Acting Speaker, the majority leader of the House, was chairman of a committee to investigate communistic activities in those days. At any rate, I became very much interested in the movement at that time, which had as its object the investigation of Communists in this country. That was many years ago. It is over 20 years ago, probably 25.

I went down to the Attorney General's Department and I saw and read much of the literature that had been captured in the back alleys, hovels, and other places in the big cities. It was an amazing thing to find that Communists were holding classes for the youngsters in those days in back alleys and underground cellars; that the communistic leaders were having the children of that day march in a circle around the American flag, spit on it, and repeat in unison, "I hate the American flag." That was in the literature of those days.

I had photostats made of much of that literature. I had a large amount of it and took it home. I used it in my district, pointing out the danger of communism. I read some of those circulars and literature to the people. Well, everything was going along peacefully, everybody was prosperous in those days, hence it did not create any great interest or any particular concern. Finally, Congress ceased to appropriate money to carry on this work, as the record will show.

If you will stop and think, there were several years that they carried on these schools of communism with the youngsters. If you will figure back now, the children that were indoctrinated then with communism, through our carelessness, are the leaders today in this communistic movement which now seeks to overthrow our form of government.

Mr. Speaker, when we start in to investigate communism, because of present disclosures, we should see it through and then be vigilant forever afterward in its suppression.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly in favor of the pending resolution to give the Committee on Military Affairs the power of investigation. I believe this power should be extended to all of our major committees so that we may know the facts. I have here an article taken out of the Worcester Telegram which I think may give the Military Affairs Committee some work to do.

The title of this article is "May Shift War Plants to France." I do not know how many Members of the House have seen it, it is an Associated Press story from Philadelphia, on January 18, and it reads as follows:

MAY SHIFT WAR PLANTS TO FRANCE

PHILADELPHIA, January 18.—Possible shift of heavy war industries to France as a solution to western-front supply problems was disclosed today by Frank L. McNamee, Philadelphia regional war manpower director.

McNamee, in an interview on his return here from a 3 weeks' tour of European battlefields, said transfer of United States plants would:

"Give the workers of France an opportunity to contribute toward the war effort * * * and would tend to stabilize the economic situation in France by providing jobs.

"We're going to have to help France, anyhow, and we've got to equip five of their new divisions," he said. "They might as well have a part in it."

He said he discussed the problem with Gen. Dwight Eisenhower and quoted the general as saying there was a possibility of moving war plants to France.

As I recollect it, during the time of the German occupation of France, the French munition industries were going at full blast, turning out war material for the Germans. France has a number of war plants today. No doubt they have been or can be rehabilitated. I hope the committee will take this subject matter under consideration.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, while we are on this subject, may I call the attention of the Committee on Military Affairs to another very serious proposition with reference to this question of Communists being commissioned in the United States Army.

I understand also that somebody in the War Department has been destroying their records. I want to repeat that now so that every Member of the House will understand it. I have been informed, and the Committee on Military Affairs can get the information, that somebody in the War Department has been destroying the records of these men who are being commissioned and who have heretofore embraced the Communist doctrine. I hope you will investigate that proposition fully and let us clean this mess up while we are at it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 38 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1945, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed to continue the study,

inquiry, and investigation begun under the authority of House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and for such purpose shall have the same powers and duties as those conferred upon it by House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress. The committee shall report to the House during the present Congress the results of its studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I shall later yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, this is a continuation of the investigation under the authority that was given to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the Seventy-seventh Congress. The matter was continued into the Seventy-eighth Congress. During the life of the investigation there have been 15 reports made. I refer to the cancelation of Higgins contract, South Portland Shipbuilding Corporation, steel shortage, Waterman Steamship Corporation, Baltimore Mail Steamship Co., Tampa Shipbuilding Co., plate fractures on welded ships, merchant marine in overseas aviation, purchase of Morgan Line, merchant shipbuilding program and related matters on the west coast, Rheem Manufacturing Co., fishery problems, East Coast Shipyards, Inc., ship repair yards, Red Sea space charter rates.

May I say that there has been appropriated for the use of this committee the sum of $127,000. At the conclusion of the last session the committee had an unexpended balance of about $18,000. Further, I may say in actual cash it has returned into the Treasury over a million dollars. In one of the first investigations that was made, the Portland Shipbuilding Co., it resulted in the reduction of fees on contracts that had been let for 60 ships at $16,000 apiece, amounting to $960,000. Before the investigation was concluded there was paid into the Government $75,000 by reason of an overpayment there. These two items aggregated over $1,000,000. There were other savings effected and waste eliminated.

At the conclusion of investigation on the Red Sea charter rates, two companies made returns of over $300,000. The charter rates are iniquitous, and have been the subject of study by the committee. They are still subject to renegotiation. Whether or not they will be renegotiated is a matter now before the Price Renegotiation Board, and will be followed up. We have cooperated with the Renegotiation Board. That Board has effected savings in maritime contracts of about $250,000,000.

There has been a studied attempt to avoid duplication of any investigation that is being conducted in the Senate. Wherever an investigation has been under way in the Senate, such as the Truman committee, counsel for the committee has cooperated with them and told them that any information available would be turned over to them. They have in the main certainly cooperated with our committee and turned over what information they could. The same is true of the General Accounting Office and other agencies.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. In referring to the Portland shipbuilding yard the gentleman had reference to Portland, Oreg., and not Portland, Maine?

Mr. BLAND. Portland, Maine.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. That is the New York Shipbuilding Co., is it not, or the New England Shipbuilding Co.?

Mr. BLAND. No; it was the South Portland Shipbuilding Co., which was the predecessor of the New England Shipbuilding Co. Our investigation resulted in the reorganization of the South Portland Co.

There is a particular matter now that we wish to follow up. I refer to the operation of ship repair yards. Many of the reports we have made involve money that should be returned to or recovered by the Government. I have taken them up with the Maritime Commission. I took up with counsel for the War Shipping Administration a report that was made by the committee concerning a matter that was resulting in a waste of money, as we saw it, and have received a report from the counsel that they have taken steps to correct that situation. We have not reported all matters to the House, but endeavored to secure their correction. One matter that we took up with one of the yards disclosed an excessive use of manpower. The result was that we reached a point which resulted in the decrease of 3,100 men and about $34,000 a day was saved for the Government by that reduction in manpower.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is the gentleman's committee going to investigate the conditions down on the Delaware water front in Philadelphia?

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman evidently refers to the matter which he called to my attention and which had, within the last few days, certainly within the last week, been brought to my attention, as to War Shipping repair contracts. That is a matter that we wish to go into fully. The contract itself is bad. I understand the contract is being made the subject of reconsideration now. It involves time and material plus a billings fee, so that the contract is an inducement to expend money and increase cost rather than to save money. It is an invitation to extravagance. The gentleman refers to what is known as the kickback racket?

Mr. RICH. That is right.

Mr. BLAND. I conferred with the gentleman who was sent over to my office by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and we found that the War Shipping Administration had itself initiated measures of relief.

The gentleman who came to my office also referred to similar practices that were existent in some of the yards where there were transports being repaired. I sent them to the attorney for the Military Affairs Investigating Committee as we did not have jurisdiction of those repairs.

Mr. RICH. We can expect that that is going to be investigated. I may say for the benefit of the House that the subcontractors on certain contracts along the Delaware River are demanding a kick-back of $4.75 a day from every individual who works on that certain job. Unless they pay in cash at the end of the day the amount of 1 hour's pay, the workers are not permitted to work on the Delaware River on those contracts.

Mr. BLAND. That has been very largely terminated there as to maritime repairs by the Office of the War Shipping Administration. If it is still in existence there or at any other places it will be investigated.

Mr. RICH. We can expect that your committee is going to make a thorough investigation of it?

Mr. BLAND. Yes. There have but recently come to me—within the last few days or within the last week, reports of apparent kick-backs and graft by welding subcontractors. Apparently this practice, alleged to be common, grew up because of inordinately high rates paid to welding subcontractors and welding companies which mushroomed into existence, and began bidding against each other and paid graft to representatives of the shipyards in order to obtain such contracts. It is said that the practice is still extant but because of the covert nature of such transactions, the committee has been unable to secure evidence of specific instances. That is the report made to me within the last week by the former counsel for the investigating committee.

Mr. RICH. You have first-hand information now from men who were discharged because they would not kick back at the end of each day?

Mr. BLAND. We think we have sources that can be followed through to give us some information on that subject. It will be made a complete subject of investigation.

Mr. RICH. There is certainly a racket down there. I think if we want to save money for this country, goodness only knows that this Congress ought to begin saving something pretty soon or we will not have anything.

Mr. BLAND. With reference to these war repair contracts, the importance will be seen from the fact that during the fiscal year 1943 repairs and conversions for the War Shipping Administration cost more than $400,000,000. Because of the number of repairs that are coming in the burden of repairing those ships has increased the cost so that they may increase considerably in a charge upon the Treasury.

Among other studies that should be made will be the authorization for repair and conversion expenditures at these ship repair yards. I am informed that the galleys in the *George Washington* were rebuilt three times and the lighting circuits in the operating room were completed twice.

With reference to fire watchers and guards, it is the opinion of some officials

of the War Shipping Administration that the number of guards and watchers has been grossly excessive. In the case of the *George Washington*, which was converted to a troopship at a cost of about $12,000,000, more than a million dollars was spent on fire watchers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. And there are matters of auditing contracts. But not alone in the matter of investigations of money expended has the committee tried to perform its work. The Subcommittee on Fisheries has done splendid work in straightening out difficulties and troubles that were threatened. First we had trouble with the O. P. A. We had to get the men around the table and try to work out some sort of an agreement. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries went up to the New England coast and by that means averted some strike situation up there. Already there is a resolution pending, offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER], who comes from New England, a resolution calling for an investigation of matters that will be carried out by this committee. Another has been introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]. Within the last few days without any authority to spend any money, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries, went up to the Great Lakes at his own expense and conducted a very satisfactory conference with respect to matters on the Great Lakes involving problems of conservation, pollution, and so forth. Another great work has been done by the subcommittee having to do with the production of steel and other material needed for construction purposes. The gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN], who is chairman of that subcommittee, have done a great work in that respect. Their work started at the time the Higgins contract was cut off because of the shortage of steel. They have been trying to get material for use in shipbuilding and they have done a great job. The reports as filed will be found to be factual, corrective in many respects, remedial, and constructive.

Someone has said the existence of the power to investigate is in itself a deterrent or corrective. These fellows are a little more watchful when someone is watching them. When you say, "Let the committee do it," where would we get in investigating the Maritime Commission if we relied entirely upon them? Those men are honest. But I want to send a man who can examine the books, who can study the reports that they receive, who can trace rumors and ascertain the facts at first hand. I do not wish to rely entirely upon information that comes from the Maritime Commission, or from the other agencies subject to investigation.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me that when men come to you and tell you they had a job where they got $4.75 an hour, and they were taken off the job, you should listen to them. By the way, one of the reporters said, "You do not mean $4.75 an hour? You mean $4.75 a day?" I said, "No; I mean $4.75 an hour." He said, "I am wasting my time here." The situation is this: "These fellows are getting $4.75 an hour. They work 8 hours or 16 hours a day, and they get time and a half for everything over 8 hours. They have to kick back in cash at least $4.75 an hour to the man they are working for each day. If he has 10 men, there is almost a hundred dollars a day that is kicked back. If that is crooked work, you ought to see that some fellows are put behind the bars.

Mr. BLAND. I did listen to the men who were sent over—we had an extended conference with the men sent over by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. We obtained whatever information they had. The former counsel for the committee will go into the matter very fully. He has been very diligent in the past. The committee will inquire fully who the matters referred to.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. I think you have done a remarkable job. There is one question I would like to ask. Have you in these investigations discovered any acts of fraud or misconduct on the part of any Maritime Commission or noncommission officer or employee?

Mr. BLAND. I do not recall that we have.

Mr. NORRELL. Then I am wondering if there is not a gross miscarriage of justice caused by inefficiency somewhere in the Maritime Commission.

Mr. BLAND. In some cases there would appear to be inefficiency, but on the whole the Maritime Commission has done an excellent job, and it has been done under very trying circumstances.

Mr. NORRELL. I agree with the gentleman that as a whole they have done a splendid job, but if there is one act of fraud somebody down there ought to be responsible for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries has performed a real service and has saved millions of dollars for the Government under the authority of House Resolution 281, of the Seventy-seventh Congress. It should be authorized to continue its work under the pending resolution, House Resolution 38. The resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. I sincerely hope it will be passed without any opposition.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, most of the debate this afternoon in connection with continuing these investigations has been along the line of what each committee should investigate. It seems to me if the House is interested in the work being done by these committees and if Members of the House have notions as to what should be done by the respective committees, they should advise the committee. It is easy to write a letter to a committee advising the committee as to what the Member thinks should be investigated. Something specific will then be at hand for the committee, rather than the Members making speeches on the floor about what the committee should do, and without calling the attention of the committee to the information in the possession of the Member. All committee members cannot possibly read all these speeches and extensions.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I rose to ask a question of the gentleman from Virginia, but he did not yield.

I do not know what the scope of this investigation is, what is authorized. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] was with me in Alaska a few years ago, and we found there that about $60,000,000 worth of fish were taken out of Alaskan waters every year, largely with traps owned by people who did not live in Alaska.

As a result the people in Alaska were to that extent denied the right to fish for a living. I was trying to find out whether this investigation we are now authorizing would be sufficiently broad to enable this committee to investigate that proposition in order that we might give to the people of Alaska the same protection we give our people along our own shores here in the United States and the same protection the Dominion of Canada gives her citizens in the matter of fisheries.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Mississippi is not a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee but he should read this resolution. This resolution gives the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries the right to investigate anything over which that committee has jurisdiction—and that committee does have jurisdiction over our fisheries. I think, therefore, the gentleman is entitled to an affirmative reply.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. BLAND. There was an investigation, if I may be pardoned, an investigation some years ago, and a report was made to the effect that a great deal of the difficulty in getting out the fish was due to the requisitioning of boats by the War Department.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Virginia that Alaska is a large Territory, with an area of about 580,000 square miles. Alaskan waters constitute some of the finest fishing grounds on earth; yet the people who live there are not allowed to make a living out of their own waters because those traps are owned by monopolies which

ship in a bunch of Chinese coolies or bring in people from elsewhere during the short season the salmon are going up the streams, thus leaving the people of Alaska without employment. What I should like to see is the same policy put into effect in Alaska that Canada has put into effect in British Columbia and other Maritime Provinces, and what various States of this Union have done, and give the individual citizen of Alaska the right to make a living on his own fishing grounds.

Mr. BLAND. Many problems were investigated on that trip to Alaska a few years ago, but we found no evidence of the bringing in of coolie labor.

Mr. RANKIN. The value of the fish taken from Alaskan waters every year amounts to more than the value of the wheat crop of Ohio or the cotton crop of Louisiana or Tennessee; yet it is simply being poured into the coffers of certain fishing monopolies, and the people who go to Alaska to try to build their homes and make a living come away in despair. We ought to take steps to protect the people of Alaska in their rights to their fishing grounds just as California protects her people; Washington, Virginia, Mississippi, and every other State in the Union, as well as the Dominion of Canada, protect their people.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, there may be much merit in what the gentleman says, and possibly is.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman knows; he was there with me.

Mr. MICHENER. I was there; and I know there is much in what the gentleman says. If the gentleman will accept a suggestion, I think he could contribute something of value if he would prepare a bill on the subject. It would be referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and would be a positive, affirmative step in the right direction, and he would have accomplished something.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. It might be of interest to the gentleman who brought up the great amount of food produced by fishermen that it was developed in the course of hearings that the fishermen as an average produce more food than any other food producer in the world. Next to that is the hog farmer of the Corn Belt, but the hog farmer and the poultry farmer are in part dependent on the fisherman for his high-protein food. Fishing is an industry that it would be well we learned more about. It has many problems. In one section of the country they have developed markets for one type of fish, yet the same type of fish is thrown away in other sections of the country. There is another thing that might be of interest to the Members. Several years ago there was a shortage of containers and it became evident that it would be difficult to get supplies to the North. There was a great salmon run that year. The committee had before it representatives of the War Shipping Administration, the Coast Guard, the Army, Navy, and other governmental agencies. It developed that in some instances the cubical contents of a ship were being filled up but not the deadweight tonnage, because they were actually shipping cans and nets.

Mr. RANKIN. The State of California leads all other States in the production of fish. Last year she produced 1,200,000,000 pounds. Massachusetts is next with about 510,000,000, while Alaska produced 560,000,000.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I do not want the House to debate this matter indefinitely.

Mr. RANKIN. Alaska is the second largest fishing ground in America, if not in the world; yet, its fishing industry is monopolized by a few big interests and the people who live in Alaska are not permitted to make it their business.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I asked the gentleman to yield because I want to propound a question to the gentleman from Mississippi. Is it true the only revenue the United States receives from the fisheries of Alaska is the tax which we place on the container in which the fish is canned?

Mr. RANKIN. The Territory of Alaska gets a small tax; then we get the income tax, and I think that is about the only tax we place upon them. It is just about the most profitable and about the least taxed industry of its magnitude in the United States.

Mr. JENSEN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, some day we are going to be called upon to make a State of Alaska. Many young men who come back from this war will want to go there to live, and what I am after is to make it possible for them to live there and to make their own living out of Alaskan resources. This is not a new subject with me. I have been clamoring for legislation of this kind for a long time. I went up there and made some investigations. I am merely giving you the results of those investigations. It is time that the Congress take the responsibility and pass laws to protect people who want to go to Alaska and make it their permanent home.

Mr. JENSEN. The revenue we derive from the fisheries of Alaska is almost negligible.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BLAND. We held hearings up there, we made investigations, and all of those who wanted to come and attend the hearings could do so.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not care about hearings. I want some legislation passed that will correct this condition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, out in the West today because there has been a lack of thorough investigation of this problem, we stand to lose the great salmon fishery industry in the Sacramento River. The Army engineers are proposing the building of a number of dams and structures along that watercourse which will effectively block the salmon run and stop it. This represents a value of between $600,000 and $1,000,000 a year.

Under the provision of this resolution, allowing for investigation and reconciliation of this problem, may result that in future water developments the economy of the fisheries will be taken into consideration along with salinity control, power, flood control, and other economics that make these great dams necessary.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from California that we had that identical question up when we were building the Bonneville Dam. We built fish ladders there to permit the salmon to ascend that stream during the spawning season. The charge was made that the fish could not climb those ladders. I made a trip to Bonneville and I saw and talked with the men who were in charge there, and those fish are climbing those ladders and going up that stream just as they did before the dam was built. We can do the same thing on the Sacramento.

Mr. MILLER of California. I agree with the gentleman that at Bonneville it was possible, because there you have a thousand miles of river above the dam where the fish can spawn. But there is one dam now proposed, the Table Mountain Dam on the Sacramento, that if built will effectively bar the passage of salmon upstream. Between the proposed Table Mountain Dam and Shasta Dam are the only remaining spawning beds on the Sacramento. They will be flooded and so destroyed. The problem here is not comparable with the one at Bonneville.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 93 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is authorized, as a committee, by subcommittee, or otherwise, to continue during the present Congress the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 98 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and for such purposes such committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon such committee by House Resolution 98 of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution in effect is a continuing resolution which continues the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which has done a particularly good job during the Seventy-eighth Congress. It went into various matters. It did an outstanding job in investigating grade labeling and also

went very exhaustively into the newsprint situation.

I have no requests for time on this side, and the gentleman from Indiana tells me that he has no requests for time.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made, and to insert some statistics on fish production of the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter I received, and a report from the National Catholic Conference, and my reply.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an item from the New York Times magazine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Los Angeles Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FUEL FOR THE MACHINES OF WAR

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, we have all frequently heard, read, and undoubterly uttered something to the effect that this is a mechanized war—a war of machines.

All these utterances have been entirely justified—for it is a truism. This is a mechanized war—a war of machines.

When we think of this war as a war of machines, however, most of us are likely to think only of the fighting machines themselves without taking into consideration the fact that these machines must be fueled with petroleum products—petroleum products which must be produced, refined, and then shipped to the widely scattered fighting fronts all over the world; the big bulk of these products going to these fronts from our own country, the world's greatest producer of petroleum.

I must confess that I had previously not given the problem of fueling the machines of war much detailed thought and study until, late in 1944, when the charge was aired in the press of this country that the only reason General Patton's lightning drive across France was halted short of Berlin lay in the fact that the gasoline supply for his armored columns broke down.

The statement was credited to a Mr. Fred Crawford, of Cleveland, who spoke before the National Association of Manufacturers upon his return from a brief visit to the European theater of operations as one member of a group of industrialists who went across to look over the war from the other side. His observations about the break-down of the gasoline supply were widely quoted.

As a Member of this House my natural interest in the conduct of the war, and in any assertion which might charge, justly or unjustly, that some part of our war effort is breaking down, led me to inquire into the gasoline-supply situation of the Army, both in this country and in Europe, with particular emphasis upon the supply of gasoline and oil for ground vehicles, from the mighty mechanized monsters which carry fortified firepower into the front yard of the enemy, to the all-essential trucks carrying vital supplies to the front and the agile jeeps which carry personnel and light equipment over terrain even a burro would find difficult.

In my inquiries into the gasoline-supply picture, I found that the staff responsibility for procurement and supply of petroleum products for all Army uses except for Air Forces aircraft is vested in one relatively small but highly important division of the Office of the Quartermaster General; a division known as the Fuels and Lubricants Division. My opinion, formed as a result of inquiring into this activity of the Office of the Quartermaster General, which not only has the responsibility for procurement and supply, but under whose direction Quartermaster troops in every theater of operation are charged with its distribution to troops, is that the Fuels and Lubricants Division is doing an excellent job of furnishing this vital life blood of mechanized warfare to every using vehicle and organization.

As I probed further into the question of gasoline and oil supply to our troops, I found an article written by Warren C. Platt, the editor and publisher of the National Petroleum News and one of the most astute observers in the petroleum industry. Mr. Platt, who has been serving his paper as a war correspondent in Europe for the past 7 months, wrote from Paris, after publication of the Crawford statement:

> When Fred Crawford, Cleveland industrialist, and one of the ablest examples of sound management in big business, told the National Association of Manufacturers that Patton's Third Army was stopped for lack of motor fuel, as if that was the real reason and there were no others, Crawford, in effect, was indicting the men of the Army and those late of business, who are doing one of the greatest jobs in business management in all history.

I find that reports reaching the office of Maj. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory, the Quartermaster General, here in Washington, tell of the heroic, 24-hour-a-day job which the soldiers of Quartermaster gasoline-supply units—and other supply units—undertook and carried out to get supplies up to the fast-moving Army. They tell how truck columns hurtled through burning towns, set afire by both our own and enemy fire and bombing, to carry highly inflammable supplies of volatile motor fuel up to the using tanks, half-tracks, and other vehicles plowing their way up the French roadways behind rapidly retreating Germans.

In one of these reports, the story is told of a daring truck driver who volunteered to take his truck through the holocaust of what a few hours before had been a town—just to see if it were safe for the rest of the outfit to come through. He made it, and immediately behind him came the rest of the truckloads of gasoline destined for the roaring battle machines up ahead. If any mines had been planted there, he would have been blown to bits.

This is typical of the reports covering the supply of gasoline and oil to the Third Army. Another described the holding of a small bit of ground, upon which were situated dumps of gasoline already packaged in 5-gallon blitz cans, against enemy snipers and counter attacks. The Quartermaster soldiers, whose job it was to deliver, and protect, this vital fluid of warfare, did their job well. There was no bogging down on their part.

Mr. Speaker, more than half of the total tonnage of supplies carried by invasion forces represents petroleum products. The lesson that this volume was necessary was learned in the invasion of north Africa, of Sicily, and of Italy. It was put into practice when the greatest of the invasions took place—the invasion of fortress Europe.

More than half of the necessarily limited tonnage landed on Normandy beaches, on the beachheads established later, and still later at the rehabilitated ports which our fighting men wrested from the enemy, represented petroleum products. Most of this tonnage was shuttled across the English Channel and the North Sea from Britain, where we had been building up millions upon millions of gallons of storage for months before D–day. Today, many tanker loads of these products, I am told, are going direct from ports in our own country directly to the ports of debarktation in France, thereby saving the necessity for transshipment from England. But a number of important ports are still held by enemy troops according to our maps in the Speaker's lobby.

During the drive on Paris, when rail transportation from the invasion coast inland was completely disrupted by the rapidly retreating Nazis, every available motor vehicle was called into use to carry the precious stores of gasoline and oil inland. As the Army moved forward, and railroads were repaired, the petroleum products were carried to forward

railheads by the trainload and there transferred to trucks which carried them up to using units. The engineers rapidly constructed pipe lines for these products only a few days behind the advancing Army, but, obviously, this job could not possibly keep up with the mechanized might of the Third Army as it rolled virtually unchecked toward the captive French capital.

All these means were used; the movement of gasoline even took precedence over virtually all other supplies than food and ammunition. Gasoline and oil poured eastward from the coast by the thousands of barrels, and distribution was handled remarkably smoothly and efficiently. I am in no position to say what actually caused the ultimate slowup of the javelin thrust of the Third Army; but I am convinced that it was not the lack of gasoline, at least not this lack by itself. To be sure, the difficulty of getting fuel for the machines of war across the devastated French countryside may have been weighed, along with other difficulties, when it was determined to halt the forward push. The real reason why it was halted probably will remain a military secret for some time to come, but I have yet to hear or read of the opinion of any responsible military leader connected with the French invasion that the lack of gasoline was the sole reason for the stopping of the advance.

Members of the House Military Affairs Committee who visited the European fighting fronts in December, have returned to tell us both on and off the record of many of their observations. Some of them have indicated, if I understand them correctly, that Patton's drive was slowed and stopped for a number of reasons, among them being important strategical and tactical reasons.

A personal answer to such questions was given me last summer when I talked with certain retired officers of the Army who hold permanent ranks equal to the permanent ranks of many of our high commanders in the European theater. They recall the fact that the area now occupied by our troops in France, Belgium, and Holland is as familiar to the German General Staff as are their own estates in Germany. They recalled the many battles that had been fought in this area over the past 2,000 years and pointed out how German armies had been able to suck invading armies through the gaps in the mountain ranges and around the northern end onto the plains of the Rhine and into the Ruhr regions, only to trap them and there annihilate them. It is quite reasonable to expect that the General Staff of our armies in Europe were fully aware of these dangers and hence that they were unwilling to risk such a probability without having strong forces fully supplied in support of our advancing Third Army before permitting it to make the headlong plunge into German territory.

Now, we who, even in the days before gasoline rationing, may have burned a maximum of 100 gallons of gasoline per month in our daily pursuits—and that is quite a bit unless one is on the road most of the time—have a hard time visualizing the vast quantities of gasoline and oil used by a mechanized army.

I have here some figures which I obtained from the Fuels and Lubricants Division of the Office of the Quartermaster General which will give you a rough idea:

One armored battalion—and we do not know for sure how many such battalions there were in the armies moving across France, but we do know there were quite a few divisions each made up of a number of battalions—each armored battalion requires 17,000 gallons of fuel and 215 gallons of oil to move 100 miles. That is just to move on a straight line, without maneuvering, without having to stop and do a job of fighting along the way, without taking into account the shell-blasted roads and the detours through gullies and fields and hedge rows.

Just how much is 17,000 gallons of gasoline? Well, it is more than the capacity of two of the large tank cars you have seen on the railroad, and translated into truckloads of 5 gallon blitz cans—loaded to their maximum load of 250 cans each—it is at least 14 truckloads.

To express it in another way—a heavy tank, under ideal conditions, burns 20 gallons of fuel per hour; so does a medium tank. A light tank uses 9, a half track 7, a 2½-ton truck—which has been called by General Patton himself our most valuable weapon—burns 4 gallons per hour, and a jeep, 3. Those are figures for ideal conditions—just moving smoothly along a surfaced highway—as the going gets tougher the consumption goes up.

Also, consider the vehicles of the units and organizations which must travel with, or immediately behind an advancing armored column—the countless jeeps, supply trucks, staff, and command cars of the units which must keep on the move in support of the mechanized thrust—all of these have to be supplied with gasoline, too, thousands of gallons of it.

The Army officers who are running the gasoline and oil supply establishment for the Army are, for the most part, experienced former businessmen who have been called upon to help the Army do its supply job. They are the ones who formulated these plans; they are the ones who are assuring that the plans are being carried out. The organization which has been set up to supply petroleum products to our ground troops—that is, the Fuels and Lubricants Division of the Office of the Quartermaster General, under the direction of Brig. Gen. Howard L. Peckham—is an organization such as has never before been set up in the history of the petroleum industry. General Gregory has drawn on the best brains of the petroleum industry, from large and small companies, to do the planning and executing of the supply function. More than 90 percent of the officers on the staff of the division came directly from the industry to the Army. These officers' experience with all phases of petroleum, from production right through to distribution, averages more than 10 years each, and some of them have had as many as 25 years in the industry. No single company in the industry could command such a wealth of experience and sound business management as are assembled in this division. Its outstanding accomplishments are, in my opinion, a fine tribute to the organizing genius of General Gregory and to the division chief, General Peckham.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, a member of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is paying a well-deserved tribute to the Fuels and Lubricants Division of the Quartermaster General's office, but it might be said that all branches of the Quartermaster Corps have done a most remarkable job in this war in supplying and equipping our forces.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the distinguished gentleman. I am sure what he has to say is entirely true.

Mr. SHORT. It is due to the outstanding organizing genius and business ability of General Gregory. I think the gentleman should not overlook, in pointing out the tremendous amount of oil and gasoline that is used on the battle fronts, the fact that we use perhaps much more here at home in training in the many camps over the country.

Mr. HINSHAW. Quite so—millions of gallons are used.

Figures are boring, particularly in an address, but in order to delineate the magnitude of the task undertaken and carried out by men who left lucrative positions in the industry to pool their talents in the interest of our military need, I want to call your attention to just a few.

I have learned that during the fiscal year ended last June 30, the Division processed requisitions and arranged for the purchase of more than a billion gallons of gasoline; about 50,000,000 gallons of various types of engine oils; nearly 3,000,000 gallons of gear lubricants; and about 50,000,000 pounds of greases of all types.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, an able member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. JENSEN. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the fine presentation the gentleman has made in pointing out the great need for gasoline and oil. About 2 years ago General Arnold, Chief of the Air Corps, made a talk to the Committee on Appropriations of the House, at which time he gave us quite a surprise when he said it required over 3 tons of gasoline to carry 3 tons of fighting material, food, and equipment over the Himalaya Mountains from India to China.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is by use of the Air Force transport airplanes?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe that statement is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. It was then that I heard many members of the Committee on Appropriations say, and I know they have lived up to their promise, that henceforth they would conserve gasoline and oil to the best of their ability because that really brought it home to us.

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope it would. I thank the gentleman for his presentation of the vital importance of petroleum.

In addition to these and numerous other products, the Division procured an average of more than a million and a quarter 5-gallon blitz cans per month and almost a half million 55-gallon drums per month during the past fiscal year.

But procurement is only a part of the story. Working with other agencies, the Division has worked toward simplification of specifications so as to permit greater facility in production and procurement. It has inaugurated a strict inspection system to assure that the quality of fuel sent abroad for use by the troops enabled their vehicles to operate at maximum efficiency. It has supervised the training of the personnel of mobile petroleum laboratories which test petroleum products in the field, both our own and those captured from the enemy, to further assure quality. It has developed new types of dispensers to facilitate handling of gasoline and oil in the field.

In every theater staff officers charged with petroleum supply are in close liaison with the Division in Washington, sending back estimated requirements, suggestions, reports, all of which are translated into action designed to make more efficient the flow of petroleum products to the using units. Many of these officers were once on the staff of the Division here in Washington, and have been trained in the procedures from this end.

On the basis of intelligence reports, the Division has compiled estimates of enemy consumption of fuels and lubricants, their available production, and the many types of substitutes now being used by the Germans and Japs.

I could go on at length, describing the business set-up which has been organized to do the job of supplying our ground forces with petroleum products, the lifeblood of mechanized warfare. But I believe I have presented enough facts to fix in your minds that we have an organization which is capable of making, and has made, long-range plans to assure an adequate supply.

I hope that I have been able, in this brief summation of the gargantuan job of keeping a mechanized army rolling, to call to mind some of the vast array of details which must be kept constantly in ordered process. The Fuels and Lubricants Division must literally follow the liquid petroleum from the derrick floor in the oil fields of Texas, Oklahoma, and California to the gasoline tanks of fighting vehicles. I am convinced that it has done its job well.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman inform us whether or not any subsidy has been voted for the payment of producers operating stripper wells? Some time ago this House passed legislation increasing the price by 35 cents a barrel.

Mr. HINSHAW. No; the price was not increased.

Mr. SHORT. I feel it is too bad the price has not been increased, for had it been we would perhaps today have greater supply.

Mr. HINSHAW. I believe some subsidy has been granted to the stripper wells.

Mr. Speaker, may I say in conclusion that we have another drive on in Europe. I am perfectly convinced that this new drive will go forward without any stoppage or accusation of stoppage because of lack of gasoline or lubricating oils or other petroleum products. I feel sure that our stocks of such supplies are adequate unless some unforeseen Nazi breakthrough might let them capture a large part of it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. As I recall the House passed a bill to increase the price of crude oil 35 cents a barrel but it failed to pass the Senate. I am just wondering whether or not any effort is being made to reenact such legislation.

Mr. HINSHAW. That I do not know.

Mr. SHORT. I believe the gentleman from California would favor it, would he not?

Mr. HINSHAW. I voted for the last bill the gentleman speaks of. It was presented, as I remember it, by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY].

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is right. Although I have no oil in my district I voted for it.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think it is very necessary if we are to have the fullest production for this country

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

A SOLDIER'S ATTITUDE TOWARD NATIONAL-SERVICE LEGISLATION

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL-SERVICE LEGISLATION

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a letter from a good union man and a brave soldier. He writes on the subject of national-service legislation. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to incorporate this letter in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LACY. And by way of introduction thereto let me say that Sgt. Bill Wood was a C. I. O. organizer in the Yakima Valley in the State of Washington where he did what he could toward improving the living and working conditions of the people there. He is now continuing his efforts on behalf of the whole country. He distinguished himself with outstanding gallantry during the Nazi offensive from the Ardennes Forest when he climbed on a disabled tank and removed the machine gun. Turning it against the enemy with deadly effect, he is credited with a substantial part in stopping the breakthrough that threatened in his sector of that front. Later he scaled a wall under mortar fire and with a hand grenade put out of commission a Nazi machine-gun nest.

Sergeant Wood's letter deals with the soldier's attitude, and his own attitude as a union man and as a good soldier, in behalf of national-service legislation. I believe the Members of the House will be interested in reading it. The letter reads as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., *February 17, 1945.*

Hon. HUGH DE LACY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HUGH: I want to thank you for your vote in favor of the May national-service bill.

I am now on leave from my infantry combat unit now fighting in Germany. Just before I left the line about a dozen of us at a quiet moment were talking about national-service legislation. Some of the boys wondered whether labor would understand how desperately we at the front needed this all-out war support from the home front but those of us who were union men were sure that our union brothers at home would back us up.

It got to be quite a discussion and I told the fellows how labor and the people in my city of Seattle had elected you, one of themselves, to Congress to help us win the war. So you can see I really felt good when I read that you voted the way I knew you would vote; the way that I had told the boys you would vote—for them.

In a couple of days I will start on my way back to the battle front in Europe. The fellows in my outfit that I will return and fight with are the finest bunch of fellows that I have ever known. I guess the fellows in every outfit up front are like that.

It's pretty rough up front. We fight hard and try to win the war quickly because the faster the war is won the greater number of us will come home alive. National-service legislation will save the lives of some of us on the battle front. We really appreciate you being in there pitching for us, Hugh. Keep it up.

Sincerely,
Staff Sgt. WILLIAM H. WOOD,
Company B, Three Hundred and Nineteenth Infantry, A. P. O. 80, New York, N. Y.

Because these are the words of one of the heroes of this war, I believe the House will join with me in satisfaction that its action in following President Roosevelt's recommendation for national-service legislation will help save the lives of other heroes like Bill Wood.

Because they are also the words of a loyal union man, I believe Members will also join me when I further express my own gratification that this House wisely defeated attempts to make of such legislation an instrument to destroy organized labor.

Many of us voted for the May bill because of these two important truths, even though we did not think it the best possible manpower legislation, and supported amendments which we felt would perfect the purposes sought by the President.

I read this letter with additional satisfaction today because the Senate Military Affairs Committee has now recommended legislation to perfect administration of manpower controls, answer the plea of this fighting hero, and further protect the interests of the Nation's great war producers—the unsung war workers.

The enactment soon of a manpower bill reflecting the combined wisdom and considered judgment of both bodies of Congress will fittingly answer the plea of Sergeant Wood, worker, union member, and hero in his country's cause.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DREWRY (at the request of Mr. BLAND), for balance of week, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 27, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m. Tuesday, February 27, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

259. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia by adding a new section 548a; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

260. A letter from the Chairman, Commissioner John Russell Young, District Unemployment Compensation Board, transmitting, in accordance with section 13 (c) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, their report covering the administration and operation of the said act for the calendar year 1944; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

261. A letter from the national president, American War Mothers, transmitting a report of the American War Mothers, October 1, 1943, to October 1, 1944; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

262. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the extension and application of the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to certain officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Concurrent Resolution 29. Concurrent resolution to reaffirm the necessity of the Tydings amendment in our war effort, and creating a congressional committee to investigate the necessity of agricultural deferments; without amendment (Rept. No. 216). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Patents. H. R. 1439. A bill to prohibit proof of acts done by an inventor in foreign countries; with amendment (Rept. No. 217). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 149. Resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 106, a joint resolution to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors essential to the war effort; without amendment (Rept. No. 218). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Patents. H. R. 1654. A bill to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2125. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; with amendment (Rept. No. 220). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 2340. A bill to give effect to the status of loco parentis in connection with the exemptions for dependents under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 2341. A bill to provide pay for certain enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps, retired after 30 years of service, active or fleet reserve, who have served honorably as commissioned officers during both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. R. 2342. A bill relating to the deductibility under chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of expenses paid or incurred in determining Federal income-tax liability; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 2343. A bill to continue existing gold reserve ratios required to be maintained against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation and Federal Reserve bank deposits by increasing the monetary value of gold; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2344. A bill to amend section 3 (a) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, relating to exempted securities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2345. A bill to protect veterans in employment; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2346. A bill to provide aid for the readjustment in civilian life of those persons who rendered war service in the United States merchant marine during World War No. 2, and to provide aid for the families of deceased war-service merchant seamen; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 2347. A bill to provide and insure a dependable supply of domestic natural rubber and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia:

H. R. 2348. A bill to provide for the coverage of certain drugs under the Federal narcotic laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERIDAN:

H. R. 2349. A bill to interpret and define the term "National Guard" and to determine the Federal recognition of service therein; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2350. A bill to maintain on active duty, during the present war, officers of the Army of the United States who reach retirement age; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2351. A bill to repeal the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended and extended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2352. A bill to extend liability for training and service under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 to persons holding certain offices under the United States or any State, Terrritory, or the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R 2353. A bill relating to compensation of certain officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS:

H. R. 2354. A bill to restore to the active list of the Army and to active duty certain retired officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committtee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DE LACY:

H. R. 2355. A bill to provide that periods of vocational training undertaken by disabled veterans in preparing for employment by the United States shall be credited for retirement purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 2356. A bill to regulate burial space in national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 2357. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia:

H. R. 2358. A bill to designate the white flowering American dogwood as the national flower of the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2359. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the following stream: Lost River, a tributary of the Clearwater River, in the State of Minnesota, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committtee on Flood Control.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent Resolution to express the disapproval of the Congress of the decision made at the Crimean Conference relating to the partition of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. Res. 150. Resolution directing the Secretary of War to transmit certain information to the House; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. Res. 151. Resolution recognizing the contribution which is being made by the World's Sunday School Association to bring about a restoration and expansion of the system of Christian education disrupted by the war; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. Res. 152. Resolution providing for the payment of the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 38; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial, of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for a constitutional amendment providing for ratification of treaties by a majority of the Members of the House and the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make an accurate survey of the agricultural situation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take prompt action to ratify the agreement between the Government of the United States and the Dominion of Canada for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway; to the Committee on Rivers and Habors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to repeal Public Law 403 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, being an act to promote the national security and defense by establishing daylight-saving time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAVAGE: Memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, urging the President and the Congress to approve and pass the minimum measures for the benefit of the merchant marine, as submitted by Rear Admiral Emory S. Land; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 2360. A bill for the relief of E. J. Ide; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2361. A bill for the relief of Alexander Sawyer; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2362. A bill for the relief of Edward Woolf; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 2363. A bill relating to the operation of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 in the case of Anna B. Patton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2364. A bill for the relief of Hughie Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2365. A bill for the relief of J. E. Carroll; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2366. A bill for the relief of G. W. Gainey; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2367. A bill for the relief of W. E. Howell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2368. A bill for the relief of M. E. Gainey; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2369. A bill for the relief of Willis Hobbs; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2370. A bill for the relief of George Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2371. A bill for the relief of Warn Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2372. A bill for the relief of John Adams Webster; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2373. A bill for the relief of Ira Henderson; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

102. By Mrs. BOLTON: Petition of sundry citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, urging favorable action on the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

103. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Ethel Swisher and 200 other citizens of Lakewood, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

104. By Mr. FORAND: Joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island, requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to give particular consideration to the pressing situation with relation to the plight of Rhode Island farmers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, February 26, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. M. E. Dodd, D. D., LL. D., pastor of the First Baptist Church, Shreveport, La., and former president of the Southern Baptist Convention, offered the following prayer:

O God, our help in ages past,
Our hope for years to come,
Our refuge from the stormy blast,
And our eternal home:

Unto Thee we lift up our hearts in a prayer of praise and petition. We gratefully acknowledge Thee as the giver of every good and perfect gift, and would claim the promise of Thy holy word, that if we acknowledge Thee in all our ways Thou wilt direct our paths.

We thank Thee for our beloved country, for the founding fathers, whose faith and fidelity laid foundations strong and sure, whose principles and policies have given guidance through all the years of peril and prosperity.

We thank Thee for the institutions of our land, which have for their purpose the glory of God and the good of humanity; for our homes, our schools, and our churches.

We thank Thee for the marvelous manner in which Thou hast blessed our land with prosperity and power, bringing her to her present position of world service.

We pray Thy blessings upon our armed forces. Bless our men and women who are in the uniformed service of the Nation wherever they may be, whether on land or sea, whether in the air or under the water, whether in training camps, in hospitals, or in prisoner-of-war camps; be Thou with them, even as we pray that Thou wilt be with us here.

We pray Thy blessing upon our allies. Give to all who struggle and fight and bleed and die for freedom great courage, strong faith, high hopes, and stout hearts that they may carry on to a successful conclusion.

And we would pray that Thou wilt give us grace like unto that which characterized our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to pray for our enemies. Save them, we pray Thee, from their own sins and faults, even as we pray that we may be delivered from ours. By Thy grace and mercy remove from the hearts of all of us the spirit of vengeance and revenge. Help us to know that no permanent and lasting good can be accomplished by harboring hatreds and by seeking vindictive revenge.

And when the days of peace come, we pray that Thou wilt give that wisdom which cometh down from above, which is first peaceable and then pure and is easily entreated to our statesmen and leaders who shall have the responsibility of writing the peace terms. May they think and talk and write and act as under the all-seeing eye of the eternal and omnipotent God, to whom all men shall answer in the final day of reckoning for all the deeds done in the body.

Bless, we beseech Thee, each and every Member of the Senate of the United States as they deal with the momentous matters of state, and especially when they come to make the final decision on world relationship. Grant that through them and their acts there may speedily come universal understanding and good will, mutual cooperation and helpfulness, health and happiness, peace and prosperity to all peoples and the dawning of that day when all battleflags shall be furled, and we shall be joined in a federation of mankind in a parliament of the world, when—

"No longer from its brazen portals
The war's great organs rend the skies,
But beautiful as songs of the immortals
The holy melodies of peace arise."

This is our prayer, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Monday, February 26, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

PAY-ROLL TAXES FOR OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS' BENEFITS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a brief observation?

Mr. BARKLEY. I withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I want to refer briefly to the situation which Congress confronts in respect to pay-roll taxes to sustain old-age and survivors' benefits under the Social Security Act.

Senators will remember that Congress has repeatedly frozen these taxes at the existing 2-percent rate—1 percent on employers and 1 percent on employees. This has been done annually—and always in the rush hours at the turn of the year, just before the statutory increase in pay-roll taxes would otherwise become effective.

Having had something to do with these annual freezes, I want to say again that this method of meeting the problem on

the floor of Congress each December is wholly unsatisfactory and unscientific. But we shall again be in this position next December unless we do something about it in the interim. The issue will be particularly acute this year because the total pay-roll tax jumps from 2 percent to 5 percent next New Year's, and Congress will face a more serious responsibility than ever in this connection.

It was in an effort to meet this situation on a broad, sound basis that the Senate Finance Committee—and later the Senate itself—approved my Senate concurrent resolution calling upon the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to explore this whole subject; and to arm itself with an advisory council of experts such as helped so signally when we wrote the social-security amendments in 1939, and to report not later than next October 1. The resolution calls for inquiry into expanded coverage and expanded benefits as well as a permanent pay-roll tax formula for the old-age-benefits section of the Social Security Act.

Two months have now passed and this study has not yet been instituted. The resolution still awaits action in the Rules Committee of the House. With greatest respect for the body at the other end of the Capitol, and without intending to speak in any spirit of complaint, I express the hope that the Congress may soon put itself in position to deal effectively with this problem so that we may not again confront next fall the necessity of taking last-minute judgment on this pay-roll tax, which otherwise will increase 150 percent on both workers and employers next January.

Mr. President, I desire particularly to call attention to a statement which has just been issued jointly by the American Life Convention, the Life Insurance Association of America, and the National Association of Life Underwriters. These are the citizens among us who are most technically informed upon this subject and whose opinions are of the greatest value. I desire to quote just a few sentences from their report:

> Because of the complexity of the old-age security financing problem and its far-reaching ramifications, it should have most careful consideration by Congress. To continue the current procedure of freezing the present 2-percent pay-roll tax rate a year at a time is not satisfactory in connection with such an important matter, nor is it fair either to labor or enterprise to have the tax question uncertain or indefinite. As an aid in arriving at a sound solution to the problem, the formation of an advisory committee of qualified persons to be appointed jointly by the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee of the House has been recommended. A committee of this kind can make a thorough study of the problem and report on it, as did the advisory council which recommended the numerous changes adopted in 1939.

Mr. President, I merely call attention to the fact that these highest external authorities in our country on the subject of social security totally concur in the resolution which has been adopted by the Senate on this subject.

I am pleading only that next fall, when we shall have to act upon these pay-roll taxes in respect to social security, we shall not again be left in the position in which we have found ourselves year after year, without an adequate basis upon which to act.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2122) to extend to 6 months after the termination of hostilities the period during which females may be employed in the District of Columbia for more than 8 hours a day, or 48 hours a week, under temporary permits, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CORDON:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the original act of the Congress providing for the administration of the revested Oregon and California grant lands and the reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands restored to mineral entry all of such revested and reconveyed lands; and

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior has ruled that the act of Congress of August 28, 1937, providing for permanent forest yield has impliedly prevented mineral entries on said lands; and

"Whereas this ruling forever forecloses the development of more than 2,000,000 acres of the public domain within the State of Oregon containing vast mineral potentialities and prevents the proper economic development of the State of Oregon; and

"Whereas there is now pending in the Senate of the United States a bill, S. 313, introduced by Senator CORDON, to restore to the citizens of Oregon the right to locate, explore, and develop these mineral lands as intended by the original act of Congress relating thereto: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized and requested to enact S. 313, to the end that these lands may be opened to mineral entry; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state be authorized and he hereby is directed to forward immediately a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon delegation in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. TAYLOR:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, do respectfully represent: that

"Whereas the standards of modern economic society require that when that part of our population which has reached its years of decline in efficiency and can no longer compete under the pressure of modern economic conditions, as self-supporting members of society, the people as a whole should see to it that help in some minimum amount be available to them; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has established and maintains a social security system which has been of benefit to those fortunate enough to be covered by its provisions, its success being due to the fact that it provides for the retirement of the individual by the accumulation of payments made during the years of his greatest earning capacity, thus anticipating the burden of taking care of him in his years of decline; and

"Whereas this Social Security System, inaugurated and maintained by the Federal Government, covers, under its provisions, only certain classes of the population, but it is our belief that the classes not included are as much entitled to its benefits as those now covered, and that to extend its benefits to all citizens is only a matter of justice to all; and

"Whereas the proposal to include the farmers, the self-employed, the irregularly employed, the teachers, public-service employees, and all classes still outside the Federal system, has been endorsed by a large number of civic, fraternal, and farm and labor organizations, local and national: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Idaho, jointly, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact such legislation as is necessary to extend the benefits of the Federal Social Security System to the classes of people referred to above as well as to other exempted classes, at the earliest time feasible; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Idaho be hereby authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to the Senators and Representatives of Idaho in the two Houses of Congress."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 2

"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that although we are aware that winning of the present World War is of primary importance, we are facing a critical shortage of efficient farm labor, which will drastically affect the vital contribution of Idaho to the food-production industry;

"Whereas there exists an acute shortage of labor on the farms and ranches of the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas we are now informed that the Selective Service headquarters in Washington, D. C., have issued an order that all young men between the ages of 18 to 26 be classified I–A and presented to the draft boards for preliminary induction indiscriminately; and

"Whereas we are of the opinion that general agricultural and livestock industries will suffer to a very great extent under such indiscriminate induction, regardless of responsible and of key operating men; and

"Whereas Idaho agricultural production depends largely upon men well trained in mechanics and operation of power machinery and irrigation; and

"Whereas we cannot avail ourselves of labor—Japanese, Mexican, or Jamaican—trained to these positions; and

"Whereas we are receiving very few discharged veterans of this war able to work:

"Now, therefore, we, the legislators of the State of Idaho, do hereby most respectfully urge your honorable body, the Congress of the United States, that your honorable body take such action as is necessary to see that an accurate survey be immediately made of our agricultural-production situation before we have lost so many of our key operational men that our production be greatly decreased during the following years, and especially the next 2 years: Be it

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and is hereby directed, to immediately forward certified copies of this joint memorial to the Honorable James F. Byrnes, War Mobilization Director; the Honorable Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, Washington, D. C.; President of the Senate; Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; and the President, Franklin D. Roosevelt; be it further

"Resolved, That because now Selective Service headquarters have sent out instructions to the Idaho State and local boards, which instructions indiscriminately place all men between the ages of 18 to 26 in draft class I–A and subject them to immediate induction, the speaker of the house and president of the senate are hereby authorized and directed to send by telegram copies of this memorial to President Franklin D. Roosevelt; James F. Byrnes, War Mobilization Director; Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey; Chairman May, House Military Affairs Committee."

STATEMENT BY OFFICERS OF NATIONAL FEDERATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter embodying a statement signed by the officers of the National Federation of Federal Employees which I am glad to approve.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a statement was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION
OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES,
Washington, D. C., February 21, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR: We, the members of the executive council of the National Federation of Federal Employees, in session in Washington this week, urge prompt enactment by the Congress of legislation to secure the following objectives:

The maximum practicable immediate base pay increase for all Federal employees, in determining which the wages of private industry, cost of living, difficulty and responsibility of the job, availability of personnel, and other pertinent factors should be taken into consideration.

True time and a half for all time worked above 40 hours per week.

An equitable night differential compensation.

A comprehensive revision, at the earliest practicable time, of all pertinent phases of the entire Federal classification structure, with a view to the adoption of a permanent governmental policy which will be equitable alike to employee, Government, and taxpayer.

Overtime pay for holiday work.

Reduction in the time required for salary advancement from the present 30 months and 18 months to 18 months and 12 months.

These are measures which are fundamental to preserving and enhancing the efficiency and the effectiveness of the Federal service in behalf of the Nation.

They are steps which are required not alone by the present critical war situation but for the proper long-range development and progress of the service.

We bespeak your active support of legislation to secure these objectives.

Respectfully,

Luther C. Steward, president, Kansas City, Mo.; Gertrude M. McNally, secretary-treasurer, Berwyn, Md.; Walter P. Taylor, first vice president, College Station, Tex.; Ulrey J. Biller, second vice president, Washington, D. C.; Geo. L. Evans, third vice president, Denver, Colo.; Vaux Owen, fourth vice president, Atlanta, Ga.; L. J. Wall, fifth vice president, Springfield, Ill.; Al Berryessa, sixth vice president, San Francisco, Calif.; Oscar W. Dam, seventh vice president, Seattle, Wash.; John J. Royle, eighth vice president, Watertown, Mass.; Elisabeth B. Rauworth, ninth vice president, Tucson, Ariz.

STATEMENT BY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE KANSAS COUNCIL OF CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGES

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter embodying a statement by the executive committee of the Kansas Council of Church-Related Colleges, at Wichita, Kans., February 7, 1945, and signed by W. W. Peters, president of the council.

There being no objection, the letter embodying a statement was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCPHERSON COLLEGE,
McPherson, Kans., February 23, 1945.

Senator CLYDE M. REED,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REED: The executive committee of the Kansas Council of Church-Related Colleges in session at Wichita, Kans., February 7, 1945, instructed me as president of the council to write you and to include the following statement:

"NATIONAL COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN HIGHER EDUCATION, JANUARY 10, 1945

"Whereas the Selective Service Act is adequate to provide trained manpower during the present war emergency; and

"Whereas the shape of our foreign policy and future military needs is still indefinite; and

"Whereas there is insufficient evidence that the proposed plan of a year of compulsory military training is the only satisfactory method of achieving the end of preparedness: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Commission on Christian Higher Education of the Association of American Colleges urges that Congress postpone decision on the matter of compulsory peacetime military training until the war is over and the shape of the peace is clear; and

"That in the meantime Congress create a commission broadly representative of education, religion, industry, the Army, the Navy, and others, to study the best ways in which national security can be achieved without injury to democratic ideals, and to report back to Congress."

We heartily concur in the above resolution of the National Commission on Christian Higher Education which was passed by the educational agencies at the annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges in session at Atlantic City, January 8–12, 1945.

Respectfully submitted.

W. W. PETERS.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on February 26, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 76. An act for the relief of John T. Cooper;

S. 210. An act to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of the old lighthouse keeper's residence in Manitowoc, Wis., to the Otto Oas Post, No. 659, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis.," approved June 16, 1938;

S. 213. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States Naval Ordnance Plant at Canton, Ohio;

S. 216. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain lands situated at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H.;

S. 218. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain lands situated in San Diego County, State of California;

S. 219. An act to amend section 1442, Revised Statutes, relating to furlough of officers by the Secretary of the Navy;

S. 221. An act to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil;

S. 315. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S. 317. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer for the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; and

S. 335. An act for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 639. A bill for the relief of Ben White and certain other persons in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties, Calif.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 640. A bill to grant the status of a quota immigrant to Dr. Wilhelm Wolfgang Krauss; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 641. A bill to provide, in the case of certain Government employees dying after September 18, 1939, for payment for accumulated or accrued annual leave due at the time of death; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. HATCH (by request):

S. 642. A bill for the relief of Ida F. Braun, Alice Braun Menges, and Carl J. Braun, individually and as executors of the estate of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as legatees and beneficiaries of the will of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as the sole parties in interest by succession under the last will and testament of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and under the last will and testament of Herman W. Braun, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 643. A bill for the relief of Ern Wright; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 644. A bill to provide for the education and training of members of the merchant marine and certain members of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps, after their discharge or conclusion of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 645. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 481), as amended;

S. 646. A bill to provide for the advancement of Capt. Edward Macauley, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of rear admiral; and

S. 647. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the State of Rhode Island, for highway purposes only, a strip of land within the Naval Advance Base Depot at North Kingstown, R. I.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 648. A bill to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor," approved June 7, 1924; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. SCRUGHAM):

S. 649. A bill to continue existing gold reserve ratios required to be maintained against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation and Federal Reserve bank deposits by increasing the monetary value of gold; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 650. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 651. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Wilbur Keiser; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2122) to extend to 6 months after the termination of hostilities the period during which females may be employed in the District of Columbia for more than 8 hours a day, or 48 hours a week, under temporary permits, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

POLICY OF MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN BILLS—CHANGES OF REFERENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, there are numerous bills introduced at every session of the Congress dealing with persons who have served in the armed forces of the United States which, under the custom of the Senate, have been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. These bills for the most part are for the purpose of correcting military records of the individuals concerned so as to give them a pensionable status. The Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, at a meeting today, decided it would be a better policy for such bills to be hereafter considered by the Committee on Pensions, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the following bills and that they be referred to the Committee on Pensions:

S. 260. A bill for the relief of Robert H. Wilder;

S. 262. A bill for the relief of William D. Ellison;

S. 265. A bill for the relief of Hector H. Perry;

S. 266. A bill for the relief of William H. Rouncevill;

S. 327. A bill to place John P. Shaffer on the emergency officers' retired list, and for other purposes;

S. 398. A bill for the relief of Joseph Kenney;

S. 444. A bill to reinstate Walter C. Smith with the rank of first lieutenant and to authorize his retirement;

S. 457. A bill to place John P. Shaffer on the emergency officers' retired list, and for other purposes;

S. 471. A bill for the relief of Samuel F. Howard; and

S. 568. A bill for the relief of John M. Grady.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the changes of reference will be made as requested by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the following bills and that they be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. 369. A bill to amend certain provisions of law relating to overtime pay, and for other purposes; and

S. 370. A bill relating to the hours of employment, compensation, and conditions of employment of employees engaged in interstate commerce or the production of goods for such commerce or employed in the performance of any Government contract.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the changes of reference will be made as requested by the Senator from Utah.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TYDINGS submitted an amendment and Mr. LANGER and Mr. TAFT each submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

THE MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY BILL—EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Where the Shoe Pinches," discussing the reference of the bill providing for a Missouri Valley Authority to the Commerce Committee, published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of February 24, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BRETTON WOODS MONETARY CONFERENCE—SUMMARY REPORT BY GEORGE H. E. SMITH

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a summary report on the Bretton Woods Monetary Conference, prepared by George H. E. Smith, research assistant to the minority leader, which appears in the Appendix.]

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—ARTICLE BY JUDSON KING

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Whither R. E. A.," written by Judson King and published in the March 1, 1945, issue of Public Utilities, which appears in the Appendix.]

REGULATION OF THE BUSINESS OF INSURANCE—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 340) to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Overton
Bailey	Hart	Pepper
Ball	Hatch	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hawkes	Reed
Barkley	Hayden	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Brewster	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Butler	Kilgore	Taft
Byrd	La Follette	Taylor
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Cordon	McMahon	Tydings
Donnell	Maybank	Vandenberg
Downey	Mead	Wagner
Eastland	Millikin	Walsh
Ellender	Moore	Wheeler
Ferguson	Morse	Wherry
Fulbright	Murdock	White
George	Murray	Wiley
Gerry	Myers	Willis
Green	O'Daniel	Wilson
Guffey	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a delegate to the International Conference in Mexico and therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on official business as a delegate to the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report on Senate bill 340, the so-called insurance bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] desired to be heard, and gave notice of his desire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is present. Does the Senator from Florida desire to be heard?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, Mr. President.

SERVICE OF 18-YEAR OLD BOYS AT THE FRONT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield. Does the Senator wish to make a statement?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. It would take me about 10 minutes. I am afraid the Senator from Florida had better proceed. I will wait, unless the Senator will yield for 10 minutes.

Mr. PEPPER. It would be a convenience to me if the Senator from Ohio were to proceed, because I have some material I wanted to look at.

Mr. TAFT. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Florida I will proceed.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, my attention has been called by many of my constituents to instances in which 18-year-old boys have been sent to the front with only 3 months' basic training, and have been killed or wounded within 7 months of the time when they were inducted into the Army. When the first draft bill was passed, the statement was made that men could not be trained short of 15 months. Congress finally enacted legislation based on the theory that 12 months was the proper period. When the age was lowered to 18 in 1942 the Senate adopted an amendment providing expressly that persons under 20 years of age should not be placed in actual combat duty outside the United States until after they had 1 year's military training. This amendment was eliminated in conference on the earnest plea "that the complicated administration necessarily involved in the handling of large numbers of men by the Army" made it important not to impose any express limitation—see letter from the President to Senator GURNEY, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 23, 1942, page 8582. When the conference report came up in the Senate I asked the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who was in charge of the bill, whether any assurance had been received from the Army that proper training would be given. The Senator said the committee had received assurances that the inductees would receive every bit of training that was necessary for them to have before they went into combat service, and that "the very great majority of those who go into front-line combat will have 12 months' training as they have had in the past."

The War Department adopted the policy that boys would not be sent abroad until they were 19 years of age, and as late as June 7, 1944, Lieutenant General McNarney stated before the Senate committee that no young man under 19 years of age assigned to the Infantry would be sent overseas. That policy later was revised to include also men assigned to our armored forces. But on December 7 Secretary Patterson issued a statement in which he said that urgent military requirements had necessitated revision of this policy, and added:

> This change in the replacement system has brought no relaxation in the thoroughness of preparatory combat training. In general a minimum of approximately 8 months elapses between an individual's induction and his assignment under the replacement system to an active sector of the front. No individual is committed to combat until adequate individual tests and physical examinations have confirmed the state of his training and his fitness for the hardships of battle.

Thus we see that the Army has steadily whittled away its statements of policy which a large number of parents in this country regarded as definite promises. It is quite true that the wording was never an absolute promise, but, nevertheless, it did state what the Army presumably thought was wise policy.

I have now heard of numerous cases of boys sent into active combat after 7 months in the Army and without the vestige of any training except the basic 13 weeks. As a particular instance I cite the case of Pvt. Robert R. Pogue, of Cincinnati, who was inducted the end of June, only a few days after his 18th birthday, left for a port of embarkation Christmas night and was killed in France on February 3.

Mr. President, I talked with a man who went from England to Le Havre on a boat which carried 1,500 replacements, two-thirds of whom were 18 years old, and all of whom were being sent direct from Le Havre to combat divisions at the front.

I have before me a stack of telegrams and letters from all over the United States setting forth instances of boys 18 years old who have been sent abroad within 6 months of the time they were inducted, and frequently sent immediately to the front, without any adequate training with units and even without any experience with units before they were actually put at the front.

As far as I can find out, the practice now is to give these boys 13 weeks of basic training and then ship them directly to the front. It seems to me that this practice is not only a violation of the Army's own principles, but is grossly unfair to the boys involved. They apparently have had no training with any unit until that unit is under fire. They are not able to take care of themselves as they should be. It is inconceivable that they can be of any great value to the unit which they join.

Mr. President, I have talked with men who served in the World War who have said that young boys who were sent to serve with a company in the middle of a fight were more of a hindrance to the company than they were of any actual advantage.

The impression given by Secretary Patterson's statement in December was to the effect that they would receive additional training with some unit abroad before being sent to the front, but from the large number of casualties among boys of 18 I do not believe that this is being done.

I believe the policy should be immediately revised. No boy less than 19 years of age with less than 8 months training should be placed in active combat.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Has any statement been made by the Army that there are in this country no trained men who have been in the service longer than 8 months, and who are available for combat duty?

Mr. TAFT. I think the last statement made by the Army was Secretary Patterson's statement of December 7, to which I referred, which was to the effect that conditions had changed so that they could no longer adhere to the rule they had formerly adopted of not sending men overseas before they were 19, for various reasons which Secretary Patterson set forth in his statement of December 7. But the clear implication that I received from that statement was that there shall be a minimum of approximately 8 months elapsing between induction and assignment to active service at the front, which means 3 months' training at home, and then being sent promptly abroad they would have at least 3 months of training abroad. He did not say so expressly, but I think that is the impression that is to be gained from his statement.

Mr. WALSH. I do not think anything would satisfy the parents of these boys, unless there is the assertion that there are no other troops available, and that we have reached such a stage in the war that it is necessary to take these boys almost as soon as they are inducted into the Army. The general public does not believe that situation exists. If such a situation does exist it ought to be stated because complaints against sending these youths into combat without longer periods of training are numerous and bitter.

Mr. TAFT. I may be wrong, but I do not think it has been claimed that that situation does exist. Also investigation may show that there is some training given abroad. But certainly the cases I have heard of—and I have a long list of boys killed or wounded within 30 days from the time they left our shores—would seem to indicate that they are not being trained abroad to any extent whatever.

Mr. WALSH. We have all received similar letters. Let me say to the Senator that he has taken up a matter which is very close to the hearts of the American people, and I find that there is much resentment, not only among parents of boys who have been sent overseas after a short period of training, and who have been wounded or killed, but among all the people in the communities where these youths have resided. Something ought to be done to relieve the situation, or to make clear to the American people that no other soldiers are available except these youths. I do not believe that is the fact, however. The Senator's

service in calling attention to this matter is most commendable.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. May I ask the Senator from Ohio first, before I make any statement at all, whether he has seen the letter which has become a public letter, written to JAMES W. WADSWORTH, of the House of Representatives, on January 17, 1945.

Mr. TAFT. No; I have not seen that letter.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The letter is from W. W. Irvine, Brigadier General, G. S. C., Acting Assistant Chief of Staff. The letter, Mr. President, deals with the subject the Senator from Ohio has mentioned. I therefore ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, why can we not have the letter read for the benefit of all Senators?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I would rather have the letter read, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the reading of the letter? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 17, 1945.

Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WADSWORTH: In the absence of Maj. Gen. Ray E. Porter, to whom your letter of January 11 is addressed, I shall present the views and policies of the War Department concerning the training and overseas assignment of replacements, with particular reference to the points emphasized by Mr. Marvin in his letter to you.

Your constituent makes four major points. In summary, these involve: (1) the short period of time elapsing between the induction of young men and their becoming casualties; (2) the commitment of the 18-year-old group to battle prior to similar commitment of older men who have been in service for several years; (3) the inadequacy of a 17 weeks' training period for replacements, when compared with the full year of training advocated by the Army for peacetime; and (4) the inference that young men with 17 weeks' training in the United States plus a very short period of overseas training are being organized into units and then, as units, sent into battle.

In the early stages of mobilization, we were able to afford inductees additional training in units after they had completed their basic and specialist training. As mobilization and deployment have progressed, however, our requirements for men to fill new units has steadily decreased until, as the matter now stands, our great need is for replacements to fill ranks depleted by combat. The bulk of these replacements must be trained as infantry, since infantry suffers the heaviest losses in battle. As stated by Mr. Marvin, replacements are normally given basic and specialist training for 17 weeks. This period, followed by a short furlough, processing, and travel to his overseas destination, may result in the arrival of a soldier in a theater of operations within 6 months after the date of his induction. How soon thereafter he enters combat as a replacement in a trained unit depends upon the demands for his services. Obviously, considering the numbers engaged, there will be casualties among replacements who have had only 6 months' service.

With regard to Mr. Marvin's statement that "some even not yet graduated from high school" are among those becoming casualties within 6 months after induction, I know you are aware that the War Department has made every effort consistent with the successful prosecution of the war to hold to a minimum the number of 18-year-olds entering combat. Following are extracts of War Department policy in this respect:

"Men less than 19 years of age who have had less than 6 months' training and pre-Pearl Harbor fathers who have had less than 6 months' training will be used as overseas replacements only after all other replacement resources have been exhausted." (Revision of February 28, 1944.)

"In selecting replacements for shipment overseas, the following order of priority will be observed:

"(1) Those who have attained the age 19 and are not pre-Pearl Harbor fathers.

"(2) Those pre-Pearl Harbor fathers who have attained age 19.

"(3) Those who have not attained age 19.

"No infantry or armored replacements will be shipped overseas until they have attained age 19." (Revision of June 24, 1944.)

The foregoing policies were rigorously observed and were continued until their further observance became impossible for military reasons. These reasons were our urgent needs for infantry and armored replacements, needs which developed in early fall of last year and could not be deferred without serious effects on our operations overseas. The Under Secretary of War in a statement to the press on December 7, 1944, clarified the War Department position in this respect. A copy of the press release is enclosed.

Mr. Marvin's second point is that at present young men are getting into the front line sooner than older men who have been in service several years. The bulk of the men now being received from selective service are in the 18- and 19-year-old group. Initially only individuals between the ages of 21 and 38 were inducted, and this age group furnished sufficient personnel to provide the military forces required by our early plans. As the military situation developed, it became apparent that there were not enough men in the older group with the necessary physical stamina to meet requirements fully. It therefore became necessary to draw inductees from a lower-age bracket. As a result, the age limit was lowered to include the 18-year-old group. Since this group had not been previously inducted, a high proportion of these individuals was obtained in the months that followed.

Thereafter every effort was made to give young men all possible training before committing them to combat. Divisions not scheduled for early movement overseas were stripped of older men and younger men assigned in their places. With the shift of the bulk of our Army overseas, this process had to be curtailed in mid-1944.

In February 1944 the policy was adopted of not sending men under 19 years of age as replacements for infantry and armored units as long as others were obtainable. This further stiffened in June to bar the sending of any such men. This policy was adhered to as long as military operations permitted. In December 1944, the Army announced a change in policy which permitted the 18-year-old soldier to be sent overseas. This was only one of the actions taken to meet the situation. Another was the withdrawing of some 95,000 physically fit and older men from the Army Air Forces and Army Service Forces for retraining as infantry. The process is in effect overseas as well as in the United States. Overseas commanders are kept fully informed of the amount of training each individual has had before leaving the United States.

The third point under consideration is the adequacy of our replacement training period. Originally, as you know, the replacement training period was 13 weeks. After some time, however, we found it was possible to meet our needs and at the same time increase to 17 weeks this training period. This was continued until very recently when our replacement demand became so urgent as to require the reduction of the training period to 15 weeks. Carefully worked out training tests and battle experience have demonstrated that the average soldier in 13 to 17 weeks can be brought to a training level that permits him to fill a vacancy in a trained team. In contrasting the training of units and of replacements, however, it should be understood that a replacement joins a trained organization. He performs acceptably well, and learns quickly in combat. He is flanked by men who are experienced. He follows their lead and is guided by their advice.

Mr. Marvin makes a comparison between the training of replacements and the 1-year training period which the Army advocates for peacetime. It is considered that the two are not comparable. It is important to realize that the year's training covers the period necessary for both individual training and the team training and development of leadership required to build such organizations as regiments or divisions. On the other hand, the replacement joins a unit made up of experienced soldiers and benefits from their knowledge and skill for his final training on the job. You will recall that General Marshall explained in the attached letter to you in 1942 the marked disparity between unit training and the training required for replacements.

Lastly, Mr. Marvin infers that replacements with little overseas training are being sent into battle as units. This is not correct. As explained above, replacements are not formed into new units, but are infiltrated into trained, and for the most part, battle-seasoned organizations.

The War Department appreciates your interest and if further details are desired, I will be happy to discuss the matter at your convenience.

Faithfully yours,

W. W. IRVINE,
Brigadier General, General Staff Corps, Acting Assistant Chief of Staff, G–3.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in further reference to the subject which has been discussed, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some testimony appearing on page 349 of the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs in connection with the mobilization of civilian manpower. Let me say that on February 15 the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] asked several questions of General Handy. Those questions and the answers to them go very fully into the matter under discussion. I may say that I know the situation has caused great concern to the chairman of the committee, and I know that he went over it with all the officers who appeared at the committee hearings. I think the statement of General Handy could be used in further explanation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator HILL. I would like to ask the general a question on the record.

Those men here in the United States who are being trained for overseas, what will be the average time that a man will stay here if he is going over as an individual replacement, and what will be the average time he will stay here if he is going with a unit?

General HANDY. On the individuals, for the ground forces, we count over-all that from the

time we induct a man it will be at least 6 months before he is available on the front, actually in battle.

Now, to answer your specific question, for the ground force replacement, the actual training period is 15 weeks. We recently cut it down from 17. We had 13 weeks originally and were able to work it up to 17, and then, due to the fact in January we had some heavy calls we had to meet, we reduced it to 15 weeks. The man must be inducted and go through processing and then he has 15 weeks training, and some take longer than that.

Senator HILL. Those who do not show themselves proficient are turned back.

General HANDY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. This comes to us very often, General. Will you explain why the exceptions are made and how it happens that a man almost as soon as he is inducted is rushed over because he belongs to a certain unit and fills a place in it?

General HANDY. Those cases that have gone over rather quickly are Infantry replacements. That has been the big difficulty, and 90 percent of our ground losses have been in the Infantry, and they have had to be replaced quickly and by young men. These young men are the ones who are suitable and the only ones who can stand the gaff. I imagine some men have been gotten over there in less than 6 months, but the average time I would say would be at least 6 months before we get a man to the front.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

I cannot add much to what General Irvine has said or to the statement the Senator from South Carolina has had inserted in the RECORD. Of course, it is unfortunate that we have reached such a point in the war that at times it is necessary to use men who have not had all the training they should have had. If Senators will keep in mind what replacement means in the Army, I think they will realize that no matter how well a plan may be made there will be exceptions to it. Not only must there be replacements of individuals in a given unit but there must also be replacement of units by other units. In that way individual soldiers find themselves in a unit of which they become so much a part of the team or group that to remove them would be fatal to the efficient operation of the unit and would be contrary to the best tactics and the most efficient way of conducting the operations of the Army.

I know it goes without saying that the Senate was most loath to adopt the amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act which reduced the age of selectees from 20 to 18 years. We had long hearings with regard to that matter. We were told, as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has stated, that, of course the aim would always be to give all the training which could be given before the men entered actual combat. Such training will always be desired by all right-thinking officers, because it will mean a better army and a better chance for success.

The things which have been done have been done because of the necessities of the situation. Sad to relate, due to the way the war is going, probably there will be many more occasions when it will be necessary to depart from the ordinary method of procedure. The Senator from Massachusetts stated that, of course, we cannot ever satisfy the parents. I do not know whether there is ever a satisfactory explanation for any losses in war, except, perhaps, those for which soldiers are honored or losses incident to the cause they serve when they offer themselves for their country and make the supreme sacrifice. Everyone knows that if officers of the Army or Navy were derelict in their duty and were not thoughtful of the welfare of the men under them, such officers would immediately be removed. Although the present war is the most terrible of all wars which have ever been fought, undoubtedly it can be said without fear of contradiction that in the present war the officers are more thoughtful of the welfare of their men than officers have ever been able to be in any other war. I think that statement should be made, and that we should have that much of an understanding. I am sure the Senator from Ohio has that understanding, and I am confident that there is no need for me to inform him of that situation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, nothing which has been read or said denies the facts I stated. Today the facts are that soldiers who are inducted at 18 years of age are given 13 or 15 weeks' training immediately following their induction and then are shipped abroad as soon as they can be shipped, and as soon as they are abroad they are assigned to units which are engaged in combat at the front. Nothing which has been said denies that that is the case.

I think such a policy is wholly without justification. It seems to me that a unit with 90 men in it is no better off by having 10 new men who know nothing about combat sent to it as replacements. I think the new men should have a period of 2 or 3 months in training behind the lines until they are familiar with the operations of their unit and until they know what they are supposed to do.

I cannot conceive that our country, with 10,000,000 men in the Army, is unable to provide other men for replacements. However, if it is not able to do so, I think the various units are better off if they do not have new and comparatively untrained men sent to them as replacements when they are actually engaged in combat. Of course, the Army says it is not using such new men to make up entire units, but is using them simply as replacements in units previously formed.

I hold in my hand some 10 or 20 telegrams and letters which cite specific cases of men who have been assigned to combat duty after less than 7 months in the Army. I think that is in violation of the policy suggested by Secretary Patterson, and I think the Army should immediately revise it. If it is necessary to send them abroad so soon, very well; but I think that to send them into combat when they have had so little training is most unfair to the men, does no good to the Army, and certainly is in violation of the principles laid down by the Senate, at least, when it revised the Selective Training and Service Act. I think the Army could revise that policy and still exercise due care, and I very much hope the Army will do so.

REGULATION OF THE BUSINESS OF INSURANCE—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 340) to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate, but I desire to speak briefly about the pending conference report on the insurance bill, and there will have to be a vote upon it. So I suggest the absence of a quorum. Perhaps the roll can be called quickly, but I wish to have as many Senators as possible present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Overton
Bailey	Hart	Pepper
Ball	Hatch	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hawkes	Reed
Barkley	Hayden	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Brewster	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Butler	Kilgore	Taft
Byrd	La Follette	Taylor
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Cordon	McMahon	Tydings
Donnell	Maybank	Vandenberg
Downey	Mead	Wagner
Eastland	Millikin	Walsh
Ellender	Moore	Wheeler
Ferguson	Morse	Wherry
Fulbright	Murdock	White
George	Murray	Wiley
Gerry	Myers	Willis
Green	O'Daniel	Wilson
Guffey	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate for only a few minutes, I promise not to trespass unreasonably upon its patience.

We all know that last June, in the Southeastern Underwriters case, the Supreme Court of the United States held that the insurance business came within the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution, and that therefore the Clayton Act and the Sherman Antitrust Act were applicable to such business.

Mr. President, an effort was made by Senators and Representatives while this case was pending in the Supreme Court to enact legislation which would have explicitly exempted the insurance business from the applicability of the Sherman and Clayton Acts. However, the legislation which had been submitted was not adopted by the Senate, although, I believe, it was adopted by the House. After the decision of the Supreme Court holding that insurance is interstate commerce within the meaning of the commerce clause of the Constitution, legislation has been initiated in both Houses

of the Congress to affect in one way or another the Supreme Court's decision. I feel that the adoption of the conference report which embodies such legislation would have the effect of emasculating the Supreme Court's decision, and holding by congressional action that the Sherman and the Clayton Acts do not apply for all practical purposes to the business of insurance. That is the exact point to which I wish to address myself.

The exact language to which I wish to direct criticism appears in section 2 (b) of the conference report now lying on the desks of Senators, and reading as follows:

Provided, That after January 1, 1948, the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, and the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, shall be applicable to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by State law.

I am not complaining about any other provision of the conference report. In other sections of the conference report it is provided that the States shall have the power to regulate and tax the business of insurance. I am not complaining about that. In another part of the conference report it is provided that there shall be an unqualified moratorium on the applicability of the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act to the business of insurance until January 1, 1948. In other words, none of those four Federal acts would be applicable to the business of insurance until January 1, 1948. That would be a longer moratorium than the President, in two letters to which I will refer, indicated he would prefer, but I am not complaining even about a 3-year moratorium. There is considerable justification for the States being given an opportunity to modify their laws respecting the insurance business so that they shall not be in conflict with the four Federal acts enumerated in the provision to which I have referred. But I do object, Mr. President—and I believe the Senate, when it reflects upon the matter, will object—to the provision which I read providing that for all future time the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act shall not apply to the business of insurance except in a State which has not regulated the insurance business or to the extent a State has not denied the effect of such Federal acts.

Mr. President, if that language had contained the limitation that the State regulation, in order to be valid, must not be inconsistent with the Clayton Act or the Sherman Act, I should have no objection to it. But under the language which I have read, and to which I am addressing my criticism, namely, that the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act shall be applicable to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by State law, the State would be given the right to determine when, whether, and to what degree those three acts were applicable to the business of insurance. The various States, without any limitation upon their power, or without any requirement that State regulation shall not be inconsistent with the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act——

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator undoubtedly recognizes the fact that the Congress of the United States would not attempt to tell a State how and upon what subject it should legislate. The Senator will agree with that statement, will he not?

Mr. PEPPER. On the contrary, Mr. President, I may say that I am not willing to leave the applicability and the effectiveness of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act to the decision of a State legislature. By doing so the Congress would be abrogating its power with respect to the subject exclusively to the several legislatures, that is, if we pass this law without imposing any limitation upon the States in the exercise of their regulatory power that it must be not inconsistent with the Clayton Act or the Sherman Act.

Mr. McCARRAN. Under the provisions of the section in the conference report to which the Senator addresses himself, the States are advised and warned that they have a moratorium of 3 years during which they may bring themselves into compliance by way of regulation. If at the end of the 3 years they have not brought themselves into compliance, if they have not regulated the business of insurance, then they must take the consequences because after that period is over the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act and the other acts become immediately again in force as regards the business of insurance. That is all there is to that provision.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I realize that, but will the Senator tell the Senate if I am not correct in saying that under the conference report provision to which I referred the States can regulate the business of insurance in a way inconsistent with the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act.

Mr. McCARRAN. If they do it, they do it at their own hazard.

Mr. PEPPER. What does the Senator mean by "their own hazard"?

Mr. McCARRAN. Congress has always the power over interstate commerce.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator means we may change the law.

Mr. McCARRAN. The States cannot take the Congress out of a position where it can regulate interstate commerce.

Mr. PEPPER. We have taken ourselves out of that position in this case.

Mr. McCARRAN. We have done so for 10 years.

Mr. PEPPER. Oh, no; that is a question of fact. What I want to say—and I should like to have the Senator address himself to this point—is that when this bill passed the Senate it contained an absolute 3-year moratorium; when it passed the House it contained a 3-year moratorium, and there was nothing in it which suggested the language to which I now object—and I should like to make this very clear:

Provided, That after January 1, 1948, the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, and the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, shall be applicable to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by State law.

That is new language, which was put in by the conference committee. It did not appear in the Senate bill; it did not appear in the House bill, and were it not for our broad interpretation of the power of conferees when the text of a Senate bill is stricken out and an entirely new bill inserted by the other House conferees may practically rewrite a bill, that provision would be outside the scope of the authority of the conferees.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator the language which he has just read to the Senate was put in by the conferees within the scope of their authority, and if it did anything it made more airtight the very provision the Senate had passed in the first instance and which the House had also passed.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I respectfully disagree with my able friend, and I should like to state why. Here is the language of the Senate bill as passed by the Senate:

That the Congress hereby declares that the continued regulation and taxation by the several States of the business of insurance is in the public interest, and that silence on the part of the Congress shall not be construed to impose any barrier to the regulation or taxation of such business by the several States.

Then the Senate bill went on to provide:

No act of Congress, except • • • the Sherman Act and/or the Clayton Act shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State or for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance.

Then it proceeds further:

Nothing contained in the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, or the act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, shall apply to the business of insurance.

Then it goes on to provide a 3-year flat moratorium.

But, Mr. President, nowhere in the Senate bill and nowhere in the House bill is there any authority to the States to prevent the applicability of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act after 3 years to the business of insurance in the States. That is the vice of the provision to which I am now referring.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will permit me to proceed for a few moments, then I will yield.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to read two letters from the President to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] affecting this subject, which will point out the distinction I am trying to make in what I have to say. On the 10th of June in response to a letter from the able Senator from Maryland to him, as appears

on page 482 of the RECORD of January 25 of this year, the President replied to the able Senator from Maryland as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR RADCLIFFE: I have your letter of June 6 with respect to the recent decision of the Supreme Court deciding that insurance comes under the provisions of the Sherman Act. You suggest that this would probably mean supervision by the Federal Government.

The Attorney General advises me that he does not believe that this alternative is inevitable or even probable. He tells me that there is nothing in the decision which prevents the regulation by the States of insurance rates as long as that regulation does not interfere with the provisions of the Sherman Act.

As long as that regulation does not interfere with the Sherman Act.

Personally, I know of no effort at this time to bring insurance companies under over-all Federal regulation. Whether or not such control were adopted would depend, I think, very much on the attitude of the companies themselves in complying with the provisions of the Sherman Act.

The Attorney General assures me that he is anxious that the insurance companies and the State insurance officials shall have a reasonable time within which to conform their practices and statutes to the decision of the Supreme Court.

With best regards, always,

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The President said there that he was in favor of a moratorium to give the States time to do what? To bring their laws into conformity with the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act.

The second letter from the President dated January 2, 1945—the other letter was dated June 10, 1944—and addressed like the first letter, to the able Senator from Maryland, is as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR RADCLIFFE: In your letter of December 20, you suggest that there should be some form of a moratorium during which insurance companies will have an opportunity to readjust their practices in order to bring them into conformity with the Supreme Court decision in the Southeastern Underwriters Association case, and during which legislation might be enacted. The Attorney General advises me that several months ago he told the Senate Judiciary Committee that no new antitrust prosecutions against insurance companies would be instituted during a reasonable readjustment period.

The responsibility for the regulation of the business of insurance has been left with the States; and I can assure you that this administration is not sponsoring Federal legislation to regulate insurance or to interfere with the continued regulation and taxation by the States of the business of insurance.

I call the attention of Senators to this sentence:

But there is no conflict between the application of the antitrust laws and effective State regulation of insurance companies, and there is no valid reason for giving any special exemption from the antitrust laws to the business of insurance. The antitrust laws prohibit private rate fixing arrangements between insurance companies and acts of boycott, coercion, or intimidation. The antitrust laws do not conflict with affirmative regulation of insurance by the States such as agreed insurance rates if they are affirmatively approved by State officials.

Senator O'MAHONEY introduced a bill in the last Congress which would have provided for a moratorium from the Sherman Act, except for acts of boycott, coercion, or intimidation, until March 1, 1946. This would appear to give sufficient time to permit the necessary readjustment to the Supreme Court decision. I would favor legislation of this general character. It would permit the orderly correction of abuses which have existed in the insurance business and would preserve the right of the States to regulate with full responsibility.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. President, those two letters indicate the point that I am trying to make at the present time, namely, that the President thought that it was proper to give the insurance companies time to readjust to the decision of the Supreme Court and to give the States time to adjust their laws so that they would be in conformity with the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. The President never contemplated and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in the bill he introduced, as I understood his able address, never contemplated that the regulation by the States should be so broad in character that it could be in conflict with and in limitation of the provisions of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act.

The Senate, when it passed this bill, provided for a moratorium, which is all right. It was longer than the President seemed to indicate, but no one raised any question about the moratorium being 3 years. The House carried the same provision and provided a 3-year moratorium, and I am not complaining about that, and if the conferees had not changed the provisions of the Senate bill and the House bill, but had put in everything they have in this conference report, leaving 3 years as the absolute moratorium during which these laws could not apply, I should be willing to accede to that. But the language to which I object is the language which I read in the conference report, which carries, not a 3-year moratorium, but a perpetual moratorium. This is the language to which I object:

Provided, That after January 1, 1948, the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, and the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, shall be applicable to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by State law.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will allow me another minute, I shall lay a predicate I should like to have him discuss, if he would like to do so.

This is my contention, that under that provision we have given to the States the power to preempt the field covered at the present time by the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. If the States move into that field, if they occupy that territory, that, by the provisions of this report, makes the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act inapplicable to that extent. This is the way it would work out, in violation of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. The vice I complain of in the case which eventually reached the Supreme Court, and was decided by the Supreme Court, was the practice of the insurance companies in the Southeastern States of getting together in what they called rate bureaus. They come together and, for all practical purposes, it was charged in the indictments, they fixed rates in all the Southern States of this country, one of which happens to be my State.

What was the effect of that policy? From the decision of the Supreme Court itself I have it—and I am reading from the language of the Supreme Court on page 542, of Three hundred and twenty-second United States:

During the period 1931–41 a total of $183,000,000 in premiums were collected by local agents in the six States, most of which was transmitted to home offices in other States; while during the same period—

Ten years—

$215,000,000 in losses was paid by checks or drafts sent from the home offices to the companies' local agents for delivery to the policyholders.

That means that in those Southern States affected by the decision, in a 10-year period, these stock fire-insurance companies collected in premiums $488,000,000 and paid out $215,000,000.

Mr. President, in my State of Florida—and these figures are furnished me by the Department of Justice—in the period from 1931 to 1940 these stock fire companies received in net premiums written $89,191,740. The losses paid in Florida in the same period of 10 years were $30,215,253; that is, $89,000,000 premiums received in 10 years in Florida, and $30,000,000 paid in losses, nearly three times as much received in premiums during the 10-year period in that one State by that particular group of companies covered by the indictment; and that was not all the companies doing business in the South during that time.

Mr. President, I am not an insurance man, and perhaps that sum is a reserve which should be created, but it seems to me that the vice in price fixing is there well illustrated, the vice of people who fix prices gouging excessive profits out of the people who pay the premiums. That is what they have been doing. They were indicted in the Southeastern Underwriters' case, and it was held that even if all these things charged were committed, nevertheless insurance was not commerce, and the Sherman Act and Clayton Act could not apply anyway.

In a monumental opinion that was written by Mr. Justice Black, the Supreme Court held that the insurance business as carried on at the present time is commerce within the meaning of the Federal Constitution, and therefore that the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act are applicable to that business, as they are applicable to all other businesses. They should be applicable to that business as to all other businesses. What right is there in an insurance company, per se, to have some sanctuary behind some immunity by which it may fix prices, may squeeze out a competitor, may commit monopoly, may combine with others in restraint of trade, and do all the other things prohibited by the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, and

yet not be amenable to the law as all other business is? Yet, after the Supreme Court has made that monumental decision, I have very deep concern, Mr. President, and I believe the language of this conference report to which I have adverted bears it out, that a State could provide by statute that insurance companies may belong to a rating bureau, as they have been having one, and that that rating bureau may continue to fix rates, as they have been fixing rates, and the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act would not have any applicability against that offense they might attempt to commit.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield first to the Senator from Wyoming, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I sympathize very deeply with the concern which the Senator from Florida has expressed this morning lest anything should be done by the Congress which would enable private abuses to continue in the insurance field. I am convinced, however, that the apprehensions which the Senator states with respect to this conference report are not well founded.

I wish to call the Senator's attention to the Supreme Court decision in the case of Parker against Brown, reported in 317 United States Reports at page 341. Reading from page 350, I find this language:

> Section 1 of the Sherman Act (15 U. S. C., sec. 1) makes unlawful "every contract, combination * * * or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States." And section 2 (15 U. S. C., sec. 2) makes it unlawful to monopolize, or attempt to monopolize, or combine or conspire with any other person or persons, to monopolize any part of the trade or commerce among the several States." We may assume for present purposes that the California prorate program—
>
> Which was an agricultural program—
>
> would violate the Sherman Act if it were organized and made effective solely by virtue of a contract, combination or conspiracy of private persons, individual or corporate.

I take it that the Senator is apprehensive lest a statute passed by a State attempting to give validity to a private agreement to regulate would be recognized under this language. I think it would not, because on page 351 of the same case, Parker against Brown, I find this language from the Supreme Court:

> True, a State does not give immunity to those who violate the Sherman Act by authorizing them to violate it, or by declaring that their action is lawful (*Northern Securities Co.* v. *United States*, 193 U. S. 197, 332, 344-347).

Therefore I have no doubt in my own mind that no State, under the terms of the conference report, could give authority to violate the Sherman antitrust law. But we have this field in which definitions may be a little bit difficult and vague.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will permit me on that point——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator allow me to conclude?

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There has never been any doubt, so far as I have been able to discern, among those who have been taking the position which the Senator from Florida has taken on this insurance bill, that private agreements by which these rates were enforced were violations and are violations of the antitrust laws. There is nothing in the conference report that relieves insurance companies from the prohibition of the antitrust law, because there has been written back into the bill language which was taken out by the House which would have exempted agreements from the prohibition of the antitrust law. Therefore any attempt by a small group of insurance companies to enter into an agreement by which they would penalize any person or any business which was attempting to do business in the insurance field in a way that was disapproved by them, would be absolutely prohibited by this provision.

Mr. PEPPER. Let me reply to the able Senator. In the first place let me say that he and the able Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], who is on the Senate floor, have been perfectly splendid in their efforts to keep the United States Supreme Court decision from being emasculated by legislation. But may I address myself to the point which the Senator from Wyoming has made? The Senator cited the Parker against Brown case, which was a case where a State approved of apportionment of the field, and the question was whether or not these companies which complied with that State decision were guilty of violating the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act, and it was held that where the State approved by law what they did, that that was all right, or rather where the State itself determined that that was the thing to do, the companies were not violating the law.

But here is the difference between that case and what we are considering. That was a case which did not involve a Federal statute containing the language which I object to in the conference report, namely, that the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act shall be applicable to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by State law. If the States regulate or legislate on the subject by saying that it is all right for insurance companies to belong to a rating bureau, and it is all right for the companies, through that rating bureau, to fix rates, then is not that State legislation on the subject? Is not that State regulation of the companies? Then it is not a question of whether that would give immunity against a Federal prosecution to those favorably affected by that regulation. It is a question of whether, under the language of the proposed statute which is embodied in the conference report, we do not by legislation legitimize any such regulation or any such legislation as that.

I admit I would be satisfied with the applicability of the Parker against Brown case, I will say to the Senator, if it were not for this language to which I am addressing myself. If only the rest of the language of the original bill were in there, and they were only given the right to regulate as they are given the right to do in the first part of this bill, then I am confident that the courts would hold that if they tried to legitimize a private agreement which per se violated the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act, that that would not be called regulation so as to protect them from prosecution.

But if we say—which we do say by the language, in my humble opinion—that if they preempt this field by regulating it by State legislation, then the Federal act shall not apply; there is not anything to prosecute. There is not any juridical question that is raised. We have then given them carte blanche to legislate on anything they want to, and have said that if they regulate, then we withdraw from the field to the extent that they have covered it, and if we legitimize a rate they have fixed in practice can anybody deny that they have covered the subject, that they have regulated the field, and that they have occupied the domain? If they have, then we have by our own act provided that the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act shall not have any effect in a case of that sort.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator in speaking of the language of the report indicates that it would permit absolute preemption of the field by the State, so far as regulation of insurance is concerned; that it would allow a State to repeal all its insurance laws and give carte blanche to insurance companies.

Mr. PEPPER. A State has the right, without any legislation, to regulate anything pertaining to the insurance business, and to the extent that it regulates it has legitimized in its regulations so far as these Federal acts are concerned, and by the proposed legislation we would give them the right to go as far toward cutting down or toward emasculating the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act as they choose to go. The able Senator from Utah in his argument concerning the legislative history of the bill on the 25th of January pointed out time after time that even the original bill to a considerable extent gave that authority, and then when there was some clarification of that in section 2 by the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to make the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act particularly applicable, then they came right back in the conference—no doubt unintentionally, but they came right back in the conference and in my opinion gave the States the right to do anything they wanted to do relative to regulation without any limitation that it must not be an encroachment upon the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator will permit, let us look at the legislative history. The Senate bill, after the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was included, made the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act applicable regardless of what the several States might do, except during the moratorium. When the bill went to the House that

language, the amendment of Senator FERGUSON, was stricken out entirely. The conference report is a compromise certainly between the position taken by the Senator from Florida and the position taken by, let us say, the proponents of the Bailey bill. But certainly the language here is sufficient, and if I did not think so I would not support the measure to protect Congress in any future action it might take in the event of failure by the respective States to adequately regulate the business of insurance. The language I refer to reads as follows:

Shall be applicable—

Referring to the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act—

to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by State law.

Does the Senator take the position that the States could absolutely repeal all their insurance laws and still be regulating insurance?

Mr. PEPPER. Well, if they repeal the laws and had no regulation, of course, that would not be regulation.

Mr. MURDOCK. That would not be regulation. If the Senator will permit me, let us take the next step. Let us say that they do regulate, but that their regulations were in conflict with the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act or permitted actions or activities violative of those acts. Would the Senator say that by reason of the fact that they had so regulated, such regulation removed the insurance business in that State from the application of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator were to read on paper what he has just asked me, he would see that in his hypothesis he assumes that the State regulation was not in conflict with the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. I am only speaking, I will say to my friend, about the case where State regulation invades the domain of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, and after the Senator states his opinion I should like the Senator from Michigan, who handled this bill, to advise the Senate whether or not under this language to which I am objecting it is possible for a State by its own regulation to curb and cut down the extent and the effect and the applicability of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to answer that question.

Mr. PEPPER. Is that possible under this language?

Mr. FERGUSON. Under the language which is now in the bill as it appears in the conference report, if a State passes an act regulating insurance or taxing insurance, and that regulation is contrary to the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act, with three exceptions, then the State law would be the law. Here are the exceptions:

Nothing contained in this act shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement to boycott, coerce, or intimidate, or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

In other words, under the terms of the bill, there are six things on which a State could not legislate. They are boycott, coercion, or intimidation, or agreements to boycott, coerce, or intimidate. But with respect to anything else, if the States were specifically to legislate upon a particular point, and that legislation were contrary to the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, or the Federal Trade Commission Act, then the State law would be binding. That is exactly what we attempted to do in the bill. It is clear what we intended to do. After a conference with the House, we believed that the States should regulate insurance, and taxation on the insurance business. But we spelled out certain things on which we thought Congress should not allow the States to legislate. Those are the things which I have mentioned. As to the others, the State has full power to act by legislation—not by agreement but by legislative act. The Senator from Florida was talking about an agreement which related to many States. This bill would not permit such an agreement, because no State law could allow a monopoly to exist outside the State.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator for his clarity and candor. Let me ask the Senator a question. Suppose the State of Florida, through its legislature, were to provide that insurance companies may belong to a rating bureau, the headquarters of which is in Atlanta, and that such rating bureau may be the instrumentality through which rates are fixed, and that those rates, when fixed, shall be applicable within the State of Florida. Would the State legislature have authority to do that under the language to which I am addressing myself?

Mr. FERGUSON. This bill would permit—and I think it is fair to say that it is intended to permit—rating bureaus, because in the last session we passed a bill for the District of Columbia allowing rating. What we saw as wrong was the fixing of rates without statutory authority in the States; but we believe that State rights should permit a State to say that it believes in a rating bureau. I think the insurance companies have convinced many members of the legislature that we cannot have open competition in fixing rates on insurance. If we do, we shall have chaos. There will be failures, and failures always follow losses.

The sale of insurance is not the same as the sale of an article in a store. When one buys an article in a store, he brings it home with him. In the case of insurance, he buys a promise to pay upon the happening of a certain event, and that event may be the burning of his home. If the company is not sound and solvent at the time the house burns, or at the time claim is made, there is no insurance at all. That is what we have tried to avoid.

Mr. PEPPER. In other words, the Senator believes in a form of rate fixing?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. There is no doubt that the bill allows it; but we believe that all the wisdom is not here in Congress. We believe that there is some wisdom left in the legislatures of the various States, and that they should exercise their judgment and regulate insurance, except in the respects which we have enumerated.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the able Senator has made a good argument for price fixing and rate fixing. The same argument could be made for cartels. The same argument could be made for price fixing in the lumber industry or the steel industry. The people engaged in those industries are not criminals. When they fix prices, they believe that it is a good thing for the industry. Many of them believe that price fixing is a good thing for the country. But the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act have put the Government of the United States on record against price fixing. We are rapidly going on record against cartels. We believe in a system of free enterprise which will give business the right and duty to compete upon a fair basis. That is the American way, Mr. President.

The able Senator from Michigan has been very candid. It is intended by the proponents of this measure that the right of rate-fixing shall be preserved. The Senator has said that if rates are fixed by a rating bureau, and if the State legislation legitimizes that practice, it is intended by the language to which I have referred to approve it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If we were to move completely out of the field, I could probably agree with the Senator. But, in my opinion, the first sentence in subsection (b) of section 2 is the answer. It reads as follows:

No act of Congress shall be construed to invalidate, impair, or supersede any law enacted by any State for the purpose of regulating the business of insurance, or which imposes a fee or tax upon such business, unless such act specifically relates to the business of insurance.

We were confronted in the Senate and in the House, not with a theory but with a fact. We were confronted with a choice between the Bailey bill or something better. I believe that while the conference report does not wholly satisfy me, it is better than the Bailey bill.

Let us assume that the State does the very thing which the Senator from Florida says it may do in order to permit rate making. According to the Senator from Michigan, under State regulation the States permit rate making by the companies. Suppose the Congress thinks that the States have gone too far. Let us assume that the Congress construes such action to be a deliberate attempt to get out from under the beneficial provisions of the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act. If the conference report were agreed to, the Congress would not entirely give up the field. The Congress would still retain the power—if it needed to be retained—by an act specifically relating to insurance, to invalidate an objectionable regulation on the part of the State. Such regulation would be superseded, in my opinion, by affirmative action by Congress on the same subject. Does not that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator is absolutely correct in saying that under the decision of the United States Supreme Court the Congress has the authority to

regulate the business of insurance as interstate commerce. We may withdraw the leave we grant to the States to limit, impair, curtail, or defeat the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act, except in respect to boycott, intimidation, or coercion. We can withdraw the power we give to the States; but I raise the question, Mr. President, Why give away the power in the first place?

Let me read the brief letter from the President, to show how clearly he saw this issue. In reply to a letter from the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] he said——

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, before the Senator reads the letter, let me ask him a question. Does the Senator believe that the President of the United States was fully apprised as to the trend in the Congress of the United States, and as to the attitude of a majority of Congress on this subject? That is the problem with which we in the Judiciary Committee were confronted.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course, I cannot comment upon that point, because I am not advised; but let me read again the language of the President in his letter to the able Senator from Maryland. The letter is dated June 10, 1944:

MY DEAR SENATOR RADCLIFFE: I have your letter of June 6 with respect to the recent decision of the Supreme Court deciding that insurance comes under the provisions of the Sherman Act. You suggest that this would probably mean supervision by the Federal Government.

The Attorney General advises me that he does not believe that this alternative is inevitable or even probable. He tells me that there is nothing in the decision which prevents the regulation by the States of insurance rates as long as that regulation does not interfere with the provisions of the Sherman Act.

Personally, I know of no effort at this time to bring insurance companies under over-all Federal regulation. Whether or not such control were adopted would depend, I think, very much on the attitude of the companies themselves in complying with the provisions of the Sherman Act.

The Attorney General assures me that he is anxious that the insurance companies and the State insurance officials shall have a reasonable time within which to conform their practices and statutes to the decision of the Supreme Court.

That means bringing them into harmony with the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. That is the bill which the Senate passed.

I have the bill before me. I could read it to the Senate. As the Senate passed the bill it carried out the thought I have mentioned, except it provided for a moratorium of 3 years, during which the insurance officials and insurance companies could square their conduct and their regulations with the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. That is the bill the House passed. I wish to read to the Senate the report of the House managers to show that in their report to their own body they did not intimate any such provision as the one about which I am complaining today. As one reads the report he would think that the bill was as passed by the Senate. It permitted them to regulate. It provided for a 3-year moratorium and provided that after the 3 years had elapsed the antitrust laws were absolutely to go back into effect.

I read the statement of the managers on the part of the House:

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 340) to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause. The committee of conference recommends that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment, and that the House agree to the same.

It was the purpose on the part of the managers of the House to have the agreement between themselves and the managers on the part of the Senate to state in as clear language as possible that a moratorium be granted to the insurance business from the operation of the act of July 2, 1890, as amended, known as the Sherman Act, and the act of October 15, 1914, as amended, known as the Clayton Act, and the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, until January 1, 1948, leaving the taxing and regulatory powers of the several States fully protected.

They mean within the 3-year moratorium.

I read further from the statement:

The principal difference between the conference report and the bill as it passed the House lies in the inclusion of the act of September 26, 1914, known as the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the act of June 19, 1936, known as the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, in the moratorium provision, and making clear the intention of the Congress that the acts of boycott, coercion, and intimidation are subject to the operation of the suspended statutes even during the moratorium period.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
C. E. HANCOCK,
Managers on the part of the House.

What do they say? They say they are reporting to the House the bill about insurance, with the understanding that the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act will go into full effect, but only after an intervening moratorium period of 3 years, and that during that 3-year moratorium the States will be able to pass any legislation they wish to pass insofar as the Clayton Act, the Sherman Act, and the other mentioned acts are relevant, with the exception of legislation pertaining to the boycott, coercion, and intimidation sections.

They state that with the exception of such legislation, during the 3-year period the States can do anything they wish to do—but with the clear implication that after the 3 years have elapsed the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the decision of the United States Supreme Court will go into full force and effect.

But the conference report added a matter to which no reference is made in that statement. The conference report added the language to which I object, as follows:

Provided, That after January 1, 1948, the Act of July 2—

In other words, the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and Federal Trade Commission Act, and so forth—

shall be applicable—

And we must realize that that will be after the moratorium period—

to the business of insurance to the extent that such business is not regulated by State law.

The Senate has heard the able Senator from Michigan say that regulation by State law may mean any degree of encroachment upon the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act which a legislature may desire to exercise, except with respect to the coercion, intimidation, and boycott sections.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is there any question, after reading the President's letter, that what the President contemplated was that the States would be given an opportunity to regulate the insurance business? The President's letter contemplates that; does it not?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes—but not inconsistently with the Sherman Act.

Mr. MURDOCK. Very well. Let us take the Senator's position on that point. The President did contemplate affirmative regulation by the States; did he not?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. All right. Let us take the next step. They cannot do that if the Congress of the United States preempts the field; can they?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. And is it not a reasonable thing for the Congress to do; and is it not even expedient for the Congress to say to the States that we do trust them to a certain extent, and, as the able Senator from Michigan expressed it, we recognize that all wisdom is not lodged in the Congress of the United States. If we believe—and I think the great majority of the Congress do so believe—that the regulation of insurance should continue under State regulation, then why not be willing to give the States within the 3-year period an opportunity to step into the field, and also why not be willing to have confidence that the States will do a good job when they step into it?

Now we come back to the first sentence of the language to which the Senator from Florida has referred. If we find that they have not done it, if we find that they have tried to evade and circumvent and get away from the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, the Congress will still be in a position to step in and undo everything they have done; will it not?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the reason why I cannot agree with my able friend the Senator from Utah is because I believe in the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do, too.

Mr. PEPPER. That is the reason why I am not willing to give the States the

power pro tanto to repeal or invalidate either one of those acts, and that is what the language to which I am addressing myself would permit them to do, as stated very candidly, ably, and clearly by the able Senator from Michigan.

I am opposed to that. I do not see any reason for giving them the authority to do it in the first place, and then saying, "We will take it away from you at some subsequent time." Why not let the Congress preserve the integrity of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act and of the monumental decision of the Supreme Court of the United States by simply providing, "We will give you a 3-year moratorium period, but after the 3-year moratorium the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act will go into full force and effect"?

Mr. McCARRAN. Why give them a 3-year moratorium at all, then? Why not say there will be no such legislation?

Mr. PEPPER. All right; I will reply to that question. It is because in the opinion of some—and I am not quarreling with them—the States should have some opportunity to adjust their regulatory legislation to square with the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act.

Mr. McCARRAN. But if they did, the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act would not impinge; is not that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. If we cut it down to conformity with the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, then they would not impinge. But I am not talking about the period within the 3-year moratorium. Under the language of the conference report to which I have adverted, after the 3-year moratorium period, as the Senator from Michigan has pointed out, they can curtail by State legislation the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act to any degree that they desire to do so, except as respects the boycott, coercion, and intimidation sections.

Mr. RADCLIFFE and Mr. MURDOCK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield first to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I do not share the lack of confidence which the Senator from Florida has in State regulation. We have seen an enormous industry—the insurance industry—built up in the last 100 years, to be one of the biggest industries in this country. On the whole it has been constructed soundly. We know that a few years ago when the depression was with us, with all of its terrors and calamities, and when many other forms of business were rocked to their foundations, the insurance business as a whole remained sound. One of the greatest blessings we had during those distressing days was that the insurance business did stand stanch and weathered safely the financial cataclysm.

Do not forget that the insurance industry was under State regulation. When we attempt to consider what may happen we must not ignore the fact that State regulation has resulted in the development of a tremendous industry which is vital to the welfare of the people of the country. I believe that any attitude of mind which assumes that the States, after having on the whole very wisely and very securely built up a great business, would now take advantage of an opportunity to misuse and abuse their trust is a reflection on State administration and is entirely unwarranted.

Under the conference report the States would have certain opportunities to regulate. There are special reasons why that should be done. However, they would be given such a real opportunity. If they have acted well in the past, why is it not reasonable now to show some confidence in them with respect to the future? If they should attempt to enact any laws which would permit boycotting or unjust discrimination, this bill would intervene and prevent. If the Congress of the United States should feel at any time that its confidence had been misplaced, the Federal Government could step in.

In regard to the rating bureaus, I may say that some companies utilize them and some do not under existing laws and regulations.

Allow me to remind the Senator from Florida of one characteristic of the insurance business. An insurance company can be organized very quickly. It does not require an enormous plant, as does the steel business, for instance, or use of special materials. Whenever an insurance company acquires profits which seem to be excessive, or whenever an apparent opportunity is afforded to make money in the insurance business, a new insurance company is likely to come into existence. And such a course would continue under this act. Whether a new or old company desires to go under a rating bureau or not will be decided by its management. I do not believe that it is necessary for us at this time to assume that the States will run out on their obligations and treat the act as waste paper. I hope the conference report will be adopted.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if we do not expect the States in their regulation to encroach upon the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, why give them authority to do so? If we believe in the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, why should we delegate to State legislatures the right to cloud them and curtail their effectiveness should they wish to do so?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to answer the Senator's question specifically. First, however, the matter is not a theoretical one. It is an extraordinarily practical matter. I am viewing it from the point of view of a person who has lived with the problem of State and Federal regulation almost from the moment the original bill to exempt insurance from all aspects of the antitrust laws was introduced.

Mr. President, there are three forms of regulation. There is State regulation, concerning which the Senator from Maryland has spoken so clearly. There is Federal regulation as a legal possibility, but no one is urging it now.

The third, and this has been harmful to the public interest, is regulation by private combinations and groups; a type of regulation which has been enforced by private combinations and groups through private rules and regulations under which persons engaged in the insurance industry could be tried and convicted for the violation of private law. That type of regulation would be absolutely outlawed should the conference report be adopted.

Mr. PEPPER. Not if the State legislatures decided otherwise.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there is not a line or sentence in the proposed act, as I have read it, which would delegate to any State the power to legislate in the field of interstate and foreign commerce. State regulation must be for the State and not for the United States. The bill does not sacrifice the power of Congress to regulate in the field of interstate commerce, but, wisely, it seems to me, undertakes to say in effect to the State, "For this period take the responsibility and regulate insurance in the interest of the public."

Mr. PEPPER. Not for this period; but indefinitely.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. For this period so far as the antitrust laws are concerned, it would be a moratorium.

Mr. PEPPER. Oh, we are not talking about a moratorium; we are talking about the period beyond the moratorium.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator cannot separate his interpretation of the conference report from the word "moratorium." It is the purpose of the proposed act to grant a moratorium. It would be an absurd construction to say that in one section of the law a moratorium is provided, but in another section it is provided that there shall be no moratorium.

Within its own boundaries the State may authorize agreements for rate making just as the Congress of the United States, by passing the Interstate Commerce Act, authorized rate making by combinations in the railroad field, and just as practically every State in the Union has authorized public utility rate making within the States. But what I wish to say to the Senator from Florida, and to other Senators as well, without any reservation, is this: When the moratorium period passes, the Sherman Act, the Clayton Act, and the Federal Trade Commission Act come to life again in the field of interstate commerce, and in the field of interstate regulation. Nothing in the proposed law would authorize a State to try to regulate for other States, or authorize any private group or association to regulate in the field of interestate commerce.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to clarify in my mind the Senator's distinction. The able Senator from Michigan said a moment ago, in response to my invitation, that if the insurance companies doing business in the Southeastern States were to fix their rates through a rating bureau centered in Atlanta, and if they applied in the State of Florida for the rates which had been fixed, but did so by authority of the State Legislature of Florida, it would be consistent with this proposed act, and

would be lawful. Am I correct in my statement?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield. I invite the able Senator from Michigan to state whether I was correct in my statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator's statement was that the proposed act would permit a State to regulate interstate commerce—insurance is interstate commerce—in the various States, the State could not do it.

Mr. PEPPER. No one is claiming that. I am asking the Senator whether or not, under the conference report it would be lawful for the State of Florida, through its legislature, to authorize the charging in Florida of premiums which had been fixed by the insurance companies through the instrumentality of a rating bureau in Atlanta, or anywhere else.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that under this bill they could allow a rate-making bureau to sit anywhere to fix the rates for Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course, the able Senator has made it very clear that they could, and, of course, they could. So the distinction about intrastate and interstate commerce, of course, is not applicable to that particular point.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to conclude my remarks by saying that if the Senate would reject the conference report, with the direction to the conferees or with the implicaton arising from its rejection, that the Senate would like this language to be stricken or to go back to conference with the House to reconsider this matter, it is possible that the language could be eliminated. But what I am complaining about is not the regulatory power of the States respecting insurance companies or respecting tax matters; I am not even complaining about a 3-year moratorium during which period the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act do not have any authority at all, except as they may affect boycotts, coercion, or intimidation; but I am complaining about the conference report giving to the State legislatures after the 3-year moratorium period the power to curtail, to cut down, to negative, or to repeal the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. I do not believe the Senate, with due respect for those laws which have been on the statute books respectively since 1890 and 1914, protecting the people of this country against monopoly and against combinations in restraint of trade—I do not believe that the Senate wants to give an invitation to the States to let insurance companies continue to exercise the trade practices under which in my State of Florida in the last 10 years they got premiums of $90,000,000 and paid out losses of $30,000,000, in round figures.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall yield in a moment. I do not believe that the Senate knowingly wishes to legitimatize a law which would give the insurance companies the power to continue, even under State legislative authority, practices, which, according to the finding of the United States Supreme Court, in the Southeastern States in the last 10 years permitted them to collect premiums—I say in the last 10 years, it was in the period from 1931 to 1941—of $488,000,000 and to pay out losses of $215,000,000. That is what Mr. Justice Black, in the majority opinion of the United States Supreme Court, said they did, exercising the rate-fixing authority with complete immunity from the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act at a time when every other business enterprise in America was restrained by those laws from indulging in practices of that sort. But the insurance companies, cloaked in the holy garments of some kind of immunity that the Supreme Court should never by dicta have conferred upon them, and due to the failure of the Supreme Court before last June to set aside the language of previous decisions, were sanctioned and protected in almost legalized robbery up until June 5 of last year. Senators know that as soon as the decision of that date was rendered the insurance companies scurried like frightened animals to the sanctuary of Congress, seeking here that they might be clothed again by legislation with the privileges and prerogatives they had previously enjoyed until that Supreme Court decision was rendered. And here in the Senate while that case was pending legislation was introduced, and in the House legislation was introduced, to keep the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act from being applicable to the business of insurance. Either of those bills, if enacted, would have nullified the decision of the Supreme Court when it was finally rendered.

Now Mr. President——

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. PEPPER. In a moment I will yield.

Mr. President, after the House passed a bill that provided a moratorium, giving the States the opportunity to correct their laws and bring them into conformity with the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, after the Senate did the same thing, after the Attorney General came here and testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee that he had no objection to a reasonable moratorium in order to let them put their house in order, and after the President wrote two letters to the able Senator from Maryland saying that he had no objection to a reasonable moratorium, what are we faced with here today? A carte blanche authority at this late date which has been contained in no previous legislation, which has not passed the House or the Senate; we are now confronted with the language of this conference report which for the first time gives the States carte blanche to legitimatize the very vices against which the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act were directed, to which acts the insurance companies at last have been made amenable by the decision of the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. PEPPER. I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator from Florida paid the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and myself a great compliment some moments ago.

Mr. PEPPER. The two Senators deserve it.

Mr. MURDOCK. We derived a great deal of comfort from it, and thought that we were on the same side as the Senator from Florida. I desire now to compliment the Senator from Florida on the fine argument he has made; and if he will be patient with me, I want again to call his attention to the fact that we are now confronted, as we have been heretofore, with a practical situation and not a theory. The Senator evidently would have the Senate believe that the House passed a bill which would be more desirable and more satisfactory to him than the conference report. Certainly the Senator does not know what was in the House bill when he takes that position.

What we were confronted with, in the first place, was that the House pass by an overwhelming majority the bill introduced by Representative WALTER and Representative HANCOCK, of New York, which absolutely removed insurance from the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act. That bill came to the Senate and was held up by the Senator from Wyoming, with a little help from a few other Senators, until a decision from the Supreme Court was handed down. Then after many months had gone by, I would say by a herculean effort on the part of the Senator from Wyoming, with a little help from some other Senators, there was brought out a bill which in my opinion, was not nearly so good as the pending conference report. That bill was sent over to the House. The language of which I am sure the Senator from Florida approves, was stricken out by the House and new matter inserted; the bill was returned to the Senate, and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee asked for a conference.

The Senator's argument is the same argument I would have made here a few months ago; but, confronted with the fact that we had to take either the bill which was passed by the House at the last session or something else, I finally consented to support the conference report, which, in my opinion, not only grants a moratorium but allows the States to come affirmatively into the picture. If they do something objectionable, something we do not want done, then the Congress reserves the right to strike it down, and, with arguments such as those the able Senator from Florida is making, we could make both the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act applicable in their full vigor against anything the States might do.

So, I ask why not join us at this time and give the States the opportunity under this conference report to do what, in my opinion, they will do, and that is the right thing.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I want to compliment the Senator from Utah——

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I desire to supplement what the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] has said with a little further history. The bill which first passed the House set aside the decision of the Supreme Court completely and declared a policy by Congress. That drifted along in the Judiciary Committee for some time, but the bill that came out was a decided improvement on that policy-making piece of legislation. The Senate passed that improved bill. Mind you, Mr. President, that was the first step, and in that step the Senate had gained its point.

The House then struck out our bill completely, after the enacting clause, and sent over a bill which again the Senate refused to accept, and again the Senate and House went into conference and we brought out an improved bill. On each occasion the Senate has won its point, right straight along.

This conference report was adopted by the House by a vote yesterday, and is now before the Senate. Let us either do something that is progressive, which will relieve an industry of an embarrassing situation, or do nothing, and leave chaos and confusion.

If the Senator were correct in his assumption we could go back, but the Senator's argument has been made time and again in various places. I am sorry to say he is in error in his whole premise in this matter, which is unusual for him. This conference report should be adopted as it is.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, let me say two things. First, the able Senator from Wyoming and the able Senator from Utah, joined in by other Senators on the floor, particularly I remember by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], have fought valiantly in their effort to avoid the very result against which I am trying to protest here today. I am not complaining at the policy of these gentlemen in stopping their fight at this point. Perhaps they are right in saying that there is a practical situation which they cannot surmount, and therefore we have to yield our individual convictions and subscribe to their view. However, I will say that in my 8 years in the Senate I have seen conference reports voted on here as many as two or three times. This conference report has not been voted on by the Senate before. Am I correct in saying that? On the contrary, this conference report contains language which was not in the bill as it passed the Senate. If the conferees had been back again and again to the House, and the House were adamant, then the members of the conference might properly say to their colleagues, "Gentlemen, we ask to be discharged, because we have done our very best." But the difficulty which our representatives may encounter it would seem to me would preclude the Members of this body from expressing their sentiments on this subject. If, after further effort, they should again meet failure on account of the adamant resistance they encountered from the House, well and good. But, Mr. President, right here, for the first time, this conference report is brought up, with the full knowledge that the legal effect of it, and the intended effect, not intended by the able Senator from Wyoming and the able Senator from Utah, but by the proponents of this series of legislation, is that the States shall have authority to repeal, pro tanto, the applicability of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act to insurance within their borders. To accept that view at first blush without a protest, but giving countenance and acquiescence to that policy, seems to me to impugn the integrity of the Supreme Court decision, and our long insistence upon adherence to the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act.

I merely appeal to the Senate, that we express ourselves on this conference report. If it is the opinion and the pleasure of Senators that they prefer that the States have that authority, if they believe in rate fixing, if they believe that it is a good thing to let practices persist under which these innumerable insurance companies in my State in 10 years collected three times as much in premiums as they paid out in losses, they have a right to take that position. But I did think it might with propriety be brought to the attention of the Senate, and I want Senators to have an opportunity to express their opinions by a roll call when the debate on the subject shall be concluded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say, first, in connection with the concluding remark of the Senator from Florida, that as a direct result of the debate in the Congress of the United States over this insurance legislation there has already been a substantial reduction of insurance rates by the authority of the State regulatory bodies of several of the States, including the State of New York. But I desire to call particular attention to the fact that now, as the Senator from Utah has said, we are confronted by a practical problem and not a theoretical dispute.

Of course, it has been found in the past to be in the public interest to permit corporations and persons engaged in businesses affecting the public to agree upon rates. We have eminent precedent for that in the Interstate Commerce Act; we have precedent for it in innumerable State public-utility acts.

PRIVATE INSURANCE GOVERNMENT OUTLAWED

The vice in the insurance industry, Mr. President, was not that there were rating bureaus, but that there was in the industry a system of private government which had been built up by a small group of insurance companies, which companies undertook by their agreements and understandings to invade the field of Congress to regulate commerce. These private groups sought, by the imposition of penalties, by writing rules and regulations, and by holding secret trials, or at least claiming the right to do so, to enforce not public regulations written by public authority but regulations for the insurance business which they wrote themselves in their wholly private and exclusive associations.

To me, Mr. President, this conference report represents a tremendous gain because it outlaws completely all steps by which small groups have attempted to establish themselves in control in the great interstate and international business of insurance.

I have here in my hand, Mr. President, the rules and regulations of the Insurance Executive Association, a national organization of a small group of private companies which occupy a throne at the top of a vast hierarchy of regional associations, by which they had attempted successfully to say who should and who should not engage in the insurance business, what commission an agent should receive or should not receive, who could have desk room in the office of the representative of an insurance company, and how the business should be conducted. This organization is governed not freely by members all on an equal basis, but wholly upon the basis of economic power measured by the amount of premiums collected by its members.

Let me read to the Members of the Senate just a few words from these rules and regulations with respect to the manner in which the association was governed:

> The number of votes to be cast by members at meetings shall be based on their assessable premium incomes as elsewhere herein provided. There shall be two methods of voting—one to be on ordinary association matters and the other to be on appeals from fines or other penalties for violation of rules or ethics. On ordinary association matters the voting shall be as follows:
>
> Group premiums of less than $7,500,000 shall entitle a member to one vote.

Let us remember that we are dealing, now, not with individuals, but with the corporations which the individuals represented.

> Group premiums of $7,500,000 and over but less than $10,000,000 shall entitle a member to two votes.
>
> Group premiums of $10,000,000 and over but less than $12,500,000 shall entitle a member to three votes.
>
> Group premiums of $12,500,000 and over but less than $15,000,000 shall entitle a member to four votes.
>
> Group premiums of $15,000,000 and over but less than $20,000,000 shall entitle a member to five votes.
>
> Group premiums of $20,000,000 shall entitle a member to six votes, and for each full multiple of $5,000,000 of premium income in excess of $20,000,000 a member shall be entitled to one additional vote.

This is the extraordinary manner in which the Insurance Executives Association, which operates in the field of interstate and foreign commerce from one end of the country to the other, is governed. It would be impossible to imagine a more effective system of concentrating economic power over a business in the hands of those who are financially most powerful. The company with the biggest cash account occupies the most powerful place. Equality of merit has no place in the philosophy of this group.

The trustees of this association were given tremendous power.

In addition to their other duties—

And I am reading now—

the trustees shall be especially charged with the following duties:

(a) They shall recommend to the association for adoption such changes in the methods of conducting the insurance business as may in their judgment benefit member companies and render better and more comprehensive service to the insurance public.

(b) They shall enforce the rules and principles of this organization and/or cooperate in the enforcement of the rules of the several territorial and special organizations and in case of violation or evasion of such rules and principles shall also institute such punitive and/or competitive measures as may effectually deter companies from indulging in unfair practices.

"Benefits" for member companies. That was the first consideration of the trustees. "Comprehensive service," whatever that may be, for the insuring public came second, but paragraph (b) with its penalties shows clearly that this group has set up its own little private N. R. A. to regiment the insurance business.

It would be impossible, Mr. President, to imagine language better calculated to place into the hands of a small private group the power to exercise complete control over a vast industry.

Here is the section on complaints and charges:

Complaints and charges may be filed with the president, who shall present the complaints or charges to the board of trustees. If so requested, the president shall not at any time reveal the name of the complainant to the member complained against, to any member of the board of trustees, or to any other person.

Imagine that in a nation the law of which is based upon the principle that any accused person is entitled to be confronted by the person who brings the charge against him. The Insurance Executives Association undertook by regulation to coerce, intimidate, and boycott its own members and compel them to obey the rules and regulations the association itself prescribed.

PENALTIES AND DECISIONS

Whenever the trustees by a vote of two-thirds of their membership shall decide that any member has been guilty of unfair or unethical conduct involving violation or evasion of the rules or principles herein outlined, they shall impose upon such member any penalty they may believe to be most appropriate and fitting, including expulsion from membership, or they may refer their finding to the territorial or special organization having jurisdiction for the imposition of a proper penalty. In case the trustees shall impose a fine upon a member because of any unfair or unethical act or practice the amount of such fine shall be determined by them, having regard to the importance of the matters involved and the evidence of deliberate intent on the part of the member found guilty.

No monetary fine in excess of $10,000 shall be imposed upon a member for any single offense.

In addition to or in lieu of a fine the board of trustees may require that the offending member shall retire from risks or agencies involved for such period as the board of trustees may decide upon and/or that such member shall make adequate restitution when possible to the member or members who may have been injured by the unfair or unethical act of the offending member.

Mr. President, such is the record of one agreement to coerce and intimidate persons engaged in the insurance business. Such is the bald story told in the rules and regulations of the Insurance Executives Association, under the auspices of which came the proposal in the first instance when a Federal indictment was brought in Atlanta, that the Congress of the United States calmly and completely surrender its jurisdiction in the field of interstate commerce so that the Insurance Executives Association could govern in that field according to its own will.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In subsection (b) of section 3 of the conference report we find this language:

Nothing contained in this act shall render the said Sherman Act inapplicable to any agreement to boycott, coerce, or intimidate, or act of boycott, coercion, or intimidation.

That language does not seem to apply to combinations among insurance companies within the States or among their agents. Why was that language limited to boycott, coercion, or intimidation, which does not include combinations that do not involve either boycott, coercion, or intimidation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because the committee was cognizant of the fact that many salutary combinations might be proposed and which ought to be approved, to which there was no objection. From the very beginning, Mr. President, of this controversy over insurance I have always taken the position that I saw no objection to combinations or agreements among the companies in the public interest provided those combinations and agreements were in the open and approved by law. Public supervision of agreements is essential.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask this question: Suppose the regulatory laws of a State permit combinations which might be regarded as violative of the Sherman or Clayton Acts, and over which Congress itself might wish to exercise jurisdiction, are such combinations so sanctioned by the laws of the States to be allowed, even if Congress itself should decide to exercise jurisdiction?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; my judgment is that every effective combination or agreement to carry out a program against the public interest of which I have had any knowledge in this whole insurance study would be prohibited by the very section the Senator from Kentucky has quoted.

Moreover, this proposed act leaves wholly undisturbed, indeed, it fortifies the decision of the Supreme Court that insurance is commerce. It leaves the antitrust laws in full force and effect, even during the moratorium period, against boycotts and agreements to boycott. As I was saying, it is a matter of confronting the facts or arguing on theory. There are agreements and combinations in the public interests which can safely be permitted, but this agreement from which I have been reading is the sort of agreement which ought to be condemned, which ought to be outlawed, and which, in the language of section 3 (b) of the conference report, which the Senator has now read, would be completely outlawed. I refer to the prohibition against agreements to coerce or intimidate.

Let me say to the Senator that when the Senate bill was passed it contained a prohibition against agreements of this kind. When the bill was reported upon the floor of the House the prohibition against such agreements had been eliminated. It was restored in conference; and my feeling is that the great gain which has been achieved by the complete agreement of the Senate and House conferees, to the effect that agreements as well as acts of boycott, coercion, and intimidation should be outlawed, is so distinctly in the public interest that we should not risk its loss.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am anxious to have the Senator's interpretation in the RECORD, because it may have some bearing on the future course, not only of legislation, but of court decisions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the interpretation has already been set forth very clearly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it the Senator's interpretation of the conference report that if a State legislature, in its attempt to regulate the insurance business within the confines of the State, should sanction combinations and agreements, Congress itself, if it should determine, after looking into the matter, that such combinations and agreements were against the public interest, would not, by the terms of the proposed law, be estopped from dealing with such combinations and agreements?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; the right of Congress to legislate in the field of insurance is explicitly recognized in this report. Let me read the language——

Mr. BARKLEY. I am familiar with the language, but the Senator might put it into the RECORD. Even the proposed law could be repealed by the next Congress if it should see fit to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. What I am anxious about is to know that I, as a Senator, will not be estopped in the future from voting upon any legislation regulating insurance, which has been declared to be interstate commerce, and which I have always believed to be interstate commerce. If I vote for this conference report, I am not estopped, as a Senator, from voting for any law which may be under consideration hereafter by Congress dealing with insurance, to the extent that any State authority does not touch the subject, or, if it touches it, does not deal adequately with it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In response to the Senator's question, let me say that one of the House conferees, in the course of the conference, used this sentence, which I thought was extremely apt: "This is a bill to authorize the States to regulate the insurance business; and if the States

do not regulate it, the Federal Government can."

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think there can be no doubt about that.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. What the Senator has said is addressed to future conduct under the prohibition against the Congress enacting an ex post facto law. If this bill were enacted into law, we could not at any time go back and provide for the penalization of anyone who had acted pursuant to a State statute prior to any corrective legislation on the part of Congress, even though such conduct pursuant to the State statute was contrary to the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My interpretation of the language which I have just read—and I am sure that all the other conferees are in agreement—is that it would permit the Federal Government to continue to indict and prosecute any person or any group for any agreement or act of boycott, intimidation, or coercion, in the past or in the future.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the able Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I did not, of course, limit my question to boycott, coercion, or intimidation, because surely boycott, coercion, and intimidation are not coextensive with the offenses described in the Sherman Act or the Clayton Act. There are other offenses which may be committed under the Sherman Act and under the Clayton Act, in addition to boycott, coercion, and intimidation, are there not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. So all the conference report does is to limit the legislatures, in authorizing violation of the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, only with respect to boycott, coercion, or intimidation. However, all the other offenses which are condemned by the Clayton Act or the Sherman Act may, under the proposed legislation, be authorized pursuant to State laws.

AN INVITATION TO THE EXERCISE OF GOOD FAITH

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When the Senator says "may" I agree with him; but it must be remembered that the Sherman antitrust law is such a simple law, expressed in so few words, that it has been variously interpreted and variously misunderstood. Many a great industry has been bothered for fear that it would be in violation of the antitrust law when undertaking to pursue a course which seemed to be in the public interest. I confess that I have had great sympathy with the attitude of some of the oil companies, which, for example, under N. R. A., at the invitation of Congress, did combine and cooperate to do certain things. After the N. R. A. was struck down by the decision of the Supreme Court, they were prosecuted under the Sherman law for doing one of the very things the N. R. A. had invited them to do.

What I think should be done here is to bring clarity out of a situation of confusion. The conference report would give to the States, to the Congress, and to industry the opportunity so to adjust the laws and insurance practices as to bring clarity into the whole situation, in the public interest. It is an invitation to the States to legislate in good faith. It is an invitation to the insurance industry to operate in good faith in the halls of the various State legislatures, and of Congress.

During this controversy, time after time executives of insurance companies spoke to me and told me of the things which I have brought out, but said, "Do not quote me. Do not mention my name." One day toward the close of the last session I met a group of insurance executives who were in Washington at the time the Judiciary Committee had reported a previous bill, in December. They were concerned about the interpretation of the bill. They were in conference here with State insurance commissioners working out this compromise. I said to them, "If you agree with me, why do you not say so?" The answer of one of them, who is a nationally known figure, was, "We cannot afford to." They could not afford to because of secret practices such as those enumerated in the document from which I have been reading.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think it should be added in reply to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] that there is no attempt here to have Congress throttled in the future in acting upon insurance legislation. Subsection (b) of section 2 provides that if Congress does act, the act shall specifically relate to the business of insurance.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. What we have in mind is that the insurance business, being interstate commerce, if we merely enact a law relating to interstate commerce, or if there is a law now on the statute books relating in some way to interstate commerce, it would not apply to insurance. We wanted to be sure that the Congress, in its wisdom, would act specifically with reference to insurance in enacting the law.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In other words, no existing law and no future law should, by mere implication, be applied to the business of insurance.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was the understanding.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, we would not repeal this law by implication.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. President, it is for those reasons that I feel that this legislation, as embodied in the conference report, is decidedly in the public interest, and should be enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. PEPPER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement with reference to the conference report.

When I first came to Congress years ago, and became a Member of the House of Representatives, there existed in my State an intolerable condition with reference to insurance practices. It applied more to fire, tornado, and other types of insurance than it did to life insurance.

Recognizing that situation, I went to see the Attorney General of the United States, who at the time happened to be James B. McReynolds, later an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court under the appointment of President Wilson, to inquire if some action could not be taken against the practices which then were obtaining in my State under the Sherman antitrust law. Of course, I was confronted with the statement that the Supreme Court of the United States had held that insurance was not interstate commerce, and therefore the Federal Government could do nothing about it. I then expressed myself as believing, despite the decision of the Supreme Court, that insurance was interstate commerce; for I have always believed that a policy of insurance issued in the city of New York and sent to Kentucky or to San Francisco is just as much interstate commerce as is a certificate of stock issued in New York and sent to Kentucky or San Francisco or any other State.

Therefore, I need not say that when the Supreme Court reversed its previous decision in the insurance case, and held that insurance is interstate commerce, I was greatly pleased and encouraged.

As we all know, prior to that decision of the Supreme Court, there was introduced in Congress a bill, the object of which was by means of legislation to take insurance out of the category of interstate commerce. I presume that the object of the bill was to anticipate any possible decision of the Supreme Court, so that, no matter what the Court might decide, Congress would have previously declared the insurance business not to be interstate commerce. I wish to pay tribute to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and other Senators on and off the Judiciary Committtee for the fight they made to prevent the enactment, in advance of a decision, of legislation, which would have made the decision of the Supreme Court a moot question, if the legislation then in contemplation had been enacted.

Of course, I said then—and I said it to many men in the insurance business—that I might not vote in the Senate for a bill setting out the details of the regulation of the insurance business, but I certainly would not vote for a bill which would exempt insurance companies from regulation by Congress. The two propositions are entirely different. I doubt whether I would vote to exempt any character of business which can be interpreted as interstate commerce from the application of the Clayton Act, the Sherman Act, or any other act regulating interstate commerce.

Now we have had all that, and now we come to the proposition that, the Senate, having passed a bill and the House having passed a bill, the bill as passed by the House, as one Senator said to me in private, almost ruined the bill passed by the Senate; so the matter had to go to conference.

I have been somewhat disturbed by the provision in subsection (b) of section 2 of the conference report. However, I think that under the interpretation given it by the conferees my doubts have been resolved, and I intend to vote for approval of the conference report. But I wish it to be understood that in voting for approval of the conference report I am accepting the interpretation placed upon it by the conferees, namely, that if any State, through its legislature, undertakes to go through the form of regulation merely in order to put insurance companies within that State on an island of safety from congressional regulation, that effort will be futile, and not only can Congress deal with any phase of the insurance business not dealt with by a State legislature, but even in a case in which a State legislature deals with any phase of it, but does not deal with it adequately in the opinion of Congress, Congress is not in any way barred by the conference report from dealing with that subject and with the phase of it which Congress deems to have been inadequately dealt with by the State; so that hereafter we can enact such legislation as we may deem proper and wise to have enacted in connection with the regulation of this business, which clearly is interstate commerce.

On that theory I shall vote for acceptance of the conference report, because I realize that we cannot change it. We must either accept it or reject it. If we were to reject it, we might get something even worse. There is no guaranty that we would not.

Therefore, Mr. President, I feel that I am justified in voting for acceptance of the conference report with this interpretation placed upon it by the conferees, and I accept that interpretation as my own.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report on Senate bill 340.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. If we were not to accept the conference report at all, would not the States then, under existing law, have authority to legislate with respect to anything which is not in violation of a Federal law in that field?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; the States would. In other words, the States could regulate the intrastate phases and aspects of insurance, but probably they could not legislate with reference to the interstate character of insurance, because under the decision of the Supreme Court the antitrust laws apply. In other words, Congress has occupied the field. Having occupied it, the States are more or less estopped from dealing with that field, except only as it applies to the intrastate character of the insurance business.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Would not the States have all the authority, in the opinion of the able Senator, which they would have under the conference report, except in respect to legislating or regulating in violation of or inconsistently with any paramount Federal law?

Mr. BARKLEY. They would; there is no question about that. But I will say to the Senator that in view of the fact that the two Houses have seen fit to grant what we have called a moratorium, and in view of the fact that the President declared himself in favor of the moratorium, and now we are undertaking to deal with it, in order to give the States themselves an opportunity to regulate, to see what they will do about it within this period, I have reached the conclusion that by granting the moratorium which has been referred to we are denying ourselves as a Congress no authority ultimately to deal with the subject.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. If we do not enact any legislation at this time, the situation will be a very serious one. The State insurance commissioners do not know what to do. For instance, they do not know whether they can collect taxes or issue permits. The insurance companies do not know whether they can pay taxes. The insurance commissioners do not know whether they can issue regulations. The entire operation of the insurance business is now in more or less a chaotic condition due to uncertainties which require immediate legislative action. We must have some legislation at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that. I may also say that the bill was not worked out by the insurance companies. It was largely worked out by a conference of insurance commissioners, who represent the people of the States, and who did not take the viewpoint, I will say, expressed by the insurance companies, namely, to instigate certain legislation in an effort to anticipate the decision of the Supreme Court and to make it nugatory.

I am not uneasy about the situation; I do not believe that hereafter the Congress will not have full authority to deal with the subject if the States do not do so.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Downey	Hoey
Bailey	Eastland	Johnson, Calif.
Ball	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Bankhead	Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.
Barkley	Fulbright	Kilgore
Brewster	George	La Follette
Burton	Gerry	Langer
Bushfield	Green	McCarran
Butler	Guffey	McFarland
Byrd	Gurney	McKellar
Capehart	Hart	McMahon
Capper	Hatch	Maybank
Chandler	Hawkes	Mead
Chavez	Hayden	Millikin
Cordon	Hickenlooper	Moore
Donnell	Hill	Morse
Murdock	Russell	Vandenberg
Murray	Saltonstall	Walsh
Myers	Shipstead	Wheeler
O'Daniel	Smith	Wherry
O'Mahoney	Stewart	White
Overton	Taft	Wiley
Pepper	Thomas, Okla.	Willis
Radcliffe	Thomas, Utah	Wilson
Revercomb	Tunnell	
Robertson	Tydings	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report on Senate bill 340, the so-called insurance bill.

Mr. WHITE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES]. I am not advised how either Senator would vote if present and voting. I vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is detained at one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Mississippi. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] is detained in a conference at the White House. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a delegate to the International Conference in Mexico. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on official business as a delegate to the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent. Both Senators would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is detained on official business. He has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. If present, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is detained on official business, has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. If present, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is detained on departmental business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 8, as follows:

YEAS—68

Aiken	Hart	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hatch	Radcliffe
Ball	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hayden	Robertson
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Russell
Brewster	Hoey	Saltonstall
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Byrd	La Follette	Taft
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Cordon	McMahon	Vandenberg
Donnell	Maybank	Walsh
Eastland	Mead	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Moore	White
Fulbright	Morse	Wiley
George	Murdock	Willis
Gerry	Myers	Wilson
Gurney	O'Daniel	

NAYS—8

Downey	Hill	Overton
Green	Kilgore	Pepper
Guffey	Murray	

NOT VOTING—20

Andrews	Connally	Reed
Austin	Glass	Scrugham
Bilbo	Lucas	Taylor
Bridges	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Briggs	Magnuson	Tobey
Brooks	Mitchell	Wagner
Buck	Moses	

So the conference report was agreed to.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment reported by the committee in the nature of a substitute. Amendments to the amendment are now in order.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should like to address the Senate on the substitute proposed by the committee. It has been my privilege to attend the hearings of the Military Affairs Committee on the so-called work-or-fight bill, and the development of the legislation through those hearings has convinced me that the proposal recommended by the committee meets the situation, and meets it in the best interests of the Nation with a view to the most rapid solution of our production problem.

I believe it will be helpful to review what is accomplished in the light of the bill as it passed the House and as it stands before the Senate today. First of all, I believe that the whole matter is set forth well and appropriately in the committee report, and I urge Members of the Senate to read the report.

Next, I wish to admit, as everyone does admit, I believe, and as, I think, has been clearly established, that there is a substantial need for additional production of war materials in order to meet our essential requirements in the critical months ahead of us. It has also been established that there may come a crisis 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 months ahead which makes it necessary for us to take every possible precaution in order to be ready for whatever emergency may arise. I believe that the Senate should pass the pending bill in the light of the circumstances which confront us and do whatever is necessary to meet the production need established by the War Department and asked for by them.

The only real issue is as to which method will best meet that need. Some members of the committee opposed this committee substitute because it was too drastic; others opposed it because it was not drastic enough. That situation in itself should recommend the substitute as a reasonable middle ground.

First, I wish to point out that I believe that House bill 1752 is not adequate and is a dangerous bill in the form in which it came from the House. I take this position for two reasons. First of all, the bill passed the House as a labor draft bill, amounting to a national selective service act on a small scale. It applies only to one-third of the labor force of the United States, while what we need is some measure to reach the whole labor force of the United States, if we are going to solve the production problem equitably and justly. I say the House bill reaches only one-third of the labor force for the reason that it applies only to men between the ages of 18 and 45. The statistics presented to the committee showed that by leaving out the women and leaving out men under 18 and men over 45, there would be left out about two-thirds of the labor force of the United States. Therefore, while there may be reason for applying the bill only to this one-third, yet it is obvious that it does not reach the whole labor force, although it is that whole labor force that is required to meet the emergencies of production as adequately as our whole military manpower meets our military emergencies of combat and supply.

Secondly, the bill as it passed the House attempts to allocate this one-third to appropriate essential work through use of the Selective Service System. We had no testimony before our committee which supported such a method of allocation. It was pointed out that the Selective Service System is adapted to the drafting of men; it is not adapted to the allocation of men to the several branches of industry where they may be most needed. At present we have the War Manpower Commission doing this under its voluntary system. Accordingly, if the bill as it passed the House were to stand, it would create confusion in that it would apply the Selective Service System to one-third of those involved in industry, whereas two-thirds would still be operating under the voluntary administration of the Manpower Commission, thereby applying a conflicting system to the two groups.

Furthermore, the Selective Service System, as was shown by the testimony to my satisfaction is not designed or prepared to handle the allocating of men to particular industrial units. As General Hershey said, it is adapted to drafting men and pushing them up for military service as they are needed. It is not adapted to selecting them for industrial work or channeling them into places where they are needed in industry. The change from the Manpower Commission to the Selective Service System would provoke delay rather than eliminate delay in allocating men to the places where they are most needed.

Therefore, it seemed clear to the committee as a whole, although no express vote was taken on it, that if the bill as it passed the House were to be made the basis of legislation, it should be modified so that its mechanism would come within the hands of the War Manpower Commission under the direction of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Office. I believe that even so modified it would not be a sound solution of the problem.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BURTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Did General Hershey indicate that he had not previously supported the so-called May bill as a practical solution of the problem?

Mr. BURTON. He indicated that he would be glad to support it with the amendments which would put the administration of the allocation of labor under the direction of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Office.

Mr. BREWSTER. Did the War Manpower Commission convince the Senator that they had hitherto adequately handled this problem?

Mr. BURTON. They convinced me that they had made a great deal of progress with it. They convinced me further that if they were given the backing of some legislative support, plus two or three additions in the bill which I shall mention, they would meet the need more adequately than it could be met by changing the whole system over to a draft system at this late time.

Mr. BREWSTER. Did Mr. McNutt point out that he had hitherto always opposed any legislation as entirely unnecessary until the crisis became so acute it could no longer be ignored?

Mr. BURTON. I do not think he testified on that point, but he did indicate that there had been thus far no legislative authority behind his system, but that his system, as he put it, had been highly successful, although they had made a number of errors as they had proceeded.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I wonder if the Senator from Ohio would not like to have us get into the RECORD at this point the words of General Hershey himself when the questions were put to him in regard to his support of the amendment. If the Senator from Ohio will permit, I should like to read just a paragraph or two from the record, beginning on page 152. Before General Hershey made any statement at all, the chairman asked this question:

The CHAIRMAN. General Hershey, first of all, may I ask you this question: In your report to us on the bill you are the only one of the departmental chiefs, or nearly the only one, that did not mention the suggested amendments; now, shall we assume that you are against those amendments?

General HERSHEY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We may assume that you are for the amendments?

General HERSHEY. Yes, sir. If the committee wants, I can tell you why that letter was written as it was.

The CHAIRMAN. We don't need that. Your answer it that I, as chairman, may tell anyone that asks that you are for the amendments that were suggested?

General HERSHEY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And there is no lack of harmony with you and your department in support of those amendments?

General HERSHEY. That is true.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from Utah, and I think for the record it might well appear that the amendments which were under discussion at that time between the chairman of the committee and General Hershey were the amendments to House bill 1752 which would place the allocation of workers under the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I do not know whether the Senator is in the position to give us the information or not, but I hope someone on the floor will sometime point out what power there is now in any department of the Government to handle this manpower situation, to what extent it has been exercised, and to what extent it has not been exercised. I find many people have the impression that there has been a failure to exercise power already in existence to relieve the shortage, and I should like to have someone, concisely and to the point, develop that feature of the discussion.

Mr. BURTON. I may say to the Senator from Massachusetts that Mr. McNutt, in response to repeated questions, pointed out that he did not have statutory authority for the system he was putting into effect, but that he did claim for it rather excellent success on a voluntary basis.

Mr. WALSH. Has he authority to close up a nonessential industry?

Mr. BURTON. Not statutory authority, no; and I do not know that he has closed up an essential industry directly.

Mr. WALSH. Has he any authority to do so under a directive by the President?

Mr. BURTON. He claims authority under the directives to put ceilings upon employment on a voluntary basis. He has no statutory authority for it.

Mr. WALSH. Has that authority been exercised?

Mr. BURTON. His authority to apply ceilings has been exercised as a part of his program, but it rests on a voluntary basis.

Mr. WALSH. Has it been successful?

Mr. BURTON. He claims it has been successful, with a reasonable allowance for mistakes.

Mr. WALSH. And he has exercised it to the full extent, so that now it is necessary to pass some drastic legislation. Does he say that?

Mr. BURTON. I think his position would be fairly stated by saying that he felt that over a period of 2 or 3 years he has developed a system which he finds to be one to be commended, and as meeting the present situation, but that if there is to be a nemergency which will call for added production, or a greater redistribution of labor than now is necessary, he will welcome statutory authority upon which to rely. He regards himself, as I see it, as substantially at the limit to which he may go on a voluntary basis, and that he can not go much further on that basis.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to have some presentation made as to why there has been a failure or hesitancy to exercise whatever power now exists.

Mr. BURTON. I may at this point appropriately, therefore, read to the Senate, in answer to the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts, a brief statement of Mr. McNutt's program as he stated it to us. It is found on page 107 of the hearings.

Mr. WALSH. Is it a program he has exercised heretofore?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. And is exercising now?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Yet does he say that, notwithstanding that program, further legislation is necessary?

Mr. BURTON. He did not bring himself quite to the point of saying that further legislation was necessary.

Mr. WALSH. Does the committee think so?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the committee think further legislation is necessary?

Mr. BURTON. That is exactly what the committee has recommended. They have put legislation behind this program, with one or two additional helps.

Mr. WALSH. Which is contained in the so-called substitute bill?

Mr. BURTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WALSH. I appreciate the Senator's responses.

Mr. BURTON. Referring to Mr. McNutt's program, he does not base it, of course, on legislation, but refers to it as a voluntary program which he has been using.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In the last 2 weeks there have been repeated reports from various parts of the country as to the break-down of the voluntary system. I know that in the State of Massachusetts there was reference to New Bedford, and there was reference to Pennsylvania and to New Jersey. Were those instances in any way brought to the attention of the committee?

Mr. BURTON. No exhaustive examination was made by the committee of complaints. There were several references made to several points, and Mr. McNutt discussed several of them.

I shall read now the statement of Mr. McNutt to which I referred.

Mr. WALSH. I shall be glad to hear it.

Mr. BURTON. It is on page 107 of the hearings, Mr. McNutt said:

> Let me recapitulate: The essence of the War Manpower Commission program may be summarized under three major headings.
>
> 1. Employment stabilization, which makes it necessary for a worker in an essential activity to obtain a statement of availability before leaving his job.
>
> 2. Priority referral of workers, which allocates our labor supply to plants on the basis of the urgency of their need for workers.
>
> 3. Employment ceilings, which budget the available labor supply and assure that employment in war plants is maintained at the level necessary to meet production schedules.
>
> How has this program been working during the past 3 years?
>
> I have already alluded to its success measured in terms of war production. It has by no means worked perfectly but a good job has been done. No reasonable man expects that we will ever attain perfection in this field.
>
> Admittedly, we have had no statutory penalties to enforce our regulations. And yet, we have had exceptionally good compliance, save for isolated instances, because of the active and aggressive support of management and labor.
>
> The program is a going concern in every labor market area in the Nation. The administrative machinery includes in addition to the War Manpower Commission's regional and area offices the national network of local public employment offices. These offices are staffed with trained personnel with more than 10 years' experience in the recruitment and placement of workers, in analyzing workers' occupational qualifications, and in determining the occupational needs of particular plants.

I close the quotation at that point.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio. Now may I ask him a question? Is there authority now in the War Manpower Commission to go into a nonessential mill and say to a man working there, "You must leave your job and go into this essential industry," and if the worker says, "I will not do it," he can be dismissed from the job in which he is engaged?

Mr. BURTON. No; I think not.

Mr. WALSH. The situation in New Bedford, which the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has referred to, was that an effort was made to induce workers to leave the textile mills and to go into a tire factory in the same community, and the effort met with violent resistance. There were some prospects that there might be riots in the city if the ruling was enforced rigidly. But I understand that the power existed of making the man lose his job, but that he could not be compelled to go to the other place. Of course, I assume the House bill would provide that such a man could be arrested and sent to jail. But I presume that even under the present law you could go to the extent of depriving a man of the work in which he was engaged on the basis that it was nonessential.

Mr. BURTON. I think there would be statutory authority for that.

Mr. WALSH. Already there is authority to deprive a man of employment, as it amounts to, if it is found that the industry in which he is engaged is a nonessential industry, and if he does not go to the essential industry. Are we agreed on that?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think in the New Bedford case the companies operated under a so-called employment ceiling. The textile mills were told that they were limited to so many men and that they would have to dismiss 700 men, as I recall, and they picked out the men whom they said were out of a job and said to them, "Now we want you to go and take the other job," which the men refuse to

take. Whether the officials had the authority to impose that ceiling or not, they sought to assert that authority.

Mr. BURTON. The employment ceiling is one of the methods of the War Manpower Commission which its Chairman cites as part of his program, but for which he does not claim statutory authority.

Mr. BREWSTER. So when the official told the men they were through there they were operating outside the law?

Mr. BURTON. They were operating under a voluntary agreement, and they might have exercised some indirect pressure.

Mr. WALSH. The employment ceiling could be placed at zero.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. If the bill as recommended by the committee is passed there would be statutory authority to act, if there were any challenge of the authority. There is no statutory authority now.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is most unfortunate that power should be exercised without actual authority to exercise it.

Mr. WALSH. Are we correct in concluding from our little discussion here that under the House bill, in the circumstances named, if the man in a textile mill when directed to do so, would not go to the tire factory, could then be arrested and fined?

Mr. BURTON. Not exactly that. The House bill would draft individuals between the ages of 18 and 45, and if a man happens to be drafted and refuses to go where he is sent, he can be arrested and put in jail.

Mr. WALSH. The House bill would be stronger in its effect; you would not have to invite a man to change his position—you could draft him.

Mr. BURTON. He could be drafted under the House bill, whereas the bill recommended by the Senate committee would authorize a ceiling to be placed on employment in certain industries, and if such a ceiling were placed on an industry there would be an elimination of certain men from that industry, and those men when eliminated by the employing agencies would be without jobs until they got other jobs.

Mr. BREWSTER. Further, is it not a fact that under the present system if successfully operated, that a man would be condemned to starve? That is, he would be out of one job, and if he refused to take the job they wanted him to, he would have no job. He cannot be legally employed.

Mr. BURTON. If a man refuses to take a job anywhere now he will starve.

Mr. BREWSTER. Under the edict of the War Manpower Commission, he is thrown out of his job which he has and is performing satisfactorily, and he cannot go back in the job which he desired.

Mr. BURTON. He might not be able to get the job that he wanted. The whole theory of the substitute bill is that it would be applied on the basis of governmental authorization of what work is essential. In this emergency, when we need the right men in the right places, whether they be in uniform or out of uniform, we should seek to use our full manpower wherever it will help essential production the most.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have great respect for the views of the Senator from Ohio. I am trying to get some information. I am not familiar with the matter under discussion. I was not present at the hearings and have not had time to read them all, and I am very much confused about this matter. The question I wanted to ask the Senator in this. Is it true that all our allies can by law take needed laborers and put them to work wherever it is desired to put them to work? Is that correct?

Mr. BURTON. I do not know that it applies to all of them, but our major allies do have that power now and do exercise it to draft labor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it or is it not true that the United States, with a voluntary system, has far out-produced any of our allies?

Mr. BURTON. I think there is no question about the success of our voluntary system and the fact that we have broken all records.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have broken all records with our voluntary system. Why, then, at the very end of the war should we do away with our voluntary system, and undertake to follow the plans which have not proved so successful with our allies?

Mr. BURTON. I am not advocating that we do that. What I am advocating is the committee's recommendation as a substitute for the House bill. The House bill is an abandonment of that theory. It provides for a drafting of labor, and although it is not a national service act, it is a partial drafting of labor. The attitude of the committee is that we now have this voluntary system; it is just about on the border line of reaching its maximum performance, but it needs help in order to carry it further in an equitable manner under the system already operating, and I will outline later the provisions that are put into this bill for that purpose.

For example, if a man is directed into other work and taken from the work that he has, he is given the right of reemployment, he is given transportation to go to the place of employment and transportation back again. There is a new right given to the War Manpower Commission to survey governmental plants themselves and to see whether they are using unnecessary labor. This right of survey heretofore has not been open to the War Manpower Commission. There are various steps of that kind authorized in order to help redistribute the labor that is now in some places being hoarded and while in other places it is needed. We are facing the great crisis of the war itself, and we want to make sure that as we proceed toward that crisis we have our manpower allocated where it will give the most and best production. I am not asking that we abandon our theory of voluntary cooperation. I am asking that we officially adopt that plan of operation and give it statutory support right along the lines on which it is now proceeding. I believe that to do this will help rather than hinder the results now being obtained.

Mr. McKELLAR. When it is said that we will give statutory support, is that not equivalent to saying that we will just draft them a little bit?

Mr. BURTON. No.

Mr. McKELLAR. Just get over the line and ease them over, so to speak, into a method which has not proved satisfactory with other nations? I am a great believer in voluntary labor of the kind we now have.

Mr. BURTON. So am I.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am opposed to drafting labor. I think it is a mistake to draft labor, and especially do I think it is a mistake when we know that we have accomplished so much with voluntary labor. Everyone in the world knows that up to this day we have been successful with the voluntary system. I disagree with the Senator from Ohio that we are now approaching the crisis in the war. We have already passed that crisis. It is, in my judgment, a question of mopping up.

Mr. BURTON. I am afraid the Senator is wrong about that matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. I may be wrong. I have been wrong before in making guesses—and it is a guess, of course. But I think we have passed the crisis, and I think the world realizes today that we have passed the crisis. I do not want to abandon the voluntary system after the fight is over.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator, particularly for his emphasis on the question of drafting labor. This is not a bill for the drafting of labor. There is a sharp distinction between that bill and the substitute proposed by the committee. I may point out that the substitute came to the committee as a measure which had been considered, prepared, and agreed upon between representatives of organized labor, representatives of industry, and to some extent representatives of organized agriculture as the proper way to approach the problem. Two amendments were added after the substitute came to the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is this a bill which is agreed upon by all the various interests? Does labor approve the substitute? Does the Army approve the substitute? Do all interests approve the substitute?

Mr. BURTON. No.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is not this a regimentation bill?

Mr. BURTON. No. It is not quite as simple as that. Let me explain it.

The representatives of the Army came before us and urged upon us what I urged upon the Senator, namely, the seriousness of the present military situation. They went further and recommended the House bill, with an amendment as to procedure, turning the administration of it over to the War Manpower Commission and the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. The Army recommendation, therefore, is that we should increase production, and do it by drafting labor, as provided in the House bill, with an amendment. What is proposed to the Senate is recognition of the fact that the Army has told us that there is a need, but changing the method of meeting that need to the method recommended by industry, agriculture, and labor—not unanimously, but

by a preponderance of their testimony. I believe that the substitute, as presented to the committee on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], was a measure agreed to among representatives of labor and of industry. However, in the committee an amendment was added, providing an additional penalty. With respect to that additional penalty, I do not believe there is complete agreement. However, except for that penalty—and I believe that the bill is a good bill, either with or without the penalty—the substance of the bill which comes before us is a recognition by labor and industry as to the method by which production can be increased. Labor and industry know more about the way in which production can be increased than do we, or, I believe, than do the War and Navy Departments.

This measure is a declaration by industry that, instead of the Army method of drafting labor, they would welcome recognition by statute of the voluntary system, and that they will go ahead on that basis.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is true, is it not, that after the amendments were added, the original sponsors of the bill in the committee voted against their own bill in the committee? I refer to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

Mr. BURTON. Not on the final approval.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes; on the final vote.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator will remember that only four votes were cast against it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I believe so, if my memory is correct. I was one of them. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] was another.

Mr. BURTON. Also the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Montana voted against it, as did also the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

Mr. BURTON. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then the original sponsor of the bill, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], voted against his bill after the amendments were added.

Mr. BURTON. After the amendment to which I have referred, relating to the penalty, was added.

Mr. CHANDLER. There were two penalty amendments.

Mr. BURTON. One relates to the Tydings amendment, and the other to the subject we are now discussing.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. With respect to the matter about which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] was inquiring, namely, the structure of the substitute as compared with the structure of the House bill, let me say that the substitute comes to us with the recommendation of those who are now working under the voluntary system. They say, "We recommend that this be done, and we are glad to have it done. It will help to bring about increased production on a fair basis. It will also help to encourage the soldiers." Let us say, for the sake of argument, that objection would be made to the penalty——

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe the Senator has touched upon a subject with respect to which we should be very careful. We should not do anything which would in any way injure the morale of the soldiers who are fighting for us abroad. They are doing a marvelous job. In my judgment, no soldiers in the history of the civilized world have ever done half as good a job as our soldiers are doing, and under such adverse circumstances, our armies being scattered all over the world. Both the enlisted men and the officers are doing a fine job, and we ought to do everything we can to sustain them. But when it comes to breaking down a system which has proved, by actual experience in this very war, to be the most productive of all systems, it seems to me that we should proceed with a great deal of care. That is further shown by the fact that in regard to these bills the Senator's committee has been the most divided committee I have ever seen. Members of the committee are honest in their convictions. They honestly differ with their fellows. I am sure that every member of the committee is trying to do a good job. However, the very fact of this divergence of opinion on the part of members of the committee indicates what a serious undertaking we are proceeding with. For that reason, I am in great doubt and confusion, not being a member of the committee, and not having heard the testimony and arguments. I am in great confusion as to what we ought to do. I cannot see why we should discard our own system, which has accomplished more than has been done by any other nation, and at the last moment take over a system which has not worked well in other nations.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, the committee, by an overwhelming vote—the figures of which I do not have in mind—decided to proceed with the substitute instead of the bill which passed the House. I believe that would meet the objection of the Senator from Tennessee. The substitute is an approved measure. Proceeding with the substitute, even after a penalty clause was added to it which resulted in one of the sponsors voting against it, the vote in the committee was 13 to 4 in favor of the substitute, which is doing pretty well for a Senate committee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I will not interrupt the Senator further. The Senator has been very kind and indulgent toward me.

I am wondering why it is that we see on the streets of this city so many young men between the ages of 20 and 30. Wherever we go we see those magnificent physical specimens. Why is it that the Army and Navy cannot get those young men? Why should so many of them be deferred? They are all over town. They are to be found in every city in the country. If we need additional soldiers, why should those young men be deferred? Why can they not go to the front?

Mr. BURTON. That is a subject for separate investigation. All of us sympathize with the position of the Senator from Tennessee.

However, the question which we are facing here is not the question of drafting men for military service. I believe that that subject is adequately covered by statute. It is a question of administration.

The problem which we have before us is that of reallocating and redistributing workers in industry where they are needed. I believe that we are doing what the Senator wants us to do. We are not drafting labor. We are putting into statutory language the voluntary system now being used. I believe that that is the kind of contribution to the morale of the soldiers that we can well make, because it shows them that we here at home are doing everything we can to make sure that our labor is put to the best possible use. The War Department and the Navy Department argued strongly on the basis of morale. They say that what is needed at this time is a demonstration by the people at home that they are willing to work as hard as the men at the front are working. Therefore, they argue for this kind of a measure. They go even further and argue for the bill which passed the House. I do not believe that it is necessary to pass the House bill in order to meet the morale argument. I believe that the best way to meet the morale argument is to provide the solution which will result in the greatest production; and I believe that the committee substitute will accomplish that purpose.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I am frank to say to the Senator that so far as I am concerned, I believe that the measure which has been reported to the Senate by the Committee on Military Affairs is preferable to the bill as it passed the House; but I am afraid that we should be making a mistake even if we were to pass the bill reported to the Senate.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I expect shortly to present to the Senate the provisions which are in the substitute proposed by our committee. I believe that the substitute will prove itself. I believe that there is only one feature open to contention, and that is the penalty section. I believe that the substitute is a good bill, even without the penalty section.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The question of morale has been raised. I believe that that is a very important consideration. As I recall the testimony of the Secretary of War, if he made any statement which, in justice, could be construed as support for this measure, it was on the question of morale.

In answer to a direct question, he said that if the House bill passed—the bill the

committee rejected by a vote of 12 to 6—the morale effects would immediately be felt on the fighting fronts. He said the material effects probably would not be felt for months.

We abandoned the original House bill, and both the Senator from Ohio and I agree that we should have abandoned it. Now we have a bill which contains the penalty clauses and the imposition of zero ceilings. In a measure, I am almost as far away from the viewpoint of the War Department officials as I can be. One of my colleagues asked me yesterday whether I was opposed to any legislation or any bill. I said I was opposed to any I had seen. In relation to the voluntary method and by the methods employed by the War Manpower Commission, and testified to before the committee as being effective and capable of supplying the number of men urgently needed to perform everything which has been ordered or which the people of our country have been ordered to do or which it is presumed they are able to do, the passage of any bill will confuse the situation.

Time will be required to get the pending bill into operation. The employers do not want it. The workers do not want it; certainly they do not want it with the penalty clauses included. I am just as far away from the viewpoint of the officials of the War Department who have advocated this legislation as I can be; because, as the Senator from Tennessee has said, some of them said last year that the war would be over quite soon. High Army officials and high officials in other branches of the Government made such statements. But the war was not over soon. Relying on those statements, many persons left their jobs. After the break-through occurred in Belgium, they were shocked, and they returned to their jobs.

The Senator will agree, I am sure, that the testimony we had there was almost conclusive in showing that at the present time the manpower situation in the United States is better than it has ever been in all the history of our country. So I question the wisdom of molesting it even with this apparently inoffensive bill, even after the penalty clauses are striken from it.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, it is on that point that I disagree with the Senator. I believe that there will be, in addition to a strengthening of morale, a strengthening of production. I believe it is in accordance with the wishes of both the workers and the industrialists to put such a law on the statute books and to provide them with the transportation and reemployment aid which is provided in the bill. I think the bill will be helpful, even without the penalty provisions. I think there will be substantial value in the bill, because of the provisions relative to court proceedings and taxes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let us take the statement that democracy in this instance has failed. Suppose the Nazis go on the radio and say that, according to the statement of the Secretary of War of the United States, democracy has failed in this particular, and that they regret the failure of our democracy—notwithstanding the fact that we have made all these records and have produced all these materials and equipment. Suppose the Nazis go on the radio and say to our soldiers, "Democratic methods have failed, and now in America they are adopting Fascist methods; they are forcing the people of America, under threat of extreme penalties, to produce the things you need."

I question the morale value of the bill, in view of a statement of that sort which might well be made by the Nazis, and which I have an idea will be made by them.

Mr. BURTON. I have an idea, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky, that no matter what we do or do not do, the Nazis will find something to broadcast which will be critical of our people and of our efforts. But I think there are many persons who give more consideration to the judgment of the Congress than they do to statements made by the Nazis. I think our obligation is to take the step which will provide the best production of war materials which are needed at this time. That is what the Army is looking for.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, the Senator and I disagree about what is necessary. I am prepared to vote for anything which will help bring the war to a quick conclusion. If I felt that any measure would be either helpful or necessary in reaching that goal, I would vote for it. But I fear that the pending bill will be hurtful.

Mr. BURTON. Let me say that I think we are justified in taking the recommendation of the Army and the Navy regarding the need, and I think we are justified in taking the recommendation of the industrialists and of labor regarding the method. I believe that the record already made by this method, in addition to their recommendation of it, is a sufficient recommendation of it for us; and I believe that if we follow that course we will be serving the best interests of our country.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Is not the voluntary system of priority referrals, of requiring an employee who quits an essential job to get a certificate of availability, of requiring an employer who rehires him to see that he has such a certificate, and of providing employment ceilings, a sound method of handling the manpower situation and channeling available labor where it is needed, and is it not a method which has been agreed upon by both management, labor, and Government in the various labor-market areas, so that the basic tools are voluntary, but they are beginning to break down simply because there are a few chiselers—perhaps 5 or 10 percent of the employers, for instance—who refuse to recognize a certificate of availability, and who, if they need a man, do not ask him for such a certificate, or else they violate the ceilings? When such things begin to occur in a given labor market they tend to spread.

By the pending bill we would give the War Manpower Commission authority to take care of the few chiselers who are not going along with the voluntary program.

Mr. BURTON. I think that is correct. To emphasize what the Senator from Minnesota has been saying, let me state that there now has been established under authority of Congress something which I felt was needed from the beginning of the war, and which, I think, would have been most helpful if we had had it all during the war, namely, a joint committee representing agriculture, labor, industry, and the public, to act as an advisory committee on such questions as this. No such committee was formed under the leadership of this administration during the war until Congress provided for it. Finally, it was appointed as a 12-member board in order to help the Board on War Mobilzation and Reconversion. That 12-member board included as its members Mr. William H. Davis, Chairman of the War Labor Board; Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, regional director of the War Manpower Commission; William L. Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O.; T. C. Cashen, of the railroad brotherhoods; Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation; James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union; Albert S. Goss, master of the National Grange; Eric A. Johnston, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce; George H. Mead, chairman of the board of the Mead Corporation; and Nathaniel Dyke, Jr., special assistant, Smaller War Plants Corporation. I may say that we think that committee is the kind of committee which is patriotically and also professionally capable of passing upon issues of this kind. That committee has been working on this matter.

This committee, under whose advice the voluntary system to which the Senator has referred has been developed, on last January 10 went so far, upon the presentation made to it at that time, as to endorse even the House bill. That committee's opinion is to be found in a resolution which was disclosed to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and appears on page 254 of the hearings, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the Board advises the Director that it favors the principle that persons not drafted but subject to draft are under obligation to serve in the civilian forces wherever their services are most needed, but it feels that any act of Congress embodying that principle shall contain adequate safeguards to assure the placement of all civilian workers in the hands of the War Manpower Commission and the War Food Administration and their duly constituted labor, agriculture, management committees, and that the Selective Service boards should determine only whether the individual is to be inducted into the military service.

In other words, they endorsed the House bill with amendments providing for utilization of the machinery which already is handling the voluntary problem.

If the Senate adopts the substitute proposal now before it, the Senate will be following the directions in the second part of the Advisory Board's recommendations and will be putting into law the

voluntary system. To do this the Senate will not be going even as far as the Advisory Board recommended on January 10. The Senate in approving the substitute will be more conservative than the Army and Navy and more conservative than the Advisory Board was on January 10.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for further comment?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I think the section giving the War Manpower Commission authority to go into any war plant and make a labor utilization study may help the manpower situation as much as any other provision of the bill will. As the Senator knows, the Mead committee investigating the war effort has had testimony in one instance after another to the effect that a War Manpower Commission study of labor utilization has decreased the demand for labor and has increased production. But the fact is that some employers have refused to permit the making of such studies. The pending bill would provide authority for the War Manpower Commission to make such studies anywhere.

Mr. BURTON. I may say that in the substitute, as recommended by the committee, there are 14 points relative to bringing out aids to production at this time. It is upon those that we rely. The one the Senator from Minnesota has mentioned is one of them which will be included in the description of the bill, and it is of vital importance.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. With respect to the morale feature of the pending legislation, it has been said that we have now reached a crisis in this war. Mr. Patterson has said that there is a greater need for directing misapplied manpower than for making up shortages of manpower.

I ask Senators to read an editorial from the Stars and Stripes. The Stars and Stripes is a paper published and distributed among American soldiers. The editorial to which I refer calls for the passage of the May bill. It states in strong terms why the soldiers want the bill to become law. It stated that soldiers could not understand why such legislation was being opposed.

Mr. BURTON. I presume the Senator is referring to the editorial which stated that the bill should not be called the May bill but the "must bill."

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

Mr. President, I wish to reiterate what all of us have heard quite frequently. I invite the attention of the Senate to the testimony which was given before the committee by Mr. Bard. He stated:

> Here is our problem: In the first 6 months of 1945 the armed forces will require 900,000 men.

I presume he means that that many men will be drafted during the first 6 months of this year.

He continues:

> In the same period, 700,000 additional workers will be required for war production. In other words, we have a manpower problem of 1,600,000 men in the next 6 months. Where will they come from? We cannot afford to take chances. We cannot afford to make any mistakes.

Mr. Paul V. McNutt, whom Senators have quoted, and who has referred to the success of the voluntary system made the following statement before the committee:

> The War Manpower Commission's position on the purposes of this legislation was stated to the House Military Affairs Committee by Judge Hay at its hearings last month. It was stated again in my letter of January 29 to Chairman THOMAS in which I submitted my recommendations with respect to H. R. 1752. In that letter I recommended that legislation which would insure that our needs for manpower for war production were met on time and which would take full advantage of our experience in manpower recruitment, placement, and stabilization should be favorably considered by the Congress.
>
> That recommendation was not based upon any conclusion that our manpower program has failed, but upon a recognition of the fact that at this crucial period of the war we must be sure that there will be no failure in our ability to man urgent plants promptly.

I wish also to read an excerpt from the testimony of Mr. J. A. Krug, Chairman of the War Production Board, who testified before the committee as follows:

> There has been a lot of talk about the voluntary system, the cooperative system, and that has worked out amazingly well in some 4 years of defense and war effort. I don't want to discount that for a moment. It has produced amazing results.
>
> On the other hand, the actual evidence of the last 3 months demonstrates that the voluntary plan is not working in this present crisis. I do not think it is working at the present time, because we drained away so much of the working force into the armed forces, and we have heaped on our productive machine such a load that that plan alone no longer works.
>
> As evidence of that I would like to cite the War Manpower Commission figures on these so-called must plants—which is not by any means the total war picture but is just as to certain plants where the emergency is so great that we have put them at the top of the heap—but looking at those, the War Manpower Commission reports that on December 1 the must plants needed 90,000 men; on December 31 the must plants needed 148,000 men; on January 12 the must plants needed 178,000 men.

Mr. President, those are the figures to which the Senator from Kentucky was referring the other day when he asked if there had not been a decline in the number of men employed in plants.

A great deal of testimony was given to support the theory that the voluntary system had not failed. But, Mr. President, we are now reaching a crisis in this war. The time is approaching when we shall need to exert every single fiber which we possess in furthering the production of war goods. I am as much in favor of the voluntary system as is anyone else. As a matter of fact, I should prefer the voluntary system with respect to the induction into the service of soldiers. That system was used successfully in the past, and during the First World War many persons opposed the drafting of soldiers. I am prepared to say that my State of Tennessee has a very high record with respect to the voluntary service of soldiers. I wish it were not necessary to draft labor. But when every person who is qualified to speak on the subject, from the President of the United States down, is in favor of the bill, and when the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Admiral of the Fleet, the Director of the War Production Board, and the Director of the War Manpower Commission, as well as others who are cooperating to the end that the necessary articles of war be manufactured are in favor of the bill, I cannot fail to support some kind of legislation which would draft labor as well as soldiers.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Tennessee has said. It seems to me that he has hit the nail squarely on the head in pointing out that what we need today is to help the armed forces to the greatest possible extent. If we can obtain better and more adequate production by the direct drafting of manpower, that is the way it should be done. If we can obtain better and more adequate production by relying upon the voluntary system, that is the way it should be done. Or, if we can obtain a better result by a combination of the voluntary system and the support of Congress, we should follow that course. I believe the third system is the best method. In my judgment, we will obtain the best results by combining the system we now have, a system of purely voluntary service, with the support of Congress.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, yesterday I made the statement that there were some 700,000 needed for war industries. In addition to that, of course, there are 900,000 needed for the first 6 months by the Army and Navy, making a total of 1,600,000.

Mr. BURTON. In 6 months?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; making a total of 1,600,000. As the Senator brought out, 400,000 have to be taken out.

Mr. BURTON. That is, 400,000 out of the 900,000 who go into the Army will have to come out of industry, so that there will be an industrial need for 700,000 plus 400,000, or 1,100,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. And that 400,000 will have to be replaced. I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that I agree with what has been said about what private industry has done. No one can say but that they have done a remarkable job, but I continually hear people say it is a small segment of the people who are not doing their share, or who are not trying to do their share. As to how large a segment it is I do not know in the final detail, but I do know that I asked the Secretary of War twice in the committee about the matter, and the Secretary made this statement:

> When I say they are able to do it, I had an estimate made for me yesterday which shows that there are over 6,000,000 men, to make a most conservative estimate, between 18 and 37, inclusive, not classified as engaged in essential industry.

The thought I have is that if there are 6,000,000 men in this country who are not engaged in essential industry, as stated by the Secretary of War on page 17 of the hearings, the time has come when the Senate of the United States, in justice to the 6,000,000 who are in the Army, should do something to make these civilians do their share, regardless of

what the voluntary system has done or will do.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Has the President approved the substitute bill?

Mr. BURTON. Not that I know of. The President sent a message to the leader of the majority asking early action on a bill, and I suppose that at that time he referred to the House bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. He referred specifically, in the message, to the May bill.

Mr. BURTON. He had not seen the substitute.

Mr. BARKLEY. No, he had not; so far as I know. I do not know whether he had or not.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Has the Secretary of War approved the substitute?

Mr. BURTON. The Secretary of War is advocating the bill as it passed the House, with amendments which would put the authority under the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. MILLIKIN. He has not approved the substitute?

Mr. BURTON. He has not. He goes further than the substitute.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Has the Secretary of the Navy approved the substitute?

Mr. BURTON. Like the Secretary of War, he is for something more stringent.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So all the argument that rests on what the Secretary of War thinks or what the Secretary of the Navy thinks falls because they are not for this substitute?

Mr. BURTON. No. Insofar as the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy report to us what the war needs are, we take their word for it and follow their recommendations, but insofar as they get into the field of industry and attempt to tell us how to fill industrial needs, we take the word of the industrial leaders and workers in that field.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That was not my point.

Mr. BURTON. It was my point.

Mr. MILLIKIN. My point is that if the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy were for the May bill, and if they were for the May bill and for it strong, they are bound to be against the substitute, and all the morale argument based upon the liking of the Secretary of War for the May bill will fall, so far as the substitute is concerned.

Mr. BURTON. Not at all because I think the morale argument does not turn on what the particular language of a particular bill may be. What the morale argument turns on is that there be a recognition by Congress that we are in a crisis in the war, and that the Congress is doing what will help most in carrying on the war, and what will help the morale is not what the bill or the susbstitute contains, but whether Congress has done the best it can, and I believe if Congress adopts the substitute, that will provide the morale factor we need.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest that if the Secretary of War thinks the May bill is necessary for morale, then this pallid substitute would be more or less innocuous so far as morale is concerned. Let me observe also that I think we can make far too much of this morale business. Our soldiers are fighting men. They are concerned with killing the enemy and with protecting their own lives. They have no time for philosophical abstractions. Much of this morale talk we hear carries the offensive implication that our servicemen are manic depressives, that one day they are up in the clouds full of euphoria and the next day down in the depths, waiting every moment to hear what we in the Senate are doing.

Mr. BURTON. Let me suggest to the Senator from Colorado that he introduced the morale argument into the debate rather than I myself.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The morale argument has been proceeding for half an hour.

Mr. BURTON. I pointed out that the morale argument was presented by the War and Navy Departments. I am presenting this matter, not based on the morale argument but on the basis of what will result in the best war production we can secure. Some of the servicemen may hear about it and some may not. I agree with the Senator that what the servicemen want to hear is that Congress is doing its job as they are doing theirs. So far as morale is concerned, however, I think it is important for us to recognize that we will not be doing our share, and therefore we will be weakening morale, if we do not pass a bill to meet the needs. For from this being a pallid substitute, I believe the substitute of the committee will do more to produce the materials needed than will the House bill, and that is why I am for it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator yield for one more observation?

Mr. BURTON. I am very happy to.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It was the notion of the Secretary of War that the May bill would increase the morale of our servicemen, and I assume that it is the view of the junior Senator from Ohio that the substitute will have the same effect, although it is different.

Mr. BURTON. Substantially the same effect; perhaps it will increase morale even more, because it puts even a greater reliance on the freedom of operation than would the May bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Those who press the morale argument tell us that the soldier says, "We want the civilian people forced to work just as we are forced to fight." That is the guts of the morale argument.

Mr. BURTON. No; that is not the guts of the morale argument. It is not that the soldier wants to see them forced to fight; he wants to see that all the material that can be produced is being produced at home.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Not only that, but as the distinguished Senator from Ohio knows, the soldiers have not only been forced to fight, but they have been forced to work in this country. They have been sent to Philadelphia to load ships because civilians would not do it. They have been sent into the cotton mills in South Carolina, and sent here and there by the thousands, not only sent out to fight but to work.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And they have been forced to work for Montgomery Ward.

Mr. MAYBANK. That may have been necessary.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator from Ohio yield further?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I think the observation is that they have been forced; that is the point.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to have someone who believes in this forced labor legislation explain to me how the son of a working man, raised in a working man's home, can have his morale improved by the knowledge that we are passing legislation, or that legislation has even been offered in the Congress, that would put his father or brother to work for a private employer against his will.

Mr. BURTON. It will come about in exactly the same way that representatives of labor organizations endorsed this substitute when presented by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] to the committee, on the ground that they had worked out a fair plan, making sure that the allocations were made in the proper manner, and that the laboring man was interested in labor doing its full share. That is why we have a letter from Philip Murray recommending the passage of some such legislation as that before us. That is why we had recommendations from other labor organizations. I might read this statement to the Senator, and he might pass it on to the sons of laboring men who might be sons of C. I. O. members. The quotation from Philip Murray is found at page 289 of the hearings. He was not a witness, but this was a written statement sent in through his representative:

> The Congress of Industrial Organizations endorses the bill introduced by Senators KILGORE, WAGNER, and others (amendments in the nature of a substitute for S. 36 were submitted to the Senate by Senators KILGORE, WAGNER, and FERGUSON on the next day after this hearing), and urges the Senate Military Affairs Committee to report the bill favorably instead of the May-Bailey bill.

We have a similar statement from another representative of labor. In order to be clear I should also say that since this was sent in there has been added a penalty clause that was not in the substitute when Mr. MURRAY wrote his letter, but I believe the penalty clause merely makes the substitute more effective along its original lines.

Mr. MILLIKIN. But did any of those labor leaders endorse the May bill?

Mr. BURTON. Not that I know of. One of the agricultural organizations endorsed the May bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Was there not some Communist labor leader who endorsed it?

Mr. BURTON. Not that I know of.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think it ought to be said that the testimony contained in this record of the hearings is testimony

given on the May-Bailey bill. So far as I know the hearings contain no testimony on the present version.

Mr. BURTON. May I interrupt the Senator from Kentucky? The matter I read, being on page 289 of the hearings, is directly on the substitute measure introduced by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

Mr. CHANDLER. I will admit that, but that is not the way the bill came before the committee.

Mr. BURTON. The matter I read is directed to the substitute as it is here before us, without the penalty clauses.

Mr. CHANDLER. And without the farm amendment.

Mr. BURTON. That is attached to the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not know of any labor leader or anyone else outside the membership of the committee that voted for the bill, who has approved of it, or expressed any approval of it. Most of this bookful of testimony was on the May-Bailey bill.

Someone a while ago undertook to say that the War Manpower Commissioner approved this bill. Did the Senator hear any testimony given before the committee to the effect that Paul McNutt approved the May-Bailey bill or the one now before us?

Mr. BURTON. He approved the May-Bailey bill, together with the amendments recommended, which would put the War Manpower Commission in the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

Mr. CHANDLER. But did he not say, as regards workers in the war industries in the United States, that the war manpower situation in the United States on the 1st of January was better than it had been at any time in its history? Did he not say that the original shortage was one-hundred-and-seventy-thousand-odd workers, and did he not say that he could get those workers by using the present method, without anything else being done? Does not the Senator recall that?

Mr. BURTON. As to whether he said he could get those workers without getting anything else in the way of legislation I do not recall, perhaps it was off the record.

Mr. CHANDLER. He said that.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, let me show what he said in that respect.

Mr. CHANDLER. Just a moment, befor the Senator from Ohio yields to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BURTON. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee in a moment, but I want first to follow up what the Senator from Kentucky has just stated. I may say that I understood Mr. McNutt to endorse the May-Bailey bill, as amended, so as to give the direction and the powers to the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. He did that in spite of the success of his own system. He took that position along with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and all the rest of the Government officials who appeared. They all stood together. They all made the same recommendations.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will not the Senator admit that Mr. McNutt had less enthusiasm for it than all the rest of them?

Mr. BURTON. I think that is true.

Mr. CHANDLER. Am I mistaken in my guess that he was less enthusiastic about it than all the rest of them?

Mr. BURTON. Of course, that is a question of opinion, but I think it is natural that a man who is operating a voluntary system would be the least enthusiastic about going over to the May-Bailey bill. But I think that having endorsed the May-Bailey bill, he would endorse the present measure even more than the May-Bailey bill, because it is a measure which would tend to help him to carry out his program.

Mr. CHANDLER. As I recall, on the 10th day of January the so-called Gardner committee——

Mr. BURTON. The advisory board.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes, the advisory board—all its members appeared together. I think Mr. Green, Mr. Murray, Eric Johnston, and others are on that committee. Under the pressure of the urge to pass the bill quickly they sort of agreed to go along with the May-Bailey bill.

Mr. BURTON. As amended.

Mr. CHANDLER. As amended. When Mr. Eric Johnston appeared before the committee, and when the Senator from Ohio and I were questioning him, the following occurred. I wish to read a few lines on page 242:

> Senator BURTON. That brought you, then, to the point you are making, that your Board did reach a conclusion that you thought it was wise to go ahead with some legislation at this point.

At that point we had a discussion off the record, but then I asked this question:

> Senator CHANDLER. Assuming that it was testified to before the committte that the manpower situation in the United States was the best in the history of the country on January 1 and that the workers urgently needed now were between one hundred seventy and one hundred eighty thousand workers and that they could be obtained by the voluntary method, by the methods used by the War Manpower Commission, would you say this legislation was necessary under those circumstances?

We were talking about the May-Bailey bill. Mr. Johnston said:

> Under those circumstances; no.

And if I may add, did not the Senator think that after the days which had passed from the 10th of January until the day Mr. Johnston testified, that if he had ever had any enthusiasm for this bill, it had been greatly cooled?

Mr. BURTON. I think it had cooled, but I want to point out that the question asked by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], on page 242, is a typical lawyer's hypothetical question very well put, and it includes in it the assumption that these 180,000 men could be obtained by the voluntary method. Well, of course, that assumes the question.

Mr. CHANDLER. But there was no question that that was the number which all hands agreed was urgently needed.

Mr. BURTON. But there was no proof that you could obtain them voluntarily.

Mr. CHANDLER. Here is the individual who has been charged with obtaining them, and the Senator will recall that he said he could obtain them by using his present methods.

Mr. BURTON. I think he said he could obtain them, but he did not know what the future might bring and, therefore, so on and so on.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, he did not know what the future might bring. No one but the Army would predict that something will happen which does not happen. The Army predicted that the war would be over at a certain time, and the war continued. If the Army were now to predict that the war will continue, we can perhaps just as well consider that it will soon stop, because they have made some notorious mistakes in their predictions.

Mr. BURTON. I think his recommendation was based on safeguarding the future rather than the present.

I should like to yield to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. CHANDLER. May I finish my discussion on the point we are now on?

Mr. BURTON. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator will agree that the Secretary of War said that the material effect for good on the Army would not be felt on the front for 6 or 7 months, and with respect to what is proposed to be done now, if it does good, which I question, we are not going to have any good effects from it, except for morale, for 6 or 7 months.

Mr. BURTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], but I should like to conclude, on the point the Senator from Kentucky has made, with respect to the proposed legislation having an effect on morale. I believe it would have a substantial beneficial effect several months from now on production. That is why we are attempting to pass this legislation at this time. In the substitute we are using the voluntary system. We are not going to discard any of that system. We will have all that McNutt had and more.

Mr. CHANDLER. If I believed that the bill would accomplish such good things I would be glad to support it.

Mr. BURTON. Perhaps if we drop an amendment or two somewhere along the line we may have the Senator's support.

Mr. CHANDLER. It will be necessary to drop an amendment or two in order to obtain my support.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, it is necessary that this bill be passed in order to step up production. In 4 or 5 months we will begin to notice a shortage. In connection with the German breakthrough which occurred in December, and which we have spoken of, I believe General Eisenhower made the statement that we used supplies that we did not expect to use until the spring of the next year, but we used those supplies because we were forced to use them. Mr. McNutt said he thinks the proposed legislation ought to be passed as a safeguard; that if we made any mistake hereafter we should make the mistake on the right side of the ledger.

I want to complete reading testimony which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] did not read. I wish to take

up one more question or two that was asked of Mr. Johnston after the Senator from Kentucky had completed his questioning. On page 242 of the record the following occurred——

Mr. BURTON. This is in the testimony of Eric Johnston?

Mr. STEWART. Yes. I am beginning where the Senator from Kentucky concluded. I asked Mr. Johnston:

Senator STEWART. Assuming that the Secretary of War testified that 16,500 soldiers had already been sent back to civilian work and that there were demands and requests being made for more, which they couldn't afford to spare, would you think that that indicated that there was an ample supply of civilian employees?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I would want to know all the facts back of sending the troops in.

Thereupon I asked this question:

Senator STEWART. All right. Suppose a part of the facts are that the Secretary of War testifies that there is an actual shortage in the production of numerous types of munitions, such as certain-sized shells, mortar shells, and other things, and certain kinds of clothing and things of that sort, and that under the voluntary method they have been unable to persuade civilians to go into the plants that manufacture these needed things—would that be indicative of a shortage?

To which Mr. Eric Johnston replied:

Of course, if the Secretary of War says that, and it is accurate, compulsory legislation is essential.

Now if that is not a conclusion I never saw one.

Mr. CHANDLER. If it is accurate.

Mr. STEWART. If it is accurate. Where is any testimony to the contrary? We are dealing with a situation here with respect to which witness after witness says this thing is necessary, and out of the mouth of not a single qualified witness is it disputed. That is the most remarkable situation I ever saw. Everyone in charge of the war says we need this thing, that we have to have it, and I have yet to hear testimony of a single man to dispute it. Although I did not attend all the hearings, I read them all.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to remind Senators that in January there was a meeting of the Advisory Board. Representatives of various organizations met at the White House. There was an agreement by practically all those present. I understand that one representative was absent, and perhaps another did not vote for it. The full record is available. With possibly one exception, representatives of industry and labor all agreed on the May bill, which was sent over from the House, with the amendments which were to be added placing the administration of the law under the office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. So between January 20 and February 20 some disagreement seems to have arisen, not only among the people, but among those who had previously agreed on a bill.

To emphasize that point more strongly, let me read what Mr. McNutt said, at page 119 of the hearings:

Mr. MCNUTT. I say, on the whole, the record has been remarkable. There have been places, of course, where it has not been successful, and it would be helpful if you had some tool where, voluntary methods failing, you could go in and really get the job done.

Mr. President, I believe that that is the desire of this committee. It is our desire to bring to the Senate, and have the Senate pass, a bill by which, when voluntary cooperation fails, we can get the job done, and support those on the fighting front.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Earlier I made inquiry regarding the evidence before the committee as to the voluntary system. I understood that the question had not been much discussed. I address myself to pages 48 and 49 of the record, where The Under Secretary of War testified as to four of the conspicuous cases in which the voluntary system had entirely failed, namely, in Newark, Allentown, Philadelphia, and New Bedford. I do not understand that in any of those cases there was any difficulty so far as the employers were concerned. They cooperated to the limit. The community cooperated to the limit. So there was no question of a break-down on that score. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio in what way the proposed substitute would meet that situation?

Mr. BURTON. I do not have at hand the details with regard to each of the instances referred to by the Senator. I gained the very clear impression that those instances were also reported to the Advisory Board. The Advisory Board followed up those cases; but I understand that the extreme conclusions drawn by the War Department were not sustained. We did look into the Allentown situation, and it did not by any means disclose the degree of failure which might be inferred from the statements of the Undersecretary of War when he presented the case. The report of the Under Secretary of War was made during the early stages of the Allentown program. It was just getting under way. It was picking up rapidly from day to day. I gained the impression from subsequent witnesses—one of them may have been Mr. McNutt—that it indicated much greater success than was suggested in the first report of the Under Secretary of War.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. With respect to the Allentown program, I read the following from the testimony of Under Secretary of War Patterson, on page 48 of the record:

The Allentown program has been in effect for 4 weeks. As of February 3 the War Manpower Commission reported that 261 workers under the program have been referred to war jobs and that 107 of these have actually taken war jobs.

There was an immediate need for 2,400.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I have read the story in the New Bedford case. The principal contention of the men who were refusing transfer was that the War Manpower Commission had no legal authority to establish ceilings, or to refer them to war industry. Certainly this bill would remove that principal argument.

Mr. BREWSTER. May I inquire where that evidence came from?

Mr. BALL. I did not say I had evidence. I have the news stories, which show that the main objection of the employees with reference to taking jobs in the tire plant was that the War Manpower Commission lacked legal authority.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that I have just returned from the New England area this afternoon. I read in detail the stories published in the Boston newspapers, and I found nothing to support that suggestion. The refusal of the workers was based entirely on individual grounds. They resented dismissal from their jobs, and absolutely refused to be transferred. They threatened very serious trouble over the situation.

Mr. BALL. I know that the story is to that effect; but the stories appearing in the Washington newspapers were to the effect that the main contention of the union and the employees was that the War Manpower Commission had no legal authority to take the steps which it had taken.

Mr. BREWSTER. That contention did not appear in the New England newspapers.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I refer the Senator to page 122 of the RECORD, at which point Mr. McNutt went into the Allentown situation, under examination by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], bringing it down to date, and referring at that time to total placements since notice of the program was issued and the program actually went into operation. The total was 708, which I believe compares with the figure of 107 which was used in the first instance. The program was just under way, and had not yet reached its peak.

Mr. BREWSTER. The figures given on page 122 cover all placements. We all know that there has been a regular turnover of approximately 7 percent in war industries, which has been measurably replaced. That is the entire difficulty. I do not believe we can give the Allentown system credit for 708 placements, because that figure includes also the replacements which would normally take place.

Mr. BURTON. All the figures are given in the report on employment at Allentown, in connection with the program there. I should like to use the instances of the voluntary system referred to by the Senator from Maine to illustrate the fact that there was an effort, under the voluntary system, to proceed in a practical manner, through cooperation, to fit men into places where they were needed. I believe that the thing which is needed is something which Congress alone can provide, and that is a declaration that the Congress has reached the conclusion that the time has come for a proper

allocation of workers. There is a shortage of men properly allocated. Therefore there is a special need for the people to recognize the necessity for a reallocation. Legislation behind the voluntary system would help to overcome doubt on the part of any who might be doubtful as to the need for their responding to the demand. I believe that the very fact that we have built up the voluntary system to a certain point, and have shown the need of it in various communities, is a demonstration that support is necessary for carrying it on. However, there is no proof that we need to go as far as the May bill goes, in changing the whole system and superimposing a new system, which, I fear, would delay rather than help the orderly movement toward greater production.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Was it not true that in all cases involving community efforts to meet the situation, there was the most wholehearted community cooperation, including cooperation by agencies of every character—labor, industry, and chambers of commerce? Was there not full cooperation by the public authorities, and by the governmental authorities in Washington concerned with production? I believe that in the Allentown case it was testified that $250,000 had been spent in an attempt to show the workers the absolute necessity of this program. Does the Senator believe that any pious resolutions by Congress, containing no compulsory requirements whatsoever, would lend any additional prestige or force to the program, after it has been proved to be entirely impossible to handle the problem on a purely local basis?

Mr. BURTON. I should not call this a pious resolution of the Congress.

Mr. BREWSTER. What is there in the bill that has any application to the worker? A $10,000 penalty is imposed on the employer, but there is no evidence to show that the employer has failed to cooperate to the limit. The Senator from Minnesota referred to some who did not recognize referrals; but in the evidence which I read, there is no suggestion that there has not been full cooperation on the part of employers. In justice to the boys overseas, what is there in the bill that applies to the individual, to indicate that we feel that he should do his part?

Mr. BURTON. There is no penalty applied to the individual, because he is not ordered around. However, there is a declaration that under proper governmental authority, when a ceiling is established, it must be put into effect. From that point on there will be recognition of the ceiling in any given plant, and from that point on there will be no further hoarding in that plant.

Mr. BREWSTER. That applies to the employer; but there has been no evidence that there has been a refusal on the part of employers to cooperate. It is a question of the men accepting jobs in other plants to which they are referred, which jobs they have refused to take in every one of the cases as to which we have evidence.

Mr. BURTON. I think we have evidence of cooperation in the major plants. I do not think we have evidence of the application to the community as a whole. That would come about through legislation applying to the large and small, the essential and the nonessential. Today, we simply cannot get universal cooperation by voluntary means to the same extent that we can get it by the application of a law. But the question is, How far shall the law go? In meeting the comparatively small need which lies ahead, I do not see the necessity of changing the whole system into one of drafting, instead of having the entire 14-point voluntary program providing for added pressure here and there and providing for the saving of labor here and there, and perhaps resulting in bringing available labor to Allentown, under the plan, whereas perhaps otherwise such labor would not be available to Allentown.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. In speaking of the voluntary system, does the Senator contend that the bill would put into effect all the voluntary system—for instance, the certificates of availability?

Mr. BURTON. I have outlined the 14 points which the bill will put into effect. But it certainly will put into effect the 3 I mentioned as being the outstanding points in the voluntary system.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the provision to be found on page 16, in lines 1 to 6, authorize the War Manpower Commission, or its Chairman, as the bill provides, to put certificates of availability into effect? As they have been used in the past, they have been an attempt to freeze labor on the job. Would the provision to which I have referred permit a laborer to be told, "You must have a certificate of availability before you can leave a plant or get a job"?

Mr. BURTON. I think it will be helpful if I am permitted to discuss the provisions of the bill one by one, as we proceed. In that way I will come to the point about which the Senator has been speaking. Certificates of availability are best covered by the provision on page 17, in section 6 (a). But if I am allowed to do so, I prefer to take up the bill point by point.

Mr. FERGUSON. But would that section permit the regulations?

On page 15 we find the following provision:

(b) To the extent necessary to carry out the purposes and means declared in the first section of this act and also for the purpose of keeping activities and places of employment essential to the war effort in productive operation, the Chairman is authorized and directed, by regulation—

Then it is provided that he may—

prescribe employment ceilings in designated areas, activities, or places of employment fixing the maximum number of workers, by age, sex, or occupational qualifications—

And this is the important part—

who may be there employed and prohibiting the employment of workers beyond such maximum number.

When we say that he is directed by regulation to fix who may be there employed, would it not permit him to use certificates of availability?

Mr. BURTON. I may say that certificates of availability are referred to much more clearly in section 6 (a), on page 17, and we also have the ceiling provision which has just been read by the Senator.

But I should like to discuss the details of the bill when I get to it, and I should like to get to it as quickly as possible.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. No doubt the Senator will recall that during the deliberations in the committee I tried, but without success, to strike that provision from the bill, on the ground that it establishes zero ceilings and that it would empower the War Manpower Commission to take any employee out of his place. Also, the second provision would prohibit or regulate the hiring, rehiring, solicitation, or recruitment of new workers by employers. That provision could put an employer entirely out of business; it could make it impossible for him to get anyone to work for him until the war is over. The Senator will agree to that; will he?

Mr. BURTON. I agree to that. But I should like to postpone the discussion of these matters until I have presented the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think the device of using the certificates of availability will come under paragraph (2), on page 16, in line 6, where we find that language "to prohibit or regulate the hiring, rehiring, solicitation, or recruitment of new workers by employers."

The certificate of availability is one of the devices which can be used in accomplishing those purposes.

I think it should be pointed out that on page 17, in section 6 (a), provision is made "for the issuance of a certificate to any person with respect to whom he finds that such person (1) has been released by his employer from a position," and so forth.

I refer to the provision on page 17 regarding certificates of reemployment. I think certificates of availability, which the Senator from Michigan wishes to have, can be provided under the regulations, as was pointed out.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield, but I hope we do not get into a discussion of this particular section before taking up a point-by-point presentation of the bill. I know it will be much easier to handle the discussion by referring to the various sections in their proper order. However, I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. I take it that the certificate mentioned on page 17 is one which an employee will be able to use in order to get his job back.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am talking about the present certificates of availability.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The certificate of availability will be a device which will be used under paragraph (2), on page 16.

Mr. FERGUSON. Could it not also be used under paragraph (1)?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should think so. But inasmuch as paragraph (2) deals with the hiring, rehiring, and other phases of employment, it will be more consistently used under paragraph (2) than under paragraph (1). Both refer to the same thing. But the certificate of reemployment is another matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. Later I will have some questions to ask regarding the application of the penalty clauses in relation to paragraphs (1) and (2).

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I feel that it is very important for me to set the Senate aright regarding what has been done in north Jersey, because a moment ago the Senator from Maine remarked that the plan and campaign had been almost a complete failure. I wish to state that the plan of voluntary cooperation, if that is what Senators choose to call it, has been extremely successful in north Jersey. It had not been as successful as we would have liked it to be. But, Mr. President, when I say that at least 50 very able men have devoted a large part of their time during the last 4 months to solving the manpower problem in north Jersey, then the Senate will realize that they have been very serious and earnest and that they are just as interested in backing up the troops abroad as you and I are.

I wish the Senate to know that 4 months ago in north Jersey we were losing more than 400 men a day from essential war plants. In this effort, which was directed by Mr. William J. Orchard of Belleville, N. J., and on which we have spent approximately $300,000 in an attempt to accomplish the desired result, not only has the loss of 400 men a day from essential war plants in north Jersey been stopped, but the trend has been reversed, and more than 4,000 men have been added to essential industries in northern New Jersey, whereas 20,000 men were needed.

I can tell the Senate, and I think the Senate probably would like to know, the feeling of many important people in New Jersey regarding the pending bill. The sentiment is divided, it is very sincerely divided. Some persons—even the chairman of the committee, Mr. William Orchard, who has worked day and night on this problem—have now reached the conclusion that the problem cannot be solved by voluntary methods. On the other hand, other men who are just as able and who have also given a great deal of time to this important work, differ with him and them, and think that the progress which has been made justifies continuing the voluntary effort.

That is why I have the very definite feeling that each one of us, when we hear all the arguments, must consult his own conscience in reaching what seems to be the proper determination; because there is not a Member of this great body who does not desire to back up in every necessary way the millions of men whom we have taken from civilian life, without their consent, and have sent to all the corners of the earth.

I thought the Senator from Ohio would like to know that the campaign in northern New Jersey has not been a complete failure.

Mr. BURTON. I am glad to have the Senator's testimony. In the light of it, I wonder if the Senator cannot go a little further; for it would be very helpful to have him present the attitude of the leaders of the movement toward the step as proposed in the substitute amendment, which would continue what is now being done, but with the force of statute behind it, instead of turning to the May-Bailey bill, which would involve a draft of labor.

Mr. HAWKES. From all the communications which I have received from manufacturers in North Jersey, and from persons at other points throughout the United States—unfortunately, many people in the United States think that I partly represent them as their Senator—I should say that the sentiment seems to be strongly in favor of not going further than a reinforcement of the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. BURTON. That would be an endorsement of the committee amendment rather than the May-Bafley bill.

Mr. HAWKES. I may say that what the Senator has said expresses the general impression which I have received. I have talked with many businessmen with regard to the penalty clause. I believe that the Senator from Maine made a very good point when he said that the penalty clause relates almost entirely to the employer.

Mr. BURTON. So does the bill.

Mr. HAWKES. I believe it to be a very fundamental mistake. I believe that a person with the best of intentions, operating industry under all the regulations, controls, and tribulations to which he has been subjected, could very easily violate the purposes of the bill without wishing to do so.

Mr. BURTON. I point out to the Senator that the penalty referred to is the penalty which exists in the Second War Powers Act and relates only to willful violation.

Mr. HAWKES. Who will determine whether the violation is willful or not?

Mr. BURTON. Those who would determine it under the Second War Powers Act. It is not a special clause, or an especially harsh clause. Whenever there is enacted a statute placing an obligation upon someone, almost always there is a provision incorporated making a violation of the act a misdemeanor. It is not an extraordinary penalty. It would merely provide that if one willfully violates the provisions which have been enacted into law, he is guilty of a misdemeanor.

Mr. HAWKES. The question is, Will the law be correctly applied? That is a question involving the administration of the law, and I suppose we must have confidence that it will be administered fairly.

Mr. BURTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I submit a suggestion to the Senator from New Jersey?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I also come from one of the great arsenals of democracy. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee has said that the voice of the armed services speaks unanimously in demanding increased war production. I believe that almost without exception the voice of war production in my arsenal of democracy speaks unanimously to the effect that the May bill is calculated to produce less rather than more war production.

Mr. BURTON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The able Senator from Ohio announced the appropriate rule when he said that we are required to listen to the voice of the armed services in determining the need, and then we are required to listen to the voice of those who have the "know-how" to meet the need.

Mr. BURTON. I agree with the Senator. I believe that the recommendation of the Senate committee follows such a principle. I believe that when I come tomorrow to the 14 points involved in the recommendation it will be seen that those points are logical implementations of the present effort at production, that they will improve production, and continue the effort now being made along that line. I believe that to be the kind of contribution to production which Congress should now make.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I gather from the statement of the Senator that he does not hope to conclude his remarks this afternoon.

Mr. BURTON. I have felt throughout that it was vitally important to put before the Senate at some point the 14 points which would make the bill effective, but I do not believe I can do so today.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has referred to them, but has not discussed them. If he desires now to cease and desist, as we say in the Federal trade law, I am perfectly agreeable that it be done.

Mr. BURTON. I appreciate the Senator's statement, and I should like to obtain the floor tomorrow shortly after the convening of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I anticipate no objection.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army; and

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Paul F. Foster, United States Naval Reserve, to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to continue while serving as assistant naval inspector general;

Capt. Henry M. Briggs, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Caribbean Sea frontier, and until reporting for other permanent duty;

Capt. John Perry, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 19th day of October 1943; and

Capt. Davenport Browne, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as assistant chief of staff (personnel) to commander, western sea frontier, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

By Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Patents:

Harold H. Jacobs, of Massachusetts, to be examiner-in-chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George R. Merrell to act as Commissioner of the United States of America to India, with the rank of Minister.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jewell W. Swofford to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Wednesday, February 28, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 27 (legislative day of February 26), 1945:

FOREIGN SERVICE

George R. Merrell to act as Commissioner of the United States of America to India with the rank of Minister.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Jewell W. Swofford to be a member for a term of 6 years from March 15, 1945.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Alma I. Jones, Chancellor.
J. Heard Saxon, Dothan.
Glenn Draper, Langdale.
Mary W. Hale, Leesburg.

CALIFORNIA

Margaret C. Monahan, Newcastle.
Florence M. Davis, Project City.
Lorraine F. Wyckoff, Rutherford.
Arthur L. Benedict, Sonoma.
Juanita W. Gay, Topanga.

COLORADO

Francis B. Flanagan, Holyoke.

IDAHO

Grace Fleck Bixler, Heyburn.

ILLINOIS

John L. Haines, Galva.
Clara L. Doll, Garden Prairie.
Johanna M. Payne, Hartsburg.
Kenneth D. Minteer, Keithsburg.
Cecilia E. Kelroy, Mundelein.
Lenor Hayes, Ogden.
Mary W. Tolar, Pulaski.
Marguerite D. Brown, Richmond.
Ralph H. Hartman, Sugar Grove.

INDIANA

Mae M. Kneisley, Hanna.
Otha H. Scott, Ladoga.

LOUISIANA

Susie H. Reid, Gilliam.
Lucile Arceneaux, Scott.

MARYLAND

Guy E. Boston, Berlin.

MINNESOTA

Arthur A. Vermeersch, Ghent.

NEBRASKA

John H. Hopkins, Omaha.

NORTH CAROLINA

Genevieve H. Wright, Cashiers.

OKLAHOMA

Gertrude M. Crabb, Arcadia.
Cara M. Masters, Cardin.
Hubert E. Williams, Cordell.
Amanda V. Schneider, Nicoma Park.
Rawley E. Hart, Paoli.
Ethel Shoup, Ripley.
Agnes H. Lockard, Tuskahoma.

OREGON

Frances N. McCormick, Gilchrist.
Alta M. Weigel, Oak Grove.

PENNSYLVANIA

Roseina M. Jackson, Coal Valley.
J. Frank Mulberger, Elderton.
Guido Donati, Kelly Station.
J. Paul Rice, Line Lexington.
Daniel E. Held, North Apollo.
Morrell E. Devlin, Tamaqua.

RHODE ISLAND

Walter Joseph Allaire, Esmond.
Frederick Baldwin, Mapleville.

TENNESSEE

Gertrude S. Moore, Mooresburg.
John E. Barnes, Ramer.

VIRGINIA

Stacy S. Swart, Fairfax.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Master, who art the author of peace and concord, enable us this day to speak in love the truth about all others and about life. Always make our motives sincere and a tonic for wholesome fellowship. Grant that Thy spirit may give our lives meaning and beauty, infusing them with eternal worth whileness and with a deep sense of reality.

We would that our responsibilities may close all gaps and find response in our unusual privileges and allow no broken defense of ours to spell neglect. As we see humanity's supreme need, grant that our pole star may not fade in the heavens, nor our compass fail, but direct us in the open way that leads to God. O for a contagion of faith that will sweep away our wrongdoings and build a new life rich in possibilities and outlook. Never was there such a time when we needed to stand strong and clear with such a grip on our civilization. Our patriotic sons and daughters have made a tryst with death and are marching bravely into battle; O let us make a tryst with life, crusading for peace and native land. Bless us for the sake of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. EARTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. EARTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member from Tennessee, I had not planned to speak this soon. I received notice from Senator STEWART of a meeting of the advisory committee on fresh berries at O. P. A. I attended this meeting, first because I represent an agricultural area greatly affected by O. P. A., and next as a member of the Agriculture Committee I want to be versed relative to the things therewith. I attended this meeting down at O. P. A. along with two other Congressmen, and we had an experience that I did not expect, in that we are held responsible to represent farmers and industry and charged with the responsibility of intelligently aiding in the making of laws. But this morning we, Members of Congress, were excluded from that meeting, and I do not like it.

I do not like it because when O. P. A. throws Congressmen out of a meeting called to establish ceilings on agricultural products they throw out the elected representatives of the producers of those products and the creators of O. P. A. This is still the people's Government, and such secrecy smacks of utter disre-

gard for the people who support our Government.

Instead of an advisory committee it appears that a selected group were called to be told what a few policy-making individuals are willing for the berry people to have rather than to be counseled and advised with.

To exclude the representatives of those people just because a lady in O. P. A. wrote a directive not only smacks of gross underhanded secret methods used but is Government without representation. It makes the Boston Tea Party insignificant, and I do not intend to be shoved out of meetings where the interest of my people is involved and remain silent. I want something done, for I say again I do not like it.

MAUGER CONSTRUCTION CO.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 1842) for the relief of the Mauger Construction Co. be restored to the Private Calendar. It was objected to during the call of that calendar last week. I have contacted the objectors as well as the leadership, and there are no objections to this request, I am informed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 2374) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 221), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "How Broke Is Great Britain?" I have submitted this article to the Government Printing Office, and I find that it runs over the usual allotment, amounting to about 2¼ pages. The cost will be $117. Regardless of that, I ask that it be included in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subject matters and to include in one an editorial from the Washington Star and in the other an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ADEQUATE NURSING CARE FOR THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 153), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2277) to insure adequate nursing care for the armed forces. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a table showing the history of income-tax legislation since 1913.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects and include a resolution adopted by the Oregon Legislature in each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on cooperatives by John H. Davis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein House Joint Resolution 4, requesting the Congress of the United States to initiate proper action for the immediate admission of Alaska as a State, which was passed by the Montana Legislature.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a communication written to me by Mr. C. Barry Shannon, publisher of the Palm Beach Publications, Inc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Washington Post of February 20, 1945, entitled "Radio Signal Leads to Rescue of 250 Stranded Allied Flyers," and a letter to the editor of the Washington Post from Constantin Fotitch, former Ambassador of Yugoslavia, concerning the article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES TREASURY—FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to say to my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, that there are many things happening here that I do not like. I watch the daily statement of the Treasury Department and I see that not only the war functions are increasing our deficit daily, and if you will observe this from day to day you will notice the same thing is happening in the regular operation of departments, but the regular functions of the Government that have been operating are all too expensively operated. We ought to try to curtail their expenses. We can and must get some economy in Government. They are increasing many of them and going ahead of what they were a year ago in expenses. It does not make sense to me, and I do not like it.

When you find out that we are now $234,474,769,033.67 in the red on February 23, I do not like it. I hope the Committee on Appropriations or some other department of this Government outside of this Congress will do something to curtail expenses and get some economy, because this Congress will not cut down these operating expenses, and I do not like it. I hope we will economize in the operation of our Government, before it is too late. You cannot go much further in operating a greater deficit. Where are you going to get the money?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I sympathize with my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Tennessee, and offer my cooperation in trying to get some of these bureaucratic agencies straightened out so that they will abide by the will of Congress and give a common, ordinary Representative a hearing. The gentleman will find in addition to what he has already learned that the O. P. A. generally makes its decisions and calls in the Advisory Board and tells them what they are going to do to the industry rather than to listen to the advice that the men in the industry offer to the O. P. A.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. The gentleman does not mean "usually"; he means "invariably," does he not?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, I will accept that because I know that it is true. They seldom listen to the advice, if ever, of the Advisory Board or what the Advisory Board tells them is the proper thing to do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a clipping.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE PHILIPPINE COMMONWEALTH

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and include a newspaper article on the subject of water pollution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short editorial from the Grandville Herald, of my State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUNKER asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

COAL PRODUCTION

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and also to extend my remarks in the Appendix on the same subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. I rise to bring to the attention of the House one fact about which they should know. That is that the coal miners of this country produced more coal in 1944 than in any other year in the history of the Nation. The coal miners did this despite the fact that 130,000 of their own membership had gone into the service of their country. They did it under most adverse circumstances.

I also want to pay compliment to the railroads of the United States. This past winter has been one of the most terrific in the history of the Nation as far as transportation is concerned. This fact has delayed the hauling of coal. In case anyone should advance the proposition that the miners or operators or railroads have been deficient in any way, it must be remembered that there has been no deficiency. They have transcended every other record. I shall have more to say on this subject than I can say in this 1 minute. Should you be interested you can see my additional remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD of this date.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from Grosse Pointe News.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DEFERMENT OF FARM LABOR

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 149) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 106) to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors essential to the war effort. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order House Joint Resolution 106, reported out by the Military Affairs Committee, which is designed to put some teeth in the Tydings amendment with reference to farm labor.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], after which I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this resolution brings up for consideration the so-called Flannagan joint resolution. The purpose of the Flannagan resolution is to try to stop Selective Service from paralyzing the agricultural production of the country. We thought we had done that when we passed the so-called Tydings amendment; we thought we had made it specific and clear in that amendment that farm labor that was essential and necessary to food production should not be drafted unless proper replacements were obtained. The Tydings amendment was just about as clear, I think, as the English language could make it, and was so construed by Selective Service for about 2 years. At the end of that time somebody had the bright idea that here was a large pool of young manhood working on the farms that could be drafted into the Army; so they changed the construction of the Tydings amendment.

The Tydings amendment states specifically that this class of men cannot be drafted if engaged in essential farm labor. They changed the construction of that amendment to mean that the Selective Service could determine the question of their relative importance in agriculture or in the Army; and then they proceeded to tell the local draft boards that it was very essential to have them in the Army. The result has been that all over this Nation in the agricultural areas, farms are being closed down, dairy herds are being disposed of, and our agricultural production right at the beginning of the productive season is just about paralyzed. Congress realizes, if the Selective Service does not, that we have got to feed this Nation, we have got to feed the Army, and we have got to feed many of the nations that have been devastated by war. So the Flannagan resolution proceeds to tell Selective Service in very plain language that they must cease putting the interpretation upon the Tydings amendment that they previously put upon it and shall interpret it according to its plain language.

We have two resolutions here, we have also the so-called Lemke resolution, which is a resolution of investigation. I believe we should pass both these resolutions, because the Flannagan resolution must be passed by the Senate and then signed by the President. The Lemke resolution would become effective at once in conducting an investigation into the question of why the selective-service

boards cannot understand plain English when Congress writes it in an act. So my idea is, and I hope the House will concur, that we ought to shoot both barrels in the beginning and pass both the Flannagan and the Lemke resolutions.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I agree with what the gentleman says, that the Selective Service System ought to be able to understand the English language when Congress writes it; but does not the gentleman think that the Supreme Court ought to be able to understand it also?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The Supreme Court is not engaged in this particular matter of drafting people. The problem we have to deal with is another matter. I do believe that the construction General Hershey has placed upon the Tydings amendment is a splendid illustration of the methods used by executive departments to repeal or amend acts of Congress by construction.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not want to put all the blame on General Hershey, because when General Hershey sent word to the draft boards he included the statement in his message that the President stated that men deferred in agriculture under 26 years of age were more essential to the war effort as members of the armed forces. It was the President's statement that caused all of this confusion.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know whether the President ever said anything like that or not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] three additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the President said anything about it or not. I am familiar with the telegram of General Hershey to which the gentleman refers. It was signed by General Hershey and General Hershey said the President found so-and-so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the difficulty grow out of the fact that the State directors, or at least some of them, one in Michigan, for instance, will not correctly interpret the Tydings amendment? Here is what the county agent in Mason County says:

> General Hershey repeatedly states that the local boards have been instructed to review each case—

That is all right. Then the county agent continues—

> which is absolutely at variance with the verbal instructions given them by the district director.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Well, there have been all sorts of instructions given.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The Agricultural Committee of the House had General Hershey before it and he made this statement:

> If I did not believe that under the Tydings amendment we could take every boy off the farm for the war effort I would come in here and ask for an amendment.

So that is the interpretation he has placed upon the Tydings amendment and I think that is the interpretation he has sent out to the State boards and to the local draft boards.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman from Missouri is a member of the Agricultural Committee, and I ask him now if General Hershey's construction of the Tydings amendment is not going to paralyze agricultural production in this country during the present year?

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Here is what I had reference to: If the Supreme Court of the United States, the highest tribunal of the land, charged with the responsibility of construing acts of Congress and upholding the Constitution, is going to ruthlessly set aside both, we cannot expect subordinate agencies of the Government to uphold them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. I was at the meeting that General Hershey attended, and to quote General Hershey, he said he was given an opinion by the President that it would not affect agricultural production to take the young men off the farm from 18 to 26. That is the quotation he gave us from the President.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 149 makes in order House Joint Resolution 106, introduced by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]. As I understand it, the only difference between a House joint resolution and an ordinary bill is that the joint resolution does not anticipate the appropriation of money. In other ways a joint resolution has the effect of law and must be passed by both branches of the Congress and approved by the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called Flannagan resolution is before the House because of what seems to be a very evident misinterpretation of the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act. The Tydings amendment was written into the Selective Service Act in 1942. There was no question as to its interpretation, either by the Director of Selective Service, General Hershey, or by any local draft board, or by any other official of the United States Government until January this year.

If I may, I would like to read the provisions of the Tydings amendment so the Members may be familiar with it.

> Every registrant found by a selective-service local board subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) 2, to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

Now, that wording seems rather clear, does it not? Yet in January of this year Director of War Mobilization Byrnes issued a statement in which he said the President had found it more essential for a farm worker to serve in the armed forces than on the farm. Based upon that statement General Hershey then sent out an order to the local draft boards to review and reexamine all deferments of agricultural workers in the lower age bracket. Immediately this heavy induction of farm workers began.

Later, an unofficial committee of some 175 or 200 Members of the House met with General Hershey and he agreed and admitted, at that time, that the Tydings amendment was still the law of the land and that it should be obeyed. He then agreed to send out a clarifying statement to the local draft boards of the country, on the basis that some of the draft boards had evidently misinterpreted his original order. That clarifying statement was sent out by the General promptly as promised.

However, in spite of it, messages continued to flow into Washington that these young men on the farms, essential workers now, mind you—for there is no desire on the part of the Congress to in any way protect the slacker or the unessential worker who may go to the farm—that these men are still being drafted; and that in some instances Army officers were going about the country telling local draft boards to disregard everything else and go ahead and induct these men.

General Hershey was then called before the House Committee on Agriculture where, lo and behold, he brought forth an entirely new idea, some sort of a system of relativity, something like the Einstein theory, whereby these farm workers would be drafted regardless of the Tydings amendment.

This resolution simply strengthens the Tydings amendment; in other words, the Congress is just passing another law to say what it means, what it said in the first law. I hope this resolution will be adopted.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, for the past 12 years it has been my happy privilege as well as high honor to represent a great agricultural district, the beautiful Shenandoah Valley of Virginia, the rolling blue-grass hills of Highland and Bath where we used to send 1,800-pound cattle straight to market without being corn fed, as well as to represent the fine agricultural counties of Rappahannock, Amherst, and Nelson on the east side of the Blue Ridge. I am familiar with their farm problems.

They have done a fine job to meet the increased demands of the war effort with decreased labor and a shortage of machinery.

The draft boards of my district and of my State, and I believe of the Nation, have handled a very difficult problem in a splendid way, but as has already been pointed out, the directive of General Hershey of January 3 created confusion in some of these rural sections about the right to draft farm labor under the provisions of the Tydings amendment.

I think, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] explained, the interpretation or explanation of that directive subsequently sent out by General Hershey has, to a large measure, met the situation. I am going to support this rule and the resolution that it will bring before us to make assurance doubly sure that farm workers who are essential and irreplaceable shall be entitled to exemption.

I wish to bring to the attention of the House a situation which gives promise of being as acute this year as the farm problem, and that is the problem of bituminous coal. You heard my distinguished friend and fellow member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], tell you that notwithstanding sending over 100,000 workers out of 400,000 workers into military service the bituminous coal fields of this Nation produced last year the record of 620,000,000 tons. You can better understand what that production means when I tell you that 400,000 men produced 620,000,000 tons in this country, while 700,000 British coal miners produced only 200,000,000 tons. Of course, that disparity is primarily due to the fact that our coal mines are largely mechanized and the British mines are not.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Notwithstanding the fine record made by the mine workers and the railroads and the operators, we still have a deficit of about 15,000,000 tons of coal, and if we have another strike we will be in a tragic situation.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The gentleman's statement is true as far as it goes, but it does not go half far enough.

It is proposed to draft some 12,000 to 15,000 coal miners. Those of us who have some familiarity with the mining situation know that you cannot get a certificate to mine coal until you have served an apprenticeship of 1 year under a competent foreman and have passed an examination, and they allow only 5 apprentices to each competent foreman. Instead of facing a deficit of 15,000,000 tons without any strike, we face, according to the last report of the Bituminous Coal Administrator, a deficit of 50,000,000 tons. One of the biggest producers in the Nation told me today that without any strikes, if the draft goes ahead and takes our trained miners, we will face a deficit of from 50,000,000 to 75,000,000 tons.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Is it not a fact that you cannot put inexperienced men into the mines without endangering the lives of all those below ground?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Both the State laws and the Federal laws prohibit it. As I have explained, it takes a year of training before a man can get a certificate to go in on his own. Otherwise, he is in there as an apprentice under the immediate supervision of a trained foreman. You cannot put the poolroom loafers in there, you cannot put the IV–F's in there, you just cannot take anybody out of the Army and put him in there.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it the gentleman's purpose to offer an appropriate amendment to the pending resolution?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I propose to offer an appropriate amendment that will put a coal miner who is found to be essential and irreplaceable on a par with the treatment this resolution will give to farm labor. But I will go further than that and provide, if I can procure permission to do it, that any coal miner given any such exemption will lose it if he goes on strike.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I happen to have had about 15 years of experience in the operation of coal mines myself, that is, connected directly with them. There is another problem connected with this that has not been brought out here and which I think the gentleman ought to stress. That is that when you take an essential man, a foreman, for instance, you not only take his services away from the mine but you cripple to the extent of 10 or 15 percent the efficiency of the whole working force.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I have in mind a mine in West Virginia that has been putting out 20 tons per day per worker. That is about 10 times what the average British worker turns out. The superintendent of that mine told me this morning if they drafted any more men from his mine the entire mine would have to be shut down, and that is not taking into consideration Mr. Ickes' estimate that they are liable to go short 50,000,000 tons. Now, we know we had to cut down to 90 percent of previous domestic consumption for this year, and a lot of homes went cold because of the unusual severity of winter weather. Do you know that an order has already been issued, or if it has not been issued it has been framed, to cut us to 80 percent? And if we have a strike they might as well say, "You get no coal" because we will be cut to a point where we could not keep our homes and our schools warm, and essential industry would have to be on a part-time basis. Great Britain has tried drafting coal miners. They pulled men out of the coal mines for military service and for industries assumed to be more essential to the war effort, and they found that production in coal fell to a point that for 1 man-day gained from that transfer they lost 10 to 50 man-days in some industry whose operation was curtailed for lack of coal.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. FLOOD. You are speaking of the bituminous mines when you ask for deferment for miners. I take it for granted when you use the word "miners" you include anthracite as well?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I think it ought to be covered. Bituminous is a critical thing because in addition to being put on notice that "we will not trespass on your property without a contract," a strike vote has already been ordered. But it has not been ordered in the anthracite field yet.

Mr. FLOOD. You will agree, however, that the anthracite mines are just as vital a war necessity and if this applies to deferment for bituminous miners it should as well apply for domestic fuel purposes and for the anthracite miners as well.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I had in mind framing an amendment to read "coal mining" and that would cover both.

Mr. FLOOD. Thank you.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. Has the gentleman gone into the matter of how much coal we are exporting to Argentina and South America?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Not fully, but it is relatively small. The shortage of coal is world-wide, and we have given priority to our war industries and to our homes. We have shipped a little but it has not amounted to much.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REED of New York. I was not in the Chamber when the gentleman started his discussion, but there is one point which I do not think has been developed. I have had communications from the mine owners relative to this. In some of the mines the men have left, hundreds of them have left even the smaller mines, to get the high wages paid in certain plants, and give their reason that it was not only the high pay but the fact that they did not have to do anything in those plants.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I talked with a very highly placed Government official this morning. He mentioned the May bill, the manpower bill that we passed, and when I say that I am disappointed in the way that the Senate has treated that bill I am indulging in a gross understatement. It would not be becoming, of course, for me to criticize the Senate, or any Member of the Senate, but I thought when I listened to that appeal Sunday afternoon from our Secretary of the Navy speaking over the radio from Guam when he told us how our marines had

fought, bled, and died on Iwo, and then wound up with a plea to us on the home front to back them up with full production, I could not see how the Senate or anybody else in this country could refuse to take what steps are available to us to speed up production which all of us know is falling, and which can be very serious to the entire war effort.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I am very anxious to cooperate with the gentleman in obtaining the adoption of the amendment he proposes, but I am fearful that his amendment would not be in order to the Flannagan resolution. I wonder if the gentleman has conferred with the Parliamentarian in that regard, because if it is not in order, then the time to take steps so that it would be in order is on the rule itself, which is now before the House.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The gentleman's point is well taken. I have had no opportunity to confer with the Parliamentarian. I will endeavor to do so before we vote on the rule. But I certainly think that if the amendment I have in mind is not germane, the rule should be changed to make it germane, because this is one of the most vital things that confronts us. Not only is all the war effort at stake, but our hospitals, our schools, and our home life are all at stake if we do not have coal next winter.

I told you that those who have the matter in charge, both in the Government and as operators, are gravely concerned with the problem, irrespective of the call that has been issued for a Nation-wide strike to shut down our coal mines unless they can get the wages that have not yet been demanded.

I did not follow up what this Government official told me this morning about the May manpower bill. He said if we had that bill now we could so use the manpower that has not been used, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] said, bring back to the coal fields any trained men who have left for higher pay, and that we would not have to draft for military service a single trained coal miner. They might take some water boys and outside workers, but we would not have to pull men who are irreplaceable.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Shortly after that bill was introduced, seeking to provide manpower for industry, I was informed by two or three different coal operators that their working force had picked up as high as 25 percent, and their production had increased, and that it had had a decided effect.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I do not think there is any doubt about it, but we have not done our job. It is not fair to say to General Hershey, "You have exceeded your authority in putting stress upon the need for men in the military service" unless we do our part to utilize available manpower. He has not asked for any more men than they need; but we are not doing our job on the home front in utilizing to the best advantage the labor that is not needed in the military service.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. As bad as that is, is not the threatened strike more serious right now?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Of course, I cannot believe that the patriotic men in our coal mines would destroy this war effort in any such way as that.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. We have had strikes, you know, under similar circumstances.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PHILBIN). The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the resolution which is now before the House does not have anything to do with coal miners and the coal situation. It deals entirely with agricultural farm help. There is nothing new in the Flannagan resolution. The Congress passed and the President signed an amendment to the selective training and service law embodying the Tydings amendment. I have addressed the House on numerous occasions with reference to the way that amendment is being interpreted by General Hershey. The Flannagan resolution, which will be a law if enacted and signed by the President, does two things. First, it is a legislative directive or a law which directs a bureaucrat to interpret and to enforce the law as the Congress intended. That is all it does as far as that phase is concerned.

The last sentence is an amendment to the Tydings amendment. That sentence provides in substance that, if in the rescreening of this farm help, any of these men who have been deferred because they were essential on the farm, are found to be physically incapacitated for Army service and are placed in class IV-F, then they shall be required to remain in the essential farm job on the farm which they have been deferred to do.

So as far as the coal situation is concerned, if this resolution passes it will bring the Flannagan resolution or bill—it is in effect a bill—before the House, and it will be open to any germane amendments. The Committee on Rules heard no discussion whatever about the coal situation. There was no suggestion before the Committee on Rules other than that this open rule should be presented. The pending rule was asked for unanimously by the Committee on Military Affairs. When therefore the bill is read for amendment under the 5-minute rule, if the amendment with regard to coal miners is germane to the agricultural class or group, it will be in order. My own view is it will not be in order. I may be wrong. If I am right, I suggest that the Representatives interested in the deferment of coal miners go before the Committee on Military Affairs and secure an amendment that would accomplish the purpose they seek.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield briefly.

Mr. BAILEY. In view of the interpretation the gentleman from Michigan is placing on this rule and this resolution, am I to understand that he is inviting the House to defeat this rule?

Mr. MICHENER. I certainly am not. I cannot conceive of any such construction being placed upon my remarks. What I am saying is, that we are here dealing with farm labor under the rules of the House. I am sure the gentleman from West Virginia will, after he has been here a little while, find that what I have said coincides with the rules of the House. I want to help the gentleman. This is the wrong place, under the rules, to offer an amendment relating to coal miners.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PHILBIN). The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I, too, yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, we all realize why this resolution is here. It is here because certain of the people charged with the administration of the Selective Service Act in the opinion of many of us have sought to circumvent and avoid certain of the plain language of the basic act.

To me it has always seemed quite clear that when we enacted the Tydings amendment we expected that essential farm workers who were irreplaceable would be deferred from the operation of the Selective Service Act. To my mind that language was put in the act because we understood and knew that our food production would have to be kept up, that it was absolutely essential that the food be produced to sustain and maintain not only our own fighting men and civilian population, but, to some measure, the fighting men and civilian populations of our allies. Of course, none of us want any man deferred who does not classify as an essential farm worker; but we have held that if they are so essential and irreplaceable they should be deferred.

This bill undertakes to restate to those in charge of administering selective service what I think was the clear intent of the Congress. If it is necessary for us to do that, although it is putting us in a rather ridiculous position, then I for one am ready to go along to see that our intention is restated. But this bill undertakes to do another thing commented upon briefly by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. Speaker, this bill in its final sentence, and I direct your attention to it, states as follows:

> It shall be the duty of any such registrant who is also found by his local selective-service board to be physically or otherwise unfit for military training and service to remain in such agricultural occupation or endeavor unless and until released from

such agricultural occupation or endeavor by his local selective-service board, and violations of this provision shall be considered an evasion of service in the land or naval forces.

Mr. Speaker, as I read that language it can mean only one thing, and that is that the man out in Indiana operating a 160-acre farm deferred as an agricultural worker who is then turned up IV–F, would, under the provisions undertaken to be written into the law by this language, be required to stay on that particular farm and in that job whether or not he should so elect to stay. In order that there be no misunderstanding on my part about it, I checked with the author of the bill, who is chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and he tells me that that is the correct understanding.

Not so long ago we had what was called a work-or-jail bill. Certain people in opposition to that bill referred to certain of its provisions as involuntary servitude. If that could be said of the provisions of that bill, then certainly this language can be said to provide a condition of serfdom for the farmers who would be affected by it.

Under existing law there is no similar treatment of the man deferred as a key worker in an essential industry. Under the law as it exists today, according to my understanding, a worker in an airplane factory deferred as a key worker and who then turned up IV–F could leave that job and go any place else to work that he might want to go.

We did pass the so-called work-or-jail bill that I referred to, and it is now under debate in the other body. As it is now presented to that body it contains nothing like this language applicable to industrial workers.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is this: Why set up in this bill in which we are undertaking to clarify the intent of Congress in respect to deferment of essential farm workers rank discrimination against the farmer and the farm worker as compared with the industrial worker in the city? If we are to have such a provision applicable to farm workers by which compulsion shall be imposed upon them in respect to their particular employment, compulsion which would freeze them on the farm where they are presently employed, why not work that out in conjunction with the legislation that is understood to apply over all? What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. If it is to be congressional policy to apply compulsion to the industrial worker, then, all right, it should be congressional policy to apply compulsion to the farm worker. But I say that at this present stage of things, to my mind it would be wrong for us to include that language in this bill, thus setting up what I again say is discrimination against the farm worker who has been thereby deferred.

My view is that that language should be stricken from the bill. Let us go ahead and do what we undertook to do, yes, what I think most of us understood we were going to do by the adoption of this resolution and then leave to the general over-all determination the question as to the degree of compulsion in respect to freezing men into jobs that is involved in the language I have referred to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I think the gentleman will recall, if he will think a little further about it, that the Senate committee at one time had practically this construction written into the bill which they reported. I am not sure that it is in it now. But if you strike out all of the part of the resolution beginning with the word "it" in line 6 on page 2, down to and including the end of it, you leave the resolution clean of any question concerning the extent of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. No; I do not think so at all. It is the foregoing language which provides that in determining the Tydings amendment there shall be no reference to the relative essentiality of the registrant to farm employment or to military service. The gentleman knows that that is the way by which Selective Service undertook to circumvent the Tydings amendment.

Mr. MAY. I think the gentleman has entirely misunderstood me.

Mr. HALLECK. I understood the gentleman to say and to contend that if we took out the last sentence beginning on line 6, page 2, that there would not be anything left in the bill.

Mr. MAY. No, no. I said we would leave the bill just as expressed by congressional intent; what we meant by the Tydings amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. For that I stand.

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. I think that that is what this bill should do. If there is to be inserted in the other body or in conference something about compulsion on industrial workers and something about compulsion on agricultural workers, let us work it all out together.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman's suggestion can be carried out, can it not, when it is before the House? The gentleman can offer an amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

Mr. MICHENER. That does not have anything to do with the rule. I take it the gentleman is for the rule.

Mr. HALLECK. I am for the adoption of the rule. I yielded before I completed my statement, but it is my intention, unless somebody else does it, to offer an amendment to strike out this language, letting this bill go through as clarifying the congressional intent in respect to the Tydings amendment and leaving to the working out of the general over-all proposition that is now in the process of being determined the ultimate question as to the degree and type of compulsion that shall be exerted by Government on industrial and agricultural workers.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended—Public Law 772, Seventy-seventh Congress, chapter 638, second session, H. R. 7528—which was approved and signed by the President November 13, 1942. I quote from the law:

> Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

Now, Mr. Speaker, certainly, the intent of Congress is clearly defined in this section which is now a law of our land. I am wondering who has authority to refuse to obey this law, and why the Attorney General does not enforce this item. Under what authority does General Hershey, or any other individual, have the right to ignore the law. Congress recognized, in the passing of this amendment—known as the Tydings amendment—that farming and production of food is essential to the war effort, and we should demand that the law be obeyed. If the bureau heads are going to continue to ignore the laws passed by Congress, Congress should remove those bureau heads. It is certainly time that Congress insist that we are the legislative body, that no directives replace existing laws, and that our people are to be governed by laws passed by Congress and not by directives issued by any individual.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein a few excerpts from the hundreds of letters and telegrams I received on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I simply desire to state that I favor the adoption of the Lemke resolution as well as the adoption of the Flannagan resolution, because the Lemke resolution implements the Flannagan joint resolution.

Mr. LEMKE. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that in considering this subject we are going to forget all about partisanship. This question that confronts us and the Nation affects our war effort. The Nation's food supply must remain unimpaired. The time has come for us to see to it that we give full consideration and honest consideration to this matter without regard to partisanship.

I am for this rule and I am for the Flannagan joint resolution, whether it is amended or not, for the reason that it carries out, although in a different way, the same matters that are covered in my own resolution. I have no pride of authorship in a resolution, but I want to be sure that when we get through we will have accomplished our purpose.

The difference between the Flannagan resolution and the Lemke resolution, representing the committee of 11 which, in turn, represents 250 Members of Congress, is this: The Flannagan resolution is in the form of a joint resolution. If passed, it will have to be signed by the President. Let us not fool ourselves. We do not know what the President will do. I am not speaking for the President. I do not know what he is going to do and neither do you. But I shall not assume that General Hershey is doing what he is doing without some suggestion from somewhere higher up.

The time has come to talk plainly. General Hershey, whether ordered or not, deliberately tried to nullify the Tydings amendment. When he appeared before the 250 Members of Congress he tried to run around all corners and get around without touching the corners.

When he appeared before the Committee on Agriculture, of which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] is chairman, he was a little more versatile and slipped around more readily. He finally, on January 22, sent out a correction of his erroneous directive of January 3, and a few days later he sent out another statement that nullified his correction of January 22. I say he deliberately intends to ruin the farms of this Nation. I do not care whether he does it knowingly or unknowingly, but I am satisfied he does it knowingly.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think we should say this for General Hershey, that he did admit he was acting as a deputy sheriff in taking and serving orders, without holding himself responsible for the orders he was carrying out.

Mr. LEMKE. I will agree that he said that on one occasion, but it is very hard to know what was really in his mind when you take all of his statements at the various meetings. When you consider all of the conversations we had with him, then I know he is acting as more than a deputy sheriff.

I know that some of the local boards have been asked to resign when they did not do what he wanted them to do. I know he told us to take an appeal to him, and then in cases where he had reversed the local boards when the appeal was taken, he refused to correct his mistake. He not only refused to reverse himself but he misstated the facts upon which he attempted to justify and substantiate his own actions.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think one of the unfortunate things is that most of the damage has already been done, when we are trying to get this thing fixed up here and get them to follow the law.

Mr. LEMKE. That is why I think you should pass the Flannagan joint resolution now, and you should follow that immediately by passing the Lemke concurrent resolution. That will give the local boards immediately the correct interpretation by Congress of its own act. They will accept the interpretation of Congress, I am sure, in place of that of General Hershey.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not only that, but after Brigadier General Pearson, who is State director in Michigan, sent out his corrective, his subordinates went around and told the board verbally to disregard the written corrective.

Mr. LEMKE. The same thing was done in Ohio, Indiana, and other States.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. In the opinion of the gentleman, will the passage of House Joint Resolution 106 in any way interfere with the passage of the Lemke resolution? Does the gentleman have a rule on that resolution, or the promise that the rule will be acted on immediately thereafter?

Mr. LEMKE. I had a rule 6 days before the Flannagan resolution got a rule, but I have no objection to that at all. I have no pride of authorship. But I do want to stop this wholesale, illegal, unlawful induction of essential farmers. There is no conflict in the Flannagan and Lemke resolutions. I am sure the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will support the Lemke resolution.

The Lemke resolution in addition to correcting the erroneous, unwarranted interpretation put upon the Tydings amendment by General Hershey, also creates a committee to see to it that in the future neither General Hershey nor any other Federal official dares violate an act of Congress under the pretense that he has not enough intelligence to read the English language, and understand what the act means. That committee will be a constant reminder that the laws of this Nation must be observed or impeachment might follow.

I insert a few excerpts from the hundreds of letters and telegrams I have received showing clearly that the violation of the Tydings amendment is not confined to one State or one locality:

I am a farmer in I–A. To report for induction February 13, 1945. I am one of a hundred farmers from board No. 3, Richland County, Mansfield, Ohio. I have had a hearing; they refused to reopen my case. They have not received any orders to defer farmers under Tydings amendment. They are following Hershey's order of January 3, 1945.

I am 22 years old. I own a complete line of new farming equipment. Also have dairy cows, hogs, sheep, and chickens. I do this work alone; I have no other help.

CARL EHRET.

SHELBY, OHIO.

Things are going from bad to worse on my son's farm. There is no one but his wife with a little child 1 year of age; impossible to take care of all the work that so badly needs doing on that farm. The entire feed crop of 1944 is still in the field, and at least 12 bales of cotton unpicked; not one to harvest the rest of the crop worth about $5,000. His sheep now lambing and there is a very high death loss, they cannot be cared for. Everything is on standstill and going to ruin.

I am his 65-year-old father and living 90 miles from him. I am in poor health and depend largely on my son's help, in harvesting my grain crop, handling the combine and binder, and help me to tend to my beef cattle.

CHARLES JURECK.

PAINT ROCK, TEX.

They are taking them all, and they have large farms.

The American people are awfully sick of this. We are short of food now. * * *

To get what they want they call in General Marshall or some other stool pigeon; then if they cannot get it they say G. I. Joe wants it.

Mrs. J. HERRINGTON.

SARATOGA SPRINGS, N. Y.

In regard to General Hershey's actions I don't think he is playing a fair game with agriculture. It is my firm conviction that too many farm workers have been drafted already and what few that are left are very essential and cannot be replaced. In view of agriculture and especially North Dakota, it is a very serious situation, and I am very much concerned. In many cases, including my own county, local draft boards have misinterpreted orders and have and are acting too hastily in the taking of farmers and farm workers that are necessary on the farms.

WM. PHELPS, Jr.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *February 6, 1945.*

The enclosed public sale notices appearing in our local papers (Findlay, Ohio) show what the drafting of young farmers is doing to our part of the country. With our young farmers in the armed services, the threat to the Nation's food supply increases. Old men and women, even though trained on the farm, cannot do all the heavy work that real farming requires.

Mrs. P. D. VOORHEIS.

FINDLAY, OHIO, *January 30, 1945.*

As you know, however, General Hershey has again run true to form and has repudiated his pledge given to your committee and is again drafting farm workers and farmers. Not only that, but as you possibly may not know, appeal boards, under his direction, are reversing C–II classification given farmers by local boards and are forcing these essential—even vital—workers into the armed forces. Only a day or two ago an Alabama local board, resigned in a body because the Government appeal agent had reversed the C–II deferred classification given to 40 farmers by the board and had reclassified these workers into I–A.

There is no use trying to deal with Hershey. * * * He had reversed himself times without number during his tenure of office. Why keep beating around the bush about this vital question of farm workers? If my understanding of the Tydings amendment is correct, Hershey has no more legal right to draft farm workers than he has to draft you. * * *

A. H. GALLIGER.

HOT SPRINGS, ARK., *February 9, 1945.*

I am a farmer 57 years old. Last December 28 my boy was drafted and it leaves me in a very bad situation. I raise hogs, peanuts, raise good quantity of chickens and turkeys and corn, have two power corn shellers, one peanut picker, three tractors, and other power-driven farm equipment. And this boy of mine was the operator. Now the machines and tractors will have to be idle for lack of someone to operate them, and I am not able to do it.

This neighborhood is badly in need of their use in farming and harvesting. The draft board told the boy and myself that the outside pressure was too great. They seem to feel that he was entitled to deferment.

ISAAC BYRUM.

TYNER, N. C., *February 2, 1945.*

I never saw so much confusion and uncertainty right at a time when farmers are to begin their 1945 operations. Day before yesterday all our Midwest radio stations quoted Hershey as saying, "Tydings amendment or no Tydings amendment, all the 18-25 men would be inducted." The local boards, most of them want to do all they can but they are all confused too. I was in town an hour or so yesterday and a half dozen farmers said, "If my last man goes I'll have to leave the farm idle. I can't farm it, and no one around can absorb it, and I can't find help anywhere. * * *

Let me give you one example. John Doe was married in 1939 and has farmed the 160 alone since 1939. Last year he farmed the neighbor's 160, making 320. This was done with 1 additional man. He has 30 head of milk cows, 25 of which are either milking or will be in milk in 1945. This home farm has been producing from 125 to 200 head of hogs and from 3,000 to 4,000 pounds of butterfat a year. In addition in 1944 the 320 acres produced 8,000 bushels of corn, 100 tons of hay, 1,500 bushels of oats, 100 tons of silage, besides pasture and straw.

H. L. DIETERICH.

BROOKLYN, IOWA, *February 8, 1945.*

I noticed in a recent Fargo Forum where it quoted some of your statements about selective service with General Hershey. I agree with you fully that although General Hershey says the Tydings amendment is still in effect, a lot or probably most of the local boards do not seem to be aware of it and are drafting farmers and farm help that shouldn't be.

WM. PHELPS, Jr.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 27, 1945.*

I am also proud to think that you men are trying to keep our home front in order. What I mean, to keep our farms in operation. To my estimation if we don't, we will lose the war, too. But I am still hoping and praying that the Congress of our United States will take those serious matters in their hands and not turn all those important issues over to just one man.

CHARLES WITKER.

PEMBERVILLE, OHIO, *January 31, 1945.*

It has been voiced among many that it is a scheme to get rid of the little farmer—drafting more than a million men from farms and yipping for more food to be produced doesn't make sense. There may be a diabolical scheme behind it to cause the little farmer to give way to the big one.

Mrs. W. D. LITTLEDALE.

LOMBARD, ILL.

Why is the young farmer and farm labor being drafted from the farms? Is this Tydings amendment for farm help just another joke? If it is a national law, then why don't Congress see to it that the Tydings amendment is followed by the draft boards strictly according to law? * * *

In 1943 and 1944 around here there were hundreds of head of good milk and dairy cows that were sold direct to the butcher for slaughter, as the young farmers were drafted from the farms where they had as many as 30 to 50 milk cows to each farm, just because these young farmers were living with their mother and father on the same farm, well the father and mother could not do this farm work besides milking the cows after their sons were drafted from the farms into the Army.

F. JOHNSON.

DISHMAN, WASH., *January 20, 1945.*

We farmers are deeply concerned about the present policy of the administration in drafting young farmers.

Apparently the administration has cast aside all caution and is stubbornly intent on drafting all farmers "at least those under 26," regardless of the effect it will have on agriculture or on ruining the farms operated by men who cannot be replaced.

The results of this policy may not be felt immediately, but if in the coming season production of food is far below our Nation's needs, the Government will have only itself to blame.

We farmers have sweated it out for a number of years with a minimum of help and lack of equipment. Now when the need for food is greater than ever they step in and draft the backbone of our mechanized farming.

I am enclosing a clipping from our local paper regarding farmer drafting. Is Hershey dictator of the American people?

V. E. NELSON.

DOUGLAS, N. DAK., *February 8, 1945.*

The draft board in this county is not and has not observed the Tydings amendment. They have taken every man in the county between the ages of 18 and 26 and are now taking the ones up to 30. In several cases they have taken the only man on the place.

My son was taken December 28, and he was the only man on his place of nearly 5,000 acres. Of course, I am having to close his place out.

W. J. NEVILLE.

HENRIETTA, TEX., *February 5, 1945.*

As I am about to be inducted into the United States armed services through the channels of my local draft board, No. 2, Wayne County, Ohio, I would like to point out to you some of the facts of my case.

I am the operator of a 265-acre general livestock farm. I have no other help excepting my father, Vinson S. Orr, who is a rural mail carrier for the past 24 years. I do custom work with my cornpicker and combine. Therefore, you will see that my case is worth consideration. This farm will be put out of production with my removal.

KENNETH R. ORR.

FREDERICKSBURG, OHIO, *February 12, 1945.*

Farmers out here are completely upset. Regardless of what Hershey says, local boards are inducting farm boys who are sole operators of dairy farms. What is the sense of sending all these registrants to induction centers for physicals before induction if they do not intend to draft them? It's only a waste of bond money. If the Government has so much money for physical examinations, why not send all of us? I would like a check-up, too. People won't buy bonds with such a waste of funds. * * *

Hershey is bound and determined to grab their farm help if it's the last thing he ever does, while in the cost-plus plants many men are ashamed to take their pay for the little work they are doing, and no farm machinery being produced under the false guise of manpower shortage.

We are asked to produce more again in 1945—no manpower—no machinery. I do not have the answer. Do you? I can only suggest that Congress will have to act and act fast, or there will be lots of factory workers so weak that they can't eat. There even may be a food shortage for the soldiers. All farm-machinery factories have now notified dealers of large cut-backs over original promises which were a mere nothing to meet dire needs.

K. W. HONES,

State President, Farmers Union.

CHIPPEWA FALLS, WIS., *February 10, 1945.*

I talked to a chairman of a local board and here is what he told me, "Mr. Hershey says, 'Draft all farmers under the age of 26 years who have been previously deferred under the Tydings amendment'," and he went on to say that so far as he was concerned the Tydings amendment was not now worth the paper it was written on and he had acted as Mr. Hershey instructed and not by law. Now if that is not abrogating the Tydings amendment you tell me what you call it. * * *

An amendment enacted by our respective legislators for the security of the country and armed forces can be devastated by just one man; if anything could be of more humiliation to our legislative body and people I do not know what it could be unless abrogate our representative form of government. * * *

Here is a boy 23 years old, has 20 cows milking, 12,800 laying hens, and farming nearly 100 acres of land all by himself, except in haysaving time and he has got to report for preinduction examination February 5. He will be away all day and there is no one to feed stock and hens all, and I guess he will be given 60 days to dispose of his stock and hens.

Do you think boys like these are worth more in the Army than on the farm? There are thousands of other boys in the same boat with these boys. Do you think the local boards are carrying out the Tydings amendment?

F. M. HUNTER.

MADISON HEIGHTS, VA., *January 31, 1945.*

My son, Bobby Harrison Taylor, now 17 years will be 18 years March 7, the only boy I have left at home. I have one son in Germany. My husband died October 15, 1943. I have two little girls at home, ages 13 and 16, neither one very strong. I am in bad health, have heart trouble, also kidney trouble. Have a farm—97 acres, 2 cows, 2 mules, 2 hogs, 75 chickens. Allotment for tobacco 10 acres; corn, vegetables, etc., about 15 or 20 acres. A supply of farming tools.

Mrs. DELLA M. TAYLOR.

RURAL HALL, N. C., *February 6, 1945.*

We have a son, an only child who was reclassified from II–C to I–A.

He operates our farm. Has never worked anywhere else. His father has arthritis, and will have to sell out if they take our son.

There are only about a half dozen boys left around here with a radius of about 25 miles.

These boys help all the other farmers around, as there isn't any help available.

Mrs. KENNETH WATERS.

ZANESVILLE, OHIO, *February 8, 1945.*

It looks as though they are planning to strip the country of all physically fit boys off the farms and induct them into the service, in direct violation of the Tydings amendment, and against the advice of practically all the agricultural leaders and economists. State Director Heninger made a statement this past week that they would take 5,100 boys between the ages of 18 to 26 from Nebraska in the next few months.

O. P. COOK.

ALVO, NEBR., *February 1, 1945.*

Last week 10 of the farm workers in our parish formerly classified as II–C according to the Tydings amendment were given their preinduction physicals. Nine of the men passed and are now I–A. * * *

Yet the draft board, over the protests of the local agricultural county agent, has put all of these farm hands in I–A.

In my own particular case, the man in question has been with me for 9 years and is my one remaining farm hand. If he is inducted I will have to go out of business.

THOMAS W. MELIUS, Sr.

METAIRIE, LA., *February 1, 1945.*

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this rule and the resolution which it makes in order. I am also in favor of the Lemke resolution. I think we are justified in voting for both of them. This is the situation which confronted this country as far as agricultural production is concerned on last January 3. We had the War Food Administrator giving us the food goals for the year 1945. Those goals were higher than they have been for any year in our history. Every year for the last 4 the farmers of this country have produced more than they produced in the preceding year, and more than they have produced in any year in our history. They have done that, of course, in spite of a lack of labor and lack of machinery and lack of transportation, and everything else that goes to make for farm production. Now there are fewer farm workers this year than there were last year, and the year before, and the year before. There have been fewer every year, fewer farm workers on the farms since last January 1 than we ever had since they have been keeping records of farm workers. On January 1, 1945, there had been deferred about 360,000 men between the ages of 18 and 26 who were on the farm. They were deferred under the Tydings amendment as essential agricultural workers. Most of them would have been continued in that class if it had not been for a directive General Hershey issued on the 3d of January in which he put an entirely new interpretation upon the Tydings amendment, and virtually instructed the local selective service boards not to construe the Tydings amendment as it had heretofore been construed, but to introduce into it a new element; that is, the element of comparative essentiality. In other words, he said to the local boards it does not make any difference if a man is regularly engaged in agriculture, if his agricultural occupation is essential to the war effort; and if he cannot be replaced, it still does not make any difference, you are to send him into the service if you think he is needed worse in the Army than he is on the farm. I submit that was never in the Tydings amendment. That element was never intended to be entered into by the Congress. It was put there by this directive. It is in order to correct that misinterpretation of the Tydings amendment that we have this legislation before us today. We should not have to consider this legislation, but it is necessary in order to correct that interpretation which is taking men off the farms, thousands of them who are needed to be kept there if we are going to meet our agricultural goals this year.

It is very clearly shown, I am sure, by the testimony of General Hershey that he intended there should be a new interpretation, and that that interpretation should take men off the farms previously deferred because he said to the Committee on Agriculture that he expected, or hoped, rather, to get at least 100,000 out of 360,000 men who had been deferred under the Tydings amendment. Now, they had all been deferred under the original construction of the Tydings amendment, so it follows, of course, they could not be taken off of the farms where they are needed worse this year than ever before, when our production goals are greater, unless it was expected to put a new construction upon the Tydings amendment and get them in in that way.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will not the gentleman state in connection with his observations with regard to the crop we produced last year that the cultural conditions, the weather conditions, and the conditions for cultivating and harvesting were most unusual last year and were more favorable last year and better than we can expect this year?

Mr. HOPE. Yes; I am glad the gentleman brought that up.

It is true that conditions, as far as weather is concerned, were better the last 4 years than normally. This year if we should be so unfortunate as to have even normal weather I do not see how we can meet our goals, even if we leave all of these men on the farms.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I will take this time to read a letter from my local county draft board with reference to the Tydings amendment, which outlines the action which they took on it:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
LOCAL BOARD, NO. 1, GOODHUE COUNTY,
Red Wing, Minn., February 19, 1945.

Congressman AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: After closely studying your letters and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the local board together with the local appeal agents, who have concurred with us on our decision, have decided that we have been in error in the interpretation of the law. It was not so much the misinformation received but the lack of information that has led to the confusion. It appears very plain now that under the Tydings amendment the local board classifies a registrant in his relation to the farm and does not classify him as other registrants are classified—in relation to their industry compared to the need for men in the armed forces. After having decided that a man is necessary to agriculture the local board's work is completed. It then remains the duty of Congress either to keep that man in agriculture or change the law for him to enter the service.

The fact that the board agrees or disagrees with the Tydings amendment does not enter into the case at all. Until the law is changed an essential farm worker shall be exempt from service. Back in 1942, this board told State selective service that all men who were then left on the farms were essential and we could not take any more of them consistent with the agricultural policy at that time. Agriculture was then on the critical list, and furthermore there were sufficient men in industry to fill calls. With the war continuing and having drained all men in the ages 18 to 26 from industry it seemed the only logical thing to do, when the armed forces demanded more men from the 18–26 group, was to take men from that age group wherever we could find them. While the board was never directly instructed to take any certain man, we were instructed to "consider taking agricultural workers in the light of the President's findings."

Our decision has had the following immediate effect on the draft situation here. We recalled all induction notices of farm workers in the call for the 24th of February. We reopened all cases of the appeal board where the classification had been upheld in I–A and reclassified them back to II–C. All pending I–A registrants in agriculture were reclassified back to II–C. The total number effected by this action was approximately 300. The number of men now in I–A in this board is less than 100 and they are the group in industry in the age group 26–30.

* * * * *

The further induction of the agricultural worker in Goodhue County is now in the hands of Congress as the local board declared all agriculture workers essential to agriculture back in August of 1942 and they all come under the Tydings amendment.

Kindest personal regards,

H. E. RARDIN,
Secretary, Goodhue County Local Board.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this letter in my remarks and certain other extracts from letters and directives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This local board has interpreted the law according to the intent of Congress.

I am happy to say that this local board has arrived at its decision by following the law as passed by Congress and not following the interpretation placed upon the Tydings amendment by the executive department.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the gentleman's local draft board deserves considerable credit. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that it is not fair to the local draft boards, who are contributing of their time and effort without pay, to be placed on the spot by the National Selective Service Director, so that they are forced to make this type of interpretation and have pressure brought back on them because they fear violating the law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree with the gentleman. I think the local draft boards, by and large, have done a magnificent job. They have done it without compensation, and no thanks.

Mr. MUNDT. And we can rectify that here today.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has expired.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the first concern of this body is the winning of the war and bringing our boys back home. I am sure this Congress wants to give 100 percent cooperation to the fighting forces of this Nation. There are two ways to bring about speedy victory: one, having a sufficient fighting force; two, having a force at home that will produce foodstuffs.

You know it has been said that an army moves forward on its stomach. It is just as important to produce food on the home front as it is that we have a fighting force over there. Without food our armies cannot win the victory.

It is my considered opinion that we have sufficient manpower to win the war and at the same time sufficient manpower to produce enough foodstuffs, provided the manpower is properly and wisely allocated and selected, and I believe it was the intention of Congress, when the Selective Service Act was passed, that proper distribution or selection should be made for the fighting forces and proper manpower be left in agriculture and industry that might be essential in carrying on the war to a speedy and victorious conclusion.

Agriculture is not only an essential industry but it is a critical industry. The Tydings amendment recognized and defined the policy of dealing with farm labor, but, unfortunately, the spirit and letter of the Tydings amendment has not been respected by the various departments of the Selective Service System and as a consequence the farm labor, which is essential for the raising of foodstuffs, has been drafted into the armed services, thereby leaving the farms depleted of sufficient help and manpower to produce sufficient foodstuffs.

My district is the Sixth Congressional District of Florida and is an agricultural district. This district has produced 65 percent to 70 percent of the winter crops of the State of Florida. In addition to this, the raising of livestock and cattle is carried on extensively, and I therefore am particularly interested in the resolution about to be considered, that the farmers of my district, as well as the Nation, be fully and adequately protected in that they shall have sufficient farm labor to carry on their farming and cattle raising so as to produce foods essential to the war effort.

The farmers of my district have appealed to me, as their Congressman, asking for aid and assistance. One farmer, who carries on large operations in my area, advised me they were drafting the men in agriculture under 26 years, no matter how essential, and that the farms in his neighborhood are being depleted of farm labor to such an extent that farming operations would have to cease.

I am just in receipt of a resolution passed by the Florida State Cattlemen's Association at Orlando, Fla., on February 16, 1945, appealing to Congress and others in authority to take appropriate action to prevent the taking of absolutely essential and necessary men, if the Congress expected producers to fulfill the task set for them in supplying the necessary food and feed crops. I incorporate this resolution in my remarks:

Whereas it has been brought to our attention that the State director of selective service has persisted in inducting into the armed forces men occupying essential and critical positions on farms and ranches, thereby reducing, and in some cases virtually stopping, the production of necessary food for the armed forces and civilian population; and

Whereas the State director of selective service has consistently ignored the Tydings amendment in both letter and spirit, which amendment was enacted into law for the purpose of protecting all phases of agriculture; and

Whereas the situation on farms and ranches in Florida is becoming so serious that it is impossible to find replacements to do the absolutely essential and necessary work, and serious damage is occurring both to crops and livestock because of this condition; and

Whereas we recognize the seriousness of the war situation and the necessity that sufficient manpower be provided for the armed forces; and

Whereas we are also conscious of the continuous requests and demands of the War Food Administration for a sufficient supply of food for the armed forces and civilian population: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, directors of the Florida State Cattlemen's Association, in regular meeting assembled in Orlando, Fla., February 16, 1945, do hereby express regret that such conditions exist and protest such arbitrary procedure, and urgently appeal to our national delegation in the Congress and others in authority to take such action as necessary to see that the Selective Service Act, as amended, is administered according to the letter and spirit, not only in Florida but throughout our Nation.

The above resolution duly passed by the board of directors of the Florida State Cattlemen's Association, Orlando, Fla., February 16, 1945.

P. E. WILLIAMS, *President*.

I therefore hope that the Congress will adopt this rule and pass the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 106, to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors essential to the war effort.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 106, to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, as we all know by this time the Tydings amendment which was passed in 1942, instructed the draft boards to defer all boys regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained. The language of the Tydings amendment is:

Necessary to or regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

That amendment was observed by Selective Service until the beginning of this year. The Committee on Agriculture did not have any complaints as to the way the Tydings amendment was being administered by the respective local boards until after January 3, 1945. On January 3, 1945, the Director of Selective Service, General Hershey, issued Directive No. 288, which reversed the interpretation the Selective Service up to that time had placed upon the amendment.

The directive of January 3, 1945, it will be observed, covers about two pages of single-space type, and purported to instruct the boards to rescreen these farm boys between the ages of 18 and 25 for the purpose of finding out if any of them should be inducted into the service under the Tydings amendment. That is all right. The boys should be rescreened and those who do not measure up to the Tydings amendment placed into the service. But it is strange, to say the least, that it would take two typewritten pages to instruct the local boards to observe the Tydings amendment in rescreening the boys, because the Tydings amendment is plain and unambiguous. That directive, in my opinion, was issued to circumvent the Tydings amendment, and that is the reason we find so much conversation in the direction. It was an indirect way, I am afraid, of telling the local boards to disregard the Tydings amendment in rescreening, because we find that the local boards immediately thereafter commenced inducting these farm boys between the ages of 18 and 25 regardless of the provisions of the Tydings amendment after receipt of the directive. Seemingly the only thing the local board considered was the boy's physical condition. If he passes the physical he was put into the service regardless of the Tydings amendment.

This brought on complaints from farmers in every section of the country.

On January 22 the House Committee on Agriculture was called together and General Hershey and Judge Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, were requested to appear. We had lengthy hearings. General Hershey still maintained that the Tydings amendment was the law of the land and that he intended to observe the Tydings amendment. Then we said to General Hershey, "If that is your attitude in this matter, if you have placed the same construction upon the amendment as we have, say so in plain English so that there can be no mistake." We stayed together until a directive was worked out agreeable to the House Committee on Agriculture and to General Hershey.

This second directive, that is the directive of January 22, and which was issued in order to clarify the directive of January 3, is short and to the point:

Section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act, known as the Tydings amendment, places upon each local board the responsibility to determine, subject to appeal in the case of the individual registrant, whether or not the registrant meets the requirements prescribed by this section.

The directive is clear. It is unambiguous. It places the same interpretation upon the Tydings amendment that had been placed upon the amendment by the local draft boards up to January 3; the same interpretation that had been placed upon the Tydings amendment by the Congress of the United States.

But the ink on the directive of January 22 had hardly gotten dry before General Hershey wrote an editorial, signed it, and had it published in the Selective Service publication, and sent to every draft board in this country. What did that editorial say? It said indirectly to the local draft boards to disregard the directive of January 22 and govern yourselves according to the directive of January 3. It wiped out everything that had been agreed to between General Hershey and the Committee on Agriculture on January 22.

On February 5 the Committee on Agriculture, having been advised that this editorial had been issued, again requested General Hershey to appear before the committee, which he did, and we finally pinned him down to the real issue. This matter had been dragging along from January 3 until February 5 before we ever got General Hershey to join the issue with the Congress. Then it was for the first time that he brought in this theory of relativity that no one had ever heard about, and he said that under the Tydings amendment it was the duty of the draft boards to make two determinations, that is, whether the farm boy was relatively more essential to the war effort than he was to the farm. He brought in the element of comparative or relative essentiality, something no one ever heard of before. Under the Tydings amendment the local boards are called upon to make but one determination, namely: Whether the registrant is necessary to or regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort; and not whether the registrant is more essential to the war effort than he is to the farm effort, or is more essential to the farm effort than he is to the war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Under the Tydings amendment we all know that the draft boards were to make one determination and only one. We laid down the yardstick for the draft boards to follow. The determination as I have stated, was this: Is the boy essential to the farm effort? If he is, leave him on the farm. If he is not, put him into the service. We did not tell the boards to bring the boy up and then make the determination as to whether he was more essential to the war effort than he was to the war food effort and vice versa. Oh, no. Now, when we found out that the Tydings amendment was being misinterpreted the resolution we are now considering was introduced, and it was introduced to force Selective Service to observe the Tydings amendment and to place upon that amendment the construction that the Selective Service itself placed upon it up to January 3, and the interpretation this Congress has always placed upon it.

Just one word with reference to the provision in the resolution freezing the IV–F boys on the farm. Remember now that under the Tydings amendment these boys on the farm between 18 and 25 were there by reason of the Tydings amendment. Yes; that is the reason they were there. They had not been given a physical examination. The boards under the Tydings amendment had determined that they were essential to the war food effort and had left them on the farms.

When you bring these boys in and rescreen them and give them their premedical examinations, it is going to develop that a certain percentage of them are physically unfit for the war effort and when this is found out they will be put in IV–F. What does this mean? It means simply this: These boys were deferred under the Tydings amendment because they were found essential to the farm effort, and having been so deferred were subject to immediate induction into the service if they left the farm. But now when you give them the premedical examination and they are found unfit for military service, the Army says to them, "We do not want you," and under the law they are released from the farm. Of course, human nature on the farm being the same as it is anywhere else, these boys are going to leave the farm when released and go across the road and get a position at a wage scale four or five times the farm wage scale, and cut down their hours of work from 12 to 14 hours per day to 7 and 8 hours. That is the story.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we have reached a rather sad state of affairs when Congress must pass a resolution calling upon those in power to enforce the laws of the land. Yet that is the situation in which we find ourselves today.

The Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act was clear and to the point. It provided that farm boys essential to the production of food should be deferred from service in the armed forces so long as they remained in such essential work.

This resolution, which I supported in committee and shall vote for today, has been made necessary because Selective Service officials have chosen to disregard the Tydings amendment. They have called upon local draft boards to disregard the Tydings amendment, with the result that our agricultural manpower is being depleted and our future food supply is being gravely threatened.

Selective Service officials have gone so far as to tell members of local draft boards that unless they induct agricultural workers they would be asked to resign. They have been further advised that if they deferred agricultural workers such cases would be appealed and the deferments would be nullified anyway. In other words, Mr. Chairman, local board members were told they must ignore the law of the land, or else.

Local draft board members throughout my congressional district and the State of Michigan have my utmost regard. As in all other sections of the country, they have served diligently and well, without any compensation and with very little credit being given to them. All are law-abiding and respected citizens who have been placed in a very embarrassing position by those in high places who have called upon them to disregard a law which clearly and concisely states the will of Congress.

I am for this resolution because I believe it will aid local draft board members in making the decisions which they honestly believe should be rendered in each individual case. Local board members may be depended upon to be fair and impartial in their judgment. They are familiar with local situations and they know when and where men are needed to keep farms in operation, and, at the same time, those who should be in the Army. This resolution, as I see it, should eliminate all misunderstandings and make it possible for local board members to do the job they are expected to do.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to see if I can explain this matter so it will be thoroughly understood by all the members of the Committee. The original Tydings amendment provided three things as essential for an inductee to come under the amendment. One was that he be regularly employed in agriculture. The second was that he be essential to the war effort. The third was that there be no replacement for him.

As I view this resolution, it adds very little to what the law originally provided. I wish to point out particularly in respect to the argument of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] that what he objects to in the present resolution, the freezing of farm workers, the IV–F workers, is essentially in the Tydings amendment.

The original Tydings amendment provided "that should any person," that is, a person who is on the farm, "leave, except for induction," he shall be reclassified, and such registrant shall be made immediately available for military service—and this is the important part—"unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests his local board to determine and such local board" shall determine "that it is for the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work."

In other words, before he could leave the farm and go to a shipyard, for instance, the local board had to take up the problem and determine whether or not it was for the best interest of the war effort for him to leave the farm and go to the shipyard. That is exactly what the boards out in our part of the country determine. They weigh one occupation against the other and determine that he is more essential in a shipyard or in a factory or that he is more essential on the farm.

Under the resolution that has been presented here, all they do is provide that

men who are classified as IV–F's shall remain on the farm for essential war production until their local board allows them to leave the farm and go somewhere else.

In the original Tydings law, the IV–F's were at liberty to go when and where they pleased, as they could not be inducted into the armed services, not being able to meet the physical requirements. The others could be inducted so they really had the choice of going into the services or of having the local boards acquiesce in their going into some type of essential war work.

This resolution submits a very reasonable proposition. It is a very sensible one. The whole idea of Selective Service is to get men for the Army and to insure maximum production. There is no production, in my opinion, that is as important as food production. All this resolution does is simply to say to those very men that the draft board has registered and over whom that board has jurisdiction, "You stay on the farm until we allow you to go somewhere else." There is no compulsion to that any more than there was compulsion in the original registration. General Hershey made a statement before our committee which I want to differ with, and do so respectfully. He said the basic idea of the selective service law was to induct men into the armed forces. That may be one of the main purposes. But the purpose is to unify our whole human force, the military force and the production forces and the forces producing food. The reason we passed the law was to lay down the rules whereby we could get the maximum military efficiency because we have the maximum production. That is exactly what this resolution will bring about, in my opinion, because it will place on the farms the necessary farm workers and it will keep jurisdiction over them and hold them on the farms until they can show the local boards that they are more useful somewhere else.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman think, however, that to the extent we keep farm workers on the farms who might otherwise go into military service we therefore put an additional load or burden upon other industries which are pressed, as the farming industry is, because if we do not get them from the farms you have to go to the coal mines or the railroads or somewhere else to get them?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The point is we need those essential workers. This resolution says substantially, "You are essential and you have to stay on the farm as long as you are essential until you can show your local board you can be used somewhere else with equal effect and support to the war effort."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to state that I intend to support the Flannagan resolution, which is now pending, and I will also support the Lemke resolution, which is also pending. Our farmers in this country are in a sad plight. Their farm boys and their farm labor have largely been taken into the Army and they have experienced great difficulty in securing the needed farm machinery which would, in some measure, save the manpower upon our farms. The Selective Service System has been blowing both hot and cold upon this very serious problem. If the Selective Service System had adhered to the provisions of the Tydings amendment, it is my firm conviction that much trouble would have been averted. However, it has appeared to be the policy of the Selective Service System to bypass the Tydings amendment, and that is just what it has done. In one breath the Selective Service System, by and through General Hershey, has made the statement that the Tydings amendment would be adhered to, and recently the local boards throughout the Nation were advised that the Tydings amendment was in force and that its provisions should be followed, and in the very next breath another and different order was issued from that agency insisting that another and a different interpretation of the Tydings amendment was made and that the new interpretation should be followed.

It was under the new, or the modified, interpretation by General Hershey in which he presented the doctrine of essentiality—that is "to determine whether the boy was more essential to the war effort in the Army, or upon the farm." The result has been, that the local boards have been confused, and greatly disturbed, as to what course they should pursue, and in order to follow the orders of the head of the Selective Service System many farm boys have been inducted into the Army, which should have been left at their work, and on their jobs, upon the farms. Of course, through this great confusion which has resulted, great damage has been done to our farmers, and to the farming operations throughout the country. That great damage will result in a decreased production of food, and a shortage of food will directly interfere with the prosecution of the war.

Mr. Chairman, it is tragic, indeed, that this unfortunate situation has been brought about—and, may I say, it has been brought about by and through the confusion resulting from the various and conflicting orders issued by the Selective Service System in Washington. In my home State of Indiana, after General Hershey sent forward the message to the local boards, wherein they were advised that the Tydings amendment was in full force and effect, and that the same should be fully respected in all determinations made by them, other information was scattered broadcast to the effect that the message contained in the telegram, theretofore sent out to the local boards by General Hershey, was not to be considered or followed. And, almost immediately after that message was sent out to the local boards, the head of the Selective Service System, in Indiana, issued an order to reclassify all II–C boys, on the farms, and to prepare to induct approximately 85 percent of them into the Army. Of course, that order has been followed by some local boards, while other local boards, who were familiar with the circumstances, have not complied with it. The local boards have had a hard problem before them. They have served gratuitously, and they have tried to do a good job, but the cross-orders and the confusing regulations and instructions issued from the Washington office has caused great confusion, and the result has been distress among our farmers, and their farm boys and farm help.

I fear, Mr. Chairman, that the damage has already been done to our farmers. Their help has been taken without any justification. If the Tydings amendment had been followed, as it should have been, our farmers could have done a much better job in producing food. However, with this latest assault upon the farm boys and farm help, whereby they have been taken into the service without regard to their great need upon the farm, I fear a greatly decreased production of food will be the result, and this will be a very great obstruction to our war effort.

Mr. Chairman, our farmers have a justified complaint because of this effort to induct the farm boys, and farm help, into the Army—and without taking into careful consideration their great need upon the farms where they are working. This practice has resulted in a very great damage to this highly essential occupation in time of war. Our farmers, with less help in 1945 than they had in 1944, will be unable to produce the volume of food that was produced last year. This may result in the end, Mr. Chairman, that many people will be hungry in the future.

It is my hope that both resolutions, to which I have referred, will be passed—and that our farmers may receive some relief by reason of the Congress expressing its positive position upon this subject. We cannot let our farmers down. They are producing the necessary food for victory. They must have the necessary help with which to accomplish that end. Let us help them do it today.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, it almost looks from reports we are receiving from responsible local authorities that it is too late for anything we here do to guarantee the retention on our farms of enough young, able-bodied farm workers to insure meeting our 1945 food production goals. One county in my congressional district reports that already the local board has stated it would have to take every one of the farm boys 18 through 25 in order to meet their quotas. The farmers of the country will be trying to meet the increase in acreage demanded by our war commitments in 1945 with less machinery, and with repairs to their old, worn-out equipment almost impossible to obtain. How in the world can they produce the food if they also lose all the young, skilled workers? We already are experiencing food shortages in several critical items. We are facing

even more alarming meat shortages in 1945 according to the War Food Administration. And yet we know that local boards are forcing practically all our 18-through-25 boys off the farms. Local boards have been subjected to the most effective kinds of pressure through executive directives and statements from Government officials, which have led them to consider when they classify the farm registrants not whether or not the boy in question is doing essential work as far as our food program is concerned but whether in the opinion of individual officials that boy is relatively as essential to agriculture as he is to the Army. When Congress passed the Tydings amendment there was a conviction in the minds of the Members that there could be no doubt that food is an essential part of the war effort—that we could not fight a war without food. It was the intent of Congress that a young man's essentiality to agriculture was to be the determining factor in his classification.

Members of Congress who were interested in the protection of the production of vitally necessary foodstuffs have tried every means at our command—the press, the radio, and personal appeals—to counteract the misleading effect of executive directives which brought about the drafting of alarming numbers of farm workers, but the continuing reports from agricultural districts where local boards are cleaning out completely the younger farm workers have been conclusive evidence that we have failed. We have only one recourse left—it is our urgent duty and responsibility to strengthen the Tydings amendment by the passage of legislation protecting the deferred status of essential farm workers. This legislation should also correct the inequitable differences in interpretation of the Tydings amendment by different local boards. In some areas local draft boards have through their own initiative refused to be misled by confusing directives and have announced that in spite of pressure brought on them, they would continue to defer all young men essential to agriculture without consideration of any relative essentiality to other branches of the war effort. Other boards have interpreted executive directives to mean that agriculture is not even an essential service and are preparing to draft all men 18 through 25. One of my counties reports that there are remaining on the farms there less than half as many young men 18 through 25 as in any neighboring county, a condition for which local officials offer no satisfactory explanation. The local board has been less cooperative with food producers than have the boards of neighboring counties. We cannot allow such discrimination to continue if we have the power to stop it. I hope the legislation currently being considered will be passed without any further delay and that it will be enforced.

Mr. AREND. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, from all over my district comes protests against the unwarranted and illegal action of the Selective Service in inducting many engaged in agriculture into the armed services, in direct violation of the Tydings amendment to the selective-service law.

It is high time that notice be served on the President, General Hershey, and all other Government agencies that the laws passed by Congress are to be obeyed by them, as well as by all other citizens; that, notwithstanding the New Deal theory that we should have government by man and be ruled and governed by directives and bureaucratic orders, we still have a government by law; that the executive branch should administer the laws passed by Congress and not attempt to make law by Executive directives or bureau orders or to nullify the law.

The law reads as follows:

> Every registrant found by the selective board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

You will note this law provides that the selective service board has the responsibility of determining those registrants who are "necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort."

Now, let us see what has been done. Recently General Hershey issued a directive to local boards which said the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion had written him a letter stating in part that—

> The President has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not essential to the best interest of our war effort.

The letter then says the President had authorized him to ask General Hershey to take action in connection with the administration of the Tydings amendment that would, in effect, nullify that law. The law does not give the President any authority to make findings or to do anything in connection with agricultural deferments. His action is an unauthorized assumption of power which he does not have.

In accordance with General Hershey's directive the local boards began changing the classification of deferred farm workers from II–C to I–A and began inducting them into the armed forces.

Probably the local boards should not be blamed for this as they are only following what they consider as an order issued to them, although as a matter of fact, the local boards should, and they would be wholly justified, in refusing to follow this directive or any other one that directs them not to follow the law.

In Indiana the State selective-service director sent a letter to all local boards, from which I quote the following:

> It is our opinion, based upon all facts available to this headquarters, that further deferment of farmers under 26 years of age must henceforth be restricted in most cases to those registrants who are sole owners-operators, who are fully equipped and fully engaged in extensive farm operations, plus those few cases which involve situations of extreme hardship.

There is not authority in law for an instruction to defer only "sole owners-operators, who are fully equipped and fully engaged in extensive farm operations, plus those few cases which involve situations of extreme hardship." Another assumption of power which does not exist.

From the above it is plain that the President, the so-called Assistant President, General Hershey, and the State director of selective service in effect ordered the local boards to disregard the law and to disregard their own rulings as to deferments of those engaged in agriculture.

Let me mention only a few of the many cases called to my attention. One is that of a farm owner who has 1 son serving in the Army, and who is farming 500 acres, which is stocked with 15 milk cows, 21 brood sows, 150 hogs, 30 feeding cattle, and who has 3 tractors and full equipment, which was operated by the owner and 1 son who had been deferred under the Tydings amendment. Now this son has been placed in I–A and inducted on January 31. The father advises that he cannot get help and that he must materially curtail his farm operations, which means less acreage in crops and less production of livestock.

In another case I was sent an advertisement of a public sale, reading:

> As I am being inducted into the armed services, I will sell at public auction—

He listed for auction a complete outfit of farm implements and machinery, 32 head of Hereford cows, 5 Jersey cows, 1,000 bushels of corn, all his chickens, 100 bales of clover hay, and all other grain and household goods and numerous tools. Another farm out of production.

Here is another. A man 23 years old, living with his mother on a 360-acre farm, which he was farming. This farm has 200 acres in cultivation and in production and the rest in pasture, barn lots, and so forth. It has 8 barns, all filled with grain, hay, and livestock. There are 55 head of beef cattle, 6 dairy cows, 20 brood sows ready to farrow this spring, and 40 head of feeding hogs. The farm is equipped with mechanized equipment, all tools tractor-driven, has its own hammer mill, combine and pick-up baler and a 6-ton truck to haul produce to the market. He has more than enough units to defer 2 men, still he has been placed in I–A and ordered inducted. Another farm out of production.

Why, in one town of 500, the people face the complete loss of their milk supply by the induction of the last remaining son of the only dairyman left supplying the town.

Another farmer who has 1 son in the service, who operated his farm with the help of another son and who has 700 beef cattle, 1,500 feed-lot lambs and 150 hogs, as well as 50 bred ewes and 30 bred sows, will be forced to liquidate all the breeding stock along with two-thirds of the feed-lot stock because his son has been placed in I–A and inducted.

Another man farming 600 acres will be forced to liquidate his 200 young feed-lot cattle and cut his farm operations in half or more because his son who is 18 has been placed in I–A and inducted.

Another farmer, who has been producing 600 hogs per year, has to liquidate his stock and be content to raise what crops he can tend because his son has been placed in I–A and inducted.

Another farmer writes me as follows:

I am writing you this letter to let you know some things that are happening here. I want the public to know part of what is going on right here at home.

My son was classified in II–C by the selective service board until the 10th of January when he got a I–A card. He was called before the board and was told that the board got a new ruling that all between 18 and 26 would have to go into the service. In 1944 my son and I farmed over 300 acres. We produced 54,870 pounds of pork, 26,435 pounds of beef, 2,915 pounds of lamb, 40,855 pounds of milk, 2,194 dozen eggs, 1,890 pounds of poultry. We had 92 acres in beans, 76 acres in corn, 47 acres in hay, and 10 acres in wheat.

With my son gone into the Army, and as it is impossible to get farm labor, you can readily see that I will be forced to greatly reduce production.

Another farmer writes me:

Now I farm 300 and more acres, my rent for the coming year is already paid and I am not financially able to lose that. I have over 60 head of cattle and put out from 80 to 90 gallons of milk daily. I raise the feed for this stock. We pasteurize and distribute the milk. My nephew has been working for me for several years. His classification has been changed from II–C to I–A. I do not see how it will be possible for me to continue on. I wish to be patriotic but I do not think the farmers are getting a square deal in this particular set-up. It is really alarming the number of farmers who have already given up or are planning to do so.

Another farmer writes me:

Again and again and again have we farmers been called upon to produce more and more and more, with less and less and less, and the enclosed bill of sale is a part of my forced answer to this appeal for more food. Two years ago three of us gave our entire time to production, then my hired man left and then last year my son and I carried on and produced 49 tons of pork, 15 tons of beef, besides eggs, milk, honey, wheat, etc. My son was in class II–C, but has now been placed in I–A and inducted, and I am left to do all the work on a 390-acre stock and grain farm. It moves me to think of a quotation from the Psalms that I heard an old man give in 1914 at the beginning of World War No. 1. It was this: "How long, O Lord, how long; will it forever be?"

I might mention one other case, that of a sole operator of a 20-cow dairy farm, who has called on his local draft board to come and sell out his herd and farm, because he was reclassified into I–A and ordered inducted. Many other similar cases could be cited.

In each of these cases the local boards had, in conformity with the law, placed these farm operators and workers in class II–C but, since the issuance of the above-mentioned directive and orders, they have been reclassified into I–A and inducted into the armed forces.

I think Congress should make it plain to the executive branch of the Government that the laws passed by Congress are to be obeyed and are to be administered so as to give them full effect.

If the administration thinks laws passed by Congress are wrong or that they should be changed, the right thing to do is to ask Congress to change the law, but not to deliberately nullify them by administrative action.

Members of Congress are the people's representatives and upon Congress has devolved the responsibility to protect the people from the present administration's efforts to completely regiment them.

We are repeatedly told that "food will win the war." Our farmers have patriotically worked long hours, without being able to get needed equipment and machinery, while great quantities were sent to other nations, and with a shortage of farm labor, still these loyal citizens have produced great amounts of food, grain, vegetables, and livestock. They are entitled to more consideration than they are getting. They are mindful, however, of the administration's boast of a planned economy, and they also remember about the planned scarcity which was supposed to bring prosperity. They remember the killing of the pigs and the plowing under of the crops, and many are asking why money is appropriated to encourage the production of crops, some of which have production subsidies, while at the same time another Government agency is paying an export subsidy on the same crops, and at the same time the Government, acting through the Selective Service, is so depleting the farms of workers that it is greatly curtailing food production.

Now the War Food Administration announces that it is trying to curb the current decline in butter production by revising the Government's milk and butterfat subsidy program. However, we have one arm of the Government putting farmers out of the milk- and butter-production business, thus creating additional shortages, while another agency attempts to increase the production through subsidy manipulations. If the Government will let our farmers have sufficient labor and give them a chance, they will produce enough milk and butter.

Oh, we hear much about manpower shortages in industry, but really there is no manpower shortage. What we actually have is manpower wastage, poor use of available manpower, and the Government itself, including the Army and the Navy, is the worst offender. We need a wise, sensible use of manpower.

We are told that we have $100,000,000,000 worth of surplus war materials, which simply means that our Government has expended $100,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' and bond buyers' money for labor and material which we do not need. This is a waste of manpower as well as of money and material. We know there is always waste in war, but need we have this much waste? We are told that the war has cost us, up to date, a total of $230,000,000,000. This includes the pay of those in the armed services and all lend-lease aid. It certainly seems that out of this amount of total cost that $100,000,000,000 wasted is very much too much and shows an alarming state of inefficiency.

Many instances have been cited where the Government has sold and is selling as surplus property large quantities of material, while at the very same time the Army and Navy are buying large quantities of the very same items from manufacturers, a further waste of manpower, money, and material. The Navy is asking for more employees for a navy yard while admitting that the workmen at this yard have been making chessboards and checkerboards, oyster-shucking tables, napkin rings, and fine furniture for the officers. Why, it has even been shown that the Government has sold many items at a very cheap price and then purchased the same items back from the purchasers at a greatly increased price. The Government paid $1,500 each for searchlights, declared them surplus, and sold them at auction for $155 each, paid the auctioneer's fees, cost of advertising, and so forth, and then bought them back for $235 each. It sold plumbing strainers as surplus property for $3.25 each and then bought them back for $12 each. Enormous quantities of so-called surplus material are being offered for sale, while at the same time the Government is buying enormous quantities of the same items at full price. All this shows a waste of manpower, money, and materials.

A miserable record has been made in procurement and, as the facts become known, it will be evident that the waste and purchasing scandals of the First World War are mild in comparison.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress should act at once to see to it that the Tydings amendment is obeyed by the Selective Service and to stop the needless and useless waste of manpower, money, and material. The people are expecting and are entitled to immediate action and, while I realize the administration will oppose this and bring its full power against it, that is no reason why action should be delayed. Congress has the responsibility, and if Congress either cannot or will not act, then our form of constitutional government is surely in serious difficulty.

In this hour of national emergency I plead with those of the majority party to lay aside partisan advantages and considerations and look only to the best interests of our country and to join us in our efforts to stop waste and inefficiency and preserve constitutional government.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCOWEN].

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the Flannagan amendment.

It is intended to reenact the Tydings amendment and to reemphasize the meaning intended by Congress when the Tydings amendment was first passed. The Tydings amendment was not and is not meant to provide for the deferment of any particular person. It aims to set forth clearly the conditions under which certain farm-labor draftees shall be given deferment in such a way that the National Selective Service can have no excuse for putting a different interpretation on it than the Congress has intended. The farm is evidently regarded in the category with other war activities. The three main points for deferment seem to

be that the farm draftee is irreplaceable, is continuously engaged in farm work, and that the farm produces a sufficiently substantial amount of food products essential to the war effort. When these main provisions of the Tydings amendment have been satisfied, along with possibly some other minor factors, the farm draftee, in the opinion of many people, ought to be deferred.

Many of the newspapers in my district every week carry notices of sale of farms, livestock, and farm equipment. Many of these are for sale because deferment was not granted in many cases where the farm draftee would fit into the provisions of the Tydings amendment. This situation can mean only one thing, that there will be a considerable curtailment of the production of food and dairy products in my congressional district this year because there are practically no replaceables and the men and women left on the farms are too old to carry on.

If the Flannagan amendment, which is a reenactment of the Tydings amendment, should become the law real soon, it will do some good. But even at that it will come too late to save the great loss already sustained. I hope the amendment will pass.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this resolution, but I must say that it has come to a pretty pass in this great country of ours when this Congress finds it necessary to bring a bill here such as this House Joint Resolution 106 to force the administration now in power to obey another law, namely, the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act which has for over 2 years operated effectively in the winning of the war, but that is what we are obliged to do.

The Tydings amendment was made the law of the land not to keep farmers out of the war, but to insure a sufficient food, feed, and fiber supply, so necessary in the prosecution of the war.

And let me say right here that thousands upon thousands of farmers have been deferred and frozen on the farms, and thus denied their sincere, patriotic desire to join the armed forces of their country. Think that over, then I am sure you will not think too ill of them.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for me to disagree with my distinguished chairman upon this question. I think we overlook the fact that most things that are now being done are essential to the war effort.

My district is about half coal mining and half agriculture. I have a stack of telegrams on my desk this morning informing me that it is very likely the coal mines are going to be closed unless they can get more miners to mine coal. It is an open question about our production of food being the most essential factor in the war effort. As this war has progressed it has been shown that the production of food may be important today, and the distribution of food and getting it to our fighting men may be just as important tomorrow.

It seems to me that in this entire discussion we are placing the farm youth of this country in a very unfavorable light. The farm boys have no desire to be deferred from military service. It seems strange to me at this time, in the home stretch of this war, that we would want to be changing the rules of the game.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. We are not changing the rules of the game. This Congress made this determination in 1942. The only thing this resolution does is to make Selective Service respect the law of Congress. If we have reached the point that these farm boys are needed in the Army let Selective Service come and tell the committee honestly that that is the situation and ask us to repeal the Tydings amendment. We are only asking Selective Service to observe the law of this land.

Mr. GRANGER. I do not yield any further. That is exactly what Selective Service is trying to do, as you know. They are trying to have an opportunity, without being restrained by the Congress, to rescreen these boys, and if there are any who are not essential in the production of food, then they shall go into the Army.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I know the gentleman wants to be fair, but that is not what Selective Service is doing. I have a drawer full of clippings where this board and the other board has resigned. Why? Because they have been forced to override one of the laws of this land, namely, the Tydings amendments, and before they will do it, they will resign.

Mr. GRANGER. This whole question has arisen because of isolated cases and isolated complaints. I have never seen one scrap of evidence from any draft board in this country, complaining that they have been advised to do something that they should not do under the Tydings amendment; not a single one. It is true we have had individuals appear before our committee and point out the necessity of having workers on the farm, but if I should vote for this amendment then I should be compelled, if the coal operators should come here tomorrow and present such a resolution, to vote for that. Then I should have to vote for the railroads, the merchant marines, and everyone else. Then who is going to fight the war?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, perhaps the House finds itself in the rather ridiculous position today of reasserting a law which it had passed not only once but twice. When we passed the National Selective Service Act in 1940 we provided for the deferment of necessary agricultural workers. That was being partially ignored in 1941 by Selective Service.

In 1942 the clarifying Tydings amendment was adopted, and now we are placing ourselves in the ridiculous situation of again asserting that we have the Tydings amendment. It is the most perfect example I have seen of a case of where those downtown do not believe in the plain language Congress has adopted.

Two weeks ago I was out home and passed through as many counties of my district as I could. I am now addressing my remarks particularly to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER]. Two county war boards asked me to meet with them, boards made up, Mr. Chairman, of both farmers and businessmen. They were most deeply concerned as to what had happened since January 3, 1945, and what the draft boards had done in taking the residual of our farm workers who had heretofore been recognized by national, State, and local boards as coming under the Tydings amendment, as deferable under the Tydings amendment; and they were taking the balance of them. I asked them: Up to the present time—that was 2 weeks ago—what is the effect of the last taking of this farm help on your county's production on an acreage basis? They replied that they estimated that on an acreage basis the farm production in two highly cultivated counties would be reduced from 20 to 25 percent. That was just on the acreage basis. You will have also a further great reduction of food production upon the farms because you are getting inefficient help in so many instances.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I am heartily in accord with this resolution; I am heartily in accord with the Lemke resolution; I believe both should be passed. What I am anxious to do is to impress upon these agencies downtown respect for the laws passed by Congress. If Selective Service or the administration does not think a law we have passed is proper, why do they not come here, be honest with us, and ask for its repeal or amendment? Instead, we find ourselves compelled to act again because they disregard the law.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I believe this debate has proved beyond doubt that many essential farm workers have been inducted into the Army in contradiction to the provisions of the Tydings amendment. My question is this: Is it possible so to amend the Flannagan resolution as to give some relief for those boys who have been inducted in defiance of the Tydings amendment, so that those men and boys so inducted may be honorably discharged and returned to essential farm production in which they were previously engaged?

Mr. O'HARA. They ought to be returned, but I do not know whether the bill can be so amended as to effect their return.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this resolution passes. Over 200 Members of Congress on the 16th of January met with General Hershey. At that time General Hershey told us that of course he recognized

and expected the draft boards to recognize the Tydings amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia a few minutes ago referred to the bituminous-coal workers and the possibility of amending this resolution to include them. There is considerable doubt as to the germaneness of such an amendment, but one thing I wish to impress upon the membership at this time is that there is no more patriotic group of men in America than the anthracite-coal miners of northeastern Pennsylvania. At no time during this war have the anthracite miners asked any deferment from the draft. This has been the declared policy of the leaders and the officers of the organization of miners, the United Mine Workers of America, and of the miners themselves. On numerous occasions mine union locals unanimously have resolved against claiming special privileges as mine workers from the Selective Service Act. Claims, of course, have been filed by management for certain necessary and essential workers in the hard-coal mines; but the mine workers themselves have frequently spoken against deferment.

So that any time such a suggestion is made I would like to make it very clear to the membership that the anthracite-coal miners are not excelled in their patriotism. In my district of a half million people there are now 75,000 men and women in the armed forces. I have been legal adviser for a draft board at Wilkes-Barre since the Draft Act was passed, and I have never known a miner to ask for deferment because of that fact of employment alone. I repeat now for emphatic purposes that claiming blanket deferment has never been the policy of the anthracite workers, and it has been declared time and time again that the anthracite-coal miners are proud of their record of production and patriotism, which has given us millions more tons of coal with thousands of less workers in the past year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, we have House Joint Resolution 106 before us today, the Flannagan resolution. The chief objective of the sponsor of the resolution is to impress upon the Military Establishment of this Government that the laws passed by Congress must not be ignored nor deliberately misinterpreted. Every Member of the House who comes from an agricultural area engaged in the production of food for the civilian population, the armed forces, and the people of liberated countries, knows that laborers on the farms essential to food production have been taken from the farms in violation of the Tydings amendment. Already it has endangered our food supply for the future; in fact, if this wholesale stripping of the farms of essential labor is not stopped the people of this country, as well as others, will face a ghastly shortage of food. I have been amazed that in a free country such as ours, an officer charged with the meticulous observance of the law should arrogantly disregard the plain mandate of the law such as appears to have been the case in literally hundreds of localities throughout the Nation. I think one of the most flagrant exhibitions of the usurpation of arbitrary power appeared in the directive issued by General Hershey, No. 288, January 3, 1945. The Members of the House are familiar with that directive which reads as follows:

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,
Washington, D. C.

State director advice (No. 288) issued January 3, 1945.

Subject: Reclassification of registrants in agriculture, ages 18–25.

CONFIRMATION OF TELEGRAM TO ALL STATE DIRECTORS WITHIN CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES, DATED JANUARY 3, 1945

The following letter from the Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion has been received by the Director of Selective Service:

"The Secretaries of War and Navy have advised me jointly that the calls from the Army and Navy to be met in the coming year will exhaust the eligibles in the 18-through-25-year group at an early date. The Army and Navy believe it essential to the effective prosecution of the war to induct more men in this age group.

"You have reported that other than the men becoming 18 years of age the only remaining substantial source in this age group is in the 364,000 men now deferred because of agricultural occupation. You have further advised me that if this group is not available, you must call into the service occupationally deferred men in the next age group, 26 years and older, most of whom are fathers.

"The Chairman of the War Production Board, Mr. Krug, advises me that the loss of these men would make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to meet critical war demands. Moreover, these older men would not meet the expressed needs of the Army and Navy.

"The War Food Administrator, Mr. Jones, had advised me that although we still need all the food we can raise, the loss of production through the induction into the armed services of the physically qualified men in this 18-through-25-years-age group who do not clearly fall within the scope of the Tydings amendment should not result in a critical condition.

"The Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act does not give the agricultural worker absolute exemption from selective service. It was not so intended. In asking Congress to adopt this amendment Senator TYDINGS said: 'All my amendment seeks to do is to provide that whenever a person is employed continuously in good faith in the production of food, and taking him off the farm would leave a large section of land uncultivated and there is no replacement, he shall be deferred upon those facts until a replacement can be found.'

"I have reported these facts to the President. He has found that the further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age groups because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men. The President feels in view of existing conditions agriculture, like our other war industries can, with few exceptions, be carried on by those in the older age groups.

"The President has authorized me to ask you to take such action in connection with the administration of the Tydings amendment as may be necessary to provide to the full extent permitted by law for the reclassification and induction of the men agriculturally deferred in the age group 18 through 25."

Forward text of Justice Byrnes' letter to all local boards and board of appeal. Direct all local boards to promptly review the cases of all registrants ages 18 through 25 deferred in class II–C excluding those identified by the letters "F" or "L." In considering the classification or retention of such registrants in Class II–C, local boards will consider the President's finding that "The further deferment of all men now deferred in the 18 through 25 age group because of agricultural occupation is not as essential to the best interest of our war effort as is the urgent and more essential need of the Army and Navy for young men." Also direct local boards to issue orders for preinduction physical examination to all registrants ages 18 through 25 in class II–C, excluding those identified with the letters "F" or "L" in accordance with the most expeditious schedules it is possible for you to arrange with the commanding general of your service command. In order to accomplish the review and preinduction physical examination as promptly as possible, local boards may conduct the review of any such class II–C registrants at the same time as they are forwarding such registrants for preinduction physical examination.

HERSHEY.

Mr. Chairman, it may be that we have arrived at the time when those in authority have turned back the pages of history to find a precedent to support the Tydings amendment. I recall that Sir William Blackstone in his commentary points out that—

When any doubt arose upon the construction of the Roman laws, the usage was to state the case to the emperor in writing and take his opinion upon it. The answers of the emperor were called rescripts and these had in succeeding cases the force of perpetual laws.

Now the question to be decided by this House is whether or not the laws passed by it are to be twisted and tortured to meet the whims of arbitrary executive power. If we are going to maintain the Anglo-Saxon principles of freedom in this country it will be necessary to depart from this attempt to resort to imperial "rescripts" and adopt those fair and rational methods of interpretation of laws which have been followed in our country for more than a century and a half. What are some of these rules of statutory construction?

The fairest and most rational method to interpret the will of the legislator is by exploring his intentions at the time when the law was made, by signs the most natural and probable. And these signs are either the words, the context, the subject matter, the effect and consequences, or the spirit and reason of the law.

Let us take a short view of them all:

1. Words are generally to be understood in their usual and most known signification; not so much regarding the propriety of grammar, as their general and popular use.

2. If words happen to be still dubious, we can establish their meaning from the context, with which it may be of singular use to compare a word or a sentence, whenever they are ambiguous, equivocal, or intricate.

3. As to the subject matter, words are always to be understood as having a regard

thereto, for that is always supposed to be in the eye of the legislator, and all his expressions directed to that end.

4. As to the effects and consequences, the rule is, that where words bear either none, or a very absurd signification, if literally understood, we must a little deviate from the received sense of them.

5. But lastly, the most universal and effectual way of discovering the true meaning of a law, when the words are dubious, is by considering the reason and spirit of it; or the cause which moved the legislature to enact it. Fod when this reason ceases the law itself ought likewise to cease with it.

Mr. Chairman, neither the President of the United States nor General Hershey can defend their position on the basis of the fair interpretation of the Tydings amendment. This amendment could never have been introduced and enacted for any other purpose than to see that the farms were not bled of the labor essential to maximum production of food for the civilian population, the military, and to meet our obligation to the starving people of liberated countries.

I can imagine no more unjust and tyrannical and deceptive action than has been displayed in the interpretation of the Tydings amendment. The language of the Tydings amendment is perfectly clear and reads as follows:

(k) Every registrant found by a selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained: *Provided*, That any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land or naval forces under this act, his selective service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately available for military service, unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work.

The directive went out on January 3, 1945, led every draft board in the country to believe that the President had issued an order which was superior to any law passed by Congress relating to farm help and the necessity for adequate help to produce food. Let me read a letter which is only one of hundreds of thousands of letters of similar import:

I am 25 years old and I have a wife and three small children. I own and operate two farms, one of 70 acres and one of 250 acres. I have 26 head of cattle of which 21 will be milking in the spring.

I sincerely thank you for your effort in my behalf. I hope that the resolution to force General Hershey to observe the law can be passed. A farmer cannot plan and go ahead with his work not knowing if he is going to be a farmer or a soldier. It seems that the New Deal has no respect for any law unless it is in accordance with their desires. As things stand now, in accordance with my classification of I-A, I will be inducted into the armed forces on March 27 or 28. This is unjust and unfair, but as a citizen I have to take it and like it. This action means that I will have to sell my cattle, horses, and farming tools the first week or two in March, so as to be ready to go when I am called. These two farms will be left to stand idle and run down. Eight years of hard work will be wasted. The farm will be a burden to my family as the Government makes no allowance for the paying of taxes, insurance, and repairs or for paying for the property itself.

I see according to General Hershey's letter to you that I was placed in I-A by order of the President, and his decision, "in the absence of new evidence, is final." I wrote to General Hershey and gave him additional evidence to what he had when the decision was made. General Hershey did not have even the decency to answer my letter. I have noticed in the newspapers that there is going to be an investigation into this farm-labor draft by members of a Senate committee. I would appreciate it very much if you could send me the address of this committee, as I think I have some information they could use. It seems strange to me that the number of Federal employees who are of draft age and who are also deferred should increase almost double, while farmers are being drafted, and you cannot buy a pound of butter or cheese even if you have got the points and money.

Mr. Chairman, the sacrifice that our fighting forces are making upon the theory that they are preserving the American way of life and underwriting our institutions of liberty is a travesty if the Executive can flout the law and deceive the patriotic members of draft boards who wish to render a real and honest service to their country. I do not believe that there is a draft board in the country that would knowingly disregard the laws of their country, but when they are told that a directive, such as that issued on January 3 1945, is superior to any law passed by Congress, and then to be told further by officers of the Army to ignore the Tydings amendment, this Nation faces a challenge that Congress should accept by passing one of these resolutions now before the House, preferably the Lemke resolution, which does not lend itself to a Presidential veto.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. As a matter of fact, under the Tydings amendment or under the selective service law the President has no authority to make any finding as to what is necessary.

Mr. REED of New York. None whatever. The Tydings amendment is the law of the land.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JONKMAN. Some time before January 3 Justice Felix Frankfurter rendered the following opinion. He said the notion, because the words of a statute are plain that therefore the meaning is also plain, is just pernicious oversimplification. The Supreme Court is also a law-making body of this land, and if that statement becomes the law, can this Congress express itself in such a way as to have its mandates carried out?

Mr. REED of New York. Apparently not.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain excerpts.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY].

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the resolution before us for several reasons. Those who are for this measure appear to be for it partly because, as they say, it simply reaffirms a situation which existed before, and concerning which there has been neglect on the part of the Selective Service Director. Others say that it is needed to correct a basic situation that is wrong.

May I point out that in my opinion, since this question has been agitated during the short term that I have been a Member of this Congress—this session—it has borne all the earmarks of a sustained attack upon the administration of the Selective Service System. I was an invited member who attended that famous meeting when General Hershey came before 150 or 160 Members of Congress. At that time, I regret to say, the floor was open only to those who wished to put some kind of pressure upon the general. Nevertheless, the general made some very important points on that occasion. He said:

I am required to raise 750,000 men by the 1st of July. Where will I get them? Who will be responsible if some section of the front gives way? Who will be responsible if I cannot raise the 750,000 men I am asked to raise?

The general made some other interesting points.

He pointed out that of those drafted up to March 1944, 11 percent were from the farms, 41 percent were laborers, and operatives, semiskilled and skilled labor, and 12 percent were foremen and craftsmen. In other words, up to that point, March 1944, 53 percent of those in the armed forces had come from among the industrial workers and 11 percent from the farm population. The percentage of the farmers to the whole population is 18 percent. Thus we drew 11 percent from 18 percent, and we drew 53 percent from 31 percent of the population.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LACY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I know the gentleman recognizes that the production of food is essential to the war effort.

Mr. DE LACY. I also recognize that without the production of steel and coal and ships and bullets we cannot fight, either.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does not the gentleman believe it would be better to change the law if these men are needed, and I will agree they are needed, rather than to override the law and misinterpret it?

Mr. DE LACY. I do not agree that the law has been overridden. The fundamental law in this case, as I understand, is the law which establishes the military liability, or the privilege, if we

put it that way, that everyone has for military service. The law exempts no one. The purpose of the Tydings amendment was no more and no less than to see to it that our essential food production did not suffer by reason of people who were needed for that production being taken from the farms.

But the Tydings amendment could not change the basic law, which is that the Nation can and must take every able-bodied man who is needed for combat service.

Men, skilled and needed men, up to 33 years of age are now being taken from industry—and this despite a lag in certain critical war production.

Under existing law essential farm workers must get full consideration.

The Flannagan resolution does not change the status quo in any important particular. Its chief effect is to reaffirm previous congressional action at a time when emphasis on keeping any group out of military service only introduces additional rigidity in the whole manpower field.

The military authorities must determine how many men the prosecution of the war demands. The Selective Service System must find those men, and can only take them in accordance with what the local boards believe will least injure essential production in all programs. I believe we should let the status quo stand and, instead of undermining General Hershey, give him the support his difficult job demands.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, to me it is regrettable that it becomes necessary for the Congress to consider a resolution which has for its principal purpose rededicating the Congress, or emphasizing the fact that it favors the enforcement of legislation which has already passed both Houses of Congress and has been the law of the land for more than 2 years.

The unhappy situation is that Congress has delegated such wide and extensive powers to the administrative branch of the Government over a period of years, and the administrative officials have become so adept in circumventing the intent of the law when it does not suit their convenience, that we now face a situation where there is an attempt on the part of the Directors of War Mobilization and Selective Service to ignore the letter and spirit of the law, and by instructions to local draft boards to call to the armed services those boys who have been deferred by law to raise the food to feed the world. These boys have given up the opportunity to serve with their buddies, or the allure of high wages paid in the war plants, and have dedicated themselves to the most important task of raising food. They have toiled long and hard, they have had assurance under the law that they would be permitted to carry on and to harvest the crop. Many of them now find themselves uprooted by administrative edict with great loss to themselves, and loss to the national larder.

Farming is a business of long and careful planning; it cannot be started or concluded at will. The loss to production already incurred because of these ill-advised "instructions" is untold. My correspondence reveals hundreds of farms which cannot be operated because of the drafting of men who were once deferred under the Tydings amendment, and thousands of head of livestock which must be disposed of before it is ready for market. This situation is multiplied many times over the country. What it will mean to the bread basket of the Nation and that of our allies is not a pleasant thought.

I realize the difficulties faced by those responsible for filling the ranks of our armed forces. I also realize that soldiers who fight must eat. I say again, I regret the necessity for Congress to restate its position with respect to laws already on the statute books. I am heartily in favor of the resolution.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, we in the agricultural areas are particularly interested at this time in manpower and machinery and in the weather during the crop seasons. We do not have much control over the weather. Therefore we have to look to manpower and we have to look to an adequate supply of farm machinery to do the job expected of agriculture in raising the food supply for the Nation.

I have been trying to get figures from the Selective Service as to exactly how many men have been drawn from the field of agriculture since January 1 for service in the armed forces or reclassified with a view to using them therein, but I have been unable to get these figures because of the shortness of time. However, I have been able to get some figures on machinery and I think they will be of interest to you.

Just a moment ago I got a telephone report from the War Food Administration that the present allocation of steel to the farm-machinery industry has been so reduced that we can expect farm-machinery manufacture in the third quarter of the calendar year to be reduced to about 60 percent of the needed or planned volume. At the present time farm-machinery production is running about 78 percent of the planned program.

The farmers in my district, which is the southeast corner of Iowa, are already extending themselves to the utmost to raise the full supply of food that is expected from that area. They cannot do this with old men or with children or with people from the cities who do not know how to do farm work. They are losing some of their young vigorous men, they look forward to further curtailment in the farm-machinery supply, and they are still entirely dependent on powers beyond their control in the matter of weather. We are literally placing our fate in the lap of the gods in the matter of our food supply to be raised in the year 1945, and we need the services of every available young farm worker on our Iowa farms.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the Tydings amendment does not now and never has offered itself as a loophole through which farm boys are to avoid service in the armed forces. It was adopted because of the necessity of keeping men upon the farms who were able to do the work required to produce food. The law is very specific as to the requirements for deferment. There is no reason whatever that there should be any misunderstanding about it. There must be no replacement available, it must be essential agricultural work, and the man must be fully engaged.

I came to Washington with a very high regard for the men in the National Selective Service, and with a very high regard for that national office. I have lost some of that regard since January 3 of this year. I am allergic to double talk. I am, therefore, in favor of the passage of the Lemke resolution as well as the passage of the Flannagan resolution, because there is little or no conflict between them, and on only one point is there any duplication.

The Flannagan amendment is a joint resolution. It must go up the Avenue. It must wait there for a required time, and it may be signed or it may be vetoed. The Lemke amendment confirms the Tydings amendment and at the same time sets up a committee so that we may ask why it is that this condition exists, and who it is who is saying to the people of the United States that the laws of Congress are to be disregarded. I hope that by such a process I may again get back the regard I had for General Hershey, because I think we will find out that General Hershey is simply, as a good soldier, obeying the orders which are given him by someone higher up.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Does the gentleman feel that we can accomplish anything by the passage of this resolution which is not already in the law as passed by Congress? In other words, I am very definitely in favor of the objectives which we seek in this resolution, but are we going to accomplish anything more by adding another sentence or two?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I see what the gentleman is getting at, and I say, yes, we are, because the confusion exists in the local draft boards, and those people today who are saying there is nothing that can be done about this, forget that the jurisdiction rests in the local draft boards and that there is no danger whatever of the local draft boards deferring a man who should be in the armed services because they are dealing with the local communities. If a local draft board defers the son of Henry Roe and drafts the son of John Doe, the board members hear about it locally in the community.

Another reason I am in favor of the so-called Lemke resolution passing is because I think Congress has the right and the duty to find out if any of these pools of manpower actually exist. It is said

the War Department is the greatest hoarder of manpower. Certainly we know that there are more than 7,000,000 men abroad in the services, with only a small proportion of that number in or near the front lines; and we know that there are 5,000,000 men in the training camps and other installations in the United States. These figures are out of proportion to a demand that all farm workers under 26 be rushed into uniform, even if they have been deferred under the Tydings amendment.

Recently, according to a letter to me, 7,500 men were laid off from one Pacific coast shipyard. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] tells me that 12,000 will shortly be let out of the New England shipyards. We all know and hear the reports from the industries themselves, and of the Government agencies. General Hershey says he has not the power to determine the facts of these conditions. The Military Affairs Committee members say that men in the present administration who could answer the questions calmly decline to come before that committee. I suggest that the proper respect of the Congress is at stake.

There is a practical side. We have an excess of some foodstuffs, too little of others. We have that condition because nature has given us 4 growing years we had no right to expect or hope for. A normal year will cut us down; a long-overdue bad year will seriously reduce food supplies. Out where I live, the loss of a milker who had been deferred under the Tydings amendment means 40 more milk cows sent to the butcher; more than all the cows in some eastern dairies. We cannot replace the milker now, and the old people and the children cannot do the work.

The Lemke amendment is not personal with the gentleman from North Dakota. A few days after the now famous Hershey directive of January 3, a group of more than 50 Members of this House met almost spontaneously in the committee room of the Committee on Agriculture. From that group a small committee of 11 members were appointed to do something about the obvious disregard for the law as enacted by Congress.

The committee consisted, in addition to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE], of Mr. WHITE, of Idaho; Mr. LARCADE, of Louisiana; Mr. O'HARA, of Minnesota; Mr. REED, of New York; Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN of Minnesota; Mr. RAINS, of Alabama; Mr. HORAN, of Washington; and myself.

The following Monday, January 15, a mass meeting attended by probably 200 Members of Congress heard General Hershey give the same confusing and conflicting statements he has given several times since then.

The committee of 11 was instructed to prepare a resolution to clear up the confusion. What you now call the Lemke resolution is the result. It represents therefore the desire of a large number of the men and women in this House. It would be unfortunate indeed if the majority leadership of the House, under administration direction if such is the case, should put further obstacles in the way of bringing up this resolution for a vote at the earliest possible moment.

While this resolution was in process, the Committee on Agriculture, under the gentleman from Virginia, Chairman FLANNAGAN, held hearings and secured from General Hershey the now famous telegram, sent to all State directors, telling each one that the Tydings amendment is still the law and that authority still rests with the local boards. Letters which the committee has in its files, and the disregard generally for this telegram on the part of draft boards, raises the question of what verbal or other instructions followed the telegram unofficially.

On the instructions of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] introduced House Joint Resolution 106, now before us. The committee of 11 has supported this resolution; the members of the Committee on Agriculture have supported House Concurrent Resolution 27, the Lemke resolution. Both should pass. Both should pass immediately. Both are needed.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I think everyone has sympathy with the farmers in the great difficulties that this Nation is experiencing in producing food for the war effort. I desire to call your attention, however, to the fact that when the military leaders of this country call upon the Selective Service to deliver so-and-so many men into the armed service at any specific time, if any one group or category of citizens of the United States are especially deferred through an act of Congress which may have been passed, that the draft falls more heavily upon the other groups of the United States. I represent a district which is very largely industrial and partly agricultural. I can tell you from the messages that I have received that the Selective Service in the State of California has notified the local boards that within 120 days, rather within 90 to 120 days, all the young men who are physically qualified, regardless of their occupation, but under the ages of 26 years, will be in the armed services. If you are going to defer the agricultural man by any such act as this, it simply means that you are going to strike at the heart of war production on the other hand, because quotas must be met.

Now the problem which confronts the War Manpower Commission and Selective Service with reference to war industries and the farmers is not with those men who are vulnerable to the draft. The problem is with those men who have been led to believe that they are not vulnerable to the draft. In the aircraft industry, of which there is a very large plant in my district, and there are many more in my county, the labor turn-over is in the nonvulnerable group. The same thing is true in agriculture. When Selective Service reduces the age limit for induction, it relieves from their obligation those thus made nonvulnerable. They leave their jobs and wander from job to job or back to the old job again. When a deferred farm hand is classified IV-F, he feels free to go where he pleases for higher wages. And you may find them working for banks, or they might be working for an aircraft company perhaps, but generally in some occupation where the number of employees is less than seven and there is no ceiling upon the wage that they can be paid.

Selective Service has notified industry in my State that every deferred man, essential or not, between 18 and 29, and who is able-bodied, would be called into service within 90 to 120 days. And what happens? Industry says that if that is done, they cannot meet their schedules. The only young men they have left are considered vital to production.

And we have some of the most important war-production schedules in the United States, if not in the world. We are at the present time developing and beginning to place into production jet-propelled planes that are so necessary to defeat the German jet-propelled planes over Germany, and with which we expect to meet the Japs with their jet-propelled planes over Asia.

A man who was not vulnerable and who is still not vulnerable is free to go where he chooses. Make every man up to 45 years of age vulnerable to the military draft if they leave their essential jobs and you will eliminate turn-over and increase production in all categories and be able to carry on the war effort satisfactorily. You do not need penalties beyond existing penalties. You only need the fact of vulnerability.

I think we are going at this business in a very miserable, piecemeal way. I do not approve of this present type of legislation, although it will be passed.

Mr. Chairman, this bill affects only farm workers. It first defers all persons engaged in agriculture, even though their military services might be needed. Then it locks into his job the agricultural worker who is classified IV-F and places upon him stiff penalties for changing jobs or quitting.

What will be the result to the agricultural IV-F? It will be tantamount, meaning his job, tantamount to penal servitude. Why? Because the minimum-wage and maximum-hours laws do not apply to agricultural labor. A farm owner could say to his IV-F farm hands, "I am reducing your pay to $1 per month, and you can have 6 hours off to sleep. If you quit, the Government can fine you $10,000 and put you in the penitentiary for 5 years under the law passed by Congress." There is nothing I know of to prevent that happening, except the conscience of the farm owner. Under this bill, as it stands, and if passed, the farmer can use this law as a black-snake whip over the backs of his IV-F farm hands. I for one will not vote for such an iniquitous act. I will vote for the Halleck amendment and against the bill. If the Selective Service Act is inadequate, and I agree to that premise, then let the Selective Service Act be amended so that it applies fairly to all persons, regardless of the classification of their employment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, Members of Congress find themselves in a very embarrassing position today in the consideration of this resolution. We are simply reemphasizing and reaffirming a prior law of the Congress namely, the Tydings amendment. It has been ignored and bypassed by the Director of Selective Service and we have no assurance at this moment that this new resolution of the Congress will not be ignored in turn.

It seems to me that this whole dispute and misinterpretation of the law has been caused by the directive of the President which stated that those deferred in agriculture were more essential in the armed services than on the farm. Until agriculture is definitely designated and recognized as an essential industry, we apparently cannot expect much relief.

It is high time that the mandates of the Congress be obeyed. In passing this resolution we are only telling the Selective Service that Congress meant exactly what it said when it passed the Tydings amendment. If those in charge of our Government agencies and departments refuse to recognize and live up to the clear mandates of the Congress, it simply means that representative government is on the way out.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time, 4 minutes, to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, it may be that this is a situation where we are working too late, and this may be more or less of an abortive effort, but in case some of those who represent industrial districts think this is a bogyman, I have here—and I will not burden the record by inserting them therein—bills for 29 farm sales that were advertised in my district just this week. Twenty-nine sales, and the auctioneers in my district have been booked up for every day since the 1st day of January

This batch of sale bills alone shows there will be over 355 head of dairy cattle put on the block. Some of those will be absorbed by neighboring farms, but most of them will not be.

Why are these folks leaving the farm? In many cases it is because the last man has been taken into the armed services. In other instances the hired hands have gone into defense work at higher pay. In other cases these farmers have reached the state in their old age where they cannot carry on any longer. Others are retiring due to ill health. But whatever the reasons for these sales the situation is serious, because in order to produce as our war workers have been producing, they must have food. So that our men in the armed services may continue to fight as they have been fighting they must have food. If we do not have food, we cannot win the war. So this is a serious question and deserves every bit of consideration and all of the mental genius that this House and the entire Congress has to solve it and solve it before it is too late.

Mr. BREHM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. I would like to observe with regard to my own State of Ohio that of all boys registered between 18 and 26, close to 500,000, only 1.9 percent of those boys have been deferred to follow agricultural pursuits. So the farmers in Ohio have not taken any unfair advantage of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is true in every State in the Union.

I may say further that within the next week or 10 days there will be in my district one dairy which produces more than 1,000 quarts of milk a day for my home city, that will undoubtedly close, because all of their manpower has gone. They have made every effort to secure help. They have called in the older folks. They have tried to get war prisoners to operate that dairy. The last man has now gone and only one man well up in years, who is ill, is left to run the dairy to supply 1,000 quarts of milk. That is a small matter, but if you multiply that a thousandfold over the entire country, the problem is a serious one indeed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I shall weigh the words, brief as they may be, that I shall speak upon the pending proposal.

At the outset I believe the flat statement can be made, and some day will be proved, to the effect that this resolution is discriminatory in nature and that the Membership of this House should not appease any single group, however worthy that group may be, during the crucial period of what we hope will be the concluding phases of this global conflict.

Earlier today my splendid colleague from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] spoke of the productive and beautiful section he represents. His district joins the territory I serve in this body. I agree he has a fine countryside—only surpassed by the hill and valley land that we have in West Virginia. I represent a district which is diversified from the standpoint of farming and other horticultural pursuits. It is, also, a district that embraces an important mining industry. In West Virginia we have approximately 100,000 bituminous coal miners. Approximately 12,000 of these miners live in 9 counties of the 15 counties that I have the responsibility to represent.

I listened with intense interest to the words of the gentleman from Pennsylvania when he told us that the members of the mining industry, both those who mine the coal and those who operate the mines, have asked no deferment in connection with the war effort. I believe that to be generally true, but I do say that regardless of whether the request has been made or not, this does not alleviate the tragic condition that takes place in this industry from the standpoint of the shrinkage of its manpower in the necessary production of the matériel of this war. We face this year, even if no new strikes occur in the coal-mining industry, a shortage of 50,000,000 tons of coal. The same situation may exist in other industries, steel and allied production of implements with which we win a war.

I believe that some day, if the House votes favorably on this resolution, we shall know that we have failed the country in the over-all obligation for fighting manpower. We should vote and act in accordance with the dire needs for the forces which carry forward this war effort. To single out any group for special treatment, however worthy and deserving and vital it may be, will some day be proved to be wrong, viewed in the light of our national responsibility.

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. HEDRICK. We still have fresh in our minds the suffering here in Washington a few weeks ago from the shortage of coal. Does not the gentleman believe that unless some relief is afforded to the coal-mining industry the suffering this winter may be great over the entire country, due to the shortage of coal.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the gentleman from West Virginia is correct. The suffering may become of a very damaging nature on the home front to the prosecution of the war in the coming months. But regardless of whether it is the coal industry, the shipbuilding industry, or any other in America, we should not single out by legislation the deferment, almost a mandatory deferment, for one group. I believe such action is an interference with the strategy and the prosecution of the war by those individuals we have directly charged with forming and carrying out that plan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do we not have deferment as to essential workers in industry?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Certainly, the deferments are subject to our war needs. The Tydings farm amendment is all that is needed. Farmer folks, in West Virginia, and throughout the Nation, are loyal and ask no special favors.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, may I call the attention of the House to the fact that in the State of Iowa approximately 13 percent of our population is in the armed forces. The national average is about 10 percent. It, therefore, appears that our agricultural areas in Iowa have produced all their fair share of inductees into the Army and Navy.

I favor the adoption of both these resolutions. I hope that our selective-service boards will closely scrutinize inductions from farm areas to the end that agricultural production may continue at its high level.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"In carrying out the provisions of this subsection the local selective-service board in classifying the registrant shall base its findings solely and exclusively on whether the registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort and whether a satisfactory replacement can be obtained without reference to the relative essentiality of the registrant to an agricultural occupation or endeavor as compared with any other occupation, service, or endeavor. It shall be the duty of any such registrant who is also found by his local selective-service board to be physically or otherwise unfit for military training and service to remain in such agricultural occupation or endeavor unless and until released from such agricultural occupation or endeavor by his local selective-service board, and violations of this provision shall be considered an evasion of service in the land or naval forces."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it has already been stated that the passage of this resolution is rather unusual legislative procedure, which, of course, is quite true; but it does two things it should not do, yet I am in the unhappy position of probably having to vote for it. The obligation of the chairman of a committee is such that he is in effect in a strait jacket when he brings a bill to the floor of the House. Of course, that does not mean he shall not vote his convictions.

The general law on the subject of classification, selection, and induction of men into the armed forces is embraced in what is known as the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. The pending resolution merely reasserts what the Congress has heretofore enacted in the form of legislation by way of an amendment to that act.

The thing that seems objectionable in this proceeding is the latter clause of the pending resolution beginning with the word "It" in line 6, page 2, and going to the end of the section. That language provides that where the medical authorities have found that a man is physically unfit for military service, he is immediately frozen on the farm and is not permitted to leave under penalty of being designated as one evading the provisions of the Selective Service Act. If that left him where he could be utilized elsewhere, after having been found physically unfit, I should not greatly object to it, but it constitutes nothing more or less than saying that those men must stay and will have to stay on the farm regardless of the need for them elsewhere, even though we were being invaded.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I agree with the gentleman. That last sentence is a very dangerous one and it is rather inconsistent with the position of some of us with reference to the May bill when that bill was before us heretofore. That is a sentence that should come out of the bill.

Mr. MAY. I think the House should strike it out when that point is reached. I shall not oppose such an amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does not the gentleman think that the last clause to the effect that he shall remain on the farm until released from such agricultural occupation or endeavor by his local selective board makes the clause unobjectionable? In other words, he has a chance to go to his board, make his plea, and get released and go elsewhere.

Mr. MAY. But the point I make is that when they are once frozen they will not be dealt with any more.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No. The board can release them.

Mr. MAY. I understand that; but I make the point they will not do it. After they once say that, they will leave these men there. Unless we get the manpower that is required at this time, between now and the middle of April, we will not need it at all, perhaps; at least, we have to get it by the 30th of June.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the position the gentleman finds himself in in reporting this legislation to the floor. However, will the gentleman not agree that the production of foodstuffs and the production of war materials, all vital endeavors on the home front, are welded into one, and that this legislation would single out for preferential treatment from a group of worthy industries one particular class?

Mr. MAY. I think there was merit in the argument of some gentleman awhile ago when he said that if you exempt the farmers as a group, when you come up with another resolution relating to the miners as a group or the railroaders as a group or some other minority group, they should be treated in exactly the same way. That is my reaction to it, and as a matter of fact the proposal is grossly discriminatory in favor of one group as against other groups. Finally, our first obligation is to the men who are fighting and dying on all the battle fronts of the world. All men may do as they wish, but for me I am going to follow the leadership of the men that are charged with the responsibility of waging a successful war.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the agricultural industry, of course, is our basic industry. Naturally it has my sympathies. The old saying that you can take a boy from the country but you can never take the country out of him, is true. I came from there. You see it sticking out all over my face. If I had the choice, I do not believe I would remove that brand.

The agricultural industry of America has got to be assisted; it has got to be encouraged if all other industry in our country is to succeed, because when it fails, all other industry will ultimately fail. So I am in favor of not only encouraging, but assisting agriculture in every way that is constitutional and right. If there would be such a thing as a farm bloc in the Congress, which there is not, I would be one of them, or be a member of that bloc. I have been accused of it anyway. I would be frank to tell you that I would be a member of it.

But, Members of this great body, it seems to me in the passage of the legislation before us we are going a long way. I believe it is ill-advised legislation. Of course, I would hate to vote against it, and perhaps I would not vote against such a resolution if called upon to vote, but this legislation should not be passed by this body at this time.

The agricultural worker, the farmer, as a rule, does not want any advantages and he does not want any class legislation. He wants to be given an even break with his fellow Americans in order that he might render the same kind of service to his flag and to his country that the rest of them render. If you pass this legislation, in my opinion you are going to put a hard and fast rule of law on the books that may rise up later like Banquo's ghost to haunt you.

You will recall that this Congress passed some legislation a few days ago where it openly admitted that it had made a mistake a few years ago in consolidating some lending agencies with the Department of Commerce. This Congress also, a year or so ago, admitted its mistake in passing some neutrality legislation which was a mistake and which helped no one but injured ourselves. Let us not do that now. Let us all be Americans. Let us all have a part in this war—industry, labor, the farmer, professional men, and all. It is our war. You have heard it said in the well of this House, and I say it again, that there is a war on, and we should all work together, cooperate shoulder to shoulder, pushing the wheels until we win this great conflict.

If this Congress makes a mistake now it may wake up a few weeks from now and feel that it should not have done so. You are going to place on a par with the real farmers those drug-store farmers who since the war came on and since the Selective Service Act was passed, and since the Tydings amendment was adopted, decided all at once, with the aid of their rich relatives, that they were great farmers, and who were sent out into the country to herd a few head of cattle and to run a little tractor in order to get exempt from rendering that service that every red-blooded American ought to smile and delight in rendering to his country and to his flag.

The thing we ought to do today is pass over this legislation for the present. I should like to see it recommitted. Then we should adopt the Lemke resolution and let the Congress investigate and see whether General Hershey has made a mistake.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. You seem to be mad at the Director of this agency. I think he has done a wonderful job, taking everything into consideration, but if he has done what you have said he has done, if he has violated the mandate of this House, why get up here and try to pass legislation to correct that? Why not impeach him, as it is our duty, as I see it, to do, rather than to pass legislation about it?

If you pass this legislation you will enact a law that will forever prohibit the drafting of any agricultural worker, regardless of whether he is essential or not. I am in favor of the Tydings amendment and I am in favor of deferring essential agricultural workers as long as it can be done; and it is going to be necessary to do that if we produce a sufficient amount of food to feed our Army as well as ourselves. But the time might come—it does not look near as likely to come now as it did a year or two ago—but the time might come when our lives would be more essential than a few weeks of agricultural work. Conditions could become such that it would be necessary to save our very existence, for us to have all agricultural workers in the service. Yet if such conditions should arise, you would prohibit the drafting of anyone engaged in agricultural services; and this, if such a condition arose, would be detrimental to the welfare of our great country.

You are taking this matter out of the hands of the local selective-service boards, who are acquainted with the situation, and who know what persons are hiding behind a smokescreen or agricultural skirt in order to dodge service for their country. Let us not pass this ill-advised legislation at this time and tie our hands in the future. After the investigation called for by the Lemke amendment we will know whether or not the Selective Service System has made a mistake in construing the Tydings amendment. I do not know whether the Tydings amendment provides for an iron-clad deferment of agricultural workers, or all of the agricultural workers. If it does it is bad legislation, in that, when the time comes that service in our armed forces is more essential to our very existence, then, at that time, agricultural work is not as essential as that which would save us from utter destruction. Yet, if we pass this legislation and such a condition arises, we will be prohibited from calling them in to help save our very existence.

Let us pass over this legislation. If it does become necessary to pass it later, of course the House can do it then. Let us let well enough alone now.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, in Oklahoma for every farmer that asked to be deferred 7¼ times as many went to the Army as against 1 worker in industry. In the State of North Dakota 28 farmers went as against 1 in industry.

I think the fault lies with the three conflicting directives recently sent to the local selective service boards, which have misinterpreted and misconstrued the Tydings amendment. We certainly should put the force of law in the strongest language possible into seeing that we are welded into one people, a government of laws and not a government by men.

We American farmers declared and won the independence of this country. It was we who set the blueprint and adopted the Constitution so that those in industries are enjoying today greater favors than the farmers. Now why should the farmer be discriminated against to the tune of seven and one-quarter farmers to one laborer in industry in any State?

Take the States bordering Oklahoma. In Arkansas 0.4 as against 3.5. In Kansas it is 1.2 as against 9 percent. Missouri 1.1 to 1.4. Texas 1.1 as against 1.4.

There is an over-all of 3 to 1 discrimination. Where the fault lies, your thought is as good as mine but I have frankly stated my views. I do not know whether in the State of Texas the local boards take the bits in their teeth and interpret the law as is. But I do know in my State we have patriotic citizens upon every board trying to win this war and trying to put forth every effort, and cooperating as fully as any State in the Union, and after much study and thought I am convinced this question of interpreting the Tydings amendment should be by law passed by Congress and not left to man-made directives. We are all familiar with the three telegrams that went out to all the selective boards, the first quoting the President, the second revising or modifying it, and the third more or less middle of the road, with the impression to follow the first and disregard the second.

As has been suggested it is not going to do any good to have transportation to take care of the great industrial centers unless we have some food for the human body. We know that coal is very necessary. We know it takes coal and oil to pull the freight cars and turn the wheels of commerce and industry. But we know the men who move the trains have to have something inside of them before they can shovel the coal and scoop it into the furnace to the boilers which pull the trains. Let us be fair with the farmer in deferring him, as we are to the industrial worker.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, we are on the threshold of undertaking to make a crop this year. There is no way of turning back the hands of the clock. If we produce food to win the war we must begin at planting time and keep up the work until the crops are harvested and animals are grown and fattened for market. We must produce the poultry, the eggs, the milk, butter, cheese, berries, and fruits necessary to feed our people, and our armed forces and our allies. The farms in my district have been stripped of their boys. There is rarely a day that I do not get a letter from some grief-stricken father or mother on the farm whose boy has either been killed or captured or is missing in action or wounded. It is a practical proposition. Only farmers can work the farms; only they know how to do the job.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to proceed for a few minutes somewhat out of order.

On February 22 of last week I received an interesting and informative letter from my friend the junior Senator from Tennessee, TOM STEWART. Senator STEWART is always on the alert when the interests of the people of Tennessee are involved. In this letter he advised me that the strawberry problem is up again and that the National Berry Association heads would meet with the O. P. A. on February 27 for the purpose of cutting the price of Tennessee strawberries. He had been informed that the O. P. A. had already decided to cut Tennessee strawberries to about $1.56 per crate less than California, Colorado, Nevada, Washington, Utah and other western States receive. And he stated that the alleged reason for this, as given in the "high sounding phrase the bureaucrats in the O. P. A. are using; is historical difference in price." Senator STEWART then went on to say:

> Of course, this is pure bunk and nothing but O. P. A. jargon which simply means that because at one time other States received $1.56 more per crate than was paid in Tennessee, it must be thus always.

Senator STEWART then relates Charles Lamb's account of the origin of roast pig. According to Lamb, a Chinese hut burned during the absence of the family. Upon the family's return, in poking around among the ashes they found the roasted remains of the family pig. They undertook to remove the pig from the ashes while it was hot. A Chinaman accidentally stuck his finger into the pig's cooked flesh. Because he slightly burned his finger he stuck it in his mouth and for the first time tasted roast pig. It was so good he repeated the performance and soon the whole family was eating roast pig. Any time thereafter when any Chinese family desired roast pig they simply fastened the family pig in the house and set fire to the house because that was the historic way to roast a pig.

Senator STEWART was unable to fathom the reasoning of the O. P. A. bureaucrats in arbitrarily lowering the price of Tennessee strawberries below the cost of production on any other basis than that of its historical reasons. He invited me to meet him and other Members of Congress from strawberry-growing sections at room 5139, Federal Office Building No. 1, Second and D Streets SW., today at 10 a. m. Now, we do not raise so many strawberries in my district, but I am interested in the rights of the people everywhere. I was a little late in arriving. On reaching the door of the meeting place I found two of my colleagues on the outside of the closed doorway not even looking in. They were Representatives JAMES H. MORRISON, of Louisiana, and HAROLD H. EARTHMAN, of Tennessee. They informed me that they had been in the conference room where the bureaucrats were preparing to "cow tromp" the strawberry growers not in their favor and that the bureaucrats had invited them to place themselves on the exterior of the room. In other words, these elected representatives of the people were told to

get out and to stand not upon the order of their going. This was something new to me. On the whole, I have found Government officials in Washington courteous even though set in their ways and sometimes stubborn.

I said, "Boys, what's the matter?" They said, "Well, they put us out." I said, "You ought not to feel badly about that. You are just elected representatives of the people in Congress. What rights have you as against a bureaucrat?" About that time a couple of bureaucrats came up. Representative MORRISON does not ordinarily take "no" for an answer, and he stated his intention to reenter the room where one of his constituents was present. He demanded to know by what law he as a Member of Congress was denied entrance into this bureaucratic "holy of holies," or words to that effect. The bureaucrat who was doing the talking was by this time getting "pale around the gills" and he stated to Representative MORRISON that he was going to recess the meeting while he interviewed some "gal" to find out by what law, rhyme, or reason he was slamming the door in the face of Members of Congress when money was about to be taken out of the pockets of their constituents. I wondered "why I was ever begun for, if I was so soon to be done for." And having business in my office and remembering what happened to Sewell Avery, and not wishing to be carried out, I came back on the Hill, where a Member can yet occupy his own office. Seriously, this high-handed, pigheaded insolence raises a number of questions.

First. The right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievance. If the people have this right they most assuredly have the right to exercise it through their elected representatives. It is impossible for the thousands of farmers adversely affected by this ruinous reduction in the price at which they are permitted to sell their berries to come to Washington to present their grievances. Their only chance to be heard is through their Representatives in Congress.

A bureaucrat of the species once said, "We are the people, and wisdom shall perish with us."

I witnessed this morning a glaring and outrageous example of—

But man, proud man,
Drest in a little brief authority,
Most ignorant of what he's most assured,
His glassy essence, like an angry ape,
Plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven
As make the angels weep.

Truly—

Authority intoxicates,
And makes mere sots of magistrates;
The fumes of it invade the brain,
And make men giddy, proud, and vain.

To produce strawberries requires the hardest kind of labor. Those who grow them should not be robbed of a just price for their crop by the senseless edict of those who are drunk with usurped authority exercised "with cruel claws." Henry Ward Beecher once said, "God could have made a better berry than the strawberry, but He never did."

Brothers MORRISON, EARTHMAN, and myself got the "razzberry" from a few small-potato bureaucrats, but I favor giving them the "works." It is in the power of this Congress to cut off their water. The process of putting strait jackets on the free people of this country by a motley crew who could not be elected dog pelter back home must be stopped.

We can and should reduce them to their proper size and when we do they will drop through a narrow crack into oblivion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not use all the time, but I would like the attention of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN]. There has been some question raised on the floor about the intent in the last part of the resolution as to whether it is the intent to freeze the individual farm worker in his employment for a specific employer for whom he may now be working, or is it the intention only to require him to remain employed in agriculture?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. It was the intent that he remain in agriculture; not on a particular farm. I do not think there is any question about the correct interpretation of the language that appears in the bill. The language is plain and unambiguous. It reads:

It shall be the duty of any such registrant who is also found by his local selective-service board to be physically or otherwise unfit for military training and service to remain in such agricultural occupation or endeavor unless and until released from such agricultural occupation or endeavor by his local selective-service board.

It does not say on any particular farm.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I asked the gentleman to yield only that my position and what I previously said on the rule might be understood. In what I said on the rule, I referred to a conversation I had today with the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the author of the bill. I quoted him as saying to me that his interpretation of this language, as he gave it to me today was that it would require the individual to stay on the farm, being the farm for work on which he had been deferred. That was my clear understanding of what the gentleman said.

I do not believe you can read the last sentence alone and arrive at a fair determination as to what the language means. The preceding language is that a man shall be deferred if he is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort and where a satisfactory replacement cannot be obtained. The language in the last sentence refers to "such" deferments. To my mind, you do not defer a man just by reason of his general employment. The question of his deferment is determined by the particular job he is doing. And to my mind, the language clearly means that it is that job which he cannot leave if this action is taken.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I am sorry the gentleman got that impression from anything I said here today because it is far from the intent I had in mind. I had no idea of freezing the farm boy to any particular farm. I wanted to keep him in agriculture. I think that is just what this provision does; it tells him to remain in such agricultural occupation or endeavor until and unless released by his local draft board.

Mr. HALLECK. I dislike to pursue it further, but I think the gentleman was here when I spoke before and made reference in my remarks to what my understanding of the language was. Until this moment I did not hear the gentleman suggest otherwise. Certainly I would not want to misrepresent his position.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I am sorry I did not hear the gentleman's reference to me in his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALLECK: On page 2, line 6, after the period strike out the balance of the section.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for me to submit a consent request?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot reach an agreement as to the length of time necessary to finish this section and all amendments thereto.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this amendment has just been offered. I believe it would be better if the gentleman would withhold his request for the time being and permit debate to proceed for a while.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes, in support of his amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, first of all I wish to suggest that I appreciate the fact that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs is in agreement with me that this language should be stricken out. As I said when I spoke on the rule, and much of what I say now may be in repetition, but certainly it will be of value to those who were not here when I spoke on the rule—this resolution is here to clarify the intent of Congress in respect to the so-called Tydings amendment and to bring the administration of that act by the Selective Service in conformity with the Tydings amendment and defer agricultural workers when they are irreplaceable and essential in the war effort.

It has been suggested that this language which has been read does not provide compulsion. It clearly provides compulsion. The gentleman from Virginia himself stated that the man must remain in agriculture. Certainly that is a measure of compulsion if that interpretation is correct. My interpretation of the words is that in the case of the man who has been deferred because he was in an agricultural occupation and was irreplaceable, the fact of irreplaceability necessarily referred to a particular job

in agriculture. The language referring to such deferment cannot mean anything other than that if a man farming 160 acres of land out in Indiana is ordered in in this screening process and is given a physical examination and turns up IV–F he will be required under this language to stay on that 160-acre farm whether he wants to or not.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Under the Tydings amendment, the boy is frozen to the farm. His board may immediately reclassify him and put him in I–A for immediate induction.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me comment on that. An agricultural deferment, even as an industrial deferment in a key industry, requires, of course, that he stay in that job, or, at least, in an equally essential job to avoid induction into the service. But this language is not that proposition at all. This language has to do with the man who has been deferred for an agricultural occupation, is turned up IV–F, and is thereby apprised of the fact he need not stay in an essential industry or agriculture in order to avoid being inducted into the Army because they have said to him that he is IV–F. I say that the Selective Service should never have ordered these men in if they were properly deferred for agricultural occupations, but having done that, having made what I say was a mistake, it looks to me as if they are asking us now to lock the door after the horse is stolen.

Let me pursue the matter a little further, because it seems to me it is an argument that cannot be successfully contended against. Not so long ago we had up for consideration here a bill to provide for employee compulsion, for a measure of freeze and compulsion in respect to employment. Some of us, not believing that that was the best way to bring about maximum production, believing that it was unconstitutional, and for other reasons, voted against that bill. Those Members who voted against compulsion for industrial workers will be hard put to vote for this bill that will provide compulsion for agricultural workers if my amendment does not prevail, which leads me to this point: The "work or jail" bill that we passed is now being debated in the other body. It is reported in the press, and I think, if we had time to examine the bill before them, it would disclose the fact that the elements of compulsion have been taken out of the bill. Conceivably, if this bill were to be passed and taken over into the Senate as it passed the House and there adopted, and then if compulsion is taken out of the other bill, we would be in the wholly untenable position of having voted compulsion for farm workers and having failed to vote compulsion for industrial workers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, whether we are to have compulsion in respect to individual employment in industry or in agriculture is a matter of policy for the Congress of the United States to determine. When that policy is finally determined, whatever my own views about it may be or may have been, I shall abide by that determination as a determination of legislative congressional intent. But the point I make is that the place to work that out is in the bill which is now pending in the Senate. If we are to have compulsion on one side, then let us have compulsion on the other side. It can all be worked out in the general bill. That bill is ahead of this one, it is now being debated in the other body, it is assumed it will soon be in conference, and that is the time, that is the place, to enact compulsory control of individual employment if that is what the Congress wants to do. But to include it in the thing we have started out to do here can only jeopardize the accomplishment of the objective that is foremost in the minds of all of us, which is, we want a clarification of the Tydings amendment, we want to be sure that the Selective Service does what the Congress intended it shall do.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. May I point out if my understanding is correct, that the work bill as we passed it in the House applied to agriculture just as well as industry, wherein under its provisions the draft board could say to a man, "You go to work on the farm."

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. On this matter of replaceability we find in the last part of this bill that it talks in terms of the Selective Service Board releasing the man from such agricultural occupation or endeavor, and then on the matter of satisfactory replacement it does not specify that that shall be for a specific job.

In some farm occupations, such as corn husking, a corn husker can be irreplaceable for a whole community, and there is no thought of his working for the same owner throughout the corn-husking season. He must husk corn for the whole community if he is going to do his full job, and I think the draft board should find him not replaceable if he is husking corn for another farmer across the road.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the last sentence must be read in connection with the language preceding which undertakes to provide the basis for deferment.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the members will not become confused. These farm boys between 18 and 25 are on the farm today by virtue of the Tydings amendment. Do not forget that. Had it not been for the Tydings amendment many of them would be in the service today. These boys have never been given the physical examination. They have now been ordered in to take the physical examination. If percentages hold up, around 40 percent of them will be rejected because of failure to pass the physical examination.

What happens then? They are put in IV–F, which means that the Army will not take them. They have been released from the farm, and you know that the farm will lose those boys because they will immediately go to industry to work where they can get four or five times the wage and will have their hours of labor cut from 12 and 14 hours to 7 and 8 hours.

Under the Tydings amendment, which has been the law of the land since 1942, these boys are frozen to the farm. If they have been deferred under the Tydings amendment, they must remain on the farm; if they leave they are brought in by the draft boards and inducted into the Army.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, that is assuming their physical qualifications.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. No; whether found physically qualified for Army service or not, they go into the Army, and unless you have this provision in the resolution, you are releasing these boys not only from the farm, but you are releasing them from the Army, and they become free to do whatever they please. They can do anything in the world they choose to do. They do not have to go into an industry that is essential to the war effort. They do not have to remain on the farm and produce food that is necessary to the war effort. They can go down here and loaf around the pool rooms and the dance halls and no one in this country can touch them.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not true that many of the men in war industry have been deferred by reason of their essentiality in that industry, and is it not further true that if the Selective Service should call them all in and a lot of them should be found to be IV–F, under existing law they could take any job they wanted to?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Farming has never been classified as an essential war undertaking. Farming has been taken care of heretofore under the Tydings amendment. By reason of the Tydings amendment it has never been necessary to classify farming as essential to the war effort.

Let me say to the gentleman that our great farm organizations have given study and thought to this question. I have here, and I would have inserted them in the RECORD while we were in the House but for lack of time, letters from the Farm Bureau and the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Association endorsing House Joint Resolution 106. I also have a letter from the National

Grange and a telegram from the National Council of Farm Cooperatives endorsing all of the resolution except the penalty provision. I will obtain permission later to insert these letters and telegrams at this point in the RECORD:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., February 24, 1945.
Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN FLANNAGAN: We strongly favor the provisions of House Joint Resolution 106 as reported by the House Committee on Military Affairs, which seeks to clarify the original Tydings amendment for the deferment of essential persons engaged in agriculture.

This measure will correct what we believe to be an erroneous interpretation of the original Tydings amendment requiring the deferment of persons regularly engaged in agricultural work essential to the war effort for whom no satisfactory replacements can be obtained. Due to confusion, misunderstandings, and misinterpretations of the Tydings amendment, it is virtually being nullified to a considerable extent in many areas of the country.

This measure will also correct another weakness in the present Tydings amendment. Under the provisions of the Tydings amendment in existing law, all deferred workers engaged in agriculture are forbidden to leave essential agricultural work unless they receive the permission of their local draft board. The penalty for violation of this provision is induction into the armed forces, but this penalty is of no value in the case of deferred registrants when they are called up for physical examinations and are rejected for military service because of physical disqualifications. Recently the Selective Service System has issued orders that all deferred registrants in agriculture, 18 through 25 years of age, must be given a preinduction physical examination. Based upon past experience, possibly one-third to one-half of those examined will be rejected for physical disqualifications.

It is therefore urgent that steps be taken immediately to correct this weakness in the penalty provisions of the Tydings amendment. House Joint Resolution 106 corrects this weakness by providing that any persons who have been deferred from military service because of their essentiality to agriculture and are rejected because of physical disqualifications, are still subject to the same requirement as other deferred registrants to remain in essential agricultural work; and if they violate this provision by leaving their agricultural occupation without obtaining the consent of their local selective-service board, they will be subject to the same penalty as any other violator of the Selective Service Act.

As you know, we have supported legislation amending the Selective Service Act which would embody the work-or-fight principle, wherein all persons of draft age who are engaged in essential occupations, either in industry or agriculture, would be forbidden to leave such essential occupations without the consent of their local selective service boards; and wherein authority also would be given to local selective service boards to require, whenever necessary, persons who are not engaged in any essential war work, either in industry or agriculture, to become employed in essential war work, either in industry or agriculture, or be subject to induction into the armed forces or subject to the same penalties as any other violator of the Selective Service Act.

We believe such work-or-fight legislation, which is applicable in reality, only to the slacker, who is not making any contribution to the war effort, would be much more effective and defensible than sweeping, general manpower legislation, which would subject all employers and all workers of all ages—male and female—to regulation by some Federal agency.

Due to the delay which has arisen in connection with the enactment of work-or-fight legislation, it is vitally important to take immediate action to clarify the provisions of the Tydings amendment. Unless action is taken very quickly, it will be too late to rectify the situation, at least as far as the 18 through 25 age group is concerned. This is going to be the most critical year of the war so far as the manpower shortage on the farm is concerned. Farmers are already straining every effort, toiling extermely long hours—from 60 to 80 hours a week—to meet their food production goals. It is our considered opinion that the loss of any substantial number of farm workers at this time will result in a reduction of essential food supplies which are critically needed.

Therefore, we hope that Congress will take immediate action to enact the Tydings-Flannagan joint resolutions (S. J. Res. 33; H. J. Res. 106).

Sincerely yours,
EDW. A. O'NEAL, *President.*

THE NATIONAL COOPERATIVE
MILK PRODUCERS' FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1945.
Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FLANNAGAN: This is to advise that our board of directors meeting in Washington February 14 and 15, endorsed the principles which later became embodied in House Joint Resolution 106, introduced by you, and its companion bill, Senate Joint Resolution 33, introduced by Senator TYDINGS. They believe that passage of the resolution and its enactment into law would give some needed additonal protection to the farm people.

At the same time our organization declared itself opposed to the May-Bailey bill. Even should your resolution be attached to the May-Bailey bill as an amendment, we would be opposed to that bill.

We hope that your resolution can go through the Congress on its own merits.

Sincerely yours,
CHAS. W. HOLMAN,
Secretary, The National Cooperative
Milk Producers' Federation.

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., February 27, 1945.
Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FLANNAGAN: We have carefully read House Joint Resolution No. 106, which you introduced, together with the report of the House Committee on Military Affairs regarding the same.

We believe it would serve a useful purpose to strengthen and clarify the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act. This legislation was necessary at the time of its enactment, and it is just as necessary now. By all means, it should be observed and lived up to by the draft boards and all those connected with the Selective Service System.

We have been particularly fortunate by virtue of the fact that we have had favorable growing weather every year since the United States entered the war. This has meant a great deal, but on the law of averages we cannot expect it to continue indefinitely. We do not know when we may encounter a year of drought and bad growing weather generally. Common prudence dictates that we should not take any unnecessary chances with our food supply. We need all the food we can produce under present conditions, and it takes manpower to produce food. No other segment of our civilian population has made a greater contribution to the war effort than those engaged in agriculture.

While those who have been given deferred classification as essential agricultural workers should naturally remain so employed, we do not think the penalty imposed for transferring to some other line of work essential to the war effort should be more severe in the case of agricultural workers than the penalty inflicted on industrial workers for making a similar change.

Very sincerely yours,
THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
FRED BRENCKMAN,
Washington Representative.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 27, 1945.*
Hon. JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The provisions of House Joint Resolution 106 and Senate Joint Resolution 33, requiring local selective-service boards to base their classification of a registrant solely on whether he is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation and on whether a satisfactory replacement can be obtained without reference to essentiality in any other occupation or service, are fundamentally sound and should be enacted into law. However, before enacting penalty provisions against registrants deferred as physically unfit, freezing them in agricultural occupations, serious consideration should be given to the relative effects of this provision as between different areas, in some of which farm production contributes to urban lend-lease and military supplies and in other areas is mostly on a subsistence basis and contributes little to the war effort.

JOHN H. DAVIS,
Executive Secretary, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I stated in the debate on the rule that I wished to offer an amendment putting coal miners on a parity with the treatment given in this bill to farm workers. I understand the amendment will be held not to be germane, but, having promised to offer it, I should like to have a chance to get it in the RECORD.

Mr. MAY. I will include that within the time. The gentleman can do that.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. In that connection, I want to read the statement put out last week by the Solid Fuels Administrator, which I did not have this morning. It corroborates what I said about the very acute situation we face, even if we have no strikes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, if we pass this joint resolution in the next 15 or 20 minutes it will probably go over to the other end of the Capitol and fool around over there a couple of weeks. Why not let us talk a little bit on it?

Mr. MAY. The reason I do not want to delay it longer is that I was put on the spot here last Monday.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has been on it a good many times.

Mr. MAY. I assured the House I would dispose of it the best way I could.

Mr. MICHENER. The best way the gentleman can dispose of it is to let us discuss it.

Mr. WORLEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 2, line 9, strike out "such" and insert "some essential."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to take care of the objection made by the gentleman from Indiana to the last sentence of the bill. The gentleman from Indiana construed that sentence to mean that if a person is placed in IV–F, then he is frozen on the particular farm on which he is then working. His argument for his amendment is based upon that ground. But the amendment that I offer strikes out the word "such" and inserts the words "some essential," so that the sentence would then read as follows:

It shall be the duty of any such registrant who is also found by his local selective-service board to be physically or otherwise unfit for military training and service to remain in some essential agricultural occupation or endeavor.

That entirely lifts the objection that the gentleman from Indiana has made to this section because it does not freeze him on any particular farm, but requires him to remain in an essential agricultural endeavor if he has been deferred for that purpose.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. While I think that the language is plain and is not ambiguous and that under the language the farm boy is not frozen to any particular farm, if that will clear the matter up in any way and relieve it of any confusion, I am perfectly willing for that amendment to be adopted, because that was what I had in mind, that the farm boy should remain in some farm occupation or endeavor.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is my interpretation of the language of the bill, but I think this would clarify the situation and remove the objection made by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I only want to say for the benefit of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Virginia that I already had at the Clerk's desk an amendment exactly similar to the amendment just offered by him. That is all I wanted to say.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am so sorry that the gentleman did not get it in ahead of mine.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate the gentleman's interest in trying to bring about a clearer understanding of what is here sought to be done. But for myself, as I pointed out when I was interrogated by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], while his interpretation, or the interpretation that he has stated, as clarified by your amendment, would remove an element of the compulsion, it still to my mind imposes an element of compulsion upon men who are registered IV–F if they are in agriculture, which is not present as against men in IV–F in industry.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; but if you strike out that sentence you release those men who upon physical examination are found and classified to be in IV–F. The basic theory of the bill is that these men have been deferred on account of their agricultural efforts and they ought to be continued frozen on the farm.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to try to get over the idea that the resolution before us does not call for any more compulsion than the original Tydings amendment. The Tydings amendment, after the main part of the amendment, provides as follows:

That should any such person—

Meaning a person who is deferred—

leave such occupation except for induction the board shall reclassify such registrant—

And induct him into the military service—

unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation or endeavor for other work.

Now, in the resolution before us we say that we freeze the workers by requiring them to stay in agricultural work unless the local boards release them. In the original Tydings amendment the registrant must come back to the local board and be reclassified and inducted into the armed services or go into some other kind of work for which he may be deferred. I want to point out to the Members of the committee that the portion of the Tydings amendment that I read is a part of the selective-service law and all of the provisions of the selective-service law, including the penal provisions, are applicable to the Tydings amendment as it was incorporated in the law in 1941. In other words he had to work in a deferrable job or go into a deferrable job. If he went from the farm into a job which the board had not determined was in the best interests of the war effort, he would then be in violation of the Selective Training and Service Act, and subject to its penalties the same as he is under this resolution.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. It seems to me the obvious answer is that if the language which I seek to strike out does not add anything to the language that is presently in the law and which will be continued in the law, then why have the language in here? Why not go ahead with my amendment and strike it out.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to answer that specifically. In the resolution the persons concerned are those who are classified IV–F. Therefore, they would not be subject to military duty and under the Tydings amendment; could not be inducted. We want to be sure by this resolution, that those men who are registered under the selective-service law, but not available for military duty, shall remain in esential industry. One of those industries that we are here dealing with is the farm. Therefore, I think that in substance there is no more compulsion in this resolution than there is in the original Tydings amendment, which the gentleman probably voted for.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Is not a further answer to the gentleman from Indiana the fact that we have a different situation because when these men are ordered in to take a physical examination, they bring themselves out from under the provisions of the Tydings amendment which the gentleman just read? Therefore, it is necesary to have a provision of this kind in order to keep them where they have been all the time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is correct, because many of these men were not physically examined.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it not correct then that the argument of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] is valid, that you are writing into the law a discriminatory feature against IV–F's in agriculture, which does not hold for IV–F's in industry?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. You are not writing any discriminatory feature at all, because you are considering agricultural workers as a class; not as a group that you discriminate against. It is a class of one type of essential industry.

Mr. MUNDT. But you are not writing the same rule or policy for industry.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It is substantially in the bill I voted for, the May bill.

Mr. MUNDT. The May bill covers all classes, and this covers only agriculture.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. There is a vast difference. This is a classification and not a discrimination.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to comment on what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has just stated, which is that Selective Service called the boys up for physical examination, who were properly deferred, and are thereby penalized.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not agree that they are penalized.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman think it is right to treat these boys as evaders of service in the land or naval forces, as the penalty to be imposed in this law provides?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is not a correct statement of the situation. The IV–F's are not evaders. They cannot serve because they have not the phys-

ical qualifications required by the armed forces. This is no fault of theirs. But many of them can serve in some productive capacity which will help the armed forces. We recognize in the Selective Training and Service Act their obligation to serve, by requiring them to register. Now by this resolution we try to make the obligation effective by requiring them, if they are in essential farm work, to stay there until their own board determines that they may go to other essential war work. Rather than penalizing this great group of patriotic persons it dignifies their situation and helps them find a place in the productive forces that will contribute directly to our fighters and help them win the war more quickly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to use very much time. The biggest question before this House today does not relate alone to these deferments or the Tydings amendment. The big question before the House now is whether this is actually the greatest legislative body in the world, whether this is a government of laws or a government of men. Our boys are not fighting to establish a government of men. They are fighting to destroy a government that was going down that bloody, murderous, totalitarian path.

It would certainly be a travesty if this Congress were to let another branch of the Government write the laws of this country. This is a chance for the Congress to establish the fact that it is the law-making body and that every official in this Government has to obey the legal mandates of this representative body of a sovereign people.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman: If we agree to that and behave ourselves, be good boys, will the gentleman bring up for passage this afternoon the Lemke resolution?

Mr. MAY. My committe did not report out the Lemke resolution. I have nothing to do with that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just wondered whether the gentleman was in favor of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes?

Mr. WORLEY and Mr. GALLAGHER objected.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Halleck amendment has two purposes. I disagree with the gentleman from Indiana as to his principal purpose. He is opposed to anything in this resolution that smacks of compulsion. With that I disagree. I believe these deferred IV–F's should be compelled to remain on the farm.

I do agree with his interpretation as to what this amendment means. For instance, in line 1, page 2, we find this language:

> The registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation.

Before the man is deferred he must be engaged in some specific farm endeavor. No man is deferred because he is engaged in general agriculture. The occupation must be confined to a specific endeavor.

Secondly, the last sentence contains the word "such." To what does the word "such" refer?

> It shall be the duty of such registrant—

Who? A registrant deferred in connection with a specific endeavor.

To remain where?

> In such agricultural occupation and endeavor unless and until released from such agricultural occupation or endeavor.

I emphasize the word "such."

It is not agriculture in general. We are not dealing here with the subject of agriculture. We are dealing with specific deferments because those deferments are essential in agriculture.

To that extent, if you want to correct that word "such," which may be done very easily in line 9 by changing it to read: "To remain in an agricultural occupation."

If you refer to agriculture in general, just say "In an essential agricultural occupation."

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I think the language is clear, but if it is not it should be. We were not trying to freeze the farm boy to any particular farm.

Mr. MICHENER. I agree with the gentleman. Because I have but a minute or two left I hope my friend will forgive me if I do not yield further.

Why should we be freezing these boys to these jobs? I have a letter on my desk today stating the case of a young man who was deferred after much difficulty because he was engaged in a specific agricultural endeavor. He was found essential to the operation of 500 acres of land. He had a hard job being deferred.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. After this man had been deferred, the Hershey order came along and he was ordered rescreened. He was sent in for a physical examination. He never had had a physical examination because he had been deferred without it. It was found that he had had asthma at one time and therefore he was placed in IV–F. Instead of going back to the occupation in which he had been engaged and which had saved him from service, he said he was not going to stay there any longer; that he was now IV–F, that they could not make him serve, that he was going to the city to get a job in an automobile plant where he could get $100 a week instead of $25 on the farm.

Those are things you must stop and think about. This is not the time for technicalities. It is a question of getting the men who are necessary, first, to produce food, and, second, on the battle fronts. This bill will get the men on the food front.

Mr. Chairman, the man to whom I have just referred is not a typical farmer. This bill as reported by the Military Affairs Committee will not freeze any farmer to any job other than the one for which he was deferred. If he were found physically fit, and if the Tydings amendment were adhered to, he could be compelled to enter the service or remain on the farm. Any way you look at it, there is compulsion involved. The man who is drafted submits to compulsion. Our people generally must submit to price fixing, rationing, and priorities. Again there is compulsion. At long last the night clubs are affected. Again there is compulsion. Thou shalt and thou shalt not are familiar terms emanating from war necessities, and it little behooves us on the home front to be bickering and quarreling among ourselves and insisting on all the rights we enjoyed in peacetime. The boys who are taken by the nape of the neck, put into the service, forwarded to all points of the compass to endure untold hardship and even death understand what compulsion means and are at least entitled to have adequate food from home.

The purpose of this resolution is to assure these boys that very thing. For my part, I am not going to be squeamish for fear I will compel some IV–F who has been working on the farm, who is working on the farm, and who is qualified to work on the farm, to remain on the farm if that is essential to the winning of the war. It matters not to me what others may do. That is the way I feel about it and that is the course I am going to pursue.

During the last month some of us have done all humanly possible to compel the Selective Service Director to interpret the Tydings amendment as the Congress intended. The prime purpose of the bill we are soon to vote on is to reenact the Tydings amendment as a new law. This will not add a jot or a tittle to the Tydings amendment but will be a directive on the part of the Congress to the Selective Service Director to carry out the law. That official is now administering the law by virtue of the Byrnes directive. Those who are opposed to the principle of the Tydings amendment should vote against this resolution, but in doing so they must not forget that the efficiency, accomplishment, and success of the battle line depends entirely on the food and supplies coming from the farms and factories.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will not adopt the Halleck amendment. The gentleman from Indiana has made out a very persuasive case to the effect that we are discriminating against agriculture because by this provision we are

treating farmers differently from industrial workers, but I submit that the Tydings amendment itself treats agriculture differently from the treatment we have given any other group of workers. It is very logical and very natural, since we did that, that we should treat the farmers in this particular group differently from the way we treat other registrants who have been classified as IV–F. I see no discrimination there.

We should not forget that every man who would be affected by this amendment has already been deferred under the Tydings amendment. He is one of the 360,000 men between the ages of 18 and 26 who were on the farms on the 1st day of January 1945 and who have been classified as II–C because of his being engaged in an agricultural occupation. I think most of those men are real farmers, they are on the job in good faith, although there are a few men like the one mentioned by the gentleman from Michigan who have gone to the farm for the purpose of evading service in the Army. Those who have gone there for that purpose should not be permitted at this particular time to desert an essential occupation like agriculture in which they are needed if we are going to meet our food goals simply because they have been classified IV–F after they have enjoyed the protection of being classified II–C during all this period. Mr. Chairman, if that be true, and I know it is true, there is not going to be any genuine, bona fide farmer who will be injured by this provision. It will catch only the few who are on a farm for the purpose of evading military service.

I call attention also to the fact that all this provision does is leave it up to the local board to decide what to do with the man. He does not have to stay on the same farm if the local board decides he can go to another farm and render an agricultural service there. It is all in the hands of the local board.

This amendment may not affect very many people. I do not think it will. Most of the men who have stayed on the farms all this time are genuine farmers and if they had wanted to leave they would have gone long before this. They have stayed there this long because they are engaged in agriculture, that was their business and their life work, and they will continue to stay there.

The necessity for this legislation at the present time is that the Selective Service has ordered up for examination all these men, some of whom will be classified as IV–F. These men have been kept on the farm heretofore by reason of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] said that is already in the law, and I refer to the penalty for leaving the farm. Is that true?

Mr. HOPE. If a man has been classified under the Tydings amendment, the penalties are there, but when he is found to be IV–F, then he is no longer subject to those penalties and we substitute this provision.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not see why anybody should want to protect draft dodgers and help them escape service in the armed forces.

Mr. HOPE. Then the gentleman is against the Halleck amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] suggested that in line 9 the word "such" should be changed to "an." It seems to me, if we are going to achieve the purpose which the gentleman has expressed and for which he argues very persuasively, we should change the word "such" to "an essential."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to clear up in my own mind, at least, the meaning of the words used in this resolution. I would like to have an explanation from the distinguished gentleman from Virginia who introduced the resolution as to the meaning of the words as he employed them.

It is my understanding that some selective-service boards have defined the term "agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort" very narrowly; in other words, they believe that those words mean only the growing of crops and the handling of crops.

May I ask the gentleman from Virginia whether he had such a narrow definition in mind or if he intended those words to include the raising of poultry, the production of eggs, and the handling of poultry and eggs?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I think those undertakings are clearly agricultural undertakings and endeavors, and I think the local boards have so construed it. I do not think any narrow interpretation has been placed upon what "agricultural endeavors" or "agricultural undertakings" means.

Mr. CLASON. In offering this resolution, then, the gentleman intends that those words are to include the raising of poultry and the production of eggs?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I certainly do.

Mr. CLASON. How about livestock?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I certainly do.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am experiencing some difficulty in being able to differentiate between the importance of straight agricultural production, as the gentleman has suggested, and the first processing, the transportation, the distribution, and the final sale to the consuming public. It is all important from one end of it to another. Why stop with merely production of agricultural products?

Mr. CLASON. What I had in mind was to get the interpretation of the gentleman who offered the resolution so that in adopting this resolution, if it is adopted, all of us will be thinking in the same terms and have in mind what the gentleman from Virginia has in mind.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am opposed to piecemeal legislation.

Mr. CLASON. Is dairying included? There is a question whether that is covered.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Dairying is one of the most essential agricultural endeavors, and I think is so recognized.

Mr. GIFFORD. How about the shellfish farms?

Mr. CLASON. I will yield in order that that question may be asked of the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GIFFORD. Of course, I would be dilatory in my duty here if I did not inquire at least whether the shellfish farms are included. Sometimes you refer to those fellows as fishermen. Of course, I have to offer an amendment to include fishermen, unless I get an admission, at least, that they are included in that category as being essential to the war effort. When they scrape the bottom, which is ground with a little water on top of the land, they try to make themselves fishermen because of that. They rake the bottoms for the flounders. We have shellfish farms, and I want that clarified.

Mr. CLASON. I do not think the gentleman from Virginia was paying close attention, and I am not in a position to answer the question.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HULL. I object unless I am recognized.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WORLEY. Would such a motion preclude an amendment being offered after debate has closed?

The CHAIRMAN. Not to the amendment now pending.

Mr. WORLEY. This section, though, is the entire section in the bill. It is the entire bill, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. There would not be any further debate on this section or the pending amendment if the motion was agreed to. Amendments may be offered but not debated.

Mr. WORLEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAY. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman from Kentucky going to take all that time?

Mr. MAY. No. I asked for a part of the time. I will take 10 minutes of that time for the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How about the rule that you cannot speak more than twice to the same amendment on the same day?

Mr. MAY. That will leave 35 minutes for the other Members. I have been requested by that side of the House to expedite this legislation and I want to do it.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WORLEY. I did not understand thoroughly the ruling of the Chair. May I ask again, if the request is agreed to, will that preclude any additional amendments from being offered?

The CHAIRMAN. It will not, but the amendments will not be debatable after the time has expired.

Mr. WORLEY. Then I object to the request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WORLEY) there were—ayes 103, noes 28.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Virginia that there are two amendments pending now. These amendments must be disposed of.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITE. The House has just limited the debate at 45 minutes. How is that time to be apportioned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will endeavor to divide it equally between the two sides, among those who were standing.

Mr. WHITE. I was standing, I will report to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's name is on the list.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. HULL. Yes; I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, is a motion to strike out all after the enacting clause a preferential motion?

The CHAIRMAN. It is not.

Mr. WORLEY. When can it be offered?

The CHAIRMAN. It can be offered when the pending amendments are disposed of.

Mr. WORLEY. But, as I understand it, it will not be debatable; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. Not after the 45 minutes has expired. It would be debatable during the 45 minutes.

Mr. WORLEY. But the pending amendments will not be disposed of until the expiration of the 45 minutes; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That, of course, is a matter that rests with the Committee.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, Congress endeavored to dispose of this entire matter by passing the Tydings amendment. If the purpose and the spirit of that law had been respected by some of the officials who have mixed up the situation so badly, this legislation would not have been necessary. At it is, in all sections, and in the Northwest in particular, with which I am familiar, it has caused a very chaotic situation.

I represent a dairy district. Wisconsin produced last year about one-eighth of all the dairy products coming into commercial channels in the United States. Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, and the Dakotas produced one-third of all the dairy products entering into commercial channels. That dairy industry is more seriously affected by the disregard shown by General Hershey of the purpose of the Tydings amendment than probably any other section of the country.

In the weekly papers in my district last week there were 55 farm auction advertisements for sales this week. In the papers this week there will be an even larger number of farm auction advertisements. Farmers are selling out, leaving their farms, and many farms will remain idle throughout the growing season because of the lack of help.

Now, if we are not going to do anything for those farmers there is going to be a serious decline in dairy production.

If all the agencies here in Washington which are urging the farmers to increase production are going to be permitted to override the laws passed by Congress, and possibly this one will be overridden, too, I cannot say, we are going to have a lack of production of the essentials of living so far as food supplies are concerned.

Thirty-nine percent of the foods furnished to the armed forces of the United States are dairy products. One-third of those products are coming from those 5 States which I mentioned. I have received as many as 600 letters on this matter since General Hershey issued his directive in January, over 600 letters from people directly affected by that order to the draft boards, conscripting essential farm workers.

The farmers are selling out because they cannot carry on.

This morning I had a letter from a woman in Barron County, Wis., one of our best dairy counties. Her husband is dead. She has one arm crippled with infantile paralysis, so she cannot milk. She has a boy 7, a girl 12, and a boy 18 years of age. Tomorrow, that boy, the only worker on a 240-acre farm, with 24 head of cattle and other young stock, will have to leave the farm and go to Milwaukee to take his physical examination.

In another case a man 81 years old has a farm of 190 acres, 20 head of cows, and other stock. They have taken his only worker, and that farmer has to go out of business.

I have another letter from a resident of a school district in my own county, in which he states that three of the adjacent farms to his own will be vacant throughout the season. I could recite many more such complaints.

Unless we pass legislation which will take away the power of the bureau chieftains to overrule the laws of this country, passed by Congress to increase farm production, we shall have a serious food situation next winter, far worse than we have at present.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] has expired.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I think there has been a great deal of confusion about this bill. I know I have been much disturbed about it and much confused about the meaning of it. Clearly the first part of the bill simply says to the Selective Service that we want them to follow the law as it is written until Congress changes the law. Possibly the law should be changed. If it needs to be changed, we should change it, but until Congress does change it, it should be obeyed as written. If General Marshall will come up here and say that the armed forces need the repeal of the Tydings amendment, I will vote to repeal it, and I know this House will vote to repeal it. I want, and I know you want, the Army and Navy to have every man they need, but if they are unwilling to take these boys off the farm, I do not think that we should allow them to violate the plain letter of the law. I think that most of our farm boys want to get into the service, but I do not believe that anyone should be sent in violation of the law.

It seems to me the important thing now is to determine what the last part of this bill means. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] made a very impressive explanation, but I am convinced there is another explanation and that it is a sound explanation, and that it has not been fully presented to this House. Most of us have gone on the assumption that these last six lines on page 2 refer to any IV–F who might be working on the farm at the time he was called. I had feared that the last part of this bill was intended to freeze any such man where he was under pain of being prosecuted as a draft evader if he left; whereas the physically fit man who was deferred for essential farm work was held on the farm only under penalty of being drafted if he left. That would indeed be an unfair discrimination as between the two; but the author of the bill has explained to me, and I think correctly, that under the very terms of this bill those last six lines can only relate to a man who was at one time deferred as an essential agricultural worker and who at a later time was classified IV–F. If it were not so, it would not read, "It shall be the duty of any such registrant." "Such registrant" must refer to a registrant deferred under the Tydings amendment. A man deferred under the Tydings amendment is deferred on the theory that he is necessary on the farm. If at a later date when a physical examination is given he is classified IV–F, then he must under this bill remain on the farm. Why should he not remain there? He has already said he was necessary.

If, in fact, he is not necessary, he should not be allowed to profit by his own fraud. In the beginning he was not given a physical examination. He was simply deferred when he showed that he was necessary in an essential agricultural occupation, and the board immediately classified him II–C. They now come along and give him a physical examination and find that the man is actually IV–F. He has asthma, or heart trouble, or some defect. Then they give him a IV–F deferment. Under the previously existing situation he could do what the gentleman from Michigan pointed out. He could run off somewhere else where he can make more money. Under the terms of this bill, that man, and only that man, is compelled to remain on the farm and carry out the work for which he previously received deferment.

I think that places a vastly different interpretation on it from that which I felt belonged on it when the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] so persuasively presented his amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. There are in industry today men who have been deferred by reason of their essentiality in that industry. Now then, if they should be determined to be IV–F, there is no similar restraint in any existing law applied to them.

Mr. POAGE. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. In regard to their opportunity to get some other job. The only point I am making is that if compulsion is to be applied to agricultural workers, it ought to be applied to industrial workers, who should be given the same sort of treatment.

Mr. POAGE. I agree with the gentleman that we should apply it to everyone. I wish we could apply it to everyone in this bill. We cannot but it seems to me we are setting a precedent and I would like to see it applied all the way down the line, that any man, when he receives deferment as an essential worker, should be required to work on that job and not be given an opportunity to say later, "I don't need an occupational deferment any longer so I am not going to stay on this job." He ought to be required to stay on, of course. We ought to apply it all the way down the line, but we can apply it only to one group now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WORLEY moves that the committee do now rise and report the joint resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have one purpose and only one purpose in making this motion. I believe that if we should pass this resolution we will be turning our backs on the men at the front. I am firmly convinced of this. I come from an agricultural and ranching district which, despite desperate farm labor and machinery shortages, has met every food-production goal and every other war demand made of them, and they meant every word when they and the people of this Nation pledged all our resources, of every kind and character, to the winning of this war. It is the only thing to do in these grave days of warfare.

Selective Service has estimated that by July 1 we must have 900,000 men for the Army and Navy and Marine Corps. Where do you think those men are coming from? Upon Congress rests the duty to provide all of the manpower the Army and Navy need. If we should fail, then the entire war effort collapses. I do not believe they should take all of them from agricultural pursuits, not by any means, but I do know we are ready and willing to make our pro rata contribution of men when the war demands, but every other industry should also contribute its fair share. There is not a farmer or a rancher in my district who wants any special favors for himself or anyone else. I take pride in pointing out that my district, the Panhandle of Texas, has the highest percentage of native-born Americans in it than any other section of the country, and they appreciate fully the circumstances we are in.

I am one of those who saw active duty early in this war and I came back with a new sense of values as to what is important and what is not important in getting this war won. We should all know by now that wars are not won with too little, too late. There is only one question, only one thing, as I see it, that is of the greatest importance, and that is to meet and back up with everything we have in our power every demand made by the Army and Navy in order to successfully prosecute this war.

We discussed this particular matter in the Committee on Agriculture, and had General Hershey there twice. We had testimony to the effect that if they took an additional hundred thousand men from agricultural pursuits, it would make the production of food more difficult. We all agree to that. But what is the alternative? Suppose we deny to the armed forces a hundred thousand men they must have; what then? On the one hand it might result in us back here on the home front tightening up our belts a little bit, but on the other hand the lack of manpower in battle lines will result in death or worse to several hundred thousands of the finest men we have. I know my people do not want this to happen. There are too many boys from Texas now in the battle lines of the world who need relief and replacements.

I believe the Tydings amendment is sufficient to see us through the rest of this war. I was for the Tydings amendment when it passed and I am for it now, however by passing this resolution now we would be doing nothing in the world but hindering the war effort and would upset the Selective Service System in large measure, and would create additional confusion within the ranks of Selective Service and the local draft boards.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. WORLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I agree with much of what the gentleman has said but does he not believe it would be possible for the armed services to get all the men they need now out of the four and a half million men in training in the United States?

Mr. WORLEY. Their answer to that is "No." I have great confidence in General Marshall, Admiral King, and in the other military and naval officers who make up our joint staff. I am taking their recommendations because I believe they know their business and are giving their best in winning this war.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WORLEY. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I understand the gentleman to state that he thought the Tydings amendment was sufficient to carry us through.

Mr. WORLEY. I believe it is.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. All this resolution attempts to do is to force Selective Service to observe the Tydings amendment.

Mr. WORLEY. I appreciate but cannot agree with the position taken by the gentleman.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is all we are trying to do.

Mr. WORLEY. And may I point out further that official figures show most of our Texas farm boys have already gone to war, and the percentage of agricultural deferments, age 18 to 26, in Texas is only 1.4, whereas, in some States, North Dakota, for example, the percentage in the same age bracket of farm deferments is 25.9; Iowa, 16.5; South Dakota, 25.7; Minnesota, 12.2; Nebraska, 14.1; Kansas, 9; Wisconsin, 16.6. In other words, Texas has a total registration between ages 18 to 26 of 433,257. Of this number, only 6,213 have been deferred as being essential to agricultural production. Since Texas has already given so many men to the armed services, how about some other sections of this Nation providing some more manpower for the armed forces? The passage of this act would freeze all of those in the high deferment areas and would continue to impose a very unfair and unequal burden on States like Texas, North Carolina, South Carolina, and other Southern States with a low deferment percentage. Most of our boys have already answered the call to arms by volunteering, and it is not fair to them to change the rules in the middle of the game. Let us keep the Tydings amendment as it is, but see that it is fairly enforced in all sections of the country alike.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has exp ed.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I have, under the reservation previously made, 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman that two 5-minute speeches are in order on this motion, 5 minutes for and 5 minutes against the motion. If the gentleman does not care to use the 5 minutes against the motion the Chair will put the question.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. IZAC. Could not some other Member be recognized in opposition?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky may use the time in any way he sees fit.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it necessary to take the time in opposition to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WORLEY) there were—ayes 24, noes 65.

So the preferential motion was rejected.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises the gentleman that time has already been fixed.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet when the motion to fix time was put.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair regrets that he did not get the gentleman's name, but time has already been divided among those Members whose names have been listed.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, does that give me an opportunity to speak at all?

The CHAIRMAN. If there is any time left, the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, the Army wants men from 18 to 25 years of age. Those are the men who are fighting in France and Germany today and winning the battles over there. Practically the same situation obtains in the Pacific.

Today by this resolution we are trying to save some 340,000 in that age group of manhood who are on the farms. There are likewise some 35,000 of this age deferred in the factories. I am wondering since when did those young boys up to 26 years of age become the indispensable men? In other words, if the Army needs these men to win the battles that have yet to be won to win the war, we should give the Army and Navy those younger men.

Now, why are we debating here by the hour to save a few boys on the farms?

We have had tremendous losses, about a million casualties so far, and it will probably go up to 2,000,000 before the finish. Those million casualties are mostly from among the young men of this country. Why should we make a group, such as the farm group, a separate and distinct body and say to them, "Now, you are doing so much better a job here on the farm that you do not have to give blood or limb or life to your country."

In my opinion we should exempt nobody under the age of 26, because the burdens of war and the sacrifices should be shared equally and because those are the men the Army and the Navy say they have to have to win the war.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WORLEY. In face of the request of the Army and the Navy for 900,000 men by June, this resolution provides:

> In carrying out the provisions of this subsection the local selective-service board in classifying the registrant shall base its findings solely and exclusively on whether the registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor—

And so forth. They cannot even consider how badly they might be needed at the front.

Mr. IZAC. That is why I am against the resolution, and I am against the Tydings amendment and I am against anything that stands in the way of winning the war in these next few months. If we turn this resolution down, maybe the Senate will have backbone enough to throw out all legislation that intereferes with the winning of the war at this late date.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is the position of the gentleman, and I assure him that many of his colleagues feel likewise, that the passage of this resolution will make mandatory preferential treatment; is that not right?

Mr. IZAC. Preferential treatment of 340,000 boys on the farm who are no more dear and no more precious to their fathers and mothers than are the other boys who have been taken away and are now serving in the Army and the Navy.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. May it be said of these boys that they are not asking to be deferred, either.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct. I think they will go if they know what is expected of them.

Let me say this further, that the Army today, with the millions of men above the age of 26, can send some of those older people back to the farms and take these 18-to-25-year-olds if they need them so badly to finish the winning of the war.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IZAC. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. What substitute would the gentleman offer to secure food production, not only for feeding America, but for feeding the world?

Mr. IZAC. I would say, as I just finished saying that there are many men in the armed services above an age that the Army say are not good for combat. They are scraping the barrel now all over this country and getting these men up to 26 years of age and putting them in the front lines now. They are the ones they say they need to win the war. Let the Army release the older men for the farms.

Mr. BREHM. But many of the older men are not trained in agricultural pursuits.

Mr. IZAC. Correct. But there surely are enough with farming experience to replace the young able-bodied men to the number of 340,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, almost every man who has appeared on this floor either for or against this bill has prefaced his remarks by saying that he was terribly confused about it, which is some indication to me that we ought to think this bill through and that perhaps it is not wise legislation. That is the way I felt about it in the Committee on Military Affairs, likewise the chairman, and I see other members like the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], and others. This is the third time we have passed the Tydings amendment. This is just another gesture.

All of us are for the farmers, of course. Every Member of this House is for proper and adequate food production, although in that connection it should not be forgotten that the farmers of America produced, harvested, and sold the greatest crops last year and the year before in the history of this Nation.

But to come right down to the merits of this legislation, I would like for any man to tell me how he can write any plainer language than the present Tydings amendment. I supported the Tydings amendment in the beginning and am still for it. Furthermore, I want it enforced. But after all, it is up to local draft boards. Here is the language:

> (k) Every registrant found by a selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] says, "I want an amendment to defer the coal miners." Somebody else will probably say, "I want an amendment to exempt the railroad men." The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] will likely want his fishermen treated fairly. The truth is that under existing legislation the farmers are the only group in the Nation who have by law been placed in a separate and special category. I do not believe they want any special favors. Most of the farm and ranch boys in my part of the world have already been drafted. I do not know any reason why those who are left on the farm should receive special consideration. This is everybody's war and is an all-out war. But after all, do not forget one thing, that this whole problem goes back to the judgment and discretion of

the local draft boards. They are friends and neighbors. They have done a grand and patriotic job. They can be depended upon to treat everybody fairly.

Perhaps under that unfortunate directive of January 3 last some mistakes were made; nevertheless, I think there has been an honest effort to correct same. But now you come along with this resolution, and I ask you friends of the farmers to read this last sentence carefully—and the farmers have no better friend than I—where it states:

Violations of this provision shall be considered an evasion of service in the land or naval forces.

A violation would send a farmer boy to the penitentiary for 5 years and impose a fine of $10,000. I am not for anything like that.

This is class legislation. The farmers do not want discrimination in their favor, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY] said a while ago. They only want a square deal. They want their boys treated fairly and squarely, like all other boys. Heaven knows the leaders of our armed forces, including General Marshall and Admiral King, have said we must have 900,000 men by the 1st day of July. There are 500,000 American boys in the hospitals of the world today. Our losses are now running more than 30,000 a month. I do not know why a good, healthy, farm boy who is physically perfect and under 26 years of age and in I-A, and a replacement is available, should not be getting in a uniform just like the boys on the adjoining farms have done. If we have a few more Iwo Jimas they are all going anyway. The farms are not going to be any account to anybody if we do not win this war.

I believe that you cannot in justice give special treatment to any class, and I do not believe the farmers want it. Besides, I claim that under the language of this resolution you do not accomplish one thing that is not in existing law. This bill in its present form is a joke and no credit to us. This resolution ought to be recommitted or defeated.

Mr. BENDER. If the gentleman will yield, is he in favor of the nurses' bill?

Mr. THOMASON. Of course, I am for the nurses' bill, I am for the work-or-fight bill, I am for anything and everything that is necessary to win this war, at the earliest possible moment and get all our boys and girls back home. We are now on the home stretch. We at home owe a duty to all our fighting men, and we are not going to let them down by playing any favorites. I repeat that the whole problem goes back to local draft boards and I know they will do the right and fair thing in we, as well as a few indiscreet brass hats in the Army, will let them use their own good judgment. They will get the men the Army and Navy leaders say they must have.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a good deal of interest to this debate, but it seems to me that the language in this bill is confusing and does not reach the issue. The issue, as I understand it, of the Tydings amendment, was to assure production of food in this country, and it was not a matter of giving a preference to anyone or discriminating against the citizens engaged in any industry. The Tydings amendment was passed to insure that this Nation and the farming industry could produce sufficient food with which to supply the country and to feed the armed forces which we sent to all parts of the world. I am confused by the language in the resolution which says:

It shall be the duty of any such registrant who is also found by his local selective-service board to be physically or otherwise unfit for military training and service to remain in such agricultural occupation or endeavor unless and until released from such agricultural occupation or endeavor by his local selective-service board, and violations of this provision shall be considered an evasion of service in the land or naval forces.

Now the language plainly says, "unfit." We have classified a lot of people as unfit for military duty and we have released these people from the armed services or from liability to service in the armed forces because they were unfit. We have released men who are in athletics. We have released entertainers. We have released people in all vocations. Why should we single out the farming industry and say that people who are unfit for military duty shall be considered as evading service in the land or naval forces if they do not stay on the farm? It seems to me to be rank discrimination. It seems to me that if the author of the bill wanted to make it clear he could have said "found by the local selective-service board to be essential for the farming industry." Then if they are released from military service they would have to stay on the farm or else be considered as evading service in the land or naval forces. It seems to me that the language is confusing. It does not carry out the objective sought to be obtained. For that reason, I am not going to support this piece of legislation.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I think the gentleman from Idaho has pointed out the fatal defect in this resolution. If we had adopted the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], we would have eliminated this obnoxious language and yet would have carried out the original intent of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri to the fact that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana is still pending and has not been voted on.

Mr. SHORT. That is the reason I say we should strike the language out.

In this war emergency we can sacrifice many of our industries but our Army and Navy must be fed. To feed our Army and Navy we must raise crops. To raise crops we must have enough experienced farm hands to cultivate the farms of this country and harvest the crops. We live in a mechanical age. The boys that run the farm tractors and operate and repair farm machinery are irreplacable. No Mexican nor Jamaica Negro can man a tractor or keep modern farm machinery in repair, or operate milking machines. We are not dealing with the question of discriminating against the people in any industry, we are dealing with a national program to feed the armed forces of this country and its civilian population. The success of this program is just as essential as carrying a rifle or manning a ship. The Tydings amendment is a safeguard to winning the war, and I propose to support the Lemke resolution to clarify the meaning and application of the Tydings amendment in order to secure the production of the food necessary to feed our Army and Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I would have preferred to discuss this bill on its preferential merits. Farmers, so-called are practitioners, whereas an agriculturalist may be only a theorist, an experimentor or may even carry on non-essential work.

In the last war certain people attempted to be classed as farmers because their fathers had money with which to buy farms and could place their sons on them simply to escape the draft. I suggest that we consult the dictionary and learn the difference between "farmer" and "agriculturalist". I acknowledge that I am a little worried about this preferential group we are providing for, although I am for the farmer, and I feel compelled to vote for the resolution. I cannot let the occasion pass without reminding you that a fisherman should receive the same consideration as a farmer. I do not intend to offer an amendment to include the fishermen, because a point of order would be raised against it, and I do not like "to puff against the wind." A farmer tills the land and he is an agriculturalist, but because there is water over the land which the fisherman cultivates, he is not classed as an agriculturalist. I claim he ought to be. He is often working on the land, even if it be a little under water. The fish that swim are like the poultry and the pigeons that fly over the farmer's land, but pigeon raising is recognized as farming. Although an amendment might be overruled, I do have the opportunity to remind you that a fisherman often cultivates the land especially shellfish grounds. Whether my people cultivate land under water or otherwise should not matter. When it comes to deferring fishermen, I will remind you that they have to buck the storms and the cold, and it is hard to get men. They have to be highly trained to man the large fishing boats. They dredge the bottom with ropes sometimes several hundred feet long. Flounder and other fish that you eat come from the bottom of the sea. So I emphatically state that if this resolution applies to agriculturalists, I want the fishermen to be considered. I regret that an amendment to include fisherman could not be considered as in order on this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I will not be able in the 45 minutes allotted to the pending amendments to offer the amendment which I mentioned this morning when the rule was being discussed. I will offer it at the end of that time, but it cannot then be debated. I understand my amendment is subject to a point of order, but I do want to impress upon this body and upon the entire Nation the seriousness of our coal situation.

I have a statement here made last week before the War Production Board by Mr. Ickes:

> The lack of adequate manpower was cited as the main factor in the present serious coal situation in a statement by Solid Fuels Administrator Ickes before the War Production Board on February 20. Pointing to dropping production, peak requirement levels, and dangerously low stocks, Ickes reviewed the conservation and distribution measures which have been adopted and called for cooperation and speedy action by all concerned to meet the country's coal needs.
>
> A net loss of 30,000 bituminous and 4,000 anthracite miners during 1945 is expected as a result of the new policy on draft deferments. Ickes said that these losses will be primarily responsible for a deficit of 50,000,000 tons of bituminous and 5,000,000 tons of anthracite, and that even drastic reductions in coal stocks and enforced conservation will not prevent fuel hardships. Estimates so far, he said, have been based on the assumption of continuous operation, and we cannot afford to have any stoppage in coal mining, no matter how short. Contending that "the coal pattern has been set for the duration of the war," Ickes said, "If we do not have enough coal, and we are going to have less * * * industrial activity must be adjusted downward to the place where there will be enough coal to go around. Many industrial activities must be discontinued and most others slowed down."

We have had a brown-out of electric signs and black-out of the whoopee joints. In a year's time those commendable measures will save only 1 day's production of bituminous coal.

The amendment I will offer simply adds the words "coal mining" after the word "agriculture" wherever it appears in the bill.

This would extend to coal miners the same provisions carried in the bill for agricultural workers.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Would not the gentleman make the statement on account of his study of this problem that the coal shortage is perhaps more acute than the production of food?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Both are serious.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have taken this time to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] what the penalty provided by this bill is. I read in the last sentence of the bill talking about penalty:

> And violations of this provision shall be considered an evasion of service in the land or naval forces.

What is that penalty?

Mr. HALLECK. I think it is 5 years' imprisonment and a fine up to $10,000, which, of course, is a right drastic penalty for the farm worker against whom it might be applied.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman.

Let me say in conclusion—and I have only a minute—that I wish to endorse the statement made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY], endorse it wholeheartedly, because he has very well expressed the views I myself hold on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, for the last few weeks the Committee on Military Affairs has been listening to the demand for manpower, especially as it concerned the Army. We are here today arguing over 341,000 people. When we first drew the draft act we insisted upon categories being set up in that act. Congress was fully agreed on that. We tried to operate Selective Service more or less under the category system. The Tydings amendment, of course, was special and I think has been favorable to the farmers. There is no one more in sympathy with the farmers and their troubles in respect to manpower than I. I was raised on a farm and am still operating 2 or 3. I know the difficulties they face. But the thing that impressed me most today was the fact that we have something like 5,000,000 boys on battle fronts all over the world, boys that come from good American homes. Most of us in the House have boys in the service. I want these boys to have everything possible. I want them to have replacements, and the replacements must come from the manpower here on the home front. Yesterday I went to the Surgeon General's office and asked for information as to the exact number, on a daily basis, of wounded and sick in the hospitals. They gave me the figure of 8,100 each day out of service because of wounds or illness. That in round numbers for each 30 days would be something like 240,000 men. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is something to think about.

If we adopt this measure today there is no doubt but what Selective Service will probably try to adhere to it more strictly, and men in this group of 18-to-26-year olds who are needed in the Army today will be exempted from service. If I am correct, there are something like 30,000,000 people engaged in agriculture today, 10,000,000 families. If I am not correct the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture I am sure will correct me.

We are wasting our time arguing over 341,000 men. I think every Member will agree that this is not going to wreck the food program of the country or keep the Army and our civilians on the home front from receiving the necessary food. I certainly do not feel that way myself. My sentiments are much like those of the gentleman from Texas. The first obligation of this body is to try to keep in line with the War Department, which the committee that reports this bill to the floor tries at all times to do. I opposed the bill in the committee.

Mr. Chairman, our first obligation is to the boys in the service and to the men engaged in our war effort. They have shown us very plainly in the last few weeks that it is going to be necessary to have at least 900,000 additional men by the 1st of June. I do not see how we can turn down the Army's request in that regard. Where are they coming from?

I received a letter from a boy with a little business and 3 children who was drafted last week. He is between the ages of 30 and 38. My State today has only 1 percent in deferred farmers from 18 to 26 years of age, or 2,752, which is a very small number compared with our State's total registration for draft of 278,742 between ages of 18 and 26 years of age. It is not going to do the agricultural situation in my State one iota of good, because the farm boys are already gone into service of their country and we are particularly proud of their record, and I am going to do all I can to provide the necessary replacements. This is my reason for opposing this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, for the remainder of the time.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, there are a few things that, in my opinion, the Committee has overlooked with respect to the pending resolution. First of all we wrote the Tydings amendment into the original Selective Training and Service Act. The other day we wrote it into the so-called work-or-fight bill, and that amendment was in the bill which we passed. The matter is now pending for discussion in the Senate of the United States. But unless we adopt the Halleck amendment, which proposes to strike the last clause from this legislation, I do not see how anybody can vote for it. I owe it to myself and to the House to make that statement.

In the original Tydings amendment the only penalty placed upon the farm boy was if he did not stay put when he was assigned a job he would be inducted into the service unless he went voluntarily into the service. After this resolution deals with the Tydings amendment it adds an additional clause at the end of it that it is proposed to be stricken out by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. That clause provides expressly if they violate any of the provisions of the clause they shall be regarded thereafter as evaders of the Selective Training and Service Act and subjects them not to exceed 5 years in the penitentiary and to a fine of not exceeding $10,000. If the House wants to vote for that kind of penalty for the farm boy in order to get the same thing for him that he already has, I have

no objection, but I cannot vote for the bill with that provision in it.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. I concur heartily in what the gentleman said. I voted against this bill in committee because I felt we would be imposing upon the farmers of this Nation as a group the only penalty that is imposed upon any group.

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. ELSTON. We stamp them as draft evaders while other persons can go on strike and do whatever else they want to without any penalties.

Mr. MAY. And they are fixing to penalize them again over in other body by provision inserted in the manpower bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I think the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs has very clearly and fairly stated this proposition. At the present time and under existing law we are only drafting men into our armed services, is that not true?

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. But if we should adopt this amendment, we would then penalize those men who were found physically and mentally unfit and compel them to remain on the farm whether they wanted to or not?

Mr. MAY. That is, without the Halleck amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Yes; as the resolution is presently written.

Mr. MAY. No; we must adopt the Halleck amendment in order to make the resolution workable.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. As a matter of fact, we have deferred many people from the service because they were physically unfit, but we did not enact any law that they had to work where they were stationed.

Mr. MAY. You even say of these farm boys, if they are found physically unfit and then do not stay on the farm, they are subject to this penalty.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Under this provision what will the situation of the farm boy be who has been put in IV–F? The gentleman knows and I know and everyone else familiar with the selective service law knows that that boy has been released from the Army. He has been released from the farm, and he can go down to one of these pool rooms and spend his time until the war is over and no one can touch him. Is that what the gentleman wants done?

Mr. MAY. No. I will say this, under the Tydings amendment as now written into law, when he is once assigned to a farm job he shall remain there unless he goes to the armed forces, and that prohibits him from going to a pool room, because the only place he can go except the farm is into the armed forces. That is what we now have without resorting to the method set up in the latter clause of the pending resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Halleck amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALLECK: Page 2, line 6, after the period, strike out the balance of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FLANNAGAN and Mr. MICHENER) there were—ayes 91, noes 81.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia:

Page 2, line 2, after "agricultural", insert a comma and the words "coal mining."

Page 2, line 9, after "agricultural", insert a comma and the words "coal mining."

Page 2, line 10, after "endeavor", insert "as the case may be."

Page 2, line 10, after "agricultural", insert a comma and the words "coal mining."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the pending joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MCCORMACK] having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 106) to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors essential to the war effort, pursuant to House Resolution 149, reported the resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. THOMASON. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMASON moves to recommit the joint resolution to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMASON) there were—ayes 53, noes 133.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-four Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolution just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and include a memorial of the State legislature of Idaho.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, at its twenty-eighth session, memorialized Congress as follows:

House Joint Memorial 1

A joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, do respectfully represent that

Whereas the standards of modern economic society require that when that part of our population which has reached its years of decline in efficiency and can no longer compete under the pressure of modern economic conditions, as self-supporting members of society, the people as a whole should see to it that help in some minimum amount be available to them; and

Whereas the Federal Government has established and maintains a social security system which has been of benefit to those

fortunate enough to be covered by its provisions, its success being due to the fact that it provides for the retirement of the individual by the accumulation of payments made during the years of his greatest earning capacity, thus anticipating the burden of taking care of him in his years of decline; and

Whereas this social security system, inaugurated and maintained by the Federal Government, covers, under its provisions, only certain classes of the population, but it is our belief that the classes not included are as much entitled to its benefits as those now covered, and that to extend its benefits to all citizens is only a matter of justice to all; and

Whereas the proposal to include the farmers, the self-employed, the irregularly employed, the teachers, public-service employees, and all classes still outside the Federal system, has been endorsed by a large number of civic, fraternal, and farm and labor organizations, local and national: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Idaho (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact such legislation as is necessary to extend the benefits of the Federal social security system to the classes of people referred to above as well as to other exempted classes, at the earliest time feasible; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Idaho be hereby authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to the Senators and Representatives of Idaho in the two Houses of Congress.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, during the debate this afternoon I made reference to letters from the American Farm Bureau, the National Grange, and the National Cooperative Milk Producers Association, endorsing the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to insert these letters immediately following my remarks in Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of New York memorializing Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today by including certain quotations, letters, and the directive of General Hershey.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today in Committee and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee today and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address delivered by the gentleman from Michigan, Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT, before the Economic Club of Detroit, on February 26, 1945.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGLINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a speech I delivered in Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two articles, one from the Des Moines Register of February 23, 1945, and the other from the Washington Times-Herald of February 27.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting an article by Mr. Philip Wylie.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman form New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Hamilton, Ohio, Tribune-News, and an article referred to therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two different subjects.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a short discourse on hospitals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein two telegrams with regard to the drafting of nurses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech I recently made at the Jackson Day dinner at Waltham, Mass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the extension of my remarks made in Committee today I may include certain quotations and excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to include as a part thereof an article by Harold Collander in the New York Times of last Saturday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and insert a letter received from one of my constituents and also an article and editorial from the same source.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCOWEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein three affidavits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Government finance and interest rates and to include a statement by Mr. A. A. Potter. The Government Printer informs me that this will require 3 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the people of America have watched with intense interest from day to day the progress of the battle in the Philippines. Last night many of you listened over the radio to the inspiring addresses first by General MacArthur and a little later by President Osmeña of the Philippine Commonwealth. It seems to me it is worthy of a moment's pause for the people of this country to enter in their hearts into that celebration also.

Last night there at Manila a great concourse of people gathered, many thousands of them. They were celebrating an event of great historical import. It has been almost unprecedented in history when the armies of a great nation have invaded as liberators the

lands of another nation that immediately upon the completion of the conquest or retaking of the capital the civil government has been handed back immediately to the people of that country. The events of yesterday evening are ample evidence and testimony to the effect that America has kept faith, that America meant what she said when she told the people of the Philippines that as soon as the Japanese invaders were driven out the liberties of these people would be restored and they would again have a free government.

I quote this paragraph from General MacArthur's speech:

On behalf of my Government I now solemnly declare, Mr. President, the full powers and responsibilities under the Constitution restored to the Commonwealth whose city is here reestablished as provided by law. Your country is once again at liberty to pursue its destiny to an honored position in the family of free nations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point first the address by General MacArthur and following that the address by President Osmeña.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

(The speeches referred to follow:

ADDRESS OF GENERAL M'ARTHUR

Mr. President, more than 3 years have elapsed—years of bitterness, struggle, and sacrifice—since I withdrew our forces and installations from this beautiful city that over and under fire, its churches, monuments, and cultural centers might, in accordance with the rules of warfare, be spared the violence of military ravage. The enemy would not have it so. And much that I sought to preserve has been unnecessarily destroyed by his desperate action at bay. By these actions he has wantonly fixed the future pattern of his own doom. Then we were but a small force struggling to stem the advance of overwhelming hordes treacherously hurled against us behind the masks of professed friendship and international good will. That struggle was not in vain. God has indeed blessed our arms.

The girded and unleashed power of America supported by our allies turned the tide of battle in the Pacific and resulted in an unbroken series of crushing defeats upon the enemy, culminating in the redemption of your soil and the liberation of your people.

My country has kept the faith. Its soldiers come here as an army of freemen dedicated with your people to the cause of human liberty, and committed to the task of destroying those evil forces that have fought to suppress it by brutality of the sword.

An army of freemen has brought your people once again under democracy's banner to rededicate their churches, long desecrated, to the glory of God and public worship; to reopen their schools to liberal education; to till the soil and reap its harvest without fear of confiscation; to reestablish their industries that they may again enjoy the profit from their sweat and enjoy their homes unafraid of violent intrusion.

Thus to millions of your now liberated people comes the opportunity to pledge themselves, their hearts, their minds, and their hands to the task of building a new and stronger nation, a nation consecrated in the blood nobly shed that this might be a nation dedicated to making imperishable those sacred liberties for which we have fought and for which many have died.

On behalf of my Government, I now solemnly declare, Mr. President, the full powers and responsibilities under the Constitution restored to the Commonwealth, whose seat is here reestablished as provided by law. Your country is once again at liberty to pursue its destiny to an honored position in the family of free nations.

Your capital city, severely punished though it be, has regained its rightful place as a symbol of democracy.

MANILA, P. I., February 28.—President Sergio Osmeña expressed hope today that next August 13, the forty-seventh anniversary of the landing of American forces in Manila, can become Philippine Independence Day.

Osmeña, in accepting the civil responsibilities for liberated areas of the islands from Gen. Douglas MacArthur, urged all Filipinos to submerge political differences in quickly reviving their commonwealth.

"We have President Roosevelt's word that when normal conditions have returned," he said, "law and order reestablished, and democratic processes restored, our request for the advancement of the date of independence will be granted.

"I hope this can be accomplished on August 13, 1945, the forty-seventh anniversary of the landing of the American forces in Manila. Thus, occupation day will become Philippine Independence Day."

Earlier in his speech of acceptance, Osmeña declared the "victory of American arms is not a victory for power, control, or domination, but a victory for freedom, democracy, and independence."

He pledged Philippine participation in the war until the enemy is "completely vanquished," and said the campaign in the islands would be "prosecuted relentlessly and with dispatch in order that the people's agony may not be prolonged and precious human life may be salvaged."

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION — PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE MARCH 7 AND 8

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization may on March 7 and 8, if necessary, sit during the sessions of the House unless otherwise ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If the gentleman will modify his request that the committee may sit during general debate those 2 days the Chair can entertain it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I so modify my request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization may on March 7 and 8 sit during sessions of the House, during general debate.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

MAJ. R. W. SCHROEDER

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include an article from Collier's dated March 25, 1944, being an article by Frederick R. Neely.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago today, Maj. R. W. Schroeder, United States Army, then chief of the flying section of McCook Field, Dayton, Ohio, completed a series of exhaustive tests to develop practical devices for aiding aircraft to reach and operate at extreme heights, when he established a world altitude record of 38,180 feet. At that time this was the highest point ever reached by a human being. This feat was accomplished with the aid of the turbosupercharger, a development of the First World War which had been tabled but revived in 1919.

On this flight of February 27, 1920, Major Schroeder became unconscious after establishing the new record, fell 30,000 feet, but regained consciousness 3,000 feet above the ground. His eyes were frozen and he was suffering from exhaustion and exposure. Even though he was equipped with a parachute, and in spite of his precarious condition, he landed his plane successfully, thereby saving its valuable turbo-supercharger and barographs which recorded the progress and height of the flight. As he landed his plane, Major Schroeder again became unconscious and was taken to the post hospital, where he received treatment for several weeks.

Major Schroeder accomplished his flight at great personal risk and barely escaped with his life and his valuable findings. His records revealed a rise in temperature at the great height he reached and also strong winds which blew his airplane backward toward the east, although he was flying in a westerly heading. This is regarded as conclusive evidence that he penetrated the stratosphere—the first in the history of the airplane. His success, against overwhelming odds, inspired continued work on the turbosupercharger for the utilization of high altitudes for military and commercial operations, the results of which are being successfully demonstrated daily by the high altitude bombing operations of our airmen against Germany and Japan.

Major Schroeder's vision as to the future possibilities of the turbosupercharger and of high altitude warfare have resulted in America being preeminent in that field. His determination to speed the development of high altitude operations by personally undertaking all the test flights on the turbosupercharger from the very first, and his determination to prove this belief at the risk of his life on numerous test flights with primitive protective equipment, are in the highest traditions of the Army Air Forces.

Major Schroeder left active duty with the Army in November 1920 and returned to civil aviation, in which he had been engaged since 1910 before answering his country's call in the First World War. His contributions to the growth of civilian flying, notably air-line operations, are many and valuable.

Today, at the age of 59, at his home in Glenview, Ill., he is slowly winning back his health. His many friends, including those in the aviation industry, regret that suitable recognition has never come to Major Schroeder from the Government he served so heroically and constructively. The law and Executive order governing the award of the Distinguished Flying Cross excludes Major

Schroeder from consideration by the War Department because of time-limit provisions. There is, however, ample precedent for the Distinguished Flying Cross to be awarded under congressional authority.

A special committee of Major Schroeder's friends in aviation, and they are legion, led by Capt. Eddie Rickenbacker, have prepared a thorough brief in support of this award from official Army records and qualified eyewitnesses of the flight 25 years ago.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to introduce on this, the twenty-fifth anniversary of the flight, from which our victorious attacks on Berlin and Tokyo stem today, a bill providing for the award of the Distinguished Flying Cross for Major Schroeder's epochal achievement.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. My colleague from Illinois very appropriately pays tribute today to a man who many of us call "Shorty Schroeder." It was only a few months ago—I forget the exact date—that I talked with Major Schroeder when he attended the dinner of the Early Birds in New York City. He was brought there in a wheelchair. In spite of his suffering he was cheerful and greeted the flyers of another day and those who fought for better air power pleasantly. As a result of the experiments which he carried forward, he is almost a casualty of the planning for this war. I think the gentleman is offering a resolution which should meet with the most thoughtful consideration of this body.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the contribution made by the gentleman from West Virginia who has often on the floor of this House and elsewhere taken a keen interest in aviation.

A more complete story of Major Schroeder's flight is covered in an article in Wing Talk in Collier's by Frederick R. Neely, as follows:

WING TALK

(By Frederick R. Neely)

Out in the suburbs of Chicago sits a tall, lean, gray airman of other days, fighting back from a long illness and leafing through his records. One, in particular, tells how on February 27, 1920, he flew to a new world altitude record of 38,180 feet and was the first person to penetrate the stratosphere; how he came within seconds of losing his life and his valuable scientific findings; and how, when he returned to earth, his flight dispelled all doubts as to the practicability and future of the turbosupercharger which at this moment is helping those B–17's, B–24's, P–38's and PBY–4's to stay high above the enemy and his flak as they drive home their missions of the day.

February 27, 24 years ago, is the highest historical milestone in a long line of aviation achievements credited to Maj. R. W. "Shorty" Schroeder, six-foot-four pilot, mechanic, engineer and elder statesman of aviation. Yet his anniversary and the epochal date in aviation history can hardly mean much to the youngsters operating high above the world, because most of them were not born when "Shorty" Schroeder determined that the upper air held unlimited possibilities for successful military and commercial operations and that he was going up there to find out for himself.

Establishing the highest point then reached by man in a power-driven aircraft was incidental to the more valuable and less colorful achievements which this and other high-altitude flights of his gave to present-day aviation. The turbosupercharger, abandoned at the end of World War No. 1 was rejuvenated early in 1919, and a handful of farsighted men worked quietly at the McCook Field in Dayton.

These included the inventor, Dr. Sanford A. Moss, of Lynn, Mass.; Col. V. E. Clark, noted aeronautical engineer, of Culver City, Calif.; Maj. George E. A. Hallett, chief of the power plant section of the old engineering division, now of La Mesa, Calif.; Mr. A. L. Berger, Army civilian engineer, of Wright Field; Mr. Edward L. Pratt, also an engine specialist, of Wright Field; Mr. George W. Elsey, of Western Springs, Ill., who flew as "Shorty's" observer on many of his test flights; and "Shorty," who was chief of the flight test section, another designation for the Army's chief test pilot.

But in the words of Major Hallett, now retired from the Army: "In spite of our determination to develop the turbosupercharger, the work of Dr. Moss in making and improving them, and the work of my organization, we could very easily have failed to keep the project alive if we had not had Major Schroeder as our test pilot and at our council table during the critical first 18 months to 2 years of this development."

On his record-breaking flight, Shorty not only confirmed the permanent place the turbo would have in high-altitude operations, now being demonstrated successfully every day, but he also brought back for solution many other problems of operation at great heights. Outstanding among these were: the necessity of diverting exhaust gases from the cockpit; new design to provide for an intercooling device between compressor and carburetor to reduce preignition; improvement on the existing types of oxygen masks to insure a reliable and proportional feed; and suitable clothes to protect airmen from the bitter cold.

One of the documents recalling the past, which Shorty reads with understanding interest, is by his superior, Colonel Clark, who engineered the famous Clark Y-wing section, the standard for plane designers for many years.

Colonel Clark's eyewitness account of the epochal flight is:

"As Major Schroeder expected a strong wind from the West at the high altitudes, he maintained a westward heading until, as it happened, he had broken the world's altitude record. In spite of the fact that he maintained a westward heading, the airplane was blown backward until it was almost over Springfield, Ohio, about 24 miles northeast of Dayton. At that time, in spite of Major Schroeder's best efforts to obtain livable oxygen supply, he became unconscious.

"When Major Schroeder regained consciousness he found that his eyes had been frozen shut, making it impossible for him to read his instruments or to see objects on the ground. His senses of feeling and hearing told him that the air speed was very high, and so he eased back gently on the control stick. After a bit he was able to pry one eye open a little—enough to see that his altimeter reading was 3,000 feet, though he thought it should have been 23,000 feet. He flew around for a little while, trying to regain his faculties, and was finally able to see that he was quite low, whereupon he became convinced that his altitude was 3,000 feet.

"Actually, he had fallen unconscious, with the airplane diving out of control at terrifically high speeds, for more than 30,000 feet. He thought he saw buildings underneath and decided to try to fly straight until he was sure that the airplane was well away from any buildings and then he could bail out with his parachute. But, remembering that it would be impossible to replace the supercharger and its accessories for many months, he determined to land the airplane. He lost altitude gradually with reduced power and effected a successful landing at McCook Field, which was quite small, holding an eye partly open during the actual close approach and landing.

"As he cut the ignition, he again lost consciousness, and was carried from the cockpit to the post hospital."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RABAUT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

G. I. BILL

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I shall only consume a small amount of the 20 minutes' time allotted to me. I merely wish to direct the attention of the House to a bill introduced by me today for the purpose of amending the G. I. bill for veterans.

Congress, when it passed the G. I. bill, passed upon the question of whether or not the veterans of this war should be given guaranty for loans for the purpose of purchasing farm, business, or residential property. It is not my purpose, in connection with the bill I have introduced, to amend that thought, but I believe an injustice appears in the law as it now stands in the matter of the time limit granted to the veterans in which to apply for the loans.

Let me read section 500 (a) of title III, which says that the veterans may apply:

Two years after separation from the military or naval forces, or 2 years after the termination of the war, whichever is the later date, but in no event more than 5 years after the termination of the war.

The interpretation placed upon that means that if a man is in the service, for example, in the army of occupation, for some time after the war is concluded, then he is penalized by reason of his additional service to his country.

I hold that the right of a veteran, as provided by the Congress, to borrow money and have that loan guaranteed by the Government as one of the benefits resulting from his service in this war is an individual matter, and that every veteran entitled to the provisions of that bill should be entitled to the full provisions of the bill. I do not want to see the loan feature of the law allow the full 5 years for some veterans and only 1 or 2 years, or no years, for others.

Therefore today I have introduced an amendment to the G. I. bill which reads as follows:

That section 500 (a) of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (relating to the guaranty of loans to veterans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property) is amended by striking out the words "2 years after separation from the military or naval forces, or 2 years after the termination of the war, whichever is the later date, but in no event more than 5 years after the termination of the war" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "10 years after separation from the military or naval forces."

The simple operation of that amendment is that every person now in the armed forces or who has served during

this war and who is entitled to the benefits of the G. I. bill may know that he has the right to apply for this loan at any time within the 10-year period from the time he is discharged from the service. The fundamental thing in this proposal is that it gives every veteran an equal amount of time under the law in which to make his application. I will not quarrel with anyone as to what number of years may be set as a proper time, but I do think it is vital that we recognize this principle of an absolutely equal right for every individual in the armed forces.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a brief newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RABAUT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

OFFICE OF WAR INFORMATION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter written by Elmer Davis to the Honorable James F. Byrnes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on January 6, last, a letter was written by Elmer Davis, Director of the Office of War Information, to the Honorable James Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion. This letter is as follows:

JANUARY 6, 1945.

The Honorable JAMES F. BYRNES,
Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

DEAR MR. JUSTICE: As requested by your office, this letter is furnished to describe the current operations and plans of O. W. I. as they relate to the maintenance of an orderly information liaison with O. W. M. R. and throughout appropriate parts of the Government. The following coordination procedures do not materially differ from those of the past except as they have been modified to meet the problems created by the enlarged activities of O. W. M. R.

1. Deputies of O. W. I. are continually informed of major plans of the departments and agencies with which they have liaison through regular consultation with their top officials and information divisions. Even if no news release is desired, they keep abreast of developments in order to anticipate possible informational conflicts.

2. When a major news release is planned, the deputy is informed well in advance by the department or agency concerned. He then confers with other deputies to see if the proposed release is consistent with other plans of other agencies. Suggestions for handling are frequently developed from such conferences.

3. The O. W. I. deputy to O. W. M. R. especially is being advised by other O. W. I. deputies of major plans and he in turn maintains close liaison with O. W. M. R., thus being able to offer appropriate advice to the other deputies.

4. The O. W. I. deputy to the War and Navy Departments is especially responsible for keeping informed in advance of their "non-military" information and is working out procedures with them designed to bring about appropriate clearance with civilian departments and agencies, especially O. W. M. R.

5. As added assurance of deputy clearance, the O. W. I. news desk notifies the appropriate deputy of major news releases which come to the desk.

6. Through conferences the news desk is advised by the deputies as specifically as possible of basic policies of all departments and agencies.

7. The O. W. I. speech-clearance unit operates on a similar basis.

8. Certain fixtures are being developed in major information areas so as to provide regular reports of factual situations, such reports being reconciled among departments and agencies which may be involved, and thereafter serving as basic guides to all agencies. For instance, it is expected that the W. P. B. monthly production report will be agreed and adhered to by all agencies.

9. Each department or agency now advises the O. W. I. News Bureau in advance of press conferences, stating the subject thereof. It is requested that this notification also be made to the deputy and that it include a memorandum, stating the substance of the major information to be issued at the press conference. From such memorandum, the deputy may make suggestions as to whether the proposed information conflicts with information issued or to be issued by other agencies.

I expect to distribute this letter appropriately throughout the Government in order that all concerned may have an understanding of the operation.

Cordially,

ELMER DAVIS, *Director.*

Mr. Speaker, this letter indicates that under direction of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion the O. W. I. has been set up as a clearing house for all information that is to be given out by any department or agency of the Government. This means that if a newspaper reporter goes to any bureau or department and asks for any information or any interview, it must clear the O. W. I. This letter was evidently dictated by James R. Brackett, Deputy Director, whose experience according to the information furnished me by the Office of War Information is confined to governmental service, and a position with the receivers of the Associated Gas & Electric Co. At one time he was a cub reporter in the galleries and that is all the newspaper experience he has had. I understand he is drawing about $9,000 a year and is First Deputy Administrator.

It is apparent that this incompetent outfit is attempting to destroy the freedom of the press and to prevent them from getting information about the Government. I feel that it is my duty to call this matter to the attention of the Congress to indicate that I am opposed to this sort of thing, and that I intend to do my very best to protect the people of this country so that we will not have a smothering outfit which will prevent the newspapers and the press of this country from getting information about their own affairs.

Perhaps the O. W. I. is not the most incompetent set-up in the Government, but it is a good runner-up and amongst the most incompetent. They might do a good job of smothering but refuse to give out any information. That departments or agencies must submit things of this kind to an agency of this type before they give any information to the press means that no information will be given out except if it is doctored up to suit the administration.

President Roosevelt made an announcement of certain things that we were fighting for about 3 years ago. Among those things were the four so-called freedoms and one of those is freedom of the press. Now we are being faced not only with restrictions that this, the O. W. I., is placing upon all of the news of the country, but we are faced with an agitation on the part of the administration supporters to have all of our sources of war news confined to the Government and issued by the Government.

Two of the three major radio networks are both closed to commentators criticizing the administration. That is, the National Broadcasting Co. and the Columbia Broadcasting Co. are both under the absolute domination and control of the New Deal administration. The Mutual Broadcasting Co. is just hanging on. The pressure placed upon the radio organizations by the Federal Communications Commission has resulted almost in destroying the freedom of the radio. The freedom of the press is the last bulwark of American liberty; if we lose that the new dealers will have established a complete dictatorship here in America. It has been bad enough all the way through the Roosevelt administration, but any decree which clamps down harder against the possibility of press associations obtaining news is something that we should fight against and work against here in the Congress.

No one objects to war censorship but when under cover of war censorship or anything of that character, we get to the point where we are trying to have censorship with everything else, it is carrying the thing too far and it is time to stop.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] is recognized for 10 minutes.

AN ANSWER TO STATE DEPARTMENT BROADCAST TO THE PEOPLE

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago the State Department announced a series of broadcasts over national hook-ups to the people of America wherein it was proposed to inform our people regarding State Department policies. This announcement was welcomed generally because the State Department for the past 12 years has kept the American people in the dark. American people generally looked forward to these series of broadcasts hoping that some real information would be given by this most important department of our Government in these crucial times.

Last Saturday we were treated to the first of the series of these broadcasts. I listened very carefully, as did perhaps millions of other Americans. After listening to the first broadcast last Saturday evening I recommend to the State Department that if all other forthcoming broadcasts are going to be hodgepodges of misinformation as was the first broadcast, then I recommend that the balance of the series be canceled.

After listening to Saturday's broadcast I was convinced that at Yalta, Stalin got not only most of Europe, he also got our State Department thrown in to boot as a propaganda agency for selling the Yalta Conference to our people. I say this because the broadcast last Saturday sounded more like Moscow propaganda than a report to the people.

The misinformation given by the State Department last Saturday attempted to justify the fifth partition of Poland. The State Department's defense of the lynching of Poland at Yalta is mysteriously identical to the arguments used by Moscow. In trying to justify the international crime of the ages, where the first time in the history of man or beast allies got together and divided the spoils of a fellow ally, the State Department last Saturday said:

> The Crimean decision was fair because it gave Russia a part of Poland settled predominately by Russian and Ukranian rather than Polish peoples.

This kind of misinformation sounds like Pravda. But it was not Pravda speaking last Saturday—it was our own State Department. Now it appears to me that before our own State Department went on the air it should at least have checked the facts before making such a loose statement of misinformation. The State Department has thousands of people idling in its offices, and it seems fitting, to say the least, that at least someone could have been given the task of checking the facts before they went on the air. Archibald MacLeish, who participated in this program of misinformation, was at one time very closely connected with our own Congressional Library, which has the facts. Surely he had every access to the facts if it was facts the State Department wanted to reveal.

Now, what are the facts regarding the make-up of the population of Poland east of the Ribbentrop-Molotov line? Notice I say Ribbentrop-Molotov line—not the Curzon line. There is no such thing as a definite Curzon line, but it is called the Curzon line to take the curse out of it and to get away from Moscow appeasement of Hitler which resulted in the Ribbentrop-Molotov line. Yes; what are the true facts of the population make-up east of this line?

According to the 1931 census, the populations of Poland east of the Ribbontrop-Molotov line was 12,012,000. Those are the latest figures available. If figures for 1939 were available they would be more favorable to Poland because there was an unprecedented increase in Polish population in this area. All records of births and population changes from 1931–39 bear this out. Those records too are available in the Congressional Library. But since accurate figures are available only up to 1931—the last official census report—let us examine those figures and see how our State Department used the air waves to misinform our people in trying to justify the Yalta crime of the ages.

According to the 1931 census report, the make up of the population of Poland east of this "crime" conference line was as follows:

Poles	4,794,000
Russians	120,000

I repeat those figures. East of the disputed line in 1931 there were 4,794,000 Poles and only 120,000 Russians. The Poles made up 40 percent of the population east of this line and the Russians only 1 percent—yet our State Department last Saturday said that the settlement at Crimea was fair because the Yalta conference gave Russia a part of Poland settled predominately by Russians. Just think of it, our State Department says that Poland should not have that territory because they have only 40 percent of the population of that territory. In the same breath our State Department says the Russians should have that territory because only 1 percent of the population is Russian. I do not know what kind of reasoning the State Department uses—but it looks like there was little regard for truth or justice in its broadcast.

We condemn Hitler, and rightfully so, because he took over Czechoslovakia where 10 percent of the population was German. We condemn Hitler, and rightfully so, because he took over Austria and Hungary where almost 10 percent of the population was German. Yet while we condemn Hitler for his inhumanity—our State Department says it is just fine for Russia to take over territory where the population is only 1 percent Russian. Has our State Department no sense of reasoning even if it has little regard for facts? In the broadcast, why did our State Department not tell that out of more than 12,000,000 people in that area there are only 120,000 Russians or 1 percent of the population; and almost 5,000,000 Poles, or 40 percent of the population?

The conscience must have bothered the broadcasters of the State Department a trifle because it was also stated that while Russians alone do not have very much in that area, the Russians and Ukrainians have a predominence of the population. But this is another bit of misinformation because according to the 1931 census there were only 4,139,000 Ukrainians in this part of Poland. Yes; put in Ukrainians with the Russians and they account for only 35 percent of the population of this area as compared to the Polish 40 percent. Yet our State Department, disregarding facts, stated only last Saturday that the Russians and Ukrainians have a preponderance of the population in that area. Even with the Ukrainians, the Russians account for only 35 percent of the population. Non-Russians and non-Ukrainians account for 65 percent of the population of that area. Even the Russians and Ukrainians combined do not come anywhere near the Polish population.

In that area are 1,045,000 Jews, certainly not Russians; 76,000 Lithuanians, certainly not Russians; 80,000 Germans, certainly not Russians; 32,000 Czechs, certainly not Russians, and balance of other nationalities, certainly not Russians. To justify their ignominious stand, our State Department had to stretch its imagination and class Russians and Ukrainians as being the same. The broadcasters of the State Department evidently studied little history or they would know that Ukrainians are not Russians by any stretch of the imagination. Ukrainians have always belonged to western civilization and the Russians to Asiatic civilization. Just because the Ukraine belongs to Russia by force with the aid of American lend-lease does not make a Ukrainian a Russian. Carrying our State Department's reasoning to its logical conclusion, very soon we will have our State Department classing Rumanians, Czechs, Yugoslavs, Finns, Lithuanians, Latvians, and Estonians as Russians. By might, with the aid of American lend-lease, Russia already has or will soon have all this territory under her management. So get ready Czechs, Finns, Rumanians, Yugoslavs, and others—very soon you are going to lose your identity because our State Department will soon class you all as Russians just as it now already classes Ukrainians as Russians.

If our State Department wanted to report facts, here is something else they should have told. While there are only 120,000 Russians in this disputed territory, there are more than one and a half million Poles in Russia. According to State Department reasoning there is more justification for Poland to grab Russian land and people than there is for Russia to grab Polish land and people. This appears rather silly does it not? But it is not too silly, for our State Department uses that kind of reasoning.

As an American, I find no justification whatever for the State Department's program of misinformation of last Saturday. It was indeed a most pitiful attempt to justify a great wrong. If the speakers of the State Department had merely said, "Poland is an unfortunate victim of United States of America appeasement, we are sorry it had to happen," American people would have some respect for it because of its truthfulness. But when the State Department insists on giving misinformation to cover up a crime—then I say it would be better if the State Department had never said a word.

PUT POLAND IN BAD LIGHT

Another trick of the speakers of the State Department last Saturday was their statements about free elections in Poland. The speakers tried to create the impression that we got something there. Here again the State Department seems to know little if anything about the facts. Russia is going to occupy Poland during this so-called free election. Whoever heard of a free election in Russia. The State Department had better learn a few things about the free election Russia sponsored in Lithuania. The State Department should also learn something about how Russia conducted a free election in eatern Poland in 1939. Free elections under Russian rule—how stupid of anyone to even imagine it. It is a pity that the State Department does not learn that Poland has had free elections wherein a higher percentage of people voted in Poland in their last peacetime election than voted in our own country. In Poland's last peacetime election, 48 percent of the men and

women above 21 voted. In the United States of America in 1940 only 37 percent of our eligible voters voted. Poland has always had free elections since 1920. Russia has never had a free election in a thousand years. Yet our State Department gleefully states that all will be well in Poland because the Russian Army of occupation will now see to it that Poland has free elections. What a pity of a defense. What colossal fabrication to give the people of America. My best advice is that the State Department study a little history and political science before they undertake another broadcast.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. VURSELL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) for an indefinite period, on account of illness in the family.

To Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 35. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 28, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m. Wednesday, February 28, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings on Wednesday and Thursday, March 7 and 8, at 10 o'clock a. m. on H. R. 173, 1548, 1624, and 2256.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2374. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 153. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 2277, a bill to insure adequate nursing care for the armed forces; without amendment (Rept. No. 222). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 235. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 236. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2068. A bill to provide for the settlement of claim of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service; with amendment (Rept. No. 237). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 32. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934; without amendment (Rept. No. 238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 534. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1842. A bill for the relief of the Mauger Construction Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 259. A bill for the relief of Leo Gottlieb; without amendment (Rept. No. 224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 905. A bill for the relief of Paul T. Thompson; with amendment (Rept. No. 225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 987. A bill for the relief of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 226). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1012. A bill for the relief of A. P. Scarborough and J. D. Etheridge; with amendment (Rept. No. 227). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1492. A bill for the relief of Florence J. Sypert, administratrix of the estate of Leona Connor Childers, with amendment (Rept. No. 228). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1540. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Effie S. Campbell ;without amendment (Rept. No. 229). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1567. A bill for the relief of Katherine Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COLE of Kansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1669. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Stowell; with amendment (Rept. No. 231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2005. A bill for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant; with amendment (Rept. No. 232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2006. A bil for the relief of Boyd B. Black; with amendment (Rept. No. 233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2186. A bill for the relief of Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2053) granting a pension to Rachel Melvina Ann Campbell Frum, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 2375. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the period during which veterans may apply for the guaranty of loans relating to homes, farms, and business property; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 2376. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital at Boley, Okla., for Negro veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 2377. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the admission of Iowa into the Union as a State; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2378. A bill to amend Public Law 537, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 2, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2379. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2380. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office at Baldwyn, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 2381. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 2382. A bill to amend the Transportation of Explosives Act, with respect to quantity of explosives which may be transported under specified conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2383. A bill to amend the provision in the act of May 23, 1908, and section 13 of the act of March 1, 1911, as amended, authorizing payment of a portion of national forest receipts to States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2384. A bill to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia by adding a new section 548a; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2385. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act (June 26, 1934, ch. 750, sec.

1; 48 Stat. 1216); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 2386. A bill to provide military status for women who served overseas with the Army of the United States during World War No. 1; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2387. A bill to provide for a new base period, and for considering increases in the cost of farm labor, in determining parity prices for agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2388. A bill to provide for enlistments in the Regular Army during the period of the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2389. A bill to amend the National Defense Act, as amended, so as to limit the application of provisions for retirement of wing commanders of the Air Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2390. A bill to amend the act creating the Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 154. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs to study the progress of the war effort; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LEA:

H. Res. 155. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to continue the investigation with respect to petroleum begun under House Resolution 290, Seventy-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as is necessary to extend the benefits of the Federal social security system to farmers, the self-employed, the irregularly employed, the teachers, public-service employees, and all classes still outside the Federal system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to amend the Constitution of the United States, relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

H. R. 2391. A bill for the relief of John J. Redmond; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BUNKER:

H. R. 2392. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Swett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 2393. A bill for the relief of Elsie Peter; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2394. A bill to authorize the President to present the Distinguished Flying Cross to Maj. Rudolph W. Schroeder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 2395. A bill to authorize the presentation of an appropriate medal to J. Edgar Hoover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H. R. 2396. A bill for the relief of the parents of the late James W. Seeger; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2397. A bill for the relief of Joseph F. Gdaniec; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGLINCHEY:

H. R. 2398. A bill for the relief of William J. Debler; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 2399. A bill for the relief of Arlethia Rosser; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 2400. A bill for the relief of the estate of Frank D. Howells, deceased, former treasurer of the city of Richmond, Ind.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WASIELEWSKI:

H. R. 2401. A bill for the relief of Hannah Hidde and Doris Hidde; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

105. By Mr. GRANT of Indiana: Petition of James G. Hangis, president, and Anthony G. Nikitas, secretary, of South Bend Chapter 100, the Order of Ahepa, addressed to the President and the Congress of the United States, respectfully requesting the aid of the Government of the United States in the solution of the urgent problems of Greece, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

106. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of music students of Marietta High School, Marietta, Ohio, supporting Senate bill 63, which provides that Congress enforce the Bill of Rights by enacting legislation which will prevent interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial programs when presented by educational institutions not in competition with professional talent; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

107. By Mr. HOEVEN: Petition from George W. Utech and sundry others residing in and around Le Mars, Iowa, protesting the passage of any peacetime conscription law at this time; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

108. By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana: Memorial of Montana Legislature, House Joint Memorial No. 4, relating to payments under Bankhead-Jones Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

109. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 4501, passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, relative to returning the liberated heroes of Bataan to the United States via San Francisco; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

110. Also, letter from the San Francisco C. I. O. Council addressed to Hon. Roger D. Lapham, mayor of San Francisco, concerning Hetch Hetchy power; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

111. Also, resolution No. 4494, passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, endorsing request by the President for Federal appropriation of $73,115,000 to assist cities in their post-war plans; to the Committee on Appropriations.

112. By the SPEAKER: Petition of George Webb, of the State of Oregon, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to his claim for payment from Bonneville Power Administration for services rendered between July 14 and July 28, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, February 26, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, amid the tensions of these terrific days, we seek in Thy presence a saving experience of inner quiet and certainty. We are tossed and agitated in a troubled world, our ears are filled with the world's din, and our spirits grow weary in a violent generation. We need Thee as a strong foundation that storms cannot shake, as a deep well that droughts cannot exhaust, as an inner citadel that no foe can seize.

We come with intercession, not from lips alone but from spirits, in deep anxiety concerning the world our children will inherit from our hands. For our Nation, its leaders in these dread times, its multitudes of youth who serve its cause upon the sea and in the air and on battlefields around the world, we lift our hearts.

For all who are responsible partners in shaping the policies and in directing the designs of a powerful nation whose leadership can make or break hopes of a better world, we pray. May we be ministers of abiding peace, true servants of the common good, and forerunners of Thy kingdom's coming. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Tuesday, February 27, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hart	Overton
Ball	Hatch	Pepper
Bankhead	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hayden	Reed
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Brewster	Hill	Robertson
Bridges	Hoey	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Saltonstall
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Stewart
Byrd	La Follette	Taft
Capehart	Langer	Taylor
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McMahon	Tobey
Donnell	Magnuson	Tunnell
Downey	Maybank	Vandenberg
Eastland	Mead	Wagner
Ellender	Millikin	Walsh
Ferguson	Moore	Wheeler
Fulbright	Morse	Wherry
George	Murdock	White
Gerry	Murray	Wiley
Green	Myers	Willis
Guffey	O'Daniel	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. BRIGGS] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a delegate to the Inter-American Conference in Mexico and therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on official business as a delegate to the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NOTICE OF ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AND ORDER OF BUSINESS ON THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to announce that at 12:30 o'clock tomorrow, in the Hall of the House of Representatives, the President will address a joint session of the two Houses of Congress.

I wish also to state that inasmuch as the nomination of Mr. Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce has been made a special order for tomorrow, immediately upon the return of the Senate to the Senate Chamber we will proceed with the consideration of the nomination, and I hope we may be able to dispose of it tomorrow afternoon.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 106) to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors essential to the war effort, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 32) providing for a joint session of the Congress on Thursday, March 1, 1945, at 12:30 o'clock postmeridian, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker pro tempore had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 340) to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance, and it was signed by the Vice President.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the House concurrent resolution which has just been messaged from the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 32, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, the 1st day of March 1945, at 12:30 o'clock postmeridian, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the House concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 32) was considered and agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WALSH:

Resolutions adopted by the Polish Women's Business and Professional Club, of New Bedford, Mass., protesting against the proposed fifth partition of Poland, and pertaining to the Polish Government and related questions affecting proposals for the disposition of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MYERS:

A resolution sponsored and signed by members of the Men's Bible Class of the First Presbyterian Church, of Lansdowne, Pa., endorsing adoption by the Senate of the so-called Connally resolution declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States; advocating support of a peace plan entitled "Six Pillars of Peace" as proposed by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, and favoring the delegation of some of the Members of Congress and representatives of the churches to participate in the coming peace negotiations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GREEN:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Finance.

"Senate Resolution 42

"Resolution memorializing Congress to expedite the erection of a veterans' hospital in the State of Rhode Island to meet the increasing demands for hospitalization and out-patient medication

"Whereas a veterans' center has been established in the city of Newport; and

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the mayor and board of aldermen, through the Federal officials of the Veterans' Bureau, that there has been no increase in hospital bed capacity for veterans; and

"Whereas the veterans' administration in the State of Rhode Island services the city of Taunton, Mass., the city of New Bedford, Mass., the city of Fall River, Mass., in addition to the entire State of Rhode Island; and

"Whereas there are but 80 beds available at the United States Naval Hospital in Newport, R. I., for veterans; and

"Whereas there are over 5,000 men and women in service from the city of Newport alone and an additional 2,000 from the county of Newport; and

"Whereas, as has been stated, the number of beds available is far from adequate and there are no hospital beds available for women: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States are earnestly requested to use the utmost effort to expedite the erection of a veterans' hospital somewhere in the State of Rhode Island in order to meet the growing demands for hospitalization and out-patient medication; and the Secretary of State is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to His Excellency, J. Howard McGrath, Governor of the State of Rhode Island, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. GUFFEY:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Whereas as a result of the recent momentous Crimean Conference, in which Winston Churchill, Josef Stalin, and Franklin D. Roosevelt represented the cause of the Allied Nations, the President of the United States has named an eight-member bipartisan delegation to represent our country at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco which will be convened to devise a world security organization; and

"Whereas as a result of the Crimean Conference and by means of the United Nations Conference there is reason for mankind to hope and confidently expect that there will be created a world organization composed of nations dedicated to the preservation of world peace; and

"Whereas the peace to be achieved is to be based upon the recognition of the fact that our freedom-loving peoples are by right entitled to their independent national existence; and

"Whereas the framework of the peace as projected at the Crimean Conference will promote freedom of trade and prosperity based upon a revived world industry; and

"Whereas the United Nations Conference as projected at the Crimean Conference offers the reason to hope that in the days to come in the new world that is to be created there will be a greater freedom from want, a greater measure of employment, a greater degree of human happiness than the world has ever known; and

"Whereas the leaders of the Allied Nations by their achievements have abundantly answered those who have unjustly and prematurely criticized them: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this house joins in the rejoicing of the people of our State in their acclaim of the decisions and spirit of the Crimean Conference and that for ourselves and for the people of this Commonwealth we pledge to the nonpartisan delegation that will represent our country at the San Francisco conference to devise a world security organization, a sympathetic understanding of their aims and efforts, and sustained support of their ideals."

ENDORSEMENT OF NOMINATION OF HENRY A. WALLACE BY DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. GUFFEY presented a letter from the chairman of the Pennsylvania Democratic State Committee, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENNSYLVANIA DEMOCRATIC
STATE COMMITTEE,
Harrisburg, Pa., February 13, 1945.

Hon. JOSEPH F. GUFFEY,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At a caucus of the Democratic members of the house of representatives held in the State Capitol, Harrisburg, Pa., on February 12, a motion was made and unanimously carried commenting the President for his appointment of Henry A. Wallace to the Cabinet post of Secretary of Commerce, and urging you to do everything in your power to support the President's appointment.

This action of the house caucus is in conformity with the sentiment of the rank and file of the people of the State of Pennsylvania.

The caucus instructed me to ask you to use your good offices toward a speedy and favorable action on Mr. Wallace's appointment.

With kind regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

DAVID L. LAWRENCE,
State Chairman.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO RATIFICATION OF TREATIES—JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE LEGISLATURE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD, under the rule, a joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of North Carolina, relating to a proposed constitutional amendment touching upon the ratification of treaties.

The joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 128

Joint resolution memorializing Congress for a constitutional amendment providing for ratification of treaties by a majority of the Members of the House and Senate

Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that the President shall have the power, by and with the advice of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and

Whereas this constitutional provision disqualifies the more representative House of Representatives from any participation in treaty-making and has led in the past to obstruction by determined minorities in the Senate; and

Whereas it is of utmost importance that the National Government shall be able to effectuate any international agreement upon which the President and a majority of the Senators and a majority of the Representatives agree: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring):

SECTION 1. That the General Assembly of North Carolina respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to propose either to the legislatures of the several States or to convention in the several States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, reading substantially as follows:

The President shall have the power by and with the advice and consent of Congress to make treaties, provided a majority of the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall consent thereto.

SEC. 2. That a duly certified copy of this resolution be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and one copy of the same sent to each of the North Carolina Senators and Members of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.

In the general assembly, read three times and ratified, this 23d day of February 1945.

REPRESENTATION AT PEACE CONFERENCE OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES—RESOLUTION OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD, under the rule, a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, respecting representation at the coming peace conference of members of the armed forces.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution to provide for representation at the peace conference to follow the present war from the armed forces of the United States of America

Whereas since December 7, 1941, our country has been engaged in the most destructive and devastating war with Germany, Japan, and Italy, and the youth and young men of our Nation have been called upon not only to fight but to die upon the battlefields of the world; and

Whereas the American soldiers have fought with unequaled courage, valor, and bravery moving always forward from victory to victory, spilling their very lifeblood that our cherished American ideals might not perish; and

Whereas the military leaders of all the allies believe that the German Nation will probably collapse in a matter of weeks, that the utter defeat and destruction of Japan must and will eventually follow: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina, Memorializing the Congress of the United States to see that 12,000,000 men of the armed forces be represented at the peace conference, that there be selected 1 member from the personnel of the enlisted men of the Army, 1 from the Navy, and 1 from the Air Force, to have their part in the deliberation for the peace of the world.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

On February 27, 1945:

S. 35. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

On February 28, 1945:

S. 340. An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 652. A bill to provide for the issuance of death certificates in the case of persons dying in the military or naval forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahama:

S. 653. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended," approved January 24, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 654. A bill to provide for the conservation of fish and wildlife on the Klamath Reservation, in Oregon, and for other purposes; and

S. 655. A bill amending the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1207), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salary and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Klamath General Council, members of the Klamath business committee and other committees appointed by said Klamath General Council, and official delegates of the Klamath Tribe, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 656. A bill to amend the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944, approved June 28, 1944 (Public Law 375, 78th Cong.), to provide for an extension of the period for the liquidation of the Public Works Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

S. 657. A bill for the relief of Mabel K. Young; and

S. 658. A bill for the relief of the G. Fava Fruit Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 659. A bill to permit the naturalization of foreign seamen who serve on American-owned vessels for a period of at least 3 years while the United States is at war; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an agreement amending the original agreement entered into by the States of New York and Vermont relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MYERS (for himself and Mr. GUFFEY):

S. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 1 as National Freedom Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim the first day of each new year as Good Neighbor Day for the purpose of setting an example in neighborliness on the first day of the year, to serve as an inspiration and a standard for all the days to follow—leading to better relations at home, in all the Americas, and throughout the world; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 106) to amend section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors essential to the war effort, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSHFIELD and Mr. McFARLAND each submitted an amendment, and Mr. O'DANIEL submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAPEHART submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 1752, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR SUBMISSION OF REPORT BY SPECIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a resolution I am now submitting to extend to March 15 the time for the Special Committee on Campaign Expenditures to file its report. The time for filing the report was fixed as March 1, but it has proven impracticable to complete the report and get it to the Printer by that time, although half of the report has gone to the Printer, and the rest is almost ready to be sent.

The second resolving clause reads as follows:

Resolved, That this extension of time for making its report shall not extend the authority of the committee except to employ

and pay the necessary staff in connection with the preparation of its report.

At the meeting of the committee this morning I was instructed to ask the Senate for this extension of time, and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 88) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the time for making a report by the Special Committee to Investigate Presidential, Vice Presidential, and Senatorial Campaign Expenditures in 1944, authorized by Senate Resolution 263, agreed to March 30, 1944, as extended by Senate Resolution 355, agreed to December 18, 1944, is hereby further extended to March 15, 1945; and be it further

Resolved, That this extension of time for making its report shall not extend the authority of the committee except to employ and pay the necessary staff in connection with the preparation of its report.

SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMP IN COMMEMORATION OF FRANCIS SCOTT KEY

Mr. RADCLIFFE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 89), which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that September 14, 1944, having been the one hundred and thirtieth anniversary of the writing of the Star-Spangled Banner, the Postmaster General should issue a special postage stamp, of such denomination, of such design, and for such period as he may determine, in commemoration of the author of our national anthem, Francis Scott Key.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. WHITE. I submit an order and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order will be read.

The order was read as follows:

Ordered, That the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] be excused from further service upon the Committee on Civil Service and that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] be assigned to service on that committee, and that he [Mr. HART] also be assigned to service on the Committees on Commerce, Manufactures, and Public Buildings and Grounds, and that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] be excused from further service on the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the order? The Chair hears none, and without objection, it is agreed to.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I may say a brief word respecting the order. The order represents an effort to find suitable committee assignments for the new Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART]. It has been worked out by the majority leader and by me, and I want to take the opportunity to express my appreciation to the majority leader for his courtesy in bringing about this arrangement, which I hope will be satisfactory to all concerned.

On motion of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] be assigned to service on the Committee on Appropriations, and that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] be assigned to service on the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH AT JACKSON DAY DINNER IN BOSTON

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the Jackson Day Democratic dinner held in Boston February 24, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA DURING SERVICES SPONSORED BY THE FORTY-SECOND DIVISION

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina during services sponsored by the Forty-Second (Rainbow) Division veterans, Washington, D. C., February 22, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR GUFFEY BY MARY MORRIS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an interview with Senator GUFFEY by Mary Morris, published in the February 25 issue of PM, which appears in the Appendix.]

FARM COMMUNICATIONS AFTER THE WAR—ADDRESS BY PAUL A. WALKER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Farm Communications After the War," delivered by Commissioner Paul A. Walker of the Federal Communications Commission, before the third annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, San Antonio, Tex., January 16, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

RIVER AND VALLEY DEVELOPMENT—ARTICLE BY MORRIS L. COOKE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Morris L. Cooke on the subject of river and valley development, originally published in the New Republic and reprinted in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of December 15, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

FULL EMPLOYMENT AFTER THE WAR—THE MURRAY BILL

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Charles Darlington containing an interview with Beardsley Ruml concerning employment after the war, and an editorial entitled "The Murray Bill," published in the last issue of the Commonweal, which appear in the Appendix.]

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which is a substitute for the entire bill. Under the precedents of the Senate, such a substitute is not regarded as an amendment in the first degree, for the purpose of amendment, and it is therefore open to amendment in two degrees. Perfecting amendments have precedence, and should be offered before action is taken by the Senate on the committee amendment.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I wish to speak upon the question directly before the Senate, and I wish to speak in support of the substitute which is offered by the Committee on Military Affairs to H. R. 1752. I believe that a clear understanding of the bill and the issues will demonstrate the wisdom of using that substitute. I think it is helpful for us to realize that this bill originated in the Senate as Senate bill 36, introduced by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. The Senate, however, did not act upon that bill except to refer it to the Committee on Military Affairs. However, in the House of Representatives a similar bill (H. R. 1752) was introduced by Mr. MAY, and on February 6 was passed by the House of Representatives and reached the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate. The Committee on Military Affairs then having before it both the House bill and the Senate bill, voted to proceed with H. R. 1752. There were presented to the committee certain amendments to H. R. 1752. There also was presented to the committee a substitute for the bill. This substitute was presented before the Military Affairs Committee by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The committee thereupon voted to proceed with the consideration of that substitute. It voted this by a large majority, I believe about 12 to 6. Therefore the Senate Committee on Military Affairs has not considered amendments to H. R. 1752 on any basis except that of this substitute. That is important to remember, I believe, as we proceed to consider the issue before the Senate, because the issue is between H. R. 1752, a draft bill drafting labor, and the substitute which is not a draft bill at all. The substitute merely places the authority of law behind the procedures of the War Manpower Commission and the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, as now being operated on a voluntary basis. The substitute also adds to those practices certain additional practices which experience has shown will be helpful in increasing production.

Yesterday I emphasized the fact that before the Committee on Military Affairs there were no witnesses who advocated the passage of the House bill as it passed the House. The witnesses representing the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Government in general did emphasize the great crisis we are facing, did urge upon us the taking of immediate steps to increase the production of this Nation so as to meet not only the present emergencies but what might become future emergencies 4, 5, or 6 months ahead. In doing so, they said that if the House bill were to be passed it should be amended so that the administration of it, so far as it relates to the allocation of labor, would be placed in the hands of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion and, through it, the War Manpower Commission, instead of under the Selective Service System. I believe that such amendments would greatly improve the bill as it passed the House.

But the Committee on Military Affairs proceeded to take further testimony. The rest of the testimony before the committee consisting primarily of the testi-

mony of representatives of industry, labor, and agriculture, was striking, in that, while it recognized the same necessity for action which the War and Navy Departments recognized, and took their judgment upon the military necessity, it also pointed out that to follow the procedure in the House bill might very well handicap instead of advance production by changing the method at this time and discarding the procedures which have been developed. Those witnesses recommended, as the procedure for meeting the industrial side of the crisis, the procedure which the committee adopted. On that basis, the committee adopted the principle of following the experts in the Army and Navy as to the military necessity, and of following the experts in industry, labor, and agriculture, as to the method of meeting that necessity with increased production of war materials. I believe that is the best procedure to follow, to the extent that we are to rely on the judgment of others.

However, I believe that we should consider the question on its merits and take primary responsibility ourselves for the decisions to be reached. The critical point is that it is obvious that the Nation and the Congress must do everything possible to provide adequate war materials for fighting the war. Our obligation is to see that that is done.

As regards the argument as to the effect on the morale of the troops, I believe that the thing which would help the morale of the troops to the greatest extent would be for them to realize that we have acted in accordance with the best advice, and have taken a course which will give them the greatest amount of material at the earliest possible date. Therefore, our responsibility is to follow that course; and I believe it can be demonstrated that the substitute reported by the committee does follow that course.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was struck by an article on the front page of the Washington Post after Secretary Stimson and Under Secretary Patterson had testified the first time. I quote the following sentence:

> Stimson and Patterson agreed that the form the legislation takes is not so important as its early passage.

If that is even remotely correct, then it seems to me that in making our decision we certainly are free agents to consult those who have demonstrated that they know how to produce war materials.

Mr. BURTON. I think that is a fair statement, and I think it fairly represents what would be the judgment of the Secretary of War. As a matter of fact, at the time he made his recommendation, this particular substitute had not yet been presented to the committee. We may well accept his original recommendation as being what that quotation indicates, namely, that prompt action is of first importance, and that the form is not so important as prompt action. Of course, the form should include the best possible solution. I am sure that the Secretary would leave that decision on procedure to us.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I stated yesterday, my perplexity is that I come from a great State which has made incalculable records in respect to war production. Those records have been made under the management and supervision of citizens of my State who are patriotic and in whom I have a right to believe. When they tell me that the May bill would stop them from reaching their objective, instead of helping them to reach it, I am unable to understand why I should not rely upon the advice of those experts, upon whom the Government itself has had to rely for all the production which has been achieved up to date. Under the circumstances it seems to me that if I respond to the War Department request for the May bill I am, by the same token, contributing to the defeat of the purpose which the War Department and the Navy Department say is essential, namely, the increased production of war materials. I dislike the idea which seems to be so prevalent, that those who do not accept the May bill are standing in opposition to war production. In my opinion, based upon the views of citizens of Michigan in whom I have a right to believe, in opposing the May bill and supporting the substitute I am contributing to increased production. Does the Senator agree with that analysis?

Mr. BURTON. I thoroughly agree with that analysis. I well recall that the Senator from Michigan presented to our committee a telegram emphasizing the point which he has made, and urging the committee to hold further hearings, in order that there might be full appreciation of the point of view of the industrialists, agriculturists, and laborers who had had experience in that field. That testimony was taken and it has had large influence upon the committee.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Undoubtedly the Senator from Ohio, as has the Senator from Michigan, has gone through many war plants, and has noted the careful security precautions taken to see that no person of dangerous proclivities obtained employment there. The purpose of such precautions is not only to protect the product being manufactured but also those engaged in handling it. Would it not be just as dangerous to have in such plants an unwilling or slave type of labor, which is not sympathetic; and would it not upset all the precautions we have taken to insure a pure product. In other words, a man who would carelessly omit putting a rivet in a plane is just as dangerous as a man who would do so maliciously. That is a point which impresses itself on me as a psychological point to be studied. I believe that the industrialists of the country have a better knowledge of the problem than have the military experts, when it comes to the actual production of material in a plant.

Mr. BURTON. I think the Senator makes an especially valuable point when he emphasizes the fact that the willingness and enthusiasm of labor is a vital factor. The high record of production to which the Senator from Michigan has referred has up to this time been built upon that factor. I believe that if we can preserve that factor by following the procedure recommended by those men, rather than one which they oppose, we shall tend to increase rather than decrease the production which has already been achieved.

Mr. President, I wish to present the 14 points which the substitute includes, because I believe that they will be helpful in understanding why we should have this bill instead of no bill. At the same time, I think I should state briefly the reasons why I think the House bill, even as modified so as to transfer certain powers to the War Manpower Commission, would not meet the problem.

First of all, the House bill makes a discrimination between one-third of the laborers and the other two-thirds. The House bill, even as modified, would apply only to men between the ages of 18 and 45, that is to those subject to the military draft. Therefore it would not draft women. It would not draft men under 18 years of age, or men over 45 years of age. They, as well as the one-third of the Nation's labor force that is between the ages of 18 and 45, are the soldiers of our industrial Army. To treat this one-third differently from the other two-thirds would establish a different obligation for employees doing precisely the same work in the plants, and therefore, it seems to me, would result in unwise discrimination.

Secondly, it puts compulsion directly upon the laborer. I believe that our experience shows that that is not necessary. The failure of labor to respond has been a factor, but it has been a minor factor rather than a major factor. To impose a draft upon everyone between the ages of 18 and 45 because of the few delinquents involved is not the best way to reach those delinquents. I believe they can best be reached by making more effective the distribution of labor under the voluntary system, under authority of law.

Third. As pointed out by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the compulsory draft is distasteful to some of the men involved, and therefore contributes to a reaction against it by labor, rather than to an increased supply of labor under compulsion.

Fourth. It disregards the progress which has been made during the past 2 years. If we proceed at this point to abandon the voluntary system and methods of distribution, and adopt instead a compulsory draft, we disregard the records made in this Nation throughout the past 2 years.

Fifth. The House bill disregards the advice of those most directly concerned, as emphasized by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

Sixth. It would result in a delay, because there would be a change of systems, and the result might even lead to litigation. There has been reference to the fact that a legal question has been raised, as to whether or not the Congress may

lawfully draft individuals to serve other individuals.

Personally, from what I have studied in connection with the matter, I believe that that suggestion cannot be sustained as a legal objection. But there would be nothing to prevent the starting of litigation at this critical time by those who wished to start it.

Finally, I believe its effect on morale of our troops would not be good unless it served to bring about increased production, unless it served to bring about better feeling, and unless it served to show to the world that we had the strength of faith to go ahead and make good our program of voluntary cooperation.

If we were to adopt the draft principle, that would not be helpful to the morale of the troops. If it resulted in less production it certainly would not be helpful.

But on the other hand, if we can retain the progress we have made, and can capitalize on it and can say to the soldiers, "We will not only improve on the production needs we have made but we will do it without drafting a single individual. We will do it by being fair and by concentrating on the points which have been shown to be weak and where there has been some holding back under the voluntary system.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. The reason for this legislation, regardless of whatever form it may take, is to increase the production of war implements and munitions over and above our present production, of course.

Mr. BURTON. In certain spots in particular. The shortage is spotty, not general.

Mr. OVERTON. Yes; but the purpose is to bring about an increase in production.

Mr. BURTON. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. What does the evidences show? Does it show that there has not been a full-capacity production with respect to the spots to which the Senator has referred, or otherwise? Is that due to lack of cooperation on the part of the companies and the manufacturers, or is it due to lack of cooperation on the part of labor, or is it due to lack of cooperation by both? If so, which one has sinned the more?

Mr. BURTON. I am not prepared to point a finger at any of them or to charge any of them with having sinned, but I am prepared to say that the situation is due to a multitude of factors. The result of the labors of those who have struggled with this problem for 2 years, is this bill which has come to us as a recommendation from industrialists, labor and agriculture alike, saying, for example, that we need to be able to survey the Government-controlled production plants, which we have not been able to do before, in order to point out where there is wastage of labor in those plants. Also there is need for the channeling of workers, so they will reach the plants where they are most needed, and there are some plants where unessential items are being manufactured, where a limit should be imposed on the number of employees who may be retained. In still other places we would like to be able to pay transportation costs for those employees who are sent to distant places. Finally, we would like to be able to guarantee them that they will get their old jobs back when the war is over. Those are practical things which are being pointed to as being necessary in order to increase production in places where it has fallen short.

Mr. OVERTON. I understand that, and I have no doubt that those objectives are very meritorious ones. But I wish to find out whether labor is entirely at fault, or whether only the companies are at fault, or whether both of them are at fault.

Mr. BURTON. I think some of the shortage might be charged to laborers and some might be charged to industrialists and some might be charged to agriculturalists. But, in general, each group is entitled to tremendous credit for the results which have been obtained.

Mr. OVERTON. The substitute imposes a penalty on the companies and their management; does it not?

Mr. BURTON. I will reach that in due course, but I would like merely to touch on it briefly at this point, in order to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. OVERTON. Does it impose a penalty?

Mr. BURTON. When the Senator asks whether it imposes a penalty on employers, I wish to say that here is an act which applies primarily to employers. To whatever group the act applies, we then apply precisely the same language relating to court procedure and to misdemeanors that is contained in the act relating to the war powers of the Nation. All we say by way of penalty is that we apply under this act the same penalties as apply under the Second War Powers Act. It is a misdemeanor if that act is violated, and it will be a misdemeanor if this act is violated. If there is any obligation on the employer, the misdemeanor provisions will apply to the employer if he violates that obligation. If there is any obligation on the employee, the misdemeanor provisions will apply to the employee if he violates the obligation.

If most of the obligations are imposed on employers, then, of course, most of the penalties would be imposed on the employers if they violate the obligations.

Mr. OVERTON. Then, most of the penalties are imposed on the employers; are they?

Mr. BURTON. The bill imposes penalties on whoever violates the obligations.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the bill impose penalties on employees?

Mr. BURTON. If they violate the provisions of the act.

Mr. OVERTON. Would it impose penalties on employees?

Mr. BURTON. One of the members of the committee, and I will mention him by name, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], pointed out that he had not located a single point at which an obligation was imposed on an employee, and therefore he had not been able to find any point at which a penalty would be imposed on an employee. But he would not say that the penalties applied only to employers, because no one can tell in connection with the working out of a bill of this kind whether it will apply only to employers, inasmuch as it might apply to others in some unforeseen manner.

This bill is blanket legislation which imposes penalties for misdemeanors.

Mr. OVERTON. Can the Senator point out any part of the bill which imposes penalties on employees?

Mr. BURTON. I do not know of any instances where it directly applies obligations to employees, for the failure to perform which they would be subject to penalties.

Mr. OVERTON. Why should the so-called penal clauses be so drafted as to refer to legislation already upon the statute books, legislation which we find is not very clearly expressed when we go back to the statute to which the section refers? Why not spell out exactly what penalties we are going to impose for the violation of this act—penalties to be imposed on the employer or the employee. If we propose to punish only the employer, why do we not come right out and say so? If we are going to let the laborers go scot free, why do not we say so? Why have this provision which refers to another act? Why not let the act carry its own penalties?

Mr. BURTON. I think I can answer those questions to the satisfaction of the Senator. No attempt is made to pick out the employers or to distinguish them from the employees. As the penalty clause has been inserted in the bill, it follows the same structure which the representatives of labor and industry themselves followed when agreeing upon this proposition. In order to bring into operation existing uniform methods of enforcement and in order not to repeat at length paragraphs of existing law relating merely to procedure, they said in section 7 of the substitute that paragraphs (3), (4), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act of 1942, shall be applicable.

I think that is a perfectly normal way to say, "We have passed this act to meet the conditions as we see them. We therefore include by reference, as the procedure to be used in enforcing this act, the same procedure we have already enacted under the Second War Powers Act."

However, they did not include paragraph (5), which provided for the misdemeanor penalty.

All that the Committee on Military Affairs did was to put paragraph (5) in with paragraphs (3), (4), (6), (7), and (8), which already are in the bill. Therefore, the committee adopted precisely the existing procedure approved by Congress in connection with the Second War Powers Act. So the bill provides that the penalties will apply to anyone affected by the act. If this bill, in the judgment of the representatives of the public, labor, agriculture, and industry, will be most effective by placing obligations upon employers, and if such provisions are enacted into law, it is normal that whatever penalties go with such obligations

should be applied to the law; and the penalties will then fall wherever they may. If the obligation itself is properly placed on the employer, then the penalty is properly placed on the employer.

Mr. OVERTON. I understand. Theoretically that is beautiful. But when we get down to a practical interpretation of the bill, I have not yet been able to find any Senator, lawyer, or layman who can tell me exactly what penalty is imposed and whether it would apply to employees as well as to employers. Most persons are of the opinion, as I understand the situation, that the employee has no penalty imposed upon him.

The point I make is this: Does not the Senator think that the bill would be vastly improved if the penal clause were rewritten, so that, instead of referring to two different statutes, a penalty were prescribed, just as will be intended by the Congress if it enacts the bill?

Mr. BURTON. I may say that I have no objection whatever to rewriting paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) into this bill.

Mr. OVERTON. But the difficulty with doing that is that it is very difficult to interpret them.

Mr. BURTON. No. Here is paragraph (5) to which the Senator has referred in particular. It is paragraph (5) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the Second War Powers Act. It is perfectly simple. Here it is:

> Any person who willfully performs any act prohibited, or willfully fails to perform any act required, by any provision of this subsection (a) or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder, whether heretofore or hereafter issued, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

That is the clause which we have put into many bills. It is as precise and as definite as the bill itself. If the bill itself is not clear the penalty is not clear, but the fault is not with subsection (5).

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I examine this bill I find that the penalty does not really apply to anything in the bill in its present form. In other words, as the bill is written today, neither an employee nor an employer could violate the act, or any section of it, in such a way that it would be willful under the penalty clause. The section to which reference has been made undertakes to provide the penalty for a violation of the rules, regulations, and orders which will be drawn under the act. When we, today, say that the act applies to one or the other, it depends on what the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission provides in an order, or in a regulation, or in a rule under and by virtue of the act. I find no section in the bill today which a man could really violate, because certain rules, regulations, and orders are authorized in the bill, and the question as to who can or cannot violate the act, and who will become liable to a penalty of 1 year imprisonment and a fine of up to $10,000 will depend on the wording of the order.

Mr. BURTON. I think the Senator has stated what is true with regard to all administrative measures. Practically all of them require some rules and regulations in order to be put into effective operation, and therefore it is an important, appropriate, and necessary practice to authorize by statute that a penalty shall be attached through regulations when issued. Without such authorization from Congress there could be no penalty attached to a violation of the regulations. Within the limitation put upon the regulation, and within the scope of the act to which the regulation must conform, it has been the practice to authorize a penalty for violation of the regulation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then it would be true under the proposed act that we would have to wait until after the rules and regulations and orders were drafted in order to determine whether or not the penalty applied to an employee or an employer.

Mr. BURTON. Speaking to the point which was raised by the Senator from Louisiana, I think the Senator's statement would bear out the point which I made a moment ago, namely, that it is not correct to say that the language applies to any particular person. It applies to regulations under the act, and it might develop that some obligation had been placed upon a person who was not an employer, for example. But it would have to come within the scope of the act. It would be unsound from a legal point of view to guarantee now that there could not be some instance of the application of penalties to employees under regulations not yet issued.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is the Senator of the opinion that the proposed act contains any authority for the War Manpower Commission to make any regulation directed at labor, the violation of which would be subject to penalty?

Mr. BURTON. I do not recognize any such provision in the bill, but the bill is one of those instances in which an effort will be made to enforce something which will call for cooperation. The effect of the bill is to proceed upon the basis which has been developed through the voluntary procedure which spreads from the employee. Therefore, as the theory is carried out, there is nothing to indicate that an obligation would be placed upon the employee except, for example, through the indirect effect upon him if he were put off work because of a ceiling established for his plant and he had to seek work somewhere else.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. For my own personal information, I should like to propound a question. So far I have heard of scarcely a single industrialist, labor leader, or labor organization in my State which has endorsed the pending bill. The fact is that the preponderance of messages which I have received indicate that those sending them are opposed to the bill.

Mr. BURTON. Does that include the substitute or the original bill?

Mr. CAPEHART. It includes the original bill and the substitute. The Senator has made the statement that labor, agriculture, and industry are all in favor of the bill. If it is in order I ask, Who are they? In my State the situation has been directly the reverse.

Mr. BURTON. We discussed that subject yesterday, and I think it would be appropriate now for me to explain why I think the substitute meets the present needs. One of the reasons that I believe so is that it follows the advice of many of those who are especially concerned. To endorse this advice I shall refer briefly to a few quotations appearing in the printed hearings. I refer, for example, to page 174 of the hearings, on which appears a portion of the testimony of Mr. Ira Mosher, president of the National Association of Manufacturers. On page 174 he sets forth his recommendation as follows:

> The four things we recommend are these: The right to establish ceilings on the number of workers that any employer may employ. That covers essential, nonessential, and everything.
>
> That authority should be given to compel employers to release those employees in excess of the number of employed under that ceiling. You get there into the matter of seniority and other things that workers have come to enjoy as their own, and when you compel a man to leave one job for another one we think it can be best handled by pressure on the employer.
>
> We think hiring should be restricted except on referral of workers by the appropriate Government agency, which Government agencies exist today.
>
> We think in order to enforce the regulations, if it becomes necessary that summary proceedings in the courts, much the same as price ceilings are enforced, would solve the problem.
>
> Of course, such a program has to have some national coordination. But it is our belief that responsibility for determining the need for installing the controls, as well as the responsibility for administration, should rest in the local communities in the machinery that does exist there and would exist there if supplemented by this additional authority we do recommend.

Mr. Mosher later handed to the committee a number of telegrams from industrialists throughout the Nation. They are set forth in the hearings from page 198 to 206. I shall quote briefly from three of them. Here is one from the Employers' Association of Portsmouth, Ohio, the first sentence of which is as follows:

> We look upon the May bill as detrimental rather than helpful to the present situation.

Reference there was made to the original bill which had been introduced, and the sender of the telegram was indicating his opposition to the bill.

I refer to a telegram from Sidney E. Cornelius, Manufacturers Association of Hartford County, Connecticut, dated February 3, 1945, as follows:

> Re your wire, still opposed to national service bill. Prefer manpower program with statutory authority and recourse to the courts. Daily load of job seekers at local United States Employment Office rising. State manpower director in newspaper article claims manpower situation not as serious as

before. Need seems to be for certain types specialized workers.

A telegram from M. W. Ford of Hartford, Conn., dated February 3, 1945, reads as follows:

Manpower shortage in Connecticut is local problem and will not be solved by passage May bill or other national legislation. Strengthening of present program would be of assistance. Important war production in Connecticut is not being retarded to any important degree by present situation.

Then I refer to page 311 where Lewis G. Hines, national legislative representative of the American Federation of Labor, testified, as follows:

We contend that the voluntary system of free labor has not failed. We point with pride to the production records of free American workers and American industry. We call attention to the existing machinery set up to handle war manpower problems now functioning in the War Manpower Commission where labor and management committees have done such a splendid job.

The answer to any problem arising out of manpower shortages should not be coercive legislation, scrapping the present machinery and setting up new programs to be administered by Selective Service with punitive penalties. The functions of Selective Service should be confined solely and strictly to supplying our military needs.

That was in opposition to the May bill rather than to the substitute, which had not then been presented to him.

I quote next a statement which does relate directly to the substitute. It is found on page 269 and is a statement of Philip Murray, president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations and United Steel Workers of America, presented to the hearing by Mr. Golden on Mr. Murray's behalf.

The Congress of Industrial Organizations endorses the bill introduced by Senators KILGORE, WAGNER, and others—

That is the substitute—

[amendments in the nature of a substitute for S. 36 were submitted to the Senate by Senators KILGORE, WAGNER, and FERGUSON on the next day after this hearing]—

That is an interlineation inserted in the record—

and urges the Senate Military Affairs Committee to report the bill favorably instead of the May-Bailey bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

Mr. BURTON. I should like to complete this little group of excerpts from the hearings. I find on page 282 the statement of Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, in which he said:

The National Grange, as such, has taken no action on the bill now before this committee. When our annual convention was held in November this proposed legislation had not been introduced.

However, I may say that from the start the Grange has been in favor of the voluntary system of meeting our labor requirements.

It is, of course, perfectly proper to draft men for military services in time of war when the life of the Nation is at stake, but we do not consider it proper to draft men to work in industry for the profit of someone else. We believe such a proposal to be of very doubtful constitutionality. Further than that, we do not believe such a plan would produce the desired results.

And on page 276 James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers' Union, said:

On behalf of the National Farmers Union, I wish to express opposition to the House bill providing limited national service legislation. We believe it not only unnecessary at this time but positively harmful to the best utilization of all available manpower and to the most effective prosecution of the war.

Instead, we recommend a unified and strengthened War Manpower Commission, having responsibility for the best use of all manpower in industry, agriculture, and all civilian services, and with statutory authority to enforce directives issued after consultation with management-labor-agriculture committees.

That is the trend of the testimony plus the fact that when the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] presented the substitute they presented it with the statement that it was the result of understandings reached between industry and labor, and it was presented in that manner.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was a little confused because the mail I have had from Indiana is all against any sort of legislation that has to do with the drafting of labor.

Mr. BURTON. Most of the testimony before the committee, except from our Government officials, would be consistent in general with that view. There is a great deal of opposition to the drafting of labor, but very little opposition to carrying forward the present program and putting the strength of Congress behind it. There are some direct endorsements of that policy by those who are most directly concerned. The issue that comes to the Senate as presented by the War and Navy Departments is this: There is an emergency; there is a need. Shall we draft labor? Shall we do nothing? Or shall we do that which will increase production with the least trouble and delay? We believe the substitute goes down that last middle road.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator's position, I understand, is that the bill strengthens the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. BURTON. Yes; it strengthens the War Manpower Commission. By adding to its powers the 14 points that I will name, I believe it contributes just enough to strengthen the Commission without disorganizing the progress we have made and without placing a draft upon labor.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to ask the Senator a question. There has been this endorsement by labor, management, business, and agriculture. I sat in the committee and heard much of it. Does that endorsement carry clear through to the point of involving and including the penalty clause, or was that endorsement prior to the penalty clause?

Mr. BURTON. That was made clear yesterday, but I am glad the Senator has brought it up again. The penalty clause was not in the substitute bill; it was left out. Paragraph (5) to which I referred a little while ago was omitted from the draft presented by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. That was added by the committee itself on motion of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and is in the bill by committee action. Therefore, I think it is fair to say that the endorsements of the substitute by industry and labor do not carry with them any expression one way or the other on the penalty clause.

Mr. HAWKES. Can the Senator enlighten me on another point? Has he any information to give us as to how industry and labor feel in regard to the penalty clause?

Mr. BURTON. I have not. I would rather leave that to those who first proposed the substitute and probably are more familiar with that situation than am I. But I might say my own conclusion, and I believe that of the committee, is that having imposed an obligation in the bill there should be no objection to attaching to it the normal misdemeanor clause. There are special reasons for putting it in, because, although there are other enforcement provisions in the bill, they do not cover all cases. For example, there is a prohibition against using expenditures made in violation of the provisions of the act as a deduction from the employer's income tax. There is also a provision allowing recourse to the courts. Those are helpful but do not cover all cases. As I said yesterday, I would be for the substitute with or without the penalty clause, but I think that with the penalty clause it provides a more normal recognition of a serious obligation. Therefore I would favor leaving it in.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not object to the penalty clause if it applies fairly to all parties and is not loaded on one group.

Mr. BURTON. It is clear it applies to any person who willfully violates the act whoever he may be.

Mr. HAWKES. If that be true, in the event of a willful violation of the act, if it applies to every party to the program, then I think it is fair and sound.

Now I wish to leave this thought with the Senator from Ohio and the other Senators: I am inclined to favor the substitute over anything that has been offered up to date because it is simply carrying forward a program that has been eminently successful, and it is augmenting that program, and it has the approval of these different groups of our society that are necessary to make the program successful.

Mr. BURTON. And they are the ones who have been having the experience as well as the ones who have got to carry on under the law.

Mr. HAWKES. I want to go further and say that I am in favor of anything that is necessary to win the war and to support the boys who have been taken, as I said yesterday, from all walks of life and sent all over the face of the earth. We should not let them down. I want to be sure that we need this and not anything else, because I am not

in favor of further regimentation of the American people beyond the point that is necessary to win the war. I am inclined to believe, as I stand here today, that the putting of teeth into the power of the War Manpower Commission to regulate employment and to do the things that are necessary to increase essential production is probably the best course to pursue in this very serious situation. I was talking with a very distinguished Britisher the other day, and referred to both the Senate bill and the House bill. He said so far as he could see if we had enacted the House measure a year ago it might have been better than the substitute; but it took England from 7 months to a year to put into force what we would be trying to do in the May-Bailey bill.

I leave the thought with the Senator that time is of the essence in what we are trying to do now. Time is the most important thing. Nothing should interfere with the rendering promptly of the aid which is needed. That is all this means. This legislation should be enacted without delay so that we can go ahead and have the material made so as to supply the boys at the front with the things they must have on time.

I leave with the Senator from Ohio the thought that time is vital, that we are only carrying forward in this substitute the program which has been eminently successful and which will be helped by the aid afforded by the bill reported by the Senate Military Affairs Committee. I personally believe the enactment of the measure will be very helpful in meeting the situation which confronts the Nation as to certain essential and vital war materials.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from New Jersey. If we do nothing, it seems to me we are letting the soldier down, because there are some things which cannot be done voluntarily which are in these 14 points. If we go too far, as I believe the May bill does, we are interfering with what the Senator wants to see done, whereas if we go forward and supplement the law, I feel we are on the right track.

The reasons why I believe this bill provides the necessary program are, first, that it applies the necessary pressure to increase production.

Next, it applies to all labor forces, not merely to the one-third between 18 and 45, but to all labor.

Next, it is suited to the size of the need. The need is for an increase and a reallocation of labor, not a major increase in numbers but an important reallocation. The substitute reaches toward those very points. It assists with the reallocation, and it superimposes on the existing practice some new obligations that will increase the labor available for essential war work.

Next, it is based upon the voluntary system now in use, and does not carry with it the natural reaction that comes from forced action under a draft act. It would not result in litigation, whereas the other, as indicated by some of the communications, might well bring us into litigation on fundamental points.

Finally, as to the morale factor, I believe the passage of this bill will contribute more to the morale of the troops than the passage of the original measure.

Mr. President, that brings me to the list of the 14 points which I believe are important, and which show exactly what this bill does. As an introduction to the 14 points, I refer to page 12 of the bill before us, in section 1 (b), because there are listed 5 summarized purposes of the bill under which the main points can readily be grouped:

(b) The purposes of this act are to provide the most practicable and effective means to accomplish the fulfillment of such obligation—

That is, the obligation to work—

and to provide for making the most effective use of the manpower resources of the Nation by the following means, among others: (1) By providing for the accurate determination of manpower requirements and supply, and of the relative urgency of the needs of employers for workers.

I may point out that without the act we would have been unable to do that.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to suggest a point right there. I have had a long life in business, and I have never seen any efficient management in business which took a concern that was run very well and changed the whole system all at once. I have seen men sit down together, when things were not being done well enough, and study how to improve the situation without disturbing and disrupting the whole organization and the whole operation. I think that is the strongest point in connection with the substitute bill; it extends the power of the present system of operations.

Mr. BURTON. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. HAWKES. The substitute amendment is just augmenting, improving, and strengthening the bill, so that it will be more effective in handling the situation without loss of time. If the Senator will pardon me, I wanted to bring that point out at this juncture in his argument.

Mr. BURTON. I welcome the interruption, because it emphasizes the policy of strengthening and improving in those places where experience indicates what is needed.

Mr. HAWKES. Also it will help keep the hearts and minds of men and women on their jobs, and will put a little more pressure on them to do a better job. I thank the Senator very much for yielding.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his contribution.

The second point is:

By reducing wasteful labor turn-over and unnecessary labor migration.

That is carried out by the certificates of availability, to which I have referred:

(3) By channeling available manpower to employments in which workers will contribute most to the war effort.

That is provided for through the special provisions on channeling and directing labor.

(4) By making available, for work in essential activities, workers presently employed in activities of relative unimportance to the war effort.

That is provided for by provisions relating to ceilings.

(5) By promoting the maximum utilization by employers of their available work force.

That is especially emphasized by provisions for management-labor committees

Now, as to the 14 points:

The first point is not one that appears in any particular section. The first point is that the substitute gives congressional sanction to the declaration that there is need for all available people to go into essential industry at this time. All of us know that there is a natural disinclination on the part of individuals to give up whatever they are doing even to go into an essential industry. It is an inconvenience for them, let us say, and they will not do it unless they recognize there is a real need for it.

Not long ago I was in Ohio, and there was discussion there of the bill we are considering. I was told that just the discussion had already resulted in a number of young people leaving what they were doing and going into essential industries, because they recognized from the discussion that there was a real need. I think that is an important phase, the congressional sanction given to the need which has been explained to us by the war agencies of our Government.

The second point relates to management and labor conditions. This is covered on page 13, in section 2 (b). Here I wish to emphasize what I believe is an important point in our whole consideration of the progress we have made. As I stated yesterday, from the beginning of the war the Nation would have benefited tremendously by the appointment of an advisory board composed of people who had drawn experience directly from management, labor, agriculture, and public service. Placed together on an advisory board they could turn their attention as a unit upon the problems of the Nation. That came about for the first time when there was appointed, under the War Mobilization Act, a national advisory board.

Testimony was given before our committee to the effect that the management-labor policy committees, which had been appointed under the voluntary system, had brought about such a meeting between management and labor that it had proven invaluable in meeting many problems. Some of the witnesses pointed out that the experience and the community of interest that came from the national committees and local committees was of permanent benefit to our Nation. Therefore we find in section 2 (b) this paragraph which has not been the law, but would now give official recognition to these committees:

(b) The Chairman shall provide for the establishment of a national management-labor

policy committee, regional management-labor committees, and State or local management-labor committees consisting in each case of representatives of labor, industrial management, and, where appropriate, agriculture, the members of which shall be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923. These committees shall be consulted on basic policy decisions made at their respective administrative levels in the course of the administration of the functions vested in the Chairman by this act.

The third point deals with the coordination of labor and service through the War Manpower Commission and the War Mobilization and Reconversion Office. We find that on page 14, in section 3 (a). It is clear from the testimony that some of the troubles which have resulted in the past were due to lack of coordination. That is to say, a contract would be let to one plant, and then when that plant, we will say, had shut down a little later, and the men went to another plant, it would get another contract, whereas if it had been notified and there had been coordination, there would not have been that disruption of industry. This paragraph contains these important provisions not now existing:

SEC. 3 (a) The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall, subject to the direction of the President, provide for coordinating the activities of all departments and agencies of the Government responsible for production, procurement, or manpower in such manner as to carry out most effectively the purposes declared in the first section of this act.

Then this provision:

The Director shall provide, among other things that manpower requirements and the availability of manpower shall be given due consideration in determining where production schedules shall be increased or decreased and where contracts shall be awarded, terminated, or permitted to expire—

And then there is this new practical provision not existing before in the law—

and that notice shall be given to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission at the earliest practicable time of all changes or anticipated changes in war-production schedules, all awards or anticipated awards of war contracts, and all terminations or anticipated terminations of war contracts, which are likely to result in any substantial increase or decrease of the manpower requirements of any employer or any area. All departments and agencies of the Government shall comply with orders and regulations issued by the Director under authority of this section.

Mr. President, that paragraph alone, carried out in accordance with its purpose, may well eliminate many of the cases that have been coming to the attention of committees of Congress. This provides coordination and for notice among the governmental agencies and among the different producing departments and plants of the Government.

The fourth point. It provides for surveys in the plants that are run by the Government itself. That provision is on page 14, section 3 (b). I may point out that examinations made by committees of Congress, especially the Mead committee, have emphasized the fact that there has been a tremendous wastage and hoarding of labor in governmental departments. The War Manpower Commission has not had the authority and has not been permitted to make surveys within those plants to see where there was hoarding within the Government itself. This provision gives that power, and places that responsibility upon the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

Section 3 (b) reads as follows:

(b) The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall make or cause to be made in-plant surveys and other investigations of the use of manpower by the War Department and the Navy Department, to determine the extent to which such Departments are making the most effective use, in activities relating to production, procurement, or repairs, of individuals in their employ or subject to their jurisdiction as members of the armed forces, and shall take or cause to be taken, appropriate measures to eliminate labor wastage and labor hoarding, and otherwise to promote the full utilization by such departments of individuals in their employ or subject to their jurisdiction as members of the armed forces, and otherwise to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. President, that is a provision which does not need enforcement by penalty; it simply calls upon a public officer to do the things that he has not been able to do before, that is to make surveys of Government plants. The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, where he finds hoarding and excess labor in the plants of the United States, can himself take or cause to be taken appropriate measures to eliminate labor wastage and labor hoarding in such places. That is the type of contribution which the act makes which is needed in order to give a fair deal to industry and to labor and to the armed forces, by increasing our production.

The fifth point. This applies to similar surveys in plants other than governmental plants. This provision is found on page 15, in section 4 (a). There it is provided that—

The Chairman shall provide for such in-plant surveys and other investigations of activities and places of employment, as may be necessary to determine the extent to which such activities or places of employment are making the most effective use of individuals in their employ, to the end that appropriate measures may be taken to eliminate labor wastage and labor hoarding, to promote full utilization for purposes essential to the war effort, by employers of their available work force, and otherwise to promote the purposes of this act.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Under that provision is it the Senator's judgment that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission can make rules and regulations applicable both to the employer and the employee? I have in mind the colloquy which took place between the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Ohio. It is that which prompts my question.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to read that clause again in the light of the Senator's question:

The Chairman shall provide for such in-plant surveys and other investigations of activities and places of employment, as may be necessary to determine the extent to which such activities or places of employment are making the most effective use of individuals in their employ, to the end that appropriate measures may be taken to eliminate labor wastage and labor hoarding, to promote full utilization for purposes essential to the war effort, by employers of their available work force.

That would be open to the interpretation, I would think, that among the rules and regulations which he could make would be those which would call upon these plants to make efficient use of their labor, and they as employers would have to carry out such regulations.

Mr. MURDOCK. And if the Senator is correct in his construction of that provision, he could also, could he not, make such regulations apply to the employee to the end that he must cooperate in whatever may be the best means of doing that?

Mr. BURTON. It is intended, of course, primarily that measures be taken by the employer, and whether or not the regulations would be such that not only the employer should take these measures but the employee shall obey these regulations, I am not perfectly clear, but I can see the possibility of such jurisdiction.

Mr. MURDOCK. I was going back to the discussion of the penalty features.

Mr. BURTON. I understand.

Mr. MURDOCK. If that could be done and the regulations made applicable to both employer and employee, and then there was a failure on the part of either, then the penalty certainly would apply to both the employer and the employee.

Mr. BURTON. In any event there has to be a willful failure under the clause. But the whole act, to my mind, is appropriately to be read in connection with the first paragraph which says:

That every individual is obligated to serve the Nation in that capacity for which he or she is best qualified, and to continue in such capacity so long as his or her services are required, to the end that the Nation may make the most effective use of its manpower resources in support of the war effort.

That is an express declaration of the obligation of the individual.

I turn now to the sixth point. This is the one that relates to ceilings, and is found on pages 15 and 16, section 4 (b) (1). Let me point out, first, that this provision for ceilings is to be applied where it is necessary. This is not a blanket provision. This does not automatically put ceilings on throughout the Nation. This applies, according to the whole theory of the act, that where there is need for ceilings it provides authority to place ceilings there. Where there is no shortage of labor or excess labor, the people would not feel any difference whether the provision were in the law or not.

The provision in section 4 (b) (1) is as follows:

(b) To the extent necessary to carry out the purposes and means declared in the first section of this act and also for the purpose of keeping activities and places of employment essential to the war effort in productive operation, the Chairman is authorized and directed, by regulation (1) to prescribe employment ceilings in designated areas, activities, or places of employment fixing the maximum number of workers, by age, sex, or occupational qualifications, who may be there

employed and prohibiting the employment of workers beyond such maximum number.

That gives statutory authority to the ceiling program that has been put into effect thus far on a purely voluntary basis. I am sure that there are instances throughout the United States where the addition of this authority to impose ceilings will make the difference between excess labor and the absence of excess labor in the plants. It is often the border-line plant that hangs on until there is a legal obligation imposed to make the change. It is that accumulation of individuals in border-line plants that may make the difference we seek to make.

The seventh point relates to the certificate of availability and the regulations with respect to hiring, rehiring, solicitation, or recruitment of new workers. I refer to page 16, section 4 (b) (2). This gives the Chairman the right "to prohibit or regulate the hiring, rehiring, solicitation, or recruitment of new workers by employers. No employer shall hire or retain in his employ any individual in violation of such regulations."

The eighth point relates to the channelization, that is, the direction of the worker to the place where he would most help the Government. This includes the priority referral system. I would refer, therefore, to section 4 (b) (2) again, which gives general authority over that, and I also would refer to section 2 (c).

Section 2 (c) is also a recognition of channels of employment. It provides as follows:

(c) To the maximum degree consistent with this act and with its purposes, local initiative and cooperative efforts of management, labor, and agriculture shall be encouraged and utilized, and use shall be made of existing hiring channels such as private employers, labor organizations, professional organizations, schools, colleges, technical institutions, and Government agencies.

The ninth point is a new point. It deals with assistance in enabling labor to meet the demand put upon it. This part of the bill provides for transportation to and from the assignments made in this emergency. It is found on page 16, in section 4 (c). This section is carefully safeguarded. A reading of it will show the care with which this substitute bill has been prepared:

(c) In the case of any individual who, in response to the request of the Chairman, agrees to accept employment outside the locality where he is then residing, the Chairman, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, may furnish transportation to the location of such employment, and, if such individual complies thereafter with the requests and requirements made under this act with respect to his accepting and continuing in any employment or employments in the same locality until the Chairman determines that he is no longer needed in such locality for work essential to the war effort, may furnish transportation back to the locality from which transportation was originally furnished for such individual under this subsection, or to any other locality selected by the individual which is not farther distant. The cost of such transportation shall not exceed the amounts allowable for individual civilian employees in the executive branch of the Government and shall not include any per diem allowance. The Chairman shall exercise the authority conferred by this subsection only to the extent that he deems the exercise thereof necessary to aid in relieving manpower shortages which substantially impede the war effort.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. If a man who is moved from one locality to another does not stay on the job where he is requested to work by the War Manpower Commission, he is in a measure penalized by not being given a ticket back home. Is not that correct?

Mr. BURTON. That is correct. The ticket back home is for those who comply with the law.

Mr. GURNEY. As I see it, under the terms of the bill, he is one man against whom some sort of a penalty is imposed.

Mr. BURTON. I should say he would lose a bonus rather than suffer a penalty.

The tenth point relates to reemployment. This provision is roughly similar in its intent, but not entirely identical with the provision for men who are drafted into the military service, and who will come back and seek their original employment after having been taken from it. This provision is found on pages 17 and 18, in section 6 (a). First of all, it provides for a certificate to be issued, which will be helpful in the administration of the act. Beginning on page 18, line 6, the language is then as follows:

Any person to whom such a certificate is issued under this subsection shall be entitled to the benefits of section 8 (b) (except the last paragraph thereof and except that in lieu of the 90-day period therein specified, the time within which application for reemployment in his former position must be made shall be 30 days), 8 (c), and 8 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to the same extent as if he had left such position in order to be and had been inducted into the land or naval forces for training and service, had been relieved therefrom on the day on which such certificate is issued to him, and had been given the certificate referred to in section 8 (a) of such act.

There is a provisio which puts him back in precisely the same position in which he was when he left. He does not get an added guaranty of a year's employment upon his return:

Provided, That this section shall not be construed to confer greater employment rights than the individual would have had if he had remained employed in such position during the period of the employment or employments accepted by him upon the request of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

The eleventh point has to do with one of the enforcement provisions, unique in this bill, I believe, although not entirely unique in its conception. It is found on page 20, in section 8, which provides that if an employer shall violate the act by employing men above the ceiling, for example, he shall then not be allowed to count his expenditures in such employment as a deduction from income, or as a cost or expense for the purpose of computing the tax payable under any act of Congress, or for the purpose of determining the amount to be paid or recovered from any person with respect to the performance of any contract with the United States.

Mr. President, I believe that is an important provision. It is an automatic provision. It provides that the employer who violates the act penalizes himself on his income-tax return or on his contract. It may not cover every possible case, because some contractors might be working at a loss, and have no income tax to pay. Others might not be working on a Government contract at all. But so far as it does apply, it is an effective measure for carrying out the whole principle of the act.

The twelfth point which I make relates to the right to enforce the law by resort to the courts. This provision is found on page 19, in section 7. This is included in the material to which I recently referred in a colloquy. The provision is as follows:

SEC. 7. Paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), as amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, shall be applicable with respect to this act to the same extent as such paragraphs are applicable with respect to such subsection (a), except that, for the purposes of this act, the word "President", wherever it occurs in such paragraphs, shall be deemed to refer to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

What I wish to emphasize is that the application of this court procedure is not something extraordinary. It is quite ordinary. It merely makes available under the provisions of the proposed act precisely the same procedure which is available under the Second War Powers Act. I know of no opposition which has been expressed to permitting the courts to be used for this purpose, either by injunction or otherwise, as expressly referred to in paragraph 6 of the Second War Powers Act.

The thirteenth point to which I refer relates to willful violations of the act. That point was discussed sometime ago between the Senator from Michigan and myself. It applies to the ordinary penalties applicable under the Second War Powers Act. It includes paragraph (5), along with the rest of them. To my mind, it is a perfectly reasonable addition to any act to say that we mean what we say when we enact the law—in other words, that anyone willfully violating the law commits a misdemeanor.

The fourteenth point relates to the tightening of the Tydings amendment. I shall not take the time of the Senate to comment on that subject at length, because I am sure it will be discussed at length by other Senators. The provision appears in section 11 of the substitute. It is an amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act. Therefore naturally the penalty for violation of it is the penalty which flows from a violation of that act. Violation of the Selective Training and Service Act is a felony. Therefore the penalty is heavier than for violation of other provisions of the bill which do not come under the Selective Training and Service Act.

Mr. President, I believe that in these 14 points of the substitute we have made an intelligent survey of the needs of our

time. The substitute would help, and not hinder the increased production so urgently called for by the War and Navy Departments. I believe that the substitute proceeds along the middle ground. It is neither two drastic nor too lenient. I believe that it is the answer which we should give promptly to the demand that the Congress and the people at home do their full share toward winning this war, which shall and must be won.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As I understand the Senator's position, he favors the approach of the substitute because in his mind it provides a better utilization of labor than would be possible by merely drafting labor and piling it up where there is a bad utilization.

Mr. BURTON. It provides a better utilization, and does it without upsetting the present system and running the danger of interfering with production, as I am afraid the other method would do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. And if a better utilization of labor is not had, merely the piling up of additional labor through a draft will not cure anything, but will aggravate an already badly aggravated situation; is not that true?

Mr. BURTON. I think that is clear, on the ground that there is not an overall shortage of labor in the Nation, but there is a spotty shortage, and therefore what is required is better distribution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. I am much impressed by the Senator's argument on that point.

In that connection I should like to read into the RECORD a personal letter I received today from a worker in a war-production plant. It seems to me that his letter gives some of the details of the evils we are trying to correct. It points out some of the bad things we are trying to correct, and which must be cured before we shall ever have in this country a program which will result in increased production. I thank the Senator for yielding to me, and now I desire to read the letter into the RECORD at this point. The letter is addressed to me; it comes to me from a personal friend. He writes the following:

Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Military Affairs Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After reading accounts pro and con before your committee, re the "work or else" bill, I decided to describe conditions as I saw them inside war plants during the past 3 years. Usually there were at least three employees for each job, and not once during that time did I see an employee do 4 hours' work in a single day.

I must have hit the jackpot for loafing, however, when I came to the Rheems Manufacturing Co.'s shipyard at Providence, R. I., in December 1942. Every ne'er-do-well and racketeer in Providence and adjacent communities had congregated here, not to work, but to evade the draft and get paid for doing so. Bookmakers and canvassers for the numbers racket were busy throughout the yard, but production was almost at a standstill.

Early in 1943 Rheems got out under fire and the yard was taken over by Walsh-Kaiser Co., but no effort was made to increase production. Here a Liberty ship at $8,000,000 set an all-time record for cost per ton for any type of ship.

It was quite evident that a minimum of production with the greatest possible number of employees was the object of this yard; at least 20 percent of the employees never did any work except to act as union stewards and organizers when they were not gambling or bookmaking, and many of them were paid above the basic rate, and production, by men who were willing to work, was retarded by duds in the capacity of foremen, who insisted on achieving results by a roundabout way, due in some instances to incompetence. Among the foremen in the shipfitting department were a W. P. A. artist, a band leader, a gas-station attendant, and a furniture salesman. Most of the work was done at least twice.

During the 2 years I spent in the yard I consistently worked 6 days a week but could have accomplished more by working 1 day each week if no obstacles were put in my way.

Although the yard employs an average of 20,000, the work could be done by a third of that number.

It is impossible for me to say who is responsible for the poor production record of this yard, but labor racketeers, management, the personnel of Government agencies, and outside influences seem to have a hand in the matter.

During a change-over from Liberty ships to corvettes early in 1943, more than 1,000 men were laid off, and amongst them were the most experienced men in the yard. At the same time green men were being hired and sent to training schools in the yard.

Cost-plus contracts are wasteful of manpower and the taxpayers' money, and have created a racket in war production.

Yours truly.

That description may be somewhat exaggerated, and probably it is not typical of all the shipyards. But at least it is one honest man's view, and I know him to be an honest man.

Mr. BURTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BAILEY obtained the floor.

Mr. OVERTON and Mr. THOMAS of Utah addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hart	Overton
Ball	Hatch	Pepper
Bankhead	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hayden	Reed
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Brewster	Hill	Robertson
Bridges	Hoey	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Saltonstall
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Butler	Kilgore	Stewart
Byrd	La Follette	Taft
Capehart	Langer	Taylor
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McMahon	Tobey
Donnell	Magnuson	Tunnell
Downey	Maybank	Vandenberg
Eastland	Mead	Wagner
Ellender	Millikin	Walsh
Ferguson	Moore	Wheeler
Fulbright	Morse	Wherry
George	Murdock	White
Gerry	Murray	Wiley
Green	Myers	Willis
Guffey	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] has the floor.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion which has taken place with regard to the committee substitute. I think that the Senators who have spoken in favor of it have explained it in a most thorough-going manner. I congratulate them. But so far I have not heard any Senator contend or even suggest that the committee substitute remotely, directly, indirectly, or in any degree whatsoever meets the situation which is presented by the facts and circumstances as given to us by the leaders of the armed forces, the responsible leaders upon whom we must rely.

I have heard nothing from any source which would tend to comfort my mind in any way whatever with respect to the great demands which are being made upon our armed forces and their leaders as we now move in what we very fondly hope to be a final and supreme effort of the great struggle taking place in Europe. Senators who advocate the amendment, and certainly those who will vote for it should feel satisfied before voting for it, that it meets the demands of the critical and inestimable important situation existing with regard to the great war to which our country is committed.

What do Senators say, Mr. President? They say that the proposed legislation will bring about a unity between industry and labor. So what? We are not legislating for industry and labor. We are legislating for our country. Doubtless no legislation right now would satisfy industry and labor. I have not heard of either of them demanding any affirmative action of any kind. But what about the demands which have been presented by the Secretary of War? What about the facts which have been laid before us by the Secretary of the Navy? Are we politicians, we statesmen, if you choose, we civilians, to assume the responsibility? Can we assume the responsibility, or are we to shift it to the president of the United States Chamber of Commerce? Can we give the responsibility to Hon. John L. Lewis? Can we give it to Hon. Philip Murray, or to Hon. William Green? Shall we be satisfied, Mr. President, that the proposed legislation is acquiesced in by the Chamber of Commerce and the great labor leaders, but that it is not supported, it is not recommended, and it is not being asked for by the responsible leaders of the armed forces, to whom our men are looking, to whom our country is looking, to whom the whole world is looking, and to whom you and I must look.

I have heard no one say that this proposed legislation meets the demand of the Chief of Staff; I have heard no one say that it meets the recommendation of the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief; I have heard no one say that this proposed legislation meets the demands of the Navy. The plea is that it is a rather pleasing thing to the capitalists and to the workers. Well, the boys over yonder who are fight-

ing are fighting for us all. I would rather please them than all the capitalists who ever will live or ever have lived. I would rather please them; I would rather do my duty by them than to please all the labor leaders and all the capitalists who ever will live or ever have lived or ever can live; and I feel I have a responsibility, which I do not think I can transfer. If we make a mistake here in our more or less commendable effort to appease capital and labor, if we succeed simply in appeasing them and fail to supply the fighting men with the arms by means of which they defend us, there will be very little for us to comfort ourselves about; there will be no answer we can give to them when those who return come marching home.

What is the situation? Of course, I am not going to undertake to describe it; but the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy in the report before the Senate tell us in plain language that we will need 900,000 more fighting men in the first 6 months of this year. We may need more, because we do not know how many will be wounded or how many will die between now and the 1st of July. But, taking their word for it, 900,000 fighting men are needed now and 700,000 more workingmen are needed now to supply the fighting men with arms, with ammunition, with ships, and tanks and food. It is no time, so far as I am concerned, to appease anybody. The time has come when we must look a tremendous situation in the face and grapple with it as it is and relieve it according to the power and responsibility that rest upon us.

Mr. President, I have said some things about the bill. My distinguished and honored friend from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] spoke of it yesterday as the "so-called work-and-fight bill." I think he is a very accurate gentleman. He put in the word "so-called." There is no work in the bill; there is no fight in the bill; there is a good deal of idleness in the bill, specifically provided—to lay workers off and let them starve or go fishing. I fear that is the idea more generally here than could be desired. It is worse than plowing under the wheat and it is worse than plowing up the cotton after it was 6 inches high. The bill is going to throw them out of work, and say "We will not let you work anywhere; you can loaf the remainder of the year." There is no fight in that; there is no work in that; there is not a line in this bill that puts anybody into a battle line or back of a fighting man.

There is not a line in this bill that puts a gun in anybody's hands. I think it is the watch-and-wait bill or the wait-and-see bill.

We did have a work-or-fight bill. It came to the Senate from the House of Representatives and everybody who read it knew that if that bill should be passed, men in America who could work would either work or fight and everybody in America knew that if that bill should pass it would meet the demands presented to us by the responsible leaders of the armed forces.

I made about the bill some severe statements which I am going to justify. I have it here before me. It starts out fine:

> That (a) every individual is obligated to serve the Nation in that capacity for which he or she is best qualified, and to continue in such capacity so long as his or her services are required, to the end that the Nation may make the most effective use of its manpower resources in support of the war effort.

That is the only part of the bill that I am for. It states a great principle of national life derived from the Constitution and from the history of men. Now let us see how it proceeds. The next paragraph tells what the purposes of the proposed act are. Purposes are one thing and provisions are another. The way to hell itself is paved with good intentions, with high purposes. I will not read about the purposes I will merely say that the purposes are rather plausible. Now let us see how the purposes are to be carried out:

> The Chairman—

That is the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission—

> shall provide for the establishment of a national management-labor policy committee—

It is all going to be referred to a committee. Well, Mr. President, you know what they said about Noah's Ark, that it would never have been built if Noah had referred it to a committee—

> regional management-labor committees, and State or local management-labor committees consisting in each case of representatives of labor, industrial management, and, where appropriate, agriculture, the members of which shall be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923.

Very well. The Senate gets the idea there. The First Army and the Ninth Army are marching today on Cologne and we are appointing committees. Tell that to them if you want to. "Oh, we are doing a great job for you. You fight and die, and we appoint a whole lot of committees over here. We are going to do something. We know you need arms, we know you need tanks, we know you need guns, we know you need reinforcements and reserves, we know you need nurses, we know you need ships; we know you are on the battle line, and are in the very midst, in the vortex of the crisis, and we appoint about 600 or 700 committees!" That is no way to meet the situation like our present one.

Listen to this:

> To the maximum degree consistent with this act and with its purposes, local initiative and cooperative efforts of management, lab.r, and agriculture shall be encouraged and utilized.

Do Senators get the idea? We are going out to encourage local initiative, to get up a big ballyhoo.

Oh, my soul, Mr. President. Three and a half million of our sons are in battle, on the battle line. They are dying on Iwo. Three-fourths of the line in Europe is our line, and we are told that our men must shortly have arms, they must shortly have ammunition, they must shortly have guns and tanks and ships.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. Let me finish my sentence. We are going forth panoplied in the might of our great Nation, waving the American flag over our heads, and encouraging initiative. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not true, also, that three-fourths of the line in Europe is held by the sons of men we are seeking to draft?

Mr. BAILEY. I have no question about that.

Mr. KILGORE. It is not just our sons, the sons of Senators; it is the sons of the men we are seeking to draft.

Mr. BAILEY. I am not trying to drive anyone. I am rather sorry that is brought up, that we are trying to drive somebody, or some class. The sons were drafted. Now, why can we not draft the fathers?

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. Let me finish this thought and I will yield. I wish to get the point over. I understood the Senator from West Virginia to say we are driving. We have taken 10,500,000 men by the power of the draft, and we did not ask them whether they should go or not. We did not ask them where they should go and we did not let them say when they would fight or when they would be wounded or when they would die. But we cannot draft their daddies. Hear me, my friends, hear me. The daddies of America will be glad to help those sons, and they will be glad to join with us in drafting themselves and their fellow men to save those sons. I have no question about that.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. BAILEY. I promised to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. KILGORE. We told them who their employer would be, and for whose profit they would work, did we not?

Mr. BAILEY. I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. KILGORE. We did tell those sons the name of their employer, and for whose profit they would work, did we not?

Mr. BAILEY. Oh, yes; they are working for the United States. I wish to ask my friend when did we get to the doctrine that the men who manufacture the munitions are not working for the United States? They are not working as gloriously as the boys who die on the battlefield do. "When shall their glory fade—or our debt?"—might be said of our fighting men. But we have taught the American people—the Congress, and all the newspapers, and everybody else in the United States—that the war effort on the farm, in the factory, in the home, by the fireside, is war effort for the United States. We told the boys as we sent them forth that we would stand by them to the last dollar and the last ounce of our power. I do not understand the Senator. He thinks that because someone works over here building a ship he is not in the war effort. That is a new doctrine to me.

I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. In criticizing the bill pending before the Senate, the Senator is referring to the May bill, which passed the House and came to our committee.

Mr. BAILEY. I was trying to get to that. I was dealing with the inadequacy of the pending bill—the substitute for the May bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that that bill referred only to males between the ages of 18 and 45 to be drafted for war work?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that the Selective Service have drafted only those between 18 and 45 for military service?

Mr. BAILEY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. What is fair for one is certainly fair for the other.

Mr. BAILEY. I thought I understood that. Those who complain—with all due respect and a great deal of courtesy—that we did not draft everybody, men, women, and children, were just engaging in a little criticism. They do not want us to do that. If they do, let them offer an amendment to draft everyone up to 75 years of age, and I will go with them, just as far as they will carry me. I will vote for it. But, of course, I know that would defeat the bill, and I would not say that was the motive of any Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The bill for which I voted in the committee—that is, when the vote was 12 to 6, and I was on the 6 end—was the bill which came over from the House, with the amendments proposed by Government officials, the Army and the Navy. It is known as the Bailey-Brewster bill. As I understand, that bill included only the drafting of those between 18 and 45, who are in nonessential, nonproductive work at this time, while others of the same age, as the Senator so ably stated, are on the battle fronts of the world. Am I correct?

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator is correct. And I should like to say to the Senator, in that connection, that the age limitation was fixed to correspond with the age limitation in the selective service. But if I can get the vote of any Senator for something that is positive in this situation, by changing the age from 18 to 95, I will put it in. I am not worrying about that.

Mr. KILGORE. Would the Senator also add to that the drafting of capital and war plants? If the Senator would do that, I would join him in such a bill.

Mr. BAILEY. I am working for that now. I do not know whether the Senator was in the Senate at the time or not, but the Senator from Georgia and I had a discussion, I think in 1940 or 1941, in the spring, before Pearl Harbor, and I laid down the proposition then, and I have never varied from it, that if we got into this war we would have to match the total power of our enemies with total effort here. I do not care what it takes, I will go the limit, and I recall that, in speaking for lease-lend here, when I stated that war might follow, I said that if war should come we would fight to the last man or to the last dollar; and that took in all the men and all the capital in the country. So I am not getting religion just recently; I have had it all the time.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I shall yield to the Senator, but I did not want to speak at any length. I wanted to take my seat within 50 or 60 minutes. I never like to say I will not yield to any Senator, but I am going to ask Senators who are moved to interrupt me to sort of reconsider. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Did it not appear in the RECORD in connection with the question raised by the Senator from West Virginia as to drafting capital that under the provisions developed under the direction of the Senator from Georgia and the Finance Committee, 95 percent of excess profits are now taken in taxes, and that, in addition to that, this administration, under the provisions of renegotiation, has absolute power to take the last 5 percent and the shirt along with it? So that if there is any failure in allowing excessive profits to escape taxation, it does not rest as a responsibility upon the Congress. Certainly we have done all we could be expected to do.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; and I voted for all those measures, renegotiation, and the excess-profits tax. I get the idea that there is some suggestion here that we spare capital. God forbid. The idea of us sparing capital when our sons are in battle. The thought is abhorrent.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, one other thought. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] yesterday asserted that the age group between 18 to 45 was not adequate because it would take only one-third of the labor supply. Do not the figures show that there is an ample supply of men available within that group to supply the requirements which the Senator has outlined?

Mr. BAILEY. That is the evidence.

Mr. BREWSTER. Whether or not it is adequate to draw on a group which is sufficient and eligible like their companions of the same age who have been taken, or to go through the motions of drawing on a much larger group with practically no enforcable obligations upon those men to serve.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; but if we should need them we will take them in.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, not to comment upon what has just been said but to speak of something that preceded?

Mr. BAILEY. I am trying to make an explanation of the bill, and if I am asked to yield to debates between other Senators, I may not be able to do so.

Mr. KILGORE. I would simply say that when the proposal was made for placing a $25,000-a-year salary ceiling the reaction in the Congress of the United States was most unfavorable.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the Senator from West Virginia. We practically did that in the revenue act.

I was going on to explain the bill, which has been explained so many times. I had gotten to this maximum-degree-consistent clause. That is where we are going to get for ourselves some local initiative and cooperation. This is section 3 (a).

> The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall, subject to the direction of the President, provide for coordinating the activities—

Well, see what we have previously in the bill. There was initiating and cooperating. And further along we obligate. And over here we have the provision for committees. And now we have got down to section 3, and we are going to coordinate.

Mr. President, we propose to win this war with big words. [Laughter.] Now, what a figure we cut for ourselves. What a picture we paint of ourselves—with the manpower shortage, and the armed forces in the crisis conducting themselves like the heroes they are. I do not want to make any appeal to anyone's emotion, but paint the picture for yourselves. Paint the picture of the men in the air. One of them came back the other day to my office. He was a Virginia boy. I had employed him as a stenographer before the war. He was a little fellow. He did his work and before the call came he went. He came back and came to my office the other day. He had gone on 33 missions over Germany in a bomber. He looked like the man that he was, and worthy of the gentlemen of the valley—

> The knightliest of a knightly race which from the days of old,
> Have kept the light of chivalry aflame in hearts of gold.

We talked. I said, "You have performed your mission. It is wonderful. It is great to see you back. I hope you can stay." "Oh," he said, "no. I have applied to be sent to bomb Japan."

Are we going to coordinate for him? Are we going to get up some initiative for him? Are we going to appease capital for him—and John Lewis, who is about to bring a strike down on us?

Now I come to subsection (b) of section 3:

> The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall make or cause to be made in-plant surveys and other investigations.

That is Mr. McNutt; he is going to make in-plant surveys. I have heard of all sorts of surveys, but this is the first I have heard of an in-plant survey. I think I know what it means. The last time I heard of Mr. McNutt, however, was over in Europe. I suppose he was making an out-plant survey over there. I do not know. He presented a very inspiring spectacle, I would think. He is a very handsome gentleman. I reckoned it did those boys good to take a look at him and then go into battle—not to return. But he is going to make in-plant surveys for us.

Then follows the language:

> Other investigation of the use of manpower by the War Department—

The idea is that there is something short there. The language continues:

> and the Navy Department, to determine the extent to which such Departments are making the most effective use—

They are going to check them up while the boys die. How long do Senators reckon that will take? We will have the war with Japan won before they get

through with the in-plant surveys and reach a conclusion as to what the War Department has been doing.

The War Department and the Navy Department are telling us they need 900,000 servicemen and 700,000 workers. In order to find out whether they are telling the truth or not we are going to send the Honorable Paul McNutt down to make an in-plant survey. Senators can do that if they want to, but I am not going to vote for it. I would be ashamed to answer the men on the battle fronts with any such conduct.

The Army and the Navy tell us they need 700,000 men. Very well, here is the answer: "We will send down Mr. McNutt and he will make in-plant surveys and tell us whether you are telling the truth or not," I suppose.

Further the bill provides in section 4 (a):

Except as to the cases covered by subsection (b) of section 3, the Chairman shall provide for such in-plant surveys and other investigations of activities of places of employment as may be necessary to determine the extent to which such activities or places of employment are making the most effective use of individuals.

So they are going all around looking after effective uses.

Further on—

To the extent necessary to carry out the purposes and means declared in the first section and also for the purpose of keeping activities and places of employment essential to the war effort in productive operation, the Chairman is authorized and directed—

To make regulations. Coordinate. Cooperate. Activate. Survey. And regulate. Well, that is a terrible army we are bringing up. That is throwing the reserves in. That is beating Hitler and whoever the Japs may have for leader—I do not know—the Emperor, I presume. That is the size of it, Senators.

This is the "wait and see" bill. The "wait and see and survey and investigate and regulate" bill.

Then subsection (b):

In the case of any individual who, in response to the request of the Chairman, agrees to accept employment outside the locality where he is then residing the Chairman, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, may furnish transportation.

So we activate, cooperate, "surveyate," coordinate, and transport——

Mr. BARKLEY. And "transportate."

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; and "transportate." It is a great bill. It furnishes a tremendous solution. That is an answer to the War Department. That will put the fear of God in Hitler's heart. Mr. McNutt is going to regulate and "transportate."

The Chairman shall provide for the issuance of a certificate—

So he will "certificate" also.

No wage or other compensation paid for services rendered in any employment * * * shall be allowed or allowable as a deduction from income.

I have no objection to that, but it seems to me to be squinting in the direction of a revenue measure initiated by the Senate. The House may have a little quarrel over that, but if the House does not quarrel about it, it is all right with me.

The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall submit reports to the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives on the 1st days of January—

January is past. That provision will not apply until next January.

April—

I suppose that means this year, if possible; but he could not do all those things in that time to save his soul. He is a mighty man, but he cannot do all those things by the 1st of April.

July, and October—

I hope and pray to God that most of the war will be over by July. I do not know.

That is the bill. It is said that there is no compulsion in it. If a worker is held to be necessary and indispensable, and is told where to work, and is given transportation, if he does not go, but chooses to stay at home, he must stay there and do nothing. That is terrible punishment, is it not? He can get a fishing line, rod, and reel, and a bait bucket and go down to the Potomac to catch catfish. Is not that a picture to paint of this situation? Is not that something for us as Senators to contemplate?

Who sent the boys abroad? You and I. Who put the military command over them? You and I. Who gave them assurances that we would stand by them? You and I. Who is responsible? You and I. We are going to turn loose everyone who works where he is not needed in the war effort, and let him fish while these men die. I do not know anything about morale. It is what Mr. Winston Churchill, in a speech the other day, called an imponderable. It seems to me that if anything would break down the morale of an American soldier, the program which I have outlined would break it down. But I am not saying that it would, because I do not think it would. Mr. President, I do not believe that all the powers can whip them or break down their morale. I am not at all fearful on that score.

I have become an old man. Old men have a way of thinking that the rising generation is going to the dogs. I have fought against it all my life, because I was once a member of the rising generation, and was very nearly condemned to death for it. I have a great deal of sympathy with the rising generation. I believe that all the old grouchy pessimists are ready to bow down at the feet of those boys. We know that they are capable. We know that they are brave. We know that they are adequate, and we know that they are heroic. I will be willing to lie down and die and leave this country in their hands, with perfect assurance that it will be cared for better than my generation cared for it. So I am not worried about that.

I have been worried about the folks who stayed at home. The other day night baseball was eliminated, and weeping and wailing could be heard all over town. Just think of it! Mr. President, we are not going to have night baseball this year!

The other day the curfew regulations were applied, and in New York there was a final celebration, like that on New Year's eve. "Get drunk and make merry, because Monday we can not do so after midnight!" That is a pretty picture to set before our fighting men.

Recently there came to my notice a song about Trinidad. I do not wish to cast any reflection on any country; but the other day when I went home that song was being played on the phonograph. I had never heard it before. It was a perfect description of the happy life in Trinidad. It described the Yankee-man drinking rum and Coca-Cola; everybody working for the American dollar, and every day like New Year's Eve. That is one conception of how we should conduct ourselves during the war.

Shall we dodge the capitalist? Is he such a dangerous man? Shall I get under the table when John Lewis comes by? He is the fiercest-looking man I have ever looked at; and, of course, if Sidney Hillman should go by I would bow very low. I might climb all the way up to the penthouse on top of the Hotel Morrison on my knees, and perhaps I might get somewhere politically. I do not know. I am not going to do it. I have no idea of doing it.

Mr. President, I would rather listen to General Marshall, Secretary of War Stimson, Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, Mr. Bard, Judge Patterson, General Arnold, and President Roosevelt, the Commander in Chief, than all the political powers that ever existed. Those men are now our leaders. Someone may call me a rubber stamp. I am very proud of it. I voted for every war measure that has been recommended to us. I have not hesitated to do so. I know that I am not a warrior. I know that carrying on a war requires the greatest of skill. It was the first of skills. The word "Army" means skilled. It means trained. I am no strategist. I would not know how many men would be required for a given military operation. I would not know whether to attack the right flank, the left flank, or the center. These men have been trained. Ever since the early days of the country men have been trained at West Point and Annapolis to tell us what to do in a time like this.

The military experts tell us that they need 700,000 men to produce munitions, and that they must have them. They know. I am going to vote to support them. I am not going to investigate, or do any of the other things described by the long words in the bill. I am not going to fight this war with words.

Mr. President, that is the way I feel, and I am going through on that line. If after we are through with this bill, we are told that 5,000,000 more workers are needed, if they can be found I am going to vote to provide them. If we are told that 10,000,000 more fighters are needed, if they can be found I will vote to provide them.

Mr. President, I do not wish to make any unfair appeal. If we do not convince our enemies that we are not prepared to throw the full force of this great country into this war and win it, we shall prolong the war for months, and I fear even for years. In that aspect, it is a life-and-death matter. Suppose

we send to Herr Hitler and to the Japanese Emperor the news that the United States Congress is not standing back, that we are not flinching, that we are not faltering. That would help right now. We have put three and one-half million of our boys into the battle lines. We will stand by them to the last man and the last dollar.

I can tell what Hitler himself said. Those who have read his book and who have read Herr Rauschnigg's conversations with Herr Hitler prior to the war will verify what I am saying. He said in Mein Kampf that the United States was a great colossus. He used the word "colossus." He did not want us to get into any war; he did not want to get into a war with us. He referred to us as the Colossus of the West. In his conversation with Rauschnigg he said, "Oh, the United States do not make any difference. They are just a democracy. They will fall into all sorts of quarrels. They will divide up. They will flinch. They will have their groups. They are a gang of politicians. I don't care whether they are in the war or not." That was Herr Hitler's estimate of us.

I am not going to justify it. I might be disposed to do so, but I am not going to do so. I have a reason for my position. I would be ashamed of myself to my dying day if I had a part in sending three and a half million of our American boys across the Atlantic Ocean and onto the shores of Europe, under German guns, and through France and Belgium and over to the Siegfried line, and across the great Pacific Ocean to Guadalcanal and New Guinea, Saipan, Tarawa, and the Philippines and Iwo, and then did not support them. I would be ashamed of myself until I died if I did not give them everything my country has got. And you would be ashamed, too, Senators. You would not stop here to deal with capitalists or group leaders. Come, let us deal with all the boys, and in the name of our country.

Some have said they would beat us for office. Well, what if they do? Are not Senators expendable? Senators' sons are expendable. Senators also are expendable—politically and in any other way that can be thought of. I would be very much ashamed, Mr. President, to see those boys come marching back—some on crutches, some on stumps of legs, and some left in the eternal night—while I catered to Sidney Hillman—God forbid!—or while I bowed the knee to John Lewis, or any of the capitalists, for that matter. Throw all of them in together. Think about the country. Think about the boys. Think about the generals who are responsible, who are begging us for men, who are begging us for arms and ammunition.

Now I come to another matter. It is said, "Oh, well, this thing is involuntary servitude. There cannot be involuntary servitude in this country. This is a violation of the thirteenth amendment, which provides that there shall be no slavery or involuntary servitude in the United States. And this May bill—oh, slavery!"

Mr. President, sometimes I think it is a great thing to have friends made for the Constitution at some time or other—men who have paid no attention to it for 10 years or more. I brought a copy of the Constitution with me today. It is a great book; but there is not a thing in it which would show that the May bill or the House bill provides for involuntary servitude.

I think I can take the time to read the applicable provisions. There is no question about the power of the Congress, and there is no question about what the Constitution provides. I read from the Constitution:

> The Congress shall have power * * * to raise and support armies.

The Constitution did not merely use the words "raise armies." It also says "support armies." We cannot support them with these big words; I will say that. If that is your idea of supporting the Army, just get out and quit. I will say that.

You cannot investigate and extenuate, and thus support armies.

Mr. BARKLEY. And "transportate."

Mr. BAILEY. Yes. The Constitution did not merely say "raise armies."

What does "support the Army" mean? It means food, ships, planes, ammunition, supplies. Where do we produce them? We produce them in the plants here at home. They cannot be produced in Europe. That is what supporting the armies means.

The next provision is that—

> The Congress shall have power * * * to provide and maintain a Navy.

Thus reads the Constitution. Of course, the old rule of interpretation applies; and I would rely on it alone if I had no more to go by. But I have here some doctrine which once was authority. I would not be so sure of it now. [Laughter.] But here are the great words of interpretation of the Constitution so far as the Congress is concerned:

> Let the end be legitimate—

Supporting and maintaining armies is legitimate; that is clear—

> Let it be within the scope of the Constitution—

"Raise and support armies" and "provide and maintain a Navy" is the plain language of the Constitution:

> And all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consistent with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional.

Of course, we have the power—not only the power, but the obligation and the duty; they are written down here. We can do whatever is necessary to be done to support our armies. Of course, it would be very foolish for us to send an army to the Philippines and not support it. It would be a strange procedure for use to send 2,000,000 men to the borders of Germany and the fortifications of the Siegfried line and not support them. We do not think about it. If we have to support them, we have to support them in whatever ways we can. If they need men over here to work, of course, we can conscript the men and put them into selective service; and if they get out under the IV–F classification, of course, we can tell them where to go, for they are under the command. If a man gets out on some other ground, we can go after him, and we can say to him, "All right; you will not be allowed to drink rum and Coca-Cola and run a soft-drink stand or whatever you please. You are under the obligation of the Government, and its honor is at stake. Our honor is bound up with those boys now. If you go back on them you will lie in a dishonored grave."

Some say that probably all that is too simple, and that I should have some authority. I have some authority, Mr. President. This entire question has been raised before. I should like to say that we know that no question of slavery is involved. We know it is not slavery to go to your house and get your son and put a uniform on him and say to him, "Go." That is not slavery.

Some say that to require men to work is to place them under involuntary servitude if the work involves the building of a gun, or the building of a ship in order to carry a soldier abroad to fight. Where do we get the idea that we can send our men into foreign lands and then cite the Constitution in arguing that we cannot support those men? The argument is ridiculous on its face. The Supreme Court has said so.

At the October term 1917, in the Selective Draft Law cases, reported in two-hundred and forty-fifth United States Reports, page 366, Chief Justice White in delivering the opinion of the Supreme Court, said—I shall not undertake to read the entire opinion, but only the last words of it:

> Finally, as we are unable to conceive upon what theory the exaction by Government from the citizen of the performance of his supreme and noble duty of contributing to the defense of the rights and honor of the Nation, as the result of a war declared by the great representative body of the people, can be said to be the imposition of involuntary servitude in violation of the prohibitions of the thirteenth amendment; we are constrained to the conclusion that the contention to that effect is refuted by its mere statement.

That contention is being made here.

I cite Chase, Statutes of Ohio, and also *Butler* v. *Perry* (240 U. S.); and *Robertson* v. *Baldwin* (165 U. S.). These cases are also on the subject of the selective draft.

At page 373, Two Hundred and Forty-fifth United States, appears the following:

> The law imposes neither slavery nor involuntary servitude. The thirteenth amendment was intended to abolish only the well-known forms of slavery and involuntary servitude akin thereto, and not to destroy the power of the Government to compel citizens to render public service.

I do not believe that the present Supreme Court would hold differently.

I again quote from the same series of selective draft cases to which I have referred.

> That the power to compel military service is an incident of sovereignty appears from the custom of nations.

The decision continues.

I am very much interested to note that even in the South, where we are supposed to be individualistic, the framers of

the Constitution of the Southern Confederacy retained word for word the language of the Federal Constitution on the subject of war, armies, and navies. Decisions which were announced in cases involving this question in Georgia, North Carolina, Mississippi, and Alabama, were all sustained. Senators will recall what happened during the Civil War. It was in 1863 that this Nation adopted conscription. The Confederacy adopted conscription, and so did the Federal Government. There is no room for any dispute on that subject.

Mr. President, lawyers should now and then go to the dictionary as well as to the lawbooks.

This is what Webster says:

Servitude: 1. (a) Condition of a slave, slavery, serfdom, bondage, state of compulsory subjection to a master; (b) political subjection to foreign state or to oppression; as, to deliver a country from servitude.

That is the first step in the definition of servitude. The second and subsequent steps are:

2. Vassalage; feudal homage (obsolete).
3. Condition of being bound to service; specifically: (a) In French and English colonies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the condition of transported or colonial laborers who, under contract or by custom, rendered service with temporary and limited loss of political and personal liberty. Servitude existed in America from 1619 to 1819.

We got rid of servitude before we got rid of slavery.

(b) A similar condition of enforced service which, in various phases, has existed in South America, South Africa, Java, etc.
4. State of slavish dependence; mental or moral bondage; social compulsion.
5. Status or employment as a servant; service; also, servants collectively (archaic).
6. Service required as a punishment for crime (penal servitude).
7. Term of service; apprenticeship.

Mr. President, those are the definitions of servitude.

We take a man and put him into the Army or Navy, and no slavery or servitude is involved. No one thinks it is. He is a free man fighting for freedom. He has his vote and his rights. He has his Congress to represent him, his President to speak for him, and his courts to give him justice. He is not a slave. No one will say that he is. No one will dare say so in his presence.

Here is another man who is not fit for combat duty. He has been honorably discharged, or put into IV–F, or has been deferred on account of his skill. We say to him, "Young man, your country needs you. We have sent men abroad. They are fighting. They are losing their lives. 'Theirs not to reason why; theirs but to do and die.' They need supplies. They need ships. You go and help make them."

That is not slavery. We say to him, "You go and make them where they can be made." That is not slavery.

We do not say to him, "You shall not work—go down to the branch and fish." We say to him, "You go out and stand by your country and stand by her sons. Do your duty here at home, even though you cannot do anything which would measure up to your obligations to the fighting men."

Mr. President, if I understand correctly, the boys whom we have sent abroad are fighting for every man, woman, and child in America, as well as for the generations which are to come. There is not a man, woman, or child in American who is not under the obligation of doing everything within his human power, no matter what, to support our men in the service, to arm them, to equip them, to encourage them, to cheer them, and to bring them to victory, home, and peace. The pending bill does not meet that situation. Some appear to believe it may be the best we can afford, but it does not meet the situation. I am sorry that it does not.

Last summer the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and I introduced a bill similar to the pending measure. We went before the committee and spoke in its behalf. The Secretary of War, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy—now the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Forrestal—and General Hershey also appeared before the committee. However, it died the death. Do Senators know why? Before we were able to make much progress with it it died. The Army wanted it passed, and the Navy wanted it passed. But our men had landed at Cherbourg. Our brave sons had whipped the German Army. The conflict was one of the most tremendous military movements in all history. The Germans fled before the American soldiers. France was liberated. The German Army was routed. Lloyds was betting 7 to 5 that the war would end on November 1. Some of our own military leaders said it would end by December 1. I was foolish enough to think that it might end on October 1 or sooner. All of us are wishful thinkers. I would not get through this war unless I could be a wishful thinker. Wishful thinking is a great morale maintainer. When, Mr. President, you are low down in your spirits, indulge in a little wishful thinking; in other words, indulge in optimism. I do it, and I am not ashamed of it.

But consider what happened. We relaxed our efforts and relied on our hopes; but when Christmas came along we saw our boys in retreat. I remember last Christmas Day. My heart was bowed down; it was no happy Christmas at my house. I did not know what was going to happen. I thought our soldiers might be driven back to the coast. I did not think the Germans would defeat them; oh, no; but that was a terrific surprise, a tremendous reverse. Now those same boys have recovered all the ground which was lost.

Do you know, Mr. President, why it happened? Not because we did not supply them with munitions; there were enough of them; but because they could not get the munitions I know about that; I know it from eminent authority who was present and who was not a soldier, either. Antwerp had not been opened up and we had 200 ships filled with munitions in the English Channel waiting for a chance to move—200 ships acting as warehouses; and so our men could not be properly supplied.

Now 700,000 men are needed to supply those soldiers and we have got to make provision for that; we have the demand now; we are going to need them in 60 days. Yes; they are getting along all right now, and have enough to continue operations for awhile but the way they are dying, the way they are shooting, the way they are wearing out trucks, guns, and tanks it is necessary to have 700,000 men go to work at the earliest possible moment, otherwise our men on the battle fronts will face another serious situation, not because ships cannot get into Antwerp, but because ships cannot get cargoes.

Mr. President, if we want to expedite the conclusion of the war, let the world know that we will not falter, that we will not flinch, that we are not afraid of anything at home, just as our sons are not afraid of anything abroad.

If we want to convince our enemies that their case is hopeless, we can strike a blow here, not so powerful as the blows our soldiers are striking over there, but a blow which will greatly reinforce what they are doing. The Germans then will know, and the Japs then will know, that they are up against a nation that is fighting without reservation, that we are going to hit with all we have, and will keep on hitting, and not be afraid, and not be divided, and not hold anything back.

Mr. President, I should like to go along with any legislation which will accomplish the result for which I plead. I know that time is of the essence. I am not going to vote to investigate conditions to see if there is cooperation and all that. Our men in the fighting lines are asking for arms. Shall we give them to them? They are asking for some sort of gesture in the Senate and in the Congress to indicate that the country is united and is back of them and will see them through to victory and bring them home in triumph and joy and to a peace which I hope will be enduring. Shall we answer them with this substitute? No, Mr. President, we cannot do that; the Senate cannot afford to do it, we cannot do it for the sake of our own selves.

I am not wedded to any bill especially. We hear of the May-Bailey bill. I have no pride of authorship in it and no right to claim any. I want a bill though, a bill that is something, a bill that meets the situation, and I will vote for any bill that does meet it. I do not see how we can get by in any other way. Mr. President, I do not see how we can look forward to victory in any other way. Some men might hate to see victory come, they might hate to see the boys come back. I believe I will say something about that.

They will be back, bless God; they will come back, and millions of them will go to the polls. We are responsible to them, too. They will be at the polls at the next election, and we will have to give answer to them, too. They and their buddies, eleven and one-half million of them, and their mothers, 5,000,000 of them, and their fathers, 5,000,000 more—we will answer to them. I am not holding out any threat; God knows I would not do that, but I am talking now about a few of the people who want us to appease them. I want the approval of the men on the

fighting front, and not the approval of the capitalists. I despise men who are trying to get rich out of this war. I do not know anything more contemptible than the buzzards that have followed every war, picking here and picking there, piling up their gains while men are dying. There are vultures over all armies and all continents in peace and war. I am not worrying about that, but I am not going to appease any group on earth. The farmers? No. The laborers? No. Capitalists? No. Political parties? No. I would rather do my duty by our men at the front and die than to appease them all, because if I did not, no earthly honor would be worth a snap of the finger, as we all know.

So, Mr. President, that is the case. I am hoping that the Senate may defeat the pending bill; vote it down. Then the House bill will come up. The pending measure is a substitute for the May bill, or the House bill, I should say. Then consider the House bill, think it over, and if it is wrong, amend it, do what you please with it; but in the name of God and our country, let us give our fighting men something of a substantial character in answer to the demands of their responsible leaders.

Mr. REVERCOMB obtained the floor.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am asking for a moment following the statement of the Senator from North Carolina in order to yield my time to one who is in the front line. By the courtesy of the Senator from West Virginia I wish to read a letter which arrived yesterday from the western front.

Mr. President, the writer of this letter is one who volunteered, who has been in the service for more than 4 years and has been overseas for approximately 2 years, and is now a lieutenant colonel. I shall not mention his name, since I presume it is a violation of military regulations for any one of these 11,000,000 boys to write his views on this question to his Representative or Senator, even though it so much concerns their lives; but this man did write, and I read his letter:

> Now being with another division which has done considerable here on the western front and even now is in action, I can't help but take cognizance of the very considerable interest by all of us in the critical events in the good old U. S. A. I would feel deeply negligent if I did not take the liberty of attempting to convey to you some of the definite expressions of opinion I have heard here on the front in Germany.
>
> Most important, we cannot at all comprehend why it is considered democratic that certain fine young Americans here and elsewhere are compelled, though nevertheless willing, to sacrifice even to the supreme sacrifice in battle, while yet others still are softly cradled in a home atmosphere or give themselves to a war job on a purely voluntary basis. No one here is complaining with their lot—in fact, we are rather proud of the privilege of being a part of the best army in the world. However, it is felt that if democracy is to have meaning, it must also imply some sacrifice and service to all that it may endure. America mobilized on a total-war program will certainly tend to bring this terrible conflict to a swifter, definite conclusion. The effect of total mobilization as a morale factor alone on our troops would certainly be of vital significance. Frankly, as I sense the attitude here it is "Let's get this thing over and go home" and "Why aren't all able-bodied men in America mobilized for total war effort?" The ever-present question of strikes and management of labor is always timely with front-line troops.
>
> I deeply appreciate this opportunity of writing you and believe my feelings as expressed are truly typical of a great many of us here who left family, home, and positions 4 or more years ago to see this thing through.

That is the end of the letter. Last night there arrived from my own son, a captain, in a hospital in France, a story of his experiences. Volunteering 4 years ago as a private, he has been almost 3 years overseas—in the South Pacific, in Africa, in Italy, and now in France. He asked only one thing. He said:

> Give us the nurses that these boys must have to live.

I cannot join in supporting the May bill drafting nurses—the women of this country—to go overseas, as apparently they must, and not ask young men who are able to help out in any way in their power here at home.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I offer and send to the desk an amendment in the form of a substitute for the amendment reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. I do not ask that it be read, because a copy of it is on the desk of each Senator, but I invite the attention of my colleagues to the contents of the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The amendment is as follows:

Amendment (in the nature of a substitute) intended to be proposed by Mr. REVERCOMB (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON) to the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, viz: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That (a) every individual is obligated to serve the Nation in the capacity for which he or she is best qualified, and to continue in such capacity so long as his or her services are required, to the end that all persons may be usefully employed and may give effective service in support of the war effort.

"(b) The purposes of this act are to provide a practicable and effective means to accomplish the fulfillment of such obligation by the following means among others:

"(1) By providing for the employment of certain persons liable for training and service in the land or naval forces who, for any reason have been deferred or discharged from active service in the armed forces; and

"(2) By reducing wasteful labor turn-over and unnecessary labor migration; and

"(3) By channeling available workers into employment which will contribute most to the war effort; and

"(4) By permitting the maximum utilization by employers of available work forces.

"SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(n) (1) In additon to the liability for training and service in the land or naval forces, every registrant between the ages of 18 and 45, who is not a member of such forces on active duty and is not excepted from training and service under (5) (c) (1) or (d) shall be required to perform substantial work in some lawful occupation; and for the purposes of this subsection, each selective-service local board shall determine within the area over which it has jurisdiction which of such registrants within the limits of such area are performing substantial work in a lawful occupation. Any such registrant between the ages of 18 and 45 who is not performing substantial work in a lawful occupation as determined by the selective-service board, shall forthwith be ordered by said local board to report on a designated date, fixed by said local board, for induction into the land or naval forces.

"'(2) If for any reason any such registrant so ordered to report for induction is not accepted for service in the land or naval forces when called for induction, as provided in this section, then the local selective-service board shall forthwith certify the name of such registrant to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. Any registrant so certified to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall be required to accept such employment, and to work at such employment, as shall be designated for him by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, through such agencies as said Chairman may designate: *Provided, however*, That such registrant so certified for work by the selective-service local board is physically and otherwise able to perform the work assigned to him

"'(3) A registrant liable to perform such work, who is now or hereafter employed by an employer through such certification as aforesaid, shall have a duty not to voluntarily discontinue such employment unless his selective-service local board shall find that such person has good reason to discontinue such work or that such work is no longer needed in the best interest of the war effort.

"'(4) Any person affected by the provisions of this subsection shall have the right to appeal from the decision of the selective-service local board in the same manner as is provided in section 10 (a) (2) of this act.

"'(5) Any violation of the provisions of this subsection shall be construed an evasion of service in the land and naval forces and shall be punished accordingly, as provided in this act.'

"SEC. 3. Section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'In carrying out the provisions of this subsection the selective-service local board in classifying the registrant shall base its findings solely and exclusively on whether the registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort and whether a satisfactory replacement can be obtained, without reference to the relative essentiality of the registrant to an agricultural occupation or endeavor as compared with any other occupation, service, or endeavor; and the foregoing provisions of this sentence shall apply also upon an appeal or review of a decision made thereunder by a selective-service local board.'

"SEC. 4. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall make or cause to be made in-plant surveys and other investigations of the use of manpower by the War Department and the Navy Department, to determine the extent to which such departments are making the most effective use, in activities relating to production, procurement, or repairs, of individuals in their employ or subject to their jurisdiction as members of the armed forces, and shall take or cause to be taken appropriate measures to eliminate labor wastage and labor hoarding, and otherwise to promote the full utilization by such departments of individuals in their employ or subject to their jurisdiction as members of the armed forces, and otherwise to carry out the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 5. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall provide for such in-plant surveys and other investigations of activities and places of employment as may be necessary to determine the extent to which such activities or places of employment are making the most effective use of individuals

in their employ, to the end that appropriate measures may be taken to eliminate labor wastage and labor hoarding, to promote full utilization of the labor there employed.

"SEC. 6. To the extent necessary to carry out the purposes expressed in the first section of this act and in particular to promote the maximum utilization by employers of available work forces, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is authorized and directed to prescribe the maximum number of workers, by age, sex, and occupational qualifications who may be employed in any plant or place of employment and to prohibit or regulate the hiring, rehiring, selection, or recruitment of new workers by employers: *Provided, however,* That no such regulation, or order thereunder, shall reduce the number of employees in any lawful place of employment which is an operating and going concern (other than a place of entertainment and amusement), below 50 percent of the number employed in such place of employment at the time of the effective date of this act.

"It shall be unlawful for any employer to hire or retain in his employ any individual in violation of such regulations or any order issued by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission pursuant thereto.

"SEC. 7. The Chairman shall by regulation provide an opportunity for a hearing before an impartial administrative tribunal to any person who claims that any action taken with respect to him under this act, or any regulation or order thereunder, is unreasonable as applied to him or is inconsistent with such act, regulation, or order. Subject to such further administrative review as may be provided in regulations under this section, the determination made after such hearing shall be final. To the extent practicable and appropriate, such regulations shall provide for such hearings to be accorded in local areas and for such hearing tribunals to be so constituted as to permit the ascertainment of the views of persons selected as representatives of management, labor, and agricultural interest in the locality.

"SEC. 8. (a) The Chairman shall provide for the issuance of a certificate of reemployment to any person with respect to whom he finds that such person (1) has been released by his employer from a position pursuant to a request or requirement made under this act and (2) has complied thereafter with the requests and requirements made under this act with respect to his accepting and continuing in any employment or employments in the locality where such person originally worked or other locality where such person voluntarily agreed to work. Any such person who has remained unemployed for a period of 30 days, despite his compliance with the requests and requirements of the Chairman, shall be entitled to have a certificate promptly issued to him under this subsection. Any person to whom such a certificate is issued under this subsection shall be entitled to the benefits of section 8 (b) (except the last paragraph thereof and except that in lieu of the 90-day period therein specified, the time within which application for reemployment in his former position must be made shall be 30 days), 8 (c), and 8 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to the same extent as if he had left such position in order to be and had been inducted into the land or naval forces for training and service, had been relieved therefrom on the day on which such certificate is issued to him, and had been given the certificate referred to in section 8 (a) of such act: *Provided,* That this subsection shall not be construed to confer greater employment rights than the individual would have had if he had remained employed in such position during the period of the employment or employments accepted by him upon the request of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. No person shall be deemed to have violated the provision of section 6 of this act, or any order or regulation thereunder, by reason of restoring to and continuing in his employ any person to whom a certificate has been issued under this subsection, when such person was unable to obtain other employment within 30 days after his release from employment by reason of the fixing of a maximum employment ceiling.

"(b) Section 8 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" 'If such person, within 90 days after having been relieved from such training and service or from such hospitalization, has become employed in an employment accepted by him at the request of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission under the War Manpower Act of 1945, any period (before sec. 4 (b) of such act ceased to be in effect) while he is employed in an employment so accepted by him (and any period, not exceeding 15 days, between leaving one such employment and entering upon another such employment) shall be disregarded in computing the 90-day period within which application for reemployment in his former position must be made and shall be counted as training and service in the land or naval forces for the purposes of subsection (c).'

"SEC. 9. In the case of any individual who, in response to the request of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, agrees to accept employment outside the locality where he is then residing, the Chairman, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, may furnish transportation to the location of such employment, and, if such individual complies thereafter with the requests and requirements made under this act with respect to his accepting and continuing in any employment or employments in the same locality until the Chairman determines that he is no longer needed in such locality for work essential to the war effort, may furnish transportation back to the locality from which transportation was originally furnished for such individual under this subsection, or to any other locality selected by the individual which is not farther distant. The cost of such transportation shall not exceed the amounts allowable for individual civilian employees in the executive branch of the Government and shall not include any per diem allowance. The Chairman shall exercise the authority conferred by this subsection only to the extent that he deems the exercise thereof necessary to aid in relieving manpower shortages which substantially impede the war effort.

"SEC. 10. Any employer who violates any regulation or any order made pursuant thereto as provided in section 6 of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof in the district court of the United States for the district in which such violation occurred, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 12 months or by a fine not to exceed $10,000, or both.

"SEC. 11. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, an agency of the Government created pursuant to Executive Order No. 9139, dated April 18, 1942, as amended and supplemented (in this act referred to as the 'Chairman'), shall perform the functions vested in him by this act under the direction and supervision of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

"SEC. 12. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall submit reports to the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives on the 1st days of January, April, July, and October of each year on the activities undertaken or contemplated by him under this act. Such reports shall summarize and appraise manpower mobilization activities and problems.

"SEC. 13. The provisions of this act shall not be applicable with respect to the employment of persons by any State or any political subdivision thereof, without its consent.

"SEC. 14. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances, other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 15. The provisions of sections 4, 5, and 6 of this act, and all regulations, orders, or requirements thereunder, shall cease to be effective upon termination of hostilities in the present war, as declared by the President or by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, or upon December 31, 1946, whichever is the earlier.

"SEC. 16. This act may be cited as the 'War Manpower Act of 1945.' "

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, before going into the amendment by way of explanation, let me say that I realize that it is not usual for a member of a committee to offer an amendment to replace the bill reported by the committee, but I would call attention to the situation here, that it is quite unusual in that many of the members of the committee, at least some of them, who voted to report the bill out of the Committee on Military Affairs, expressly reserved the right to oppose it, as some are opposing it, on the floor of the Senate.

My sole purpose in offering this substitute is an earnest desire to meet the objections which have been raised to the bill passed by the House and the bill reported by way of amendment out of the Committee on Military Affairs. A principal objection to both bills is on the question of penalties and the substitute is intended to clarify that subject. Further, it brings into work those registrants who do not work in any lawful occupation today. It places a limit upon the power of the War Manpower Commission to close businesses by taking people from them. It permits the use of available labor and prevents labor hoardings in the large plants of the country.

In the case of persons who may be thrown out of work by the placing of a work ceiling or maximum number who might be employed at any place, the amendment would permit them, if they cannot find other work, to return to the jobs from which they were ousted. In other words, it would cure a great fault in the bill reported out of the Committee on Military Affairs, which would create unemployment if followed in the fixing of ceilings.

Turning to the amendment, a print of which is on the desks of my colleagues, section 2 provides that the selective-service board in each locality shall be empowered and directed to call up all registrants between the ages of 18 and 45 years who are not substantially at work in some lawful occupation. Those men when called up are to be offered to the armed services. If for any reason the services will not accept them, then the local draft board will certify their names to the War Manpower Commission, and they will be placed at work if they are physically able to perform the work assigned them.

Mr. President, that is a new feature in the proposed legislation. It is meant to reach out and catch the man who is not working at all. I wish to say—and no doubt this has been the experience of other Senators—that I have received many letters from communities in my State in which there are some who have

been deferred or some who were discharged from the services for one reason or another who have returned and have not worked at all. That situation is very demoralizing, and well we can see it would be, to those mothers and fathers whose boys have been taken into the armed forces.

There is no reason why, if force or power is to be used over anyone, that the first class touched in this country should not be those who are not working at any lawful occupation. They are to be called up by the authority that knows them best, the authority that is closest to them, the local selective service board. If they are physically fit to perform work, being examined just as any other registrants called up would be, then a man is certified for work, and it is up to the War Manpower Commission to find him a job. The same penalties are placed upon that registrant when called under the provision of the substitute bill as are placed upon one called for service in the armed forces. That is the first operative section of the substitute bill.

We come to section 3. Section 3 deals with the Tydings amendment, that is, with farm labor, and as the language is phrased in the substitute bill it removes the penalty from the farm boy and becomes a directive to the local selective service board—in that it requires that any person who is engaged in essential agriculture and cannot be replaced shall be left on the farm. I point out that in the amendment reported by the Military Affairs Committee such a boy is subjected—and he is the only deferred person who is so subjected—to the penalties of $5,000 fine, I believe, and up to 10 years in the penitentiary. I can see no fairness in placing a special penalty upon the farm boy and not upon the others. For that reason the language of the substitute bill is so framed that the selective service board is directed and it has a duty under the law to defer that boy, but he is not singled out for a fine and jail punishment.

The question then is raised: Suppose he does not stay on the farm. If he does not stay on the farm, but leaves it and goes to another occupation, then he is subject to call for service. But someone may say, "Suppose he is a IV–F. Suppose he loafs." If this substitute bill is passed and he fails to be employed he will be caught under the section of the substitute and placed at work. So we need no penalty to keep him at work, because if he leaves a place of work in agriculture and seeks a job elsewhere he does not have the protection afforded a farm worker, and is called up for service in the armed forces. On the other hand, if he has left his farm work but cannot be used in the armed services because he is classified IV–F, then he is caught under section 2, in the substitute bill, which I have described, in that he is compelled to work under the penalties of the Selective Service Act.

Section 4 is very similar to—in fact it follows the section in the committee's bill dealing with this subject. It calls for surveys by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission in the plants to ascertain if too many individuals are working there, in order that we may know whether full use is being made of the labor which is available. It is no longer a debatable question in this country that there are many plants which are overstaffed and overmanned. I have received letters time and again from men I knew who had gone to work in plants telling me of the loafing and loitering that goes on among the employees and the absenteeism that exists there because there are too many men to perform the work that is called for. That has been revealed time after time by reports made to the Senate. So the purpose of this provision is first to make a survey to see if there are too many workers in these plants, not only in private industry but also in plants operated by the Army and the Navy.

The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is given the power to fix a ceiling of employment, as to the maximum number that may work at any place of employment. That provision follows the provisions of the committee bill. But I want to point out to the Senate, Mr. President, that if we stop there, remembering that this applies to every place of employment in the country, the store, the meat shop, any place of employment where men are engaged in work, we will have placed a power in the War Manpower Commission to close up every going business in this country. So, therefore, the new proposal would place a limit upon that power of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. It is provided that no such regulation by him—

> Or order thereunder, shall reduce the number of employees in any lawful place of employment which is an operating and going concern other than a place of entertainment and amusement, below 50 percent of the number employed in such place of employment at the time of the effective date of this act.

An exception was made there as to places of amusement and entertainment because in drafting the bill it was thought that they were perhaps less essential than other places of employment. However, I may say, Mr. President, as the author of the bill, if it is objected to seriously, and some have already said that they thought it was an unfair discrimination, I am perfectly willing that places of amusement and entertainment be protected to the same extent as other places of employment.

I do not believe the time has come in this country when it is necessary to place a power in the hands of any administrator to close up places of business here. They are essential parts of the community life and the national life of America, and I feel that if any power be granted to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission over places of employment, then a limit should be placed upon it so that these places of employment cannot be wiped out and destroyed——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let us suppose that under the bill which the Senator proposes the ceiling were fixed on, let us say, 50 men of a particular group, and there were a thousand individuals working in the factory, but it was desired to take 50 welders and there were only 60 welders in the plant; how would the Senator's amendment affect that kind of a ceiling?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, just as he would under the committee's bill, would fix the method of keeping 50 and turning 10 of them loose.

Mr. FERGUSON. He could take 50 and allow 10 to remain so long as he did not reduce the whole force below 50 percent, is that correct?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct. He must not reduce the whole employment below 50 percent of the number employed in the place of employment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would that cover particular units? Suppose there were four or five units in one city, as we have them in Michigan. We have plants of one corporation at different locations. Would that cover 50 percent of such a corporation's or company's men, or would it apply only in the particular plant.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It would apply in the particular plant of production, I should think.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is that the way the amendment reads?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The amendment provides that the number of employees shall not be reduced below 50 percent of the number employed in such place of employment. If the particular place is the place of employment, and I take it that it is, then a 50-percent limit would be placed on the number of persons who could be taken from that place of employment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well. Let us consider a foundry where all the molders work in 1 plant, in a separate building, and there are 60 men working there, and the effort is made to take 40, which would bring the number employed below the 50 percent, would they be allowed to take 40 such workers out of that plant?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The plant, I take it, is the one place of employment. I do not think you could break it down into departments or buildings. I think the place of employment would be the whole operation.

Section 8 of my amendment provides that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission "shall provide for the issuance of a certificate of reemployment to any person with respect to whom he finds that such person (1) has been released by his employer from a position pursuant to a request or requirement made under this act and (2) has complied thereafter with the requests and requirements made under this act with respect to his accepting and continuing in any employment or employments in the locality where such person originally worked or other locality where such person voluntarily agreed to work. Any such person who has remained unem-

ployed for a period of 30 days, despite his compliance with the requests and requirements of the chairman, shall be entitled to have a certificate promptly issued to him under this subsection."

The purpose of that provision is this: If a ceiling is placed upon any employment, and the number of workers who may be employed is fixed, and many are thrown out of employment, it is possible that they will not be fitted for employment elsewhere. This section provides that, regardless of the ceiling fixed, after 30 days seeking to find a place to work, if a worker cannot find a job in the locality where he lives, or to which he has voluntarily gone, he may come back and seek employment at the original place of employment, regardless of the ceiling which has been fixed there.

I can well see the necessity for this provision, for example, I know that in many stores in cities of my own State the clerks are elderly men and women. If as a result of the exercise of the power given to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to fix employment at 50 percent, men and women who can not work elsewhere will be turned out of jobs as clerks.

This provision would enable them, regardless of the ceiling fixed in a particular store or place of employment, to come back to their old jobs if they could not find jobs elsewhere. I believe that that is a protection to which they are entitled. Otherwise, the administration of the bill as reported by the committee would result in the unemployment of those who are now employed and rendering service in useful places throughout the country.

There has been considerable dispute, and apparently some confusion, as to who would suffer the penalty provided by the substitute reported by the committee. Some say that it would fall only on the employer for violating the regulations with respect to the employment ceiling. Others say that it would fall also on the worker. My amendment would do away with any doubt on that question, or any basis of dispute. It expressly provides that it shall be a misdemeanor for any employer to refuse or fail to obey the regulations issued with respect to the fixing of employment ceilings. The penalty is chiefly placed on the employer, or it should be, as he alone controls the number employed under the ceiling order of War Manpower.

Mr. President, that in essence is the amendment which I have offered as a substitute for the amendment reported by the committee. I offer it in all earnestness, with the hope of meeting the objections which have been raised to the May bill, passed by the House of Representatives, and the committee substitute, reported by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. In substance, my amendment is the bill as reported by the Military Affairs Committee, with the changes which I have noted. It would add a plan to require those who are not working in any lawful occupation to be placed at work. It would reach the loafer, the man who has no work, and does not wish to work, if he is between the ages of 18 and 45 and has found a hiding place through deferment by his draft board.

Before closing, let me briefly review the question which we have before us for decision. We here consider two bills. We have the May bill, as passed by the House, which seeks to place every worker under the selective-service law, and imposes a penalty upon the worker who refuses to comply. It places him in the hands and under the direction of a Government administrator. The penalty not only falls upon the man who does not want to work, not only upon the man who is shirking work, but it falls with equal force upon the willing worker. It would be the longest step ever taken in the history of this Government toward control of individual citizens, or segments of our population, in their private lives.

Able arguments have been made, the eloquent appeals have been made, somewhat to sentiment, that the May bill should be passed. Mr. President, this is no time for an appeal to sentiment. Every Member of this body wishes to do what he can to support our soldiers; but we ought to do it in a practical way, which will give them real support. We are not fooling them, and we do not wish to do so. If I believed for a moment that the May bill would really help to shorten the war and insure early victory, I would readily support it. I believe that sentiment is shared by every other Member of this body.

But what is the purpose behind the May bill? What reasons are given by those who insist that it be passed? Two reasons are given. The first is that it would create better and more abundant production. The second is that it would bolster the morale of the men at the fighting fronts. Let us go into those reasons, which are asserted to be the basis for asking for the passage of that bill.

Mr. President, every one of the witnesses who testified in behalf of the May bill before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs admitted that America has done the greatest job of production in her history or in the history of the world. As was so ably pointed out here the other day, not only have American workmen and American manufacturers produced goods and munitions of war for our own troops, but they have produced war materials for all our allies.

In the face of that record, shall we now say to the willing working men and women of this country, "We are going to place you under the control of your Government, and move you, at the command of someone in Washington, to any place in the United States, or even beyond its borders"? In the testimony of witnesses before the Military Affairs Committee, as revealed by the record before us, some question was raised about moving people. We have not come to that in this country. It is not yet needed. Time and again the heads of administrative departments who are asking for this legislation said that it would not be necessary, that they would find places for them in the local areas. However, when they were asked whether they would agree to have written into the law a limit upon the distance workers might be moved, not one of them was willing that that be done. They want to gain absolute control over our workers and move them around as they please. Some say that we have taken men into the military service and moved them great distances, to Europe and to the South Pacific, so why not do the same thing with the civilians?

Certainly there is a real and great difference between the organization of an army, a fighting force, and the organization of the civilian life of America. I wish the Senate to remember that the people who are working back home—the fathers, mothers, brothers, and wives of the servicemen—are looking after the welfare and protection of those the servicemen have left behind. They have done a great job. Why, then, in the face of it, are we going to take away from them their freedom to labor and to produce when they have made such a great record in this war?

The American workingman has produced more per capita than has the workingman in England, where there is Government-enforced and Government-controlled labor. Mr. President, if it would help, we would do it; we would depart from our traditional practices. But we will not get as good production by forced labor as by the labor of freemen. Not in America. And let us not write into our law something which is new, something which is called regimentation, something which amounts to control of the individual citizen by his Government. Let us not needlessly write it into the laws of our country.

There is also talk of morale. I feel as does the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. I cannot attach a great deal of weight to the argument based on morale. What is going to increase the morale of the soldiers? Will it increase their morale for us to proceed, while they are out of this country, to pass a bill placing upon their fathers and their brothers the shackles of Government control? What will the boys think they are fighting for if those back at home, behind their backs, create a virtual slave labor for those they left here, and when it is so needless, as shown by the record which has been made? No, Mr. President; I think the morale of the American fighting men would not be helped by any such measure as that.

Let us look at this situation in a practical way. What brought it about? In the latter part of 1944 the people of this country, including those who worked in the mills and factories, were led to believe that the war in Europe was about over; and many of them left the war-production plants, and many returned to find peacetime jobs or jobs which they thought would continue for them when peace came. They thought peace was coming early. They had a right to believe that, because those in authority made statements which led them to believe it. They were not quitting or falling down on the war effort. They were not deserting their jobs. They earnestly and honestly believed that the war in Europe had come to an end or was about

to come to an end. Let me cite some statements which indicate so well the justification for that feeling. I have no desire to cast any ill reflection on the gentlemen who made the statements, because I do not doubt for a moment that they believed every word they said, however unwisely uttered. But the statements were made, and they had their effect upon the people of our country.

The Under Secretary of War made the following statement in August of 1944:

> Victory over the Germans is not far off.

That statement went out to the people of our country, and doubtless it went to the boys at the fighting fronts. We hear a great deal of talk about morale, but did not those persons have a right to believe that the war was about ended?

Gen. George C. Marshall made the following statement on December 7, and I know he was speaking in earnest when he made it:

> Before this statement is published, hostilities might have terminated in the European theater.

When that statement came from the commander of the American armies, did not the men in the plants have a right to believe that the war in Europe was about to terminate? Add to all that the cancelation of many contracts for the production of war materials. Add to that the statements by the then head of the War Production Board that the time had come when we would start again to make the implements of peacetime life in America.

All those things occurred. We are not placing blame, but we are showing the reason for a situation which can be met without hysteria which will bring us to the enactment of unwise legislation.

There is talk of morale, Mr. President. I will tell you what will bring better morale to the American soldiers. We will bring improved morale to them if we relieve them from war fatigue by getting them some relief at the fronts. That can be done without drawing too heavily upon the manpower of America. Why cannot the liberated Frenchmen who served in the armies of France be placed in the lines at the fighting fronts in France? They would be fighting for their own homes and freedom. They are good fighters. It is said that some of them are now being equipped. But there is no reason under the sun why those men, who have received their liberty and are once more free—some 2,000,000 or more trained soldiers—could not go to the relief of the men who now are at the fighting fronts in Europe. I cannot understand the policy of our own War Department when it will not insist upon receiving the aid of the soldiers of our Allied countries and will drain and drain the young men out of this country as replacements for Europe when there are millions of trained Allied soldiers already there, now liberated and ready to be equipped. The War Department is unnecessarily making a manpower problem for us. Why in the name of sense, and consideration for the people of our own country, will not our military leaders have some regard for continued established order in the civil and national life of this country? Why not utilize for the armed services the available manpower of our Allied Nations?

To the south of us are the countries of South America. Brazil already has one division in Europe, and we are advised that it has performed well and courageously. But there are other countries in South and Central America with great resources of manpower and soldier power which can be called upon for the replacements needed at the fighting fronts. That would bring improved morale to the hearts of American soldiers.

I repeat that we should give our soldiers some rest and some relief from the fatigue of fighting. And that can be done without drawing upon the continually exhausted young manpower of this country.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that the President himself, at Boston on October 28, said that the war with Germany had entered its final phase. No doubt that statement was a contributing factor to the departure of so many persons from the war jobs in which they were then engaged.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, certainly it is true that men in high places led the people of our country to believe that the time had come when it was no longer necessary to man the factories. Of course, under the circumstances, many factory workers left their jobs.

Yesterday, or the day before, attention was called to the fact that many young men 18 years of age are being taken into the fighting forces of this country and are being sent to the front lines of battle with but little training. That situation is not a morale builder.

I desire to call to the attention of the War Department, which makes the policies and is responsible for following such a course of action, the fact that it could well turn to the great manpower reserves of France and of the countries of South America and Central America, who are ready Allies of ours, and who wish to take a part in this great conflict and have declared war upon our enemies. Let them take an active part in the fighting zones, and let them have a voice at the peace table when the war has been won.

Since the turn of events, at which time it was seen that the war in Europe was not going to end as suddenly as it was stated by some last fall it would end, many workers have returned to the plants. They are American working men and women. We have been told, Mr. President, that the workers are returning to the plants. We have been told that they have been returning even within recent months.

Perhaps the greatest fault of the committee substitute is that it could create unemployment. It empowers the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, without limitation, to go into any plant or place of work and fix the maximum number of persons to be employed there. In so doing many persons would be turned out of employment and many of them would be unable to find other jobs. The substitute which I have offered would correct such a situation by permitting the person who had been discharged, and who could not obtain a job elsewhere within 30 days from his discharge, to return to his old job, regardless of the ceiling which might have been established in that particular place.

At this point I wish to read from an editorial printed in the February 12, 1945, issue of the Pathfinder magazine on the subject of the national-service bill which we have come to know as the May bill. The editorial reads as follows:

> Point one against the bill: We aren't going to get more production by using forced labor. Slaves don't produce like freemen. The output of a man forced to do a job he doesn't want to do drops off 25 to 50 percent. Homer, the blind bard of Greece, was 4,000 years ahead of the efficiency experts when he wrote, "Whatever day makes man a slave, takes half his worth away."
>
> Point two against the bill: It is not the function of military leaders to undertake the responsibility of getting out industrial production. You don't go to a lawyer for a toothache. The military's art is the art of organized destruction. The art of production belongs jointly to industrial management and labor, they are the ones who have carried us through from the wooden guns of 1939 to the rocket bombs and B-29's of today.

Mr. President, I think the editorial sums up in a conclusive way the objections to the May bill. I think that it points out to us why we cannot place shackles of force upon the people in the civilian life of this country, or upon any part of our population. For that reason I have opposed the enactment of the May bill. It would not result in greater production, but less production. I object to it further on the ground that it would inject into our form of government something which would be abhorrent to us, something which we must fight against more and more every day, namely, the control of the life of the individual citizen by some administrator of government. A few months ago when we considered the so-called unemployment compensation bill I opposed the effort which was made on the floor of the Senate to place a work administrator over the workers of the country. I now fight the May bill for the same reason and because it would not afford even temporary help to our armed forces.

I am opposed to the committee's substitute. The substitute which I have offered is solely to correct what I believe to be bad features in the committee substitute. That substitute would place upon the farm worker the threat of wrong punishment. The substitute which I have offered would permit the local selective draft board to compel the real offender, the man who will not willingly work in any lawful employment, to work. I believe that the adoption of the substitute which I have offered would result in the nonworker willingly seeking a job.

Mr. President, I further believe that the committee substitute would be harmful because it would vest the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission with power to close small independent

businesses throughout the country. I feel that a limitation should be placed upon such powers, and it would be so placed by the substitute which I offered at the beginning of my remarks.

I now submit for the consideration of the Senate this substitute for the amendment reported by the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. President, in connection with my remarks I wish to read a letter which I just received from a soldier in Italy. I have received many letters upon the subject we have been discussing. I do not intend to read all of them, but I have a letter here from a soldier in Italy dated February 12 which reads as follows:

Dear Senator REVERCOMB: In keeping with the democratic process, although in the Army, I would like to express a negative opinion to the proposed "do or die" legislation.

The work-or-fight bill along with the May bill (H. R. 3947) are not conducive to the freedom for which we strive. Although slackers and IV-F's have been a bone of contention with me since I volunteered for the Army 4 years ago I still feel that in spite of the enjoyment and satisfaction I would derive from watching them exudate for a while, the consequences would be detrimental to free institutions.

Realizing that personal freedom can be justified only so long as the abuse of that freedom does not retard the general welfare, I can see a logical argument for forcing the slackers to go to work. But to carry that reasoning further to include the general welfare the potentialities of such legislation are frightening. Freedom, above all else, being the ultimate goal for which we strive, it seems quite incongruous to forsake that goal to win a war, especially so when the military phase of the crisis has already subsided to a point where the introduction of such a bill can be viewed with suspicion. An inquiry into the files of the Military Affairs Committee should reveal an abundance of men in the services. If this is proved to be untrue my experiences have been very deceiving. With this thought in mind and in consideration of the enormous war effort already accomplished by the American people it appears that this proposed legislation is a bit inconsistent; especially so at this stage of the game. There is no pending crisis that warrants such potential sacrifices to the democratic process.

That letter was received from a soldier on the fighting front in Italy. Those boys understand—they want to keep America free—they want to return to a free America.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter dated February 26, 1945, from Mr. Ira Mosher, president of the National Association of Manufacturers. Mr. Mosher is an operator of a munitions plant in Connecticut. I believe that his letter sums up the pending subject matter better than I could put it in words.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MANUFACTURERS,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1945.

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: There is only one controlling issue in the current discussion over manpower and that is: What action will give the greatest war production with maximum speed? This vital point, unfortunately, has been beclouded. Therefore, I believe it may be worth some additional emphasis.

It is my opinion that industry is of the overwhelming belief that the bill sponsored by you and Senators WAGNER and FERGUSON proposes the most effective legislation that has been offered to obtain maximum production desired by the War and Navy Departments and by the Nation at large. Your bill would cover all the Nation's men and women, whereas the measure passed by the House would have affected some 17,000,000 men between the ages of 18 and 45. These men comprise only about 30 percent of the total labor force. Moreover, Government records show that workers in this age group, more than any other age group, remained on their jobs even during the period between July and October of last year when the total work force changed from 55,000,000 in July to 52,870,000 in October.

Unfortunately, the Senate Military Affairs Committee did not approve the bill as presented by you and your two colleagues. For this reason, it is my sincere belief that certain modifications of the bill as reported may be required if it is to accomplish the objective desired.

As you know, industry presented to the Senate Military Affairs Committee information which showed conclusively that manpower shortages are confined to a few localities or areas and that no over-all shortage of manpower exists. The committee also received evidence from the War Manpower Commission showing the same facts. In view of this local, or what might best be described as spotty manpower shortages, it is the opinion of industry that the machinery for correcting these situations should be operated as largely as possible in the local communities or areas where such situations exist. This opinion is based upon the belief that representatives of management, labor, and government in these areas are best equipped with the knowledge essential to the solution of the problem.

I therefore would like to suggest that the bill provide clearly that its administration be placed, insofar as possible, with the local community or area agencies of the W. M. C. The bill sponsored by you contained language which would accomplish this objective. Your bill provided:

"To the maximum extent consistent with the purposes of the act the War Manpower Commission shall decentralize the determination of policy and the administration of operations."

Industry has supported action to strengthen the W. M. C. largely because that Commission has operated basically in the community and because of this, there has been in W. M. C. operations an opportunity for local determination of the extent to which its programs were to be applied locally to meet the manpower needs. Under the existing W. M. C. organization, administrative decisions affecting any employer or employee are made locally and can be appealed to the area management-labor committee, then to the regional management-labor committee, and finally to the national management-labor policy committee.

The bill sponsored by you provided for a continuation of this appeal procedure in section 5 (b). The bill approved by the committee provides an opportunity for hearing before an impartial administrative tribunal. It also provides that to the extent practicable and appropriate hearings are to be accorded in local areas before tribunals so constituted as to permit the ascertainment of the views of persons selected as representatives of management, labor, and agricultural interests in the locality.

I am perplexed as to the meaning of the new appeal provision and I feel that it should be clarified. If it is the intent of this provision that a new impartial tribunal be established to hear a further appeal from decisions of the management-labor committees, I have no objection. On the other hand, if this provision means the appeals are to be restricted then I hope the Senate may see fit to restore the place of the management-labor committees in the program.

Clarification of the appeals procedure seems doubly important in view of the fact that this amendment is accompanied by another injecting heavy criminal penalties.

The bill as reported incorporates the fine and imprisonment penalties of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended by the Second War Powers Act. The bill does not specify the violations for which the penalties will be applied. Furthermore, it does not indicate whether the penalties shall be applied to employees although the committee report indicates that the penalties will apply only to employer violations of section 4 (b) of the bill which relates to employment ceilings and control of employment. In order to avoid confusion, I would suggest that the penalties be stated in full and incorporated in section 4 (b). I also suggest that the heavy penalties be restricted to cases of willful violation.

In the bill sponsored by you, provision was made for the application of economic penalties or sanctions under which wages paid to an employee in violation of the act or regulation were not deductible for income-tax purposes or allowed as costs under Government contracts. This provision has been retained and thus the committee bill provides two type of penalties for violations, economic and criminal.

In view of the insertion of fine and imprisonment penalties by the committee, the imposition of an additional economic penalty seems unnecessary and I urge this provision be omitted. In any event, I urge that all penalties under this bill be restricted to willful violations. I believe such a provision is particularly advisable in a program of this sort, which can be administered effectively and intelligently only on the basis of specific orders.

There is another provision of the committee bill which I find difficult to understand. This is contained in section 10 (a) and seems to extend the scope of the act to independent contractors. The provision appears to be founded upon a fear that some employer may attempt to evade the act through the vehicle of some type of contract which would establish a relationship different from the normal employment contract. Although the section may prevent some evasion, it is my belief that it will interfere with production in many more cases by requiring every employer to investigate the status of each secondary contractor, and that contractor's employees, with whom he does business. It is my opinion that this confusing provision is unnecessary.

One additional point, I hope, will receive appropriate attention by the Senate. It is this that there is no provision in the committee bill which affords any protection against arbitrary and unreasonable employment ceilings. Some such provisions should be included in order that the Congress may be assured that its solution to the manpower problem will be effective.

Very truly yours,

IRA MOSHER, *President.*

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter received from Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, on the subject of the pending legislation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1945.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The American Federation of Labor is opposed to H. R. 1752 as reported by the Senate Military Affairs Committee because it contains the Austin amendment (sec. 7), which incorporates paragraph 5 of the second section of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act of 1942.

The Austin amendment, therefore, reads as follows:

"Any person who willfully performs any act prohibited, or willfully fails to perform any act required by, any provision of this subsection (2) or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder, whether heretofore or hereafter issued, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both."

This amendment is unnecessary and highly objectionable. The penalties provided for in the amendment are unreasonable and indefensible. The working people of the Nation who have served so efficiently since Pearl Harbor will resent being subjected to such unreasonable and oppressive penalties.

Without the Austin amendment, through labor ceilings placed upon the employer and control of hiring supported by financial penalties which may result through court action, enforcement of the bill can be brought about.

Individual compulsion of workers is not needed and is not required by the bill as reported. Amendments so providing should therefore not be incorporated in the bill when it is under consideration on the floor of the Senate. If such amendments are added providing for compulsion of individuals, the bill will not only become unworkable but be very harmful and impede war production.

If legislation must be passed, the committee bill with the Austin amendment eliminated from it would not be so drastic nor so bitterly unpalatable.

Sincerely yours,

W. GREEN, *President.*

GIVE NEWSPAPERS THE ARMS WITH WHICH TO FIGHT

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, as an interlude to the very valuable and informative discussion on the question of the May-Bailey bill, I wish to address the Senate for a few moments on another topic.

Several months ago it was my privilege on the floor of the Senate to pay tribute to the service which the smaller newspapers of America have given to the successful prosecution of the war effort. No other agency has been more instrumental in promoting the proper attitude of the people toward the war and sustaining the contact of the fathers and mothers at home with the boys on the fighting front and young women in the service of our country at home and abroad. Today, I wish to add to that tribute a few words of commendation for the service given by the larger newspapers of our country.

Mr. President, I am impelled to do this for two reasons: First, the very fine tribute paid to the newspapers of the country by Byron Price, Director of Censorship, in an address delivered last Thursday acknowledging the gift to the Library of Congress of one of the original copies of the Bill of Rights. Mr. Price praised the voluntary censorship assumed by the press out of respect to the need of our Government in prosecution of the war, and to the very great assistance afforded by the newspapers in disseminating information and in supporting the morale of the country in these trying days. In the second place, the newspapers of the country are greatly disturbed by rumors, which have become widely circulated, that the supply of print-paper, without which newspapers cannot render adequate service, will be considerably reduced in the second quarter of the current year by order of the Pulp-paper Division of the War Production Board.

Recently, as a member of the Joint Committee on Printing, I surveyed the proposed needs for Government printing during that same quarter, beginning in April. The requirements asked totaled in amount a million and a quarter pounds more than was used for governmental purposes in the current quarter. There has been a steady increase in the use of paper for Government purposes, while it is proposed to curtail the supply for newspaper usage.

I do not intend to criticize here the various agencies of Government which deem it so necessary to carry on their propaganda as well as their essential needs during these war times, but I do contend that the Government is making a grave mistake if it restricts to a greater degree than it is willing to assume for itself the use of paper for newspaper publishing.

I wish to take this occasion to pay tribute to the contribution which the larger newspapers are making toward our war effort. For a concrete example, I have selected one newspaper—the South Bend Tribune—one of the most outstanding newspapers in the Middle West, and while its contribution in its area has been remarkable, it is but a measure of what all the large city newspapers of the country are doing. In 1943 the Tribune's contribution to the war effort was 157,745 lines. In 1944, because of less demands, it was 51,009 lines. In January 1945, it was 3,311 lines. The Tribune was very glad to make this contribution, and expects to continue so long as its valuable space is required to aid in worthy win-the-war causes. In addition to this linage, most of which was display advertising, there were given gladly and freely many news stories the value of which, judging from results, must have been considerable.

Since the attack on Pearl Harbor the South Bend Tribune has given unsparingly of its space and energy to furthering the cause for which America is fighting. In days which have seen a rationing of advertising space to meet a constantly lessening supply of newsprint the Tribune has given unstintingly of its news columns in furtherance of the requests of various patriotic endeavors.

This policy often has resulted in the omission of local and telegraph news and of advertising, and has led to the elimination for the duration of valuable features and the curtailment of others. However, the Tribune had felt that nothing was so important as the advancement of the war effort. The various war efforts supported by the Tribune are almost too numerous to list. They cover every reasonable request advanced by the armed forces and the home front. Not only has every war-loan drive been supported to the fullest, but in addition the Tribune has lent its vice president, Franklin D. Schurz, to the St. Joseph County War Savings Finance Committee.

Mr. Schurz was county chairman of the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth War Loan drives. His efforts are greatly responsible for the reputation St. Joseph County has acquired as the Nation's "bond buyingest" county. Every quota has been raised; several have been doubled and still St. Joseph County is buying bonds and will do so as long as necessary.

Early in the war the Tribune organized a 1-day scrap-metal drive that raised 2,400,000 pounds of old metal in South Bend and Mishawaka on a single day. The teamsters' union provided drivers; business firms provided trucks and the citizenry provided brawn, muscle, and scrap metal in response to the Tribune's appeals. The drive was so successful that subsequent scrap-metal and scrap-paper drives have been modeled after it.

And so it has been in the case of other appeals, covering such a wide range of subjects as waste fats, American Red Cross, clothing for war-devastated peoples, appeals for manpower, nurses, rationing, and others. Always the Tribune has been out in front, asking and pleading for support by its readers, estimated at a quarter of a million.

Ration tables were carried by the Tribune as a regular feature at the start of the program. Today a ration guide advising readers of expiration dates and other pertinent information is a regular Tribune feature. Recently the Tribune worked hand in hand with the local war production board to insure the success of the dim-out in northern Indiana and southern Michigan. At the same time the new coal regulations were given prominence in the Tribune.

As a home front morale builder the Tribune has developed columns of service notes telling of the activities of local and other men in the armed services. Men returning from the various theaters of war are interviewed in as many instances as possible and made the subject of articles describing their experiences. This, it is felt, inspires loyalty and a sense of individual responsibility on the part of the people.

While this is not an exhaustive study of the Tribune's war-effort activities it does attempt to give a cross section of what that newspaper is attempting to do. I have a letter to the Tribune from Mr. Giles L. Cain, of South Bend, chairman of the South Bend civilian defense salvage committee, in which he says:

> We of the salvage division of the civilian defense corps are more than ordinarily proud of the outstanding manner in which the South Bend Tribune has supported the war-necessary salvage activities. Humbly we acknowledge that all our efforts would have virtually been in vain were it not for the unselfish, consistent, and aggressive support we have enjoyed from your publication.
>
> Believe me, sir, when I say that we of the salvage division from the mayor on down through the ranks are grateful. We wonder what could have been accomplished nationally if every salvage effort everywhere met the same powerful backing we have always had

from the Tribune. We have not kept files on the enormous publicity the Tribune has given the gathering of waste paper, metals, and the lowly tin can as well as waste kitchen fats and greases. All we know, sir, is that you of the Tribune have done an outstanding job, performed a patriotic service with heart-warming zeal and cheerfulness that left nothing more to be desired.

I think we can say with pardonable pride that our salvage efforts in South Bend and environs have been successful. But we can say so only because we have had your unstinted support from the beginning. You have made our community salvage conscious. You have made the going easier for the men and youths who have helped in the task. You have done much to make people not only salvage-minded but proud to help in this phase of the war effort. Our salvage activities have brought in thousands of dollars for the works of mercy of the Red Cross and the United War Chest; for the Servicemen's Center and youth recreation programs; for the less fortunate at home and abroad. We know that they, too, want us to thank you and the Tribune for your marvelous work.

William Klusmeier, chairman of the St. Joseph County War Bond Sales Committee, writes:

As we enter the fourth year of War bond buying in St. Joseph County, it brings to mind the discussion we had the day after Pearl Harbor. At that time you will recall I had been offered the chairmanship of this county and based my acceptance upon whether or not the South Bend Tribune would support a program to help the people of St. Joseph County save $100,000,000 and I am happy to report that this goal is in sight.

I am sure that no newspaper in the Nation has given more space than has the South Bend Tribune to establish this record of bond buying, which is outstanding in the country. Without the tremendous amount of publicity you have given this promotion it could not have succeeded but as it stands this county leads the State of Indiana per capita.

In writing this letter of appreciation for the very liberal space you have given our committee promotions, I also wish to say that we are very fortunate to have your vice president, Franklin D. Schurz, give so liberally of his time and ability in publicity and field organization. There is no way that we can place a value on the work that Mr. Schurz has done for the war finance committee in this county, aside from being the State war finance publicity chairman.

The successful promotion which we have had would not have been possible without the South Bend Tribune promoting them both editorially and with very desirable space. We had the Hollywood group and 257 firms pledged 90-percent participation in pay-roll deductions. In September of 1942 we were the first county to deliberately double its quota and make it. Then we had the two war correspondents brought here by the South Bend Tribune, and War bonds were the price of admission. Jimmy Cagney followed, and the number of 10-percent bond buyers was increased from 6,000 to 27,000. We then had the most outstanding exhibition of war material ever shown in this part of the country, which was another direct promotion of Mr. Schurz and the South Bend Tribune. This resulted in thousands of people buying their full War-bond quota, which was the price of admission to this war material show. In addition to this we have had six war loans and all of them have been a success. As a result of all of this our county has made 37 consecutive War-bond quotas, the only county in the State that has this record.

I find it is a real pleasure to write you this letter reviewing the War-bond record of our county. I want to emphasize again that it has been made possible only through the cooperation of the South Bend Tribune. The Seventh War Loan is coming up and we will be assured of making it with your cooperation. I hope it will be possible for you to continue to spearhead our bond buying, as the people of St. Joseph County have come to expect it of the South Bend Tribune.

A letter from E. C. Wenz, district manager of the W. P. B., says:

I wish to take this opportunity to thank you for the many courtesies your newspaper has extended to this organization in connection with War Production Board problems as they affect the public and various manufacturing organizations in this district.

The cooperation of your organization in publicizing War Production Board orders of all kinds and placing before the public, through the medium of the newspaper, the facts in connection with the various programs such as conservation, salvage, priorities, manpower problems, and instructions and other information on subjects too numerous to mention has been 100 percent.

I wish especially to commend you and your staff on the way the publicity and pictures were handled recently in the manpower campaign in which you gave the necessary publicity to certain "must" plants in connection with the importance of their products to the war effort. This campaign, as far as I can determine, went a long way in manning these particular plants to enable them to bring their production up to schedule.

The foregoing testimonials speak for themselves. I give this information in the interest of justice to American newspapers, for this experience has been exemplified by thousands of newspapers in America.

It does seem to virtually all of them that with the constant demands made by Government agencies, national, State, and local, greater consideration should be given to the absolute need of more newsprint by most, if not all, American newspapers. This need is pressing. Many newspapers are now compelled to refuse advertisers additional space. This means a financial loss to them. Of course, they could eliminate all or most of the space so freely given to Government requirements and sell it to the advertisers, but their desire that the war be won quickly is a greater importance to them than the financial gain.

THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF THE COAST GUARD'S PORT SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, February 25 marked the third anniversary of one of the more important but lesser known jobs of our armed forces. Just 3 years ago, the President delegated to the Secretary of the Navy the primary responsibility for safeguarding our ports, harbors, vessels, and water-front facilities. This job of taking all necessary measures for their protection was promptly assigned by the Secretary to the Commandant of the Coast Guard, under whose direction this work has since been carried forward. The importance of this work can be evaluated only when it is remembered that all war equipment and supplies sent to our armies and allies abroad must be shipped through our ports. Any damage to port facilities, or to vessels while in port, would result in an almost proportional lowering of the volume of equipment which can be gotten to our fighting forces. Obviously, any such reduction would, in turn, cause a proportional decrease in our armies' war potential and an increase in both the time required to vanquish our enemies and in the number of our men whose blood and lives would be required to do the job.

The enormous scope and burden of this port security responsibility can be visualized only when it is placed against the background of the tremendous quantities of war materials which are required to be shipped to our armed forces abroad. Let us look for a moment at the amount required for the conquest of Iwo Jima, a tiny island in the Pacific. Our fighting forces at that place have already received enough oil to make a train of tank cars of 10,000 gallons each extending 238 miles long. They have gotten enough gasoline to operate 30,730 automobiles for a full year and enough lubricating oil for one complete change for 465,000 cars. Enough food to feed a city the size of Columbus, Ohio, for 30 days has been shipped to them. And they have enough ammunition—bombs, shells, rockets, and cartridges—to fill 480 freight cars. All of this first had to be shipped from American ports. Multiply the amounts needed for the Iwo Jima action by the number and extent of the other operations by our armed forces abroad and some picture develops of the almost limitless amounts which we must ship. And almost all such shipments, as well as the vessels which carry them and the facilities over which they are loaded, are protected by the Coast Guard.

With the great increase in the number of ships and the volume of cargo passing through our ports have also come the need to use inexperienced personnel, the need for greater speed in loading, and the inability properly to maintain our facilities. All have added to the difficulties of the Coast Guard's port security responsibility. Yet the job has been done, and done well. In pre-war years, water-front and vessel losses from fire alone were tremendous. In the 3 years since the Coast Guard has taken over, however, despite the tremendous expansion in the utilization of our ports, no water-front loss of importance has occurred to any vessel or water-front facility for whose protection the Coast Guard is responsible. No ship has been delayed and no cargo has been lessened by any injuries or damage that could have been avoided. That record has not been a matter of luck. It has only resulted from the development by the Coast Guard of an integrated port-security program designed to prevent losses from accident, negligence, or sabotage.

Protection against fire has been a primary measure. To handle this, the Coast Guard has instituted a widespread fire-prevention program for the removal of fire hazards, and with the voluntary cooperation of owners and operators of vessels and facilities has achieved great success in removing causes of fires which might cause widespread havoc. In addition, the Coast Guard early recognized that the greatest difficulty in handling water-front fires was the lack of specialized fire-fighting equipment, especially equipment which would enable fires to be attacked from the waterside as well as from the land. At the time the Coast Guard was given the port-security job, there were less than 40 fireboats in

all ports of the United States. Now the Coast Guard has its own fleet of over 250 such craft, each carrying the finest of fire-fighting equipment and each having a minimum pumping capacity of over 2,000 gallons per minute. They have done remarkably good work.

With the great increase in the activities of our armies abroad has come a huge expansion in shipments of explosives and petroleum products, which are the basic sinews of modern war. By statute and Executive order the Coast Guard has been charged with responsibility for supervising the loadings of these dangerous articles and insuring their safety aboard ship. In recent months, both the Army and the Navy have turned to trained Coast Guard details for supervision of loadings at their terminals both here and outside the country. Through the combination of knowledge, extreme care, and the sound training of the supervising personnel, the Coast Guard has been able to avoid any explosion or disaster at any terminal or ship supervised by one of the details. Such supervision is one of the more hazardous of war jobs, and the men who daily performed it are worthy of high commendation.

Other Coast Guard activities have also contributed to the security of our ports. Movements of all vessels in American waters have been controlled by a system of required licenses and by small boat patrols. Admittance to vessels and water-front facilities have been controlled by Coast Guard identification cards so as to insure the barring of persons whose presence thereon would be inimical to the Nation's war effort. And requirements for obtaining Coast Guard explosives-handling permits have insured the competency of longshoremen handling these dangerous articles.

All of these Coast Guard activities have combined to assure the safety of our ports and vessels and to guarantee the safe shipment abroad of necessary war materials and supplies. To Admiral Waesche and the men and officers of the Coast Guard who have performed these duties so faithfully and well must go the appreciation of the entire country. With their help, the supplies are getting through to our armies and allies as rapidly as production and transportation facilities will permit. They are doing a great job.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold H. Jacobs, of Massachusetts, to be Examiner in Chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Perry to be rear admiral, to rank from October 19, 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul F. Foster, to be commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to continue while serving as assistant naval inspector general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry M. Briggs to be commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Caribbean Sea Frontier, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Davenport Browne to be commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as assistant chief of staff (personnel) to commander, Western Sea Frontier, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 1, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 28 (legislative day of February 26), 1945:

UNITED STATES PATENT OFFICE

Harold H. Jacobs, to be examiner in chief, Board of Appeals, United States Patent Office.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To Quartermaster Corps

Capt. Joseph Eakens James, Jr.

To Ordnance Department

First Lt. Joshua Asher Finkel

To Air Corps

Second Lt. Albert Carl Hegenberger
Second Lt. Ernest Hinds

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be first lieutenants

Lamar Asbury Welch, Infantry.
Jean Koke Lambert, Infantry.
Robert Ernst Conine, Infantry.
William Jones Williams, Coast Artillery Corps.
Robert Edmund Hand, Field Artillery.
Verle Douglas Miller, Infantry.
Frank Henry Stone, Infantry.
Samuel Meyer Lipton, Corps of Engineers.
Lucien Fairfax Keller, Infantry.
Arthur James DeLuca, Infantry.
Thomas Carlton Reddington, Field Artillery, subject to examination required by law.
Paul Julian Maline, Coast Artillery Corps.
John Farwell Mitchell, Field Artillery.
James Virgil Johnston, Jr., Infantry, subject to examination required by law.
Donald Norman Cameron, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.
Gene Richard Welch, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.
John Charles Liggett, Signal Corps.
David Dorsey Hulsey, Chemical Warfare Service.
Frank Clifford Healy, Cavalry, subject to examination required by law.
Hunter Marion Brumfield, Infantry.
Irvin Marshall Rice, Corps of Engineers.
James Byron Scherer, Field Artillery.
Frederick Claus Zumsteg, Field Artillery.
Kenneth Mace Gonseth, Signal Corps.
George Marcel Cummins, Field Artillery, subject to examination required by law.
Raymond Elmer Smart, Jr., Air Corps.
Claude Esmond Bailey, Jr., Infantry.
Andrew Lacock Cox, Coast Artillery Corps, subject to examination required by law.
Charles Parsons Clark, Jr., Field Artillery.
Ferdinand Frederick Glomb, Jr., Air Corps.
William Waldorf Barnes, Infantry.
Carroll Bernard McElroy, Air Corps, subject ject to examination required by law.
Francis Xavier Leary, Field Artillery, subject to examination required by law.
Almon Louis Hugins, Jr., Infantry.
Tom Billie Strother, Coast Artillery Corps.
William Numsen Lucke, Corps of Engineers.
Calvin Aldrich Heath, Infantry.
Robert John MacGregor Fyfe, Jr., Infantry.
Robert Clark Storey, Infantry.
Joseph Thornell Stephens, Field Artillery.
Joseph Olai Stensland, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.
Adolph John Leocha, Coast Artillery Corps.
Arthur Webster Hodges, Jr., Infantry.
Corson Landrum Hilton, Jr., Infantry.
Harold Vincent Maixner, Infantry.
Richard Oliver Gordon, Chemical Warfare Service.
Emery Ellis Bellonby, Coast Artillery Corps.
Phillip Haines Baker, Coast Artillery Corps.
William Robert Tuck, Cavalry.
George Abbott Lucey, Cavalry, subject to examination required by law.
Jack Carl Maldonado, Coast Artillery Corps.
John William Barrett, Infantry.
Thomas Kleberg Hughes, Signal Corps.
Jay Byron Mowbray, Infantry.
Robert Leslie Bereuter, Infantry.
Carl William Plitt, Infantry.
John Arthur Martin, Chemical Warfare Service, subject to examination required by law.

John Allen Coulter, Infantry.
Walter John Rankin, Field Artillery.
Richard Leo Dooley, Field Artillery.
John Elliott Arthur, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
George Thomas Mehalko, Coast Artillery Corps.
Wiley Freeman Shaver, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
Wilbur Craig Boyce, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
Henry Gaston Mitchel 3d, Field Artillery.
Clarence Frank Sills, Field Artillery.
Thomas Glen Ferguson, Field Artillery.
Niels Marius Dahl, Infantry.
Daniel Francis Munster, Quartermaster Corps.
William Timothy Hatter, Field Artillery.
Wayne Harold Lee, Ordnance Department.
William Joshua Logan, Coast Artillery Corps.
Fredrick Kenneth Hughes, Cavalry, subject to examination required by law.
Leonard James Goodsell, Corps of Engineers.
Marshall Owen Becker, Infantry.
Kenny Walter Erickson, Infantry.
Joseph Michael Williamson, Field Artillery.
David Albert Gile, Coast Artillery Corps.
David Christy Warwick, Air Corps.
Joseph Szabo, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.
Robert Harrison Zimmerman, Coast Artillery Corps.
Joseph Francis Dunn, Coast Artillery Corps.
Willard Olcott Foster, Jr., Cavalry.
Edward Nicholas Wellems, Infantry.
Kenneth Lee Garrett, Air Corps.
Robert McDonald Shannon, Jr., Corps of Engineers.
Harold Easton Nelson, Corps of Engineers.
Vitaly Kovalevsky, Field Artillery.
Gordon Buford Patton, Field Artillery.
James Beal Kelly, Field Artillery.
Franklin Milton Davis, Jr., Cavalry.
Walter Eugene Burrell, Coast Artillery Corps.
Robert Louis Sweeney, Jr., Cavalry.
Walter Leroy Miller, Jr., Infantry.
Robert James Morgan, Field Artillery.
John Arthur Ford, Quartermaster Corps.
Robert Maurice Johnson, Signal Corps, subject to examination required by law.
Joseph Alva Ogle, Field Artillery.
Henry John Schutte, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps, subject to examination required by law.
Clinton Fort Matthews, Signal Corps.
Frank Fairfield Carr, Cavalry.
Carl Howard Schofield, Infantry.
Robert Thomas Larson, Infantry.
Carl Peden Croninger, Cavalry.
Henry John Muller, Jr., Infantry.
George Irvin Forsythe, Infantry.
Robert Charles Forbes, Infantry.
Edmund Francis Driscoll, Infantry.
Maurice Katz, Infantry.
Herbert Leonard Peavy, Field Artillery.
Boylston Brooks Lewis, Air Corps.
Ernest Charles McInnis, Jr., Field Artillery.
Maynard Clayton Raney, Signal Corps.
James Arthur Hebbeler, Field Artillery.
Kenneth Loring Booth, Field Artillery.
Joseph Briggs DeVennish, Air Corps.
James Elmer Simmons, Infantry.
John William Jennings, Jr., Field Artillery.
Gregory Jackson Skinner, Corps of Engineers.
Vincent Louis Ruwet, Infantry.
Myron Thorne Johnston, Field Artillery.
Thomas Charles Conroy, Air Corps.
Joseph Louie Coleman, Quartermaster Corps.
Paul Millman Morrill, Infantry.
Paul Frederick Lawson, Infantry.
Hugh Porter Stubbs, Jr., Field Artillery.
Elmer Schmierer, Infantry.
Frank Ovid Hamilton, Field Artillery.
Charles Albert Jones, Jr., Corps of Engineers.
Maurice Clavelle Holden, Infantry.
Warren Grant Leonard, Ordnance Department, subject to examination required by law.
Robert Holmes Pettee, Infantry.
Edward Thielens Peeples, Coast Artillery Corps.
Martin Jack Manhoff, Infantry.
Paul V. Hannah, Coast Artillery Corps.
William Friedman, Infantry.
Richard French Cox, Coast Artillery Corps.
Harry Babcock Brown, Field Artillery.
Jesse Melvin Charlton, Jr., Infantry.
Robert Sigman Regenstein, Quartermaster Corps.
Daniel Campbell Brawner, Air Corps.
Robert Frank Garner, Jr., Chemical Warfare Service.
George William Smith, Field Artillery.
Walter Ferson Tucker, Field Artillery.
Thomas Nugent Courvoisie, Field Artillery.
Carl Morrison Allen, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps.
William Cecil Crawford, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.
William Woodrow Cozad, Quartermaster Corps.
George Herbert De Chow, Infantry.
Howard Marquard Hansen, Signal Corps.
John McAdams, Infantry.
George William Carter, Infantry.
Robert Callen Russell, Quartermaster Corps.
Milton Clark Hess, Quartermaster Corps.
Thomas Furman Spencer, Corps of Engineers.
William Walter Sedr, Corps of Engineers.
Donald Palmer Boyer, Jr., Infantry.
Kenwood Ross, Ordnance Department.
Dayton Willis Eddy, Infantry.
George Edwin Bucklin, Infantry.
Charles Gilliland Renfro, Field Artillery.
Viron Edward Bird, Finance Department.
Leo Martin Kane, Quartermaster Corps.
John Kearns Muller, Corps of Engineers.
Jack Wesley Streeton, Air Corps, subject to examination required by law.
Alton Davis Arnold, Corps of Engineers.
James Grover Holland, Jr., Infantry.
Glenn B. Daughton, Signal Corps.
Jose Antonio Andino, Chemical Warfare Service.
Raymond Geyer Jones, Field Artillery.
Ralph Scott Johnson, Infantry.
Robert Warren Perkins, Coast Artillery Corps, subject to examination required by law.
Edward George Uhl, Ordnance Department.
Howell Edward Cobb, Coast Artillery Corps.
Henry Koepcke, Jr., Infantry.
Albert John Wetzel, Jr., Air Corps.
Louis Arthur Waple, Coast Artillery Corps.
Jack Helm Remele, Coast Artillery Corps.
Robert Elwood Kimball, Signal Corps.
William Edward McBride, Infantry.
Rex Applegate, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.
Jesse Thomas, Jr., Corps of Engineers.
Arden Wirth Dow, Infantry.
Frederick Allen Hippey, Fileld Artillery.
Herman Martin Volheim, Infantry, subject to examination required by law.
Roger Jerome Aull, Field Artillery.
Patrick Joseph Gibbons, Jr., Infantry.
William Walter Harvey, Jr., Infantry.
James Edward Hammer, Field Artillery.
Victor Lee Cary, Quartermaster Corps, subject to examination required by law.
Clare Norton Lyke, Field Artillery.
Allen William Rodeheffer, Field Artillery.
Thomas James Camp, Jr., Field Artillery.
John Locke Cheney, Field Artillery.
Charles Raymond Graham, Ordnance Department.
Wallace Erwin Bjornson, Signal Corps.
Jerald Morris Davies, Air Corps.
Anthony Pierre Bonnaffon, Field Artillery.
Stuart Campbell Williams, Field Artillery.
Thomas Raymond Cross, Infantry.
Philip Clark Calhoun, Infantry.
Ferdinand Herman Flick, Coast Artillery Corps.
David Lane Aldinger, Cavalry.
Robert Rorbach Fisk, Ordnance Department.
Benjamin Paul Blasingame, Signal Corps.
Ben Lamar Anderson, Infantry.
Orwin Clark Talbott, Infantry.
James Dunceith Beckett, Infantry.
Charles Woodburn Matheny, Jr., Field Artillery.
Ira Christian Rumburg, Infantry.
Robert Mayer Hamilton, Infantry.
Elbridge Lee Snapp, Quartermaster Corps.
Leonard Charles Miller, Chemical Warfare Service, subject to examination required by law.
James Edwin Foley, Air Corps.

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

John Perry to be a rear admiral.

Paul F. Foster to be a commodore in the Naval Reserve, for temporary service, to continue while serving as assistant naval inspector general.

Henry M. Briggs to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, Caribbean Sea Frontier, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Davenport Browne to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as assistant chief of staff (personnel) to commander, Western Sea Frontier, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

POSTMASTERS

IOWA

Ruby I. Rinkler, West Des Moines.

MASSACHUSETTS

Fred M. Adelmann, Norwood.

NEW JERSEY

Patrick J. McGrath, Bayonne.
Frank J. Mallia, Lodi.
Harry Natalo, North Hackensack.
Sarah E. Burke, Stelton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in Thy kingdom, which is everlasting in power infinite, the living stones of Thy temple of the new humanity are redeemed and saved from sin. We pray Thee to arm us, not with a new faith but with more power in that faith which we learned at the knees of mother. Stir and shake up the banked fires of the altars of every creed that there may be a rise of fresh spiritual life fusing them into real, genuine brotherhood.

Heavenly Father, give us a vision of that goal toward which the tired and weary feet on battle lines are toiling onward, when the bright sky of victory may be seen by the longing eyes of the world. It matters little where the pain is if it draws us nearer God; we care not how hard the way if it increases our self-dedication to our brother man. Lead us quietly along the path of each day's duty which alone has victory that overcomes the world. May all conventional idols be

shattered, when with increased understanding we shall be able to mold the spirit of the new day, a day of true Christian fraternity. Through Christ our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 340) entitled "An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Administrative Office of the United States Courts.
5. National Archives.
6. Office of Civilian Defense.
7. United States courts, northern district of California.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of Labor.
4. Department of the Navy.
5. Foreign Economic Administration.
6. Office of Price Administration.
7. Selective Service System.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Commerce.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. National Archives.
5. General Accounting Office.
6. Library of Congress.
7. Office of Price Administration.
8. Office of War Information.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Federal Power Commission.
4. Office of Price Administration.
5. Office of War Information.
6. Library of Congress.
7. Railroad Retirement Board.
8. War Relocation Authority.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

THE LATE EDWIN M. WATSON

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, we have heard with great regret of the death of Maj. Gen. Edwin M. Watson, the President's military aide and secretary. I am sure I express the sentiment of the entire membership of the House when I extend to his family and to his friends our sympathy and our own sorrow at his passing. We will miss his genial personality at the White House.

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Con. Res. 32), as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, the 1st day of March 1945, at 12:30 o'clock p. m., for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMPOWERING SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO DECLARE RECESS OF HOUSE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order on tomorrow for the Speaker pro tempore to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE LATE EDWIN M. WATSON

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege during the last few years to call at the White House on numerous occasions with reference to the military affairs of our country. It was indeed quite a shock when I learned that Maj. Gen. Edwin M. Watson passed on.

It was no trouble at all for General Watson to interrupt his own proceedings in order that he might accommodate anyone who called at the White House, by phone or in person.

He possessed an extraordinary personality. He was congenial, gracious, and efficient. We know President Roosevelt will feel lost for a time without General Watson's counsel, good humor, and advice. I will miss him. His host of friends will miss him. His country loses the services of a great patriotic and hard-working servant.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I received unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD certain remarks in connection with the revenue laws enacted since 1913. My remarks exceeded the allowance to the extent of a cost of $338, according to a letter I have from the Public Printer. I ask unanimous consent that these may be included in the RECORD notwithstanding the extra cost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object. I call attention to the fact that these estimates of the printer are always exaggerated, because they take into consideration the help. As a matter of fact no extra help will be required. The help at the Printing Office is already employed there and the only extra cost involved will be the cost of the paper and the ink that it takes to print these remarks.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address by the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON] on the subject Hawaii's Debt to New England.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution passed by the Senate of the State of New York.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a G. I. in the South Pacific relative to the Army's furlough rotation policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post entitled "Signal to the House."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Toledo (Ohio) Blade.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "New Crops for the New World." I have an estimate from the Public Printer that this will exceed by $143 the amount that is allowable, and I ask unanimous consent that I may include this article notwithstanding the additional cost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered last Monday night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PRECOMBAT TRAINING

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the tragic things in this war is the attitude of our military forces in sending the young, untrained, and inexperienced boys into combat duty without having first received ample training in the arts of war. Within the past few weeks several young boys, of 18 years, who had their basic training of 13 weeks were sent almost immediately across and into combat. The result has been that those young boys, inexperienced as they were, suffered injuries and death because of their unpreparedness for combat. I have a letter from the father of a boy, 18 years of age, who reports that in his immediate vicinity his own son and two other boys of the same age, with but very little training, were sent across and into combat, and the result was that two of these boys were wounded and the third boy of this group was killed. These boys graduated from school in June 1944. They suffered their wounds, and the one boy was killed in combat, in January 1945. The practice of the War Department, and our officers in the Army, of sending these young, untrained, and inexperienced boys into combat, without sufficient training, is one of the tragedies of this war. We have untold thousands of older men in the Army, stationed in camps all over our country, who have been trained for a long period of time, who are far better equipped to meet the enemy than these young, inadequately trained, and inexperienced young boys. The practice of sending these young boys into combat without adequate training must be stopped. These young boys must be given a chance to save their lives, and this can only be done when they have been adequately and thoroughly trained in the arts of war.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2374) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; and, pending that motion, I should like to reach an agreement with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] regarding time for general debate.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the understanding I had with the chairman is that we should have general debate all day today, that then we should read the first four pages of the bill, and that when we had concluded that the Committee would rise for the day; also, that the time should be equally divided.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate run throughout the day, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the understanding being that at the conclusion of general debate the first four pages of the bill will be read, after which the Committee will rise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2374, with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, during the next few days millions of taxpayers all over the United States will be wrestling with the problem of meeting their financial obligations to the Government. These taxpayers first of all are interested in providing the Government with the necessary funds for the most effective prosecution of the war, but they are also interested in the condition of our National Treasury and in effecting such economy as can be effected without materially retarding the termination of war.

I am especially interested in the appropriation pertaining to the housing of war workers. I know more about that particular problem than I do any other part of the bill, being a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and having traveled several thousand miles making a personal investigation of the housing needs of war workers.

Also, during the last few days my remarks in regard to inefficiency and lax working habits have brought me a barrage of letters containing information from workers in defense plants who are in a position to make very personal observations of what is going on. I am sure some of the money requested by the National Housing Administration is earmarked for some of these plants where there is overstaffing and inefficiency and therefore not need for additional manpower or housing for same.

As I am going to point out as I go along, in order to justify an appropriation for additional Federal public housing we must first justify the need for the manpower that is going to occupy this housing. I have prepared excerpts from a number of letters which I have received during the past 10 days illustrating the waste and misuse of manpower already on the scene at war plants, navy yards, and Government agencies. However, I should like to make a few personal observations on the war housing appropriations before reading these excerpts from letters.

A few days ago I was talking with a friend and relative of mine who is employed in the largest defense industry in Fort Wayne, Ind. During our conversation he remarked that he made $126 last week. When I asked him what he was doing, I discovered he was making a very much needed piece of equipment for some of our newest implements of war. After informing him of the importance of this particular item and of the very urgent need for these new war items, I asked him how many of those items he was able to make per day. This was his answer. I quote:

> I was making 15 per day and I could make 30, but my union boss demanded that I cut my production to 6 per day or else I would lose my job. He said the company was getting $50 for each of those items and I was making entirely too much money for the company and would have to cut my production.

This was the case where a man could make 30 pieces of equipment per day, but is making only 6. In other words, they are employing 5 men to do the work that 1 man could do. Incidentally, this man has several brothers in the service.

When we employ five men in a defense plant to do the work that one man could do, that means we are utilizing five times the housing that is necessary to house the war workers to do that particular war job. In another instance a man walked into my office the other day and informed me he had been discharged from his job in a navy yard where he was drawing a very high salary because he would not and could not tolerate the loafing and idleness which is prevalent among shipyard workers. I have in my files letters which I have received during the past few weeks from employees of four different navy yards. I could enlarge upon that statement a little because this morning I received letters from workers in two additional navy yards, the Bremerton Navy Yard and the Mare Island Navy Yard in California. I will read some excerpts from those letters testifying to the same inefficiency and overstaffing which are included in the following excerpts——

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Can you lay your finger on the reason why these men are not permitted to work and give a full day's work to the Government for the wages they are being paid?

Mr. WILSON. Yes; I can. It usually is not the worker's fault. It is usually the fault of some supervisor or some union boss to whom this person must pay his respects by laying a certain amount of money on the line before he can get and hold the job. The more workers the more money on the line, the more housing and cost to taxpayer.

Mr. RICH. Is that an honest way to treat the taxpayers of this Government or to treat this Government itself in permitting things of that kind to happen?

Mr. WILSON. No; it certainly is everything but an honest way.

Let me quote from some of the letters. And I have each and every letter from which I am quoting here; they are signed letters from people employed by the concerns:

Allow me to say that your enclosed remarks in regard to loafing are justified. Right, it does cost the taxpayers millions of dollars, and in contrast to our boys at the front, it is a crime and shame. I look at the division in which I work, and I now see in front of me 5 lieutenants, 9 so-called supervisors, and 40 rank-and-file employees, typists reading books held in the drawer and papers on the desk for a cover-up. Some are writing letters, and some are visiting. It is a regular practice to build up employees' lists to secure supervisor's rating.

Now this letter came in this morning from the Pacific coast. This navy yard should be investigated.

Another letter:

Your quoted comments in the local morning paper attracted my attention, and from my observation too little attention is being paid to a serious matter that has considerable bearing on the manpower shortage. That is a lack of desire on the part of a lot of employees to perform the work for which they are being paid high wages. There must be some truth in the subject from the amount of gossip around. For instance, it is reported to me that a group of day employees in a local plant in answer to appeals and display advertisements of a local ordnance plant in the local papers asking for production help of all or part time, decided to help out by working on the swing shift, 7 to 11 p. m.

All went well for a few days, and then occasionally another worker would drop by and say, "Slow down, buddy." Occasionally the advice was not heeded, and on the following pay-roll day they were handed their checks and told their services were no longer needed.

Now we are tolerating these slowdowns in defense plants, demanded by union bosses or supervisors; yet we are employing thousands of additional workers for which we are asked to appropriate the taxpayers' money to house.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If we would get efficiency in these Government-operated plants, or plants that are operating on a cost-plus system, what percent of the employees does the gentleman believe we could save from those plants to work on the farms or to go into the military service? What percent of the manpower does the gentleman think we could save today if we had efficiency in manpower operations?

Mr. WILSON. I think it would be not less than 40 percent. That has been my observation.

Now, I quote from a letter received from a girl in a navy yard, with whom I am pretty well acquainted:

Right in my own vicinity girls as well as men are employed by the Government. They write one or two letters a day, and the rest of the day they knit or gossip or whatever may pass the time away.

If this appropriation is granted for housing, there will be no less than 500 houses built out of it to house the loafers to whom this girl is referring:

One girl held a position and found that she was losing her skill as a stenographer and so decided to take down the various conversations of those about her. A supervisor came by and said she was working so hard that she needed assistance and immediately delegated two girls to help lighten her task.

Understand she had nothing to do. She was losing her efficiency and so she tried to take down the conversations of people around her, and she was delegated two employees to help her do that job.

That sounds like a joke, but it is true. There is no end of such cases here.

Here is another letter:

I note with interest a news item appearing in the Wall Street Journal and I think it timely. Others should express themselves as you have done but I am sorry to say some like to play the game sitting on the fence.

I have been through plants working on war work, two within the last 30 days. In one everyone was on the job, while in the other not half were working. As many as four or five were in groups talking and doing nothing. One couple spooning in an out-of-the-way place in a storage warehouse. These are some of the people we will have to make jobs for in the future, and unless the unions come to the rescue and help correct the attitude of many members of the union I cannot figure how the United States will be able to compete in world markets.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. With this extravagance on the part of workers in industry, does the gentleman believe we will be able to raise enough revenue to take care of the deficit that will be contracted by this administration in the next 3 or 4 years?

Mr. WILSON. That is an interesting observation which would require a great deal of time to answer. Briefly I would say "No."

I notice an extract from a letter which I received from Oak Ridge, Tenn. I believe that is in the district of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

I have just now read in the Knoxville Journal, under Washington date line, 19th of February, what you had to say about war workers killing time. You should see just for 1 day what I have seen every day for nearly 2 years—workers for from 8 to 12 hours or more actually not working more than from 1 to 2½ hours. Just now, 12:30 a. m. February 20, a dozen or more workers I come in contact with every night are off—some are gone in their cars and will be back in time to check out at 2:30. Some of them are more or less in a "weaving" way, others gloating over their winnings or despondent over their losses.

I have another letter I received this morning which indicates the same situation in the same war plant at Oakridge, Tenn., where we have built thousands of housing units with the taxpayers' money.

This letter contains the statement:

As per your news note on promoted sabotage by many United States Army and Navy officers and engineers, may I advise: I have four boys in service, each a volunteer. Two daughters employed as junior secretaries in California and Texas Navy bases were so nauseated by the lack of any opportunity to earn their salary that they each quit.

One of those girls was employed in Texas, one in California. They quit their jobs because they did not have anything to do. But think of the thousands who are employed there for whom we are building housing and recreation facilities and furnishing hospitalization and transportation out of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. MASON. No wonder, then, that Lindsay Warren stated before a Senate committee that we had wasted, squandered $50,000,000,000 on this war effort of ours.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I heard Lindsay Warren make that statement myself in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. He said it was caused by this cost-plus system of handing out these contracts and the extravagant way in which the Navy is passing the money out to contractors.

I heard the Navy men say that there was no redress from the subcontractors, who could demand almost anything they wanted, a thousand, ten thousand, or twenty thousand dollars for receiving these subcontracts and they paid the

money over to the contractors and laughed at the suggestion that there was some method by which we could get the money back or punish the people who were getting contracts under proceedings of that kind.

I feel that it is high time the Appropriations Committee in bringing in bills like this scrutinized every dollar. They should not permit money to be spent in this way or in any unnecessary way. It is up to this Congress to stop this spending. If we do not stop it, God save the Nation.

Mr. WILSON. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Further quoting from the letter:

Out here we civilians easily recognize, that around 60 to 80 percent of the Navy building program is, so far as winning this war is concerned, nothing but dirty traitorous sabotage.

They are not referring to the constructive work done, they are referring to that portion of it which has not contributed to the success of the Navy or to the success of the Navy building program or to the success of winning this war.

I am sure you read the insertion that was placed in the RECORD the other day by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON]. This article was inserted on February 20th. It appeared in the Washington Post on February 12, 1945, and I want to read just two paragraphs from that insertion:

In Cleveland the local bureaus of the Federal Government are a bad example. Everyone knows they are overstaffed. Army, Navy, Air Force, and W. P. B. A clerk in the W. P. B. said to me: "We have nothing to do in our department, but today they hired three more girls." In the military staffs, great numbers of young men in uniform are holding jobs that older men or women could do equally well.

An appalling waste of manpower is in the cost-plus-fixed-fee factories, where the Government pays the bill. The turn-over in these establishments is such that, as one labor union man said, "Putting manpower into these factories is just like throwing mud against the wall in the hope that some of it will stick." Of one notorious plant, the Cleveland people say that the workers play bridge on the assembly line.

Here is another reference:

I worked in the Navy Department, and in two different sections in this agency. I thought they really needed stenographers when I came to Washington to be nearer my son when he entered Annapolis. But they don't need them. We are overstaffed because (and this is my personal observation) there are many deferred men and IV-F's in Government. They justify their unessential jobs by putting on a front of clerks and stenographers hard at work wasting paper.

I see in the paper where you raised your voice against loafing on the job in Washington.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I see in the paper where you raised your voice against loafing on the job in Washington. If you want to see something really rotten or just plain sabotage and treason, just come down here and take a look at this job. Take a look at the scrap pile at K-25, and see the immense quantity of new material just thrown in the dump—new valves, pipe fittings, and anything you might name are to be seen. They could pave roads out here with bolts and nuts that are left out in the rain to rust.

For every man working there are five loafing, gambling, or drinking. I came 1,500 miles out here thinking I was going to help my country. The first thing the boss told me was that they were in no hurry whatsoever and to kill all the time I could but keep out of sight. They said the war was just one big pleasure trip. I am a World War veteran, my son is in the Second Marines and has been wounded in action. I belong to the union because I have to to work on a defense job.

DEAR MR. WILSON: I read your article in the Mobile Register, dated February 19, 1945. I admire the stand that you have taken in regard to the loafing of civil-service employees and their bosses.

It is a deplorable situation that exists in the United States Maritime Inspection Department, Ship Construction, and no one seems able to do anything about it. If a report is sent to the Civil Service Commission in Washington, D. C., it is referred back to the regional office where they place a black mark against the one that makes the report.

DEAR MR. WILSON: I have just finished reading your article in the Washington News, or rather the article by the News entitled, "Wilson, the Curfew Man, Is at It Again."

You are perfectly right in your views. Come, or send one of your men to the Fifteenth and E Street door of the Commerce Building and notice the procession of clerks, mostly women, going out of that door and returning with coffee, cokes, sandwiches, cake, etc., at any hour during the afternoon, especially. This causes resentment among the clerks who try to do their duty and work instead of going out of the building at all hours. There are entirely too many clerks, anyway. If there were not too many, they would not have time to talk, chatter, yell across rooms, etc., so the rest of the clerks cannot concentrate.

Then, why allow clerks to stand in line for an hour or so to buy cigarettes? We certainly cannot need a draft-or-work law as long as this goes on. Other people cannot get the necessities of life, meat, chicken, turkey, butter, etc., and I see no reason for allowing clerks wasting time to stand in line, during office hours, for cigarettes.

HONORABLE SIR: Being patriotic and knowing that we are at war, I was reluctant about bringing attention to Washington the vast waste in the manpower of Government offices. Visit the O. P. A., W. P. B., for that matter any Government office, and you'll find hundreds of girls wasting their time and so many men at desks, looking important but actually doing nothing.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that my time has expired, for I have dozens of letters containing statements similar to these excerpts which I have just read. Of all the people who wrote me, there were only two who did not concur in my observations on waste, inefficiency, and incompetency in Government. I hope to have more to say on this subject at a later date.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, the President sent forward an estimate for an appropriation of $23,000,000 to carry forward the community facilities program of the Federal Works Agency to June 30, 1945. This sum is the balance of the amount authorized by the basic act. The President pointed out that it was necessary also to raise the limitation on the amount which may be spent for community services from $80,000,000 to $85,000,000.

The Appropriations Committee now proposes an appropriation of $20,000,000 and proposes also to raise the service limitation by the requested amount.

If the committee had stopped there its proposals would have been responsive to the need. The committee expresses apprehension about continuation of the service program after the 1st of July and reserves $18,000,000 of the $201,000,000 appropriation for that purpose. This reservation makes the bill unworkable for the following reasons:

First. It provides the wholly inadequate sum of $2,000,000 for both construction and service projects between now and July 1.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman will permit me to conclude my statement, I will be glad to yield later.

Mr. TABER. I will give the gentleman some more time, if necessary, so that he might yield to me.

Mr. LANHAM. I will be glad to yield under those circumstances.

Mr. TABER. These people have an unexpended balance for services of $34,500,000 as of the 1st of February. It is $488,000, to be exact. On top of that, their rate of expenditure last year was $3,300,000 and the current rate is $4,000,000 a month. Five times four are twenty. Twenty from thirty-four is fourteen. That means they have $14,000,000 to play with in that fund between now and the 1st of July. That is the picture that they presented without giving a dollar to them.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman, in my opinion, is absolutely inaccurate in his estimate in that regard. I am advised by the Federal Works Agency that they have spent almost all of their money in their expenditures and present allocations to the $80,000,000 limitation placed in the law for services.

Mr. TABER. There is the figure that they furnished themselves.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The figures to which the gentleman from New York calls attention are, as will be noted from the context, unexpended balances. But the question with which we are dealing here is not unexpended balances but unobligated balances. Only unobligated balances can construct new projects or operate either new or old projects. The figures cited ignore those sums in the unexpended balances which are obligated or which are being obligated, as explained before the committee, and which for that reason will not be available for future expenditure.

Mr. LANHAM. That was the idea I was trying to impress, that there have been allocations of these funds, and I am advised by the Federal Works Agency that they lack very little of being up to their $80,000,000 limitation as it is at present. For that reason the Committee on Appropriations in this bill increases that limitation to $85,000,000.

Second. The expenditures for service already approach $80,000,000, and when $85,000,000 has been spent for services, no further expenditure can be made under the law. Thus a large part of the intended $18,000,000 expenditure after June 30 would be immobilized.

The committee in the same bill recommends an appropriation of $84,373,000 for additional war housing. This will meet a pressing need. But at the same time the committee prevents the provision of the necessary water, sewers, schools, hospitals, and other community facilities and services necessary for this additional housing, services which are absolutely necessary to keep the various plants in efficient operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes, and I ask the gentleman to yield to me at this time, because I would like to correct those statements that he has made.

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I am afraid that the gentleman has been misled, because the testimony and the tables that appear on pages 292 and 324 of the hearings do not bear out the statements at all. They do bear out just exactly what I said, that they have $14,000,000 to spare between now and the 1st day of July, without having a cent given to them. I am absolutely correct, and their own tables prove it.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman is confusing unexpended balances and the obligations for which those expenditures are required.

Mr. TABER. I am not confused, because I am telling the gentleman just exactly what it is. The tables show what is unobligated and unallocated.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as everybody knows, all of these governmental agencies have constantly in process the obligation of balances. When they appeared before us they made it clear that the unexpended balances did not include obligated funds or projects being processed.

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct, and they are obligated almost up to the limitation of the present law.

I repeat, I suggest that the bill should provide the whole amount stated for this program for the period ending June 30, 1945. To accomplish this, the following language should be eliminated from the bill, and I propose to offer an amendment tomorrow to this effect:

> On page 8, in lines 8 to 12, eliminate the comma and strike out the following words: "and of the additional amount appropriated under this head not less than $18,000,000 shall be reserved for financing contributions subsequent to June 30, 1945, for the objects to which this proviso applies."

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds have conducted monthly conferences with the Federal Works Administrator on the community facilities program since its inauguration. Another such conference is scheduled for Tuesday next. The committee have for some time intended and do now intend to inquire into the necessity of increasing the authorizations for community facilities. The committee propose to report to the House at its early convenience, after the subject has been exhaustively examined, what further provision should be made for the program after June 30, 1945.

I therefore trust that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the House will be willing to agree to the amendment suggested so that the current bill may provide for the community facilities program, both construction and services, for the current fiscal year, leaving open for further decision what additional provision along these lines, if any, should be made.

The Congress has been prompt and liberal with appropriations for the military branches of the Government. The comparatively modest appropriations for community facilities are necessary to the war program. They ease the burden in the war communities where it is beyond the ability of those communities to bear and they may be said to be the little leaven that leaveneth the whole loaf.

I want to quote this from the report of the committee, found on page 5:

> Irrespective of the merits of new projects, construction, or service, the committee was confronted by the fact that the additional appropriation requested, if employed as projected, would leave no margin for maintaining and operating service projects when funds within the existing authorized appropriation ceiling become exhausted. That ceiling may or may not be raised.

May I say in that connection that there is absolutely no necessity for the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to take up the matter of further authorizations along this line until the authorizations already made have been used and appropriations made under them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

INCOME TAXES—A JUST AND EQUITABLE DEDUCTION

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have today introduced a bill to amend section 23 (a) (1) (A) of the Internal Revenue Code to the end that in the case of a Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, Congress, who maintains a home in the State, Territory, or possession from which he was elected or appointed, rent paid or incurred by him for housing necessary to enable him to be in attendance at the sessions of Congress shall be considered an expense paid or incurred in connection with his carrying on the functions of his public office.

Such an amendment is long overdue. The courts have adopted a liberal attitude toward what constitutes "home" and have rejected the Treasury's attempt to place a man's home at his job. A man's home is his permanent residence.

The expense incurred by those above indicated, included in and as a part of the discharge of their official duties while away from home, compelled as they are to maintain themselves, and to maintain in fact and effect two homes, is obviously a deductible item and should be made so as a matter of law rather than left to the discretion of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, internal-revenue collectors country-wide, or to the judgment of the Board of Tax Appeals.

This amendment should be a matter of substantive law, and the Ways and Means Committee should see that it is so enacted.

As the law now stands a rank injustice is perpetrated. Not to permit, definitely and specifically, such a deduction as a matter of law and equity is an inequitable, illegal, and unjust discrimination against Members of Congress and others, and it should be ended.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be notified when I have consumed 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, by way of preliminary comment, nothing is to be gained here by making extravagant assertions which cannot be corroborated by facts. Men who make inflammatory statements here on the floor which are not based on facts are rendering a disservice to this body and to the country.

For example, a Member from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] rose here on the floor and made a statement the gist of which was that the head of the General Accounting Office, Mr. Lindsay Warren, had made a statement before a congressional committee to the effect that some $50,000,000,000 had been utterly wasted in transactions relating to the conduct of the war.

Now, the facts are these: In a hearing before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT], a member of that committee, made the observation that probably a large amount of money had been lost through cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts. I have before me a transcript of that hearing and this is what was said:

> Mr. GOSSETT. I have made a careless statement, purely careless because I have no earthly way of even approximating it (cost of cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracting), that doubtless it has added $50,000,000,000 to the cost of the war.
>
> Mr. WARREN. I would not think your figure would be too much out of line.

Now, all of us know that a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract is highly undesirable and not to be employed in normal times, and under the practice of this administration has not been resorted to except in cases of emergency. But when this war dropped suddenly upon us, with the attack on Pearl Harbor, and when it became necessary to make preparations to defend the Nation and prepare for the titanic struggle ahead of us, we had to discard normal business methods. We had to get plants and bases and ships and we had to get them immediately. Under the urgent necessity of arming in time, we had to resort to the cost-plus contract. To have followed any other method would have involved delay which would have been fatal.

War is always wasteful. War is never economical. War cannot be conducted according to ordinary business practices. In the beginning we required the fabrication of materials, the processing of which, and the cost of which, were wholly problematical. No one could say what was a

reasonable cost because no one had ever done work of that kind. It had to be done immediately. As a matter of fact, time and time again we caught the bus by the narrowest margin; and we did it necessarily through cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts. There was no other workable arrangement available. There was no other way to be certain we would get the work done. It frequently happened that the press of war contracts was so great that we could not secure bids under any circumstances. There was nobody to bid. Nobody had the facilities, and in justice to themselves and to the Government could not follow the business methods which would ordinarily be followed in time of peace. So we made cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts and under those cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts we have won the war. Any man who stands on this floor and seeks to lead the House to believe, and seeks to lead the country to believe, that by the use of those cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts there has been avoidable or controllable waste, is not familiar with the facts and is rendering a disservice to the Nation.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my good friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Do you believe in economy in the operation of government?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman might as well ask me if I believe in sin or if I believe in righteousness.

Mr. RICH. Well, from that statement, I do not believe that you do.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further to such irrelevant interruptions. I want to say that this war has been waged more economically than any war ever fought in the history of the United States. And when this war is over and the inevitable checking up begins and the committees of investigation are appointed and go into every crook and cranny of expenditures in the prosecution of this war, they will find that it was handled in a remarkably economical manner, in proportion to the sums involved, the masses of men engaged, and to the interests at stake.

Mr. WHITE. Can the gentleman say the same thing of the accumulation of national debt?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am going to talk about the national debt presently. The national debt has been kept within the lowest limits and has been handled in an economical and businesslike way. For example, in all former wars the money used by the United States Government in the prosecution of the war was obtained at high rates of interest and at constantly advancing rates of interest as the war progressed. Never before in any crisis have sums of these huge proportions been borrowed at such low rates of interest or been so wisely administered. The same is true of every phase of the war; and any American ought to take pride in that record instead of trying to make partisan capital here on the floor by misrepresenting what has been accomplished.

Mr. RICH. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania,

Mr. RICH. In connection with the subcontracts that are being let now, we can bring you all the proof you want that in many of those cases the subcontractors are giving to the main contractors fabulous sums.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Very well. The gentleman says he can bring us proof. Let him come here with the proof.

Mr. RICH. We have given it to you and you will not do anything with it. You say you are for economy but you are not. I will give it to you in 24 hours.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman can show that in the expenditures reflected in this bill we have wasted money, or have done so in the past, we shall be glad to have him do so. Now is the time and this is the place. Let us have the proof.

Of course, in the enlistment of millions of men, 22,000,000 men in industrial plants in the United States in this war and 11,000,000 in the armed services, in the enlistment of 20,000,000 or 25,000,000 men and in the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars the gentleman may be able to find a flyspeck here and there where some contractor or subcontractor has used bad judgment. Conceivably he might even find an occasional case of corruption by some irresponsible subordinate, although we have not been able to find them in the hearings on this bill. But in the conduct of the war and in the formulation of the policies under which the war has been prosecuted you will find no culpable delinquencies. This war is the best-managed war, the freest of instances of mismanagement or incompetency or inefficiency in the history not only of this Nation but of the world.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We welcome criticism but it should be constructive criticism, and it should be based on facts. We deal in this bill with gigantic problems. We submit here our method of solving them. If you have a better method, we shall be glad to have you present it. And if you can show it is better, we will adopt it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakcta.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have a great deal of respect for the chairman of the committee. I was going to venture the observation that when he indulges in the realms of prophecy with regard to the findings of investigating committees after the war, I am afraid he is a little optimistic.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. At the close of World War No. 1, an investigating committee of this House spent over a million dollars trying to find something to criticize in the administration of the war. All they were able to find was that the Army had bought too many saddles and too many bridles for the number of horses we had. Out of that entire transaction of the World War the committee was not able to find evidence to support a single prosecution by the Department of Justice. The conduct of that war and the integrity, ability, patriotism, and efficiency of the men who conducted it is a glorious page in American history. And when the history of this war is written it will reflect as great credit and honor on American arms, and on the efficiency and integrity of every man connected with it from the Commander in Chief down to the last private in the ranks.

Based on the record of the last war, as well as upon our common knowledge of the manner in which this war is being operated, I venture the prediction that when we have again won a notable American victory, the gentleman will not be able to point to anything any less creditable in the management of this war than in the management of the last war.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my friend from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The chairman of our committee is usually well informed, but I am sure if he reads the report made by a committee of this House headed by ex-Congressman Graham, of Illinois, which committee conducted investigations of war contracts in the last war over a period of 1 year, which investigation shows that many millions and millions of dollars had been wastefully expended, I am sure if he read that report he would not have us draw the inference that the Graham committee found nothing irregular in the contract system of the last war.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Oh, I have said that money has been wastefully expended because you cannot wage war without wasteful expenditures. I will say to the gentleman that neither Mr. Graham nor Mr. Graham's committee found one case of culpability in that "wasteful expenditure" which warranted prosecution under the law.

We submit today, Mr. Chairman, the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1945. All deficiency appropriation bills are depressing because they mean we have found it necessary to spend money we had not anticipated spending and which we had not planned to spend. In this bill we are called upon to appropriate nearly two and one-half billions not included in the annual supply bills. Deficiency bills are disappointing not only because of the heavy draft upon the Treasury, but because they indicate, first, we may have made some error in drafting the original bills; second, they indicate that the Congress has found it necessary to enact laws not in contemplation at the time, involving new and additional expenditures; third, and the matter of largest concern, that departmental officials have disregarded the antideficiency law and have made expenditures neither warranted nor authorized. The present bill, unfortunately, carries items severally occasioned by all three.

But in this deficiency bill there is the compensating fact that 97 percent of the money provided by the bill is for war purposes. And the great bulk of that amount is for the Navy. No one will question the advisability of these naval expenditures. I am certain all Members of the House who attended the conference with Admiral King and General Marshall will recall with gratification Admiral King's statement, "The Navy which you provided, and the support

which you are giving it, is making victory possible." The $1,914,000,000 deficiency appropriations for Navy purposes is made necessary by the developments of the war, and is principally for the Bureaus of Ships and Ordnance, involving the repair of various ships, the cost of which has been larger than originally anticipated.

Taking up the bill categorically, we provide an appropriation for the War Manpower Commission due to two things. First, our increased and accelerated production, with which we are all familiar. It has taken more munitions than we anticipated and additional expenditures are required on that account. In the second place, it provides for the administration of a new law, the Serviceman's Readjustment Act, which must be serviced and of which we had no intimation at the time the original estimate was before us. We have provided the full amount for the War Manpower Commission and we also have provided the full amount estimated by the Bureau of the Budget for the Office of Price Administration, except a 10 percent reduction in that portion of the estimate for defraying the cost of penalty mail.

This deficit was brought about by two laws passed by the Congress since enactment of the original bill. One is the penalty mail law and the other is the Stabilization Extension Act, with which all Members of the House are familiar because they have been passed in the last year, and, of course, require servicing.

We had two items from the Social Security Board, one for the Bureau of Old-Age Pensions and one for the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors' Insurance. The first we allowed in full and the second we cut approximately in half, the reduction applying wholly to personnel.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Under the Federal Works Agency, Community Facilities Bureau, which has been discussed on the floor today, we found still unobligated approximately $12,000,000. There remained unappropriated of our authorization, $23,000,000, or a total of approximately $35,000,000 if all were made available and used. It requires approximately $8,000,000 of the $12,000,000 for maintaining and operating service projects to carry us to the end of the fiscal year. We allowed $20,000,000, within $3,000,000 of our authorization, and have reserved $18,000,000 of that amount for servicing facilities after next June 30, leaving $2,000,000 to be added to unobligated funds of about $4,000,000, or approximately $6,000,000 for new projects.

Mr. Chairman, let me call attention to the fact that this new housing and this servicing of new projects is required only in case of increased production in existing plants or in the establishment of new plants. While our Army is following the long-established military axiom that we push preparations for war as if the war were to continue indefinitely, it becomes more and more apparent to all of us that the European war is nearing its close.

With the cessation of the European war there will be a lessened pressure upon us for munitions and equipment. Our factories are now geared to a two-war program. When one of the two closes we can ease up, and certainly no new factories will be necessary; in other words, with the close of the European war the shifting of population which requires this additional and temporary housing and facilities will stop. So we may safely conclude that in the coming fiscal year 1945–46, there will be no shifts of population which will warrant much, if any, additional projects in either housing or facilities. All that will be necessary will be the maintenance of service on existing projects, and even that will drop materially. With that in view, the committee believes that it has made ample provision both for community facilities and for temporary war housing—at least at this time.

The estimate for the General Accounting Office, which has just been mentioned in our discussion on the floor, is due to the enactment of the new law requiring the audit of financial transactions of all Government corporations by that agency. I think there is no difference of opinion here on the floor, and there certainly was none in the committee, as to the need for such provision and the importance of such audits.

Under the series of new laws passed within the past year providing for veterans of the war, for rates of payment, for standards of eligibility, and so forth, additional funds are required for the Veterans' Administration and we allowed the full amount recommended under the Budget estimate.

The $30,000,000 estimated as necessary to put into effect and to carry out the new law just enacted for Federal crop insurance is included in the bill as submitted by the Bureau of the Budget.

However, the request of the Department of the Interior for $40,000 for the Office of High Commissioner of the Philippine Islands seemed to the committee unwarranted in view of the fact that under statutory provision we give the Filipinos their independence in 1946 or sooner. In the meantime we have an adequate military government in the islands, and the provision for the Office of High Commissioner and the reestablishment of civil jurisdiction of the United States in the Philippine Islands for the brief interval between now and the transfer of the entire government to the Filipino Republic, would not seem to justify further expenditures for this purpose. Accordingly, the entire amount has been denied.

One item which has been the subject of considerable correspondence with the committee is the item of $30,000 for the United Nations Commission for investigation of war crimes. That was denied in the last deficiency appropriation bill. The committee, in the enactment of the last deficiency bill, eliminated all except the most urgent estimates.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Would the gentleman say that the failure to include the $30,000, now reduced to $25,000, to defray the expenses of our representative in London attending the United Nations War Crimes Commission, was due to failure of the State Department to make the request for such funds?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We had an estimate for $30,000, as I recall, in connection with the last deficiency bill, but the testimony before us, which is available in the hearings on the bill for anyone who may be interested, did not lead us to believe that there would be any considerable loss in failing to take care of it at that particular time. In view of the fact that we were eliminating all appropriations not urgently needed in the interval between that bill and this bill, and the apparent lack of urgency in this item, we left it out, along with many other items of that character. From the situation as presented to us, we understood the Commission could utilize attachés of the State Department available at that time. As a matter of fact, that is exactly what the Commission did. It appointed an Army officer for that purpose, and he has been on the job ever since. So far as we are informed, the failure to provide this $30,000 has in no way militated against the efficiency of the service.

Mr. CELLER. It has militated against it in the sense that the State Department used the failure of the gentleman's committee to recommend to the House that appropriation as a pretext for recalling Herbert C. Pell, a Presidential appointee to the United Nations War Crimes Commission.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, the gentleman understands that the official to whom he refers was never mentioned to our committee. We know nothing about him and have no official information about his retention or dismissal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes additional.

The question which the gentleman propounds is a question which should be submitted to the State Department, rather than to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CELLER. May I state, for the purpose of the RECORD, that Mr. Pell is a very eminent gentleman who has done very fine and most exemplary work in London as our representative. I do hope we will reinstate this appropriation, and that, following that, the State Department will redesignate him as our representative in London.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As far as the committee is informed, everything the gentleman says about Mr. Pell is accurate and authoritative and is borne out by all the records in the case. As to the action of the State Department, of course, we have no information and no jurisdiction.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Replying to the gentleman from New York, may I say that the matter has been presented to the Committee on Appropriations for the Department of State and is under consideration at the present time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under the Treasury Department we have an estimate for restoration of capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation. We had an item for the same purpose last March. At that time the amount of the deficit was some thirty-nine and a half million dollars. At this time the deficit amounts to practically a quarter of a billion dollars. When the matter came before the committee last year we inquired of them what would be the effect if we failed to provide this amount of money, and we were told it would have no effect at all; that the Commodity Credit Corporation would proceed as it had before. Subsequent testimony shows that is exactly what they did. It was without effect in any way whatever. Consequently, when this estimate came before us for the same purpose we asked the same question, and again we were told it would not affect the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation; that they have their sources from which they could borrow money and could carry on their activities uninterrupted in any way by failure to provide that amount. Therefore, we have not provided the money.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. You say you failed to provide the money. If you look up the Treasury statement and see what you have spent in the last 10 or 12 years it does not look to me as if you failed to furnish everybody every dollar they wanted for anything and everything that they wanted in this whole administration.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman has this consolation, that he protested on every occasion. But judging by the various votes on the measures under consideration, he failed to accompany his protests by facts sufficiently convincing to affect the decision of the Members of the House on either side of the aisle.

Mr. RICH. Because today we are $235,000,000,000 in the red. Think of it. You never heard of such a statement like that in all the history of the world.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is approximately right.

Mr. RICH. And it is terrible.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All misfortunes brought about by war are terrible.

Mr. RICH. Terrible.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There are other things more terrible, defeat and the unnecessary loss of our men.

Mr. RICH. Yes, sir; I tried to get a little economy in government, but the gentleman from Missouri is for spending.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman's objections will be entered in the RECORD. But if the money had not been spent American soldiers would have lacked clothing and shelter and hospitalization and would have died of the flu without having reached the front lines, as they did in the last war. They would have lacked proper food and been fed embalmed beef as they were in the Spanish-American War. When General Marshall and Admiral King were before our committee they were asked if the committee had failed to provide money needed for anything to insure the well-being of our men and the winning of ultimate victory and both answered that we had provided money for every need of the armed forces. I would rather have that accolade than any encomium the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania might pronounce.

Mr. Chairman, may I discuss briefly the financial status of the country and the relation of appropriations and expenditures to the national debt. We owe a lot of money, an unprecedented amount of money. Up to this time we have a public debt approaching $220,000,000,000. It has been estimated by the Bureau of the Budget that at the end of this fiscal year we will have a public debt of approximately $251,000,000,000, a debt such as has never been carried by any other nation at any time, an amount of money so stupendous as to defy the comprehension of the human mind. This money must be paid back. When can we begin to pay it back? We have been running in the red ever since 1931. For 15 years we have been spending more money every year than we took in. No individual and no nation can continue that indefinitely.

Of course, it was necessary. It was unavoidable. The house was on fire. We had to preserve the house. We had to preserve the Nation. As between the two alternatives, we spent the money. But eventually necessity for financing actual war operations will be ended. That, however, will not close our war accounts. We will still be in a precarious position financially. We will be confronted with a peacetime budget unexampled in previous peacetime budgets in the United States. We will be under the necessity of meeting the following unprecedented obligations:

First. The necessity of meeting public debt retirement.

Second. The necessity of meeting interest on the public debt, which alone will be twice the amount of the entire Federal Budget in former years not so far remote.

Third. Under the peace agreements which will be made, it will be necessary to maintain standing armies and navies and to supply defense establishments in far greater proportion than ever before.

Fourth. We will have the necessity of providing for more than a million veterans who have been disabled in this war. Our increased veterans' benefits will constitute a stupendous and steadily increasing obligation.

Fifth. We will have to take care of the merchant marine which has been expanded until today it is the greatest ocean-carrying organization ever launched upon the seas.

In addition there will be other expenses of Government brought about as a result of our participation in this war, which must be met annually. To meet these unprecedented obligations we must adopt unprecedented economies.

Even now, in the peak of the war, strong influence is being brought to bear on Congress and its committees for expenditures that could be avoided.

Mr. Chairman, the Budgets of the future should avoid new projects and new undertakings. They certainly should avoid them in this critical year of the war. No provision should be made except for essential war activities. I trust that all subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations, which are now preparing bills will scrutinize their budgets and eliminate every new project or every old project that can be dispensed with, in order to meet the tremendous demands which will confront us at the end of this war and when the income of the Government must drop drastically with the discontinuance of war production. Even now sources of revenue are contracting. Already there is an urge to reduce taxes. We are told that jobs depend upon relief of industry from the present burdensome taxes. We are further told that there must be a reduction in personal income taxes in order that there may be more funds available for purchasing by individuals with a view to encouraging production and in turn promoting post-war employment.

We face a rapidly developing situation that should have serious attention by every Member of the House regardless of party or any other consideration except the future welfare of our Government.

In the last 500 years every government which has fallen, with the exception of those which have crumpled under the impact of the Axis Armies, and every administration in parliamentary governments that has fallen, has been wrecked upon the rocks of unbalanced budgets resulting from unwise or excessive governmental expenditures.

The United States Government is today as well established as any government upon the globe, and no power on earth can disturb its stability from the outside; the only danger is from the inside, and the only inside danger is from expenditure for purposes which we can get along without. I earnestly appeal to every member of the Committee on Appropriations, especially to every chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations to avoid such items; and then, if such items are included in the bill, I invite the Members of the House to strike them out when they come to the floor.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one-half minute remaining.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I surely agree with the premise the gentleman from Missouri has presented here, but I have just been wondering if it does not irritate him to have——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Nothing irritates me when I have the approval of my good friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If it does not irritate him to have agencies set up during peacetime to meet some peacetime emergency come before his committee and try to make believe they have something to do with winning the war and thus keep themselves continued? It is not only a question of the money involved but also the manpower that goes along with their operation, and this during wartime. Does it not irritate the chairman of the committee to have these agencies come before him in this manner—not new war agencies but old agencies created in peacetimes to meet some temporary emergency?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will take 1 more minute; the gentleman's question is too important to be overlooked.

Let me diverge for a minute to say that the President is coming down tomorrow at 12:30. I refer to his visit in order to say that the discussion of this bill will be deferred for the message, will be resumed at the conclusion of the joint session.

There are indications also that at the close of the German war the President of the United States will return to again address the Congress in order to submit a revised Budget, which will be millions of dollars below the Budget under which we are operating. He is coming down to recommend the discontinuance of war activities which can be dispensed with and drastic reductions in expenditures for war agencies whose continuance will be necessary but which can be expected to operate on a much lower scale.

So the Budget under which we are now operating may be considered as tentative. And our estimates and appropriations for the future are contingent. Under requirements embodied by the Committee on Appropriations in former appropriation bills, the departments are now conducting studies with a view to indicating, on short notice, those expenditures which can be eliminated and those expenditures which can be reduced coincident with changes on the war front, and unexpended balances which can be dispensed with will be impounded. These provisions have the approval of the President and will be invoked promptly on the first authentic news of final collapse of the Axis Powers. The first readjustment will be made at the close of the German war, and the final adjustment at the close of the Japanese war. In the meantime every reduction is being made in the supply bills consonant with the unrestricted prosecution of the war to an early and victorious conclusion.

Nothing will affect more profoundly the future progress and welfare of our country than our fiscal integrity and the financial solvency of the Government. That must be our first consideration in the formulation of the appropriation bills from now until the final extinction of the national debt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to skim over the bill first and give you a little picture of what the whole bill is before I get down to specific items. There is involved in the bill something like three and one-half billions of dollars which are made available to the different agencies and departments of the Government to spend, that they could not spend if it were not for this bill. Of this amount, roughly, $1,000,000,000 is for use of the Army, and this is a very rough estimate because it involves transfers within the Military Establishment. It does not involve new appropriations but involves money transferred from what had been previously appropriated to items where the need has shifted to other things.

Then there is $1,900,000,000 for the Navy. There was a cut of $20,000,000 in this item in connection with a postwar item. We thought for that kind of a project, which was wharfing, that they would have plenty of time to do it after the war is over and that it is not necessary at the present time to divert manpower to complete it.

There is a small item for the O. P. A. There are a few small items for the Department of Agriculture, the big one being an item for suppression of forest fires, and the next biggest one, as I remember it, being about a million dollars to get rid of the chinch bugs and similar pests that infest the Middle West.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is that item limited to chinch bugs or does it include grasshoppers?

Mr. TABER. No; it covers similar pests. I presume the grasshopper proposition is perhaps as important as the other one, probably more important. But it covers what they told us they would need.

There are a lot of items for the State Department. There is an item in here for the War Relocation Authority. There is a small item, comparatively, for the O. P. A.

Within the State Department we have carried one item about which there has been a good deal of talk in the papers. It is a minor item as far as dollars go but probably is a bad item as far as the efficiency of the project it is supposed to cover goes. I refer to the War Crimes Commission set-up. It appeared quite clearly in the hearings that the only item involved at the present time and until the close of the war is the gathering together of evidence of various kinds and that that was more a matter which a group of clerks in the embassy could do a good job on than a group of higher-ups who would be chosen supposedly because of their ability to pass judgment upon things. I really believe that the reestablishment of that outfit will be a matter which will hamper the prosecution of the war criminals rather than forward it. However, it is a small item in dollars, only $25,000 being involved, which would mean a lot to me but it does not mean a lot comparatively so far as the expenditures of the Government are concerned.

There is one thing that I wish to call attention to that is getting to be a menace to the Government, and a very serious menace, and that is the enormous quantity of publicity and propaganda artists who are supported on the departmental and bureaucratic pay rolls. A short study of that situation revealed over 38,000 upon the rolls. It has been called to my attention particularly through the operations of certain parts of the State Department and certain units of the War Relocation Authority. The smart outfits, like the National Housing Agency and the Community Facilities set-up, are major offenders along this particular line. Their activities along that particular line and that particular set-up have come to be a menace to decent control of the Government by the Congress. They promote agitation all over the country for the expenditure of funds, and so when we come to meet here we are faced not by the needs of the Government as they develop in the hearings that the committees bring before you when a bill is brought up, but by a false idea of what the situation is with reference to these things that are created by bureaucratic propaganda. That sort of a thing is an absolute menace to our Government, financially and otherwise.

One of the worst offenders is the Department of Agriculture. It is about time that we in the Congress began to tighten up on that situation all the way down the line. The money that is spent for that purpose is, in my opinion, spent in violation of the law, and it should be stopped. But we are in a very serious situation insofar as that is concerned, because the Attorney General will not do anything to enforce any such law as that in the interest of the people.

I want to talk to you now about the community facilities proposition. I had a little discussion here with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]. It is perfectly apparent that Mr. LANHAM has been deceived by some information which has been handed to him by the community facilities outfit. They came up here, and they did not have the slightest idea "where they were at."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 27, noes 52.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 57, noes 61.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum is present. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I am sure the gentleman from New York is deeply gratified by the sudden increase in his audience, all of whom are interested in what the gentleman has to say.

Mr. TABER. I hope they are anxious to hear it.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I am anxious to hear it. If the gentleman will yield, in that connection, I take it you are going to discuss the Federal Works Agency proposition now?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. PITTENGER. In connection with that matter, there is a shipyard doing war work on the outskirts of Duluth, Minn. That is where the St. Lawrence seaway begins and ends. The Federal Works Agency, as I understand it, came in with a recommendation that the $28,000 item in this proposition you are going to discuss be included, and that other people contribute $10,000 additional. Now, I am told, and this refers to your talk with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]—I have not talked with him—but I am told if language on page 8 of the bill stays there, which in effect is supposed to earmark $18,000,000, not alone this project, which is purely for the benefit of the Government because of the war effort, will not be undertaken but many other projects will also fail. I think many Members in the House are interested in this language at about the middle of page 8 of this bill. This sewer project is needed in the interest of public health, which would be endangered. I had anticipated there would not be any particular difficulty in a matter which had so much merit to it, when, according to many Members of the House, the War Department and other agencies are spending a lot of money in ways that probably are not necessary. I would like to have the gentleman comment on that.

Mr. TABER. I do not know anything about the project in the gentleman's district of $28,000, except that it is there. I am going to give a complete picture of this community facilities proposition according to the hearings that have been held by the committee, and frankly, that is all I have to go on. I have not any subterranean channels or any secret means of approach. Now, as to whether these folks told us the truth when they came up before us, I do not know. I cannot help it. I know they came up here and they did not know where they were and their figures did not balance, and it was all mixed up, and we sent them back to get their material straightened out.

After a couple of days they came up with some more. We finally went over it and balanced it up as best we could. Now, here is the picture: As of January 31, 1945, there is an unexpended balance on the projects for construction of $67,500,000.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusets. Is that community facilities?

Mr. TABER. It is construction under community facilities. I have not yet come to the services feature. I will not get to that for quite a bit, because I want to analyze this so that the membership may just see what the picture is.

That appears in a table on page 324 of the hearings. A previous table appears on page 292 of the hearings. That is December 31, 1944. On December 31, 1944, the unexpended balance was $73,900,000. So that they spent the difference between those two sums in that month, or $6,400,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The difference between those two tables shows the amount spent in the month of January of this year?

Mr. TABER. That is right. Now that would be on the basis of a little over 10 months' money available for expenditure, which would carry us to the 1st of November.

There were unobligated funds as of the 31st of December, and this appears on page 292, of $25,708,000. On the 31st of January there was $24,557,000. That means that they obligated $1,151,000 in January 1945, and if they obligate at the same rate the rest of the time, they can go on obligating for 20 months on that basis. That means away into the last end of the year 1946.

The unallocated balance on January 31 was $6,335,000. I am referring to the same table that I did before. On December 31 it was $7,015,000. That means that they allocated $690,000 in the month of January. On that same basis, and at that same rate, they have funds to continue those allocations for 9 full months from the 1st of February 1945, which would carry us to the 1st day of October 1945.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman used the words "continue obligating" when he meant to say "continue allocating."

Mr. TABER. Allotting at the same rate; yes.

Now, that is something of the picture of the construction fund.

If they tell you they do not have any funds to allocate, they tell you a different story than they told us.

When it comes to the service end of it, on the same tables to which I referred before, that is the one on page 292, and the one on page 324, there was unexpended as the 31st of December, $38,112,000.

As of the 31st of January, $34,488,000, or an expenditure for the month of $3,624,000. If the expenditures might be accelerated considerably and it should go up to $4,000,000 a month at the end of this current fiscal year they would have spent out of that $34,000,000 which is unexpended, $20,000,000, and they have a margin of $14,000,000 to carry them to the 1st of July. On the other hand, if it should be expended as long as it might last, they have enough to carry them at the rate they went in January for over 9 months, or until the 1st day of October.

They had unobligated in the services' fund as of December 31, $11,295,000 and as of January 31, $10,126,000.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield with reference to the amounts in the printed hearings, tell us the page of the hearings?

Mr. TABER. Page 292 carries the December 31 figure and page 324 the January 31 figure.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is the gentleman now coming to page 325?

Mr. TABER. The figure of "Unobligated for services" on page 324 is $10,126,000.

Mr. PITTENGER. When the gentleman gets time I call his attention to page 325 where the figures apparently do not jibe with any he has quoted.

Mr. TABER. I shall be glad to discuss that when we get to them.

That means that during the month of January there was obligated $1,169,000, and that in turn means that to continue for the next 9½ months they have plenty of money—if they go on obligating just as they have been.

If you will turn to page 292 you will see there was unallocated $10,445,000 on December 31, and you will see from page 324 there was unallocated for services $7,309,000 on January 31, meaning that they allocated $3,145,000 in the month of January.

Their story was as they came to us that they wanted money to carry them through to the 1st of July.

There is another item that I think must be considered along with this, because if there was any shortage there is plenty of money there for them to get at. They have as of the 31st of January $6,800,000, as appears on page 324, of unexpended balance in their administrative expenses; their expenditures have been going along at the rate of $330,000 a month on an average through the fiscal year 1944 according to their estimate. That means they have money enough on hand to carry them for 20 full months in administrative expenses. I do not believe any agency of the Government ought to be provided with funds to carry them for 20 full months.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. May I say that the budget officer of this agency has advised me twice over the telephone that they have no need whatsoever so far as this fiscal year is concerned for the $800,000 included for administrative expenses.

Mr. TABER. I understand that is absolutely correct. Out of that $6,800,000,

at least $4,000,000 can be moved right over into that unallocated item for services if there is any occasion to have more money. I just want to show what the situation of this agency is. I want the House to deal with it honestly and fairly, without emotion and getting excited about it.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. I am not trying to heckle the gentleman, but I want information.

Mr. TABER. I appreciate the gentleman's position.

Mr. PITTENGER. My information is to the effect that if the paragraph I referred to in the bill is not stricken out, there are a large number of projects for which funds cannot be used, because it is a limitation on expenditure. I call the gentleman's attention to page 325, where the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] refers to an unobligated balance of $6,909,692.07. He and Mr. Field are discussing that matter. Then the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] refers to an unobligated balance of $25,000,000 in round figures and again to an unallotted balance of $7,015,931.79. Here is what the witness, Mr. Field, states:

> The two amounts which you have just given cannot be added together as each is a balance of the same appropriation.

Mr. TABER. I understand that. That is correct.

Mr. PITTENGER. Well, somebody is incorrect. Maybe someone in the agency is wrong as an accounting proposition. I am concerned about a sewer project which ought to be undertaken, which should be built just as quick as the frost is out of the ground in the interest of the health of certain shipyard workers, because they are building ships for the Government. The city cannot build the sewer, the city should not have to build the sewer because it is construction for war workers and will not be there when the war is over. I think I am safe in that assumption.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I am sympathetic with the gentleman's desire to see the sewer built. On the other hand, when these people come before us and indicate the type of unexpended balance that they have, and they show the slow rate of obligation that they make, and they indicate further the amount of unobligated balances that they have, there is absolutely no reason in honest management of Government activities why they cannot provide the $28,000 to take care of the gentleman's sewer project without another dollar of appropriation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Referring to the table on page 324, and particularly to the unallotted balance for the construction of projects, it shows a balance there of $6,335,000, which is the figure the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. TABER. On page 324?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, on page 324 of the hearings. The unallotted balance for construction of projects is $6,335,000.

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The appropriation proposes a total amount of $20,000,000, $18,000,000 of which would be earmarked or reserved for certain objects to be used after June 30. Those objects apparently include the service item, so that there would be left $2,000,000 of the $20,000,000 which would be available for construction, and that could be added to the $6,335,000, is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the appropriation is made as the bill is presently written, that would make a total of $8,335,000 for construction projects, assuming no allotments have been made since January 31?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The testimony of Mr. Field on page 326 is that they have applications for new projects in their docket amounting to $13,500,000, and presumably the sewer project which the gentleman from Minnesota is interested in is in that docket of $13,500,000.

Mr. TABER. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Presumably so. If it is down there on file, it is in that docket; and then there would be available a total of $8,335,000 which could be allotted toward this $13,500,000; is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is what it works out to. On the other hand, you have this picture: Here is $25,000,000 of unobligated funds on January 31, right in the period which you would think, if these projects were going to go through for which allotments had been made, that there would be enormous obligations. There are only about a million dollars of obligations. The exact figure is $1,151,000. If the allotments were genuine, they would not have any substantial balance of unobligated funds now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I do not just understand how it could be possible, if these are all urgent projects that need to be done in the interest of the war effort, that in that period there could be just about 4 percent of the total let to contract. There evidently were, if they told the picture as it was, $18,000,000 of projects for which allotments had been made and for which no obligations had been made as of the 1st of December, and only $1,151,000 was let.

There could be no better evidence that the urgency of the situation that they presented to us did not exist. On top of that we have that terrible overload of administrative reserves. There has been appropriated by the Congress, due to the tremendous pressure that has been put on and the unwillingness of the membership to sit down and listen to this situation and reason it out on the basis of the testimony that was presented, a sort of a run-into-the-fire proposition to accept anything that they asked for and that they wanted. We have given them administrative limits that have been all out of line. They have double the help they need right now. They are absolutely running around the country and doing nothing that is constructive.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I happen to be a member of the committee that is just fixing a new debt limit of $300,000,000,000. May I say that I have the most profound admiration for the effort that the gentleman and some of his colleagues are making to hold down these expenses. I do not want to take too much of the gentleman's time, but it must be rather discouraging to make the battle which he makes on the floor of the House, and then find that in another body the items are put back, it goes to conference, the expenditures remain, and then comes along a deficiency bill, first one and then another. I think it would be a good thing for this Congress if they abolished the deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. Well, there would be something to that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I ask the gentleman this question? I notice the committee also proposes a directive on priorities; that priorities shall be given to projects that involve an estimated cost to the Federal Government of less than $250,000. Did the committee find that there were many of these projects in the docket on file down there that exceeded $250,000?

Mr. TABER. I cannot answer that question. I understand that there were considerable, but I do not have that information at present. There was a list of projects placed in the record, or furnished the committee, but I do not have those items available at present.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My point in bringing it up was this: The $6,335,000 remaining unallotted as of January 31, plus the $2,000,000 made available by this appropriation, makes a total of $8,335,000 available for allotment, against applications in the docket of $13,500,000; that is, there will be money available for construction amounting to 61 percent of the total number of applications in their docket. If this restriction giving priority to projects under $250,000, substantially, throws out a few large projects, this $8,335,000 could take care of 75 to 95 percent of the projects under $250,000.

Mr. TABER. I think they could do that without any trouble. Frankly, I do not believe that this item or the housing item that is contained in this bill has been justified in the slightest degree, and I do not see how I can go along with them.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. There is a great deal for housing in this bill, is there not?

Mr. TABER. Between eighty-four and eighty-five millions. I do not have the exact figure in my head.

Mr. SHORT. The reason I asked the gentleman that question is that last December I drove with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES], who is now on the floor, from here up to Worcester. As we drove through or nearby Hartford, Conn., I saw a huge housing project. I do not know how many houses there were in the project, but there was a vast number, with sidewalks and driveways. Not a single one of those buildings has ever been occupied by an individual. They have been standing there for months. Still we talk about manpower shortages and shortages of material in this country and waste of materials. Yet, a farmer out in my district has to go to the A. A. A. to get permission before he can get enough lumber to build a chicken coop or a hog pen to cover the old sow before she has a litter of pigs.

Mr. TABER. Is the gentleman sure they have not taken the better of these houses that have not been occupied and turned them into German prisoner camps?

Mr. SHORT. I do not know. Perhaps the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, can give us an estimate of the number of buildings in that particular project and also the approximate cost. I was shocked at the situation at that particular spot, and I think the gentleman will find that duplicated pretty widely all over the country.

Mr. TABER. I know in my territory the only use they have been able to put some of their projects to is as German prisoner camps.

Mr. SHORT. They built camps that would house 10,000 people, a small city in itself, and they have never been occupied or used. Still you come in here with $84,000,000 more for housing.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. The project which my colleague from Missouri mentioned is the one known as the West End Apartments in West Hartford, Conn. It has been built now nearly 2 years. There are over 200 units in it. It cost nearly $2,000,000. There has never been a foot set in any one of those apartments. They have been lying there dormant ever since.

Mr. TABER. Yet, they report to us that these projects are 98 percent occupied. That is the way that thing has been going on. That is the reason many of us feel that the war effort would be best promoted by getting rid of unnecessary expenditures of money and unnecessary diversion of manpower from the war effort.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to note that the Committee on Appropriations has requested moneys to defray the expenses of our representative at the United Nations War Crimes Commission in London. It is my hope that the State Department will send back to London Herbert C. Pell, who had been appointed as our representative to the London conference. He is a Presidential appointee, but because of failure of appropriations in the last Congress the State Department said they were unable to continue a representative at that Commission.

In that connection, I want to bring up a rather interesting factor with reference to the punishment of war criminals and draw your attention to a very significant fact, that there are some in this country in high places and many more in high places in Britain who do not want any punishment visited upon Emperor Hirohito. Now we hear some strange conclusions reached on the subject of the trial and punishment of those guilty of war atrocities. For example, at the recent Institute of Pacific Relations at Hot Springs, a proposal was made by Sir Paul Butler, leading adviser to the British Foreign Office, to the effect that Emperor Hirohito and the Japanese ruling class be retained in the post-war Japan set-up. This was his blunt statement. He said:

> No alternative to the monarchial system under the present Emperor or some other member of his family is likely to provide the focus of stability which will be essential if the state is not to dissolve into chaos.

Now, in my humble opinion, it is difficult to understand the tender concern of Sir Paul for the office of the Mikado. Can he forget so soon and can others who are like-minded forget so soon, the death march at Bataan? Representatives of other nations attending the institute at Hot Springs immediately expressed, and properly so, horror at the idea. Dr. Hu Shih, former Chinese Ambassador to the United States, facetiously suggested, "Hirohito might be exiled to London along with other discredited monarchs."

The entire Chinese nation was up in arms, and well might they be up in arms, when they heard this strange statement coming from the lips of Sir Paul Butler. They knew and you know and I know that the Emperor is the head of the military caste which has caused so much suffering and travail in the Far East. Manila was declared an open city. Recently, however, under orders from above, Zeroes zoomed over Manila at low altitudes and machine gunned thousands and thousands of innocent men, women, and children, thanks to Hirohito. Other United Nations delegates also were vigorously opposed to the British policy announced by Sir Paul Butler of appeasing the Emperor, particularly members of the British Dominions—Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. Strangely, our own delegates to the conference were silent. Why? Well might you ask Why were our delegates silent? Let us consider the views of Eugene Dooman, former counselor of the American Embassy in Tokyo, and long a resident in Japan. He now is employed in the capacity of Special Assistant to the State Department. He likewise believes in retaining the Emperor and believes, furthermore, we can only rely on the Japanese business leaders, the count circle, aristocrats, and officialdom. He supports the present ruling groups with the exception of the military extremists.

It is the old story of the man who has lost his individuality and precious American heritage of liberty by permitting himself to be absorbed by an alien background in which he has lived too long.

We demand a complete house cleaning in the East. We are not going to build a Cliveden set in Japan, not even to please Sir Paul Butler and Eugene Dooman. The Mikado, be he God or devil must go. Shintoism and Emperor worship is no more difficult to wipe out than Hitlerism and nazi-ism. The latter are just as deeply rooted in Germany and in German life and economy. The Mikado must go. The person of Hirohito and the office of Emperor are a menace to future peace. The war lords of Japan, the genro or council of so-called elder statesmen, and the Japanese count and baron circle would rise again to power if we kept the Mikado and would use the Mikado or the Emperor again as a tool to further their interests. If we remove the Emperor's entourage and industrialists and war lords and keep the Emperor we would have a recrudescence of atrocities that we now have, because the Emperor would soon again surround himself and entrench in power a new set of rogues.

We are told that a few families, together with the Emperor, absolutely control Japan. I am reading from a most recent book called What To Do With Japan. On page 124 we find this statement. That book is written by a student of Japan and things Japanese, Wilfrid Fleisher. He was formerly editor of a powerful newspaper in Tokyo. I quote him:

> The outstanding characteristic of Japanese big business is that it is concentrated in the hands of a dozen families, of which the big four, in the pre-war days, were Mitsui, Mitsubishi, Sumitomo, and Yasuda. These four alone controlled one-third of Japan's industry and commerce. It has been said that these business leaders have been the power behind the militarists since they supplied the sinews of war without which it would have been impossible for Japan to launch upon her conquests.

Now, I hope it is the purpose of the War Crimes Commission to go after these militarists, economic militarists, and business dynasty in Japan and wipe out these families; but it would avail naught to wipe them out if you did not wipe out at the same time the Mikado.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. NORRELL. I agree with the gentleman in his statement that these war lords should be destroyed, but I have been under the impression that the agitation of this question before unconditional surrender might make the resistance on the part of those enemies more, and our agitation might inure to the detriment of our soldiers. I would like to have the gentleman's observation on that matter.

Mr. CELLER. It would not make a particle of difference to those fanatics in Japan, no matter what you do. We have proclaimed unconditional surrender, and that has not detracted from the ferocity of those who are in charge of the war machine in Japan. We cannot be tender and we cannot be solicitous of the future of Hitler or Hirohito or any one of the followers of those men. We must show the mailed fist now and make them realize that unless they change their tactics we are going to mete out to them uttermost punishment. It is "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth."

Let me read to you what a very distinguished admiral said, Admiral Halsey, who just returned from the theater of combat operations in the Far East. He should know better than anyone in this Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CELLER. He displayed little patience with those who contend that it is important to preserve Japan's Emperor as one who can stabilize the country after the war.

"There ought not to be any Mikado when this is over," he said.

"Will we bomb the Mikado's palace, then?" he was asked.

"We never bomb anything except military objectives," he said. Then he laughed and added, "Of course, if the B–29's bomb through an overcast, they might hit the palace by mistake." He laughed again and said, "I would sure hate to have them kill the Emperor's white horse, though, because I want to ride it."

Donald Roberts, a professor of history at St. John's University in Shanghai, gives us the following:

What they did to the Kaiser last time is what we should do to the Japanese Emperor now. There is no room for a royal house of that kind anywhere in the world.

Another authority is Sun Fo, president of the legislative yuan in China. He says that "the Mikado must go" and adds that only then "the self-deluded and grandeur-dazed Japanese people will realize that the reign of Imperial Japan is ended forever, never to return." His idea is to establish a republic in Japan and teach the Japanese "the intricacies of democratic self-government without the hypnotic spells of a divine ruler." He draws attention to the fact that China got rid of her Emperor, though that institution had been deeply ingrained in China.

Dr. B. A. Liu, writing in Contemporary China, states:

The people of Japan will never be rid of the shackles of Shintoism, nor able to enjoy real freedom of religion until the whole mikado system is abolished and all forms of political coercion are removed from the religious worship of the people. Incidentally it would make it harder for the Japanese militarists to start another war if the soldiers cannot expect to become gods by the act of dying in battle.

Furthermore it is interesting to note that the father of the present Emperor, Emperor Taisho, was demented during the last 10 years of his reign. When Hirohito became Prince Regent and later Emperor foreign diplomats were rather disturbed. They watched him carefully. We do not really know the mental state of the Emperor. In any event, it would be dangerous to continue on the throne such a one with such a taint.

Also from the outset of the war our Government from President Roosevelt and former Secretary of State Hull down has been rather tender in its references to Hirohito. They have condemned Hitler and Mussolini, but have limited their condemnation to the war lords of Japan. Never is mention made of Hirohito. Even the distinguished Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Grew, in his speeches made throughout the country avoided any disparaging remarks about Hirohito. When Elmer Davis was asked about this he explained it was a State Department policy.

I do not agree with that policy. I say this with no disrespect to our distinguished President or our very able Secretary of State or our efficient Acting Secretary of State. In fact, all my criticism this afternoon is meant in kindness. I simply exercise my right to express my views without fear or favor in the hope that the Department and its officials will accept my criticism in the same spirit.

Mr. Wilfrid Fleisher, above referred to, in his book, What To Do With Japan, takes the viewpoint that the office of Mikado can be used as a medium through which the Allied Military Government may govern Japan. His idea is that the fanatic Japs will remain loyal to an emperor and loyal to naught else. I do not agree with him. He even says that the Japanese people will pin the blame for defeat on the war lords. He would have Hirohito deposed or made to abdicate in favor of the Crown Prince. Frankly Hirohito, or a crown prince, or any kind of a mikado, is just as baneful. If the ingrained thought is Hirohito is a god, how would the Japanese react to the deposal of Hirohito? A god does not abdicate. We are told the office of Mikado is a symbol. That symbol must go.

We must indoctrinate the Japanese with new and democratic symbols.

If further authority is required, permit me to quote from an interesting statement, appearing in The Sacred Cow of Japan by Owen Lattimore in the January issue of the Atlantic Monthly. He emphasizes that it is the idea of the Emperor as the "sacred cow" of Japan that has led to the advocacy of the maintenance of the Emperor as a necessary focus of stability in future Japan. He says significantly:

The Japanese, like other people, can adopt any system of society, but only if the changes made go beyond catchwords and permeate the whole society. Democracy in Japan cannot be attained by changing the status of the Emperor, but will require democratic changes throughout Japanese society. There is, in fact, a democratic potential in Japanese life which has had to be kept down by force. From 1931 onward, each crisis of Japanese policy has been preceded by attempts of the people to form democratic parties and to vote against war. The militarists have forced crises abroad partly in order to seize and keep control at home; and since, in these crises, they have always professed to be defending the interests of the Emperor, the Emperor is now identified as the resort of final appeal against any democratic trend. The democratic potential is still there, but if it is ever to emerge we must first, in the words of Sun Fo, "puncture the myth of the divinity of the Mikado."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING. Mr. Chairman, according to a news report contained in the Washington Evening Star of yesterday, the United States delegation at Mexico City has proposed a formal definition of the term "war criminal" to be adopted by the Inter-American Conference being held in that city. It is reported that the definition has classed as war criminals "the Axis leaders and their associates who have caused to be committed" as well as the individuals who actually committed, hideous crimes in violation of:

First. The laws of war.

Second. Existing treaties.

Third. Rules of international law.

Fourth. Penal codes of civilized nations.

Fifth. The concepts of civilized life.

The resolution also called upon the Inter-American Juridical Committee to prepare a plan of extradition of these war criminals, for adoption by the conference. In light of the disgraceful handling of the war criminal trials after the last war, and the position taken by the United States in the matter of the punishment of chiefs of state at that time, I feel obliged to take the well of the House and point out to my honorable colleagues the very weak position this country is apparently taking on this all-important subject of war criminals and their punishment.

Nowhere is there specifically mentioned in this proposed definition anything that would provide for the punishment of chiefs of state such as Hitler and Hirohito. In view of the stand taken by both America and Japan after the last war—that chiefs of state were not responsible for breaches of law and were answerable not to the judicial but to the political authority of their own countries—we can only assume that the words "Axis leaders" used in the proposed definition is qualified to exclude chiefs of state pursuant to the official stand taken by this Government on this very question following the last war. For the sake of clarity and justice, any definition of war criminals should specifically indicate that chiefs of state are not to be exempt. I do not want the American people deluded into thinking that Hitler and Hirohito will stand trial, and later disillusion them by no punitive action being taken with reference to them whatsoever.

Another point to be noted from this proposed definition is that it completely excludes from trial or punishment the economic war criminals—the so-called great industrialists who conspired with Axis leaders to not only act as the espionage centers for the German and Japanese military cliques, but to prevent our preparation for war through extension of their control into this country,

Britain, and others through cartel agreements, patent monopolies, and licenses; not to speak of the Thyssens and the Krupps who financed Hitler and the Free Corps. The qualifying words in the proposed definition, "hideous crimes," seems to specifically exempt these guilty conspirators from trial and punishment for the economic crimes they have committed. Despite the fact that these economic leaders are the seeds of war, they will apparently be preserved and protected so they can plot the next world war.

Another phase of this proposed definition that concerns me greatly, is that part which defines war criminals as those who have committed hideous crimes in the violation of penal codes of civilized nations. Does this mean that we are going to insist on the proof required by the penal codes of this country and Britain which provide for the use of strict common-law rules of evidence. One of the grievous mistakes of the last war was the British insistence of proof according to strict English standards. Claud Mullins, who was present at the Leipsig trials as interpreter for the British Mission, and who wrote a book on the subject, reminds us that—

It is exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, for Englishmen to prove the conduct of ex-enemy generals according to the standards of proof obtaining in British courts.

This statement would be applicable to the standard of proof obtaining in American courts. If we are to require such stiff standards of proof, the trial of war criminals will prove to be a burlesque performance with war criminals as the star performers, such as we are witnessing in the present sedition trials.

Now, with reference to the extradition of war criminals, it is a commendable thing to have all of the Latin-American countries enter into an agreement providing for the extradition of war criminals who seek to avoid punishment by escaping to neutral nations or other asylums. I say it is commendable if all of the Latin-American countries so agree, but at the conference in Mexico City all of the Latin-American countries are not represented. The very country we are worried about on the subject of furnishing refuge to war criminals, namely Argentina, is not represented. The agreement without Argentina is useless. What is to be done with that country if she furnishes refuge to war criminals?

On the 19th day of February, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution No. 30, calling for an American declaration of policy on the subject of the apprehension and punishment of war criminals, which I should like at this time, to respectfully call to the attention of the House.

The resolution follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 30

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be the policy of the Government and its agencies and representatives—

(a) To cooperate with the nations allied with the United States in the present war in the determination of those persons, irrespective of rank, who shall be brought to trial, or summarily punished, as war criminals, for the perpetration of, or the participation in, acts of atrocity, or treachery, oppression, or pillage by political, military, or economic means.

(b) To determine no one exempt from trial or punishment by virtue of his status as head of any state, or as an official of any state, or as an industrialist or civilian, or by virtue of the fact that the acts involved were the acts of state or were performed under the compulsion of superior orders.

(c) To join with other nations in the use of such means as may be necessary, including force, without regard to any treaties of extradition or respect to sovereignty, to secure the person or property of those persons determined to be war criminals who have already fled, or who may hereafter flee, to any neutral nation, or any other nation, that may harbor them or afford them a place of asylum.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I take this time primarily to emphasize three matters which are referred to either directly or indirectly in the committee report and which have an important bearing upon the power of the Congress to properly control Federal expenditures.

ANTIDEFICIENCY LAW VIOLATED

The first matter to which I desire to refer is the utter disregard or deliberate violation of the so-called Antideficiency Act.

The committee report states that the committee has met with instances indicating either a lack of knowledge or an utter disregard of the so-called anti deficiency law in that agencies have reported overobligations during the first half of the fiscal year to an extent which places the Congress in the position of either granting additional funds or forcing the curtailment of operations, which in some cases would be unwise and harmful.

The report continues:

That sort of practice cannot be continued, particularly when the Congress is in continuous session. It must be stopped.

Mr. Chairman, title 31, section 665, of the United States Code, known as the antideficiency law, provides that all appropriations made for contingent expenses or general purposes, except appropriations made in fulfillment of contract obligations expressly authorized by law, shall on or before the beginning of each fiscal year be so apportioned by monthly or other allotment as to prevent expenditures in one portion of the year which may necessitate deficiency or additional appropriations to complete the service of the fiscal year for which the appropriations are made.

The law further provides, that any person violating any provision of this section shall be summarily removed from office and shall also be punished by a fine of not less than $100 or by imprisonment for not less than 1 month.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the law at this point in the RECORD:

Title 31, section 665, United States Code: "No executive department or other Government establishment of the United States shall expend, in any one fiscal year, any sum in excess of appropriations made by Congress for that fiscal year, or involve the Government in any contract or other obligation for the future payment of money in excess of such appropriations unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law. Nor shall any department or any officer of the Government accept voluntary service for the Government or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of sudden emergency involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property. All appropriations made for contingent expenses or other general purposes, except appropriations made in fulfillment of contract obligations expressly authorized by law, or for objects required or authorized by law without reference to the amounts annually appropriated therefor, shall, on or before the beginning of each fiscal year, be so apportioned by monthly or other allotments as to prevent expenditures in one portion of the year which may necessitate deficiency or additional appropriations to complete the service of the fiscal year for which said appropriations are made and all such apportionments shall be adhered to and shall not be waived or modified except upon the happening of some extraordinary emergency or unusual circumstance which could not be anticipated at the time of making such apportionment, but this provision shall not apply to contingent appropriations of the Senate or House of Representatives and in case said apportionments are waived or modified as herein provided, the same shall be waived or modified in writing by the head of such executive department or other Government establishment having control of the expenditure, and the reasons therefor shall be fully set forth in each particular case and communicated to Congress in connection with estimates for any additional appropriations required on account thereof. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be summarily removed from office and shall also be punished by a fine of not less than $100 or by imprisonment for not less than 1 month." (R. S. 3679; Mar. 3, 1905, ch. 1484, sec. 4, 33 Stat. 1257; Feb. 27, 1906, ch. 510, sec. 3, 34 Stat. 48.)

Mr. Chairman, time and time again there have been instances recently before the Appropriations Committee where the terms of this statute appear to have been utterly disregarded or deliberately violated. Time and time again we have come face to face with overobligations by this or that agency, with no check whatsoever by the Bureau of the Budget, confronting the Congress with the necessity either of putting up additional funds or of making unjustified slashes in respect to the balance of a fiscal year.

The practice must cease, Mr. Chairman. If it does not cease the penalties referred to must be enforced.

RECLASSIFICATION BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The second matter to which I desire to refer is the practice in respect to reclassifying positions by the Civil Service Commission. It is a matter similar in character to that to which I have just referred.

The committee report indicates that another matter of questionable propriety continually confronting the committee is that of reclassification of positions of Federal employees. It points out that there seems to be a more liberal attitude toward reclassification than obtained in the not remote past, and that under an interpretation of the General Accounting Office, approval of the Civil Service Commission is apparently tantamount to legislative approval, thus creating a legal

obligation which must be discharged. The committee calls the attention of the Committee on Civil Service to the matter indicating that inquiry may disclose the advisability of passing legislation making the effectiveness of reclassification subject to the specific provision of funds therefor.

There is another statute, Mr. Chairman on the books today which would seem to be applicable in this connection.

Title 5, section 667, United States Code, chapter 13, referring to classification of civilian employees, provides that increases in compensation shall be allowed upon the attainment and maintenance of the appropriate efficiency ratings, to the next higher rate within the salary range of the grade. It further provides, however, that in no case shall the compensation of any employee be increased unless Congress has appropriated money from which the increase may lawfully be paid.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the law at this point in the RECORD:

Title 5, section 667, United States Code, chapter 13, Classification of Civilian Employees:

"Increases in compensation shall be allowed upon the attainment and maintenance of the appropriate efficiency ratings, to the next higher rate within the salary range of grade. In no case shall the compensation of any employee be increased unless Congress has appropriated money from which the increase may lawfully be paid, nor shall the rate for any employee be increased beyond the maximum rate for the grade to which his position is allocated. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent the promotion of an employee from one class to a vacant position in a higher class at any time in accordance with civil-service rules, and when so promoted the employee shall receive compensation according to the schedule established for the class to which he is promoted." (Mar. 4, 1923, ch. 265, sec. 7, 42 Stat. 1940.)

Here again, Mr. Chairman, there appears to be growing up a general practice which is wholly unjustified. Time and time again the committee is confronted by reclassification upward by the Civil Service Commission, reclassification on the specific request of the agency concerned, with no check whatsoever by the Bureau of the Budget, congressional authorization again being requested after the horse has left the stable.

Why, we had one case, Mr. Chairman, as the members will remember, where the Federal Communications Commission actually came before the Appropriations Committee and requested funds for additional personnel to be put on the rolls of the agency. Then instead of using the money for that purpose, the agency proceeded to obtain reclassification through the Civil Service Commission and expended the money largely for that purpose.

A check on this practice is vital. If present legislation is inadequate, new legislation should promptly be enacted.

PUBLIC ROADS APPROPRIATIONS

The third matter, Mr. Chairman, to which I desire to refer, is the present system of appropriations for our public roads.

The Committee will note that against an authorization of $290,000,000 for access roads there are appropriations to date of $230,000,000 and obligations of $287,500,000; in other words, an excess of obligations over appropriations amounting to $57,500,000.

Similarly, in respect to strategic network highways and bridges, against an authorization of $50,000,000 we find appropriations amounting to $20,000,000, and obligations amounting to $45,000,000, or $25,000,000 in excess of appropriations.

Here again Congress is asked to appropriate for obligations already incurred. In effect, the Public Roads Administrator appropriates while the Congress is called upon to act in the role of a rubber stamp. The same situation will be found in respect to Federal-aid highway system appropriations, in respect to Federal-aid secondary and feeder road appropriations, and in respect to other road appropriations generally.

Congress has little or no control over either the rate or the objects of expenditure. The law should be changed and changed promptly to provide for normal methods of control.

All three matters, Mr. Chairman, are important to the proper and effective control by the Congress over the purse strings of the Nation. I trust the necessary steps will be promptly taken by all concerned to assure that control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

F. W. A. COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to speak at length on this bill today. I think the major items have already been covered. I may refer very briefly, however, to two items which appear in the bill.

The item for community facilities has already been dealt with in detail by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. The record indicates that community facilities have been operated through 1,756 Federal projects in 777 localities. These projects include, as has been pointed out, first, construction projects, and second, service projects. The latter include such items as school services; child care; health matters, which ought to be taken care of by the public-health service; recreation programs, in my judgment, to an excessive degree; fire and police protection, which surely is preeminently a local responsibility; and other activities.

In my opinion, community facilities activities have extended beyond the scope of the activities contemplated by the Congress in enacting the applicable legislation. In my opinion, these activities have been at times extravagantly operated. In my opinion, they have included an administrative set-up which is without justification. While I fully realize the importance of community facilities within their proper scope, the item pending before the committee at this time in my opinion has not been justified. In the light of the testimony before the Appropriations Committee I share the view of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] in this connection.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DE LACY. Under that community-facilities appropriation for the so-called Lanham Act funds, is it the opinion of the committee that there are sufficient unallocated balances so that worthy projects in the congested areas contemplated to be served by the act can get sufficient appropriations without more money than the committee recommends?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. My personal opinion is that the laudable object which the gentleman has in mind can be accomplished without any additional money at this time. The commitee has recommended an increase of $20,000,000, $2,000,000 to be available during the balance of the present fiscal year, $18,000,000 to be reserved for the fiscal year 1946.

Mr. DE LACY. The situation, sir, is quite difficult in my district, which includes the Puget Sound Navy Yard at Bremerton, Wash. There a tremendous increase in population is taking place, as in so many other war centers. Of course, the Government owns the best industrial property, it being devoted to the navy yard itself. There is no taxation on that, and the town, which has grown from 18,000 population before the war to 85,000 at the present time, even though it taxes itself 37 mills for school purposes alone, simply cannot build schools and school facilities from community funds and State funds. It is very important to us. Could the gentleman comment on that? It is very important to us.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will say to the gentleman I can understand his point of view entirely. I am well aware that there is a more acute problem in this respect on the west coast than elsewhere in the country. I hope and believe, in the light of the information which the agency has given the Appropriations Committee, that all essential work in this field can be taken care of without the appropriation of additional funds at this time.

Mr. DE LACY. I thank the gentleman.

N. H. A. WAR HOUSING

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Now, Mr. Chairman, just a word, before concluding, as to the National Housing Agency, which asks Congress for an additional $90,000,000 for war housing, the Appropriations Committee having recommended between eighty-four and eighty-five million dollars for this purpose.

The Committee, I am sure, is aware of the enormous expenditure in the housing field which has been incurred by the Federal Government.

In connection with the recent hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill, the Administrator of this agency furnished a table showing the total investment and contingent liabilities of the Government in Federal housing amounting to $13,804,000,000.

The Federal Public Housing Authority indicates construction of 3,700,000 war housing units to date, which on a basis

of 3 per family, would seem to be more than adequate to take care of the 9,400,000 workers now employed directly in war work outside the armed forces.

Over and above this, the Federal Housing Administration tells us that it has insured the construction of some 400,000 war housing units at a cost of $1,700,000,000, enough units, according to its statement, to rebuild completely the 4 cities of Washington, D. C.; Atlanta, Ga.; St. Paul, Minn.; and Portland, Maine.

Over and above this the Home Loan Bank System has contributed largely in the war housing field. The program has been an enormous one.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, that program has carried with it enormous waste and inefficiency. I have spoken on this floor once or twice before in this general connection. I am not going to emphasize it at length today.

I hold in my hand, however, a copy of a newspaper article entitled, "$5,000,000 Housing Project Becomes a Ghost Town." Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

FIVE-MILLION-DOLLAR HOUSING PROJECT BECOMES A "GHOST TOWN"

(By Mary Spargo)

The finest Government housing project in the United States became a "ghost town" before it was completed, chagrined Federal Public Housing Authority officials disclosed yesterday, but the blame for wasting an investment of $5,000,000 rests with the Navy Department, they insisted.

F. P. H. A. told the Washington Post that they have ordered 900 of the 1,200 family dwelling units in Lacey Park, Johnsville, Pa., padlocked and the apartments kept merely in a stand-by condition.

Lacey Park, built to accommodate the workers of the Johnsville plant of the Brewster Aeronautical Corporation, is comparable to Fairlington and McLean Gardens, F. P. H. A. said, but considered prettier than either, and the very best in the United States.

Over strenuous objections of the National Housing Agency, over-all housing authority, the Navy Department insisted the project be built, F. P. H. A. said.

The project now has some 160 families living in it, and is unlikely to receive any more, housing experts insist, because the Navy has canceled its contract with the Brewster Corporation.

Even as the project reached completion in March of this year, the Navy Department was considering taking over the Johnsville plant for a reconversion center, attached to the Philadelphia Naval Air Station.

F. P. H. A. disclosed that when the Navy proposed the building of the permanent brick village for Johnsville workers housing officials said only temporary war housing was then permitted. The project was bitterly fought.

The Navy Department insisted, however, according to F. P. H. A., that temporary housing was not good enough for the skilled airplane workmen of Brewster.

Because of the necessity of depending upon the armed services for priorities for any war-worker developments, F. P. H. A. gave in and W. P. B. granted the priorities for the construction of the elaborate brick development.

Officials of the U. A. W.-C. I. O. Local 365 of the Brewster workers charged yesterday the development was never needed at any time.

They insist it was the brain child of Frederick J. (Skippy) Reibel, Jr., Navy-installed president, who preceded Henry Kaiser. Reibel, according to his testimony before the House Naval Affairs Committee last year, was in constant difficulty with the union, although he developed the housing idea and similar projects, including a strip-tease show for Brewster workers. Union officials charged he was "paternalistic" in his approach.

ASK INVESTIGATION

Union officials announced yesterday they have asked an investigation by the Senate Truman committee into the reasons for the stop-order on production of Brewster's Corsair fighters for the Navy.

They charged that while Brewster's termination order made a 50-percent cut, the termination orders to Vought-Sikorsky in Bridgeport, Conn., and Goodyear in Akron, Ohio, for the same planes amounted to only a 20-percent slash.

Brewster plants, in rural areas, have experienced no labor shortage, while Akron and Bridgeport are among the most critical labor areas in the country.

There was a report yesterday that Brewster hoped to receive "letters of intent," legal equivalents of a contract from the Army to manufacture bombs and chemical containers.

Brewster officials said that even were such a plant to go through it would mean only short-time employment at the Long Island City plant for 300 or 400 workers.

PARTS TO BECOME SCRAP

The Long Island City plants have already turned out all the parts to fulfill the entire Navy Corsair contract. Fully half of these will become scrap metal under the termination order.

Millions of dollars, union officials said, are involved in scrapping these parts which will not fit any other airplane. The Navy already has spent nearly $80,000,000 in its Brewster operations, exclusive of the housing.

F. P. H. A. revealed that temporary houses from Fulmore Heights, another Government development at Brewster, are being moved now to Front Royal and Aberdeen.

No new temporary housing is being built at Johnsville now, F. P. H. A. said.

C. I. O. Chieftain Philip Murray commented bitterly yesterday upon Navy action in terminating the Brewster contract a few short months after the plants had started to deliver planes following 2 years of inaction.

He said workers at Johnsville were rewarded for their diligence by "unemployment and extreme personal disorder."

In connection with recent hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill, a project known as the Ivy City project here in Washington was described, the evidence apparently indicating an expenditure of $1,535,000 for 308 units of demountable war housing or approximately $5,000 per unit.

I could multiply examples of waste and inefficiency if time permitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I have mentioned before, Mr. Chairman, that in my judgment the administrative set-up of this agency is excessive. Over and above F. P. H. A. in the construction field; F. H. A. in the mortgage insurance field; the Home Loan Bank System, Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and Home Owners' Loan Corporation in the credit, insurance, and salvage fields, all of which have field offices, travel, and other expenses, we find the set-up of the National Housing Administrator with 321 people in the department, 163 people in 7 regional offices, and 326 people in 35 war housing centers, involving a total administrative expenditure of about $3,900,000. Most of the funds for this administrative expenditure come through the Lanham Act. In dealing with that act the attempt should be made to hold the expenditure within proper bounds.

Testifying before the Independent Offices Appropriation Subcommittee on January 12 or thereabouts, long after the break-through by Von Rundstedt, representatives of this agency stated in substance that the War Housing program as of October 31, 1944, was 94 percent complete; that large-scale programming had long since ceased; that there was no longer a housing shortage, as a generalized condition; that the need for a small volume of temporary war housing could be provided by moving existing war houses, or by employing movable units; and that experiments were actually being conducted in sawing up temporary construction and shipping some 1,300 units for barracks in France.

Seventeen days later the same representatives of the same agency appeared before the Deficiency Subcommittee requesting the pending appropriation of $90,000,000 for war housing purposes.

I confess, Mr. Chairman, that it is difficult for me to believe that so large a sum at this time is essential for the purpose in question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON].

SMALL BUSINESS: CASUALTY OR COMBATANT?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, it is a common practice today for many of us to pay a glowing tribute to small business and point to our small manufacturers, storekeepers, and service-station operators as the backbone of democracy. Too many of us here in Congress and in high industrial positions pay this verbal tribute and then pass on to vote for and endorse programs which are anything but helpful to this class of our citizens.

I am not going to devote these few remarks to submission of statistics to show that small business has fared well or poorly in recent years. Figures can often be made to prove anything we wish them to prove. Some authorities will tell you that we have had half a million businesses close during the war period that were not replaced through new openings. Others will point with pride to the splendid prosperity that our small manufacturers and retailers have enjoyed during wartime when viewed en masse.

I am not so much concerned with what has happened to small business during the war as I am with what will happen to it when the war is over and the difficult adjustments from war to peace are with us. War makes casualties, many of whom survive and recover to fight the good fight of business competition another day just as long as the gates of opportunity are open to them.

We do not hold the procurement agencies to blame for having loaded the war contracts on the biggest firms, those able

to process them rapidly and with efficiency. The fact that 81 percent of our war manufacturing contracts were held by only 208 firms a few months ago does not necessarily mean that small manufacturing firms were not getting plenty of business from the Government under our vast war buying programs.

We do not hold the Chairman of the War Production Board responsible for having availed himself of clauses in our war emergency laws which caused the Department of Justice to refrain from prosecuting many pending antitrust suits during wartime. He was justified in asking postponements of these litigations in order to keep the high company officials named at their desks and on the job in behalf of a total war effort.

We do not hold the Office of Price Administration to blame for having so held the line that many small manufacturers and retailers were hard put to make ends meet in their own businesses. Inflation had to be held in check and the magnitude of the agency's job precluded the handling of every alleged hardship case on an individual basis and with dispatch.

We do not hold the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to blame for having so concentrated on the major private financings with Government funds and so doing with bankerlike caution that the Congress had to create a separate Federal financing agency—the Smaller War Plants Corporation—to care for the urgent needs of small business.

All these things had to be done. The war came first and the war still comes first.

It is not too soon, however, for a few of us here in Congress who are not too greatly burdened with other duties to start giving serious thought to the possible position of small business in the post-war period and be looking far enough ahead to lay the groundwork for such legislation as may be truly necessary to preserve and keep healthy the 3,000,000 small firms which are, in every sense of the word, the backbone of America.

The time must come when the Congress and the departments of the Federal Government must once again buckle down to the tasks of peace. To my mind, one of the primary problems of peace will be the creation and maintenance of an economic climate in this country in which qualified small businesses can take root and flourish. Inattention by Government to this problem can lead only to a political and economic condition better left undescribed at this time.

When the war is over, the improvements in technical practices and the new inventions which have come directly out of the war at Government expense should not become the sole and secret property of the great industrial corporations in whose laboratories much of the experimental work has been done.

When the war is over, the Department of Justice, through its Antitrust Division, must courageously attack the monopolies whose existence can be proven.

When the war is over, the Federal Trade Commission must emerge from its war-given cloister and assume in full the duties which Congress assigned it many years ago in numerous acts of Congress. The Congress deserves much credit for its foresight and wisdom in passing such laws as the Robinson-Patman Act and other laws, the enforcement of which are principally the province of the Federal Trade Commission. New legislation along these lines may be needed, but, first, existing laws should be enforced, or repealed.

The travesty of a recent decision which forced several large steel companies and their major officials to pay fines totaling only $240,000 for admitted violations of our monopoly laws is not the fault of those making the decision but rather of Congress for not having teeth in these laws that would make the violators feel the sting of penalty. Instead, these violators are in the position of winners at a lottery. They paid for their tickets, but, much worse, they did not have to pay for them until they had received large dividends on a meager investment not yet paid for.

Today, large business organizations are parading behind the banner of small business, are creating special research staffs to study and report on the problems of small business, and are generally creating the impression that only through them can small business secure the justice and full opportunity that it deserves. With these programs I have no argument, but let us never forget that these organizations are financed by a few large firms, think fundamentally in terms of the best interests of these few large firms and many times advocate programs which are not applicable for use by and on behalf of small business.

If we face the facts honestly, we will recognize that small business has no lobby, has no national organization, and its only voice is the voice of its duly elected Representative in Congress.

It is easy for us to listen to the voice of the special interest. It is always close to us here in Washington. Let us not forget to listen for the voice of our merchants, our small manufacturers, and our individually owned local enterprises which go to make up our individual towns, cities, and cross-road hamlets. This voice will not come to Washington to seek us out. We must hear it and we must remember what it says when we are here in Washington.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to ask the chairman of the committee a question relative to the item discussed in the hearings on pages 493, 494, and 495. This concerns an item for $104,400 for the Buckeye Irrigation District and $10,000 for the Arlington Canal. I take it from the statements in the hearings that no appropriation can be expected for those two items until authorization is passed by the Congress.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee did not pass on the merits of these propositions. The estimate, as submitted to us by the Bureau of the Budget, embraced so much legislation that we felt we were not in a position to recommend the appropriation or to include legislation of so obvious a character in an appropriation bill.

We omitted the item without passing either upon its need or effect in order to permit the Committee on Indian Affairs, the legislative committee having jurisdiction over such matters, to take it up for consideration. If the Committee on Indian Affairs brings in House-approved legislation authorizing the appropriation we shall then be in position to consider the item. I could not, of course, say what the position of the committee would be, even if it were authorized by law, but we would at least be in position where we could consider it on its merits; whereas, under the present circumstances we would not be authorized to take any action, either on the estimate or the accompanying legislation.

Mr. MURDOCK. It was in the interest of saving time and disposing of this long-delayed claim quickly that I raise the question now. I had hoped that it might be included at once without further authorization in this deficiency bill, but if it will not be considered in the regular Interior appropriation bill either for the same reason, I take it another course is needed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As the gentleman knows, we are precluded from including in general appropriation bills legislation of any character. Sometimes, of course, where we have the approval of the legislative committee having jurisdiction of the subject matter and the legislation required is a minor consideration, we have at times included it in our bills; but in this case there was major legislation involved, some of it rather intricate legislation, and we felt impelled, under the circumstances, to await action by the legislative committee and the House.

Mr. MURDOCK. I recognize the justice of the claim so thoroughly that I shall proceed at once to try to get the necessary further action.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is to be regretted that the situation was so technical as to prevent inclusion in this bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman from Arizona gets a bill passed he will have no trouble in getting it through the Appropriations Committee because the Appropriations Committee grants everything everybody wants whether we are at war or not at war. All you have to do, brother, is just get a bill passed; that is all; we have the money.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to say that frequently I find myself in accord with what the gentleman from Pennsylvania says; but unfortunately on this occasion he is in error, and, if he will consider the records of the Committee on Appropriations he will find that we have frequently denied funds under the broadest authorization by the House.

The Committee on Appropriations, as I have said before, has a veto power on all legislation enacted by the Congress requiring funds for its enforcement. It is within the province of the Committee on Appropriations to appropriate all the money authorized in enabling legislation, or to appropriate a part of it, or it may refuse to appropriate any of it. That is

the function—and the only function—of the Committee on Appropriations under the rules of the House. If the committee cannot and does not deny appropriations which it considers inexpedient there might as well not be a Committee on Appropriations—and all the combined resources of all the treasuries and exchequers of the world would not suffice to pay the bill if the committee appropriated all the authorizations enacted by Congress.

May I say again, if the appropriation in which the gentleman is interested is authorized by the appropriate committee and the House we shall be glad to take it under advisement.

Mr. MURDOCK. This is a case in which the United States Government, through the Indian Bureau, has impinged upon the water rights of these two reclamation districts below the Coolidge Dam and below the San Carlos Indian reclamation project. Water has been taken away from these pioneer farmers. The amounts specified in the items are adjudged to be conservative estimates of the damage done these two districts by the Government's construction on the Gila River above them. Of course, I am anxious that the claim be settled at the earliest possible moment, as every day is costing the farmers a loss through no fault of their own.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to give to the House a factual report of the progress that is being made by the Navy Department and the Standard Oil Co. of California on Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1, at Elk Hills in Kern County, Calif. In my opinion it is important that the Congress keep in close touch with all developments in connection with the use of our carefully hoarded reserves.

The Navy operates on oil, and most of the products and byproducts of crude oil are highly essential to the successful prosecution of the war, particularly the war against Japan. Our reserves were set aside and carefully guarded in order that we might have a dependable supply of oil available in the event of a serious national emergency. That emergency is now here, and the needs of our fleet in the Pacific, plus the lack of an adequate supply of petroleum products from other sources, created a situation that forced the Navy to depart from its former policy of preserving the Elk Hills oil supply in the ground.

In order to ascertain just what is being done under the present operating agreement, the chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee recently authorized an inspection by the members of that committee. Fifteen members made the trip, accompanied by the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT], in whose district the Elk Hills Reserve is located, the Commissioner from Puerto Rico, and Capt. W. G. Greenman, director of the Navy's petroleum reserves. I, for one, feel that our time was well spent, and I am sure that my colleagues on the committee share this opinion. Our visual inspection of the property, in addition to the information furnished by representatves of both the Navy Department and the Standard Oil Co., gave us an insight into the present outstanding accomplishments under the unit-plan contract that could be obtained in no other way.

Now for a brief history of the events leading up to the present contract and operating agreement.

At the turn of the century and during the period when the Navy was faced with the problem of conversion from coal to oil for fuel, President Theodore Roosevelt initiated an inquiry by the United States Geological Survey as to those parts of the public lands believed to contain oil. This report was completed after he had left office but resulted in the withdrawal from public entry or claim, by President Taft, of certain large areas in California and Wyoming, and their subsequent designation as naval petroleum reserves. Among these were some 38,000 acres in what is now known as the Elk Hills, Kern County, Calif., which President Taft set aside on September 2, 1912, as Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1.

The reserve was enlarged to 43,815 acres by Executive order on October 15, 1942. The purpose in extending the limits of the reserve was to include edge leases located on the same geological structure, the continued operation of which was draining oil from the reserve.

The first discovery of oil was made on Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1 in 1919. There were claims to an appreciable percentage of the lands within the designated reserve by private interests. This fact led to long years of litigation and controversy between the Government and these claimants with which we are all familiar and which is a matter of official record. The full story may be found in Senate Document 187, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session—History of Naval Petroleum Reserves, prepared by the Navy Department at the request of Hon. DAVID I. WALSH, chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, United States Senate.

Climaxing this period of controversy and under stress of increasing war demand for petroleum in the Pacific area, the Navy entered into an agreement with Standard Oil Co. of California on November 20, 1942, for the development and operation of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1. Under this agreement, Standard was designated operator and was allowed to produce 15,000 barrels of oil per day to maintain its commitments for war contracts.

This agreement was entered into under the assumption that authority therefor existed under the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 813) as amended by the act of June 30, 1938 (52 Stat. 1252; 34 U. S. C., 524). However, an adverse opinion by the Attorney General led to cancelation of the agreement by the rescission and operating agreement which was approved by the Attorney General and signed by the President on September 8, 1943. Under this latter agreement and subsequent extensions, Standard was authorized to continue production pending the passage of enabling legislation. This was provided by Public Law 343, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, approved on June 17, 1944.

In the face of ever-increasing demands for petroleum products in the Pacific theater of operations, and upon a finding of necessity made by the Secretary of the Navy, and approved by the President, on the basis of information and recommendations from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the joint resolution—Public Law 344, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session—became law on June 17, 1944. Under its provisions, Congress increased the allowable production from the reserve to 65,000 barrels of oil per day and limited the period of production to 18 months, dating from June 1, 1944. A ceiling of 30,000,000 barrels was placed on the total production permitted under this act.

Concurrently with the framing and enactment of the enabling legislation, a unit-plan contract and an operating agreement were drawn up between the Navy Department and Standard Oil Co. of California. These were executed by Navy and Standard as of June 19, 1944, and were approved by the President on June 28, 1944.

Under the terms of the unit-plan contract, development and operation of the Reserve is being carried out as a unit without regard to surface property lines. All operations are under the direction of an operating committee composed of two members, one representing Standard and the other representing the Navy, and in the event of disagreement the opinion of the Secretary of the Navy governs. The ultimate participation of each party to the contract in any producing horizon, both for production and for expenditures in development and operation of the Reserve, is established on a percentage basis which represents the relationship between the acre-feet of oil sand in the Reserve to that underlying the respective lands of Standard and Navy. This acre-footage is determined by an engineering committee consisting of six members, three representing Standard and three Navy, subject to final ruling by the Secretary of the Navy in case of disagreement. The present participating percentages, which allow Standard approximately a one-third interest, are based on an engineering study dated November 20, 1942, which is the date of the signing of the original agreement. Provision is made in the contract for retroactive revision of these percentages from time to time as additional subsurface data becomes available, and in such manner as to cause Navy and Standard properly to share in the total eventual production.

Provision has been made for complete control of the rate of production, including the power of suspension, from the Reserve by the Secretary of the Navy. In addition, under the terms, now operative, of the unit-plan contract, Standard is limited in its withdrawals of oil from the Shallow Oil Zone to 25,000,000 barrels or to one-third of its estimated share therein whichever of said events occurs first, always subject to the authority of the Secretary of the Navy to suspend production. The unit-plan

contract also controls Standard's take in all other zones on the Reserve.

At Navy's sole election, pursuant to the unit plan contract, Standard was retained as the operator for unit operation and functions under the direct supervision of the operating committee in accordance with the operating agreement. All operations must be conducted at actual cost exclusive of home office overhead.

In accordance with the enabling legislation, all expense incurred in increasing the productive capacity of the reserve to 65,000 barrels a day is paid currently by Navy out of an appropriation authorized by Congress. All such costs are entered on the books of the unit operation to the credit of Navy for utimate sharing on the basis of the finally determined percentage of participation by Navy and Standard. In addition, all direct services and all materials for the unit operation furnished by Navy for this increasing production are likewise credited for ultimate sharing.

In this connection all expenditures under the unit plan contract and operating agreement are subject to audit by Navy. To effect this, the Secretary of the Navy established the Office of Cost Inspector for Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1. The cost inspector is under the jurisdiction of the Cost Inspection Service of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. His functions are similar to those of an independent audit firm, and are for the purpose of protecting the Government's interests. He is responsible for proper accounting for production and all related costs under the unit plan contract and operating agreement both as to current cost and production sharings, as well as the ultimate settlement therefor.

Navy engineers originally estimated that with the continuous use of 15 drilling strings 20 wells could be completed per month, and with an estimated initial production of 200 barrels per day per well, the maximum allowable production, so essential to the war effort, of 65,000 barrels per day would be attained by the end of June 1945.

The first well under unit operation was spudded on June 29, 1944; the day following the approval by the President of the unit plan contract and the operating agreement. The progress during the first few months was decidedly below the engineers' estimates. Drilling contractors were not readily available due to prior commitments and the critical labor shortage on the west coast. All were faced with the same problem; men available were unskilled and either overage or were boys under military age working during summer vacation. This was further aggravated by the fact that a large percentage of the technical staffs formerly employed by the oil industry are now in the armed services.

In view of these circumstances, Navy was called on to assist in securing labor, materials, and so forth necessary to the performance by Standard of the work and services contemplated under the operating agreement. The Navy immediately set about assembling the required personnel and a recent count shows that approximately 217 enlisted men and 31 officers are now employed on Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 1, either by the unit operation or in a supervisory capacity for Navy. All of these officers and men have had a good oil-field background and are performing, together with Standard, a splendid service for the war effort.

As a result, since the latter part of October an average of 19 drilling strings has been maintained and the backlog of underproduction, during the initial period has been completely wiped out. Current completions are at the rate of approximately one well per day. On February 19, the unit operation was capable of producing some 60,000 barrels of oil daily. This is approximately 15,000 barrels per day in excess of the original estimate for this date. Barring unforeseen circumstances, it is now estimated that the 65,000-barrel-per-day goal will be attained by the 1st of April 1945, 3 months ahead of the original estimate. One hundred and fifty-nine wells have been completed as producers and only two wells have been abandoned as dry holes.

Navy's share of the production from the reserve is delivered by unit operation to the naval fuel annex adjacent to the reserve. This annex is under the direct supervision of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, and is responsible for the receipt, custody, and sale to purchasers of all of the natural gas, natural gasoline, and associated hydrocarbons produced for Navy's account and delivered to it from unit operation.

All sales of these products from the reserve are made competitively at public sale. Purchasers are required to produce specified refined products usable by the armed services in the Pacific theater. This resulted in awarding sales contracts to Union Oil Co. of California, Shell Oil Co., Inc., the Texas Oil Co., General Petroleum Corporation of California, Richfield Oil Corporation, and Mohawk Petroleum Corporation.

Up to January 31, 1945, there has been received from unit operation for Navy's account some 3,030,000 barrels of crude oil, 220,000 gallons of natural gasoline, and 171,200,000 cubic feet of natural gas. It is anticipated that in excess of 14,000,000 barrels of crude oil will be received by the Navy between February 1 and November 30, 1945.

A tentative financial forecast of Navy's position at the end of the authorized period of production on November 30, 1945, based upon incurred and estimated expenditures and receipts, shows that the total estimated revenue flowing to the United States Treasury from Navy's share of the production will amount to some $16,800,000 and that the expenditures incurred for all purposes including permanent oil-field improvements and for providing for future production and readiness will total some $13,000,000. This will mean a net estimated income on a cash basis of some $3,800,000 to the end of the presently authorized period.

Under the terms of the unit-plan contract, the engineering committee on December 19, 1944, submitted an estimate of 283,000,000 barrels of recoverable oil as of November 20, 1942, within what is now designated as the proven production area of the shallow oil zone. This area includes only about 10,000 acres of the total of 43,815 included in the reserve.

Earlier, it has been mentioned that Standard is limited in its withdrawals of oil from the shallow zone to one-third of its estimated share therein or to 25,000,000 barrels, whichever of said events occur first. This estimate of 283,000,000 barrels indicates clearly that Standard's production would be cut off long before it has received the one-third of its allowed participating interest.

With the exception of seven wells drilled to the Stevens zone which underlies the eastern part of the reserve, a full three-quarters of the field is still unexplored, and nothing is known of the productive possibilities of either the shallow or deeper horizons in this area.

The first value of a reserve of oil in the ground is based on the knowledge of how much recoverable oil the reserve contains. Its second value is its readiness to produce. Knowledge of recoverable oil can be gained only by drilling wells to the producing horizons, and readiness can be maintained only by keeping the wells in an operating condition. In other words, we must know how much ready cash we have in the bank.

It is a generally accepted fact that there is a decided decrease in discoveries of substantial new production in California. Granting this, a serious situation would exist on the west coast if, 15 years hence, a national emergency develops which would require deliveries of refined products to the Pacific theater of action in quantities comparable to present-day requirements.

Considering this, it is obvious that the Navy must know what its reserves of oil are on the west coast in order properly to plan to supplement the failing resources of California which is now indicated.

It is understood that the Navy is preparing a plan for presentation to the Congress which, if approved, will permit full exploration for readiness purposes of the Elk Hills. This plan should receive the support of Congress, and money should be appropriated to drill the wells to provide the knowledge of our military oil resources in this largely unexplored reserve and to keep the wells in readiness for use in a future emergency.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in closing I want to say just a word about the fine spirit of cooperation that has made the present outstanding record at Elk Hills possible. I was particularly impressed with the caliber of men we found administering the gigantic development task, their knowledge of the problems involved, and their evident desire to successfully complete a job that had to be done and that is being done—and done well.

For the efficient and well-trained representatives of both the Navy Department and the Standard Oil Co., I have nothing but the highest praise. We can rest secure in the knowledge that when Admiral Nimitz's fleet needs oil for fuel, and when our planes that are fighting the Japs need 100-octane gas, the needed supplies will not be lacking because we did not develop the available reserves.

Perhaps a fitting conclusion is best expressed by the following statement of Lieutenant (Jr. Gr.) Chermak, who is

presently employed in the office of the Navy's Director of Petroleum Reserves:

The activity of the Navy may be likened to the playing of a giant console organ with Navy at the keyboard. The music that is played is determined by the gods of war, its fullness is dependent upon the pipes and stops made available to the organist. The pipes are the wells of production and stops are the controls. Navy, the organist sitting at the keyboard, works these stops. Standard operates the bellows. From their joint effort flows a symphony of oil which increases with the tempo of war. The stops which give this symphony its fullness, its refinement, its harmony, and its final expression must be varied and many. There must be exploratory stops, developing stops, prospecting stops, as well as stops controlling immediate operation so that the pipes can produce their swelling crescendo in full consonance with the keys touched by the guiding hand of Navy, the organist.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak about the bill which will come up tomorrow, and about the Pacific coast, especially. I want to speak about the amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]. As the war in the Pacific is intensified, more and more people are coming to the Pacific coast. To meet our war schedules, as the Army moves out from the west coast, as ships go out from our great western ports, we need facilities on an ever-mounting scale to assist our war workers. We need nurseries. We need recreation centers. We need more schools. We need the help that can come to us only through Lanham Act funds. We want to do a good job in California for the war, and we have been trying to do a good job. I do not feel we can do what will be expected of us to finish this war swiftly and with a minimum cost of lives unless we receive the kind of help we need in recreational facilities, housing, nursery, and school projects.

Now, I know that on the east coast most of your facilities are set; that the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], will not affect you on the east coast, but it will affect you indirectly because to the degree that we are efficient on the Pacific coast, and I mean the whole Pacific coast, to that degree the war will more quickly be over.

You know and I know all the hell that our boys are going through in the Pacific. And the release of the $18,000,000 that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] asks for, so that it can be spent now when it is needed, is simply a drop in the bucket if it means shortening the war by only a few months or even a few days. We were asked to pass a work-or-fight bill. I voted for that bill. It was the hardest thing I have ever done in my life, but to vote for that bill and not provide for the greatest possible efficiency in war plants at this time is, to put it very mildly, just not common horse sense. We hope that all of you—this is not a partisan issue—will vote to release these few million dollars for use now, and they are just a few millions of dollars by comparison with what we are up against. I hope all of us will be wise enough to make these funds available at once. Mr. LANHAM's name to those of us who have come but lately from our communities is a household word. Why is his name a household word today? I do not suppose people have the vaguest idea what he looks like, but he is known across the land because the need of our people in war industries has been so great. The Lanham Act funds have endeavored to meet the problem. I beg of this House that they support the amendment which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] will present tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

THE BLOOM 1949 BILL

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, lend-lease extension is now before the Foreign Affairs Committee. Everyone on the committee favors extending our program of military mutual aid for a year from now, but the Bloom bill, H. R. 2013, extends the power to carry out lend-lease agreements until July 1, 1949, over 4 years from now, well into the next Presidential administration, and far into what we hope will be post-war period.

No good reason has been given for this extension to 1949. The President, Secretary Stimson, and Mr. Crowley, Lend-Lease Administrator, have all said that lend-lease should end with the war.

For the post-war period, we have U. N. R. R. A. for relief and rehabilitation, the Bretton Woods bank proposal for economic reconstruction, the San Francisco conference for military security. Each of these have been, or will be, submitted to Congress for approval. If we extend lend-lease to 1949 none of these will need to come to Congress, for agreements to cover post-war relief, rehabilitation, reconstruction, and the post-war policing of Germany and Japan can be made for 4 years under lend-lease, which was not a war measure, but a national defense measure, operating in peacetime before war, and after war.

This attempt to circumvent Congress in determining our post-war policies will raise a domestic issue which may be disastrous to our foreign policy. A majority of Congress is determined to assume increased international obligations, but is opposed to using this as a means of changing our form of government here at home. We want to go in as a republic, with three branches of government working together.

This is the issue on extending lend-lease. Shall it be for a year for military needs, as all agree, or until 1949, as the Bloom bill suggests?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, early in the afternoon there was some reference made to testimony given by the Comptroller General before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. In order that the record may be absolutely accurate in this particular I want to read that testimony.

I have here a copy of the hearings of date February 13, incident to H. R. 131, before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

Mr. GOSSETT. This may not be germane to the bill, and I do not want to go into the philosophy of cost-plus contracts—they may be absolutely necessary in expediting the entire war program—but do you have any way of estimating just how much cost-plus contracting may have added to the over-all cost of the war.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. GOSSETT, I of course could not even give you an idea, but I would say it is just so staggering that it is beyond our guess or computation.

Mr. GOSSETT. I have made a careless statement, purely careless because I have no earthly way of even approximating it, that doubtless it has added $50,000,000,000 to the cost of the war.

Mr. WARREN. I would not think your figure would be too much out of line.

That is all of the testimony as given before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments incident to that question. I wanted it to go into the RECORD because of some difference of opinion as to just what was said and done.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I just want to call attention to the fact that in the independent offices bill hearings, at page 1138, for this year the Comptroller General indicated no less than $3,333,660,923 as the total amount of exceptions taken by the General Accounting Office in respect of cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman.

The purpose of this bill, H. R. 131, which we hope to bring before the House shortly, is to chink some of the holes through which gratuities, bonuses, and so forth, have been leaking.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. I am glad, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] put that statement in reference to cutbacks in contracts in the RECORD, reading the testimony of the Comptroller General into the RECORD, because I intended to do so at this point, for I wanted to show the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], that the cost-plus system has been so extravagantly handled by the Government during the last 3 years.

I further want to show to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations the statement made by the Comptroller General in reference to these cost-plus contracts, pointing out a few of the instances in which subcontractors deliberately paid money to the prime contractors to get the job. I quote from the testimony of Comptroller General Lindsay Warren, for whom I have the greatest respect, testimony from the same hearings from which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] quoted a few moments ago:

A subcontractor, the S. & F. Tool Co., paid to James W. Grady, an employee in the purchasing department of the prime contractor,

the Packard Motor Co., commissions aggregating $55,000. That was charged up to the Government under the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract.

Another contractor, the Embassy Industrial Engineering Co., paid commissions aggregating $55,000 to another concern, the Northwestern Engineering Co., solely owned by J. A. Webber, an executive officer of the subcontractor, on articles manufactured by the subcontractor for the prime contractor, the Emerson Electric Co.

A third firm, the Paramount Engineering Co., paid commissions in the amount of $2,200 to Ralph W. Pierce, a purchasing agent of a prime contractor, the Ford Motor Co.; in the amount of $1,000 to L. Blumenthal, a master mechanic of another prime contractor, the Chrysler Motor Co.

A fourth firm, the Apex Metal Specialties, Inc., made an agreement to pay to one John McCormick, 10 percent commission on certain gun parts at the basic price of $12 each and 50 percent of all moneys received over and above the basic price of $12, and that substantial orders for these parts were received from a prime contractor, the Olds Motor Division of General Motors, at a price of $29.50, which price was later reduced to $19.50.

I can give you a lot more illustrations of these grasping men who are getting money out of the Government; yet you sit here and say there is no graft in the Government now. It is full of graft; I call it stealing money from our Government. If that is not graft, then I do not know what is graft. This is the time for you as chairman of the Appropriations Committee to take action. You on that side spend all this money, and you are responsible more than any other individual Member of Congress because you can clamp the lid down on the Treasury if you wish. Instead of that you are always as a committee squandering the taxpayers' money. We are paying to everybody for everything that they can get. Remember spend, spend, spend—elect, elect, elect; now it will be tax, tax, tax—pay, pay, pay.

Mr. Chairman, a lot of people do not understand this Treasury statement. I want to show you something not in the form of the Treasury statement but in the form of a graph. Maybe you can read a graph better than the Treasury statement. I do not know that many Members of the House realize what we are headed for, but if you will read this, you will see what this administration has done.

Where did we stand when this administration came into power in 1933? At that time the United States Government was only $20,500,000,000 in the red. Just prior to the beginning of the present war the Government was $48,500,000,000 in the red. In other words, you did not have a balanced Budget in any one year of this administration. This administration is responsible for that, although the President many times in 1932 stated he would balance the Budget. But what did you do? You never balanced anything. You could not balance anything. The only thing I think you could balance would be a pole on the end of somebody's chin. You are fooling someone all the time.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman calls attention to what appears to be exorbitant fees amounting to some $55,000. But did the gentleman read Mr. Warren's statement in which he said that it looked as if there might have been graft amounting to as much as $50,000,000,000?

Mr. RICH. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] just put that in the RECORD for all Members of the Congress to see.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, we have a bill before us calling for an appropriation of $2,453,177,125.60.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. It is about three and one-half billion dollars altogether, because there are transfers involved.

Mr. RICH. Well, forgive me. These figures are so big I cannot digest them and I cannot state them in entirety. In other words, they do not put this out as it should be so that we could find out how much it is. We have now on the floor about 15 or 20 Members, perhaps 25. If we had a bill up here involving only $100,000, all the Members of the House would be on the floor because they would probably know what $100,000 is, but when we have a bill involving an appropriation of two and one-half billion dollars, or three and one-half billion dollars, they all leave the floor. There is no use of the Members of Congress being here, because they leave it up to the Appropriations Committee anyway. The Appropriations Committee allows what the Budget Bureau suggests, and the Budget Bureau is directly responsible to the President. When the President of the United States wants anything he tells the Budget Bureau to go to the Appropriations Committee, and the Appropriations Committee, which is responsible because you have the majority over there, appropriates the money. I was a member of the Appropriations Committee for several years, and I tried to hold it down, but you cannot hold it down in this administration. It is always up, up, up; you always want more appropriations, more money. The men on this side of the House, and the ladies, too, ask for more money, more money, and more money, and as a rule they get it. But it is borrowed money still to be paid.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know where the money is coming from? Where are you going to get this money? I have been watching the situation for over 12 years now. In 1934 I asked that question many times when the appropriation bills only involved a total of about four or five billion dollars. Today they run up to sixty or seventy billion dollars, but nobody is interested. They might be interested, but they are not interested enough to try to cut down the appropriations.

I want to say to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee that a lot of things come in here that are not necessary. They are not needed during this war and the gentleman should be the first one, and his committee, to say: "We are not going to do these things during the war; we will hold them up until after the war is over." If you do that, you will cut out a whole lot of things that this Government is doing at the present time that ought to be eliminated. You will save expenses and manpower for the use of the war effort.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Why does not the gentleman specify what they are and when they come to the House—why does he not move to cut them from the bill?

The gentleman always makes the broad statement, "Where are you going to get the money?" but he never mentions things in this bill that ought not to be there and he never makes a motion to strike them out.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is either not on the floor of the House or he does not want to vote for them. There are a lot of things in here that you can cut out now, and it will not affect the war at all.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then I expect the gentleman to rise and move to strike them out.

Mr. RICH. Will you strike them out? You are always the first one to get up and say, "Come on and vote for it." You are doing everything you can to get these fellows to vote. You know that is the case, because I have watched you all the way through. You talk economy, but you do not vote economy, because you do not practice it. I like to see a fellow practice what he preaches. I like to see a fellow get up and say that he is for economy and then stand up and vote these things down, but I do not like to hear a fellow say he is for economy, then every time somebody wants something, have him say, "I am here ready to hand it to you." I do not like that. I can disagree with a fellow on the floor of the House if he is honest in his convictions, that is his business, and he has a right to that opinion, and he can do just as he wants to about it. That is none of my concern.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I think it should be stated in all fairness to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that during his period of service here in the Congress of the United States he has sponsored scores of amendments to cut down appropriations, and he has sponsored appropriations which have prevailed.

Mr. RICH. I thank the gentleman. Well, I have sponsored a whole lot more that did not prevail than the ones that did prevail.

I talk about economy in government, and it does not do any good. I vote for economy in government, and I am in the great minority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. I thank the gentleman. You know, I got to thinking this thing over and I have come to the conclusion that the United States of America 10 years ago was the greatest country on the face of the earth. It was the most solid country financially. It was the best country in every sense of the word. If I knew of any country that had better laws than the United States of America, I would want to pattern something after them. But I know of none. At that time our standards of living were the highest; our working conditions were the best. But we started out with the New Deal in 1933 and we started to condemn the capitalistic system. Under the capitalistic system for 160 years we built this country up to make it the greatest country on the face of the earth, say what you please. A lot of people now condemn it. A lot of the heads of this administration began to call everybody that was a capitalist a name of some kind. They began to call him an economic royalist; then you called him a Bourbon; then you called him a copperhead; then you called him a rattlesnake. They were called everything, so that a man in business was considered by the administration a rascal and a scoundrel. Then they condemned the courts. But I want to say to you right now I think the quicker this country gets back and discards the New Deal before it wrecks us altogether, the better we are going to be off, so that if a man owns his own home, where he can own his own automobile he will not be disgraced for being a capitalist; so that the people who are interested in owning their individual possessions will have pride and joy in those things, and so that we can go out and pay off this great debt that you have created, and try to eliminate unnecessary expenditures and try to get a balanced Budget so that we will not wreck our Nation. I think we should stop this name calling. We should come back and try to undo the damage that has been done by the courts of this country, where you have appointed these people who render their decisions on the trend of the times; when they figure that because the President of the United States wants something they are going to give a decision that will be up to his liking. That is not what the courts of the United States are for. They are supposed to render decisions according to the laws that the Congress passes, and not by the Chief Executive. Then we also want to get back and have a little efficiency in government. We want to take this Government and strip it now back to where it was before Mr. Roosevelt came into power. At that time we had 500,000 Government employees. Today we have 3,500,000. Mr. Roosevelt says, "We will economize in government; we will consolidate the departments; we will take the bureaus and put them together, thus cutting expenses." He said that in 1932 and up to 1934, but he has forgotten it altogether since that time.

What have you done? You have done anything but that. You have created more Government bureaus than this Nation has ever known. You have more people on the pay rolls of this Government than we ever had. Now is the time, while we need these men in the war effort, to get them out into the ordinary business procedure of this country. If you do that, you will accomplish something. This is the time to cut down these departments, this is the time to consolidate them, and this is the time that we need the men on the fighting fronts. If you are going to have a nation such as the boys are fighting for in Europe today, and such as they had before they left, you want to do it pretty quick. Do it now, or you will have communism.

While I want to do what I can to help the foreign countries, my first obligation is to America. It is America first, last, and all the time for "Bob" RICH. I want to do what I can to see that the people of this country maintain a standard of living the same as they had when they left this country. I want to see that we bring those boys back into a country that has not been taken over by the Communists. I think it is high time we act, and act freely and fully and quickly. I shall use my efforts to stop wars, but I am not one to have America police all the other nations of the world. That is not our duty or our privilege. Keep America free. Keep America at liberty. Keep America safe for Americans. But keep America American.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the situation does not warrant the sober consideration of much that has been said, but lest some of the wide range of statements which have been made be taken seriously by the uninformed, let me repeat that no one defends the cost-plus contract under normal conditions. It was necessary in this case, however, as it is in every war, because we had no other way of securing in time the materials required to defend our shores.

Furthermore, although we did not know when we entered the war what would be a fair price for these various services and munitions; we took a precaution no other administration has ever taken. We renegotiated contracts throughout, and thereby saved millions of dollars, and reclaimed any surplus payment which may have been involved in any such plus-cost contracts.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, we took away from any man who was making too much money out of any of these war contracts, through a rigorous income tax any surplus money he was making above a reasonable profit on his investment.

Mr. Chairman, although the amount of money spent in munitions and other contracts in this war reaches far beyond anything ever conceived of, there have been fewer millionaires made in this war than in any previous war ever fought by the United States.

The absurdity of the gentleman's position is shown by the fact that he criticizes the President because of failure to balance the Budget. If the gentleman's desire to balance the Budget had been achieved in these last few years, there would be no Budget, for the very obvious reason that in such contingency the fiscal affairs of this country would now be administered by Germany and by Japan.

In the greatest war in history we have attained every objective. Never before has any war been fought so economically in the expenditure of wealth and lives. And we have won, and are winning the most glorious victories in the history of human conflict. Every American has a right to be proud of the President, the Army, and the Navy, and the workers in field and factory who have made it possible.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I see an item in this bill for $5,024,842.34. When I looked at it at first it did not please me, but then after reflection and thinking of the long period of time I have been fighting the California jurisdictional Indian bill on the floor of this House and to know now my efforts to keep those who will benefit by this appropriation from taking $100,000,000 out of the Treasury, I feel it is well worth while to end the case. You will remember for years I have been opposing legislation which has been introduced in behalf of the Indians of California. The Indians of California maintained that this country took from them a very large acreage. Many resolutions were introduced. A jurisdictional bill was passed and sent to the Court of Claims. The State of California authorized the attorney general of California to represent the Indians. It is admitted by all concerned that this country never did sign a treaty with the Indians of California. There were many efforts in the last few years to change the original jurisdictional act. If we had permitted those changes there would have been nothing for the Court of Claims to do but grant a judgment for over $100,000,000.

I understand that this case was finally settled by stipulation. An agreement was reached between the representatives of the Attorney General of the United States and the representatives of the attorney general of the State of California. The amount agreed upon was $5,024,842.34, the amount which is carried in this bill. Well, that is a great deal less than $100,000,000. So I say to those of you, and to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and Mr. Bob Bacon, who has passed on, who helped to stop the passage of legislation which would have taken a hundred million dollars out of the Treasury, our efforts are rewarded because this disposes of the case once and for all. At least I hope so. No other resolutions should ever be brought to this House to refer any other case to the Court of Claims which involves the Indians of California. It will be the great-great-grandchildren of the Indians whose lands they claim were taken away from them who will receive the benefit of this appropriation, and not any individual who might have been on those lands when they claim the Government took over the property. I simply wanted to make this observation to show that some of our fights here on Indian jurisdictional bills have been

beneficial to the Government and the taxpayers in the end.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have but a few moments to address myself to one phase of this particular problem. Without going into debate with the gentleman on the minority side, Mr. TABER, in regard to his statements regarding the amount of money that is left, I refer you to page 5 of the committee report, where you see a table of figures and also to the top of page 6. The particular figure I am interested in at this time is the figure at the top of page 6, which says:

For new projects, either construction or service, and contingencies, $5,806,257.

In other words, approximately $6,000,000 are available for new projects and services and contingencies. On page 5, I want you to note that the Federal Works Administration has authorized new projects to the tune of $17,000,000.

These projects have been approved after intense screening by their respective urgency committees on the local level.

In other words, $6,000,000 is available for a $17,000,000 job. In order to get any of these projects approved, it must be certified in the local area that it has a direct bearing upon the success of the war effort.

I turn to my own district with which I am very familiar. We have several hundred war plants in or contiguous to my congressional district, plants like the Chrysler Motor Co., Lockheed Aircraft, Consolidated Steel, United States Rubber Co., Goodrich Rubber Co., Willys-Overland Co. the Aluminum Co. of America, all of which are engaged in war contracts. In order to make the things that are made in these factories we have had to bring in hundreds of thousands of additional workers to California, from the States of all the Members in this House. That has thrown an educational burden on our school districts which is almost unbearable. We have erected, out of our own funds, scores and scores of temporary school buildings. In my particular area at this time, out of 12 elementary schools in one consolidated school district, 8 of them are running double shifts, and some of them more than that. Schools with a seating capacity of 525 are handling 880 pupils. Schools with 210 pupil capacity are handling 425 by rotating shifts, and with very inadequate facilities. We are willing to put up the 50 percent necessary under the Lanham Act appropriation, but we beg of you to consider that this is a Federal responsibility to help us in the education of these children who are not natives of our area, but who have come in with their parents and are helping to do this wonderful job of war production.

We ask you to consider that when the language contained on page 7 of the bill is considered. That language says that $18,000,000 of this $20,000,000 shall not be immediately available. In other words, that appropriation of $20,000,000 is really an appropriation of $2,000,000 for this construction of school and other facilities; $18,000,000 is held over until after June 30, and the need is now. These applications have been certified by the war urgency committees in their respective districts. Priorities have been promised for them, and the Federal Works Administration has given its approval to these projects. Now, to do a $17,000,000 job you are making available only $6,000,000.

When the Lanham amendment, which I understand will be offered at the proper time, is presented, I wish to call the attention of this House to that particular fact. You are only making available at the present time $6,000,000 to do a $17,000,000 job, which needs doing now. After June 30, the $18,000,000, which is reserved, is not available for the construction of these new hospitals, schools, and fire facilities. It is only available for maintenance and service. So therefore, after June 30, this $18,000,000 is not available for the specific thing that should be done now. I ask you to consider this tomorrow when the bill comes up for amendment.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I endorse the necessity for the fund that my colleague has just informed the House about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The information my colleague has given the House affecting new projects is very vital to a section in southern California whose population has increased by 750,000 additional people since the war. Not only for new projects but for maintenance of hospital facilities that have been overtaxed by the increased number of people coming in there and from inadequate facilities that were there before they came. I expect to support the Lanham amendment when it is presented tomorrow for the reason that it will create a decided hardship upon our area if it is not adopted.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to thank the gentleman for his contribution. I wish also to call the attention of the membership to the fact that the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] was one of the supervisors of Los Angeles County. He has had this immediate problem under his jurisdiction as a civic administrator in that particular locality. He made an enviable record in the supervisor's job, and I am sure the State of California will be pleased with his work here in the Congress.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thank the gentleman for his compliment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to say to the gentleman that not only does this $18,000,000 withholding clause affect the city of Los Angeles, but it affects San Diego, San Francisco, Richmond, Spokane, Seattle, and any of the war industries cities in Oregon; in fact, the whole Pacific coast, which is a hotbed of war industry, is affected by this particular withholding clause. And I would say that the need which I know exists in my district and other districts of southern California is duplicated not only in the west-coast war-industries cities, but in the southern California cities and some of the eastern cities, because it is a portion of the amount to which local State educational groups contribute 50 percent and therefore it is applicable all over the United States. Seventeen million dollars' worth of approved projects have already been passed upon, yet under the terms of this bill there will be only $6,000,000 to meet that need.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOOK. The remarks of the gentleman are applicable also to the great manufacturing area of Detroit.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am sure it is, and also to the other Great Lakes cities that are engaged in carrying out war contracts. I hope the membership of the House will give these facts consideration tomorrow and support the Lanham amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as so many of us have so often been accused of being short-sighted because we did not always accept the administration's orders as to the passage of legislation, it might be well to call attention to some of the views expressed by those who direct the activities of the House which have been shown by subsequent events to be unsound. The claim that the right to work in a war industry cannot be exercised until the would-be worker has joined a union, met the union's demands for cash, does not seem to me to be in line with the American way.

Twenty-seven days ago, on January 31, the House had under consideration the work-or-jail bill and at that time the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] offered the following amendment:

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: Page 6, after line 6, add a new paragraph, to read as follows:

"Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to modify or otherwise affect in any way existing laws relating to maximum hours, minimum wages, overtime pay or collective bargaining, or relating to mediation, arbitration, or other procedures for the settlement of any labor controversies or questions: *Provided*, That every person assigned to employment under this section shall have the right to join any union or organization of employees, but no such person shall be obliged to join any such union or organization as a condition of his employment if he should not freely choose to do so."

The purpose of that amendment was to provide that anyone who wanted to do so might work in a war plant without being required to join a union, or remain a member of a union, or pay initiation fees and dues.

In opposing that amendment the Speaker of the House made one of his rare appearances before the House and

insisted that the amendment should be voted down. Speaking in behalf of the bill, among other things he said:

Judge Patterson said he could operate under this bill as it is written. The Army and the Navy say that they can operate and do the job of getting the 900,000 men into the armed forces and the 700,000 men and women in industry that they say are vitally needed for replacements on the battle fronts and for places on the fighting line.

Then the Speaker went on to say that he would not be one to question the judgment of those in authority. He said:

If this bill had never been brought to the floor of the House, that would be one thing. Even if the Chief of Staff of the Army and the Chief of Naval Operations, whom the boys out on the battle fronts look up to as their leaders in the Army and in the Navy, had not said that this is needed in order to prepare the instruments with which our men are to defend themselves and fight the enemy, what are these men, who have been on the battle fronts so long without relief, and who have already taken more at the front than any of us thought mortal men could bear, going to think if we do not pass a bill?

He continued in these words:

If you want a bill, if you want to satisfy the boys out there who are doing their part and more than their part, you had better vote down all of these amendments that will eliminate support and go on and pass it, so that the men who are at the helm of our destiny may go ahead and do the things they think are necessary in order to win this war.

The bill then under consideration was a bill to get 700,000 men and women into the factories on war production and, in effect, we were told by the Speaker of the House that if we did not go along with that bill and pass it at that time, in fact on that day, we would not be doing the right thing by those in the service, we would be letting them down. Many believed that the passage of the bill would hinder, not promote, production. The House passed the bill and it went over to the Senate and there it is today, after 27 days. For 27 days that bill has been over there—no final action taken. I wonder just how important that bill really is.

I say, too, that Judge Patterson and the Army and Navy officials, if they advocated that bill, were mistaken as to what it would do. It is true Hershey went out and quoted what Byrnes said the President said, and by so doing confused local draft boards—inducted some men who were exempt. Yesterday this House spent from noon until 5 o'clock trying to tell General Hershey and those in authority administering the Selective Service law that we meant what we said when the Tydings amendment was adopted.

Mr. Chairman, as to whether the Wadsworth amendment would have been of value may be an open, debatable question, but one thing is certain, the right of an American citizen to work to aid in producing munitions of war which those on the fighting front need should not be questioned. Nor should it be denied because some organization insists it must be paid before a worker can go on the job. Nevertheless, when this House sought by that amendment to make it possible for every man and every woman to work in a factory where they could find a job, when that factory is engaged in war production, the House voted down the amendment.

What is the result? Let me call your attention to the Detroit News of February 26. Clear across the top in bold type runs a line, "Picket line rings Dodge." Over in the news part we have the story of the strike—"13,000 stay out of B–29 war plant—Production kept at a standstill." Now, note this:

THIRTEEN THOUSAND STAY OUT AT B–29 WAR PLANT—PRODUCTION KEPT AT A STANDSTILL

Picket lines ringed gates of the Dodge main plant of Chrysler Corporation Saturday as a strike involving nearly 13,000 war workers kept production at a virtual standstill.

Company spokesmen said that small groups of employees approached the gates but were persuaded by pickets not to enter the plant.

Of the approximately 9,400 employees on the day shift, 500 were in the plant, according to company spokesmen. These, however, were mostly maintenance employees and a few tool and die workers, the company spokesmen said.

PROMISE TO STAY OUT

The nearly 13,000 employees on all shifts who struck Friday and walked out of the plant met with officers of the Dodge local in relays as they left the plant and assured the local union officers they would not return to work until ordered to do so by the officers, according to Mike Novak, president of Dodge Local 3, U. A. W.-C. I. O.

The strike, which began in the B–29 aircraft engine parts department and mushroomed through the plant, stalled production of parts for B–29 bombers, antiaircraft guns, Army trucks, rockets, and tanks.

Most of the striking employees remained away from their jobs today despite a back-to-work order issued Friday by George F. Addes, secretary-treasurer of the Intenational U. A. W.-C. I. O., and acting president in the absence of R. J. Thomas.

A picket line. Men marching shoulder to shoulder, not against the Germans, not against the Japs, but marching shoulder to shoulder, blocking the gates that gave entrance to a war plant where B–29's were being made, a picket line with men marching shoulder to shoulder, keeping away the brothers, sisters, the mothers, and other relatives of men who are fighting across the seas, denying those people, those relatives, the right to go in and aid in the manufacture of munitions of war. Men across the sea marching to death, men in Detroit marching to prevent the production of bombers, guns, ammunition.

Do we need some sort of legislation? We not only need legislation, but in Michigan we need the enforcement of a law which is already on the statute books, a State statute which makes it a criminal offense for any man to interfere with another on his way to employment. For the life of me I cannot understand it. The Governor of Michigan is a Republican, a veteran of the First World War; in fact, he left a leg in France. I cannot understand why that Governor with the State troops and the State police at his command will let a picket line by force keep the relatives of men who are fighting abroad out of a plant where they want to work.

That was Monday. Here is Tuesday, the same paper, "Strike perils jobs of one hundred thousand" clear across the page. One hundred thousand may go on strike.

Over on the other side:

UNITED STATES APPEAL SCORNED BY DODGE MEN—FOURTEEN OTHER PLANTS MAY HAVE TO CLOSE

Government warnings that the strike at the Dodge main division of the Chrysler Corporation will affect the progress of General Eisenhower's offensive on the Western Front were ignored Monday by the plant's 13,500 striking employees, who have rejected all back-to-work demands.

A company spokesman said that, in addition to effecting a complete shut-down of the Dodge main plant, the strike has forced the suspension of assembly of heavy trucks at the Dodge truck plant and threatens to halt production by over 100,000 workers in 13 other Chrysler plants in Detroit and Chicago.

Approximately 2,000 employees were sent home from the assembly lines at the truck plant, he said, although some of the subassembly departments there are still operating.

MAIN PLANT PICKETED

The spokesman reported that about 400 pickets ringed the Dodge main plant Monday, keeping out all production employees. Only office workers were permitted to enter.

And again reference is made to the picket line, and again the Government, the War Labor Board tells the strikers to go back to work. In justice let it be said that an officer of the local union, Addes, speaking for R. J. Thomas, president of the union, who was absent, demanded that the men go back to work; ordered them back. But they did not go back. They stayed out on strike. They call it a wildcat strike. No matter what the name it delays production and that delay is almost certain to cost lives.

Let me read you a little more, and this refers to the drivers' strike:

Among the Dodge strikers are more than 100 interplant truck drivers. The company spokesman explained how their work stoppage will affect the other Chrysler plants:

"This department not only handles the movement of materials out of the Dodge main plant, but also between all other Chrysler plants.

"Thus, by continuing the strike, the drivers will prevent Helldiver wing sections from being shipped from the Jefferson plant to the De Soto Wyoming plant; B–29 bomber parts from Highland Park to De Soto Warren; bomber and Helldiver pieces from Plymouth to De Soto plants; gun assemblies from De Soto to the tank arsenal; Bofors gun parts from Jefferson to the Plymouth plant; Dodge truck parts from Highland Park to the Dodge truck plant, and many other similar movements of vitally needed parts and assemblies.

"Thus," he said, "as plants run out of stock which they need for their own assembly work either from Dodge or from other Chrysler Corporation plants, or as they build up excessive banks of materials which cannot be shipped, they will progressively have to shut down."

U. A. W. OFFICIALS BOOED

The strike began Friday in protest against the discharge of eight men for alleged "loafing." Union spokesman said the company instituted a speed-up with which the men could not keep up.

The strikers during the meeting Sunday voted to remain on strike until the eight men are reinstated or the Army takes over the plant.

Pleas made by international U. A. W.-C. I. O. officials for an end to the strike were booed. Several patriotic appeals made by the rank and file members were also hooted down.

Just what kind of men are these who while men are dying on Iwo—in Germany—boo a speaker who asks them to help make the bombers needed in the fight?

What does the Government do, anything?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Here is the Detroit Free Press of the same day, Tuesday, yesterday. Let me read just a little.

HITS ARMY AND NAVY—STRIKE AT DODGE SNOWBALLS INTO NATIONAL CRISIS

The Dodge strike has stalled production on vital material that is needed at this very moment by General Eisenhower and Admiral Nimitz.

The strike was caused by the discharge of seven Dodge workers.

As a result of the discharges, all the workers in the Dodge main plant went on strike.

The corporation already has been forced to send home workers in the Dodge truck plant.

Among the strikers are about 100 men who drive trucks from one Chrysler plant to another.

On this network of trucking the war production in almost all of the corporation's 13 Detroit plants depends.

A company spokesman describes what will happen to the other plants as a "creeping paralysis," due to the shortage of materials that are trucked from one plant to another.

Here is how it works:

1. Workers in the DeSoto-Wyoming plant will be thrown out of work because Helldiver wing sections cannot be shipped there from the Jefferson plant.

2. DeSoto-Warren plant workers will be without B–29 Superfortress parts to work on because shipments will stop coming from the Highland Park plant.

3. Inability to ship bomber and Helldiver parts from the Plymouth plant will throw additional thousands of DeSoto workers out of jobs.

4. Production at the tank arsenal will lag because gun assemblies from the DeSoto plant will be cut off.

5. Plymouth plant workers will be made idle because Bofors antiaircraft gun parts will not be shipped from the Jefferson plant.

6. Dodge truck workers are being laid off because truck parts have stopped moving from the Dodge plant. Additional truck plant workers will be laid off because other parts will stop coming from the Highland Park plant.

7. The huge Dodge-Chicago plant may have to stop production of finished B–29 Superfortress engines because parts have stopped coming from the Dodge main plant in Hamtramck.

8. Many other vital parts and assemblies, equally essential, will be tied up and thousands of other workers will be thrown out of their jobs because of the stoppage of deliveries.

The Government orders them back, the union officials order them back, but they will not work; they boo the plea that they help supply the men on the front line.

Their names should be published in the daily press.

Here is a part of the story from the same paper:

STRIKERS GET A NEW W. L. B. ULTIMATUM—15,800 IDLE AT DODGE ORDERED TO GO BACK

Immediate termination of the Dodge strike, which has made 15,800 workers idle and threatens within a few days to immobilize 100,000 vital war workers, was ordered late Monday by the regional War Labor Board.

An end of the strike immediately, however, was not believed possible. Officials of Dodge Local 3, U. A. W.-C. I. O., of which the strikers are members, postponed until Tuesday a meeting of the local's executive board to discuss the W. L. B. order.

The same day the local will discuss plans for a mass meeting of the strikers, at which the local's members will be informed of the W. L. B. order.

In the meantime, however, the National W. L. B. in Washington may take further action if the regional board's order is not complied with.

International officers of the U. A. W.-C. I. O., headed by George F. Addes, acting president, also were watching the situation closely.

Addes threatened immediate action last week, and it was believed possible he might call a special meeting of the union's international executive board to punish the striking local.

The regional W. L. B. order was issued after an all-day hearing with management and union officials, and with Army and Navy officers.

The W. L. B. expressed vital concern over getting out the weapons produced by the Chrysler Corporation for the European and Pacific fighting fronts.

It was predicted by Army and Navy officers, and by management spokesmen, that if the strike lasts all week the 13 Chrysler plants in Detroit, and possibly the Dodge-Chicago plant, will be paralyzed. Closing of all these plants would throw about 100,000 workers out of jobs.

A few men were discharged because it was said they were loafing, and straightaway the members of the union, in violation of the no-strike pledge, tied up production. The union officials gave orders that they should go back to work, the War Labor Board gave orders that they should go back to work, but they did not go back, and at the same time the press tells us, while we are passing down here in the House a work-or-jail bill, that 20,000 workers in Detroit are applying for unemployment insurance. What is the sense of drafting men, shifting them about from factory to factory, when in Michigan there are thousands of employees who are demanding and receiving unemployment insurance; while other thousands go on strike? To me it does not make sense.

What I cannot understand is why the administration, with the powers granted it by the Smith-Connally bill, does not do something effective about these slowdowns, these stoppages, these strikes. Whenever there is a strike, and there is a cost-plus contract involved, if the strike is called because of a demand for an increase in wages, all too often the Government takes possession of the factory as they did with the Montgomery-Ward civil business, grants the increase and pays it out of sums added to the contract price which in the end comes out of the pockets of the taxpayers. There is a strike in Chicago, or down in Gary, where the furnaces were out of repair. There were four men to each shift. The union demanded that management add another man on these four or five batteries. The other man was added with the agreement that when the repairs were made he would be taken off. The repairs were made and the extra was taken off. Then a strike was called and production is down. Why does not the Government, the administration, take some effective action not only against the employers but against the union and those who slowed down production? Is it because the P. A. C. and the C. I. O. supported the fourth-term candidate? Because the C. I. O. and the P. A. C. elected the candidate for a fourth term?

Why draft men to work when the unions will not permit them to work until its demands have been met?

An editorial from the Detroit Free Press of the 27th expresses one view of the situation:

WHILE FIGHTING MEN DIE DODGE STRIKE

The Stars and Stripes flies in the wind over Mount Suribachi, but it will never be viewed by hundreds of marines dead in the terrific battle for Iwo Jima.

Cologne and the Rhine lie ahead of the assault forces of General Eisenhower. Monday the Yanks drove within sight of the ancient Rhine city. Countless magnificent young fighting men in that raging battle area will not live to view the Rhine close up.

And here in Detroit the view toward all battle fronts is obscured by a wholly different kind of warfare.

The Dodge strike, begun over a dispute about less than a dozen men, gets in the way.

It gets in the way to the extent that the strike, in the words of a regional W. L. B. spokesman, "has completely paralyzed production of extremely critical war material."

The strike not only flouts the W. L. B. It is in violation of the no-strike pledge. It is in defiance of the orders of the international union.

Dodge makes B–29 Superfortress parts. B–29s are the strongest air weapon being used against Japan.

The Dodge assignment covers heavy trucks, tanks, rocket shells, and guns. All these are vital to the ongoing of the Allied drive toward the heart of Germany.

What a contrast is here between the war fronts and a vital section of the home front! And what a shameful mockery!

It has been suggested that the Dodge warfare is based in great part upon suspicion. Charge and countercharge are that the union and the company seek to strengthen their respective positions in preparation for the post-war period.

The fighting forces and the Detroit public cannot know about the right of that. If it is true, and if it is symptomatic, it is a sorry foundation upon which to build decent post-war Detroit industrial relations.

That, though, is beside the point. The Dodge strike bears directly upon a global war that is a long way from won.

The matter of gravest concern, the stupefying thing, is that the little self-interest of any civilian group can be placed so far ahead of the desperate need for constant, unstinted war production for the supply of all fronts.

Is the war "nearly over"? One might think so if the Dodge strike were a criterion.

But ask the question of the battered, battle-tired G. I. slugging his way toward Cologne.

Ask it of the weary Marine fighting onward in inch-by-inch subjugation of Iwo Jima.

Ask it of the men who fly the B–29s over Toyko, who stand at battle stations on shipboard or who furrow the underseas on submarine missions.

Last Saturday General Eisenhower's order to his troops spoke of the possibility that the Allied Armies might have to drive on into "the center of the Reich to meet the Russian Armies" before Germany is defeated.

Speaking from Pacific Fleet headquarters on Guam on Sunday, Secretary of the Navy

Forrestal pleaded for more and more munitions and supplies.

"Production saves us many lives," he said. "It will take the output, however, of many factories and hard work by all hands in those factories for months to come if we are to keep the edge of power."

"All hands * * * months to come."

And in Detroit, heart of the supply arsenal, a strike is in progress that threatens to halt production in more than a dozen other war plants employing 101,000 workers.

No, this strike isn't concerned solely with the cases of less than half a dozen men.

It concerns all Detroit.

It concerns war production in other cities.

It concerns the life or death of countless fighting men on many battle fronts.

Can any alleged issue or grievance compare with these matters?

The imperative factor can be summed up in four words: Settle this strike now.

When will we cease playing at war here at home? When we end the special privileges which hinder the war effort, delay victory, and cost lives.

STRIKES IN WAR PLANTS

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, this afternoon the House had the privilege of listening to our able colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], at which time he read some newspaper articles from Detroit reporting that strikes were right now in progress in war plants there, a deplorable situation at this time. The gentleman from Michigan asked why these strikes were permitted to go on. It came to my mind that an article which was recently printed in the Washington Times-Herald might to some degree answer the gentleman's queries.

I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks to include this article from the Washington Times-Herald, and that my remarks may follow immediately after those of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

FRANKFURTER HELD KEY NEW DEAL SCHEMER—"PALACE" PLOTS COMPARE WITH FRENCH INTRIGUE

(By Walter Trohan)

A story of scheming and intriguing in the White House by topflight New Dealers for highest official posts, reminiscent of the conspiring for royal favor in the court of Louis XIV, was given to the Chicago Tribune and Times-Herald yesterday.

The story was unfolded by White House intimates and dignitaries of senatorial, Cabinet, and judicial rank. These were seen separately, but all told the same tale under heavy injunction that their identities be protected.

POWER BEHIND THRONE

The key figure of the grand conspiracy, according to these highly informed sources, is Justice Felix Frankfurter of the Supreme Court, who for almost 12 years has been acknowledged as the outstanding power behind the Roosevelt throne.

The foreign-born Justice, who is reputed to have the New Deal administration and the New Deal Supreme Court under his thumb, is said to cherish the ambition to be the first Chief Justice of the International Court of Justice to be set up under the Dumbarton Oaks program.

Frankfurter has confided to friends that he is certain he can get President Roosevelt's nomination for the post, and that he is hopeful of securing favorable support from Prime Minister Churchill and Marshal Stalin.

RELIES ON CHURCHILL

The former Harvard Law School professor, who brought many of his students into Government posts and was instrumental in the development of many New Deal innovations, expects to have his nomination seconded by Churchill as payment for his efforts for the British cause.

Frankfurter is credited by many with repeal of the arms embargo, the Neutrality Act, and the cash-and-carry provision for purchase of materials here by warring governments.

He is also widely regarded as the originator of the deal under which the United States exchanged 50 destroyers for the right to acquire a chain of Western Hemisphere air bases on British soil, and as the originator of lend-lease.

Frankfurter is said to believe that Stalin will be favorably inclined toward him because of his championship of Sacco and Vanzetti, Reds who went to the chair for murder in Massachusetts, and his work in investigating I. W. W. deportation cases as counsel of President Wilson's Mediation Commission in 1917.

DENOUNCED BY T. R.

In the latter role he was denounced in an open letter by former President Theodore Roosevelt for taking "an attitude which seems to me to be fundamentally that of Trotsky and other Bolsheviki leaders in Russia, an attitude which may be fraught with mischief to this country."

Under the Dumbarton Oaks program an international court would be set up as "the principal judicial organ of the organization." It is generally expected that this court will be a new court rather than a continuation of the World Court, which has headquarters at The Hague.

In pressing his campaign for World Court chief justiceship, Frankfurter, according to the dignitaries and White House sources, has concocted a grand plan under which Cabinet posts, Supreme Court seats, and other posts would be shuffled at a furious pace. Some of the plan is already under way, they added.

BACKING FRANKFURTER

Said to be associated with Frankfurter and prepared to reap benefits of Presidential favor are Samuel "Sammy the Rose" Rosenman, White House counsel and former New York judge; Oscar Cox, general counsel of the Foreign Economic Administration; Charles Fahey, Solicitor General; and Henry Kaiser, New-Deal-favored industrialist.

Under the plan, Rosenman would jump from the White House to the Solicitor Generalship and to Frankfurter's seat on the Supreme Court with a possible short stay as Attorney General; Cox would become General Counsel for the State Department; Fahey would get a seat on the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, with a Supreme Court post in the offing; and Kaiser would become the Nation's No. 1 economic power, possibly as head of the R. F. C.

PLACE FOR FAHEY

Frankfurter's attempts to get Rosenman the post of Solicitor General was helped by War Mobilization Director Byrnes, who is feuding with the New Yorker and anxious to get him out of the White House. However, Attorney General Biddle, also feuding with Rosenman, is unwilling to accept him. Later Rosenman would go to the high Court, possibly after succeeding Biddle, who is reportedly on Frankfurter's blacklist.

Fahey, in return for relinquishing his post to Rosenman, would go on the Court of Appeals and be held in reserve for the Supreme Court later.

The Frankfurter clique hopes Justice Murphy will be persuaded to leave the bench to resume his old post of Governor General of the Philippines. If this vacancy does not develop, others might. It has long been expected that Chief Justice Stone and Justice Roberts will resign.

Cox is said to be preparing to succeed Leo Crowley as head of F. E. A. In this post he would work to bring that organization within the State Department and in payment be made General Counsel of the Department.

ORIGINAL PLAN SCRAPPED

Originally the plan contemplated placing Ben Cohen, counsel for Byrnes and former White House adviser, in the State Department post. This was rejected when it was considered that Rosenman, Cohen, and Cox might provoke outbursts from race baiters. Cohen was left out of the deal reportedly for this reason and because opposition developed to him in the State Department.

Kaiser has received large contracts from the New Deal. In return he supported the fourth term vigorously. According to the dignitaries, he would be made an economic power because he has promised to go along with the plans of the White House palace guard.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago we passed a bill appropriating about $6,000,000 to finance the taking of a farm census. Many of us were opposed to it on the ground that this is no time to take such a census, in view of the manpower shortage. Now we find that farmers are beginning to rebel. I want to read from a newspaper article from one of my counties with reference to what is going on in that connection. This article appeared in the Evening Times of Monroe, Wis.:

A few Green County farmers, suspicious of the motives behind the Federal farm census, have barred the enumerators from their farms or have refused to yield any information concerning their farming operations.

In that county we have a splendid county agent by the name of Edwin Baker. Mr. Baker has been endeavoring to secure the information that is required by the Farm Census Bureau. He has had to call for help, and he has called in the State chairman of enumerators. Between the two, they have been attempting to sell the farmers in Green County on the idea that this census is necessary.

I read a further excerpt from the article. This is a statement made by the State enumerator, a Mr. Smithback. He said:

In some Wisconsin counties farmers greeted census enumerators with axes and shotguns, displaying a belligerency which, said Baker, showed a lack of understanding of the motives behind the census. The enumerators, Baker wants to assure the farmers, are not getting information for tax purposes, are not snooping, but are carrying on a regular 5-year census.

The farmers, however, come back with this proposition, and I conclude reading from the article:

What befuddles the enumerators and other officials, of course, is when the farmer bluntly says: "Why, when most of this information (all that is pertinent) already is in the hands of the triple A, does a government which is pleading for manpower, pleading for conservation of cars and tires and traveling, send 12,000 men out in cars to traverse the countryside, to get information which already is on file!"

Mr. Chairman, that sounds much like the argument that was made on this floor only a few weeks ago. I believe a serious mistake was made when this House appropriated more than $6,000,000 to conduct a farm census at this particular time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have a letter here in the file from one of those enumerators. I did not suppose they were at work on it yet. This woman writes that she is taking a census in one of the townships in St. Joseph County, Mich. She says that after she has covered just half of her township she finds that a thousand acres in that one township are uncultivated and will be uncultivated during the summer because they have taken the agricultural workers off. She says some of the farmers say there is no use of having a census now because there will not be anything to report.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read down to and including line 25, page 4.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. MCCORMACK having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2374) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill today have permission to revise and extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain testimony which he presented before the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may extend his remarks and include a recent article by Gould Lincoln.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks which I made today and include excerpts from the United States Code and the newspaper articles to which I referred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I asked for permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement, all of which together covers three pages. The Public Printer informs me I did not use the correct language. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent to extend my statement in the RECORD, together with a statement by Mr. A. A. Potter. The Public Printer says it will take three pages, at a cost of $156.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein House Concurrent Resolution 30, which I have introduced.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and also to include in the remarks I made today certain newspaper articles and statements and an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Stockton Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SEATING ARRANGEMENTS AT THE JOINT SESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

On tomorrow immediately after the convening of the House, in view of the fact that a joint session will be held, which will be addressed by the President of the United States, the door on the left of the Chair and the door on the right of the Chair will be open and no others. No one will be permitted upon the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

Usually this announcement has been made by the Speaker on past occasions after consulting with the leaders of the House. The minority leader has not been consulted, but the Chair is confident the minority leader will interpose no objection to the announcement which the Chair has just made.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman tell us when the tickets to the gallery will be made available to Members?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Doorkeeper will furnish the ticket which each Member will receive. The occupant of the Chair spoke to the Doorkeeper a few moments ago and that is in the process of being done. The Chair is glad the inquiry was made, because time is of the essence, as every Member will realize. Members will be watching and waiting for the ticket which will be delivered to them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein excerpts from several letters written to me by a young naval officer, who was my dearly beloved nephew, and who has recently lost his life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial which appeared in the San Diego Journal of February 26, 1945.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

SEATING IN THE GALLERIES AT THE JOINT SESSION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make an inquiry of the Chair, although I do not know that it is a parliamentary inquiry. Heretofore, when tickets have been distributed, there were a certain number of step tickets. Does the minority get any of those, or do they all go to the majority?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is a double-edged question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is a very important one to some of the Members on the minority side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not undertake to answer the question, because no matter how it is answered, it is put in such manner as would make it appear that tickets have been distributed in the past contrary to the understanding of the Chair. That matter is left with the Doorkeeper, who is an officer of the House.

It is the understanding of the Chair that there are a little over 600 seats, including the step seats. There are 531 Members of both branches of Congress.

The gentleman from Michigan very kindly talked with the present occupant of the chair earlier this afternoon on this subject as a result of which the Chair made certain inquiries. The gentleman from Michigan informed the Chair that the late Doorkeeper gave two tickets to each Member on an occasion of this kind; at least that is the recollection of the present occupant of the chair on the substance of our talk. Is the Chair's recollection correct?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is my recollection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair made inquiry and found that there are a little over 600 seats altogether in the gallery. There are 531 Members of both branches of the Congress. It follows therefore that each Member could not have received 2 tickets in the past.

Each Member will receive one ticket. The Chair assumes that the other tickets are distributed in a proper and equitable way.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Under that theory the minority should receive a certain percentage either for distribution by the minority leader or by lot, or some way, because they should not all go to the other side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot say that the gentleman's statement is correct that they do all go to the other side. So far as the gentleman from Massachusetts is concerned, he expects one ticket.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know the gentleman is very modest and very economical.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts does not want any more than any other Member receives.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Here is another Member who gets only one ticket, he can tell the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know the attitude of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, but I think the minority should have maybe one out of that surplus one hundred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has given the gentleman all the information the Chair has, and certainly all the information that is available to the Chair.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot accept the gentleman's statement that the majority side receives all the tickets, because that would not represent the true situation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I realized it was not the Chair's function and I was merely imposing upon the Chair's good nature in my quest for information; that was all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair always tries to be good-natured with the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The Chair is always very generous.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 340. An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 1, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m. Thursday, March 1, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings on Wednesday and Thursday, March 7 and 8, at 10 o'clock a. m. on H. R. 173, 1548, 1624, and 2256.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

263. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize adjustments of irrigation charges in certain land exchanges within Indian irrigation projects; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

264. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on the Civil Service. H. R. 577. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation with amendment (Rept. No. 241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 914. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado and Kansas to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Arkansas River; without amendment (Rept. No. 242). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLE of Kansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1344. A bill for the relief of George Webb; with amendment (Rept. No. 240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 2402. A bill to provide that postmasters shall be reimbursed for certain incidental expenses of third- and fourth-class post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 2403. A bill to impose an occupational excise tax upon certain dealers in peyote, to impose a transfer tax upon certain dealings in peyote, to safeguard the revenue therefrom by registry and recording, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina:

H. R. 2404. A bill to increase the debt limit of the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 2405. A bill authorizing the transfer for park purposes of certain lands located near Chesapeake Street and Nichols Avenue SW., in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2406. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, to provide for the establishment of a uniform classification and a uniform scale of class rates for railroad freight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 2407. A bill to amend section 12 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 2408. A bill relating to certain necessary expenses paid or incurred in connection with carrying on the functions of certain public offices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2409. A bill to extend through December 31, 1945, the period in which receipts and accruals under war contracts shall be subject to renegotiation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 2410. A bill to continue existing gold reserve ratios required to be maintained against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation and Federal Reserve bank deposits by increasing the monetary value of gold; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 2411. A bill to expedite the hearing and determination of matters pending or hereafter pending before the Supreme Court of the United States by authorizing the designation of retired Justices for service on such Court when necessary to obtain a quorum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 2412. A bill to amend the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1944, approved June 28, 1944 (Public Law 375, 78th Cong.), to provide for an extension of the period for the liquidation of the Public Works Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 2413. A bill to prohibit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs from requiring "pauper's oaths" of veterans applying for hospital treatment or domiciliary care, and to eliminate inability to defray expenses of hospital treatment or domiciliary care as a prerequisite of obtaining such treatment or care in a Veterans' Administration facility; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation for the relief of counties whose taxable property has been taken over for national forests and parks; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to lend their immediate assistance in obtaining tobacco-plant bed cloth for the farmers of eastern North Carolina; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact Senate bill 313 to the end that certain lands may be opened to mineral entry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 2414. A bill for the relief of the estate of Ed Edmondson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 2415. A bill for the relief of Joseph Tarantola and Ida Tarantola; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

113. By Mr. HALE: Memorial of the State of Maine, protesting the passage of legislation providing for the drafting of men for labor in industrial plants; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

114. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution adopted by the New Jersey State legislative board, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, objection to the proposed St. Lawrence waterway and power project; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

115. By Mr. LYNCH: Memorial of the Senate of the State of New York requesting the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to accord the State of New York title in fee to the land now owned by the United States and leased to the State of New York for the use of the New York State Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

116. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 17 residents of St. Clair, Mich., expressing interest in legislation which will prevent interference with the broadcasting of noncommercial programs presented by recognized educational institutions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, February 26, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mankind, with minds burdened for the Nation and for the world, with haunting fears of a war won and a peace lost, in this baffling hour we turn to Thee knowing that low lies our best till lifted up to heaven. Unworthy though we are, Thou hast made us keepers of the holy flame of freedom the fathers kindled with their lives. We would share that sacred fire until tyranny everywhere having been consumed all the nations of the earth shall be blessed.

As this day the President of the Republic, returning from world-embracing councils, stands before the Congress in an historic hour to lift up the hopes and dreams for world accord and cooperation, we would bow with grateful hearts that by the victorious sword of the United Nations this hour has arrived on Thy calendar of salvation. Steel our wills and steady our hands with power and wisdom that with eager joy we may dedicate the Nation's strength to throw open the gates of a new life for all mankind. We ask it in that Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, February 28, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On February 24, 1945:

S. 375. An act to provide for the effective administration of certain lending agencies of the Federal Government.

On February 28, 1945:

S. 210. An act to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the conveyance of the old lighthouse keeper's residence in Manitowoc, Wis., to the Otto Oas Post, No. 659, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Manitowoc, Wis.," approved June 16, 1938;

S. 213. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of Canton, Ohio, for highway purposes only, a strip of land situated within the United States naval ordnance plant at Canton, Ohio;

S. 216. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to Oahu Railway & Land Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain lands situated at Halawa, Ewa, Oahu, T. H.;

S. 218. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain lands situated in San Diego County, State of California;

S. 219. An act to amend section 1442, Revised Statutes, relating to furlough of officers by the Secretary of the Navy;

S. 221. An act to authorize Lewis Hobart Kenney, Charles Garner, Charles Clement Goodman, and Henry Charles Robinson to accept decorations and orders tendered them by the Government of the United States of Brazil;

S. 315. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes;

S. 317. An act for the relief of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer for the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; and

S. 338. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and sections 7 to 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to encourage the growing of war crops by protecting the allotments of producers of cotton, wheat, and peanuts.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	Overton
Bailey	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Hoey	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Bushfield	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Taylor
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Capehart	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Tobey
Chavez	McMahon	Tunnell
Cordon	Magnuson	Tydings
Donnell	Maybank	Vandenberg
Downey	Mead	Wagner
Eastland	Millikin	Walsh
Ellender	Mitchell	Wheeler
Ferguson	Moore	Wherry
Fulbright	Morse	White
George	Murdock	Wiley
Gerry	Murray	Willis
Green	Myers	Wilson
Guffey	O'Daniel	
Gurney	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a delegate to the Inter-American Conference in Mexico and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on official business as a delegate to the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL-BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HART] a member of the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

BOARD OF REGENTS, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 20, ch. 3, sec. 43), the Chair appoints the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, to fill existing vacancies thereon.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) and (b) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the 10-year period from October 9, 1934, to June 30, 1944, which includes the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 1, 1945.*

[The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.]

EXECUTIVE COMMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 12)

A commmunication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1945, amounting to $47,625 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 13)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations, fiscal year 1945, for the District of Columbia, amounting to $33,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, WAR DEPARTMENT, FOR FLOOD CONTROL (S. DOC. NO. 10)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the War Department, for flood control, fiscal year 1945, amounting to $1,000,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, WAR DEPARTMENT, FOR FLOOD CONTROL (S. DOC. NO. 11)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the War Department, for flood control, fiscal year 1945, in the form of an amendment to the Budget, amounting to $5,000,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES FOR THE SENATE (S. DOC. NO. 14)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Legislative Branch, United States Senate, fiscal year 1945, amounting to $211,215 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

FISHERY RESOURCES OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report (Fish and Wildlife Service) on a survey of the fishery resources of the United States and its possessions (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

PAYMENT OF IRRIGATION CHARGES AGAINST CERTAIN PUEBLO INDIAN LANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate reports for the month of February 1945, from the acting chairman and chairmen of certain committees, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS

MARCH 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of February 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
John F. Feeney	1425 Rhode Island Ave. NW	General Accounting Office, Washington, D. C.	$6,400
Harold E. Merrick	906 Aspen St. NW	do	4,800
Thomas J. Scott	1210 34th St. SE	Federal Bureau of Investigation, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.	4,800
Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen	1434 Saratoga Ave	District of Columbia Government	3,500

KENNETH MCKELLAR, *Acting Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

MARCH 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of February 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Capt. James A. Saunders, U. S. Navy (retired).	4105 Oliver St., Chevy Chase, Md	Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$6,000
Chief Yeoman Herbert S. Atkinson (AA), U. S. Naval Reserve.	2405 Pennington Road, Trenton, N. J	Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	1,512

DAVID I. WALSH, *Chairman.*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

MARCH 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of February 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Joe L. Martinez (investigator)	208 Massachusetts Ave. NE	U. S. Maritime Commission, Commerce Bldg., 14th St., between E and Constitution Ave. NW.	$3,800
Franklin N. Parks (investigator)	No. 106, 4021 Benton St. NW	Office of Price Administration, 2d and D Sts. SW	3,800
Brig. Gen. Frank E. Lowe	1316 New Hampshire Ave	Finance Office, Pentagon Bldg	6,000

JAS. M. MEAD, *Chairman.*

SENATE NAVY LIAISON OFFICE, ROOM 461, SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

MARCH 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of February 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lt. Frederick A. McLaughlin, U. S. Naval Reserve.	5305 41st St. NW, Washington, D. C.	Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	$2,400
Lt. Joseph G. Feeney, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2740 29th St. NW, Washington, D. C.	do	2,400
Yeoman (2d cl) Eleanor W. St. Clair, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2134 R St. NW, Washington, D. C.	do	1,152
Yeoman (2d cl) Loretto F. Jochman, U. S. Naval Reserve.	do	do	1,152

The above employees are representatives of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Navy Department, to assist Senators on naval personnel matter.

DAVID I. WALSH.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WARTIME HEALTH AND EDUCATION

MARCH 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of February 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Lauretta April	2714 Quarry Road NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, 3d St. and Independence Ave. SW.	$3,200
Groff Conklin	514 2d St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	5,600
Philip C. Curtis	4303 Russell Ave., Mount Rainier, Md.	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	3,800
Ruth Fine	804 Houston Ave., Takoma Park, Md.	Federal Public Housing Administration, 1001 Vermont Ave. NW.	2,000
Rose Gerber	2513 14th St. NE., Washington, D. C.	Navy Department, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	2,000
Bernard Leroy	Persimmon Tree Road, Bethesda, Md.	do	6,000
Harald Lund	476 N St. SW., Washington, D. C.	do	6,200
Carl Malmberg	1813 F St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Federal Security Agency, 1825 H St. NW.	5,600
Love Morgan	1007 18th St. SE., Washington, D. C.	Veterans' Administration, Vermont Ave. and I St. NW.	[1] 2,000
Ruth Morgenstein	2022 Rodman St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do	2,600
Sari Schwartz	1701 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Federal Public Housing Administration, 1001 Vermont Ave. NW.	2,000
Lt. Leslie Falk, Medical Corps, Army of the United States.	2804 Terrace Road SE., Washington, D. C.	U. S. Army, Pentagon Bldg.	2,000
Lt. Comdr. John B. Truslow, Medical Corps, U. S. Naval Reserve.	2607 Peabody St., West Hyattsville, Md.	U. S. Navy, 18th St. and Constitution Ave. NW.	3,000
Dolores Raschella (resigned, Feb. 7, 1945).			

[1] On extended leave without pay.

CLAUDE PEPPER, *Chairman.*

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President and referred as indicated:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Minnesota; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take prompt action to ratify the agreement between the Government of the United States and the Dominion of Canada for the development of the St. Lawrence waterway

"Whereas representatives of the Governments of the United States and of the Dominion of Canada in 1941 consummated and signed an agreement for the development of the St. Lawrence River, both for navigation and power purposes, so as to permit free passage of oceangoing ships from the Atlantic Ocean to the head of the Great Lakes and into the heart of the American continent, and make available the development of this great potential source of electric energy for necessary public use; and

"Whereas the agreement was under consideration by the Congress of the United States at the time of the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor, and shortly thereafter we were at war with the Central Powers in Europe, as a consequence of which action on the agreement was advisedly deferred; and

"Whereas world developments since 1941 have made it increasingly apparent that the securing of a permanent and just peace will inevitably be attended with vastly increased commerce with foreign nations, and particularly with the European and Asiatic nations, and the great industries located on the Great Lakes and the agriculture of the Northwest States will benefit as a result of the opening of the St. Lawrence as a shorter route for ocean commerce to deliver to foreign nations the products of our industries and agriculture, and more than ever before the development of the power to be generated by the St. Lawrence is recognized as a vital economic necessity; and

"Whereas the agreement is now again being submitted to the Congress of the United States for approval, the Presidents of the United States for the past 25 years have committed themselves to the development of the St. Lawrence, and President Franklin D. Roosevelt has characterized the St. Lawrence project as of economic value comparable to the Panama Canal, and a vital necessity as a defense measure; and

"Whereas the State of Minnesota, through its legislature, for the last 25 years has affirmed its continued support of this project, and through the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Commission of Minnesota has continuously promoted the development of the St. Lawrence River, believing that the project is a vital necessity for the stimulation and development of the resources of this State and of the entire Northwest, as well as a great economic advantage to the Nation, and that the project has already been too long delayed: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That we commend and support the President of the United States in his steadfast, consistent, and energetic support of this project, and urge the Congress of the United States, without further delay, to approve and ratify the agreement already concluded with the Dominion of Canada, and provide the necessary funds for the speedy completion of this great project as a vital, economic, and defense necessity.

"That the secretary of state be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress of the State of Minnesota.

"EDWARD J. THYE,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to repeal Public Law No. 403 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, being an act to promote the national security and defense by establishing daylight saving time

"Whereas the Seventy-seventh Congress enacted an act to promote the national security and defense by establishing daylight-saving time, which was approved January 20, 1942, Public Law No. 403 (S. 2160); and

"Whereas the basic industry of this State and the one in which the greatest number of people of this State are engaged or employed is agriculture; and

"Whereas the observance of this law has disrupted schedules of farms and caused great inconvenience to agriculture, which necessarily operates by the hours of the sun rather than the clock; and

"Whereas the benefits of daylight saving time could be more satisfactorily obtained by the simple adjustment of working sched-

ules in a few industries: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States, at its present sitting, be and the same is urgently petitioned and requested to enact such legislation as will accomplish the repeal of the act of Congress aforesaid; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly authenticated copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives from the State of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States.

"EDWARD J. THYE,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing Congress to enact the bill (S. 313) to reopen the revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands to exploration, location, entry, and disposition under the general mining laws; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

(See joint memorial printed in full when presented by Mr. CORDON on February 27, 1945, p. 1472, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

RELIEF OF COUNTIES WHOSE TAXABLE PROPERTY WAS TAKEN OVER FOR NATIONAL PURPOSES—RESOLUTION OF NORTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a resolution which was adopted by the General Assembly of North Carolina, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution of the North Carolina Legislature was received and referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 95

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress to enact legislation for the relief of counties whose taxable property has been taken over for national forests and parks

Whereas the National Government has acquired and now holds a large amount of lands in this State acquired for national forests and national parks; and

Whereas in some counties the amount of land so taken represents a large proportion of the taxable property of the counties and, while held by the National Government, is not subject to taxation by the various counties of the State in which such lands lie; and

Whereas by reason of the taking of such lands many of said counties are unable to meet the payments on outstanding obligations and pay the other operating expenses of the counties for maintaining the necessary services for the people therein; and

Whereas the taking of such property and the loss of such taxes has created a crisis in the county government of many counties of the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring):

SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to adopt some legislation which will provide for annual payments to the various counties of the State, compensating such counties for the loss in taxes from the lands taken over by the National Government for national forests and national parks therein, to the end that said counties may continue to function and meet the necessary obligations of county government.

SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution shall be sent by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and a copy thereof be sent to each Member of Congress from the State of North Carolina.

SEC. 3. That this resolution shall be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.

In the general assembly, read three times and ratified, this the 23d day of February 1945.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITION

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a petition signed by about 269 citizens of Delaware asking for the enactment of legislation to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States. I request that it may be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petition presented by the Senator from Delaware will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 467. A bill for the relief of Maj. Malcolm K. Beyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 65); and

H. R. 1360. A bill for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors; with an amendment (Rept. No. 66).

By Mr. TAYLOR, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 514. A bill for the relief of the Baldwin Bros. Paving Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 67); and

H. R. 262. A bill for the relief of Ruben M. Herren; without amendment (Rept. No. 68).

By Mr. McMAHON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 256. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luther J. Head; without amendment (Rept. No. 69); and

H. R. 916. A bill for the relief of the estates of Robert C. Meals and Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, Donald Meals (a minor), and Betty Wrightstone (a minor); without amendment (Rept. No. 70).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 407. A bill for the relief of Pierce William Van Doren and Elmer J. Coates; with amendments (Rept. No. 71); and

S. 426. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter M. Johnson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 72).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 515. A bill for the relief of Wallace Robertson, Henry Bowker, and Edward Parisian, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 73);

S. 544. A bill for the relief of Dave Hougardy; without amendment (Rept. No. 74); and

H. R. 1793. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 75).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. OVERTON:

S. 660. A bill to transfer certain lands situated in Rapides Parish, La., to board of supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 661. A bill for the relief of Harold H. Rhodes; and

S. 662. A bill for the relief of the Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 663. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Henry I. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 664. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 665. A bill to reimburse uncompensated leave to Government Printing Office employees earned during the fiscal year 1932; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 666. A bill for the relief of certain civilian employees, or former civilian employees, of the War Department on account of loss, damage, or destruction of personal property of such employees or former employees as a result of a fire on July 28, 1941, at Borinquen Field, Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 667. A bill for the relief of Harland Bartholomew and associates; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 668. A bill granting a pension to Emma S. Boutwell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 669. A bill to name a dam on the Little Missouri River in Pike County, Ark., and the reservoir created by the same; to the Committee on Commerce.

DEMOCRACY AT THE CROSSROADS—ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. BRIGGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Democracy at the Crossroads, delivered by the Vice President, at Jefferson City, Mo., February 22, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CRIMEA CONFERENCE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHEELER

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Crimea Conference," delivered by him on February 27, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT—ADDRESS BY MRS. EMMA GUFFEY MILLER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the equal rights amendment delivered by Mrs. Emma Guffey Miller on February 10, 1945, at Boston, Mass., before the National Association of University Women, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRIMACY OF THE SPIRITUAL—ADDRESS BY GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Primacy of the Spiritual," delivered by George E. Stringfellow on the occasion of his retiring as president of the Kiwanis Club of New York City, on January 3, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENT—EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS GLOBE-DEMOCRAT

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Bretton Woods Agreement," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of February 16, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES AND STRIKES—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from North Carolina newspapers dealing with the so-called work-or-fight bill and one dealing with strikes, which appear in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT REGULATION OF BUSINESS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Compulsory State—the Men of Business Who Build Booby Traps for Themselves," published in the Wall Street Journal of February 13, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SIXTY-MILLION-JOB PROGRAM—ARTICLE BY JACK REED

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Willis Calls Sixty-Million-Job Plan 'Political Propaganda,'" published in the Indianapolis Star of February 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT ON THE YALTA CONFERENCE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand that the House of Representatives has requested that the Senate be in the Hall of the House at a quarter past 12 o'clock. So I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives and that, upon the conclusion of the President's address, it return to its Chamber and resume the consideration of business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Kentucky is agreed to, and the Senate will proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives to meet with the House in joint session.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Leslie L. Biffle), its Sergeant at Arms (Wall Doxey), the Vice President, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of hearing the address by the President of the United States on the recent Yalta Conference.

(For the President's address delivered this day to the joint session of the two Houses, see p. 1618 of the House proceedings of March 1, 1945.)

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m., and the Vice President resumed the chair.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing a nomination) which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Chaplain Robert D. Workman, United States Navy, to have the rank of rear admiral in the Navy, while serving as chief of chaplains under the Chief of Naval Personnel.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry A Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, since the nomination of Henry Wallace was sent to the Senate for confirmation I have received many messages from my constituents in Alabama regarding it. I have received messages from organized groups, both in favor and in opposition to the nomination. In addition, I have received many messages written spontaneously by persons who rarely feel called upon to express themselves directly on pending issues. Through these latter there runs a significant reaction, a reaction which can best be described as dismay and concern over the violent and unreasoning opposition to Henry Wallace from some quarters. The particular group of constituents of which I speak find it difficult to understand why Henry Wallace should have been the object of such attacks. From what they know of Henry Wallace—and by now most Americans have a clear conception of the man and the guiding purposes of his life—and what they know of the problems and opportunities that confront us, they cannot comprehend why he should now be opposed so vehemently and at times maliciously.

Granted the significance of the issue, sufficient evidence is at hand on which the Senate can arrive at a decision. Volumes have been spoken and written on the issue. Much has been said that needed to be said at this time in America. Some things have been said which should not have been said and which are lacking in both reason and fact.

For example, in the heat of debate, the charge was made that "Mr. Wallace made a failure as Secretary of Agriculture." I hesitate to take the time of the Senate to remind it how utterly ridiculous such a statement is. I do not believe it influenced many people, unless there be some whose memories are so short and whose sources of information so meager that they do not know the truth.

The truth is that when Henry Wallace became Secretary of Agriculture the farmers of this Nation were bankrupt. I use that term in its literal meaning. Not only were millions of individual farmers in personal legal bankruptcy, but the farmers of this Nation as a whole did not have the assets, or the potential assets at prevailing prices, to pay off their debts.

Henry Wallace was the man who conceived the basic remedies for this tragic situation. Henry Wallace was the man who organized the machinery for applying the programs for which Congress passed the necessary legislation. I would not, and he would not, deny for a moment the credit due the thousands of men and women who were associated with him in that program—George Peek, Chester Davis, M. L. Wilson, Howard Tolley, Cully Cobb, R. M. Evans, and many others of the staffs of the Department of Agriculture, the extension services in the States, and the land-grant colleges. Not only these but literally millions of farmers participated in the planning and application of these programs, for Henry Wallace insisted from the outset that the farmers themselves should be finally responsible for determining whether, and how, quotas should be applied, and for determining many of the basic policies in the operation of the various agricultural programs.

Nor, Mr. President, would I deny to the Congress its proper credit for adopting and setting up the machinery for these programs. The Congress itself repeatedly demonstrated its faith in Henry Wallace by continual enactment of necessary legislation and by making the necessary appropriations to carry out the legislation. Those members of both parties who supported these programs year in and year out, and both major parties which have now accepted the basic programs in their platforms, also share in the credit. These programs proved realistic and practical during the years when we were faced with the problem of rotting surpluses in our granaries, unwanted cotton in our warehouses, and unfed cattle overrunning the pens of our stockyards.

These programs proved sufficiently flexible to be immediately adapted to the necessities of war; I am confident that in the readjustments from war back to peace the basic principles of the programs will be found essential again.

From a state of bankruptcy, American agriculture has progressed to the present astounding success in the production of the food and fiber products essential in the conduct of the present global war. We have the best fed and best clothed Army in all history. Food has been available for the civilian population in quantities that no nation involved in war, either at present or at any time in the past, has ever experienced. More than that, we have had sufficient quantities to permit allotments to our allies in order that they might be able to operate more effectively in destroying the common enemy.

Will any man deny that Henry Wallace was more responsible than any other single individual for establishing American agriculture on the sound basis which has made this tremendous achievement possible? "Inexperienced" is indeed a silly description of the man who directed the most intricate and comprehensive economic structure ever devised in a democratic nation—a structure that included such varied programs as produc-

tion quotas for 6,000,000 farms, loans of all kinds to farmers totaling $9,000,000,000, rehabilitation loans for dispossessed tenants on which loans there was a greater return than on loans to many of our great industrial concerns; soil conservation; R. E. A., the food stamp plan, the school-lunch program, agricultural research, and so on through a long list which does not need recital here.

What happened to the individual farm family during this period? The average net income of the farm family trebled. The fertility of the farmer's soil has been restored to a measure believed impossible in so short a time. The American farmer still does not participate in the national income to the extent that economic justice requires. But, Mr. President, today there is hope that the American farmer will be restored to full participation in every phase of our national life.

Henry Wallace came to Washington with the conviction that wealth in its natural course flows upward, not downward. He knew that a hot fire at the bottom would heat the flue all the way to the top. He knew that the industrial tycoons do not do business at the corner drugstore, with the baker, or at the shoe-repair shop. So Henry started at the bottom—with the smallest businessman in America, the farmer—the bankrupt farmer and the American with little economic stake in America. He made a specialty of little business. He made those little businesses pay. He started their dollars on their natural course. Those dollars bought new paint for weathered farm buildings, new farm machinery, new clothes and washing machines, and paid furnishing accounts and doctor bills long overdue. Those dollars flowed through every segment and stratum of American business. They fired the furnaces at Pittsburgh.

I am interested in Henry Wallace because of my concern for the welfare and prosperity of all the people of the Nation and, particularly, of the people of Alabama, the men and women who work on its farms, in its cotton and steel mills, its mines and factories—and the welfare of those who own or hope to own some of those enterprises. It was in the twenties that I first met Henry Wallace, and, I must confess, it was this man of the West who first impressed upon me in full force the true nature of the slow strangulation of enterprise in both the West and South through the iniquitous system of freight-rate differentials. Henry Wallace was a pioneer in this fight.

It was on the occasion of my first meeting with him that I had the heartening experience of talking to a man from the West who understood the economic suicide inherent in the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. For Henry Wallace saw clearly then, as every reputable student of economics either saw at the time or has since come to acknowledge, that by erecting an insurmountable tariff wall around this Nation we were stifling the channels of international trade, denying other nations an opportunity to pay their debts to us, and committing the ultimate folly of killing the market for our own farm and factory products abroad.

Alabama and the Nation need men like Henry Wallace in positions of authority. Without such men the hope for a dynamic expansion of industry in the South is lost. Without such men the development of hundreds of plants to process our raw materials, provide jobs for our people, and a market for our goods cannot be achieved. It is said by some that the South has a surplus of men, women, and children. The truth is that the South has a shortage of opportunity. Until that shortage is remedied millions of people will continue to leave the South to find opportunity in other sections of the country, and carry with them an enormous investment in the expenditures that have been made for their food, clothing, shelter, and education.

The South has a continuing stake in freeing private enterprise from the shackles of monopoly restraints, the development of a transportation system that will permit the free flow of goods from region to region, the development of international markets, and a healthy flow of goods between nations. This Nation as a whole has an identical stake if our economy and way of life are to be preserved. I know of no man, either from within or without the South, who has a more intimate knowledge of the basic economic problems which affect its farms and factories than has Henry Wallace. I know of no man who has had a more genuine concern for the continual development of the South's opportunities.

There are cynics who scoff at Henry Wallace as an idealist. It is a startling and a depressing thought that a man should be ridiculed because he believes in applying the principles of Christianity in everyday life.

If this Nation needs, and if the world in which we are living requires, more selfishness and more greed, more selfishness in daily living, more selfishness among groups within the Nation, and more selfishness between nations, then Henry Wallace is not qualified for a position of responsibility in the Government.

If this Nation is through with its efforts to apply the basic principles of democracy, if it is ready to term Christianity "impractical," then Henry Wallace is certainly not needed at this time.

But if we listen to the American people, I think we will hear a clear mandate to the effect that this Nation is not afraid of idealism in its every-day life, and that it is not ready to relapse into an era of cynicism and selfishness. The human misery and wreckage around this globe are products not of impractical ideals, but of the very opposite. We know that greed, selfishness, suspicion, and distrust are not the keys to world order, security, and prosperity that our self-styled practical men would have us believe.

Can any Senator take pride in the fact that "visionary" has become a term of contempt in powerful circles within our Nation? Every man who has made a contribution to American history since the Nation's founding has been nagged and belittled by the naggers and prattlers of their times. This Nation was carved out by George Washington despite those who said it was folly to believe that untrained farmers, armed with hunting rifles, could defeat a well-trained professional army. The men who conceived our Constitution and its system of a government of laws as an answer to tyranny were denounced as wishful thinkers and impractical idealists. Thomas Jefferson's Bill of Rights was hooted at as an idealistic mirage by those who said it was not only impractical but foolish to believe that the individual citizen could be assured his personal, political, intellectual, economic, and spiritual liberties.

This Nation is still not so old that it is ready to turn its back on men of vision. Without vision we shall certainly suffer the paralysis of decay. Henry Wallace believes fervently in the continuing dynamic expansion of America's capacity to produce. He believes in a continuing opportunity for productive enterprise, and a rising flow of the goods and services to which our people are entitled. Without such expansion there will not be jobs for the men who are today fighting and sacrificing for the opportunity of peace and security. If apple selling is not to become the vocation of the veterans of this war, we must have a bold, courageous faith in America's future. If we are not to suffer another terrible depression, we must have vision, foresight, and determination in shaping the Nation's future.

Henry Wallace is one of this Nation's great protectors of American enterprise. Without such men we cannot protect and preserve the structure of this Nation's economy. It will be radical and dangerous to risk the economic chaos which will surely follow if we pursue the timid, halting, and confused course of inaction and delay. Henry Wallace was one of the men who provided the foresight and initiative to shape new measures to restore American agriculture a decade ago when it writhed in the agony of bankruptcy and decay. At the time the programs with which he has been identified were conceived, they were damned as impractical and unworkable. Today those basic programs have won the acceptance of both political parties, and as we look back we see that they were in fact, sound conservation measures.

Bernard Baruch recently took note of the misquotation and distortion of a remark which is quoted with glee by those who scoff at Henry Wallace. Mr. Baruch, who is certainly no upstart as a student of the American economy, had this to say recently before the New York Herald Tribune forum:

> The objective of a world community is not so academic as it seems. In fact, supplying everyone who needs it, and who is willing to work, even including the Hottentots, with a quart of milk a day might prove an economic as well as a social advantage. It might even be profitable. I say this as an aside to those pretendedly hard men of business who seemingly scorn any touch of idealism, part of which may be only enlightened self-interest. Besides, idealism is the very core of our American spirit. Read the Declaration of Independence.

Bernard Baruch concluded by emphasizing a point which Henry Wallace has always emphasized:

> Well fed, clothed, housed, and educated, man is less inclined toward spoliation and bloodshed than is his ill-used brother.

Even a business writer so little inclined to view Wallace with favor as Ralph Robey, writing in the department Business Tides, in Newsweek, challenged the unimaginative and hide-bound business element in these words:

> Wallace has a program. You say it is silly. But can you prove it; prove it in a way which the next 10 people with whom you talk will understand, and will believe? And then can you go ahead and spell out an alternative means which offers more promise of making sure that there will be a job in the post-war period for everyone who wants to work?

Mr. Robey is right. This Nation cannot go forward on the motive power of those who scream and call names; it cannot prosper on a diet of negativism and defeat; it was not built by those whose only cue was to tear down.

The name of Henry Wallace is not a new one on the American scene. There was the grandfather of the present Wallace—Uncle Henry Wallace, as he was known to thousands across the Nation. There was the father, Henry Cantwell Wallace, himself a former Secretary of Agriculture. The present Henry Wallace is the third of a succession of men from the West who have raised a clarion voice against economic injustice and greed. There has been a consistency in grandfather, son, and grandson seldom found in three successive generations of men. This consistency has been characterized by straight speaking, the highest personal integrity, and a rugged, immovabl. concern for the public welfare.

Grandfather and father could certainly take pride in the fact that throughout this bitter fight no man has yet, by either hint or implication, questioned the present Henry Wallace's integrity. Each fight in which he has been involved has increased his stature and the number of people who respect his bigness of spirit.

It has been suggested by those who either are not aware of the facts or do not care to inform themselves that Henry Wallace has been a failure at conducting his own business. Yet when the record is consulted he is acknowledged as a success in varied fields—as an agricultural economist and statistician, as an agronomist, as a writer, as a public administrator. He was even a success as a Vice President, something of a novelty in American history. His research in the science of plant breeding led to his establishment of the first commercial production of hybrid corn seed, an enterprise which resulted in a tremendous increase in corn production for hundreds of thousands of farmers and a highly successful personal business for him.

What happens on the American political scene draws the interest of peoples in many lands. The course of government here carries the hopes of millions who have come to look upon this Nation's acceptance of international responsibility as a determining factor in the security and welfare of peoples everywhere. Henry Wallace has become a symbol to those in other nations who look to America with a new respect and a new faith. When he traveled among the nations to the south, it will be recalled, he addressed our neighbors in Spanish. Again when he crossed Siberia he talked to Russians at their agricultural experiment stations about the international progress of the science of agriculture in their own tongue. When he arrived in China, diligent study of the Chinese language made it possible for him to greet our Chinese allies in their own language and to talk with them directly about the future of these peoples whose lives have become a symbol of mixed tragedy and hope.

This matter of addressing peoples in their own tongues may not be of major significance in itself, but it is one reason for the widespread respect for Henry Wallace and for America among peoples outside our country. It is one evidence of his appreciation and respect for other cultures, and the contributions which others can and are making to the peace and security of the world of the future. A rebuke to Henry Wallace by the Senate would dismay and dishearten many outside this Nation.

Here at home there are few men in public life today who have as great a personal following among men and women of all groups and all sections of the country as Henry Wallace. His presence in the Cabinet will broaden and strengthen the base of support for Government in these critical years. Likewise, a denial of this opportunity for him to reenter the Cabinet would weaken and undermine faith in Congress and the National Government.

Mr. President, I have been in politics for a long time, and in stormy places; but I have never seen or experienced before such a thunderstorm of excitement, wild charges, defamation, and extravagant libel as this question of an ordinarily routine confirmation to a Cabinet post has brought down upon Henry Wallace's head, and your head, and mine. I have argued here before, and I repeat now, that we, as Senators, should put such malignance and hysteria aside, turn our minds to other pressing considerations, and confirm this appointment immediately.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at the end of the present war, most of the nations will find themselves debt ridden and prostrate. They will look to the United States to lead them out of economic chaos.

The foundation of world security will be the domestic prosperity of the United States. It will be a part of our responsibility to the world to maintain that prosperity.

To properly exercise leadership, it will be necessary for us to build our own national economy on a foundation so firm that we will not fail in the great task which lies before us.

We should assume this leadership in all humility, however, remembering that until we entered the war we, ourselves, had not achieved a stable and balanced economy, and that only war provided full employment for our own people.

Our pre-war economy failed to prevent the present war. A return to the same level will not prevent future wars. We cannot insure the future welfare of our own Nation, let alone the world, by a return even to the most prosperous conditions which prevailed previous to this war.

Our past record is not so perfect that we can afford to close our minds to new ideas.

True conservatism consists of maintaining the best in our institutions without obstructing progress. We must not confuse conservatism with obstructionism, for the latter may lead to rifts in our social structure, with undesirable consequences.

We are considering today whether we will approve for Secretary of Commerce a man who holds that the best we have done in the past is inadequate for the future, and who is bold enough to advance new ideas.

He holds that it is possible to expand our national economy so as to provide full employment for 60,000,000 people.

He has met with ridicule because of his confidence in the future of the United States.

He has been derided and verbally stoned because he expresses faith in the common man and champions the cause of the weak and unfortunate.

He has unloosed a torrent of abuse upon his head for advocating equality of opportunity for all.

He has been misrepresented. His words have been twisted and his record distorted from one end of this country to the other, until one is forced to wonder if fairness and justice are taking a holiday.

It is not my intention to speak in defense of Henry Wallace. He needs no defense from me. His record for honesty and courage and loyalty and as an administrator will compare well with that of any of his contemporaries, including his enemies and critics.

I shall, therefore, devote my attention to the situation which will confront us as we near the end of this world war, when the position of Secretary of Commerce will be important.

We need men with both courage and foresight to face that which lies before us. This is no time for fainthearted leadership.

In his message to Congress last year, President Roosevelt enunciated an eight-point economic bill of rights. Specifically these points are:

The right to useful and remunerative jobs.

The right to a decent living, with adequate food and clothing and recreation.

The right of the farmer to raise and sell his products at prices which will give his family a decent living.

The right of every businessman, large and small, to be free from unfair competition and domination by monopolies.

The right of every family to a decent home.

The right to adequate medical care and good health.

The right to protection from fear of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment.

The right to a good education.

Can anyone deny that those rights should be our objective?

As one who has never cast his vote for President Roosevelt, let me say that I subscribe to these aims. They embody the spirit of practical Christianity. Only the politically blind will oppose them,

because of their dislike for the administration.

It matters little to me what the source may be of any plan if it will promote the welfare and security of our people and extend the spirit of Christianity throughout the world.

No one has the right to deride the goal of 60,000,000 jobs, if 60,000,000 jobs will attain the objectives specified in the President's economic bill of rights.

I do not know whether 60,000,000 is the right number, but I do know that, regardless of party, regardless of position, and regardless of all else, it should be the aim of each and every one of us to work for full employment and equal opportunity for all.

We have no right to be defeatists. We have no right to say that it cannot be done. It can be done, for it must be done.

We shall face a test as great as any nation ever faced in time of peace, but we will meet it victoriously.

To meet this test we must resolve first of all that we will not permit a policy of scarcity to prevail. Only a policy of plenty, with full production and full employment, will carry us through the difficult period of the post-war years.

There are those who fear the coming of peace. There are those who fear that our form of government is in danger.

Of course our Government is in danger. It has been in danger ever since the day it was born. Anything worth having is always in danger, but we have successfully defended it many times in the past. We can successfully defend it now.

The only chance I see for an overthrow of our Government will be a degree of unemployment which becomes uncontrollable.

It is unemployment and want that breed war among the nations and revolutions in government.

I do not believe the form of government under which we have lived 160 years will be radically changed.

We shall not become Fascists or Communists overnight. True, we have in America believers in these totalitarian forms of government, but 99 percent of the people of our country are believers in our own form of government.

The words "Communist" and "Fascist" are cruel words when applied to loyal American citizens who have nothing in common with those forms of government. Decent men will not use these words against those with whom they disagree.

Many a man has been called a Communist or a Fascist simply because his enemies can find nothing else wrong with him.

Now, what about the 60,000,000 jobs, or whatever number is necessary to provide employment for all who wish to work?

Unfortunately, some persons appear to take the attitude that jobs are available from only two sources—either the Federal Government or a few great corporations.

It is true that the Federal Government and big business are large employers of labor, but after this war we must make every effort to provide opportunities which will give an increased outlet for personal initiative and a greater opportunity for personal independence.

Middle-class Americans constitute the foundation on which democracy and good government must rest. Their lives must not be dominated either by Government or economic monopolies.

If America is seriously in danger of becoming a Communist or Fascist nation, it will be because we have become overbalanced on the side of Government or corporation employment. If carried too far, either one could lead to a change in government.

Let us, therefore, strive to develop our post-war economy in such a way that, so far as possible, every man may be his own master, own his own home, and develop his own opportunity.

With the coming of the armistice, we face the first stage of the remaking of our national industry and commerce from the business of war to the business of peace.

The way in which we handle this transition will have a determining effect upon our future well-being.

Besides 10,000,000 veterans who will want to return to peacetime pursuits, there are 20,000,000 men and women now engaged in war industries, most of whom will want to return to private employment.

Several million men and women whose homes have been dislocated because of the war will return to their own communities or seek new fields of employment elsewhere.

Many persons employed in war industries have made money, have saved money, have bought Government bonds, and will be amply able to provide for themselves through the conversion period.

Others have been negligent and wasteful of their earnings and may conceivably become public problems.

Millions of others, however, through no fault of their own, will be little, if any, better off financially than they were when the war began.

If we do not, through the cooperation of Government and business, make adequate provision for productive employment for these millions of people, then we may see the start of a decline in business which will affect everyone adversely.

Let us, therefore, see to it that families are returned to their own homes and that unemployment compensation in adequate amount and for a proper length of time is provided for them.

Let us, also, promptly provide coverage for the several million people now unprotected against unemployment, including the civilian employees of the War and Navy Departments. Congress blundered in this last fall. It is not too late to correct our error now.

An extensive public works program should be in readiness to absorb a large number of those who would otherwise be unemployed, whenever the need appears.

If by employing a million men on public projects at the right time we can prevent 10,000,000 more from becoming idle later, it is only the part of sanity and wisdom to do so.

Unemployment is cumulative. If we control it at the start, our task is easier.

I hope that we may profit from the errors of the public-works program of the last decade.

Let us avoid at all cost the symbols of humiliation which marked every project of the W. P. A.

Let us avoid the wastefulness of programs which induced local governments to incur burdens of debt beyond their ability to carry.

Let our public-works projects be of that type which will not only encourage but necessitate an expansion in private industry.

I rather like Mr. Wallace's suggestion that public-works programs, except those that are universally recognized as requiring direct public employment—such as highway construction—be carried out by contract with private industry. This method at least would remove the stigma of public relief which branded millions of deserving workers under the W. P. A.

This may not be the best method, but I am willing to try it. Whether it works or not will depend largely upon the private contractors themselves.

Some people object to public works of almost any kind. If they had their way, we would still be driving our ox teams over the toll roads.

Almost every great industry in America is today dependent upon our magnificent system of highways, and yet many of us here recall instances when there was definite opposition to the elimination of certain privately owned roads and bridges.

The mass production of the automobile was made possible by the fact that we had public highways on which to drive millions of cars.

There are men who fought every attempt to develop public power in our country, yet we would not be winning this war today if their opposition had not been overcome and Grand Coulee, Bonneville, Boulder Dam, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and other public power develops had not been constructed over their objections.

Materials of war have been produced in record-breaking quantities by private industry as a result of public power development.

There is more work to be done in developing our natural resources—work which will not only give a high degree of employment with its consequent increase in business for manufacturers, tradespeople, and transportation companies, but which will create enormous permanent additions to our national wealth and our national security.

Are we going to let provincial thinking and selfish desire block the development of such natural resources as the Missouri, the St. Lawrence, and the Arkansas Rivers and to jeopardize the future welfare of our people and the safety of our Nation?

I hesitate to think what would happen in this country if the apostles of defeatism and greed could have their way.

They cry out against Government employment of every form, yet the course they advocate would lead straight to Government employment in a degree

which would make their wildest fears seem insignificant.

Do they remember the bonus army that came to Washington some 13 years ago?

There were about 3,000 men in that bonus army—unemployed veterans. They created something of a panic at that time.

The Government finally sent them up to Vermont to build dams. The conduct of these men of the bonus army there was as orderly as the conduct of men in other walks of life. They proved that they would work when opportunity to work was afforded them.

If 3,000 unemployed veterans alarmed the city of Washington a few years ago, let those who now support a course which will surely lead to greater unemployment among servicemen imagine, if they can, what will happen if after this war the 3,000 men of the bonus army shall be multiplied a thousand times.

Let 5,000,000 veterans become unemployed and we will see a demand for Government operation of industrial plants. When that time comes, those who now pursue a course which can only lead to the "bread line and bayonet" method of dealing with unemployment will be very glad to vote for anything to satisfy the demands of these men.

The question may properly arise as to what we can do to guarantee an expansion of our domestic economy to an extent which will provide approximately full employment.

There are a thousand ways by which contributions may be made to this end without resorting to direct Government employment of labor. Here are just a few of them which pertain primarily to rural development—and I speak of rural development because that is a field of our economy with which I am most familiar, and which comes first to my mind:

First. Insure farmers of an income which will put agriculture on an equitable basis with other factors of our national economy. The American farm is still the world's best market. If its purchasing power is not maintained, full employment without extensive Government assistance will be impossible.

Second. Extend to over 4,000,000 farms now without electric service the benefits of rural electrification.

Third. Extend to 5,000,000 farm homes the advantages which rural telephone lines can provide.

Fourth. Establish a rural sanitation authority which will enable farm people to provide adequate water supply and sewage disposal for their homes, thereby contributing to the comforts of rural living and to the health of the Nation.

Fifth. Develop water transportation wherever practicable and in connection with this development, every kilowatt-hour of electric energy which can be economically produced, for we will need it in the years that lie ahead.

Sixth. Continue farm credit cooperatives and oppose the efforts of those who even now are attempting to do away with these organizations which guarantee comparatively low-cost credit to farmers.

Seventh. Encourage the organization of farm cooperatives. We need the family farm in America, but this type of farming cannot compete with the corporation farm, and particularly with foreign production, except through organization.

Eighth. Provide a better health program for all the people of this country with adequate hospital facilities, health inspection in schools, and adequate provision for medical services for all.

Ninth. Develop a national system of air transportation to the fullest extent so that communities heretofore at a disadvantage may take their rightful place in the economic world. The development of air transportation will make possible the decentralization of population and industry, which of itself will necessitate a vastly expanded economy with its subsequent increase in opportunities for employment and proper living conditions.

Finally, let us determine that never again shall people go hungry in this Nation while food rots on the farm.

As an immediate start toward guaranteeing adequate diets for all our people we can expand the school lunch program, encourage factory feeding of the proper kind and work out a food allotment program which will serve the twofold purpose of eliminating farm surpluses and improving the health of those who are presently undernourished.

The health of our people is a national asset of greatest importance in peace or war.

I have said little concerning the development of our foreign trade. That subject is too great to be covered here. I will say that, to my mind, it offers possibilities which even the imagination cannot comprehend today.

In concluding, Mr. President, let me say that I believe the partial program which I have suggested can be safely entrusted to Henry Wallace as Secretary of Commerce, as far as the Secretary of Commerce would have anything to do about it.

I further believe that the members of the Cabinet are in fact personal advisers of the President and that he should be permitted to choose anyone he wishes for a Cabinet post so long as that person's record is clear and his character unquestioned.

As I have said, I have never voted for President Roosevelt. I was on the losing side in the last election; but, so far as I am concerned, the election campaign was over on the night of November 7, 1944.

Our Nation is now engaged in the most crucial war of all time. The fate of the entire world depends on the outcome of this war.

We will win it and when it has been won, we will be confronted with the problems of peace—new problems that we have never had to meet before.

The American people have decided that the present administration shall handle those problems.

I would not consider it good citizenship on my part, and certainly not statesmanship, to attempt to obstruct the Government in its effort to solve these problems in the best possible manner.

I regard it as my right and duty to criticize the Government when I think it is in error and to fight at all times to put it on a sounder and more business-like basis, but I will not heckle and obstruct it at every turn in order to bring upon it a record of failure.

I will make every effort to assist in doing those things which must be done to promote national and international welfare and security. As a patriotic citizen, I can do no less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The pending question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I received a letter, from which I wish to read, for it might be said that it gives me the text for the remarks which I am about to make:

To begin with, I feel that essentially the Wallace episode is merely an incident in a rather fundamental trend which must engage our attention.

I am referring, of course, to the renewed interest of Congress in Government corporations. The operation of the R. F. C. from the Department of Commerce is obviously not the sole intent of Congress. The House passed a measure which would tighten congressional control over the R. F. C. and the subsidiary lending agencies. BYRD and BUTLER are reported as sponsoring a bill to regularize Government corporations by requiring them to submit their programs and fund requests to the Bureau of the Budget. Their bill also provides for an annual audit by the General Accounting Office.

The whole question of Government entities of tremendous power has been brought into the spotlight by the Wallace nomination.

Charlie Dawes, Atlee Pomerene, and Jesse Jones were keenly conscious of their responsibilities. Under Wallace, of course, the R. F. C. could easily become a vehicle for economic and social crackpots.

The R. F. C. is, however, only one of a great many Government corporations. Back here in the hinterlands we are, of course, appalled at the tremendous pyramid of Government corporations ranging in their activities from business loans to urban and rural mortgages. They include the Defense Homes Corporation, the Disaster Loans Corporation, the Electric Home and Farm Authority, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Production Credit Corporation, the Regional Credit Corporation, the United States Commercial Company, and the Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Incorporated.

You will recall that after the last World War CARTER GLASS, who was then Secretary of the Treasury, urged that Government corporations be brought under the general budgeting system.

You will recall also that it was only a decade ago that people were blindly complacent in their happy, innocent assumption that Federal lending corporations were an emergency measure.

It hasn't worked out that way. The probabilities are that the huge pyramid is here to stay. If it is here to stay, then, to borrow a phrase from the late Jim Reed, "the times are ripe and rotten ripe" for Congress to take appropriate steps to keep governmental corporations within control.

Mr. President, we are coming again to a fork in the road. The Senate and the House of Representatives are soon to lead America in one direction or the other—to post-war depression or prosperity.

In this Chamber we are soon to confirm or reject one of the proposed guides for our American journey. He is Henry Wallace. In passing upon him for the office of Secretary of Commerce, the Senate will be exercising its free choice as defined by section 2, article II of the United States Constitution.

I have heard so many arguments on the subject of what the Constitution means that I shall forego looking at any language except the Constitution. When the Constitution delegates to me, as a Senator of the United States, the responsibility of voting for or against the confirmation of a nomination, it needs no further definition. That power is full and complete in me. The only question is my responsibility and how I interpret it.

But whatever action we take on Henry Wallace's nomination, we may be certain that it will not be a conclusive action. We, here, will be taking a turn in the road, but it will not be a decisive turn. For the battle royal will only then have begun over the policies which Henry Wallace represents.

I do not rejoice over this forthcoming battle. I fervently wish that Providence could so enlighten the eyes of all of us, that one path—the true path to post-war prosperity—would become universally apparent and acceptable. But that, unfortunately, is not the case. The lines in America are already forming on the great debate to come. I may only pray that it will be a cool, calm, and constructive debate. And I, for one, may only humbly make the contribution which my conscience demands of me.

In this debate, we have on the one hand, the folks who honestly believe that Henry Wallace is, in effect, a new messiah. They think he will lead us into the promised land by taking a direction due leftward. And on the other hand, we have the folks who are equally honest and have due respect for Mr. Wallace's sincerity and integrity, but are certain that his beliefs make him a false prophet.

These latter folks—horse-sense folks—do not want us to view Mr. Wallace as a man apart. They want us to see him in the light of the long line of synthetic economists who have been preaching to us since 1933 to depart from our American way of life. These ersatz thinkers borrowed their ideas from the economic advisers of Mussolini and Hitler. And the horse-sense folks want us to remember what happened when America tried out those ersatz ideas of Mr. Wallace's forerunners, the New Deal "brain trusters." Under their guidance we stumbled through 7 hard years, not into a promised land, but unto a deeper wilderness of their own misguided making.

The New Deal! That is the issue which is before us today and which will be before us for a long time to come. The New Deal—not a scare name, not an irrational bogie, but a false philosophy of life and government. It is this philosophy—economic, political, and spiritual—which Mr. Wallace expounds most prominently today, and which he frankly promises to advance, come what may.

The horse-sense folks have deep-rooted dispute with this New Deal philosophy, not with Mr. Wallace as a personality. For they once bought and tried the New Deal bill of goods and found it wholly wanting. They took a long swallow of its economic patent medicine in order to cure their real and imaginary national ills, but they lived to regret it.

Speaking of patent medicine, as a matter of fact, the cracker-barrel folks in America think that the whole tribe of New Dealers resembles the medicine men of old. And they have mighty good reasons for comparing the mumbo jumbo of the medicine men to the economic lingo of the New Dealers. These folks hear the New Dealers glad-handing their audience with their dripping praise of the common man. Then, they hear them "carrying on" about the aches and ills of our American economic body. Soon, they watch the slick process of fear suggestion taking effect, and the American public beginning to tremble with "shivers and shakes." Then, at last, as was to be expected, they watch the New Deal medicine men boost their cure-all: "And now, ladies and gentlemen, if you will step right up, we will present for your astonished and beaming countenances the remedy that makes a sick nation well and a well nation better—the New Deal's magic healer of 1945. This miraculous panacea has received the unqualified endorsement of some of the foremost potentates of Europe. So reach down into your pockets, my friends, and purchase this boon to mankind. All in one great pink bottle, wrapped in red tape. Come and get it, good people."

If, Mr. President, you think that is a weak take-off on what the medicine man could do, you never saw the medicine man. I have seen strong lumberjacks who, after listening to the medicine man, finally conceived in their minds the notion that they were ill, and I have seen them buy one bottle, five bottles of the stuff, trembling and afraid because of the suggestion of sickness and illness. And thus it went on, through the years.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator left out one important point. All of us would like to know how much a bottle. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. I have seen a bottle of such stuff which, upon later analysis, was found to cost 7 cents to produce, including the bottle, sell for a dollar a bottle or six for five bucks. And we know what the purchaser got.

Now, after this kind of snake-oil talk, even the horse-sense folks have to pinch themselves to keep from being hypnotized. What helps them to keep their senses is the memory of what happened toward about 1940. About then, after they had been guzzling the New Deal's firewater for 7 years, they went crawling, as sick as ever as a Nation, to the New Dealers. And the New Dealers told them something like this:

"Yes sirree, folks, that was only the beginning. Now you've got to use our double-sized All-Red Healer to put you out of your misery!"

Mr. President, I am talking about a man's philosophy. I am not talking facetiously.

Mr. President, many times in years past I was a spectator at medicine-man shows. I saw the medicine man mount the platform and spout a lot of "banana oil" about some fabulous cure-all. I saw good, honest folks come up to the medicine man, looking at him as if he were a savior, and plunk down their hard-earned American eagles for worthless nostrums. I, too, regard much of the talk we hear nowadays as the talk of medicine men about their medicine. They may self-righteously believe in the value of their cure-all. But I remember the lesson of the past: that their panacea is both worthless and downright dangerous. So I am not going to be silent while they continue to hawk their wares. And I am not going to be placed in the category of a conservative or a Tory because I stand for American principles.

So, here and now, I propose to examine the patent medicine put out by the New Deal & Co., Henry Wallace, proprietor in chief. I propose to debunk the whole company's sales talk and show it up for exactly what it is—in an American word of common usage, if not of the most genteel society—hokum. I am going to take their hokum apart and show you its basic ingredients. Those ingredients are:

First. The hokum of fear.
Second. The hokum of newness.
Third. The hokum of government.
Fourth. The hokum of strife.
Fifth. The hokum of guaranties.

Remember them: Fear, newness, government, strife, and guaranties.

Then after cleaning some of the New Deal's hokum out of our ears we will be able to do some straight thinking on how to proceed on the American way to prosperity.

1. THE HOKUM OF FEAR

The unchanging come-on of every medicine man is his appeal to fear. Raise hobgoblins in your audience's eye and pretty soon you have raised its hair, its blood pressure, and its eagerness to do whatever you tell it. So the New Dealers have scared the American public about the past and about the future. They have piously bemoaned the depressions of bygone days and they have wailed about more "hard times comin' aknockin' at the door," particularly if the indispensable Mr. Wallace is not confirmed, or if he is, indeed, made a martyr to his beliefs by the action of the big, bad Senate. The New Dealers gloomily forecast bread lines, soup kitchens, apple stands on street corners, and every other dismal picture they can draw.

Now, what are the facts about this hokum?

First. The fact is that our American system has had enough vitality in the span of a handful of generations to give us blessings in greater abundance than

ever before experienced by any people at any time in man's history.

With only 7 percent of the world's population, even before the war, we possessed 71 percent of the world's automobiles, 59 percent of the world's telephones, 52 percent of the radio sets. We drank 55 percent of all the coffee consumed in the world, rolled on 63 percent of the petroleum and 66 percent of the rubber, and used 75 percent of all the silk in the world. Twenty-six million of our children normally attended school. We had 912 radio stations and 20,000 motion-picture theaters. We owned 141,000,000 life-insurance policies and had 44,000,000 bank deposits, with $130,000,000,000 on deposit.

Second. The fact is that our 16-cylinder American system has experienced some avoidable depression bumps on the road in the past. But it has hit these bumps because whenever Government, business, labor, or agriculture took over the steering wheel they have gone where they jolly well pleased without sufficient respect for the wishes of their partners. And when they were not at the wheel they have done a lot of back-seat driving by shouting out conflicting directions. But we have learned our lesson. We have learned that we will make the most mileage toward prosperity if we all work as a team, if we leave Government at the wheel, but only as the willing chauffeur who fulfills the mutual requirements of the three great cooperating groups. Government is a servant, not a master.

Third. The fact is that no single man is so essential to the prosperity of America that the Nation will collapse if he occupies or does not occupy an important position in Government. That goes for Henry Wallace or anyone else.

Fourth. The fact is that no man on either side of the Senate aisle ever had the slightest intention of crucifying Mr. Wallace or making him a martyr. No one wanted to nail him to the cross, although many of us wanted to "nail" as "bunk" some of his misleading notions, just as the electorate of my State nailed his bunk in the last election campaign after he had come to Wisconsin and canvassed from county to county against the Senator who is now speaking. [Laughter.]

Fifth. The fact is that right now, in the words of President Roosevelt, himself, "we have nothing to fear but fear itself."

Sixth. The fact is that we can achieve every single one of the tempting objectives which Henry Wallace has presented to the American public—better housing, better health, better security, better wages, working conditions, hours, and so forth, without Mr. Wallace's bag of economic tricks.

Now we can prove this crucial sixth point without any star-gazing, but with realistic evidence.

(a) Within the last few days, the chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Mr. Beardsley Ruml, has stated that "it was reasonable" to expect that American private business would provide 54,000,000 to 56,000,000 jobs after the war.

Who wants credit for that? Henry Wallace? Why should we not take the blinders off our eyes and see that business is given the credit to which it is entitled?

Mr. Ruml also estimated that positions in Government and military service would add enough jobs to that total to attain the national goal of 60,000,000 jobs.

There we have one angle of the situation. Is there any reason, therefore, why we should fear and then turn the job over to Government to do? It has enough to attend to in the political field.

(b) Another famous economist, Dr. Sumner H. Slichter, formerly of the University of Wisconsin, and now at Harvard University, has expressed the same well-founded high expectations in a recent article. He estimated that "after the war, the total demand for housing, industrial plant and equipment, inventories, and net exports will be about $24,600,000,000. With Government demanding $31,000,000,000 of goods, and consumers $104,000,000,000, the total demand would be about $159,600,000,000, or $3,600,000,000 more than the estimated output of 57,000,000 men working 7.5 percent fewer hours at present efficiency."

Let me note parenthetically that the average working hours per week in manufacturing are now about 45½. High working hours, including overtime, will, of course, be appreciably lowered after the war.

(c) A recent article in the Christian Science Monitor has breathed the same kind of optimism.

I have before me some quotations from this refreshing article. They should help to dispel the stale, feverish air of misery spread by the New Dealers.

I read as follows:

> There is a curious contrast between recent rises in the stock market and the current pessimism of most of the public about the immediate post-war period. The stock market is saying in no uncertain terms that prosperity or full employment for industry, or the high wartime rate of business, is to continue well into the peace.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Yet in contrast most of the public still seems to fear that the moment the war in the Pacific ends there will be a depression, with millions of soldiers and war workers in danger of unemployment. On things like this the stock market is usually more right than the public, and in point of fact there are substantial reasons for expecting that high industrial activity and plentiful jobs will persist for many months and perhaps years after the final disillusionment of Germany and Japan.
>
> * * * * *
>
> There are plenty of developments which argue powerfully for the optimists. Savings in the United States are far over $100,000,000,000, rising around $35,000,000,000 a year. The rest of the world has $20,000,000,000 of gold and dollar credits plus the hope of large American loans, with or without the help of the Bretton Woods Bank for Reconstruction and Development. And there are growing scarcities of cars, tires, decent homes, clothes, etc., in the United States and appalling needs in Europe and Asia. More impressive, however, is what might be called an argument from the trend. Month after month the trend is for the optimistic argument to get better.
>
> * * * * *
>
> And with equal steadiness the talk grows into bigger and bigger totals of what foreign countries will be wanting in the way of American export goods—$6,000,000,000 for Russia, $2,000,000,000 for France, $2,000,000,000 for Italy, $3,500,000,000 for China, and so on.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Last bullish argument, and perhaps most impressive of all, is the political probability that hold-the-line and Government controls (rationing, allocations, etc.) will be continued for "a while at least" after the war. All previous post-war booms have been allowed to blow their tops in inflationary speculation which exhausted buying power in a hurry. This time the steam is likely to be held in and will therefore in all probability last much longer than ever before.

(d) Let us recognize that one of the crucial factors in post-war prosperity will be the maintenance of demand at its present high level. There is no reason why we cannot do this, or why we cannot start our peacetime production humming and keep it humming right along.

What a market for goods America is today. Manufacturers want to modernize their machinery and their plants. Merchants want to restock their bare shelves and build the most up-to-date trade outlets.

Consumer wants are breath-taking because they have been unfilled for so long. Right now, for example, there is a backlog of demand for 12,000,000 to 15,000,000 automobiles, or 3 years of record-breaking auto-production capacity. Had consumer durable goods been manufactured during 1942–44, 10,000,000 refrigerators would have been produced, 16,500,000 electric irons, 41,000,000 radios, 82,000,000 clocks and watches, 6,000,000 washing machines Six and one-half million couples have been married during the last 4 years and a high proportion of them have not set up housekeeping. The marriage rate is expected to continue to rise in the first 2 years after the war, and the annual United States increase in number of families to be about 550,000. This means more demand for homes and for home furnishings of every kind. The National Housing Agency has estimated that during the first post-war decade an average yearly construction of 1,250,000 nonfarm dwellings alone will be required, or 300,000 more than the number constructed during the 1925 peak year.

What a thrilling challenge all this is to the productive genius of our citizens.

(e) But this is not all. Vast new horizons in brand new industries are opening up in aviation, in plastics, and in electronics. Take the last industry alone, electronics. In the 1939 Census of Manufacturers it occupied a mere subheading, "Radio and tubes" under "Electrical machinery." By 1941 it produced approximately $300,000,000 of goods in its own right. By 1944 this figure had soared to $4,000,000,000, or a 1,333 percent increase in 3 years, or the equal of the dollar product volume of the third largest industry group in the 1939 census, namely, the great automobile

and automobile equipment industry. And the electronics industry is still an infant!

Let me recall to Members of the Senate the stunning fact that since 1870 15 completely new industries, employing 15,000,000 workers, have developed from scientific research. We today are standing on the threshold of a scientific age of incredible inventions and advances for peacetime abundance.

(f) And lastly, under this major category of the items of false fear, let us take a brief look at the 60,000,000 job figure which the new dealers say we cannot attain without their hocus-pocus. Many economists think this figure is entirely too high. They say we can have what is called full employment at a much lower figure, by retiring the old folks, sending our youngsters back to school, and making it possible for many of our womenfolk to keep house and have their husbands be the breadwinners.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] eloquently made a very telling point along this line last week. He stated that it was not an arbitrarily high number of jobs but the standard of living of a people which made for their well-being and happiness.

Right now we have 51,250,000 people in the civilian labor force, in addition to 12,000,000 persons in the armed services. That makes 63,250,000 for the total labor force. However, a minimum of 2,000,000 will be required for the armed services even after the long period of demobilization, and an additional 6,000,000 may be expected to withdraw from the labor force voluntarily as soon as the war emergency is over. Deduct those 8,000,000 people from the 63,250,000 and you have 55,250,000 for whom we must provide jobs. That is about the figure for which the American Legion has inaugurated its Nation-wide job program. And that is a far more reasonable and feasible number than the sky-high 60,000,000 figure.

Those should be points enough to dispel the great amount of hokum aimed at inculcating fear in the hearts of Americans.

2. THE HOKUM OF NEWNESS

Somehow folks always seem to "take to" anything that is wrapped up in a new package. So the new dealers have proclaimed their job program as "the latest thing" in public policy.

Actually, it is no such thing. It is the oldest stuff in the world, the stuff of which the ancient institution of slavery was made. It is the stuff which we imported in the early thirties from the very dictator nations which we have since had to fight so bloodily on battlefields. Moreover, it is the same concoction which was brewed for us in such heaping quantities between 1933 and 1940 and which gave us nothing but more financial headaches and spiritual heartaches.

The new dealers called it "pump priming" then and a lot of other innocent names. But it had the same ingredients—government pap, bureaucratic patronage, and political pork. And what disastrous results they produced!

In 1933, when the New Deal took over, we had five and one-eighth million households and nineteen and five-eighths million persons receiving all sorts of Federal, State, and local relief. By 1939, after an unparalleled orgy of deficit financing, we had six and one-half million households and nineteen and one-quarter million persons on relief! Those figures are from the W. P. A. Statistical Bulletin. In 1940, the year before we got into this war, after 7 years of blindly following false Messiahs, we had 10,000,000 unemployed. During that 7 years, we had an average of ten and one-half million unemployed.

Why should we expect any different results this time? Call the old formula by any high-sounding name "Cradle-to-the-Grave Security," "the Beveridge Plan," "Jobs for All"—so long as it has the same unsound ingredients, it will lead to economic ruin. Give its apologists enough rope, and they will hang our entire system. For once they upset the apple cart, destroy the delicate balance in our political life, by centralizing power in the executive branch of the Government, it inevitably follows that they will destroy the delicate balance of our economic life. Through deficit financing, they will settle government's huge weight upon the back of private enterprise and crush it to death. The process can proceed by reverse order—that is, destroy the economic checks and balances first, and then the political. That is what happened in Italy; that is what happened in Germany. That is recent history, not medieval history. But, either way, our spiritual foundations will be simultaneously undermined and the result will be a dictatorship of the Fascist or Communist stripe.

There is nothing new about any of the New Deal's creations, except the new wonder that folks could fall, hook, line, and sinker, for discredited theories over and over and over and over again.

3. THE HOKUM OF GOVERNMENT

The source of all of Mr. Wallace's miracles and of all the New Deal's cures is, of course, Washington, D. C. This is the birthplace of all that is good and all that is holy. If in doubt, turn to government. If suspicious, remember that government moves in a mysterious way, its wonders to perform. Government does everything better. Government knows best. Government, government, government!

Now, where in all of this New Deal palaver is there any fundamental recognition of the grass roots and city genius working for private profit and the public good, which made this Nation the magnificent country that it is? Was it the bureaucratic seat-warmers who spanned the Nation with railroads, who built the blast furnaces, broke the virgin soil, constructed the cities? Was it the slide-rule professors who brought about the miracle of American munitions, ships, and airplane production during this war? Was it the Washington dreamers who boosted the Nation's food output between 1940 and 1944 by 23 percent, while the Nation's farm population dropped by 16 percent? Stop and think that over. Who was it but the common man, the man of energy, the man who was willing to sweat and work and labor?

Was our war-production achievement due to Government? Or was it not often in spite of the confusing, conflicting, and confounding orders issued pell-mell by authority-mad bureaucrats?

Government is neither a seat of virtue nor a seat of evil, but just what the prevailing administration makes it. If "the powers that be" decide to "serve the Nation's best interest" by socking private enterprise in the jaw, it is inevitable that free enterprise will soon go down and go down for the count at that. And when it does go down, the Nation will go down with it. Let us not forget recent history in Germany and in Italy.

So, enough of the New Deal hokum that Government is going to operate in a vacuum and produce job magic. Magic never produces any real jobs except for the magician himself. Government may, by "made work," produce jobs but the jobs will not pay real American pay envelopes. They will give little more than the subsistence hand-outs of the old W. P. A.—$31.20 a month for unskilled W. P. A. workers in the South, for example. Because the fatal paradox is that Government cannot provide high wages unless it is to make its employment more attractive than private employment, and thus keep persons on its rolls indefinitely.

4. THE HOKUM OF STRIFE

New Deal propaganda seethes with strife. Big business is pictured at the throat of little business. The farmer is viewed as perpetually at loggerheads with the consumer, the consumer at swords point with the middleman, the middleman at odds with the producer, the producer at odds with labor. The Nation is presented as an economic arena where rival groups slug it out to their mutual extinction. The New Deal seems to thrive on this strife. It provides a convenient excuse for its wholesale intervention. It jibes with the New Deal's parent philosophy of class warfare.

Now, of course, this Nation is founded on checks and balances in the economic as well as the political sphere. And there have been in the past many private persons and groups which have sought to throttle their competitors through monopoly or unfair practices. Wealth has often been concentrated to an undue extreme. But it is quite wrong to assume that these minor correctible shortcomings of our free competitive system are anything but the exception or are inevitable.

Certainly in war, every economic group in America has recognized its interdependence, although even during this period, there have been some obstinate stand-outs. Is there any reason why in the peace to come, our economic groups cannot work together to their mutual satisfaction and profit? Are not the profit-sharing policies between management and labor, the employee pension and insurance plans of many industries the widespread labor-management committees, the projected $600,000,000 financial pool for America's small businesses to be provided by our private banks—are these not all healthy signs? Do they not prove that the strife which the New Deal sees with such glee—or some may say,

fosters with such success—is not the actual order of the day?

5. THE HOKUM OF GUARANTIES

Mr. President, the biggest bait in the New Deal trap is the hokum about guaranties. What has not the New Deal promised to guarantee? It has vowed to guarantee jobs, credits, profits, educations, security, health, housing. It has practically promised to give the moon on a silver platter to every American citizen.

But it fails to tell us the price, the age-old price of slavery in a planned economy in which wages, hours, and every other factor of production, distribution, and consumption are held in the iron fist of Government.

I say beware of these guaranties. Beware of these bureaucrats bearing gifts. "He who would give up liberty for security deserves neither." The caged bird has a guaranty of security, but it cannot fly. The hog that is fattened for the slaughter has a guaranty of security up until a certain date.

I say beware of these guaranties not only because of what we will lose materially but because of what we will lose spiritually—our self-reliance, our self-respect, our initiative, our joy in free labor by the sweat of our brow and the toil of our brain.

Let no one in this Chamber think for one moment that the insidious philosophy of "the world owes me a living" has not already sapped much of the productive energies of our people. Government, the great provider, has taken care of virtually everything in the last few years. It has given management lush contracts, stockholders fat dividends, labor boom salaries. Of course, everyone has had to work mighty hard during these war years, but no one had had to stir to drum up business. There has not been any need for salesmanship; for Government has turned out to be a peerless customer, anxious to take everything that would meet specifications and to pay handsomely for it.

Even as far back as 1942, the magazine, Fortune, reported that the will for private enterprise was being dangerously paralyzed. I desire to repeat that, Mr. President. In 1942 Fortune magazine said the will for private enterprise was being dangerously paralyzed. In July of that year this magazine asked the question: "Do you think some form of socialism would be a good thing or a bad thing for the country as a whole?" Twenty-five and one-half percent of the Nation thought it would be a good thing. Forty and one-half percent thought it would be a bad thing, and 34 percent did not know. The highest favoring vote for socialism came from business executives 40 percent, and the lowest from farm labor, 17½ percent! If these figures do not show that it is later than many of us have thought to halt the trend toward socialism, I do not know what will show it.

Slowly, subtly the process of indoctrination of our people to a life where government takes care of everything goes on. And this hokum about guaranties is in the forefront of this indoctrination.

There is much more hokum from where all this came—the thinking mills of the New Deal. But this is enough to point to the unmistakable conclusion that the American people have been under the high pressure of supersalesmen of collectivism for far too long.

The time has come to resolve to abandon all trails which lead to despotism and ruin and to march forward on the American way of liberty and prosperity.

THE AMERICAN WAY

What should be our program as we proceed along this way?

First, make up our minds that there is more than enough resourcefulness and vitality in our American system of private enterprise to bring on and maintain prosperity. Banish the fear that we cannot accomplish this through our free and voluntary means. "Fear is present where faith is absent." Let us have faith in ourselves and in our country.

Second, keep America's brain power mobilized for peace as well as for war. Do not immediately disperse from the Government service the able leaders recruited from industry. The war on depression will be as important as the war on the Axis. Let us keep in many of the high seats of Government the men who have helped us through the war production emergency and have fought off the dream schemes of the new dealers.

Third, give community planning the green light. Do not let the false thinkers of the Left monopolize planning. That is what they want, Mr. President. They want a monopolized planning; they want to take over. They think it is their show, their America, that it does not belong to you and me.

Planning is nothing more than constructive foresight based on corrective hindsight. But let not our planning be perverted into regimentation. In every city and hamlet of our Nation, let representatives of labor, business, agriculture, and Government sit down and voluntarily work out community problems. Democratically coordinate these plans at the State and at the Federal levels, and give every assistance and encouragement to them.

Fourth. Give private enterprise the green light. Promise it—with the intention of fulfilling our promise—that we will reward its initiative and remove nuisance restrictions and competition on the part of Government. As I said before, neither the Federal nor the State Government should take things over to the point where either becomes the master.

Fifth. Set Government's lop-sided house in order. Reorganize and reduce the top-heavy, sprawling bureaucracy and balance the Budget. A statement to America that the Budget would be balanced, bureaucrats thrown out, and corners cut would do more to instill confidence in the hearts of millions who own Government bonds than would anything else.

Sixth. Announce Government's role as that of a good Samaritan, not a Santa Claus, on both the home and foreign fronts, helping both Americans and foreigners to help themselves, to solve their own problems through themselves.

Seventh. Establish cooperation as the order of the day between business, labor, and agriculture throughout the reconversion period and permanently thereafter.

Eighth. Maintain open the arteries of competition by curbing both monopolies and cartels and giving encouragement and assistance to small businessmen.

It is only through measures such as these that we may be true to the heritage which is ours. Only thus may we transmit the blessings of our way of life both to our returning young men and women of the armed services and our citizens of the civilian population and to their children, and their children's children, in the days to come.

Let the torch of freedom "be a lamp unto our feet and a light unto our path."

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I believe the citizens of the State of New Jersey are entitled to know why I shall vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce. There are no personal reasons, nor is there any unfriendliness in the vote.

Most of our citizens are familiar with the President's letter to the Honorable Jesse Jones, in which he requested Mr. Jones' resignation in order that he, the President, might nominate Mr. Wallace.

Let us here disregard the political pay-off, which is admitted in the letter.

Let us here disregard the question as to whether this reward given to Henry Wallace for his activities in the political campaign is either illegal, immoral, or an unethical violation of the third section of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act. I think it is.

Let us here disregard the fact that the President has done the unusual thing of discharging, or asking for the resignation, of an able, patriotic man, who, according to the President himself, has done a good job.

I cannot disregard the fact that Mr. Wallace's appointment produces an unbalanced Cabinet, because I do not believe anyone will doubt that Mr. Wallace has been endeavoring primarily to represent the organized labor leaders, and the Cabinet already has a Secretary of Labor—Miss Perkins—who certainly cannot be accused of being unfavorable to labor.

The office of Secretary of Commerce should be occupied by one who is skilled and experienced in business, industry, and commerce and has the interest of promoting the welfare of business, industry, and commerce, with due regard to the welfare of the Nation.

I still believe in our system of government—the freedom of the individual to engage in business and the vital necessity of each citizen accepting his individual responsibility in order to continue our American system on its upward progress.

We are fighting this war to preserve the right to have and express a difference of opinion. The telegrams and letters I have received from the citizens of New Jersey, as well as citizens throughout the United States, are preponderantly against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Wallace—just as I am against it.

Mr. Wallace seems to be in doubt as to the continuing value of the Constitu-

tion of the United States; otherwise, in his book Whose Constitution he would not have said:

We in the United States should eventually be prepared if necessary to work out in the spirit of Madison a mechanism which would embody the spirit of the age as successfully as the Constitution of 1787 mirrored the philosophy of the eighteenth century. We may hope that such action can be taken as bloodlessly as the Constitution was enacted and that the handiwork will be as enduring. This will undoubtedly be possible if a spirit of common sense prevails; and if we use our Constitution as Hamilton anticipated it should be used, such action may not be necessary at all.

I still believe that our Constitution, with its provisions for amendment, should not be altered, destroyed, or replaced.

Theodore Roosevelt once said that the pure idealist is the most dangerous man in the world because he is often honest, sincere, and conscientious but through lack of experience in the practical affairs of life, he misleads many to their detriment. I believe Mr. Wallace is a pure idealist.

Saying you are for the common man is one thing. Being for the common man but failing to accomplish anything of consequence for his benefit because of false philosophies and inexperience is another thing.

But being sincerely for the best interest of the common man and using the lessons that come from the experience of life to create intelligent cooperation with the common man, in order that he may have the necessary opportunities to enable him to enjoy a fair and honest chance to raise his standard of living and obtain security under a solvent government is the only helpful course that brings to him true, enduring benefits. This course should be the objective of all good Americans.

I still believe in the philosophies of our forefathers who founded and developed this Nation and afforded its people the highest living standard on the face of the earth.

This accomplishment of our forefathers, which we are now destroying, was made under the principle that the citizen supports the Government, and not under the principle that the Government supports the citizen. It was made under the principle that the Government should keep opportunity open to all its citizens, and not under the principle that the Government owes a tailor-made job to its citizens.

The two fundamental reasons which actuate me to vote against the confirmation of Mr. Wallace are, first, the fact that I believe the people of the United States would like to see a better balanced Cabinet than Mr. Wallace's appointment would produce, and, secondly, I wish to see our Government remain solvent and its various groups prosper, so that opportunities of advancement for the common man may be a reality, rather than merely a promised and coveted goal.

It is my firm conviction that Mr. Wallace's philosophy of life and government, if carried into effect, will destroy the opportunities of free man and lead to Government regimentation and enslavement. Let us remember, my fellow Senators, that Government-guaranteed security means nothing else than a mortgage on individual liberty.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, it is with considerable humility and with some trepidation that I rise to contribute a few words to this discussion. It is, I believe, thought that a newcomer should keep his seat for a time until he has become better acquainted with the procedures of and the issues before the Congress. However, I am somewhat vexed at having to sit here and listen to all the reverberations from the other side of the aisle with nothing emanating from this side. It does not seem to be of a great deal of importance so I think this may be a good time for me to practice a little bit. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, on this occasion the issue at least, is easy to comprehend. It is well understood in every hamlet of the land, and I dare say the expressions of opinions on this question which have come to the Senators are in volume and emphasis almost without precedent. Everywhere citizens whose eyes are fixed on the future are deeply stirred and alarmed lest the decision made here should check the country's progress to a more prosperous condition than that which prevailed before the war. The people of my State, Mr. President, and of the great West are deeply interested in the question now before the Senate.

The post-war objective laid out by President Roosevelt is 60,000,000 jobs to be supplied normally by private enterprise. Most of these, obviously, must come from what we refer to as small business, if we are to have an adequate and well-distributed economy. In my State small business is about all the business there is. In nearly all the West, and in my State especially, small business comprises an overwhelming majority of the business we have. The great State of Idaho, which I have the honor in part to represent, has abundant, and varied, but still largely undeveloped, natural resources. We have an enterprising, industrious and honest people, and could easily with proper development support a far greater population in prosperity and happiness. We have always been a raw material producing State, laboring under the handicap of excessive freight rates in order to transport what we produce to market, and much of the wealth already produced has been drawn away to the seats of great corporate enterprise.

Mr. President, such a State as mine is keenly interested in having in the Department of Commerce a man of large national views, a man who is interested in seeing ample credit and enterprise directed to the areas that have been neglected, and not primarily as a guardian of the gigantic concerns which already dominate our business life. We want leadership that looks into the future, not merely a close conservator of what we have. We want more jobs, more wealth, more people, better homes, transportation systems, and many other things.

Mr. Wallace, I am convinced by the record, is no enemy of any kind of business. He has strong faith that free private enterprise can produce 60,000,000 jobs after the war. If in wartime we can produce goods worth $200,000,000,000 or more, he believes we can produce in great abundance houses, machinery, and clothing in peacetime. He conceives the Government to be a great power in reserve, to maintain order and balance, to hold the scales even, and be prepared to carry on public works if for any reason the economic machine falters and unemployment soars to 3,000,000. He has a detailed plan to supervise the whole stupendous undertaking and keep it in balance, so as to avoid panics and shutdowns. And, first of all, he has abounding faith in America.

Private industry must have faith to expand before it can be expected to take necessary risks; private investors must be assured that the full power of our Government stands ready to forestall any threatened economic collapse.

The experience of 1929 has not been forgotten. The vast credit of the Government standing ready to share unusual and abnormal risks with the private investor in getting started is needed to give business the confidence necessary to produce the jobs. No public figure has come forward with so fine an analysis of the problem and so definite a program to meet it as has Mr. Wallace. He has demonstrated both the vision and the power to act boldly and practically. If he cannot direct the great campaign to furnish real employment that shall enrich every part of our broad land, then, in my judgment, no one else has appeared who can. Certainly no one who has the outlook of a full-time banker is likely to have the large grasp necessary to do the job.

This contest on the domestic business scene is at bottom between those who believe that some 20,000 big enterprises allowed to do as they please, but shored up when crises come, to be sure, can do the job without much concern for 3,000,000 small businesses scattered over the country. Mr. Wallace is for a new economic freedom for everybody, and he recognizes the obstacles, not only in finance but in international trade policies which destroy confidence and opportunity in all sections of our land. His intelligence is applied to the whole problem, not merely to a small segment of it.

Mr. President, the speeches previous to mine, made by able Senators, have been to the effect that what we want is experienced businessmen to conduct the departments of Government. We do not want idealists and men of vision. We want sound businessmen. A few days ago the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] made the statement that President Roosevelt showed a lack of confidence in Henry Wallace in the letter which he wrote to Mr. Jones when he said, "For that reason only I am going to give Henry the job." I do not think he showed a lack of confidence in Mr. Wallace. I think he placed too much confidence in Mr. Jones when he thought he would not publish the letter.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. My statement about lack of confidence related to the President's interference in the nomination of Mr. Wallace as Vice President, and his obvious desire not to have him run on the ticket, or have his name submitted to the people, as a handicap to the Democratic ticket. I do not think I used the letter to which the Senator refers.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Has not the Senator heard it said that the Devil quotes Scripture to his own ends? Would that have any analogy, in the Senator's mind, to the effort of the able Senator from Ohio to be the analyst of Democratic Party affairs?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to read a brief editorial. It was written by a Republican. Whenever I wish to make an argument and bolster it with statements from someone who is supposed to be an authority, I always try to choose a Republican, because then it cannot be said that I am prejudiced. I am sure that nearly all Senators on the other side of the aisle, and I believe every Senator on this side of the aisle, will join with me in saying that William Allen White was a great American, beloved and respected by all thinking Americans. Shortly before his death he visited Washington to look things over, and he wrote the following editorial, which appeared in the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette:

SAYS BIG BUSINESS IS RUNNING WAR—STARK MAD, RUTHLESS MEN OWE FIRST ALLEGIANCE TO THEIR OWN STOCKHOLDERS, DECLARES NOTED EDITOR

William Allen White, noted editor of the Emporia (Kans.) Gazette, recently came to Washington to learn first-hand how the war is getting on. After sizing up the situation, he wrote his impressions for his paper.

"One cannot move about Washington," he said, "without bumping into the fact that we are running two wars—a foreign war and a domestic war.

"The domestic war front is in the various war boards. Every great commodity industry in this country is organized nationally and many of them, perhaps most of them, are parts of great national organizations, cartels, agreements, which function on both sides of the battle front."

UNCHECKED BY GOD OR MAN

"Here in Washington every industry is interested in saving its own self. It wants to come out of the war with a whole hide and with its organization unimpaired, legally or illegally.

"One is surprised to find men representing great commodity trusts or agreements or syndicates planted in the various war boards.

"It is silly to say new dealers run this show. It's run largely by absentee owners of amalgamated industrial wealth—men who either directly or through their employers control small minority blocs, closely organized, that manipulate the physical plants of these trusts.

"For the most part, these managerial magnates are decent, patriotic Americans. They have great talents. If you touch them in 9 relations of life out of 10, they are kindly, courteous, Christian gentlemen.

"But in the tenth relation, where it touches their own organization, they are stark mad, ruthless, unchecked by God or man, paranoiacs, in fact, as evil in their design as Hitler."

FIGHT FOR STOCKHOLDERS

"They are determined to come out of this war victors for their own stockholders—which is not surprising. It is understandable also for Hitler to desire to come out of this war at any cost victor for the German people.

"But this attitude of the men who control the great commodity industries, and who propose to run them according to their own judgment and their own morals, do not make a pretty picture for the welfare of the common man.

"These international combinations of indutsrial capital are fierce troglodyte animals with tremendous power and no social brains. They hover like an old silurian reptile about our decent, more or less Christian, civilization—like great dragons in this modern day when dragons are supposed to be dead."

Mr. President, personally, I would rather have Henry Wallace, with all his idealism and love of mankind—which seems to be a crime in the eyes of some—as Secretary of Commerce than one of the fierce troglodyte animals with tremendous power and no social brains, to which Mr. White refers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	Overton
Bailey	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Hoey	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Bushfield	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Taylor
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Capehart	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Tobey
Chavez	McMahon	Tunnell
Cordon	Magnuson	Tydings
Donnell	Maybank	Vandenberg
Downey	Mead	Wagner
Eastland	Millikin	Walsh
Ellender	Mitchell	Wheeler
Ferguson	Moore	Wherry
Fulbright	Morse	White
George	Murdock	Wiley
Gerry	Murray	Willis
Green	Myers	Wilson
Guffey	O'Daniel	
Gurney	O'Mahoney	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, as a member of the possibly dwindling minority of the minority, upon this side, who have felt inclined to support the Presidential right to choose as members of his Cabinet those who are reputable men, I think perhaps I should put in the RECORD, not for the purpose of persuading anyone or justifying myself, but simply for the purposes of record, the reasons which have actuated me as a member of the Committee on Commerce in first considering this matter when I had more distinguished company, and more recently in the consideration of the matter here.

For a century every President of the United States has been permitted to have as members of his Cabinet those who were personally and politically congenial, so long as they were reputable and honest men and were not affected with any private interest which would suggest prejudice in the performance of their public duty.

No one challenges the authority or responsibility of the Senate under the Constitution to pass upon Cabinet nominations exactly like all other Executive appointments. However, as a conservative, I must point out that it is significant that the practice of a century indicates the consideration which has been given by the Senate to the desirability of unity in the executive branch of the Government in the interest of sound and successful administration. Certainly in this century of consistent consideration of the President's official family by men of all parties there has been no implication of approval of the ideas or the ideologies of the appointees. It would be easy to suggest many men in both parties who might seem far better qualified to perform the duties of Secretary of Commerce than the present nominee. That way, however, lies the encroachment of the legislative upon the executive department of the Government and the threat of chaos in administration.

The present nominee seems to many perfectly to personify the economic and social views, if any, of this administration. Much of the criticism is based upon a frankness of expression that is both unusual and refreshing in men in public life. America has been wandering in a dismal swamp of uncertainty and confusion in domestic policies, chasing a will-o'-the-wisp of constantly changing proposals for restoring our economic well-being. Hatred of Henry Wallace based upon fear is the surest way of annointing him as the messiah of a new day. If our responsibilities permitted consideration of political consequences, it would be easy to envision Henry Wallace as the catalyst, to use a New Deal word, who may finally enable America really to choose up sides in these evolutionary days.

Those, like myself, who disagree with Henry Wallace may prudently devote their time and talents to the development of a sounder program and a more appealing candidate to seek the support of the American people. That crusade may be gladly and enthusiastically joined by every American who believes it is high time that America had a chance to endorse a program which recognizes the amazing progress of the United States under our present economic and social and governmental system, and which seeks simply to adapt that system to the world of tomorrow, without discarding the principles of sound government and sound thinking which have made America in the last century the productive marvel and envy of all the world.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, during the past month the confirmation of the nomination of Henry A. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce apparently has become increasingly probable. During the same month the roll call of the opposition to the confirmation has therefore become increasingly merely a referendum upon Mr. Wallace's policies. This referendum vote will serve as a partial

guide to the attitude of the Senate on similar policies.

I agree with such general objectives of Mr. Wallace as the vital need for postwar full employment and for international peace and security. I propose to do everything possible to attain those objectives by sound methods. On the other hand, I strongly disagree with Mr. Wallace's policies and those of the President to reach their objectives through prodigal governmental spending, governmental deficits, and governmental borrowing.

I regard such prodigalities as inexcusable violations of the trusteeship of governmental power over the public's own assets. Unless checked, such prodigality will not only waste the country's resources but will endanger the living standards, the personal freedom, and the international peace available for our children and our children's children, for whose futures we have been elected special trustees.

I voted my opposition to such prodigal policies last November, as did the majority of the voters in Ohio. I expect, therefore, to vote against the confirmation of Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce, to record opposition to many of his political policies.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, during the time when Mr. Wallace's name has been before the Senate, I have received many letters in regard to the nomination. I desire to insert at this point in the RECORD a long and thoughtful letter from a friend of mine in regard to the nomination of Mr. Wallace, and my reply thereto.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTROSE, COLO., *January 26, 1945.*

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
United States Senator from Colorado,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ED. JOHNSON: * * * It is obvious that if the appointment of Henry Wallace is confirmed by the United States Senate, he will wield more control in America than a combination of the three largest banks of the United States, plus the United States Steel Co., plus the General Motors Co., plus the Ford Motor Co., if they were all acting in unison and according to plan. In such a position Mr. Wallace, representing the lender, can impose all types of covenants on the borrower who will naturally be anxious to promote the latter's business, great or small, and can require the borrower to assume and agree to observe regimentation of all his actions and behavior under the direct control of the Government, without limit, even to the point of writing into the loan agreement covenants pertaining to the employment of the labor used in the conduct of the borrower's business and particularly the terms and conditions of such employment, all at the borrower's expense.

The ideals or principles of a man represent one phase of his character make-up. His policies represent another. Mr. Wallace is already on record against the following of the American tradition of making the American way of life adjust itself to the limitations and requirements of a written Constitution, and being cognizant of the fact that subversive elements in our midst are engaged in a revolution, will change completely our form of government. I quote him:

"We are in for a profound revolution. Those of us who realize the inevitability of revolution are anxious that it be gradual and bloodless instead of sudden and bloody."

This in itself comes as near saying that he is in favor of a bloody revolution if it has to come to that, but hopes that it will be a peaceful one, as any comment I have heard from a public character.

He is a planner after the ways of the Communists and Socialists: believes not only in the state's planning for the individual but forcing the individual to behave according to such plan, the while trying to laugh off reference to Socialists, Communists, or Fascists. Here is what he covertly states:

"They will not be Socialists, Communists, or Fascists, but plain men trying to gain by democratic methods the professed objectives of the Communists, Socialists, and Fascists."

Any sane man knows that such an objective is impossible under our existing Federal Constitution.

He expects eventually to completely dominate farmers and producers, generally, and the great individualists who have made an outstanding record in fields of manufacture and of production in the present war effort. In fact he bluntly says:

"It may be necessary to make a public utility out of agriculture. Every plowed field would have its permit sticking up on its post—it would be necessary to go to Congress to get a very large appropriation so as to have a police force of half a million men to keep down racketeering."

That he will ignore public opinion, which is the most important factor in this America of ours, and as a public official of the state, force the electorate who comprise and vocalize that public opinion to do things against their respective (instead of his doing it as the agent of public opinion and the servant thereof) wills, is evidenced by this astounding statement made by him:

"Much as we dislike them, the new types of social control that we have now in operation are here to stay, and to grow on a world or national scale. We shall have to go on doing all these things we do not want to do."

That he expects, regardless of his high idealism, to force regimentation and Government planning on the lowly, common man, is not the subject of argument, so far as his pernicious declarations are concerned. He expresses himself in the words of a cold, icy, determined dictator. I quote again:

"Regimentation without stint might, indeed, I sometimes think, go further and faster here than anywhere else if we once took the bit in our teeth and set up for a 100-percent American conformity in everything."

To show that the American people are not informed of the hidden secret trend as relevant to the above pronouncements by Mr. Wallace, the brief, blunt comment of the king's jester, Harry Hopkins, is here quoted: "People are too damned dumb to understand."

With the above statements and declarations made by Mr. Wallace in mind, what do the rank and file of the American people think he will do if placed in direct control of and charged with the administration of practically all of the liquid assets held at the present time by the United States Government as creditor? He will regiment business, of course, and he will name not the conditions generally imposed between the borrower and the lender, but the conditions imposed by a man who has become a jealous ideologist, and who will concentrate more thinking how much further a particular plan of his will advance the ideology, rather than whether it is satisfactory to ensure the payment of the money borrowed.

(1) Henry Wallace is not equipped by any previous experience for heading the world's most colossal banking system—the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

(2) His nomination is a frank political pay-off. The President openly and frankly states that Mr. Wallace wanted to be Secretary of Commerce and that the President, because of Mr. Wallace's work for the success of the ticket, thinks the latter is entitled to the job.

(3) The fact further is that the private business, large and small, which Mr. Wallace wants to help, is more suspicious of him and his plans of regimentation than it is of any other public man in the United States

How can we expect teamwork from a combination of elements suspicious of each other, such as business and agricultural interests on the one hand and Mr. Wallace on the other hand are of each other?

* * * * * *

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation should be divorced from Mr. Wallace's domination or control by the Congress of the United States because of the wartime emergency. Before 4 more years go by it is my prediction that the rank and file of American people will be much better advised of the possible and dangerous consequences of our present trend than they are at this time

I take it for granted that every person with common sense is in agreement on the proposition that the world owes no man a living, but that a man is entitled to free, fair opportunity to make a living. This pertains to the right of the individual, but that individual has an obligation which is no better interpreted than in the parable of the talents from the lips of the Incomparable One who saw, knew, and understood realities, rewards, and penalities of human behavior for a period far beyond the confusion and controversy of His time. The parable is as follows (St. Matthew XXV, 14: 30):

"For even as men going into a far country, called his servants and delivered to them his goods.

"And to one he gave five talents, and to another two, and to another one, to everyone according to his proper ability, and immediately he took his journey.

"And he that received the five talents went his way, and traded with the same, and gained other five.

"And in like manner he that had received the two gained other two.

"But he that had received the one, going his way, digged into the earth and hid his lord's money.

"But after a long time, the lord of these servants came, and reckoned with them.

"And he that had received the five talents, counting, brought other five talents saying 'Lord, thou didst deliver to me five talents, behold I have gained other five over and above.'

"His lord said to him 'Well done, good and faithful servant; because thou has been faithful over a few things, I will place thee over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy lord.'

"And he also that had received the two talents came and said: 'Lord, thou delivered two talents to me; behold, I have gained other two.'

"His lord said to him 'Well done, good and faithful servant; because thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will place thee over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy lord.'

"But he that had received the one talent came and said: 'Lord, I know that thou art a hard man; thou reapest where thou hast not sown; and gatherest where thou hast not strewed.

" 'And being afraid, I went and hid the talent in the earth; behold, here thou hast that which is thine.'

"And his lord answering, said to him: 'Wicked and slothful servant; thou knewest that I reap where I sow not, and gather where I have not strewed.

" 'Thou oughtest, therefore, to have committed my money to the bankers and at my coming, I should have received my own with usury.

" 'Take ye away, therefore, the talents from him, and give it to him that hath ten talents.

" 'For to everyone that hath shall be given; and he shall abound; but from him that hath not, that also which he seemeth to have shall be taken away.' "

The chief enduring qualities of the New Testament which epitomize His philosophy of life are that everything depends on the individual, and that the individual has a direct responsibility for his own welfare. Metaphorically, that individual represents a light bulb. Whether by proper contact with the dynamic generator of Divinity the individual wants that bulb to shine forth with the effulgent glow of inner satisfaction, is up to the individual. The responsibility for not establishing the contact, also is the individual's. Such is the reason for the enduring basis of Christianity. Similarly, the reason that Christianity is bitterly opposed by the Fascist state in Italy, the Nazi dictatorship in Germany, and the compelling and all-powerful dominating state influence of communistic Russia, is that these different forms of government must of necessity make all human beings mere serfs in carrying out their plan of government, if that plan is to be successful.

The nineteenth-century liberalism of Cobden and Bright, of Adam Smith and Hume, or even Locke and Milton, who inherited zealously the theory that any social organization must primarily be established on basic individualism (the theory that consideration of the rights of the individual and the resultant effects of any proposed such plan of social organization of individual rights) as that theory was developed by Erasmus, Montaigne, Cicero, Tacitus, Pericles, Thucydides, etc., prompts me to assert that the present trend of government in the United States will bring about, if unchecked, the abandonment of this century-old but enduring philosophy.

The Renaissance period in our history stands out as the era when individuals, unfettered and encouraged, while the power of state remained in a condition of suspended animation, were permitted the unregulated development and expression of their respective talents, energies, and genius. It is to that period we ascribe some of our greatest literature, thought, true liberalism, and advancement. It stands out with brilliant splendor as a tribute to the accomplishments of various individual members who were, because of lack of restraint upon them at the time, permitted to hand down to succeeding generations the invaluable treasures of their respective handiworks in the way of art, literature, sculpture, poetry, music, and inventive formulas.

The framers of our Federal Constitution, some of whom were outstanding students of political science, surveyed the crimes, follies, and misfortunes of mankind as the latter were recorded in the historical records of the past, and decided that private enterprise as a twin companion of individual liberty, was of equal importance with the inherent rights of the individual, such as freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, due process (which meant the right to be tried before regularly organized courts controlled by orderly procedure, previously adopted from the experience of the ages).

The history of the United States of America since that Constitution was adopted may clearly be described as the flowering result of the Renaissance period. So definite has been that result that today our country has become so great in its colossal development that we are financing our associates in the World War as well as sending our sons to engage in battle everywhere, not only on far-flung battle fronts, but are lending and leasing to every other allied participant food, clothing, munitions, and war equipment in unbelievable numbers and amounts for their aid, use, and protection.

It is interesting to note that Russia has received seven or eight billions of dollars under our lend-lease arrangements—and it will be further interesting, later on, to read the statistics showing what portion of American money, equipment, such as trucks, guns, food, planes, and ammunition, was available for use by her valorous sons in the present stupendous drive to reach Berlin—all of which brings us to the point that during the period when individual enterprise had full sway, the average American had finally attained a higher standard of living than had any other citizen of any other country on the face of the globe during any present or any previous period in the world's history.

Right here I want to observe that because our country and Russia are joined together as allies during the present war, is no reason why we should be required to adopt the Russian theory of government. If I am in the livestock business and I am interested in keeping pure a common source of water supply for my flocks, and in preserving pasturage for my animals, it is common sense for me to join with anybody to prevent the poisoning of the springs or the impairment of my pasturage by some malevolent individual who, at the moment happens to have evil designs against us both, but after we have jointly protected ourselves from the evil design and eliminated or enjoined the continuance of the source of it, that is no reason why I have to adopt a religion or politics which my neighbor espoused, nor even his business methods, for that matter. I may have "lent" or "leased" him during the period of peril, equipment for our common protection. We have been paid in full—each of us—by the mutual aid we have rendered to each other for common protection.

Now we face in this America of ours today, definite threats having for their purpose the undermining of what I choose to call the "liberalism of our western civilization." This trend or threat began more than a century ago. Socialism was the seed, or the dynamic force which produced it. St. Simeon, one of the founders, was franker than our present-day Socialists are, because he believed in frankness and bluntness and had not learned the psychological force of "boring from within." His plan, plainly stated, was to reorganize society on the hierarchian lines and by imposition of a "coercive spiritual power" where freedom was concerned, produce the subjective and regimented citizen. He and his fellow prophets and creators made no bones about their intention. Freedom of thought, they asserted, and regarded it as the root evil of the 19th century society. He predicted that those in organized society who did not obey his proposed planning boards would be, and I quote him literally, "treated as cattle." De Toqueville, liberal Democrat that he was, and who believed sincerely in freedom of thought and action, immediately discerned that democracy was an essentially individualistic institution and stood, therefore, in irreconcilable conflict with the Socialist theory of St. Simeon et al. He said in 1848:

"Democracy extends the sphere of individual freedom. Socialism restricts it. Democracy attaches all possible value to every man. Socialism makes each man a mere number; a mere agent; have nothing in common but one word "equality"; but notice the differences; while democracy seeks equalities in liberty, socialism seeks equalities in restraint and servitude."

With these thoughts and the above quotations from former Vice President Wallace in mind, can any man of common sense, honestly assert that Henry Wallace is interested in enforcing in America the American type of individual enterprise in order to carry out the American way of life, or the bureaucratic type of state domination, imposing a condition of servitude on the individual citizen as practiced today in continental Europe?

Henry Wallace's asserted intention to provide jobs for 60,000,000 people of his appointment is confirmed as a repetition of pump-priming activities with which some of us have been sadly familiar. Such practice had us in a tail-spin just before the present war. If it had not been for the fact that private enterprise had through the years built up an equity for more than 150 years, money could not have been borrowed to temporarily avert such pump-priming consequence—the present war and its exacting employments could not have averted the fast-overcoming economic cataclysm. We have attempted to borrow and borrow and spend and spend our way into a fantastic prosperity which sometimes makes us forget that it is all on the cuff—or, in other words, has been accomplished with our savings—we the people being unable to produce the profit or wealth to pay as we go, or to make the various enterprises sustain the cost of experiments to be conducted on the strength of our credit? Henry Wallace intends to take practically all the liquid assets our Government has, and under the guise of extending the credit of our Government to borrowers, attempt to spend our way into full employment. This, in spite of the fact that such a program is based wholly on borrowed money.

The chief weakness in Henry Wallace's thinking process is that he believes a paradise on earth can be created by law. If God Almighty, with the aid of a divinely conceived Son, has been unable to do it, how does Henry Wallace think he can improve such a lesson to be learned from divine experience and substitute a mere man-made plan of his own?

If the Senate of the United States will before it confirms the nomination of Henry A. Wallace, appoint an impartial committee to investigate Mr. Wallace's administration of the Farm Security Administration, with a view of determining what his record in action actually has been in displaying a flair for fantastic theories, or on the other hand showing practical realism, it will find all the evidence necessary to fortify its reason for rendering a verdict based on fact.

The chief guilt of our present era lies in the fact that we feel as a certainty what Omar Khyaam knew was a futility when many centuries ago he observed:

"Ah! love, could but you and I with Him conspire,
To change this sorry scheme of things, entire,
Would we not shatter it to bits
And remold it nearer to the heart's desire?"

Mr. Wallace may have a desire in his heart, but his thinking process is fatally faulty. He feels that law and the heart's desire can correct all the evils of our time.

The foregoing comprises the first, or major consideration for our serious reflection if we regard any type of government from a practical knowledge of human nature. There are others that should not be lost sight of.

A second consideration is that in estimating the value of any system of government institutions due regard must be had to the true functions of government and to the limitations imposed by nature upon what it is possible for government to accomplish. We all know, of course, that we cannot abolish all the evils in this world by statute, or by the enforcement of statutes, nor can we prevent the inexorable law of nature which decrees that suffering shall follow vice, and all the evil passions and folly of mankind. Law cannot give to depravity the rewards of virtue, to indolence the rewards of ambition, or to ignorance the rewards of learning. The utmost that government can do is measurably to protect men, not against the wrong they do themselves, but against wrong done by others, and to promote the long, slow process of educating mind and character to a better knowledge and nobler standards of life and conduct. We know all this, but when we see how much misery there is in the world and instinctively cry out against it, and when we forget how little after all it is possible

for any government to do, and to hold the particular government of the time and place to a standard of responsibility which no government can possibly meet. The chief motive power which has moved mankind along the course of development that we call the progress of civilization, has been the sum total of intelligent selfishness in a vast number of individuals, each working for his own support, his own gain, his own betterment. It is that which has cleared the forests and cultivated the fields, and built ships and railroads, made the discoveries and inventions, covered the earth with commerce, softened by intercourse the enmities of nations and races, and made possible the wonders of literature and of art. Gradually, during the long process, selfishness has grown more intelligent, with a broader view of individual benefit from the common good, and gradually the influences of nobler standards of altruism, of justice, and human sympathy have impressed themselves upon the conception of right conduct among civilized men. But the complete control of such motives will be the millenium. Any attempt to enforce a millenial standard now by law must necessarily fail, and any judgment which assumes government's responsibility to enforce such a standard must be an unjust judgment. Indeed, no such standard can ever be forced. It must come, not by superior force, but from the changed nature of man, from his willingness to be altogether just and merciful.

Also, it is not merely useless but injurious for government to attempt too much. It is manifest that to enable it to deal with the new conditions I have described, we must invest government with authority to interfere with the individual conduct of the citizen to a degree hitherto unknown in this country. When government undertakes to give the individual citizen protection by regulating the conduct of others toward him in the field where formerly he protected himself by his freedom of contract, it is limiting the liberty of the citizen whose conduct is regulated and taking a step in the direction of paternal government. While the new conditions of industrial life make it plainly necessary that many such steps shall be taken, they should be taken only so far as they are necessary and are effective. Interference with the individual liberty by government should be jealously watched and restrained, because the habit of undue interference destroys that independence of character without which in its citizens no free government can endure.

"We should not forget that while institutions receive their form from national character, they have a powerful reflex influence upon that character. Just so far as a nation allows its institutions to be molded by its weaknesses of character rather than by its strength, it creates an influence to increase weakness at the expense of strength.

"The habit of undue interference by government in private affairs breeds the habit of undue reliance upon government in private affairs at the expense of individual initiative, energy, enterprise, courage, independent manhood.

"The strength of self-government and the motive power of progress must be found in the characters of the individual citizens who make up a nation. Weaken individual character among people by comfortable reliance upon paternal government and a nation soon becomes incapable of free self-government and fit only to be governed; the higher and nobler qualities of national life that make for ideals and effort and achievement become atrophied and the nation is decadent.

"In the nature of things all government must be imperfect because men are imperfect. Every system has its shortcomings and inconveniences; and these are seen and felt as they exist in the system under which we live, while the shortcomings and inconveniences of other systems are forgotten or ignored.

"It is not unusual to see governmental methods reformed and after a time, long enough to forget the evils that caused the change, to have a new movement for a reform which consists in changing back to substantially the same old methods that were cast out by the first reform.

"The recognition of shortcomings or inconveniences in government is not by itself sufficient to warrant a change of system. There should also be an effort to estimate and compare the shortcomings and inconveniences of the system to be substituted, for although they may be different, they will certainly exist."

How true that is. The Ten Commandments of divine mandate, given to Moses on Mount Sinai, are asserted by competent philosophers to be the most compelling influence in mankind's attempt to improve abiding standards of behavior for that mankind to observe. They have been supplemented by empirical law. Yet, men are murdered in war and in peace times. This is no reason why they should be abandoned or ignored. Under the system of private enterprise, it is true that some businessmen are selfish, grasping, and unsocial in their views, and as to their responsibilities. Is this any sound reason to believe that under Henry Wallace such impulses among mankind will lose their rancid abhorrence?

There is left much for people under the American way of life to do in improving beyond any previous accomplishment of the race, the social conditions of our time. Employers of labor can cooperate to encourage industry to assume as carrying charges and overhead, many burdens having for their purpose the alleviation of human misery.

I believe such things can be accomplished, but only when industry itself can make the money to pay such charges. Certainly pump-priming contributions under the guise of Government loans cannot long endure as chaos and bankruptcy will surely result.

Another thought: The abuse of power on the part of the executive authority has been the curse of the ages. Our Constitution attempted to limit the unrestrained exercise of that power. The Congress of the United States of America, of which you are a part, is the only remaining bulwark left in our America to protect our people from its abuse. I am not concerned with the personalities involved in the now famous Montgomery Ward controversy, but I am deeply distressed over the efforts of our Government officials to use the United States Army to appropriate a wholesale and retail business engaged in supplying peacetime needs, when no such authority was ever granted by your body to engage in such a lawless act. All these things dovetail together. Because from my viewpoint the appointment of Henry Wallace will result in the egregious use and abuse of the powers of his office to a manner and extent that was never contemplated by your body when it passed the original legislation which was the sole source of authority of the official agent to act.

I started this letter for the purpose of complimenting you. In connection therewith, I felt that I owed you the duty of stating my reasons for supporting your present attitude for opposing the Wallace appointment. None of these reasons above stated may appeal to you. But in this America of ours, feeling that I know and understand what my treasured ones are fighting for in the active service of our common country's cause, I hope you will not consider it too forward of me to express without any rancor whatever, on behalf of one group of Americans, our sincere concern over what we believe is a dangerous trend in our Government's present course.

I have frequently heard Henry Wallace's personality likened unto the second coming of Jesus Christ. I have no personal objection to his wearing such righteous robes, but I do object to his being accorded the priceless privilege of wearing the lowly Nazarene's sacred sandals while he is in a position to show a record of results achieved through divine inspiration which qualifies him as a vital vice regent of the very God himself.

In view of the foregoing comments, it is my conviction that when any consideration is given by our Government to the subject of world peace or peace treaties the first and most essential and important thing to be kept in mind is that our American way of life and our opportunity for individual enterprise should be kept foremost in mind, and that no treaty or agreement of any kind should be entered into which could by any possibility submerge the American ideals and the right of the individual to develop himself in his own way and that he be particularly not subject to overwhelming and commanding state direction and bureaucratic domination.

It has been no wonder to me that the C. I. O. supported Mr. Wallace so vigorously and enthusiastically when his name was put up for Vice President.

I read this letter to a farmer friend of mine up to the end of the foregoing paragraph, with the idea of stopping there. When I had finished reading it he wanted to know in what way the American people would be better advised of the dangerous consequences of the "present trend" and what I meant by the foregoing words. I explained to him what I had in mind. When I had concluded, he told me to put the reasons for my fears of the present trend in this letter as I stated them to him. Here they are:

Let us assume that Henry Wallace possesses some well-meant idealisms and has a heart full of good intentions. In connection with this admission, what reader of this article remembers the emotional tribute by Walt Whitman to that great leader whom Lloyd George said "belongs to the ages." I quote Mr. Whitman:

"One of the best commentators of Shakespeare makes the height and aggregate of his qualities as a poet to be that he thoroughly blended the ideal with the practical or realistic. If this be so, I should say what Shakespeare did in poetic expression, Abe Lincoln essentially did in his personal and official life."

I sincerely believe that Henry Wallace wholly fails to possess those qualities which are capable of blending the high ideals with the practical or realistic in life, and in the economic world in particular. He therefore lacks the necessary qualities required to administer and direct the disposition on behalf of the American people of the huge reservoir of liquid assets belonging to them, because we know these must be carefully nurtured in view of our tremendous national debt, if private enterprise is to put in effect business policies created by it. Such a program is absolutely necessary if individual enterprise is to be permitted to so conduct its business as to employ the maximum number of people out of the wealth it will create and from its own production.

I do not regard the reappointment of Jesse Jones as essential. Some other individual may fit into the present scheme of things better than would Mr. Jones. What we do want, however, is someone who retains an absolute faith in the principles of liberalism, of Locke, Smith, et al., as they were being applied in America, and whose eyes and ambitions have not been diverted with frenzied adulation toward foreign ideological shrines. Capital and big business should not control or unduly influence the administration of the R. F. C. Some realistic man with an eye devoted to big and small business alike, with faith in an ever-expanding world, and the best ultimate interests and welfare of the

common people and the laborers to be employed, will serve America better than would the election of any man as the President of the United States at this particular time.

Does our Government wish to underwrite the failures made by the visionary optimism of so many individuals engaged in private enterprise? No government possibly could do it without dragging down to a common level every successful unit of private enterprise.

Our American way of life is what is known among historians and philosophers as western civilization, where the waters and nutrition, encouraging individual development and enterprise, have been mainly responsible not only for the growth of the tree of that western civilization but for the bountifulness of the fruits of that tree in the way of advanced standards of living for the greatest possible number of people.

Our American institutions in their manner of expressing and interpreting western civilization mean simply the foregoing objectives if they mean anything.

The tree of that civilization, together with the trees which metaphorically represent the British Commonwealths of today, stand grouped together among the trees representing other Nations' civilization, some stunted, some bearing bitter fruit, but all comprising, nevertheless, the forest containing incongruous species which we call all together our world civilization.

Such other Oriental or European trees mostly live in an atmosphere where the individual, his rights and his future activities, exist in surroundings suppressively contained in the firm steel frame and mailed grasp of state discipline and tyrannical mandate, even to the extent of liquidating the individual, if he happens to oppose the majority sentiment—a mild way of extending official murder, in order to make easy the culmination of the great cause.

What is that "cause" or "object"? I have hunted for several years now for a definition which I could reliably quote from the pen of Mr. Stalin himself. I finally found it in his book on Leninism which I possess. I quote: (study the following definition well.)

"The dictatorship of the proletariat is the domination of the proletariat under the bourgeoisie, untrammeled by law, based on violence, and enjoying the sympathy and support of the toiling masses. Democracy under the capitalistic system is the democracy of the exploiting minority."

Charles Beard is our greatest living and most highly respected United States historian He has from time to time attacked and bitterly denounced here and there evidences of the mal-exercise of power by, and the greed of, certain capitalists, just as he still condemns murder as a violation of the Ten Commandments. He has witnessed through the power of influence of public opinion alone the enactment in 1913 of a Federal income tax revenue measure imposing a tax of 2 percent on certain individual's, corporation's, and partnership's incomes. (It is interesting to recollect that the famous attorney, Mr. Choate, bitterly argued the unconstitutionality of this act before the Supreme Court of the United States on the major ground that if Congress could impose a 2 percent tax for the aforesaid purposes, it could later on increase such tax to 10 or 20 percent of the income described in the foregoing legislation, and this, in Mr. Choate's judgment, would amount to confiscation.) Since the enactment of that legislation Mr. Beard had observed a depletion of estates by inheritance-tax exaction, and of yearly incomes by taxes thereon, until today, in excess of 90 percent of the largest of incomes, and inherited estates, may be legally set aside and extracted for Government use and expenditure. Mr. Beard has likewise witnessed the elimination of many abuses of power covertly exercised in our administration of government because of the influence of civilian public opinion. He has likewise studied national and world trends of the various nations existing in the world today, and has a more complete understanding of the historical backgrounds and dynamisms of the several nations in this troubled world of ours than any other single man in America today.

What was his written warning to our western civilization as expressed briefly by him about a year ago? I quote:

"Whatever may be the future of international relations, most Americans, I take it, will agree that our Republic, including all the values connected with it, is to be maintained and that the civilization which it represents (western) is to be continually advanced."

How can this advice be followed if our Government in America is merged in any way, internationally, with Mr. Stalin's, or how can this advice be followed if we stand by and permit the experimentation with bureaucratic schemes of state domination and control by bureau mandates which belong in Russia and should find no root for nourishment or encouragement in this American soil or ours?

In his early days, Mr. Stalin directed the killing with dynamite of guardians of government money in order to steal such money. His present foreign Vice Commissar, Maxim Litvinoff, was jailed for passing some of this "hot" money. Mr. Stalin enforced the edict of government by men over men as opposed to a government of laws to be enforced impartially and under the rules of justice for observance by every individual alike. When Kerensky, who believed in democracy, came into power in Russia, the great Democrat released Stalin from an Arctic prison camp only to find himself fleeing 6 months later in undisguised fear of being summarily disposed of by the very prisoner to whom he had extended mercy and freedom.

Mr. Stalin proceeded to denounce democracy and to begin immediately the construction of the socialist state, and gave instructions to his monolithic party to bring to immediate culmination a totalitarian governing body. He packed every bureau of brutal authority with his personal henchmen. He knew that the chief dynamism of socialism was more and more control by the state over the individual, knowing full well that after this single, sole party obtained complete control, the state as such would wither away and that every person within its dominion would be at the complete mercy of the party without any established constitutional rights to protect them. What provision did he make for free speech, free press, and the protection of the minority? His record is the best evidence. The minorities who have opposed him have either been jailed, exiled, or killed. As individuals they could claim no civil liberties whatever, nor religious liberties, either, for that matter. He has murdered thousands of prosperous peasants (Sulaks), and has starved to death by withholding wheat from 3,600,000 peasants who sincerely objected to collectivism, and in the great purge, brutally liquidated a million Communists who opposed his policies. His orgies became so bloody Lady Astor was moved, exasperatingly, to interrogate him as follows: "When are you going to stop killing people?" Unabashed, he snapped back: "When it is no longer necessary." His henchmen, under his direction dictated the policies, editorials, and news appearing in every newspaper published in his realm. Is it any wonder a prominent Russian observed recently in the United States of America: "You have to read the American newspapers to learn what is really going on in Russia."

At this point I think there should be pointed out the distinguishing contrast in habit, custom, and method of preserving objectives between western and oriental or European civilization. In the first place, what we have always called our Colonial Revolution was, generally speaking, no revolution at all. We accepted the common law of England, with certain limitation, when we adopted the Constitution of the United States, and the Magna Carta of England is revered in America, just as it is in England. We are traditionists, pure and simple. In other words, the habits and customs of centuries became traditions with us after a long, long time. Revolutions, scientifically defined, as applied to government, mean a complete change or turning upside down. While we in America might have dug a new channel, we diverted the same pure waters of liberty and individual rights as our English forefathers did.

Constitutional government, a government of laws, identifies and distinguishes the governments comprising western civilizations. England has an unwritten constitution based on the habits and customs long established by a homogeneous people, but it is a constitution just the same. When Washington frowned on military dictatorship, and thereafter presided at the convention which framed the Constitution of the United States, he left no doubt as to where he stood on the subject, because he knew the danger of the undelegated use of power. How wise and statesmanlike he was. A recent incident will explain his vision and wisdom. Much hullabaloo and personal controversy have been raised over the military seizure without court authority of the Montgomery Ward Co. The case, after the seizure, finally was decided in Judge Phillip Sullivan's Federal court in Chicago. He held that it was simply a question as to whether the people's representatives in Congress (including yourself) had by legislation delegated such power to the President. He held the mere fact that Congress had authorized the taking over of industries engaged in production of certain articles considered necessary to supply the armed services of the United States under certain situations, did not cover a civilian enterprise, not engaged in such production, but devoted to distributing goods, wares, and merchandise after they had been produced by others and wholly sold for civilian consumption. It took just a whole lot of Irish guts on the part of the Honorable Phillip Sullivan, appointee of President Roosevelt now serving on the Federal bench at Chicago, to bow at the shrine of sheer patriotism and devotion to the Constitution and hold that the power which the Chief Executive attempted to exercise through the military department of our Government, was not granted by the Congress of the United States. His decision was clearly right.

For some years now we citizens of America have been successively feeling and inhaling the smothering effects of bureaucratic domination and regimentation in this Government of ours. The words quoted from the lips of Mr. Wallace near the beginning of this letter show plainly where he stands in connection with his peaceful effort to dominate, shackle, and strait jacket the citizenship and especially the farmers of America in order to enforce his idealism on them.

What does his elevation to the position of Secretary of Commerce and dominating head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation mean to the average citizen in America? Let us reflect a moment. We are now told on good authority that the R. F. C. alone has in its possession and control $45,000,000,000 in assets belonging to us and which we as taxpayers have made possible. Roughly speaking this amounts to $1,000 for every family existing in America. The average head of a family knows what it means to work and by the use of thrift and sacrifice, save $1,000. I am quite sure if this fact were brought home to the various heads of the families in America, and they were asked for an opinion as to whether Mr. Wallace's nomination for the foregoing position should

be confirmed or rejected, they would study a long time before deciding to let their $1,000 interest in the huge reservoir of national assets be handled by Henry Wallace. He has already testified before your body. He is going to provide jobs whether or not and he is not interested particularly in whether the so-called private enterprise he expects to underwrite makes money or not, so long as it provides jobs. My prediction is that if he should be placed at the head of the R. F. C. he will be encouraging a lot of so-called private enterprises which will compete with private enterprises already in existence, and which are self-supporting, and pay their own way. The result will be chaos, even among our most prosperous private enterprise establishments. We have some pretty strong individualists in this State, Senator JOHNSON, and also the biggest percentage of independent voters north of the Mason and Dixon line. It has not done Mr. Wallace's cause much good in Colorado when fathers and mothers of sons and daughters engaged in real tough war service read that he was a guest of Sidney Hillman and the latter's Political Action Committee, and sympath'zers in New York City the other night, and went all out in explaining his ideological notions, ably supported by the personal presence and enthusiastic hand-clapping of Eleanor Roosevelt, the while fortified with a telegram of 1,000-percent backing in anything Mr. Wallace wanted to do, signed by the President himself.

Sidney Hillman, the host of Mr. Wallace at the New York banquet, is now abroad encouraging the formation of an international labor organization. It will be interesting to learn how the Russian labor organizations which are a part of Mr. Stalin's government and are under his complete domination, will be able to adjust their philosophies to those of our western civilization?

To put it in another way: If Henry Wallace is confirmed as head of the R. F. C., gone forever is the business formula by which America has reached the most stupendous heights ever reached by any nation in any economic world. That formula simply stated is:

(a) To make or produce things and services for people, and through mass production, reduce the cost, thus extending the purchase range among the greatest possible number of customers or patrons;

(b) To provide jobs for people; and

(c) To make profits for the owners.

(d) Such profits to be taxes for social purposes.

I contend that America has been able to supply the demand for taxes for social purposes solely because of the ingenuity and aptness of our leaders in private enterprise who have produced these profits, without which so much humanitarian and social advancement could not have been attained. We have become so paralyzed in our thinking while self-indulging and experimenting with borrowed money that we have become unmindful of the age-old warning, "Pay as you go," because we are fast approaching the time where, like an Irish blackthorn club, it will hit us squarely between the eyes. All one needs to do is to remember that after the present war ends we shall owe at least 10 times the amount of the indebtedness resulting from the last war. We may adjust our food, clothing, and housing requirements to fix a shrinking income, but we cannot avoid a fixed Government overhead 10 times greater than the one that eventually faced us after the last war and bore us down.

If Mr. Wallace becomes head of the R. F. C., there is no question but that Sidney Hillman will write into every contract of employment the unilateral provisions thereof, when any industry owned or controlled by the R. F. C., or which is a heavy debtor thereto, with the ultimate result that the sensibility and faith of the average American in our western civilization will be shocked and tormented to a degree not now capable of estimation. Their ultimate resentment will be shock producing. I know you will probably not agree with many things I have said, but I cannot resist the temptation first to give you every encouragement possible in the stand you have taken. I also felt it was an obligation of true sportsmanship to advise you frankly and in detail of my reasons for opposing Mr. Wallace's confirmation. More power to you. I am not exaggerating the fact at all when I say to you that, according to the sentiments that have been so frequently expressed to me by Colorado citizens, Republicans and Democrats alike, they are overwhelmingly behind you in the stand you have taken. I also believe a respect for your past and present courage will increase as time goes on and that in Colorado's future history you will be appraised as one of her all-time foremost statesmen among both the Democratic and Republican Parties alike.

We started out in these United States to preserve civilian supremacy over the threat of a possible military dictatorship. That civilian supremacy has survived, but today, as never before, it faces the threat of bureaucratic supremacy which has a way of insulating itself from the will of the people and is beyond the direct reach of their ballots because bureaucratic officials are appointed and not elected officers. When the American people learn that in a republic bureaus, masquerading as benefactors of our citizenship, can bring about totalitarianism and a regimentation of the individual, it will not take them long to obstruct the trend. The people whose sons and daughters are daily risking their lives on far-flung battle fronts to preserve the American way of life are conscientiously reappraising the real values of that way of life, and when they get intelligently oriented this America of ours will steer a safe, sane course.

The valiant course you are taking in stemming the trend toward State regimentation stamps you and your record as one of the outstanding contributions made by any American statesman of our time.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES J. MOYNIHAN.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., February 15, 1945.

Mr. CHARLES J. MOYNIHAN,
Attorney at Law, Montrose, Colo.

DEAR CHARLES: I have read your letter respecting the confirmation of Henry A. Wallace with deep interest and wholehearted approval insofar as it applies to the R. F. C. and other lending agencies. When the Hoover administration created the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, they created an instrument which with a little more courage and vision might have averted the acuteness of the depression. They applied its almost limitless possibilities with such fear and trembling that the New Deal became inevitable. Our mutual friend, Wilson McCarthy, who was on the Reconstruction Finance Board, at that time agrees with me with respect to the foregoing.

From the very first the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been in the hands of safe and sound businessmen. Congress, as confidence in it grew, has entrusted it with more and more power until at the present time it can control American industry if so inclined.

The Wallace crowd were quick to see this, and they put over some fast and furious political maneuvering that has equalled anything the world has yet seen in the line of political intrigue. Apparently the President became obligated to them and was their victim. He extricated himself by the most awkward and naive, yet politically shrewd, letter ever written by any President of the United States. Mr. Roosevelt is too smart to not have had a purpose in the shocking disclosures of his letter to Jesse Jones. I think that he deliberately wrote it on the sour note of political machinations to call an alarming situation to the attention of the Senate and the country.

Congress made a tragic mistake when it gave the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the power of life and death over the economy of this country and an even greater mistake when it placed it in the President's Cabinet. In the hands of Jesse Jones that power was not abused, but even so in a democracy, such power should not be held by any man.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that in the Senate vote on the Wallace confirmation, nine Republicans voted for Wallace; one gave up his vote to pair with an absent Democratic Wallace supporter; and one Republican who was absent was announced as supporting Henry Wallace. Thus one out of every three Republicans was a Wallace supporter.

A partisan political matter, spelled out by the President as "ward politics," is before the Senate for approval, and the Republicans did not rally as one man to oppose it. In fact, every third Republican supported this open-spoils system politics and this threat to our traditional free enterprise system, which has made America the wonder Nation of the world. The case is clear. Congress must take the tremendous power centered in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation out of the President's Cabinet and place close congressional safeguards about it.

The pressure on Democratic Senators to confirm Wallace was tremendous, but enough of us stood pat until it was agreed to remove the control of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation from the Department of Commerce. When this is done by law, Wallace will be confirmed Secretary without much trouble, since many Senators who do not support the Wallace political philosophy feel that any President should have a Cabinet of his choosing.

In your lengthy and painstaking analysis of the issues involved, you have brought forth an unanswerable and overwhelming argument against the confirmation of Mr. Wallace to control the greatest banking institution ever to exist on earth—the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I am grateful to you for your comprehensive and ably documented statement.

Sincerely,

E. C. JOHNSON.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in view of the remarks of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], I should like to insert in the RECORD a statement regarding the seven nominations of Cabinet officers which have been rejected by the Senate since very early days:

First, Roger B. Taney, of Maryland, was nominated by President Jackson as Secretary of the Treasury, and the nomination was rejected on June 24, 1834.

Caleb Cushing, of Massachusetts, was nominated by President Tyler to be Secretary of the Treasury. His nomination was three times submitted to the Senate, and was three times rejected, all on March 3, 1843.

David Henshaw, of Massachusetts, was nominated by President Tyler to be Secretary of the Navy. His nomination was rejected on January 15, 1844.

James Madison Porter, of Pennsylvania, was nominated by President Tyler to be Secretary of War, and his nomination was rejected on January 30, 1844.

James S. Green, of New Jersey, was nominated by President Tyler to be Secretary of the Treasury, and his nomination was rejected on June 15, 1844.

Henry Stanbery, of Ohio, was nominated by President Johnson to be Attorney General, and his nomination was rejected on June 2, 1868.

Charles Beecher Warren, of Michigan, was on two occasions nominated by President Coolidge to be Attorney General. His first nomination, made on March 5, 1925, was rejected on March 10, 1925. He was again nominated on March 12, 1925, and his nomination was again rejected on March 16, 1925.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I do not gather that the Senator from Ohio intended his statement as an indication of the incorrectness of my statement regarding what has been done in the past century, since only two of the instances he has cited come within the past century, and in both those instances question was raised as to whether the private interests of the individual would not suggest prejudice in the performance of his public duty.

I think the practice of this century may well invite the sympathetic consideration of the Senate when we recognize the hundreds of men who have served during that period and the number of very violent social and economic disagreements which undoubtedly have occurred during the many turbulent periods which have transpired.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Henry A. Wallace, of Iowa, to be Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. HILL and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. BROOKS' name was called). On this vote the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is paired with the senior Senator from that State [Mr. LUCAS]. My understanding is that, if present, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] would vote "yea," and the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], if permitted to vote, would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a delegate to the Inter-American Conference in Mexico and therefore is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES] would vote "yea."

The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is paired with his colleague [Mr. BROOKS]. If present and voting, the senior Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the junior Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on official business as a delegate to the Inter-American Conference in Mexico.

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—56

Aiken	Hatch	Myers
Bailey	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hill	Overton
Bankhead	Hoey	Pepper
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Brewster	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Briggs	La Follette	Shipstead
Chandler	Langer	Taylor
Chavez	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McMahon	Tobey
Ellender	Magnuson	Tunnell
Fulbright	Maybank	Tydings
George	Mead	Wagner
Gerry	Mitchell	Walsh
Green	Morse	Wheeler
Guffey	Murdock	Wilson
Hart	Murray	

NAYS—32

Bridges	Gurney	Robertson
Buck	Hawkes	Smith
Burton	Hickenlooper	Stewart
Bushfield	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McKellar	Vandenberg
Capehart	Millikin	Wherry
Capper	Moore	White
Cordon	O'Daniel	Wiley
Donnell	Reed	Willis
Ferguson	Revercomb	

NOT VOTING—8

Andrews	Connally	Moses
Austin	Glass	Scrugham
Brooks	Lucas	

So the nomination of Henry A. Wallace, of Iowa, to be Secretary of Commerce was confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to state the further nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified at once of all confirmations of today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

PROPOSED DEFERMENT OF COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN FROM MILITARY SERVICE

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, last week I introduced a joint resolution to amend the Selective Service Act so as to place commercial fishermen in the same category with agricultural laborers under the Tydings amendment. I hope the Senate will give serious consideration to the joint resolution, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point my reasons for introducing the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reasons for the joint resolution to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing extension of liability.

The so-called Tydings amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as approved November 13, 1942, has provided for the deferment of those persons who are regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation. The wording of the law follows:

"(k) Every registrant found by a selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort, shall be deferred from training and service in the land and naval forces so long as he remains so engaged and until such time as a satisfactory replacement can be obtained: *Provided*, That should any such person leave such occupation or endeavor, except for induction into the land or naval forces under this act, his selective-service local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), shall reclassify such registrant in a class immediately as available for military service, unless prior to leaving such occupation or endeavor he requests such local board to determine, and such local board, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2), determines, that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation of endeavor for other work."

When the Tydings amendment was adopted it had become increasingly apparent that a continued and unlimited induction of farmers and farm laborers into the armed forces would endanger the necessary food supply for the United States.

At the time the Tydings amendment was discussed in Congress nothing was said about the importance of commercial fishing and fishing industries.

The following data should be kept in mind:

In 1940, 4,200,000,000 pounds of fish were consumed in the United States, while the consumption of meat was 18,700,000,000 pounds. This ratio of about 23:100 has changed tremendously. According to the Office of Price Administration's statistics, 127 pounds of meat will be available per person in 1945 as compared with 148 pounds available in 1944. The difference has to be made good by other foodstuffs, of which fish is the most important.

The fishery industries already, until now, did a tremendous job to fill the increased demands under constantly decreasing manpower. From 84,000 regular fishermen and until March 1944, about 20,000 went to the armed forces, about 10,000 were absorbed by other war industries. In the time from March 1944 to December 1944 about 9,000 more fishermen have been drafted. It is estimated that today only 45,000 men have remained out of the original 84,000. While in peacetime the average fisherman caught about 33,000 pounds of fish per year, the War Food Administration requires the remaining men to catch about 117,000 pounds of fish. The production for 1944 shows that each remaining fisherman caught about 95,000 pounds of fish in that year.

In the past only scarce recognition was given by the national headquarters of the Selective Service System to the importance of the fishery industries. As long as Local Board Memorandum No. 115 did not make distinctions as to age groups (it was before May 12, 1944), commercial fishing was considered as an essential activity being formally on the same level with agriculture but not having the specific protection which was expressed in the Tydings amendment. When on May 12, 1944, local board memorandum was amended, the age groups 26 to 29 and 30 to 37 were fairly protected by the provision that such registrant may be retained or placed in a deferred classification if found to be necessary to and regularly engaged in activities in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or if they are found to be necessary and regularly engaged in activities in war production. The deferment of men under 26 years of age became difficult. As a result of several meetings of the interagency committee of the War Manpower Commission, captains and engineers of vessels over 10 gross tons were made eligible for deferment,

altogether about 475 keymen, if they were certified by the Office of the Coordinator of Fisheries.

As the situation stands today, these 475 keymen and 4,475 skilled fishermen are threatened by induction. The loss of a captain or engineer means in many cases the lay-up of a vessel with a crew of some five to twelve men. If one takes an average lay-up of only 7 men, the loss for the fishery industries would be about 316,000,000 pounds estimated production and 389,000,000 pounds of production as required by the War Food Administration. The men in the 26–30 age group have recently been reclassified as I–A as far as they are physically fit. There are about 4,475 men in this age group. Their induction would probably mean an additional loss of 425,000,000 pounds of estimated production and 523,000,000 pounds production as required by the War Food Administration. Altogether the induction of these men would cut present production by about 25 percent if one places the estimates on a simple direct calculation of projected production figures multiplied by the number of fishermen. Not reflected in these figures is the considerably greater average productivity of the younger men.

If the fishermen, captains, and engineers in question will be inducted in the armed forces, the production of fish probably will be in 1945 about 3,000,000,000 pounds, as compared to the 5,200,000,000 pounds set as a goal by the War Food Administration and as compared to the 4,200,000,000 pounds actual production, 1944.

There seems to be no other way of protecting the national interests but by the enactment of legislation. The national headquarters of the Selective Service System in many cases could not, and will not, give the recognition to the fishery industries which seems to be neceessary. The national headquarters of the Selective Service System leaves to the local draft boards and appeal boards to determine whether a man above 26 is necessary to and regularly engaged in activities in support of the national interests if he is in a fishery occupation. (Only if an appeal board's vote is split, appeal to the Presidential appeal board is possible.) The local draft boards vary in their appreciation of the fishery industries. There are sometimes occupational preferences and predilections and in some areas there is antagonism between farmer and fishermen, between fishery industries and war industries. Despite the best intention of the national headquarters of the Selective Service System, which reviews selected cases submitted by the Coordinator of Fisheries, until now no unified ruling could be reached and in many cases men have been inducted before appropriate steps could be taken at the national level.

The fishermen are small in number but rich in production. According to a testimony of Dr. Robert F. Griggs, chairman of the division of biology and agriculture of the National Research Council, before the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries (Union Calendar No. 693, p. 2), no farmer can produce as much as a fisherman can produce. From the testimony of Dr. Griggs the following may be quoted:

"The most productive form of animal industry is in producing pork, and the area in which the most pork is produced is in the Corn Belt. An Iowa farmer on 160 acres can produce about 50,000 pounds of live weight of pork per year. The crew of a trawler off the banks of Newfoundland will bring in, averaging in the year, 200,000 pounds of cod and other fish. That is four times as much live weight food as the Iowa farmer can produce.

"Last year in the California pilchard industry the product per man was 500,000 pounds. That is 10 times as much food as the most productive farm industry can produce."

If by the amendment to the Selective Service Act protection is sought for the fishery industries, it is merely done in the national interest which is at stake under the present shortage of meat and under the constant extension of the theaters of war, which means a greater need of food which can be appropriately preserved and transported over wide areas and which in great quantities can be made available to the armed forces and to the civilian population in foreign countries far distant from America. We think that it is in the public interest that the Congress take the necessary steps to exempt from the draft the comparatively few fishermen left in the draft age.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the hour, it is not desired to resume today the consideration of the so-called manpower bill. Therefore, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, March 2, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 1 (legislative day of February 26), 1945:

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

William T. Sherwood, of Washington, D. C., to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, to fill an existing vacancy.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

George A. Cook, of Illinois, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1948. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

Assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons, effective dates indicated:

Walter B. Quisenberry, April 18, 1945.
Alfred H. Lawton, April 17, 1945.
Henry D. Ecker, April 10, 1945.
Philip H. Best, August 8, 1944.
William R. Rosanoff, March 3, 1945.

Passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons, effective March 6, 1945:

Harry Eagle
Carroll E. Palmer
George H. Hunt

Passed assistant surgeons to be temporary surgeons, effective February 1, 1945:

Selwyn H. Drummond	John C. Grier, Jr.
James L. Baker	Benjamin Wolfman
Richard K. Winston	James M. Hundley
John F. Oesterle	Robert E. Miller

Temporary surgeon to be temporary senior surgeon, effective February 1, 1945:

Harold R. Sandstead

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Emery Ernest Alling, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 1, 1945.

Maj. John Allison Worrell, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 15, 1945.

PHARMACY CORPS

To be captains

First Lt. Bernard Korn, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 4, 1945.

First Lt. Ennis Dallas Sandberg, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major), with rank from March 4, 1945.

First Lt. James Thomas Richards, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 4, 1945.

CHAPLAINS

To be captains

Chaplain (First Lt.) Alfred Charles Longley, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from March 7, 1945.

Chaplain (First Lt.) Maury Hundley, Jr., United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from March 9, 1945.

Chaplain (First Lt.) John Porter Fellows, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from March 21, 1945.

IN THE NAVY

Pay Director Horace D. Nuber to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, to continue while serving as assistant chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

Pay Director William J. Carter to be paymaster general and chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CALIFORNIA

Frances A. Osterhout, Planada, Calif., in place of J. W. Wilson, resigned.

Ruth C. Parker, Rivera, Calif., in place of G. E. Curley, resigned.

Dorothy M. Lyon, Springville, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

COLORADO

Hinton H. Hunter, Lamar, Colo., in place of E. H. Applegate, Jr. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1942.

DELAWARE

Roy R. Veasey, Farnhurst, Del. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

GEORGIA

William Haralson Simons, Social Circle, Ga., in place of Jessie Gunter, deceased.

Edgar J. Stapleton, Stapleton, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

ILLINOIS

Harris L. Bone, Bethany, Ill., in place of V. D. Snyder, transferred.

Frank F. Donagh, Compton, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Walter F. Wilbourn, Olive Branch, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Herbert Shibe, Winchester, Ill., in place of J. R. King, resigned.

IOWA

Bernard F. Welsh, Charles City, Iowa, in place of T. C. Kelly, resigned.

Cleone E. Holscher, Ladora, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

John Blake, Polk City, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

KANSAS

Sue V. Hemphill, Clay Center, Kans., in place of B. F. Hemphill, resigned.

Fred R. Wilson, Jetmore, Kans., in place of S. J. Abbott, transferred.

Clarence M. Fitzwilliam, Wichita, Kans., in place of J. B. Riddle, retired.

KENTUCKY

Maud Comer, Gamaliel, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Forest E. Jordan, Germantown, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Pansy Music, Seco, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MARYLAND

Raymond W. Noble, Frederalsburg, Md., in place of J. A. Johnson, transferred.

MICHIGAN

Mabel D. Hartman, Baroda, Mich., in place of M. P. Ladwig, deceased.

Kathleen I. Adams, Lachine, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Martha Compeau, Munger, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MISSOURI

Horace Walker Ames, De Soto, Mo., in place of R. W. Marsden, resigned.
Louis P. Hubert, Florissant, Mo., in place of A. M. Pondrom, transferred.
Burl P. Mitchell, Seligman, Mo., in place of Z. S. Northcutt, transferred.

MONTANA

Martha P. McCrory, Kevin, Mont., in place of E. C. Hockman, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Richard F. McMahon, Montclair, N. J., in place of P. J. Egan, resigned.
Edward J. Jennings, Trenton, N. J., in place of J. M. Carson, deceased.

NEW YORK

George E. Hlavac, Bohemia, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

NORTH DAKOTA

Harold R. McKechnie, Calvin, N. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OKLAHOMA

Myrl J. Finch, Tupelo, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ann K. Hunt, Darlington, Pa., in place of A. K. Hunt, resigned.
Edla N. Huffman, Marshalls Creek, Pa., in place of Norman Huffman, deceased.
Orvilla M. Hardican, Secane, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Goldie H. Wright, Wind Ridge, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

PUERTO RICO

Maria C. Abraham, Aibonito, P. R., in place of N. O. Lebron, retired.

RHODE ISLAND

Mildred B. Beaudreau, West Kingston, R. I., in place of G. S. Groome, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Leona H. Becket, Nisland, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

TENNESSEE

Sam Spencer, Burns, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Creed B. Shockley, Spencer, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Etta E. Jones, Strawberry Plains, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

TEXAS

Fred C. Bogs, Hufsmith, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

VIRGINIA

Glessie L. Martin, Big Stone Gap, Va., in place of I. C. Taylor, deceased.
Joseph D. Murden, Londonbridge, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WASHINGTON

Wayne Ballard, Cle Elum, Wash., in place of H. W. Kreidel, resigned.
Leon O. Boling, McCleary, Wash., in place of Leonard McCleary, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Alice B. Kidd, Bufnwell, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Willie I. Shaver, Handley, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

WISCONSIN

Frank P. McManman, Wisconsin Dells, Wis., in place of F. P. McManman. Incumbent's commission expired July 12, 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 1 (legislative day of February 26), 1945:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce.

POSTMASTERS

MAINE

H. Emily Cunningham, Damariscotta Mills.

NEW YORK

Martin E. Couillou, East Northport.
Jess J. Lantry, Hogansburg.
Daniel P. Doran, Jordan.

OKLAHOMA

Goldie R. Strain, Wann.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 1 (legislative day of February 26), 1945:

POSTMASTER

KENTUCKY

J. Logan Warren to be postmaster at McHenry, in the State of Kentucky.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 1, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our blessed Galilean Master, as we follow Thy teaching, grant that we may be duty-minded, that we may love people and strive to meet their deepest needs. As advance guards of the forces of light and good will, help us to leaven the lives of those whom we touch. In the midst of these perverse times, when men are ground down under the heel of tyranny, O let us hear the voice of Him crying in the wilderness: "Prepare ye the way of the Lord and make straight His paths." Let us adorn our position by living the truth in beauty, blameless, without reproach; may it be seen by the bowed head and the wounded spirit and in equality of sacrifice, and thus magnify our influence before the world.

Our Heavenly Father, we are grateful and rejoice for the safe return of our President, who gives of himself for the liberties of the embattled peoples. Graciously bless him with all that he needs to face life quietly, bravely, and triumphantly; and Thine shall be the praise. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatlin, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of the Congress on Thursday, March 1, 1945.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to order entered yesterday, the Chair declares a recess of the House subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE

At 12 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper, Mr. Ralph R. Roberts, announced the Vice President of the United States and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Members of the House rose.

The Senate, preceded by the Vice President and by their Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT took the chair at the right of the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On behalf of the House, the Chair appoints the following Members of the House as a committee to escort the President into the Chamber: The gentlemen from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] as a committee on the part of the Senate to conduct the President into the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m. the Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President entered the Chamber and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m. the President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House amidst prolonged applause.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCORMACK). Senators and Representatives, I have the great pleasure, the high privilege, and the distinguished honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES BEFORE A JOINT SESSION OF THE SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE SUBJECT OF THE YALTA CONFERENCE

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Vice President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress, I hope you will pardon me for the unusual posture of sitting down during the presentation of what I wish to say, but I know you will realize it makes it a lot easier for me in not having to carry about 10 pounds of steel around the bottom of my legs [laughter] and also because of the fact I have just completed a 14,000-mile trip. [Applause.]

First of all, I want to say that it is good to be home. It has been a long journey and, I hope you will also agree, so far a fruitful one.

Speaking in all frankness, the question of whether it is entirely fruitful or not lies to a great extent in your hands, for unless you here in the Halls of the American Congress, with the support of the American people concur in the general

conclusions reached at that place called Yalta, and give them your active support, the meeting will not have produced lasting results. And that is why I have come before you at the earliest hour I could after my return. I want to make a personal report to you and at the same time to the people of the country.

Many months of earnest work are ahead of us all, and I should like to feel that when the last stone is laid on the structure of international peace it will be an achievement toward which all of us in America have worked steadfastly and unselfishly together.

I am returning from this trip that took me so far, refreshed and inspired. I was well the entire time. I was not ill for a second until I arrived back in Washington, and here I heard all of the rumors which had occurred in my absence. [Laughter.] Yes; I returned from the trip refreshed and inspired. The Roosevelts are not, as you may suspect, averse to travel [laughter]; we seem to thrive on it. [Applause.]

And far away as I was, I was kept constantly informed of affairs in the United States. The modern miracles of rapid communication have made this world very small. We must always bear in mind that fact when we speak or think of international relations. I received a steady stream of messages from Washington, I might say from not only the executive branch with all its departments, but also from the legislative branch in its two departments; and except where radio silence was necessary for security purposes I could continuously send messages any place in the world; and, of course, in a grave emergency we could even have risked the breaking of the security rule.

I come from the Crimean Conference with a firm belief that we have made a good start on the road to a world of peace. There were two main purposes in this Crimean Conference: the first was to bring defeat to Germany with the greatest possible speed and the smallest possible loss of Allied men. That purpose is now being carried out in great force. The Germany Army, the German people are feeling the ever-increasing might of our fighting men and of the Allied Armies; and every hour gives us added pride in the heroic advance of our troops in Germany on German soil toward a meeting with the gallant Red Army.

The second purpose was to continue to build the foundation for an international accord that would bring order and security after the chaos of the war, that would give some assurance of lasting peace among the nations of the world. Toward that goal a tremendous stride was made.

At Tehran a little over a year ago there were long-range military plans laid by the Chiefs of Staff of the three most powerful nations. Among the civilian leaders at Tehran, however, at that time there were only exchanges of views and expressions of opinion. No political arrangements were made, and none was attempted.

At the Crimean Conference, however, the time had come for getting down to specific cases in the political field.

There was on all sides at this Conference an enthusiastic effort to reach an agreement. Since the time of Tehran, a year ago, there had developed among all of us—what shall I call it?—a greater facility in negotiating with each other that augurs well for the peace of the world; we know each other better.

I have never for an instant wavered in my belief that an agreement to insure world peace and security can be reached.

There were a number of things that we did that were concrete, that were definite; for instance, the lapse of time between Tehran and Yalta without conferences of representatives, of civilian representatives of the three major powers, has proved to be too long—14 months. During that long period local problems were permitted to become acute in places like Poland, Greece, Italy, and Yugoslavia.

Therefore, we decided at Yalta that even if circumstances made it impossible for the heads of the three governments to meet more often in the future, we would make sure that there would be more frequent personal contacts for exchange of views between the secretaries of state and the foreign ministers of these three powers.

We arranged for periodic meetings at intervals of 3 or 4 months. I feel very confident that under this arrangement there will be no recurrences of the incidents which this winter disturbed the friends of world-wide cooperation and collaboration.

When we met at Yalta, in addition to laying out strategic and tactical plans for the complete and final military victory over Germany, there were other problems of vital political consequence.

For instance, first there was the problem of the occupation and control of Germany after victory, the complete destruction of her military power, and the assurance that neither nazi-ism nor Prussian militarism could again be revived to threaten the peace and civilization of the world. [Applause.]

Secondly, again for example, there was the settlement of the few differences that remained among us with respect to the international security organization after the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. As you remember, at that time and afterward, I said we had agreed 90 percent. That is a pretty good percentage. I think the other 10 percent was ironed out at Yalta.

Thirdly, there were the general political and economic problems common to all of the areas that would be in the future, or which have been liberated from the Nazi yoke. We over here find it very difficult to understand the ramifications of many of these problems in foreign lands, but we are trying to.

Fourth, there were the special problems created by Poland and Yugoslavia.

Days were spent in discussing these momentous matters, and we argued freely and frankly across the table. But at the end on every point unanimous agreement was reached. And more important even than the agreement of words, I may say we achieved a unity of thought and a way of getting along together. [Applause.]

We know, of course, that it was Hitler's hope and the German war lords' hope that we would not agree—that some slight crack might appear in the solid wall of Allied unity, a crack that would give him and his fellow gangsters one last hope of escaping their just doom. That is the objective for which his propaganda machine has been working for many months. But Hitler has failed. [Applause.]

Never before have the major allies been more closely united—not only in their war aims but also in their peace aims. And they are determined to continue to be united, to be united with each other—and with all peace-loving nations—so that the ideal of lasting peace will become a reality.

The Soviet, and British, and United States Chiefs of Staff held daily meetings with each other. They conferred frequently with Marshal Stalin, Prime Minister Churchill, and with me on the problem of coordinating the strategic and tactical efforts of the Allied Powers. They completed their plans for the final knock-out blows to Germany.

At the time of the Tehran Conference, the Russian front, for instance, was removed so far from the American and British fronts that, while certain long-range strategic cooperation was possible, there could be no tactical, day-by-day coordination. They were too far apart. But Russian troops have now crossed Poland. They are fighting on the eastern soil of Germany herself; British and American troops are now on German soil close to the Rhine River in the west. It is a different situation today from what it was 14 months ago. A closer tactical liaison has become possible for the first time in Europe. That was something else that was accomplished in the Crimean Conference.

Provision was made for daily exchange of information between the armies under the command of General Eisenhower on the Western front and those armies under the command of the Soviet marshals on that long Eastern front, and also with our armies in Italy—without the necessity of going through the Chiefs of Staff in Washington or London as in the past.

You have seen one result of this exchange of information in the recent bombings by American and English aircraft of points which are directly related to the Russian advance on Berlin.

From now on, American and British heavy bombers will be used—in the day-by-day tactics of the war. We have begun to realize, I think, that there is all the difference in the world between tactics on the one side and strategy on the other—day-by-day tactical war in direct support of Soviet armies as well as in the support of our own on the Western front.

They are now engaged in bombing and strafing in order to hamper the movement of German reserves, German materials to the Eastern and Western fronts from other parts of Germany or from Italy.

Arrangements have been made for the most effective distribution of all available material and transportation to the places where they can best be used in

the combined war effort—American, British, and Russian.

The details of these plans and arrangements are military secrets, of course; but this tying of things in together is going to hasten the day of the final collapse of Germany. The Nazis are learning about some of them already, to their sorrow, and I think all three of us at the conference felt that they will learn more about them tomorrow, and the next day, and the day after that. [Applause.]

There will be no respite from these attacks. We will not desist for one moment until unconditional surrender. [Applause.]

You know, I have always felt that common sense prevails in the long run—quiet, over-night thinking. I think that is true in Germany just as much as it is here. The German people as well as the German soldiers must realize that the sooner—the sooner they give up and surrender—surrender by groups or as individuals, the sooner their present agony will be over. They must realize that only with complete surrender can they begin to reestablish themselves as people whom the world might accept as decent neighbors.

We made it clear again at Yalta, and I now repeat—that unconditional surrender does not mean the destruction or enslavement of the German people. The Nazi leaders have deliberately withheld that part of the Yalta declaration from the German press and radio. They seek to convince the people of Germany that the Yalta declaration does mean slavery and destruction for them. They are working at it day and night, for that is how the Nazi hope to save their own skins—to deceive their people into continued and useless resistance.

We did, however, make it clear at the conference just what unconditional surrender does mean for Germany.

It means the temporary control of Germany by Great Britain, Russia, France, and the United States. Each of these nations will occupy and control a separate zone of Germany—and the administration of the four zones will be coordinated—coordinated in Berlin by a Control Council composed of the representatives of the four nations.

Unconditional surrender means something else. It means the end of nazi-ism. [Applause.] It means the end of the Nazi Party and all of its barbaric laws and institutions.

It means the termination of all militaristic influence in the public, private, and cultural life of Germany.

It means for the Nazi war criminals a punishment that is speedy and just—and severe.

It means the complete disarmament of Germany; the destruction of its militarism and its military equipment; the end of its production of armament; the dispersal of all of its armed forces; the permanent dismemberment of the German General Staff which has so often shattered the peace of the world.

It means that Germany will have to make reparations—reparations in kind for the damage which it has done to the innocent victims of its aggression.

By compelling reparations in kind—in plants, in machinery, in rolling stock, in raw materials—we shall avoid the mistakes that we and other people—other nations—made after the last war, the demanding of reparations in the form of money which Germany could never pay.

We do not want the German people to starve, or to become a burden on the rest of the world.

Our objective in handling Germany is simple—it is to secure the peace of the rest of the world now and in the future. Too much experience has shown that that objective is impossible if Germany is allowed to retain any ability to wage aggressive warfare. [Applause.]

These objectives will not hurt the German people. On the contrary, they will protect them from a repetition of the fate which the General Staff and Kaiserism imposed on them before, and which Hitlerism is now imposing upon them again a hundredfold. It will be removing a cancer from the German body politic, which for generations has produced only misery, only pain, for the whole world.

During my stay in Yalta, I saw the kind of reckless, senseless fury and terrible destruction which comes out of German militarism. Yalta on the Black Sea had no military significance of any kind. It had no defense.

Before the last war it had been a resort—a resort for people like the Czars, and princes, and aristocracy, and the hangers-on. However, after the war, after the Red revolution, and until the attack on the Soviet Union by Hitler a few years ago, the palaces and the villas of Yalta had been used as a rest and recreation center by the Russian people.

The Nazi officers took over the former palaces and villas for their own use. The only reason that the so-called palace of the former Czar was still habitable when we got there was that it had been given—or he thought it had been given—to a German general for his own property and his own use. And when the rest of Yalta was destroyed, he kept soldiers there to protect what he thought had become his own personal villa.

When the Red army forced the Nazis out of the Crimea almost a year ago last April, it was found that all of the palaces were looted by the Nazis, and then nearly all of them were destroyed by bombs placed on the inside. Even the humblest of the homes of Yalta were not spared.

There was little left of it except blank walls, ruins, destruction.

Sevastopol—that was a fortified port about 40 or 50 miles away—there again was a scene of utter destruction of a large city and great navy yards and great fortifications. I think less than a dozen buildings were left intact in the entire city.

I had read about Warsaw and Lidice and Rotterdam and Coventry, but I saw Sevastopol and Yalta! And I know there is not room enough on earth for both German militarism and Christian decency. [Applause.]

But—to go on with the story which I hope to do in under an hour—of equal importance with the military arrangements at the Crimean Conference were the agreements reached with respect to a general international organization for lasting world peace. The foundations were laid at Dumbarton Oaks. There was one point, however, on which agreement was not reached. It involved the procedure of voting—of voting in the Security Council. I want to try to make it clear by making it simple. It took me hours and hours to get the thing straight in my own mind—and many conferences.

At the Crimean Conference, the Americans made a proposal—a proposal on the subject which, after full discussion, I am glad to say was unanimously adopted by the other two nations.

It is not yet possible to announce the terms of it publicly, but it will be in a very short time.

When the conclusions reached with respect to voting are made known I think and I hope that you will find them fair—that you will find them a fair solution of this complicated and difficult problem—I might almost say a legislative problem. They are founded in justice, and will go far to insure international cooperation for the maintenance of peace.

There is going to be held, you know—after we have straightened that voting matter out—in San Francisco a meeting of all the United Nations of the world on the 25th of April. There, we all hope, and confidently expect, to execute a definite charter of organization under which the peace of the world will be preserved and the forces of aggression permanently outlawed.

This time we are not making the mistake of waiting until the end of the war to set up the machinery of peace. This time, as we fight together to win the war finally, we work together to keep it from happening again.

As you know, I have always been a believer in the document called the Constitution. I spent a good deal of time in educating two other nations of the world with regard to the Constitution of the United States—that the charter has to be and should be approved by the Senate of the United States under the Constitution. I think the other nations of the world know it now. [Laughter.] I am aware of that fact and now all the other nations are. And we hope the Senate will approve what is set forth as the charter of the United Nations when they all come together in San Francisco next month.

The Senate of the United States, through its appropriate representatives, has been kept continuously advised of the program of this Government in the creation of the International Security Organization.

The Senate and the House will both be represented at the San Francisco Conference. The congressional delegates will consist of an equal number of Republican and Democratic members. The American delegation is, in every sense of the word, bipartisan because world peace is not exactly a party question. I think that Republicans want peace just as much as Democrats. [Applause.] It is not a party question any

more than is military victory—the winning of the war.

When the Republic was threatened, first by the Nazi clutch for world conquest back in 1939 and 1940 and then by the Japanese treachery in 1941, partisanship and politics were laid aside by nearly every American, and every resource was dedicated to our common safety. The same consecration to the cause of peace will be expected, I think, by every patriotic American—by every human soul overseas, too.

The structure of world peace cannot be the work of one man, or one party, or one nation. It cannot be just an American peace, or a British peace, or a Russian, French, or a Chinese peace. It cannot be a peace of large nations—or of small nations. It must be a peace which rests on the cooperative effort of the whole world.

It cannot be a structure complete. It cannot be what some people think—a structure of complete perfection at first. But it can be a peace—and it will be a peace—based on the sound and just principles of the Atlantic Charter, on the conception of the dignity of the human being, and on the guaranties of tolerance and freedom of religious worship.

As the Allied armies have marched to military victory they have liberated peoples whose liberties had been crushed by the Nazis for 4 long years and whose economy had been reduced to ruin by Nazi despoilers.

There have been instances of political confusion and unrest in these liberated areas—that is not unexpected—as in Greece, or in Poland, or in Yugoslavia, and there may be more. Worse than that, there actually began to grow up in some of these places queer ideas of, for instance, "spheres of influence" that were incompatible with the basic principles of international collaboration. If allowed to go on unchecked, these developments might have had tragic results.

It is fruitless to try to place blame for this situation on one particular nation or on another. It is the kind of development that is almost inevitable unless the major powers of the world continue without interruption to work together and assume joint responsibility for the solution of problems that may arise to endanger the peace of the world.

We met in the Crimea, determined to settle this matter of liberated areas. Things that might happen that we cannot foresee at this moment might happen suddenly—unexpectedly—next week or next month. And I am happy to confirm to the Congress that we did arrive at a settlement and, incidentally, a unanimous settlement.

The three most powerful nations have agreed that the political and economic problems of any area liberated from the Nazi conquest, or of any former Nazi satellite, are a joint responsibility of all three governments. They will join together, during the temporary period of instability after hostilities, to help the people of any liberated area or of any former satellite state to solve their own problems through firmly established democratic processes.

They will endeavor to see to it that interim governments—the people who carry on the interim governments between the occupation of Germany and the day of true independence—will be as representative as possible of all democratic elements in the population, and that free elections are held as soon as possible thereafter.

The responsibility for political conditions thousands of miles away can no longer be avoided, I think, by this great Nation. Certainly, I do not want to live to see another war. As I have said, the world is smaller—smaller every year. The United States now exerts a tremendous influence in the cause of peace. Whatever people over here think or talk in the interests of peace is, of course, known the world over. The slightest remark in either House of Congress is known all over the world the following day. We will continue to exert that influence only if we are willing to continue to share in the responsibility for keeping the peace. It will be our own tragic loss if we were to shirk that responsibility.

Final decisions in these areas are going to be made jointly, and, therefore, they will often be the result of give-and-take compromise. The United States will not always have its way 100 percent—nor will Russia, nor Great Britain. We shall not always have ideal solutions to complicated international problem, even though we are determined continuously to strive toward that ideal. But I am sure that—under the agreement reached at Yalta—there will be a more stable political Europe than ever before. Of course, once there has been a true expression of the people's will in any country, our immediate responsibility ends—with the exception only of such action as may be agreed upon by the International Security Organization we hope to set up.

The United Nations must also begin to help these liberated areas adequately to reconstruct their economy—I do not want them to starve to death—so that they are ready to resume their places in the world. The Nazi war machine has stripped them of raw materials, machine tools, trucks, locomotives, and things like that. They have left the industry of these places stagnant and much of the agricultural areas unproductive. The Nazis have left complete or partial ruin in their wake.

To start the wheels running again is not a mere matter of relief. It is to the national interest of all of us to see that these liberated areas are again made self-supporting and productive so that they do not need continuous relief from us. I should say that was an argument based upon common sense.

One outstanding example of joint action by the three major Allied Powers was the solution reached on Poland. The whole Polish question was a potential source of trouble in post-war Europe, and we came to the conference determined to find a common ground for its solution. We did. We know everybody does not agree with it—obviously.

Our objective was to help create a strong, independent, and prosperous nation—that is the thing we must all remember—those words agreed to by Russia, by Britain, and by me. The objective of making Poland a strong, independent, and prosperous nation with a government ultimately to be selected by the Polish people themselves.

To achieve this objective, it was necessary to provide for the formation of a new government much more representative than had been possible while Poland was enslaved. There are, you know, two governments; one in London, one in Lublin, practically in Russia.

Accordingly, steps were taken at Yalta to reorganize the existing provisional government in Poland on a broader democratic basis, so as to include democratic leaders now in Poland and those abroad. This new, reorganized government will be recognized by all of us as the temporary government of Poland. Poland needs a temporary government in the worst way—an interim government is another way to put it. However, the new Polish Provisional Government of National Unity will be pledged to holding a free election as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and a secret ballot.

Throughout history, Poland has been the corridor through which attacks on Russia have been made. Twice in this generation, Germany has struck at Russia through this corridor. To insure European security and world peace, a strong and independent Poland is necessary to prevent that from happening again.

The decisions with respect to the boundaries of Poland were frankly a compromise. I did not agree with all of it by any means. But we did not go as far as Britain wanted in certain areas; we did did not go as far as Russia wanted in certain areas; and we did not go as far as I wanted in certain areas. It was a compromise.

While the decision is a compromise it is one, however, under which the Poles will receive compensation in territory in the North and West in exchange for what they lose by the Curzon Line in the East. The limits of the Western border will be permanently fixed in the final Peace Conference. Roughly, this will include in the new, strong Poland quite a large slice of what is now called Germany. It was agreed also that the new Poland will have a large and long coast line and many new harbors; also that East Prussia—most of it—will go to Poland. A corner of it will go to Russia; also—what shall I call it—the anomoly of the Free State of Danzig—I think Danzig would be a lot better if it were Polish.

It is well known that the people east of the Curzon Line—this is an example of why it is a compromise—the people east of the Curzon Line are predominantly White Russians and Ukrainians—a very great majority—not Polish; and the people west of that line are predominantly Polish, except in that part of East Prussia and Eastern Germany which would go to the new Poland. As far back as 1919, representatives of the Allies agreed that the Curzon Line represented a fair boundary between the two peoples. You must remember also that there was no Poland or had not been any Polish Government before 1919 for a great many generations.

I am convinced that this agreement on Poland, under the circumstances, is the most hopeful agreement possible for a free, independent, and prosperous Polish State.

The Crimean Conference was a meeting of the three major military powers on whose shoulders rests the chief responsibility and burden of the war. Although, for this reason, another nation was not included—France was not a participant in the conference—no one should detract from the recognition which was accorded there to her role in the future of Europe and the future of the world.

France has been invited to accept a zone of control in Germany, and to participate as a fourth member of the Allied Control Council on Germany.

She has been invited to join as a sponsor of the International Conference at San Francisco next month.

She will be a permanent member of the International Security Council together with the other four major powers.

And, finally, we have asked France that she be associated with us in our joint responsibility over the liberated areas of Europe.

There were, of course, a number of smaller things I have not time to go into on which joint agreement was had. We hope things will straighten out.

Agreement was reached on Yugoslavia, as announced in the communiqué; and we hope that it is in process of fulfillment.

We have to remember that there are a great many prima donnas in the world all wishing to be heard before anything becomes final; so we may have a little delay while we listen to more prima donnas. [Laughter.]

Quite naturally, this conference concerned itself only with the European war and with the political problems of Europe—and not with the Pacific war.

At Malta, however, our Combined British and American Staffs made their plans to increase their attack against Japan.

The Japanese war lords know that they are not being overlooked. They have felt the force of our B–29's, and our carrier planes; they have felt the naval might of the United States and do not appear very anxious to come out and try it again.

The Japs know what it means to hear that "the United States marines have landed." [Applause.] And I think I may add, having Iwo Jima in mind, that "the situation is well in hand." [Applause.]

They also know what is in store for the homeland of Japan now that General MacArthur has completed his magnificent march back to Manila [applause], and with Admiral Nimitz establishing air bases right in their own back yard. [Applause.] But lest somebody lay off work in the United States I can repeat what I have said—a short sentence even in my sleep: "We haven't won the wars yet," with an "s" on wars. It is a long, tough road to Tokyo; it is longer to Tokyo than it is to Berlin in every sense of the word.

The defeat of Germany will not mean the end of the war against Japan; on the contrary, we must be prepared for a long and a costly struggle in the Pacific.

But the unconditional surrender of Japan is as essential as the defeat of Germany. [Applause.] I say that advisedly with the thought in mind that that is especially true if our plans for world peace are to succeed. For Japanese militarism must be wiped out as thoroughly as German militarism.

On the way back from the Crimea, I made arrangements to meet personally King Farouk, of Egypt; Haile Selassie, Emperor of Ethiopia; and King Ibn Saud, of Saudi Arabia. Our conversations had to do with matters of common interest. They will be of great mutual advantage because they gave us an opportunity of meeting and talking face to face, and of exchanging views in personal conversation instead of formal correspondence. For instance, from Ibn Saud, of Arabia, I learned more of the whole problem of the Moslems and more about the Jewish problem in 5 minutes than I could have learned by the exchange of a dozen letters.

On my voyage, I had the benefit of seeing the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force at work.

All Americans, I think, would feel as proud of our armed forces as I am if they could see and hear what I did.

Against the most efficient professional soldiers and sailors and airmen of all history, our men stood and fought—and won. [Applause.]

I think that this is our chance to see to it that the sons and grandsons of these gallant fighting men do not have to do it all over again in a few years.

The Conference in the Crimea was a turning point, I hope, in our history and, therefore, in the history of the world. There will soon be presented to the Senate and to the American people a great decision that will determine the fate of the United States—and I think, therefore, the fate of the world—for generations to come.

There can be no middle ground here. We shall have to take the responsibility for world collaboration, or we shall have to bear the responsibility for another world conflict.

I know that the word "planning" is not looked upon with favor in some circles. In domestic affairs, tragic mistakes have been made by reason of lack of planning; and, on the other hand, many great improvements in living, and many benefits to the human race, have been accomplished as a result of adequate, intelligent planning—reclamation of desert areas, developments of whole river valleys, provision for adequate housing.

The same will be true in relations between nations. For the second time, in the lives of most of us, this generation is face to face with the objective of preventing wars. To meet that objective, the nations of the world will either have a plan or they will not. The groundwork of a plan has now been furnished and has been submitted to humanity for discussion and decision.

No plan is perfect. Whatever is adopted at San Francisco will doubtless have to be amended time and again over the years, just as our own Constitution has been. No one can say exactly how long any plan will last. Peace can endure only so long as humanity really insists upon it, and is willing to work for it, and sacrifice for it.

Twenty-five years ago, American fighting men looked to the statesmen of the world to finish the work of peace for which they fought and suffered. We failed them. We failed them then. We cannot fail them again, and expect the world to survive.

I think the Crimean Conference was a successful effort by the three leading nations to find a common ground for peace. It spells—and it ought to spell—the end of the system of unilateral action, exclusive alliances, and spheres of influence, and balances of power, and all the other expedients which have been tried for centuries and have always failed.

We propose to substitute for all these, a universal organization in which all peace-loving nations will finally have a chance to join.

I am confident that the Congress and the American people will accept the results of this Conference as the beginnings of a permanent structure of peace upon which we can begin to build, under God, that better world into which our children and grandchildren—yours and mine, and the children and grandchildren of the whole world—must live, and can live.

And that, my friends, is the only message I can give you. I feel it very deeply as I know that all of you are feeling it today and are going to feel it in the future. [Applause.]

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the President retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

At 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m. the Speaker pro tempore announced that the joint session was dissolved.

Thereupon the Members of the Cabinet retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Thereupon the Vice President and the Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore at 1:31 o'clock p. m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The message of the President will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed (H. Doc. 106).

At this time the Chair will declare the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, so that the radio paraphernalia may be removed.

RECESS

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER THE RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK, at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks by including therein a recent radio address which he made.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Prime Minister Winston Churchill before the British House of Commons.

Mr. Speaker, I made inquiry of the Printing Office. They informed me that it will exceed the limit, and the estimate on it is $312. I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on Alaska.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and include therein a letter.

Mr. CHENOWETH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today after the completion of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances; in one to include an article by Dr. Reed and in the other to include an address he recently made.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects and include two newspaper articles.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 27]

Andrews, Ala.	Eaton	Hébert
Bishop	Ellsworth	Heidinger
Bunker	Elsaesser	Hill
Celler	Fenton	Holifield
Chelf	Fernandez	Jackson
Clark	Geelan	King
Clements	Gorski	Kirwan
Coffee	Green	LaFollette
Courtney	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Landis
Dawson	Harless, Ariz.	Larcade
Drewry	Hays	Lea
Durham	Ludlow	Lewis
Maloney	Rizley	Simpson, Pa.
Murray, Tenn.	Rogers, Fla.	Talbot
O'Brien, Mich.	Rogers, Mass.	Thom
Patman	Rogers, N. Y.	Traynor
Patterson	Rowan	Vursell
Rains	Sabath	Weaver
Rivers	Sheridan	West
	Simpson, Ill.	Winter

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 369 Members having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1945

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2374) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 2374, with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Training for nurses (national defense): The appropriations "Training for nurses, Public Health Service (national defense)", in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Acts for fiscal years 1944 and 1945, shall be considered as having been made available for travel.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I note in the report of the committee on the housing question on page 6 that there was authorized under title I of the Lanham Act of October 14, 1940, an appropriation of $1,500,000,000 for the purpose of meeting acute housing shortages, and that all but $7,878 of that amount has been provided for; and that there is an additional application in this bill for the sum of $90,000,000. I have no fight with any particular project for which that money is being appropriated. But 1 year ago when this bill was on the floor, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia was good enough to let me have a moment of time, and I, at that time, called the attention of those in authority to the fact that in my congressional district there are 8,000 empty houses, all of them in excellent condition. Throughout the country there are today 29 surplus labor areas. In the particular section of the State of Pennsylvania which is represented by the gentleman from Pottsville, Dr. FENTON, by the gentleman from Luzerne County [Mr. FLOOD], and by myself from Lackawanna County, there are 12,000 men and women out of work. Thirty-some-odd-thousand men have gone to other parts of the country to find employment. Forty-some-odd thousand have gone to the armed services.

During the last 2 weeks I have had a conference with those in the office of the Under Secretary of War. We have had a conference with those in the office of the Acting Secretary of the Navy. This morning I was in contact with Mr. Justice Byrnes. Next week we will have a conference with General Clay. But I say it is a shame. It is a shame that in the conduct of the war program we find it necessary to spend $1,500,000,000 and an additional $90,000,000 for housing, however worthy these particular projects may be, and yet neglect areas with surplus labor and with thousands upon thousands of empty houses. Each one of these red dots on this map which I hold in my hand represents five empty houses throughout the Lackawanna and Luzerne County areas of Pennsylvania. Once again I want to call the attention of those who are allocating construction of projects, if there are any more to be constructed, they ought to give attention to the Pennsylvania area which I represent.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. As I understand it, the gentleman's complaint is that many of those plants have not been located where housing is available to that extent. I understand further that these particular houses to which he refers are not in one of those war areas, but that if a defense plant had been established there, these houses would have been available?

Mr. MURPHY. That is exactly correct. I want to emphasize the necessity of bringing the job to the worker instead of continuing to place projects in areas where they have not one but three, four, and five No. 1 defense areas, with no available labor.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that contracts have but recently been let for the building of jet airplanes in the San Diego, Calif., area, the most critical labor shortage and housing shortage area in the United States, which will require bringing in some 8,600 new workers and constructing a considerable number of new housing facilities, and that the contract and that work could possibly be done in the East just as well as anywhere else.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Division of Mental Hygiene: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1945, for Division of Mental Hygiene, Public Health Service, including the objects specified under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1945, $30,000.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am deeply interested in the thought just xpressed by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. It seems to me, in view of the present discussions of war manpower problems which have become so acute that it has necessitated action by the Congress, we ought to give serious consideration to the whole problem of allocations by the procurement agencies which are responsible for the vast building of factories and the production of armaments and supplies needed in this war effort. May I call your attention to the fact that down at Mobile, Ala., in that great shipbuilding and drydocks area, where there were employed at the peak some 26,000 to 30,000 employees, in a period of two weeks' time recently that company discharged 8,000 employees.

In the New York City area and in the New England area there is a surplus of shipbuilding labor. In the Baltimore area there is a critical shortage of shipbuilding labor. A question that is very properly asked by the ship workers of this Nation is this: Why is it not possible to place an order for the construction or repair of ships at Mobile or at Boston or at New York or at Brooklyn, instead of concentrating that production at Baltimore, in an area where they have a critical labor shortage. Instead of suggesting a solution of the manpower problem by transporting workers from one city to another, why would it not be possible to allocate work in the shipbuilding program or the production program, to the localities where there is no critical shortage of labor? It would be just as easy for a ship to go up to the New York area to be repaired as to go into Baltimore. It would be very easy to take some of those ships into Mobile where they are laying off thousands of workers, and thus not only relieve the labor situation and the necessity for finding jobs for those thousands who are being discharged, but it makes for more equal distribution of community facilities, housing and everything else. It seems to me the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] has touched upon a very important matter in connection with this whole war effort. When we are solicited to continue pouring money into the construction of housing and community facilities in the already congested areas, it seems to me we could start at the other end of the dilemma and transfer some of the work projects out of those critical areas and put them into other areas where there is not a critical shortage of labor.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not a fact also that wherever there is congestion of labor there is also a great lack of necessary accommodations of life, in addition to housing, such as food? I have a letter today from a man in California saying that he knew of 8,000 employees who left one plant because of a shortage of food in that community.

Mr. KEEFE. I think that is exactly right, and it is because of those shortages of community facilities and everything else that we are being called upon to make these constant appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I think there is one thing, in considering this housing problem, that we should remember, and that is that this is not for the purpose of giving employment to people; it is not for the purpose of accommodating chambers of commerce; it is not for the purpose of getting projects in our congressional districts. It is for the purpose of winning the war and winning it quickly.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] says he thinks the industries should be brought to where the workers are. As far as that is practicable, that is true. It ought to be done.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Not right now.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not want the gentleman to misquote me or misinterpret my statement.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman then. What did the gentleman say?

Mr. KEEFE. The industry is already located at Mobile. It is already located at Brooklyn. It is already located at Boston. All I am asking is that the work be brought where the industry is already located and where the labor is already present.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is asking that, but the people in charge of the program and the people who have done a masterful job in production tell us that they cannot further expand those industries in those areas. We know that the aircraft industry, for instance, is on the west coast and the most of the housing is needed on the west coast. That is where the emphasis on this thing is going to be. Judge Patterson of the Army and Admiral Moreell of the Navy's yards and docks said they had combed this program carefully and that they must have these workers in expanded industry, and they cannot get them there because they do not have the facilities for them. They cannot get our friends from Pennsylvania to go to the west coast and work in the aircraft industry.

They cannot take those people out there because there are no houses for them to live in, there are no facilities for them. In parts of Virginia, my own State, not in my own district, I know where men are being transported in busses 75 miles to Navy projects. Those projects cannot be moved. There was a project, one of the first in the war program, located in my district. Not many months ago we got information that the thing would probably be closed up very soon. A little bit later, after the emphasis of the war changed, there is a $10,000,000 expansion to that project and men are now being transported 75 or 100 miles to it. It is perfectly true that you can go to certain places and see great numbers of houses that are not occupied, but that is because emphasis has changed from one kind of production to another, it has changed from one point to another, and I say that as long as the leaders in the War and Navy Departments, who have had charge of this production problem and who have given us the record they have, want this, they should have it. Read in the hearings what Judge Patterson and Admiral Moreell said. They stated: "We have gone over every bit of this. We need every bit of this and probably more. If it is authorized by the Congress, before final construction begins we will go over it again and check it again." I think our friend from Texas, chairman of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, who has given a good deal of consideration to this matter, at the proper time will have something to say.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. That is what the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Wisconsin are stating to the gentleman. Instead of building the industry in California, build the industry in Pennsylvania where they have labor, where they have the houses, where they have the men to do the work. There is another thing about this. We have taken for granted everything that the Army says ought to be done. Now, some of the people in the Army we found out ought to learn something, and if we can teach them something, for instance, that it is just as easy to build a plant where the people are and better, we ought to change their views and get them to do that very thing.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania thinks he can teach the Army that it is economically or logically sound to begin the construction of an aircraft industry in Pennsylvania, then I think the gentleman is going to have a hard problem doing that.

Mr. RICH. We have air-plant facilities right in my own district and we can build more of them. We can also build them in the district represented by the gentleman from Scranton just as well.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman knows that the course of this war has dictated that that industry be laid out on the west coast on the Pacific Ocean. The question of transportation and the question of labor indicate that is the place it has to be concentrated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I am in hopes that the membership of this House will pay attention to the facts as they

have been developed in the hearings and will weigh the things that really mean something and do the things that need to be done instead of doing things that some promoter has tried to put across. I am going to call your attention briefly to some of the tragedies of this proposition presented to us today with reference to the housing business.

On page 203 of the hearings you will find the number of different types of public housing projects that are proposed. The grand total is 30,428; single unit, 23,440. That means family units costing on an average, according to their story, $3,500; single-person units, $5,900; stopgap, including trailers and quick-construction jobs that cost anywhere from $600 to $1,200, 1,055.

That is the proportion in which intelligence is used in setting up this program and that is why they are able to submit to you figures running up to $84,000,000. It is just perfectly ridiculous. If they were going to put up stopgap or trailer housing where they would provide the housing facilities inside of 60 days and where the cost would be moderate, there would be much more sense to a lot of their operations but instead of that they want to spend from three to five times what they should spent on a unit, and not give service to the people who are hauled around to these war plants.

What they care about is perpetuating their proposition. I will admit that it was exceedingly difficult to get any facts. It is exceedingly difficult to understand them the way they throw statements at you, but I do want to call attention to some of the things which were presented to us.

On page 202 of the hearings you find this: Total number of war workers in the Douglas aircraft plant, which they propose to increase in number on July 1, 1944, 31,933; number in January 1945, 29,000. Number anticipated at peak in July 1945, 32,200. That means an increase of only 300 above the figure for July 1944. So you can see how much sense they make of their operations. They have 2,000 houses under construction and they propose to build 500 more with this money. That is perfectly ridiculous. That means 2,500 houses for 300 more workers than a year ago. The stuff all goes together in just about that shape.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. We have heretofore made all sorts of appropriations for them. Sometimes there has been a fight on it, and sometimes there has not. But it is about time that the Congress of the United States came to and appreciated its responsibility with reference to this situation. I want to see everything done to provide our Army and our Navy with the proper things with which to win the war. Every man in this House wants to do the same thing. Every time we go ahead and accept the recommendation of some agency, which does not know what it is talking about, and whose story does not go together, instead of sitting down and figuring the thing out on the square, we impede and we hamper the war effort, because the folks cannot work in a war factory and produce when they are building houses of this kind that are not needed.

I hope that when the House comes to vote on this question it will think about this thing; that it will feel its responsibility and will not be guided by its emotions in this connection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

Grants to States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1945, for grants to State for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind, $6,200,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 6, line 22, before the period, insert the following: "*Provided*, That section 5 (f) of Public Law 45, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved April 29, 1943 (50 U. S. C., 1355), is hereby amended so as to include income and resources from performance of service as a nurse as an employee, or in connection with the care of sick or confined persons as an employee, in addition to income and resources from agricultural labor or labor performed in connection with the raising or harvesting of agricultural commodities as an employee, as income which shall not be a basis of excluding payments made to such an individual in computing the payments as in such section provided."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we have cooperated with the gentleman from South Dakota in the formation of this amendment and we approve it in the form in which he has offered it. We accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

FREEING O. A. A. CLIENTS FOR NURSING

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This amendment will make it possible for qualified women to work as part-time nurses or nurses aides without being thrown off old-age assistance rolls. It is identical to the action taken to help in the shortage of agricultural labor 2 years ago—Public Law 45, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved April 29, 1943.

At that time the Appropriations Committee had considered a proposal to expend money for the importation of agricultural workers from Mexico and Puerto Rico. The committee decided that many older men on the old-age assistance rolls could help with chores or help in critical periods of planting and harvesting and thereby do a great deal to meet the shortage of farm workers. The committee and the Congress recognized that these men could not work under existing law and continue to receive old-age assistance without being subject to deductions for the money they might thus earn, or be thrown off the rolls altogether and then possibly suffer delay in being restored while they were reinvestigated.

Today we are confronted with a shortage of nurses in the Army and Navy hospitals, to meet which a nurses' draft bill has been reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. There is a shortage of nurses in veterans' facilities. To meet these shortages will create a further drain upon nurses for the care of civilians, regardless of whether it is done by volunteer methods or otherwise.

In every community there are many older women who are excellent practical nurses. Some of them did volunteer nursing in the flu epidemic of World War No. 1. Most of them know a great deal about practical nursing as a matter of experience in the rearing of a family. The amendment which I have offered seeks to tap this large pool of potential nursing aid.

I believe it will materially help in meeting the shortage of nurses for the care of civilians and thereby relieve hundreds of younger nurses for service in the Army, Navy, and Veterans' Administration hospitals.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Temporary aid to enemy aliens and other restricted persons: The limitation of $50,000 under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1945, upon the amount which may be transferred to this appropriation from "Salaries and expenses, War Relocation Authority," is hereby increased to $150,000.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph commencing on page 7, line 1, and extending through line 7 on that page, that it changes existing law.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

War public works (community facilities): For an additional amount to enable the Federal Works Administrator to carry out the functions vested in him by titles II and III of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1531–1534 and 1541), $20,000,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, but not to be available for obligation for new projects after June 30, 1945, of which amount not to exceed $800,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, including the objects specified under the head "Defense public works (community facilities)" in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, and the joint resolution approved December 23, 1941 (Public Law 371): *Provided*, That the limitation of $80,000,000 under this head in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1945, on the total amount that may be allocated for contributions to public and private agencies for the maintenance and operation of public works after July 1, 1943, is hereby increased to $85,000,000, and of the additional amount appropriated under this head not less than $18,000,000 shall be reserved for

financing contributions subsequent to June 30, 1945, for the objects to which this proviso applies: *Provided further,* That in making allocations out of the funds appropriated in this paragraph for construction projects priority shall be given to emergency projects involving an estimated cost to the Federal Government of less than $250,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the following language on page 8, lines 3 to 8, that it changes existing law:

That the limitation of $80,000,000 under this head in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1945, on the total amount that may be allocated for contributions to public and private agencies for the maintenance and operation of public works after July 1, 1943, is hereby increased to $85,000,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I gave notice on yesterday that I would introduce an amendment to the provision in this bill striking out the language on page 8 after the figures "$85,000,000" in line 8 down to the word "*Provided*" in line 12.

I regret very much that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has made this point of order because it is going to operate very materially against the existing projects and the workers who are carrying on their operations in this war effort in the field of production. I will give you the figures, which are revised up until today, with reference to this situation.

The gentleman from New York, I assume, has made this point of order on his own responsibility, and of course it was for him to decide whether or not he would take that step.

Today the unallotted money for services in the Federal Works Agency is $4,700,000 as against this $80,000,000 limitation in existing law. The amount needed to carry on these existing service projects, the ones that are already in existence and being operated, during the remainder of this fiscal year is $6,300,000. Therefore, the point of order made by the gentleman from New York prevents the operation of existing services for much of the remainder of this fiscal year, and absolutely forbids the allocation or allotment of any additional money for any new service that may be necessary.

Many Members of this House have come to see me with reference to the urgent necessity of continuing existing services and providing new services in the districts which they represent, but that cannot be done in view of the point of order made by the gentleman from New York.

In addition to the fact that leaving this limitation where it is will not allow existing services to continue through this fiscal year, there are $3,400,000 of new service projects that are ready to allot; so those of you who are interested in those new service projects that have been approved insofar as preliminary studies are concerned may rest assured that through this point of order those new services cannot be provided. That is why this limitation of $85,000,000 is necessary, against which the gentleman from New York has made this point of order.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. Does not my distinguished chairman feel, based on a check of the record of the past, that the Federal Works Agency is going to continue to have new projects all the time, so that when it comes before this body and asks for additional money it can always put up the plea that it has projects yet to complete?

Mr. LANHAM. Those new projects do not originate in the Federal Works Agency. They come from the districts in war areas that the gentleman and many others represent, where these war plants are situated and where the needs are pressing, and where proper investigation is made to determine those needs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat confused about the psychology of the gentleman from New York. I recall that in the last Congress, in less than 1 month, Secretary Patterson and Admiral Moreell and some of the other high-ranking officers of the Army and Navy came down and told the Committee on Appropriations on two different bills that we needed what aggregated more than $100,000,000,000 to build these plants for ships, planes, munitions, ordnance, and so forth. And very graciously, without dotting an "i" or crossing a "t," and without a dissenting vote in this House, we appropriated more than $100,000,000,000 for those necessary purposes. But perhaps we may strain at gnats and swallow camels. When we try to get some housing and some community facilities so that workingmen and women can live near those plants and make those plants operative, we hear a great hue and cry that we are wasting Federal money.

This is a war-emergency act. It terminates with the conclusion of this war. This housing is to be disposed of and gotten out of the way of private enterprise. But these workers must have living conditions under which they can labor if you expect these plants to go on and the essential increased production to be accomplished.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman has spoken several times of community services and facilities. Would he elaborate a little on what that constitutes?

Mr. LANHAM. This appropriation of $20,000,000 for construction and services includes services such as light, water, and heat, and the various things needed to make those houses livable by the workmen at those plants. Perhaps a new teacher is needed for a school attended by children of immigrant war workers. Perhaps there has been an addition made there. The children of the war workers are there. They are such services as that. Yet, the limitation that the gentleman from New York has insisted on keeping in existing law would prevent even the performing of all those services just for the remainder of this fiscal year.

Getting down to this proposition of construction, altogether the Federal Works Agency has unallotted $10,700,000. Now, you subtract from that $10,700,000 the $6,300,000 which is necessary to service only existing projects, which cannot be wholly done since this point of order has been made, and that leaves them with $4,400,000 which they say will very likely be necessary for overruns in the construction that is now being done. Because, you know, in these times you can never absolutely accurately estimate in advance the cost of labor and materials. The remainder of the $20,000,000 provided in this bill, if we were allowed to use it, less these services, would leave about $15,000,000 for new construction. Already projects are ready for approval for new construction aggregating $17,200,000.

I am making these remarks in order that we may know, if we do not get this increased production, now that we have stepped up our offensive in every theater of war, and when these high representatives of the Army and Navy come before the Committee on Appropriations and urge the necessity for speedy action in getting these facilities built and getting this construction, that we are here going to tie their hands and say we know more about conducting this war than the Army and Navy, the people whose business it is to conduct it; that we know more about what the Federal Works Agency has available than they themselves know.

Why, this Government in our organic law was separated into three coordinate branches. Each branch must rely upon the efficiency and the honesty of the other branches. The only source from which you can possibly get accurate information is from these agencies. Let me repeat, that the services now being carried on at the plants already in existence cannot be carried on until the end of this fiscal year because of this point of order, and no new services can be provided. There is no use to have housing, of course, if you cannot have services. Four walls and a roof are not sufficient living accommodations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I certainly dislike to take exception to the remarks of my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], but I cannot help but make this observation, that one agency—and there are a number of agencies in the Government that are following the same procedure—the Federal Works Agency—is following a policy that they are always going to have projects unfinished, so that

they can come before this body and say to you, and truthfully so, "We have projects in your district unfinished and if you do not appropriate this money or if you do not pass the enabling legislation for this money, your projects are going to stop."

I say to you, Mr. Chairman, it is time for this body to serve notice on every Government agency that from now on we are going to insist that they live within the enabling legislation we have passed and the appropriations that we have made.

We are all in favor of winning the war, and I certainly regret that some of our Members get up on the floor and say "if you pass, or do not pass, this or that you are hindering the war effort." Let us check and see what the committee, after a careful and thorough study, has to say in regard to further exenditures for this department. Mr. Chairman, the report of the chairman of this committee the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], on page 168, reads as follows:

> What we are up against on the other side is the insistence that capital expenditures are about over, and all of our factories are built, and that all of our expansion has been made, that it is now merely a matter of maintenance, that these shifts in population have already been accomplished, and that we had had sufficient housing up to this time, there is no need for the Government going in and putting up additional housing, when there may be in the near future an evidence of the urgent need of changing occupations.

We all know that facilities go along with the housing program. We have new construction practically completed as far as industry and war production is concerned. Now we have requests from this agency that various new facilities be constructed and that they be granted additional money to carry on the program. What are we going to do with these new projects, these new houses constructed by Federal funds, when this war is over? We have thousands of vacant Federal houses now, that will soon represent a ghost town and will certainly decrease the value of private property that adjoins them. Do you want a group of vacant Federal houses next to your home?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I remember distinctly when the chairman of our committee made that very pertinent remark to the witnesses for the Army and the Navy; but in answer to that the gentleman will find that Judge Patterson, and the representatives of the Navy and the War Production Board said that what he said was true, but on the other hand they were not able now to get labor in critical war industries because they had no place for them to live and no community facilities.

Mr. McGREGOR. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, but I wonder why these orders are not placed in localities where industry, labor, housing, and other facilities are available. We listened a few moments ago to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. He informed us that in the Mobile, Ala., area there were thousands of men being laid off. In Baltimore there is a shortage of labor. Yet the War Department and the Navy Department continue to place orders in Baltimore. Why can they not place some of those orders at Mobile where the housing, facilities, and labor are available? If the Army and the Navy and the War Department are going to insist on placing orders where there is no extra labor and where there are no houses, we are going to be asked forever to appropriate money for houses, facilities, and will continue to have a shortage of manpower in one area and a surplus in another.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I appreciate the argument the gentleman is making about shifting these Navy and War contracts to the right places so that there will be no congestion, but the fact remains that they awarded the contracts to the places where congestion, insofar as population is concerned, and where inadequate housing, now exists. In spite of the fact that it is there, it has to be provided for. In addition to that, if this money is taken out of this bill the burden will fall upon the local communities, the counties, and the cities to take care of these increased services, not alone people to house, but adequate medical aid and other services necessary. Those budgets have been closed. They cannot incur further expenditures. Their tax rates are set. Where are those people going to get the service?

Mr. McGREGOR. I say to you if you are going to depend upon immediate aid coming to your locality by money that is carried in this appropriation, the Federal Works Agency will have to work faster than they have ever worked before.

Mr. Chairman, I ask each and every Member to carefully consider this request for money and I do especially ask that you carefully investigate these two departments—the F. W. A. and National Housing Agency—and determine for yourself, regardless of whether or not you have a project in your district, if they are doing a good job. Check and see if they are giving any consideration to the recommendations of your local people. I am asking you to do this because at an early date these two departments will request of this body additional authorization for new projects. So please familiarize yourself with activities of the Federal Works Agency and the National Housing Agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. LANHAM: On page 8, line 8, after the figures "$85,000,000", strike the comma and the remainder of line 8, all of lines 9, 10, and 11, and the words "proviso applies" on line 12.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, although the adoption of this amendment, which certainly should be adopted, will not relieve to any great extent some of the monkey wrenches that are being thrown into our war effort, it will be helpful in some respects. Provision is made in this bill for an appropriation of $20,000,000 provided they will not use $18,000,000 of it until after the 30th of June of this year.

Mr. Chairman, I have endeavored in remarks made earlier to show that, even if the point of order had not been made and the limitation had been increased to $85,000,000, it would still be very difficult to carry on existing services and provide for new services which have already been approved. It is going to make it doubly burdensome, even under the $80,000,000 limitation, if we provide that for the remainder of this fiscal year they can use but $2,000,000 out of the $20,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how much credence Members give to statements of those who are in charge of our war effort and in what they say about their needs, but I do them the justice to believe that they are a good bit more familiar with the situation than I am. In most instances their judgment is accepted in this body without a dissenting voice; but when we come along to the proposition of trying to make these plants operate and give now the increased production that those in charge tell us is so vitally necessary, I cannot understand the attitude that would say: "Oh, well, we will give you just a little part of what you need, then we will take away what you need now and place that over so you can use it possibly in the next fiscal year, or until the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds can hold further hearings and determine just how much more we are going to need for the remainder of the war."

Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee has not yet appropriated the amounts authorized through legislation of the Congress emanating from the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee for this housing and for these community facilities. Why, in the name of high heaven, should we be authorizing greater expenditures when the expenditures we have authorized, though badly needed, are not being used?

We are holding a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds next Tuesday with representatives of the Federal Works Agency and of the National Housing Agency to see what the future requirements may be, insofar as they can be estimated in the uncertainties as to the length of the duration of this war. But, certainly, now that we have been crippled by the point of order which denies the possibility of raising this limitation to $85,000,000, we should not pile Pelion on Ossa with reference to the harm we are doing and say, "You cannot use $18,000,000 that is so vitally needed of the appropriation of $20,000,000 we are making."

I trust that the committee will agree to my amendment and that we shall not absolutely tie and bind those who are carrying out the laws that we ourselves have passed.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I just want to elaborate a little on the remarks I made a moment ago in regard to the responsibility of the local communities carrying this burden in the absence of these funds being provided, which the gentleman's amendment, if adopted, would provide. In my own county there is an increase of 750,000 people due to the war effort. The local community cannot maintain the added services necessary and, in addition to that, there are some 750 beds in the county hospital to be provided for.

Mr. LANHAM. Those are Federal responsibilities of the war that I am doing my best to get met in the proper Federal way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. Chairman, I have no source of information on this particular subject except the hearings that were held and I am obliged to depend upon them. I made a statement yesterday with reference to this situation. I showed then just what it was, but just so you may get a little better picture of the sort of thing we are up against, I call your attention to the figures that the gentleman has given us, which do not jibe with the figures we were given, and I also call attention to page 266 of the hearings where General Fleming said that there was a balance available and left of $12,509,694.

Then I call attention to their own figures on page 324 in the table there which shows that they have unallocated balances of $7,301,000 in one set-up, and $3,335,000 in another on the 31st day of January, or a total of over $13,600,000. The figures do not go together at all but this is the picture.

On the 31st of January they had, according to that table, available for further allotments for community facilities $7,301,000 which in my opinion, according to the way they have been going heretofore, would take care of the needy cases. I do not think there is any question in the world about it. It is a terrible situation when these people run around and give figures of one kind to one committee and another kind to another committee. It makes you have doubt as to whether you can trust anything they say to you. Frankly, I do not believe there is a single activity that those people are required to do that could not be taken care of with the funds now available. They have absorbed and set up as an administrative reserve $6,850,000, which is enough money to carry them on the pay roll for 22 months, which is perfectly ridiculous.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I ask the gentleman whether he can assure me that the various projects in the different places involved, such as those having to do with schools and sewers, with child care and so on, will be continued?

Mr. TABER. The motion that has been made would have no effect on the construction of sewers and that sort of thing.

Mrs. BOLTON. Or the continuance of the things now going on?

Mr. TABER. Money is already provided for all of those projects and set up in a reserve, but the contracts are not being let. For instance, they have $25,000,000 of funds that they have allocated, and they have been allocated quite a while, but they are letting to contract only at the rate of a million dollars a month. The obligations that they are incurring are readily made inside the allotments that have already been made to them. Of course, they have set up too big a reserve for administrative expenses so that they might continue themselves on the pay roll, and that is a cover-up to keep the thing out of sight.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph, and all amendments thereto, close in 45 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I object. I would like to have 5 minutes, and that would cut us down to about 3 minutes apiece.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we ought to get through sometime this afternoon.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I appreciate that, but I would like to have 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto, close in 1 hour, the last 15 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC].

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, in justification for the amount asked by the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds [Mr. LANHAM], let me say that there is a need for these community facilities and for additional housing, if not in all parts of the country where some cut-backs are taking place in munition plants, at least on the west coast, which is to bear the brunt of this war from now until the end of the war with Japan.

In the Consolidated Aircraft factory they have been trying for a long time to get an additional 4,000 men. You may say, "Why do they need those 4,000 men? Why do they not put the contract some place where there is less congestion?" I will tell you why they do not, because to build the Super-Liberators there are only a few factories in this country that can be used; only a few that are capable of building them, and one of these is in San Diego. But we already have no vacant housing space in San Diego. Neither have we housing available for the returning veterans who are coming back at the rate of 50,000 a month from the front lines. Those men coming back to their own home towns cannot find a place to live, because the war workers are occupying all available quarters.

So how are we going to get those 4,000 men to build adidtional super-Liberators? You cannot bring them into a place like San Diego or any other congested area without giving them a place to live. It is true the War Production Board at first said that all you need is four walls and a roof and that will take care of them. It will not take care of them. They will come there and they will go back home if you do not give them a decent place to live and some decent education for their children.

These community facilities must be kept going all the time. You must pay the teachers in the schools. You must pay for all the services that go into the living of a community.

In addition, we are going to be compelled to build housing, true temporary housing, until the last day of the war, because the whole west coast is so congested now that we cannot put any additional workers there.

It happens also that we have some new very highly technical aircraft coming on. I might mention one factory in my district, Ryan Aircraft, that is building the jet-propelled planes.

You expect our boys to win over the Germans and the Japanese. They will if we give them the equipment, but we cannot turn out these jet-propelled planes without workmen in the factories, and there is no place to house any additional workers.

So I beg of you, if it is the last thing you do, do not hinder the war effort, do not stand in the way of bringing men, skilled workmen and otherwise, from other sections of the country where their jobs have passed, into our congested areas where the plants are now. It would do no good to add another $200,000,000 for new plants elsewhere that might be finished probably by the time the war ends. On the west coast we have these factories in being today. It is too late to change that. We need a few more men to turn out the Superfortresses and the jet-propelled planes. We cannot have these men unless you make it possible for them and their families to live in some kind of decency. Even the Navy families out there have no place to live, and they call on me, "Why don't you stand by the Navy?" I want to stand by the Navy. I want to give them decent living quarters at least as long as the war is going on. I am doing everything I can and the Navy Department is building as many housing units as it possibly can in all of those congested areas to take care of the Navy families. All this is part of the picture; and community facilities for all of these housing projects, as well as additional housing itself, must be provided. I have outlined the need, and it is now up to the Congress to provide adequate funds. Without them, the progress of the war toward victory will be impeded and delayed, and the cost of that is beyond mere dollars and cents.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from California [Mr. IZAC] has told the story well. May I call the attention of my colleagues on this side of the House to the fact that we have had about a million men returned from the armed services so far. I assume that something like half of them have gone into war work and that approximately half of them are either physically or psychologically unable to participate in war production to any great extent. Consequently, in these congested areas—and our area is rated as a No. 1 area—they are unable to find housing for themselves and their little families. That is the truth. I have had calls upon me from the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the service officers under the Selective Service Act in my district, asking and praying and well nigh demanding that this Congress do something to provide some way in which these returning veterans may obtain the same priority for housing as is available for our war workers. Of course, they should have housing made available to them so that they can go back to live decently with their little families.

Then, too, in a good many of these areas the factories were built by the Defense Plant Corporation. They are Government owned, as far as the properties are concerned. It is impossible for the municipalities to tax those factories, to tax that property in order to raise the necessary revenue to take care of this additional load. If they could do so, I doubt that they would be in here asking for any support. However, under the charters of these cities, as granted by our State, in many cases there is a limitation upon the amount of tax they may levy—that is, the number of dollars per thousand dollars of assessed valuation. In my home city there is a tax limit for ordinary municipal purposes of $1 per hundred dollars of assessed valuation. Perhaps it would be better if we had not placed that limitation there, so that we could raise additional revenue in times of stress, but there is that limitation on the tax levy at the present time.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield very briefly.

Mr. MILLER of California. The statement which the gentleman just made about the tax limitation in California obtains in all cities of the sixth class I believe, and that is in the smaller communities where most of this is.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes; I thank the gentleman for his contribution. And so when they come in here and say, "Well, if you want these people to be able to work in the plants, if you want the women to work there, then they are going to have to leave their children some place while they work," now, for goodness sake, we had a manpower problem brought up to us here the other day in which the Committee on Military Affairs showed how many people were going to be needed in the Army, how many men, and how many men and women in industry over the next few months. If you want to have them available to do this job, then you have to make some provision for the children of working women. I do not like to differ with anyone on the committee, but in this case it is not a question of a few million dollars, it is a question of war production, and I offer it to you in that sense and in no other. We must have the necessary facilities and wherewithal to support them.

Mr. Chairman, my district has increased in population by around 150,000 people in the past 4 years. We are now entered upon a vitally important aircraft program—that of building the new jet-propelled P–80. We will do our level best to turn them out in quantity. We are also engaged in fabricating rockets by the million and other war instruments. Our more recently expanded war-work communities are having serious growing pains. The municipal and school-district officers have performed wonders, but they cannot work miracles. This amendment should be adopted to aid them.

Mr. Chairman, by authority granted, I include the following article from this morning's Washington Post. The article follows:

UNITED STATES JET TOPS ALL IN SPEED, ARNOLD SAYS

(By James V. Piersol)

Production of the Army's first jet-powered combat plane was anncunced yesterday afternoon by H. H. Arnold, commanding general of the Army Air Forces, who said it is believed to be the fastest fighter in existence.

Designers of the new plane, the Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, in a simultaneous announcement, described its performance as superlative. It has been designated as the P–80 and named the "Shooting Star."

In a third announcement, the General Electric Co., builders of the propellerless jet which powers the fighter, stated its single gas turbine is the most powerful airplane engine in the world. That would give it an initial thrust of more than 3,000 horsepower. It was described as making a noise like a giant blow torch and driving the plane through the skies like an apparition of death.

The extent of production of the new model was not disclosed, but it was previously announced that General Electric and the Allison Division of General Motors Corporation are already making substantial numbers of the turbines at Schenectady, N. Y., and Indianapolis, Ind.

Lockheed has four plants active on the project at Burbank, Calif., and North American Aviation, Inc., has another large plant building the type at Kansas City, Mo. Capacity is indicated by the fact that the Kansas City plant alone turned out more than 500 Lockheed Lightnings in January, and all parties concerned have stated the Shooting Star is more simple to build.

Simplicity of the type was indicated by the fact that the engine of the P–80 can be completely changed in 15 minutes. It takes that long to remove the propeller from the conventional airplane engine and about 8 hours to make a complete engine replacement.

"Carefully guarded development flights of the plane have been confined to remote Army fields," General Arnold's announcement stated. "The Shooting Star is extremely maneuverable. * * * It can carry heavy loads of ammunition, photographic equipment, bombs, and fuel. The pressurized cabin, unique among production fighters, is equipped for pilot 'G' suits to ease the discomfort of sharp turns and pull-outs after long dives."

Lockheed engineers described the wing of the fighter as being "so refined as to class it as a new type. It has a knife-like leading edge and other aerodynamic innovations that master the problems encountered when the speed of sound is approached or passed."

The engine virtually takes its power from the atmosphere.

"Air is drawn through intake ducts and screened," states the Army's description. "The air then flows through the compressor of the turbine into a chamber where it is heated by a burning fuel similar to ordinary kerosene. The rush of hot air revolves the turbine to turn the compressor. Gas rushing out through a huge nozzle at the rear of the fuselage propels the plane."

The power plant was described as weighing about one-half as much as conventional airplane engines of proportionate power.

Design of the plane is credited to Clarence L. Johnson, Lockheed's chief of research, and unidentified engineers of the Army Air Forces Technical Service Command of Wright Field, Ohio. All parties credit Air Commodore Frank Whittle of the British Royal Air Force for the original engine design. Credit for pushing the design into production within the unprecedented time of 143 days after it was started was given to General Arnold. He was first to interest the American manufacturers in the British engine.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, in the past 2 years I have had an opportunity as a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, serving in the capacity of chairman of a subcommittee, to go on an investigation of housing conditions near the defense plants and other purposes in the United States, and I want to call the attention of the membership of the House to the fact that I believe the amendment of our chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] should be adopted. I am sorry our good friend from New York [Mr. TABER] has raised a point of order, because I feel great harm might come from the results of that. Perhaps it seems to many of the Members today that this is California day because several of the California delegation are going to speak on this.

I want to cite to the membership of the House the Bermite powder plant, of Saugus, Calif., which made 20-millimeter shells exclusively up to 2 months ago. Now they make fuzes for a large percentage of our rockets. A short distance away those rockets are being tested. It is imperative that they have more housing facilities immediately in furtherance of the war effort. Many of us do not know about these things. They have been kept secret up until recently. That is one of the reasons that we should not have a point of order against this. We should have no interruptions in our building program or our program of providing facilities in those areas where we must have the manpower to manufacture this war material.

As I see it today, it will not be long—perhaps it will not be needed at all—but until victory comes, up to the last moment we must put forth every effort and we at home should not make any mistake of any kind whatsoever. I believe a mistake might be made right here today if this amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] is not adopted wholeheartedly. I would like to see the gentleman from New York

withdraw his point of order. I do not believe this is the time to be throwing these kind of hooks into a deal when it looks like we are on the right track. I personally know from my own experience, and my record here in the House will show, that I want to conserve the American dollar just as much as any other Member of this Congress, and I do not yield to anyone on that point. But I believe that for the good of our Nation this is a time we should do everything we can to promote the winning of the war just as soon as we can.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I have a suggestion or two to make which I hope will be considered pertinent. One is reply to the accusation that this is a program originated by the Federal Works Administration in order to perpetuate itself and its activities. We are in a war. Applications came from the people in affected areas and from the War and Navy Departments. Men and boys are coming back to the United States in numbers which alarm us. They are wounded and sick and need care more than at any other time. They need all kinds of facilities necessary for human existence. They need places where they may go temporarily to receive treatment, augmenting in very large measure the work of the veterans' hospitals which I am afraid will prove entirely too small. They are coming back by the thousands and perhaps may come by the millions. I want to give you a little testimony about my own town which is in a defense area but which has no particular plants that we call exclusively war agencies or war manufacturing plants.

Every factory there is dedicated to the manufacture of war materials. That is 90 percent of its output. The people go from my county to points in Virginia where there are exclusively war-material plants. They live in my community where their families must be cared for. Their children and their wives must have hospital care, nurse care, educational care, and child care. The Federal Works Agency is not projecting this as a self-perpetuating proposition.

In my home town there is a hospital furnished by the Duke Foundation, but the Duke Foundation has no funds with which to enlarge it. I have not been in that hospital within 2 or 3 years when it was not overtaxed. I was there the other day. The sitting rooms, the halls, and every available space in there are taken up by patients, many of them soldiers, and the wives and children of soldiers. The doors of that hospital are open to every soldier and his family regardless of whether they are able to pay a price for treatment and care or not. Over in another end of my county they have another hospital needing enlargement. It was not known whether the Federal Works Agency could meet the need and a preacher went over the country and begged the money to pay for it themselves. We are like the gentleman suggested about limitations of taxation. Our State would do a great deal toward enlarging these facilities for hospital care, nurse care, child care, and education, but we cannot do all of it. Are we going to fail here? I hope not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call attention to certain material in the RECORD which has been subject to some misinterpretation today.

On the first point that this agency has sought to work undue pressure on Members of this body by building up a backlog of dangling and unfinished promises and projects, I desire to call the attention of the Members to the following points on page 315 of the hearings. Mr. Field is testifying:

> Mr. FIELD. In general the tests of need of construction and service are: Whether a community has expanded because of the war and the defense program; whether the armed services, the War Production Board, or the War Manpower Commission, whichever is involved in the war activities of the community, believe that these facilities or services are needed; whether the lack of the facilities would impede the war effort; and whether the facilities cannot be furnished by the community without imposing an undue tax burden.
>
> Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is mere expansion enough, or do you consider what the community may have in the way of financial capacity?
>
> Mr. FIELD. We do consider what financial capacity the community has.

Those are the facts in the record. Members will do well to recall statements which gentlemen have made before this House.

This agency likewise said that such projects, approved after such searching examination, but for which they had no money, now totaled $13,500,000, and that without additional funds they could not start them and they could not carry on their service.

I would like very much to see the amendment which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] offered, agreed to. It closely affects the congested districts which so many of us in these war times represent. The school system of Bremerton, Wash., which is the location of the great Puget Sound Navy Yard, is vitally affected by the passage or the failure of this amendment. We have two badly needed school constructions there which will not be undertaken if more funds are not made available.

I hope that the new amendment which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] has offered will be passed by this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] has expired.

Mr. GERLACH. Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel about the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee, but it is my intention to bring before you a few facts.

I have listened to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations with interest, who has stated that the airplane plants are mostly located in California. I believe the largest ones are. However, I represent two counties in eastern Pennsylvania and I have one airplane plant in each of those counties.

The first one in Buck County, known as the Brewster plant, was under investigation and operation of the Navy and after an investigation was closed. At that plant there was a $5,000,000 housing project which has never been occupied by any tenants whatsoever, is now a ghost town.

There is a plant also at Allentown, Pa., which is still operating and building the most important dive-bombing Navy plane that the Navy is building at the present time. When they arrived in Allentown they were told by the real estate men and by other business interests in Allentown that there was no additional housing needed there; but they proceeded under the Navy to build 360 units in Allentown. Those units were 40 percent completed when they were demolished by order of the Navy Department at a loss of $350 to the taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with those responsible for the building of housing, but I believe that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of this House listen entirely too much to those in the Army and Navy to give them information that they should receive from those municipalities where the housing is going to be built, who know far better what housing is necessary than do the Army and Navy. God only knows, the Army and Navy have a job to do to win this war. They have been trained in the military end of war. I think it would be far better if we allowed the folk back home, who know that business, to suggest to the committees what is necessary in the way of housing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, when I first came back here to Washington to represent the Eleventh District of California, it was my privilege to be assigned to the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee of the House, under the very able chairmanship of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]. Soon after coming back here, also it was an additional honor to be assigned to a subcommittee to check into the needs in war-congested areas throughout the Nation, especially on the west coast.

During those days when we took those trips it was brought home to us very vividly the extreme need not only for housing, but for additional community facilities. In the 2 years since that time that need has greatly increased. The increased population on the west coast, the increased war production, the increased emphasis on the war in the Pacific, and the greater increase on all these different factors that will come during the next few months, make it imperative that there be sufficient housing and that there be sufficient community facilities.

We used to hear in this House a great deal of talk about labor absenteeism. The more that absenteeism was checked into the more it was found that the absentee rate was high when there were improper community housing and improper community facilities, and that the absentee rate was low when there was adequate community facilities and housing.

The gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC] and the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] have given specific examples of the type of community facilities that are badly needed out there. Let me give one additional type that has not been mentioned and which may be greatly harmed if funds are not available. In a particular community on the west coast now producing more fish products than any other area of the United States, a great many women are working in the factories. In order that those women may work, there have to be nursery schools and other facilities for their children. All along the west coast such nursery schools are now increasing and multiplying. The more they are increased and the better they are staffed, the less will be the problem of manpower and womanpower in essential war industries and industries closely allied to the war effort. By his insistence upon his point of order, the gentleman from New York is doing great injury to these projects.

I should like to take this opportunity also to say one further thing, and that is this: Certain insinuations have been raised here today regarding the National Housing Agency and the Federal Works Agency. It has been implied that these are self-perpetuating bureaus. Of all the Government agencies I have come in contact with I know of none that are more conscientious in trying to do the job than these two. I know of no two Government administrators who are better qualified and who are more conscientious than Mr. Blandford, head of the National Housing Agency, and General Fleming, head of the Federal Works Agency. They are doing an excellent job.

May I also say that the chairman of the Public Building and Grounds Committee of this House on the first Tuesday of every month calls a meeting; at that time these Administrators and their assistants are brought up here and the problems are worked out mutually between the administration and this committee of Congress. Problems are frankly faced, and ironed out cooperatively between Congressmen and Administrators.

I think if that particular device which has been instituted by the distinguished gentleman from Texas were followed by other committees of the House there would be less friction and less conflict and greater achievement in Government bureaus.

One final word. It has been mentioned on this floor this afternoon that these community facilities would not be necessary if war contracts were awarded to other sections of the country. Ladies and gentlemen, you cannot change the fact that the war emphasis is being placed increasingly on the Pacific coast. You cannot change the location of the big bomber plants. You cannot change the location of Bremerton Navy Yard. You cannot change the location of Mare Island. You cannot change the location of Port Hueneme, one of the most important ports for shipping supplies to our men in the Pacific. It is the existence of these and countless other war and naval bases that has brought about the congestion on the west coast. Because of this fact, hundreds of thousands of workers have had to be brought to this section of the country. It is only fair to them, it is only fair to those in our armed services that the facilities in question be provided here. To fail to do this would be to directly injure the war effort.

This is not a matter that affects only the west coast. Directly or indirectly it affects every State and every community in the United States. I beg of the membership of this House that sectional prejudice, local interests, and political sniping be laid aside and the bigger issues given paramount consideration. I hope that we here will place the war effort ahead of anything and everything else. By our action on this amendment and similar ones we will make our position here clear. For my part, I wish to take my stand along with those who are willing to provide proper and decent community facilities for our war workers who are contributing so much to the coming victory over Japan.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], and the chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs for Congested Areas, the gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC]. I do not believe that there are two better informed men in this House on the needs of community facilities throughout this country than those two men, both of whom have already spoken on this subject. The gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC] has been serving as chairman of this subcommittee for the past 2 years. In those 2 years he has done more good for these congested areas throughout the country, I think, than any other committee of the House. He has made two trips to the west coast. He spent a week holding hearings in Seattle, Portland, Long Beach, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Diego. He was not just calling in members of the armed forces, the representatives of the Army and the Navy. They were open hearings, and the officials of the State and the cities were invited to every hearing that was held. They all had their say. They were all for the same purpose, that is, that we need those buildings; we need these various facilities. If anybody is going to take the blame for taking away from those men who are working in the airplane factories and in the shipyards of this country the decent standard living conditions that we are entitled to, it will be you who did not vote for this appropriation. It is going to be the end of the Republican Party on this side for making the point of order as they have in striking out the amount included for the Federal Works Agency at the present time. I remember when they criticized W. P. A. They will criticize every Government agency when they get the chance. But I do not believe there is a better Government agency operating at this time than the Federal Works Agency. I want to see that agency continued, because when this war is over we are going to have some Government agencies. We are going to have men looking for jobs, and I would much rather see an agency like the Federal Works Agency, with a background of public works projects on the shelf to throw in during a slack time of employment, than to have another W. P. A. on our hands which we will have if the Republican Party on this side has its say about it in this particular bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH].

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I cannot endorse what the previous speaker just said concerning the Republican Members of the House. There may be times when individuals might be stigmatized for being too economical, but when he includes all of the Members on the other side he can exclude me in this instance, because I spoke on the Lanham amendment before he did.

May I say that before coming to Congress I resigned from the position of member of the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County. We have a hundred-million-dollar budget to run that county. In addition to the funds we provide for the services of people who are affected by the war in the congested areas, it is necessary for us to look to aid from the Federal Government for services such as the Lanham amendment would provide.

In addition to the funds we provide out of the tax revenues we collect from the people on real or personal property, we have the burden of the Defense Plant Corporation installations in Los Angeles County that takes out a million dollars' worth of tax revenues that we would otherwise have if it was taxed as a private possession; in other words, we are facing the responsibility of meeting this added cost that will be placed upon us if this fund is not left in this bill, plus the loss of a million dollars in tax revenues because of installations of the Federal Government for war purposes. So I am appealing on the basis of fair and reasonable judgment to the Members of this House to adopt the Lanham amendment and leave this fund in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to point out that there are some projects out there now that require housing very badly. The one I am thinking about in particular is the ship supply depot at Stockton, Calif., where there are now only 50 employees, but on July 1 there will be 3,145 employees. That group needs 2,903 houses. There is not one single available house in Stockton. That depot is the one that is going to supply the major part of the supplies for the Pacific Fleet in the present war. To service them properly, we must have houses, and they should be built in the next few months to take care of those workers.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. I appreciate what my colleague says. Let me remind the House also that recently Eric Johnston, of the United States Chamber of Commerce, made the statement that the Government awarded a contract in the San Diego area that will require 5,000

additional men. You cannot get men into San Diego with a shoehorn now, and you cannot find space to put up tents to put people in there. Still there has been an award of a contract that will require 5,000 additional homes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, we are discussing here an appropriation bill that carries $2,000,000,000. I want to inform the Committee of a single transaction that involves a like amount. It is reported in the Washington Post of March 1. I read from an article entitled, "France Is Given Huge Credit To Step Up Its Part in War."

France yesterday accepted a new-type lend-lease arrangement offered by the United States which, in addition to the customary lend-lease and reciprocal aid agreements, provides for credits to France totaling $2,575,000,000.

The credits cover such civilian-type items as oil, other raw materials, food, locomotives, railroad cars, and industrial equipment and are designed to insure eventual cash repayment for that part of the total which would be left over at the end of the war for possible peacetime use by the French.

The credit device which was made a part of a lend-lease arrangement for the first time is designed to facilitate the disposal of surpluses which may be on hand or in a partially complete stage in the United States when hostilities cease.

Establishment of the credit mechanism was interpreted as indicating a United States desire to have lend-leased goods that have post-war significance accepted as the start of post-war trade, with munitions written off on some other basis.

Included in this arrangement are locomotives, railroad cars, merchant marine facilities, harbor watercraft, fishing fleets, barges, metalworking machinery, industrial and mining equipment.

Mr. Chairman, I am informed that at the present time we are engaged in getting out an order for France under lend-lease of 1,500 locomotives. They are given preference in using our facilities to get out these locomotives, while at the same time we are unable to move the wheat and other food in the Western States due to the shortage in railroad equipment.

I was here when we passed the Lend-Lease Act. I do not recall that that act carried a provision for any cash advances to the countries with which we have made lend-lease arrangements. I am wondering how far our international financiers will go, with the people in charge of our Government departments, in piling up an insurmountable burden for the taxpayers of this country to shoulder. I think Congress should investigate transactions of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I want to bring to your attention another specific instance of school-facility needs in my particular district. Just recently the Army Air Corps finished an Army air depot right in the middle of one of my school districts, and they are employing 3,000 people there. A recent survey of 1,087 war housing units in my district showed 3 pupils per housing unit. We are operating right now at one end of this particular district with 4,586 pupils, many of them attending in a set of temporary buildings we have erected.

The State of California is spending up to $4,000 per classroom unit per year, the highest in the Nation next to New York. We are doing our part in this educational program but we cannot do it all. We have an overload of 1,694 children right in that one school district whose parents were brought in there to help in the war effort. Their parents are working in the Phelps-Dodge Corporation, the Chrysler Tank Manufacturing Corporation, the Willys-Overland Co., the United States Rubber Co., the Goodrich Rubber Co., and other defense plants, all of them on war contracts.

We have talked a lot about money here today. There is about $20,000,000 involved in this particular amendment I am interested in right at this point. That is less than the cost of 1 cruiser, yet it means that close to 100,000 pupils will not get adequate school facilities in America if these funds are withheld from community uses.

I have in my hand a chart of 1 small school district of 12 elementary schools, 8 of which are operating on double shifts. One school has a capacity of 315 pupils and has 520 pupils in it, and it has many temporary bungalow school buildings. That is what we are asking you for in removing this $18,000,000 limitation, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]. This is one of the specific cases of actual war-area need. We are not talking now in terms of economy. We are going to save a certain number of millions of dollars, to be sure, by cutting out the use of Lanham Act funds. We can save more by drastically eliminating all Federal expenditures. Of course, this would be ridiculous, and I do not advocate such a policy. I advocate the expenditure of Federal funds where it has been proven to be necessary to help local communities carry the burden of increased expenses, chargeable directly to critical war-area conditions. There is a time to talk about economy. But this is the time to talk about educating American children. I am talking to you about kids who have to go to school in critical defense areas. We must have help. We have kids out there whose parents are working. They are working there on Federal war contracts for the benefit of the Nation. The Pacific coast is going to be a hotbed of war industry for a long time, until this war is won in the South Pacific and Far East. I ask the consideration of the House on this particular amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]. Give us a little support on that and we will educate these children and send them back to your States educated, but we do need a little bit of help. The only place to get that help is through matching local funds with Lanham Act funds, such as those contained in this appropriation. For the sake of the education of the future citizens of America, I urge that you support this amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I had not planned to make my maiden speech this afternoon until I discovered what is very apparently a move which will have tragic results in my own congressional district in California unless the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] should succeed. I have the honor to represent in this distinguished body the great Eighteenth Congressional District in the State of California which, broadly speaking, contains the great shipbuilding industries—Calship, Consolidated Ship, Craig, the great Roosevelt Naval Base—and the great aircraft industries of Douglas at Long Beach, and Consolidated Vultee. So I think if there is any district in this Nation which should be concerned with the stability and education and security of the children of that district, it is the district which I represent. I think I speak with some authority because of the fact, may I point out to this distinguished body, that for 15 consecutive years before I came here I had the responsibility and pleasure of serving as chairman of the recreation and playground commission of my own city. In that continuous relationship for more than 15 years and ever since the war started, I came intimately in touch with the fine operations and fine effects of the Lanham Act as administered by the departments charged with administering those funds in my district. Under the tax limitation in the State of California as it applies to some 20 incorporated cities in my district, it is physically, literally, and legally impossible for the budgets of those twenty-odd cities in the Eighteenth Congressional District to reshift and restabilize themselves so as to take care of this tragic emergency if it occurs as the result of taking away from the Nation these funds that we so badly need there.

We talk about winning the war. Good. That is our major objective in this world. But close to that is the objective that we shall not lose the education and the morale and the security of our children while we are doing it. I know of no act on the statute books of this great Nation which tends more to the security of our children in the schools and recreation departments all over the Nation than does the practical application of the Lanham Act. Men work and will go to work where their children are happy, safe, and secure. There is no act on our statute books that tends more to draw men to critical areas where they are needed in the war industries than does this act. It keeps the children more secure, freer from the hazards of juvenile delinquency than any Federal provision which we have. We should carry this amendment by all means.

Mr. Chairman, this hellish, global war will be the effective cause of hundreds of thousands of delinquent children in this Nation without Congress unnecessarily contributing to more juvenile delinquency. If we, today, without reasonable notice to other governmental agencies in the respective States and communities of the States, take away the necessary Federal monies on which they have been dependent to carry on these necessary child-welfare programs the

balance of the fiscal year, such action by this Congress would be nothing less than tragic to the Eighteenth Congressional District of California. I emphatically resist the move against this Lanham fund which would have that result.

American men and women locate for work, not only where they can get good wages, but where their children are served by good schools and recreation opportunities. This Lanham Act supplements such essentials for decent raising of children. American men and women will not travel to points for work where their children are in danger, or unnecessarily exposed due to lack of community educational and recreational facilities.

It has been said that the army moves forward on its stomach. I now say that a nation only goes forward as its children are reasonably well educated and their minds and bodies well trained, and strengthened. Recreational illiteracy is no less dangerous than classroom illiteracy. Recreation, playgrounds, and park departments, as well as the school departments of the great Eighteenth District of California are absolutely dependent on these supplemental moneys under the Lanham Act. It is being penny-wise to try and save a few dollars in this epochal war at the expense of the childhood of our Nation.

Every need for additional housing as stressed this afternoon by my distinguished colleagues from southern California can be multiplied and thus stated, as the need which exists in the Eighteenth District of California. It was reported to me during the recent debate time on the work-or-jail bill that the only manpower shortage apparent in the Eighteenth Congressional District of California was the result of a shortage of housing facilities.

So, gentlemen, I implore you to not undertake in this sudden unnecessary manner to save a few pennies, comparatively, when the result thereof will so vitally affect the permanent welfare of possibly millions of children, for by so doing you definitely limit, restrict, retard, and devaluate for all time the primary interests of our Nation—our children.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER.]

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides the money for the war on the home front. Paying for the war on the home front, is just as vital to the war as the expenditure of money for those things with which it is fought on the active battle fronts. There is a great upswing of activity on the Pacific coast due to concentration of the war in the Pacific and to the extending of its battle lines. Let me point out to you that carrying the war farther away from our own coast and into Japan proper is going to require a turn-around of ships at a much more rapid rate than is now employed. It is going to require an increase in shipping that is far out of proportion to the distance the battle front bears from the west coast. It is going to require more longshoremen and warehousemen, for instance. The longshoremen now on the Pacific coast are ill-housed yet today and there is a demand for some 4,000 additional of them. They must be housed—recreation, transportation, and other community facilities must be provided for them. Schools must be expanded to educate their children, health services must be established, and so forth, that will allow them to lead normal lives if their working efficiency is not to be impaired.

Members preceding me have talked about expansion in their several districts. Let me tell you that on San Francisco Bay, on which my district borders, a new ammunition dump has recently been established. They have taken over 4,000 acres of the most arable land in Contra Costa County; land that the owners and the community did not want them to take. They could not locate an ammunition dump to serve the Pacific war in Pennsylvania or at Mobile, Ala. It had to be there because it was at the place closest to the war, the place where rail and water transportation meet. This imposes a new weight on a small town of some 1,500 population; conditions that they cannot meet. They must have Federal assistance if they are going to carry on normal community facilities. Not only schools, but sewers, recreation, and such things.

In another community bordering on California's inland waters, near which is located a great camp from which men depart for the Pacific, a hospital is needed. It is needed for very peculiar reasons. At this camp, divisions which were trained elsewhere in the country, destined for the Pacific, were housed from 6 weeks to 2 months in their final preparations for overseas duty. It is a port of embarkation. The wives of those young soldiers followed them there. The maternity rate in this town jumped to about 35 per month. These women, the wives of our soldiers, have to be cared for. The Government has built a hospital using Lanham Act money but the money to operate that hospital is tied to the funds this amendment seeks to unfreeze.

This is only one case of many that could be cited.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RICH. California, here we come. I am not for California when I think we are doing the wrong thing, but I am for California when I think we are doing the right thing.

The gentleman who just preceded me, was telling you about the Army coming in there and taking the best land they had near San Francisco and using it as a supply base. The question today in my judgment is, Should we permit the Army to do anything they want to do without challenging anything they do? I do not think they do things right and I am going to prove it to you right now.

The gentleman spoke about taking the best land they had near San Francisco for an ammunition dump. In my district 3 years ago they took the very best land we had to make a powder manufacturing establishment, at White Deer. We tried to get the Army not to take that good agricultural land. We wanted them to use land that was not so valuable. They spent over a hundred million dollars building this plant. They put in eight lines to manufacture powder. They started one line and ran it a little while and then closed it down. It has not operated since and probably never will, because they have dismantled a great part of it during the last year. They not only built that manufacturing plant at White Deer but they went to Meadville, Pa., and they did the same thing. It shows me that the Army does a lot of things that it should not do.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] said they could not build an airplane factory any place except California, because that is where all the airplanes are built. We have got an airplane factory in Lock Haven, Pa. We manufacture engines for airplanes at Williamsport. The gentleman from Scranton spoke to you a while ago and said he has thousands of people who want jobs. The homes are there. The schools are there. The facilities are there. The coal is there and there is everything but the plant, or for the Army to say that we are going to manufacture planes in Scranton. If you had materials that were necessary you would not have to build the schools, you would not have to build the houses, you would not have to build a lot of things you are doing now. It would be a great deal cheaper to build the plant than it would be to build all these houses and move all the people. Just review the situation that has happened during the last 3 or 4 years in trying to move families. The people of this country do not want you to shove them all around. They would like to have some choice about the place where they would live.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask if any member of the committee desires to speak? If not, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I sat here in the Chamber listening to the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, during which he pointed out the necessity for economy in government and as a fellow Missourian I could not help but feel in my heart a great admiration for him and the position that he took. I think he is doing and is going to do a great service to the people of this country. In view of my personal admiration for the chairman of that great committee, I always hesitate to oppose any position he takes. On the other hand, it happens that I am a member of the Buildings and Grounds Committee under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. Chairman, I have had opportunity during the last 2 or 3 years to observe something of the housing and facilities program. I am not going into that. I know that mistakes have been made the same as they have been made in every other department of the Government. But war is an expensive business. When

you suddenly draw 10,000,000 men together, weld them into a great army in the shortest space of time known in the history of the world, build great factories, create new armaments that were never built before, you are bound to make some mistakes. But the greatest mistake that we could make today is to blunder in the prosecution of this war.

It has only been a few months ago since any of you ever heard of a bazooka, or a rocket gun. Never before in our history have so many new inventions been brought forth. Many vast new improvements of old weapons have changed the whole course of the war and have been brought forth in a short period of time. The result is that it has been necessary almost overnight to set up new factories for the purpose of manufacturing newly discovered weapons of war, which weapons of war have saved the lives of countless thousands of our American boys.

Here is what I want to say in connection with the Lanham amendment: His amendment seeks to set aside that clause in the bill which defers expenditure of this money until the middle of next summer. If we are going to need the money at all, we will probably need it before that time. By tying this string around the $18,000,000, holding it tight in a bag until the middle of next summer, you may by voting against the Lanham amendment destroy the lives of 10,000 men over a period of a night and a day. Never have I seen an amendment, since I have been here, that I thought was more important than is this amendment.

I can well understand the position of the Appropriations Committee. I know the sincerity of its purpose. The members of that committee want to save as much of this $18,000,000 as they can, and I am with them on that score, but let us not take a chance on wasting the lives of thousands of our young men because we do not have the facilities where we need them to build the things necessary for the protection of our soldiers and sailors.

I read an article the other day in one of our leading magazines telling the story of the rocket gun. When the Third and Fourth Divisions of the Marine Corps approached Iwo Jima there was a zero hour, the period when they got away from the protecting shells of the big guns of the fleet and before they could set up their instruments, their machine guns and so forth on the shore to reply to the fire of the Japanese who were entrenched along the shore. That is when we lost so many of our splendid boys. But this new invention, the bazooka or rocket gun, laid down such a barrage of fire that it just simply pulverized everything within its reach.

Mr. Chairman, let us not do anything that is going to stop the production of these new instruments of war, because we cannot look that far ahead. Let us vote for the Lanham amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for 2 minutes in the hope that I might remove from the minds of some of the Members of this House the notion that this is a matter which purely concerns the State of California. That is not true. This is general all over the Nation.

In the capital of my own State we have a huge naval ordnance plant and some $75,000,000 have been expended by the Federal Government in enlarging this plant since the outbreak of the war. That brought in thousands of additional workmen and their children who had to be taken care of. As the secretary of the State board of school finances for some years in West Virginia, I know that there is an arrangement with the Housing Authority of the United States Government to pay the school officials of that particular county and city so many thousand dollars annually. If the $18,000,000 affected by the pending amendment is lost, I doubt very seriously whether the Authority will have the money with which to carry out existing obligations, to say nothing about money with which to build new housing facilities.

Mr. Chairman, I trust it will be the pleasure of the Committee to approve the Lanham amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the question is whether we shall eat our cake or keep it. We cannot do both. The bill provides that $18,000,000 shall be reserved for maintenance of service projects after July 1, 1945. The amendment opens the $18,000,000 for immediate spending for other purposes and leaves us without any assurance that the existing service projects will be operated after the first of the fiscal year. Which shall we do? Shall we dissipate this money now or shall we insure future operation of our service projects?

Let us remember two things. First, the projects cannot be serviced without $18,000,000. Second, there is no more money where this came from. We have now exhausted all of the original $500,000,000 authorization. Only $3,000,000 remains.

Now, where will we be if we eat our cake now and spend this $18,000,000 on new projects and then are unable to get further authorization? "Oh," somebody says, "we will have no trouble getting new authorization any time we want it." But can you depend on that?

Everybody knows that the German war will end before the close of the fiscal year. Even the most pessimistic observers do not place the collapse of German arms later than June. And it may come much sonner.

Now, this authorization is a war measure. We might say it is a two-war measure, because last summer when both the Army and the Navy were predicting the end of the war by October, we started demobilization of war industries. Plants all over the country were closed down and others slowed production. Thirty miles from my home one of the great TNT plants closed down and was dismantled. When it became apparent the war would not end in October it was reconditioned and is now running again. But there can be no doubt that when the Hitler government folds up we will go back to the situation we had expected to be in last October. Everywhere plants will be closing or slowing up. No new plants will be opened and no expansions will be made. Under such conditions as that, what argument is there for authorization legislation for war housing and war utilities?

Let us not take that gamble. We are already arranging here to spend money for harness for a dead horse. The German war is already dying. It cannot survive. The Jap war will go on but at the most it can only utilize half of present plant facilities.

Under the provisions of the bill as reported to the House $8,703,437 is provided to maintain and operate our service projects until June 30. And $18,000,000 is provided to maintain and operate them after June 30. And then, in addition to these two appropriations, a further appropriation of $6,933,000 is provided for new projects. I was about to forget to add that another additional $4,928,030 is available for administrative expenses. The committee has provided liberally for every need and it has insured maintenance and operation of all service projects after June 30. The pending amendment disrupts this balanced arrangement and provides for the immediate consumption of the $18,000,000, leaving nothing for maintenance and operation after June 30.

Now, if the German war ends and you cannot get another authorization, and we have no authority to provide money for operation, where will we find ourselves?

Mr. Chairman, this proposal to continue expenditures, regardless of the certain ending of the war in the near future, presents a serious situation. It illustrates the difficulty we are going to have pinching off these war activities and getting out of the habit of spending money regardless of whether we have it or not. One of the many hardships of war is that it gets us into the habit of large expenditures. It is easy to start these spending sprees, but hard to stop them. We ought to reserve this $18,000,000. The taxpayers will need it next taxpaying day. We do not have to spend it. We have $6,933,000 to spend without using it. I appeal to the House to start national economy and national tax reduction right here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LANHAM) there were—ayes 92, noes 71.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. LANHAM.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 103, noes 78.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 8, line 12, strike out the word "further."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. MCCORMACK, having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. SPARKMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2374) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, March 5, after the completion of business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Milwaukee Journal.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee today and include an article from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter from a constituent with regard to surplus property.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS—PERMISSION TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H. R. 689

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be permitted to file a supplemental report on the bill (H. R. 689) relating to the Foreign Service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include therein an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post on the farmer faces another tough year.

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, there never was a critical phase in history in which a speech purporting to clarify a situation left more unsaid than the President's speech today. And these silences must give all of us grave concern.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a statement of the American Labor Party on the matter of punishment of war criminals.

GENERAL LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill in committee today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do this for the purpose of asking the majority leader the program for next week.

Mr. RAMSPECK. In response to the question of the distinguished minority leader, it had been hoped that the nurses bill could be brought up tomorrow, but since it cannot be completed tomorrow it has been decided to call it up on Monday after the Consent Calendar. The rule and general debate will be disposed of, and the amendment stage will be taken up on Tuesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In other words, we will not start to read the bill until Tuesday?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct. As far as I can announce right now, that is the only major legislation there is in sight. It is possible that a rule may be brought in on some other matter such as the Commodity Credit, and if so, that will be taken up.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

GOVERNMENT CENSORSHIP

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on February 27, 1945, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] raised the question of government censorship. At this time, I would like to state that my enthusiasm for freedom of the press will equal, at any time and under any circumstances, that of my distinguished colleague. And I believe that is the position of every Member of the House. It cannot be successfully contradicted that an unfettered press is a prime weapon in the war against fascism or communism and other forms of tyrannous interference with personal and political liberty. And not alone does this apply to the domestic sphere but, in my judgment, should apply as well to the broader field of international relations. I was pleased to learn of the resolution introduced by Secretary of State Stettinius at the Mexico City Conference of the American Republics, recognizing as the essential obligation of democratic governments the assurance to their people of free and impartial access to information. And that as evidence of their good faith in the principles of democracy the American governments by this resolution are requested to abandon as soon as possible after the war the censorship measures and press and radio controls found necessary during the conflict. I propose, at a later date, to present a resolution to this House expressing the sentiment that certain provisions having to do with the freedom of the press and the availability of news and communication facilities equally and freely throughout the world be made part of the coming peace program.

I must observe, however, that with the Nation at war the rule of reason on this subject, as on every other subject, must prevail for the purposes of national safety and security. It appears that some few people because they are so close to the forest cannot see any trees and in addition have peopled that forest with the bogey man of censorship.

In calling attention to a letter from Elmer Davis to Justice Byrnes, the gentleman from New York is seeing things that are not there. He does a little interpolating for the obvious purpose of setting up a censorship bogey. And after setting it up he declares, "It is apparent that this incompetent outfit is attempting to destroy the freedom of the press and to prevent them from getting information about the Government."

Now, from this the gentleman from New York purposes to protect the people of this country.

The facts, of course, are well known not only to you gentlemen, but the newspapers, the radio, and the public. There is no censorship other than that of the voluntary code administered through the Office of Censorship, which is wholly apart from the Office of War Information. There is no attempt ever made to keep the press or the public from having news of their government. On the contrary, the Office of War Information does a tremendous job in assisting the newspapers and the radio in their work, which is to obtain and relay the news to the public.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman realize that the O. W. I. requires the different agencies, before they make any statement, to come to them and let them rewrite it for them? They will not allow the press to ask these people any questions unless they prepare the answers in advance.

Mr. FLOOD. May I answer the distinguished gentleman from New York in this way: I have anticipated that such questions might be asked by the gentleman, and, if he will permit me to finish, I hope my answer to that interrogation is contained in the manuscript before me.

Mr. TABER. Of course, the gentleman realizes that Mr. Davis, of the O. W. I., pleaded guilty.

Mr. FLOOD. I am aware of no such plea, and I doubt very much if anybody in the House is so aware or the public or the press, but may I go on?

Now, so far as the letter itself is concerned, the gentleman from New York could have saved a lot of time if he had recited the facts, as I purpose to do now. The letter informed Justice Byrnes of the mechanics of operation of the Domestic Branch of O. W. I. Copies of that letter were sent to the heads of all Federal agencies. Practically all of the heads of these agencies have acknowledged the letter; some have taken advantage of the opportunity to ask for more assistance from O. W. I, and not one has complained.

The gentleman, instead of presenting the facts, has obscured them. Mr. Davis' letter to Justice Byrnes represented a proper and desirable action aimed at accomplishing the very end for which the Office of War Information was created—that is to promote the dissemination of the fullest and most accurate information possible within the limits of military security.

Note that I say "most accurate information"; for it is one of the responsibilities of O. W. I. to see that formal official statements from the executive branch of the Government are consistent with each other and with the facts.

The O. W. I. deserves great credit for the work it has done to see that the American people are not befuddled by a host of official spokesmen, each one putting his own interpretation on the same piece of news. As a result of O. W. I.'s activities, the American people and the American press are not getting less news—as the gentleman from New York would try to make you believe—they are getting more news and more accurate news. You know that; the gentlemen in the press gallery know that. They know that they can go to any official of the Government, they can attend any press conference to which they are accredited, they can ask any questions they or their editors can think up—and no O. W. I., nor any other agency, stands—or wants to stand, or should stand—in their way.

It is my information that the O. W. I., instead of standing in the way, contributes materially to that purpose.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I wish that what the gentleman said were true, but I receive communications from people who are trying to get information—representatives of the press, for instance, who are unable to get that information because of this regulation.

Mr. FLOOD. I will reply to the distinguished gentleman from New York by saying that he is begging the question. Unquestionably that might be true, but the purpose of the O. W. I. is to correlate and coordinate the information in such a way that there are not a dozen or a series of mouthpieces expressing diversified opinions on the same question.

Mr. TABER. And they will not permit these gentlemen to give out information that is not under control.

Mr. FLOOD. That again begs the question and is the gentleman's opinion. It is that opinion which the gentleman expressed to which I am making reply.

Had the gentleman from New York turned to page 290 of the House Appropriation Subcommittee hearings on the national war agencies appropriation bill for 1945, I am sure he would not have made the statements concerning Mr. Brackett, the O. W. I. employee whose name he has brought into the debate.

It is singular that the gentleman from New York failed so to refresh his memory, because the record shows that he was present at the very hearings to which I refer.

Mr. TABER. I brought out the facts shown on that page. I had those in front of me.

Mr. FLOOD. I am aware of that, but I would like to finish.

The hearings show that Mr. Brackett is a native of South Dakota and that he completed his education at the Universities of Nebraska and South Dakota with a B. A. degree. During the 9 years from 1926 to 1935 he was a reporter, copy reader, editorial writer, and special writer on economics and finance successively for the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader, the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune, the New York World, the City News Association of New York, and for the Associated Press, both in New York and Washington.

From 1935 to 1938 Mr. Brackett was Assistant Supervisor of Information of the Securities and Exchange Commission, then served for a year as assistant to the executive secretary of the Temporary National Economic Committee, then became executive secretary of that committee. The committee, by the way, functioned under the chairmanship of Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, and included distinguished members of both Houses of the Congress, such as the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. REECE].

In 1940 Mr. Brackett became executive assistant to the trustees of the Associated Gas & Electric Corporation at a salary of $9,000 a year, a position which he held until he joined the O. W. I. on March 15, 1943, at a base salary of $8,000.

I say these things in fairness to the O. W. I. and to Mr. Brackett.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, the other evening I had a very unusual experience. While reading one of the Washington newspapers, I noticed a report therein that our Appropriations Committee of the House had approved the deficiency appropriation for various agencies, and among them was the Office of Price Administration for $6,235,000, which brought the total appropriation for the year to more than $185,000,000 for this agency.

This would not be unusual if it were not for the statement appearing in the article that the House committee had transmitted a report complimenting this Office for performing a most difficult and herculean task in a very praiseworthy manner.

At the outset, I would not have anyone believe that I do not thoroughly approve of price control and rationing in principle, or that I do not believe that the Office of Price Administration has performed a service to the people of the United States. However, I have always believed in fair and impartial enforcement of regulations which were fixed to govern a large number of people.

I cannot agree that the Office of Price Administration has administered the regulations—in the State of Ohio and in the Cincinnati district particularly—fairly and impartially. I cannot agree that it has made use of the available funds for the purpose of providing fair and impartial administration of its regulations. I have in my files definite evidence of petty grafting on the part of board employees, condoned by members of the rationing board and supported by supervisory officials in the district. I have in my files evidence of discriminatory enforcement procedures which have led to a complete reversal of the volume of business enjoyed by firms which were in business during base periods as compared with those firms which were not in business during the base periods but came into existence during the so-called rationing periods.

I have endeavored to have these matters adjusted within the framework of Office of Price Administration regulations, and have run up against a stone wall of conspiracy within the Boards Operation Division, the Enforcement Division, and the Hearing Commissioners Division.

I cite the chronology of one instance in which I attempted to have a matter handled in an orderly manner under O. P. A. regulations:

First. In July 1943, a member of the family of the food rationing clerk of the Hamilton, Ohio, board attempted to borrow $50 from a person engaged in operating a cafe and restaurant. This request was refused.

Second. In September 1943, this restaurant operator was required to file an application for ration points with the

Hamilton board. This application was questioned by the food rationing clerk, and the operator was required to show records sustaining his application. He did this, and proved his right to points under his original application. However, he was held up for 24 days before the points were issued.

Third. Between September 1943 and December 1943, the food-rationing clerk and other clerks, including the chief clerk of the board, in off-duty hours of the night season were known to have discussed the case in the places of business of competitors, and to have sworn to "get" this particular operator before they were through.

Fourth. On January 1, 1944, operators of restaurants were required to file a different type of application, which included a statement of the total number of customers served both liquid and food and the dollars received for such service; the total number of customers served with food only and the amount of money received for such service; and the total number of people served refreshments only and the dollars received from sale of refreshments and other liquid servings. This operator filed his application in accordance with the regulations and was requested to prove his figures. This he did on February 8 and February 18, 1944.

Fifth. Not satisfied with this proof, the board referred the matter to the Cincinnati enforcement office and a field examination was ordered.

Sixth. Field examiners came into the operator's place of business on three distinct occasions, gathering material in the course of their investigation. At no time did they disclose what they were investigating or what information they wanted, except to request the records of cash receipts and disbursements. These they were furnished, and they were also told that if they would disclose the reason for their investigation and the exact figures they were seeking to verify, the operator would be glad to supply the records of those transactions. The investigators told the operator that they could not discuss the case with him nor with his accountant.

Seventh. Representing this operator as an accountant, I requested that the board disclose the reason for their investigation and the exact figures that they desired to have proven. Instead of being given this information, charges were filed against the operator and a hearing set for May 8, the day before the primary in which I was a candidate. However, the Cincinnati office of the Enforcement Division neglected to say at what building and in what room the hearing would be held, and therefore the hearing notice was invalid. It was corrected a day later, and the hearing set for May 9, which was primary day in our district. We requested a continuance from May 9, and it was set for June 9, because the hearing commissioners reach our territory only once in 30 days.

Eighth. On June 9 we appeared with the records of the operations—an attorney representing the client and myself as his accountant—prepared to furnish full and complete information under oath. The Government's attorney refused to go on with the hearing, and the hearing commissioner at that time stated that the charges as drawn were the worst he had ever seen in his experience with the O. P. A. and that even if the Government proved every charge made, he could not see what kind of an order he could issue. The Government had subpenaed the two clerks in my office and had closed my office down completely for the period of this hearing, and we insisted that the hearing be completed. However, the hearing commissioner decided that depositions should be taken from the two clerks, that we should continue the hearing, and that a conference should be held, at which the matter could be completely ironed out. This was agreed to.

Ninth. A conference was held with the chief field examiner, and it was agreed to keep guest checks for 1 month to prove the operation of the spot. The attitude of the chief examiner at this conference was that the restaurant was not to be permitted under any circumstances to have the points that were due it in accordance with its application. We kept the guest checks, however, during the month of July 1944, and proved from these checks that the application was correct.

Tenth. Immediately thereafter the chief examiner of the district resigned and the enforcement attorney who had brought the charges resigned. However, no points were issued to the operator.

Eleventh. I called this case specifically to the attention of the Office of Price Administration on September 17, 1944, and received no answer.

Twelfth. On November 17, 1944, the Office of Price Administration liaison officer to Congress wrote me and asked me to submit to him any questions that I might have regarding the operation of O. P. A. in my district. I submitted this problem in a five-page letter, asking that a complete examination of the operations of the Hamilton board in connection with institutional users' allotments be conducted and that the base-period figures of the 254 applications in this board's district be verified by the records of the operators and that this be done prior to December 31, 1944, because of the provision in the regulations which required these operators to save their base-period records of the month of December 1942 for 2 years. I was advised that this would be done.

Thirteenth. On December 5 I received a reply to my letter of September 17, 1944, saying that my letter had gotten into the files by mistake but that they were referring it to the Division of Enforcement. I replied, calling their attention to the fact that my criticisms were in connection with administration and not enforcement and that the matter had been submitted to Washington at the request of the congressional liaison officer of the O. P. A. and that I was awaiting his report.

Fourteenth. On December 15, I received a letter from the district director, suggesting that a personal conference might be advisable. I was able to attend this conference in his office in Cincinnati on December 29. He had in his office at that time the enforcement officer of the division, with the file of the operator referred to in the beginning of this discourse. I told them that I was not in their office seeking favors, that I did not desire to discuss the case that was then before their hearing commissioner, that if the case was still pending it should be heard, and that I insisted upon its being heard. They then arranged for a hearing to be held January 17, 1945.

Fifteenth. At the hearing on January 17, 1945, which started at 9:30 in the morning and lasted until 7 in the evening, the field examiners, under oath, disclosed that they were particularly instructed not to discuss this case with anyone, and particularly not with Mr. Gardner. They admitted that their examination had not been thorough, that they had not asked for records supporting the application. The operator on his part submitted records which completely supported the applications which he had made for January 1944 and every period thereafter.

Sixteenth. At the conclusion of the hearing, the hearing commissioner in summing up the evidence said, "It is apparent that the defendant has complied with the regulation and has kept the records necessary to compile the application which he made." At this point up jumped the chief enforcement attorney for O. P. A. and said, "I hope that the findings will not recite that the records were adequate." The hearing commissioner hesitated, his face flushed, and he said, "Oh, no."

Seventeenth. On January 18 he issued a warning order stating that the records were not adequate, although the evidence had disclosed that they were a complete record of the daily figures required and they were never challenged as to accuracy or authenticity. Furthermore, they had all been in the hands of the local board as early as February 8 and 18 of 1944, a full year previous to the hearing.

Eighteenth. We are now engaged in having the full stenographic transcript of the hearing prepared, and are appealing the findings of the hearing commissioner to the chief hearing commissioner in Washington. It is pertinent to note that during this entire delay and up to September 1944 no points were issued to this operator for his business for the year 1944. In September, without answering my letter, the O. P. A. did issue to the operator points in an amount based upon his base period only.

I charge that this case was instigated as a political hurdle for my own candidacy, that it was the result of a conspiracy headed by the chief clerk of the Hamilton board, that her act was condoned by the members of the Hamilton board in a hearing February 18, 1944, when they stated that whatever the clerks of this board do we will support them.

I further charge that the chief food rationing officer of the Cincinnati district was involved in the conspiracy, that the chief field examiner of the Cincinnati office was involved in the conspiracy, and that the enforcement division of the Cincinnati district office was also involved. The resignations of Mr. Fisher, the chief field examiner, and of Mr. George Weber, the O. P. A. attorney,

are evidence of the fact that they could not sustain their position in this matter.

I further charge that the chief clerk of the Hamilton board advised other operators in the Hamilton district to fix their base figures at a point sufficiently high to guarantee them sufficient points to cover their desired meat allotments, and that if the examination I requested from the O. P. A. had been completed by January 1, 1944, fully 80 percent of these operators could not have sustained their base period figures. The investigation which I requested through the liaison officer in November 1944 was conducted in December 1944, but not thoroughly, and no report was ever issued to me concerning the findings. However, another investigation was undertaken in the month of January 1945, and while a gentleman from the Washington O. P. A. office talked with me for 15 minutes in my Hamilton office at that time, he has not yet submitted his report on the matter and I have no advice as to when this report will be filed.

I charge that this condition exists in the Cincinnati district because of the fact that there is no effort made to obtain efficient personnel, and that one of the reasons for this deficiency which we are now covering with this appropriation lies in the fact that an employee who was earning $3,800 per year was moved to a job paying $5,600, and the $3,800 job was filled with the man who had been in the $5,500 position, and he continued to receive $5,600. The man who was moved from the low-priced job to the high-priced job was located in the Dayton, Ohio, office, where he maintained an insurance agency while employed in the O. P. A., and spent part of his afternoons playing handball in the Dayton Y. M. C. A.

I make these observations and these charges in the hope that we may strengthen the administration of which I am a part, and not with any intention of criticizing the entire structure of the O. P. A. There are some very glaring abuses of administrative procedures, and up to this time I have found no way within the O. P. A. of correcting these abuses. The small businessman is not given adequate protection in the procedures of the O. P. A. The chiseler is still free to ply his art, but, in my experience, the businessman who attempts to comply with the regulations is subject to the petty spite and personal animosities of local board clerks in some instances.

It seems that if the hearing procedures were removed from the Office of Price Administration and placed under a Federal court commissioner, similar to bankruptcy procedure, a more fair and impartial determination of facts could be obtained. Further, it seems that the personnel of local boards has not been instructed to furnish both the business operator and the consumer with information concerning the regulations of the Office of Price Administration. The business operator is not permitted to even read the regulations and interpretations which are sent to the local boards through the so-called Alexander Publishing Co. bible.

I personally believe that the administrative procedures of the Office of Price Administration should be definitely fixed by statute law passed by this Congress, and that the administrative procedures should follow the lines of the Internal Revenue Department in determining the basis for charges and in procedures to be followed by business operators. If this type of organization is followed the consumer cannot be hurt any more than is legally possible under orders which are now in existence, some of which do not hold the price line. The Kroger Grocery & Baking Co., in its report for 1943 advised its stockholders that it had loaned $50,000 worth of junior executives to the Office of Price Administration, and that they were then reporting for the year 1943 more profit than they had ever made. Their report for the year 1944 discloses even greater earnings than they reported in 1943.

When I was district comptroller for the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., in Philadelphia, we were extremely lucky to net 1 cent per gross dollar of sales. In the year 1943 a small chain of grocery stores, under price regulations then existing, had a net profit of 5 cents per gross dollar of sales, and in view of the Kroger Grocery & Baking Co.'s statement this condition existed in all chain stores at that time.

While this deficiency appropriation must be passed at this time to pay the cost of operating the agency for the period covered, we should not lose sight of the fact that fundamental changes in administrative methods and fundamental changes in enforcement procedures ought to be provided by statute law before we reenact the powers of the Office of Price Administration.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota, for 1 week, starting Monday March 5, on account of official business.

To Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. THOMASON) for today and balance of this week, on account of illness in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 2, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 o'clock a. m. Friday, March 2, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings on Wednesday and Thursday, March 7 and 8, at 10 o'clock a. m. on H. R. 173, 1548, 1624, and 2256.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'TOOLE: Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 18. Joint resolution providing for the celebration in 1945 of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 243). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 659. A bill to enable the Department of State, pursuant to its responsibilities under the Constitution and statutes of the United States, more effectively to carry out its prescribed and traditional responsibilities in the foreign field; to strengthen the Foreign Service, permitting fullest utilization of available personnel and facilities of other departments and agencies and coordination of activities abroad of the United States under a Foreign Service for the United States unified under the guidance of the Department of State; without amendment (Rept. No. 51, pt. II). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 2416. A bill authorizing the State of Alabama to lease or sell and convey all or any part of the Salt Springs land granted to said State by the act of March 2, 1819; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 2417. A bill to authorize the completion by the use of Lanham Act funds of hospital projects initiated by the Works Progress Administration and the Work Projects Administration to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 2418. A bill to authorize the United States commissioner for the Sequoia National Park to exercise similar functions for the Kings Canyon National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 2419. A bill relating to the credit for tax withheld at source on wages of certain fiscal-year taxpayers to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 2420. A bill to provide for the erection of a monument to the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 2421. A bill to treat certain predecessor and successor railroad corporations as the same taxpayer for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 2422. A bill to establish and provide for a system of old-age and survivors insurance for employees of religious, charitable, educational, and certain other organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 2423. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands acquired by the United States for the Silver Creek recreational demonstration project, Oregon, for the purpose of consolidating holdings therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 2424. A bill to establish in the Health Department of the government of the Dis-

trict of Columbia the position of assistant health officer in charge of tuberculosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KNUTSON (by request):

H. R. 2425. A bill to repeal certain acts of Congress, known as Indian liquor laws, in certain parts of Minnesota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 2426. A bill to subject Indians and Indian reservations in the State of Minnesota to the laws of the State, with certain exceptions; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. Con Res. 33. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the bill (H. R. 2000) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," together with the accompanying report thereon; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 2427. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cox; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY:

H. R. 2428. A bill for the relief of Herman Paul; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 2429. A bill for the relief of the alien Chu Shee (Chu Ng Sze); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GILLESPIE:

H. R. 2430. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eugenie U. Bolstad; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 2431. A bill for the relief of Monite Waterproof Glue Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 2432. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter E. Patton; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

117. Mr. BELL presented a memorial of the City Council of Kansas City, Mo., urging that a veterans' hospital be located in that city because of the natural advantages of transportation and because about 40,000 men and women residents of that city are now in the armed forces, which was referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 2, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, February 26, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in the midst of this world of sight and sound, with all its squalor and splendor, make sensitive our spirits to the realities and glories of the world unseen and eternal which encircles us. Feeling the pulsing of that other world closer to us than breathing, may there be vouchsafed to us even in the waiting tasks of a common day an escape into eternity, bright shoots of everlastingness edging with crimson and gold the work given us to do.

Unto our keeping Thou hast committed a national heritage luminous with freedom's glorious light. For all the glory which is America we bless Thy name, for borders without guns, for frontiers which are swinging gates, for unity in diversity, for peace which spans a continent, and for equality which beckons all to the summits.

Strengthen in us the steadfast faith that these healing trees of human good, grown in this land of the free, may blossom under all skies in all the earth. Facing decisions of destiny, unite our hearts and minds, we beseech Thee, in a mighty purpose that we fail not man nor Thee. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Thursday, March 1, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 1, 1945, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 76. An act for the relief of John T. Cooper; and

S. 335. An act for the relief of Mrs. Amy McKnight.

DEVELOPMENT OF RESOURCES OF THE CUMBERLAND AND TENNESSEE RIVERS AND VALLEYS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a copy of a communication from the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority submitting a report entitled "A Report on the Physiographic, Economic, and Other Relationships Between the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers and Between Their Drainage Areas." This report was prepared at my request under the authority vested in the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority by section 22 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act and Executive Order No. 6161 issued pursuant thereto.

The report points out the similarity and interrelationship between the problems of development of the resources of the Cumberland and Tennessee Valleys.

I have heretofore recommended to the Congress the enactment of legislation to bring the Cumberland River and its tributaries within the scope of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. I take this opportunity to urge again that the Congress give consideration to the enactment of such legislation.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 2, 1945.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The message is accompanied by a report from the Tennesseee Valley Authority.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the message and accompanying report be printed as a Senate document with illustrations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. Doc. No. 16)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1945, in the sum of $3,000,000 for the Federal Security Agency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

DAMAGE CLAIMS ON ACCOUNT OF DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY, PERSONAL INJURY, OR DEATH (S. Doc. No. 17)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay claims for damages to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death, in the sum of $103,052.96, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of law and require an appropriation for their payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO PRIVATELY OWNED PROPERTY (S. Doc. No. 18)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting est mates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments and independent establishments to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, in the sum of $13,845.63, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of law and require an appropriation for their payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE TO ROADS AND HIGHWAYS OF STATES (S. Doc. No. 19)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Public Roads Administration to pay claims for damage to roads and highways of States or their subdivisions, in the sum of $45,302.86, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of law and require an appropriation for their payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENT RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVEENMENT BY A DISTRICT COURT (S. Doc. No. 20)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation for the payment of a judgment rendered against the Government by a district court, amounting to $5,808, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (S. Doc. No. 21)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Department of Justice to pay claims for damages in the sum of $62, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of

law and require an appropriation for payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENT RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY A DISTRICT COURT (S. Doc. No. 22)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a record of judgment rendered against the Government by a district court as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which requires an appropriation of $10,010, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. Doc. No. 23)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims, which has been submitted by the Treasury Department and requires an appropriation for payment, amounting to $9,308.27 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. Doc. No. 24)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting pursuant to law, estimates of appropriation amounting to $317,236.03, to cover claims allowed by the General Accounting Office and for the services of the several departments and independent establishments (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ADJUSTMENTS OF IRRIGATION CHARGES IN LAND EXCHANGES WITHIN INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize adjustments of irrigation charges in certain land exchanges within Indian irrigation projects (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"STATE OF NEW YORK, IN SENATE,
"Albany, February 20, 1945.

"Whereas the proper training of officers for the American merchant marine is of recognized importance to the State of New York; and

"Whereas the New York State Merchant Marine Academy, which was founded in 1875 by the New York City Board of Education and which became a State institution by chapter 322 of the laws of 1913, has over the years provided training and facilities for many hundreds of men who have served efficiently and honorably in the American merchant marine; and

"Whereas said New York State Merchant Marine Academy is now located on lands known as Fort Schuyler Reservation, owned by the United States and leased under act of Congress, approved August 19, 1937 (Public, No. 316, 75th Cong.); and

"Whereas in order that the State of New York may fully utilize such land now owned by the United States by providing such new construction as appears necessary and securing the most modern equipment for training purposes: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved (if the assembly concur)*, That the Legislature of the State of New York hereby respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as may be necessary to accord to the State of New York title in fee to the land now owned by the United States and leased to the State of New York for the use of the New York State Merchant Marine Academy; and be it further

"*Resolved (if the assembly concur)*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress of the United States from the State of New York."

A memorial of the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Memorial 1

"*To the President of the United States, to the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate from Alaska:*

"Your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the Territory of Alaska in the seventeenth regular session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas the Government of the United States has expressed a deep concern for the need of developing and protecting Alaska's great natural resources; and

"Whereas the fishing industry estimates the presence of some 100,000 sea lions in the territorial waters of Alaska, and it is estimated that a sea lion, as a warm-blooded animal, consumes approximately 60 pounds of fish daily, thereby in the aggregate consuming annually 2,190,000,000 pounds of fish, or a loss to the industry of some $219,000,000 annually; and

"Whereas the number of sea lions in Alaskan waters is steadily increasing:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist respectfully prays that appropriate action be taken by the Government of the United States to remedy this critical situation.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, memorializing Congress to enact legislation for the relief of counties whose taxable property has been taken over for national forests and parks; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented on the 1st instant by Mr. HOEY, p. 1599, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the mayor and board of aldermen of the city of Chelsea, Mass., relating to the designation by the President of the United States of Brotherhood Week, and felicitating the President on his timely proclamation designating such week; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A resolution adopted by the one hundred and fourth annual meeting of the American Statistical Association, favoring and supporting the efforts of the Federal statistical agencies cooperating with the Bureau of the Budget in planning and making provision for an adequate statistical program for the benefit of business, labor, agriculture, and the Government, and endorsing the objective of establishing basic governmental statistics upon a level of completeness and adequacy; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the Monocacy Lions Club, of Montgomery County, Md., favoring the prompt enactment of Senate bill 181, the so-called Federal aid for education bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by the treasurer, from the South-East Coal Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for full cooperation with the National Coal Association in support of an amendment to be offered to clarify the Office of Price Administration Act in eliminating the item of percentage depletion from the cost form which coal-producing companies are required to file with the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES—MEMORIAL OF THE MAINE LEGISLATURE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD under the rule a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, recently passed, voicing its opposition to what is generally called the work-or-fight bill.

There being no objection, the memorial of the Legislature of Maine was ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the ninety-second legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress legislation purporting to authorize the drafting of men, now free, for labor in industrial plants to work for private employers, who would make a profit on their labor; and

Whereas such legislation is unconstitutional, being in violation of the direct and positive prohibition of the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America; and

Whereas the passage of such legislation would betray those who have died for the American way of life, because it would destroy the very thing for which they have died: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, your memorialists, do hereby respectfully petition and urge the Members of Congress to oppose said legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state, by registered mail, to the proper officers and committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, the President of the United States, and to each of the Representatives and Senators representing the State of Maine in the United States Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a memorial identical with the foregoing, which was ordered to lie on the table.

COMMEMORATIVE POSTAGE STAMPS FOR CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE OF SWISS COLONIZATION OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, some days ago at the request of the Wisconsin Legislature and prominent Americans of

Swiss descent I introduced a bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Swiss colony at New Glarus, Wis., and the birth of the Swiss cheese industry in Wisconsin.

Mr. President, after listening to the beautiful prayer of the Chaplain this morning, I am reminded it is the Swiss, a nation made up of Germans, Italians, French, and Austrians living together as we do under one flag and yet speaking their respective tongues, who have demonstrated to the other peoples of the earth the way to peace. A century ago an off-shoot of that people came to Wisconsin and established at New Glarus, Wis., the nucleus of the beneficent influence that the Swiss people have contributed wherever they have gone all over this earth.

Recently, cognizant of the significance of this offshoot in their body politic; recognizing that the Swiss brought to our Commonwealth not only great constructive ideas, showing the way for people to live together, but brought also a great new industry, the cheese industry, the Wisconsin State Legislature adopted a resolution of which I read a part as follows:

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Wisconsin Legislature hereby makes official request on behalf of the State of Wisconsin to the Postmaster General of the United States for reconsideration of the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in recognition of the centennial observance of the Swiss colonization and the birth of the Swiss cheese industry in Wisconsin—

And so forth. I will say that I made the request to the Postmaster General. He, thinking it was only a small local matter, rejected it. Then I asked him to reconsider. The Postmaster General has said that he will reconsider the matter. Meanwhile I have introduced my bill and meanwhile, recognizing that the President of the United States is one of the great collectors of stamps in the world, a philatelist of the first water and an authority on that subject, I wrote him a personal letter

My letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 24, 1945.

The Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor of presenting to you, on behalf of the citizens of my State, their petition for the issuance of a series of stamps to commemorate the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Swiss Colony at New Glarus, Wis., and the birth of the Swiss cheese industry in the Badger State. The Postmaster General has already extended to me his willing assurance that this proposal will receive his own most immediate and thoughtful consideration.

The merit of this proposal will be readily apparent, particularly to a philatelist of the long experience and appreciation of yourself.

This proposal would be a fitting honor to the revered Swiss element of our population which has carried on the traditions of its former motherland of thrift, diligence, and harmony, which are in such faithful keeping to the traditions of its adopted land. This proposal, moreover, would be an inspiration to the dairy farmers of America who have made so resounding a contribution in peace to the national health, and in war, to the Nation's well-being in its grave ordeal. Lastly, this proposal would be a token of fellowship and warmth to the splendid little democracy of Switzerland which has stood so high in the respect of our people and which has recently acted so forthrightly to block the economic subterfuge of the Nazi Government.

Knowing that, in the midst of your pressing duties of state, you will find a brief moment to send this commemorative stamp project on its victorious way, I am,

Respectfully,

ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator.

I sincerely hope that my request will be granted, and that it will not be necessary to ask the appropriate committee to act upon the bill which I have introduced; but, if the request should be again rejected, in view of the fact that in the past we have recognized other great national groups that have come to this country such as the Huguenots, the Walloons, and others, and have issued commemorative stamps, I think is it only fitting in this period of the world's history that we commemorate the significant fact of the settlement of this great strong Swiss people in America. They have contributed stability and strength and wealth to this Nation.

I ask that the resolution of the Wisconsin Legislature be printed in full in the RECORD following my remarks, and that it may be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 37

Joint resolution relating to an official request by the State of Wisconsin to the Postmaster General of the United States for reconsideration of the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp for the centennial observance of the Swiss colonization in Wisconsin

Whereas the year 1945 marks the one-hundredth anniversary of one of the most noteworthy events in the development of the Middle West, the carefully planned migration of 108 bold-hearted and liberty-loving Swiss colonists from the overcrowded canton of Glarus, Switzerland, to the fertile Sugar River Valley of Green County; and

Whereas, as that little band of Swiss pioneers by their hard work and perseverance shaped in a large measure the agricultural destiny of a Commonwealth, so have their descendants by their industry carried on and prospered to make Green County today one of the richest farming districts and Swiss cheese centers in the world; and

Whereas an organization is being created in the Green County area to promote a fitting centennial observance in 1945 of the settlement of Swiss colonists and the birth of the Swiss cheese industry in Wisconsin; and is otherwise desirous of encouraging the constructive industry and forward-looking progress demonstrated by the Swiss colonists of Wisconsin and their succeeding generations, which is a solid foundation for an enduring civilized society; and

Whereas it is deemed advisable that a commemorative postage stamp be issued by the Postmaster General of the United States in recognition of this observance; and

Whereas such action and reconsideration can be taken by the Postmaster General only upon official request from the State of Wisconsin: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Wisconsin Legislature hereby makes official request on behalf of the State of Wisconsin to the Postmaster General of the United States for reconsideration of the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp in recognition of the centennial observance of the Swiss colonization and the birth of the Swiss cheese industry in Wisconsin, such stamp to be of such design as the Postmaster General may determine. The Governor of Wisconsin is respectfully requested and authorized to cooperate in securing the reconsideration thereof and to make any arrangements that may be necessary with the Postmaster General for the issuance of said stamp; be it further

Resolved, That a properly attested copy of this resolution be sent to the Postmaster General of the United States and to each Wisconsin Member of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE, by unanimous consent, presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of Wisconsin, identical with the foregoing resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

REPORTS OF THE NAVAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 59. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," approved July 24, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 76);

S. 397. A bill to provide for the presentation of medals to members of the United States Antarctic Expedition of 1939–41; without amendment (Rept. No. 77);

S. 525. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval training center, Farragut, Idaho, on July 10, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 78);

S. 569. A bill to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the training building at the Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, N. C., on June 3, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 79);

S. 646. A bill to provide for the advancement of Capt. Edward Macauley, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of rear admiral; without amendment (Rept. No. 80);

H. R. 197. A bill to establish the grade of general in the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 81); and

H. R. 1646. A bill to establish the grade of admiral in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 82).

By Mr. GERRY, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 647. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the State of Rhode Island, for highway purposes only, a strip of land within the naval advance base depot at North Kingstown, R. I.; without amendment (Rept. No. 83).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 670. A bill for the relief of Wilfred Dagenais; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 671. A bill for the relief of Horace G. Lawler; and

S. 672. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Weir Lillis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHANDLER (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON):

S. 673. A bill to prescribe the tenure of office of members of the President's Cabinet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES—AMENDMENT

Mr. BAILEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BEFORE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL-DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. MEAD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 90), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That 1,000 additional copies of part 25 and each subsequent part of the hearings held before the special committee of the Senate authorized and directed to make a study and investigation of the operation of the national-defense program be printed for the use of said committee.

COMPENSATION OR PENSION TO VETERANS OR THEIR DEPENDENTS (S. DOC. NO. 15)

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask to have printed as a Senate document an analysis of elements of entitlements to and rates of compensation or pension. It is an analysis of the laws granting compensation or pension to veterans of all the wars or to their dependents. It has been very carefully prepared by the Veterans' Administration, and has been checked for errors. I may say that there is a very great demand for this document. The sale of the document has been very great as it was heretofore printed, and now it has been brought down to date, with numerous corrections and additional citations.

An estimate of cost of printing the matter as a Senate document has been made, which I submit herewith. I ask unanimous consent that the document may be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION IN UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by G. F. Geissler, director, western division, United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, relative to food production and food production goals in Utah, which appears in the Appendix.]

EMPLOYMENT OF RETURNING VETERANS—ARTICLE BY RICHARD B. COLE

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Returning Veterans Pose Vital Post-War Challenge and Opportunity," by Richard B. Cole, containing an interview with John J. Hagerty, the New England R. F. C. manager, which appears in the Appendix.]

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment heretofore offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] as a substitute for the language proposed to be inserted in the bill by the amendment reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have a few words to say about the pending bill, H. R. 1752. This bill is of vital importance to all America. Every Member of the Senate has been informed and is well aware of the appalling number of losses we are suffering today on the far-flung battle fronts of the world, where our brave and heroic boys are desperately fighting and dying at the hands of the beastly enemy. Every Member of the Senate is well aware of the urgent appeals which have been made by American generals and soldiers for more and more weapons of war with which to fight off and defeat those savage enemies. The victory must be won at the earliest possible moment. Every minute, every slight delay means the loss of many more of our fine American boys. Without plenty of the right types of war weapons and materials our fighting men are helplessly and mercilessly at the disposal of the savage enemy. This we all well know, and I am sure we all agree that something must be done, and done quickly, to correct this deplorable situation.

It is for this reason, Mr. President, that I refer to the committee substitute for the pending bill, H. R. 1752, and the two amendments I am offering. I feel that the committee substitute for H. R. 1752 has been subjected to so much compromise that it is now a very weak measure, but, regardless of whether it is weak or strong, I intend to support it as presented or as finally amended, because my policy on all war measures is to support our Commander in Chief in his requests for legislation which he states is necessary to further the war effort. That has been my policy heretofore and I do not intend to change it. Under our constitutional form of government, the responsibility for prosecution of the war rests exclusively on the shoulders of our Commander in Chief, and he should, therefore, be provided with everything he says is necessary for the successful prosecution of the war, regardless of whether anybody else thinks he is right or thinks he is wrong.

The two amendments which I have proposed are intended to strengthen the bill. These amendments will abolish all restrictions on the number of hours a person may work per day, per week, or per any work period, and will also provide the same hourly rate of pay for each hour worked by each person.

The 40-hour week was established during peacetime, for the purpose of dividing the available work among more people and thus help solve the unemployment problem with which this Nation was faced at that time. This may have been a good policy at that time, but it is certainly a very bad policy at this time, when we are engaged in an all-out war, and when our very urgent war-production problem has completely displaced our pre-war peactime unemployment problem.

The penalty wage scale for work in excess of 40 hours per week was established simply as a penalty to help force compliance with the 40-hour-week law. This penalty wage scale also may have been a good policy during the period of unemployment during peacetime, but it also is certainly a very bad policy now, during a period of all-out war, when the problem of production of war weapons and materials has completely displaced the old problem of pre-war peacetime unemployment. My two amendments, Mr. President, are simply intended to nullify those two outmoded policies during this war emergency. If desired, those policies can be reinstated after the war is finally won.

It may be possible, Mr. President, for the Senate committee substitute for H. R. 1752 to bring about increased production to a very limited extent, but with my amendments added, production can be definitely and immediately increased any amount desired. If 25 percent increased production is desired, all that is necessary is for all workers who now work 40 hours a week to work 50 hours a week, and all others who work different periods to work 25 percent more hours. If 50 percent increased production is desired, all that is necessary is for all workers who now work 40 hours a week to work 60 hours a week, and all who work other periods to work 50 percent more hours. It is a very simple solution to a tremendously important problem. The adoption of my amendments would also be highly beneficial to the workers themselves, because their weekly income would increase from 25 percent to 50 percent or more, with practically no increase in their living expenses.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. What would the Senator think of the proposition, in order to keep workers on the job and having them work longer hours, which, I take it, is what the Senator is trying to accomplish, of making provision that after a corporation got the first 5 percent of profit the next 5 percent should go to the workers?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Does the Senator mean a cooperative arrangement, that they would pay the workers an additional premium for additional work?

Mr. LANGER. After the corporation for which they were working got a profit of 5 percent, let us say, the next 5 percent should go to the workers, and above that they should split even?

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is a wage problem which I shall touch on later in my remarks.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator's idea is to have the employees work longer hours?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; providing they want to and have the opportunity.

Mr. LANGER. And produce more goods?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes. In addition to what I have said, Mr. President, under my amendments the new materials produced would be not only greater in quantity but also better in quality, because they would be produced by the same experienced, willing, and patriotic hands who are now producing, instead of by the inexperienced and possibly unwilling hands of drafted or forced labor.

In eliminating the penalty pay for so-called overtime, thousands of good, experienced workers could be released for war work by establishments dealing exclusively in civilian goods and services. These institutions have the prices of their goods and services limited either by price ceilings or competition, and many of them would lose money and possibly be forced into bankruptcy if they had to pay penalty wages. Consequently they do not permit their employees to work overtime at penalty wages, but instead they employ more people at the regular base pay, which ties up from 25 percent to 50 percent more employees than they would need if my amendments were enacted.

Mr. President, my amendments do not deal in wages. The amount of wages paid is a matter which should be agreed to by employers and employees. Personally I do not consider this any time to reduce hourly wages of any of our patriotic workers on the production front, and with the demand for labor so urgent, there need be no fears of any wage reductions at this time. If my amendments are adopted the new base-wage rate in all cases could be established at the average hourly earnings being paid on the date the amendments became effective, and thus no employee would suffer any reduction in weekly earnings if he worked the same number of hours each week thereafter, and would enjoy increased weekly earnings to the extent that he worked an increased number of hours per week thereafter. Those who desired to work longer hours, and thus earn more money per week, could do so, if additional hours of employment were offered to them, and those who did not desire to work longer hours need not do so. Anybody who understands the thrift and patriotism of American laboring men and women knows that under this arrangement more additional man-hours will be volunteered than will be needed. Such a vast reservoir of additional man-hours would be created by the adoption of these two amendments that all necessary and urgently needed increased production of war weapons would be realized without further delay, and all this would be accomplished on a voluntary basis at increased remuneration to employees, and at no increased unit price to employers, or to the United States Government and its taxpayers, as the exclusive buyer of war weapons and materials.

In closing, Mr. President, permit me to say that I am one who has great faith in the patriotism of our American laboring men and women, and in their desire to work to the limit of their endurance to increase production and hasten the day of victory. I am not one who believes that any appreciable number of the laboring people of this Nation lay down on their jobs when they heard the optomistic reports of some of our public officials last fall regarding the early ending of the war. I congratulate the working men and women of America on the almost miraculous job of production they have done in spite of the legislative and executive shackles which have been imposed upon them.

Remove those restrictions on the number of hours they are privileged to work, and repeal those archaic laws which were enacted during a wholly different era of our economic life, and the production of urgently needed war weapons will increase far beyond our requirements. That heart-rending plea of our fighting boys who must depend on us to back them up and keep them supplied with weapons and equipment while they are face to face with the ruthless and savage enemies, must be answered. We at home must not fail those brave boys who are shedding their precious blood and sacrificing their very lives to defeat the enemy. No sacrifice that we can make here on the home front is too great, if it will render even the smallest assistance to our fighting men.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of these two amendments. I sincerely hope they will be adopted and made part of whatever bill comes out of this Chamber, but regardless of whether they are adopted, and regardless of what kind of bill comes out for final vote, I will support it if it is what our Commander in Chief says is necessary to hasten the end of this bloody war.

I ask, Mr. President, that both the amendments which I am proposing be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this place.

There being no objection, the amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. O'DANIEL were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

"SEC. —. That the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 be amended as follows: 'At the end of the act, insert the following: "That during the wars in which the United States is engaged no employer shall enter into any contract or arrangement, or enforce or carry out the provisions of any contract or arrangement, which provides that with respect to employees engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods directly or indirectly for such commerce, or engaged in performing work under any contact with the United States, there shall be any discrimination against any person because he is or is not a member of a labor organization. No employer who violates the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall, for a period of 2 years after such violation occurs, be eligible to enter into any contract with the United States; and no officer or agency of the United States shall enter into a contract with any such employer during such 2-year period. The Secretary of Labor shall keep the various contracting officers and agencies of the United States informed as to the names of employers who are ineligible by reason of this section to enter into contracts with the United States." ' "

At the end of the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

"SEC. —. That section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 7. Every employer shall pay to any of his employees who are engaged in commerce, or in the production of goods directly or indirectly for commerce, compensation at the same rate for all hours worked by such employee during any pay period.'

"SEC. 2. Until the termination of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, (a) no provision of Federal or State law which limits or restricts hours of employment shall be applicable with respect to employees of any contractor who are engaged in the performance of work directly or indirectly necessary for the fulfillment of any contract between such contractor and the United States, and (b) no provision in any contract heretofore or hereafter made with the United States restricting or limiting the hours of employment of employees employed under or in connection with such contract, and no penalty or forfeiture for violation of any such provision, shall be enforceable by any officer or agency of the United States.

"SEC. 3. The act entitled 'An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes,' approved June 30, 1936, is amended by adding at the end of the first section thereof the following new paragraph:

" '(f) When the wage rates for regular hours of employment have been determined for the purposes of this act, the same hourly wage rates shall apply with respect to all hours worked during any day or workweek or other work period in employment with respect to which wages are determined under this section.' "

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. If the two amendments proposed by the Senator from Texas were adopted, by what percentage would production be increased, in the Senator's opinion?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think it can be increased any amount desired; at least 25 percent or 50 percent. It is such a little thing to work 50 hours instead of 40 hours a week, and I think that most every patriotic American worker would gladly work the additional hours if he were permitted to do so. If he is now working 40 hours a week and increases his working time to 60 hours a week there would be a 50 percent increase in production, because the worker would devote 50 percent more of his time to production. The experienced hands that are now working 40 hours and producing would simply continue and produce an additional 50 percent.

Mr. LANGER. What would the Senator say with respect to whether the work would be quite as efficient if a man works more than a certain number of hours a day?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I realize, of course, that there might be some difference. However the philosophy of penalty pay for overtime work which is now being practiced in this country is based on the theory that there is no decrease or let-down in the later hours of any work period. In fact, more pay is granted for later hours of work than is granted for work done in the earlier hours when the worker is fresh. I might also say that I do not agree with this philosophy and my amendments are intended to correct this policy and pay each employee the same hourly wage for each hour he works. If a man is worth $1.50 an hour

for any hour he works, he should not be forced to accept $1 an hour for the first 40 hours he works each week.

Mr. LANGER. But the penalty pay is for the purpose of discouraging overtime work, is it not?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; and it not only discourages overtime work but it prevents it in many cases. Legislation was originally enacted for the purpose of discouraging overtime work, but that was when we had an unemployment problem. We now have the opposite condition, and the penalty wage scale should be abolished. I think we can depend upon the employees of this country giving a full hour's work for a full hour's pay, whether it be the first hour they work or the last hour they work, and they should receive the same pay for each hour.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment I wish to propose to the amendment of the committee in the nature of a substitute, and ask that it be pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 21, beginning with line 21, it is proposed to strike out all of page 21 and all of page 22 down to and including line 19, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

In carrying out the provisions of this subsection (except the proviso of the foregoing paragraph) the selective-service local board in classifying the registrant shall base its findings solely and exclusively on whether the registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort and whether a satisfactory replacement can be obtained, without reference to the relative essentiality of the registrant to an agricultural occupation or endeavor as compared with any other occupation, service, or endeavor; and the foregoing provision of this sentence shall apply upon any appeal or review of a decision made thereunder by a selective-service local board. Such deferment shall be made by said board without consideration of any other circumstance or condition whatsoever; and during the period of such deferment for such purpose, no other classification shall be made by said board. It shall be the duty of any registrant who is now or hereafter deferred under this subsection and who has been found unacceptable to the land or naval forces for training and service, not to voluntarily leave or discontinue such agricultural occupation or endeavor unless his selective-service local board (subject to appeal in the same manner as is provided in section 10 (a) (2)) has determined that it is no longer necessary in the interest of the war effort for him to remain in such agricultural occupation or endeavor or that he has a justifiable reason for discontinuing such agricultural occupation or endeavor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland to the amendment of the committee in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield for that purpose?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do, very gladly.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Overton
Bailey	Hayden	Pepper
Bankhead	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hill	Reed
Bilbo	Hoey	Revercomb
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Butler	Kilgore	Shipstead
Byrd	La Follette	Stewart
Capehart	Langer	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Taylor
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Chavez	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McMahon	Tobey
Downey	Magnuson	Tunnell
Eastland	Maybank	Tydings
Ellender	Mead	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Millikin	Wagner
Fulbright	Mitchell	Walsh
George	Moore	Wheeler
Gerry	Morse	Wherry
Green	Murdock	White
Guffey	Murray	Wiley
Gurney	Myers	Willis
Hart	O'Daniel	Wilson
Hatch	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. MOSES], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a delegate to the Inter-American Conference in Mexico and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on official business as a delegate to the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, beginning on page 21.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to take a few minutes to discuss the pending amendment and the general issue of manpower.

It must be obvious to all who have given consideration to this bill that there has been great reluctance in the minds of most Members of Congress to pass the type of bill which was considered and acted upon by the House, and which came over to this body. I think there can be no doubt that the bill which was passed by the House and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs would scarcely have been approved in the House if it had not been for the fact that every influence of leadership was exercised to make certain that the bill was adopted without substantial amendment. As a matter of fact, the appeal was made that no amendment should be offered upon the floor of the House. However, an amendment was offered, in the nature of a substitute, which was based upon the theory that the selective-service boards throughout the country should make a survey of the utilization of manpower in their respective areas and districts. That amendment failed by only 10 votes.

What impresses me, Mr. President, is that Members of the Senate, as well as Members of the House, have realized that the proposal which is here made goes to the very foundation of democratic action, that is to say, to the very foundation of action in a free government by free citizens. The legislative body has hesitated to apply to individuals who are engaged in work on the home front the sanctions which are applied to those who are called for service in the armed forces. That contrast has been cited by some as a reason for the passage of the bill which came from the House. It has been suggested that failure to pass that bill would be an indication of an unwillingness to support the men who are fighting in the armed forces. It would be nothing of the sort, Mr. President. The reluctance of Congress to apply these drastic sanctions to civilian workers springs from the basic sentiment of America that individuals should not be subject to compulsion, and that to apply such sanctions to individuals working for other individuals or organizations which may profit from their labor, is altogether out of harmony with our system of government.

I think, Mr. President, that a much more significant phase of this debate is that Members of Congress seem to want to do what can be done to make the voluntary system of labor do the job which everyone acknowledges must be accomplished. The reason why there is so much hesitancy about adopting the compulsory labor principle is that the sentiment of this country realizes that if we take that step, we shall have taken the last step toward complete totalitarian and authoritarian government. It has been suggested upon this floor that if we should fail to pass the bill which came from the House we should be sending a message to Herr Hitler that the Congress of the United States was not supporting the soldiers upon the fighting fronts.

Mr. President, yesterday at the joint session of Congress I listened to the report of the President upon the Yalta Conference, and heard him say that unconditional surrender means the end of nazi-ism. It immediately occurred to me that here in the Senate we were being asked, at the very moment when the end of nazi-ism is in sight in Europe, to adopt the very principle of Nazi control of individual lives by applying to civilian workers the direct force of authoritarian rule.

I venture to say, Mr. President, that a much better message to Herr Hitler would be the message which we are already able to send, namely, that the people of the United States, by the method of voluntary cooperation, have accomplished the most stupendous task of military production in all history. A much better message to Herr Hitler, I think, and one much more understandable to him, is being delivered at this

moment along the River Rhine by the soldiers of the United States who are equipped with the munitions of war provided for them by civilian workers at home who have not yet been compelled to receive direct and complete orders from their Government.

I venture to say, Mr. President, that very few have had an opportunity to read the bill which we are asked to pass by those who are opposing the committee substitute. I recommend a reading of this measure if we desire to understand the tremendous step toward authoritarian government which we on the home front are being asked to take in the guise of supporting the morale of the soldiers. Since the beginning of this debate I have received, I am glad to say, several letters from men who are fighting with our troops overseas. In the letters they discuss this very bill. Not one of those soldiers has asked for the passage of the so-called work-or-fight bill. On the contrary, each one of the writers has expressed the hope that when he returns to his home he will return to a Nation in which civilian workers are still able to select their jobs.

I had the opportunity the other day to discuss briefly the record of production in the United States. I pointed out that the workers upon the home front have not only equipped and supplied our own Army and our own Navy, in which there are now enrolled more than 11,000,000 men, but they have supplied and equipped the armies and the navies of our allies in this war. Last night on the radio some of the Members of the Senate may have heard the report of a newspaperman who has just returned from a visit not only to Moscow but to Warsaw, to the areas in Europe which the Red Army has recently overrun. One of the questions the interviewer addressed to that newspaper correspondent was whether he had seen any evidences of the lend-lease materials of the United States on the Russian front. His answer was that his eye fell on such evidences everywhere. He mentioned jeeps and aircraft, and said that all the transportation of the Russian forces was done in American planes, and the Russian Army was equipped with untold numbers of jeeps, which the Russians called Willys, after the name of the original manufacturer of the jeep. This is the contribution of free labor to the war effort. But we are asked to abandon that system for one by which civilian workers will be frozen to their jobs and, having been frozen there, by which others may be compelled to go to other jobs, whatever they may be.

The breadth of the bill I hold in my hand, Mr. President, is not confined to service in the armed forces. This measure, which passed the House and which has been described here upon the floor as being much better than the committee bill, contains the following provision:

(n) (1) In addition to the liability for training and service in the land or naval forces, every registrant between the ages of 18 and 45 who is not a member of such forces on active duty and is not exempted or deferred from training and service therein by section 5 (c) (1) or (d) shall be liable to perform work in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, or in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort.

What is the duty which is to be imposed upon the citizens of America between the ages of 18 and 45 by this provision, which makes them liable to perform work in an activity in support of the national health, safety, or interest? Who has defined "interest"? Who has defined "safety"? Who has defined "health"? Under this bill it would be possible to write regulations combining those objectives of work; and, if the bill were passed, it would be possible for the administrator in charge to send persons to some unknown labor in some undefined area in support of an undefined activity in the national interest. There can scarcely be any doubt, Mr. President, it seems to me, that language of that kind conveys to the administering officials complete and unlimited power over the lives and labor of the citizens of the United States who are between the ages of 18 and 45. Is it any wonder that when the Committee on Military Affairs of the United States Senate began to scrutinize the language of the bill which came to us from the House of Representatives, the committee hesitated?

Mr. President, I am moved to say at this juncture that I have observed a disposition upon the part of editorial writers throughout the United States to condemn the Congress as a rubber stamp whatever the Congress accepts, without amendment, a measure which may be sent to it from an executive department or bureau. But at the same time, when, as in this instance, a standing committee of the United States Senate undertakes in the performance of its duty to scrutinize the language it is asked to approve, then it is condemned for dilatory tactics. I venture to say that most of the editorial writers who have criticized the Senate Committee on Military Affairs for not having placed a rubber stamp upon the bill as it came from the House have not themselves read this bill. They do not know that we are asked to give to an administrative official a power to send citizens of the United States to any activity the administering official may choose for work in support of the national interest.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very much interested in the able argument of the Senator from Wyoming regarding the unlimited power granted by the May bill, which is one of the bills now pending before the Senate. I realize that the power of control over workers between 18 and 45 years of age falls alike on the willing worker and the one who is not willing to work. I agree that that is wrong. But I point out to the Senator that I have offered a substitute which would apply the rule only to those who are not working in some lawful occupation. It would apply the rule to the loafer and require that he be called up for military service when he refuses to work in some lawful occupation. He would be called up by his selective-service board, like any other young man of the country, and be offered to the armed services. If he should be rejected he would be certified for work, and the War Manpower Commission would find a job for him. Certainly the Senator cannot object to such a measure being taken against those who are able to work but refuse to work at some lawful occupation. I call the situation to the Senator's attention because I am in full accord with him that the power provided in the May bill should not be exercised over the workers of the Nation, but I assert that the loafers in the various communities who will not work in any lawful occupation should be called to military service or compelled to work.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia was one of the most diligent members of the committee in studying the bill. I have taken the position that any legislation which we enact should not be geared to the failure of recalcitrants, but should be geared to the willingness of the great majority of our people to do the right thing when the means is provided for doing it. In the course of my remarks I shall undertake to discuss briefly the substitute which the able Senator has presented.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The substitute which I have offered is geared to the thesis that we must protect the freedom of the worker. But the men within draft age who will not work—and there must be many of them, as evidenced by the letters which I have received—must be compelled to work. I think that we still can gear our legislation to the high plane of protection of the freedom of the willing worker. However, that is no reason why we should overlook those who will not work at any lawful occupation. I think we owe it to the country, and to the willing worker of the country, as well as to the men in the armed services, to see that those who will not work shall be compelled to work during this time of war.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in my judgment, no legislation is necessary to accomplish the end to which the Senator refers. Under the selective-service law provision is made for drafting into the military service men between 18 and 45 years of age. The record presented before the Military Affairs Committee shows clearly that at this moment there are 750,000 individuals on limited service in the Army of the United States.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I agree with the statement that 750,000 men are on limited service, but the Senator will recall the testimony of the representatives of the War Department and the Navy Department. The Secretary of War, the Under Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Under Secretary of the Navy, and General Hershey, head of the Selective Service, all stated that they had been urged to take into the armed services men who had been classified as IV–F and were not working. We were told that the services were saturated with men of that type and that they could not take any more of them. Are we to provide a hiding place for men between 18 and 45 years of age, and allow them to

loaf? The Senator knows as well as I do that when once men are deferred the Army and Navy have no control over them. They could be called a dozen times, and neither the Army nor the Navy would take them. Some place in the war effort should be provided for such men so that they may be put to work.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in my judgment, it would be necessary only for the War Department to accept 100 or 200 such persons as have been described by the Senator from West Virginia, and immediately there would be an end of all attempts on the part of such persons to escape service.

I may cite one or two cases which have come under my personal observation. I know of one young man who was a skilled mechanic at the woodworking trade. Unfortunately he had but one eye. Yet he was drafted and accepted for military service. His skill as a mechanic, which would have been of great value to the country in a war plant where such skill was required, was absolutely wasted in the Army because he was assigned to digging ditches in a camp. That is the reason why the Senator from West Virginia, as well as the committee, have recommended the enactment of legislation providing for a survey of the utilization of manpower in the Army, Navy, and civilian plants.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. As the Senator knows, I am not a member of the Military Affairs Committee. What is the situation under the original bill with regard to a particular occupation such as that of lawyer? Could such a man who had devoted his life to legal work be taken out of his office by the local board and assigned to digging ditches?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; without question. Let me read to the Senator the language appearing in section 1 of the bill as passed by the House:

> For the purposes of this subsection—

That refers to the "freeze" section—

> the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, or the agency designated by him, shall from time to time by regulations designate—

In passing allow me to invite attention to the fact that by those words the Congress is asked to delegate to the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion the powers to legislate—

> and certify to the Director of Selective Service, the plants and facilities, and the activities therein, in war production—

Now observe this language—

> or in support of the national health, safety, or interest, and the farms and agricultural occupations and endeavors essential to the war effort.

Here is a power to the Director of War Mobilization to designate the particular plants and the types of activity. Then, the section goes on:

> In making such designations, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion may make classifications on the basis of geographical areas, types of activities, types of occupations within activities, and types of plants, facilities, and farms.

I submit, in response to the Senator from Delaware, that there is a power without limit to designate any occupation, any calling, in any manner for any work in a war factory or a farm or "in support of the national health safety or interest."

Mr. TUNNELL. Then, as I understand the Senator, a person may be taken from his law office or from a bank or from any of the various activities of life and placed in some other activity that might suit the particular board or person making the assignment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely.

Mr. TUNNELL. Is there the same protection as to physical examination? Of course, I am not in that category personally, but would those who are in it be protected by physical examination, I am wondering.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The object of this bill is to include in its application men who are not physically suited for the Army; so that what the Senator suggests would not be taken into consideration. If we were to pass this bill, I may say to the Senator from Delaware, we would be placing in the hands of a central officer in Washington the control over the activities of the men of the United States between the ages of 18 and 45 wherever they may be, and it would be, in my judgment, absolutely impossible for any group or any man in Washington to conceive and write regulations that could cause anything but injustice all over the United States.

Mr. TUNNELL. Would not that be a threat to all sorts of business and activities? Instead of aiding the Nation in preparation for war, would it not break up peace activities?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My judgment is that it would bring about chaos. It would destroy a system which is now working reasonably well and which the Committee on Military Affairs seeks to improve, and would substitute a new and untried system—untried, I say, except in Britain and in Russia. How it has worked in Russia I am not competent to say, but the record from Britain shows that it has not worked there.

Mr. TUNNELL. As I understand the Senator, the very purpose of these provisions is to place people in work in which they are not at the time working. The very purpose is to change the activities of men, no matter how well prepared they may be in the civil duties of life, to something with which probably they are not familiar.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the Senator's interpretation.

Mr. TUNNELL. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senator from Delaware raised the question he did. I desire it clearly understood that I am not debating this subject with the Senator from Wyoming on the basis of the approval of the May bill. He and I are opposed to the May bill and its provision for moving workers in this country. The question I am discussing is not with regard to the workers, but with regard to those who are not working at any occupation.

A few moments ago the distinguished Senator made the statement that if a hundred or two hundred of these nonworkers or loafers were taken into the service through the selective service boards the problem I have presented would be met. I do not follow the argument of the Senator, because, as the Senator himself has said, 750,000 of them have been taken already.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But they were not taken for that purpose, let me say to the Senator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me read to the Senator from the hearings. This very question was raised in the discussions in the committee when the Under Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, was there. This question was asked of Mr. Patterson:

> Senator REVERCOMB. Can you not change your rules of accepting men in the Army and take some of these IV–F's and put them in places where they could serve?

The answer made by Mr. Patterson on behalf of the Army and War Department was—

> This bill as originally introduced provided for that, but the Army has all of the limited-service men it can possibly use.

Then the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] asked:

> Senator HILL. You mean, as far as Army duties are concerned?
>
> Secretary PATTERSON. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator HILL. You do not need any more limited-service men as far as the military machine is concerned?
>
> Secretary PATTERSON. Of the 900,000 men to be inducted in the first 6 months, both the Army and the Navy want those men to be fit for combat, for all-around service, and we have no use and no need for IV–F's or men who as soon as they get into the Army will have to be taken care of in a hospital. We are short of nurses already. We need them in civilian industry.

The statement of the Under Secretary of War is that they are not going to take any of these men for limited service.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me call the attention of the Senator to the fact that an individual who would be sent to a hospital in the Army would be of no use in a war plant.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course, he would not be, but there are many of them who would not have to be sent to a hospital.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Under Secretary of War was not talking about those because he did not want them. I wonder what the Senator from West Virginia expected the Under Secretary of War to say. He was arguing for the May bill, and, of course, he was not going to present evidence that would tear it down.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Under Secretary was stating the facts and stating his policy. He said the men they would take must be fit for combat, and they would not take any more IV–F's. Many men classified as IV–F's can still perform work, though they may not be fit for combat duty. The provision in my substitute is that they shall be called up for service in the Army and Navy, and, if they can be accepted, then let them be accepted into the service, but if they cannot be then those who have not worked at any occupation and refuse to work at any should be assigned some work.

That is all there is to the provision I have offered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I can understand very well the theory upon which the Senator from West Virginia has been working upon this measure, and, while I realize that his motives are of the best and his desire is to bring about the most efficient use of manpower, I respectfully disagree with the proposal which he makes. I think the committee bill is a much better approach, as I shall undertake to try to demonstrate a little later.

For the present I wish to read one or two more paragraphs from the bill we are asked to support by those who are advocating the measure as it passed the House. I read now from page 3, beginning in line 11:

Upon receiving such a certification for a particular area—

This refers to the certification which the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion is authorized to make and which is described, let me say in response to the question of the Senator from Delaware—

the Director of Selective Service—

(A) shall designate the categories (by age and other status) of registrants who are liable to perform work under paragraph (1) and who are not deferred under subsection (k) or by reason of being engaged in an activity in war production or in support of the national health, safety, or interest—

Again we get that phrase, which recurs over and over again without any definition—

from which categories men capable of performing the work involved shall be called before calls are made from other categories. In designating such categories the Director shall first designate categories which include registrants who are, by reason of their age and other status, the type of men he deems can transfer to such work with the least disruption to the civilian economy and to themselves in comparison with men in other categories.

There, Mr. President, the complete power of discretion over the lives of all civilians between the ages of 18 and 45 is granted to one man.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Is the person who is being sent from his work to some other work consulted at all, so far as his preference or desire as to work is concerned? What is the provision as to that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is a very able lawyer. I call his attention to the provision which is made in the bill as passed by the House by which a registrant can defend himself. I refer the Senator to section 4 of the bill, on page 9, beginning in the paragraph which starts in line 16:

It shall be a defense to such alleged violation for the individual to show (1) that he made application to his selective-service local board for a determination described in section 5 (n) (2), and (2) that the denial of such application was not based on a fair consideration of his application.

I ask the Senator from Delaware, how can any person anywhere prove a negative?

Mr. TUNNELL. Then, I gather from the answer of the Senator that what a man has to do in order to be relieved is to convince the person to whom he is making the application that he did not give any consideration to the former application.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I venture to say that once a case is decided, it is decided.

Mr. TUNNELL. Undoubtedly. But I mean, he must convince the person with the power that the one who made the decision, that is, himself, was simply wrong, and did not give fair consideration to the matter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely. I was reading from the provisions in section 1 (4) on page 3. Now, so that there may be no misunderstanding of the power which the bill would give over veterans, as well as civilians, I wish to invite the attention of Senators to the language which appears on page 4, beginning in line 1. We are still discussing the power of the Director of Selective Service. I read:

And may exclude, or by regulations provide for the exclusion, from any category so designated, of those types of veterans (discharged or released from active duty in the land or naval forces under conditions not dishonorable) whose exclusion from such category the Director deems fair and equitable.

Congress is not asked in the bill to define the conditions which it deems fair and equitable for the exclusion of a man who has already been drafted for military service and discharged, or the conditions under which he shall be obligated to additional service, not working directly for his country, but to work for his country only indirectly, in some war plant.

Mr. President, here I wish to call attention to the difference between drafting a man for service in the Army and drafting a man for work in a factory or a mine, or on a farm. When a boy in the United States is taken from his home and his business and sent into a camp, or into a military installation, he serves under exactly the same conditions as all the other persons in his status; nay, more than that, officers and men live together in the camps and on the front under practically the same conditions, and a man who is drafted for military service may rise by showing his ability, his military capacity, and earn a commission; and many of them have done so. But who is there so naive as to believe that a man who may be drafted from his normal occupation and his normal skill and sent to work in the factory of another man, under compulsion, is likely to have an opportunity to rise? Such a person so drafted, so compelled to labor, would be in a class utterly and completely apart.

Mr. President, that is a condition which I am not willing to impose upon the male citizens of the United States between the ages of 18 and 45, particularly when some of them may be veterans who have already performed service on the fighting front.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to ask the Senator whether he believes there is any significance in the language on page 5 of the original bill, in the fifth line, where the word "employers" is used instead of "employment." A worker could pick out the particular man who was to employ him, I understand, if the employer was among those listed, I suppose, by the board, but the bill does not provide that a man shall have any choice as to the kind of employment to which he may be sent. It is only as to who will be the boss.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right. I think it was intended that there should be no choice of employment, but the language reads:

It shall be the duty of the registrant to whom such an order is directed to comply therewith, provided the order gives him a reasonable choice of employers for whom to work.

But what is a reasonable choice? The choice is only of employers, and not of employment.

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it would be possible to go through the original bill paragraph by paragraph and line by line to show the weaknesses of the measure. I shall not take the time of the Senate to do that, but I do want to call attention to another example of the negative proof which is being extended to the person to whom the compulsions of this bill would apply. This is to be found on page 10, beginning in line 4:

In case of an alleged violation of section 5 (n) (4) it shall be a defense to such alleged violation for the individual to say (1) that he made timely application for revocation or modification of the order under section 5 (n) (4), and (2)—

Observe the word is not "or"; it is "and"—

and (2) that the denial of the revocation or modification requested was not based on a fair consideration of his application.

An utterly impossible condition to perform.

These, Mr. President, are some of the reasons why I characterize the original bill as a totalitarian measure which would subject the male citizens of the United States between the ages of 18 and 45 to compulsion the extent of which no man on this floor and no advocate of the bill can foretell. I feel very deeply that at this very moment, when the President of the United States tells us that unconditional surrender means the end of nazi-ism, the Congress of the United States should be the last body in which there should be advocated the adoption of these sanctions over the lives of free American citizens.

We know that free America has done this wonderful job. It has done it in the free way. It has done it, of course, by accepting many sacrifices. Most of those sacrifices, Mr. President, have been accepted willingly. Of course, there have been men in business, in labor, in the professions, in idle occupations, who have not done their part, but they are few and far between when considered in comparison with millions who have done their part in the great job that America has done.

I want to be able to say when the history of this war is written that we did not find it necessary to apply totalitarian

sanctions to the people of America. Although Herr Hitler said democracy was outmoded and could not fight because it was not subjected to compulsion; although he said that the colossus of the new hemisphere would fail because the democratic system was an outworn system, I want to be able to boast when this war is over as we can boast now, that the democratic system was capable of doing the job, and is doing the job, and will continue to do the job until the end.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does not the distinguished Senator from Wyoming think that we are now telling Hitler in the only language that he could understand the very thing the Senator suggests?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Precisely. We are telling him not only with the glorious and brave achievements of our soldiers and our sailors, but with the output of American industry and American labor, that the democratic system, the free system, is capable of protecting and maintaining freedom in all the world. Are we here, at the very end, to abandon these principles and adopt the method of Hitler, which has proven utterly ineffectual, to destroy democracy, though he had a start of many years in the organization of science and industry?

Mr. President, three proposals have been submitted to the Congress of the United States for the solution of the undoubtedly difficult problem of manpower which we confront. One of these is the draft bill, the compulsory labor bill, which I have just been discussing. Another is the suggestion that the objective should be achieved through the Selective Service System, and the third is the committee bill.

The second plan is that which is suggested in the substitute offered by the very able junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. That bill would depend for its effectiveness upon the work of the local selective-service boards. It has a fatal defect, in my opinion, although I utterly sympathize with the objective which is sought to be attained. At first blush it would seem to be the proper way to act, until we consider that the selective-service boards are voluntary boards. They have no staffs. For the most part such boards operate throughout the country by the voluntary activity of the members, with one or two clerks. Usually some competent and patriotic young woman in the area, the town or the district, acts as clerk for the board. The members of the board are businessmen and professional men and community leaders who are patriotically giving of their time. They cannot be expected to make the sort of in-plant surveys which must be made and ought to be made if we are to have an efficient utilization of our manpower. So I say, Mr. President, the proposal of the Senator from West Virginia contains a fatal defect.

It contains another which, in my judgment, would invite a veto, if it should pass, because in section 4 of the substitute offered by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and by my very able colleague from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], whose purpose it is to make a constructive solution, I well understand, it is provided:

> The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall make or cause to be made in-plant surveys and other investigations of the use of manpower by the War Department and the Navy Department.

Mr. President, I feel confident that both the War and Navy Departments would object to extending authority and power to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to conduct such surveys in the installations of the Army and Navy.

This provision, like the provision with respect to selective service, would require a complete reorganization of the system which is now in effect. For that reason, Mr. President, it seems to me that it is not as effective as the committee bill. In the committee bill, cognizant of this difficulty, but in the realization that, as suggested by the Senator from West Virginia and my colleague from Wyoming, there should be and must be a survey of the utilization of manpower in the War and Navy Departments, we have provided that the task shall be performed under the general direction of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. This provision is to be found in section 3 (b). This is the language of the committee:

> (b) The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall make or cause to be made in-plant surveys and other investigations of the use of manpower by the War Department and the Navy Department, to determine the extent to which such departments are making the most effective use, in activities relating to production, procurement, or repairs, of individuals in their employ or subject to their jurisdiction as members of the armed forces, and shall take or cause to be taken, appropriate measures to eliminate labor wastage and labor hoarding, and otherwise to promote the full utilization by such departments of individuals in their employ or subject to their jurisdiction as members of the armed forces, and otherwise to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. President, that language was drawn in that way expressly for the purpose of providing the easiest and most effective way, without in any sense giving offense to the War and Navy Departments, for the survey of the utilization of manpower. It will be observed that this power is granted to the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, to whom reference is frequently made in the press as the "Assistant President," the man who has been designated by the Commander in Chief to act upon the home front. It was the belief of the Military Affairs Committee that this direction could properly be given to the man whom the President, by Executive order, has already designated as his principal spokesman upon the home front in the war effort, to "make or cause to be made" certain surveys and investigations. That is the phrase that we use in the amendment reported by the committee. He would also be authorized to coordinate the operations and activities of production.

Mr. President, let me add an additional word. The committee substitute is a very constructive and able effort, with the exception of the two or three criticisms which I have made, to bring together the bill which the committee has recommended and the Selective Service System. I am convinced, for the reason already mentioned, namely, the lack of staff in the local boards, that this authority must be given to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, as is provided in the committee substitute. After full consideration, the committee was guided by the thought that the War Manpower Commission, having been established for the express purpose of dealing with manpower, and having agencies and branches all over the country, is ready now to do the work of channeling workers into the places where they are needed, provided we give them the support of statute law. What has been done in the past has been done largely under Executive order.

Mr. President, the committee substitute is an effort to perfect the system we now have. Each of the other two measures, the House bill and the substitute proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] would require a complete reorganization of our system. On the contrary, the committee substitute does not require a reorganization. It merely strengthens the arm of the agency already at work. It does things which should have been done long since.

Let me call attention particularly to the provisions of section 3 (a), to be found on page 14:

> SEC. 3. (a) The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall, subject to the direction of the President, provide for coordinating the activities of all departments and agencies of the Government responsible for production, procurement, or manpower in such manner as to carry out most effectively the purposes declared in the first section of this act. The Director shall provide, among other things, that manpower requirements and the availability of manpower shall be given due consideration in determining where production schedules shall be increased or decreased and where contracts shall be awarded, terminated, or permitted to expire, and that notice shall be given to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission at the earliest practicable time of all changes or anticipated changes in war-production schedules, all awards or anticipated awards of war contracts, and all terminations or anticipated terminations of war contracts, which are likely to result in any substantial increase or decrease of the manpower requirements of any employer or any area. All departments and agencies of the Government shall comply with orders and regulations issued by the Director under authority of this section.

Here is a constructive attempt, we believe, to channel contracts into the area where the labor supply appears. Here is an attempt to make known in advance when a contract is expiring. Frequently when a contract is about to expire, the contractor knows that it is coming to an end. The workers know that it is coming to an end, but they have no knowledge as to whether or not a new contract is coming. The result, in all human nature, frequently has been a letting down of work. This would be obviated by the provisions of the committee amendment. Here we have the

effort to improve and make more efficient the plan which is already working.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry that a conference prevented my hearing the entire speech of the Senator. Has the Senator commented on section 7, referred to as the Austin amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I have not commented on that.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to hear the Senator's views on it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My own view is that that amendment should not be in the bill, and I intend to support the amendment of the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] to eliminate the compulsion the amendment provides, because I think it is unnecessary. I feel that we should not run the risk that any authority would be granted to draft a regulation for the violation of which an individual might be liable to the punishment set forth in the language which the Austin amendment incorporates in the bill. I feel that it is unnecessary.

I feel also that, so far as I can read the bill, authority is not granted to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to draft such a regulation. I believe that by perfecting the voluntary system we can do much more to solve the manpower problem than by adopting any of the drastic methods which would provoke a feeling that the fundamental free choice of American workers was being denied.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am sorry I did not hear the entire statement upon the point the Senator is making; but he did not indicate, did he, any compulsion or any punishment was to be placed upon an employee under the substitute I have offered?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no. I understand that.

Mr. President, I think that this in effect completes what I desire to say about the bill. I feel that the substitute should not be adopted and that the committee bill, with the change which is proposed by the amendment of the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] merits the support of the Senate.

I can say that under the able and laudable chairmanship of the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] the Committee on Military Affairs, in my judgment, has done an exceptionally hard-working, intelligent job upon this bill. It scrutinized with great care the measure which came from the House. It was not afraid to accept its responsibility. It did not hesitate to read the proposed bill, line by line. When it became clear, upon the first reading of the bill, that many amendments would have to be adopted, then members of the committee and Senators outside the committee, like the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who, as a member of the Mead committee, formerly the Truman committee, has had opportunity to see how manpower has been wasted because we have not had legislation of this kind, gave their best thought and their diligent effort to drafting a bill which would meet the problem. Mr. President, I think it does meet the problem, and, as I said, it merits the support of the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TYDINGS. My understanding is that the amendment which I have offered to House bill 1752 is now pending. Is it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. TYDINGS. That amendment is offered as an amendment to the committee substitute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. Inasmuch as the amendment which is now pending, has, so far as I know, eliminated any objections raised by the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], who, so far as I know, were the only opponents of it, the remainder of the Senate being a unit in support of reenforcing and restating the so-called Tydings agricultural amendment, I am very hopeful that it may be acted upon at this time, for the debate is not turning on what is pending before the Senate, but on the relative merits of the bill introduced by the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from West Virginia, the committee substitute, and the House bill.

So, whichever one of the three of the Senate finally agrees to pass, I do not know that any Senator is opposed to this amendment. Thus, I am hopeful that it may be disposed of now, so that we may have before us what is actually the subject of the discussion.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Maryland a question relative to the second part of his amendment, found on page 2, beginning in line 10, reading as follows:

> It shall be the duty of any registrant who is now or hereafter deferred under this subsection and who has been found unacceptable to the land or naval forces for training and service, not to voluntarily leave or discontinue such agricultural occupation or endeavor unless his selective-service local board (subject to appeal in the same manner as is provided in section 10 (a) (2)) has determined that it is no longer necessary in the interest of the war effort.

And so forth. Will the Senator please interpret the last line I read—line 17?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. The man to whom this language refers was originally deferred because of his agricultural occupation. Subsequent to his deferment it might be found that he was physically unable to perform military service. Therefore, he would be excused from performing military service, not because of his agricultural occupation, but because of his physical disability. In such cases some men who have requested deferment because of agricultural occupation, finding that they no longer needed to work on the farm, after they have been found to be physically disabled have left the farm and have engaged in some other occupation. I think that a man who asks to be deferred from military service because of agricultural occupation, and who subsequent to such deferment is found to be unable to serve in the Army because of physical incapacity, has the duty to remain on the farm.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us consider the case of a farmer who has been deferred and placed in either class IV-F or class II-C. Probably he works 8, 9, or 10 months of the year on the farm, producing wheat or corn, let us say. He does not need to work every day, but, of course, it is essential that when spring comes he cultivate the crops, and that when the fall harvest comes he be on the farm. Subsequently, at a time between seasons, when there is no particular need for him on the farm, he is granted permission by his selective-service board to work in a packing plant for 2 months—or, as in the South, to go into the woods to engage in lumbering operations. Would there be any difficulty about his returning to the farm the following season?

Mr. TYDINGS. Not a bit.

Mr. WHERRY. It is up to the draft board which classifies him, is it?

Mr. TYDINGS. Is the Senator speaking of a man who has been found physically unfit for service in the Army?

Mr. WHERRY. I am.

Mr. TYDINGS. He is always under the control of the draft board, even after he has been found to be physically unfit.

Mr. WHERRY. But would he have to go back to the draft board and offer himself again for service in the armed forces?

Mr. TYDINGS. I imagine the draft board would give him the right to transfer to such seasonal work for a limited number of months, and when that period expires he would automatically go back to the farm.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that provided for in the amendment?

Mr. TYDINGS. So far as it can be provided, I would say "Yes."

Mr. WHERRY. So it will not be necessary for such a man to report back to his draft board; he will be allowed to return to the farm, and there will be no question of violation of the regulations or of imposition of the penalties provided in the measure, which are rather heavy.

Mr. TYDINGS. The penalties have been eliminated.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sorry I was not in the Chamber when that was done.

Mr. TYDINGS. But he would be left under the control of the draft board, which could put him into military service in a limited capacity. All the penalties have been eliminated.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I rose to my feet for two purposes. In the first place, Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland has stated that the amendment

should be accepted by the Senate because it would appear in any one of the three bills.

Mr. TYDINGS. I offered it only to the bill of which the Senator from Utah is more or less the author.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. The reason I speak now is because of the Senator's statement in regard to penalties. On a rereading of the Senator's revised amendment beginning in line 10, and in the light of his statement that the penalties have been eliminated, I think it would be better, if he will not assume that I am giving him advice, to reconsider the matter, because I believe that the penalties have not been removed. I think that by use of the words "it shall be the duty," in line 10, all the penalties prescribed by section 11 of the Selective Service Act, as amended, will still be in force. They are extremely severe penalties. If the Senator does not object, and inasmuch as some Senators have urged the rejection of the last paragraph because of the severe penalties it provides, I suggest that action be delayed until we come to the question in one of the other bills—in case we do come to it—or, in case the Revercomb substitute is accepted, bring the matter up again after study and consideration.

Mr. TYDINGS. My understanding of the parliamentary situation is that unless the offer is made at this time it will not be in order should the Revercomb amendment be adopted.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true; but if the Revercomb amendment were adopted the Senator would have a chance to correct his amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then I should be in the same position I am in now, because I am offering this amendment as an amendment to the committee amendment so that when we are given a choice between accepting the Revercomb amendment and the committee substitute we may know the final form of the committee substitute.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Has the Senator studied section 11 of the Selective Service Act? If so, does he feel that the penalties have been removed?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Kentucky, and myself have discussed that matter. The Senator from West Virginia is of the opinion that from the wording of the language there would be no criminal penalty which would fall upon the registrant as a result of his draft board ruling. Do I make myself clear?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes; I think I understand what the Senator means.

Mr. TYDINGS. There would be no penalty. However, the draft board could certify the man for limited military service. To that extent, if he did not remain on the farm after he had used the farm to escape military service, the draft board could certify him for military service.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator will note that he has made everything which follows line 10 a duty.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The beginning of section 11 of the Selective Service and Training Act, as amended, starts with the words, "Any person charged as herein provided with the duty of carrying out any of the provisions of this act."

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. So if the Senator is satisfied with having the last paragraph come under the penalty provided in section 11 to which I have referred, I, of course, am satisfied, because the bill which I am sponsoring carries a stronger penalty than the one to which reference has been made. The Senator himself has said that the penalties have been removed, but I am wondering if he is sure they have been removed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; the penalties have been removed. Of course, if a man had been given a deferment and then walked off the job, the board could recall him, reclassify him, and put him into some other service. I have no objection to the provision with reasonable penalties, and none without reasonable penalties. The main purpose of the amendment is to prevent draft boards from drafting men whom the law specifically states shall not be drafted under certain conditions. The other provision to which the Senator from Utah has referred was added at the request of certain organizations who asserted that in some cases men would be deferred because of being engaged in an agricultural occupation, and then after they had been found to be physically incapacitated for military service they would no longer use their agricultural deferment but would leave the farm and obtain a higher-paid job, knowing that they would not be drafted anyway because they were not physically fit.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. If the registrant should fail to perform a duty, is there any penalty provided in the Selective Service Act, and, if so, would not that penalty be imposed against him under the Senator's amendment?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think it is of major importance at this juncture whether the word "duty" stays in or goes out of the amendment, because it is perfectly obvious that the amendment will have to go to conference. My suggestion is that all opinions expressed on the floor of the Senate must of necessity be opinions with regard to the legal phase of the subject. They have not been carefully considered and weighed as a result of a conference with representatives of the military service. Therefore, if the amendment is adopted, and there is any provision in it which has been subject to misinterpretation, the conference is the place where it can be refined so that it will be expressive of the will of the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any objection to deleting the word "duty" from the paragraph?

Mr. TYDINGS. Not so far as I am concerned. In my judgment that part of the amendment is only about 2 percent of what we are trying to accomplish. I should not object to eliminating all the language after line 10 on page 2 of the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us take it out.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, it is obvious that some men who go to a draft board and are excused from military service because of working on a farm, when they learn that they are physically incapacitated for military service, will cease to work on the farm, knowing that they will not be drafted because of certain physical disabilities. It is my opinion that as a question of specific morality, any man who is excused from military service because of doing some form of work essential to the war effort should not be allowed to leave the work when the situation changes in the way I have described.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I read this section, if we should delete the word "duty" in line 10, page 2, of the amendment the provision would still be in such form as to make it the duty of the registrant to do the necessary thing, and therefore the penalty would still be applicable.

Mr. TYDINGS. What would the Senator suggest?

Mr. FERGUSON. I suggest that the language be stricken out. Under the law as it stands today, if a man is classified one day as IV–F the board may call him in the next day and put him into limited service.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think the Senator has caught the point which I am attempting to make. Let me cite a possible situation. John Brown is excused from military service because he is working on a farm in an essential endeavor and for him there is no replacement.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that.

Mr. TYDINGS. He is exempt, although he could have been called up for military service and, to all intents and purposes, could now be fighting in the Army in France or in the Southwest Pacific. For 6 months or a year after he is deferred he is protected, so to speak, from military service and is called up again by the draft board and told, "Whether you are under the law of Congress or not, we will take you because we need you." While they get ready to take him they find that he is physically incapacitated for military service. In other words, to use the common parlance of the day, he is "IV–F'd." He says, "There is no use of my staying on the farm any longer. It is true that I got out of military service for a year under the guise of being a farmer during the war; but now that I find they will not take me because of physical inability, I am going to lease the farm and take the train tomorrow for Baltimore, Philadelphia, or New York, where I can get 8 or 10 dollars a day by working 8 hours a day and get time and a half for overtime, and so forth." So, I think that a man who has asked for military deferment because of agricultural occupation finds he can be

excused anyway on other grounds and then does not stand by what he asked for in the first place, is not entitled, in the eyes of the veterans who are dying on the battle front, to any further consideration, and I would advise that the penalty apply to a man who takes that position without the permission of the draft board.

Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. MURDOCK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia, and then I shall yield to the other Senators.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, if the able Senator from Maryland will observe, I have taken the privilege of placing in the substitute which I have offered largely the language of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad to know that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In the proposed substitute it is directed to the local service boards, and requires that the boy be left on the farm; and if he is essential to farm work and cannot be replaced, no penalty is imposed upon him. Now, the case cited by the Senator from Maryland would be met under the substitute for this reason——

Mr. TYDINGS. May I interrupt the Senator for a moment to say that the provision which has just been read and to which the debate has been addressed has nothing to do at all with the deferment of an able-bodied man who has received agricultural deferment from military service.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; I understand.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is no penalty, there is nothing of the sort that applies to an able-bodied man who has received agricultural deferment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And who stays on the farm?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. It deals only with the man who apparently thought he is able-bodied, gets a deferment, and escapes military service; then, finding he is not able-bodied, says, "I do not intend to work on the farm any more."

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is so. I should like to address myself to the substitute. Under the substitute measure, in the first place, one deferred by the Selective Service Board for farm work as a necessary worker has no penalty placed upon him whether he be able-bodied or IV-F. If the IV-F man goes back to the farm deferred and cannot be accepted into the Army because of his physical condition and he finds that out and leaves the farm, then under the bill of the committee there is nothing that can be done to him.

Mr. TYDINGS. But under my amendment there is.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under the amendment as written with the penalties included in it. But let me state what would happen under the substitute amendment which has been offered. If that man left the farm he would have to go into some work whether he was a IV-F or able-bodied. Of course, if he is able-bodied and leaves the farm, he is called up for military service; if he is not able-bodied but classified IV-F, under this bill he has got to take a job or become a loafer.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator means under his proposed substitute bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes. If he becomes a loafer, he is called by the Selective Service and offered to the military service, and, if they will not accept him, the War Manpower Commission finds a job for him and he must take it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Suppose he will not take the job?

Mr. REVERCOMB. If he is able to work, the same penalties would be imposed upon him as would be imposed on the man who refused to accept service when called by the draft board.

Mr. TYDINGS. In other words, if the Selective Service Board says to John Brown "Go into a plant and make shells," and he says, "I will not go," he is subject to 5 years' imprisonment and a $10,000 fine under the substitute bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall state how I interpret it. There is no Member of the Senate, so far as I know, who opposes, in essence, the amendment I have proposed, and as a matter of fact no one is opposed to any of it except the last 10 lines, which may be subject to a questionable interpretation. I assume I have stated it correctly. I feel this way about this amendment: If a man has gotten deferment from military service upon his statement that he is going to work on the farm and no one can take his place, and he subsequently finds, even though there is no one to take his place, that he is physically incapacitated for military service and he uses that condition as a means of avoiding work, and goes some place else in violation of his first deferment, then whatever penalty is already in the law for evasion of the draft or any other part of the draft machinery ought to apply. That is my interpretation. While there is no specific penalty, the draft board can call back such a man and reclassify him for limited military service or anything they care to do, and the penalty would be in keeping control over him even though he had left the farm.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator from Maryland accept an amendment striking out all the language after the period following the word "board" in line 10?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will tell the Senator what I would suggest in the interest of good legislation. I do not know as yet whether we are going to have the House bill or the committee bill or the substitute bill. I think the suggestion of the Senator from Nebraska is a good one, that for the time being there be eliminated all the remaining part from line 10 down to the end of the amendment. However, when this bill goes to conference there ought to be sufficient leeway in conference to take care of a man who originally was deferred because he was working on a farm but who, finding himself unable to serve from a physical point, left the farm and went back on his original request.

Mr. President, I modify my amendment by striking out on page 2, line 10, after the word "board", the remainder of the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. As I understand the Senator's modified amendment and comparing it with the so-called committee bill, it relates to section 11 of the bill, pages 21 and 22?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. Therefore, what it would do to the bill that came from the committee would be to strike out on page 22, line 7, all the language beginning "It shall be the duty of any registrant who is now or hereafter deferred" to the end of the section.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BURTON. But it would leave in the first provision of section 11, and would add to it a new sentence, about which, I believe, there is no controversy, and which reads as follows:

> Such deferment shall be made by said board without consideration of any other circumstance or condition whatsoever; and during the period of such deferment for such purpose, no other classification shall be made by said board.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator's description of the present situation is completely accurate.

Mr. BURTON. The part that would remain in the Senator's proposal would seem to me, from the history of the case, to be without controversy. The Senator is striking out a sentence as to which there has been some controversy because of its penalty implications, but he would be definitely amending the bill as it came from the committee by striking out the important paragraph as to which the Senator has made some reference, indicating how valuable it may be.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. I promised to yield to the junior Senator from Utah, and for the moment it had slipped my mind.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I have listened to the Senator with much interest, and, as I understand him now, his amendment, by way of modification, takes out——

Mr. TYDINGS. All the IV-F cases.

Mr. MURDOCK. It seems to me that if the language in question should be stricken out, it would do this with the boy on the farm: He is deferred on account of doing farm labor. Then he is called up for induction. At that time his

deferment is canceled, as I understand deferment; is it not?

Mr. TYDINGS. No.

Mr. MURDOCK. If he is physically fit and is so found, he goes into the Army.

Mr. TYDINGS. No. The boy is called up while his deferment is in existence.

Mr. MURDOCK. I understand.

Mr. TYDINGS. He is called up more or less for what is called a reexamination or reclassification. When he appears before the board, the first thing they do is to examine him, and we might as well tell the truth about the matter, the psychological factor back of it is that the registrant is in a position where he is afraid that if he does not do pretty much as it is implied he should do, something is going to happen to him. So there is a certain amount of coercion. What in the world is the use of examining a man physically when a board has already said he should be deferred because there is no replacement for him in the community?

Mr. MURDOCK. I see no reason; but I take the position that when the board calls him for induction and then finds that he is physically unfit, certainly that has canceled his deferment.

Let us apply the same type of provision to a boy, working in some plant, who is being deferred. Would the Senator from Maryland want to say to the farm boy, "Because your deferment has been canceled, because you have been determined to be unfit, you must go back to the farm, regardless"? Would the Senator want to say that to the farm boy, and still say to the boy who works in a plant, who is called up, let us say, under the same circumstances, "Although we do this to the farm boy, now that you are found to be in IV–F, you can elect to go onto a farm if you want to"? To me it is not logical.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is why we struck it out, not that we are not in basic agreement as to the intrinsic merit of a provision dealing with this subject, but it is perfectly obvious that it has not been rounded into perfect shape, and we are hoping that this matter will all be dealt with in conference.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am glad it was deleted.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have two questions to ask, the first one of the Chair, dealing with the parliamentary situation. If we accept the modification embodied in the Tydings amendment, and adopt it, will that carry through the modification to the bill which will be before the Senate after action on the Revercomb substitute?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is an amendment to the committee substitute.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. So that it will amend the committee substitute, regardless of any action taken on the Revercomb substitute?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The next question I would ask of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I desire to ask a question at that point.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall yield to the Senator from West Virginia in a moment.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In order that I may have the wisdom and experience of the Senator from Maryland in conference, let me ask him to explain to us exactly what the added sentence will do to the amendment, if he will give us an illustration such as the one he has given us in regard to the boy who is deferred for agricultural purposes.

Mr. TYDINGS. At the request of the Senator from Utah, I shall read the amendment slowly as it now stands, and then attempt in a few sentences, if I may, to interpret it properly. It reads:

> In carrying out the provisions of this subsection * * * the selective-service local board in classifying the registrant shall base its findings solely and exclusively on whether the registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort and whether a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

That was basically the original Tydings amendment. Now we have added the words "without reference to the relative essentiality of the registrant to an agricultural occupation or endeavor as compared with any other occupation, service, or endeavor." That is new language, and its purpose is this: The draft boards have said, "We know that the Tydings amendment is the law, but the Selective Service has said to us in so many words, 'Notwithstanding the Tydings amendment, if you find we need this boy more than the farmer needs him, go ahead and take him anyway, whether there is a replacement for him or not.'"

In order to cure that situation, we have written into the amendment a provision that the requirements which I read on page 1 shall be paramount without regard to any other service or occupation whatsoever. So much for that. I continue reading:

> The foregoing provision of this sentence shall apply upon any appeal or review of a decision made thereunder by a selective-service local board.

That is inserted so that after the local board acts on a case the same formula shall apply to the appeals board in the determination of a case. I read further:

> Such deferment shall be made by said board without consideration of any other circumstance or condition whatsoever.

That was inserted because it was thought that, having tried to go around the law once in a certain manner, we would close that door and say, "You cannot resort to anything else that will tear down this amendment." In other words, Congress is in this position: In order to carry out a perfectly plain and frank and clear definition of policy heretofore agreed to, we have had to restate it and write around it all sorts of safeguards to keep the executive agencies from ignoring the wish and nullifying the action of the Congress. I read further:

> And during the period of such deferment for such purpose no other classification shall be made by said board.

That forbids the draft boards, while the circumstances remain the same, from calling a man back when there has been no change in conditions, as I have said, and reclassifying him so as to put him into the service, the will of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. REVERCOMB addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Maryland yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont, then I shall yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland whether his new amendment, which requires the Selective Service to obey the law of Congress, would have any effect upon a situation such as that which is prevalent in my State? There are about 150 young men in Vermont working on farms, mostly their fathers' farms, who put in 6 to 10 hours a day on the farm, then take the milk from their farm to the milk plant, and on the way collect milk from the neighbors' farms and carry that also. It takes them 3 or 4 hours a day to do that, so that they put in between 12 and 14 hours a day in all, working on the farm and carrying the milk. These boys have been advised by their county farm labor directors that they must stop carrying their neighbors' milk, or they will be classed as truck drivers and lose their farm-labor deferment.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the ruling of the board in the Senator's State is extreme, but I cannot say it is incorrect for the following reason: I have had brought to my attention a similar situation in my own State involving deferred men who on 1 day a week take a quantity of butter into Baltimore City, where they "huckster" it, as we say, and the selective-service board says such men are not putting in their time on the farm but are retail merchants. In another case there was a man who ran a farm during the day, with the help of his wife, and operated a filling station in limited hours in the evening. The man was stretching himself to the utmost, working all day long, and in the evening doing this extra work in order to take advantage of the prosperity in the country and make some extra money with which to reduce the mortgage on his farm.

The point is that the minute a man starts to depart from purely farm work a multitude of situations arise, and if latitude were given, an impossible condition would exist until the whole of the farm deferment program would fall into disrepute. Whereas up to the present time, so far as I know, the worker in the factory, the man in the city, the businessman, and the soldier and the sailor and the airman on the front, are all sympathetic with the evident intent of Congress, properly applied, because they do not feel that in the main the program has been abused, but that it has resulted in a considerable contribution to the Nation's total war effort. Therefore, I would have to say to the Senator, much as I sympathize with the situation he has presented, that I doubt if we can provide such exceptions as he suggests in the law.

Mr. AIKEN. The individuals in question are in a position where one agency of the Government is telling them to

pool their products and efforts in order to save tires and gasoline, and the Selective Service tells them that if they do they will be drafted into the Army.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, but I think we ought to be fair enough to consider such a situation as this: Let us say there are two boys, John Brown and William Smith. They grew up in the same community. They are of the same age. One goes out and faces the greatest danger on the battle front, where he may be called upon to give his all, his young life. The other one, because of his particular adaptability and the need on the farm, escapes the danger of losing his life. Therefore I believe that where a farm deferment is given to one of two young men, as it must be given all over America in accordance with the example I have presented, it ought to be for farm work and for nothing else. I do not believe that men who have been given the privilege of deferment because they are needed on the farm ought to spread their energy to huckstering, or to operations involving the use of gasoline or to anything else which is not a service on the farm within the meaning of the deferment provisions of the act.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think such a thing is happening.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do.

Mr. AIKEN. As one gets nearer to large cities such things might happen, but in my State the work involved is simply the carrying of milk from the farm to the milk plant, which may be anywhere from 5 to 15 miles away. Although probably there is no way of changing the regulations, the result is that many more men will be required to do the same amount of work than would otherwise be necessary.

Mr. TYDINGS. That may be. But in order that the war effort may continue the man ought to devote all his time to creating or producing food, and if he does not create or produce food, then he ought not to have the privilege of deferment. It is a privilege, a very high privilege, made necessary because there is no other way to produce the food than the way we have provided. But the man who receives a deferment from military service ought to meet the tests of civilian production 100 percent, and he ought not to be deferred if he meets them only 99.44 percent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. A few moments ago the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, the able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], made inquiry as to whether the amendment, as modified by the Senator from Maryland, was an amendment to the committee amendment or to the substitute which I offered. I wish to say—as was correctly answered—it is an amendment to the committee bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to say to the Senator that the exact language, as now modified by the Senator from Maryland, is contained in my substitute as originally offered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I want the distinguished Senator from Maryland to know that I agree with him fully in what he is trying to do. No one has rendered a greater service in working out agricultural deferment than has the Senator from Maryland, and we all compliment him for it.

If the Senator will follow what I shall read, beginning in line 8, on page 2:

> And during the period of such deferment for such purpose, no other classification shall be made by said board.

Should not the words "of said registrant" be inserted following the word "classification"?

Mr. TYDINGS. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. WHERRY. The middle of line 8, on page 2, of the Senator's amendment. I simply make the suggestion to the Senator in order that the language may be clarified.

Mr. TYDINGS. What is the Senator's suggestion?

Mr. WHERRY. Beginning in line 8, on page 2, the Senator's amendment reads:

> During the period of such deferment for such purpose, no other classification shall be made by said board.

Should not the words "of said registrant" be inserted between the word "classification" and the word "shall"?

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the insertion of those words would strengthen the provision. I have no objection to having the words inserted. I perfect my amendment by the insertion of the words "of said registrant" between the words "classification" and "shall."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland has the right to perfect his amendment in the way he has done.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I call the Senator's attention in line 4 on page 1 of his amendment to the following words, "solely and exclusively on whether the registrant is necessary."

Let us suppose a case. A farmer has two sons. The draft board decides that the farm could be operated with one son. So it puts the other son into I–A. He is sent off to the induction center, but fails in his examination and is not accepted, so he is back on the farm again. When he comes back is the draft board precluded from considering the fact that the individual who was sent to the induction center has been rejected? The language of the amendment would seem to imply that the only thing the draft board could do would be to consider the one item of essentiality for farm work.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, I do not think such a thing as the Senator has suggested would happen very often.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. In other words, a man has either been already deferred or he has not been deferred.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. But the draft board could, if it wanted to do so, again call a man for induction who had previously failed in his physical examination.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. But under the wording of the Senator's amendment is the draft board prevented from considering that rejection?

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, no. If the individual has been deferred because of military incapacity, as in the case the Senator mentioned, the one who has been deferred because of physical incapacity is a IV–F. What is the Senator's question concerning the IV–F individual?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. As I understand the Selective Service Act, generally, the draft board could send him again to an induction center, even though he had been rejected.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. But does not the language of the Senator's amendment which I have read prevent the board from considering the previous rejection at all?

Mr. TYDINGS. No.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Would not that language prevent the board from considering anything but agricultural essentiality?

Mr. TYDINGS. No, it would not; not if the individual had already been deferred because of physical incapacity, because obviously he could not again be called for military service unless he had been cured of his physical disability.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. He could be called, of course, but he could not be inducted.

Mr. TYDINGS. The original intent of the so-called Tydings amendment was to exempt only men who were going to be taken into the military service for whom there was no replacement.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is true.

Mr. TYDINGS. We are now dealing with men who could not be taken into the military service because of physical disability. In my opinion such men always remain under the jurisdiction of the draft board for further examination or for further classification, depending upon whether they improve, and what the situation is.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. So the language of the Senator's amendment would not prevent that?

Mr. TYDINGS. No. I do not think so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In such a case, where the farmer had two sons, and the draft board decided that the farm could be operated by one of them, and the other one was sent to an induction center, and was turned down for physical reasons, and returned home, then the draft board could consider whether the other one who had been left home originally should be taken.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; because the one with a defect who returned home would be a replacement for the other.

Mr. BARKLEY. Or the board could send the first one back to the induction center if he were found qualified and fit to go into the Army.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. In either case it would be a question of providing a replacement.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], as modified, to the committee amendment.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah obtained the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if any Senator wishes to speak concerning the Revercomb substitute I will yield the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 16, line 8, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following proviso:

Provided, That no regulation or interpretation shall be issued, or action taken, by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission which reduces the employment ceiling of any regular publication, daily, weekly, or monthly, or of any news-gathering or news-disseminating organization, below the number employed in any such publication or organization in any month in the year 1944.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the committee substitute.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the heart of the committee substitute is contained in section 4 (b), in which the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, by himself, and individually, is given power to prescribe employment ceilings in designated areas, activities, or places of employment, fixing the maximum number of workers, by age, sex, or occupational qualifications, who may be there employed, and prohibiting the employment of workers beyond such maximum number.

I think it is admitted that with such power the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission might close up any establishment in the United States. That probably is the most arbitrary power ever given anyone to deal with employers or plants. I have some doubt about the wisdom of granting such broad powers at all, and that question may be discussed; but I feel perfectly confident that that power ought not to be given to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission over any part of the press of the United States. He ought not to have the power to close up any newspaper or magazine. He ought not to have the power to close any regular reporting agency. I do not think that anyone has alleged that an excessive number of persons are engaged in that industry. No evidence of that kind has been presented. As a matter of fact, nearly all the newspapers and publications had fewer employees in 1944 than they had before.

My amendment is as follows:

Provided, That no regulation or interpretation shall be issued, or action taken, by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission which reduces the employment ceiling of any regular publication, daily, weekly, or monthly, or of any news-gathering or news-disseminating organization, below the number employed in any such publication or organization in any month in the year 1944.

Under the terms of my amendment, no one could start a new newspaper or publication in order to evade the draft. The amendment simply provides that in the case of organizations which were operating in the year 1944, and employing a certain number of persons, the number of persons so employed may not be reduced.

I believe there is one thing upon which we can all agree, and that is that we should maintain in this country, to the very greatest possible extent, the freedom of the press. It seems to me that the press is a unique case. It sets no example for any other industry. I very much hope that the chairman of the committee may see fit to accept my amendment, which I believe could in no possible way hinder the successful operation of the act.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. I agree with the Senator from Ohio, and intend to support his amendment. In the committee I offered an amendment to strike out the entire provision, because there is no question that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission would have power to establish zero ceilings and thereby, as the Senator has suggested, put anyone out of business. I believe that we ought not to give him such power. We were not successful in the committee in having that provision stricken from the bill; but I hope before the bill is passed that another attempt will be made, and that we may be more successful. Certainly the press ought not to be subject to such power. Many other industries ought not to be subject to it.

Mr. TAFT. I believe that the press represents a peculiar case. I feel that the press ought not to be limited at all in its employment. Possibly if the provision as applied to other industries is to be changed, it may be desirable to limit control over employment ceilings to 50 percent, or some other figure. However, I am glad that the Senator intends to support this amendment. I hope the chairman of the committee will accept it.

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope to interest the Senator in an amendment to strike out the entire provision.

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to support such an amendment if it is offered.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the question is not a vital one, if I may judge from the expressions offered in the committee. Senators who pointed out that there was power in the bill to reduce employment ceilings to zero were answered almost entirely by the statement that it would not be done. I think there is no doubt in the mind of anyone that no administrator in the United States would attempt to close out a newspaper by this method.

It was deemed by the committee that it was better to have no exceptions, and I myself feel that the committee was wise in providing no exceptions. But no Senator can talk against making an exception of this kind, because no one can conceive of any administrator attempting to curtail or interfere with the press. Therefore the acceptance of the amendment should hinge on whether the Senate wishes to make any exceptions. If we start making exceptions there will be no end of them. It is probably better that we have faith in the administrator to cooperate within both the spirit and the letter of our Constitution.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I appreciate what the able chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee has said. In many cases all that it is necessary to do to close a newspaper in the country is to take away one printer. Some of them are being closed now. Many of them have only one printer or one linotype operator. If he is taken away, the plant must close.

Clause (2) of subsection (b) of section 4 provides that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall have authority—

(2) To prohibit or regulate the hiring, rehiring, solicitation, or recruitment of new workers by employers. No employer shall hire or retain in his employ any individual in violation of such regulations.

I do not wish to indicate a lack of trust in any Government official, but I do not intend to vote to give any man the power to do what is suggested.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the committee substitute. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Overton
Bailey	Hayden	Pepper
Bankhead	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hill	Reed
Bilbo	Hoey	Revercomb
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Butler	Kilgore	Shipstead
Byrd	La Follette	Stewart
Capehart	Langer	Taft
Capper	McCarran	Taylor
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Chavez	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McMahon	Tobey
Downey	Magnuson	Tunnell
Eastland	Maybank	Tydings
Ellender	Mead	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Millikin	Wagner
Fulbright	Mitchell	Walsh
George	Moore	Wheeler
Gerry	Morse	Wherry
Green	Murdock	White
Guffey	Murray	Wiley
Gurney	Myers	Willis
Hart	O'Daniel	Wilson
Hatch	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have been supporting the Tydings amendment. I desire to give the reasons why I am in favor of it. I wrote to the Department of Agriculture, and on the 28th of February I received a letter from the director of the western division of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, Mr. Geissler. I might add, Mr. President, that his letter is a report regarding just one State, but it is typical of the agricultural States. Let me say very frankly that I do not see how General Hershey can possibly keep on taking the boys the way he has been taking them in my State and at the same time have the Department of Agriculture expect to carry out the program it has announced for North Dakota. The letter to which I have referred, from the head of the western division of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, reads as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1945.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I thought that you might like a report at this time on the past year's production and the 1945 production goals adopted by North Dakota agricultural leaders after careful study of national food requirements and the State's capacity to produce.

You will note from the attached table that farmers in North Dakota are again asked to carry out another big production job. In total, it compares very closely with the 1944 effort with the exception of the flaxseed goal on which North Dakota farmers are asked to carry a large part of the critical need for an expanded acreage. While the 1945 job appears comparable to the huge assignment carried out by the State's farmers in 1944, it is in fact a bigger job because it is complicated by the effects of another year of war which means that shortages may be even more acute in many farm production facilities.

Since the adoption of the State goals, meetings have been held at which county representatives have also joined in the acceptance of these goals as a war assignment for the State. The farmer-committeemen of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency and representatives of other farm groups are already actively at work informing farmers of the 1945 food requirements and developing farm plans to meet these goals.

The 1945 goals for North Dakota, as you will notice, represent very sharp increases over the acreages and livestock numbers in the 1937–41 period. It is a very large assignment that is asked of North Dakota farmers, but they have already indicated that they stand ready to make a real drive to carry through to another year of outstanding production. This was displayed very clearly in the reactions to the flaxseed goal. They were ready to produce it if it was needed for the war, but at the same time they wanted to be sure that it was a war need for which they were producing. The $5-per-acre payment which the Congress made possible through special authorization will furnish a very great incentive in attaining the needed production of this high-risk crop. The flaxseed goal has become a Government-farmer cooperative war project which has moved the goal from the impossible category to the difficult.

While labor is the problem of greatest concern to the farmers at present and the one that will have the most influence on their 1945 plans, the transportation problem is also very critical and can very easily result in a major storage problem at harvest time. Shortages must also be reckoned with in virtually all of the production facilities. However, it appears that farmers generally will plant to meet war needs again this year and rely upon their own ingenuity and maximum cooperation to pull them through what they very clearly see as their toughest production assignment of the war.

I wish to repeat that statement, Mr. President: The Agricultural Adjustment Administration says it is the toughest job that these farmers have ever been called upon to do.

I continue to read the letter:

The A. A. A. farmer-committeemen, as in the past, will be working with farmers throughout the entire production period to assist them in meeting the obstacles to production that might seem impossible if the need to overcome them was less important. If courage and extra effort will get the job done, I am confident that North Dakota's farmers will come through with another outstanding contribution toward meeting war's huge food requirements.

On the right-hand side of the attached table is a comparison of North Dakota's 1944 production with average production in the 1937–41 period. It tells a story of a tremendous production for the war effort and I am sure that you have seen accounts in North Dakota papers of what this has meant in the way of vastly increased State income.

Such sharp increases in production have taken their toll in soil resources, but North Dakota farmers have been aware of this drain on their soil and have carried out a rather heavy conservation effort along with the record production job. Shortages of farming facilities might have been expected to reduce their conservation work, but actually they carried out a record amount of conservation under the agricultural conservation program of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency. The Government assistance to North Dakota farmers on the soil and water conservation practices carried out under the 1944 A. A. A. program are estimated to be close to $6,000,000 compared to $4,810,000 of assistance on conservation in 1943. Much of the big increase in North Dakota production is the result of conservation work carried out under former A. A. A. programs. I am greatly impressed in driving through the State these days by the very marked improvement in farming methods that have been made in North Dakota in the last 10 years. As a North Dakota farmer I get a real feeling of pride out of this and you, of course, have reason for even greater satisfaction in what has been accomplished in this way. It is an accomplishment of great value to the State and the Nation as well as the individual farmers who have benefited.

When the North Dakota farmer-committeemen have completed the important 1945 farm plan sign-up, and accurate estimates can be made of the total of the farm goals that your farmers voluntarily set for themselves, I will report to you our success in the first phase of the 1945 production effort. We must first get the needed acreages planted. I will also advise you at that time regarding our progress on the 1945 agricultural conservation program and the production problems that are being encountered.

Sincerely yours,

G. F. GEISSLER,
Director, Western Division.

Mr. President, in order that Senators may understand the situation our farmers confront, and what they are asked to do, I read from some tables which have come directly from the Department of Agriculture.

Take, for example, the matter of sows which must farrow in the spring. The yearly average between 1937 and 1941 was 99,000. In 1945 the farmers were asked for 190,000 sows, an increase of 92 percent of parity, or 192 percent. Mind you, Mr. President, this request was in spite of the fact that last year the O. P. A. set ceiling prices by which the farmers of North Dakota were robbed of hundreds of thousands of dollars. It was at a time when the 5 packing plants refused to buy North Dakota hogs because, so they said, they had no room for refrigeration. They were buying hogs weighing less than 200 pounds, and hogs weighing more than 330 pounds, at a discount of 4 or 5 cents a pound. The result was that some of our farmers who were unable to pay $1 a bushel for barley, and from $1.10 to $1.15 a bushel for corn to feed the hogs, which were rapidly attaining more than top weight, sometimes had to sell them at a sacrifice.

Let us take the matter of corn. The average for the 5-year period to which I have referred was 1,109,000 acres. This year the Department of Agriculture wants us to plant 1,283,000 acres.

The yearly average for oats from 1937 to 1941 was 1,816 000 acres. This year the Depat tment of Agriculture wants us to plant 2,560,000 acres.

The yearly average for barley during the same period was 1,859,000 acres. This year our farmers are asked to plant 2,649,000 acres.

The yearly average for wheat during the same period was 8,749,000 acres. This year our farmers are asked to plant 10,000,000 acres.

The average yearly acreage of flaxseed for the 5-year period was 564,000 acres. This year, believe it or not ,the Department of Agriculture wants us to plant 1,807,000 acres, or more than three times the former average acreage.

Our average yearly acreage of Irish potatoes was 143,000 acres. This year we have been asked to plant 187,000 acres.

Our average yearly acreage of alfalfa seed was 18,000 acres. This year we have been asked to plant 40,000 acres.

I now come to the subject of cattle, and I invite the attention of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who has been very much interested in that subject. I am sure that the figures which I shall present with reference to North Dakota will correspond very nearly to those with reference to Nebraska.

For the 5-year period to which I have already referred the number of cattle and calves raised in North Dakota was 1,256,000. This year the Department of Agriculture wants us to raise 37 percent more or 1,720,000 head.

I am sure that the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska will recall that only a few weeks ago he stood beside me on the Senate floor and told me that the feeding lots in Nebraska were empty, and that the farmers there were losing money. He was appealing most eloquently for relief.

For sheep and lambs, the average for the 5-year period in North Dakota was

913,000. This year we are asked to produce 1,058,000.

For the 5-year period between 1937 and 1941, North Dakota raised 7,097,000 chickens. For 1945 the Department of Agriculture wants the farmers of North Dakota to produce 11,500,000 chickens.

The Department of Agriculture has not yet fixed the quota on eggs, but they want us to produce more milk. For the 5-year period to which I have referred the average yearly production of milk in North Dakota was 1,985,000,000 pounds, and for 1945 we are asked to produce 2,152,000,000 pounds.

Mr. President, I have not counted them, but I have before me approximately 500 letters which have come to me within the past 10 days. I wish to read some of them at this time. Any Senator who wishes to do so may examine them. They are practically all alike. I now hold in my hand one from Manfred, N. Dak., written on the 25th day of January, which is about the time the letters commenced coming to me. It was shortly after General Hershey had issued the call which really set aside the Tydings amendment. The letter was as follows:

We want to inform you that awful things are going on here. All the boys who had still been deferred are now being sent to Fort Snelling. While they are gone we do not know what to do with the stock and sheep. There is just too much work for old farmers and worn-out mothers to do. What must be done with these fresh and calving cows and lambing sheep?

We expect you to help us now, not next week or later. See that these boys who are still on the farm stay.

Yours respectfully.

Mr. and Mrs. B. E. FEHR.

Here is a letter from Fredonia, N. Dak. I might say that these letters are available to any Senator who cares to examine them. I notice that some Senators are nodding their heads, indicating that probably they have received similar letters by the score. The letter from Fredonia reads as follows:

FREDONIA, N. DAK., *January 25, 1945.*

DEAR MR. LANGER: I will ask you a question. I am a farmer. I own 5 quarters of land—350 acres crop land—and a full line of machinery, 45 head of cattle, some horses, hogs, and everything. So, I got one boy. He is 18 years old. Now, that's all the help I got beside me. I am 45. So, what can I do when they call him in the Army? My wife is in poor health. Is there any chance for me to keep him at home? When they call on him, I got to quit farming as soon as they call him. So, please let me know as soon as you can. I always depend on LANGER.

Yours.

FRED WESZNER.

Here is one from Burnstad, N. Dak.:

BURNSTAD, N. DAK.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER:

Received your letter some time ago about the new set-up which passed in Congress and am very glad of some of the things.

But the most thing I'd like to know or like to have is hired help. We all know and all hear that the IV-F's are going to be drafted so I would like to know if I couldn't keep one back. I farm a little better than 300 acres and have 90 head of cattle which to be taken care of and am all alone, which is too much work. Am 46 years old, farming all my life. Would appreciate very much if you could do something for me.

Let me know soon.

Yours truly.

WENTELL BECKER.

Here is a letter from Solen, N. Dak.:

SOLEN, N. DAK., *January 23, 1945.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: I am writing to you asking for advice about my son. He is in class II–C now until May. But they want to take all the farm boys to Fort Snelling that are in II–C.

I am a sick man. I was to see the doctor last week and he cannot help me. Please see what you can do about it and let me know right away. I would appreciate it very much. I plant over 400 acres of crop and have 45 head of cattle. He is the only one that can work. I have two girls and another boy, yet, that is going to school. He also is sick with hay fever and cannot work. The doctor said not to keep him on the farm because that won't help him. That is why I am sending him to school.

So please help me so my son won't have to go. If they take him I have to quit farming and without farming I cannot make a living.

Very truly yours.

JACOB HEINERT.

So I could go on with letters, Mr. President, but the ones I have read are typical.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from North Dakota if he has continued to get letters, as I have, even after the so-called corrective Hershey directive went out, notifying the local draft boards to comply strictly with the law as set forth in the Tydings amendment. Does the Senator still have letters coming to him from different draft boards?

Mr. LANGER. Let me say to the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska that when I got these letters I packaged them and got in touch with General Hershey. When I went to see him he commenced to tell me that the Tydings amendment had been—I say set aside, but he used other words. I said, "Very well, General, it will be a great favor to me if you will talk directly to the people of North Dakota." The result was we went over to a radio station and there we made a 15-minute record, of which General Hershey took about 13½ minutes. We advertised that fact in North Dakota and General Hershey talked directly to the farmers of the State of North Dakota. I thought that would be a fair way. Notice was given to all the draft boards so that they could listen in. That record was broadcast not only once but several times, not only by one radio station but by practically every radio station in the State of North Dakota. When he got through explaining to the farmers of North Dakota, Mr. President, believe it or not, I received more letters, let me say in reply to the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska, than I got before that record was broadcast on those radio stations, some of them in Nebraska, so I have no doubt the junior Senator from Nebraska had much correspondence along the same line. I continued to receive letters from farmers who said they had heard General Hershey talking over the radio.

Now I ask unanimous consent to place the table in the RECORD at this point in my remarks—the table accompanying Mr. Geissler's letter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

The table is as follows:

North Dakota

Commodity	1945 goals with comparisons				1944 production with comparisons			
	Unit	1945 goal	1937–41 average	Goal as percent of average	Unit	1944 production	1937–41 average	1944 as percent of average
Corn	Acre	1,283,000	1,100,000	116	Bushel	36,250,000	21,017,000	173
Oats	Acre	2,560,000	1,816,000	141	Bushel	82,041,000	38,098,000	215
Barley	Acre	2,640,000	1,859,000	142	Bushel	59,062,000	28,781,000	205
Wheat	Acre	10,000,000	8,740,000	114	Bushel	161,630,000	88,437,000	183
Flaxseed	Acre	1,807,000	564,000	320	Bushel	7,661,000	2,563,000	299
Irish potatoes	Acre	187,000	143,000	131	Bushel	20,875,000	13,539,000	154
Legume seeds:								
Alfalfa	Acre	40,000	18,000	222	Bushel	27,000	20,000	135
Sweet clover	Acre	20,000	29,000	69	Bushel	20,000	74,000	39
Sows farrowed:								
Spring	Number	190,000	99,000	192	Number	160,000	99,000	162
Fall	Number	(1)	16,000		Number	25,000	16,000	156
On farms Jan. 1:								
Cattle and calves	Number	[2] 1,720,000	1,256,000	137	Number	[3] 1,905,000	1,256,000	152
Sheep and lambs	Number	[2] 1,058,000	913,000	116	Number	[3] 967,000	913,000	106
Raised on farms:								
Chickens	Number	11,500,000	7,097,000	162	Number	12,309,000	7,097,000	173
Turkeys	Number	1,200,000	1,424,000	84	Number	992,000	1,424,000	70
Farm production:								
Eggs	Dozen	(4)	27,917,000		Dozen	55,667,000	27,917,000	199
Milk	Pound	[2] 2,152,000,000	1,985,000,000	108	Pound	[3] 2,183,000,000	1,985,000,000	110

[1] To be announced later.

[2] Jan. 1, 1946.

[3] Jan. 1, 1945.

[4] No State goals established.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also have before me a table furnished by J. M. Thompson, Assistant Director, Western Division, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, showing the harvested acreage and production of grains for various years.

Mr. Geissler in his letter stated what a very fine job the farmers of North Dakota had done. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the table furnished by Mr. Thompson, because it shows that without exception the production of corn, wheat, oats, barley, flaxseed, and grain sorghum was greater in 1944 than in any previous year. I did not mention rye because it happens the year was a poor one for rye and the figures for rye are a little bit less.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the table may be printed in the RECORD.

The table referred to is as follows:

Harvested acreage and production—Grains

	Harvested acreage (thousands of acres)						Production (thousands of bushels)					
	Average, 1930–39	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944	Average, 1930–39	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
Corn	90,049	86,738	86,186	89,484	94,455	97,235	2,307,452	2,449,200	2,677,517	3,175,154	3,034,354	3,228,361
Wheat	55,743	52,980	55,642	49,464	50,648	59,309	745,575	816,698	943,127	981,327	841,023	1,078,647
Oats	36,653	35,393	37,965	37,899	38,395	38,984	1,016,061	1,235,628	1,180,663	1,358,730	1,137,504	1,166,392
Barley	10,732	13,496	14,220	16,782	14,768	12,359	226,460	309,235	362,082	426,150	324,150	284,426
Rye	3,298	3,210	3,570	3,837	2,755	2,254	37,899	40,601	45,364	57,341	30,452	25,872
Flaxseed	1,780	3,180	3,275	4,402	5,847	2,794	11,252	31,127	32,285	40,660	51,946	23,527
Grain sorghums (for grain)	4,063	10,325	5,982	5,996	6,662	9,117	52,747	121,371	111,784	107,245	103,864	181,756
Rice	943	1,069	1,214	1,477	1,468	1,466	45,712	52,754	51,323	66,363	64,843	70,237
Total	212,281	206,391	208,054	209,241	214,998	223,518	4,443,158	5,056,614	5,404,145	6,212,970	5,588,136	6,059,218

Source: Annual Summary, Crop Production, BAE.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to another very important matter, namely, that of farm machinery. Last year I conducted a series of hearings, and in the one little county of Hettinger alone, of which the county seat is Mott, the county agent testified that because they did not have proper machinery the farmers there lost more than a million bushels of wheat and flaxseed. When I returned to Washington I took the matter up with the War Production Board and was informed the situation would be remedied. They said that no longer would farm machinery be rationed. I call the attention of the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] to this statement, because I conducted one of my meetings in a county adjoining his State, and I found the situation to be exactly the same in South Dakota as it was in North Dakota. The War Production Board said that more farm machinery would be manufactured. "The time was," they said, "when many tractors and combines were sent to Canada; they have been taken right by the doors of the farmers of North and South Dakota through Portal to Canada, but that is a thing of the past."

I called the attention of the distinguished Senator the other day to the fact that in the little town of Portal, one little port of entry, in the month of July and the first 2 weeks in August last year, while the farmers of the Northwest were begging for combines and tractors, through that 1 little town in 6 weeks there were shipped 355 combines and 655 rubber-tired tractors. They were taken right by the doors of the farmers of the United States under lend-lease and exported to Canada.

What is the situation today? Farmers keep writing and telegraphing for machinery, and when we go over to the War Production Board what do they tell us? A few weeks ago they said the concerns manufacturing farm machinery were nearly 40 percent behind schedule. It is not quite so bad now. A farmer telegraphs and says, "I want a wheel, just a wheel for an old drill," and he cannot get it. Send a telegram to an implement house in North Dakota, and it will be found it cannot furnish it. Farmers telegraph for plows and cannot get them. They cannot get tractors; they cannot get binders; they cannot get drills. Yet, in spite of that, we find that the A. A. A. and the Agricultural Department are asking farmers to raise larger crops than they ever raised before in their history.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not care to interrupt the argument the Senator is making, but I should like to make an observation relative to the demand for farm machinery by farmers throughout our section.

Located about 40 miles from where I live in Nebraska there is a town called Beatrice. Recently a farm sale was held there, because the farmer who had operated the farm had passed on, and his widow, who was the administratrix of his estate, advertised the farm for sale. It is a fine farming community, and the farm home was like a great number of others in that section. It was not unusually large, but, on the other hand, it was a good sized home. This sale was not one of the ordinary commercial sales, such as a sale where a great deal of machinery is offered.

It so happened that 3 years before the farmer bought a new row-crop Farm-all tractor. Selling some of the machinery that goes through the O. P. A. routine sometimes involves a great deal of difficulty, so the banker told the widow to advertise the tractor for $800, and ask that those who wanted to buy should bring certified bank checks, because they wanted no question about settlement, or any question about whether the payment would go through the O. P. A., whether it was over or under the price fixed. In this community, which is just about like all average farm communities in eastern North Dakota, on the afternoon when the tractor was sold 170 farmers put up certified checks for $800 apiece to buy that one farm road tractor. In other words, $136,000 was put up in the effort of these farmers to buy one used tractor.

Mr. President, that gives some idea of the scarcity of farm machinery. I think it is one of the most unfortunate conditions that have come to my attention. In the Senate we are talking about legislation to provide against unemployment. After the war ends there will be so much consumer demand that, in my opinion, we shall not be able to meet it. Our manufacturers have not made an automobile for 4 years, and before the war they made 5,000,000 each year. They have not made a washing machine or a radio. The junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] knows about that. None of these articles could go on the market in the last few years. On top of that, there is machinery that is worn out, and replacements are now needed. Yet the officials in the Government agencies in Washington have allocated these things under lend-lease to countries which either cannot or will not use the implements, and allocated them to other departments which could not use them.

I call attention to what has been referred to by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, that in order to have food produced for the Army and the civilian population some machinery must be afforded now to the good old United States of America. These stories spell what we need. We need farm machinery, especially so since the farm boys have been taken off the farms under the directive of General Hershey.

I desire to say one more thing, although I do not wish to break in on the Senator's argument.

Mr. LANGER. I want the Senator to take all the time he desires.

Mr. WHERRY. In Nebraska last year we had the largest corn crop in the history of the State, and at the time when the Hershey directive was issued, which we have been trying to clarify under the Tydings amendment, there were 100,000,000 bushels of corn in the fields not even shucked, most of it lying on the ground because corn pickers were not available

and we did not have the boys to shuck the corn. No farm boys, no farming equipment, no repairs, no transportation, no lumber, no cribbing, and to keep consistent with agriculture the departments and agencies say "No" to all appeals for aid.

Now the Government is asking for an increase of 13½ percent all along the line in production of food; yet it has taken the boys, under what I call a circumvention of the Tydings amendment, and is not giving our farmers the machinery with which to replace the old machinery, or providing men to replace the boys taken off the farms to do the hand work.

If this country is to go forward this year in the production of the agricultural supplies which are so badly needed, the departments must make available some of the machinery required for farm purposes, and furnish it to the farmers, instead of sending it across the water to countries where the people do not even know how to use it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, let me call the Senator's attention to one other matter before he takes his seat. I spoke a few days ago about some of the nonfarm tractors, tractors set aside to fix up golf courses, so that some can go out and play golf.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me tell the Senator about that. That was one reason why on February 19, 1945, I introduced Senate bill 585. It was to help the boys who come back from the service and put more machinery on the farm. When the men in industry go to their positions their tools are there, but in the case of veterans who come back from the service and want to go back on the farm, where they have liquidated their machinery, where they sold out, they cannot resume the operation of their farms, even though they have the farms, because of the scarcity of machinery. If they go to the retailers they find they have orders stacked in some places so high that a veteran would not get a piece of machinery for the next 2 or 3 years. So we investigated and we found that farm machinery was being manufactured for nonfarm agencies, and that there is a great deal of nonfarm machinery manufactured and allocated on order.

Take the case of manure spreaders. The idea of a nonfarm manure spreader. I do not know where it would be used. Or take a nonfarm tractor. I was told by an official of one of the largest implement firms that they had 800 tractors on order for nonfarm use, and they had to be bought by institutions or by those who are not in the farming business. Yet they are farm tractors.

Therefore I introduced Senate bill 585, providing for the transfer of those implements to the War Food Administration for distribution where they will be in essential use. Let us get these tractors, and let us get the manure spreaders, and the other implements, on the farms, where they belong. A great volume of equipment which the farmers could get, is lying in the wholesale and retail houses. There are all kinds of implements manufactured today for civilian purposes which the farmers cannot get, yet they are in dire need of tractors right now in order to start off with the spring crops.

Mr. LANGER. Could the farmers in Nebraska get corn pickers when they needed them?

Mr. WHERRY. No. There is a well-beaten path I have trodden to all the agencies in an effort to get corn pickers. Now the farmers want machinery. The boys are coming back, and every boy who comes home and wants to go to farming should have a chance to do so. The W. P. B. should certainly take into consideration what Canada has done. Canada has made an allotment of steel and has put into a pool all the steel necessary to manufacture machinery and give it to the returning veterans, and the United States should do the same, and could do the same without detracting from the quotas set aside for the farmers of this country.

I thank the Senator. I did not intend to interrupt him, but this matter has been on my heart and mind, and I thank him for giving me the opportunity to say a word about it.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator. I ask the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] if he does not remember the letter he put into the RECORD last year from a soldier in Africa telling about the warehouses there filled with rubber-tired combines, not one of which had been used.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I remember the letter very distinctly. The combines, which were large ones, were stored in the warehouses in north Africa, and the average farmer in the area in which they were stored has a 10-acre farm on a hillside, and anyone who knows anything about a farm knows it is not possible to use that kind of a combine on that kind of a farm; but some smart boy conceived the idea of filling the huge warehouses in north Africa with that kind of farm machinery.

Mr. LANGER. What is the situation with regard to the farmers in South Dakota being able to obtain plows?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. There are not any.

Mr. LANGER. Or binders, or drills?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. There are none of them.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, they are not rationed, but there is no place where they can be bought in the State of South Dakota, no matter where one goes?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. For example, the quota of corn pickers in Cass County was 5, and there were 251 applications for the corn pickers. Senators will remember that I referred to that situation some 5 or 6 weeks ago.

So, Mr. President, I shall watch with a great deal of interest the action which will be taken, even though the Tydings amendment has been adopted, because thousand of farm boys have heretofore been taken out of my State. Even though the Tydings amendment becomes law I shall watch with a great deal of interest to ascertain whether more attention is paid to the present Tydings amendment, which has now been adopted and incorporated into a proposed law, than was paid to the original Tydings amendment. It seems to me that when an official deliberately sets aside the law and takes young farm men, with the result that so many farmers must quit farming, some remedy shall be found by Congress, because in the last analysis it is the Congress which the people will hold responsible.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter I have received from the Governor of Montana be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF MONTANA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Helena, February 20, 1945.

Hon. B. K. WHEELER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: On February 15, I wired you as follows:

"Under Hershey's interpretation Tydings amendment selective service is stripping agriculture of essential and irreplaceable men. Unless Congress intervenes and makes sure Tydings amendment complied with production in Montana will be tremendously reduced. Farmers have taken a beating and under present operation selective service they might as well close up shop. Please use your best efforts to protect the people of Montana."

In order that you may be better informed of the problems confronting the farmers of Montana, due to the manpower shortage, I am enclosing a few of the many letters I have received in regard to the situation, which is becoming critical.

I am also enclosing copy of a statement which I have sent to all selective-service boards and to General Hershey.

I am unalterably opposed to the wholesale induction of farmers and farm workers where no replacements are available and sincerely hope that something can be done to prevent further stripping our farms of essential workers.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Cordially yours,
SAM C. FORD, *Governor.*

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee substitute and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 16, line 6, it is proposed to strike out in section 4 (b) the words "and (2)" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(2) to prescribe minimum requirements of production in designated places of employment, plants, or units of production, either in toto as to such places, plants, or units, or as to workers by age, sex, or occupational qualifications, who may be there employed, and (3)."

On page 16, line 9, it is proposed to insert in the same section, following the word "regulations", the following: "No employer or employee, acting alone or in conjunction with others, shall perform any act or enter into any agreement or conspiracy willfully intended to decrease or slow down production, in violation of such regulations."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana has offered two amendments. Does the Senator want them to be considered together or separately?

Mr. CAPEHART. I want them to be considered together.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments will be considered together.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall speak only briefly on the amendments. My only purpose in offering them is to be helpful.

First, I should like to say that I am opposed to the general principle of any forced manpower legislation. However, if, in the opinion of this body and if in the opinion of the Army and the Navy, such legislation is needed, then let us enact legislation which will get the job done.

The only purpose of the proposed legislation we have been debating is to insure adequate production. The only interest the Army and the Navy have in the bill is that they shall be supplied with an ample amount of war material. The only interest the men in the services, some of whom are sitting in the gallery, have when they are on the fighting line is that they shall have a sufficient amount of war materials, that they shall have guns when they need them, that they shall have tanks when they need them, that they shall have ammunition when they need it. I am certain the Army and the Navy care not whether we supply them with sufficient materials of war by using 10,000,000 men or 20,000,000 men. Therefore the problem is one of production.

My amendment will help production. I think it has been brought out in the debate and in the hearings that manpower shortage is spotty; that we have a shortage of war materials possibly only in certain factories, or in connection with certain items. My amendment, if adopted, will do this: Where there is a shortage of any given item in any given factory—and the War Department of course knows of that shortage—my amendment will enable the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to establish a minimum requirement of production if that specific factory and it will prohibit the employer or the employee, or both, from slowing up production in any way whatsoever.

It will enable the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and the Army and the Navy to go into the factories where there is a genuine shortage, factories which are producing critical materials badly needed at the front, and give them the opportunity to do the things necessary to get the materials to our boys who are fighting on the fronts.

That, as I see it, is the only purpose of the proposed legislation now pending before the Senate.

I hope the Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee will support my amendment, and I ask for its adoption.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana seems logical. It is, as the Senator from Indiana has said, logical from the standpoint of increasing production and manpower; and it seems therefore to have a place in the bill. But the amendment goes to the heart of what have become practices of industry and labor in working out understandings and contracts. Therefore the amendment is more complex than it appears to be on the surface or on first reading. I think it would be unwise to adopt this type of amendment. The amendment would modify the Fair Labor Standards Act. It would enter into the field of labor relations. It would multiply the possibilities of invitation to dispute which I mentioned in my opening remarks on the bill. It would multiply contests between labor and employers. In the final analysis it would not be an invitation to discuss the question of constitutional rights, but would be a step toward an invitation to litigation of various minor matters.

Mr. President, I ought to point out that our task in conference will be a terrific one, because one bill under consideration follows one philosophy and another follows another. In view of the situation I trust the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me to place in the RECORD an extraneous matter which does not refer to the Senator's amendment, and which it will take me only a few minutes to present?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this morning in the hearing held in the Appropriations Committee, General Hines appeared before the committee and submitted a matter which I think the Senate ought to know about, in the consideration of the pending bill generally.

In the so-called G. I. act, on page 14, there appears this language with reference to returning soldiers, which is found in subsection (b) of section 700, under title V:

(b) Such person shall be deemed eligible to receive an allowance for any week of unemployment if claim is made for such allowance and the Administrator finds with respect to such week that—

(1) the person is residing in the United States at the time of such claim;

(2) the person is completely unemployed, having performed no service and received no wages, or is partially unemployed in that services have been performed for less than a full workweek and the wages for the week are less than the allowance under this title plus $3;

(3) the person is registered with and continues to report to a public unemployment office, in accordance with its regulations;

(4) the person is able to work and available for suitable work: *Provided*, That no claimant shall be considered ineligible in any period of continuous unemployment for failure to comply with the provisions of this subparagraph if such failure is due to an illness or disability which occurs after the commencement of such period.

General Hines asked for an appropriation to pay such claims, and the committee found a very unusual situation existing in that connection. In a short time, from February 3 to February 10, one week, the amount paid was $602,000. I shall ask later to have the list incorporated in the RECORD, together with General Hines' letter, so that Senators may see the number of claims being presented from their States.

General Hines testified that 27,000 returning soldiers were being paid $20 a week because they could not find employment; and such payment is provided for in the act. Think of it! We are about to draft young men for work, yet here is a reservoir of 27,000 young men, returning soldiers, able and willing to work. They must register their names with the employment office. If we need workers, I cannot imagine why this reservoir of 27,000 men, costing us an enormous sum of money, cannot be used, instead of drafting or conscripting labor. Why cannot the returning soldiers be used? What is the matter with our officials? What is the matter with the War Manpower Commission? Why does it not undertake to use this reservoir of labor before undertaking to do what I think is a violation of the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States?

I bring this question to the attention of the Senate, and especially to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. I think there ought to be some explanation as to why the Government is paying more than $80 a month to each of these returning soldiers, having them register, and having them certify that they are without employment and cannot get it, while at the same time the Congress is called upon to draft other laborers to do the work which no doubt these boys would be glad to do.

Mr. President, I ask that the exact terms of the statute, together with the letter from General Hines to me, which I received just a few moments ago, and the list, by States, of the returning veterans, showing the amount which they are receiving, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TITLE V

CHAPTER VII—READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES FOR FORMER MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO ARE UNEMPLOYED

SEC. 700. (a) Any person who shall have served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who shall have been discharged or released from active service under conditions other than dishonorable, after active service of 90 days or more, or by reason of an injury or disability incurred in service in line of duty, shall be entitled, in accordance with the provisions of this title and regulations issued by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs pursuant thereto, to receive a readjustment allowance as provided herein for each week of unemployment, not to exceed a total of 52 weeks, which (1) begins after the first Sunday of the third calendar month after the date of enactment hereof, and (2) occurs not later than 2 years after discharge or release or the termination of the war, whichever is the later date: *Provided*, That no such allowance shall be paid for any period for which he receives increased pension under part VII of Veterans Regulation 1 (a) or a subsistence allowance under part VIII of such regulation: *Provided further*, That no readjustment allowance shall be payable for any week commencing more than 5 years after the termination of hostilities in the present war.

(b) Such person shall be deemed eligible to receive an allowance for any week of

unemployment if claim is made for such allowance and the Administrator finds with respect to such week that—

(1) the person is residing in the United States at the time of such claim;

(2) the person is completely unemployed, having performed no service and received no wages, or is partially unemployed in that services have been performed for less than a full workweek and the wages for the week are less than the allowance under this title plus $3;

(3) the person is registered with and continues to report to a public employment office, in accordance with its regulations;

(4) the person is able to work and available for suitable work: *Provided*, That no claimant shall be considered ineligible in any period of continuous unemployment for failure to comply with the provisions of this subparagraph if such failure is due to an illness or disability which occurs after the commencement of such period.

MARCH 2, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: In compliance with your telephonic request of this date I wish to advise you that during the week of February 10, 1945, 27,877 veterans were paid $627,757 as readjustment allowances under Title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

To be eligible for such allowances a person must be residing in the United States (as defined in section 1502 of the act) and, except as to self-employment, be completely unemployed, and able to and available for work at the time of application.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK T. HINES,
Administrator.

Readjustment allowances—Number of veterans paid and amount paid for week ended Feb. 10, 1945, under title V, Public Law 346 (78th Cong.)

	Feb. 3		Feb. 10	
	Number of veterans paid	Amount paid	Number of veterans paid	Amount paid
Alabama	509	$11,423	399	$8,542
Arizona	141	3,157	153	3,339
Arkansas	420	10,409	434	10,396
California	1,831	48,003	1,768	44,057
Colorado	59	1,241	57	1,294
Connecticut	515	11,675	470	10,613
Delaware	35	740	43	869
District of Columbia	364	7,237	400	7,963
Florida	411	10,225	440	9,791
Georgia	368	9,670	370	10,178
Hawaii, Territory of	12	240	10	200
Idaho	16	520	29	1,008
Illinois	931	23,231	845	20,665
Indiana	535	10,284	503	9,544
Iowa	494	11,900	451	10,676
Kansas	71	1,658	66	1,461
Kentucky	449	11,526	491	11,672
Louisiana	77	1,693	58	1,415
Maine	139	2,755	197	3,923
Maryland	118	2,480	121	2,592
Massachusetts	1,070	21,206	839	18,381
Michigan	477	12,221	524	12,835
Minnesota	395	8,245	458	9,638
Mississippi	175	4,346	134	3,002
Missouri	422	9,320	422	9,458
Montana	61	1,298	63	1,395
Nebraska	9	300	11	320
Nevada	9	177	9	217
New Hampshire	122	2,642	117	2,783
New Jersey	1,240	29,146	1,264	28,504
New Mexico	11	220	13	260
New York	1,910	40,799	3,537	80,709
North Carolina	691	14,196	660	13,974
North Dakota	13	279	14	299
Ohio	214	7,022	199	6,028
Oklahoma	77	1,522	74	1,464
Oregon	66	1,578	56	1,314
Pennsylvania	3,125	63,986	3,153	64,794
Puerto Rico	3,145	88,043	3,202	81,758
Rhode Island	397	8,180	400	8,482
South Carolina	285	$6,207	298	$6,837
South Dakota	44	1,034	54	1,525
Tennessee	1,002	25,900	1,100	28,796
Texas	2,108	49,984	2,470	49,229
Utah	28	597	17	328
Vermont	42	883	51	1,254
Virginia	162	4,041	193	4,885
Washington	73	1,453	71	1,414
West Virginia	580	11,587	635	12,675
Wisconsin	244	5,436	233	4,847
Wyoming	1	20	1	154
Total	25,693	602,025	27,877	627,757

Readjustment allowances—Number of veterans paid and amount paid for week ended Feb. 10, 1945, under title V, Public Law 346 (78th Cong.)—Continued

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I urge Senators to look into the situation and see what ought to be done about it. I especially urge my good friend from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] to look into it. I urge the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to look into it, and see if this reservoir of labor cannot be used before we undertake to draft men and make them work whether they are willing or unwilling.

I thank the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Tennessee, not by way of argument, but by way of pointing out the fact, that the committee, in its hearings and discussions, did consider the very problem which he has stated. The answer we received was, of course, that even if all the veterans were put to work, that would not meet the demand for manpower. That does not mean that if one man is needed, and he is obtained, he is not helping, or that if one man who is needed is not obtained, the program is hindered.

In our report, on page 3, the committee considered this question. The statement of the committee is in keeping with what the Senator has said. I read from page 3 of the report of the committee:

To meet these needs we must look to several sources. We anticipate that a high proportion of the approximately 400,000 veterans who will be discharged between January 1 and June 30, 1945, will accept war work, provided we take proper measures to enable them to accept such war work without jeopardizing their reemployment rights in nonwar jobs. During this same period the normal net increase in our employable population will be about 500,000. And finally, some 200,000 workers will become available from munitions programs which are declining or will remain at current levels. Although about 35 percent of our war-production programs are declining, such declines rarely match rising programs, either geographically or by needed skills. Despite the best efforts of management, labor, and Government, experience has demonstrated that releases from declining programs result in some "evaporation" of workers from the labor force and some dissipation to less essential activity. But even if every worker from these sources were placed in war production, we would still be confronted by a net manpower deficit if manpower legislation is not enacted.

That means not only that we have gone into the question, but that if this source of 27,000 men is not being used, it is our duty, as the Senator from Tennessee has pointed out, to see that they are used, or made available for use.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say that I think so, too. The remarkable part about that testimony, as it was given before our committee this morning, is that it shows that we are paying out nearly $100 a month to each of these returning veterans. They are asking for employment, but cannot get employment. They would not receive the $80 or $100 a month from the Government if they could obtain employment. I have no doubt that they would very much like to have employment. I believe that if the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission would get busy, he could relieve the situation to the extent of supplying nearly one-tenth of the needed men, at least; and that would be very helpful. If we are required to violate the terms of the Constitution, as it seems to me, in order to put men to work regardless of whether they wish to work, it strikes me that if we have a reservoir of men, returning soldiers, who wish to work and whom we are paying, anyway, we might save at both ends of the line by putting these men to work.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee why they cannot work. The laws says they cannot be paid unemployment compensation if they can get jobs.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; we are told they are on the lists at the employment agencies, including the list maintained by the Director of the War Manpower Commission. They must register with him. They do not have to work, so General Hines testified this morning; and, therefore, the Government is paying them to be idle, when the War Manpower Commission is saying that it is absolutely necessary to have workers and that we must draft workers.

Mr. TAFT. Then, if the Senator's conclusion is correct, it points to the fact that there is no shortage of labor, because those men are listed as available for work and they cannot get work.

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot say that absolutely, because at present there are 27,000 men in the situation of having the Government pay them a little less than $100 a month, and I believe the request is for the drafting of approximately 400,000 men, if I recall the figures correctly.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I think I can correct the Senator from Tennessee, if the Senator will yield to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should be very happy to have the Senator do so. The Senator from Indiana has the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. They are drawing their money under the G. I. bill of rights.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. Under the G. I. bill of rights it is not a question of whether a man is physically able. The question is whether he has been declared physically unable by the Veterans Bureau. A great many of the returning veterans—in fact, practically all those returning from the Pacific area—are suffering from tropical diseases, such as malaria, which make them unfit for work. They want to get jobs. They do not want to be rated as physically unfit. They apply for work, and they work for a few days, and then malaria or some other tropical fever strikes them, and the employer has to lay them off. Then they draw the money under the G. I. bill of rights money which they would be entitled to draw under their severance pay. That is where the money is coming from.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will examine the act, he will find that it provides that the veteran has to be able to work and available for suitable work.

Mr. KILGORE. I understand that.

Mr. McKELLAR. The veteran makes such a statement to the employment office, and his name is left there. So long as he is left in that situation, without work, if the employment service does not give him work the Government must pay him $20 a week. There are 27,000 veterans in that situation. If Senators will examine the list they will find a number of veterans from each State who seek employment under those circumstances, but are not employed, although they say they are able to work. They certify that they are able to work and that they are available for work. Yet the War Manpower Commission does not put them to work.

Under those circumstances it seems to me that there is something wrong somewhere, inasmuch as those men certify they are able and willing to work and want work, as they have shown by appearing and filing their names. I think they should be put to work before we undertake to violate the terms of the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution and have involuntary servitude imposed upon other men who likewise want to work.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee, in further development of that thought, that 2 weeks ago I was in an office where there were five men, all of them discharged veterans who had suffered from battle shock and were mentally off balance. They certified they were able to work and ready to go to work, and they were incensed because they could not get a single recruiter to accept them. I was informed by the manager of the office that they had been there every morning for 6 weeks. They could not be persuaded to go to the Veterans Bureau for examination, because they said they had been promised a job and were there and wanted one. Yet anyone who examined them could tell they were mentally off balance.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course, salaries are not being paid to such young men.

Mr. President, I merely wish to leave that thought with the Senate. I thank the Senator very much for permitting me to do so.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I agree with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that this proposed legislation is most complex; and I am generally opposed to such legislation.

However, under the bill the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission would be given the right to place employment ceilings on factories. That means that he could say to one factory, "You shall have 500 men," and to another one, "You shall have a thousand men," and to another one, "You may have 1,500 men," or "10,000 men," or whatever the number might be. My position is, since I know something of the manufacturing business, that once the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission places such a ceiling on a factory, he automatically accepts responsibility for running the factory; and if we are going to permit him to place a ceiling on the number of persons who shall work in a factory, he should likewise have the right to prescribe the minimum production, and he should have the right to say that neither the management of the factory nor its employees shall interfere with producing such minimum amount.

I am making this suggestion only in an effort to be helpful. I have a son on the battle front in Belgium. The pending bill is a production bill. We are talking about getting the job done, getting supplies to the boys overseas in order to win this war.

I wish to repeat what I said a moment ago. The time is now here when production must be increased. In many instances factories with orders from the War Department are not producing. Other factories are producing critical materials. Possibly in some cases the day they are finished they are immediately flown overseas. If we are going to enact such legislation as this, then let us pass a measure which will enable the War Department to get the job done.

I appreciate that I am a freshman Senator, and I am grateful to the Senate for listening to what I have to say.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let me ask the Senator whether his second amendment requires the first amendment in order to make it work. Or can the second amendment stand by itself?

Mr. CAPEHART. I rather think not. Let me state how the situation seems to me. Many thousand factories in the United States are making war materials. It is impossible for the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission even to set a ceiling on all factories. There simply are not sufficient hours in a day to enable him to do that. The best he can do is to pick out the factories here and there that are falling down on the job. The purpose of the amendment is to provide that in the case of a factory which is falling down on the job, a factory manufacturing critical materials which are needed now—not tomorrow or the next day—by the boys at the front, the War Department, through the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, may step in, and say, "Here, 1,500 men; 1,500 guns a day; and no one, neither management nor employee, dare interfere with that production." That is the purpose of the amendment. The amendment is not directed against any class. It is designed to get the job done.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me to say so, I can understand the application of what the able Senator from Utah said regarding the difficulty of prescribing minimum requirements of production.

Mr. CAPEHART. I can understand it also.

Mr. VANDENBERG. On the other hand, I cannot for the life of me understand why there should be the slightest hesitation in saying emphatically and without reservation that no employer or employee, acting alone or in conjunction with others, shall perform any act, or enter into any agreement or conspiracy, willfully intended to arbitrarily or artifically decrease or slow down production essential to the supply lines to our soldier sons. Certainly that is one of our present sources of difficulty. I am not talking about forced labor. I am talking about forced interference with labor's rate of production if and when it occurs during the war.

Mr. CAPEHART. Suppose a factory has an order to build a hundred thousand units of some article. That may be the only order which it has. It has 1,000 employees. It is building 5,000 units a day. The contractor knows that at the end of 20 days the order will be filled. The tendency on the part of management is to spread the work out and hold those men in the hope that it will receive another order. Such action ties up manpower.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. The statement which the Senator from Indiana has made is confirmed by a letter which I received yesterday from a union employee in one of the large plants of my State. He stated that an inspection or investigation of plants should be made. He said that the plant in which he was employed could produce 25 percent greater results and reduce present employment 25 percent. It seems to me that that is the nub of the whole question. We want additional manpower for the services, and we want production to be increased. Our problem is to find the way to achieve those results. I am not a member of the committee which has been considering the pending bill, and I am looking for light. We all want to do what is necessary to achieve the desired results. But we do not wish, by unseasoned legislation, to do more harm than good. A large percentage of American workers are doing and have done a magnificent job. But there are slackers, and they must be reached effectively so that the need of the Nation may be met.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Reference has been made to the penalty clause. If an employee or employer should be guilty of a violation, what would be the penalty?

Mr. CAPEHART. It would be the same as is provided elsewhere in the bill.

Mr. OVERTON. What is the penalty which is provided in the bill?

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe it is a fine of $10,000 or 1 year in jail.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand the penalty clause, it is covered by the last sentence of paragraph (b), beginning in line 8 on page 16 of the bill. The sentence to which I refer reads:

> No employer shall hire or retain in his employ any individual in violation of such regulations.

I understand that section 7 incorporates by reference the penalties of the Second War Powers Act. It seems to me that the amendment offered by the Senator is intended to bring about the same incorporation by reference.

Mr. OVERTON. The penalty clause is very confusing. I have been unable to understand what penalties are prescribed by the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think a complete answer is that great difficulty will be had in construing the bill.

Mr. TAFT. The penalty clause seems to be fairly clear. It is incorporated by reference from the Second War Powers Act, and reads:

> Any person who willfully performs any act prohibited, or willfully fails to perform any act required, by any provision of this subsection (a) or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder, whether heretofore or hereafter issued, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

I do not say that that is a very good method to use in incorporating a penalty. But it has been done. If it has been done as to the existing clause it is also done, it seems to me, by the amendment submitted by the Senator from Indiana. I think the entire language should be clarified; but I believe that whatever penalty is imposed under subsection (b) is also covered by the Senator's amendment. In other words, I do not think the objection is a legitimate objection to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator from Ohio agree with me that section 7 should be entirely reframed?

Mr. TAFT. I think it should be eliminated or spelled out in so many words, the same as it is spelled out in the Revercomb substitute.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to the committee substitute.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have just finished a careful third reading of the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I apprehend that perhaps it carries more complexities than have up to the present time been adverted to.

In considering the amendment it seems to me that we must consider it in the light, first, of the committee amendment, which is now before the Senate. Then, having in mind that we may presently come to a consideration of what is known as the May-Bailey bill, we should consider the amendment in the terms of that bill.

We have heard a great deal of talk from time to time about the several manpower bills. We have heard them designated as the work-or-fight bill, the work-or-jail bill, the work-or-fine bill, and so forth. I undertake to say that we do not have before us, neither in the committee substitute or in the bill which passed the House, any work-or-fight bill, any work-or-jail bill, any work-or-fine bill, or any work bill whatsoever. I have read with care the bill which passed the House, and I have studied it carefully. I have also given careful study to the bill reported by the committee. I have been unable to find in either bill one word which would require 1 hour of work to be done by any person in the United States. Mr. President, perhaps we might more correctly term these bills "lead the horse to water" bills.

They do in fact provide, or at least the May bill provides, a requirement that under certain circumstances a man shall seek employment and that he shall go on the roll; but I have sought in vain in that bill one single requirement that he shall do 1 hour of honest labor after he gets on the roll. It is not there. You can lead him to water, but even the May bill is silent when you attempt to make him drink.

Mr. President, I think it was said many years ago that we were faced by a condition and not a theory, and we are faced by a condition in the problem now before the Senate. I refer to the broad problem, and not any of the proposed solutions. If in truth we have reached the point in the history of the United States when the life of the Nation requires that men, or men and women, or men, women, and children, shall give something more than has been given to guarantee that this country and its men and women now on every continent and sea, and above the earth and below the sea, around the world, shall be backed up at home, there can no longer be argument here directed at "slave labor," there can no longer be argument here to the effect that we are forcing men into servitude. Any American should be ashamed to make such a statement if we face such a condition.

Mr. President, I apprehend that the question before us is not whether we are going to meet such a condition adequately, but are we faced by the condition? If we are in fact faced by that condition, then the amendment of the junior Senator from Indiana should be but the beginning of adequate legislation to safeguard our people. If we are not faced with that necessity, then we have an altogether different problem, and perhaps we can answer our necessities with something less drastic than total mobilization, remembering always that total mobilization of men, women, children, money, and property, everything, is right and must be had if the exigencies of the occasion require.

Very grave doubt has been expressed on this floor on a number of occasions as to whether we are faced by that necessity. I confess that I entertain such a doubt. I entertain it for the same reasons that have been expressed by many of my colleagues during the consideration of the pending legislation. I know of the record of production American industry has made on a voluntary basis, and I cannot yet feel convinced that it cannot be continued. I can understand that some inducement may be worth while, but I cannot yet believe that coercion is called for. But if it be called for, I want to be registered and recorded now as going with the junior Senator from Indiana and the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], who so eloquently presented his cause a few days ago.

Mr. President, let us get back to the question of the legal effect of the amendment of the junior Senator from Indiana, if it be incorporated in the existing substitute. I stated a few moments ago that we have no work-or-fight bill, we have no bill before us, nor was there one passed by the House, requiring an hour of labor. A study of the bills shows that conclusively.

The May bill carried provision for compulsion to the extent of requiring the individuals coming within a certain classification to report for employment, and not to leave that employment, but as to the interim between the reporting and leaving, the May bill was silent. Having reported for employment, an individual might or might not work, as he saw fit, he might start a continuous absentee record, or he might follow the well-known sit-down procedure. There was nothing in the bill to make him work. If we have to make people work, let us do it along the lines of the plan of the Senator from Indiana. But if we do not have to, if the May bill goes even further than the necessities of today require, and if the considered opinion of the committee is correct, then it is enough simply to issue, as the committee suggests, what is in the nature of a legislative invitation to certain persons now employed in certain plants or activities where, perhaps, the activity is not so essential as to require the number there employed, or the number there employed are more than are needed to do the job, and who will be dropped from the rolls of that type of activity, to seek jobs, or get on the pay roll of certain war industries.

Incidentally, and in passing, the pending amendment actually sets a ceiling upon a given activity. Using the example given by the distinguished Senator from Indiana, it says to a man who employs 10,000 workmen, "You can get along with 8,000, therefore cut down the number on your rolls to 8,000," thus releasing from employment 2,000 workmen, having in mind that if the workmen are so released they will seek other jobs, and may be channeled voluntarily into the war work where they are needed. The bill contains no requirement that they shall go there, but there seems to be a hope expressed in the language of the bill that they will do so.

What the bill does is to set the ceiling and kick 2,000 men out of work in the case I have referred to. Those men are going to be out of work for 30 days before they can do anything about it unless they themselves go forth and find jobs. The bill does not even contain the requirement that the War Manpower Commission shall invite the men to go to work, but we can assume that the War Manpower Commission will in such an event exercise what would be to the War Manpower Commission, I am inclined to believe, a most rare discretion.

Mr. President, the substitute bill, in the instance I have referred to, will result in kicking 2,000 men out of that particular job, and some other number of men out of some other job, and so on, until, under its operation, in the wisdom of the War Manpower Commission, there will be a sufficient number of men out of jobs so as to cause them, under some type of a law of diminishing returns, to find one of the jobs where they are needed. That is the way it would operate with respect to the workman, and that is the man in whom we are interested. We are not interested in the employer. We are simply using the employer as a bat, in which case the workman is the ball, and we are trying to hit the workman, through the employer. That is the way it will work.

On the part of the workman, Mr. President, it is voluntary. He goes, because he himself decides to go, and gets a job where he is so desperately needed. He need not go. He goes or does not go in his discretion. And having gone to the job, he remains there at his discretion. He may leave as and when he pleases.

In view of the fact that there is in the substitute bill no compulsion upon the worker—and, frankly, I am of the opinion now that a sufficient case has not been made to require compulsion—if we are to act upon that principle, then the thing we want to keep away from is compulsion in any other guise. If we place the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] in the substitute bill, we change the whole character of the substitute bill; we make it more compulsory than the main bill; we make it do what we are all willing to pass legislation to do if it be necessary—we make it a work or fight bill, or rather a work or jail bill, because for the first time there goes with the legislation a requirement to work on the job; and also there will go into the legislation a prohibition, as I view it, against any workman now on the job, or hereafter going on the job, quitting work, because the second provision of the proposed amendment provides:

> No employer or employee, acting alone or in conjunction with others, shall perform any act or enter into any agreement or conspiracy willfully intended to decrease or slow down production, in violation of such regulations.

The regulations establish ceilings. In the first part of the proposed amendment it is proposed:

> To prescribe minimum requirements of production * * * either in toto as to such places, plants, or units, or as to workers by age, sex.

And so forth. In other words, the proposed amendment to the committee substitute will require that the workman stay on the job, do the job, and refrain from doing anything that will decrease production or slow down the operation of the plant.

Mr. President, I apprehend that among the ways in which one may willfully slow down production or decrease production is that of willfully turning around and walking away from the job—what is sometimes termed quitting it. That would appear to me to be one of the methods which would immediately come to mind by which one might slow down and decrease production.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course the second part of the amendment only prohibits such a slow-down in violation of certain regulations. They must be regulations prescribing minimum requirements. I would question whether the amendment would apply to a strike or is intended to prohibit a strike. I do not think the Senator from Indiana so intended. I doubt if the amendment would do so. I think it would prohibit an arbitrary limitation by a worker not to make more than 6 tires a day, we will say, when the Manpower Commissioner might say that there is no reason why a man cannot make 8 or 10 tires a day. I think that is what the amendment intended to accomplish. I think the Senator from Oregon places a rather broader construction on the amendment than is justified.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, that is, of course, a matter of opinion. I see the logic of the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, and I have of course a high respect for his judgment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. If what the Senator says is correct, then it would mean that a man would be subjected to punishment if he quit his job, no matter what the reason might be. Not only would a man who quit his job be subjected to punishment by being sent to the penitentiary but anyone who went on strike could be sent to jail. Certainly I would not vote for such legislation, because if it were enacted, then in my judgment it would mean practically the imposition of slavery upon individuals in their jobs. I cannot conceive that any Senator would want to go so far as to say that he would send a man to the penitentiary because the man happened to quit a job regardless of his reasons for doing so. If we are to adopt such a philosophy in this country, I am sure the boys who are fighting overseas will wonder for what they are fighting.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree with the Senator from Oregon that if we adopt this amendment we would allow the War Manpower Commission to prescribe minimum requirements. In other words, we would say that the Commission could fix the ceiling, and would have sufficient wisdom to say, "You must produce so much goods from that plant." We would say that it has the power to prescribe that a certain amount must come out of the plant. By doing so we would concede that it had all the wisdom necessary to deal with production.

Then we say in the next paragraph—and the two paragraphs are tied together—that—

> No employer or employee, acting alone or in conjunction with others, shall perform any act or enter into any agreement or conspiracy willfully intended to decrease or slow down production, in violation of such regulations.

I take that to mean that if a man willfully quits his job, and his action interferes with the production of the amount which the War Manpower Commission says should be produced in a given plant, such a man will be guilty of a misdemeanor, and under the act may be subject to imprisonment for a year and a fine of $10,000. That is the way I read it, because he would willfully quit his job. He would willfully thereby reduce the minimum set by the Manpower Commission. I do not believe that the Congress should say that the wisdom lies in the Manpower Commission to say exactly what every factory in America should produce, and that if any factory fails, because of management or labor, in the production of that exact amount, there should be a penalty.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am in accord with the construction placed upon the proposed amendment by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. As I read the words, that is what they mean.

As I stated earlier, I can conceive of a situation in which I would even go to the extent of voting for that type of required effort. To me it is neither involuntary servitude nor slavery. It would be a lesser sacrifice, a lesser surrendering of liberty than that which has already been undertaken by 12,000,000 young men and women who have been called into the armed services, or who have voluntarily gone in.

The point is that we may have to do it. It is the last thing we want to do; and there must be more than merely a clear case in favor of doing it. There must be such proof as will lead a reasoning mind to no other conclusion than that it must be done. Then I am prepared to go along with it, and strengthen it with any requirement necessary to do the job. But, Mr. President, in this bill I feel that the proposal is wholly out of order. It puts into a plan for voluntary action on the part of workers a new compulsory provision which does away entirely with the philosophy behind the substitute bill. I hope that we may consider the substitute bill substantially as reported, and determine first, as we shall by our vote on the substitute, whether, in view of all the evidence we have or can get, this step alone is enough to do the job. Then, if we must go beyond that, let us go with our eyes open.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which I ask to have read from the desk; and I also ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The amendment submitted by Mr. BAILEY was read, as follows:

On page 19, after line 16, of the committee substitute, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) Any individual who willfully fails to comply with any official request or requirement made under this act to accept or continue in employment within 15 days after the effective date prescribed in a formal notice thereof from the Chairman shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not less than 30 days or more than 1 year, or both such fine and imprisonment; and in addition shall forfeit to the United States an amount equal to any amount received by him for the period of such failure as unemployment compensation under the law of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, to be receovered in a civil suit brought by the United States."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I intended to ask unanimous consent to reconsider the Tydings amendment for the purpose of adding, in line 5, after the word "agricultural" the words "or fishing". I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Utah whether it is his interpretation that under the Tydings amendment the words "agricultural occupation or endeavor" would include commercial fishermen? In my State, and in the State of the Senator from Maryland, as well as that of the Senator from North Carolina, commercial fishermen do not reap a harvest from the land, but they do reap a harvest from the sea. Per capita, and per calorie value of food, they probably produce twice as much as does the average agricultural laborer.

The draft boards have variously interpreted the Tydings amendment under the Selective Service Act. In some cases they have deferred commercial fishermen, and in others they have not. In any event, they have not had the protection of the Tydings amendment; and I am wondering if we could not have some expression of intention, as to whether the words "agricultural occupation or endeavor" include the men who produce from the sea.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in answer to the question, I have heard about people planting fish eggs, but I have never heard of harvesting fish. The fish are hatched, of course. I do not believe that commercial fishing is included in the Tydings amendment. I am sure that if the Senator from Washington wishes to have his amendment included, he will have to offer it formally or nothing will be done for the fishermen in the Northwest.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] why objection is made to including commercial fishermen among those deferred from selective service.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, my opinion is that from the standpoint of the production of food, many persons who are engaged in harvesting fish render just as much service to the war effort as do those who are engaged in harvesting farm produce on the land. I believe the difficulty arises from the inability to erect a standard. For example, many fishermen are seasonally engaged, whereas the man on the farm is engaged in farm work more or less the year round. He goes from the planting of wheat to the harvesting of wheat, and then the planting of other types of food and other harvesting later in the fall, driving cattle to the barn, and feeding them produce from the farm during the winter. So there is a cycle of production the year round on the farm.

The difficulty has been to deal with fishing on the year-round basis. I believe the Senator would at least find sympathetic consideration for his very worthy endeavor to classify those who deserve to be classified in the fishing industry under the general rule which is now applicable to food production. I believe he would be well advised if he could, between now and the time when the bill is finally acted upon, find some language which would deal with fishing as a year-round occupation. I believe there is a reluctance to defer men for 3 or 4 months for the oyster season, for example, and another 4 or 5 months for the shad season, the rock reason, the herring season, or the tuna season. The difficulty is that the man must be regularly employed.

If he can find some language which will tie in with the agricultural provisions and will be on all fours, so to speak, with the agricultural conception of deferment, I believe I would have a very sympathetic reception for such an amendment; and, inasmuch as I am in sympathy with what he is trying to do, I shall be glad to cooperate with him in any way I can toward the accomplishment of that result.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield to me, let me say that in my section of Puget Sound many of the fishermen are working all the year round. Many of them go into the southern waters in the winter and into Alaskan waters in the summer. In many cases a man will appear before a draft board and will be asked by it, "What are you doing now?" He will reply, "Well, in the summertime I fish in Alaska."

The draft-board officials then will ask him, "What are you doing now?"

He will reply, "I am ashore, on the beach."

"Well," they will say to him, "come on, into the Army you go."

He may be the engineer or the skipper of a fishing ship. That will mean that two or three other men will be out of work for the season.

Inasmuch as the O. P. A. has informed me that next year the supply of meat will be 20 percent less than the supply available in 1944, the importance of fish products becomes greater. So it seems to me we should put the Selective Service System on notice that in cases of requests for occupational deferment in which the men can prove they are producing or catching fish, they should be given as much consideration as is given to agricultural labor, and they should be given the same protection.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that if he can devise some sort of a unit system—namely, a system requiring that the fishermen be employed all the year around, or the equivalent, and that they be able to prove that in the past they have produced a minimum number of pounds of sea food, so that the system would not be abused—the Senator might get somewhere. The difficulty has been that in many sections of the country there are many men who follow the water for 2 or 3 or 4 months, during a particular season, engaging in oystering or crabbing, or whatever their particular bent may be, and then in the off seasons, the seasons during which they are not able to obtain sufficient income from the sea, turn to more lucrative work. They engage in such work between the fishing seasons. So it would not do to defer a man who follows the sea only 4 months of the year.

If it is possible to work out some standard whereby deferment may be granted a man who is regularly employed in such work on the sea or the water, and who, in fact, is doing about the same on the water, so far as the production of food is concerned, that we expect the men on the farms to do, I believe I would give very sympathetic consideration to such an amendment. But unless it is so safeguarded, I believe the Army and the Navy would be opposed to it, and it seems to me many of the governmental bureaus would also be opposed to it, for they would very likely believe that the disadvantages would offset the advantages.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, if the bill is passed without such an amendment, the fisherman who goes to Alaska in the summertime will be placed in a war plant, and there will be a lack of production of fish.

Mr. TYDINGS. I suggest to the Senator that he ask the officials of the Selective Service System to sit down with the proper officials of the Bureau of Fisheries, and see if between them they can evolve a regulation or an amendment, for that matter, or a new law, after the pending measure is enacted, which would give the fishermen treatment equal with that accorded other persons who are producing food.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, let me say further that if such an amendment is worked out, it will be adopted, and I know my colleagues will do the best they can do to sustain it in conference.

Mr. President, I think we should not longer interfere with a vote on the amendment of the Senator from Indiana. I am sure he requested a vote some time ago, and I should like to have a vote on it. But I think it necessary to say a few words about the amendment, before the vote is taken.

Before the junior Senator from Oregon spoke, I did not interpret the amendment as in any way being an antistrike amendment or an antisabotage amendment or anything of the kind. I am sure the average Senator would not so interpret it, and I am sure the author of the amendment would not like it to be interpreted in that way. I am also sure that if the time ever comes in America when such a law has to be passed—and I think

the time will not come—we would wish to act directly on that proposition, not indirectly, as the pending amendment would do.

Mr. President, one other thing should be stated, namely, that if the two parts of the amendment are separated, as was suggested by the senior Senator from Michigan, of course that would not do at all. The assertion in the second part of the amendment is connected up with the violation of such regulations, and the regulations are mentioned in the first amendment. If we were to adopt merely the words of the second amendment, as the senior Senator from Michigan suggested, we would interfere with an excellent practice in the ending of contracts and the taking on of new contracts, where employers try their best to see that unemployment does not occur. I am sure the Senator from Indiana would not like to see placed upon the amendment the interpretation the senior Senator from Michigan has suggested.

Mr. President, I am ready to vote. I hope the amendments will be voted down.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, let me say that the amendment is not in any way intended to be an antistrike amendment. It is intended to help production for the Army and Navy, to place the necessary war materials into the hands of the boys on the fighting fronts.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, let me say just a word before the vote, if I may do so. Under the amendment as proposed by the Senator from Indiana the regulations which are referred to in the second portion of the amendment are an essential portion of the amendment. Those regulations, I take it, refer perhaps entirely, and certainly partially, to those which would be covered in the first portion of the amendment, namely, regulations under which there would be a prescription of the minimum requirements in designated places of employment, and so forth.

I wish to call attention to the fact that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is to be granted the power provided under the amendment. To my mind that is highly inadvisable, particularly in view of the fact that we have the War Production Board, which, to my mind, would be a much more appropriate agency than would the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to handle the matter of prescribing the minimum requirements of production.

In any event, whichever of the two may be the more appropriate, the amendment might quite readily lead to conflict between the two because there would be on the one hand, the War Production Board and, on the other hand, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, undertaking to prescribe regulations respecting production; and it seems to me that situation would inevitably lead to conflict.

Mr. President, I am of the opinion that, for the reason I have stated, the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I think the same reason the Senator has given—namely, that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is not qualified, and that the matter should be under the War Production Board—likewise applies so far as concerns the ability and wisdom of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to regulate and designate the number of persons who shall work in each factory. If one is pertinent the other is pertinent. If we are to have the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission designate the number of men who shall work in a factory, then we should likewise prescribe the minimum requirements. Why confuse matters by bringing in another agency? I see no reason for rejecting the amendment on the basis that one agency may have more wisdom than another. I have repeatedly said that in principle I am opposed to all manpower regulation. But if we are to enact legislation, then let us enact the kind which will result in getting the work done. My amendment will do that.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have listened to the Senator from Indiana. I was inclined to vote for his amendment until I heard the statement made that under it a man might be convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary.

I have listened to some of the arguments which have been made with reference to backing up the boys who are overseas. I believe that every Senator wants to back them up. No Member of this body has a monopoly on patriotism. No set of individuals, no War Department, no Navy Department, no business group, and no labor group has a monopoly on patriotism.

The other day I received a letter from a boy overseas. I am sorry I do not have it with me. I mislaid it. The boy wrote to his parents and wanted to know why the Congress of the United States was considering a work-or-fight bill. He said, "I am over here fighting for democracy. While I am doing that I do not wish to see us lose democracy at home. That is the way other boys with whom I have talked feel about it. We do not wish to see our mothers, wives, and sisters compelled to work where some bureaucrat tells them they must work."

Merely because the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy have told us what to do about civilian problems, that is no reason why we should follow their instructions. Representatives of management and industry came before the Military Affairs Committee and said that they were opposed to the pending legislation. Certain representatives of labor did the same. I am willing to concede that abuses have been practiced by both management and labor in the hoarding of labor in some of the plants of this country. To a large extent it has been done because of plans which were incorporated in the cost-plus agreements which had been entered into. Those practices should cease. We do not need compulsory legislation for the men and women of this country in order to bring about production. It is inconceivable to me that at this stage of the war, when everyone is saying that the progress of the war is quite satisfactory, and that our armed forces are doing wonderfully well, that certain persons should say, "We must have a work-or-fight bill so that we can say to men and women that they must work here or they must work there." We do not want bureaucrats going into a home and saying to the wife, daughter, or sweetheart of some boy, "You must go to work in this plant or in that plant."

Mr. President, shall we adopt Hitler's philosophy for this country? Shall we adopt Mr. Stalin's philosophy? The greatest manpower in the world is in Russia. There men and women are told that they must work. They are told that they must carry the hod, and that they must do other kinds of labor. They are told that they must go into the Army, or that they must do this, or do that. What has been their record in producing war material as compared with the record of the United States of America, where we have free labor and free industry? What has been the record of any country on the face of the globe which has compulsory work-or-fight laws?

I know that there are those in the United States who say that after the war is over the only thing which will save us is a military dictatorship, or something of that kind. I refuse to believe it.

I believe that we can maintain this country as a democratic republic. I am opposed to any step, and will fight any step, which is designed to give anyone power to establish either a military dictatorship or any other kind of a dictatorship in the United States. That is the direction in which we shall be headed if we enact legislation providing that a man may be sent to jail if he quits a job. Any legislation of that character which we may put on the statute books will not be taken off very quickly. We shall be confronted with one emergency after another, and told that it is necessary to maintain the work-or-fight statutes in existence. Mr. Hitler said that he was confronted with one emergency after another. He made such statements in order to establish a complete dictatorship. The same was true with reference to Italy under Mussolini.

Mr. President, I am really shocked to think that any Senator would say that he wished to see a bill passed providing that a man could be sent to the penitentiary for a year, or fined $10,000, merely because he refused to work. If a businessman or the head of an institution should conspire with some labor leader to harm the Government by slowing down work, or assigning a man to a job who should not be so assigned, that would be one thing. I believe that is what the Senator from Indiana had in mind. It is inconceivable that he had in mind what the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has said the amendment would accomplish.

Apparently there is some question as to interpretation of the amendment. I intend to vote against it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. It was never my intention that any person should be sent to the penitentiary as a result of the amendment which I have proposed. In

order to make that perfectly clear, I ask that the amendment be modified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment. He will state the modification.

Mr. CAPEHART. In line 10 of my amendment, after the word "others" I modify the amendment by inserting the words "while in continuance of his employment or in his capacity as employer." That will eliminate any misunderstanding that may arise.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I am not sure, on the spur of the moment, from hearing the modification read, how that would change the situation. Consequently I am not prepared to discuss the particular change at this time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, under the modification a person would not have to quit his job, but could simply lay off for some reason or other, and if he should lay off for a few days, under the modified amendment he would still be subject to the penalty, as I understand. He would still be continuing in the employment.

Mr. WHEELER. I have not followed the suggested modification. It is not only the particular amendment now pending and the situation called to our attention by the Senator from Oregon that concern me, but I have particularly in mind the so-called May-Bailey bill, the work-or-fight bill. As I stated, I have heard arguments to the effect that if we did not support the boys overseas, this and that would happen, that they are appealing for some such action. I have received a great many letters from boys overseas quite recently, and I have not received a single letter from any soldier anywhere in the United States or overseas advocating the kind of legislation now proposed. I have received letter from soldiers, and have seen letters written to their parents, as I stated a moment ago, asking, "What is the matter with the Congress? Do they want to say that my mother or my wife can be taken out of her home and placed in a factory or somewhere else?" Do we want further to break up the homes of America? Do we want to fasten upon the people of this country a dictatorship, from which they would not escape very soon, once it were adopted?

Mark my word, Mr. President, if that sort of measure is adopted, we will hear from these boys when they come back, because they are not going to favor the establishment of a Fascist government in the United States after they have bled and died in the fox holes all over the world.

Mr. President, I intend to vote for the compromise bill which came out of the Committtee on Military Affairs, but I hope that when the bill goes to conference it will not be brought back with some compromise made in conference which will say to the mothers of America, or to the wives of America, or to the daughters or sweethearts of America, "In the name of preserving democracy in the United States, we are going to take you out of your homes by the nape of the neck, and put you here and put you there," just as Hitler does, just as Stalin does, just as Mussolini did, and just as every other dictator on the face of the globe has done. While we were giving lip service to democracy, we would be taking a step toward dictatorship. Someone has well said that when dictatorship comes to the United States of America, it will come in the name and under the guise of preserving democracy.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I would not speak again on this subject in the Senate except for a word just spoken by the Senator from Montana. I hope every Senator will give earnest and careful consideration before he votes for any of the bills which have been offered to the Senate on this subject matter. If Senators vote for a bill and it goes to conference, and the conference finally decides, under whip and spur from the military leaders, to bring back a work-or-fight bill, Senators will have lost their opportunity to vote except either "Yes" or "No" on the conference report, and I do not want to be in that position.

The case of the British during the war has been cited to show why we should support a work-or-fight bill. The miracle of war production, that is, the miracle which has been performed in this country during the last few years, has been due in no small part to the effectiveness and the wholehearted effort of free American labor. Donald Nelson, the former head of the W. P. B., said that our war production was due to the intelligence and know-how of free American workers.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The success of the Russian armies and the success of the British armies has been due almost entirely to free enterprise and free labor in the United States of America, to what we have produced.

Mr. CHANDLER. I may not go so far as to be in complete accord with the Senator's statement, but I will say that without thousands and thousands of tons of American matériel, some of which I had the privilege of seeing go from the head of the Persian Gulf through Iran, to be used by Russian soldiers against the Germans, I have an idea that the Russian nation never would have been able to withstand the assault of the Germans at Stalingrad.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Our country has produced more than any other country has produced, and we have done it under the voluntary method. Why should we, just before the war ends, discard the method which has been so successful, and undertake to institute methods which have not been so successful?

Mr. CHANDLER. I cannot answer that question. I may say to the Senator that if I had a business which had been conducted and had done as well as the American people have done during the last few years, I would not change it for anything in the world.

Let me give some facts—and they are facts. The American Federation of Labor recently made a survey, and said they could find no evidence of manpower crisis in this country, except the crisis of manpower waste. They reported:

> Careful examination of the facts has revealed no manpower shortage which could require national-service legislation. In spite of newspaper headlines claiming a production crisis, December war-production records show an outstanding achievement. Sharply increased schedules were exceeded or met within 1 or 2 percent. Although the goals were exceptionally high, we came nearer reaching them than in almost any other month of our peak production year. This was all done voluntarily, by free American labor and employers in cooperation with government.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat something I said the other day which I believe to be true. I think the manpower situation in the United States at this hour is the best in all the history of this country. I think the cooperation between employers and employees is the best at this hour it has ever been in all the history of this country. If that be true, Mr. President, why should we change the rule of the game? Why should we hazard our record by adopting some other system? On January 12 the War Production Board, through its chairman, announced the new 1945 schedules of production. They will amount to $64,500,000,000 worth of munitions, compared with $64,000,000,000 worth the year before. So there will be an increase of only about $500,000,000 worth in the amount of munitions produced in the United States this year. That is not a tremendous increase. The $64,000,000,000 worth of munitions were produced, and the schedules were met the year before.

I wish to refer again to Joseph Keenan, the Vice Chairman of the W. P. B., who said of airplane workers' increased production in this country:

> Their sense of participation and feeling of fair play have been so heightened that they broke all records.

Rear Admiral Frederick G. Crisp said in January 1945 that production achievements to date have been nothing short of miraculous.

W. P. A. Vice Chairman C. S. Golden and J. D. Keenan said in January 1945:

> Free labor in the United States has been able to meet every demand upon it. Despite all the difficulties and handicaps American workers have made the grade in every instance.

I should like to say a word by way of comparison between the system used by the United States and Great Britain, one of our major allies. In Britain, where they have been operating under compulsory labor since May 22, as I recall, 1940, the absentee rate in 1943 was 10 percent, and in 1944 it was 10 percent. In America the absentee rate was between 6 and 7 percent.

An impartial poll of British public opinion on compulsory labor stated—

> The managements complained of indiscipline of the new labor which was unwilling because it was drafted. * * * A minority of conscripts was satisfactory.

Are we now, Mr. President, to kill the valiant spirit of voluntary cooperation by a system of compulsion in this country?

Under labor's no strike pledge, the strike record in the United States has been exceptionally low. In 1944 only

one-tenth of 1 percent of work time was lost by strikes in the United States. Man-days worked averaged 700,000,000 a month. Man-days lost by strike were only 700,000.

In Britain last year under compulsory labor, strikes caused more losses of production than at any other time during the last 12 years. Strike loss in Britain in 1944 was 16 percent above that in the United States of America. The British lost 3,600,000 man-hours. The actual loss in America was a little over 7,800,000, but it must be remembered that we have two and a half times more workers in war industries in this country than they have in Great Britain.

In December of this year we turned out 32 percent more critical aircraft than the month before, and 61 percent more mortars. We increased production of tanks, heavy trucks, and field artillery by 11 or 12 percent.

Mr. President, I wish to plead with the Senate, because I am anxious that it not support any bill on the pending subject that I have seen. I am prepared to vote for any bill that will shorten the war 1 day, or save one life, or save the leg of one American soldier; but I do not want to see a bill enacted under whip and spur in order to save the face of someone who has made a mistake, a military mistake which I regret. I regret the mistakes of our military just as I regret the mistakes of any other citizen. Such mistakes cost lives; they prolong the war; they cost money. But some day someone will be honest enough to admit a mistake, and not try to alibi the mistake off on someone else. I would not take one of our mistakes and magnify it to indicate incompetence on the part of the military, or to bring the American people into a situation that they ought not to be brought into.

Mr. President, if the bill before the Senate is passed we will have changed the whole history of this country. So far as I know there is not a single living human being who favored the work-or-fight bill except those who voted for it and almost expressed a wish that they had not done so when they brought it here. I do not know that the bill before the Senate has any real vigorous support. There is not a word of testimony in the hearings in favor of this bill.

If Senators vote for the bill before the Senate, or one of the other bills which have been presented on the subject, it will result in throwing the whole matter into conference, and the House has the Bailey bill, which I think it would be a great mistake for the Congress to enact into law. When a report is brought back from conference all the Senate can do is to vote yea or nay on the conference report. I want to avoid such a thing if it can be avoided. I do not want the bill to be written in conference. Under the circumstances it ought not to be written in conference, because we will get the May-Bailey bill or some version of the measure now before the Senate. As I said to my friend the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] today when he offered his amendment which would eliminate newspapers from the provisions of the measure, under this bill the War Manpower Commissioner can put out of business any man in the United States that he wants to, and we cannot do anything about it. Not only can he put a man out of business, but the man, when put out of business, cannot get back into business.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator, I take it, is speaking principally of the bill reported by the Military Affairs Committee, which contains no limit below which——

Mr. CHANDLER. So far as I know it is a zero-ceiling bill. That is what I understand.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is the committee amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. May I say to the able Senator that the substitute which was offered for that bill by me fixes a limit of 50 percent of the persons employed in any businesses at the time the act goes into effect, and that limitation provides a protection to the business so that it cannot be forced out of existence.

Mr. CHANDLER. If I were certain that such a provision would be enacted into law my objection to the bill would be less strong. I am fearful that the Senate will vote for a bill, and send it to conference, with the result that we will get back a drastic bill.

I say we should not pass a bill of this kind under whip and spur. I do not wish to be harsh with the sponsors of the bill. They wish to please the military. I fear for what may happen here if we take steps which will eventually place this country under the direction of the military. The people of this country do not want the country to be directed by the military. They do not want this to be a military nation. They are willing to submit to necessary controls until the war is over.

Mr. President, I repeat, with all our failures and mistakes we have made the greatest contribution to the salvation of mankind in this war that has ever been made in the history of the world. What is the justification or excuse for now abandoning the system under which we have done all this?

I spoke to the Secretary of War this morning. He is pleading for this bill, as he says, for the protection of his boys. I am prepared, and have been all the time, to vote for any bill that will contribute the slightest bit to the success of the American arms in this war. But since the proponents of the bill have not been able to show in weeks of testimony any real justification or excuse for this departure from the customs and traditions of this country which have existed since it was established, I cannot vote for the bill.

Soon we shall be asked to draft nurses. I have no intention of voting for such a proposal. Why has the Army made the standards for nurses so high that they cannot be obtained? If American women were told that American soldiers were in distress and needed nurses, the boats would not hold the women who would storm the piers for the opportunity to nurse them. We do not need to draft nurses.

Last year the Army reduced its program and closed certain plants. Now, because it made a mistake—and I regret that a mistake was made; everyone regrets it—in the twinkling of an eye we are expected to enact legislation to draft workers or send them to jail. We are not now faced with the question of jail sentences, but if we pass this bill, we shall be faced with it before we are through.

Mr. President, those are my reasons for voting for the Kilgore substitute for the May bill. I intend to vote for the substitute of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] rather than the committee amendment. If I feel as I do now, I may even vote against the Senator's amendment in the end. I wish to follow the thing all the way through. My colleagues on the Military Affairs Committee know what intense feeling I have with respect to this bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very happy that on the next to the last vote, at least, the Senator will be with me. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. While we are on the question of production, was any evidence offered before the committee showing that we are actually short of materials at this time?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not recall any.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there any shortage?

Mr. CHANDLER. It is said that we are short about 200,000 workers in industry. The figure given was from 170,000 to 200,000. The shortage is scattered and spotty. According to the War Manpower Commission, the labor exists in the country, and can be obtained.

Mr. WHERRY. Was there any showing of any shortage of material of any kind which is needed?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not know about that.

Mr. WHERRY. Was any such showing made in the evidence?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not recall that it was.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In response to the Senator from Nebraska, I think it should be said that the testimony indicated that the stepping up of schedules and requirements would make it necessary to produce larger amounts than have been produced in the past. The testimony of Under Secretary Patterson was that the men now on the fighting fronts, in all their struggles up to date, had not been confronted by any shortage.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. That is the point I am making. Up to this point, at least, there is no shortage of material.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator to remember one further thing from the

statement of the Under Secretary of War. Except for the morale factor, there is no excuse for this bill, because what we do now, if it is to be effective—and I question whether it ever will be—will not be felt on the fighting fronts for 6 or 7 months from now. We came nearer meeting the greatly increased production schedules last month than in any other month. I wish to repeat something that was said the other day. Every time a production schedule is set, we break a record; then we are asked for an increased schedule.

We have a population of approximately 135,000,000. Twelve million are in the armed services. We have furnished foodstuffs, not only for our own forces, but for nearly everybody else. We have furnished clothing and material for almost everyone else, besides our own forces. Records have been broken again and again by the free workers of the United States.

The other day I asked an Army official if some day the Army would not admit that we had done about as good a job as we could do under the circumstances, and if Army officials would not some day cease to insist that we break records, at the expense of the health and welfare of all the people. We can do just so much. Under the old common law a man was ordered to be put to death by bearing weights on his chest as heavy as he could bear, and heavier. When they became heavier, he was no more.

I do not wish ever to admit that we cannot do anything. We do many things because when we talk with our allies they say that certain things cannot be done. Our men say, "Where is this thing that cannot be done?" Our allies show it to us, and we do it. Many times they show it to us because they know that that will be our reaction. We are a record-breaking people. We do not like to admit that there is anything we cannot do. I do not wish to do anything to destroy that spirit in the American people. They possess that spirit because they are free, because they are a determined people, because they are not slaves. They own their Government. They own their freedom. No other people can outdo them. We have not only outproduced any other individual nation, but we have produced more materials of war than both Axis nations. They have produced by slave labor, and we have produced with free labor. The proposal before us is to change systems.

I do not know what Mr. Goebbels will say. I am not in his confidence. I have no idea what he will say. Someone said the other day that, of course, he would think up something to say. If we pass this bill, one thing he could say, and ought to say to the American boys who are now inside Germany is, "Back home they are putting your fathers and mothers in jail. They have not produced for you."

Mr. President, I saw many a man on the fighting front who thought everyone was on strike, because he happened to need something at the moment. He needed weapons or food. When the committee of which I was a member was in the Pacific area, whenever one of our men in the area saw a headline in the newspapers with respect to a strike, he would wonder if everyone at home had quit work. I was glad to be able to tell those men that some people were still working at home. We all regret and magnify a failure. It makes the situation look as though everything had gone wrong.

Many a soldier with whom I talked said, "Do not change the Government back home. Our country is all right. All anyone has to do to find that out is to spend 2 or 3 years in a place like this." The men would say, "Do not change our country." Every now and then a boy would say, "Happy, do not change our country. It is all right. Keep it as it was when we left it. We want to go back to it."

If I were Mr. Goebbels I would go on the radio and tell the American boys, "Your democracy has failed." The other day the Secretary of War suggested that in this particular it had failed, and could not do the job without adopting Fascist methods.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. While the Senator is speaking about breaking records, I wish to call to his attention certain paragraphs from the testimony of the Under Secretary of War before our committee. To me his statement was very impressive, indicating that we are reaching the point where perhaps we should be strengthening our production beyond what we have accomplished heretofore. I read from page 28, to show that we need still further to break records which we have already established. The Under Secretary said:

> The 1945 requirements, as estimated by the War Production Board, call for more munitions than were produced in 1944, and 1944 was our biggest year in war production. How much higher the over-all 1945 requirements will be has not yet been determined.
>
> Scheduled 1945 requirements for Army munitions are 15 percent above the 1944 production figure. For a number of critical items the required increase is much higher. The schedule for heavy field artillery ammunition is 200 percent above last year's production. The schedule for bombs and mines is up 49 percent, tanks up 64 percent, air-borne radar 59 percent, clothing 29 percent.
>
> That program for Army munitions for 1945 is a staggering task. Yet even these sharply increased schedules do not fully reflect military needs, for our needs have been scaled down in the light of known limitations on productive capacity.
>
> It is also a matter of concern to us that last year we were unable to make more modest production schedules for a number of critical items. In the second half of 1944, output of mortar ammunition was 12 percent below the schedule of June 30, 1944. Production of cotton duck was 14 percent under schedule, heavy-duty truck tires 10 percent under, and 105 howitzer ammunition 8 percent under. Deliveries of 2½-ton trucks dropped 13 percent under the June 30 schedule, and deliveries of heavier trucks dropped 20 percent below schedule.
>
> * * * * *
>
> We mean to meet the needs for 1945.

I am sure the Senator means to meet them. It is our obligation to do all we can to see that they are met.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am glad the Senator raised that point.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. Before I yield to the Senator from Vermont, I wish to answer the Senator from Ohio. The answer fits like a glove. I read from Labor's Monthly Survey for February 1945:

> On January 12, War Production Board Chairman Krug announced the new 1945 war production schedules. They will amount to $64,500,000,000 worth of munitions compared to $64,000,000,000 worth produced in 1944—no significant increase.

It is an increase of only 5 points—only $500,000,000.

Very well. The chart I have shows that new war production schedules for the first half of this year amounted to $16,400,000,000 worth in the first quarter and $16,700,000,000 worth in the second quarter. This compares with $15,800,000,000 worth in the last quarter of 1944, an increase of only 5.7 percent at most.

Very well. If this justifies sending people to jail or making them work, uprooting them, moving them all over the country, ordering them about, we should remember that in England, under this system, a million certifications were made in 5 years, and 5,400 persons were prosecuted under it, and more than 4,700 persons were sent to jail.

Mr. BURTON. That was under the compulsory labor system, not under the bill now before us.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand, but that is what we will have here, once we start.

Mr. President, I am not giving you riddles; I am giving you the facts. Since the peak of December 1943, munitions production has declined 8 percent to November 1944.

While I am not blaming the military, they are responsible for the cutting back and cutting off and closing and shutting down. We have to make it up. But why does not someone be honest enough to say, "I ordered this shut-down, and I was mistaken, and I want it put back." I want someone to be honest enough to say what is the case. We would not strip him of rank or dock his pay or anything of the sort. We are just as sorry as he is.

Now production must rise again; but even when it reaches the high point of the 1945 schedule, the over-all program will be less than we accomplished in December 1943.

Now we are going to try to do something that we have already done with volunteer labor; but we cannot do it that way this time, it seems; we are told that we must change the rules of the game, that we must change the system.

Mr. President, I wish I knew who was responsible for this measure. I confess I do not know. As we used to say down in the State legislature, some smart fellow thought this up.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. A few minutes ago the Senator from Kentucky said that if he were in Mr. Goebbels' place he would lose no opportunity to tell our boys at the

front that democracy had failed. I rise to say that Mr. Goebbels will not have to do that, because Mr. Stimson has already done it, and I think his exact words should be put in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. CHANDLER. I referred to that. I shall be glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator referred to it?

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. The exact wording is printed in the Washington Post of February 19. The words are as follows:

> The inevitable result of this failure of American democracy is now becoming apparent at this crisis of the war.

Those are the exact words which are credited to Mr. Stimson. If Mr. Stimson tells the American boys that democracy has failed in this country, why in the world does Mr. Goebbels even have to do it?

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, I regret the statement by the Secretary of War. I wish he had not made it. If any Senator had made it, he would have gone to the whipping post quickly. If any Senator had made such a statement, it would have been claimed that he was giving comfort and aid to the enemy.

I regret that any such statement was made, and I am quite sure the Secretary regrets it now.

Mr. AIKEN. And then we are informed, according to a speech by Mr. Ira Mosher, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, that—

> Supporters of the May bill were pointing with pride a few days ago to an editorial in the Stars and Stripes purporting to support the measure. This editorial supposedly reflected the soldier attitude toward national service. It now develops, according to an Associated Press dispatch from Paris, that the editorial was placed with what protesting G. I. staff members of the publication called brass-hat interference with a service publication. The editorial, the staff protests, was written by a lieutenant colonel, and was inspired by a cablegram from the Under Secretary of War.

So here we have the Secretary of War telling the boys that democracy in their country has failed, and the Under Secretary of War attempting to stir up political discontent among the boys at the front in order to get this bill through.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, it is always open season on Members of Congress.

Mr. AIKEN. When we are talking of replacements in the Army, I think we are speaking of replacements in the wrong place. The replacements should be made at the Pentagon Building, right at the top.

Mr. CHANDLER. As I said, of course it is always open season on Members of Congress, and we should not be thin skinned. We have to take all kinds of criticism, just or unjust, fair or unfair; and those who have been in Congress long enough expect it. Such criticism is made of us by persons who exercise the greatest latitude and who are under no responsibility, but we must face the voters. Of course, for years there has been under way a movement to keep the umpires off the field and put them in the grandstand. Many persons have said that should be done. But the movement never succeeded.

The statement I made a few moments ago was a complete answer to the statement of the Under Secretary of War, read into the RECORD by my friend the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. I wish to add that in the last 6 months of 1944 we made substantial gains in every one of the critical war production programs. Remember, now, Mr. President, we made gains in every one of the critical war production programs, gains ranging from 20 percent to 200 percent. In view of this miraculous and outstanding performance on the part of the patriotic men and women of this country, I ask now, Is the Senate going to say to them, "Your reward is a form of slavery or a form of forced labor or a departure from the time-honored customs and traditions of the people of this great free country"?

Mr. President, I will not vote for it. I do not intend to encourage it. I fear what may result by our passage of such legislation. I started out as a foe of it. My intense hatred for it and all it stands for has increased every day the legislation has been pending.

Before Senators vote, I should like to make a further statement. Inasmuch as the Senator from Montana indicated that he would vote for such a bill, I want the Senate to remember what that may mean. That may mean that the conference may rewrite the bill, and then it will be too late. Senators then will have to vote against it all or vote for it all. I do not want to be placed in that position.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified, offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], to the committee amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a letter which I ask to have read by the clerk. The letter is from Glenn L. Martin, one of the largest airplane manufacturers in the country. He wrote the letter to the Secretaries of War and Navy. I think the letter throws a great deal of light on this debate, if Mr. Martin's figures are in line with what the Army and Navy understand to be the facts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The legislative clerk read, as follows:

THE GLENN L. MARTIN CO.,
Baltimore, Md., February 7, 1945

The Honorable HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War, Pentagon Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We have been told by representatives of Selective Service, Army and Navy, and War Production Board that all of our present male employees now between the ages of 18 and 30 years of age will (subject to physical examination) be called for duty with the military services by approximately May 1, 1945.

Of this group, the induction of all our employees between the ages of 18 and 26 has been accomplished, which together with volunteers from this organization accounts for more than 23,000 employees now in uniform.

The balance (age 26–30) will take the vitally irreplaceable manpower out of this organization.

As president of this company, I feel it my duty to call to your attention at this time the far-reaching effect the loss of this personnel will have on our operations.

We are under contract to deliver essential aircraft to both the Army and Navy, upon which minimum delivery requirements have been established. If the above-mentioned policy is effected, the fulfillment of these aircraft delivery schedules is not attainable.

We do not wish to be considered alarmists, but, on the other hand, it is our desire to acquaint you with the absolute true facts.

For example, in our engineering department, out of a total of 19 senior aerodynamists, 18 are subject to this draft. Out of 39 senior stress engineers, 27 are subject to the present call. Thirty-three percent of all technical employees now in the engineering department are under 30 years of age and are subject to the present draft policy.

In another department 37 percent of our tool designers, including fabricators, are subject to the present draft.

The inspection department, a group of 190 supervisory personnel, will also suffer severe losses.

Our quality central engineers, numbering 80 technicians, have 66 of their number subject to the present draft. The X-ray department, which performs a very necessary function required by Army and Navy specifications, will lose 50 percent of its personnel.

The manufacturing department has 25 percent of its foremen and subforemen subject to the draft. Leaders and other first-line supervision are likewise similarly affected.

The important thing to note is the fact that such a sweeping draft policy, based entirely on age, will throw a highly skilled organization out of balance. For example, 19 senior aerodynamists are required to keep 35,000 employees manufacturing, but if this number is reduced to 1 or 2 men, their part of engineering will be missing and production drawings cannot be released to the shop for work. Therefore many thousands of shop employees not subject to the draft will be thrown out of work and in varying degrees other important departments so completely out of balance, after satisfying the draft, will obviously require a complete reorganization of the company's business. The constant reduction of supervision and material will close down divisions and departments of the company in varying degrees.

We respectfully urge an immediate survey of the aircraft industry by experienced aircraft manufacturing representatives of yours to present to you the full details in support of my very brief statements. This company is ready and willing to cooperate to the fullest extent in trying to arrive at the facts for your consideration.

We wish to assure you that when a final decision is made and you have determined the number of airplanes and the amount of engineering to be sacrificed and the men that should be drafted from our plant, we will then immediately reorganize what we have left and apply the group of remaining personnel to work assigned to us in accordance with the dictates of your priorities. All employees that cannot be efficiently utilized, due to the resulting critical shortage of experienced technical and administrative men, will be released from work and made available for other plants.

Very truly yours,

GLENN L. MARTIN,
President.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read another letter which I have received. It came from a worker in one of the shipyards of my State. I ask that his name be not read and that the letter be returned to me. I merely want the letter to appear in the RECORD. I do not wish to invoive the writer in any controversy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Senator MILLARD F. TYDINGS,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I had an experience the other day, which I think should be brought to your attention.

The other morning, in order to keep an appointment it became necessary that I hail a cab in order to get to my destination in a certain time. During the ride the driver and I engaged in a little conversation, in which he advised me of these facts.

About 2 weeks prior thereto and during the period of this work-or-fight legislation, he, feeling particularly conscientious, gave up his position as a cab driver in order to make application for a position in one of our local shipyards, he having had prior experience as a welder. On an appointed day he reported for work. He worked all morning at his given job and after lunch started the afternoon session. He had worked probably 10 minutes when he was approached by his foreman, who asked him how much work he had done that morning. This was shown to the foreman, who immediately took him from his welding job and placed him in some other position, telling him that he had accomplished too much work. During the 8 days subsequent he advised me he did not do 1 full day's work. He became disgusted with the whole thing, and on the ninth day reported back to his old position as a cab driver.

Senator, I am a State employee, and, as you know, as such, am poorly paid. Isn't there anything that you can possibly do, in order to eliminate some of the national waste which is so prevalent in our present war effort. You know and I know that this is simply increasing the national debt to unheard of amounts. We will not pay it, but future generations will pay it or else.

Please give this little note your most courteous consideration.

Yours for a more economically operated war effort.

Yours very truly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the Senate takes a recess, and before considering the Executive Calendar, on which there is only one nomination, I wish to urge, inasmuch as we shall not have a session of the Senate tomorrow, that Senators be present on Monday, and be prepared to make progress in the consideration of the pending legislation. It has been several weeks since the matter first came to the attention of Congress through the message of the President of the United States, through action in the House, and through the hearings which were held by the Senate committee. We have now been considering the bill in the Senate for a week, and have voted on only one or two comparatively minor amendments, although in a sense they were important. We have made no speed and no headway yet in the consideration of the real need sustaining the proposed legislation.

There are now pending three proposals, the bill as it passed the House, the amendment reported by the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, and the substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. I have endeavored to secure an agreement for a vote on the substitute at an hour on Monday, but the effort has failed. Therefore I hope that when we resume consideration of the bill on Monday, Senators will attend the sessions and limit their discussion to the matters which are before the Senate at the time, to pending amendments, and that we may dispose of the bill and all amendments.

If the committee amendment should be agreed to by the Senate, it would have to go to conference. If it should not be agreed to, and anything else were adopted as radically different from the bill as it passed the House as the proposed committee amendment, that would have to go to conference. Whether we like it or not, it may be that the legislation will have to be written in conference. If that shall be the case, the bill should get to conference as soon as possible, assuming we are to have legislation at all.

For these reasons I urge that Senators make every possible effort, during the further consideration of the bill next week, to speed up action on it, and get it disposed of.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

William A. Brophy, of New Mexico, to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs, vice John Collier, resigned.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to call the Executive Calendar.

TREATIES

The legislative clerk proceeded to read Executive A and H, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the treaty go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the treaty will be passed over.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Chaplain Robert D. Workman to have the rank of rear admiral in the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 5, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received March 2 (legislative day of February 26), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

FLORIDA

R. Hunter Browning, Madison, Fla., in place of E. J. Harris, resigned.

William F. Johnson, River Junction, Fla., in place of D. H. Morgan, retired.

GEORGIA

Catherine R. Lanneau, Barney, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Sarah W. Turner, Pelham, Ga., in place of J. L. Cooper, transferred.

Margaret D. Cate, Sea Island, Ga., in place of C. D. Bruce, resigned.

ILLINOIS

George Bigler, Clarendon Hills, Ill., in place of E. G. Mochel, retired.

IOWA

William J. Maguire, Vail, Iowa, in place of Martin O'Connell, transferred.

KENTUCKY

Daris U. Foley, Jamestown, Ky., in place of O. D. Smith, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Arthur I. Brown, South Lee, Mass., in place F. G. Fanning, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Henry Swaffield, Sterling, Mich., in place of E. G. Abbott, deceased.

MINNESOTA

H. Carroll Day, Albert Lea, Minn., in place of B. M. Loeffler, retired.

Anthony G. McDougall, Baudette, Minn., in place of P. B. Sanderson, retired.

Joseph F. Meighen, Preston, Minn., in place of M. E. Gartner, retired.

MISSOURI

Curtis M. Van Hoozer, Blythedale, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEBRASKA

Harold C. Bruce, Verdigre, Nebr., in place of C. O. Kocina, transferred.

NORTH CAROLINA

Byron U. Richardson, Pinehurst, N. C., in place of F. T. Currie, removed.

OREGON

Pearl A. Carsley, Malin, Oreg., in place of M. W. Thomas, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Olive Ruth Keeney, Dickerson Run, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

PUERTO RICO

Ramon Zaragoza, Penuelas, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Norman Glenn Anderson, Andrews, S. C., in place of J. R. Thompson, transferred.

Thomas P. Scott, Whitmire, S. C., in place of G. A. Douglass, transferred.

TEXAS

Ida D. Martin, Wiergate, Tex., in place of F. W. Hines, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Joseph F. Suttle, Dahlgren, Va., in place of L. A. Ashton, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

Bernice E. McDonald, Mount Clare, W. Va., in place of M. J. Fowler, resigned.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 2 (legislative day of February 26), 1945:

IN THE NAVY

Robert D. Workman, to have the rank of rear admiral in the Navy while serving as Chief of Chaplains under the Chief of Naval Personnel.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 2, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, whose nature is to have mercy and forgive, we praise Thee for the advent of our Saviour, who came to give liberty to those who were in bondage and manhood to those who were chattels. Rising to the highest sphere of service, may we be examples and an inspiration to arouse righteous enthusiasm in the breasts of men. Make us willing to yield comfort and pride and all things else save fidelity to the truth.

In its career of prosperity, wilt Thou lead our great Nation aright; purge its ignorance, its corruption, and all attendant evils. May it be a source of strength to all humanity, seeking justice and peace by forbearance; then will the world believe that we are a free and a temperate people. O hasten the time when nations shall be brought from barbarism; when truth and love shall be in the ascendant; when peace shall smile on the races of earth and creation shall no longer groan and travail in pain. In the name of our Lord and Master, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On February 13, 1945:

H. R. 621. An act to further amend section 22 of the act approved March 4, 1925, entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the naval service, and for other purposes," by changing the limitation on the total personnel of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1427. An act relating to the compensation of telephone operators on the United States Capitol telephone exchange.

On February 28, 1945:

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Census of Agriculture; and

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1945 for the Public Health Service.

On February 24, 1945:

H. R. 1808. An act to grant to the Hawaiian Electric Co. the right to construct certain ditches, tunnels, and oil pipe lines in Pearl Harbor, T. H.

EMERGENCY COMMITTEE TO SAVE JEWISH PEOPLE OF EUROPE

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to say a few words about a matter which has just come to my attention and which has shocked me very much. Some months ago a representative of an outstanding humanitarian American organization, the Emergency Committee to Save the Jewish People of Europe, was sent to Turkey on behalf of this committee to try to organize the rescue of Hebrews from the Balkan countries.

This representative, Mr. Eri Jabotinsky, went with the full approval of the President's War Refugee Board and of our own Department of State, which granted him the necessary exit visa and arranged for his priority on an Army bomber. I will not take up my colleagues' time to tell here of the valiant and important work which Mr. Jabotinsky did in Turkey, whose confidential reports to the War Refugee Board are available to the Members. Jabotinsky's work and program were in complete accord with America's policy of leadership and traditional stand of justice and aid for the persecuted.

Last week a cable was received from Mr. Jabotinsky stating that he was being forced to leave Turkey. This curious statement was cleared up by an Associated Press dispatch from Ankara, received on the 24th of February, explaining that Mr. Jabotinsky, in Turkey on a bona fide mission from the United States, had been "arrested and deported to British-controlled territory," and this report further stated that the deportation had nothing to do with our great ally and friend, Turkey.

It is with great indignation that I received this news, and, as an American citizen, I demand that a stop be put to such brazen and open interference with our foreign policy by an outside power. Since when has our foreign policy been dictated by another nation? I have already stated that the American organization which sent Mr. Jabotinsky on his mission has many supporters among Government officials and a good many of my colleagues have subscribed to the program of the emergency committee. Many of these leading Americans have instituted the proper measures to secure the release of Mr. Jabotinsky from British arrest and custody. One item which I should like to read before the House is a letter from one of the committee's cochairmen, Mr. Ben Hecht, to His Excellency the Earl of Halifax, British Ambassador to the United States, which will appear in the Appendix as an extension of my remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SOMERS of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a copy of a letter written by Mr. Ben Hecht, cochairman of the American League for a Free Palestine, to the British Ambassador to the United States, Lord Halifax.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there came to my office this morning one of the clearest, soundest, briefest discussions of economic law which has come to my notice.

This article is entitled "Federal Taxes and the Worker." It is taken from the Railroad Workers Journal and written by Robert B. Dresser. It is particularly important that every Member of this House have an opportunity, not only to read this splendid document but to have it where he can readily refer to it. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein this splendid article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of a letter from one of his constituents on the farm problem.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article entitled "War Destroying Europe's Middle Classes."

Mr. RILEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Columbia State.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the completion of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House this afternoon for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the president of the Northern Federation of Chambers of Commerce.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein an article published by the Florida Historical Society.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a certain letter which he had recently sent to Judge Vinson.

HURRAH FOR TEXAS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, this year on December 29 we will observe the one-hundredth anniversary of the annexation of the United States by the Republic of Texas, as all Texans in their innate modesty would have us believe. But today, the 2d of March, is Texas Independence Day.

We hail the State of Texas, large not only in area but great because of the character of its citizens, not the least among whom are those who honor themselves and their State by representing it in this Congress today. We do well to congratulate you and your constituents upon what you of the Lone Star State have accomplished over the years for yourselves, for the Nation, and for posterity.

As the representative of that other independent republic of yesteryear I share your pride in the fact that "independence was and is our boast." Vermonters agree that you have a right to be proud of the record your sons and daughters, true to the traditions of the fighting stock from which they come, have made throughout the years so crowded with honorable achievement.

May your Lone Star never set, but grow steadily brighter as it shines along the path of the future.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

MONUMENT IN HONOR OF THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill providing for a monument in honor of the Marine Corps. The bill provided that a photograph appearing in the Washington Post of last Wednesday be used as a model. Before I prepared the bill I called a newspaperman and asked how to identify the photograph. In the conversation he said, "Refer to the four marines." So I did. I thought myself there were four marines in that photograph. But later in the day when I received an enlarged photograph I found there were six marines in the photograph, so today I am introducing a new bill, using the words "six marines" instead of "four."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 28]

Allen, Ill.	Hancock	Ploeser
Andrews, Ala.	Hart	Powell
Barry	Hébert	Quinn, N. Y.
Bender	Hedrick	Rabin
Biemiller	Heffernan	Rains
Bishop	Heidinger	Randolph
Bland	Hill	Rich
Buckley	Holmes, Mass.	Rivers
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson,	Rowan
Cannon, Fla.	Luther A.	Sabath
Celler	Johnson,	Shafer
Clements	Lyndon B.	Sharp
Combs	Keefe	Sheridan
Curley	Keogh	Short
Dawson	King	Simpson, Ill.
Delaney,	Kopplemann	Smith, Maine
James J.	Landis	Snyder
Dickstein	Lane	Sumner, Ill.
Dingell	Latham	Talbot
Dirksen	LeCompte	Voorhis, Calif.
Douglas, Ill.	Lemke	Vursell
Drewry	Lynch	West
Eaton	McGlinchey	Wilson
Fenton	McKenzie	Winstead
Fogarty	Morrison	Woodrum, Va.
Gallagher	Murray, Tenn.	Zimmerman
Gamble	O'Hara	
Gearhart	Pa.man	
Geelan	Patterson	
Hall,	Pfeifer	
Leonard W.	Phillips	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 344 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a communication to the Farm Journal.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include House Concurrent Resolution No. 11 of the Michigan State Legislature.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two resolutions which he had introduced, and, secondly, to include certain articles from newspapers, and so forth.

Mrs. LUCE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a speech by Honorable Chih-Mai, counselor of the Chinese Embassy.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therewith two important letters on military training.

Mr. FULLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio interview on the farm draft.

Mr. RODGERS of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in Progressive, February 26, 1945, having to do with our colleague the Delegate from Alaska, BOB BARTLETT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

ALLEY DWELLING ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) and (b) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the 10-year period from October 9, 1934, to June 30, 1944, which includes the annual report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 1, 1945.*

REPORT ON PHYSIOGRAPHIC, ECONOMIC, AND OTHER RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE TENNESSEE AND CUMBERLAND RIVERS AND BETWEEN THEIR DRAINAGE AREAS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a copy of a communication from the Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority submitting a report entitled "A Report on the Physiographic, Economic, and Other Relationships Between the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers and Between Their Drainage Areas." This report was prepared at my request under the authority vested in the board of directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority by section 22 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act and Executive Order No. 6161 issued pursuant thereto.

The report points out the similarity and interrelationship between the problems of development of the resources of the Cumberland and Tennessee Valleys.

I have heretofore recommended to the Congress the enactment of legislation to bring the Cumberland River and its tributaries within the scope of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act. I take this opportunity to urge again that the Congress give consideration to the enactment of such legislation.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 2, 1945.*

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I move that the House resolve itself into Com-

mittee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2374) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2374, with Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

For the purpose of conducting the audit of all Government corporations as provided by section 5 of the act approved , Public, No. (S. 375, 79th Cong.), the Comptroller General authorized in his discretion to employ personal services by contract, or otherwise, without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes: *Provided*, That not more than 10 persons so employed may be compensated without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, only one of whom may be compensated at a rate of as much but not more than $10,000 per annum.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph on page 9 beginning in line 11 and ending on line 22 relating to the General Accounting Office on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Georgia reserve his point of order?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is an unusual provision in the bill, but it is in the bill to meet an unusual situation.

In the act of February 24, 1945, Public Law No. 4, there is laid upon the General Accounting Office an unusual burden. The Comptroller General is required by that legislation, so recently enacted that I could only secure a copy from the enrolling clerk, to audit all Government corporations. It is a stupendous task. The Comptroller General has indicated to me that there are scores of corporations involved.

This situation is further complicated by the fact that this audit is required to begin with the fiscal year 1945. Already 8 months have passed; only 4 months remain in which to make the audit, and it is necessary for him to secure these men and to secure them at once. Still further complicating the situation, men of special qualification are required; the Comptroller General must have certified public accountants, men of ability and experience. In order to get them, according to his statement which I submit, he must have some latitude in securing them as they can be recruited, and in record time.

Mr. Chairman, in order that the position of the General Accounting Office may be understood, I ask unanimous consent that the letter written by the Comptroller General of the United States may be read at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, March 2, 1945.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Because of its vital importance, I am taking the liberty of writing you concerning the provision on page 9 of the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1945, H. R. 2374, which, if enacted, will give me the authority to employ the necessary personnel to accomplish the audit of all Government corporations, as required by section 5 of Public Law 4 (S. 375), approved February 24, 1945. The provision of the first deficiency bill is as follows:

"For the purpose of conducting the audit of all Government corporations as provided by section 5 of the act approved , Public, No. (S. 375, 79th Cong.), the Comptroller General is authorized in his discretion to employ personal services by contract, or otherwise, without regard to the civil-service laws and regulations and section 3709 of the Revised Statutes: *Provided*, That not more than 10 persons so employed may be compensated without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, only 1 of whom may be compensated at a rate of as much as but not more than $10,000 per annum."

The report of your committee on H. R. 2374 states the need and purpose of this provision. However, I will outline briefly the reasons which make it so indispensable to the proper administration of this important and responsible new function of the General Accounting Office.

Section 5 of Public Law 4 provides that the financial transactions of all Government corporations shall be audited each fiscal year by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions, beginning with the current fiscal year, and that a report of each such audit shall be made to the Congress not later than the following January 15. The enactment of said section places a heavy burden on the General Accounting Office, but one which it should and will gladly undertake. The size and importance of this new audit duty is indicated by the fact that there are scores of Government corporations involved, which on June 30, 1943, had total assets of over $27,000,000,000 and total liabilities of over $22,000,000,000, according to the Report on Government Corporations issued last summer by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures (S. Doc. No. 227, 78th Cong.). This same report shows that on March 31, 1944, 7 of these corporations had outstanding obligations of $12,604,000,000, guaranteed by the United States, and 21 corporations or groups of corporations had outstanding loans of $6,568,000,000, and that on April 30, 1944, Government corporations had 67,912 employees. The operations of such corporations extend throughout the United States and reach into foreign countries. They cover almost every field of business, industry, and finance.

Although I have consistently advocated the audit of all Government corporations by the General Accounting Office as the agent of the Congress, only a few such corporations are now so audited, and there has been no opportunity to prepare for such a tremendous overnight expansion of this type of audit. The bills pending in the Senate (S. 469) and the House (H. R. 2051 and 2177), providing for financial control of Government corporations, all contemplate an audit beginning in the future, and until a few weeks ago there was no indication of any legislative action requiring such an early undertaking of the audit. As a result of the enactment of Public Law 4, the General Accounting Office will be required to audit the financial transactions of all Government corporations for the fiscal year 1945, more than 8 months of which have already elapsed. This leaves an exceedingly short time for the necessary organizing and staffing and for surveying the financial structure of the respective corporations in order to establish an efficient audit program.

The audit required by section 5 is a different type of operation than the regular governmental audit and requires personnel of different qualifications and training. The organization which is to perform it must have highly competent direction and a qualified staff of employees if the audit is to be performed effectively and produce the benefits which the Congress intended. In the present manpower situation it will be practically impossible to obtain a man of the caliber needed to head the organization, and to recruit qualified personnel in the required numbers without authority of the character proposed by the quoted provision of H. R. 2374. On the other hand, with such authority we will have the key to the problems of personnel, organization, and performance of the work.

I have not heretofore favored the granting of statutory authority to employ personnel without regard to the usual restrictions on such employment . In fact, I have repeatedly urged the Congress not to grant such authority except for the most cogent reasons. Moreover, I realize that the quoted provision is subject to a point of order. Yet similar authority has been freely granted to other departments and agencies in dozens of instances in appropriation acts for the current and prior fiscal years. I am moved to ask for it in this instance because of the great emergency which the General Accounting Office faces in carrying out the audit duties now imposed on it by law, and because I feel I would be remiss if I did not come to the Congress as quickly as possible, report the situation, and suggest a solution. The pending deficiency bill, I believe, offers the earliest opportunity of enactment of a provision to help solve this pressing problem. Attention is invited to the fact that although authorized by section 5 of Public Law 4, no additional appropriation for this work is being sought or is necessary at this time.

In this instance I strongly hope that the House will be led by its spirit of fairness and its desire for effective results to approve the provision and provide a means which will better enable the General Accounting Office to perform the duties prescribed by section 5 of Public Law 4.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I trust that after hearing the conclusive and convincing reasons given by the Comptroller General in support of his request for the inclusion of this provision in the bill the gentleman from Georgia will determine not to press his point of order. If he insists on the point of order it must be conceded under the rules.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I have conferred this morning with Mr. Frank Yates, Assistant Comptroller General, with reference to this matter. I am satisfied that it can be worked out by regulation with the Civil Service Commission. The provision proposed to be enacted in this bill is not temporary legislation, not limited as to time or number or as to type of position. It is a blanket, wide-open-door exemption from Civil Service for the purpose of auditing the accounts of these corporations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. If the words "during the fiscal year 1945" were placed ahead of the word "for" on line 12, would that not meet the objection raised with reference to that particular paragraph? That would avoid its being permanent legislation.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I could not agree to that, and I will explain why.

We recently passed a Veterans' Preference Act, in the Seventy-eighth Congress. We promised the veterans of this country that they would have preference where they were qualified for positions in the Federal Service. They cannot get that preference if we exempt the positions from civil-service procedures. I voted for that act in good faith. As far as it lies within my power, I am not going to permit it to be evaded by anybody at any time. We either meant what we said in that act or we did not, and I think we ought to stick by it.

The Civil Service Commission has authority with the approval of the President of the United States to make exceptions wherever they are necessary. Of course, we all know Lindsay Warren. We all love him. I would rather trust him with an exception of this sort than anybody I know of. But we have just been through an experience in this Congress which indicates the fallacy of legislating on the theory that a particular man is going to discharge a particular duty. We had to undo something we did when we placed the loan agencies, which this also affects, in the hands of the Department of Commerce because Mr. Jesse Jones was going to be Secretary of Commerce. Let us not make the same mistake again.

I wish to point out not only to the committee but to Mr. Warren himself that the War and Navy Departments, the W. P. B., and the O. P. A., all through this war emergency have been operating under civil-service procedure and have employed literally hundreds of thousands of people, many of whom are expert engineers, accountants, auditors, and specialists of all kinds. The same thing can be done to meet this emergency. I am quite sure the Commission will cooperate with Mr. Warren in solving his problem.

I have no objection to the exemption of the head of the new auditing section he is going to set up from the Classification Act. It will take a high-class man and they ought to have one, and they are going to have to pay him to get him. I am quite sure those things can be worked out. But, Mr. Chairman, I must insist upon my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia makes a point of order against the paragraph he pointed out. The gentleman from Missouri concedes the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: On page 9, after line 10, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"For the purpose of conducting the audit of all Government corporations as provided by section 5 of the act approved February 24, 1945, Public, No. 4, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Comptroller General is authorized in his discretion to employ not more than 10 persons without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, only one of whom may be compensated at a rate of as much as but not more than $10,000 per annum."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides for the employment of a maximum of 10 men without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act, to undertake and direct this new and highly important work. I trust it meets with the approval of the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

War housing: For an additional amount to carry out the purposes of title I of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 9), and subject to the applicable provisions of the joint resolution approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1115), $84,373,000, to remain available during the continuance of the unlimited national emergency declared by the President on May 27, 1941, but not to be available for obligation for new projects after June 30, 1945.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 10, line 12, before the period insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided*, That all obligations of this additional appropriation for projects in which (1) the War Department has a paramount interest shall first be jointly authorized in writing by the Secretary of War and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, (2) the Navy Department has a paramount interest shall first be jointly authorized in writing by the Secretary of the Navy and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, (3) the War and Navy Departments have a joint interest, direct or indirect, which they shall be presumed to have as to all projects in which the interest of either Department is not paramount, shall first be jointly authorized in writing by the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this proposal in a modified form was considered at some length by the subcommittee when drafting the bill under consideration. We have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 10, line 9, after the figures "$84,373,000", insert a comma and the following language: "Of which amount not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available for administrative expenses."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 10, line 9, strike out "$84,373,000" and insert "$42,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment, not because it cuts the amount down to what I think it should be, but because I believe it is a compromise and perhaps the House might be willing to go along on some kind of logical approach to the problem. The whole set-up here is pretty bad. The housing that has been built has been terribly expensive and poorly designed, and it has not been of the character which it should be, for the amount of money that we have dumped into it. This proposal is to cut the figure down to $42,000,000. This would permit them to put in stop-gap houses and have them ready in any spot in the United States in 60 days. It would permit putting in as many as are asked for here.

The most peculiar thing about this set-up is that whereas in previous bills they have told us they were going to put in a lot of trailer and stopgap units, here they come and state they are only going to put in a thousand out of a total of 30,000 of that character of units. It is perfectly ridiculous, because regardless of how long the war continues, we will do much better if we have to step up construction in some of these places, if we put in these trailers and quick construction jobs.

I called attention to the fact yesterday that there is no need of any such quantity of housing as they have set up. In some places where they anticipated an increase of approximately two or three hundred families over what they had on the 1st of January, they have units totaling at least 500, and they have 2,000 under construction. It just does not make sense under any kind of analysis.

I hope the Committee will adopt this amendment and save the Government $42,000,000. It will help the war effort, because it will prevent so much of the labor in those critical areas being diverted to construction jobs which will require from 3 to 6 months to complete, and which will require a great deal of labor.

I hope the Committee will adopt this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there are two war fronts, the battle front and the home front. And the home front is as important as the battle front. Unless we supply our men with ample munitions and equipment they cannot win the war.

The truth about the matter is this is a war of production. That nation which produces materials of war more effectively and most rapidly will win the war. Up to this time we have won it not only through the superior courage and stamina of our troops but, also, through our superior production.

Now, we cannot produce munitions without workmen. We cannot have workmen unless we provide them with housing accommodations. This appropriation is to provide the necessary housing accommodations. This appropriation is to sustain the home front.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a haphazard estimate. It is not a blanket, over-all appropriation to be allocated and disbursed at the will of the National Housing Agency. The estimate was presented, item by item, specifically, for constructing or providing housing exactly where it is needed. May I submit the testimony of the most dependable authority on this question, namely, Under Secretary of War Patterson. He appeared before our committee in support of the estimate and we went into the matter very exhaustively with him. Among other things he said: "If we cannot offer housing, we are and shall continue to be unable to recruit sufficient labor to turn out the required production."

In other words, he says unless we can provide the housing for which we are making this appropriation we cannot get munitions across to the fighting forces where they are needed and where our American chiefs of staff and our Allied commanders are expecting them and planning to use them. That in itself justifies the appropriation, but let us go a bit further. He says:

> It is known that there is now and for some time to come will continue to be a serious manpower shortage.

You cannot supply that shortage if there is no place for the workmen to live, no place for their families to live when they are recruited for the job; without these elemental facilities, they will not stay, they cannot stay.

I wish there were time to include in the RECORD portions of other pertinent statements by Secretary Patterson, but let me add one statement by Vice Admiral Moreell. Admiral Moreell said, and he is specific, just as this entire appropriation is for specific needs.

> The units which we are asking for now are to take care of an increase of 44,331 employees.

Not "so many thousand" on a rough guess, but the exact number actually needed to carry out our part of this war program—to support the men now on the other side—we need and must have on this one factory front alone, 44,331 employees. These men cannot be employed unless this money is provided.

Mr. Chairman, we have already cut this item to the bone. The estimate submitted to us was for $90,000,000. We have included it in the bill as $84,000,000 due to the fact that we found duplication in the estimates. We found the same items estimated under the Navy funds and, under the housing funds, items which were identical. Again, after a resurvey the Navy reported, for example, that in the Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va., Navy Yard they would be able to get along without the appropriation originally requested. So we have already reduced this appropriation to the irreducible minimum. What remains is necessary in order to keep faith with the men fighting on the other side.

I trust the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the House first to the fact that on this item there is a reduction made by the committee of $5,627,000. The committee considered this estimate very carefully. We tried to secure the most complete information, from the most responsible witnesses. Judge Patterson came before the committee and testified that this amount was absolutely essential. I for one do not see how we could go much further than we have gone in the way of a cut.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The only cuts that were made, of course, were where I found in cross-examining Admiral Moreell a group of projects that were duplicates in the Navy estimate and in this estimate.

Mr. O'NEAL. But the amount was reduced. The gentleman is to be commended for discovering the discrepencies. I think it was a very fine piece of work. The fact remains, however, that we reduced it $5,627,000. Certainly Judge Patterson is not going to come before us and advocate something so wild that the item can be cut 50 percent as the gentleman from New York suggests. Furthermore, Admiral Moreell, who is entirely reliable, testified at great length and was willing to answer questions about any individual item in this request. After going all the way through it, supported by other representatives of the Army and Navy the committee thought this amount was necessary.

Mr. Chairman, there is another thing we should consider in this matter. On page 163 of the hearings there is a list of all the projects. There is a man in this House representing every State mentioned in this list and every district in which a project is located.

Mr. Chairman, because expenditures are going into Members' districts, they will not sit here, as honorable Members of this body, and allow wanton, wild, and reckless spending, possibly twice what we need, and if there is anyone here from the State of Alabama, from Alaska, Arizona, California, and all the other States mentioned, who feels that this is too much and it is a waste of money to proceed with these projects, he should come forward and tell the committee that this is a wild estimate or that the housing is not needed. There is nothing in here for Kentucky, but I happen to know something about one of the items for Indiana. They are asking for 550 units. They are putting up another $28,000,000 powder plant over there. It is being constructed out in a little community, many miles from a large community. When I say "many" I mean 15 or 20 miles. The larger community is fully occupied and lacks housing for its needs. But certainly with $23,000,000 to be expended there for this powder plant, something has to be done to take care of the people who are to run the plant and even those who are going to construct it. Therefore, when the Army and Navy come up here and give testimony as to their needs, when we have first-hand information from Members of Congress who say by their silence, if not by their audible expression, that this is needed, it is in the interest of doing a proper job for the war and we should not make the drastic cut proposed by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment, which proposes to reduce the estimate of $84,373,000 by one-half, strikes at the very heart of production.

Last summer and fall I had the opportunity to personally investigate the housing conditions in the San Francisco Bay area. I saw conditions of squalor created through lack of adequate housing to take care of the tremendous increase in population of workers and their families that have no place in American life.

ONE OF THE GREATEST PORTS OF EMBARKATION

San Francisco is one of the world's greatest ports of embarkation. As the war in Europe comes to its climax and begins to drop off, the war in the Pacific will increase in proportion and San Francisco and the entire San Francisco Bay area will be called upon to further tremendously increase its activity. Shipping will increase; greatly increased quantities of war supplies will flow to our fighting men through the Golden Gate. If these vital war cargoes are to move smoothly and swiftly to our men, steps must be immediately taken to properly house the workers who will handle those supplies.

All shipping is under the control of the Federal Government, and only the Federal Government can meet the emergency to provide these homes.

PROBLEM GROWING IN INTENSITY

This is a problem that has been growing in intensity from the outset of the war. It has passed the denomination of "need" and has reached the point of emergency. Various governmental agencies interested in the war effort have made surveys of these conditions and the housing needs. They have made various recommendations as of the dates of their investigations. With continuously increasing numbers of workingmen being recruited, particularly longshoremen and warehousemen, who handle these vital war materials, the requirements have become more urgent.

The situation has become so serious that notwithstanding the urgent need for increasing the number of men recruited as longshoremen and warehousemen, the Joint Employer-Union Recruiting Agency operated in San Francisco was forced to turn down 107 applicants between January 5 and 31, 1945, because adequate housing to care for them and their families was not available.

TWO THOUSAND FAMILY UNITS URGENTLY NEEDED NOW

It has been recommended by representatives of the Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union who are probably in a better position to know the needs than any other group, that some 2,000 family units are urgently needed now. The longshoremen and warehousemen have responded faithfully to the Nation's needs in speedily loading our ships with war supplies so necessary to the success of our fighting forces.

I strongly urge upon the committee that it favorably consider a sufficient appropriation to properly relieve this deplorable situation.

I offer for the RECORD the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 17, 1945.*
Congressman RICHARD J. WELCH,
United States House of Representatives:
This board and the War Shipping Administration are deeply concerned over the serious and continuing shortage of housing for longshoremen in the San Francisco Bay area. It has become necessary in recruiting new men for longshore employment in order to meet increasing demand on this port to insist that only men already in possession of housing will be accepted for the industry under today's conditions. This seriously limits our ability to expand port labor supply and to meet considerable expanding needs for additional longshore labor. In view of this situation I trust that every effort will be made to obtain concurrence in proposal that maximum suggested funds be appropriated to provide new construction of housing in the San Francisco Bay area.

PACIFIC COAST MARITIME INDUSTRY BOARD.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, we all realize that in every theater of this war the offensive of the Allied Powers is being stepped up. The termination of hostilities will be determined in the matter of time by the success of those operations.

It is very natural that this enlarged scale of warfare requires greater production, and greater production can be had only through the efforts of the men and the women who produce these various articles in the plants that are scattered over this country. They cannot produce those articles or work in those plants unless they have some place in which to live.

Many of these projects which must be either created or enlarged are necessarily in rural areas because of the danger involved in the operation and the character of the output. Consequently housing is necessary. Under the provisions of the act this housing is all temporary and must be salvaged and removed to get out of the way of private enterprise when the war is over.

May I call your attention to some statements made by Judge Patterson before the Committee on Appropriations with reference to the intensified nature of our present operations. On page 169 of the hearings, after reciting the urgent necessity for this housing, and after the identical places of the allocations had been given, he had this to say:

Production of all heavy field artillery ammunition must be increased by 89 percent.

Small-arms ammunition schedules call for a 50-percent increase.

Our plans call for 24 percent more production of heavy artillery and replacement components; 19 percent more tanks must be delivered. Further increases are likely.

Production of heavy-heavy trucks, over 2½ tons, must be increased by 12 percent. Light-heavy trucks, 2½ tons, production was 12.9 percent below schedule for the last half of 1944 and at the end of the year stocks on hand were 65 percent below authorized stock levels and current unfilled demands.

That is because we could not possibly make enough last year.

Output of air-borne radar must be 31.9 percent greater.

Production of field and assault wire must be increased by 50 percent. Deliveries of dry-cell batteries are scheduled to be increased by 27 percent.

Production of cotton duck is expected to be 12 percent greater during the first quarter of 1945 than during the last quarter of 1944 and still will fall about 25 percent short of the current requirements, without taking into account previous deficits.

Heavy-duty truck-tire production for the first quarter of 1945 is scheduled at nearly 13 percent in excess of output in the fourth quarter of 1944.

Output of critical aircraft, including B-29 heavy bombers and A-26 attack bombers, must be sharply increased during the first 6 months of 1945. Requirements for many of these planes are practically unlimited.

And so forth. In other words, this is simply an effort to enable those on the home front to see that these boys who are fighting so bravely in the various theaters of war, on land, on sea, and in the air, may have the equipment of every character that they need to carry on their respective tasks.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that is pending before us seeks to cut this appropriation in half in fact, it takes off, I believe, a little more than half of it.

I cannot speak for the various projects throughout the country but I do know something about one of these projects, and I want to localize my remarks to that particular project, and that is the one at Huntsville, Ala., calling for 500 family units and 300 dormitory units.

May I say here that the only housing projects carried in this bill for the State of Alabama are those units in my district and units at three different places in the district so ably represented by my colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], who I know can very well speak for the urgency of the housing at those three particular places.

At Huntsville ammunition is being made every day for our fighting forces. It was a great thrill to me recently when I was in Belgium to run upon a young ordnance officer who, finding out that I was from Huntsville, said "You would be pleased to see the amount of ammunition we handle out here that comes directly from Huntsville."

I have visited at Huntsville, both the Huntsville Arsenal and Redstone Arsenal, a great many times when I have been back home. I have seen the products they are making. I have heard told the story of how a great amount of certain types of ammunition was flown by plane at the time of our invasion of north Africa.

Only recently those facilities have been expanded. Redstone Arsenal is in the process of being further expanded now. I had a letter just yesterday from the commanding officer of the Redstone Arsenal telling me how badly the housing is needed there. When we go back into the House I intend to ask permission to include at this point that letter from Colonel Hudson, the commanding officer at Redstone. He tells me they are going to have to employ a great many additional workers. There is absolutely no unoccupied housing there. The people are going to have to be brought in there, a great many of them, in order to fill the needs in stepping up the production that is required in that particular plant. You cannot bring them in and just expect them to camp by the side of the road. Housing must be provided, and there is no way of getting the housing down there except through this program that has been proposed. I do not know whether other districts can stand to have their housing projects cut in half, but I do know that this project cannot be cut in two if we are to produce there the munitions of war we are expected to produce.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. May I point out that a large number of industrialists appeared before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds during its hearings, and they told us that one of the largest causes of labor turn-over is lack of adequate housing for the employees. I know for a fact that is true in the gentleman's district.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure that is correct. I, for one, would not advocate the building of a single house we do not need. I certainly would not advocate wasteful housing or housing that is going to be left to form ghost towns when the war is over. But I know that we cannot produce the goods of war at the Huntsville Arsenal and at the Redstone Arsenal unless we have housing. I would suggest that if there is any Member from any district covered by these housing projects who can have his project cut half in two and still do the job, he get up here and tell the House so.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. I can testify that this is so inadequate that we will need just about double the quantity that is carried in this bill without any cut whatsoever.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should not be at all surprised to know that that is true.

The letter from Colonel Hudson, referred to above, follows:

ARMY SERVICE FORCES,
REDSTONE ARSENAL,
Huntsville, Ala., February 27, 1945.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: I appreciate your support before the House Appropriations Committee on behalf of additional housing needed at Redstone Park. As you know, it has become impossible to obtain any kind of housing accommodations in and around Huntsville. Because of this situation representatives of the N. H. A., on completion of their housing survey last month, recommended the expansion of Redstone Park.

We are starting the construction of a new production line and are doing considerable expansion work in existing facilities to provide for our increase in production schedules this year. The expansion program includes mechanization of the present production lines which will not only increase productive capacity but also efficiency of operations. In other words, fewer man-hours will be required per unit produced. We have had a pretty bad siege of weather since the first of the year which has delayed construction progress. I am hopeful, however, that by the end of June the new line will be substantially completed, as it now appears that it will have to be put into operation by then to meet production schedules.

The employment situation is becoming more critical every day. Farm labor is beginning to return to the farm, and it is going to take an all-out effort on the part of W. M. C. and U. S. E. S. to recruit enough employees to keep pace with our requirements. Our employment is now 4,411 and must be increased to over 5,000 by summer. Replacements necessary because of turn-over, including those returning to farms, are added to these requirements.

I know that you will be interested in seeing the improvements now under way, and I hope it won't be long before I will have the opportunity of showing them to you. Your continued interest in activities concerning the arsenal is greatly appreciated.

With best of wishes and kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,
CARROLL D. HUDSON,
Colonel, Ordnance Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 17 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD for the purpose of justifying the action of the subcommittee on the item of national housing in this first deficiency bill. A perfect explanation of the figures is set forth on pages 6 and 7 of the report which under leave granted me I insert at this time:

Title I of the Lanham Act of October 14, 1940, as amended, authorized an appropriation of $1,500,000,000 for the purpose of meeting acute housing shortages for industrial workers and for families and civilian personnel of the Army and Navy and civilian employees of the United States Maritime Commission. There has been appropriated against such authorization $1,380,000,000, and as of January 31, 1945, there remained available for further programing but $7,878, which assumes definitely obligating all projects in the commitment category.

The Budget has proposed an additional appropriation of $90,000,000, all of which is earmarked for presently known needs for immediate purposes. These are set forth in the tabular matter on pages 163–164 of the hearings.

Of the total additional amount requested, approximately $40,000,000 is intended for meeting needs sponsored by the Army and about $29,000,000 has Navy sponsorship. These needs were justified to the committee by Under Secretary of War Patterson and Vice Admiral Moreell, respectively. The remaining amount of the estimate is for providing "must" housing in industrial areas and on account of commercial activities in which both the Army and Navy have a single or dual interest.

The committee is recommending an appropriation of $84,373,000. The reduction of $5,627,000 is responsive to these factors: (1) The Navy had made provision in its own supplemental estimates for the instant bill for 700 family type units at the naval ammunition depot, Hastings, Nebr. The amount involved is $2,520,000. That amount has been deducted from the estimate under this head and is provided for under the Navy head. (2) A Navy restudy, according to a communication the committee has from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, dated February 21, 1945, has indicated a probable lessened need in the Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va., area, which would release $5,800,000 of the $90,000,000 estimate. The committee has taken off half of such released amount, allowing the remaining half ($2,900,000) for providing 1,000 units in Honolulu, where an acute housing shortage exists which is hampering the operation of vital military installations. One thousand units have already been programed for Hawaii out of funds heretofore made available.

The Administrator of the National Housing Agency has assured the committee that the instant proposal applies to projects which are not susceptible of private financing and that privately financed construction is availed of to the utmost.

Furthermore, as the members of the subcommittee know, it was impossible for me to be present during much of the hearings on this particular bill. My absence resulted from the necessity for appearance on my own subcommittee on appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, Justice, and the Judiciary. However, I did take leave from my subcommittee in order to be present at some of the testimony for the National Housing Agency. The record will reveal under a subcaption, "Housing for the Detroit Area"—page 212—the following statement in reply to my question as to Detroit being a critical area:

Mr. BLANDFORD. We have had a very serious situation in Detroit, particularly with respect to the Negro families. There has been an increase in the Negro population in Detroit during the war, about 70,000 persons. I think it is estimated there are about 20,000 families, and that has imposed upon us there a rather unsatisfactory housing condition, with considerable congestion, and we have been only able to finance and provide about 5,000 units.

I think those two facts indicate the seriousness of the congestion. Had conditions been better we would have done more, except for the practical problem of finding sites for such housing. It has reached the point which I think is rather serious and it has handicapped the war effort, but we are asking for another 1,000 units to at least give some relief to that situation.

Mr. RABAUT. Are those temporary or permanent units?

Mr. BLANDFORD. We have half a dozen older units which have caused us very deep concern. They would be temporary units.

The Citizens Housing Planning Council of Detroit has been cooperating with us, and the Detroit Victory Council has been a very important agency in helping us.

The Urban League, the Great Lakes Steel Corporation, and the Congress of Industrial Workers have all written in strongly urging that something be done to relieve the congestion.

Mr. RABAUT. How much have you in this bill for Detroit?

Mr. BLANDFORD. We have 1,000 units, Mr. RABAUT. It should be more, but I think we will have a time finding sites for them.

Mr. RABAUT. You are looking that situation over and doing everything you can?

Mr. BLANDFORD. Yes, sir; we are trying to keep in touch with that situation constantly. We would like to move on this immediately.

Mr. RABAUT. I think you will find sympathetic consideration given by the committee.

I have two of these letters which Mr. Blandford has received which I should like to put into the record following my remarks. One of them is from the Great Lakes Steel Corporation, and the second one is from the United Automobile-Aircraft-Agricultural Implement Workers of America.

Mr. CANNON. You may include them as a part of your remarks.

(The letters referred to are as follows:)

GREAT LAKES STEEL
CORPORATION,
DIVISION OF NATIONAL
STEEL CORPORATION,
Ecorse, Detroit, Mich., February 5, 1945.

Mr. JOHN B. BLANDFORD, Jr.,
Administrator, National Housing
Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We understand there are prospects for a new housing project in the southwest district of Detroit, or what is known as the down river district of metropolitan Detroit.

Industries in the down river district realize the necessity for relief from the housing scarcity. The Great Lakes Steel Corporation, being the biggest industry in this district, has had tremendous difficulty in the last 3 years in finding shelter for its employees.

We are totally engaged in war work and have in the neighborhood of 3,000 men in the services. We have held a high priority with the War Manpower Commission and have had to depend entirely on in-migrants. Our labor turn-over has been exceptionally high because of the lack of housing, and the shortage of labor has created many problems. We find that many men who would have liked to work for us cannot do so because they cannot find housing. At the present time among our employees alone there is a demand for approximately 1,500 homes, both white and nonwhite.

The above-mentioned conditions have been aggravated because of the congested transportation and we feel sure that if the housing is located in the down river district, both industry and the war effort will benefit.

Hoping the project will materialize, I am,

Very truly yours,
GREAT LAKES STEEL CORPORATION,
J. E. FINK,
Vice President in Charge of Operations.

UNITED AUTOMOBILE-
AIRCRAFT-AGRICULTURAL
IMPLEMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Detroit, Mich., January 27, 1945.

Mr. JOHN B. BLANDFORD, Jr.,
Administrator, National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BLANDFORD: As you know, our organization has been actively interested in the war-housing problems of congested production areas, and has always sought to be of help in effecting solutions to these problems.

In the spirit of desiring to be helpful to you, therefore, I take this occasion to call to your attention the plight of our Negro war workers in Detroit with respect to the question of housing.

You know also that the lack of adequate, healthy, and safe housing for all workers has more or less always been one of Detroit's major problems even before the war. With the war and the sharply increased tempo of production and the great influx of new workers, you can readily understand the impact on Detrot and its already inadequate housing supply. The lack of decent housing for Negroes, of course, has been chronic for many years. You can easily understand, too, what the effect here was when you consider that as a general practice Negroes are forced to find homes in rigidly defined geographical areas that had reached the saturation point years ago insofar as decent housing was concerned. This fact, coupled with the fact that Detroit's Negro population since 1940 has increased by nearly 70,000 persons and with in-migration continuing at the rate of nearly 1,000 families monthly, serves to indicate the utter seriousness of the problem. I think, too, that you will readily agree that provision of housing for Negroes has not kept pace with the population expansion. I understand that in 1944 alone over 7,000 Negro families made application with the local war-housing center for housing with about 1,400 being provided for. This does not take into account the great many thousands that had applied in previous years and for which housing has yet to be provided. I understand the total backlog of applicants still unprovided for by the war-housing center approximates 15,000.

I need not dwell any longer on the seriousness of this situation, since the facts speak for themselves. My immediate concern, of course, is with the effect this problem is having on war-production schedules, what with the lowered worker morale, lost work days because of house hunting and the tensions consequent of situations of this nature.

I cannot say strongly enough how vitally important it is that the National Housing Agency immediately take whatever steps are possible to alleviate Detroit's acute housing problem. In line with this, I would recommend the immediate announcement by your Agency of the programing of at least 3,000 additional temporary war-housing family units by public construction, and 1,500 to 2,000 H-2 or title 6 units.

I feel that nothing short of this sort of a minimum program being announced immediately can prevent a serious break-down here in civilian morale and ultimately reflect itself in lowered production of vital war implements.

Sincerely yours,
R. J. THOMAS, *President.*

Mr. Chairman, as one of my colleagues so aptly put it this afternoon, there are two fronts to the war—the fighting front and the production front. Housing is necessary to the production front. It is justified by officials of the Army, Navy, merchant marine, and leaders of industry, as well as labor. It is an expense resulting from the problems of war, and for these reasons, Mr. Chairman, the appropriation should be sustained.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to the pending amendment. It would cut the deficiency housing appropriation in half.

I have here a letter from the Seattle Chamber of Commerce which tells directly of our need for housing in that Pacific coast war-production center:

SEATTLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1945.

Hon. HUGH DE LACY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DE LACY: Numerous telegrams and letters from the Seattle Chamber of Commerce informs me that a very critical situation exists in the Puget Sound area because of the housing shortage.

With the increasing traffic to the Central and South Pacific, a large part of which moves through the ports of Seattle and Tacoma, the present condition will be greatly aggravated unless immediate relief is given.

Although there is now a labor shortage of approximately 26,000, an additional number of workmen will be needed as the war against the Japanese will demand a still increasing amount of supplies and men.

To relieve the situation as it now exists, a total of 6,288 units has been approved by the various branches of the National Housing Agency, but construction cannot be commenced until the necessary money has been appropriated by Congress.

We strongly urge you to do everything within your power to bring about an alleviation of this alarming situation.

With best wishes, I am
Very truly yours,
SEATTLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
By J. J. UNDERWOOD,
Manager, Washington, D. C., Headquarters.

Mr. Chairman, housing projects are not built unless they are needed to boost war production. Appearing before the committee, the Secretary of War, the Honorable Judge Patterson, testified as follows—page 170:

The War Department is convinced that it cannot recruit the necessary labor forces without provision for additional housing. Whether or not the May-Bailey bill is enacted, we cannot expect these people, whom we must employ, to move into areas in which there is no decent housing available to them. * * * Our conclusions have been reached in consultation with, and are concurred in by the War Manpower Commission, National Housing Agency, and the other governmental agencies which have studied the problem. They all agree that there must be more housing provided immediately if war production is to be carried on at the rate it must be.

The projects scheduled for construction are needed.

Cutting the appropriation in half will cripple an important war activity.

Thousands of workers and their families are without decent shelter in the Seattle area now. We should not add to the difficulties these patriotic men and women labor under.

It is our business to reduce those difficulties.

I hope and am confident that the amendment will be voted down and the total appropriation, $90,000,000, small enough in itself, will be approved.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York who offered this amendment is one of the ablest, most earnest, zealous, and helpful Members of the House. We agree with him that it would be criminal extravagance to appropriate money for building a single housing unit that was not absolutely necessary. But which of these has not been justified by proof in the hearings that they are so needed? We know the conditions in our own districts. It is not a question of desiring temporary housing for the sake of getting it, but for the sake of getting war work done. Consider the housing units that are to be built in my district. One of the largest ammunition factories in the world. Production must be increased to insure adequate supply for our fighting men. More workers are needed. We must have homes to hold the ones we now have and others for the new employees. It is impossible to get places for the people to live.

At Talladega they have just recently enlarged that plant. As a matter of necessity, at the insistence of the War Department, they are building an additional plant and are crying for additional workers, and there is no place to put them. I was there the other night when people were sleeping in the chairs in hotel lobbies and every room was packed. There are no houses of any kind for rent. Therefore, under those conditions, the War Department has to certify that these additional facilities are necessary. The situation is the same in the other places. In Anniston right now, realizing the need which will be only partially supplied by this appropriation, if it is not cut down, a committee of private citizens is seeking ways and means to build other housing units with private funds, over and above those contemplated in making the full amount of the appropriation now in this bill.

The funds carried in this bill will be inadequate, but without this aid there is no hope of relieving the desperate housing shortage which exists there. So, in each of the three plants for which I am speaking, why, to cut this item a penny would be a crime, and it is not going to be anywhere near sufficient even if every dime of it is appropriated.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I yield always, and gladly.

Mr. TABER. I have had some experience with this outfit. They came up in my territory, and they spent three or four million dollars building a great number of houses. They were very poorly designed. Nobody could live in them. Finally they turned them into a stockade for German prisoners of war. That is the way it has worked out up in our territory. I find that in so many places that I feel it is being run very, very badly and loosely.

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to have the pleasure of yielding again to the dis-

tinguished gentleman from New York, and I am always happy to do so. I appreciate his testimony. If we had had spent in our districts, where the need is absolutely so great as to be pathetic, the money that was spent in his district, which has proven not to have been so necessary, then we would not be here as we are today, pleading with you not to cut this meager appropriation by one dime.

We are trying to supplement, out of private funds because of the absolute necessity, not having had the generous appropriation that has been given to the District so ably represented by the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TOLAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. Nothing could give me greater pleasure than to yield to my distinguished colleague and fellow committee member from California.

Mr. TOLAN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if he thinks we can separate the Army and Navy front from the home front of production? Are they not inseparable?

Mr. HOBBS. Absolutely; they are inseparable.

Mr. TOLAN. Poor housing, insufficient housing, strikes at the very heart of the home-front production; does it not?

Mr. HOBBS. Certainly, sir. The gentleman knows, and so do those of us who are familiar with the great need this deficiency bill seeks to subserve, that there is nothing more lethal to our war effort than to have cramped quarters or no quarters at all for the men who are fighting the battle on the home front.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I have no personal knowledge of the projects covered by this proposed appropriation with the exception of one located between Marietta and Atlanta in the State of Georgia where the Army built an aircraft plant which is now operated by the Bell Co.

As of about the end of last year the Bell Co. was employing in that plant some 25,000 people. They are making B–29 bombers. On account of the accelerated program for the production of that type of aircraft they have been instructed to employ 4,000 additional people.

There is no housing available either in Atlanta or Marietta. Marietta was a city, before this plant went there, of about 8,000 people. The housing situation in Atlanta has been very bad for a considerable length of time.

This bill, as I understand it, would provide a thousand units in the neighborhood of that plant. While they will not be built in my district—they will be built in the district of my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], perhaps if they are built near the plant—but they will serve a purpose which is absolutely essential if we are to have these additional 4,000 workers engaged in the production of B–29 bombers.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is Marietta a part of Atlanta?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; it is not; it is the county seat of Cobb County, located 20 miles northwest of the center of Atlanta.

Mr. TABER. Two projects submitted here: One in Atlanta and one in Valdosta. That is all I know of in Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. This is the Bell plant, the Atlanta item. They have it under the heading of Atlanta. Valdosta is 200 miles southwest of Atlanta in an entirely different part of the State.

This is something that is absolutely essential. I have seen pictures within recent weeks of workers sleeping on benches in public buildings near this plant in Marietta. If we expect to get these additional workers and get the additional planes which are doing such an effective job out in the Pacific, we must have this housing. While I do not know anything about the other projects, I hope the amount will not be cut and that the amendment will be defeated, because I think we need the full amount recommended by the committee.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. HOBBS. I should like to ask the gentleman if he knows of any strikes in Atlanta or in that area?

Mr. RAMSPECK. We have had no strikes so far as I know in any war plant in the State of Georgia since the no-strike pledge was entered into.

Mr. HOBBS. I should like to say to the gentleman from Georgia that as far as my own district is concerned it gives me pleasure to pay the same tribute to organized labor which has done such a splendid work in all of our war plants. Every single project has been built on time without a moment's stoppage of work, and every single one of them has been done ahead of schedule and within the estimate. No increase in initiation fee nor dues has been charged by any labor union in the Fourth Congressional District of Alabama.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I understand that these workers in the Bell plant are doing an excellent job, a great many of them coming there without any training, were trained after they came to Atlanta. They came from all over Georgia and the other Southern States, and some even from as far away as New York where the Bell people trained them and sent them down there. Most of them are native Georgians who have sons or brothers in the Army or the Navy and they are interested in this job. They do need a place in which to live.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore oppose the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MURPHY] is recognized.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to vote for the pending amendment. There is an evil which exists, nevertheless, I believe the housing projects which are asked for in this appropriation should be allowed.

The vice is more fundamental. The mistake that has been made was in putting these projects in places where there are no homes and neglecting other places where there are homes. That was the mistake. It is the obligation of the proper committee of this House, in my opinion, to look over this assignment of contracts and see that they are allotted to places where there are thousands of housing units, to places with thousands of empty homes not being utilized.

I shall vote against this amendment but I hope those in authority will in the future endeavor in assigning the contracts to put them not in glutted areas, not in areas where there is no housing, but will take care of the surplus labor areas of the country and areas where there is adequate housing.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 47, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 10, line 12, after the amendment previously adopted, insert *"Provided*, That funds appropriated herein under this head shall not be available for expenditure where private builders are able, ready, and willing to supply the housing needed at rates satisfactory to the area-rent-control authorities and provided, that for this purpose a resolution by the local governing body of the community where the project is to be located will be accepted as evidence of the availability or nonavailability of private financing and construction."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I must lodge a point of order against the amendment. It is legislation on an appropriation bill. It is not admissible under the Holman rule because it involves executive discretion and does not show patent retrenchment on the face of it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold the point of order for a minute?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad to withhold the point of order temporarily.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of offering this amendment is to place before the committee the need for giving greater consideration to the possibility of private construction. The amendment suggested itself to me because of an instance where the manager for the housing people proposed construction of a public housing project and the people in that community said to me: "If this housing is needed, there are plenty of people in this community who are ready, willing, and desirous of financing it. There is no need for the Government to provide money to come in here and finance a public-housing project."

I asked then, "Are you willing to build it and abide by the rent-control rules

that they have set up here?" They said, "Yes."

Subsequently the Housing Authority decided that there was no housing needed in that particular community, and the Government was saved the expenditure. I have no doubt that there are other places where private funds are available for building all the housing needed.

The amendment would in no way cripple the construction of public housing where it is needed, but it would insure the use of private funds where they are available. While I recognize that a point of order may be lodged against the amendment, I was hoping that because of its merits the point would not be pressed.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri insist on his point of order?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I regret that I must insist on it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 404 of the act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law 529, 78th Cong.), the amount available to the Weather Bureau for the purposes specified in that section shall be $498,080.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

WEATHER IN THE POST-WAR PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman, this country has been endowed by nature with many wonderful natural resources. We may not usually think of weather as one of them, but it is, and a very important one. There are many different kinds of weather and climate in the world, and not all of them are productive. The United States has some of almost every kind, but taking the land as a whole we are about as well off in weather and climate as any country on earth, and a lot better than most. Without favorable weather and climate some of our important natural resources would be of little or no value—our fertile soils, our forests, our lakes and rivers all depend upon rainfall, favorable temperatures, and other climatic factors. If we lose these, our soil loses its productiveness, our waterways disappear, and many of our economic assets become valueless. So while we cannot control or process our weather resources as we do our minerals and our forests, we should utilize these resources to the utmost. They are constantly replenished, and although for relatively short periods they may fail us as during droughts, they are not inexhaustible like minerals. But we do not always make the best use of our climatic assets. It is the possibilities in this field that I would like to bring to your attention.

HISTORY OF WEATHER SERVICE

Long ago, in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, statesmen and scientists recognized that because weather information is of such importance to human welfare, governments should accept the responsibility for organizing and maintaining national meteorological services. At first this public-spirited view applied primarily to warnings of destructive storms, but later it came to mean day-by-day weather forecasts. By the end of the nineteenth century the principal world powers had nation-wide services in operation. In this country a small systen. of meteorological observations was started by the Army medical organization before 1850 and later the Signal Corps pioneered in extending the organization over the land. At sea the Navy did much to organize marine weather information. In 1890 these divided facilities were brought together into the unit which became known as the United States Weather Bureau, that organization that comprises the national weather service of the country, authorized by the Organic Act of 1890—act of October 1, 1890 (26 Stat. 653). Many additions and improvements have been made since that time so that by 1940 this country probably had the most intensive and progressive meteorological facilities in the world.

Scientists discovered early that meteorology in some respects is unique among sciences. The movements of the atmosphere which produce weather and climate are complex; they are not held within national boundaries, but are more or less interdependent throughout the atmosphere. To render his weather information services the meteorologist must have large numbers of daily reports from all over the country or even the hemisphere or the globe. Meteorological organization is thus an international matter and it requires a high degree of technical coordination. Observations must be standardized and correlated. For this purpose the basic meteorological organization is always integrated into a single national meteorological service which coordinates and unifies the techniques both nationally and internationally, a first requisite to reliable weather information services.

Most of you are familiar with the daily weather forecasts by radio and press but this is by no means the most productive service of the United States Weather Bureau. This public service is somewhat like the general agricultural advices published in various periodicals for use of the average farmer. They are helpful but in individual cases they are not usually as good as specific information designed to fit the particular case. The other, special services of the Weather Bureau are instrumental in adding hundreds of millions of dollars annually to the national income and in the saving of many lives and much property. They are indicative of the possibilities for further development of our natural resources in weather and climate. Among these special services are the following:

RIVER AND FLOOD WARNING SERVICE

There is an average annual property loss of $100,000,000 in this country resulting from floods. Statements furnished by property owners and others show that the river and flood forecasting service of the Weather Bureau is instrumental in the saving of $15,000,000 in property annually through its forecasts and warnings. This saving is accomplished by Weather Bureau expenditures costing less than $300,000 annually—less than one-fiftieth of its annual savings.

In the early years of the river and flood service forecasts and warnings were required only by communities along the main channels of the principal rivers where forecasts could be made for a city from the reported river stage at points upstream. On a river the size of the Missouri it is possible to anticipate rises as they move down the river, and the distances between points are large enough to give time for protective action after the forecasts are issued.

After the Nation-wide flood-control program began, the attention of cities and industrial areas located outside the flood plains of the larger rivers, but on tributary streams, was directed to the advantages of a flood-forecasting service. Accordingly, the demands for such service have been heavy and have been met in part only.

Unfortunately, on the smaller streams, the forecasting techniques used on the larger rivers are not successful because the relation of river stages between points is not consistently reliable and represents too short a time for effective action. Such forecasts must be based on rainfall, necessitating a network of stations which report amounts of rain as it falls to the river-forecast center. Of the needed 2,100 such stations, approximately 1,200 are now in operation.

There are other uses. The irrigation interests of the West are dependent for water supply on river flow from the snow fields. Inland water transportation bases its operations on the forecasts of the navigable river stages. The hydroelectric utilities operate on advance information of river conditions. Agricultural interests use the fertile flood plains of the principal rivers.

The river and flood service is conducted through 85 Weather Bureau offices located at strategic points on rivers subject to flooding. Floods occur at irregular intervals and the forecasting of floods, unlike the forecasting of weather, is not a daily occurrence. It is thus difficult to be sure that local observers are always on the alert. The same difficulty is experienced at river-forecast centers where, owing to limitations in staff, it is not possible to keep up a continuous river-service activity except at the larger river centers.

The year 1944 was noteworthy for its disastrous floods in the extensive agricultural regions of the lower Missouri and Arkansas and the middle Mississippi Valleys. Heavy rains and floods began in April and continued through May and June in many sections, seriously delaying crop planting and in many places necessitating replanting of crops vital to the conduct of the war. By summer farmers were hauling water in parts of the Ohio Valley where in 1937 they had suffered disastrous floods while in the dry Dust Bowl of the thirties prolonged rains now seriously delayed the wheat harvest in the Plains States.

The magnitude of the great flood of 1944 in the Missouri and Mississippi Valleys is shown by the stage reached at St. Louis, Mo., where the combined flows of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers produced a crest of 39.1 feet, exceeded only by the flood of 1844 when 41.4 feet was reached. The property damage caused

by the floods in the Missouri River Valley alone during 1944 has been estimated at $43,500,000, and in the middle Mississippi Valley at about $19,000,000. The warnings and advices of the river and flood forecasting service of the Weather Bureau are credited with having led to the saving of $13,000,000 worth of property which would have been lost during these floods if no warning service had been possible.

Floods such as the above which result from rather general rains and affect principally the larger rivers, can be quite accurately forecast far in advance so that protective measures can be taken. However, there is another type of flood, commonly known as the flash flood, which occurs in the smaller rivers and is generally caused by intense isolated storms. These storms come mainly during the summer season and while the conditions favoring the development of such storms can be forecast, the locality in which they will develop cannot be forecast with great accuracy now. Consequently a cloudburst in a local area may send a wall of water rushing down a narrow valley and overwhelm a community in its path without warning.

Such flash floods occur in almost any section of the country and exact a heavy toll in life and property. Other examples are the two disastrous floods in the Elkhorn River Basin in northeast Nebraska only a month apart, in May and June 1944. The property loss in the two floods, in a basin whose total drainage is only 6,000 square miles, has been estimated at $10,000,000. In different sections of Pennsylvania two flash floods, in May and again in July 1942, took a combined toll of 48 lives and a property loss of $20,000,000. In September 1942 a destructive flood in the narrow plain of the Eau Galle River in Wisconsin, which drains an area of about 100 square miles, practically destroyed the town of Spring Valley. Of 260 homes in Spring Valley only 25 were on high enough ground to escape the destructive effects of the flood.

The flood damage on the smaller tributaries of the Missouri River is known to reach several million dollars per year on the average. In June 1940 excessively heavy rains in northeast Nebraska resulted in a disastrous flood in small creeks in that area causing loss of life and considerable property damage.

Following that experience, a flood-warning network was organized by the Weather Bureau. The network consists of selected local citizens who act as rainfall observers in the headwaters of small river basins. They telephone reports of heavy rainfall to communities downstream.

The system described above was in operation in the Elkhorn River Basin in Nebraska during 1944. In May of that year heavy rains measured by the rainfall observers in the headwaters of the Elkhorn and in the Logan Creek area were reported by telephone to the keyman in the community below and flood warnings were issued. However, on the night of May 11–12 an unusually intense storm struck that particular community, flooding the streets, disrupting communications, and completely isolating the town. Only through the heroic efforts of public officials and others working with them were warnings gotten out to the people. In the words of a keyman the story is best told:

> Many were up all night and the river was watched very closely. Warnings were sent out by long and loud whistles. At 5 a. m. all businessmen were in their stores and people were on the lookout. But the water hit us like a 3-foot wall. It did not give them time enough. And, as set out before, were any one man to know what was coming, he nor anyone could have made people believe this was coming, or could have come. So, in my opinion, no warning at that time could have done much more than was done. However, from now on I am very sure all warnings will be given close attention by all.
>
> I cannot say the value of this warning, but do know that after this community was hit, all farmers and towns east of here took this warning and it was of untold value. It is too bad that it must take something of this nature to teach people to heed warnings of such value to them. But the amount of damage is yet unguessed, and as to the buildings it may take years to tell. The papers that will soon reach you picture a part, but the loss and smell cannot go into a picture.

Mr. Chairman, another flash flood of nearly the same magnitude struck the lower Elkhorn just 1 month later, in June 1944. Largely due to the fact that they were now ready to heed the warnings, and too because telephone wires were not down as in the previous flood, the people were ready when warnings were flashed. A survey of savings resulting from the flood-warning network in these two floods has been reported at an estimated $900,000. This is nearly 500 times the extra cost of the new warning network in that area.

WEATHER MAPS AND AGRICULTURE

Weather maps are highly important. They are the basis of nearly all modern weather forecasting. Daily weather maps of past years show the nature of weather changes and their movements, also the habits of storms. For example, their importance in military operations became evident early in this war. General Arnold has made a public report which includes information on the expansion of weather facilities to meet the war emergency. He said, "Weather is a critical factor in this war. The side making the best prognostications has a tremendous advantage." On the successes attained in this job a recent magazine article says:

> This up-to-the-minute forecasting of weather 400 miles from the nearest Allied observation stations was not done by aching joints or a wet finger to the wind. It was done by long looking at past weather maps. Digging into old files, the United States Weather Bureau had reconstructed maps of Northern Hemisphere weather, one for each day of the past 45 years. The task was laborious and expensive. Weather Bureau files, records of Allied Governments, all availble ship logs were combed to reconstruct the temperature and pressure every day since 1899.

Before the days of modern weather maps, thousands of lives were lost each year in storms, floods, and blizzards, and little could be done to prevent loss of crops and livestock.

Nearly all weather forecasting today is done by means of weather maps, but the maps that are used now are quite different from the ones they made in the early days of the weather service. In the old days the weather forecasters mapped the weather at the ground and did the best they could in guessing at what was going on in the upper air. Today's weather maps are drawn at many different levels. Special instruments are sent up to measure weather conditions in the upper air and send messages back by radio. Balloons are also used to show the direction and speed of the wind at various heights above the ground. All this makes it possible for the weather forecaster to construct a sort of bird's-eye view of the atmosphere in three dimensions by using several maps and diagrams.

Dependable forecasts 5 days to a week in advance are much needed for farming. For this purpose it is necessary to use other methods of drawing weather maps. In general, this involves a study of weather conditions over the entire Northern Hemisphere. The weather forecasters use what might be called average maps. For example, for weather forecasts 5 days ahead the Weather Bureau draws maps showing 5-day averages of conditions around the Northern Hemisphere. These maps show that the movements of weather around the world and also north and south between the equator and the pole vary over periods of several days or weeks. These maps give a measure of the strength of the circulation of the atmosphere. By watching the maps the forecasters are able to tell in a general way how much rain or snow there is likely to be in different parts of the country in the next 5 days and whether the temperatures will be about normal for the season or above or below the average. The Weather Bureau began experimenting with this new type of forecasting befor the war, and has used it to a large extent during the war.

The weather in every part of the world, to some extent at least, affects the weather in every other part. The weather of Asia affects the weather over the United States, but it undergoes many changes in crossing the Pacific Ocean and there are many things that must be taken into account.

The earlier method of forecasting the weather; that is, by mapping conditions in great detail and watching their movements and changes has been very much improved in the last few years. This method is absolutely necessary for the safety of flying. It also provides vital information regarding storms, floods, cold waves, freezing temperatures, and also weather forecasts for the next day or two which are so beneficial to agriculture, commerce, and industry.

Improvement and extension of the newer method of forecasting the weather several days ahead would be of enormous value to the people of the country, especially the farmers. Even greater benefits would come if it were possible to make accurate forecasts for weeks or months. The weather bureau fully realizes this. Information of this kind is of vital importance in time of war. The most concentrated efforts have been made since the beginning of the war

to improve on this type of weather forecasting and to find new methods of looking further into the future. There is every reason to believe that as a result of the war the farmer and the businessman will find improvements in this type of forecast. It is in this field that we must look for the greatest benefits in the usefulness of weather forecasting for agriculture.

WEATHER AND TRANSPORTATION

The benefits of weather service to transportation are of interest to nearly every one of our citizens. There are many ways in which the Weather Bureau serves railroads, bus and truck lines, railroad express companies, and all other kinds of transportation. This includes warnings and advices needed to protect perishable products all along the line from the pick-up at farm or factory to final delivery to the customer. Weather information is needed for day-to-day operation of freight and passenger trains, for planning work of repair and road gangs, and for many other purposes on all the railway systems of the country. Here the forecasts, warnings and flood information are indispensable.

Nearly every Weather Bureau office in the country furnishes weather information as an aid to transportation. They make prompt and regular delivery of information to shippers, giving special attention to warning of sleet, heavy snow, cold waves, floods, and unusually high or low temperatures. Shippers' forecasts tell where to expect temperatures injurious to perishable goods during the following 36 to 48 hours within a radius of several hundred miles. One of the purposes of these forecasts is to aid in planning artificial heating and refrigerating in freight cars.

To give a specific example, there are large carload distributors of bananas that are received from Central America and South America. The fruit is hauled from port to interior markets. Bananas must not be exposed to low temperatures. The variation of temperature cannot be large. In general, the range is from 52° to 62°. Temperature forecasts are relayed to field men of the fruit companies who are stationed at strategic points along the shipping route. They look after heating, icing, or ventilating the cars in accordance with the weather forecast.

The same kind of information is required for shipment of many other farm and orchard products such as apples, pears, lettuce, celery, melons, peaches, berries, onions, potatoes, and so forth. Special attention has to be given to cross-country shipments of berries, fruits, and vegetables from the Pacific Northwest to eastern markets.

Another example is the shipment and delivery of livestock. In winter weather forecasts are used to regulate the depth of bedding for the animals and the amount of heavy paper or canvas tacked on the side of the cars. For example, in the case of hogs, if a cold wind blows on one side of an unprotected car the animals will pile up deep on the opposite side and those at the bottom are suffocated. This is also true of sheep and lambs. In the shipment of poultry, there are other problems.

Another example is iron ore which usually contains considerable water. If it freezes in the car or loading bins there is serious trouble. It may have to be steamed before it can be dumped into the loading bins at the docks. Close contacts between the Weather Bureau and operators keep delays and expenses of this kind at a minimum.

There are some of the same problems in the shipment of coal. The official of one company reported that before they started using Weather Bureau forecasts they had charges of more than $100,000 in 1 year due to coal that was frozen in cars and could not be unloaded. Carloads of sand, gravel, bauxite, and other products get wet and freeze unless temperature forecasts are available.

Transportation is seriously affected and sometimes completely tied up by heavy snow. On receipt of warnings in some cities it takes hundreds of extra men to keep snow and ice from clogging the railroad switches. Whether or not to bring out the snow plows is a problem in many of our larger cities every winter.

WEATHER AND INTERNATIONAL FLYING

There is another field in which weather reporting and forecasting will have to be developed in the future. This is in international flying. In the recent International Civil Aviation Conference at Chicago more than 50 nations were represented, and it was agreed that weather reports and forecasts of special kinds for aviation will become more and more important after the war. On the airways within the United States weather service for flying has been expanded in recent years. Fortunately, this growth began several years before the war. This helped the Weather Bureau in dealing with the great increase in pilot training and in the delivery and use of military aircraft in this country. However, this requires only short range weather reporting and forecasting, usually for 6 to 12 hours. When the time came early in the war to make long delivery flights across the country and to move large numbers of bombers and fighter aircraft to the theaters of war, it was necessary to make airway forecasts longer in advance and out over ocean areas where not much flying had been done before.

Much of the flying of the future will be of this type, that is, long range flights clear across the United States or across the oceans to other countries. The International Civil Aviation Conference at Chicago recommended that the weather bureaus of the countries, including the United States, be prepared to furnish weather service of this type. Experience in making forecasts of this kind is gained only after months of study and practice. We must be ready for commercial international flying after the war, when planes from this country will be going to all parts of the world and planes from many foreign countries will be coming to the United States.

FOREST FIRE WEATHER WARNINGS

Another important activity of the Weather Bureau is the forecast service carried on as an aid to the forest protection agencies. In the conservation of our natural resources, the preservation of our forests on a planned-yield basis are severely threatened each year by the possibility that forest fires, started by lightning or by human carelessness, may wipe out in one day the stands of timber that have taken years to grow. Weather reports and forecasts are major factors in planning for prevention and suppression of forest fires on dry, hot, windy days, or on days when lightning storms are prevalent. Much has been accomplished, in past years, by the operation of the Weather Bureau's fire-weather warning service; but as more roads are constructed through the forest areas, giving access to greater numbers of the public, increasing care will have to be taken to provide adequate guard on the forests when critical weather conditions prevail. The fire-control agencies of the Forest Service and of the National Parks Service can carry out their protective action with greater economy and efficiency if they are provided with accurate, dependable weather forecasts issued by experienced weather forecasters who know the problems of forest-fire control.

There are many other fields in which weather information can be used to increase operating efficiency. Meteorological developments during the war have pointed the way to better use of our climatic resources in increasing the productiveness of American business economy. Costly mistakes of the past, such as overdevelopment of semiarid regions, can be avoided if due consideration is given to meteorological advice. After the war there will be meteorological consultants engaged in the private practice of the profession who can make specialized studies of the particular needs of individual business enterprises in order to determine how to make best use of the favorable conditions of weather and climate in designing and conducting its business operations. Then the country will reap additional benefits from the intensive work that has gone into meteorological developments during the war, the results of which are being collected and organized for public and private use through the national meteorological service of the Weather Bureau.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR RELOCATION AUTHORITY

Salaries and expenses: The limitation in the appropriation for salaries and expenses, War Relocation Authority, in the National War Agency Appropriation Act, 1945, on the amount which may be expended for travel is hereby increased from $375,000 to $475,000; and of said appropriation not to exceed $280,477 is made available for expenses incurred during the fiscal year 1945 incident to the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the emergency refugee shelter at Fort Ontario, N. Y., provided for in the President's message of June 12, 1944, to the Congress (H. Doc. 656).

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that part of the section following the semicolon in line 20 and ending on page 14, line 2, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill; furthermore, that there is no specific authority in existing statutes for the operation of this particular program. The Executive order of the President which created the War Relocation Authority does not encompass the activities for which these funds would be used.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the item is not subject to a point of order. As the committee will recall, the action of the military authorities in moving from the West Coast for supervised segregation all persons of Japanese ancestry, was one of the most mooted questions in the early days of the war. It was done under Executive authority by virtue of Executive Order No. 9102, establishing the War Relocation Authority in the Executive office of the President and defining its functions and duties. It was financed as many of the early war activities were financed out of the President's special fund. It is therefore authorized by law. This is tantamount to a reappropriation of funds, and is admissible under the rules. There are no grounds upon which a point of order can be sustained.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The gentleman has been referring to the Executive order which created the War Relocation Authority; but this refugee activity ostensibly would be conducted under the Executive order which created the War Refugee Board. I submit that there has been no legislation enacted by Congress which authorizes the appropriation of funds for this specific program.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As I understand, the gentleman's point of order goes to the item in line 21 on page 13 appropriating $280,477. That is in effect a reappropriation for the War Relocation Authority and is therefore in order.

Mr. DWORSHAK. No provision has been made for funds for the operation of the War Refugee Board. I am not questioning the Authority for the appropriation for the War Relocation Authority, but there is no existing authority for the other activity.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This is really a function of the War Relocation Authority, and we are merely making a reappropriation.

Mr. DWORSHAK. There has never been any appropriation made, so it cannot be a reappropriation for the War Refugee Board.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This is a reappropriation of funds formerly supplied by the President's fund.

Mr. DWORSHAK. There has never been any appropriation for that activity.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair ask the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], if it is his contention that the Executive order by the President would be law within the meaning of the rule requiring appropriations to be authorized by law?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In the Federal Register of Friday, March 20, 1942, appears a copy of the Executive order. Its functions are fully outlined there. One of its duties would be the establishment of such a refugee shelter as is provided here in the bill. Money has been provided for the support of the activities of this Authority out of the President's fund. This activity was initiated under competent authority and under authority of law and is work in progress. It is therefore in order under the rules of the House.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, may I add this point: The chairman of the committee persists in referring to Executive Order No. 9102, which created the War Relocation Authority, while I also direct attention to another Executive order which was issued on January 22, 1944, under which the War Refugee Board was created and under which this particular activity has been maintained. There has never been nay specific authority in law or any appropriation made heretofore, so it cannot be a reappropriation of funds.

Section 213 of Public Law 358, making appropriations for the executive offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, requires any agency established by Executive order, having been in existence for more than 1 year, to come to Congress for a regular appropriation. As the War Refugee Board had been created under Executive Order No. 9417 and had utilized money provided by the President from his emergency war found, it is obvious that no specific authorization has heretofore been considered by Congress for this activity.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SPARKMAN). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] makes the point of order against the language beginning in the concluding part of line 20 on page 13 and extending through the balance of the paragraph, that this appropriation is not authorized by law.

Under the rules of the House, no appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law.

It is the opinion of the Chair that an Executive order does not meet the requirement stated in that rule. Therefore, not being authorized by law enacted by Congress, the appropriation would not be in order. The mere fact that it may be a reappropriation would not make it in order if the original appropriation was not authorized by law.

Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Idaho.

The Clerk read as follows:

Damage claims: For the payment of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death adjusted and determined by the Secretary of War under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army," approved July 3, 1943 (Public Law 112), as fully set forth in House Document No. 72, Seventy-ninth Congress, $141,537.36.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries many million dollars of nonwar deficiency appropriations. We have heard much talk about the necessity of economy in the civil activities of the Government. If economy is not just talk, when do we start?

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw your attention to some parts of this bill where we could save some of the taxpayers' money. I would especially like the attention of the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the committee. As I said on the flood on Wednesday to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations he is responsible more than any other Member of the House of Representatives, for not cutting down unnecessary expenses. The gentleman at that time asked me what I would cut out of the bill. I wanted to present this to him and I do so now, in an effort to convince the chairman that we ought to reconsider Federal Crop Insurance.

The item amounts to $30,000,000, subscription to the capital stock of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation; for an additional amount of capital stock for crop insurance.

I would like the membership of this committee to read the testimony that was given before the Committee on Appropriations by Mr. J. Carl Wright, who is manager of that Corporation. I do not know Mr. Wright. I do not know anything about him at all. However, when I read all the testimony contained in the hearings before the committee, given by Mr. Wright, I cannot understand how the committee can authorize the expenditure of $30,000,000 more for the Federal Crop Insurance Act, and then permit him to operate the Corporation.

Let me call your attention to the fact that the act was passed in 1938. The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation was supposed to incorporate for $100,000,000. Congress paid in $40,000,000 at that time. This man, Mr. Wright, is manager of the Corporation. I do not know who the trustees or directors of the Corporation are. The stockholders are the taxpayers of the United States. The taxpayers of this country furnished $40,000,000 for this fellow to squander in 5 years.

The capital of Crop Insurance Corporation has been impaired to the extent of $37,500,000. There are two and one-half million he says remaining as capital. All the rest has been squandered. It has been wasted. It has been lost to the taxpayers.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield right now.

Mr. Wright claims he has made about $7,000,000 on the increase in prices of the commodities which he used for the purpose of bargaining in this insurance. This also he lost. If he has lost thirty-seven and one-half millions and made a profit of seven million and lost that, he lost forty-four and one-half million all told. Also, you have nothing but $2,500,000 left as capital stock. What inefficiency I never heard of. No corporation can stand that kind of management, Government or private.

Now, I wish to ask the chairman of the Appropriations Committee if he can find any Member of Congress who would invest a thousand dollars in this corporation for this man to handle? If he so deliberately squanders thirty-seven and one-half million would the gentleman want to invest the taxpayers' money or

his own money so he can have an additional $30,000,000 to blow in? I cannot see it; I would not do it and I am against such waste and extravagance and inefficiency.

I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I may say to the gentleman that the majority of both Houses of Congress are perfectly willing to do it as evidenced by the fact that they passed the crop-insurance bill just recently.

Mr. RICH. That is just the point. I am against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. I do not care whether the House of Representatives and the Senate passed that bill once or not. If you are—well, I will not say it. We may not be fools, but we do things that fools would do. That is all I can say. Anyone who would give this man, this Corporation, $30,000,000 more does not know what he is doing. Read this set of hearings and you will conclude it is a shame, it is a crime, it is not good business at all. Nothing in the hearings justifies the appropriation.

The gentleman should give me permission to go back and offer the amendment I have at the Clerk's desk and strike out that item from the bill. That is what the gentleman ought to do.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield again to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Why does the gentleman believe the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations should not object to going back to the item just to accommodate the gentleman so that he might introduce an amendment to strike it out?

Mr. RICH. Just because I want to get a little common sense into our actions. The chairman of the committee and I had a colloquy on the floor day before yesterday in which he said that if I could show him anything that ought to be cut out he would be the first to strike it out. Now I want to see whether he means what he said. If he does he will come to the front; if he does not, then he talks one thing and does something else.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman makes a statement that is a great indictment of the people in charge of the crop-insurance program. He makes the statement that the money has been squandered.

Mr. RICH. I do. It has been wasted. It is poor management.

Mr. COOLEY. Where is the gentleman's supporting evidence for a statement?

Mr. RICH. I say that it is a deliberate—well, I cannot say "steal." When any person operates a corporation for 5 years with a capital of forty million and loses thirty-seven and one-half million, it is mighty poor business, very poor.

Mr. COOLEY. No.

Mr. RICH. It comes about by deliberate inefficiency on the part of these men; if not that, then ignorance. And I want to say this to you, brother, that if this is not stricken from the bill, I am going to find out more about this man and this Corporation and its personnel.

Mr. COOLEY. What is his name?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Wright. I am going to find out who the other directors are on that board; and if we do not turn back and strike that item out, then there is just not going to be a stone left unturned to correct things.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman realizes, I am sure, that the House, after a very long debate on the subject of crop insurance, and after considering the amendments to the original Crop Insurance Act, recently passed the act by a large and substantial majority in both Houses of Congress, and it is now the law of the land.

Mr. RICH. That is all right, brother; but if you did something wrong, this Congress now has the chance to correct it, to change it; and that is what I want to do today. I think it is only on the poorest of excuses that anyone can stand here today and advocate that we give Mr. Wright $30,000,000 more to squander in the next 3 or 4 years. And, another thing, let me say that this bill is not a regular appropriation bill. Defer this matter until you have a chance to investigate it.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman realize that Congress did withhold an annual appropriation just last year and that Congress was unwilling to provide additional funds until the basic act had been substantially amended?

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman mean until the basic act has been tried out to see whether these people are capable of running it? Mr. Chairman, everyone knows that the men in charge of this loan agency do not know what it is all about. They admit that. They proved their inefficiency. All you need to do is to read the testimony and the hearings to substantiate that. There is not one word that would justify the chairman of this subcommittee including that amount in this bill. I think it is so serious.

Mr. COOLEY. I may say on behalf of the committee and the ranking minority members of the committee that they did withhold the appropriation for one 12-month period and did withhold it until the Congress amended the law.

Mr. RICH. You should now withhold it until the regular appropriation bill comes up for consideration so that the membership of this House may have a chance to investigate it, because you gentlemen have not investigated this or you would not put it in here now. Here is a great chance to save $30,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. It is a crime to the taxpayers if you do not cut this appropriation from this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. I disagree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 25 of the bill and to the section dealing with the Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, and that lines 15 to 19 be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman may have 5 additional minutes if he wants the time at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri requests that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] have 5 additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman doing that because of generosity or what is the object anyway?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is a very important question.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are getting some valuable information.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, you better give me this time now or I will get it in a short time again if you do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the Chair did not object. Objection was made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, let me read from page 547 of the hearings:

Mr. CANNON. Now, this $30,000,000 is strictly for compliance with the act of December 23, 1944?

Mr. WRIGHT. That is right.

Mr. CANNON. And you did have a capital fund of $40,000,000 and you say that has been impaired?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, sir; up to $37,500,000, Mr. CANNON.

Mr. CANNON. And it now amounts to how much?

Mr. WRIGHT. $2,500,000.

Mr. CANNON. That is the amount left out of the $40,000,000?

Mr. WRIGHT. Yes, sir; $2,500,000 is left out of the $40,000,000, that is correct.

I could go on and read further where the other members of the committee interrogated this gentleman, Mr. Wright. Then on page 550 he gives you a table which was inserted in the record and in that table you will find that you were dealing in wheat and you lost $26,000,000 plus, you will find that you lost on the insurance of cotton $11,000,000 plus, then you have other charges of $3,448, making a total loss of $37,227,043.56.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that if we are going to do this kind of business with

the taxpayers' money, squander it in that way with inefficient men at the head of these corporations, it is about time that the people of this country wake up and say to the Congress of the United States: "You are not fit to handle the affairs of this Government of ours and we are going to put men in Congress who will see that proper officials are put at the head of each organization so that the business of the Government that is to be handled will be handled in a businesslike manner and in a way that will reflect credit on the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the Chief Executive of the United States."

Mr. Chairman, as one Member of the House, I will not countenance the squandering of the taxpayers' money in that way, when we are about to go out and ask the taxpayers to buy more bonds, when we have to ask the taxpayers of this country to furnish money for someone to spend extravagantly and waste the taxpayers' money. It is time that we do one of two things. It is time that we get a new board to manage the affairs of this Crop Insurance Corporation or get a new Congress—one of the two.

If you Members feel that I am saying things that should not be said here today, then it is just too bad. I have nothing to say but words of pity for the chairman of this committee and for the Members of Congress who will allow a thing like that to happen. It is just a shame. I do hope that we do something about this, and do it now. Strike this $30,000,000 from this appropriation, do it and do it now. Its sound, its practical, its sensible, its necessary.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has missed the boat. It is now too late to amend the provision. But knowing him as I do, knowing his large and sucessful business experience, his unusual ability as a businessman and his deep sense of fairness and equity, I cannot believe that he would deny to any one industry of the country, and to one industry alone—especially so important and efficient an industry as agriculture, the fundamental aid which every industry must have in order to successfully conduct its business.

No industry business in the country operates without insurance. It cannot be done. If you should by some stretch of the imagination withdraw insurance from any businessman in this city or in the Nation, or from any industry in city or country, paralysis would follow. Business cannot be conducted under modern conditions unless insured against unanticipated and unpredictable losses.

Now, that is all that this provision does. It provides for agriculture and the farmer the same right, the same opportunity, and the same facilities for security in the management of his business given every other business. Why should we differentiate as between the farmer and other enterprises? Why should we discriminate against agriculture by refusing a facility open to every other industry?

Unfortunately the Government is the only agency that can handle such a proposition. The field is too wide, the risks to complicated and the sums involved too large to admit private enterprise. It is a national problem and a national responsibility. In helping the farmer we are helping the Nation because we are not only making it possible for the farmer to produce needed food and fiber for the Nation, with some assurance that his unanticipated losses will be taken care of, but we stabilize his income, and we, as the Committee on Agriculture indicated when it reported out the authorization, help him to carry his own relief burdens rather than leaving it to the Government.

The only reason the Congress discontinued appropriations for this purpose in the last session was that under the original law which was, of course, in the beginning necessarily an experiment, failed to make the service self-sustaining. We now have a law formulated after long study and investigation by the Committee on Agriculture—in my opinion one of the best laws that committee has reported to the House for some time under which, after a reasonable period of probation, the service becomes self-sustaining. Provisions of the new law are such that the premiums will eventually pay the losses. It will no longer be a burden upon the Government. It is necessary, however, during the tentative period to provide working capital and that is all this paragraph does. I am certain the needs of the farmer and the needs of agriculture are so obvious the provisions of the law so just and so equitable that the appropriation reported by the committee will be sustained by the House.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is a very easy thing for the gentleman from Pennsylvania to indict those in charge of this program and to accuse them of squandering the taxpayers' money, but it is quite another thing to justify such assertions. The fact remains that the Congress in its own wisdom withheld this appropriation last year. I can say in defense of the Committee on Appropriations that they withheld the money until the basic act had been amended. I am not sure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is familiar with the amendments to the Crop Insurance Act.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I am not against this insurance, but I think the fact that the operation of this program resulted in the loss of almost the entire capital in 5 years shows that the law ought to be revised, or else new men ought to be put in charge so that the program would be handled as it was intended to be handled, according to the hearings—that is, the premiums received would keep the capital intact. If the men in charge have lost $37,500,000 out of $40,000,000 in 5 years, does not the gentleman believe there ought to be men with some experience and who know something about insurance handling this particular function of government?

Mr. COOLEY. The original experiment contemplated a possible loss of $100,000,000. Congress embarked upon that program, the gentleman's views to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. RICH. No; the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. COOLEY. That is true. After having operated and after having incurred losses of around $37,500,000, we have amended the act, as indicated by the chairman of the committee, so as to provide an additional probationary period within which the crop insurance program must be self-sustaining.

Mr. RICH. How long is that?

Mr. COOLEY. Three years.

Mr. RICH. In 3 years you will lose this $30,000,000. That is the point I am making. You have to get different men there to handle this program or you will lose the entire $30,000,000.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman that the men there probably should have the benefit of the best insurance minds in America in establishing an actuarial basis for this insurance. It is not an easy task. I do not believe you could imagine a more difficult undertaking than that of establishing an actuarially sound basis for all-risk crop insurance, something that no private corporation in America would dare to undertake at the present time, and they have not in the past.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. Is it not the weather that causes the losses? It is not the management.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. Of course, they have not been able to estimate properly the losses, but with the experience they have had in the past and the experience they will have in the next 2 or 3 years they should be able, in fact, they must be able to make the program actuarially sound and self-supporting.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am sure the gentleman from North Carolina has had a part in this legislation from the very beginning.

Mr. COOLEY. I have.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. As I recall, the gentleman was a member of the Committee on Agriculture when this bill was first drawn and submitted to the Congress.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The reason Congress felt we should do something for the farmers of the country was that the old-line insurance companies would not take the risk of insuring the crops of our farmers. If they did underwrite a risk, it was beyond the reach of the American farmer. They constituted the one large group in America which could not get insurance unless the Government did something for them. It was upon that theory that the original bill providing for crop insurance was passed.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. In the bill which we passed recently we undertook to place crop insurance upon a sound actuarial basis. The gentleman will recall that at

a conference of Members of the House and Senate it was agreed that we should bring into the organization skilled insurance men who could place crop insurance on a sound actuarial basis so that it could be administered efficiently.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say in connection with the gentleman's statement that this money has been squandered, it has not been squandered. The money has been paid into the pockets of farmers in all distressed areas of this country. But for this crop-insurance program and but for the money that has been paid out by way of indemnities in connection with the insurance program, we would have been appropriating money for direct relief in many of the stricken areas of America.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOOK. Is it not a fact that before we embarked upon this program we had absolutely no way of fixing rates and it was necessary that we go into this experimental stage in order to be able to determine what was needed?

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is entirely correct. And every man familiar with the program of insurance knows it is still in an experimental stage.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I just want to recite a fact to back up the gentleman's argument. In my own congressional district a short time ago we had 20,000 acres of wheat and flax totally destroyed by flood. If it had not been insured the people would have had to be taken care of some way.

Mr. COOLEY. If they had not been insured, they would be asking for some direct relief from the Treasury. If we can perfect the program and can make it actuarially sound, it will be a great benefit not only to America today but in years to come. It will in the long run save millions of dollars and the amounts which are appropriated for direct relief will no doubt be greatly reduced.

The crop-insurance program is still an experiment and it is so regarded by all who are familiar with its history and with its operations. I am not yet willing to predict that the experiment will be successful, but I do assert that it should be continued in the hope that it may soon be placed upon an actuarially sound basis. Practically every businessman in America has an opportunity to insure his buildings and other property, including the rewards for his labor. Insurance companies are now writing insurance on just about everything conceivable, but farmers of our country can not purchase insurance of the type provided in this all-risk crop-insurance program. A farmer has not only his money and his labor invested in a growing crop, but he also has invested in the crop his only chance of a livelihood for himself and his family. Certainly, if the Government can evolve a self-supporting program, every possible effort should be made to do so.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania indicates that the impairment of the stock is proof of bad management and incompetency and inefficiency on the part of those in charge of the program. This certainly is not true. I do not believe that even the most intelligent and best informed men of America could have in such a short period of time developed a program of this type without having impaired the capital stock. The very nature of the business of all-risk crop insurance indicates the magnitude of the task and the uncertainties of achievement. To attract participation in the program the insurance offered and the premiums charged must be made attractive to farmers. If premium rates are too high, we can not expect the desired amount of participation in the program. If premium rates are too low, the Corporation will, of course, suffer a loss. In determining a fair premium rate a multiplicity of uncertain factors must be considered.

I was chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture that wrote the first crop-insurance bill, and I was likewise chairman of the subcommittee that drafted the bill which was recently enacted, amending the basic law, and I am naturally intensely interested in the program. My interest in the program is not in any way a selfish interest. The fact is that neither the wheat nor the cotton program have yet been made attractive enough to result in anything more than a very nominal participation in the district I represent or in the State where I reside. I do hope, however, that the program will be given a fair chance and that the experiment may yet prove successful.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I have taken the floor, but not to talk about the bill. During the recent colloquy which occurred between the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], there occurred what undoubtedly is a clear breach of the rules of the House. I hope the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], will listen to what I have to say, and then I shall propound a parliamentary inquiry to the chairman of the Committee of the Whole House as to whether or not I am correct. During the colloquy the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] referred to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] as "brother" on two or three different occasions. It is my understanding of the rules that no Member has a right to refer to another Member on the floor even in the second person, as "you," and that the rules of the House provide a Member shall be addressed by his name followed by the State from which he comes, and he cannot go beyond that. That was one thing that occurred.

Another thing that occurs on this floor daily, I think unknowingly or thoughtlessly, on the part of many of the older Members of the House, and certainly on the part of some of the newer Members of the House, is that they take the floor where I now stand and, after addressing the Chair, if we are in Committee of the Whole, or the Speaker of the House when we are in the House, add "members of the committee," or "ladies and gentlemen of the House." Both of those salutations are clearly breaches of the rules of the House and should not occur. It is my understanding that the rule is, when we are in the House, to address the Speaker and then stop. If we are in Committee of the Whole we address the Chairman and stop. Anything that is added after that simply makes it amateurish or in the nature of a town hall or of an ordinary ward caucus. It should not occur in the House of Representatives of the United States.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I would like to say to my distinguished friend from Michigan there are exceptions to all rules. Today in this House of Representatives we have two distinguished gentlemen who happen to be brothers. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SCHWABE], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE]. I want to propound this question to the gentleman: Does he think the gentleman from Missouri would be out of order in addressing his distinguished brother from Oklahoma as "brother" and that that would be a violation of the rules of the House? I would like to propound that inquiry to the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. I am going to include that in the form of a parliamentary inquiry to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have enjoyed, and been instructed by the gentleman's lecture, but is it not also true that under the rules of the House the gentleman has a right to call the attention of the Chair to any breach of the rules and get a correction.

Mr. DONDERO. Answering the gentleman from Michigan, may I say that I have never undertaken to be the guardian of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are now giving us a lecture.

Mr. DONDERO. I am not lecturing to anybody. I am propounding a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, it is a long one and you are facing the House. I think if you are going to address the Chair, under the rules you should address the Chair and face the Chair.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Would the gentleman include in his parliamentary inquiry——

Mr. HOFFMAN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I refuse to yield and the gentleman from Michigan refuses to yield.

Would the gentleman include in his parliamentary inquiry the question as to whether we have to refer to the sex of Members of the House in addressing them? The gentleman has properly mentioned that we should not mention a relationship such as brother, even though it happens to be a blood relationship. I confess that to have to indicate the sex of a Member of the House is sort of a sexy proceeding, and I would prefer, if it were within the rules of the House, to refer to those who happen to be of the female sex as "the Member from Ohio" or "the Member from California."

Mr. DONDERO. I think I understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make the point of order——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I make a point of order that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is not speaking in accordance with the rules, because he is not talking about the bill nor any amendment to the bill, and he did not get permission to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan, I must, of course, leave to the Chair any decision as to what is parliamentary or otherwise. But I may suggest that when Thomas Jefferson came to write his famous parliamentary manual he prefaced that great work by citing a classic axiom by one of the noted parliamentarians of the British House of Commons of a preceding generation to the effect that a careful and scrupulous adherence to orthodox rules of procedure was requisite to the maintenance of parliamentary etiquette and was especially necessary to the protection of the minority and the efficiency of successful majorities.

This statement based on the observation and experience of a great parliamentary leader and his predecessors reaching back several generations embodied a parliamentary formula enunciated some two or three hundred years ago. But it is still one of the fundamental principles underlying applied procedure in every legislative assembly in the world today.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does not the gentleman from Missouri think that a breach of the rules of the House which in any way detracts from the dignity of this body lessens the confidence and respect of the Nation in its legislative body?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All breaches of parliamentary etiquette or departures from approved legislative procedure are subject to notice by the Chair. In the absence of notice by the Chair it is the privilege and duty of any individual Member of the House to call attention to such infraction of the rules. Of course, in the hurry and congestion of the average legislative day many minor informalities are inadvertently overlooked or ignored without serious results.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia will proceed.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, just a few weeks ago we had before the House for consideration the revised Crop Insurance Act. Many of us who have been in favor of crop insurance were dissatisfied with certain provisions in the original act. And, moreover, some of us were not satisfied with the way the act had been administered. The Committee on Agriculture, after lengthy hearings and thorough consideration, brought the revised act to the House for consideration. It was passed by this body, went to the Senate, and was passed by that body. Conferees were appointed, and the conferees worked on the matter for a good while trying to iron cut differences in such a way as to eventually make the act actuarially sound. I hope we did a pretty fair job. Time alone will tell.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, I believe, is justified in criticizing the way the act had been administered. As a matter of fact no one seemed to be satisfied with the way the act had been administered. After we passed the revised bill I arranged for a joint meeting of the Committees on Agriculture of the House and the Senate; and we invited Judge Jones, the War Food Administrator, to appear. He did. We gave him our views with reference to the administration of the act and he promised to see that our suggestions were carried out; and I have hopes that if we keep an eye on things and see that the act is administered as we think it should be administered, that by the time we are through the probationary period the act will be upon an actuarially sound basis. It would be a foolish thing for us to kill the act at this time by failure to make the necessary appropriation. It would be tantamount to saying that we did not know what we were doing a few weeks ago when we passed the act. Remember both political parties declared for crop insurance in their platforms last year. In response, not only to these declarations, but to the demands of thousands of farmers, crop insurance was revived. Are we willing at this time, before the act has been put into operation and tested, to give it a death stab in the back by failure to appropriate the funds to put the act into operation? I do not believe the House will do such a foolish thing.

We have, I believe, worked out a pretty fair crop-insurance bill. We did this knowing that we were embarking upon a new and untried undertaking. Let us give the act a fair and honest test. If, during the probationary period provided for in the act, we fail to place crop insurance upon an actuarially sound basis, I am afraid crop insurance in this country will be dead for a long time. I am anxious to give the venture a fair test. I believe the great majority of the Members feel the same way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, while the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] was on the floor, three statements were made that do not dovetail and they are, as a matter of fact, inconsistent with each other in connection with this crop-insurance plan.

The first statement was that it was not the fault of the management, but it was the fault of the weather, that caused the failure and the loss of money. The second statement was that the old-line insurance companies could not undertake to establish crop insurance; they would not dare do it, and if they did do it the premiums they would charge the farmers would be so high that the farmers could not afford to pay them. The third statement was that within the next 3 years, with this further experimenting, we are going to establish this crop-insurance program on a sound actuarial basis.

I just wonder how you are going to place those three statements together and make sense out of them. They just do not make sense, because it is an impossible thing to control the weather, and it is an impossible thing to place this Government insurance of crops on a sound actuarial basis unless you charge rates that will be so high the farmers will be unable to pay them.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I just want to state to the gentleman that the law provides that at the end of the probationary period, the premiums shall be divided pro rata among those suffering loss. It may not be actuarially sound, but it will certainly be self-supporting.

Mr. MASON. If that is true those premiums will be so high that they could also be established by the old-line insurance companies.

Mr. COOLEY. No. I may say that no old-line company in America would dare undertake to write this type of insurance. They do write hail insurance and certain specific kinds of insurance, but no company would undertake to write an all-risk insurance.

Mr. MASON. Why? Because they would have to charge premiums so high that the farmers would be unable to pay them.

Mr. COOLEY. No. In the first place, they would not be able to obtain the data necessary as a basis for this type of program.

Mr. MASON. Yet the gentleman expects to gather that data during the next 3 years so the Government can carry it on.

Mr. COOLEY. No. They have already had 4 or 5 years to collect the data. They are not authorized to embark upon any insurance program until sufficient data has been collected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, as one member of the crop insurance subcommittee I should like to make a few observations. First, there are no old line insurance companies or any new insurance companies of any kind that will go into this over-all crop insurance program. Secondly, may I say that the gentleman, Mr. J. Carl Wright, who is in charge as Director of the crop-insurance program, has had 10 years insurance experience. Two years ago he made recommendations for a number of these changes which we adopted recently. He has actually been in charge as Director only 1 year, and during the time he has been in charge he had to administer the law as it had been enacted by the Congress, cooperating with the members of this special subcommittee. The Director worked with us on the bill and numerous changes were made according to his suggestions.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. May I call the attention of the membership on both sides to the fact that crop insurance was endorsed by both the Democratic and the Republican Parties in their last conventions, and it was written into their platforms. In pursuance of that mandate from the Democratic and the Republican conventions, we wrote this insurance act.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to correct the gentleman, because I do not think he would want to leave in the RECORD that this is an over-all crop insurance plan. I would also like to take the time to correct our good chairman by saying that I do not think my party has ever endorsed the wheat and the cotton crop insurance plan. They did endorse crop insurance, and that is one thing that has caused considerable trouble in this whole insurance program; we are just taking three crops—wheat, cotton, and flax—representing around 10 to 20 percent of the national farm income, and we are telling all the rest of the farmers to get along the best they can. If this insurance is needed why not insure all the farmers not just the wheat and cotton farmers?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Republican platform contains a declaration in favor of crop insurance, and so does the Democratic platform. It was pursuant to both of those mandates that we took action back in December to revive crop insurance.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I must decline to yield further.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I want to correct the RECORD.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Just because the ranking member of the Republican committee happens to be from a wheat section and just because he wants to play ball with these cotton boys is no reason to mislead or deceive anyone and say that the Republican Party is committed to a wheat-, flax-, and cotton-insurance program when the party went on record for a crop-insurance program. This is just one more example of New Deal legislation for the few at the expense of the many. This legislation will not help the war-food program and it is doubtful if there will be any insurance of even wheat, flax, or cotton this year.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I do not yield further and I thank the gentleman for his observation. I believe, however, that the Republican Party does stand for something.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Surely they stand for crop insurance and not just wheat, cotton, and flax insurance.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. And I believe that both parties endorse crop insurance, and I think that eventually the farmers of all types will have crop insurance, which I believe the gentleman from Wisconsin will agree with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rivers and harbors: For an additional amount for rivers and harbors, including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1945, to be available until expended, $405,000.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object to the request of the gentleman from Texas, but I serve notice on the House that the Republicans are trying to have a conference this afternoon and that I am going to object to any further requests to speak out of order because I think we ought to get along with the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side, and we are ready to quit at any time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank both the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Missouri for this gracious consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I have made this request because of the peculiar American significance of this day. In these stirring times when the sons and daughters of every American State and territory, true to the type of the fighting stock of their fathers, are writing their fame with their deeds on many foreign fields, we often reflect upon inspiring incidents of our history.

We are all familiar with the Old North Church, with the ride of Paul Revere, with the fact that Thomas Jefferson from the fullness of his own mind wrote the Declaration of Independence, but I wish to bring to your attention, as has for many years been my custom, that the 2d day of March marks the anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of what became the Republic of Texas and in later years the Lone Star State of the American Union.

It is natural that the sons of Texas fighting in the various offensives feel that in view of this history they have a double heritage, that two countries are theirs, that two flags are theirs, that two glorious histories are theirs. They may add to the glamour of Lexington and Concord the glory of the Alamo and San Jacinto. They know that the fires of patriotism burned in the breasts of Washington and Anthony Wayne and Israel Putnam and many other heroes of their day and time, but they realize also that freedom had worthy advocates in Houston and Austin and Travis and Bowie and Lamar and scores of others who have made resplendent the pages of our Texas history.

I would like to bring it to your attention that this is peculiarly American history. The President of the provisional Republic of Texas hailed from New Jersey. One of the Presidents came from Virginia. One came from Georgia, and the last President of the Republic of Texas in the 9 years of its existence, and the one in my judgment most responsible for the annexation of Texas to the Union, was Anson Jones, who came from the State of Massachusetts, which is the home State of our beloved majority and minority leaders.

Among the annals of American history nothing is more stirring or tends more to make our blood tingle with pride as it courses through our veins than the immortal document that Travis wrote from the Alamo, where each and every one of that brave little band died in attestation of the sincerity of his words. That letter still exists, and I hope I may have the time to quote it now that you may add it to your store of inspiring American documents. These were his words, and they were addressed to all Americans throughout the world:

Fellow citizens and compatriots, I am besieged by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Ana. I have sustained a continued bombardment for 24 hours and have not lost a man. The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion; otherwise the garrison is to be put to the sword if the fort is taken. I have answered the summons with a cannon shot and our flag still waves proudly from the walls. I shall never surrender nor retreat. Then I call upon you in the name of liberty, of patriotism, and everything dear to the American character to come to our aid with all dispatch. The enemy is receiving reinforcements daily, which will no doubt increase to three or four thousand in 4 or 5 days. Though this call may be neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible and to die like

a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor and that of his country. Victory or death.

Travis and every one of his little band perished in the walls of the Alamo.

Today, as the boys of the Lone Star State join with the boys from the North and the South and the East and the West in accomplishing wonderful victories on foreign fields for American arms, I am glad that we have a Nation united in brotherhood, and that we can all be proud of this Texas history, which from its beginning has also been American history.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, does not the gentleman from Texas think it is a very wonderful tribute to the Mexican Nation, and to our own country as well, that now in session at Mexico City is a very eventful meeting, a meeting which bears testimony to the good feeling that has grown up through the years between our country and the great peoples below the Rio Grande?

Mr. LANHAM. It is a matter of great gratification to us all that the good-neighbor policy and the good-neighbor spirit are bringing together and solidifying more and more the peoples of the Western Hemisphere.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. McCORMACK] having resumed the chair, Mr. SPARKMAN, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration H. R. 2374, the first deficiency appropriation bill, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who have spoken on the bill may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

TO INCREASE THE DEBT LIMIT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 2404) to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes; and that the minority may have the same time within which to file minority views.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks made in Committee of the Whole a brief letter from the Seattle Chamber of Commerce on the subject under discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made today a letter to which I referred at that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Jersey Journal of February 27 by one of her constituents.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California asked and was given permission to extend her remarks and include a speech which she made at the Overseas Press Club annual banquet on March 1, 1945.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Miss Marian Randall, executive director of the Visiting Nurses Service of New York.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein a letter from Mr. McDonald, of California.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article from the Washington Post.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after all other business today I may be allowed to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH] be allowed to extend his remarks by including certain excerpts therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole today and to include certain extracts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by the Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

FLORIDA, LAND OF SUNSHINE AND FLOWERS

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk to the Members of this House for a few minutes today on the great State of Florida. Since other Members of the Florida delegation will probably have something to say on the history of our State, I will confine myself as far as possible to that history made in the Fifth Congressional District, and incidentally, this district which I represent, has the oldest historical background in the Nation.

On March 3, 1845, President Tyler signed the bill for the admission of Florida into the Union. Florida added the twenty-seventh star to the flag of the United States.

On June 23, 1845, word was received by the first State legislature, on the opening day of its session, of the death of Gen. Andrew Jackson. Out of respect to the memory of the former provisional Governor of Florida the legislature adjourned. It may be interesting to note here that the first Governor of Florida was a President of the United States.

Florida points with pride to its history, the longest and the most varied of any State in the Union. This colorful, romantic land has known the full or partial rule of four nations: Spain, France, Great Britain, and the United States.

Although it is probable that the region now called Florida was at least sighted by unknown explorers before 1513, when Juan Ponce de Leon alighted upon its east coast, this Spanish nobleman was the first to report to his government the

presence of such a land. De Leon's discovery was entirely fortuitous. He had secured permission from the King of Spain to discover an island called Bimini by the West Indians. Upon this legendary island he hoped to find both gold and a fountain of youth. He found the fountain of youth in the health-giving rays of the sun, the mild and hospitable climate, the great variety of tropical fruits and many vegetables, and in the lakes, streams, and beaches. The Spanish later implanted the gold in the golden apples, beautifully depicted in the book of the same name by the Florida author, Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings.

De Leon first came in sight of the Florida coast on March 27, 1513, probably in the region of Cape Canaveral. He did not anchor immediately but sailed up the coast to a point just north of the present site of St. Augustine, where he landed on April 2, 1513. Six days later he claimed the land for Spain, and called it Florida. He chose such a name because he had first seen the coast on Easter Sunday, which day is known to the Spanish as "Feast of the Flowers." The discoverer then sailed around the southern tip of Florida, sighted the Keys and the Tortugas, and proceeded up the west coast as far as the Apalachicola. Still believing Florida to be an island, De Leon returned to Puerto Rico.

Deciding after a few years that he would like to settle the territory, De Leon in 1521 sailed once again for Florida. This time he landed upon the southwest coast, near the present site of Charlotte Harbor. He was not to remain there long. The Caloosa Indians, taking great umbrage at the descent of the white men, shortly attacked the tiny colony. Upon receiving a wound from a poisoned arrow, De Leon retired to his ship, along with all the settlers, and sailed to Cuba, where he died in a few days from his wound. Before and after De Leon's last voyage other Spanish and Portuguese adventurers cruised along the Florida coast.

Probably inspired by the accounts of others, Hernando De Soto obtained permission to try where others had failed. De Soto landed in the region of Tampa Bay in May 1539. He then followed the route pursued by previous explorers and spent the winter near the present site of the State Capital, Tallahassee. Later he marched through the lands now embraced by Georgia, Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. He did not find the gold for which he sought. Probably his greatest achievement was that of reaching the Mississippi River inland, in whose waters he later found his final resting place.

Following De Soto's ill-fated venture the French made a serious attempt at the colonization of the southeastern coast of the United States. In 1562 Admiral de Coligny authorized a group of Huguenots, led by Jean Ribaud, to find refuge in the New World. The group led by Ribaud settled on Port Royal Sound, within the present confines of the State of South Carolina. This site was finally abandoned and Coligny finally commissioned one, Rene de Laudonniere, to head a new expedition which settled on a site near the present St. Johns River. Here the French erected Fort Caroline, the remains of which stand on that location.

The Spanish, incensed at French activity along the coast they considered strictly Spanish, dispatched their premier warrior, Pedro Menendez, to conquer and settle Florida, to disperse and destroy the colonies of any other European power. Menendez reached the present St. Augustine Harbor on St. Augustine's Day, August 28, 1565. He at once sought out the French settlement at Fort Caroline. On September 4, discovering the French vessels before the fort, he attempted to board them but the French eluded him. Menendez then returned to St. Augustine Harbor where on September 8, 1565, the city of St. Augustine, oldest in the United States, was founded. Menendez finally returned to Fort Caroline, captured the fort and massacred the French garrison and renamed the fort San Mateo.

The fierce Spaniard now turned his talents—not all of which were military—to administering St. Augustine, exploring the interior of Florida, and establishing missions. In 1567 he left for a visit to Spain. During his absence the French exacted a measure of revenge when, in 1568, Dominique de Gourges, probably a Catholic but certainly a Frenchman first, destroyed Fort San Mateo and other defenses Menendez had erected in the vicinity of the St. Johns. After hanging the Spanish survivors of his assaults, De Gourges fled, not daring, with his inferior forces, to attack St. Augustine.

Menendez returned to that city in March 1568 and at once revealed unusual executive ability. It was during this time that he personally conducted a campaign as far north as Chesapeake Bay against a group of fugitive Florida Indians. In 1572 he left Florida for the last time. Spain was never to find an adequate successor, not even in Generalissimo Franco, who, during the height of Hitler's success, laid claim to the State of Florida as a Spanish possession.

For a generation after the departure of Menendez St. Augustine declined. In 1586 Sir Francis Drake succeeded in plundering the town and burning its fort, San Juan de Pinos. The Spanish, despite such a blow, retained control of the area and by 1593 showed evidence of resurgent power. Missionary activity for the next 100 years was to be both pronounced and successful. By 1650 the Spanish, largely through the efforts of the missionaries, had penetrated nearly all of what is today the State of Florida. Through the work of these clerics the Indians were almost uniformly pacified, and a reasonably stable government established throughout Florida. Much of that land's natural wealth today stems from the work of these men. It was they who introduced the fruits of Spain to the Indians, and who taught them to grow cotton and weave cloth from it.

Probably the most important mission area was that of Apalache, the district lying, it appears, between the Suwannee and Apalachicola Rivers. Here the missionaries spread the faith and taught the art of civilized living as early, at least, as 1633. The Indians proved apt pupils and made the land blossom. When James Moore, former Governor of South Carolina, ruined the Apalache missions and dispersed the Indians, the area was returned to the forest. The destruction of this premier granary of Florida, upon which the capital, St. Augustine, was dependent in great measure for its supplies, dealt the Spanish a blow from which they were never fully to recover. They could no longer seriously attempt to Christianize or control any of the various tribes over which they held nominal suzerainty. They were likewise forced to reduce, for the nonce at least, their pretensions to territory; they were hard put, indeed, to hold the area between the Perdido River on the west, the Atlantic on the east, and the 31st parallel to the north.

At frequent intervals throughout the eighteenth century the Spanish and English clashed bitterly over territory, the former to hold, the latter to have. The more famous raids were those by Moore, Palmer, and Oglethorpe. Before he had laid waste to the fields of the Apalache, James Moore in 1702 ravaged the area around St. Augustine and then advanced upon the city itself. His subordinate, Colonel Daniel, commanded the land forces while he himself led the squadron which was to attack by sea. After succeeding in sacking the city, Daniel attacked its fort, Castillo de San Marcos, while Moore bombarded it from the sea. The combined assault was unavailing. Moore then determined to get heavier guns from Jamaica. Before these arrived two Spanish ships appeared on the horizon and Moore, panic-stricken, abandoned his own ships and supplies and fled overland in great haste to Charleston. In 1728 Colonel John Palmer of the Carolinas led an Indian foray within sight of St. Augustine. After inflicting terrible punishment upon the surrounding villages, Palmer retired, apparently without attempting to storm the fort. The next major effort to take St. Augustine was that of Governor James Oglethorpe of Georgia. Invading the Spanish province in 1739, the Englishman advanced upon St. Augustine early in the following year. By June he had set up two batteries on Anastasia Island and a third on the north beach at North River Point. To Oglethorpe's chagrin the fire emanating from these batteries made little impression upon the fort. After a month's siege the English withdrew.

From 1742 to 1748 the Spanish retaliated by raiding Georgia, which territory they had always claimed as their own. They even aspired to capture the entire colony, but failed miserably.

In 1763, as a result of the Treaty of Paris, Spain surrendered possession of east and west Florida to Great Britain in exchange for the return to Spain of Cuba, which had been captured by the Spanish in 1762. The Union Jack now waved above all Florida from the coast to the Mississippi. For administrative purposes the British split their new provinces formally into East and West Florida, the Apalachicola River serving as the dividing line. After this, trade, especially in West Florida, developed rapidly, and by the end of Britain's brief tenure in 1783, the Floridas were enjoying

a fair degree of prosperity. One of the interesting features of the British regime was the program of colonization. The British encouraged immigration from Europe, and in 1768 a Scotsman by the name of Dr. Andrew Turnbull landed a group of settlers in New Smyrna, Fla. The site was named after the birthplace of Dr. Turnbull's Greek wife, Smyrna. The majority of the later immigrants were Tories, who, after 1775, fled to Florida to escape their neighbors' wrath. The Floridas throughout the Revolution remained loyal to Great Britain and even attempted to conquer Georgia. The latter State returned the honor but was equally unsuccessful.

By the treaty of peace signed in 1783 the Floridas were returned to Spain and for the next 12 years the Spanish-American frontier was to be bitterly troubled by contests between the southern Americans who wished to reject the Spaniards, and Spain. That portion of Florida which was then known as West Florida was finally brought under the domination of the United States by President Madison's purchase of Louisiana from Napoleon and his interpretation that West Florida was a portion of Louisiana which he had purchased, but the Spanish steadfastly refused to accept America's patently erroneous interpretation; this merely whetted the appetite of this country for the Spanish possessions, and led to the organizing of a band of patriots in what was then known as East Florida, under the secret blessing of President Madison, who hoped to annex this part of the State to the United States, but because of bitter remonstrances from Spain and Great Britain Madison finally disavowed the work of the patriots, but the group persisted and in 1816 the insurgents and the Spanish alike, being sick of war, the group of patriots agreed to return to the Spanish fold, but only after the inducement of local government was offered. Later George Mathews, former Governor of Georgia, invaded East Florida with the hope of taking this territory, but was held to a standstill at St. Augustine. Because of the approaching war with the British in 1812 and Madison's realization that he did not want a hostile Spain in America's backyard, he repudiated the invasion. Had Mathews been able to take St. Augustine the President probably would have continued to smile upon him.

During the Anglo-American War of 1812–14 some Spanish sites were seized temporarily by Americans. In November 1814 General Jackson captured Pensacola, which had been used by the British as a base of operations against the Americans with the connivance of Spain and as a shelter for the Creek and Seminole Indians, allies of the British, which tribes had been defeated by Jackson earlier in the year at Horseshoe Bend, in Alabama. Pensacola was returned to the Spaniards almost immediately after its capture.

After the British war, the hero of the West was to have further sanguinary dealings with both Englishmen and Indians. In 1818 Jackson humiliated the Seminoles in the first of the great Seminole wars. It was during this campaign in Florida, still Spanish territory, that Jackson seized Pensacola. This time Jackson garrisoned the fortress town with American troops, declaring the while that if Spain could not keep her house in order, he could. John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State, warmly sustained him.

Jackson's flagrant disregard of Spanish sovereignty made Madrid painfully cognizant that the Floridas could not be held much longer. Deciding to sell them before they were grabbed by force, the Spanish minister to the United States, Onis, was ordered to affix his signature to the Adams-Onis treaty of February 1819, by which the Floridas were ceded to the United States in exchange for the latter's assumption of its nationals' claims against Spain, amounting to $5,000,000. The treaty was ratified 2 years later to the month.

The actual transfer of the Floridas to American sovereignty did not occur until July of 1821, as some time was required for Spain to evacuate her troops and work out the details incident to withdrawal. President Monroe, meanwhile, had appointed Andrew Jackson military governor of the territory. Thus Florida became a possession of the United States of America, never to be disputed again. After Jackson retired, leaving the affairs of the State in the hands of his two secretaries for the period of almost a year, the President in June 1822 appointed William P. Duval the first civil governor of the Territory of Florida.

The first legislative council, comprising 13 men, met in Pensacola in the summer of 1822; the next year it convened at St. Augustine. The legislators grew tired of having to assemble in various parts of the Territory and authorized Governor Duval to appoint two commissioners to select a site for a permanent capital. The commissioners reported in favor of the Tallahassee Indian fields, whereupon Duval, in March 1824, proclaimed that the future capital of Florida would be located upon this site. The Territory, manifestly stabilized, now received a large influx of immigrants from other States. From an estimated number of 6,000 in 1821 the population grew to 30,735 in 1830.

The progress of the Territory received a severe set-back upon the outbreak of the second Seminole War, which lasted from 1835 to 1842. The Seminoles, whose name means "separatist" or "runaway", were a hybrid race, consisting of Creek and other Indian elements, as well as a large number of Negroes who had escaped the domination of both white and red masters. After 1700 this motley group pushed over into Florida, but it was not until Revolutionary times that they received the appellation of "Seminole."

When the Americans started settling Florida they found the Seminoles occupying choice lands and harboring runaway slaves. Agitation for their removal soon developed, culminating in certain treaties and agreements under which the Seminoles were to be moved to South Florida. The Indians were dissatisfied with the agreements and refused to move, after which the Americans tried to get the Indians to move out of Florida, but they refused to do this. More treaties were made and repudiated. The government tried to enforce the treaties and war resulted in 1833. This war was to be the most savage and costly of all the Indian wars in which America has ever engaged.

The most prominent chief of the Seminoles at the time was Osceola, who was captured in the Fifth Congressional District under a flag of truce and imprisoned in Fort Castillo de San Marco at St. Augustine. Refusing to try to escape or to negotiate for his release because of what he protested as the dishonest manner in which he was captured, Osceola finally died. The war, however, was carried on and Col. Zachary Taylor in December 1837 defeated the Seminoles at Lake Okeechobee. However, the Seminoles refused to give up and it was not until 1842 when Gen. W. J. Worth offered them a reservation in South Florida, including territory in the Everglades, that the Seminoles came to terms. It may be added here that the Seminoles have never been completely subjugated and have never signed a peace treaty with the United States. They remain on their reservation living a peaceful and Bohemian life today.

Meanwhile, Florida had advanced toward statehood. In 1839 the people ratified a State constitution. Petitions were then presented requesting Congress to admit Florida into the Union. Admission, however, was opposed in northwestern Florida and in the region west of the Apalachicola. Spokesmen for the northeast advocated the division of Florida into two parts, each to be admitted at a subsequent date, with the Suwannee River as the dividing line. The Apalachicola opponents of statehood hoped to have their region annexed to Alabama. Many persons throughout the Territory, however, supported statehood, asserting that such a move would improve economic conditions, which had sunk precipitately after the crash in the late 1830's of the Territorial banks. The collapse had been the result of unrestrained speculation following a boom occasioned by the greatly increased immigration.

The most influential advocate of statehood was David Levy (who later had his name changed to David Levy Yulee), Territorial delegate to Congress. Levy pointed out that upon admission the State would receive from the Union the means to effect great internal improvements. Even more important in the successful fight for statehood than Levy's eloquence was the realization, shared by Congress and the Territory alike, that Florida's admission would balance that of Iowa, which was clamoring for admission as a free State.

On March 3, 1845, President Tyler approved the bill making Florida a State. Two months later the Florida Legislative Council called for a State election. As a result William D. Moseley became Florida's first State Governor. Florida was now on the comeback trail. Cotton goods, shoes, cigars, lumber, and naval stores were turned out in considerable quantities. In the years immediately preceding the War Between the States Florida's prosperity was more evenly distributed than at any other time before or since.

Like the other Southern States, Florida's newly won prosperity was to be destroyed by the fratricidal strife of 1861–65. Florida was one of the first to answer the challenge of Lincoln's election. In January 1861 a secession convention overwhelmingly approved an ordinance providing for the withdrawal of Florida from the Union.

Florida's role in the war was both vital and unique. The State produced enough food in 1 year to sustain a quarter million of soldiers for 6 months. In 1865 Florida contributed 2,000 head of cattle every week to the boys in gray. The State's actual fighting contribution was just as impressive. More Floridians, in proportion to population, served under the Stars and Bars than did men of any other State. It should be remembered, too, that Tallahassee was the only rebel capital east of the Mississippi which successfully defied capture throughout the war. Some of Florida's greatest heroes were Maj. Gen. Edmund Kirby Smith, the last Confederate Army commander to surrender; Maj. Gen. J. Patton Anderson; Gen. Joseph Finegan; Gen. William Miller; Gen. Sam Jones; and Capt. J. J. Dickison.

For the next 12 years glory was about all that Florida, again like the other Southern States, lived on. During the period 1869–71, especially, certain counties were subject to a reign of terror. A considerable measure of prosperity was ushered in with the governorship of William D. Bloxham, who served from 1881 to 1885. His administration covered such events as the sale of 4,000,000 acres of internal improvement lands, the beginning of a great era of railroad construction; the remarkable enterprises of H. B. Plant and Henry M. Flagler, who were initially responsible for the tremendous development which south Florida was to enjoy; the betterment of educational conditions; general municipal growth; and the unparalleled expansion of the citrus industry. Bloxham has been the only man ever to serve two terms as Governor. His second administration was from 1897–1901.

The opening years of the twentieth century were a happy augury for the future. Florida's progress could readily be seen in statistics. State tax assessments jumped from $85,158,523.63 in 1896 to $154,553,078 in 1907. Public-school costs rose during the same period from $660,249.62 to $1,351,652.74. It was truly a time of progress for education. The creation of a State university and a women's college was provided for in 1905 by the passage of the Buckman bill.

During the last quarter century the pace of progress has been phenomenal. Since 1910 the population has increased by over 100 percent. Citrus production has more than quadrupled its 1910 figure. Public-school expenditures have multiplied. The State has become one of the world's most renowned meccas for seekers of health and pleasure. Yet, Florida has only begun to realize upon her vast potentialities.

During the long and glorious history of the sun garden of America, the 12 counties now comprising the Fifth Congressional District of Florida have played an important part. The first to be created was that of St. Johns. The history of this county is the most significant of any in the State. For more than three-fourths of a century after the founding by Menendez of a colony at St. Augustine in 1565, this city, the oldest in the United States, was the most important bastion held by Europeans north of Mexico. No other county can boast of connections with so many illustrious men during the colonial period of American history. Here, too, in St. Augustine, is the justly celebrated Fort Castillo de San Marcos, for a while called Fort Marion, which no besieging army has ever been able to capture. Aside from its shrines, St. Johns is interesting today for its agricultural produce. Hastings has developed into the largest producer—1938 figures—of Irish potatoes for the spring market in the United States.

Marion, in 1844, was the next county to be created. This county embraces a large part of the area within which the treaty of Moultrie Creek placed the reservation for Seminole Indians. It was at Fort King that Osceloa is said to have thrust his knife into a table and snarled that that was the only treaty he would ever make with white men. Marion was one county the progress of which the War Between the States did not greatly affect, largely because the citrus industry supplied the wants of an ever-increasing number of people in many different areas.

The establishment of the remaining counties in the fifth district was spread over a period of some 70 years: Orange, 1845; Putnam, 1849; Sumter, 1853; Volusia, 1854; Brevard, 1855; Citrus, 1887; Lake, 1887; Osceola, 1887; Seminole, 1913, and Flagler, 1917.

The fifth district is the locale of many stories written by the popular authoress, Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings, and read by millions of people. Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings is a native of the District of Columbia, who has adopted Florida as her home State and knows the native of Florida, his weaknesses and virtues more intimately, I would say, than anyone in the State. She has lived with them until she is a part of them. She knows the beauties and the values of this tropical garden. She has written many stories of the State, a few years ago writing the Pulitzer prize winner, the Yearling, and most recently a best-seller, Cross Creek. She gives a vivid picture of the greatest and most delicious citrus fruit, the Florida orange, in her story, Golden Apples. I wish at this time to let Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings speak for Florida in an affectionate tribute to the State and I quote:

FLORIDA

AN AFFECTIONATE TRIBUTE FROM MARJORIE KINNAN RAWLINGS

My good friend, the Honorable JOE HENDRICKS, has, with a politician's naive and simple approach to art, asked me, quotes, "to describe the beauties of Florida, the lakes, streams, trees, flowers, birds, etc., in just a brief story." I myself have already written six full-length books in such an attempt, and the total volumes of this inexhaustible subject, in the more than four centuries of Florida's chaotic history, must be of almost equal bulk to that of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yet it can be said, and briefly, too, that Florida is unique among States in that her history is founded on that very beauty. Other States grew for reasons of agriculture, of forests and of gold; were sought out in search of political or religious freedom. But from the moment of Ponce de Leon's dream of the Fountain of Youth, to the same dream today in the heart of the graybeard who totters or is wheeled to the sun of St. Petersburg or Miami, men have sought Florida out of the purest and most aesthetic human impulse, the love of beauty. Like her sister, California, and that sister's, shall we say politely, fatherless child, Hollywood, Florida's stock in trade is glamour. And her glamour does not depend on the ephemeral flickering of the silver screen, but on the timeless, again to quote the Honorable Mr. HENDRICKS, "lakes, streams, trees, flowers, birds, etc."

Much of Florida is unchanged down the ages, and the ancient Spaniards came on the same wonders as delight us today. Pine forests, half shadow and half sunlight, like cathedral aisles, stretch for miles. The pines break, and there is hammock land, black of soil, lush with magnolia, sweet gum, bay, holly and live oak. The live oaks are pendulous with gray Spanish moss, stirring in the wind like the beards of long forgotten gods. The hammock breaks, and the orange groves lift their bright balls of light to the good sun. The golden apples of the Hesperides, the golden apple of Atalanta, were the orange. Limes and lemons, mangoes and papayas—all the rich fruits of the Tropics and the subtropics, offer their succulence. Everywhere are the palms, shaggy-topped and noble. And scattered throughout, like necklaces of diamond, of aquamarine and amber, are the lovely lakes, and cypress-bordered magic rivers run shining to the sea. Some of these rivers have their source in fabulous underground springs. Silver Springs, near Ocala, are the proved inspiration for Coleridge's famous poem Kubla Khan, in which "Alph, the sacred river, ran, through caverns measureless to man, down to a sunless sea." Lakes and rivers and offshore waters teem with fish of every variety.

Redbirds and mockingbirds, rustling jorees and sweet-calling wood ducks, snowy egrets and tall blue cranes, limpkins, and baldheaded eagles, the true American eagle, move and cry and sing through the dense green growth. White-tailed deer crop the myrtle buds, are startled and are gone; black bear lumber through the swamps, wildcats and panthers stalk their prey, and countless small woods creatures—raccoons, possums, foxes, scamper by night or day about their business.

And now, in spring, the yellow jessamine fills the air with spicy sweetness, and the orange groves are in bloom, their perfume almost unbearable through the long nights of moonlight. To the south, the bougainvillia and the hibiscus are flamboyant, and such an array of garden flowers and of garden vegetables is ready for man's delight as to make one wonder why the capital of the United States was not placed in the Floridian Eden instead of in Washington, D. C. And the climate! Take the lies of California, and in Florida, they are truth.

If human wantonness and human greed have here and there destroyed Arcadia, with the careless cutting and burning of forests, the useless and destructive draining of lands that were refuges for all the wild things; with the erection of billboards and transient camps; if avid purveyors to Florida's great cash crop, the tourist, have a little soiled the beauty and overcharged the seeker of loveliness, lay the blame fairly where it belongs, as all such things as greed and war and man's general inhumanity to man, must be laid, on the frailty of human nature, and not on Florida, great and gracious tropical queen. She waits, as she has done through the centuries, to be all things to all men.

Madam Speaker, I yield at this time to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

FLORIDA

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, there has been arranged in the Library of Congress a display of historical documents relating to the history of Florida. It will be on display for several weeks. It is a very good exhibit and I invite all of my colleagues to see it.

Prior to 1845, the history of Florida had been full of action and had seen the flags change from time to time. I am indebted to the Honorable T. J. Brooks, Assistant Commissioner of Agriculture of the State of Florida, for the following historical data in the publication Know Your State, published by the State Department of Agriculture:

HISTORY

Florida has a background of more than four centuries of colorful history since the coming of the white man. Indian races, extending into the dim shadows of the forgotten past, roamed its hills and shores. Explorers and settlers from Spain, France, and England have left their imprint. Some of the most interesting incidents in the history of the American Nation have to do with the old and the new land of Florida. Over its soil a prehistoric people roamed (the mound builders), then the Indian. The first flag waved was the royal banner of Spain; next the lily-spangled flag of the Kingdom of France; then the British Union Jack, the Stars and Stripes, the Stars and Bars of the Southern Confederacy, and again Stars and Stripes of our own United States.

Florida has had a very interesting and varied history. It has the oldest permanent white settlement in America, St. Augustine, but for various reasons it has developed more slowly than the other States.

On March 27, 1513, Ponce de Leon of Spain discovered land near what is now St. Augustine and landed on the 2nd of April, taking possession of the country in the name of the King of Spain. Of course the inhabitants that he found here were Indians. Much of the 35,000,000 acres of what is now Florida was a vast and lonely wilderness, but parts of it were settled by tribes of these primitive people, of whose history little is known.

Ponce de Leon landed on Easter Sunday, called in Spanish Pascua Florida, or the Feast of Flowers, and he gave the name of the day to the new country. From this has come the present name of the State. He spent some time in a fruitless search for gold and returned to his native country, but 4 years later he came back to Florida and looked for gold and precious metals again. In the meantime another Spaniard had brought an expedition to Florida and had begun trading with the natives.

In 1517, 1527, and 1539 other Spanish expeditions came to the country, the last one being the ill-fated caravan of Hernando de Soto. Each of these in turn met with failure and disappointment. All of them were searching for gold and fabulous riches which they believed to be hidden in the interior of the new country.

Traces of occupation by all of these people come vividly before us as we tour the State. The ruins and monuments of the early colonists; Indian settlements; battlefields; these mingle with modern structures and engineering feats. The past and the present combine to interest all observers.

In 1562 Jean Ribault, a Frenchman, visited this land and made a glowing report of what he saw. In 1564 French Huguenots under the leadership of Rene de Laudonniere established a colony named Fort Caroline near the mouth of the St. Johns River.

A Spanish settlement under Pedro Menéndez de Avilés was established at St. Augustine in 1565. This settlement has had an unbroken history to the present day. Menéndez's first task was the destruction of the French Fort Caroline, with the slaughter of its defenders. A French fleet under Ribault was wrecked on the coast and its survivors were captured and slaughtered by Menéndez's soldiers. This ended the first period of French contact with Florida, although an avenging expedition in 1568 destroyed the Spanish garrison which Menéndez had established on the site of Fort Caroline.

The stone ruins of missions are to be found in many places today—missions established among the Indians by Spanish priests. The Spanish also established a settlement at Pensacola. Many of these early buildings and forts still stand at Pensacola, St. Augustine, and other places.

In 1696 Pensacola was settled by the Spaniards and later all of Florida passed into the hands of the British. Both French and Spanish, however, retained claims to parts of the large territory then known as Florida, and it changed hands several times before it finally became a possession of the United States through purchase from Spain in 1821. Andrew Jackson became the first Territorial Governor of Florida, and in 1824 Tallahassee was selected as the seat of government.

In 1763 Florida was ceded to England and remained loyal to that country during the Revolutionary War. Up to 1784, when Florida was ceded back to Spain, the English established many fine plantations in Florida, and more than 15,000 English families left Florida when their flag ceased to fly over its territory.

Spain sold Florida to the United States in 1821 for $5,000,000. Florida was 1 of the 11 seceding States in 1861, and her citizens played a prominent part in the war.

In 1835 a war between the Seminoles and the United States began, resulting in much bloodshed and continuing at intervals until 1842. Few Indians remained in the State at that time, and these retreated into the Everglades, where they still live peaceably.

In 1842 the first capitol building at Tallahassee was completed, having been begun in 1826. It has since been remodeled and additions have been made.

In 1845 Florida was admitted to the Union as a State, and in 1876 its active development began. It has had a highly interesting and varied history.

HISTORICAL DATA CONCERNING FLORIDA

Period of exploration

1497: Sebastian and John Cabot, under Henry VII, of England, sail and probably mapped the entire Atlantic coast from Labrador to Mexico. First voyage of Americus Vespucius along the same route.

1502: Ponce de Leon sails with Ovando for Hispaniola (Hayti). Date of the Alberto Cantino map—first map of Florida.

1513: Ponce de Leon embarks for Bimini March 3 in search of the Fountain of Youth; discovers land March 27, on Easter Sunday (Pascua Florida), christens it Florida, the Land of Flowers; landing a little north of St. Augustine April 2. Shortly returns to Puerto Rico after discovery and charting of islands and parts of the coast.

1521: Ponce de Leon's second voyage to Florida; wounded by an Indian arrow, is carried to Cuba; dies there, and buried in his castle in Puerto Rico.

1528: Narváez's expedition embarks for Florida, landing near Tampa.

1539: De Soto lands at Tampa and marches to Anhaquea (present Tallahassee), where he spends the winter.

1540: De Soto travels on north to the headwaters of the Savannah River and thence west.

Period of colonization

1556: Elaborate expedition planned in Spain to colonize and Christianize Florida. Don Tristan de Luna chosen to command.

1559: De Luna's departure from Mexico to Florida and landing near what is now Pensacola. Hurricane destroys his fleet.

1562: Ribault's first voyage to colonize Florida. Discovers the River May (St. Johns), establishing colony of 30 men near Port Royal, and returns to France.

1564: June 22, René Laudonnière arrives on the Florida coast at the River May (St. Johns), builds Fort Caroline, and explores the country generally.

1565: September 6, St. Augustine established with great pomp and ceremony and temporary fortifications built. September 18 and 19, Menéndez marches with 500 men to Fort Caroline, capturing it September 20, with great slaughter.

1566: Menéndez returns to Spain and receives royal welcome. Small colony, including 14 women, sent from Spain to St. Augustine.

1568: De Dourges arrives at the St. Marys River and proceeds south to the St. Johns and destroys Fort San Mateo and garrison, avenging his countrymen; returns to France.

1569: Menéndez returns from Spain, rebuilds San Mateo, destroys St. Elena, then returns to Spain.

1578: St. Augustine and Florida's importance stressed at the Court of Spain and appropriations made for same.

1584: Marked influx of missionaries to Florida from Spain.

1586: Drake destroys St. Augustine and loots its treasury.

1587: St. Augustine rebuilt and much improved, with funds from Spain.

1612: Eleven convents reported flourishing and active in Florida.

1615: Probable date of building mission near St. Marys. Walls still standing.

1645: Probable date of building fort at Matanzas.

1649: Great activity in mission work and success reported in Christianizing Indians.

1665: Centenary of the establishment of St. Augustine by Menendez. The English freebooter Davis destroys the city.

1686: British succeed in conquering all Spanish territory to the north of St. Augustine and driving Spaniards out.

1696: D'Ariola founds Pensacola.

1718: First account of any setlement at St. Joseph's Bay, first by the French and later by the Spaniards.

1719: Flags changed four times this year at Pensacola, from Spain to France and vice versa

1722: Pensacola and West Florida returned to Spain by France.

1739: England declares war on Spain. Oglethorpe instructed to harass Spanish possessions in Florida.

1740: Oglethorpe proceeds to Picolata, Fla., and besieges St. Augustine.

1742: Spanish expedition from Habana and Florida attack Oglethorpe in Georgia. Defeated at the battle of Bloody Marsh Island near St. Simons.

1743: Oglethorpe's second expedition to Florida.

1755: Fernando de Herreda appointed Governor of Florida; great building activity.

1756: Castle of San Marco in St. Augustine completed in this year after 118 years' work on same.

1763: Havana restored to Spain in exchange for Florida.

1764: Great English immigration to Florida, mills and plantations started, great industry and activity.

Changing flags

1776: Year of Independence. Florida remains loyal to England.

1779: Invasion of West Florida threatened by Spaniards in Louisiana.

1780: Don Galvez and Admiral Solana concentrate their forces to attack Pensacola.

1781: Forts at Pensacola, under Col. Campbell (British), surrender to Spanish attack.

1783: Florida exchanged for the Bahama Islands.

1795: Treaty between the United States and Spain as to Florida's western boundary.

1800: Spain, by secret treaty, cedes Louisiana to France. Part of Florida seems to be included.

1803: The purchase from France of Louisiana for $15,000,000 giving the United States control of the Mississippi Valley. Boundaries between this territory and Florida again questioned.

1808: Fernandina declared a free port; became a rendezvous for much questionable trade.

1809: Napoleon, having conquered Spain in Europe, claims all her colonies, Florida included. This was stoutly resisted by the United States and later in 1823 became elaborated in the Monroe Doctrine.

1810: Republic of West Florida organized September 10, at Pensacola, to control disputed territory. Dissolved after an existence of 58 days by orders from Washington, without trouble.

1812: June 18, war declared on England by the United States. Organization of Republic of Florida.

1814: Fierce engagement off Cape Canaveral, Fla., between British and American war vessels. British troops occupy Pensacola, speedily driven out by Andrew Jackson.

1818: Jackson's second invasion of Florida.

1819: Treaty drawn up in Washington for Florida's transfer to United States.

1821: Transfer of west Florida accepted by Andrew Jackson.

Territorial period

1821: July 21, St. Johns and Escambia created counties, and municipal government established in St. Augustine and Pensacola.

1823: Second legislative council held in May, in St. Augustine, and decision made that a central point of meeting be chosen for future legislation. First treaty made, September 18, with Florida Indians at Moultrie Creek, signed by 32 leading chiefs.

1824: Dr. Simmons and John Lee Williams select Neomathla's village near Tallahassee for future State capital.

1825: Appropriation of $23,000 by the legislative council to build road from Pensacola to St. Augustine. Congress voted $200,000 to Lafayette and 23,000 acres just east of Tallahassee, Fla. Later settled by immigrants from France.

1826: Congress grants to Florida the elective franchise for their representatives in Congress and State legislature.

1828: Judicial district formed for the whole of south Florida. Court to sit at Key West. First bank organized in Florida at Tallahassee.

1829: Privilege extended to elect all officers for Florida except the governor, he being appointed by the President. Commencement of era of wildcat banking and boom towns in Florida.

1831: Bank of St. Augustine chartered.

1832: Jacksonville's first charter incorporation.

1835: Beginning of Indian war. Dade massacre, December 25. Osceola becomes a prominent leader in Indian affairs.

1837: Osceola's capture and imprisonment.

1839: Constitutional convention held at St. Joseph adjourned, having given Florida its first constitution.

1841: Closing scenes of the Indian war. Coacoochee captured and deported.

1842. Armed Occupation Act.

1844: Preparation to enter statehood.

As a State

1845: March 31, Florida and Iowa become States by the same act. Dr. John Gorrie, of Apalachicola, discovers process for making ice.

Reestablished in the Union

1868: Civil government reestablished July 4.

1877: Federal supervision of Florida affairs ends and reconstruction times closed under President Hayes.

1879: First telephone installed in Jacksonville.

1881: Sale of 4,000,000 acres of State-owned lands to Hamilton Disston and associates.

1882: Establishment of Institute for Deaf Mutes in St. Augustine, and Academy established in DeLand by H. A. DeLand.

1889: Discovery of phosphate.

1891: Subtropical exhibition opened in Jacksonville, doing much to advertise Florida's products.

1892: Flagler railroad construction reaches Titusville and work proceeds down the east coast.

1895: Severe frost, in February, destroys practically the entire citrus production of Florida for some years to come.

1896: Railroad reaches Miami June 26.

1897: Activity in railroad building on the west coast of Florida.

1898: Spanish-American War gives Florida great impetus.

1899: Fire destroys Miami.

1901: May 3, 466 acres in Jacksonville laid waste by disastrous fire, with some loss of life and untold value in records, etc.

On March 3, 1845, President Tyler signed the act which admitted Florida to the Union. The preamble and certain sections pertinent to our State are as follows:

Statute II, March 3, 1845, chapter XLVIII, an act for the admission of the States of Iowa and Florida into the Union, (a):

Whereas the people of the Territory of Iowa did, on the seventh day of October, eighteen hundred and forty-four, by a convention of delegates called and assembled for that purpose, form for themselves a constitution and State government: and whereas, the people of the Territory of Florida did, in like manner, by their delegates, on the eleventh day of January, eighteen hundred and thirty-nine, form for themselves a constitution and State government, both of which said constitutions are republican; and said conventions having asked the admission of their respective Territories into the Union as States, on equal footing with the original States:

Be it enacted, etc., That the States of Iowa and Florida be, and the same are hereby, declared to be States of the United States of America, and are hereby admitted into the Union on equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatsoever.

SEC. 5. *And be it further enacted*, That said State of Florida shall embrace the territories of east and west Florida, which by the treaty of amity, settlement and limits between the United States and Spain, on the twenty-second day of February, eighteen hundred and nineteen, were ceded to the United States.

SEC. 6. *And be it further enacted*, That until the next census and apportionment shall be made, each of said States of Iowa and Florida shall be entitled to one representative in the House of Representatives of the United States.

Certain excerpts from the Congressional Globe showing the proceedings of the Twenty-eighth Congress, second session, will be of interest and I include same herein:

[28th Cong., 2d sess., Jan. 7, 1845]

Mr. A. V. Brown, from the Committee on the Territories, reported the following bill:

H. R. 497

A bill for the admission of the States of Iowa and Florida into the Union

Whereas the people of the Territory of Iowa did, on the 7th day of October, 1844, by a convention of delegates called and assembled for that purpose, form for themselves a constitution and State government; and whereas the people of the Territory of Florida did, in like manner, by their delegates, on the 11th day of January 1839, form for themselves a constitution and State government, both of which said constitutions are republican; and said conventions having asked the admission of their respective Territories into the Union as States, on equal footing with the original States:

Be it enacted, etc., That the States of Iowa and Florida be, and the same are hereby, declared to be States of the United States of America, and are hereby admitted into the Union on equal footing with the original States, in all respects whatsoever.

SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That the following shall be the boundaries of the said State of Iowa, to wit: Beginning in the middle of the main channel of the Mississippi River, opposite the mouth of the Des Moines River; thence up the said River Des Moines, in the middle of the main chanel thereof, to a point where the northern boundary of the State of Missouri (as the same may be finally established) strikes said river; thence west with the said northern boundary (as the same may be finally established) to the middle of the main channel of the Missouri River; thence up in the middle of the main channel of the river last mentioned to the mouth of the Sioux, or Calumet River; thence in a direct line to the middle of the main channel of the St. Peters River, where the Watonwan River (according to Nicollet's map) enters the same; thence down the middle of the main channel of said river, to the middle of the main channel of the Mississippi River; thence down the middle of the main channel of said river to the place of beginning.

SEC. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That said State of Florida shall embrace the territories of East and West Florida, which, by the treaty of amity, settlement, and limits, between the United States and Spain, on the 22d day of February 1819, were ceded to the United States: *Provided*, That whenever the Federal population residing east of the Suwannee River shall amount to 35,000, all of said country lying east of said river may be erected into a separate State, to be called East Florida. But no act of the Legislature of Florida, providing for such division, shall be passed, except with the assent of the majority of the senate and house of representatives, east as well as west of said Suwannee River; nor shall such new State be admitted into the Union until it shall have form a constitution republican in its character.

SEC. 4. *And be it further enacted*, That until the next census and apportionment shall be made, each of said States of Iowa and Florida shall be entitled to one Representative in the House of Representatives of the United States.

SEC. 5. *And be it further enacted*, That said States of Iowa and Florida are admitted into the Union on the express condition that they shall never interfere with the primary disposal of the public lands lying within them, nor levy any tax on the same whilst remaining the property of the United States.

[House of Representatives, Tuesday, February 11, 1845]

RESOLUTIONS OF STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. Levy presented resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Florida, instructing their Delegate to urge upon this House the admission of Florida and Iowa into the Union of States.

ADMISSION OF IOWA AND FLORIDA

The question being taken, after some conversation, the motion of Mr. Levy was agreed to, and the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. J. W. Davis in the chair), and resumed the consideration of the bill providing for the admission of Iowa and Florida as States into the Union, with the pending amendment thereto of Mr. Duncan and Mr. Relfe.

There was a filibuster at one time. On a motion to adjourn, the vote was yeas 69, nays 84. At another time the vote was yeas 72, nays 80. On motion for the committee to

arise the vote was 76 in the affirmative and 76 in the negative, and the Chair voted in the affirmative.

[House of Representatives, Thursday, February 13, 1845]

ADMISSION OF FLORIDA AND IOWA

On the motion of Mr. Pettit, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. J. W. Davis in the chair), and resumed the consideration of the bill for the admission of Florida and Iowa into the Union.

Mr. Cobb moved the previous question on its passage.

Mr. Sample appealed to Mr. Cobb to withdraw the demand for the previous question in order to enable him to move to commit the bill with certain instructions, which were read by the Clerk, as follows:

"To report separate bills for the admission of Florida and Iowa into the Union as States, with the same boundaries for each as are contained in the present bill as amended in Committee of the Whole; and in the bill for the admission of Florida no provision shall be inserted for the formation hereafter of two States out of her Territory."

Mr. Cobb declining to withdraw,

The demand for the previous question was seconded, and the main question was ordered.

Mr. Dickey asked the yeas and nays; which were ordered.

The question was taken, and decided in the affirmative—yeas 145, nays 46, as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Anderson, Arrington, Ashe, Atkinson, Barringer, Bayly, Belser, Bidlack, Edward J. Black, James Black, James A. Black, Blackwell, Bower, Bowlin, Boyd, Brinkerhoff, Brodhead, A. V. Brown, Milton Brown, W. J. Brown, Burke, Burt, Caldwell, Campbell, Shepherd Cary, Causin, Reuben Chapman, Chappell, Chilton, Clinch, Clingman, Clinton, Cobb, Coles, Cross, Cullom, Daniel, Garrett, Davis, John W. Davis, Dawson, Dean, Dellet, Dillingham, Douglass, Dromgoole, Duncan, Ellis, Farlee, Ficklin, Foster, French, Fuller, Goggin, Willis Green, Grider, Hale, Hammett, Haralson, Hardin, Hays, Henley, Holmes, Hoge, Hopkins, Houston, Hubard, Hubbell, James B. Hunt, Charles J. Ingersoll, Jameson, Cave Johnson, Andrew Johnson, George W. Jones, Andrew Kennedy, John P. Kennedy, Kirkpatrick, Labranche, Leonard, Lucas, Lumpkin, Lyon, McCauslen, Maclay, McClelland, McClernand, McConnell, McDowell, McKay, Mathews, Edward J. Morris, Joseph Morris, Isaac E. Morse, Murphy, Newton, Norris, Owen, Parmenter, Payne, Peyton, Phoenix, Pollock, Emery D. Potter, Pratt, Purdy, David S. Reid, Reding, Relfe, Rhett, Ritter, Roberts, Rodney, Russell, St. John, Saunders, Senter, Thomas H. Seymour, Simons, Simpson, Slidell, John T. Smith, Thomas Smith, Robert Smith, Steenrod, Stephens, Stiles, James W. Stone, Alfred P. Stone, Strong, Summers, Sykes, Taylor, Thomasson, Thompson, Tibbatts, Tucker, Weller, Wentworth, Wethered, John White, Benjamin White, Woodward, Joseph A. Wright, Yancey, and Yost—145.

Nays: Messrs. Abbot, Adams, Baker, Barnard, Brengle, Buffington, Carroll, Cranston, Richard D. Davis, Deberry, Dickey, Fish, Florence, Foot, Giddings, Byram Green, Grinnell, Edward S. Hamlin, Harper, Hudson, Washington Hunt, Irvin, Jenks, Perley B. Johnson, Preston King, Daniel P. King, McIlvaine Marsh, Freeman H. Morse, Moseley, Paterson, Elisha R. Potter, Robinson, Rockwell, Rogers, Sample, Schenck, Severance, David L. Seymour, Albert Smith, Caleb B. Smith, Tilden, Tyler, Vance, Vinton, and Winthrop—46.

Mr. Slidell moved the reconsideration of the vote on the passage of the bill; and on this demanded the previous question; which was seconded, and the main question was ordered, and being taken was rejected.

So the bill was finally passed.

[In Senate, Friday, February 14, 1845]

IOWA AND FLORIDA

A message was received from the House, accompanied by the act for the admission of the States of Iowa and Florida into the Union; which were read twice, with the view of commitment.

[In Senate, Monday, February 24, 1845]

FLORIDA AND IOWA

Mr. Berrien, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back without amendment and favorably to its passage, the bill from the House for the admission of the States of Iowa and Florida into the Union.

[House of Representatives, Friday, February 14, 1845, p. 275, Congressional Globe, 28th Cong., 2d sess.]

Mr. Levy rose only for the explanation of certain facts connected with this particular subject, and not for the purpose of replying to the gentleman who preceded him. He should avail himself of some other opportunity of replying to the objections of the gentleman from New York, when some other gentleman should make a specific proposition. In reference to the objections that had been made to the provision that Florida, when possessed of the requisite population, might be divided into two States, he should, without touching on the question of the balance of power between the North and the South, refer the committee to the facts necessary to be considered in the settlement of this question. By the treaty by which Florida was ceded to the United States, it was provided, not that one territory and one people should be admitted into the Union, but two territories and two peoples. For the economy and convenience of the Government of the United States, Florida was organized into one territorial government; but it previously existed as two separate provinces of Spain, and under two separate governments. It was delivered to the United States as two separate governments; and was in fact, held for a year as such, until, by the organization of the present territorial government, it was consolidated into one. As far back as 1764, the Floridas were erected into two separate governments, East and West Florida, by a British edict and when they came into the possession of Spain, they were held as two governments till ceded to the United States. And there was good reason why there should be two governments, instead of one. Its geographical position and shape was such that one government would be exceedingly inconvenient. (Mr. L. here held up a map of the United States, showing the long peninsula of Florida, running out between the Gulf and the Atlantic, and having a considerable western territory, which might properly be said to belong to the valley of the Mississippi, so that, instead of adding to the power of the Atlantic States, it would give one State to the western, and the other to the Atlantic section.) He then contended that this government was bound in good faith to carry out the stipulations of the treaty by which the Floridas were ceded to the United States, by admitting them as two entire States, and argued that it would be a flagrant breach of trust, as well as a cruel piece of injustice to those people, to violate the treaty in the manner proposed by the gentleman from New York.

[In Senate, Saturday, March 1, 1845]

ADMISSION OF FLORIDA AND IOWA

On motion of Mr. Allen, the Senate took up the bill to provide for the admission of the Territories of Florida and Iowa into the Union as States.

The bill was considered by the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Evans said that as the bill now stood, he could not vote for it. He was under instructions from his constituents on the subject, and he hoped the bill would be so shaped as to meet the views of the people he represented. The constitution of Florida, moreover, was formed in 1838, and he did not know that the present people of Florida were in favor of it.

Mr. Berrien said that it received the sanction of a majority of the last legislature of Florida.

Mr. Evans said that might be very true, but the constitution should receive the sanction of the people of Florida. That constitution gave the legislature the power of passing laws which his constituents felt to be a grievance. He referred to the laws enacted in some of the Southern States for the arrest and imprisonment of free people of color. The operation of these laws was harassing to the people of the North. He had known voyages to be broken up by the desertion of colored seamen, who would not submit to the danger of imprisonment when they found out that the vessel in which they shipped was destined for a southern port. The public sentiment of the North was unanimous on this subject.

Mr. Evans read the resolutions of the legislature of Maine upon this subject and argued against the constitutionality of the clause in the constitution of Florida prohibiting the emancipation of slaves, and prohibiting the immigration, or discharge from on board of vessels, of free persons of color into Florida.

THE NEW STATES OF IOWA AND FLORIDA

On motion by Mr. Allen, the consideration of the House bill for the admission of Iowa and Florida into the Union was resumed—the question pending being on the amendment offered by Mr. Evans.

Mr. Choate being entitled to the floor, addressed the Senate for about an hour.

He expressed a strong wish that there had been a division of this subject, and that a bill for the admission of each State, separately, had been presented instead of a joint bill making the admission of the one dependent upon that of the other. To say the least of it, this joint legislation, under the power of Congress to admit new States, was of an extraordinary character. For the first time in the history of the exercise of that power, this mode of proceeding was now adopted. This was a peculiar circumstance, to which he wished to call the attention of the Senate and of the country. * * *

He was unwilling that hereafter, when the stand taken by her representatives, and all trace of their reasons and objections shall have passed away, Massachusetts shall be cited, as she was through mistake the other day, as the unvarying opponent of the admission of new States into this Union. It was on that account that he submitted to the Senate the remark that there was great injustice in this mode of admitting two States by one and the same bill; yet he said this, not as meaning that it was intentional injustice, but that, practically, injustice was the consequence of this mode of proceeding.

Mr. Woodbury said that he should vote against the amendment of the Senator from Maine; but, in doing so, he protested against the conclusion that his vote was given either for or against the constitutionality of the laws enacted by some of the southern States, of which Senators had complained. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. SIMMONS] had said that if we thought the provision in the constitution of Florida unconstitutional, we should strike it out. Now it was well known that Congress did not overhaul the constitutions of other States when they were admitted; and certainly they should not overhaul the constitution of Florida. That was the duty of the judiciary, and not of Congress. The only doubt he had about the matter rested upon the rights which the citizens of one State had in another State. By leaving the constitution of Florida as we found it, we did not delegate any power to

the legislature whatever. It was the people of Florida, and not Congress, who bestowed power upon that body.

The question was then taken on Mr. Evans' amendment, and decided in the negative, as follows: Yeas 12, nays 35.

Mr. Berrien said there had been some doubt about the population of Florida on the part of the Judiciary Committee—the census not having been taken generally in 1840 owing to the disturbed state of the country. The delegate from the Territory, however, had appeared before the committee and satisfied it that the population of the Territory was more than 90,000. In relation to the boundary difficulties between Missouri and Iowa, they had been obviated by provisions inserted in the bill.

After some remarks from Mr. Woodbridge in opposition, the bill was reported back to the Senate and ordered to a third reading.

It was then passed by the following vote:

Yeas: Messrs. Allen, Archer, Ashley, Atchison, Atherton, Bagby, Barrow, Bayard, Benton, Berrien, Breese, Buchanan, Cloquitt, Crittenden, Dickinson, Dix, Fairfield, Foster, Hannegan, Haywood, Henderson, Huger, Johnson, Lewis, McDuffie, Mangum, Merrick, Morehead, Niles, Semple, Sevier, Sturgeon, Tappan, Walker, White, and Woodbury—36.

Nays: Messrs. Choat, Evans, Francis, Huntington, Miller, Phelps, Simmons, Upham, and Woodbridge—9.

[House of Representatives, March 3, 1845]

IOWA AND FLORIDA

A message was received from the Senate by Asbury Dickins, esq., its secretary, announcing that the Senate had passed the bill for the admission of Florida and Iowa into the Union.

(Cries of "Good! That makes 29 stars.")

FIRST DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Madam Speaker, the First District of Florida has a population of 439,985. It includes the counties of Hardee, Hernando, Highlands, Hillsborough, Pasco, Pinellas, Polk, Manatee, and Sarasota. It is truly first in many ways—the first in population—it has within its boundaries the county mining the largest amount of phosphate in the world—the largest sponge fisheries in North America. The county producing the greatest number of hand-made cigars—the county producing the most oranges and grapefruit. De Soto landed here—de Narvaez landed in this district—Fort Dade, Fort Brooke, Fort Bassenger, Fort Meade, Fort Frazier, Fort Hannum, and many other old forts were within its boundaries. It was in this district at the Gamble mansion that Judah P. Benjamin, secretary of state of the Confederacy, stayed just before his departure, and from which he left this country. Gasper, the pirate, sailed its shores. Weedon Island culture of Indians had its birth here. The Seminoles hid in its swamps and forests—but where Indians once roved and pirate ships sailed, farms, cattle ranches, groves, and industries flourish, and fishing vessels and mighty ships now operate. One hundred years has seen the State grow to a total official population of 1,897,414, but in fact a much larger population than this. In the season 1943–44 Florida produced 80,800,000 boxes of oranges, grapefruit, and tangerines. The bank clearings in 1943 from January to July, were $1,115,409,150; an estimated gross value of $160,000,000 for citrus; $84,000,000 for vegetables, and $2,833,200 for noncitrus. The Federal income tax paid by Floridians the year June 30, 1943, totaled $110,070,864; next to Massachusetts Florida produces more seafood than any State on the Atlantic seaboard. Army and naval bases, stations, and air fields are throughout the State.

When the message came to the House from the Senate, reporting the passage of the bill in the Senate, there were cries of "Good! Good!" in the House, and it was truly good.

The income tax which she pays into the Federal Treasury each year is more than the entire amount paid for the purchase.

Florida, the winter garden of the world, furnishes life-giving vitamins to the rest of the Nation in its fruits and vegetables sent to a snow-covered northland. Phosphorus from its phosphate rock enriches the soils of worn-out lands. Its cattle and fish furnish food to many. Its products, many and varied, are a part of the national economy. Ships built in her yards ply the seven seas.

Our men and women are occupying all ranks from private to general, and seamen to admirals and have displayed fine bravery in every battlefield.

A State rich in tradition and history; a State rich in resources and products; a State still richer in possibilities of its undeveloped resources. Old in history—yet young in opportunity.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] such time as he may desire.

TERRITORIAL FLORIDA AND ANDREW JACKSON

Mr. SIKES. Madam Speaker, the story of Florida is not complete until we chronicle the part played by Andrew Jackson. Historically, the fortunes of Florida in the early nineteenth century were lighted by the trail of glory which Jackson blazed across the American horizon. His turbulent career was closely interwoven with the history of Florida. His Florida campaigns helped to make his reputation as a soldier, they insured his standing as a fearless leader. In the acquisition of the territory of Florida, and its development toward statehood, the influence of Jackson was seldom absent. By stronge coincidence, his death came soon after Florida was admitted to the Union in 1845.

Before 1810, Spanish Florida extended across a narrow strip of the Gulf Coast all the way to the Mississippi. In that year, despite Spanish protests, President Madison proclaimed American authority over the section of Florida between the Mississippi and Perdido Rivers, using as his justification the purchase of the Louisiana territory, whose boundaries were none too clearly defined. By that action, the Perdido River became the western boundary of Spanish Florida and of Florida as we know it today.

After 1814, Spain divided what was left of Florida into East Florida and West Florida, making the Suwannee River the dividing line. In subsequent years, declining Spanish interest and authority made of the peninsula, outside the few fortified towns, a haven for runaway slaves, pirates, thieves, and renegade sailors.

It was about this time that the paths of Andrew Jackson and of Florida merged. Jackson had been judge, Congressman, United States Senator, and major general of militia, and was already one of Tennessee's immortals. But he had been by-passed and denied an active command in the War of 1812 through War Department politics. In 1813, the news of a Creek uprising and the massacre of 250 persons at Fort Mims, gave Jackson his chance. The Governor authorized an expedition by the militia, and Jackson, still weak from a grievous wound received in one of his numerous affairs of honor, led the expedition.

There was much more in Jackson's mind than his Governor or the War Department might have suspected. He intended to destroy the Indians along the Coosa and Tallapoosa Rivers, then push on to Mobile, opening from Tennessee to the Gulf a highway which would be of much importance to the United States. After this was accomplished, the crowning stroke would come. He would invade Florida and seize Pensacola, thus eliminating the influence of Spain, silent ally of Britain and supporter of the Creeks. Such a bold undertaking could well end in failure or court martial for a lesser man.

Jackson crushed the Indians, and the Nation's acclaim for its one general who had shown an ability to win battles caused him to be made a major general of regulars and to be placed in command of the military district embracing Tennessee, Louisiana, and the Mississippi territory. Now Jackson was ready to move. Pensacola was next in his mind. Clothed with new authority, Jackson asked the War Department for tacit consent to stamp out the troubles which were being stirred up in west Florida. A letter which could be interpreted either as giving or withholding that consent was dispatched to him. It did not reach him until after the war. But Jackson did not wait. The British were moving into the Pensacola defenses in force, and their campaign against Mobile and New Orleans was beginning to take shape. On November 3, 1814, Jackson stormed the works at Pensacola and immediately thereafter the British blew up Fort Barrancas, which they held, and withdrew in their ships. The glory subsequently won by Jackson at New Orleans and the national standing which followed for him are familiar history.

At the close of the War of 1812, Pensacola was returned to Spain. Jackson, though still a major general in command of the southern district, went into semi-retirement at his Nashville Hermitage. However, there was constant trouble with smugglers, Indians, and runaway slaves along the Georgia-Florida border, and there was little doubt that Spanish policy and British agents encouraged these disturbances. Then in 1817, Indian War flared again.

Jackson promptly assumed command of the forces opposing the Indians. The annexation of Florida had never left his mind. His communications with Presi-

dent Monroe and with Secretary of War Calhoun left no doubt of this, or of his intentions regarding Florida if given sufficient freedom of action. His orders as he left the Florida border were very broad. They said:

> Adopt the necessary measures to terminate the conflict.

And again:

> The movement against the Seminoles * * * will bring you to a theater where you may possibly have other duties to perform * * * Great interests are at stake * * * This is not a time for repose * * * until our cause is carried triumphantly through.

The vagueness of Jackson's instructions caused him no concern. They were sufficiently clear for his warlike mind. He had plainly asked for authorization to seize Florida, stating that he would require no direct orders but would need only indirect sanction. Nor does there appear to have been any doubt in official Washington about Jackson's intentions. The Secretary of War wrote Governor Bibbs of Alabama, "General Jackson is vested with full power to conduct the war as he may think best." Calhoun knew perfectly well what Andrew Jackson thought best for Florida.

In March 1818, Jackson's troops moved into Florida. He took St. Marks without resistance, then made a forced march to the Suwannee River, 107 miles to the east, in an effort to smash Chief Billy Bowlegs. Warned of Jackson's approach by British agents, that wily chief scattered his forces and kept them out of Jackson's reach. Returning to his base of operations at Fort Gadsden on the Apalachicola, Jackson moved westward on Pensacola in May. Some of the trees along his line of march still carry the three blazed marks which characterized Jackson's Three Notch Trail, and in the clear streams of the Choctawhatchee forest are yet to be seen some of the old bridge timbers put down by Jackson's people for the crossing of their wagons and artillery.

On May 28, he received the surrender of Pensacola. He appointed one of his colonels as civil and military governor, and declared the revenue laws of the United States in force. He had no desire to linger. On May 30, he departed for Tennessee. The acclaim of the frontier States followed him homeward. His work was done. The rest was up to the diplomats, and theirs would be no easy task.

In Washington, the Spanish Minister roared his nation's indignation. The American cabinet was divided. After 4 days of argument, the Government announced that it would return the forts to Spain, but that it would not censure General Jackson. In the meantime, negotiations were kept in progress for the purchase of Florida, and finally on February 22, 1819, representatives of the two governments signed a treaty ceding Florida to the United States for $5,000,000. However, it was not actually ratified until early 1821. President Monroe promptly offered Jackson the governorship of the new territory. He accepted, and on July 17 in that year, the formal transfer of the territory took place in Pensacola. It was the third time Jackson had seen the flag of Spain replaced by that of the United States in Florida. This time his great dream had really come true. Florida was ours.

Not for 24 years would statehood come, but preparations were slowly being made toward that event. J. N. Hernandez served as the first territorial delegate to Congress. He was succeeded by Richard Keith Call, whose name was to become one of the most illustrious in early Florida history. A close friend of Andrew Jackson, he was later brigadier general of Florida Militia and Governor of the Territory.

The first legislative council convened on July 22, 1822, at Pensacola. The difficulties of conducting the State legislative assemblies alternately at Pensacola and at St. Augustine, and of carrying on the State's business across 300 miles of wilderness, brought about the selection of a central seat of government. The Indian village of Tallahassee became the site of the State capitol, and soon the fertile lands around it attracted a swarm of settlers. Middle Florida, as the area was known, for a time outstripped both the older sections in growth.

In the 1830's a new Indian war consumed the time and energies of the territory. It finally dragged to a successful conclusion, with the Indians being moved bodily to western reservations or driven into the Everglades.

New counties were constantly being formed. By 1835, eight of the sixteen counties which now make up the Third District had been formed. All of north Florida had shown substantial development, but the peninsula remained largely an unexplored wilderness.

Through all of this the steps toward statehood were progressing. Article six of the treaty of cession of 1821 provided that Florida should be admitted as a State in the Union "as soon as may be consistent with the principles of the Federal Constitution." There were retarding factors. The population was below the number of 30,000—later 47,500—required for any State coming into the Union. Florida was split by intraterritorial sectionalism. So great became the differences between east and west Florida that the question of annexation of west Florida to Alabama was seriously considered. A bill to authorize the annexation was defeated in Congress in 1840.

Meanwhile the legislative council had taken steps to solidify statehood feeling within the territory. It passed an act on February 2, 1838, calling a convention to meet at St. Joseph—now Port St. Joe—"to adopt a bill of rights and constitution and all needful measures preparatory to the admission of Florida into the National Confederacy." The convention was held in December 1838 and January 1839. A constitution was adopted and the question of ratification was submitted to the people. It was ratified by the very close vote of 2,070 to 1,975. Throughout 1840 and 1841 the debate over statehood raged. Congress was confused and took its time deciding the issue.

Finally public opinion in Florida for statehood apparently solidified under the leadership of Gov. John Branch. Early in 1845 the legislative council petitioned for the admission of Florida into the Union. A bill for the admission of Florida and Iowa into the Union was submitted and on March 3 it became a law. One hundred years ago on March 3, Florida took her place as a great American State.

In connection with Florida's centennial, I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a most interesting booklet, published by the Florida Historical Society. It is entitled "Then and Now, Florida in 1845 and 1945." For the wealth of material assembled, credit is given to the committee on information and historical data: W. T. Cash, chairman; Kathryn Abbey Hanna, Julien C. Yonge, Dena Snodgrass, David O. True, and T. T. Wentworth.

THEN AND NOW—FLORIDA IN 1845 AND 1945

GOVERNMENT TERRITORIAL OFFICERS AT TIME OF ADMISSION TO UNION

Governor	
John Branch	$2,500
Secretary of Territory	
Thomas H. Duval	1,500
Treasurer	
Henry L. Rutgers	300
Auditor of public accounts	
John Miller	300

STATE OFFICERS IN 1845

Governor	
William D. Moseley	$1,500
Secretary of state	
James T. Archer	600 and fees
Comptroller	
Nathaniel P. Bemis	800
Attorney general	
Joseph Branch	500 and fees
State treasurer	
Benjamin Byrd	800
Register of public lands	
John Beard	1,000
Commissioner of agriculture	
(None.)	
Superintendent of public instruction	
(None.)	

STATE OFFICERS IN 1945

Governor	
Millard Caldwell	$9,000
Secretary of state	
R. A. Gray	7,500
Comptroller	
J. M. Lee	7,500
Attorney general	
J. Tom Watson	7,500
State treasurer	
J. Edwin Larson	7,500

Register of public lands

(None.)

Commissioner of agriculture

Nathan Mayo	$7,500

Superintendent of public instruction

Colin English	7,500

STATE FINANCES

Outstanding territorial warrants, July 25, 1845	$19,151.69
Amount due Territory from various tax collecting officials, such as tax collectors, auctioneers, and marshals	89,482.22
Receipts of State government for fiscal year ending Oct. 31, 1846	23,412.29
Expenditures same period (warrants issued)	56,009.57
Deficit for period	27,597.28
Balance on hand July 1, 1943	16,534,595.81
General revenue receipts for fiscal year ending June 30, 1944	17,393,330.21
Miscellaneous revenue receipts warrants	100,529,115.00
Warrants canceled and restored	114,773.74
Total receipts available for year	134,571,814.26

STATE FINANCES

In 1945

Disbursements:	
For general government	$3,962,357.19
Other regular disbursements	73,094,738.76
Nonoperation disbursements	30,215,061.77
Grand total	107,272,157.72
Balance in all funds July 1, 1944	27,299,656.54

TAX SOURCES

For neither period is the list of tax sources exhaustive. In each case it is correct in a general way.

In 1845

Poll taxes.
Money at interest.
Bank stock.
Merchandise.
Carriages.
Town lots.
Wharves.
Income taxes on doctors, lawyers, etc.
Land at ⅜ cents per acre.

In 1945

Real and personal property taxes less exemptions.
Racing tax.
Occupational taxes.
Gasoline tax.
Intangible tax.
Inheritance tax, etc.

(Real estate taxes are not used to support State government, only that of counties and their subdivisions.)

POPULATION STATISTICS

In 1845

Entire State	66,634

In 1945

(Figures used are those of United States census, 1940.)

Entire State	1,897,414

TEN MOST POPULOUS COUNTIES

In 1845

Leon	9,612
Gadsden	7,645
Jefferson	6,525
Jackson	5,629
Columbia	4,084
Madison	3,762
Duval	3,511
St. Johns	3,114
Escambia	3,056
Walton	2,619

In 1945

Dade	267,739
Duval	210,143
Hillsborough	180,147
Pinellas	91,852
Polk	86,665
Palm Beach	79,989
Escambia	74,667
Orange	70,074
Volusia	53,710
Jackson	34,428

FIVE LARGEST CITIES OR TOWNS

In 1845

St. Augustine	2,459
Tallahassee	1,616
Pensacola	1,500
Key West	1,000
Apalachicola	900

In 1945

Jacksonville	173,065
Miami	172,132
Tampa	103,391
St. Petersburg	60,812
Pensacola	37,449

COMPARATIVE NUMBERS IN 10 DIFFERENT OCCUPATIONS, PROFESSIONS, OR TRADES

In 1845

Dentists	4
Editors and printers	39
Carpenters	543
Teachers	112
Physicians	135
Lawyers	131
Farm laborers	5,750
Preachers	83
Musicians and music teachers	10
Blacksmiths	120

In 1945

Dentists	710
Editors and printers (includes authors and reporters)	1,138
Carpenters	12,514
Teachers	2,891
Physicians	1,933
Lawyers (includes judges)	2,663
Farm laborers	56,151
Preachers	2,553
Musicians and music teachers	1,073
Blacksmiths	35

EDUCATION AND CULTURE [1]

In 1945

Number public schools	53
Number teachers in public schools	62
Number pupils	3,000
Annual income of all public schools	$14,900
Academies and other private schools	25
Teachers in private schools	36
Number pupils	950
Annual income of all private schools	$9,325
Average annual salary of public school teachers	$240.32
Average annual salary of private school teachers	$259.03
Universities and colleges with 4-year courses	0
Number students	0
Number newspapers and periodicals	10
Estimated circulation	4,500

In 1945

(White school statistics)

Number school centers	971
Number principals and teachers	9,993
Number pupils	288,071
Total cost of operation of all schools	$21,435,013.88
Average annual teacher's salary	$1,435.34
Average annual salary of principals	$2,604.32

[1] Figures formulated by Dr. E. L. Morphet, Director of Administration and Finance.

(Negro school statistics)

Number school centers	863
Number principals and teachers	3,312
Total cost of operating all schools	$4,012,269.56
Average annual teacher's salary	$942.20
Average annual principal's salary	$1,697.26
Universities and colleges with 4-year courses	7
Number students	7,900
Number newspapers and periodicals	218
Estimated circulation	750,000

RELIGIOUS STATISTICS

In 1845

Churches of all denominations	120
Number members	30,230
Value of church property	$105,200

In 1945

Churches of all denominations	2,754
Number members	875,000
Value of church property	$42,000,000

INDUSTRIES

(a) Agriculture and Horticulture

In 1845

Acres of land in farms, improved and unimproved	500,000
Value of all crops	$3,600,000

(These were chiefly cotton, corn, sugarcane, peanuts, sweetpotatoes, and tobacco.)

In 1945

Acres of land in farms, improved and unimproved	8,300,000
Value of all crops	$350,000,000

(Citrus fruits valued at $202,000,000 constituted more than half, but cotton, corn, sugarcane, tobacco, sweetpotatoes, and peanuts are still produced in large quantities.)

(b) Stock Raising

In 1845

Number horses, asses, and mules	10,890
Number cattle of all kinds	196,000
Number hogs	157,500
Number sheep	17,500

In 1945

Number horses, asses, and mules	55,000
Number cattle of all kinds	1,250,000
Number hogs	653,000
Number sheep	26,165

(c) Manufacturing

In 1845

Total value of all manufactures	$150,000

(Chiefly lumber, wagons and carriages, brown sugar, brick and lime, coontie starch and meal.)

In 1945

Total value of all manufactures $325,000,000

(Exclusive of war industries, which more than double the above figures.)

(d) Mining

In 1845

All mineral products	$10,000

(Chiefly clay for bricks.)

In 1945

All mineral products	$21,500,000

(Includes phosphate, limestone, Fuller's earth, titanium, coquina, and others.)

(e) Fishing

In 1845

All sea products	$150,000

(Mainly food fish and oysters.)

In 1945

All sea products	$25,776,000

(Mainly food fish, shell fish, sponge, and those used in making fertilizer.)

(f) Commerce

In 1845

Chief exports—cotton, lumber, beef cattle, hides.

In 1945

Chief exports—citrus fruits and fruit juices, lumber, naval stores, phosphate, kraft paper, early vegetables, cotton, tobacco, cigars, and sponges.

CHIEF TRADE CENTERS

In 1845

Apalachicola, Pensacola, St. Marks, Key West, Jacksonville.

In 1945

Jacksonville, Tampa, Miami, Pensacola, Panama City.

(g) Tourist Industry

In 1845

Number of tourists	550
Hotels and apartment houses	9 hotels
Annual tourist income	$60,000
Investment in amusements and recreation features	$5,000

In 1945

Number of tourists	2,500,000
Hotel and apartment houses	19,152
Annual tourist income	$300,000,000
Investment in amusements and recreation features	$750,000,000

BANKS

In 1845

Number of banks	2
Capital	$3,932,751
Loans and discounts	$2,718,234
Deposits	$46,258
Assets	$5,668,860
Liabilities	$1,542,227

In 1945

Number of banks	174
Capital	$26,643,000
Loans and discounts	$143,235,000
Deposits	$1,062,305,000
Assets	$1,125,854,000
Liabilities	$1,125,854,000

The above from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States for fiscal year 1844–45 does not give a true picture. The two banks had a mere nominal existence and the chief excuse for their being kept open was to collect interest.

From report of the Comptroller of the Currency of the United States for year ending December 3, 1943.

COMMUNICATION

In 1845

Telegraph offices	None
Telephones	None
Radios	None
Paved-road mileage	None
Miles of railway	21

In 1945

Telegraph offices	115
Telephones	271,960
Radios	500,000
Paved-road mileage	45,000
Miles of railway	7,500

TEN CHIEF POST OFFICES AND COMPENSATION OF POSTMASTER OF EACH

In 1845

Apalachicola	$1,002.37
Pensacola	$873.75
Tallahassee	$870.82
St. Augustine	$716.41
Quincy	$402.92
Jacksonville	$353.63
Marianna	$314.05
Key West	$282.70
Monticello	$196.03
Newnansville	$154.58
Number post offices	68
Total receipts	$21,700

In 1945

Miami	$7,000
Jacksonville	$6,000
Tampa	$6,000
St. Petersburg	$4,500
Pensacola	$4,200
Orlando	$4,200
West Palm Beach	$4,000
Lakeland	$3,700
Key West	$3,600
Tallahassee	$3,600
Number post offices (not including branches and stations)	680
Total receipts	$12,588,208

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PRICE] such time as he may desire.

Mr. PRICE of Florida. Madam Speaker, the history of Florida is long and varied, and there are many events that are woven into its story leading to statehood. Its settlers, from long before the Revolution, were of mixed nationalities, but all were building for a unified existence. Its days of growth moved through turbulent years of political history and intrigues, and one of the most interesting of these is the chain of events surrounding the story of the Republic of East Florida. Extending almost to the Mississippi River from the southeast Atlantic coast, the settlers set up for themselves natural boundaries, and the East Florida of the days before Statehood was almost the same as the Florida of today.

In 1811, when war clouds between the United States and Great Britain were gathering, the United States sent commissioners to Spanish Florida seeking a temporary alliance with the Nation to prevent the British from occupying the territory in case of war. Spain, of course, would not consent to such an arrangement, so other plans were devised. Under the leadership of Gen. George Mathews, the plan was carried out through the medium of a revolution of the inhabitants of East Florida, assisted by the residents of Georgia and by the regular armed forces of the United States. American troops held possession of the province of East Florida, except the fortified town of St. Augustine, from March 1812 to May 1813. This incident is known in Florida history as the Patriot Invasion, as the revolutionists called themselves Patriots in the cause of freedom. A legislative council was set up with John H. McIntosh as the director. Proclamations were issued by the patriots, appealing to the residents, to the people of St. Augustine particularly, urging them to break away from their government and join with the Territory of East Florida.

Immediately following the withdrawal of the American troops in May 1813, another intrigue developed with Gen. B. Harris' friendly negotiations with the Indians. The Indians wished to be at peace with the Patriots, so they readily signed a treaty with General Harris and his Patriots. The intrigue was well planned, for the Indians lost a large body of their best land in what is now Alachua and Marion Counties, and the Patriots' territory was accordingly enlarged.

So successful was the planned revolution and Indian settlement, that the Patriots called their new lands the "Republic of East Florida." The capital was established at Fort Mitchell, located a few miles east of the present town of Ocala, near Lake Bryant. The legislature for the republic met for the first time on January 25, 1814, with General Harris as its director and influential leader. He addressed the assembly, urging the residents to become more alert to the dangers of Spanish domination. He laid before the legislature a program of action. He urged the Patriots to send a minister to the President of the United States, vested with full and ample powers, to cede this republic to the United States and at the same time to offer on the part of the Patriots their loyalty to the Nation against all enemies.

The Legislature of the Republic of East Florida immediately passed a resolution setting forth the calamities that had befallen the Patriots, and urging the appointment of a minister plenipotentiary from the republic to the Congress of the United States. In all of Florida's varied and assorted history, this appears to be the only minister plenipotentiary on record, even though his mission was an ill-fated one.

Early in 1814, the citizenry of the Republic of East Florida drew up a long document petitioning Congress to smile upon them favorably and grant statehood to their republic. Of the 105 names on the documents, many are still perpetuated in Marion and Alachua Counties today.

Wilson Connor, who went to Florida with the Patriots Invasion under McIntosh, was appointed as minister plenipotentiary to convey the Republic's wishes to Congress. Connor also enjoyed the distinction of being the first Baptist preacher on Florida soil, having laid down his sword for the Bible after the invasion proved successful. Armed with the precious documents of the legislature of the republic, and confident of his success in the mission, Connor set out for Washington on February 15, 1814. A month later he appears in Louisburgh, N. C., from where he wrote Secretary Monroe and sent his despatches on by messenger. What personal events may have influenced Connor to discontinue his journey, we do not know, but it appears certain that the affairs of state were more urgent in Washington than in Florida. The American Government at the time was busily engaged in the war with Great Britain; Secretary Monroe undoubtedly discouraged Connor from visiting Washington.

Unlike its sister institution which in west Florida had lasted 58 days, this Republic of East Florida was in existence for 3 years, though it seemed to have functioned in a very haphazard manner and in a state of armed neutrality with Spanish interests. Its leaders were divided into lawless factions, when a surveyor named George Clarke conceived the idea of closing its unsatisfactory existence and enlisted the cooperation of the Spanish Governor Coppinger. Struggles for supremacy, combined with Indian raids, had made life most unbearable for the peace-loving settlers, so the offers of Governor Coppinger seemed very attractive. The Republic dissolved

itself and all returned again to recognize Spanish authority, under which they remained until the establishment of a territorial government under General Jackson in 1819.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Madam Speaker, 100 years ago the great State of Florida was admitted to the sisterhood of States of this Government. Florida, on the 3d day of March 1845, became the twenty-seventh State of this Union, assuming all the duties, obligations, and responsibilities of statehood, having been a Territory since 1821, with Gen. Andrew Jackson as the first military governor of the United States.

The House of Representatives, composed of just about the same type of men as you are, passed the Iowa-Florida bill for the admission of Florida to the Union by a vote of 144 to 48 on February 13, 1845, and the Senate on March 1, 1845, also passed the bill of admission by a vote of 36 to 9, there being a lapse of only 20 days intervening between the passage of the bill by the House and by the Senate, which of course demonstrated speed in legislation. Then on March 3, 1845, President John Tyler approved and signed the bill, thus making Florida the twenty-seventh State of this Union.

You gentlemen might be interested to know that Florida was discovered on Easter Sunday in 1513 by Ponce de Leon, who was not in search of material things but who wanted to be restored to youth and be rejuvenated, and he found the Fountain of Youth which has been a mecca for all Americans and for all of those whose minds dream of youth. They still come to Florida who seek both youth and health, and from the life-giving qualifications of this Fountain of Youth they go away full of youth, health, and vitality, seeing visions of which only they had dreamt.

Florida today occupies the position entirely different in character than that which it occupied yesterday. Florida of 1945 is not the same Florida as existed 100 years ago. It has undergone a series of fundamental changes—changes that are cultural, social, as well as economical. No longer is it an infant State of self-sufficing farmers, of self-contained lumber mill communities, of small isolated tourist towns and cities; it has grown up, it has achieved adulthood; it has become a mature State of independent industries, of interconnected recreational and distribution centers, of interrelated urban communities. This State has obtained high distinction, not only in the South, but also in the Nation. Florida is rich in national endowments and resources. Our geographical location affects our health, our modes of conduct, our attitudes toward life in general, our achievements as a people. In Florida we produce citrus fruits and engage in naval stores production, manufacture paper and other produce, build ships, grow winter vegetables, operate service industries, and direct tourist hotels and facilities, carry on extensive fisheries, drill for oil, and have the largest sponge industry in this country.

Florida occupies a most unique position among the States. It is a distinct commonwealth of water fronts. It has a shore line, exclusive of bays and inlets, of 1,148 miles in length, greater than any other State in the United States. With an area of 58,660 square miles, it is larger by 7,500 miles than the State o. New York, and yet it has only one-twelfth of the population of New York. It stands twenty-first in area of any State in the Union and is the second largest State east of the Mississippi, being surpassed only by Georgia. It is blessed both by the size and geographic location; it is bound to progress greatly if physical environment originally endowed with natural resources mean anything in the history of man.

One hundred years ago when Florida was admitted to the Union it had a population of about 40,000, but today her population is approximately 2,000,000. The average number of inhabitants per square mile is only about 34 as compared with 43 for the United States, over 500 for Puerto Rico and 650 for England. Florida could increase its population from 1945 to 1950 at the same rate it increased from 1930 to 1940 and have a density of population slightly less than the present population of the United States.

Florida's future is most alluring. With its peninsula jutting out into the tropical seas it will become the connecting length between the Caribbean in particular and between North America and South America in general; all Central America, half of Mexico, the West Indies, and the northern coast of Colombia and Venezuela are all closer to Florida than Chicago and New York. This entire region may be quickly reached by air by the people of Florida. The whole ground of South America is east of Florida. Jacksonville and Miami are almost on a direct line by air between the densely populated eastern section of the United States and the west coast of South America.

Florida's taxation system is, I believe, unique. We have no State inheritance tax; we have no State income tax; and under the homestead exemption law, no taxes are levied against homes up to the value of $5,000 except special assessments for benefits—which includes bonded indebtedness—and credit is allowed up to that amount on property valued at more than $5,000.

While we are proud of the progress Florida has made in the last 100 years, we shall not look backward, but our eyes will point to the future and the development of Florida and its many natural resources.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include therein an article appearing in the Washington Post of March 1 and an editorial appearing in the Evening Star entitled "Rumania As a Pattern?"

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. NORTON). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 40 minutes.

YALTA—A MORAL RETREAT—POLAND AND SMALL NATIONS CRUCIFIED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, it is my purpose to discuss that phase of the Yalta Conference agreement which deals with the so-called Polish question. The determination by the conferees to settle the boundary lines of Poland before the question was submitted to the people of Poland constitutes a retreat from the high moral ground that we have steadily maintained throughout the war. To say now that free elections are to be held and that Poland will receive a long shore line carved out of Germany, is to rob Peter to pay Paul and is a feeble effort to fool the people.

What I have to say, Madam Speaker, may not be popular; it is entirely possible that I may be charged with fostering disunity among our allies, but, notwithstanding, I feel it my duty to speak, for I am firmly convinced that a great mistake was made at Yalta; yes, a mistake, which, if not rectified, will lead to World War No. 3. I approach my task without rancor; I do so with no bitterness in my heart and with no thought to be unfair, for I fully appreciate the magnitude of the problems confronting the conferees at Yalta. I join with millions of other citizens in acknowledging that some great advances were made there. To me, however, the results of the conference must be tested by their effect upon the inalienable rights of millions of people of the small European countries, who apparently had no spokesman at Yalta.

Madam Speaker, the principles set down in the Atlantic Charter were clear and unequivocal; they were straight from the shoulder, and the world applauded. At Yalta we departed from those principles and a world mourns. Let us refresh our memories; the charter said, in part:

1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or otherwise.

2. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned.

3. They respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

It is my humble opinion, Madam Speaker, that these principles of the Atlantic Charter constitute the basis and justification for our entry into this war and the unknown sacrifices we make today. We believe them, for they were and are based upon the moral law, and we cannot escape the force of them, nor can we afford to repudiate them if we expect this war to make for a just and lasting peace.

I am reminded, Madam Speaker, of the attitude of our own State Department, when in July of 1940 it condemned in no uncertain terms the conduct of "more powerful neighbors" when the territorial integrity of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia was threatened. I quote, for the record, a part of a press release of July 23, 1940, setting forth a statement of the Under Secretary of State, the Honorable Sumner Welles:

From the day when the peoples of these republics—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia—first gained their independence and democratic form of government, the people of the United States have watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.

The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities, no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

These principles constitute the very foundations upon which the existing relationship between the 21 sovereign republics of the New World rests.

The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization—cannot be preserved.

It is difficult for me, Madam Speaker, to reconcile the position of our Government in July 1940 to that now expressed by our representatives at Yalta. Fact is they cannot be reconciled; they are contradictory positions and are geared to different fundamental principles.

From the information presently available, I believe that we have acquiesced in every demand made by Russia; we have agreed to the establishment of the Curzon line as the easternmost boundary line of Poland, which is contrary to an agreement made between Poland and Russia subsequent to the last war and violates the rights of millions of Polish people to self-determination. By this agreement we now know that Russia is to continue to dominate and control the small Baltic Nations of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, and we are thereby supporting Russia in its unlawful grab of those countries in 1940. Now we are parties to that unholy crime, notwithstanding the noble pronouncements of our State Department in 1940. So I repeat, that it is obvious that Britain and the United States have acquiesced fully in the demands of Stalin for his self-selected sphere of influence, not only in Poland and the Baltic area, but in the south of Europe also. That, Madam Speaker, constitutes a retreat from the high moral ground we have been resting upon in this war; it can but lead to another war, more deadly, more devastating, more cruel and more costly than this one.

PLEBESCITES—WHAT KIND?

We are advised, Madam Speaker, that we should not be alarmed about this situation, for the conferees have assured everybody that the people of Poland will have the right to a free election; that the elections are to be free and unfettered, and thus are within the spirit and terms of the Atlantic Charter. The question is, how free will the plebescite be? We must keep in mind that the provinces of eastern Poland, between the Curzon line and the western Russian border, had an estimated Polish population before the war of 11,807,000 while the Russians and Ukrainians had less than one-half that number. But to get back to the question of free elections. In this connection we must remember that Russia is astride of Poland and occupies all of it and is in a position to impose her will—by force as she did with the other Baltic countries. Russia wants all of Poland east of the Curzon line and will keep it regardless of what we do or say; it is in the driver's seat. And the whole scheme has our official blessing. Appeasement—what great and holy crimes have been committed in thy name?

What is the history of plebescites as conducted by Russia in the past? Two rather recent examples will suffice.

In 1939 Soviet military authorities served notice on the people of eastern Poland that elections would be held for the national assemblies. From reports available, it appears that Soviet troops then in Poland were actually employed as agitators in an effort to elect members to the so-called national assemblies favorable to their cause. Local residents were individually visited by members of the Red Army or armed workers guards who tried to persuade them that it was to their interest to vote. An atmosphere of terror was created through arrests and other repressions. In particular, any person acting against the instructions issued by Soviet propaganda agents was exposed to immediate arrest and sentenced for counter-revolutionary activities, and ultimately deported. All cultural, religious, economic, social, and trade unions, both Polish and Ukrainian as well as Jewish and other nationalities, were dissolved and their property handed over to newly created Communist organizations.

It is admitted that but one man was selected to run for each office and the candidate was in each instance a member of the Soviet Party or a citizen who had been selected by the Russians. On election day, October 22, 1939, electors were rounded up in their workshops or dragged out of their homes to the voting places. Each of them was given a card bearing the printed name of this only candidate of the district. Numerous Soviet police agents were present in all electoral premises. Those who wished to vote against the candidate knew that they exposed themselves and their families to inevitable imprisonment and deportation.

Five days after the elections, the representatives of the local population met to attend sessions of the national assemblies and, of course, everything that the Soviets wanted done was fully accomplished. A resolution was adopted unanimously favoring the Russian Government; was this a free election?

Let us now consider the second example of Russian free elections. The case in point is the treatment accorded the Latvian Republic in July of 1940. There, too, under the guise of an election provoked by unsupported charges, an election was proclaimed by the alleged "new government" which had been set up by the Soviets. On that election day the only party admitted to the elections was the pro-Soviet United Workers bloc, which represented only a very small fraction of the electorate. Approximately 80 percent of the Latvian population were farmers and factory workers from whom less than 3 percent of the population was allowed to vote. In view of that fact and foreseeing that if they ran the election with its own list, the small vote cast for it would make it ridiculous, the Communist Party did not run under its own name but joined the list of the so-called Workers' Coalition. The vast majority of the Latvian population were not permitted to form their own lists, nominate candidates and conduct preelection campaigns. At the same time, Soviet soldiers and pro-Soviet agents participated in the campaign in favor of the Workers' Coalition. All inhabitants, however, were compelled to go to the polls under the threat that if they failed to have the balloting stamp on their passports they might be considered saboteurs. Here, too, but one candidate stood for each office and he had been selected by the Soviet Party. From this it appears that these so-called free elections sponsored by the Russian Government in both these instances amount to a farce and if we are to have free elections, then it will be necessary to remove every vistage of Soviet influence in the areas where the elections are to be held.

What assurance is there, Madam Speaker, that the coming "free elections" in Poland, or elsewhere, will be conducted in a different manner than those I have mentioned? Let us remember also that arrangements right now for these elections are being made in Moscow.

The history of plebiscites is a long one. I shall not take the time to recite it at this time, except to point out that historically they have been ineffective when and where the nation which advocated the principle was in a position to nullify it by the use of force. England, Germany, France, and Russia have at some time or other been for the principle of self-determination, then at other times they have repudiated it. Our own country has, since the days of Woodrow Wilson, openly espoused the principle. Would that he could return today.

On May 27, 1916, in a public address before our entry into war, Wilson said, "We believe these fundamental things: First, that every people has a right to choose the sovereignty under which they shall live." He was here contending for the principle that change of sovereignty must not be made by conquest. Speaking before the United States Senate on January 22, 1917, he said again:

> No peace can last, or ought to last, which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that no right anywhere exists to hand peoples about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property.

This is a clear and candid statement of an abstract principle of justice which should have universal application. It has, I fear, been ignored by Mr. Roosevelt, who should have known better, for he sat at the very feet of Woodrow Wilson.

And now consider the position of Russia after the revolution and the All-Russian Convention of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies on November 8, 1917. It was after Lenin and his followers had seized control of the Russian Government that the first

official statement of the Soviet Government declared for an immediate peace without indemnities and it was talking to Poland at that time. "Forcible annexation" was defined by them as "the retention by any state of any nation without the latter being given the right of free voting in the determination of the forms of its national existence, under the condition of the complete removal of the armies of the annexing or the more powerful nation." On November 26, 1917, Trotsky, as Foreign Minister of the Soviets, proposed to all belligerents a truce and a democratic peace without annexation and without indemnities, based on the principle of the independence of nations and of their right to determine for themselves the nature of their own development.

At the Brest-Litovsk Peace Conference in December of 1917 the Russian delegates took a strong stand and demanded that peace be made on principles of no forcible union of territories conquered during the war; the evacuation of occupied territories, restoration of independence to those peoples deprived of it during the war; and a guarantee to national groups which before the war were not politically independent of the right of deciding their future sovereignty by a free referendum in which complete freedom in voting to be guaranteed to all inhabitants of the territory in question, including immigrants and refugees. What a change has now come over Russia. Then it was a new Russia pleading for its very life, and that plea found lodgment in the United States. Where? Listen—in the heart and mind of Woodrow Wilson. His voice was again heard in a historic address before the Congress of the United States on January 8, 1918, and after our entry into the First World War. He said:

> There is moreover, a voice calling for these definitions of principle and of purpose, which is, it seems to me, more thrilling and more compelling than any of the many moving voices with which the troubled air of the world is filled. It is the voice of the Russian people. They are prostrate and all but helpless, it would seem, before the grim power of Germany, which has hitherto known no relenting and no pity. Their power, apparently, is shattered, and yet their soul is not subservient. They will not yield either in principle or in action. Their conception of what is right, of what it is humane and honorable for them to accept, has been stated with a frankness, a largeness of view, a generosity of spirit, and a universal human sympathy which must challenge the admiration of every friend of mankind, and they have refused to compound their ideals or desert others that they themselves might be safe.

How much like Russia then is Poland today. The eloquent voice of Wilson pleading the cause of Russia in those dark days is the kind of a voice that should be pleading the cause of Poland today; yes, and of Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and all the other small nations in a like position.

Can you today hear the plea of that great liberty-loving people as they lie prostrate at the feet of the aggressor, as their sons fight on European battle fronts with our own sons and for the same cause? What a tragedy it is as they plead in vain for help; the voice of Wilson is silent. But I am satisfied that a just God heareth, for right is ultimately the master of might.

Listen again as Wilson speaks on that same occasion:

> The day of conquest and aggrandizement is gone by; so is also the day of secret covenants entered into in the interest of particular governments and likely at some unlooked-for moment to upset the peace of the world.

It is a far cry, Madam Speaker, from the Russians who met at Brest-Litovsk and the Russians who met at Yalta. They have now repudiated the principles announced by that first Soviet conference in 1917, and likewise we have repudiated the principles advocated so vehemently by Woodrow Wilson in 1918. And why? Only the participants at that conference have the answer; historians will judge the validity of their decisions.

Madam Speaker, the position taken by Woodrow Wilson was so effective because it was based on moral grounds, because it was the very essence of truth which cannot be overthrown for it rests upon solid rock. Whereas, expediency and the exercise of force and of power politics are contrary to the moral law and grounded in the shifting sands of skepticism and uncertainty and distrust. No matter how lofty the Yalta statement may be in its alleged adherence to the ideals expressed in the Atlantic Charter, no matter how clear the affirmations to establish a free democratic government by conducting free and unfettered elections, the fact remains that Poland is the victim of territorial aggrandizement, and territorial changes not in accord with the expressed wishes of the people. Unfortunately, Great Britain and the United States are parties to this nefarious act. It serves as notice to all the small nations in the world of a policy that is to prevail in the future. We have now embraced the principles of force and political expediency which constitute a threat to the future peace of the world.

Madam Speaker, David Lawrence, writing in the United States News of February 23, 1945, very well expresses the viewpoint of millions of Americans when he asks: "What did the American people get?"

This is a fair question in view of what has happened. He is referring to the Yalta Conference, and continuing says:

> A promise of continued war with heavier and heavier casualties against a stiffened and perhaps fanatical resistance by the German people, who have everything to gain now and little to lose by adopting desperate measures. A promise of a big standing army and compulsory military training for American youth as we furnish men and materials to keep Germany's underground forces permanently disarmed and to suppress rebellions in the liberated countries, while American boys are killed by snipers and guerilla fighters for years to come.

Continuing he says:

> This isn't a promise of peace for anybody. This is a promise of more war, because economic anarchy breeds gangsterism and dictatorship and incessant strife.

And again:

> We cannot concede that Russia is winning this war alone against Germany and so deserves everything she asks for. If American lives had not been sacrificed on the western front and if we had not supplied airplanes and other materials under lend-lease, Russia could not have mounted her offensives. The American viewpoint has back of it moral right as well as sacrifices of our manpower thousands of miles away from continental United States.
>
> For American idealism was defeated at Yalta. American constitutionalism was scorned at Yalta, and the pledges given in the Atlantic Charter that no nation—neither Russia, nor Britain nor any other country—will seek "territorial aggrandizement" were flagrantly violated at Yalta.

The statement I have just read, Madam Speaker, is not my own, but that of one of the outstanding journalists of this country. Mr. David Lawrence can never be charged as an isolationist nor do I think he is a partisan in any sense, but he brings to bear upon this great question his wide experience in the international field and his deep and earnest convictions that we have made a mistake at Yalta and that our position is untenable on moral grounds.

Madam Speaker, my plea today is for the recognition of the rights of small nations; we cannot bypass them now by ignoring their rights and expect to have established the basis for permanent peace. Russia is our friend and we have given unstintingly of our resources to her and surely she is amenable to reason. So with our British friends; we are all in this world situation together. I am satisfied, Madam Speaker, that unless we adopt the policy now of no territorial aggrandizement, we are headed for trouble in the future which can only result in another letting of blood when the next generation has reached a military age.

There is a big "if," Madam Speaker, in connection with the promise of free elections in Poland. Reports reach us already that Soviet pressure in Rumania has forced the resignation of the cabinet. It is in line with the same pattern as used already in Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. Hence, we are honestly apprehensive about the holding of free elections. There can be no exercise of the right of self-determination unless and until we as a nation guarantee they will be so held. Now is the time to serve notice on the world that the United States intends to stand up and insist that the principles announced by Woodrow Wilson in 1917–18 are just as real today and that we shall adhere to them. There must be no retreat from the moral ground upon which our cause rests.

Madam Speaker, I include as part of my remarks the following newspaper article and editorial:

[From the Washington Post of March 1, 1945]

FREQUENTLY ASSAILED RUMANIAN CABINET QUITS, RUSSIANS SAY

LONDON, February 28.—The Moscow radio said tonight the resignations of the Rumanian cabinet had been received by King Mihai, who immediately began consultations aimed at formation of a new government.

The resignation of Premier Nicolai Radescu, following a series of bloody demonstrations against his regime, was announced by the Bucharest radio. The Radescu government had been under criticism from Russia.

Earlier dispatches from Moscow had said Soviet Vice Commissar of Foreign Affairs Andrei Vishinsky had arrived in the Rumanian

capital for a first-hand inspection of the situation The dispatch said the recent disorders in Rumania had caused deep concern in Moscow.

The national democratic front has charged Radescu with failure to eliminate Fascist elements from the government and to carry out promised agrarian reforms.

Several outbreaks have occurred recently in Rumania including a clash last Saturday in Bucharest in which there were many casualties. Yesterday Groza and other members of the cabinet belonging to the national democratic front were reported to have presented a virtual ultimatum to King Mihai demanding resignation of Radescu and the arrest and punishment of those responsible for firing on the Bucharest demonstrators.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

RUMANIA AS PATTERN?

The current Communist-led uprising in the capital, Bucharest, and other cities of Rumania against the coalition government headed by Premier Nicolai Radescu climaxes an increasingly bitter quarrel between his regime and the local Communist Party associated with other leftist elements under the title of the National Democratic Front. That would seem to be a misleading title, because what we Americans would consider the most truly democratic elements of the Rumanian people, the National Peasants Party, headed by the celebrated Juliu Maniu, and the Liberals representing the urban middle classes, are in the Radescu government and have strongly opposed leftist maneuvers to bring about its overthrow. The Rumanian Communists are known to be numerically small, and even with their minor leftist auxiliaries the resulting "National Democratic Front" comprises only a fraction of the population. Their armed uprising is thus obviously the attempt of a dynamic minority to gain control of the country by strong-arm methods.

The important question is, to what degree this revolutionary action is either tacitly approved or directly inspired by Soviet Russia, which has been in effective control of Rumania ever since it abandoned the Axis and made a peace which, though ostensibly concluded with all the major Allies, was actually negotiated and signed in Moscow last September. At that time the provisional government which took power after the expulsion of the Germans by Russian armies included virtually all parties opposed to the Axis, including the Communists. By the terms of the peace treaty Rumania was allowed to govern itself subject to the oversight of an allied control commission which, though nominally including Britain and the United States, was effectively dominated by the Russian membership.

However, almost from the first, the provisional government was rent by quarrels between the constituent parties, the sharpest line of cleavage being between the leftists, who soon coalesced into the National Democratic front, and the other elements. Relatively little is known of the details because British and American journalists have not been encouraged to investigate conditions nor have the British and American members of the Allied Control Commission in Bucharest been permitted to circulate freely. Only fragmentary accounts of the current disturbances have as yet emerged from the veil of local Russian censorship, but dispatches from Moscow are more revealing. The official Soviet news agency states that the National Democratic front demanded decisive action against pro-Fascist elements in the government and the dismissal of the Radescu Government, and adds that on the demand of representatives of the Allied Control Commission the shooting of demonstrators (by the Radescu Government forces) was stopped.

All this fits into the pattern predicted by many observers that the coalition regimes permitted by Moscow in the countries overrun by its armies would presently be transformed into governments wherein the local leftist elements would predominate. That transformation has already occurred in Bulgaria and Yugoslavia and has been attempted even in Greece and Belgium outside the Russian sphere. What is occurring in Rumania should thus occasion no surprise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 15 minutes.

LET US NOT, I PRAY, SELL AMERICA DOWN THE RIVER

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe for one moment that any Member of either branch of the Congress of the United States would ever want, under any conceivable circumstances, to sell America down the river. But I am equally convinced that is exactly what we will be doing unwittingly if we pass the resolution which will soon come before us which proposes to amend the Constitution so that treaties may be ratified by a bare majority of the House and Senate, instead of by two-thirds of the Senate, as required by the existing constitutional provision.

In my opinion, that proposal to change the Constitution involves a threat of great potential danger to our constitutional form of government and to the perpetuity of our free institutions.

The American Government as devised by the fathers is the grandest government that ever existed on God's earth and my deep concern lest something may happen to it that will sap its vitality and perhaps permanently impair it prompts me to make this speech.

I appeal to you, my colleagues, to beware of this resolution, to analyze it with great care, and to consider its implications and its probable effects before you vote on it. I believe that he who supports it will be subject to bitter disillusionment in the years to come. I believe that he who votes for it will cast a vote that he is likely to regret till his dying day. The title of this resolution would be more accurate if it were described as "a resolution to wreck the Constitution of the United States." If ever there was a time when Members of Congress should "stop, look, and listen," now is the time, before we vote to put this measure on the statute books.

In speaking thus feelingly on what I regard as the menacing aspects of this proposal, I wish to make it crystal clear that I have not the slightest criticism of its proponents. They are among the most esteemed Members of this body, and justly so. They are as well meaning as I am. They are as patriotic as I am. They would no more think of doing an injury to our country than I would. They are abler than I am, which makes me marvel that they would endorse such a proposal. I can only conclude that they have not thought the problem through.

DESTROYS CHECKS AND BALANCES

We will get a clearer perspective of this proposal if we will remember that our Constitution is a rounded creation of checks and balances, and the passage of this resolution would remove and destroy one of the most important checks in the Constitution—the check against Executive usurpation in the matter of treaty making. The founding fathers knew what they were doing when they wrote into the Constitution the provision requiring a two-thirds vote of the Senate for the ratification of treaties. It was not haphazard decision on their part. They debated the subject for a long time and came to the conclusion that Congress ought to keep its hand on the making of treaties. It was to vindicate the might and power of the people's Congress that the Constitutional Convention placed in one branch of the Government—the Senate—the right to ratify treaties by a two-thirds vote.

By a strange process of reasoning the proponents of the resolution to provide for ratification of treaties by a majority vote of both Houses, instead of by two-thirds of the Senate, say that the purpose of the resolution is to give Congress authority over treaty making. "Congress ought to have more to say about it," they declare. But this resolution does not give Congress anything. Instead of giving, it takes away. It dilutes toward nothingness the authority which Congress now has over treaties by the operation of the two-thirds rule at the Senate end of the Capitol. The fact that the congressional treaty-ratification machinery is set up by the Constitution at the Senate end of the Capitol makes it no less a part of Congress and no less a bulwark to protect the rights of the people of America than if it were set up at both ends of the Capitol.

TOO MANY BLANK CHECKS

If this resolution passes, we shall witness the amazing spectacle of Congress voluntarily offering to surrender its effective authority over treaty making. We shall witness Congress, which already has given a blank check to the President in almost everything else, voluntarily weakening its power still further by removing the only effective barrier against executive usurpation in respect to treaties, thus giving him what amounts to another blank check. I have a great respect for the office of President and a great affection for the man who now holds that office. But I believe that Congress has surrendered far too many of its powers to the President as the movement toward the centralization of government has gone ahead with dizzy rapidity, and that instead of surrendering more powers we in Congress should be making moves to recapture some of the powers we already have surrendered.

Pass this resolution and you will take away the congressional brakes on treaty making. If you do this you might as well say to all future occupants of the White House: "You may negotiate treaties to your liking and send them up to Capitol Hill with perfect assurance that they will be ratified."

A congressional brake based on a mere majority vote is no brake at all, so great at all times is the power of the administration over Congress in respect to foreign affairs.

For the truth of that statement, I call to witness James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States.

MR. FARLEY SUMMONED AS WITNESS

My memory harks back to turbulent scenes in this Chamber 7 long years ago. I had secured the signatures of a majority of the Members of the lower branch to a petition to bring before the House for a vote a resolution I had introduced embodying the fine democratic principle that unless our country is invaded or attacked, or some other country in the Western Hemisphere is invaded by a non-American nation, the right to declare war shall rest solely with the people of the United States, to be decided by referendum. There was a tremendous national sentiment for the resolution—that is to say, until the administration took a hand. I have no heartburnings over what happened, and I recall the rapidly moving events objectively simply to illustrate what might and no doubt would occur in the future regardless of who may be in the White House, if the ratification of treaties is made dependent upon a mere majority vote. Permit me, in the utmost good humor, to call my star witness, James A. Farley.

Mr. Farley tells the story in his own inimitable way in his book, Behind the Ballots, an affectionately inscribed copy of which he sent to me with his loveliest compliments. If you want some interesting reading, turn to pages 361 and 362 of Mr. Farley's book, Behind the Ballots. I quote:

Time and again—

Says Mr. Farley—

when Congress has been about to vote on an important measure, I have appealed personally to Members of the Senate and House to vote as the administration wanted them to vote.

I spent an entire day on the telephone asking Democratic Members of the House of Representatives to vote against bringing up the war referendum resolution. Many of them had already voted to discharge the resolution from the committee, the first move in the parliamentary skirmish, thus in effect committing themselves to its passage. Some Members frankly said they were unable to go along with the administration. Other Members said that in deference to my request they would stand by the administration and vote in the negative. This appeal by telephone had an influence in blocking consideration of the resolution.

Mr. Farley's statement that his action on the telephone had an influence in blocking consideration of the resolution expressed it mildly, indeed. The fact is that his action, representing the administration, killed the resolution. Democracy was murdered in the House that day.

It is worthy of note that, although Mr. Farley wore calluses on his ears using the telephone and all the reactionary newspapers in the United States, the President, the Secretary of State, the Speaker of the House, the majority and minority leaders of the House, and the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps bore down like a mighty avalanche to kill my resolution, its appeal was so great that it was defeated only by a close vote, 187 yeas to 208 nays. A change of 11 votes would have saved it. I have no doubt that if the administration had not interposed, this principle of allowing the people a vote on war, except in case of attack, would now be a part of the Constitution of the United States. There is, among our citizens, a widespread acceptance of the belief that if we are to have a real democracy, the people's control of the operations of our Government should not stop at the water's edge.

MANY TYPES OF TREATIES INVOLVED

Remove the Senate's two-thirds rule in voting on treaties and substitute a bare majority of the two branches and the years to come will witness many, many repetitions of the scene described by Mr. Farley. In the long range of the future Presidents will submit treaties to Congress and will apply pressure and the opposition will crumble like a house of cards because there will be no two-thirds rule to bulwark it. The adoption of the majority idea would simply mean that in order to give the House a very deceptive and innocuous right to go through the gesture of treaty-making, we would throw away the authority of Congress over the ratification of treaties by scrapping the Senate's two-thirds rule.

What this would mean in the future we can hardly fathom. Treaties of peace are only a small number of the treaties that come before Congress for ratification. There are all kinds of treaties on all kinds of subjects, including trade treaties that are vital to the economic life of our people. Pass this legislation and all of these treaties will in fact be made by the man who happens at the time to be occupying the White House and not in any real sense by Congress.

SACRED RIGHTS OF LABOR MAY BE THREATENED

It is easily conceivable that the rights of American labor may be involved in a very vital way in some future treaty, and if action prejudicial to labor should become frozen in a treaty there would be no remedy. A statute prejudicial to labor can be repealed and gotten rid of, but not a treaty. A treaty is a contract between states and Congress cannot repeal it. So let us remember that in tampering with our constitutional treaty-ratification system we may be tampering with something very sacred to labor.

The proposal before us is very misleading. The idea of giving the House of Representatives, the body traditionally closest to the people, something to say about the ratification of treaties is appealing and on first blush is attracting the commendation of many large voting groups. It is proclaimed as a plan to strengthen the power of Congress over treaties, but what it really does is exactly the opposite of that. It weakens and nullifies the power of Congress over treaties.

WAY TO GIVE THE HOUSE REAL AUTHORITY

There is a way by which the House could be given real authority in treaty-making. That would be by changing the pending resolution to read:

The President shall have power by and with the advice and consent of Congress, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators and Representatives present concur.

To have both legislative branches ratify treaties by a two-thirds vote instead of a majority vote, would indeed make Congress a real force in treaty-making. In the incident related earlier in this speech, Mr. Farley was able to switch over a majority but he could never have switched over two-thirds.

STATE DEPARTMENT NOT ASKING FOR CHANGE

One more point and I am through. The President is not asking for this change in the treaty-ratification process. The Secretary of State is not asking for it. Nobody in the State Department is asking for it. The President is not backward in asking Congress for any authority he thinks is needed looking toward the establishment of the peace of the world, but he has not asked for this. He and Secretary Stettinius were notified of the pendency of this resolution before the committee, but they chose to say nothing in support of it.

I happen to know that the State Department does not intend to ask for its adoption. I have read the 147 pages of committee hearings diligently and I have been impressed more by what the hearings do not say than by what they do say. For instance, there is not a word in the hearings from anyone who is charged with responsibility of the foreign affairs of our Government. In view of the fact that it is possible to make a treaty that would fundamentally and radically change our form of Government and our way of life, I think it is highly important that Congress should keep its hand on the throttle. We hear it charged on all sides that Congress is breaking down. Let us not, my colleagues, be guilty of breaking ourselves down.

The Constitution of the United States, whether we realize it or not, is the cornerstone of our national welfare and the sheet anchor of our liberties. If we lose it, we lose everything. I submit that the best thing we can do with this resolution, weakening congressional control over treaties, is to defeat it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

MILK PRODUCTION FROM 1935 TO 1945

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include therein two tables from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following table shows the milk production by States by years from 1935–45. When one realizes the enormous amount of food produced by this industry in comparison to the total food produced by the few crops enjoying New Deal favor, year after year, it is well to give this great industry some time and recognition. This is all the more apparent when one realizes that the contribution of this industry to the national food supply is not only the dairy product, but in addition the beef supply of the Nation that is derived from the dairy herds of the Nation. On January 1, 1941, there were 36,000,000 dairy cattle and 31,000,000 other cattle in the United States, so it is evident that from 40 to 50 percent of the beef of the Nation is obtained from the dairy industry.

Milk produced on farms during year, by States, alphabetically, 1935–44

[Million pounds]

	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
Alabama	1,232	1,203	1,178	1,188	1,199	1,143	1,219	1,297	1,309	1,360
Arizona	224	228	214	219	235	232	241	253	252	249
Arkansas	1,224	1,235	1,321	1,363	1,354	1,335	1,453	1,467	1,411	1,445
California	4,151	4,218	4,297	4,454	4,617	4,893	5,091	5,188	5,175	5,479
Colorado	912	974	930	972	1,002	1,016	1,067	1,092	1,099	1,055
Connecticut	618	625	650	667	673	670	684	717	700	717
Delaware	126	130	127	132	139	144	154	157	151	152
Florida	290	321	323	322	330	318	343	353	366	437
Georgia	1,071	1,054	1,080	1,079	1,122	1,053	1,076	1,120	1,149	1,146
Idaho	1,043	1,071	1,075	1,110	1,164	1,228	1,324	1,368	1,357	1,405
Illinois	4,873	4,814	4,873	5,056	5,053	5,188	5,453	5,617	5,352	5,503
Indiana	3,049	3,013	2,944	3,168	3,180	3,225	3,435	3,557	3,454	3,492
Iowa	6,009	6,052	5,919	6,365	6,379	6,611	6,920	6,941	7,071	6,726
Kansas	3,075	2,861	2,708	2,869	2,881	2,860	3,172	3,332	3,296	3,172
Kentucky	1,946	1,845	1,883	1,955	1,886	1,841	1,995	2,163	2,112	2,147
Louisiana	578	588	598	647	664	628	644	667	686	695
Maine	632	626	630	638	619	638	641	636	618	654
Maryland	772	784	790	831	898	922	960	984	945	961
Massachusetts	767	770	783	784	791	810	818	811	787	777
Michigan	4,257	4,465	4,470	4,560	4,762	4,949	5,124	5,296	5,333	5,375
Minnesota	7,384	7,745	7,646	8,175	8,160	8,405	8,824	8,995	8,872	8,508
Mississippi	1,299	1,303	1,312	1,338	1,310	1,195	1,261	1,330	1,342	1,410
Missouri	3,363	3,014	3,053	3,270	3,271	3,386	3,631	3,816	3,845	4,099
Montana	693	649	623	637	682	688	733	754	760	721
Nebraska	2,689	2,623	2,356	2,479	2,618	2,589	2,752	2,969	3,064	2,785
Nevada	106	108	104	107	109	105	115	115	113	108
New Hampshire	378	372	357	353	354	361	351	348	333	340
New Jersey	858	874	903	932	943	969	1,018	1,028	1,010	1,015
New Mexico	231	244	245	257	269	287	299	306	300	270
New York	6,874	7,428	7,213	7,258	7,308	7,658	7,949	8,107	7,784	7,722
North Carolina	1,245	1,274	1,279	1,286	1,310	1,393	1,381	1,024	1,465	1,549
North Dakota	1,951	1,919	1,796	1,821	1,906	2,115	2,284	2,325	2,264	2,183
Ohio	4,356	4,389	4,434	4,551	4,570	4,617	4,838	5,130	4,976	5,174
Oklahoma	2,275	2,186	2,329	2,491	2,487	2,380	2,582	2,713	2,692	2,696
Oregon	1,329	1,333	1,336	1,350	1,364	1,394	1,428	1,482	1,468	1,463
Pennsylvania	4,472	4,532	4,496	4,523	4,511	4,696	4,869	5,022	4,863	4,976
Rhode Island	132	129	131	131	134	136	136	135	128	129
South Carolina	538	551	560	545	543	559	569	587	589	604
South Dakota	1,603	1,640	1,472	1,570	1,642	1,746	1,827	1,867	1,804	1,710
Tennessee	1,754	1,717	1,758	1,850	1,855	1,820	1,941	2,106	2,196	2,232
Texas	3,741	4,011	4,139	4,349	4,192	4,192	4,452	4,435	4,389	4,405
Utah	494	509	504	522	543	550	592	629	655	709
Vermont	1,341	1,362	1,354	1,343	1,348	1,423	1,451	1,466	1,452	1,498
Virginia	1,362	1,334	1,397	1,436	1,431	1,512	1,590	1,622	1,626	1,691
Washington	1,866	1,903	1,887	1,912	1,942	2,001	2,085	2,159	2,119	2,242
West Virginia	838	814	794	807	787	775	803	831	798	824
Wisconsin	10,921	11,598	11,378	11,862	11,973	12,665	13,625	14,239	14,334	14,643
Wyoming	263	272	259	273	282	292	298	306	306	314
United States	101,205	102,410	101,908	105,807	106,792	109,510	115,498	119,240	118,140	118,952

There are many facts evident in this table. One is that the national milk production was higher in 1942 than it has been before that year or since. In other words, an increase in national milk production has not been taking place during the war. The production was the greatest in 1942, before subsidies were paid than it has been since. Other factors are, of course, involved. You will also note that Wisconsin increased its milk production by some two and one-half billion pounds from January 1, 1940, to January 1, 1945, or an increase which is more than the total mik production of some 33 individual States.

THE PREVAILING MILK PRICES

The following table shows the milk prices by States by years from 1935 to to 1945:

Milk wholesale: Annual average price per 100 pounds received by farmers, 1935–43

State	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944[1]
Alabama	$1.85	$2.10	$2.30	$2.05	$2.00	$2.10	$2.30	$2.85	$3.45	$3.75
Arizona	1.60	1.80	1.95	1.65	1.55	1.60	1.85	2.35	2.80	3.05
Arkansas	1.80	1.95	2.00	1.65	1.65	1.80	2.15	2.60	3.20	3.25
California	1.70	1.95	2.10	1.80	1.75	1.85	2.30	2.90	3.45	3.60
Colorado	1.60	1.65	1.85	1.45	1.35	1.55	1.85	2.20	2.70	2.65
Connecticut	2.40	2.55	2.80	2.60	2.60	2.65	2.95	3.40	3.90	3.90
Delaware	1.95	2.00	2.25	2.05	2.00	2.05	2.35	2.95	3.40	3.55
Florida	3.05	3.05	3.30	3.20	3.15	3.15	3.30	3.95	4.60	4.50
Georgia	2.40	2.35	2.70	2.80	2.80	2.85	3.00	3.50	3.85	4.00
Idaho	1.40	1.60	1.65	1.30	1.30	1.50	1.85	2.20	2.65	2.55
Illinois	1.50	1.80	1.90	1.65	1.55	1.65	2.05	2.40	2.95	3.00
Indiana	1.55	1.90	2.05	1.75	1.75	1.85	2.25	2.60	3.15	3.25
Iowa	1.55	1.75	1.90	1.65	1.55	1.65	1.90	2.10	2.55	2.70
Kansas	1.50	1.75	1.90	1.70	1.60	1.70	1.95	2.35	3.00	3.05
Kentucky	1.60	1.90	2.00	1.55	1.50	1.65	2.05	2.45	3.05	3.20
Louisiana	1.95	2.10	2.25	2.15	2.05	2.30	2.45	3.00	3.65	3.75
Maine	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.10	2.45	2.85	3.40	3.50
Maryland	2.25	2.30	2.45	2.30	2.20	2.40	2.75	3.30	3.90	4.00
Massachusetts	2.80	2.85	2.75	2.65	2.65	2.65	2.65	3.45	4.00	4.00
Michigan	1.60	1.80	1.95	1.65	1.65	1.80	2.15	2.55	3.20	3.30
Minnesota	1.50	1.80	1.80	1.50	1.40	1.55	1.70	2.15	2.65	2.70
Mississippi	1.75	1.90	2.00	1.75	1.65	1.80	2.20	2.60	3.20	3.40
Missouri	1.65	1.80	1.95	1.75	1.65	1.75	2.05	2.55	3.20	3.25
Montana	1.70	1.90	2.15	1.95	1.95	2.00	2.60	2.15	2.55	2.75
Nebraska	1.60	1.80	1.90	1.60	1.55	1.70	1.90	2.35	2.75	2.85
Nevada	1.70	1.70	1.75	1.85	1.75	1.80	2.00	2.45	2.95	3.10
New Hampshire	2.10	2.10	2.00	2.10	2.15	2.25	2.55	2.95	3.50	3.60
New Jersey	2.53	2.61	2.73	2.69	2.63	2.80	2.96	3.45	3.80	4.00
New Mexico	2.25	2.40	2.50	2.40	2.35	2.40	2.55	2.80	3.65	3.80
New York	1.84	1.95	1.96	1.79	1.79	2.02	2.36	2.80	3.30	3.45
North Carolina	2.60	2.60	2.90	2.80	2.70	2.80	2.95	3.20	3.85	4.00
North Dakota	1.95	1.95	2.05	1.90	1.85	1.85	1.95	2.20	2.55	2.60
Ohio	1.65	1.90	2.05	1.80	1.65	1.75	2.25	2.65	3.20	3.30
Oklahoma	1.70	1.75	1.80	1.55	1.55	1.70	2.00	2.45	3.20	3.40

[1]Bureau of Agricultural Economics, 1944-Jan. 30, 1945, Agricultural Prices.

Milk wholesale: Annual average price per 100 pounds received by farmers, 1935–43—Continued

State	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942	1943	1944
Oregon	$1.75	$1.90	$1.90	$1.60	$1.65	$1.85	$2.30	$2.85	$3.55	$3.65
Pennsylvania	1.90	2.00	2.20	1.90	1.90	2.05	2.35	2.80	3.40	3.55
Rhode Island	2.75	2.85	2.85	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.95	3.40	3.85	3.90
South Carolina	2.75	2.65	2.75	2.85	2.85	2.90	3.05	3.45	3.95	4.10
South Dakota	1.55	1.65	1.80	1.75	1.65	1.60	1.75	2.05	2.55	2.65
Tennessee	1.90	2.00	2.20	1.80	1.80	1.95	2.35	2.70	3.40	3.55
Texas	2.15	2.20	2.30	2.10	2.05	2.10	2.40	2.95	3.60	3.60
Utah	1.40	1.55	1.60	1.35	1.35	1.45	1.75	2.25	2.80	2.85
Vermont	1.85	1.85	1.75	1.75	1.85	1.95	2.25	2.70	3.30	3.40
Virginia	2.40	2.45	2.75	2.50	2.45	2.55	2.85	3.45	3.90	4.05
Washington	1.60	1.75	1.80	1.40	1.45	1.55	2.05	2.60	3.20	3.15
West Virginia	1.80	2.00	2.20	2.10	2.05	2.15	2.40	2.75	3.35	3.50
Wisconsin	1.32	1.51	1.59	1.28	1.22	1.38	1.84	2.10	2.60	2.70
Wyoming	1.50	1.80	1.75	1.45	1.40	1.50	1.80	2.10	2.75	3.00
United States	1.74	1.93	1.97	1.72	1.68	1.82	2.18	2.57	3.12	3.24

The above table shows the following: Average price of milk in United States and in Wisconsin for years 1935 to January 1, 1945:

Year	United States price	Wisconsin price	Difference
	Per cwt.	*Per cwt.*	*Per cwt.*
1935	$1.74	$1.32	$0.42
1936	1.93	1.51	.42
1937	1.97	1.59	.38
1938	1.72	1.28	.44
1939	1.68	1.22	.46
1940	1.82	1.38	.44
1941	2.18	1.84	.34
1942	2.57	2.10	.47
1943	3.12	2.60	.52
1944	3.24	2.70	.54

This indicates a gradual increase in the differential in amount, but not in percentage of difference.

This table shows the increase in spread between the prices in States like Minnesota, Iowa, and Wisconsin, where the real volume of milk is produced, and the average national price of milk. This spread has increased until in 1944 Wisconsin milk brought 54 cents less per hundredweight than the national average price of milk per hundredweight. In fact the difference or spread between the Wisconsin price and the national was much more than the subsidy paid to Wisconsin producers.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. SMITH of Maine for Friday, March 2, on account of official business.

To Mr. HARE, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I do so for the purpose of announcing the program for next week. The Consent Calendar will be called on Monday, after which the rule on the nurses' draft bill (H. R. 2277) will be taken up. That will be followed by general debate on the bill. We hope to conclude debate on Monday and read the first section of the bill when the Committee will rise. We will consider amendments on Tuesday after the Private Calendar is disposed of. On Wednesday the Commodity Credit Corporation bill (S. 298), and on Thursday the debt-limit bill. Friday is undetermined, pending the disposition of the previously mentioned bill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3:00 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, March 5, 1945, at 12:00 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Brand Names and Newsprint Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Monday, March 5, 1945. Business to be considered: Newsprint.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, March 6, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings on Wednesday and Thursday, March 7 and 8, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 173, 1548, 1624, and 2256.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

265. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of costs, cancelations, and miscellaneous data pertaining to Indian irrigation projects compiled as of June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

266. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement of fiscal affairs of Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

267. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on a survey of the fishery resources of the United States and its possessions; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

268. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 128 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under the authority vested in him, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 244. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WEAVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 43. A bill to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases; with amendment (Rept. No. 245). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2404. A bill to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 2433. A bill to extend the eligibility for mustering-out payments to members of the armed forces discharged or released from active service to accept employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2434. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay not to exceed $50 to defray the cost of cemetery property for the burial of veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H. R. 2435. A bill to provide for taxation and assessment of real estate owned by the United States as a housing project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 2436. A bill to authorize the transfer of Fort Schuyler Military Reservation, N. Y., to the State of New York for nautical education purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 2437. A bill making appropriations for salaries and expenses necessary for wage stabilization program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H. R. 2438. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide a dependency exemption for certain foster children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2439. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 2440. A bill amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, providing for deferment of men engaged in coal mining; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2441. A bill to extend the life of national service life insurance policies owned by members of the armed forces to 10 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 2442. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, with respect to the duty on waterleaf papers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 2443. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 2444. A bill to exempt pay for service in the armed forces during the present war from the Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2445. A bill to provide a correctional system for adult and youth offenders convicted in courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 2446. A bill to create the All-American Flag Line, Inc., and to assure the United States world leadership in the field of air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 2447. A bill to provide for the issuance by the War and Navy Departments of certificates of death in the case of members of the armed forces who die in service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2448. A bill to reduce the rate of interest on loans secured by United States Government life (converted) insurance to 3 percent per annum; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2449. A bill to amend title III of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, to provide certain rights for members of the merchant marine serving during World War No. 1; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution providing for the consideration of treaties by Congress in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an agreement amending the original agreement entered into by the States of New York and Vermont relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. Res. 156. Resolution declaring it to be the constitutional right and duty of the House of Representatives to deliberate and act upon treaties in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to refrain from enacting legislation to draft men for labor in industrial plants; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation for the creation of harbors of refuge on the Great Lakes as an integral part of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate measures to the end that Palestine be opened for free immigration and unrestricted colonization so that the Jewish people may rebuild their ancestral homeland as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 2450. A bill for the relief of Bruce Bros. Grain Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 2451. A bill for the relief of Charles P. Leek, John E. Leek, and Cecil G. Leek trading under the name of Lower Bank Boat Works; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 2452. A bill for the relief of Sam Kalak; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TORRENS:

H. R. 2453. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Morton; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred, as follows:

118. By Mr. BULWINKLE: Senate Resolution No. 95 of the North Carolina 1945 General Assembly, a joint resolution memorializing the Congress to enact legislation for the relief of counties whose taxable property has been taken over for national forests and parks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

119. Also, Senate Resolution No. 28 of the North Carolina 1945 General Assembly, a resolution relating to payments in lieu of taxes on federally owned property in the State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

120. Also, Senate Resolution No. 203 of the North Carolina 1945 General Assembly, a joint resolution memorializing the Members of the North Carolina delegation in the Senate and the Congress of the United States to lend their immediate assistance in obtaining tobacco plant bed cloth for the farmers of eastern North Carolina; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

121. Also, Senate Resolution No. 33 of the North Carolina General Assembly of 1945, a joint resolution urging the Senators and Representatives of North Carolina in the Congress of the United States to use their best efforts to continue the tobacco control program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

122. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of the Committee for Defense of Rights of Poland, of Springfield, Mass., registering emphatic protest against the Yalta decisions as affecting Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

123. Also, petition of Rt. Rev. Joseph Lesniak, of Springfield, Mass., condemning the decision regarding the new partition of Poland reached at Yalta as contrary to the spirit of the Atlantic Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

124. Also, petition of Helen S. Kochanek, president of the Polanie Club of Indian Orchard, Mass., protesting the resolutions adopted at the Crimean Conference with reference to Poland as in direct opposition to the ideals expressed in the Atlantic Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

125. By Mr. MALONEY: Petition of Frank S. Caruso and various citizens of the State of Louisiana, protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

126. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Isabelle Paterson and 78 other citizens of the State of Oregon, urging favorable action on the Peterson bill, H. R. 5477; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, February 26, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we invoke the blessings of Thy presence and Thy power as we continue to go forth upon a day ladened with tasks and responsibilities which challenge the consecration of our noblest manhood.

We thank Thee for the life and character of Thy servant who walked and worked with us for a little while upon this earth and whose sun went down while it was yet day, only to rise again in heavenly blessedness.

Grant unto the bereaved and sorrowing the consolations of Thy presence and the glad assurance that his name will be forever enshrined among those whose minds and hearts were inspired by Thy grace to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with the Lord their God.

We pray that Thou wilt also so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom, and may we live and labor in faith and in faithfulness for the coming of that day when the whole earth will be illumined with the radiant splendor of the Prince of Peace.

Hear us in the name of the Christ our Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Friday, March 2, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 2, 1945, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 35) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of

certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2374) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

REFERENCE OF NOMINATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that any nominations sent to the Senate today by the President may be properly referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States nominating Fred M. Vinson, of Kentucky, to be Federal Loan Administrator, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2374) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

DEATH OF SENATOR MOSES, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senate has been saddened again by the news of the death of one of our colleagues, a man who had been permitted to serve in the Senate for only a couple of months, but who, I am sure, if he had been spared to continue his service here, would have given further evidence of his loyalty to the people and his ability in advocating their cause.

Senator MOSES was three times Governor of his State, and his record in that office was so outstanding that the people of North Dakota elected him to this body at the election last November.

The first time I ever saw Senator MOSES, then Governor of his State, he was a perfect picture of vigorous, virile manhood. His death only illustrates that the strongest among us may be taken unawares.

We all grieve over the death of Senator MOSES. We had looked forward to his service in the Senate with great pleasure and anticipation, and it is a source of profound regret to me, as I am sure it is to all of us, that he has been stricken so early in his legislative service here among us.

His family and his friends in the State of North Dakota have our deepest sympathy, and for his soul we wish that repose to which it is entitled after a busy and useful life on earth.

Mr. President, in view of these circumstances, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 91) was read by the Chief Clerk, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN MOSES, late a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

Resolved, That a committee of five Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy hereof to the family of the deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the second resolving clause, the Chair appoints the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. As a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Senator from North Dakota, I move that the Senate recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 6, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 5 (legislative day of February 26), 1945:

FEDERAL LOAN ADMINISTRATOR

Hon. Fred M. Vinson, of Kentucky, to be Federal Loan Administrator.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Christ, who art the Lamb in the midst of the throne, we lift our prayer to Thee in penitence and in supplication. Make our hearts responsive with that love which honors law and labors for brotherhood. Inspire us with lessons in the life which translate feeling into sacrificial and heroic service. Enlarge our capacity to be more thoughtful, more hopeful, and more determined as the forces of liberty hurl back the cohorts of evil. In our vision of a liberated future, grant that a consecrated manhood and womanhood may ever assume the obligations of a righteous statesmanship, that no unholy compromises may work into our legislation or stain our statute books. Incline Thine ear, O Lord, and hear our prayer for an unconquerable faith with a forward daring which makes a contagion of power for the release of a broken world. We pray that the Divine Presence may be with our Speaker and guide the Congress in all its ways. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 2, 1945, was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article by former Senator Lenroot. This exceeds the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing and I am advised by the Public Printer that the cost of printing will be $93.60. Notwithstanding the extra cost, I ask unanimous consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Nothwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Newsweek.

Mr. MANASCO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. THOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an Associated Press dispatch.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article from the Reader's Digest.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article from the United States News.

THE FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE BYRNES CURFEW ORDER

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BUNKER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LABOR PROBLEMS IN COAL PRODUCTION—IT IS UP TO CONGRESS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GATHINGS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT AT MEXICO CITY

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hail the latest development at Mexico City as a new Monroe Doctrine, a new good-neighbor policy, and a probable indication of or forerunner of things to come. This hemisphere has heretofore been guaranteed against encroachment from without by our country alone. When this agreement becomes effective, that guaranty will be increased to the extent that this hemisphere will be guaranteed against encroachment from within as well as from without, not by our country alone but by at least 20 American republics. Appreciated though the present guaranty has been, this additional one can but very greatly add to the security and the stability of all American countries and to the contentment, happiness, and success of their people.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EARTHMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a news item.

Mr. MAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief by the law firm of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius, of Philadelphia, Pa., on the constitutionality of the drafting-of-nurses legislation.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by DeWitt L. Pyburn, director of department of public works, State of Louisiana, and also an address by Leo M. Odom, chief of engineers, department of public works, Louisiana.

Mr. TRAYNOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial and other comment on star mail routes.

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a newspaper article and editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

STRIKES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I picked up the Post-Gazette, of Pittsburgh, on yesterday and I noticed therein a cartoon by Hungerford with the statement "Eight of our army got a raw deal. We all quit."

I noticed also in the cartoon there was depicted Hitler laughing and smiling. Then I thought of some of the things that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has said about communism.

I read in the papers also and I noticed that because of a difference of opinion with 8 men 33,000 are now on strike in Detroit, that 1,100 go on strike up in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., because they transferred one man from one job to another and 1,500 others go on strike, and so forth and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, cannot something be done about these malicious strikes, or Hitler will keep on laughing.

TWO STEEL MILLS SHUT—SLOW-DOWN BLAMED

ALIQUIPPA, PA., March 3.—A spokesman for the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corporation said today that two seamless-tube mills at the company's Aliquippa works have been shut down 2 days by what he termed a "slow-down" strike of 25 round mill workers.

The spokesman said 600 employees were made idle. He said that Wednesday night, shortly after the men were denied wage adjustments in the third step of contract grievance procedure, production dropped 80 percent, causing a shut-down of the mills next day. Officials of the United Steel Workers (C. I. O.) were unavailable for comment.

WALK-OUT OF 1,500 HALTS BOMB OUTPUT

PITTSBURGH, March 3.—A strike of 100 office workers at the Spang-Chalfant division of the National Supply Co., Etna, spread to 1,500 plant workers today, interrupting production of vital fragmentation bomb and shell forgings.

The production workers walked out in sympathy with the office workers, who struck Thursday, reportedly over the transfer of an employee to another job.

ONE THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED GO ON STRIKE IN UP-STATE PLANTS

WILKES-BARRE, March 3.—Approximately 1,100 employees of the Hazard Wire Rope Co. went on strike today at the firm's two plants south of here.

Thomas Williams, president of Local 1782, United Steel Workers (C. I. O.), said the workers' grievances include the discharge of an inspector. They also contend that men with years of service are being laid off while younger men are employed. George S. Gregson, general manager of the company, which is engaged in war work, refused to comment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

THE LATE JOHN MOSES

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point on the death of Senator Moses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the people of North Dakota, which I have the honor to represent as Congressman at large, are saddened by the announcement from Rochester, Minn., of the death of JOHN MOSES, junior Senator from North Dakota.

The history of JOHN MOSES is another of those interesting stories of one who has contributed so much to this America of ours. Like many other men of influence in this country, JOHN MOSES was born in a foreign land, and has necessarily suffered the difficulties which attend one coming here—learning the language, and finally fighting his way up to the high offices of Governor of his State and United States Senator.

JOHN MOSES was born in Strand, Norway, June 12, 1885. He was graduated from the Junior College of Oslo, Norway, and came to the United States in 1905 where he began work as a laborer and farm hand. In due time he was elevated to the position of secretary of the State Teachers College, Valley City, N. Dak., and later entered the University of North Dakota to study law. He graduated from this institution with B. A. and law degrees and was admitted to practice law in the State and Federal courts. He engaged in the general practice of law in the little city of Hazen, N. Dak., in the year 1917. He enjoyed a successful career as a country lawyer and soon became interested in farming and banking, and gave liberally of his time and talents in the interest of his community. He married Ethel L. Joslyn, a most cultured and interesting lady who survives him, together with three exceptionally brilliant children. His family life could well be looked upon as a model.

He was elected as Governor of the State in 1938, and was reelected in 1940 and 1942; thus he had the distinction of serving his State in the capacity of Governor three full terms.

JOHN MOSES was nominated by the Democratic Party for the United States Senate in the June primary of 1944 and won the election in the fall with a handsome majority.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that our State has been fortunate in the great contribution made to it by JOHN MOSES. As Governor, he held a steady hand over the affairs of State and at the conclusion of his third term enjoyed, without question, a position of affection in the hearts of the people few men have ever held in the State. He had the profound respect of the farmers, businessmen, merchants, bankers, and all who go to make up society in our State. His record is one of honor and credit, and affairs of State under his guidance were conducted along lines of constitutional government and sound business principles. I think the life of Senator JOHN MOSES will ever remain a living inspiration to the people who make up America. There are few countries in the world to which one may go and within the span of a lifetime accomplish so much and reach so high a pinnacle, first winning the confidence and affection of the people of his State and being rewarded by them in his election to the United States Senate. We who have a part, or a stake, in this land must forever rejoice in the fact that this is a country which keeps open the doors to all who aspire to contribute to its welfare.

It is my wish, Mr. Speaker, that all men of this generation and of the generations to follow will forever hold steadfast to this all-American principle, never yielding under influence, never receding from that important American philosophy which is that those who will to achieve, even though they come to us from another land, they find a place with us, and when they measure up to the requirements under the American system they are rewarded. The people of North Dakota and the United States have lost in the death of JOHN MOSES a great public servant.

PIKES PEAK RED CROSS CHAPTER OF COLORADO SPRINGS

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in announcing to the House that the Pikes Peak Red Cross Chapter of Colorado Springs, Colo., was the first in the Nation to go over the top last week in the annual Red Cross War Fund Drive. This chapter had hoped to raise its quota of $112,000 by noon of March 1, or 4 hours after the drive opened. However, at 3:45 that afternoon contributions had reached $112,214, and when the office closed at 6 that evening a total of $115,743.60 had been turned in.

Mr. Russell D. Law was chairman of the campaign, and had the assistance of 1,500 workers. In commenting on their success Mr. Law made the following observations:

> The job was done through the grand support of the workers. The readiness with which contributions were made showed that the people wanted to give to the Red Cross. Such a campaign could not have been carried on without the splendid support given by the newspapers and radio.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Mr. Law and his workers on their outstanding achievement in obtaining their full quota in 6 hours and 45 minutes after the campaign opened. I am sure this is a national record. El Paso County can always be depended on to respond in full measure when contributions to the war effort are requested.

NATIONAL DEBT LIMIT

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order on Thursday next to consider the bill (H. R. 2404) to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes, and that there shall be not to exceed 4 hours of general debate to be confined to the bill, the time to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the distinguished chairman if this is agreeable to the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Yes; that is the understanding.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. It was unanimously agreed to by the entire committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The time for debate and everything is agreeable?

Mr. COOPER. It is exactly the same as the last time we considered the same type of legislation, and the committee unanimously agreed to make this request.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means how high he expects to put the limit this time?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Three hundred billion dollars.

Mr. RICH. Three hundred billion dollars?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. It is $260,000,000,000 now, and we raise it to $300,000,000,000.

Mr. RICH. Three hundred billion?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Three hundred billion dollars.

Mr. RICH. Where will you ever get the money?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article and an editorial.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there have been reports around here, I do not know how accurate, that there may be a breathing spell around Easter. May I inquire of the distinguished majority leader if there is anything he can tell the membership about that?

Mr. McCORMACK. I welcome the inquiry and will say to the gentleman that I think it should be done. Whatever will be worked out by the leadership will be conferred on by the Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, and myself. My personal views are that we ought to take a recess from either March 23, or March 24, if necessary, which would be a Saturday, until April 10. That is my hope. I have the further hope that my hope will materialize. We have quite a legislative program to dispose of between now and then, if it can be done, and I think it is reasonable to assume it can, but in order to do that it will be necessary to have the cooperation of the Members in the consideration of the legislative program that will come before the House between now and March 24.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am sure the Members of the House will be glad to cooperate, working Saturdays, if necessary, and even meeting earlier in the morning.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the gentleman from Massachusetts made the inquiry. I may say that the subject was first brought up this morning in an informal talk with the Speaker. I believe the gentleman from Massachusetts is satisfied that all the information I had was communicated to him.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman is always very nice about those things.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman. I think, however, that the Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I ought to get together this afternoon and definitely agree on it. I am hopeful that a recess from either March 23, or March 24, at the latest to April 10 can be agreed upon.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have this vacation, and I hope we can have it, I earnestly request that the legislation that is brought in here be reasonable legislation that will not swamp this country but will make America better. Do not bring in legislation that will be driven through here and that we will be sorry for later.

Mr. McCORMACK. Everything that has been done during the last 12 years has been to make America better.

Mr. RICH. What you have done during the last 12 years has only wrecked this Nation. That is the trouble. That is what I want to stop.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] asks unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from certain college professors.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, last year this Congress took a great step forward in the passage of the G. I. bill of rights. The third section of this bill contained a pledge on the part of Congress and the country to take care of returning veterans and give them all the medical care and rehabilitation they would ever need. Tomorrow I am introducing a resolution which provides for the construction of a veterans' hospital and facility in my home district. I hope the Veterans' Administration will see fit to place veterans' hospitals throughout the length and breadth of this country so that we may take care of these returning soldiers, who deserve the very best of attention we can possibly give them. I know the House will take action to encourage this program and see it through.

The House resolution I will introduce authorizes the approval of a bill to construct a veterans' hospital in the Triple Cities area. There is great need for fair treatment and direct attention to the disabled veterans of my section. They have to travel many weary miles from home in order to obtain even temporary relief. Why not bring proper facilities to the southern tier of New York State by this great forward step.

The House ought to adopt this legislation right away. It reads as follows:

Whereas the Triple Cities area, including Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott and adjacent communities in Broome County, N. Y., is the home of great numbers of the armed forces of the United States fighting for freedom throughout the world; and

Whereas a tremendous number of residents of the Triple Cities area in our armed forces who already have been wounded, maimed, and crippled in this ghastly war have been sent back to the United States and are once more living in their homes at the same time requiring hospitalization; and

Whereas at present no hospital for the care and treatment of disabled veterans exists in the Triple Cities area to permit them to be near their homes and to be available for visits from their relatives and friends; and

Whereas the great value and advantage to all the people in the Triple Cities area of establishing a veterans' hospital and facility in a suitable place in Broome County have been brought to public attention by local newspapers and the veterans' organizations: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress is hereby authorized to proceed with immediate passage of necessary legislation to bring about the early construction of this hospital.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 157), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1945, the further expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 406 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and continued by House Resolution 138 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate the official conduct of Albert W. Johnson and Albert L. Watson, district judges of the United States District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, including such printing and binding and the employment of such clerical, stenographic, and other assistance as the committee may deem necessary, not to exceed the unobligated balance of the sum heretofore made available by House Resolution 407 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wish the gentleman would explain this resolution and also the others which he is going to call up.

Mr. COCHRAN. As the gentleman from Massachusetts will recall, the House last week passed five resolutions extending the jurisdiction of five special committees of the House. At that time I opposed those resolutions and said that if the House passed them it would require money for expenses. The Committee on Accounts has held hearings and provided for the expenses of the special committees. The reports are unanimous and, insofar as I am aware, they are satisfactory to both the majority and minority of the select committees. The resolution now under consideration carries $2,360, the unexpended balance. That is all the committee asked for.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries gets $30,000, made up of $18,000 unexpended balance and $12,000 additional.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate trade labeling and newsprint gets $18,000 and $2,000 additional, which is the unexpended balance.

The Committee on Military Affairs gets $60,000 and the $5,000 unexpended balance.

The Committee on Agriculture gets $40,760, which is the unexpended balance.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. These are all unanimous reports from the Committee on Accounts?

Mr. COCHRAN. They are all unanimous reports. While they do not carry as much money as was asked for, nevertheless, I understand they are all satisfactory to the committees.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES—EXPENSES FOR INVESTIGATION AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 281, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit another privileged resolution (H. Res. 158), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1945, the expenses of conducting the study, inquiry, and investigation authorized by House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and House Resolution 52 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 38 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, not to exceed $12,000 in addition to the unexpended balances of sums heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATION AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 98, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 159) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from March 1, 1945, the further expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 98, Seventy-eighth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 93 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $18,000 in addition to the unexpended balances of sums heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee thereof conducting such investigation or any part thereof, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS—EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATION AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 30, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 161), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1945, the further expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 30 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and House Resolution 20 of the Seventy-ninth

Congress, incurred by the Committee on Military Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $60,000 in addition to sums heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, unless otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the amount provided for in that resolution also cover the expenses of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs that is investigating the proposition of commissioning Communists in the United States Army?

Mr. COCHRAN. It covers the expenses of any investigation that the Committee on Military Affairs desires to make—any subject within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Military Affairs as provided for under the rules of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Either by the whole committee or by a subcommittee?

Mr. COCHRAN. It does.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] appeared before the committee this morning and said that would be investigated, and that this money would aid and assist in doing so. For that reason the committee had no hesitancy in giving him the money, to try to drive the Communists out of the Army as well as to drive them out of this country where they will never come back.

Mr. COCHRAN. Even if that matter was not involved the committee would have needed money. It is my understanding—and it has so been stated on the floor several times—the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] heads a subcommittee that has been investigating that subject for over a week.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution, House Resolution 160, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from January 3, 1945, the further expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 38 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 54 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Agriculture, acting as a whole or by subcommittee not to exceed the unobligated balance of the sum heretofore made available during the Seventy-eighth Congress, including expenditures for the employment of experts, clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I announce for the benefit of the Members of the House who may be interested, the Committee on Accounts will hold an executive session tomorrow to hear members of the Committee on Un-American Activities in respect to a request for expenses to carry on the operations of that committee. The Committee on Accounts does not hear outsiders, but any Member of the House who desires to be heard will be welcome.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is that an invitation to everybody who is opposed to the Committee on Un-American Activities to come in and oppose funds for this committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. It is an invitation to any Member of the House who desires to be heard, including any who might not be in favor of the House committee.

Mr. RANKIN. I notice that no such invitation was extended on the other resolutions. I have no objection to Members of Congress being heard, but I just wanted to know if that is an invitation to the opposition of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. COCHRAN. Certainly any Member of the House who desires to express his views, regardless of whether he is for the resolution or against it, will have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. RANKIN. About 90 percent of the American people are behind the Committee on Un-American Activities and want this appropriation made.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman know any Member of Congress who would oppose it?

Mr. RANKIN. I hope not. They will not be Members of the next Congress if they do.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. How will Members of Congress know when the meeting will be held?

Mr. COCHRAN. I made the announcement so that nobody could say the Committee on Accounts took advantage of them.

Mr. EBERHARTER. When will the hearing be held?

Mr. COCHRAN. Tomorrow morning at 10:30 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

HON. FRED VINSON

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in a telephone conversation this morning with Mr. Jesse Jones I learned that Mr. Fred M. Vinson, at present Director of Economic Stabilization, a former Member of this House, and a man highly respected by the membership of the House, has been nominated to become Administrator of the Federal loan agencies.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS RELATING TO THE ATLANTIC-GULF SHIP CANAL, FLORIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. Res. 30) authorizing the printing of certain documents relating to the Atlantic-Gulf ship canal, Florida.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the letter of the Chief of Engineers to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, dated June 15, 1942, and the letter from the Secretary of War transmitted to the House of Representatives on July 31, 1942, including a report from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 12, 1942, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Atlantic-Gulf ship canal, Florida, with a view to determining the advisability of constructing a waterway across northern Florida, of suitable dimensions for barge traffic, and over the most practicable route, to connect the existing intracoastal waterways along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 27, 1942, and subsequent correspondence in relation thereto, be printed, with an illustration, as a House document.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 689) to enable the Department of State, pursuant to its responsibilities under the Constitution and statutes of the United States, more effectively to carry out its prescribed and traditional responsibilities in the foreign field; to strengthen the Foreign Service permitting fullest utilization of available personnel and facilities of other departments and agencies and coordination of activities abroad of the United States under a Foreign Service for the United States unified under the guidance of the Department of State.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXCHANGE OF LANDS BETWEEN THE CITY OF EASTPORT, MAINE, AND THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 217) to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States, and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to transfer, under such conditions as may be approved by the said Secretary, to the city of Eastport, Maine, without cost to the city of Eastport, Maine, all right, title, and interest in and to the following parcels of land situated on Moose Island, Washington County, Maine, metes and bounds descriptions of which are on file in the War Department:

Parcel 1. A parcel of land containing eight and ninety-four one-hundredths acres, more or less, adjecent to and lying south of the southerly shore line of Carrying Place Cove, being that parcel of land formerly owned by Andrew J. Malloy and being bounded on the south by the northerly right-of-way line of Deep Cove or Barrett Road, on the east by a parcel of land formerly owned by Mrs. E. B. Townsend, and on the west by a parcel of land formerly owned by David C. MacNichol.

Parcel 2. A parcel of land containing nine and eighty-one one-hundredths acres, more or less, adjacent to and lying south of the southerly shore line of Carrying Place Cove, being that parcel of land formerly owned by Mrs. E. B. Townsend and being bounded on the south by the northerly right-of-way line of Deep Cove or Barrett Road, on the east by the westerly right-of-way line of said road, and on the west by the easterly line of a parcel of land formerly owned by Andrew J. Malloy.

Parcel 3. A parcel of land containing nine and fifty-eight one-hundredths acres, more or less, adjacent to and lying between the southwesterly right-of-way line of the Maine Central Railroad Co. and Maine State Highway No. 190, being bounded on the northeast by said right-of-way line and on the northwest by two parcels of land now or formerly owned by C. H. Bishop and W. J. Murphy, respectively.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War, in consideration of the transfer hereinabove authorized, is further authorized, on behalf of the United States, to accept from the city of Eastport, Maine, without cost to the United States, all right, title, and interest of the city in and to the following-described parcels of land situated on Moose Island, Washington County, State of Maine, metes and bounds descriptions of which are on file in the War Department.

Parcel 1. A parcel of land containing five acres, more or less, adjacent to the northerly shore line of Carrying Place Cove, being bounded on the east by a tract of land now or formerly owned by R. C. Emery and on the west by a tract of land now or formerly owned by Melinda Taylor.

Parcel 2. A parcel of land containing fifteen and twenty-five one-hundredths acres, more or less, adjacent to and lying west of the westerly right-of-way line of the Maine Central Railroad Co. and east and south of a large parcel of land now owned by the United States of America.

Parcel 3. A parcel of land containing four acres, more or less, lying between the easterly right-of-way line of the Maine Central Railroad Co. and the westerly right-of-way line of Indian or Carlow Island Road.

Parcel 4. A parcel of land containing nine and five-tenths acres, more or less, adjacent to and lying easterly of that parcel of land described in section 3 hereof as parcel 1, being bounded on the north by the southerly shore line of Passamaquoddy Bay, on the west by a parcel of land belonging to the United States of America, and on the southwest by the northeasterly right-of-way line of Indian or Carlow Island Road.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of War is further authorized to transfer, under such conditions as may be approved by the said Secretary, to the city of Eastport, Maine, without cost to the city, a permanent easement for roadway purposes, in, over, and across the following-described parcel of land situated on Moose Island, Washington County, Maine, a metes and bounds description of which is on file in the War Department:

Parcel 1. A parcel of land containing twelve and eighty-three one-hundredths acres, more or less, lying in the northwesternmost corner of Moose Island, and being formerly owned by heirs of Anderson.

SEC. 4. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EASEMENT TO DUKE POWER CO. ACROSS CAMP CROFT, S. C.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 222) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Duke Power Co. a 180-foot perpetual easement across Camp Croft, in the State of South Carolina.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, under such terms and conditions as he may deem advisable, to grant to the Duke Power Co., its successors and/or assigns, for transmission-line purposes, a 180-foot perpetual easement over, across, in, and upon Camp Croft, in the State of South Carolina.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EASEMENT TO THE ORANGE AND ROCKLAND ELECTRIC CO. ACROSS THE WEST POINT MILITARY RESERVATION, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 290) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Orange & Rockland Electric Co. a 150-foot perpetual easement across the West Point Military Reservation in the State of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, under such terms and conditions as he may deem advisable, to grant to the Orange & Rockland Electric Co., its successors and/or assigns, for transmission-line purposes, a 150-foot perpetual easement over, across, in, and upon the West Point Military Reservation in the State of New York.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AMEND THE FACT FINDERS' ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1534) to amend the Fact Finders' Act.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, two bills have been presented dealing with this subject, each bill having the same introductory number, the same title, but one of them bearing a star at the bottom of the page. The difference between the two is that in the nonstarred bill the word "nonprofit" is used, whereas in the starred bill the word "nonproject" is used.

I wish the RECORD to show that the bill which is being considered by the House is the starred bill carrying the word "nonproject."

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection O of section 4 of the act of December 5, 1924, commonly known as the Fact Finders' Act (43 Stat. 704), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SUBSEC. O. That the cost and expense after June 30, 1945, of the office of the Commissioner in the District of Columbia, and, except for such cost and expense as are incurred on behalf of specific projects, of general investigations and of nonproject offices outside the District of Columbia, shall be charged to the reclamation fund and shall not be charged as a part of the reimbursable construction or operation and maintenance costs."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENACTMENT OF TITLE 1 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE INTO POSITIVE LAW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2195) to codify and enact into positive law title 1 of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the first of some six or eight bills, each of a similar nature in that in them certain titles of the United States Code are sought to be enacted into statutory law. It is a project which was undertaken some years ago by the Committee on Revision of the Laws, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from New York. He has undertaken a task which is monumental in its scope and which, to my mind, is entirely worth while. He is to be highly complimented for the work he and his staff have done. In order that the membership of the House, and especially the new Members, may be advised of the purposes of the bills which are now on the calendar, I suggest that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] explain at this time the over-all objective of this program.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the membership of the House well knows that the United States Code in its present form is merely prima facie evidence of the law. It is the ultimate objective of the Committee on Revision of Laws finally to enact into positive law each one of the 50 titles of the code,

thus providing a permanent framework within and around which all future new and amendatory legislation may be drafted in code language.

Mr. Speaker, an attempt to enact the United States Code into law was made when it was originally prepared in 1925 but failed. We have undertaken to enact it title by title. I might call the attention of the membership of the House to the fact that title 26 is the Internal Revenue Code which was enacted into positive law. Part of the title on alien and nationality is also positive law by enactment of this House.

In the bills which appear on the calendar today, with the exception of H. R. 2200, for which I shall ask unanimous consent that it may be passed over when reached on the call of the calendar, we have simply taken the law as it presently stands and have made no substantive changes at all. We have attempted merely to set forth in each one of these titles the present existing law on that subject. We have assurance now from the other body that when and if these bills go over there they will be considered by a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of that body. I should also call to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker, the fact that this bill presently under consideration and the three immediately following it were passed by two previous Houses, to wit, on June 15, 1942, and on March 20, 1944. I should like to emphasize again that in none of these bills, except H. R. 2200, have we made the slightest attempt to make any substantive change in existing law, the purpose of the bills being simply to codify all the laws on the particular subject so that those laws might be found within the appropriate title of the code.

Mr. COLE of New York. Have any of the titles recommended by the gentleman's committee been enacted into substantive law?

Mr. KEOGH. None yet, but patience is a virtue and we are keeping right after it.

Mr. COLE of New York. In order that the House might understand definitely, I would like to inquire of the gentleman if this bill or any of those which will follow, and to be called up today, makes any change whatsoever in substantive law?

Mr. KEOGH. None, except H. R. 2200.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is not coming up today?

Mr. KEOGH. No. We are going to ask unanimous consent that that be passed over.

Mr. COLE of New York. All these bills that we are to consider today will not in any way change existing law?

Mr. KEOGH. Not in the slightest.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is simply a codification of existing law and enactment of that codification into statutory form?

Mr. KEOGH. Exactly.

Mr. COLE of New York. When these bills previously passed the House, it was by unanimous consent?

Mr. KEOGH. Yes. But may I say that in each one of these bills we include specific repeal of the previous laws that have been enacted so as to avoid redundancy and repetition.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of that committee, but I was ill in the hospital at the time these bills were considered, and I have not had an opportunity to go over them. I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

TITLE 4, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2196) to codify and enact into positive law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I desire to have my request apply to all six of these bills. I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

TITLE 6, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2197) to codify and enact into positive law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent that H. R. 2198, H. R. 2199, and H. R. 2200 also be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

KICK-BACKS ON CONTRACTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2284) to eliminate the practice by subcontractors, under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable contracts of the United States, of paying fees or kick-backs or of granting gifts or gratuities to employees of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable prime contractors or of higher-tier subcontractors for the purpose of securing the award of subcontracts or orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the statement by the Comptroller General which appears at pages 4, 5, and 6 of the report.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if he would include with that the comment in the report by the War Department, being a letter from the Secretary of War dated February 5, 1945?

Mr. COLE of New York. I will modify the request accordingly, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand certain amendments are to be offered. Are the amendments to be proposed by the gentleman from Alabama anything that the members of the Consent Calendar Committee have seen?

Mr. MANASCO. May I say to the gentleman that in printing the bill, on page 2, line 7, the word "prime" in the printed bill should have been "sub." There was a mistake there. I would also insert on line 5, page 4, after the word "contract", the words "or cost reimbursable." Those are the only amendments we have. They are simply perfecting amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the payment of any fee, commission, or compensation of any kind or the granting of any gift or gratuity of any kind, either directly or indirectly, by or on behalf of a subcontractor, as hereinafter defined, (1) to any officer, partner, employee, or agent of a prime contractor holding a contract entered into by any department, agency, or establishment of the United States for the furnishing of supplies, materials, equipment or services of any kind whatsoever, on a cost-plus-a-fixed fee or other cost-reimbursable basis; or to any such prime contractor or (2) to any officer, partner, employee, or agent of a higher tier subcontractor holding a subcontract under the prime contract, or to any such prime contractor either as an inducement for the award of a subcontract or order from the prime contractor or any subcontractor, or as an acknowledgement of a subcontact or order previously awarded, is hereby prohibited. The amount of any such fee, commission, or compensation or the cost or expense of any such gratuity or gift, whether heretofore or hereafter paid or incurred by the subcontractor, shall not be charged, either directly or indirectly, as a part of the contract price charged by the subcontractor to the prime contractor or higher tier subcontractor. The amount of any such fee, cost, or expense shall be recoverable on behalf of the United States from the subcontractor or the recipient thereof by set-off of moneys otherwise owing to the subcontractor either directly by the United States, or by a prime contractor under any cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable contract, or by an action in an appropriate court of the United States. Upon a showing that a subcontractor paid fees, commissions, or compensation or granted gifts or gratuities to an officer, partner, employee, or agent of a prime contractor or of another higher tier subcontractor, in connection with the award of a subcontract or order thereunder, it shall be conclusively presumed that the cost of such expense was included in the price of the subcontract or order and ultimately borne by the United States. Upon the direction of the contracting department or agency or of the General Accounting Office, the prime contractor shall withhold from sums otherwise due a subcontractor any amount reported to have been found to have been paid by a subcontractor as a fee, commission, or compensation or as a gift or gratuity to an officer, partner, employee, or agent of the

prime contractor or another higher tier subcontactor.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this act, the term "subcontractor" is defined as any person, including a corporation, partnership, or business association of any kind, who holds an agreement or purchase order to perform all or any part of the work or to make or to furnish any article or service required for the performance of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable contract or of a subcontract entered into thereunder, and the term "person" shall include any subcontractor, coryoration, association, trust, joint-stock company, partnership, or individual.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of ascertaining whether such fees, commissions, compensation, gifts, or gratuities have been paid or granted by a subcontractor, the General Accounting Office shall have the power to inspect the plants and to audit the books and records of any prime contractor or subcontractor engaged in the performance of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract.

SEC. 4. Any person who shall knowingly, directly or indirectly, make or receive any such prohibited payment shall be fined not more than $10,000 or be imprisoned for not more than 2 years, or both.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANASCO:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "such", strike out the word "prime" and insert in lieu thereof the word "sub."

Page 4, line 5, after the word "contract", insert "or cost reimbursable."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING NONQUOTA STATUS TO CERTAIN ALIEN VETERANS AND THEIR WIVES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 433) to grant a nonquota status to certain alien veterans and their wives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the bills which seems to declare that the war started before it actually did start. I have consulted with the author of the bill and he says he will accept an amendment to change the date September 16 to December 7, 1941. I shall offer that amendment at the appropriate time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 155; 44 Stat. 812; 4. Stat. 1009; 46 Stat. 854; 47 Stat. 656; 8 U. S. C. 204), is hereby amended by changing the period at the conclusion of subdivision (f) thereof to a semicolon, inserting the word "or" to that subdivision, and adding the following subdivision, to be known as subdivision "(g)":

"(g) An immigrant who has served honorably as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States at any time after April 20, 1898, and before July 5, 1902; or after April 5, 1917, and before November 12, 1918; or who has served or hereafter serves honorably in the said forces after September 16, 1940, and until such time as the United States shall cease to be in a state of war; and his wife and unmarried child under 21 years of age."

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEAN: On page 2, line 5, after the word "after", strike out "September 16, 1940", and insert "December 7, 1941."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VOLUNTARY RETIREMENT OF PANAMA CANAL EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2125) to amend the Canal Zone Code.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of some member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries if the sole purpose of this bill is to make the retirement privileges of Canal Zone employees subject to the same provisions as the retirement of civil-service employees in the continental United States.

Mr. BLAND. That is true, to conform with the civil-service requirements generally in the continental United States.

Mr. COLE of New York. It does not grant more advantages to the retiring Canal Zone personnel than the present civil-service retirement laws applying to employees in the United States?

Mr. BLAND. I think the Canal Zone Retirement Act does give certain advantages, but they are already law. This does not increase any of the advantages already law.

Mr. COLE of New York. This brings the retirement privileges of Canal Zone employees into conformity with the retirement privileges of continental civil-service employees?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct. It is true that the Canal Zone Act originally was a little more beneficial on the theory that the tropical climate down there made it necessary to retire men a little earlier, but this particular bill is simply to bring the Canal Zone Act in line with an amendment to the Civil Service Retirement Act passed by the Congress 3 years ago.

Mr. BLAND. The increase was not only because of the climate but also because of housing conditions. When retired, they had to return to the United States because they could not find homes down there.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That may be true, and I did not know about that part of it, but I do know that this particular bill does not confer any greater benefits on them than the other employees have under the act applying to the continental United States.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman explain to the House the reason for the committee amendment striking out the provision on page 2, line 4, which repeals existing law?

Mr. BLAND. That refers to the American experience table, does it not?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes. I can explain that. The Civil Service Commission administers three acts: the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Panama Canal Act, and the Alaska Railroad Act. They have a board of consulting actuaries in New York who have an experience table made up of the experience with these acts. The Panama Canal Zone Act, however, is the only one that has in it a requirement that they use the American table. We are repealing that requirement because it does not quite fit in with the experience based on these other acts. The committee felt it was better to have all of them under the same table. We have a very fine board of actuaries, headed by Mr. Buck, in New York, and they have been employed for many, many years by the Government to supervise the administration of these acts.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (a) of section 93 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) An employee to whom this article applies who shall have attained the age of 55 and rendered at least 25 years of service, of which not less than 15 years shall have been rendered on the Isthmus of Panama, may voluntarily retire on an annuity equivalent in value to the present worth of a deferred annuity beginning at the age at which the employee would otherwise have become eligible for retirement, computed as provided in section 96 of this title, the present worth of said deferred annuity to be determined on the basis of the American experience table on mortality and an interest rate of 4 percent, compounded annually: *Provided*, That any employee retiring prior to attaining the age of 60 under the provisions of this paragraph with at least 30 years of service shall receive an immediate annuity having a value equal to the present worth of a deferred annuity beginning at the age of 60 years, computed as provided in section 96 of this title."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after "title", strike out down to "annually" in line 7.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACTS DONE BY AN INVENTOR IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1439) to prohibit proof of acts done by an inventor in foreign countries.

The SPEAKER. Is their objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in order that the House may be advised of the effect of this bill I suggest that the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of the committee, briefly explain its provisions and purposes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, owing to a decision of the Supreme Court, there is

a conflict between two of our patent statutes and there seem to be different decisions in the various jurisdictions. The purpose of this act is to prevent some national of a foreign country endeavoring to vitiate an American patent secured under our laws by proving, although he had never made any application for a patent in his own country, that the idea had occurred to him in his own country prior to its use by the American inventor; and there would be no way at all by which an American patentee could controvert what was said. Our country is the only country which does not have a very definite law of this kind. We have it in one portion of our patent laws, but according to this decision of the Supreme Court, as shown in the report of the committee, there seems to be a conflict between two of the statutes. This bill is simply to reconcile that conflict and make our laws uniform in that regard with the laws of the other countries, and to protect American patentees under our American system.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then the effect of the law is to place a foreign national who contests or is interested in a patent in this country on the same basis as an American national is placed when he contests a patent in a foreign country?

Mr. LANHAM. Exactly.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will have to object unless I know more about it. I am opposed to all this patent business.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to give the gentleman any information I can with reference to this. I think the report shows clearly the reasons on which it is based. It is simply for the protection of American patentees who hold a patent under our system and not to allow some foreigner who has never even applied for a patent here or elsewhere to vitiate that patent upon his own testimony that the idea had occurred to him years before.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, that sounds very good, but I wonder what effect that might have on the general patent-law system. I think it is entirely too liberal and it is causing us a great deal of trouble in this country.

Mr. LANHAM. May I say to the gentleman from North Carolina that this provision is now in the law, but by reason of the interpretation of another provision of the law there seems to be a controversy. Every country which has any patent system at all has a law like this. No American citizen who has not applied for a patent can attack successfully a patent of any foreign country. We are simply trying to get for our own people the same rights, the same privileges, and the same recognition that other countries accord to their own people.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. My understanding is that this bill has passed the House on two or three previous occasions?

Mr. LANHAM. It has.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my understanding that the purpose of the bill is to reconcile two conflicting provisions of the existing law and the opinion of the Supreme Court based on one of them?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. The purpose of this is to bring about a reconciliation which will be in the best interest of our own citizens who might have any matter which comes within the purview of the patent law?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct. It is to avoid a conflict of interpretation in the judicial jurisdictions in this country. It is a matter to which I think there can be no tenable objection. I think the report sets forth very clearly the reasons for this legislation. We have passed it on two or three previous occasions.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, does this bill have any effect other than to place our patentees in the same protected position as foreign patentees?

Mr. LANHAM. That is all it does.

Mr. FOLGER. That is all it does?

Mr. LANHAM. That is correct.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4886 of the Revised Statutes (35 U. S. C. 31) be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"In proceedings in the Patent Office and in the courts of the United States, an applicant for a patent, or patentee, shall not be permitted to establish his date of invention or discovery by reference to knowledge or use thereof, or other activity with respect thereto, in a country foreign to the United States, other than the filing in a foreign country of an application for a patent for the same invention or discovery which, in accordance with the provisions of section 4887 of the Revised Statutes, is entitled to have the same force and effect as it would have had if filed in this country on the date on which it was filed in such foreign country: *Provided*, That the phrase 'country foreign to the United States' shall not be construed to include any territory or area under the control or jurisdiction or in the possession of the United States acquired by lease, or otherwise, for military, naval, national defense, or other purpose from any foreign country."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect immediately and apply to all pending applications for patents and existing patents, except that its provisions shall not be effective to nullify any judicial finding of the validity of the patent heretofore made by a court of competent jurisdiction.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "Provided", strike out lines 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and the words "foreign country" in line 12, and insert "That where an invention was made by a person, civil or military, during the time such person was domiciled in the United States or its possessions and was serving on duty with or as a member of any armed force of the United States located in a foreign country, the inventor thereof shall be entitled, in interference and other proceedings arising in connection with such invention, to the same rights of priority with respect to such invention as if the same had been made in the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGISTRATION AND PROTECTION OF TRADE-MARKS USED IN COMMERCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1654) to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I understand this bill is to be called up under suspension of the rules this afternoon.

I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE ANTIRACKETEERING ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 32) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PREVENTING MULTIPLE STATE INCOME TAXES ON SALARIES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 534) to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 24 of the Judicial Code (36 Stat. 1091; title 28, U. S. C., sec. 41) as amended, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto a new subsection immediately following subsection 28, to be known as subsection 29 and to read as follows:

"29. Of all actions, suits, or proceedings, involving the liability of any officer or employee of the United States or any Territory or possession thereof, or of the District of Columbia, or of any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing, for State tax on the compensation for personal services as such officer or employee, where the claim of domicile on the part of such officer or employee is disputed by the taxing authority of any State."

SEC. 2. That title I of the act of April 12, 1939 (ch. 59, 53 Stat. 574), be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The compensation of an officer or employee of the United States, any Territory or possession thereof, the District of Columbia, or any agency or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing, shall be subject to State tax only in the State in which such officer or employee is domiciled.

"For the purpose of this act, the domicile of such officer or employee shall be in the State which he expressly declares to be the State of his domicile: *Provided*, That he shall have acquired a domicile in such State, under the laws of such State, prior to the beginning of the annual period for which the tax

is claimed. Such declaration must be made in writing under oath to the authority whose duty it is to assess, levy, or collect such taxes and the time for filing such declaration shall not expire until 60 days after a written demand for payment of such tax shall have been received by such officer or employee."

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this act the term "State" shall include the District of Columbia and the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and the political subdivisions of the several States and Territories.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of this act the term "State tax" shall include, in addition to a tax levied by a State, a tax levied by any duly constituted taxing authority in a State.

SEC. 5. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act, or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I have made inquiry and ascertained that the name of our distinguished former colleague, Judge Fred Vinson, has been sent to the Senate by the President of the United States, to succeed Jesse Jones, as head of the lending agencies of our Government.

To those of us who served with Fred Vinson, we have a recollection of an association that has made a lasting impression upon us. Fred Vinson served in the body for a number of years. He served on the Committee on Ways and Means. He was one of the outstanding Members of the House; a gentleman of striking and dynamic personality; one of the soundest thinkers I have ever met; a man of profound judgment; a man who considers deeply all questions upon which he is to pass; a great legislator, and a man who enjoys the complete confidence and respect of every Member who served with him and every person who knows him.

In my opinion, no better choice of any person in the United States to fill this responsible position could have been made than that of Judge Vinson. I know I speak the sentiments of all who knew Fred Vinson, not only in congratulating him but in congratulating the President of the United States in selecting Judge Vinson to fill this responsible position.

The people of the United States will in Fred Vinson have a man who will give the greatest degree of service that one can humanly approximate in performing the serious duties and responsibility of the great office that I hope he will assume very shortly by quick and rapid confirmation by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, I join with other Members of the House in my praise of Fred M. Vinson. He comes from Ashland, Ky., which is located directly across the Ohio River from Ironton, Ohio, where I live. I have known him for many years. I knew him as a successful lawyer before he or I came to Congress. I have known him as a very genial Congressman. He is a very able man and has demonstrated his ability and versatility in the several important positions that he has held. I think he is one of the brightest men on fiscal matters with whom I have ever been acquainted. Instinctively he is honest and ought to do a good job in this high place to which he is to be promoted. I hope those above him in authority will not drive him to a narrow partisanship but will permit him to administer this great work as his conscience, his good judgment, and his ability would dictate.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to my distinguished friend from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I served with Judge Vinson a number of years in this House. He is very capable and I think a very honorable man. I believe the Senate and the House by legislation accomplished much in making it possible for Judge Fred Vinson rather than Hon. Henry Wallace to carry on the affairs of the great lending agencies of the United States. It was a good swap.

Mr. JENKINS. In other words, the gentleman thinks the trade was absolutely to the benefit of the people. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is it. I do not think Mr. Wallace is equipped for that job.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 577) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I object.

COMPACT FOR DIVISION OF WATERS OF ARKANSAS RIVER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 914) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado and Kansas to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Arkansas River.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Colorado and Kansas to negotiate and enter into a compact not later than January 1, 1950, providing for an equitable division and apportionment between the said States of the waters of the Arkansas River and all of its tributaries, upon the condition that one suitable person who shall be appointed by the President of the United States shall participate in said negotiations as the representative of the United States and shall make report to Congress of the proceedings and of any compact entered into: *Provided*, That any such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been ratified by the legislature of each of said States and approved by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sufficient sum to pay the salary and expenses of the representative of the United States appointed hereunder: *Provided*, That such representative, if otherwise employed by the United States, while so employed shall not receive additional salary in the appointment hereunder.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 914 grants the consent of Congress to the States of Kansas and Colorado to negotiate and enter into a contract for a division and apportionment of the waters of the Arkansas River. If and when such an agreement is made between the States, it will then come before Congress for its approval.

This bill was introduced at the request of the Governors of Kansas and Colorado and it is hoped that under the authority which it gives it will be possible to adjust and settle a water dispute between the two States which has been going on for almost 40 years. If my recollection is correct, litigation over the waters of the Arkansas River began about 1906 and the question has been in the courts almost continuously since that time. A few months ago the case reached the United States Supreme Court and that Court dismissed the proceeding and advised that the two States get together and make an agreement for the distribution of this water. This bill sets up the machinery for reaching such an agreement.

It is my understanding that the Governor of Colorado already has authority to appoint commissioners to represent that State and legislation is now in process of being enacted by the Legislature of the State of Kansas, authorizing the Governor of that State to appoint representatives to participate in these negotiations.

The Caddoa Dam which has been constructed in eastern Colorado for the purpose of impounding the waters of the Arkansas, is both an irrigation and flood-control project. Aside from its great value in controlling floods on the Arkansas River it will store in the John Martin Reservoir a large quantity of valuable irrigation water, sufficient in most years to furnish an ample water supply to all land below the dam in both Kansas and Colorado which has heretofore been under irrigation. There may perhaps be sufficient water to bring some additional land under irrigation.

As far as I know, there are no questions involved except the matter of a proper division of the impounded water for irrigation purposes. I believe that it will be possible for the commissioners appointed by the Governors of the two States to reach an agreement on this question at an early date after this legislation becomes a law. It is to be hoped that this can be done and that this long-standing dispute may be finally terminated on a basis which is mutually satisfactory.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I strongly favor H. R. 914, the bill that has just passed. This legislation is highly necessary in order to enable the States of Colorado and Kansas to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Arkansas River.

Litigation has been pending between the two States on this subject for a number of years. Several of these cases reached the Supreme Court of the United States. The last decision was in the case of the State of Colorado against the State of Kansas and others, and was handed down on December 6, 1943. While the Court found the issues in favor of the State of Colorado it made certain pertinent observations and I wish to quote a paragraph from that decision as follows:

> The reason for judicial caution in adjudicating the relative rights of States in such cases is that, while we have jurisdiction of such disputes, they involve the interests of quasi sovereigns, present complicated and delicate questions, and due to the possibility of future change of conditions, necessitate expert administration rather than judicial imposition of a hard and fast rule. Such controversies may appropriately be composed by negotiation and agreement, pursuant to the compact clause of the Federal Constitution. We say of this case, as the Court has said of interstate differences of like nature, that such mutual accommodation and agreement should, if possible, be the medium of settlement, instead of invocation of our adjudicatory power.

This bill carries out the suggestions made by the Supreme Court as contained in the above language. The Legislatures of both Kansas and Colorado are now in session. It is important that the compact commissioners from both States be appointed and begin work at the earliest possible moment.

Last year some difficulties arose over the apportionment of waters impounded in the John Martin Reservoir on the Arkansas River and located in Colorado. A temporary agreement for the division of these waters was worked out. Another irrigation season will soon be at hand. It is therefore extremely urgent and desirable that this compact commission meet and decide on a satisfactory plan for the current season. The agreement reached can then be embodied in the compact.

I now express the sincere hope and confident belief that the water users of both Kansas and Colorado will, by the compact authorized in this bill, quickly and forever settle and determine the differences that have existed so long concerning the division and distribution of the waters of the Arkansas River.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, that completes the call of the Consent Calendar.

HON. MARY T. NORTON

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish this morning to pay tribute to a great and good woman, MARY T. NORTON, who has been a Member of this body for 20 years. Twenty years ago today MARY NORTON came to Washington.

Several years ago I was sitting as a visitor in the gallery of this Chamber. I had not come to the House to listen to any special piece of legislation being discussed upon the floor but just to visit and to pay my respects to this great body. It was my good luck to be here at the time when the gentlewoman from New Jersey was fighting for the wage-hour bill. I remember MARY NORTON as I first saw her—with chestnut-brown hair, flashing eyes, and her Irish sense of humor which I have since come to know and love. I remember the understanding and the kindliness and the spirit with which she fought as she defended that bill on the floor, and a new understanding came to me of the part that women could play in the law-making body of this country. I came back day after day to watch and admire a great woman.

I went over her biographical sketch in the Congressional Directory sometime later and tried to analyze why it was that this woman, MARY NORTON, had sponsored and fought so hard for the wage-hour law. Why a woman?

I think a brief glance at MARY NORTON's history tells why she has been so interested in wages and hours. Why MARY NORTON has fought to retain the gains made for the protection of the millions of men and women of labor. Why MARY NORTON is a liberal. Why MARY NORTON is an ardent supporter of President Roosevelt.

MARY NORTON was the second oldest of four children, whose parents were both born in Ireland. They were comfortably but not affluently well off. Her father was a contractor. Before she was married she was a businesswoman, working as a secretary for several years. Her husband was a successful businessman, who retired in 1930 because of poor health. Their only child, a son, died in 1916. In her own suffering, being the kind of woman she is, MARY NORTON reached out to help others. She began to work with children, began to understand their needs, began to understand her community, and gradually began to understand the needs of her country.

Mrs. NORTON became president of the Queens Daughters, an organization connected with St. Joseph's Catholic Church, to which she belonged, which was engaged in the care of the children of working mothers.

As a result of her interest in child care, Mrs. NORTON was appointed to represent Hudson County on the Democratic State Committee in 1920 and was elected vice-chairman the following year. She was the first woman in the State to hold public office since there had never been woman suffrage before 1920. She was elected to Congress in 1924 and has been reelected every 2 years since.

Mrs. NORTON is the first Democratic woman ever to be elected to Congress, the first woman ever to head a legislative committee on the House of Representatives in the United States. She became chairman of the Labor Committee which position she now holds and was chairman of the District of Columbia Committee in 1930 and 1937. She is dean of the New Jersey delegation and is doing the work of a Senator at the present time because the State of New Jersey has no Senator representing the majority party. She was also former chairman of the New Jersey State Democratic Committee, a position she held for 4 years, resigning in 1944. She is National Democratic Committeewoman from New Jersey.

MARY NORTON is loved on both sides of the aisle. She is certainly a pattern for women in public life. I think many will come to Congress traveling the same road that MARY NORTON has traveled. I am proud to call her my friend.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HANCOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

REGISTRATION AND PROTECTION OF TRADE-MARKS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 1654) to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.,

TITLE I—THE PRINCIPAL REGISTER

SECTION 1. The owner of a trade-mark used in commerce may register his trade-mark under this act on the principal register hereby established:

(a) By filing in the Patent Office—

(1) a written application, in such form as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, verified by the applicant, or by a member of the firm or an officer of the corporation or association applying, specifying applicant's domicile and citizenship, the date of applicant's first use of the mark, the date of applicant's first use of the mark in commerce, the goods in connection with which the mark is used and the mode or manner in which the mark is used in connection with such goods, and including a statement to the effect that the person making the verification believes himself, or the firm, corporation, or association in whose behalf he makes the verification, to be the owner of the mark sought to be registered, that the mark is in use in commerce, and that no other person, firm, corporation, or association, to the best of his knowledge and belief, has the right to use such mark in commerce either in the identical form thereof or in such near resemblance thereto as might be calculated to deceive: *Provided*, That in the case of every application claiming concurrent use the applicant shall state exceptions to his claim of exclusive use, in which he shall specify, to the extent of his knowledge, any concurrent use by others, the goods or services in connection with which and the areas in which each concurrent use exists, the periods of each use, and the goods and area for which the applicant desires registration;

(2) a drawing of the mark; and

(3) such number of specimens or facsimiles of the mark as actually used as may be required by the Commissioner.

(b) By paying into the Patent Office the filing fee.

(c) By complying with such rules or regulations, not inconsistent with law, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

(d) If the applicant is not domiciled in the United States he shall designate by a written document filed in the Patent Office the name and address of some person resident in the United States on whom may be served notices or process in proceedings affecting the mark. Such notices or process may be served upon the person so designated by leaving with him or mailing to him a copy thereof at the address specified in the last designation so filed. If the person so designated cannot be found at the address given in the last designation, such notice or process may be served upon the Commissioner.

MARKS REGISTRABLE ON THE PRINCIPAL REGISTER

SEC. 2. No trade-mark by which the goods of the applicant may be distinguished from the goods of others shall be refused registration on the principal register on account of its nature unless it—

(a) Consists of or comprises immoral, deceptive, or scandalous matter; or matter which may disparage or falsely suggest a connection with persons, living or dead, institutions, beliefs, or national symbols, or bring them into contempt, or disrepute.

(b) Consists of or comprises the flag or coat of arms or other insignia of the United States, or of any State or municipality, or of any foreign nation, or any simulation thereof.

(c) Consists of or comprises a name, portrait, or signature identifying a particular living individual except by his written consent, or the name signature, or portrait of a deceased President of the United States during the life of his widow, if any, except by the written consent of the widow.

(d) Consists of or comprises a mark which so resembles a mark registered in the Patent Office or a mark or trade name previously used in the United States by another and not abandoned, as to be likely, when applied to the goods of the applicant, to cause confusion or mistake or to deceive purchasers: *Provided*, That the Commissioner may register as concurrent registrations the same or similar marks to more than one registrant when they have become entitled to use such marks as a result of their concurrent lawful use thereof in commerce prior to any of the filing dates of the applications involved and the Commissioner or a court on appeal determines that confusion or mistake or deceit of purchasers is not likely to result from the continued use of said marks under conditions and limitations as to the mode or place of use or the goods in connection with which such registrations may be granted which conditions and limitations shall be prescribed in the grant of the concurrent registrations thereof and concurrent registrations may be similarly granted by the Commissioner with such conditions and limitations when a court has finally determined that more than one person is entitled to use the same or similar marks in commerce. The Commissioner shall give not less than 30 days' written notice to all applicants, registrants, and users specified by any of the parties concerned of any application for concurrent registration and of the time and place of the hearings thereon. When the Commissioner decides to grant a concurrent registration the proposed registration shall be published in the Official Gazette of the Patent Office and the application shall be subject to opposition as hereinafter provided for other applications to register marks. Concurrent registrations may be ordered by a court in an action under the provisions of section 4915, Revised Statutes, under such conditions and limitations as the court considers proper in accordance herewith.

(e) Consists of a mark which, (1) when applied to the goods of the applicant is merely descriptive or deceptively misdescriptive of them, or (2) when applied to the goods of the applicant is primarily geographically descriptive or deceptively misdescriptive of them, except as indications of regional origin may be registrable under section 4 hereof, or (3) is primarily merely a surname.

(f) Except as expressly excluded in paragraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section, nothing herein shall prevent the registration of a mark used by the applicant which has become distinctive of the applicant's goods in commerce. The Commissioner may accept as prima facie evidence that the mark has become distinctive, as applied to the applicant's goods in commerce, proof of substantially exclusive and continuous use thereof as a mark by the applicant in commerce for the 5 years next preceding the date of the filing of the application for its registration.

SERVICE MARKS REGISTRABLE

SEC. 3. Subject to the provisions relating to the registration of trade-marks, so far as they are applicable, service marks used in commerce shall be registrable, in the same manner and with the same effect as are trade-marks, and when registered they shall be entitled to the protection provided herein in the case of trade-marks, except when used so as to represent falsely that the owner thereof makes or sells the goods on which such mark is used. The Commissioner may establish a separate register for such service marks. Applications and procedure under this section shall conform as nearly as practicable to those prescribed for the registration of trade-marks.

COLLECTIVE AND CERTIFICATION MARKS REGISTRABLE

SEC. 4. Subject to the provisions relating to the registration of trade-marks, so far as they are applicable, collective and certification marks, including indications of regional origin used in commerce, shall be registrable under this act, in the same manner and with the same effect as are trade-marks, by persons, and nations, States, municipalities, and the like, exercising legitimate control over the use of the marks sought to be registered, even though not possessing an industrial or commercial establishment, and when registered they shall be entitled to the protection provided herein in the case of trade-marks, except when used so as to represent falsely that the owner or a user thereof makes or sells the goods or performs the services on or in connection with which such mark is used. The Commissioner may establish a separate register for such collective marks and certification marks. Applications and procedure under this section shall conform as nearly as practicable to those prescribed for the registration of trade-marks.

USE BY RELATED COMPANIES

SEC. 5. Where a registered mark or a mark sought to be registered is or may be used by related companies, such use shall inure to the benefit of the registrant or applicant for registration, and such use shall not affect the validity of such mark or of its registration, provided such mark is not used in such manner as to deceive the public.

DISCLAIMERS

SEC. 6. The Commissioner shall require unregistrable matter to be disclaimed, but such disclaimer shall not prejudice or affect the applicant's or owner's rights then existing or thereafter arising in the disclaimed matter, nor shall such disclaimer prejudice or affect the applicant's or owner's rights of registration on another application of later date if the disclaimed matter has become distinctive of the applicant's or owner's goods or services.

CERTIFICATES

SEC. 7. (a) Certificates of registration of marks registered upon the principal register shall be issued in the name of the United States of America, under the seal of the Patent Office, and shall either be signed by the Commissioner or have his name printed thereon and attested by an assistant commissioner or by one of the law examiners duly designated by the Commissioner, and a record thereof, together with printed copies of the drawing and statement of the applicant, shall be kept in books for that purpose. The certificate shall reproduce the drawing of the mark, contain the statement of the applicant, and state that the mark is registered on the principal register under this act, the date of the first use of the mark, the date of the first use of the mark in commerce, the particular goods or services for which it is registered, the number and date of the registration, the term thereof, the date on which the application for registration was received in the Patent Office, and any conditions and limitations that may be imposed in the grant of the registration.

(b) A certificate of registration of a mark upon the principal register provided by this act shall be prima facie evidence of the validity of the registration, registrant's ownership of the mark, and of registrant's exclusive right to use the mark in commerce in connection with the goods or services specified in the certificate, subject to any conditions and limitations stated therein.

(c) A certificate of registration of a mark may be issued to the assignee of the applicant, but the assignment must first be recorded in the Patent Office. In case of change of ownership the Commissioner shall, at the request of the owner and upon a proper showing and the payment of the fee herein provided, issue to such assignee a new certificate of registration of the said mark in the name of such assignee, and for the unexpired part of the original period.

(d) At any time, upon application of the registrant and payment of the fee herein provided, the Commissioner may permit any registration in the Patent Office to be surrendered, canceled, or for good cause to be amended, and he may permit any registered mark to be disclaimed in whole or in part: *Provided*, That the registration when so amended shall still contain registrable matter and the mark as amended shall still be registrable as a whole, and that such amendment or disclaimer does not involve such changes in the registration as to alter materially the character of the mark. The Commissioner shall make appropriate entry upon the records of the Patent Office and upon the certificate of registration or, if said certificate is lost or destroyed, upon a certified copy thereof.

(e) Copies of any records, books, papers, or drawings belonging to the Patent Office relating to marks, and copies of certificates of registration, when authenticated by the seal of the Patent Office and certified by the Commissioner, or in his name by a chief of division duly designated by the Commissioner, shall be evidence in all cases wherein the originals would be evidence; and any person making application therefor and paying the fee required by law shall have such copies.

(f) Whenever a material mistake in a registration, incurred through the fault of the Patent Office, is clearly disclosed by the records of the Office a certificate stating the fact and nature of such mistake, signed by the Commissioner and sealed with the seal of the Patent Office, shall be issued without charge and recorded and a printed copy thereof shall be attached to each printed copy of the registration certificate and such corrected certificate shall thereafter have the same effect as if the same had been originally issued in such corrected form, or in the discretion of the Commissioner a new certificate of registration may be issued without charge. All certificates of correction heretofore issued in accordance with the rules of the Patent Office

and the registrations to which they are attached shall have the same force and effect as if such certificates and their issue had been specifically authorized by statute.

(g) Whenever a mistake has been made in a registration and a showing has been made that such mistake occurred in good faith through the fault of the applicant, the Commissioner is authorized to issue a certificate of correction or, in his discretion, a new certificate upon the payment of the required fee: *Provided*, That the correction does not involve such changes in the registration as to require republication of the mark.

DURATION

SEC. 8. (a) Each certificate of registration shall remain in force for 20 years: *Provided*, That the registration of any mark under the provisions of this act shall be canceled by the Commissioner at the end of 6 years following its date, unless within 1 year next preceding the expiration of such 6 years the registrant shall file in the Patent Office an affidavit showing that said mark is still in use or showing that its nonuse is due to special circumstances which excuse such nonuse and is not due to any intention to abandon the mark. Special notice of the requirement for such affidavit shall be attached to each certificate of registration.

(b) Any registration published under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 12 of this act shall be canceled by the Commissioner at the end of 6 years after the date of such publication unless within 1 year next preceding the expiration of such 6 years the registrant shall file in the Patent Office an affidavit showing that said mark is still in use or showing that its nonuse is due to special circumstances which excuse such nonuse and is not due to any intention to abandon the mark.

(c) The Commissioner shall notify any registrant who files either of the above-prescribed affidavits of his acceptance or refusal thereof and, if a refusal, the reasons therefor.

RENEWAL

SEC. 9. Each registration may be renewed for periods of 20 years from the end of the expiring period upon the filing of an application therefor accompanied by an affidavit by the registrant stating that the mark is still in use in commerce and the payment of the renewal fee required by this act; and such application may be made at any time within 6 months before the expiration of the period for which the certificate of registration was issued or renewed, or it may be made within 3 months after such expiration on payment of the additional fee herein provided.

An applicant for renewal not domiciled in the United States shall be subject to and comply with the provisions of section 1 (d) hereof.

ASSIGNMENT

SEC. 10. A registered mark or a mark for which application to register has been filed shall be assignable with the goodwill of the business in which the mark is used, or with that part of the goodwill of the business connected with the use of and symbolized by the mark, and in any such assignment it shall not be necessary to include the goodwill of the business connected with the use of and symbolized by any other mark used in the business or by the name or style under which the business is conducted: *Provided*, That any assigned registration may be canceled at any time if the registered mark is being used by, or with the permission of, the assignee so as to misrepresent the source of the goods or services in connection with which the mark is used. Assignments shall be by instruments in writing duly executed. Acknowledgment shall be prima facie evidence of the execution of an assignment and when recorded in the Patent Office the record shall be prima facie evidence of execution. An assignment shall be void as against any subsequent purchaser for a valuable consideration without notice, unless it is recorded in the Patent Office within 3 months after the date thereof or prior to such subsequent purchase. The Commissioner shall keep a separate record of such assignments submitted to him for recording.

An assignee not domiciled in the United States shall be subject to and comply with the provisions of section 1 (d) hereof.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND VERIFICATIONS

SEC. 11. Acknowledgments and verifications required hereunder may be made before any person within the United States authorized by law to administer oaths, or, when made in a foreign country, before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States or before any official authorized to administer oaths in the foreign country concerned whose authority shall be provided by a certificate of a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States, and shall be valid if they comply with the laws of the state or country where made.

PUBLICATION

SEC. 12. (a) Upon the filing of an application for registration and payment of the fee herein provided, the Commissioner shall refer the application to the examiner in charge of the registration of marks, who shall cause an examination to be made, and if on such examination it shall appear that the applicant is entitled to registration the Commissioner shall cause the mark to be published in the Official Gazette of the Patent Office.

(b) If the applicant is found not entitled to registration, the examiner shall advise the applicant thereof and of the reasons therefor. The applicant shall have a period of 6 months in which to reply or amend his application, which shall then be reexamined. This procedure may be repeated until (1) the examiner finally refuses registration of the mark or (2) the applicant fails for a period of 6 months to reply or amend or appeal, whereupon the application shall be deemed to have been abandoned, unless it can be shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the delay in responding was unavoidable, whereupon such time may be extended.

(c) A registrant of a mark registered under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, may, at any time prior to the expiration of the registration thereof, upon the payment of the prescribed fee, file with the Commissioner an affidavit setting forth those goods stated in the registration on which said mark is in use in commerce and that the registrant claims the benefits of this act for said mark. The Commissioner shall publish notice thereof with a reproduction of said mark in the Official Gazette, and notify the registrant of such publication and of the requirement for the affidavit of use or nonuse as provided for in subsection (b) of section 8 of this act. This subsection shall not be subject to the provisions of section 13 of this act.

OPPOSITION

SEC. 13. Any person who believes that he would be damaged by the registration of a mark upon the principal register may, upon payment of the required fee, file a verified notice of opposition in the Patent Office, stating the grounds therefor, within 30 days after the publication under subsection (a) of section 12 of this act of the mark sought to be registered. For good cause shown, the time for filing notice of opposition may be extended by the Commissioner, who shall notify the applicant. An unverified opposition may be filed by a duly authorized attorney, but such opposition shall be null and void unless verified by the opposer within a reasonable time after such filing to be fixed by the Commissioner.

CANCELATION

SEC. 14. Any person who believes that he is or will be damaged by the registration of a mark on the principal register established by this act, or under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, may, upon the payment of the prescribed fee, apply to cancel said registration—

(a) within 5 years from the date of the registration of the mark under this act; or

(b) within 5 years from the date of the publication under section 12 (c) hereof of a mark registered under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905; or

(c) at any time if the registered mark has been abandoned or its registration was obtained fraudulently or contrary to the provisions of subsections (a), (b), or (c) of section 2 of this act for a registration hereunder, or contrary to similar prohibitory provisions of said prior acts for a registration thereunder, or if the registered mark has been assigned and is being used by, or with the permission of, the assignee so as to misrepresent the source of the goods or services in connection with which the mark is used, or if the mark was registered under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, and has not been published under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 12 of this act.

SEC. 15. Except on a ground for which application to cancel may be filed at any time under subsection (c) of section 14 of this act, and except to the extent, if any, to which the use of a mark registered on the principal register infringes a valid right acquired under the law of any State or Territory by use of a mark or trade name continuing from a date prior to the date of the publication under this act of such registered mark, the right of the registrant to use such registered mark in commerce for the goods or services on or in connection with which such registered mark has been in continuous use for 5 consecutive years subsequent to the date of such registration and is still in use in commerce, shall be incontestable: *Provided*, That—

(1) there has been no final decision adverse to registrant's claim of ownership of such mark for such goods or services, or to registrant's right to register the same or to keep the same on the register; and

(2) there is no proceeding involving said rights pending in the Patent Office or in a court and not finally disposed of; and

(3) an affidavit is filed with the Commissioner within 1 year after the expiration of any such 5-year period setting forth those goods or services stated in the registration on or in connection with which such mark has been in continuous use for such 5 consecutive years and is still in use in commerce, and the other matters specified in subsections (1) and (2) hereof.

Subject to the conditions above specified in this section, the incontestable right with reference to a mark registered under this act shall apply to a mark registered under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, upon the filing of the required affidavit with the Commissioner within 1 year after the expiration of any period of 5 consecutive years after the date of publication of a mark under the provisions of subsection (c) of section 12 of this act.

The Commissioner shall notify any registrant who files the above-prescribed affidavit of the filing thereof.

INTERFERENCE

SEC. 16. Whenever application is made for the registration of a mark which so resembles a mark previously registered by another, or for the registration of which another has previously made application, as to be likely when applied to the goods or when used in connection with the services of the applicant to cause confusion or mistake or to deceive purchasers, the Commissioner may declare that an interference exists. No interference shall be declared between an application and the registration of a mark the right to the use of which has become incontestable.

SEC. 17. In every case of interference, opposition to registration, application to regis-

ter as a lawful concurrent user, or application to cancel the registration of a mark, the Commissioner shall give notice to all parties and shall direct the examiner in charge of interferences to determine and decide the respective rights of registration.

SEC. 18. In such proceedings the Commissioner may refuse to register the opposed mark, may cancel or restrict the registration of a registered mark, or may refuse to register any or all of several interfering marks, or may register the mark or marks for the person or persons entitled thereto, as the rights of the parties hereunder may be established in the proceedings: *Provided*, That in the case of the registration of any mark based on concurrent use, the Commissioner shall determine and fix the conditions and limitations provided for in subsection (d) of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 19. An all inter partes proceedings equitable principles of laches, estoppel, and acquiescence, where applicable may be considered and applied. The provisions of this section shall also govern proceedings heretofore begun in the Patent Office and not finally determined.

SEC. 20. An appeal may be taken to the Commissioner in person from any final decision of the examiner in charge of interferences or of the registration of marks upon the payment of the prescribed fees.

SEC. 21. Any applicant for registration of a mark, party to an interference proceeding, party to an opposition proceeding, party to an application to register as a lawful concurrent user, party to a cancelation proceeding, or any registrant who has filed an affidavit as provided in section 8, who is dissatisfied with the decision of the Commissioner may appeal to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals or may proceed under section 4915, Revised Statutes, as in the case of applicants for patents, under the same conditions, rules, and procedure as are prescribed in the case of patent appeals or proceedings so far as they are applicable: *Provided*, That any party who is satisfied with the decision of the Commissioner shall, upon the filing of an appeal to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals by any dissatisfied party, have the right to elect to have all further proceedings under Revised Statutes, 4915, by election as provided in Revised Statutes 4911. The Commissioner of Patents shall not be a necessary party to an inter partes proceeding under Revised Statutes 4915, but he shall be notified of the filing of the bill by the clerk of the court in which it is filed and the Commissioner shall have the right to intervene in the action.

REGISTRATION IS NOTICE

SEC. 22. Registration of a mark on the principal register provided by this act or under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, shall be constructive notice of the registrant's claim of ownership thereof.

TITLE II—THE SUPPLEMENTAL REGISTER

SEC. 23. In addition to the principal register, the Commissioner shall keep a continuation of the register provided in paragraph (b) of section 1 of the act of March 19, 1920, entitled "An act to give effect to certain provisions of the convention for the protection of trade-marks and commercial names, made and signed in the city of Buenos Aires, in the Argentine Republic, August 20, 1910, and for other purposes," to be called the supplemental register. All marks capable of distinguishing applicant's goods or services and not registrable on the principal register herein provided, except those declared to be unregistrable under paragraphs (a), (b), (c), and (d) of section 2 of this act, which have been in lawful use in commerce by the proprietor thereof, upon or in connection with any goods or services for the year preceding the filing of the application, may be registered on the supplemental register upon the payment of the prescribed fee and compliance with the provisions of section 1 so far as they are applicable.

Upon the filing of an application for registration on the supplemental register and payment of the fee herein provided the Commissioner shall refer the application to the examiner in charge of the registration of marks, who shall cause an examination to be made and if on such examination it shall appear that the applicant is entitled to registration, the registration shall be granted. If the applicant is found not entitled to registration the provisions of subsection (b) of section 12 of this act shall apply.

For the purposes of registration on the supplemental register, a mark may consist of any trade-mark, symbol, label, package, configuration of goods, name, word, slogan, phrase, surname, geographical name, numeral, or device or any combination of any of the foregoing, but such mark must be capable of distinguishing the applicant's goods or services.

Upon a proper showing by the applicant that he has begun the lawful use of his mark in foreign commerce and that he requires domestic registration as a basis for foreign protection of his mark, the Commissioner may waive the requirement of a full year's use and may grant registration forthwith.

CANCELATION

SEC. 24. Marks for the supplemental register shall not be published for or be subject to opposition, but shall be published on registration in the Official Gazette of the Patent Office. Whenever any person believes that he is or will be damaged by the registration of a mark on this register he may at any time apply to the Commissioner to cancel such registration. The Commissioner shall refer such application to the examiner in charge of interferences, who shall give notice thereof to the registrant. If it is found after a hearing before the examiner that the registrant was not entitled to register the mark at the time of his application for registation thereof, or that the mark is not used by the registrant or has been abandoned, the registration shall be canceled by the Commissioner.

SEC. 25. The certificates of registration for marks registered on the supplemental register shall be conspicuously different from certificates issued for marks registered on the principal register.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 26. The provisions of this act shall govern so far as applicable applications for registration and registrations on the supplemental register as well as those on the principal register, but applications for and registrations on the supplemental register shall not be subject to or receive the advantages of sections 2 (e), 2 (f), 7 (b), 12 (a), 13 to 18, inclusive, 22, 33, and 42 of this act.

SEC. 27. Registration of a mark on the supplemental register, or under the act of March 19, 1920, shall not preclude registration by the registrant on the principal register established by this act.

SEC. 28. Registration on the supplemental register or under the act of March 19, 1920, shall not be filed in the Department of the Treasury or be used to stop importations.

TITLE III—NOTICE OF REGISTRATION

SEC. 29. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 22 hereof, a registrant of a mark registered under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, or on the principal register established by this act, shall give notice that his mark is registered by displaying with the mark as used the words "Registered in U. S. Patent Office" or "Reg. U. S. Pat. Off." or the letter R enclosed within a circle, thus (R); and in any suit for infringement under this act by such a registrant failing so to mark goods bearing the registered mark, or by a registrant under the act of March 19, 1920, or by the registrant of a mark on the supplemental register provided by this act no profits and no damages shall be recovered under the provisions of this act unless the defendant had actual notice of the registration.

TITLE IV—CLASSIFICATION

SEC. 30. The Commissioner shall establish a classification of goods and services, for convenience of Patent Office administration, but not to limit or extend the applicant's rights. The applicant may register his mark in one application for any or all of the goods or services included in one class, upon or in connection with which he is actually using the mark. The Commissioner may issue a single certificate for one mark registered in a plurality of classes upon payment of a fee equaling the sum of the fees for each registration in each class.

TITLE V—FEES AND CHARGES

SEC. 31. The following fees shall be paid to the Patent Office under this act:

On filing each original application for registration of a mark in each class on either the principal or the supplemental register, $15; on filing each application for renewal in each class, $15; and on filing each application for renewal in each class after expiration of the registration, an additional fee of $5; on filing notice of claim of benefits of this act for a mark to be published under section 12 (c) hereof, $5; on filing notice of opposition or application for cancelation, $10; on appeal from an examiner in charge of the registration of marks to the Commissioner, $20; on appeal from an examiner in charge of interferences to the Commissioner, $20; for issuance of a new certificate of registration following change of ownership of a mark or correction of a registrant's mistake, $10; for certificate of correction of registrant's mistake, $10; for filing in each class each application communicated to the United States from the International Bureau, Habana, $15; for filing and transmitting application in each class to the International Bureau, Habana, including certificate, $10; for manuscript copies, for every 100 words or fraction thereof, 10 cents; for comparing other copies, 5 cents for every 100 words or fraction thereof; for certifying in any case, additional, 75 cents; for each additional registration or application which may be included under a single certificate, 25 cents additional; for filing disclaimer, amendment, surrender, or cancelation after registration, $10.

For abstracts of title: For the search, 1 hour or less, and certificate, $3; each additional hour or fraction thereof, $1.50; for each brief from the digest of assignments of 200 words or less, 50 cents; each additional 100 words or fraction thereof, 10 cents.

For certificate that trade-mark has not been registered—search and certificate (for deposit in foreign countries only), $3.

For title reports required for office use, $1.

For a single printed copy of statement and drawing, 10 cents; if certified, for the grant, additional, 50 cents; for the certificate, 50 cents; if renewed, for copy of certificate of renewal, additional, 50 cents.

For photographic copies of records, per page, 20 cents; if certified, for the certificate, additional, 50 cents.

For photographic copies of drawings, per sheet, 20 cents.

For recording every assignment or other paper not exceeding six pages, $3; for each additional two pages or less, $1; for each additional registration or application included, or involved in one writing where more than one is so included or involved, additional, 50 cents.

The Commissioner shall refund fees paid by mistake or in excess.

TITLE VI—REMEDIES

SEC. 32. (1) Any person who shall, in commerce, (a) use, without the consent of the registrant, any reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation of any registered mark in connection with the sale, offering for sale, or advertising of any goods or services on or in connection with which such use is likely to cause confusion or mistake or to deceive purchasers as to the source of origin of such goods or services; or (b) reproduce, counterfeit, copy, or colorably imitate any such mark and apply such reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation to labels, signs, prints, packages, wrappers, receptacles, or advertisements intended to be used upon or in connection with the sale in commerce of such goods or services, shall be liable to a civil action by the registrant for any or all of the remedies hereinafter provided, except that under subsection (b) hereof the registrant shall not be entitled to recover profits or damages unless the acts have been committed with knowledge that such mark is intended to be used to cause confusion or mistake or to deceive purchasers.

(2) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the remedies given to the owner of the right infringed shall be limited as follows: (a) Where an infringer is engaged solely in the business of printing the mark for others and establishes that he was an innocent infringer the owner of the right infringed shall be entitled as against such infringer only to an injunction against future printing; (b) where the infringement complained of is contained in or is part of paid advertising matter in a newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical the remedies of the owner of the right infringed as against the publisher or distributor of such newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical shall be confined to an injunction against the presentation of such advertising matter in future issues of such newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical: *Provided*, That these limitations shall apply only to innocent infringers; (c) injunction relief shall not be available to the owner of the right infringed in respect of an issue of a newspaper, magazine, or other similar periodical containing infringing matter when restraining the dissemination of such infringing matter in any particular issue of such periodical would delay the delivery of such issue after the regular time therefor, and such delay would be due to the method by which publication and distribution of such periodical is customarily conducted in accordance with sound business practice, and not to any method or device adopted for the evasion of this section or to prevent or delay the issuance of an injunction or restraining order with respect to such infringing matter.

SEC. 33. (a) Any certificate of registration issued under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, or of a mark registered on the principal register provided by this act and owned by a party to an action shall be admissible in evidence and shall be prima facie evidence of registrant's exclusive right to use the registered mark in commerce on the goods or services specified in the certificate subject to any conditions or limitations stated therein, but shall not preclude an opposing party from proving any legal or equitable defense or defect which might have been asserted if such mark had not been registered.

(b) If the right to use the registered mark has become incontestable under section 15 hereof, the certificate shall be conclusive evidence of the registrant's exclusive right to use the registered mark in commerce on or in connection with the goods or services specified in the certificate subject to any conditions or limitations stated therein except when one of the following defenses or defects is established:

(1) That the registration or the incontestable right to use the mark was obtained fraudulently; or

(2) That the mark has been abandoned by the registrant; or

(3) That the registered mark has been assigned and is being used, by or with the permission of the assignee, so as to misrepresent the source of the goods or services in connection with which the mark is used; or

(4) That the use of the name, term, or device charged to be an infringement is a use, otherwise than as a trade or service mark, of the party's individual name in his own business, or of the individual name of anyone in privity with such party, or of a term or device which is descriptive of and used fairly and in good faith only to describe to users the goods or services of such party, or their geographic origin; or

(5) That the mark whose use by a party is charged as an infringement was adopted without knowledge of the registrant's prior use and has been continuously used by such party or those in privity with him from a date prior to the publication of the registered mark under subsection (a) or (c) of section 12 of this act: *Provided, however*, That this defense or defect shall apply only for the area in which such continuous prior use is proved.

(6) That the mark whose use is charged as an infringement was registered and used prior to the publication under subsection (a) or (c) of section 12 of this act of the registered mark of the registrant, and not abandoned: *Provided, however*, That this defense or defect shall apply only where the said mark has been published pursuant to subsection (c) of section 12 and shall apply only for the area in which the mark was used prior to the date of publication of the registrant's mark under subsection (a) or (c) of section 12 of this act.

SEC. 34. The several courts vested with jurisdiction of civil actions arising under this act shall have power to grant injunctions, according to the principles of equity and upon such terms as the court may deem reasonable, to prevent the violation of any right of the registrant of a mark registered in the Patent Office. Any such injunction may include a provision directing the defendant to file with the court and serve on the plaintiff within 30 days after the service on the defendant of such injunction, or such extended period as the court may direct, a report in writing under oath setting forth in detail the manner and form in which the defendant has complied with the injunction. Any such injunction granted upon hearing, after notice to the defendant, by any district court of the United States, may be served on the parties against whom such injunction is granted anywhere in the United States where they may be found, and shall be operative and may be enforced by proceedings to punish for contempt, or otherwise, by the court by which such injunction was granted, or by any other United States district court in whose jurisdiction the defendant may be found.

The said courts shall have jurisdiction to enforce said injunction, as herein provided, as fully as if the injunction had been granted by the district court in which it is sought to be enforced. The clerk of the court or judge granting the injunction shall, when required to do so by the court before which application to enforce said injunction is made, transfer without delay to said court a certified copy of all papers on file in his office upon which said injunction was granted.

It shall be the duty of the clerks of such courts within 1 month after the filing of any action, suit, or proceeding arising under the provisions of this act to give notice thereof in writing to the Commissioner setting forth in order so far as known the names and addresses of the litigants and the designating number or numbers of the registration or registrations upon which the action, suit, or proceeding has been brought, and in the event any other registration be subsequently included in the action, suit, or proceeding by amendment, answer, or other pleading, the clerk shall give like notice thereof to the Commissioner, and within 1 month after the decision is rendered, appeal taken or a decree issued the clerk of the court shall give notice thereof to the Commissioner, and it shall be the duty of the Commissioner on receipt of such notice forthwith to endorse the same upon the file wrapper of the said registration or registrations and to incorporate the same as a part of the contents of said file wrapper; and for each notice required and furnished to the Commissioner in compliance herewith a fee of 50 cents shall be taxed by the clerk as costs of suit.

SEC. 35. When a violation of any right of the registrant of a mark registered in the Patent Office shall have been established in any civil action arising under this act, the plaintiff shall be entitled, subject to the provisions of sections 29 and 31 (1) (b), and subject to the principles of equity, to recover (1) defendant's profits, (2) any damages sustained by the plaintiff, and (3) the costs of the action. The court shall assess such profits and damages or cause the same to be assessed under its direction. In assessing profits the plaintiff shall be required to prove defendant's sales only; defendant must prove all elements of cost or deduction claimed. In assessing damages the court may enter judgment, according to the circumstances of the case, for any sum above the amount found as actual damages, not exceeding three times such amount. If the court shall find that the amount of the recovery based on profits is either inadequate or excessive, the court may, in its discretion, enter judgment for such sum as the court shall find to be just, according to the circumstances of the case. Such sum in either of the above circumstances shall constitute compensation and not a penalty.

SEC. 36. In any action arising under this act, in which a violation of any right of the registrant of a mark registered in the Patent Office shall have been established, the court may order that all labels, signs, prints, packages, wrappers, receptacles, and advertisements in the possession of the defendant, bearing the registered mark or any reproduction, counterfeit, copy, or colorable imitation thereof, and all plates, molds, matrices, and other means of making the same, shall be delivered up and destroyed.

SEC. 37. In any action involving a registered mark the court may determine the right to registration, order the cancelation of registrations, in whole or in part, restore canceled registrations, and otherwise rectify the register with respect to the registrations of any party to the action. Decrees and orders shall be certified by the court to the Commissioner, who shall make appropriate entry upon the records of the Patent Office, and shall be controlled thereby.

SEC. 38. Any person who shall procure registration in the Patent Office of a mark by a false or fraudulent declaration or representation, oral or in writing, or by any false means, shall be liable in a civil action by any person injured thereby for any damages sustained in consequence thereof.

SEC. 39. The district and Territorial courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction, the circuit courts of appeal of the United States and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia shall have appellate jurisdiction, of all actions arising under this act, without regard to the amount in controversy or to diversity or lack of diversity of the citizenship of the parties.

SEC. 40. Writs of certiorari may be granted by the Supreme Court of the United States for the review of cases arising under this

act in the same manner as provided for in cases under the patent laws.

SEC. 41. The Commissioner shall make rules and regulations, not inconsistent with law, for the conduct of proceedings in the Patent Office under this act.

TITLE VII—IMPORTATION FORBIDDEN OF GOODS BEARING INFRINGING MARKS OR NAMES

SEC. 42. That no article of imported merchandise which shall copy or simulate the name of any domestic manufacture, or manufacturer, or trader, or of any manufacturer or trader located in any foreign country which, by treaty, convention, or law affords similar privileges to citizens of the United States, or which shall copy or simulate a trade-mark registered in accordance with the provisions of this act or shall bear a name or mark calculated to induce the public to believe that the article is manufactured in the United States, or that it is manufactured in any foreign country or locality other than the country or locality in which it is in fact manufactured, shall be admitted to entry at any customhouse of the United States; and, in order to aid the officers of the customs in enforcing this prohibition, any domestic manufacturer or trader, and any foreign manufacturer or trader, who is entitled under the provisions of a treaty, convention, declaration, or agreement between the United States and any foreign country to the advantages afforded by law to citizens of the United States in respect to trade-marks and commercial names, may require his name and residence, and the name of the locality in which his goods are manufactured, and a copy of the certificate of registration of his trade-mark, issued in accordance with the provisions of this act, to be recorded in books which shall be kept for this purpose in the Department of the Treasury, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, and may furnish to the Department facsimiles of his name, the name of the locality in which his goods are manufactured, or of his registered trade-mark, and thereupon the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause one or more copies of the same to be transmitted to each collector or other proper officer of customs.

TITLE VIII—FALSE DESIGNATIONS OF ORIGIN AND FALSE DESCRIPTIONS FORBIDDEN

SEC. 43. (a) Any person who shall affix, apply, or annex, or use in connection with any goods or services, or any container or containers for goods, a false designation of origin, or any false description or representation, including words or other symbols tending falsely to describe or represent the same, and shall cause such goods or services to enter into commerce, and any person who shall with knowledge of the falsity of such designation of origin or description or representation cause or procure the same to be transported or used in commerce or deliver the same to any carrier to be transported or used, shall be liable to a civil action by any person doing business in the locality falsely indicated as that of origin or in the region in which said locality is situated, or by any person who believes that he is or is likely to be damaged by the use of any such false description or representation.

(b) Any goods marked or labeled in contravention of the provisions of this section shall not be imported into the United States or admitted to entry at any customhouse of the United States. The owner, importer, or consignee of goods refused entry at any customhouse under this section may have any recourse by protest or appeal that is given under the customs revenue laws or may have the remedy given by this act in cases involving goods refused entry or seized.

TITLE IX—INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS

SEC. 44. (a) The Commissioner shall keep a register of all marks communicated to him by the international bureaus provided for by the conventions for the protection of industrial property, trade-marks, trade and commercial names, and the repression of unfair competition to which the United States is or may become a party, and upon the payment of the fees required by such conventions and the fees herein prescribed may place the marks so communicated upon such register. This register shall show a facsimile of the mark or trade or commercial name; the name, citizenship, and address of the registrant; the number, date, and place of the first registration of the mark, including the dates on which application for such registration was filed and granted and the term of such registration; a list of goods or services to which the mark is applied as shown by the registration in the country of origin, and such other data as may be useful concerning the mark. This register shall be a continuation of the register provided in section 1 (a) of the act of March 19, 1920.

(b) Persons who are nationals of, domiciled in, or have a bona fide and effective business or commercial establishment in any foreign country, which is a party to (1) the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, signed at Paris on March 20, 1883; or (2) the General Inter-American Convention for Trade Mark and Commercial Protection signed at Washington on February 20, 1929; or (3) any other convention or treaty relating to trade-marks, trade or commercial names, or the repression of unfair competition to which the United States is a party, shall be entitled to the benefits and subject to the provisions of this act to the extent and under the conditions essential to give effect to any such conventions and treaties so long as the United States shall continue to be a party thereto, except as provided in the following paragraphs of this section.

(c) No registration of a mark in the United States by a person described in paragraph (b) of this section shall be granted until such mark has been registered in the country of origin of the applicant, unless the applicant alleges use in commerce.

For the purposes of this section, the country of origin of the applicant is the country in which he has a bona fide and effective industrial or commercial establishment, or if he has not such an establishment the country in which he is domiciled, or if he has not a domicile in any of the countries described in paragraph (b) of this section, the country of which he is a national.

(d) An application for registration of a mark under sections 1, 2, 3, 4, or 23 of this act filed by a person described in paragraph (b) of this section who has previously duly filed an application for registration of the same mark in one of the countries described in paragraph (b) shall be accorded the same force and effect as would be accorded to the same application if filed in the United States on the same date on which the application was first filed in such foreign country: *Provided*, That—

(1) the application in the United States is filed within 6 months from the date on which the application was first filed in the foreign country;

(2) the application conforms as nearly as practicable to the requirements of this act, but use in commerce need not be alleged;

(3) the rights acquired by third parties before the date of the filing of the first application in the foreign country shall in no way be affected by a registration obtained on an application filed under this subsection (d);

(4) nothing in this subsection (d) shall entitle the owner of a registration granted under this section to sue for acts committed prior to the date on which his mark was registered in this country unless the registration is based on use in commerce.

(e) A mark duly registered in the country of origin of the foreign applicant may be registered on the principal register if eligible, otherwise on the supplemental register herein provided. The application therefor shall be accompanied by a certified copy of the application for or registration in the country of origin of the applicant.

(f) The registration of a mark under the provisions of paragraphs (c), (d), and (e) of this section by a person described in paragraph (b) shall be independent of the registration in the country of origin and the duration, validity, or transfer in the United States of such registration shall be governed by the provisions of this act.

(g) Trade names or commercial names of persons described in paragraph (b) of this section shall be protected without the obligation of filing or registration whether or not they form parts of marks.

(h) Any person designated in paragraph (b) of this section as entitled to the benefits and subject to the provisions of this act shall be entitled to effective protection against unfair competition, and the remedies provided herein for infringement of marks shall be available so far as they may be appropriate in repressing acts of unfair competition.

(i) Citizens or residents of the United States shall have the same benefits as are granted by this section to persons described in paragraph (b) hereof.

TITLE X—CONSTRUCTION AND DEFINITIONS

SEC. 45. In the construction of this act, unless the contrary is plainly apparent from the context—

The United States includes and embraces all territory which is under its jurisdiction and control.

The word "commerce" means all commerce which may lawfully be regulated by Congress.

The term "principal register" refers to the register provided for by sections 1 through 22 hereof, and the term "supplemental register" refers to the register provided for by sections 23 through 28 hereof.

The term "person" and any other word or term used to designate the applicant or other entitled to a benefit or privilege or rendered liable under the provisions of this act includes a juristic person as well as a natural person. The term "juristic person" includes a firm, corporation, union, association, or other organization capable of suing and being sued in a court of law.

The terms "applicant" and "registrant" embrace the legal representatives and successors and assigns of such applicant or registrant.

The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Patents.

The term "related company" means any person who controls or is controlled by the registrant or applicant for registration in respect to the nature and quality of the goods or services in connection with which the mark is used.

The terms "trade name" and "commercial name" include individual names and surnames, firm names, and trade names used by manufacturers, industrialists, merchants, agriculturists, and others to identify their businesses, vocations, or occupations; the names or titles lawfully adopted and used by persons, firms, associations, corporations, companies, unions, and any manufacturing, industrial, commercial, agricultural, or other organizations engaged in trade or commerce and capable of suing and being sued in a court of law.

The term 'trade-mark" includes any word, name, symbol, or device or any combination thereof adopted and used by a manufacturer or merchant to identify his goods and distinguish them from those manufactured or sold by others.

The term "service mark" means a mark used in the sale or advertising of services to

identify the services of one person and distinguish them from the services of others and includes without limitation the marks, names, symbols, titles, designations, slogans, character names, and distinctive features of radio or other advertising used in commerce.

Each of the terms "collective mark" or "certification mark" means a mark used upon or in connection with the products or services of one or more persons other than the owner of the mark to certify or indicate regional or other origin, material, mode of manufacture, quality, accuracy, or other characteristics of such goods or services or to indicate a membership in an association or other organization or that the work or labor on the goods or services was performed by members of a union or other organization.

The term "mark" includes any trade-mark, service mark, collective mark, or certification mark entitled to registration under this act whether registered or not.

For the purposes of this act a mark shall be deemed to be used in commerce (a) on goods when it is placed in any manner on the goods or their containers or the displays associated therewith or on the tags or labels affixed thereto and the goods are sold or transported in commerce and (b) on services when it is used or displayed in the sale or advertising of services and the services are rendered in commerce.

A mark shall be deemed to be "abandoned"—

(a) When its use has been discontinued with intent not to resume. Intent not to resume may be inferred from circumstances. Nonuse for 2 consecutive years shall be prima facie abandonment.

(b) When any course of conduct of the registrant, including acts of omission as well as commission, causes the mark to lose its significance as an indication of origin.

The term "colorable imitation" includes any mark which so resembles a registered mark as to be likely to cause confusion or mistake or to deceive purchasers.

The term "registered mark" means a mark registered in the United States Patent Office under this act or under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, or the act of March 19, 1920. The phrase "marks registered in the Patent Office" means registered marks.

The term "Act of March 3, 1891," "Act of February 20, 1905," or "Act of March 19, 1920," means the respective act as amended.

A "counterfeit" is a spurious mark which is identical with, or substantially indistinguishable from, a registered mark.

Words used in the singular include the plural and vice versa.

The intent of this act is to regulate commerce within the control of Congress by making actionable the deceptive and misleading use of marks in such commerce; to protect registered marks used in such commerce from interference by State or Territorial legislation; to protect persons engaged in such commerce against unfair competition; to prevent fraud and deception in such commerce by the use of reproductions, copies, counterfeits, or colorable imitations of registered marks; and to provide rights and remedies stipulated by treaties and conventions respecting trade-marks, trade names, and unfair competition entered into between the United States and foreign nations.

TITLE XI—REPEAL OF PREVIOUS ACTS

SEC. 46. (a) This act shall be in force and take effect 1 year from its enactment, but except as otherwise herein specifically provided shall not affect any suit, proceeding or appeal then pending. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed effective 1 year from the enactment hereof, including the following acts insofar as they are inconsistent herewith: The act of Congress approved March 3, 1881, entitled "An act to authorize the registration of trade-marks and protect the same"; the act approved August 5, 1882, entitled "An act relating to the registration of trade-marks"; the act of February 20, 1905 (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 81 to 109, inclusive), entitled "An act to authorize the registration of trade-marks used in commerce with foreign nations or among the several States or with Indian tribes, and to protect the same," and the amendments thereto by the acts of May 4, 1906 (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 131 and 132; 34 Stat. 169), March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1251, 1252), February 18, 1909 (35 Stat. 627, 628), February 18, 1911 (36 Stat. 918), January 8, 1913 (37 Stat. 649), June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 647), March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1268, 1269), April 11, 1930 (46 Stat. 155), June 10, 1938 (Public, No. 586, 75th Cong., ch. 332, 3d sess.); that act of March 19, 1920 (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 121 to 128, inclusive), entitled "An act to give effect to certain provisions of the convention for the protection of trade-marks and commercial names made and signed in the city of Buenos Aires, in the Argentine Republic, August 20, 1910, and for other purposes," and the amendments thereto, including the act of June 10, 1938 (Public, No. 586, 75th Cong., ch. 332, 3d sess.): *Provided*, That this repeal shall not affect the validity of registrations granted or applied for under any of said acts prior to the effective date of this act, or rights or remedies thereunder except as provided in sections 8, 12, 14, 15, and 47 of this act; but nothing contained in this act shall be construed as limiting or restricting any statute in force on the effective date of this act which does not relate to trade-marks, or as restricting or increasing the authority of any Federal regulatory agency except as may be specifically provided in this act.

(b) Registrations now existing under the act of March 3, 1881, or the act of February 20, 1905, shall continue in full force and effect for the unexpired terms thereof and may be renewed under the provisions of section 9 of this act. Such registrations and the renewals thereof shall be subject to and shall be entitled to the benefits of the provisions of this act to the same extent and with the same force and effect as though registered on the principal register established by this act except as limited in sections 8, 12, 14, and 15 of this act. Marks registered under the "10-year proviso" of section 5 of the act of February 20, 1905, as amended, shall be deemed to have become distinctive of the registrant's goods in commerce under paragraph (f) of section 2 of this act and may be renewed under section 9 hereof as marks coming within said paragraph.

Registrations now existing under the act of March 19, 1920, shall expire 6 months after the effective date of this act, or 20 years from the dates of their registrations, whichever date is later. Such registrations shall be subject to and entitled to the benefits of the provisions of this act relating to marks registered on the supplemental register established by this act, and may not be renewed unless renewal is required to support foreign registrations. In that event renewal may be effected on the supplemental register under the provisions of section 9 of this act.

Marks registered under previous acts may, if eligible, also be registered under this act.

SEC. 47. (a) All applications for registration pending in the Patent Office at the effective date of this act may be amended, if practicable, to bring them under the provisions of this act. The prosecution of such applications so amended and the grant of registrations thereon shall be proceeded with in accordance with the provisions of this act. If such amendments are not made, the prosecution of said applications shall be proceeded with and registrations thereon granted in accordance with the acts under which said applications were filed, and said acts are hereby continued in force to this extent and for this purpose only, notwithstanding the foregoing general repeal thereof.

(b) In any case in which an appeal is pending before the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals or any United States Circuit Court of Appeals or the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia or the United States Supreme Court at the effective date of this act, the court, if it be of the opinion that the provisions of this act are applicable to the subject matter of the appeal, may apply such provision or may remand the case to the Commissioner or to the district court for the taking of additional evidence or a new trial or for reconsideration of the decision on the record as made, as the appellate court may deem proper.

SEC. 48. Section 4 of the act of January 5, 1905 (U. S. C., title 36, sec. 4), as amended, entitled "An act to incorporate the National Red Cross," and section 7 of the act of June 15, 1916 (U. S. C., title 36, sec. 27), entitled "An act to incorporate the Boy Scouts of America, and for other purposes," and the act of June 20, 1936 (U. S. C., title 22, sec. 248), entitled "An act to prohibit the commercial use of the coat of arms of the Swiss Confederation," are not repealed or affected by this act.

SEC. 49. Nothing herein shall adversely affect the rights or the enforcement of rights in marks acquired in good faith prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 50. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act shall not be affected thereby.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, may I say at the outset that the amendments to this measure are all of a typographical or clerical nature and are as set forth in the report of the committee except that in line 24, page 2, another typographical error has been detected. The word "drewing" should be changed to "drawing."

Mr. Speaker, consideration of legislation of this character was begun by the Committee on Patents about 7 years ago and I presided as chairman of a subcommittee giving consideration to the matter since that time. The hearings have been very voluminous. The bill has passed the House on three different occasions. In the last two Congresses unfortunately it has come up in the Senate on the last day of the Congress; consequently it was not finally disposed of. It has been favorably reported on each occasion by the Senate Committee on Patents.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the measure is to protect honest business and also to protect the purchasers of commodities so that they may know the origin of the goods they are buying.

The bill as now drawn meets with the general approval of those interested in trade-marks. The bill is necessary by reason of the fact that our trade-mark legislation is scattered through many statutes. A general statute was passed in 1905; it then was amended in 1920, and by reason of the progress of business and business processes some of the provisions are archaic and more or less obsolete, and this is an effort to get this

statute in one place in order that it may be well and clearly understood and in keeping with modern conditions and practices.

Another reason for seeking its speedy passage for the fourth time in this body is in order that the Senate may have ample opportunity to give it consideration early in the Congress. The subject matter of this bill is of interest to a great many people living all over the United States, and they have come here to the various hearings in great number from every part of the country. We are seeking now, in view of the fact that they do not wish to spend unnecessary time and money in making two trips, and that there is practically no objection from any of them with reference to the measure as now broadened, to obviate the necessity of having further hearings before the Committee on Patents of the House. Any necessary hearings can be held by the Senate Committee on Patents. This is a unanimous report of the Committee on Patents.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Do I understand then that the bill is in identical form as it passed the House in the last session?

Mr. LANHAM. It is not in exactly identical form because the Senate committee placed a few amendments upon it. I attended the hearings of the Senate committee, and there are one or two respects in which the bill has been modified. Then we have eliminated from this bill one feature which was objected to, and I think with reason, and I recommended the deletion of that provision suggested by the automobile people of the country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It deals then only with trade-marks?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes. Unless there are some questions asked, that is all I have to say.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NURSES' SELECTIVE SERVICE BILL OF 1945

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 153 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2277) to insure adequate nursing care for the armed forces. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, this rule is on the bill to draft the nurses of the country to serve the sick and the wounded in our armed forces. The Army and the Navy and other branches of the service insist that due to daily increasing casualities there is a continuing increased need of nurses to take care of the sick and wounded. The Committee on Military Affairs presented its request for a rule to the Committee on Rules several days ago, and upon the strength of the showing then made the committee took favorable action and brings here for consideration of the House an open rule that provides 2 hours of general debate on the bill.

The observation was made that taking these nurses into the armed service or drafting them to serve the armed forces would leave the civilian population of the country in rather an unfavorable position insofar as the care of the sick is concerned. May I say that while I would not wish to see our civilian population deprived of any service of which there is need; still, if the Army wants them, if the Army needs them, I am for giving the Army all the nurses, if necessary, and if any inconvenience or risk is to be assumed by either, then let it be taken by the civilian population, because they can at least depend upon home care.

The question has been raised as to whether this proposal clashes with the Constitution. The Committee on Military Affairs, in the report it filed, developed this argument to some extent. As for myself, I cannot see that there is any such question involved in the case. It is, however, a drafting of people according to their occupation, and in that it does that it affords the basis for complaint that it is not completely uniform in its application. What the Government needs is nurses. We are in war. What Congress is here endeavoring to do is invoke the law of necessity.

Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to consume the time of the House on the rule. I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] to be used by him as he sees fit. For the moment I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to comment on H. R. 2277, a bill to insure adequate nursing care for the armed forces.

This bill would subject to induction in the armed forces under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, all unmarried women residing in the United States between the ages of 20 and 45, who are now or hereafter become registered nurses or graduates of schools of nursing eligible for registration. The bill would forbid the deferment on occupational grounds of any graduate of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps and would require that all available graduates of that corps registered with a local selective-service board be inducted before the board orders induction of any other nurses. No nurse other than a graduate of the Cadet Nurse Corps would be subject to induction if declared by the Procurement and Assignment Service to be engaged in essential nursing services and not available for induction, or if employed as a nurse by the Veterans' Administration and not released by it.

The special provisions of the bill regarding graduates of the Cadet Nurse Corps seems to me poorly adapted to meet the needs of the armed forces.

Section 2 (a) of the Nurse Training Act—Public Law 74, Seventy-eighth Congress—requires that a girl enrolled in the Cadet Nurse Corps state merely that she "will be available for military or other Federal governmental or essential civilian services for the duration of the present war." The option is hers. With negligible exceptions, the graduates of this corps have lived up to, and are continuing to live up to, the declaration they made. Even if one feels in retrospect that it would have been wiser to demand a more stringent commitment, it seems unfair to vist upon this group, in the form of a discriminatory liability to the draft, the consequences of a governmental error of judgment for which they are in no way responsible.

In hearings before the committees of the Congress in connection with the Nurse Training Act, it was clearly indicated that the purpose of Federal aid for the training of nurses was to provide the additional nurses necessary to meet the needs of the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries through grants to institutions. The cadet nurses being trained are not in the employ of the Federal Government. They are civilian students. Most of them are young girls between 18 and 20 years of age. The Cadet Nurse Corps has been highly successful in preventing a collapse of the nursing services in civilian hospitals. During the last fiscal year, 65,000 new student nurses were enrolled. The quota for the current fiscal year is 60,000, and estimates for the next fiscal year are the same. There are more patients in civilian hospitals of the country today than ever before. The continued enrollment of student nurses is necessary if we are to maintain even the minimum standards of nursing care for the civilian sick. In this connection, it should be remembered that after the first few months of training, student nurses spend an increasing proportion of their time in the care of sick patients.

If the discriminatory provisions of H. R. 2277 are enacted, the Government will be placed in the position of breaking its agreement with the student nurses enrolled in and graduated from the Cadet Nurse Corps. This is a very serious matter involving the good faith of the Government in relation to this one group of young women.

I feel very strongly that the Government should keep faith with the terms of the agreement under which members of the Cadet Nurse Corps were enrolled. The honor and integrity of a government in dealing with any group of citizens is a basic consideration in a democracy.

The objectionable provisions of H. R. 2277 will not produce more nurses for the Army nor will it produce them sooner. On the contrary, it interposes an additional administrative step which will complicate and slow up the induction of sufficient nurses to meet the Army's needs. If every present graduate of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps were eligible and passed all the physical and professional requirements, the number would not be sufficient to meet the present military needs.

In round numbers, the figures are as follows:

Graduations from U. S. Cadet Nurse Corps prior to Jan. 1, 1945	10,000
Graduations Jan. 1 to June 30, 1945	6,000
Total	16,000
Failure to meet Army standards, physical and professional	4,000
Entered military service prior to Jan. 1, 1945	4,000
Married	1,500
Total	9,500
Net available gradates, U. S. Cadet Nurse Corps to June 30, 1945	6,500

Distribution of cadet nurses by age upon graduation [1]

Age in years:	Percent of total graduate cadet nurses
20 [2]	[3] 25
21	[3] 43
22	[3] 15
23	7
24	3
25	2
26	1
27	1
28	.6
29	.5
30 or more	1.6
Age not given	.4

[1] Based upon age recorded upon admission to school.

[2] Most of these are closely approaching 21st birthday.

[3] 83 percent are below 23 years of age.

The number actually available, 6,500, is still further reduced, since very considerable numbers have volunteered since the President's message. The exact figures are not yet available.

Thus it can be seen that there are not now, and will not be for many months to come, enough graduates of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps to meet the needs of the armed forces. The bill would apparently require that each board classify and induct all of the graduates of the corps registered with it before it could tap the vastly larger pool of available nurses. Such a requirement could not fail, I think, to delay the filling of the necessary quotas.

I recommend the deletion from the bill of section 2 (b) and the last sentence of paragraph (1) of section 2 (c). If it is the view of the Congress that special provision is necessary to assure that graduates of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps comply with section 2 (a) of the Nurse Training Act, I would suggest that such a provision be limited to those graduates who, immediately after graduation, fail to apply either for service in the armed forces or for employment in other Federal, governmental, or essential civilian services, or who thereafter cease to hold themselves available for such activities. If it is felt necessary to impose a sanction to enforce the declaration which cadet nurses have made, I suggest that at least the sanctions should not be coupled with a unilateral imposition of an agreement which they have never undertaken.

Special provisions to induct immediately any graduate of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps who has failed to comply with the obligation she undertook pursuant to section 2 (a) (1) the determination of essential nursing service. The Procurement and Assignment Service therefore could be required to certify for immediate induction any graduate of the Cadet Nurse Corps who is failing to meet her obligation. I would personally favor such a provision.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. I am very much concerned about the particular section which the gentleman has just discussed. I think it was unwise to put it in the bill, for the reason that it constitutes a material obstruction or stopgap against the actual induction of nurses not only into the Cadet Corps, but also other nurses, because those have to be exhausted first. In addition to that, it has already had a tendency to deter entrance into the nursing schools over the country under the Cadet Corps law.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman is correct. About 40 percent of these graduates have gone into military service. About 60 percent went into civilian service. In any event, suppose you do not do it, how are you going to get those 60 percent to volunteer, when you single those out as the only class which cannot say to the local draft board, "We are in an essential nursing business"?

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. Also I think the gentleman should call attention to the fact that nothing but the senior Cadet Corps class participates in this fund, under the Bolton Act. The others prior to that time do not participate in it. So you are reaching a very small class by this provision in the bill.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina. We gave our word to this class when they came in that they could select which service they would go into, or that they could go into civilian service, because at that time there came before us the Public Health Service, the American Hospital Association, the Nurses' Association, and others, who stated there were not sufficient nurses being trained in the United States and something would have to be done to provide nurses. I shall vote for the bill, but I hope that the Military Affairs Committee will agree to the amendments.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 29]

Bailey	Eaton	Morgan
Baldwin, Md.	Fallon	Neely
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fogarty	Patterson
Barrett, Pa.	Fulton	Powell
Bender	Gamble	Rains
Biemiller	Gardner	Reece, Tenn.
Bloom	Gerlach	Rivers
Bradley, Mich.	Granahan	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bradley, Pa.	Green	Robertson, Va.
Brumbaugh	Hagen	Rowan
Buckley	Hand	Sadowski
Burch	Hedrick	Sasscer
Burgin	Heidinger	Sharp
Camp	Herter	Sheridan
Campbell	Holmes, Mass.	Talbot
Cannon, Fla.	Johnson, Luther A.	Welchel
Clark	Kelly, Ill.	Weiss
Combs	Kirwan	Welch
Corbett	LeCompte	West
Curley	Lemke	White
Daughton, Va.	Lesinski	Wigglesworth
Davis	Luce	Woodhouse
Dawson	McConnell	
Dirksen	McKenzie	
Drewry		

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty Members are present, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. Cox further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein a letter from Mr. Ben Dubois, secretary of the Independent Bankers' Association, and a resolution of the Independent Bankers' Association with regard to the Bretton Woods proposal.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and include an article from the East Texas Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter.

NURSES' SELECTIVE SERVICE BILL OF 1945

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when the proposal came out to draft nurses in this country it caused me, as it did every other Member of this body, grave concern. It meant more than the drafting of nurses. It would have an effect on the civilians of this country, our hospitals, our aged, and on the newborn. But I place far above these effects the fact that the wounded and disabled soldiers of this country need these young women far more than the civilians at home. Thus, when the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs came before the Committee on Rules and stated that the Surgeon General of the Army and the War Department are in favor of drafting nurses because they are not procuring enough through voluntary enlistments, I hasten to say I am going to support this rule and, with the proper amendments—and I do believe that this bill requires many qualifying amend-

ments—I will support the bill itself. I believe, as one amendment, that the nurses should be given commissions.

I cannot see why doctors and dentists and specialists in that line should be granted commissions and the nurses should not be given commissions. I think nurses who are drafted should receive, in every instance, the same benefits that all of our other men and women in uniform receive.

I believe an amendment should be offered giving credit to the various States for voluntary enlistments. I believe the quota for a particular State should be cut down for drafting, if they have a larger number of voluntary enlistments. I believe an amendment also should be offered whereby these nurses will not have to take care of any other soldiers except those wearing the American uniform, unless it may be that the Allied soldiers are in the same theater of war.

I will not take any more time, but I think there are many amendments which should be adopted to make this bill feasible and workable.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman said he would like to have an amendment offered to commission all of the nurses who come in by virtue of this act, if it becomes law. I want to inquire whether all graduate nurses now in the military service are commissioned?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am of the opinion they are, but I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio to answer that, as she is on authority on this type of legislation.

Mrs. BOLTON. The Army Nurse Corps consists only of commissioned nurses. A bill covering that was passed last spring.

Mr. MOTT. Then certainly it would seem proper to commission the nurses who come in under this bill.

Now, another question. I understand the nursing profession is not quite, although almost, possibly, composed of women. However, there are a considerable number of men who are graduate nurses. I wanted to inquire why it would not be proper to offer an amendment to include all nurses instead of just women nurses?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. That might be workable also and it is hoped that this will come up for consideration when the bill proper comes before us.

Mr. MOTT. That would probably tend to take away some of the argument against class legislation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Yes. I believe the gentleman to be correct.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there should be any argument, in discussing this bill, as to the need of the armed service for more nurses. I am sure there is not a man or woman in this House who will not go all-out to make sure that proper and adequate medical nursing care is given to our men and women in the armed services. Therefore, the only question before us is how best to achieve that objective.

We should first examine why there is the present shortage, besides the fact that military needs have greatly increased. I wish I had a larger chart here but perhaps the Members can see this one. In the beginning of the war the Army of course had its table of organization. There were supposed to be a certain number of nurses for each thousand beds. As the number of men in the service increased, and as the quota of needed nurses went up, which is the solid line on the chart, the number of volunteers kept pace all the way up until this point was reached, at which time the Army voluntarily cut back its estimated requirements. It said it was not going to need quite so many nurses as previously expected. That was because there had been fewer casualties than had been anticipated, and with the use of penicillin and the sulfa drugs and superior care, the deaths were fewer and the convalescences less prolonged than had been anticipated. So the Army a year ago last November voluntarily cut back to 40,000 its estimated quota of nurses. Right there, of course, the volunteering leveled off, at 42,000. So it was not the fault of the nurses if fewer of them volunteered thereafter. They volunteered at a rate exactly parallel with the rate of increase in the numbers of men and women in the armed services until the Army itself felt it would not need so many nurses.

Then last spring—I think it was April or May—the Army upped its requirement to 50,000 instead of 40,000. Later it was increased to 60,000. But before the swing back to volunteering got under way what happened last summer? There were predictions by General Eisenhower and some of our greatest leaders that the war was going to be over within the year, and then Patton's and our other valiant armies in France broke loose and drove to the borders of Germany. Many people in high places freely said that the war was going to be over by the end of October. The W. P. B. cut-back production in many categories. People saw many war plants being shut down or even dismantled. Congress was called back before the end of the summer recess to enact legislation for reconversion to peacetime industry and for disposal of surplus commodities. Rationing was removed.

The Army itself had discharged over 10,000 nurses—most of them on the basis of their having married. Out of 9,000 colored nurses in this country who are graduates of accredited nurses' training schools, the Army has taken only 330 nurses, and, as the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] has just pointed out, there are more than 3,000 male nurses in this country who are perfectly qualified, who have had exactly the same training as the women nurses, but the Army is unwilling to take them as commissioned nurses. It stopped hiring nurses' aides, even though they had each had more than 150 hours of actual experience.

Nurses in civilian life who were working at top speed heard frequent reports from their friends in the service that the latter were having only 2 hours a day of real work. Is it surprising if they felt the Army apparently was not seriously pressed for more nurses? I am sure you and I would have the same sort of psychological let-down as happened with the nurses, as happened in the war plants, people thinking and believing that the war was going to be over quickly and they were more needed and useful in civilian life. So there was a dropping off until December when the Ardennes offensive of Von Rundstedt started. That began to recreate a war psychology in this country and there was promptly an increase in the number of recruits. When there is a let-down it takes a little time, of course, to get up steam again, and we are still in the stage of getting up steam.

From the President's speech on January 8, which was the first time the need was really made clear to the people, to February 24, 13,848 nurses volunteered.

Of this number the Red Cross reported last Saturday that 9,641 have already been certified to the Army and Navy. That is more than half the total of 18,000 additional nurses which the Army has asked for. In that period of about 6 weeks, 9,641 were certified by the Red Cross, which means that they had volunteered their services, their professional qualifications had been examined and found satisfactory as to training and experience, and they had been certified to the Army for physical examination and assignment to duty at whatever time they had stated they would be available, most of them in March and April, but a few not until May or June. That was the result in 6 weeks. Some of those certified will not be able to qualify, but almost half of the 18,000 the Army wanted were recruited, and on a volunteer basis.

Then this bill was introduced and it was said nurses must be drafted to get enough. Naturally many nurses took the attitude that if the group of women whose members had volunteered at a higher percentage rate than any other group of citizens in the country except doctors, were going to be discriminated against, and sort of smeared as slackers, well, why volunteer? Why not just wait and let Uncle Sam come get them. It was an understandable psychological reaction.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we were progressing satisfactorily by the volunteer method and the cause of the let-down was as Surgeon General Parran said, and I think rightly, a false peace psychology, then the first cure is not to draft nurses but to re-create the war psychology. Why should we abandon the voluntary method that worked admirably as long as we really used it, and adopt another method that is untried? Why should we not first try to correct the trouble by more vigorous use of the proved remedy rather than by scrapping it for a compulsory system, for the first time in our Nation's history?

Now, however, since this bill has been brought out and discussed, I believe we will have to pass it in order to clear the atmosphere and end the confusion—but only if it is modified, and only along with a real trial of the voluntary system.

As I say, the facts as reported by the Red Cross show that over 9,000 nurses

have been certified as eligible since January 1, and those who pass the physical examination will be ready to enter the service in the next few months, most of them in March and April. In addition, the Army should accept nurses without regard to race, creed, or color, provided they have the proper professional qualifications. It should avail itself of the services of male nurses. It should endeavor to call back into the service many of those who were separated from the service because of marriage. Some of them doubtless have children now and, of course, could not serve further, but many are available. If the Army will so modify its rules and regulations and a real recruitment campaign be put on, my belief is that very few, if any, will have to be drafted. I say this on the basis of the magnificent record the nurses have already made. The American people have never yet failed to provide the Nation with whatever it needed when they have understood the need. I am convinced they never will. Now, that brings me to the point about which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] spoke.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I have a telegram—also a letter—from a friend of mine in Illinois in which it is stated that in January 35 nurses from Danville, Ill., volunteered their services early in January and only 3 have been called yet to the Army by the Surgeon General. He cannot understand why they have not enough nurses unless it is on account of some of the delinquencies of the organization that proposes to get them into the service.

Mr. JUDD. Let me read part of a telegram which I put in the RECORD last Tuesday from the superintendent of nurses at the University of Minnesota Hospital, and this has the largest unit in the Cadet Nurse Corps in the United States. She says:

> As of February 16, 250 applications from the Minneapolis area alone since January 1. Of these only 38 have received notice of assignment from the military. Two hundred and twelve wondering why they must wait to be drafted.

If, as the Under Secretary of War said in the hearings, "The wounded cannot wait," with which I agree, then why should 212 volunteers from my city alone still be waiting to be put to work by the Army? There are hospitals in this country where nurses were accepted and were to be assigned by the Army some time ago. The hospitals went out and got older nurses to take the jobs of those who were supposed to leave. But those who were supposed to leave are still there in the hospital, and the hospital now has to support two sets of nurses until the Army gets around to taking the first set. Who is making the wounded wait? Not the nurses. Of course, I know it is hard for the Army, perhaps, to change some of its complicated regulations and procedures and traditions, but if "The wounded cannot wait," and they cannot; then we all ought to do everything that is necessary to get the right kind of care to the wounded at the right time, which is immediately.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. I want to ask the gentleman a question, because he has studied the pending legislation very carefully, and he is an authority on the subject. The gentleman made the statement that all we have to do is let these nurses know we actually need them, and let them volunteer; if we do that, we will get the required nurses immediately. How does he reconcile that statement with his other statement that, since the bill is here, of course we will have to pass it? Can it not be amended to conform to the gentleman's ideas?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; this is the kind of amendment I would like to have in the bill. I would like to have an amendment that this legislation will go into effect on such and such a date if by that date the number of applications or certifications has not reached a designated goal. Let the nurses know what the Army's requirements are going to be over the next few months, and if and when they do not meet the quotas, the law automatically goes into effect. I am sure that will clear the matter up. It is this confusion and uncertainty that discourage decision. These girls volunteer, then are not called for weeks or months. It leaves everybody unsettled. Some take the attitude, "If I am so busy here and they apparently are not so busy in the Army, why should I go?"

I should like to see an amendment of that kind so that the nurses and hospitals may have something definite upon which to plan, then I am sure we will get them.

If we were to drop this bill entirely, it might be interpreted as meaning that since we are breaking through on the Rhine, and Hitler apparently is caving in, we think there will not be need for as many more nurses as actually are needed. I suspect we need an amended bill now to clear up any confusion, but if properly amended the situation could be taken care of with little or no actual drafting, I believe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman feel there ought to be a delay of 30 or 60 days as he suggests before we take any steps at all, in face of the fact that there are now 520,000 wounded in the hospitals of this country and overseas and when they are coming back to the hospitals at the rate of 1,600 every 24 hours?

Mr. JUDD. I do not think there should be any delay at all in getting the nurses, therefore I am apealing to the Army to process quickly the 9,641 that the Red Cross has certified already, of which the Army had only taken 2,400, according to published reports last week. Many others of these girls have already been accepted but they are still unassigned. I am urging that we get the girls to where the sick and wounded are, and the voluntary method is the quickest way to do it. If we will pass the bill with the proper amendments then I am sure we will bring enough of them in without the necessity of drafting them.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the Chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, Why do they not take notice of the 9,000 certifications? I would like an answer to that. Why are they waiting?

Mr. MAY. The answer to that is that in that 9,000 at least two-thirds of them have fixed a future date for entering the service.

Mr. JUDD. Most of them during March and April.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman received that information from the Surgeon General's Office?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is it part of the record?

Mr. MAY. It is in his testimony.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman explain why 212 girls from Minneapolis are still waiting for information on their applications?

Mr. MAY. It may be due to some State committee or reassignment branch that has not reassigned them.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman will admit that it is rather discouraging to a woman to apply 6 weeks ago and still have no answer. Does that indicate to her that nurses are so desperately needed?

Mr. MAY. I agree to that, and I will take anything obscure out of this bill that will improve it.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman gave some figures for the month of January. Does he have comparable figures for the month of February?

Mr. JUDD. The figures I gave were from the President's speech on January 8 to February 24. That is as near up to date as I have seen.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What was the age limit fixed by the Army before it was fixed in this bill?

Mr. JUDD. I cannot answer what the age limit was. But this bill takes it down to 20 years.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I know of dozens of cases where registered nurses, qualified nurses, volunteered in January and were turned down because they were over 30 years of age.

Mr. JUDD. Yes. And now, Mr. Speaker, may I discuss one more point in regard to section 2 (b) of the bill, which says:

(b) No person registered with a selective-service local board under this act shall be ordered by such board to report for induction until after all qualified graduates of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps registered with such board, who are not deferred pursuant to the provisions of this act, have been ordered to report for induction.

I appeal to the members of the committee to support an amendment to strike that paragraph from the bill for four main reasons. The first is that it is a definite breach of faith.

The Bolton law, which set up the Cadet Nurse Corps, in its opening paragraph states:

Be it enacted * * * for the purpose of assuring a supply of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, relief agencies, and war industries, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated—

And so forth.

Under this language the Public Health Service set up regulations for enrolling cadets which included a pledge by each cadet nurse that she would stay in essential nursing throughout the duration of the war. But essential nursing is not necessarily military nursing. It includes veterans and civilian hospitals, war industries, and so forth. The girl could make her choice. The girls entered the corps with that understanding. They made that solemn promise. The Army had said that it probably would need about 20 percent of them. Actually, more than 40 percent of the 10,000 graduates had already volunteered by January 1, and I do not know how many more have volunteered since then. They promised only that they would go into essential nursing service, either military or civilian. Now we are saying in section 2 (b) of this bill that no selective-service board shall induct any nurse until it has first ordered to report for induction all qualified graduates of the Cadet Nurse Corps. I think that is a straight-out breach of faith and we ought not to do it.

Second, such a policy, will in the next critical weeks decrease rather than increase the number of well-trained, qualified nurses entering the service, because many of the other graduate nurses will say, "Why should we volunteer? The law says, 'Take the Cadet Corps graduates first.'" Besides, out of the 10,000 graduates 4,000 are already in the service voluntarily, and out of the 16,000 who will have graduated by July 1, it is estimated 4,000 more will be, for one reason or another, declared unqualified, 1,500 are or will be married, which leaves only 6,500 available. It still does not begin to solve the problem. If it will not supply the needed nurses fast enough, why should we postpone taking other nurses until all the corps graduates in a local board's jurisdiction are inducted? Remember, the wounded cannot wait.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlemen from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JUDD. Thank you. The third reason for eliminating this provision is that if it stands it will discourage recruiting for Cadet Corps and endanger the whole civilian and military nursing supply for the future. I suspect the morale of most of the girls already in the corps is such that they will stay, but many fathers and mothers are not going to put their high school-age girls into the only branch of women's activity which leads directly to immediate involuntary military service—requires every single graduate who can qualify to be taken first regardless of how many other more experienced nurses there may be, or how inexperienced she may be. They do not want their girls taken as a group without older women among them with longer professional service and greater maturity. Such a policy will dry up the springs from which most of our future nurses must come.

Those girls trained in the cadet corps will still have to go ultimately just like other graduate nurses, but they won't all have to go first just because they are members of the Cadet Nurse Corps. None who is qualified and declared nonessential by Procurement and Assignment will escape military service, but she will at least be allowed to volunteer.

Fourth, nurses who volunteer will give better service for the boys than those who are drafted or discriminated against. We will have better conditions and spirit in our nursing corps if the older women up to 45 are admitted right along with those new graduates, 83 percent of whom are under 23 years of age, and if all graduate nurses are treated on the same basis. It will be better for the nurses, and, most important of all, better for the patients.

Draft of all eligible graduate registered nurses would produce more nurses in a shorter time, better quality and better quantity of nursing, so that if our primary objective is to get the nurses quickly for the men, it seems to me we ought to eliminate section 2 (b).

I must say in all frankness that if it is not eliminated there are a good many of us who will support the bill if so amended who cannot in good conscience support it as it is. So when amendments are offered to eliminate that section, and to induct and commission qualified male nurses just the same as female nurses, and to take nurses without regard to race, creed, or color, if they have the proper qualifications, and to enroll married or divorced nurses without dependents, I hope the Members will support those amendments. Then, I think we can get a good bill that will do the job, without retroactive changes that will be discriminatory, a bill that will not dry up the sources of our civilian nurses as well as military nurses and veterans' hospital nurses in the years ahead.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2277) to insure adequate nursing care for the armed forces.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2277, with Mr. PACE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a very brief statement for the information of the House. I should like to have a general understanding, tacit, of course, that we shall try to conclude the general debate this afternoon, it being agreed that at the end of the general debate we shall read the first section of the bill, and then go over until tomorrow for the discussion under the 5-minute rule. That would be my plan, if there is no objection from the gentlemen on the other side, and I thought perhaps the Members would like to know it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is agreeable.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, not since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives have I brought to the floor of the House or seen brought here a bill that to me is more urgent than the pending bill, H. R. 2277.

We have today in hospitals throughout the world a few more than 520,000 wounded men. They are coming back from the field installations to the hospitals at the rate of 1,600 per day. In addition to the approximately 1,600, and the number of those who are actually coming back for hospitalization may increase from time to time, there are about 6,000 more who come back for treatment that does not necessarily require hospitalization.

When I introduced the bill originally it merely made subject to all the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act all female nurses in the United States who were registered under the laws of any State, any possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia, and who were graduates of any nursing school. The House Committee on Military Affairs, after very extensive hearings, which are printed in five separate volumes and which extended over a period of 2 weeks, reported the bill that is now pending before you, H. R. 2277.

Let me say here and now I feel I am wholly incapable of paying just tribute to the nurses' organizations of this country and to the women who appeared before our committee. There was not one complaint by any of them against military service as such. They had few objections to the pending legislation and suggested what I think were some very good amendments which I hope the House will consider when we come to the consideration of the measure.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us whether there was developed in the hearings the number of nurses who will be used for foreign service and those who will be used

here in the United States. I ask that because the evidence does show that about 1,600 wounded men are coming back here every day. That would indicate within a few months there will be a severe need for nurses here. I do not remember that there was any evidence developed showing the number that would have to be sent abroad and those who would have to be used here.

Mr. MAY. I do not remember that evidence myself, to be frank. Perhaps the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] can answer the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. DURHAM. I do recall that we have at the present time 25,300 overseas, and the rest of the 43,000, that is around 16,000, are in this country.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think that information is important in considering the striking out of the amendment to take the cadet nurses.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the committee.

Mr. FENTON. For the information of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], may I state that 71 percent of the presently available nurses are overseas.

Mr. MAY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. That probably answers the question of the gentleman from Indiana more definitely.

As chairman of the committee, I am sponsoring the passage of this bill. I think it is imperative. Therefore, I am supporting it even though I do not agree with all the provisions of the bill. So far as I am concerned, I want a bill that will entail no delay or obstruction in securing the number of nurses which are so imperatively needed.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Under this bill, would recruitment by draft be the exclusive system, or could nurses volunteer even though this bill were passed?

Mr. MAY. If the gentleman will read the last section of the bill, section 5, it expressly provides that it shall not affect the voluntary recruitment of any qualified women for the Army Nurse Corps, the Navy Nurse Corps, or the Nurse Corps of the Naval Reserve, or the appointment of members of such corps as commissioned officers as now provided by law.

I think that is the answer to the gentleman's question. We undertook to preserve every feature of the legislation which would encourage the acquisition of the necessary nurses to take care of the wounded.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Was any evidence presented to the Committee on Military Affairs that registered nurses of the country would not volunteer for service?

Mr. MAY. The evidence disclosed that just after the message of the President to the Congress to the effect that 20,000 nurses were required, there was a considerable rush for a while. Then it fell off. I have those figures, but I am afraid I do not have the time to recite them just now, as I want to discuss some of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Has the gentleman any information as to how the nurses from other Allied countries are cooperating in taking care of wounded American soldiers and to what degree they are cooperating?

Mr. MAY. I do not recall any testimony on that particular question before our committee. I did not hear some of the testimony as I was called away from the committee, but I do not believe there is anything in the record with reference to that.

I am sure some members of the Committee on Military Affairs who went overseas and who went to the battle fronts and visited the hospitals will be able to give information on that subject when they take the floor. Let me say with respect to section 2 (b), I opposed that section in the committee, but the committee adopted it and of course I am in the position of having to agree to it, although I think it is going to materially affect the induction of nurses. As I consider it, it would require that all graduate nurses of the Cadet Corps, especially under what is known as the Bolton bill, would have to be inducted before they could go out into the field and get other groups of nurses, and to that extent I do not like it, although there is a feature of the provision that is commendable and should have consideration. A great many of these nurses have been educated, since the enactment of the Bolton bill, at the expense of the Government. They signed an obligation at the time they entered those schools that they would render service either as civilian nurses or in the military service or in any public health service, where their services might be needed. In other words, I do not see anything else they could have pledged themselves to, other than that which they did. I am sure they are not in favor of that provision that would limit their right to serve. I have been receiving protests from them, but it is in the bill and the bill can operate and function very well with that provision, regardless of the views of any of us.

There is a further provision in section 2 (c), which provides that the nurses must be recruited through the State agencies or the procurement and assignment offices, and that until such time as they are made available by those agencies, which, as I understand are operating under the Manpower Commission, they will not be subject to classification for immediate induction by the draft boards.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

That provision was debated at length in the committee and the committee adopted it. The bill can function with that provision in it, but as far as I am concerned, I feel it is to some extent an obstruction to prompt and quick induction, which is the crucial thing in this legislation.

There is another feature of that particular section which provides also that as to nurses in the Veterans' Administration, they cannot be inducted or classified for induction until consent is given by the Director of the Veterans' Administration. I think I should say to the committee that the testimony was unquestionably to the effect that there has been most hearty cooperation between the Army, the Navy, and the Veterans' Administration. They work together. They have a committee that deals with the subject of nurses, and they have had no trouble whatsoever on that subject. I think if they were let alone as they are they would do a fine job, although the Director of the Veterans' Administration, General Hines, testified strongly in favor of the legislation, and stressed its importance, subject, however, to his right to veto the induction of Veterans' Administration nurses if and when they were requested by the Selective Service Board.

I am opposed to the provision in the bill which gives to the Manpower Commission or the State agencies the right to induct nurses, because that gets it to a point where it takes it absolutely outside of the Selective Service System. I feel that if they do a good job then it will not operate badly, but if they do not do a good job, there is no recourse.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Would the nurses who are inducted under this bill, be commissioned automatically?

Mr. MAY. Not automatically. General Kirk testified before the committee that the practice was that they would commission as second lieutenants all qualified nurses who meet the requirements under their regulations and under the law.

Mr. MOTT. Has the gentleman any objection to an amendment to commission these nurses when they are inducted?

Mr. MAY. Only the general principle that we have never yet in any legislation singled out any particular group to be given commissions; and I think for that reason we ought not to do it. Furthermore, no one ought to be compelled to accept a commission if they do not desire one.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. MAY. I take another minute to yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. We are so grateful to the distinguished gentleman for his explanation of the bill and for his assurance that any amendment which would benefit and accelerate the action of the bill would be welcome; but I am wondering now if the gentleman would object to an amendment authorizing and directing the local boards to take into account the number of male nurses who were engaged in essential nursing in that community on, we will say, the date of Pearl Harbor, and those who had volunteered for and been inducted into the

services of the Army and the Navy in the interim.

Mr. MAY. I am sure the local draft boards will consider the quotas that are set up in the several States, and that has already been done.

Mr. HOBBS. But the bill says "all."

Mr. MAY. Yes; but that includes those in the quotas and those that are not included in the quotas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, in these few minutes I merely wish to say that, regardless of mistakes, regardless of errors in judgment, regardless of failure possibly to plan sufficiently well ahead, both on the part of the Army and others in authority, we have reached the point where it is now a question of dire need today. This is the critical period of the war, the period in which we are incurring the heaviest casualties, and from now to the end of the war the load is going to get no less. It will be a continually rising load until we have reached the peak of wounded in hospitals both overseas and in this country.

This bill is not a perfect bill; there is considerable disagreement on the provisions of the bill as to certain amendments, as to certain subject matter which is not within the bill. I personally shall support any reasonable bill, the present bill amended or not. My own opinion, however, is that registration should be broadened. Were it possible, I should like to see the bill make mandatory the registration of all women up to 45 years of age; but certainly we should broaden it as to registration of all women qualified to be nurses.

At one time I was inclined to the amendment which is in the bill to draft all cadet nurses before coming to the registered nurses. Hindsight is sometimes better than foresight, and I believe that it is almost unanimous, and all nursing agencies throughout the country are in agreement that this portion of the bill should be removed. Beyond that, I believe the clause that has to do with married and single women should be clarified; certainly it should include a date if we are to draft only women unmarried.

Another matter that it seems to me should be in the bill, going back to the original Selective Service Act, is a provision equalizing the load by States giving effect to volunteering. No such provision is in the bill at the present time. We should have in the bill provisions that equalize this by States, giving effect to the volunteers from the various States.

I think the subject matter of commissions for members of the Nurse Corps should be definitely written into the bill.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I view of the gentleman's suggestion about increasing the age or placing a maximum age of 45 for the purpose of registration, would he tell the Members of the House what the maximum age limit today is for volunteering?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Forty-five.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I have been told they are not accepting any nurses over the age of 30 years. Is that right?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. No. The provisions of the bill permit volunteering of any person up to the age of 45.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I am talking about the present procurement program. What is the maximum age under which they are now volunteering and being accepted in the Army?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The Red Cross records show a total from Pearl Harbor to January 1 of 81,000 that have been certified to the Army and Navy.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is not what I want to know.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I am coming to it.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Does the gentleman ask, What are the present ages?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Yes. What are the regulations relative to the maximum age of a girl who wants to volunteer today in the Army Nursing Corps?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I will have to get those figures.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. The age limit is 45.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Are they accepting any girls in the Army Nursing Corps today over the age of 30 years?

Mrs. BOLTON. Certainly, every day.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I have been told otherwise.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. My original statement to the gentleman was that they may volunteer up to the age of 45 and my understanding is that is what they are doing.

Mrs. BOLTON. Would the gentleman consider an amendment providing for the registration of all nurses up to the age of 60 or 65?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I would favor any provision which would broaden the whole base for registration and thereby give us some accurate knowledge. I may say that recommendation is made by every woman's nursing organization that presented their views to us.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I should have stated this in my original statement, but did not take time to do so. It is my plan, when the bill is considered, to offer an amendment which will make the bill, as completed, title II of the Selective Training and Service Act, which will put these nurses in the same position as those who have already been inducted and it will give them the benefit of the Sailors' and Soldiers' Civil Relief Act, job security, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, we spent quite a bit of time and did a great deal of work on this bill during the last 30 days. It is a measure that has quite a number of different angles to it.

First, we tried to provide in this bill as far as we could restrictions which would give our civilians the nurses on the home front and also provide nurses to take care of our soldiers and sailors.

The nursing situation at the present time is broken down into figures about like the following:

We have 180,000 institutional nurses throughout the country. We have about 12,000 industrial nurses which, of course, is your large plants throughout the country. We have about 15,000 nurses in the Public Health Service in this country, and we have about 43,000 nurses in the service. That is the total amount of nurses. From the best information we could develop the total was around 280,000 nurses in this country. That is the number of nurses that you have to do this job with unless we can probably get back into the service some of these nurses who have retired. It is estimated by most of the nursing councils throughout the country that there are actually 400,000 nurses in this country that at one time or another had registration.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] brought up the question of what is the difficulty with the assignment of these nurses? I will admit that the picture looks rather bad when first viewing it. Thirteen thousand eight hundred and forty-eight nurse applications have been received by the Red Cross from January 30 up to February 24, Saturday. The number certified by the Red Cross to the Army, according to his figures, is correct, being a total of 9,644. I think there is only a difference of a few between our figures. Those figures were furnished to me this morning.

Now what becomes of those? Of those nurses that are certified, we lose about 25 percent through physical disability. Part of those, of course, are certified to the Navy. Many of them have dependent children and are not certified. Another thing is this: When they joined up and were certified, they had restrictions; they asked when they volunteered that they would be able to enter in March or April, and later on some other month was stated, some as far up as June 1945.

I have this information from General Lull, of the Surgeon General's Office, this morning that at the present time there is no backlog of these nurses. There

has been some delay in the service commands throughout the country. But when you analyze it, I think most of the difficulty faced lies in the above facts.

Another thing which would justify this measure, if for no other reason, is this: I have before me a break-down under the volunteer system of every State in the United States. Some States have contributed practically no nurses, whereas New York has contributed 12 percent, Pennsylvania 11 percent, and some States have not contributed one-half of 1 percent. I am going to insert this list in the RECORD, and I think that alone justifies this measure.

The Procurement and Assignment Division, as we all know, was charged with the responsibility of securing the doctors and the medical services for our Army and Navy, and I think we will all admit that they have done an excellent job. They have been able to keep on the home front most of our hospitals and public health services and private people pretty well supplied with medical services. I do not say it has been 100 percent. Many of the doctors have been working overtime, but they have done a very good job. Eighteen months ago the nurses were added to this Procurement and Assignment Division in the War Manpower Commission. They operate through 900 procurement agencies throughout the country. Under this bill those agencies will pass on the essentialities of the nurses in each local community before they are taken by your local draft boards. There were some objections to that provision in the bill, but personally I think it is a great safeguard to our civilian and our Public Health Service.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Is it true that those nurses, when they go in, have to stay for the duration?

Mr. DURHAM. Duration and 6 months.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Did the committee consider offering the proposition by which they would not have to stay for the duration? It is dreadfully hard, it seems to me, on some women to be forced to stay in the jungles 5 years, harder even than on the men. Still, such instances have been found in India and other such places.

Mr. DURHAM. Certainly we have tried to operate the rotation system. I know a nurse from my district who has been over there 24 months. She has been back just a few days.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The understanding of the nurses in this country is that they will not be rotated but will have to stay there. Under those conditions it is hard to get them to volunteer. It is a very difficult problem.

Mr. DURHAM. I am quite sure the gentlewoman agrees with me that if their services are necessary—and they are as patriotic as anybody—most of them would want to stay, if there were wounded men in the field of operations throughout the country. Of course, the gentlewoman understands we brought back about 35,000 wounded and sick men in February. It has been running about that number for the last 4 or 5 months. We have back here, as the chairman told you, 240,000 wounded men who have to be taken care of. We have transferred 25,000 nurses overseas in practically all stations throughout the world; 25,800, to be exact. By that, of course, we are relieving some of the patient load, and at the present time there are around 280,000 overseas patients in the hospitals. They are going in at the rate of about 8,100 a day. That is what it has averaged for the last 60 days, or close to that. Of course, it varies somewhat. So you can see what the tremedous load is that is piling up.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. My point is that you would not have to draft these nurses if you would ease up the conditions. You could put them on shift so that they would not have to stay all that long time.

Mr. DURHAM. That is just the difficulty. Ordinarily we have tried to carry a patient load of 1 to 14 in this country. That is the normal load to carry of a nurse on war duty. Overseas at the present time in evacuation hospitals they are carrying a load of 1 to 12. Of course, the conditions vary considerably. If a nurse is taking care of a leg wound or something that requires constant attention she cannot possibly take care of 12 people.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There is nothing in the Selective Service Act to require rotation, is there?

Mr. DURHAM. Nothing at all.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It is because of the care and consideration the Army and Navy have for the health of the soldiers that this rotation policy has been developed. Can it not be assumed that they would have the same consideration for the health of the nurses?

Mr. DURHAM. Certainly; I think so.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. We talk about 5 years. I hope we cannot now think of this war continuing another 5 years.

Mr. DURHAM. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Does the bill provide for the drafting of male nurses as well as female nurses?

Mr. DURHAM. It does not.

Mr. DINGELL. I presume they are draftable.

Mr. DURHAM. They are drafted under the Selective Service Act and inducted like any other men.

Mr. DINGELL. Can they be put into the nursing service?

Mr. DURHAM. They can be put into the nursing service. We are assured by the Surgeon General's Office that most of them are assigned to nursing duties.

Mr. DINGELL. As has been customary in the Army, no provision has ever been made for their being commissioned?

Mr. DURHAM. There has not.

Mr. DINGELL. Under the bill now pending, will not the nurses who are to be drafted be commissioned?

Mr. DURHAM. Not necessarily. The bill does not state that. Of course, that is the policy of the War Department.

Mr. DINGELL. The bill does not state that, but it is presumed that, if drafted, qualified and registered female nurses will be commissioned?

Mr. DURHAM. Under the War Department policy at the present time, that is correct.

Mr. DINGELL. The drafted men, however, with the same qualifications, will not be commissioned?

Mr. DURHAM. If they go to an officers' training school they can receive a commission up through the services.

Mr. DINGELL. But granting that they have the same qualifications, that they have been graduated from qualified hospitals and are registered nurses, if they are assigned to a hospital to do the full duties of a nurse, right side by side with female nurses, the women are commissioned but the men are not, under the present policy?

Mr. DURHAM. That is right.

Mr. DINGELL. I think that is a vicious and unfair practice by the War Department and it ought to be corrected. I think the Congress ought to take that matter up and act on it.

Mr. DURHAM. I think it should be corrected.

Mr. DINGELL. In the last session I introduced a bill that was not acted upon, dealing with that problem, and I am going to reintroduce it because that is something that ought to be corrected.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I assume the committee has gone into this, but I have only had opportunity to read part of the hearings on this bill. Are the nurses of any of the countries that are liberated going into service in the hospitals abroad?

Mr. DURHAM. I will say to the gentleman that was one thing that was not brought up in the hearings.

Mr. REED of New York. I was thinking of France, for instance. They must have a great many trained nurses. They certainly did during the First World War. They also had many hospitals. I believe it would be interesting to know whether or not they are making themselves available for our armed forces who are fighting there for them.

Mr. DURHAM. I see the gentleman's point. I think it is well that we should at least see what is being done in that regard.

Mr. REED of New York. Are they drafting nurses in Canada and Great Britain?

Mr. DURHAM. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. REED of New York. That did not appear in the hearings either?

Mr. DURHAM. No, that did not appear in the hearings either.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Referring to paragraph 2 (b) of the bill, I would

like to ask the gentleman how many nurses do we now have in the Cadet Nurse Corps?

Mr. DURHAM. 110,000.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. How many nurses do we need?

Mr. DURHAM. We need 20,000 additional nurses, for the War Department and the Navy Department.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. It is not contemplated that we can get all the nurses we need by virtue of the provisions of 2 (b), is it?

Mr. DURHAM. It is not.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. How many true, I would like to know the wisdom of keeping paragraph 2 (b) in the bill. It has been intimated by the gentleman from Kentucky, I believe, that it might even hinder the working of the bill.

Mr. DURHAM. I agree with the gentleman that it should come out. I voted against it in committee.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. PHILBIN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that in his opinion the Navy was to get a certain percentage of those drafted by the provisions of this bill in the event it is enacted into law?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes; they say at the present time they need 2,350, I believe.

Mr. PHILBIN. I understood the testimony, as I heard Admiral Agnew's testimony before the committee, to be that the Navy did not have any nurse problem and so far as the Navy was concerned they conducted their own recruitment program, the results of which were gratifying. They expected to supply all their needs without reference to a draft.

Mr. DURHAM. If the gentleman will read the hearings, he will find he qualified that statement by saying they probably would not have any trouble. But in the course of the hearings, they came in and asked us, and told us they would need something like 2,350 additional nurses.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What are the age qualifications of the Cadet Nurse Corps in paragraph 2 (b) of the bill?

Mr. DURHAM. Under the Bolton bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; what are the age qualifications in order to be members of the Cadet Nurse Corps?

Mr. DURHAM. If she is a high-school graduate, she can enter the Cadet Nurse Corps.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But what are the age qualifications?

Mr. DURHAM. There are no age qualifications. She can go in, I imagine, if she is 16 years of age if she wants to go into a nursing school.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. So far as age is concerned, there is no age limitation?

Mr. DURHAM. No; a high-school graduate can enter a cadet-nurse school.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Can the gentleman tell us how many nurses the War Department has accepted since this bill was introduced?

Mr. DURHAM. I can give the gentleman the number that will be taken in in March, which are the latest figures I have. There have been certified and already accepted, and received their travel pay, 1,200 for the month of March. That number has already been assigned. They have received all of their travel pay. That is the number of nurses for March.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. O'HARA. How many applications have been submitted which have not been processed?

Mr. DURHAM. I have tried to explain that in my statement.

Out of these 9,644 who have been certified by Procurement and Assignment and the Red Cross, you will lose about 25 percent for physical reasons. At the present time they are taking them 6 feet tall, they are taking them down to a hundred pounds or less. They have about done away with all physical requirements at the present time. They are taking most anything they can get. Perhaps 10 or 15 or 20 percent of them are married. I do not know the exact figures. When they send in their applications they say nothing about that, but when they are certified, of course, that has to be cleared up. If they are married, they are sent back home. Some of them will make provision that they will come in in March; some will want to come in in April and some in June. So it is very difficult to arrive at exactly how many you will get out of that 9,644. Evidently we are not getting very many, because in March we only got 1,200.

Mr. O'HARA. They have been going a little slow lately.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think if the gentleman will examine those figures carefully he will find that those 1,200 were as of the 1st of March. That does not include the applications that have been made during the month.

Mr. DURHAM. Certainly.

Mrs. BOLTON. There were 1,050 in January. Those were hang-overs from applications made in November and December. Then there were 860 who came in in February. They were taken in and assigned in February. The 1st of March they had assigned 1,200.

Mr. DURHAM. I think this is a pretty good indication of the applications: On January 13, after the first of the year and the President's speech, there were 5,515 people made application to the Red Cross and procurement and assignment. On January 20, 2,514 in that week made application. The week of January 27, 2,001 made application; February 3, 1,130; February 10, 952 made application; February 17, 851 made application; February 24, 885. So you can see we are going down all the time.

Mrs. BOLTON. Well, the draft bill was under consideration and the nurses are waiting a little bit.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mrs. NORTON. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us what, if any, provision is being made for colored nurses. I note that as of September 30, 1941, there were 7,678 colored nurses and there were 411,368 Negroes overseas. I was wondering whether or not the colored nurses are being utilized.

Mr. DURHAM. The Army has been taking them as the lady well knows, for some time. The Navy has agreed within the last few weeks to take them. I think if the lady will read the bill it plainly states, "All qualified nurses." If she is qualified under State regulation, whether a graduate nurse or a registered nurse, she is eligible.

Mrs. NORTON. There is no difference as to color?

Mr. DURHAM. That is the way I understand the bill.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Does that include male nurses?

Mr. DURHAM. No; this bill does not apply to them.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Then it is discriminatory?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I have some figures which I think came from the War Department showing that up to February 24 of this year there were 16,000 applications filed. Ten thousand of those 16,000 applications were certified as eligible and available, but only 4,000 have actually been commissioned in the service. Does that correspond with the gentleman's figures?

Mr. DURHAM. No; it does not. My figures are from the Procurement and Assignment and also from the Red Cross, and they should be correct.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I understand these come from the War Department.

Mr. DURHAM. I have no War Department figures on it because they have not had charge of the program of procuring these nurses. All they do is to accept them as they are sent in.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest throughout all the discussion of this bill in the Military Affairs Committee and thus far on the House floor with reference to who is at fault, if anybody, for the situation we are now in. Let me remind you that if you make a strong case here in Congress that every agency in the land has fallen down you have made a very strong case for the need of congressional action. Our boys are looking to Congress for the help they need in the nursing service, and as you progress with your condemnation of one person or another for his failure to get

the number of nurses, you are to that extent building up a strong case for our servicemen to look to Congress for the solution they need, and nobody, I think, denies the need.

The bill (H. R. 2277) under discussion today has for its purpose authorizing the induction of female nurses through amendment of the Selective Training and Service Act. The sole purpose of this bill is to insure adequate nursing care for the armed forces. The bill H. R. 2277 is the outgrowth of committee action by the Military Affairs Committee on the bill H. R. 1284, which was originally referred to the Committee on Military Affairs on January 9, 1945. This relationship of the two bills must be borne in mind in view of the fact that much of the discussion and material prepared during the consideration of the bill H. R. 1284 refers to that bill by number whereas much of the material applies equally to H. R. 2277.

It was my good fortune to attend every session of the Military Affairs Committee while this measure was under consideration. I needed and sought every available bit of information in order to reach as fair a conclusion as possible.

I have always had a deep prejudice against the conscription of women for war service. It has been my hope throughout this war that the relatively small number of women needed for the armed forces in our war program could be secured from volunteers. A situation has developed, however, wherein a relatively high percentage of the total trained nurse personnel of the Nation is needed. The result is a bill calling not only for the induction of women through selective service but also limiting the call to a very specialized group. This approach violates another principle that I had hoped we might uphold, namely, making all draft calls apply as uniformly as possible to all persons within certain age limits. Notwithstanding these points I voted for this bill in the Committee on Military Affairs, and I will vote for it here in the House.

There are several provisions in the bill now before us for consideration that should be changed or modified, but I will not undertake to discuss the proposed changes at this point. The matter of perfecting the details of the bill can be discussed better at the time the amendments are offered for consideration.

As you read the hearings you will note that I persisted from the beginning in discussing with various witnesses the matter of constitutionality of such legislation. I had reached no determination on the question of this bill's constitutionality at the time of the hearings, and my questions were intended only to develop that point as much as possible for the benefit of Congress at this time while the bill is before us for consideration.

In response to my various requests I received a memorandum from Brig. Gen. Edward W. Smith, General Staff Corps, Deputy Chief, Legislative and Liaison Division, and an opinion prepared for the American Hospital Association by the firm of Morgan, Lewis & Backius, of Philadelphia. In addition to these, Mr. James M. Gilleran, of the Library of Congress, prepared a bibliography for me on this subject. At the proper time I will ask permission to incorporate the last of these three articles in my remarks so that the Members of the House may have at hand this material. General Smith's memorandum appears in the Committee Report No. 194, accompanying the bill, and Chairman MAY has today placed in the RECORD the opinion prepared for the American Hospital Association.

I will not attempt to discuss in this brief debate the points developed in these articles further than to say that they have each made a good argument on the constitutionality of the bill (H. R. 2277). I hope the articles will clarify satisfactorily for you the matter of its constitutionality.

Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN:

The shortness of time has not allowed us to investigate thoroughly the subject in which you are interested. Therefore, this should be considered a rather cursory examination of the cases and sources concerning the subject under consideration.

If any further assistance is desired we would be glad to do what we can. The telephone extension of the reference desk in the Law Library is 462.

JAMES M. GILLERAN.

BIBLIOGRAPHY ON DUE PROCESS, EQUAL PROTECTION, ETC.

Due Process and the Selective Service System, 30 Va. L. R. 435 (June 1944).

War Power-Due Process, 23 B. U. L. Rev. 503 (November 1943).

Due Process and the Wartime Draft of Manpower, 49 W. Va. L. Q. 359 (July 1942).

The Burke-Wadsworth Conscript Bill, 9 Int. Jurid. Assoc. Bull. 15 (August 1940).

Civil Liberties and Conscription, 1 Law. Guild Rev. 6 (December 1940).

Constitutionality of Draft Legislation, 45 Law Notes 15 (September 1941).

Due Process and the Wartime Draft of Manpower, 49 W. Va. L. Q. 49 (December 1942).

Legal Basis for Conscription, 26 A. B. A. J. 701 (September 1940).

Legal Phases of the National Selective Service (address), Duke Bar A. J. (Winter 1941).

Manpower, 11 Int. Jurid, Assoc. Bull. 49 (November 1942).

Mobilization for Defense, 40 Col. L. R. 1374 (December 1940).

Mobilization for Defense, 54 Harv. L. R. 278 (December 1940).

Mobilization for Defense, 50 Yale L. J., 250 (December 1940).

Mobilization of Manpower, 17 Ind. L. J. 351 (April 1942).

Selective Service Acts of 1917 and 1940, 65 N. J. L. J. 185 (April 16-30, 1942).

Selective Service and Training Act of 1940, 15 St. J. L. R. 346 (April 1941).

* * * * *

CASES RE DUE PROCESS, EQUAL PROTECTION, ETC.

Selective Draft Law Cases (245 U. S. 366).

"The Government has the right to the military service of all its able-bodied citizens; and may, when emergency arises, justly exact that service from all." (In re Grimley (137 U. S. 147) (1890).)

Legislation respecting particular classes of persons or subjects is not repugnant to the equal protection clause provided there is a reasonable basis for the classification. (Gist of the case.) *Cotting* v. *Godard*, (183 U. S. 79).

A statute does not violate the equal protection clause merely because it is not all-embracing. (Gist of the cast.) (*James-Dickenson Farm Mortgage Co.* v. *Harry* (273 U. S. 119).)

"Every citizen owes the * * * duty, according to his capacity, to support and defend his Government against all enemies." (*Hamilton* v. *Regents of the University of California* (293 U. S. 245).)

In this case, referring to the processing of registrants through the local boards, the court said by way of dictum: "In this process the local board is charged in the first instance with the duty to make the classification of registrants which Congress in its complete discretion saw fit to authorize." (*Falbo* v. *United States* (320 U. S. 549 (1943).)

"The Constitution grants to Congress power 'to raise and support armies,' 'to provide and maintain a Navy,' and to make all laws necessary and proper to carry these powers into execution. Under this authority Congress can draft men for battle service. Its power to draft business organizations to support the fighting men who risk their lives can be no less." *United States* v. *Bethlehem Steel Corporation* (315 U. S. 289, 305 (1941)).

(NOTE.—This case was included because of the possible analogy in law between "business organizations" and any class of citizens, for purposes of the bill under consideration.)

* * * * *

All the cases that have been examined give no indication that the equal protection clause applies to the Federal Government except in those instances where due process would be violated. Therefore, most of the search has narrowed itself down to finding cases which might extend the power of Congress which was exercised in the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 to cases involving the compulsory service of groups of citizens for other than strictly military service.

Let me call your attention particularly to the fact that the fifth amendment to the Constitution contains no equal-protection clause, and it restrains only such discriminatory legislation by Congress as amounts to a denial of due process.

Irrelevant discriminations are generally prohibited but—

It by no means follows that in dealing with the perils of war, Congress and the Executive are wholly precluded from taking into account those facts and circumstances which are relevant to measures for our national defense and for the successful prosecution of the war" (Chief Justice Stone in *Hirabayashi* v. *U. S.* (320 U. S. 81, 100).

Accordingly if Congress thinks is necessary for the successful prosecution of the war to draft nurses only, as a class, Congress has the power to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, it is with a very heavy heart that I rise to discuss this bill which purposes to draft nurses for the Army.

The over-all need according to present War Department pronouncement is 60,000 nurses. According to War Department figures, there are something over 44,000 in the corps. So in order to secure a little more than 15,000 additional qualified nurses, and I am sure we are in agreement that only the qualified are good enough for those gallant men of ours, we are asked to set up a draft system which is certainly a very wide departure from American methods, so great a departure, Mr. Chairman, that it is very much to be regretted that no more than 2 hours debate has been allowed, 1 hour

on each side gives no adequate opportunity to discuss the tremendous implications of such a step. I have accepted the judgment of the lawyers that Congress has the power to raise and equip armies and to do everything therein involved. But, Mr. Speaker, this is the first time that the Congress has been asked to draft women and it is the first time a measure has been brought to this House which proposes the drafting of the members of one group because of their skill. Two hours seems a very short time to set aside for the consideration of so momentous a decision.

Even so, if it is necessary, I shall not stand in the way of a draft of nurses. I know far too well the need of our men. I know that adequate nursing care is so often the difference between life and death, the difference between invalidism and a purposeful active life.

I expect to vote for the bill, but it will be with a very real hope—the kind of hope that is a form of prayer—that it may never have to be used. I shall hope that the intensive campaign formally opened today will bring the need so forcefully to the qualified nurses of the country, to the doctors and civilians, to industry and to Government departments, that volunteers will fill this quota as they filled the early ones, making it unnecessary to invoke the draft.

I am particularly sad because I am so certain that the situation in which we find ourselves need never have arisen. It is not my purpose to criticize; too many agencies, too many individuals, are involved in the many sins of omission and commission that have created the problem the Army is faced with. Recrimination will not reverse or clear the muddy water that has flowed under the dam. Yet, I do protest, Mr. Speaker, that we should be resorting to a methodology so far removed from American principles.

I want to speak for a moment of the magnificent response that the nursing profession has made to the needs of the Army during these last years. Back in 1940 there were less than 1,000 in the Army Nurse Corps. As of December 31, 1944, there were 42,000. As of that date 81,000 nurses had volunteered, fifty-two or three thousand were in the services. Every quota was met until that of May 1944.

That difficulties were encountered then and since is readily understandable. Let me draw a few lines of the picture for you: Last fall the Surgeon General submitted a request for 50,000 nurses to the General Staff. Plans for a recruitment program, plans for an over-all registration of nurses of the country from 20 years up to 65, were about to become realities when the War Department on December 5, 1943, announced that only 40,000 nurses would be needed. Having already secured between 36,000 and 37,000 nurses, naturally it was not reasonable to expect the O. W. I. to go forward with its broad recruitment campaign when only 3,500 nurses were involved, nor could the States do anything alone in the matter of registration. They needed the help of national publicity to carry through the registration program. So we missed out on both of those things. Less than 4 months later, in April, the War Department found it necessary to increase to the 50,000 originally requested by the Surgeon General.

But the edge was off the drive of the recruitment campaign and every effort to revive it bogged down. Unfortunately also, our successes in France stimulated a peace-around-the-corner propaganda through the summer that increased with the fall. Reconversion of industry was on every tongue, men and women were leaving the war production lines in order to secure jobs in post-war work. Surely the nurses cannot be blamed if they caught the infection. In the fall the Surgeon General's office realizing that peace was not just up the street sent out a recruitment letter to some 27,000 nurses who had been classified by the Nursing Division of Procurement and Assignment as available. The negligible results showed conclusively that dramatic methods would be needed to reverse the psychology engendered by the anticipated peace. Realizing this, the Army, the Navy, the Red Cross, O. W. I., with Procurement and Assignment sought the help of the War Advertising Council, that magnificent group of advertising men who have taken on one assignment after another and put them all over: Bonds, production needs, cadet nurses, SPARS, and so forth. On October 12 one of the members of the J. Walter Thompson Co. accepted the responsibility for the anticipated campaign for nurses. Unfortunately, they had no further word from the Army until December 20, at which time they set the wheels in motion and soon had commitments for some $10,000,000 from the patriotic advertisers of this amazing country of ours. This is the campaign that broke today. I refer you to page 293 of the hearings for a brief description of the campaign plans.

Much as one may feel that had there been earlier use made of such dramatic methods of applying the American method of social pressures through publicity, there would have been no need for the legislation, the cold, grim fact is that it was not resorted to earlier and that we do not have the nurses. No one can quite take the responsibility of guaranteeing that the publicity campaign will bring the necessary results. But I am convinced that whether or not a draft of nurses is finally agreed to by both Houses, this campaign is of utmost importance and necessity. The country must be made aware of the needs of our wounded dramatically and in terms of numbers. It needs to recognize the fact that skilled nursing is one of the greatest factors in saving lives. It needs to put its broad shoulders behind the wheels of this skilled care at every point, whether the service is voluntary as it has always been, or whether, because of the many-sided mistakes, we accept a draft.

Nurses are needed now. Legislative procedure is slow at best. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I rejoice that this campaign is under way, for I know, as many of you do, how great is the need of the wounded for skilled nursing care. Let us be grateful to the American advertisers who are once again making a superb contribution to the war.

I am certain that few bills have been presented to this body that have given the Members greater concern. We are all of us aware that the implications of this act are very far reaching and may be fraught with grave dangers. It is important, therefore, that we be very certain that we protect existing institutions and do nothing that will complicate an already difficult situation. To this end I hope that this Committee will consider the various amendments with the greatest care so that this first step into new areas will be fraught with as little danger as possible.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, before this bill is finally voted upon a number of amendments will no doubt be considered. Some of these amendments I believe are necessary in order to properly safeguard the rights of all persons included within the bill and in order that controversies may be reduced to a minimum.

At first glance it may appear that a nurse drafted under this measure has all of the rights guaranteed persons subject to the Selective Service Act. This is not true, however. Every person subject to classification and induction under the Selective Service Act has a right to appeal from a decision of his local board. As a matter of fact he has three opportunities to have a decision of the local board reviewed. He may appeal to the district appeal board, to the State director of selective service, and finally to the President. A nurse drafted under the bill before us, as it is now written, has no opportunity to appeal from her classification by the Procurement and Assignment Service. This service indicates in the first instance who is and who is not available for military service. If a nurse is held to be not available her case never reaches a selective service board. Only those nurses held by the Procurement and Assignment Service to be available come within the jurisdiction of selective service, and the only function of a selective service board thereafter is to order her induction unless she is deferred because she has dependents or because she may be physically or otherwise unfit for military service. Subsection (2) of the bill before us applies only to persons referred to the Selective Service Board by the Procurement and Assignment Service and the only appeal such persons have is from a determination of their local board. Obviously there will be virtually no dependency cases for review if the Army grants commissions to all inductees.

I am not at all averse to the use of the Procurement and Assignment Service for the purpose of making recommendations to selective service boards, but I do not feel that its decisions should be final and not be subject to appeal on the part of either a nurse or her employer. If we do not change the present provision of H. R. 2277 a Procurement and Assignment Board may discriminate not only against the nurses involved but against hospitals, doctors, or others by whom such nurses may be employed and nothing can be done about it. I am sure the House does

not want to confer arbitrary and dictatorial power of this kind upon any board, yet we will do just that if the amendment which I propose to offer or some similar amendment is not adopted. I might say in passing that when the bill was under discussion in our committee our legislative counsel felt that the situation is as I have described it.

If an appeal is not permitted a Procurement and Assignment Service could, for example, designate a girl in one doctor's office as available but hold that a nurse doing the same kind of work in another doctor's office is not available. So, too, nurses in one hospital could be preferred as against those in another. The only guaranty of fairness is a right of appeal on questions of availability or nonavailability. As all persons affected by this act will be of the same profession there, of course, will be no occupational deferments as provided for in the Selective Service Act. Classification of nurses on the basis of their availability or nonavailability virtually is the only question to be decided. As the matter now stands there is no appeal from a decision on that question and selective service has nothing to do with it. We would, therefore, not give to women drafted under this bill the same consideration given men under the Selective Service Act.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. May I ask the gentleman from Ohio a question about a feature of the legislation that disturbs me very much, that is the fear that the passage of this legislation will discourage young women all over the country from studying to be nurses, and will probably do far more harm than good. Has the gentleman thought of that phase of the question?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes; I propose to discuss that in connection with an amendment which I understand will be offered in connection with the proposed draft of cadet nurses before other nurses are inducted.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I am very happy to yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. BOLTON. Would the gentleman's amendment include a right of appeal on the part of the employer?

Mr. ELSTON. It would include the same right of appeal which now exists for an employer under the Selective Service Act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I fail to understand how the gentleman construes subsection (c) (2) in the light of what he has said. As a matter of fact, it is my construction of subsection (c) (1) and (2) that instead of limiting the right of the appeal which the ordinary person has under the Selective Training and Service Act we give to these women two appeals—first an appeal within the Procurement and Assignment Service as to whether or not they become available, and then if they are certified as available to the board, we still guarantee to them every right of appeal which the Selective Training and Service Act gives them.

Mr. ELSTON. May I say to the gentleman from Alabama that the appeal provision to which he refers is an appeal within the Procurement and Assignment Service to an appeal agency set up by that Service itself. It is its own appeal agency. I do not think that would be sufficient, nor would it be wise. I am opposed to any Government bureau setting up its own appeal agency. Women should have the same right of appeal guaranteed to men under the Selective Service Act.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not the gentleman's view that the deferment provisions of law apply to cadet nurses the same as they do to all of the nurses who may be drafted? Some people think the cadet nurses have to go in the Army. As I read the bill, they can consider their situation and assign them to civilian work if they wish to.

Mr. ELSTON. As the bill is now written a graduate cadet nurse who has been referred to selective service for induction may be deferred only on the grounds described in section 5 (e) (1), other than the first sentence thereof of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. That would be because of dependency or for physical or other disability.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Also, do not the deferment provisions in this bill apply to them, and they might be assigned to some civilian hospital or to the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. ELSTON. No; the last sentence of section 2 (c) excludes graduates of the Cadet Nurse Corps, but after they get into the Army they may be assigned to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman's amendment will do exactly what the gentleman from Alabama thinks the present bill will do?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. And that is to make sure they have a chance to appeal from the Procurement and Assignment Service and from the selective service board?

Mr. ELSTON. That is all I seek to accomplish. I want every safeguard thrown around the nurses who might be inducted.

The legislation we are proposing is extremely drastic. For the first time in history the Government is reaching out and compelling a particular class of persons to serve the Government in any capacity. Unfortunately, it involves a profession whose members have already rendered magnificent service in this war. Our wounded veterans cannot sing their praises too high. They have worked long hours under the most trying circumstances without complaint, yet nurses may have to be drafted if we are to reach the goal set by the War Department. It is clear, I believe, that if the War Department had not grossly miscalculated its needs last year this legislation would not be necessary. Even now it may be questioned that a sufficient number of nurses may not be obtained by voluntary methods under a vigorous recruiting campaign. Since the first of the year enlistments have greatly increased, as I shall presently show. Perhaps we may obtain all we need without resorting to compulsion. But there is no certainty that we shall be able to accomplish this. If we fail to pass some legislation on the subject, there is the possibility that some of our wounded soldiers may suffer from lack of nursing care. While it is only a possibility, I do not feel we can gamble on that possibility. For that reason it is my purpose to support whatever legislation the House finally adopts, although I have consistently objected to certain parts of the bill now before us in its present form.

It has been indicated that an effort may be made to remove from this bill the provision requiring the induction of graduate members of the Cadet Nurse Corps first. It is my considered opinion that the present provision should remain. If legislation of this kind must be resorted to, it is a matter of simple logic that the persons drafted first should be those who, because of some benefits given them by the Government, owe an obligation to the Government and have indicated a willingness to serve the Government in consideration of such benefits. Most of you were here when we passed the Cadet Nurse Corps bill. It is Public Law 74 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, approved June 15, 1943. The bill had but one purpose, and that was to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces as well as for governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries through grants to institutions providing such training. The purpose clause of the law so indicates. So does the language immediately following the enacting clause, and I quote it as follows:

> That for the purpose of assuring a supply of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated sums sufficient to carry out the purposes of this act.

In section 2 of the act we again made it plain that the purpose of the act was to provide sufficient nurses to meet any emergency arising during the present war. The following language from section 2 is plain and not susceptible of misunderstanding:

> A plan for training of nurses may be limited to student-nurse training, or to postgraduate or refresher nursing courses, or may include both. A plan submitted by any institution may be approved only if it provides—
>
> (a) That no student or graduate nurse will be included under the plan unless in the judgment of the head of the institution such nurse will be available for military or other Federal governmental or essential civilian services for the duration of the present war, and such nurse so states in her application for inclusion under the plan.

Notwithstanding the above provisions of the law, great pressure is being exerted to prevent graduates of the Nurse Corps from being inducted first. Some of this comes from private hospitals who, of

course, have greatly benefited by the program. To date 110,000 students have enrolled and are taking their training in approximately 1,100 hospitals throughout the country. Their services necessarily are being utilized by the hospitals during their course of training in the same manner hospitals utilize services of other student nurses during their course of training. One contention of the opponents of the present provision is that student nurses, in making application for admission to the Cadet Nurse Corps were given their choice of military or civilian service. If such choice was given it is clearly contrary to the provisions of the cadet nurse bill. Obviously, under that measure an applicant could not be accepted unless she indicated her availability for military or civilian service; in other words, for whatever type of service she might be needed. Nothing in the act could be construed to give her a choice. Her assignment would necessarily depend upon the needs existing at the time of her graduation. Testimony before the Military Affairs Committee was that it costs the Government more than $1,200 to train one of these nurses. During her period of training she is furnished with a uniform by the Government and is paid certain compensation. She receives her tuition, books, room, and board at Government expense. During the first 9 months of her training she receives spending money of $15 a month. This is later increased to $20 a month, and when she becomes a senior cadet after 21 months of training she receives $30 a month. Now let us see what it would cost her if she became a student nurse without Government aid. I am informed that in virtually all hospitals a student nurse receives nothing. Moreover she must pay tuition ranging from $175 in some hospitals to $3,000 in others. In addition, she must purchase her own uniform and all other clothing as well as buy her own books.

If the nurse who receives her training at the expense of the Government is permitted to make her choice of service, it necessarily follows that those who have chosen civilian service will not be subject to the provisions of this act. It is contended that we will be breaking faith with those girls who were given the opportunity to make a choice and who have chosen civilian service if we now make them subject to be drafted first. The same contention would no doubt be made in the event they completed their course and an effort was made to draft them under this bill. If the contention is scund now it will be just as valid when that time arrives. Thus it follows that those who have been trained at Government expense will be exempt from the draft, whereas those who have been trained at their own expense will be called. Of course, the cadet nurses who have indicated a choice of military service will be subject to the provisions of this act, but having indicated that choice they probably would enlist anyhow. I can conceive of no more unfair procedure.

Not only does the Cadet Nurse Corps Act provide that graduate nurses trained under the act shall be available for the armed forces or other governmental or civilian service, but every applicant for membership in the Cadet Nurse Corps in making her application agrees to the following in writing:

> In consideration of the training, payments, and other benefits which will be provided me if I am accepted as a member of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps, I agree that, if accepted, I will be available for military or other Federal governmental or essential civilian services for the duration of the present war.

In answer to the claim that the personnel of the Cadet Nurse Corps may be reduced if they are to be drafted first, I can only say that if any cadet is unwilling to serve in the armed forces she should not in the first instance have signed the application whereby she bound herself to become available for such service. In view of her written pledge and the law itself, it is no excuse that someone without authority gave her a choice.

At the present time approximately 110,000 persons are undergoing training as cadet nurses, meaning that the cost to the Government will be about $132,000,000, even if the present number does not increase. Statistics are not available as to how many have chosen civilian service. Out of a total of 32,587 nurses expected to graduate during 1945, it is estimated 20,842 will be cadet nurses. As the National Nursing Council for War Service estimates that there are now over 135,000 student nurses, it will be seen that more than 80 percent are cadet nurses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman think that if section 2 (b) is eliminated, as some of us are urging, these graduates will still come in like all other graduate nurses under the provisions of section 2 (a), which provides that every female who is a graduate nurse or who is a registered nurse in any State shall come in? They will come in with all of the graduate nurses but they will not come in as a particular selected group who will be taken first. They will be taken in their turn.

Mr. ELSTON. No; I do not think so at all, as I stated before, these nurses have been given their choice of military or civilian service. That choice has been given improperly but it has been given nevertheless. Moreover, it is now being contended by some that it would be a breach of faith to ignore that choice. If that contention is made now it would be all the more vigorously made if an effort would be made to consider such nurses along with all others.

If the Procurement and Assignment Service sees fit to regard the promise as binding, cadets who have requested civilian service would never be referred to Selective Service and would never be drafted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. THOMASON. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute that I may ask him a question.

Does not the record show that of these nurse cadets, to whom the gentleman referred, 110,000 have entered the service and 1,200 have graduated, that only 40 percent of that 1,200 have actually entered the military service and there is absolutely no compulsion upon them?

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman from Texas is exactly right. The Government has no claim whatever upon those girls. They can graduate and never enter any nursing anywhere. Let me point out to the House that this program is going to cost the Government over $132,000,000 without increasing the present number of cadets.

Mr. THOMASON. Every one of them is being educated and trained in that service at Government expense, without any kind of compulsion. Anything they do is completely voluntary. I do not reflect upon them, because they are good, patriotic women, but nevertheless, they are educated at Government expense, without any compulsion whatever.

Mr. ELSTON. I agree they are fine, patriotic women, who are rendering an excellent wartime service. They do not seem to be the ones who are complaining about being taken first. I think they fully realize their obligation as expressed in the application they signed. And they have not ceased to make applications for training as evidenced by the fact that their number increased from 105,000 to 110,000 while this legislation was under consideration, or since the first of the year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am very much in agreement with practically all of those who have preceded me in speaking about this bill. It may be that mistakes have been made in the past in the procurement of nurses; doubtless there have been, but we are now confronted with the very realistic situation in which everybody acknowledges that we must have these nurses and must have them right away. The date that was given to us as the time that they want these additional nurses is July 1.

Dr. Harvey Stone testified before our committee. If I remember correctly, he heads up the Nursing Division of the Procurement and Assignment Service that has been carrying on this recruitment campaign. If I remember correctly, he said by July 1, through voluntary methods they could raise the number of nurses for the Army to 55,000, but they could not get that other 5,000; it would take them until the first of the year to get them by relying on voluntary means under the program that we have been carrying on; but, according to the Surgeon General of the Army and others who are vitally concerned with this program, the 1st of January is not the date they are needed; they are needed not later than July 1 of this year.

There are enough nurses in the United States to fill the needs of the armed services and to take care of our civilian needs. There are, in round numbers, 275,000 nurses in the United States, a sufficient number if they are properly distributed. One great service this bill will render if enacted into law will be to provide an orderly method of selecting and distributing those nurses all over the country as among the armed services, the Veterans' Administration, the Public Health Service, and private nursing. As I see it, this is one of the biggest benefits that will be rendered by such a law as we here propose.

A great many questions have been asked me on the floor today, as I know have been asked of every other member of the committee, as to some of the provisions in this bill. There has been considerable concern as to whether or not these people that are taken in are to be commissioned. If you will read the hearings on page 21 you will see that the Surgeon General of the Army gave us his positive assurance that they would be commissioned. There has been some discussion as to whether we should not put a provision in the bill to require them to be commissioned. In the first place, we cannot require one of them to accept a commission; it would have to be a voluntary act. In the second place, there is considerable doubt as to whether or not we can require the executive department to appoint—and that is what "commission" means—to appoint someone into an office. We would be infringing upon the appointive power of the Executive. But we do have the assurance of the Surgeon General of the Army that they will be commissioned.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. It is quite within the power of Congress to say how many of the personnel in every branch of the military and naval service may be or shall be commissioned. So, as far as that is concerned, we have the power.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree with the gentleman that it is within our power to say that so many shall be commissioned; we have said that in the past. In peacetime we have restricted them; in wartime we have lifted the restriction.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman remember that when we were discussing the "draft-18-year-olds bill" the question arose of the amount of training those boys would receive before they were sent overseas? And the assurance was given that they would not be sent overseas without 1 year's training. It was not written into the law; and, as a result, some are being sent overseas with considerably less than 1 year's training.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman is not entirely correct when he says the promise was given that they would not be sent overseas without 1 year's training. I am sure if the gentleman will read the debates that took place on the floor of the House at the time that bill was under consideration he will find that no such assurance as that was given from the well of the House during the course of that debate.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the gentleman will permit me to proceed I will yield later if I have time.

I have been asked as to what would be the effect on these nurses that may be taken in who have graduated from hospitals with less than 50 beds. Our committee wrote a provision in the bill that that of itself should not be a disqualifying factor; and I want to say that it is the answer of the committee that if such persons are taken into the service they will be commissioned and not discriminated against. In other words, the assurance is that all of those taken into the service under the terms of this bill will be granted commissions as second lieutenants in the Army Nurse Corps.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very briefly.

Mr. MOTT. I have listened to all the members of the committee who have spoken thus far, but none of them seems to be satisfied with all of the provisions of the bill. Some of them are very much opposed to certain provisions of the bill. It seems to be the consensus of opinion that the committee did not succeed in reporting out the best bill on this subject that it could. Does not the gentleman think it would be a good thing if at the conclusion of the debate we see what amendments are to be offered, then recommit the bill to the committee and give it another chance to report out something that is better?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman has been a Member of the House long enough to know that it is very seldom a piece of legislation comes out of his committee or any other committee that suits everybody on the committee. That is the purpose of the Committee of the Whole; that is, bring legislation before the Committee of the Whole and let that Committee of the Whole House perfect the legislation if it needs further perfecting after the legislative committee has reported it out. I certainly would be opposed to any motion to recommit because I think time is of the essence in connection with this legislation.

Mr. MOTT. Is it not rather unusual when all of the members of the committee object to certain provisions, which seems to be true as far as the debate has gone so far? That does not usually happen.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. May I inquire of the gentleman concerning a particular feature of this bill. When the Army was very much in need of doctors a while back the Procurement and Assignment Service was organized for the purpose of doing just what this does in respect to nurses; whereupon, after they had decided a doctor was available for the armed services, they offered him or asked him to request a commission and if he refused to do that, then, of course, he was immediately classified I–A under the draft and taken into the service as a private in the Army. This is a considerable departure from the preceding process that has been carried on by the Procurement and Assignment Service of the Army.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. I would say that the process would be the same. I take the position that you cannot require a person to take a commission. Under this bill every one of the persons meeting the requirements laid down becomes liable to induction.

Mr. HINSHAW. Liable to induction as what?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If she will accept the commission she goes in as a second lieutenant.

Mr. HINSHAW. Liable to induction as what?

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a second lieutenant, if she will accept a commission. If she refuses the commission, the Army could still use her if it wanted to in a noncommissioned status. That is, if she refused to accept the commission. You cannot force a commission. At the same time, mere refusal to accept a commission will not excuse one from service.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. On this subject of commissioning I would like to read, if the gentleman will permit, some questions by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] when General Kirk was before the committee. This question was propounded:

> Well, what I am thinking of is this: We have had some very sad experiences where the Army has offered to take people in and commission them and later on they have found a surplus and have not commissioned them. I want to be sure that these women that are taken in are going to get what you have held out to them.
>
> General KIRK. I will assure you of that, sir.
>
> Mr. JOHNSON of California. Well, can you make a personal assurance?
>
> General KIRK. Yes, sir; I can.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. There is one other thing I want to mention very briefly. I am in thorough accord with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], that these persons are entitled to all the right of appeal under the Selective Service, but I cannot agree with him in his construction of that paragraph which begins last on page 3 of the bill where we guarantee to them every right of appeal that is given by the Selective Training and Service Act. I think it is already written in there, but if there is any doubt and if it needs any assurance in any way, why, certainly, the committee will be glad to see that it is written in; but it seems to me that paragraph guarantees to them every right of appeal that is given under the Selective Training and Service Act.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Would there be any objection to offering an amendment that anyone included in this bill would be entitled to a commission?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I personally have no objection to it, but we have it in black and white in the hearings that commissions would be offered, and a committee statement on the floor of the House that they will be offered to everyone that goes in.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. This ties in with one of the things that I reported to the House when I came back from my trip to Europe having to do with the actual constitution, the make-up, of our medical corps. I have the utmost regard for General Kirk, and have confidence in his word, but I know that he cannot give the commissions. That is done by the General Staff, upon which he does not sit. From my standpoint, we are not really securing commissions for these nurses unless we write something in the bill to that effect, and I will propose a motion to that effect tomorrow. There is the possibility of a change, we know, because of the opposition from the War Department permitting commissions. The War Department does not want them commissioned as a permanency. So it seems to me, in justice to these women who are serving during the war and 6 months thereafter, that commissions should be guaranteed in the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would suggest to the gentlewoman that perhaps an amendment providing that all of these women taken in would be subject to the provisions of the Nurse Corps Act which we passed last year, would certainly attain the end that she desires.

Mrs. BOLTON. Just tendering commissions is a little slippery to me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am afraid that is as far as we can go.

Mrs. BOLTON. I feel they mean it, but they do not realize its significance.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We certainly want the same thing. We all do.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman from Alabama has discussed with me the proposal, when the bill is brought to the floor of the House, to offer an amendment to title II of the Selective Service and Training Act. I wish the gentleman would discuss the various features that that will take care of that are not in the present bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There are two things particularly that it will clear up, that there has been some doubt about. One is job security. It will make the job-security provision of the Selective Service and Training Act applicable to these people. Also it will clear up any question which may have existed as to their entitlement to any of the rights under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act between the time they are called and the time that they are actually inducted into the service.

Mrs. BOLTON. If the gentleman will yield further, it will also clarify for everyone's piece of mind the situation as regards religious groups.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true also.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Under the present selective-service law all males from 18 to 45 must register. For a while the Army inducted men up to 38 years of age. Then it cut the limit down to 30, and even to 26. Was there any testimony given as to the ages the Army will select from those nurses who will be required to register under this bill; that is, those between the ages of 20 and 45? For example, will it take those between 20 and 30 or up to 35 or to 45? I have a notion that a great many boys when they are well would prefer a pretty blond, but when they are sick or wounded will be happy to have as a nurse a motherly woman maybe of 35 or even 45; I do not know.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The testimony indicated that there would be no age category provided; that they would take them of all ages.

Mr. JUDD. Of all ages?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; no age category to be established.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the amount of time allotted to me is very short, and therefore I hope you will pardon me if I go ahead with what I have to say, and then if there is any time left I will answer any questions that may be addressed to me.

An interesting feature about this particular bill is the fact that the Army changed the ceiling of nurses which it expected to need after the committee had opened its hearings. As a matter of fact, the hearings had been in progress 3 weeks before the Army made it known to the War Manpower Commission that they had changed their ceiling from 50,000 to 60,000.

It is interesting to note in the testimony on page 109 that Dr. Stone, the man in charge of the procurement of nurses for the War Manpower Commission, was testifying on that date that the number needed altogether was 50,000 and he was interrupted by General Smith, of the War Department, who said the ceiling really was 60,000. Dr. Stone stated in reply to General Smith that he had been notified that 50,000 was the ceiling. Then General Smith stated: "It was established yesterday in the light of the testimony of the Surgeon General," 3 weeks before.

In other words, while we were in the middle of this hearing the committee was proceeding with the idea that all we needed were 50,000, and we were then told that the number was 60,000. Up until the time that testimony came in it was evident that no conscription was necessary, but when they increased it by 10,000 in the middle of the hearings, the situation was altered abruptly.

When we came to look at the different sources of the supply of nurses, 2 which immediately came up were the male nurses and the colored nurses. It is interesting to note the testimony of Miss Densford, president of the American Nurses Association, on page 189, in which she brings out the fact that there are 2,000 male nurses in the Army, and only 20 of them have commissions, serving otherwise than as nurses. These 2,000 are serving in the Medical Corps. She states it is her belief—and she is one of the authorities on nurses—that these men should be given commissions and should be permitted to act as nurses just the same as women nurses, and that their services will be just as valuable.

As to those particular nurses, the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], a member of the committee, attempted, and I thought successfully, to get an amendment into the bill which would require them to be given commissions, but apparently the drafting of the bill has been wholly on the basis of females. Therefore, outside of the very first sentence in the bill, no reference is made which would cover male nurses. Perhaps that can be cleared up during the course of the debate on the bill.

As to the colored nurses, that subject I think is a matter of great interest to many Americans. On page 15 General Kirk, the Surgeon General, testified when it was pointed out that there did not seem to be as many colored nurses in the Army as there should be in proportion to the number of registered colored nurses, "We are accepting every Negro nurse that puts in her application and meets the requirements."

On the other hand there are only 330 colored nurses out of 9,000 in the Army. Many believe that they have been discouraged from applying.

General Kirk also pointed out that white nurses are being used to attend to both white and colored patients, and at the same time colored nurses are being used for both white and colored soldiers and in hospitals where there are only white patients at times. It is very gratifying to have all of the witnesses say that these colored nurses have given very efficient service, just as good as that given by any other group in the entire Army. It is also gratifying to know that both the Army and Navy will commission all qualified colored nurses who apply. I shall follow with interest the history of the nurses in the remaining months of this war to see how many colored nurses were given commissions. The testimony indicates that no discrimination will be practiced against colored nurses who volunteer hereafter or who may be drafted under this bill. I hope the future record shows this to be true. I hope that an amendment requiring the granting of commissions to nurses upon induction is adopted. It will eliminate one possible means of discrimination.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I should like to know whether this bill covers for induction nurses who may have taken religious orders.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think it does.

Mr. HINSHAW. They could be inducted into the service?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I will yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio to answer that question.

Mrs. BOLTON. If this bill is put into effect under the Selective Service Act, as the chairman told us is intended, it covers that quite completely.

Mr. HINSHAW. What sort of uniform would they wear?

Mrs. BOLTON. They do not go into the service; they are deferred.

Mr. HINSHAW. All religious orders are deferred?

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes, Catholic or Protestant.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the armed forces are faced with a critical shortage of registered, or properly qualified, nurses. The military officials whose duty it is to provide for our battle casualties have shown us that by July of this year the Army and Navy must have some 18,500 more nurses, plus replacements for those already in the services who may be disqualified for further duty through injury or illness.

These needs must and shall be met by whatever method proves necessary for we cannot fail to provide the very best possible medical and hospital care for our constantly swelling stream of war casualties.

It is regrettable that we should find it necessary even to consider the drafting of American women for this imperative war service. If we had planned better, if we had shown greater foresight, I feel sure we could have found a way to meet this wartime requirement without compulsion. Obviously, as a single example, we might have stepped up nurse training right at the beginning of the war, instead of waiting, as we did, until July 1, 1943, to set up the Cadet Nurse Corps program under the Bolton Act. Some 32,000 or 33,000 nurses, of whom about 21,000 are Cadet Nurses, will be graduated in 1945. From that group alone our military needs might be met, except for the unfortunate fact that most of them will not earn their certificates before fall. The military needs are immediate. We cannot ask the wounded fighting men now lying in hospitals to wait 6 months for nurses.

As much as I would like to see these imperative and immediate needs met by voluntary methods, I frankly see no reason to believe that they can be. Although the services and the American Red Cross have campaigned intensively for recruits since the first of the year, only some 16,000 applications were filed to February 24, only about 10,000 applicants were certified as eligible and available, and only 4,000 actually commissioned in the services. Neither the War nor Navy Department, nor the American Nurses' Association, is optimistic about the possibility of meeting the requirements by voluntary methods.

There seems to be no alternative, therefore, for the drafing of nurses as authorized by H. R. 2277. Because this measure will insure the orderly procurement of the nurses required, and because it provides that compulsion shall not be imposed unless and until voluntary recruitment fails to meet requirements, I shall support this measure. I find little to quarrel with in the present form of the bill, although I hope two provisions for the protection of women who may be drafted will be assured by amendments.

First, we should assure that anyone subject for service under this authority will have the full right of appeal, as presently provided by the Selective Service Act.

I shall also propose an amendment which will make it mandatory upon the services to commission any nurse drafted under this authority in a rank appropriate to her age, experience, and abilities.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. Suppose a nurse qualifies according to the regulations of the War Department, but does not want a commission. Would the gentleman require her to take it?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I cannot believe that any such women will be found. Why would they not want to be commissioned? They will want to go into the Army or the Navy Nurse Corps, and will want a commission the same as the other women in the corps. Rather than leave it up to the services to change their rules and regulations from day to day as they have been doing, I want to see it written into the law.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. That situation certainly could be taken care of with an amendment providing that a commission shall be tendered to them. If they do not want to accept it, then it is up to them.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think the commission ought to be given to them, not only tendered to them. I think they ought to be commissioned if they are going to be drafted into the Nurses' Corps. They are entitled to the commission and it should be given to them.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Suppose there are conscientious objectors? I assume there are nurses who belong to religious orders who are opposed to active participation in the military service. Suppose they decline not only the commission but the service as a nurse, or any service in the Army. Are they subject to the $5,000 fine or the 5 years' imprisonment, or whatever it is that the Selective Training and Service Act provides?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Of course, it is difficult for me to understand the reasoning of any qualified nurse who would conscientiously object to nursing men who have been wounded in fighting this war.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is difficult for me to understand also, but of course the gentleman realizes those circumstances do arise.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I doubt if we shall have any such cases arise.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Would not the language on page 2 cover it where it says, "All these persons shall be registered and they are hereby subject to registration and selection for and induction into the land and naval forces of the United States under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended."

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I was about to say that I assumed the Selective Training and Service Act would apply to those cases.

Mr. JUDD. Yes; they can register as conscientious objectors.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, nobody likes this legislation, and there is not a single Member of this House who would vote to draft women for any kind of service to the country unless it was an absolute necessity. But the committee charged with the responsibility of reporting out legislation of this kind is of the unanimous opinion, so far as I know, that we are faced with a terrible emergency, and something must be done about it.

In other words, to boil it down to a few figures, which have already been quoted but which, I think, will bear repetition, the Army says that to meet the dire need for nurses at the earliest possible moment they must have 60,000, when we only have 42,000.

After the President's message on this subject in the week of January 13, there were 5,515 applications. The next month, 2,514. There has been a rapid decrease every week until the week before last there were only 851 applications. As a result of the intensive drive that has been on, which you have heard on the radio and which you have read in the press, and as a result of the activities of that marvelous organization, the Red Cross, there were only 1,860 nurses obtained during February and only 1,200 during March. The January figure was only 1,052.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. Those were nurses that were assigned to duty. They are not the only ones who applied.

Mr. THOMASON. That is right.

Mrs. BOLTON. May I remind the gentleman that in some of the remarks I made, the recruitment campaign is only opening today.

Mr. THOMASON. That is right insofar as the big drive is concerned. I am sure all of us share the hope and prayer of the lady from Ohio that this great campaign now being put on will bring the desired results, and before this legislation is finally passed and approved. We hope and pray that will happen, but with more than 500,000 of our men and boys in hospitals, sick and wounded, with about 35,000 coming in every month, and last week at the rate of 1,600 per day,

we cannot trifle with this subject. We can take no chances.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The figures the gentleman gave of the increase in the number of nurses were not net gain to the armed forces. There was an attrition going on which made the situation even less favorable.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman is correct.

I was a little surprised at the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] saying that because a few Members do not like some of the features of this bill, the thing to do was to recommit it, which would tie it up for another 2 weeks or longer when, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] said, time is of the essence. These men are suffering and dying, and must have treatment at once. No bill comes here that is absolutely perfect. There are several provisions in this bill that I do not like. I think the bill will have to be amended in several respects. That is what this discussion is all about in Committee of the Whole.

I have been impressed, as I frequently am, with the sound judgment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON]. I join with him in saying that the nurse cadets have performed a marvelous service. Nobody has questioned their patriotism or their devotion to their profession. But, nevertheless, the Government of the United States is educating those young women just as it is educating the boys at Annapolis and West Point. Every boy now at Annapolis and West Point, who recevies a free education at the hands of this generous Government, obligates himself to remain in the military service for at least 2 years before he can resign.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. Back in 1940 I went to the Secretary of War with a group of nurses and asked him to reopen the Army School of Nursing, which would have been a West Point for nurses. This is an entirely different thing. If the gentleman will go back to the hearings on the original bill, he will find this was for civilians as well.

Mr. THOMASON. I appreciate that. I know the fine contribution the lady has made in this field. I know the provisions of the Bolton bill and I remember the hearings. I admit there is a distinction, but, nevertheless, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] said, the Government has spent many millions of dollars in educating these young women. If I understand the figures, 9,000 have been graduated under that program, and only 40 percent of them asked for admission into the military service. One-fourth of those were found disqualified for physical reasons or because they were married or had minor children. As a result, the Army and Navy have only acquired about 2,500 from that splendid program.

Mr. THOMASON. I know all of these young nurses are rendering a great service to the civilian hospitals of the country; but I say that the Government, which is educating them at great expense, should be entitled to their services at least for a time during this crisis.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. I believe the gentleman from Texas will agree that the need for nurses is now, is it not?

Mr. THOMASON. Absolutely.

Mrs. BOLTON. We need them right now, before the 1st of June.

Mr. THOMASON. That is true. We cannot delay. They are young and most of them not married.

Mrs. BOLTON. I believe the gentleman will find that the 9,000 he speaks of have paid for most of their training out of their own pockets, because the Cadet Nurse Corps did not come into being until 1943.

Mr. THOMASON. Perhaps so; I do not pretend to be an expert on the subject; but in view of the dire necessity today for nurses as soon as possible, it does seem to me in all fairness that a larger percentage of those capable young women who are qualified physically should return some service to the Government in this critical hour.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I think one reason why the girls have felt that they were not under obligation was because when legislation setting up the Cadet Nurse Corps was under consideration no provision was included in the bill as to priorities. We had considerable discussion in the hearings as to whether there should not be priorities established; first, the military; second, the Veterans' Administration; and, third, essential civilian nursing. That proposition was rejected, and I think one reason there has been this confusion is because the matter of priorities was not written into the law at that time.

I do not see how we are in any position to make the language retroactive. And, entirely apart from that, it seems to me that the quickest way to get these girls whom the gentleman is concerned about, and very properly concerned, is to take all graduate nurses, for then these girls will be among them. The requirement should be on the basis of all graduate nurses, not the singling out of one particular group and thereby gumming up all the program. A lot of the older women are competent and should be made eligible. This legislation should not be confined to any particular class.

Mr. ELSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. In answer to the gentleman from Minnesota, I wish to say that the older nurses, if they want to, can always enlist. This bill does not prohibit their enlisting.

Mr. THOMASON. Of course, voluntary enlistment is still open, but the problem is that comparatively few have yet entered the service.

Mr. VURSELL. The separate draft boards can pick out the cadet nurses first, and if they have not any they can then fill their quotas from other nurses.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, as I construe the legislation as it is presently written, a cadet nurse can resign from the Cadet Nursing Corps at any time prior to graduation if she does not desire to come under the terms of the special provisions as written in this bill. But these are patriotic young women and when this Congress tells them how badly they are needed they are going to stay. The records show, in fact, that the enlistments in the Nursing Corps have increased since we started work on this legislation.

Mr. THOMASON. They have performed a very marvelous service; nobody questions that. But there are several thousand still engaged in private nursing, and for people who are not very sick.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. A few moments ago I asked a question I believe of the gentleman from Ohio, concerning the disposition of nurses who have taken religious orders. I have read the bill but I do not seem to find anything concerning it.

Mr. THOMASON. May I say that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, made the statement that at the conclusion of the reading of the bill he proposed to offer an amendment to put the whole thing under Selective Service, in which event his question will be answered to his satisfaction.

Mr. HINSHAW. How does that provide for them?

Mr. THOMASON. They will come under the provisions of the Selective Service Act. All nurses ought to be registered. The Selective Service and the Army and Navy can be trusted to do justice by all those who are qualified and who may be called into the service. It should also be made plain that Surgeon General Kirk, of the Army, says that all women who are inducted will be given commissions as second lieutenants with all the rights and benefits now accorded all men and women in the military service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the title of the bill before us, H. R. 2277, is "To insure adequate nursing care for the armed forces." This bill proposes, through the Selective Service, to secure an adequate number of qualified nurses between the ages of 20 and 45 years to insure, as the title of the bill states, adequate nursing care for our armed forces.

The all-important question to determine is: Do we have an adequate number of nurses to take care of the wounded and sick of our armed forces, and is it necessary to resort to the Selective Service in order to secure these nurses?

There seems to be no dispute that we must have an over-all of 60,000 trained and qualified nurses for the Army and we have only approximately 44,000. We

are short approximately 16,000. We also understand that the Navy must have 2,500 additional nurses. These nurses must be provided over a period from now until the first of July. A large majority are needed now. There are being brought to this country now on an average of 35,000 disabled servicemen a month. This number will increase.

There is no finer group of women in the Nation than our nurses. To the wounded and sick they take the place of mother, wife, and sister, and they have done a wonderful job. Never before, however, have we drafted nurses.

The failure to have sufficient nurses at this time for the Army may be placed squarely on the shoulders of those in charge here in Washington. They first announced that they would require only 40,000 and the nurses' organizations set about to secure volunteers to meet these requirements. They did in due course secure approximately 38,000 nurses and the goal was so nearly reached that efforts were lessened and then the Army, as we understand, jumped its requirements to 50,000 and then to 60,000. We are satisfied that if the nurses' organizations and the trained and qualified nurses of the country had been fully advised, all the nurses necessary would have been secured. Due to the bungling of the War Department we do not have the required number and hence it is necessary to take this unusual and extraordinary course to secure the needed nurses.

The records indicate that we have in all about 275,000 trained, experienced, and registered nurses in the United States. There are ample nurses to take care of our wounded and sick servicemen and to staff properly hospitals and homes for civilians if these 275,000 nurses are properly distributed. One thing that I am fearful of is, that the Government under this legislation may take over more nurses than are actually needed and will hoard nurses as they have hoarded the manpower and womanpower in the governmental agencies and in defense plants.

When this bill comes up for reading and amendment under the 5-minute rule, a number of amendments will be proposed and I am satisfied when the bill is read and amended, it will be greatly improved over the bill now before us. Until recently the armed forces turned down applications of thousands and thousands of applicants because they were more than 30 years of age, were a little too short or a little too tall, or because they had not nursed in hospitals of more than 50 beds; and furthermore they turned down thousands and thousands of well-trained and experienced men and thousands of these men, instead of performing service as nurses, were put in the kitchen in the armed services doing K. P. duty and scrubbing kitchen floors. I repeat again that it is my opinion that the condition which now confronts us is due to the lack of foresight and good judgment on the part of those whose duty it was to provide these nurses for our disabled and sick service men and women.

Congress, however, is now confronted with a condition and not a theory. Thousands and thousands of our men and women in the service are being wounded or are becoming seriously ill every day and they must have nurses—not next week or next month, but now.

Section 1 of the bill provides that it is imperative to secure immediately the services of additional trained and qualified nurses. Section 2a of the bill provides that each female between the ages of 20 and 45, who is a registered nurse in any State, Territory, or possession of the United States or in the District of Columbia; or who was a graduate from a school of nursing; or is eligible to apply for examination and registration as a registered nurse and is a single person without dependents, comes within this act. If the Army and Navy had broadened its scope as provided in this bill, of the persons from whom to make selections, they would have had ample nurses and to spare.

In 1943 under an act of Congress there was created what was known as the United States Cadet Nurse Corps. The United States Government would pay the expense of training as nurses those who applied and could meet the requirements. Approximately 110,000 applied and were accepted. It is estimated that it costs the Government approximately $1,200 to train each one of these nurses. Thousands of them have finished the course but less than 40 percent of them have entered the Government service as nurses for the armed forces or in civilian capacities. The bill before us proposes that the Army and Navy be required to first take the qualified and trained nurses from this Cadet Nurse Corps. If this is done, it will meet a large part of our nurse requirements for our armed services.

Some Members of the House object to singling out this particular group. I wonder if it is fair to do so. They accepted the Government's proposition to be trained at the expense of the Government and to be ready to perform nursing services for our armed forces and in civilian capacities. If the Government paid for their training, I think it is up to the Government to say whether they will serve as nurses for our servicemen or in civilian life. It seems to me that they are honor bound to render this service for our wounded and sick servicemen.

Now, if these nurses or other nurses are called into the service by the Government, each one of them will be commissioned as second lieutenant and will receive the pay and allowances the same as second lieutenants in the Army. This will amount to about $216 per month, and they will also be entitled to the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act.

Our soldiers and sailors are being wounded daily by the thousands, and many of them have become seriously ill because of exposure. The base pay for most of these for overseas service is $60 per month. Only a small percentage of them are officers, even second lieutenants, and these wounded and sick soldiers and sailors for the most part were not trained at Government expense. I can see no great hardship to these nurses of the Cadet Corps in being called to care for our disabled servicemen and, at the same time, receive commissions as second lieutenants, with the pay and allowances of a second lieutenant, and all the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act.

No one regrets more than I do that through the bungling of some of our leaders here in Washington, that it is necessary to draft nurses, but our disabled service men and women must have care and have it now. Prompt and careful nursing will save thousands of lives of our wounded and sick, and it will restore to health tens of thousands of others who may become disabled for life if they do not have the immediate services of skilled nurses. While our nurses will undergo great strain and make great sacrifices yet for the most part they will be out of danger. I cannot commend too highly these tens of thousands of nurses who have volunteered their services to our country in this great emergency and the thousands who will volunteer in the future, and let us indulge the hope that nurses will come forward and volunteer and that it will not be necessary for the Government to draft them. Our boys who have offered and are offering their lives and their bodies have been torn with shells, bullets, and bayonets, and their health has been broken through exposure in all parts of the world. They come first in our consideration. I know that the nurses will continue to show their high and lofty patriotism and their devotion to their high and noble profession in caring for our disabled service men and women.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, may I read at this time a wire I have just received from Mrs. Eleanor H. Trump, president, district 5, Kansas State Nurses Association, as follows:

> In regard to the drafting of nurses, bill 277, we wish to suggest (1) that a limited-service act for all women be included; (2) that all nurses drafted be commissioned; (3) no discrimination in respect to race, creed, sex, or marital status; (4) that all registered nurses be drafted, not United States Cadet Corps alone.
>
> MRS. ELEANOR H. TRUMP,
> *President, District 5,*
> *Kansas State Nurses' Association.*

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I agree in principle with the first clause of the telegram just read by the gentleman from Kansas, that drafting of nurses is justified if it is the first step in National Selective Service for all women. I learned recently that in some hospitals, including veterans' hospitals, the greatest need is not for nurses, but for attendants. The hospitals would be able to release many more graduate nurses if they had enough attendants to scrub the beds, carry trays, et cetera. It is too bad to keep highly trained nurses from using their special skills because they are performing duties that could be performed by attendants. If we are going to draft nurses and want to be really fair and to get maximum nursing service, then we should draft attendants to do the menial work around the hospitals so that the

hospitals could free more graduate nurses for the armed services.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I certainly concur in the objective of the bill to find nurses to treat our wounded men. Nobody has a quarrel with that objective. As has been said here today on several occasions, while this is not a perfect bill, yet we must have the nurses. I feel while we are here talking about this bill the boys overseas are in dire need of these services.

It was my privilege to have been overseas with the committee, and in conference with General Hawley, the Surgeon General of the European theater of operations. I know first-hand General Hawley's predicament as to nurses. The Under Secretary of War, Judge Patterson, stated before our committee that 11 hospital units were sent overseas recently without a nurse, thereby adding to the trials and tribulations of General Hawley of not having sufficient nursing personnel for those hospitals and depleting the hospital personnel he now has over there. As I say, this is not a perfect bill.

I offered in committee, when we were considering this bill, what I believed to be a sincere, conscientious effort to get these nurses and to get them now. I do not believe in waiting until June 30. If my amendment had been adopted, which would have made it mandatory upon the War Department and the Navy Department to put on a concentrated drive, a drive using every piece of machinery that they have for recruiting nurses as they are now doing for the WAC's and the WAVES, I believe the required number of nurses would have been obtained by this time. Certainly if I thought for one minute that such an amendment would thwart the objective of getting nurses, I never would have offered it. I may offer a similar amendment when we read the bill for amendments. It only lost by a few votes in the committee. I will offer it, however, if I see that this bill is going to take a lot of time. If there is a month or two before June 30, before the drafting really begins, then I should probably offer the amendment.

I do not believe in dilly-dallying. If we can get those nurses by voluntary methods, we shall have advanced that much further. My amendment will provide that if we cannot get the required number of nurses in 30 days, the War Department can then use the Selective-Service machinery as provided by this bill.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. I had the pleasure of accompanying the gentleman on the trip to the European battlefields that he spoke about, and I should like to say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania spent more time than any other member of the committee visiting hospitals, perhaps because of his profession. I do not believe there is a Member of the House who knows more about the situation concerning which he is speaking than the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. FENTON.

Mr. FENTON. What is the situation at the moment? As of this morning, when I talked with the Nurse Corps downtown? The fact of the matter is that 15,000 applications have been received. The Red Cross has already certified practically 9,000 of these applications. Of these applications that have been certified, 5,678 have been assigned since January 1. It has been admitted that 6,000 cadets will probably be assigned. There will be 1,500 colored nurses assigned. It has been estimated by none other than the Nurse Corps that 1,000 male nurses are available. Of those whose applications have been certified by the Red Cross there are 4,000 or 5,000 who have not been assigned. This brings the figure up to over 18,000 at the moment. No one in this House can tell me that a concentrated drive for 30 days, for instance, would not give us the rest of the nurses we need. We would then have all or nearly all the nurses needed, long before this bill would be able to get them. The sooner we get them the better it will be for our wounded and sick.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, in support of an amendment that may be offered, I desire to read at this time some telegrams I have received regarding this bill. They are as follows:

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO., *March 2, 1945.*
COMPTON I. WHITE,
United States Representative,
Capitol Building:

Referring to draft of senior cadet nurses. There is no need to draft students since with very few exceptions they will be sent in as soon as called for by the Army and Navy services. We trust you will vote against this draft of student nurses.

LELA O. UNDERHILL,
Registered Nurse, Director of Nurses, Latter-Day Saints Hospital School of Nursing, Idaho Falls, Idaho.

LEWISTON, IDAHO, *March 2, 1945.*
COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives:

Draft of cadets first would be harmful to future enrollment. Protest bill.

DISTRICT NUMBER 4, IDAHO STATE NURSES ASSOCIATION.

LEWISTON, IDAHO, *March 2, 1945.*
COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives:

Draft of cadet nurses harmful to enlistment. Protest bill.

ST. JOSEPHS HOSPITAL SCHOOL OF NURSING.

BOISE, IDAHO, *March 2, 1945.*
Representative COMPTON WHITE,
Washington, D. C.:

Nurses opposed to House bill 2277; defeats its purpose and is group discrimination.

CATHERINE MCCABE,
Registered Nurse.

POCATELLO, IDAHO, *March 2, 1945.*
Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Please enter my protest against that section of Nurses Selective Service Act 1945 which so patently discriminates against graduates of Cadet Nurse Corps. Passage of bill will kill recruitment of cadet nurses.

Rev. EDMUND R. CODY.

NORTH BOISE, IDAHO, *March 2, 1945.*
COMPTON WHITE,
Congressman, Washington, D. C.:

Nurse draft bill No. 2277, sections 5 and 2B, will seriously affect civilian nurse supply and student recruitment. Please use influence to insist on elimination of these sections.

HELEN B. ROSS,
Superintendent, St. Lukes Hospital and Nurses Training School.

BOISE, IDAHO, *March 2, 1945.*
Representative COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives:

Believe nurse draft bill defeats purpose intended. Recruitment for military should be assigned to State nursing councils for procurement and assignment not to a bill which discriminates against classes in the nursing profession. Please protect sections 5 and 2B. Latter will kill enrollment and recruitment to training schools. Please oppose the bill as fatal to securing graduate nurses for the military and cadets for the schools.

ST. ALPHONSOS HOSPITAL SCHOOL OF NURSING.

POCATELLO, IDAHO, *March 2, 1945.*
Representative COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We strenuously oppose the bill discriminating cadet nurses. Cadet nurses are promised definitely that they would not be singled out and drafted when our school signed the Bulletin bill. Urge utilization of male nurses in service. Recruitment hindered by this. Future must be thought of. We're counting on your help. Sincerely.

Sister MAUREEN, RSM.,
Registered Nurse, Director of Nurses, St. Anthony Hospital.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I listened to all of the hearings on this bill. I could stand up here for 15 minutes and tell you about the weaknesses in the nurses' recruiting system, but that would not get any nurses. The point is that the nurses are needed today, and we think, after mature consideration of the evidence submitted at the hearings, that this bill provides the surest and best way to get the nurses so badly needed at this very time.

This bill has had this one concrete effect already. The Surgeon General has decentralized the recruiting of nurses, so now when a nurse has been passed as being qualified she can be taken into the armed services in 10 days. Formerly it used to take from 20 to 30 days.

There are two amendments that I think should go into the bill. One of them was offered by me in the committee, but apparently it was sidetracked when the bill was drafted. That is to include male nurses. There are over 2,000 available male nurses. They ought to be taken in with the female nurses. I intend to offer an amendment to that effect. The other amendment which will be offered by one of my colleagues of the committee concerns the commissioning of nurses. We had some very sad experiences in taking in men to train flyers. They were promised commissions, but never got them. We want to be certain when we take these people in as nurses under this law by compulsion that everyone will be tendered a commission. As

I say, you can think of many minor objections and criticisms of the Army, but the important thing is that we need nurses now. This bill provides one sure way of getting the nurses promptly while the big drive to win the war is on that produces the casualties that makes the need for nurses so critical.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, in the brief time allotted me I would like to read a letter which I received this morning from a nurse in Minnesota. It reads as follows:

As a registered nurse, I am opposed to the present nurses' draft bill as it has been drawn up to be presented to Congress. I feel very strongly that a definite clause should be included in regard to commissions for drafted nurses. Why should there be any discrimination between drafted nurses and enlisted nurses as long as we are in the same status? Furthermore, doctors, dentists, and members of other professions are commissioned on entry.

I also feel that married childless nurses should be drafted as well as the single ones—especially those that were married since the Pearl Harbor incident. A majority of nurses in this group are not only drawing allotment checks besides their regular salary, but are also reaping the benefit of a much-reduced tax rate by filing joint returns which practically makes them tax exempt. Why should this group be favored again by letting them fill the positions now held by nurses who would come under the draft law? It's their war as well as ours.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Congress hereby declares that to provide adequate nursing care for the armed forces of the United States it is imperative to secure immediately the services of additional trained and qualified nurses.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PACE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2277) to insure adequate nursing care for the armed forces, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks made on the discussion of the nurses' draft bill today a bibliography on due process.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks by including, first, an editorial on the drafting of nurses; and, secondly, a brief newspaper article.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances in the Appendix of the RECORD, in two instances to include a letter, and in one instance to include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, in the limited time at my disposal in Committee of the Whole I was only able to read one or two of the seven telegrams I desired to insert in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that I may insert the other telegrams submitted to the Clerk in connection with my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein the plan of development of experimental forests in the South, as advanced by Forest Farmers Cooperative Association.

Mr. MAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Maj. Gen. Archer L. Lerch, Provost Marshal General, at the forum of the cooperative committee, on the subject of war prisoners.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include some notes on procurement and assignment of nurses; also some figures on nurses' assignment service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WOOD UTILIZATION RESEARCH

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, almost 2 years ago I called the attention of the House to the fact that some of this Nation's critical shortages could be supplied by converting wasted sawdust into essential materials. I am happy to report that during these 2 years, considerable progress has been made in this direction.

Our enemies, due to necessity, have been converting wood fiber into alcohol, protein feeds, and other products, even including clothing for their armies, for nearly 20 years. Although our scientists have for years been exploring the possibilities of utilizing wood waste, America has been slow in putting the results of their research into practical use. We have always had such a plentiful supply of raw materials that we have not really worried seriously about using our forests for anything more than a source for lumber, paper, and fuel.

Now, as a result of the drain upon our resources caused by the war, we are taking a second look at our sawdust piles. We are also developing new products from wood and better techniques for the use of ordinary lumber. I think you may be interested in a brief story of some of these accomplishments, and where and how they have been achieved.

For many years, the United States Forest Service has operated the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis. This laboratory works quietly, without fanfare or publicity. In recent years its efforts, of course, have been directed toward the war effort. The laboratory has improved the design and construction of boxes and crates, resulting in great savings in lumber and still greater savings in shipping space. It is a fact that these developments now make it possible for four ships to carry the cargo formerly requiring five ships. As one of the hundreds of examples of improved crating design; the proper redesign of a crating method for a 40-millimeter antiaircraft gun and accessories affected a saving of 200,000 cubic feet per month on shipments from just one of the ordnance depots. In the first 15 months of the war, savings in space for ordnance items have been estimated to amount to 500,000 tons.

A special type of box has been developed known as a free-falling box which will be used to drop food and medicines to soldiers. The box protects the contents from damage and will not require the use of a parachute to drop supplies.

Many of our soldiers at the fighting fronts are walking on shoe soles made of treated plywood which are as flexible as rubber soles.

By treating wood with resin under pressure, our ordinary domestic woods can be made as hard as the hardest teakwood, and are now being used on decks of naval vessels.

The Madison Laboratory has also developed a resin-impregnated paper plastic of high strength. The value of resin-treated paper produced during the past year for laminating is estimated to have been approximately $3,000,000. Some of the war uses to which this high-strength laminated paper has been put are gunners' seats, gun turrets, and ammunition cases for aircraft.

New techniques and kiln-drying schedules and end coatings for walnut gunstock blanks were developed which reduced both drying time and seasoning degrade losses. One firm in Chicago, Ill., following laboratory recommendations, dried 1,000,000 blanks with a degrade loss of only 1 percent, as compared with losses which formerly averaged about 5 percent.

It was soon apparent after the beginning of the war that we would not have enough solid timbers for the heavy structural members needed in wooden ships and boats. Consequently, the laboratory had to develop the techniques for the production of durable, laminated ship timbers. This laminating process is simply the making of large timbers by gluing together smaller pieces. This technique has now been developed for the fabrication of keels, stems, frames, and other parts of vessels. At least two firms, one in the South and one in the Northwest, are now using these processes for ship-timber manufacture.

Although the processes and techniques developed by the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., have been important in the prosecution of the war, by long odds the greatest single achievement was the complete development of the process for the production of ethyl alcohol from sawdust. The fact that

sugar can be taken from wood fiber by forcing a sulfuric-acid solution through a vat containing sawdust or chips has been known for many years. Our scientists did a great deal of valuable work, and made a number of discoveries for the improvement of this process, but Germany developed it to a full scale commercial operation nearly 20 years ago.

The National Lumber Manufacturers Association, long interested in the subject of wood waste utilization, at the beginning of the war employed two German experts, refugees from the Nazi regime, Dr. Eduard Farber and Mr. Erwin Schaefer, and embarked upon a study of wood sugar and alcohol production. Mr. Schaefer was part owner and managing director of the German alcohol-from-wood plants known as the Scholler-Tornesch works, and Dr. Farber was head of the technical operation of the German plants. Subsequently, Dr. Carl Levy, also a refugee from the Nazis, and former chief chemist for the Scholler-Tornesch works, was brought to this country by the National Lumber Manufacturers Association.

This forward-looking step made and financed by the lumber industry was soon to prove of great value in our war effort. Soon after we entered the war the Japanese cut off most of our supply of natural rubber. Plants for the manufacture of synthetic rubber were constructed. It happens that alcohol is a necessary raw material used in making synthetic rubber. Alcohol has generally been produced from molasses, sugar, and grain. It was recognized, however, by our production experts that a nonfood source of alcohol was essential. In other words, molasses, sugar, and grain were as badly needed for food as for alcohol.

Accordingly the technical division of the War Production Board, known as the Office of Production Research and Development, immediately began to gather together the facts concerning the production of alcohol from wood and other sources. They found that the Forest Products Laboratory of the United States Forest Service had been experimenting in this field. They also knew of the work of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association and of the presence in this country of the German experts. Plans were immediately made by the O. P. R. D. for the construction of a pilot plant at the laboratory in Madison. Mr. Schaefer, Dr. Farber, and Dr. Levy were made available as consultants by the lumber association. The data already assembled by the National Lumber Manufacturers Association were used. The whole operation was spark-plugged by Dr. J. Alfred Hall, then chief biochemist of the United States Forest Service.

It was soon determined that wood waste is the best source for obtaining alcohol without using a needed food product. Results came rapidly. The pilot plant not only developed a far superior process than the best method known in Germany, but within an incredibly short time the process of making alcohol from sawdust and wood chips was ready to be put into full-scale operation.

While the pilot-plant experiments were being perfected, the Forest Service made a survey in the Pacific Northwest where large quantities of sawdust and other wood waste are available, and determined that, although at least a dozen localities in the States of Oregon and Washington could develop enough waste to support a full-scale plant, the largest amount of waste, most easily obtainable, was at Springfield, Oreg. A private corporation, known as the Willamette Valley Wood Chemical Co., was organized, and application made to the War Production Board for permission to construct a plant at Springfield to produce alcohol for the rubber program from wood waste. It was the view of the War Production Board that the purpose of the plant would be to produce alcohol for war. Consequently, the application was granted, and the plant was authorized for construction by the Defense Plant Corporation, to be operated by the applicant corporation. The procedure was identical to that used in other essential war production.

The Springfield plant is now under construction, and will be in operation this summer. It will be the first plant in America to produce ethyl alcohol in large quantities from wood waste. It is estimated that this plant will produce 4,100,000 gallons of alcohol annually at a cost per gallon far below the average price now being paid by the Government for alcohol for war.

It is obvious, I think, from the few illustrations I have given, that, in the comparatively brief period of the war, research and development in the field of forest products and in wood-waste conversion has made great progress. The products of this research have been almost instantly placed to practical use. Most of this work has been done under the pressure of war necessity and therefore most of it was financed by appropriations made for war. It is impossible, of course, to estimate the net dollar value of this research program, but it is unquestionably in the millions of dollars.

It is time now to look to the future. The accomplishments I have just mentioned are wartime research and industrial achievements. The research and development program carried on largely by the Forest Products Laboratory, at Madison, Wis., has been financed with the regular laboratory appropriation, amplified by the annual expenditure of $1,549,972 from the armed forces and war agencies. Of this sum the O. P. R. D. expended $321,000 and the remainder was contributed from funds appropriated for the Army Air Corps, Army Ordnance Department, Army Signal Corps, Naval Air Corps, Navy Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Bureau of Supplies, Navy Bureau of Ships, Commodity Credit Corporation, Lend-Lease Administration, War Food Administration, and the Army Service Forces. This program will be completed June 30, 1945, at the end of the fiscal year. It does not seem likely that we can count on such agencies spending very much more money in research for war.

In other words, the time has come for the Congress to inventory the situation and determine the potential future value of forest-products research and the need for it.

More than 600,000,000 acres of land in the United States are classified as forest land.

At present it is unavoidable but true that the finished lumber produced from these lands represents a total utilization of only 30 percent of the actual wood fiber on them. The remaining 70 percent consists of sawdust, slabs, edgings, trimming which becomes waste at the mill, and the limbs, tops, and cull logs which are left in the forest. This portion of the forest which at present unavoidably becomes waste actually contains a vast quantity of usable and needed materials. From every ton of this wasted fiber, between 50 and 60 gallons of ethyl alcohol can be manufactured, or a ton of waste will furnish 450 pounds of high-protein feeding yeast, or every ton of sawdust contains cellulose which can be manufactured into rayon and other fabrics. Wood fiber also contains chemicals of value which may be extracted in the form of acids, acetone, and oils. Products classified as naval stores, including tar, turpentine, and other resinous products, can also be extracted from wood that is now going to waste.

The quantity of wood fiber that is total waste under present conditions is enormous. In the Douglas fir region of the west coast more than 2,000,000 tons of such material annually goes into the big refuse burners at the mills. Nation-wide the waste is in excess of 60,000,000 tons each year. In my own State of Oregon alone, to cite just one example, 50,000,000 gallons of alcohol could be produced annually from sawdust and other wood waste taken from only a dozen of the larger mills.

Perhaps the most interesting and mysterious usable material obtained from wood waste is in reality a byproduct known as lignin. This is the powder that remains after the sugar for making alcohol and other products is extracted from the wood. After the sugar is taken from a ton of sawdust and chips a fourth of the original weight is left. This is lignin.

The potentialities of lignin are just now being realized and explored by scientists. They know that lignin is made up of the same elements as coal and petroleum. The problem now being studied is just how its hydrocarbon molecules may be taken apart so that such products as aspirin, sulfanol, perfumes, and some bulk chemicals may be obtained. We already know that lignin is valuable for the manufacture of plastics, as a rubber extender, and that it can be used as a fertilizer when combined with nitrogen and phosphate. Vanillin flavoring is made from lignin. A derivative of lignin is also used in making concrete.

Among other possible results of research work on wood waste are the following: Tannin, used in processing leather, may be obtained from domestic woods; studies in the manufacture of lominated flooring and usable lumber are already in the pilot plant stage in the South. Synthetic plywoods, molded plywoods, and flexible plywoods are immediate possibilities. A product known as

wood iron, created by the chemical impregnation of wood under pressure, has enormous possibilities as have the various "compregs" and "impregs."

In outlining the need of further research, I think I have given some hint as to the potential national value of such work. However, the value of an expanded forest products research program is best illustrated by a very simple problem in arithmetic. If the utilization of the wood in the 600,000,000 acres of forests is increased from the present low level of 30 percent, to, say, even 40 percent, such net increase of 10 percent would, in fact, be the equivalent of adding 60,000,000 acres of virgin forest land to our national wealth. Continuing this thought, the present employment in the manufacture of forest products is now estimated by the Forest Service as being 3,500,000 man-years. If, by means of waste utilization, the total forest production figure is increased even 10 percent, some 350,000 man-years of additional employment will be provided in the postwar era. This I consider a minimum figure. Other estimates I have seen place the potential increase in employment through waste utilization as high as 2,000,000 man-years.

Although our forests represent great national value, research in the field of forest products has never kept pace with research done in other industrial fields. According to Barron's, the national financial weekly, for January 9, 1939, United States industry spent $250,000,000 for research in the year 1938. This represented approximately eight-tenths of 1 percent of the value of the manufactured products. For the same period, the value of forest products was about $3,000,000,000. Eight-tenths of 1 percent of that figure would indicate that $24,000,000 should be spent annually on forest products research if the wood-products industry had a research program comparable to that of the other industries.

If I have failed in these remarks to establish the national need for a large, vigorous, and continuing program of forest products research, it is merely because the time is too short in which to do it adequately. There is ample supporting evidence, easily available, in addition to the facts presented here, which should convince the most skeptical mind.

Assuming that we can agree that the national interest demands such a research program, let us now examine the problem to find out how such a program has been carried on in peacetime, what the future outlook is for the continuance and expansion of this program, how large a program is needed, and what part should be borne by the Federal Government and why.

The lumber-manufacturing industry is made up of 38,895 individual units. Several of the larger manufacturing concerns have their own research laboratories, and have contributed greatly toward the solution of waste utilization problems, but the remainder of the mills are so small in size that they cannot undertake much, if anything, in the way of research.

The census of manufacturing for 1937 revealed that only 75 mills may be rated as large plants producing 50,000,000 feet of lumber a year or more. These large mills produce only 20 percent of the lumber manufactured in this country.

Contrast the situation in the lumber industry with some of the other large industries. Four sugar refining companies produce 79 percent of the sugar; 4 glass companies produce 89 percent of the glass, 4 farm-machinery manufacturers produce 85 percent of our farm machinery; 64 percent of the Nation's iron and steel is produced by 8 companies; all of our linoleum comes from the plants of 4 companies; more than 90 percent of our aluminum is produced by 1 company. But, 38,820 sawmills produce 80 percent of the lumber. Obviously, these other industries are able to do their own research and product development for the reason that the benefits of their endeavors fall in a high percentage to the few units which pay the cost.

I think I should also point out that, in 1937, we had a total of 30,000 people employed in industrial research in this country, whereas during the same period, 70,000 people in Germany were thus employed, and in Russia, 100,000 people were engaged in research.

The 38,895 separate mills in the lumber manufacturing industry, through their trade associations and especially through the National Lumber Manufacturers Association, have collectively embarked on a substantial program of research. Laboratories are being operated by several regional groups. The National Lumber Manufacturers Association, through its affiliated organization, the Timber Engineering Co., has just completed the installation of a laboratory here in Washington, D. C. The pulp and paper industry has a laboratory at Appleton, Wis., under the direction of the Institute of Paper Chemistry.

Impressive as the research program of the lumber industry is, the efforts of privately financed wood products research represent only a minor fraction of the total amount of work that is needed. The wood products industry is quite similar to agriculture in that the individual units of the industry are so small and so numerous that they cannot do their own research any more than an individual farmer can do his own agricultural research.

Considerable publicly financed wood research work is being done by the States. At least 4 States have, or shortly will have, State forest products laboratories. These States are Oregon, Washington, California and Texas. In addition, more than 30 universities, colleges, and State experiment stations are conducting some research in forest utilization.

Including the present expenditures by the war agencies, the total of all forest products research, including private and public expenditures, even now represents only slightly more than one-tenth of the $24,000,000 amount estimated as adequate, as compared with other industrial research.

The present wood products research program will in all probability decrease to the extent of $1,500,000 annually at the end of this fiscal year when war research appropriations end. If the research program is merely to keep even with the amount of work that has been carried on during the past 2 years, the appropriation for forest research conducted by the United States Forest Service should be increased by a million and a half dollars in the regular agriculture appropriation bill.

If such funds are made available, the recent plan developed by the Forest Service for setting up of regional wood-utilization units can be made Nation-wide. These units would be composed of industrial and chemical engineers, paper experts, and technicians. They would study and analyze local problems, make tests under local conditions, and work with State, college, and industrial-research groups. These units would work, of course, in close cooperation with the central research laboratory of the Forest Service at Madison, Wis.

Such a plan is at least the foundation on which to build a complete program of research. To do less will be to take a backward step at a time when we are facing the need of increased industrial activity and the need for more civilian jobs for returning veterans.

It is definitely in the national interest that the Congress make certain that wood-utilization research is continued. The program of research which will develop processes and techniques for the utilization of a higher percentage of our forests will require a relatively modest sum. But if, by such an expenditure, we can increase forest utilization from the present figure of approximately 30 percent up even to 40 percent we will thereby not only provide additional employment but a substantial increase in national wealth and in the national income.

Not only will the results of such research increase our national wealth by creating something of value from material that is now wasted but the interesting fact is that the increase in value of our forests through research represents an increase in value of the Federal Government's property. A total of 170,000,000 acres, or nearly one-third of the entire forest acreage of the Nation, is Government-owned land.

It seems to me that the case is so compelling that the Congress should provide the necessary appropriation for such a program.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. O'TOOLE, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. NEELY, today and tomorrow, on account of death in his family.

To Mr. DAVIS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for 2 days, on account of important business.

To Mrs. LUCE, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia, for 1 day, on account of illness in family.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN MOSES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce to the House the death of the Honorable JOHN MOSES, a Senator of the United States from the State of North Dakota.

In the loss of the late Senator MOSES, the State of North Dakota has seen the

passing on in the prime of life, of one of its outstanding citizens, one of its able representatives in the other branch of this Congress.

The life of the late Senator is an example for all Americans to follow. Born abroad, in Norway, he came to this country and took advantage of the great educational opportunities of our country; he entered into its political life. His great mind, his sincerity, and his personal and public honesty were recognized by the people of North Dakota in electing him five times as State's attorney of Mercer County, as Governor in 1938, again in 1940, and again in 1942. At the last election he received the confidence and the support of the people of North Dakota by being elected a Member of the United States Senate. As I say, his was an example of fidelity and devotion to the high ideals which noble men and women entertain, that all of us might well follow.

We are deeply and profoundly moved by his passing on when he had so many years ahead of him to render valuable, constructive service to our country in the other branch of the Congress of the United States. I know I speak the sentiments of every Member of this body, the National House of Representatives, in conveying to the loved ones he has left behind, his wife and children, our profound sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 166).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JOHN MOSES, a Senator from the United States from the State of North Dakota.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members be appointed on the part of the House to join the committee appointed on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee on the part of the House, Messrs. LEMKE, ROBERTSON of North Dakota, HAGEN, and STARKEY.

The Clerk will report the remainder of the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 6, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Tuesday, March 6, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings on Wednesday and Thursday, March 7 and 8, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 173, 1548, 1624, and 2256.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, March 8, 1945, at 10 a. m., at which time hearings will be had on parcel-post rates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

269. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the first monthly report of the Attorney General on the disposition of surplus Government-owned propery; also, the first of a series of reports on transportation; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

270. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

271. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize relief of the chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

272. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to extend the privilege of retirement to the judges of the District Court for the District of Alaska, the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

273. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report on land acquired by the Navy, with the cost thereof, as of December 31, 1944; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

274. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $8,435,000 in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 108); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 157. Resolution to provide for further expenses of investigation authorized by House Resolution 138, Seventy-ninth Congress, a resolution to investigate the official conduct of Albert W. Johnson and Walter L. Watson, district judges of the United States Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania; without amendment (Rept. No. 247). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 158. Resolution providing for the payment of the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 38 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, a resolution to continue the investigation by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries begun under House Resolution 281, Seventy-seventh Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 248). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 159. Resolution authorizing the further expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 93, Seventy-ninth Congress, a resolution to provide for the continuation of the investigation begun under the authority of House Resolution 98, Seventy-eighth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 249). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 160. Resolution providing funds for expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 38 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and continued by House Resolution 54 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, a resolution authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to investigate the present system of marketing, transportation, and distribution of farm products; without amendment (Rept. No. 250). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 161. Resolution providing additional funds for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 2, Seventy-ninth Congress, a resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs to study the progress of the war effort; without amendment (Rept. No. 251). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2454. A bill to grant to enlisted personnel in the armed forces of the United States upon their separation from the service certain benefits with respect to accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 2455. A bill to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments with respect to strategic minerals and metals and petroleum and petroleum products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 2456. A bill to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments with respect to strategic minerals and metals and petroleum and petroleum products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

H. R. 2457. A bill to authorize adjustments of irrigation charges in certain land exchanges within Indian irrigation projects; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 2458. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 2459. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to authorize lump-sum payments to beneficiaries of national service life insurance policies; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2460. A bill to amend section 21 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 23 U. S. C., sec. 597), prescribing fees of United States commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2461. A bill concerning the method of payment of the compensation of United States commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2462. A bill to prescribe and furnish to United States commissioners standard forms and dockets and to furnish United States Code and seal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2463. A bill to amend section 35 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended (11 U. S. C. 63), so as to remove the legal

incompatibility between the office of United States commissioner and referee in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2464. A bill to amend section 5296 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the discharge of indigent convicts for nonpayment of fines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2465. A bill to amend section 20 of the act of May 28, 1896 (29 Stat. 184; 28 U. S. C. 527), so as to provide that nothing therein contained shall preclude a referee in bankruptcy or a national park commissioner from appointment also as a United States commissioner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2466. A bill to eliminate unfairness and discrimination against enlisted personnel of the Hospital Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2467. A bill to eliminate unfairness and discrimination against enlisted personnel of the Medical Department of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 2468. A bill to amend the World War Adjusted Compensation Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2469. A bill to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 2470. A bill to enlarge the jurisdiction of the United States district courts in suits against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERIDAN:

H. R. 2471. A bill to maintain on active duty, during the present war, officers of the Army of the United States who reach retirement age; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 2472. A bill to extend the age for enlistment in the Women's Army Corps to 52 years; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2473. A bill to provide for the retirement of certain veterans who served in both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 2474. A bill to establish the United States Military Aviation Academy at Altus and Frederick, Okla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2475. A bill to establish the United States Naval Aviation Academy at Clinton, Okla.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 2476. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of Narraguagus River and its tributaries, Maine, for flood control, for run-off and waterflow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 2477. A bill to give recognition to the noncombatant services under enemy fire performed by officers and enlisted men of the Medical Corps of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2478. A bill to grant to enlisted personnel in the land or naval forces certain benefits with respect to accumulated leave; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KOPPLEMANN:

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution memorializing the name of Horace Wells; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BUNKER:

H. Res. 162. Resolution providing for an investigation by the Committee on Military Affairs with respect to the recent Byrnes curfew order; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. Res. 163. Resolution to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation relating to aiding development of the pulp and paper industry; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LEA:

H. Res. 164. Resolution authorizing that the report from the chairman of the Board of Investigation and Research, dated September 18, 1944, relative to public aids to domestic transportation, be printed as a document; to the Committee on Printing.

H. Res. 165. Resolution authorizing that the report from the chairman of the Board of Investigation and Research, dated September 18, 1944, relative to carrier taxation, be printed as a document; to the Committee on Printing.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to enable and insure all practical use of radio in the operation of trains in the interest of public safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that the problem of final political status be submitted to a vote of the people of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for a more applicable season on migratory waterfowl in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to increase the Federal gasoline tax and Federal lubricating oil tax and to discontinue the same as soon as possible and refuse to reenact such taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation ceding title in fee to the State of New York for land now being used by the New York State Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to remedy the situation caused by sea lions in the fishing waters of Alaska; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to authorize the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial, of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to act favorably on Senate bill 313, to open certain lands in that State for mineral entry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 2479. A bill for the relief of Capt. Werner Holtz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2480. A bill for the relief of Wesley A. Mangelsdorf; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 2481. A bill for the relief of the estate of Ed Edmondson, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KOPPLEMANN:

H. R. 2482. A bill for the relief of Reuben J. Solomon; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2483. A bill for the relief of the estate of Michael J. McDonough, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2484. A bill for the relief of Charles Holland; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 2485. A bill for the relief of Moses Tennenbaum; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2486. A bill relating to the naturalization of Silvestro Carollo, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2487. A bill for the relief of Mrs. S. P. Burton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERIDAN:

H. R. 2488. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes M. Burke; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2489. A bill for the relief of Gaylon Dhue; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SLAUGHTER:

H. R. 2490. A bill for the relief of H. B. Gilliam and C. E. Ellis, receivers of the Quantico Co., Inc., for balance of purchase price and rentals for lands used and occupied by the United States Marine Corps at Quantico, Va.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

127. By Mr. ANGELL: Memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon to terminate the activities of the Office of Price Administration and all other agencies established for the war emergency as soon as is reasonably possible; to the Committee on Appropriations.

128. Also, memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon that the Congress of the United States enact Senate bill 313 to the end that certain lands in Oregon may be opened to mineral entry; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

129. By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana: Memorial of Montana State Legislature requesting that National and State selective-service organizations consider the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act in deferring essential farm workers from military service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

130. Also, memorial of Montana State Legislature opposing a Missouri Valley Authority; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

131. Also, memorial of Montana State Legislature amending first paragraph of section 11 of the act of Congress approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

132. By Mr. RABAUT: Memorial of Michigan State Legislature, House Concurrent Resolution No. 11, a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass legislation for the creation of harbors of refuge on the Great Lakes as an integral part of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

133. Also, memorial of the State of Michigan, Michigan Legislature, House Concurrent Resolution No. 12, a concurrent resolution requesting that the United States take appropriate measures to the end that Palestine be opened for free immigration and unrestricted colonization so that the Jewish people may rebuild their ancestral homeland as

a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

134. By Mr. WICKERSHAM: Memorial of Oklahoma State Senate, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 4, memorializing Congress and the Veterans' Administration of the Federal Government to establish within the State of Oklahoma (1) additional hospital facilities for veterans and (2) additional facilities for the Veterans' Administration for the handling of all matters in which veterans, their widows, and orphans may be interested or affected; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

135. Also, memorial of the Oklahoma State Senate, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5, a concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Veterans' Administration of the United States to establish within Oklahoma a colony-type hospital for nervous cases and pledging cooperation of the State in securing land or site therefor; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

136. Also, memorial of Oklahoma State Senate, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3, memorializing Congress and the Federal Communications Commission to take such steps as may be necessary to enable and insure all practical use of radio in the operation of trains in the interest of public safety; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, February 26, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, Master of all, at noonday and in the morning we praise Thee, we thank Thee, we glorify Thee. Thou who hast folded back the dark mantle of night to clothe us in the golden glory of this day, drive, we beseech Thee, from our hearts all gloomy thought, all hurtful ideas, make us glad with the brightness of hope, and lead our willful and wondering minds up to the pavilion of Thy presence. Thou who art the giver of all wisdom, enlighten our understanding with knowledge of the right, purge our hearts from the sins of pride and prejudice which doth so easily beset us, that no deceit may mislead us, no temptation corrupt us.

In these days of great tribulations, and yet of great expectations, give us ears to hear the sounds of Thy chariot wheels, give us eyes to thrill at the reddening dawn which lights with deathless hope even a weary world in flames. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Monday, March 5, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

FELICITATIONS FROM THE REPUBLIC OF COSTA RICA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication or address from the Secretary of the Government of Costa Rica, and directs the clerk to read it.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

REMARKS ADDRESSED TO THE UNITED STATES SENATE BY MR. FERNANDO SOTO HARRISON, SECRETARY OF GOVERNMENT AND PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF COSTA RICA

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, it is indeed a privilege which I shall long remember to be accorded this opportunity of attending a session of this honorable Senate and of addressing these few words to you.

In the name of President Teodoro Picado of Costa Rica, I present to you most cordial greetings and expressions of sincere friendship and respect. Our people have a profound admiration for your country, and your great men have been a source of inspiration to the builders of our democracy.

During this terrible war we have fought together, each according to his abilities, because we have a common destiny. In the construction of the peace, our statesmen are also working shoulder to shoulder with yours, as in Chapultepec.

The good-neighbor policy has been converted into the policy of the good brother. We Costa Ricans have felt that at the Crimea Conference we were represented because President Roosevelt in promoting the interests of the United States was also promoting those of the sister republics of the hemisphere.

This time the errors of Vienna and Versailles will not be repeated. The final act of war will not be confused with the structure of the peace. We have been preparing the international constitution upon which the peace will rest. May this constitution be as robust as the Constitution of the United States, so that it may live through a long future of work blest with peace.

WASHINGTON, *March 6, 1945.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The communication from Mr. Fernando Soto Harrison will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR MOSES, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I feel a sense of very deep personal loss in the passing of Senator MOSES, of North Dakota. He was a personal friend of mine for many years, and during the time we were both serving as chief executives of our respective States we had many things in common and worked together on problems confronting us, and I had an opportunity to become very closely acquainted with Senator MOSES.

I know of no man in public life who is finer in any of the aspects of true manhood than was JOHN MOSES. He was gentle, he was loyal, he was able in his service to his State. I feel that not only has the State of North Dakota lost one of its most outstanding citizens but the Senate has lost a man who in the course of time would have cut a large figure in our deliberations. I express very deep grief and regret at the passing of my personal friend.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR WILLIAM M. CALDER, OF NEW YORK

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, it becomes my sad duty to announce to my colleagues of the Senate the death of former Senator William M. Calder, of New York. I ask that the item in Who's Who in America dealing with Senator Calder be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

William M. Calder, ex-Senator, born in Brooklyn, N. Y., May 3, 1869. Educated in the public schools of New York; got his LL. D. at George Washington University in 1920, and at Syracuse University in 1921, Fordham University and Gonzales College in 1922.

Building commissioner of Brooklyn, 1902–3, Was a Member of the Fifty-ninth to Sixty-third Congresses, 1905–15, Sixth New York District. Delegate to Republican National Convention nine times, to 1940. Member of the United States Senate from 1917–23.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] a member of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hon. Mon Wallgren as a Member of the Senate from the State of Washington.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints as the members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, established by House Concurrent Resolution 18, Seventy-ninth Congress, the following Senators: The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House of Representatives adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. John Moses, late a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

The message announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 217. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States, and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine;

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Duke Power Co. a 180-foot perpetual easement across Camp Croft, in the State of South Carolina; and

S. 290. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Orange & Rockland Electric Co. a 150-foot perpetual easement across the West Point Military Reservation in the State of New York.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 433. An act to grant a nonquota status to certain alien veterans and their wives;

H. R. 534. An act to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases; and for other purposes;

H. R. 914. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado and Kansas to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Arkansas River;

H. R. 1439. An act to prohibit proof of acts done by an inventor in foreign countries;

H. R. 1534. An act to amend the Fact Finders' Act;

H. R. 1654. An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2125. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code; and

H. R. 2284. An act to eliminate the practice by subcontractors, under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable contracts of the United States, of paying fees or kick-backs, or of granting gifts or gratuities to employees of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable prime contractors or of higher tier subcontractors for the purpose of securing the award of subcontracts or orders.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 25)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1945, in the amount of $1,855,000 for the Post Office Department (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL ON DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT-OWNED PROPERTY, AND INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT POLICY

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, the first monthly report of the Attorney General on the disposition of surplus Government-owned property, and also the first of a series of reports on transportation, the report in question dealing with international air-transport policy, with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, submitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 128 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

RELIEF OF THE CHIEF DISBURSING OFFICER, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize relief of the Chief Disbursing Officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a report for the month of February 1945 from the chairman of the Committee on Pensions, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of February, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

PENSIONS COMMITTEE

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Louis J. Meyerle	612 Bennington Drive, Silver Spring, Md	Veterans' Administration	$5,600

JAMES M. TUNNELL, *Chairman.*

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Whereas agitation for the passage of Federal legislation approving the completion of the St. Lawrence waterway and power project has been revived in the Federal Congress; and

"Whereas the General Assembly of Pennsylvania is vitally concerned in the effect that the completion of said project would have upon its citizens; and

"Whereas the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relies substantially for its economic stability and future prosperity on the preservation of its essential mining, manufacturing, and transportation industries; and

"Whereas the production of bituminous and anthracite coal, the manufacture of steel products, and the transportation of freight by steam railroads constitute important segments of the industrial life and well-being of the Commonwealth and its citizens; and

"Whereas the development of 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectricity as contemplated by the St. Lawrence project would displace in excess of 5,000,000 tons of bituminous coal annually; and

"Whereas the completion of the St. Lawrence waterway would open existing markets for bituminous and anthracite coal mined in the Commonwealth to ruinous competition from foreign coal mined by cheap labor and transported to Great Lakes ports of the United States and Canada in tramp foreign-flag vessels at ballast rates; and

"Whereas the importation of steel and other manufactured products similarly produced at low cost in foreign countries and sold in competition with Pennsylvania manufactured goods would injuriously affect manufacturing industry and employment in the Commonwealth; and

"Whereas the diversion of freight tonnage to the proposed waterways from steam railroads serving the Commonwealth and the loss of traffic due to the diminution of coal tonnage would seriously and adversely affect the railroad industry; and

"Whereas as a result of the foregoing, thousands of citizens of Pennsylvania engaged in the mining and production of coal, the making and fabrication of steel and other products, and the transporting of freight would be deprived of their means of earning a livelihood at their chosen occupations; and

"Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence project would have an injurious effect upon the economy of the country, with incidental benefit, if any, being confined to relatively few small areas and certain manufacturers; and

"Whereas a large part of the enormous cost of this unwise and uneconomical project would fall upon the taxpayers of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved (if the house of representatives concurs)*, That the General Assembly of Pennsylvania hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States not to approve or authorize the construction of the proposed St. Lawrence waterway and power project; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative elected from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Concurrent Resolution 11

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass legislation for the creation of harbors of refuge on the Great Lakes as an integral part of interstate commerce

"Whereas it has long been recognized that the absence of harbors of refuge on the Great Lakes has been a definite deterrent to Michigan's tourist and resort business; and

"Whereas the United States War Department has spent a large amount of money and time making a survey of the Michigan shore line, as a result of which a rivers and harbors bill is now pending in Congress which includes proposed construction of 15 small boat harbors on Lake Superior and Lake Huron; and

"Whereas two groups of harbors on Lake Superior have been proposed, a primary group to be constructed at Black River, Big Bay, Little Lake, and White Fish Point, and a secondary group consisting of harbors at Grand Traverse Bay, Lac La Belle, Eagle Harbor, and Isle Royale; and on Lake Huron harbors are recommended for Port Sanilac, Port Austin, Au Sable, Harrisville, Hammond

Bay, and Point Lookout; and a harbor is also proposed on Beaver Island in Lake Michigan; and

"Whereas the congressional proposal as presented is that part of the cost should be borne by the Federal Government and part by the State government, but, in view of the fact that the Federal Government in the past has absorbed the entire cost on such harbors on the Atlantic seaboard, the Atlantic seaboard policy should be written in the congressional proposal on the theory that such harbors are considered an integral part of interstate commerce: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That Congress is urgently requested to enact legislation for the creation of harbors of refuge on the Great Lakes as an integral part of interstate commerce, the cost to be borne by the Federal Government, in view of the policy of the Federal Government with respect to bearing the cost of similar harbors on the Atlantic seaboard; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

"Adopted by the house of representatives January 30, 1945.

"Adopted by the senate February 9, 1945."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 12

"Concurrent resolution requesting that the United States take appropriate measures to the end that Palestine be opened for free immigration and unrestricted colonization so that the Jewish people may rebuild their ancestral homeland as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth.

"Whereas the Nazi persecution and wholesale slaughter of Jews in Europe have outraged the conscience of the civilized world and have vastly aggravated the tragedy of the Jewish problem thereof; and

"Whereas at the end of the present war large numbers of European Jews will find themselves in desperate need for a new home where they can rebuild their lives in dignity and security; and

"Whereas after World War No. 1, Great Britain, in the Balfour Declaration of 1917 had accepted at the instance of the Allied and Associated Powers the mandate for Palestine and had undertaken to facilitate the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine, an undertaking subsequently approved by 52 nations, including the United States; and

"Whereas this policy was concurred in by a joint resolution unanimously adopted by both Houses of the Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922; and

"Whereas the Democratic and the Republican Parties in their national conventions of 1944 adopted platforms in favor of the reestablishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; and

"Whereas the President of the United States on October 15, 1944, expressed his approval of this aim which he stated to be in accord with the traditional American policy and in keeping with the spirit of the 'four freedoms': Now therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That we the people of the State of Michigan express our profound sympathy with the millions of innocent victims of the enemy's ruthless extermination policy, and that we demand just punishment of all those who perpetrated these horrible crimes against humanity; and be it further

"Resolved, That the United States use its good offices with Great Britain to the end that Palestine be opened for free immigration and unrestricted colonization, so that the Jewish people may rebuild their ancestral homeland as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress.

"Adopted by the house February 7, 1945.

"Adopted by the senate February 14, 1945."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial to the Fish and Wildlife Service, Chicago, Ill., petitioning said Fish and Wildlife Service for a more applicable season on migratory waterfowl in the State of Montana

"Whereas the season on migratory waterfowl in Montana has been unsatisfactory for many years; and

"Whereas the State of Montana is not suited geographically for one migratory-waterfowl zone; and

"Whereas hundreds of thousands of migratory waterfowl winter in Montana annually; and

"Whereas the Montana Wildlife Federation unanimously favors this resolution: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Twenty-ninth Legislative Session in the State of Montana (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we respectfully petition the Fish and Wildlife Service that the season on migratory waterfowl open on or about September 25 each year and remain open for 90 consecutive days, or the State of Montana be divided into two zones, separating the eastern part of the State from the remainder, and that the eastern section be put in the northern zone and the remainder in the intermediate zone, and that the hours of shooting be extended to include one-half an hour after sundown; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be directed to mail copies of this resolution to the Fish and Wildlife Service, Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.; the Honorable BURTON K. WHEELER, Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY, Senators from Montana; the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD, Representative in Congress; the Honorable President of the United States Senate and the Honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial of the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Department of the Interior, the Congress of the United States, United States Senators B. K. WHEELER, JAMES E. MURRAY, Representative MIKE MANSFIELD, all of Washington, D. C., opposing the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority, so far proposed or any similar delegation of governmental power and requesting that the Missouri Basin development and operation of such development be carried on by the United States Army Engineers and the United States Bureau of Reclamation under such plans of unified or joint representation as may be decided by Congress

"Whereas there has been and is proposed legislation in the Congress of the United States which would create a so-called Missouri Valley Authority covering the waters of the Missouri Basin; and

"Whereas the waters of such Missouri Basin originate in and adjacent to the State of Montana, and such waters are of vital importance and necessary to the stabilization of the agricultural and livestock industries of this State, and to the welfare and prosperity of the inhabitants thereof; and

"Whereas such Missouri River Basin waters are of great value to the welfare and prosperity of the people of Montana because such waters should be used for the production of cheap and plentiful hydroelectric power for use in rural electrification projects and industry to the end that Montana may enjoy the benefits of such power by increasing agricultural and industrial production, thereby furnishing employment and providing homes and business enterprise for our returning soldiers; and

"Whereas the fact of the importance of such waters to the people of the State of Montana, and to the welfare and prosperity of said State has long been recognized with the consequences that studies relating to the proper utilization of soil and water resources have been made by the United States Bureau of Reclamation and by the United States Army Engineers, and such plans have been coordinated in detail following such studies, which plans would result in great benefit to the people of the State of Montana from the standpoint of the use of such waters for the purposes of agriculture and great benefit would result to the inhabitants of States within the basin by reason of flood control and navigation which would follow such proposed development; and

"Whereas said Army Engineers and said Bureau of Reclamation are departments of long standing in the United States Government and have demonstrated their complete competence to undertake and carry forward the programs which have been outlined by them; and

"Whereas the inhabitants of the State of Montana have long since acquired property rights and interests in the waters of said Missouri Basin by reason of the ownership of water rights which are appurtenant to the land and without which such land to which such water rights are appurtenant would be rendered of little or no value; and

"Whereas the program of the Bureau of Reclamation and of the Army Engineers is compatible with such recognized water rights and with the normal processes of government; and

"Whereas the authority and bureau to be created by said proposed Missouri Valley Authority are inconsistent and incompatible with said rights of ownership and with the regularly constituted forms of government under which we operate; and

"Whereas there is a growing tendency in the Federal Government of the United States to encroach upon the rights originally reserved to the respective States, and to impose centralized government regulations and authorities in place of local government as contemplated under the Constitution of the United States and the Constitution of the State of Montana, and to usurp the powers, privileges, and rights of the various States of the United States, including the State of Montana: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Twenty-ninth Legislative Session of the State of Montana (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring), That we are opposed to the passage by the Congress of the United States of said Missouri Valley Authority legislation so far proposed or any similar delegation of governmental power, and that we favor the development of said Missouri Basin through such coordinated plans as have been developed by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army Engineers; and that not only should the planning and construction of such projects be entrusted to the Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in their respective fields according to their agreed plans, but the management, operation, and control

of all the projects of such unified and integrated plans should also remain in the same agencies working as joint operators or managers under such plans of unified or joint representation as may be directed by Congress, and that in any plans, means should be provided for the appropriate participation of State and local interests; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this joint memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Department of the Interior, to the Congress of the United States, to United States Senators B. K. WHEELER and JAMES E. MURRAY, to Representative MIKE MANSFIELD, all of Washington, D. C."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution requesting of the Congress of the United States that the problem of final political status be submitted to a vote of the people of Puerto Rico

"Whereas it is the feeling of the people of Puerto Rico that the problem of their definitive political status should be settled at the latest when the present war ends, or before that time if that were compatible with or favorable to the best development of the war effort against the totalitarian powers;

"Whereas the people of Puerto Rico have expressed themselves as opposed to any system of government in which sovereignty over their own life does not derive democratically from the governed, and therefore they desire the prompt termination of the colonial regime in Puerto Rico;

"Whereas it is the desire of the people of Puerto Rico, based on the Atlantic Charter and on the right of self-determination, to be enabled to decide, in a fraternal spirit with the people, the Congress, and the Government of the United States, on the political status that they may prefer for themselves; and

"Whereas the people of Puerto Rico should have the opportunity of deciding on their definitive political status within the clearest knowledge of the mutual economic relationships and mutual moral obligations that would exist under any form of status that they may approve with their votes in a plebiscite or referendum completely apart from the general elections: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of Puerto Rico (the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico concurring)*,

"First. To petition respectfully, as by the present, from the Congress of the United States, the enactment of a law instrumenting the alternative forms of definitive political status for Puerto Rico that Congress may be disposed to grant upon approval of any of them by the people of Puerto Rico, in such manner that our people may have clear knowledge of the mutual economic relationships and the recognition of mutual moral obligations that would exist under each of the alternative forms that Congress may present to them.

"Second. That a similar petition be made to the President of the United States, requesting his support for such a measure before Congress.

"Third. That the referendum be carried out in such a manner that the people of Puerto Rico may express either their approval of any of the alternatives that may be submitted to them, or their disapproval of all of them of the latter should be their judgment.

"Fourth. That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, as President of the Senate, to the chairman of the Committees on Insular Affairs of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to the Governor of Puerto Rico, and to the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico in Washington."

By Mr. McFARLAND:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of Arizona; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial urging efforts in behalf of national and international agreements guaranteeing freedom of access to and transportation of news

"*To the Congress and the Secretary of State of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Freedom of speech and of the press, as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, is essential to the proper functioning of democracy, for only when men are free to report the facts of happenings of public import, and to communicate and publish them, can the people have knowledge by which the majority can exercise its will.

"Freedom of speech and press is the strongest guaranty of peace in the world, for normal men become killers only under the influence of mass emotion, and the most powerful implement of dictators and rulers who seek to drive their peoples to war is control and distortion of the flow of news. Such control, whether it be direct or indirect, gravely imperils the prospect of peace and human progress, for national prejudices, once aroused, are easily inflamed. People who are made slaves to such passions like to have them confirmed in what they hear and read.

"It is a basic democratic principle that the truth will prevail if it is not stifled at the source or before it can be reported to the public. If men are free to get the news of happenings of public import at the source, to transmit it and publish it, truthful men will ever be present to report the truth, and distorted and dishonest reports, spread for ulterior purposes, will be discredited. Thus will war-making schemes of dictators or dictatorial groups be frustrated.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, urges:

"1. That the Congress, the Secretary of State of the United States, and all representatives of the United States and official organizations having to do with foreign affairs and with any future peace settlements of this war, endeavor to have incorporated in national and international agreements proper provisions for freedom to report and publish news, and to seek the agreement of all nations that there shall be:

"1a. Freedom of access to news at its source on equal terms to all properly accredited reporters and correspondents, both native and foreign.

"1b. Freedom of transmission of news on equal terms to all at reasonable rates and with reasonable promptness.

"1c. Freedom of publication of both domestic and foreign news subject only to fair laws against libel and unjustified damage.

"Adopted by the senate February 6, 1945.

"Adopted by the house February 17, 1945.

"Approved by the Governor February 20, 1945."

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 4

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Veterans' Administration of the Federal Government to establish within the State of Oklahoma (1) additional hospital facilities for veterans, and (2) additional facilities for the Veterans' Administration for the handling of all matters in which veterans, their widows, and orphans may be interested or affected

"Whereas the hospital facilities in Oklahoma for veterans are wholly inadequate to care for the number of Oklahoma veterans who will need hospitalization, and

"Whereas the facilities for the Veterans' Administration in Oklahoma for the handling of all matters in which veterans, their widows, and orphans may be interested or affected, are likewise inadequate, and

"Whereas our Nation must not fail to provide for these veterans, their widows, and orphans: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein)*:

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America and the Veterans' Administration of the United States, be and they are hereby memorialized and requested:

"(a) To establish additional hospital facilities for veterans within the State of Oklahoma, the location thereof to be at some place centrally located within the State.

"(b) To establish additional facilities within the State of Oklahoma for the Veterans' Administration for the handling of all matters in which veterans, their widows, and orphans may be interested or affected.

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Senate be and he is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress and to Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

"Adopted by the senate the 13th day of February 1945."

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States and the Veterans' Administration of the United States to establish within Oklahoma a colony-type hospital for nervous cases and pledging cooperation of State in securing land or site therefor

"Whereas after the hardships of war many of the veterans returning to Oklahoma will suffer from nervous diseases, and

"Whereas it is believed that the colony-type hospital would be best for the treatment of these cases: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma:*

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States of America and the Veterans' Administration of the United States be and they are hereby memorialized and requested to establish within the State of Oklahoma a colony-type hospital for nervous cases, and the cooperation of the State of Oklahoma is hereby pledged in the securing of land or site for said hospital.

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Senate be and he is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation in Congress, and to Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

"Adopted by the senate the 13th day of February 1945."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission to take such steps as may be necessary to enable and insure all practical use of radio in the operation of trains in the interest of public safety

"Whereas within the past few years there have been far-reaching developments in the science of electronics so that it has become a matter of common knowledge that the use of this technical development will diminish the possibility of train wrecks and will otherwise be of great benefit to the public; and

"Whereas this is a proper subject for the consideration of the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas this matter has already had the consideration of the Federal Communications Commission in particular reference to the allocation of radio frequencies to the

railroad industry for this purpose, and it has conducted extensive research in that connection and has made proposed allocations of radio frequencies to the railroad industry for this purpose; and

"Whereas the Federal Communications Commission in its report dated January 15, 1945, has stated that: 'It is hoped, in the light of the evidence adduced at the railroad radio hearing regarding the improved safety and efficiency factors attendant upon the use of radio in railroad operations, that the railroad industry will make the fullest possible use of the frequencies proposed to be allocated as soon as materials are available': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"1. That the State of Oklahoma is seriously interested and concerned in the problem of public safety and in the use by the railroad industry of radio technique as a safety measure; and

"2. Be it further resolved that the Federal Communications Commission be commended for its interest and efforts in this connection and that the railroad industry be commended for its splendid efforts being made in experiments looking to a solution of this highly technical problem; and

"3. Be it further resolved that it is the sense of the State Legislature of the State of Oklahoma that this matter should be pursued diligently by the Congress of the United States, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, to the end that as soon as possible this equipment be installed wherever practicable throughout the railroad industry; and,

"4. Be it further resolved that the secretary of the State senate be and is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to all of the Members of the congressional delegation, both in the Senate and in the House, from the State of Oklahoma, and to the Secretary and each member of the Federal Communications Commission, and to the Secretary and each member of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

"Adopted by the senate the 1st day of February 1945."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Oklahoma identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the vivisection of dogs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate resolution requesting the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to extend the wild game season for a period of 90 days

"Whereas due to the large increase of wild waterfowl as reported by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and

"Whereas this increase would seem to justify the taking of a reasonable number of wild waterfowl for food and sport; and

"Whereas the number of persons who are in a position to shoot wild waterfowl has been very much reduced: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Senate of Maryland, That the United States Fish and Wildlife Service be and it is hereby requested to extend the open season for killing wild waterfowl for a period of 90 days; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be and he is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Interior, the chairmen of the United States Senate and House Committees on Wildlife and Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from Maryland.

"Read and adopted February 20, 1945."

LIMITATION OF FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—RESOLUTION OF WASHINGTON COUNTY (MD.) TAXPAYERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. RADCLIFFE presented a resolution adopted by the Washington County (Md.) Taxpayers' Association, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas our country is engaged in a desperate, life-and-death struggle in which civilians, acting both individually and collectively through their Government, are expected to make sacrifices befitting the sacrifices made by the men and women in the armed services in a joint effort to safeguard our freedom and our democracy; and

Whereas our enormous public debt, resulting partly from military necessities and partly from long-continued deficit spending, threatens now to equal the entire wealth of the Nation and thereby to jeopardize the Government's solvency; and

Whereas there exists in the Federal Government, first, a tendency to appease large group interests by the use of Federal funds, much to the detriment of our national economy and unity and, secondly, a kindred tendency to appropriate funds to local communities and States for other than Federal needs, thus engendering a shameful, wasteful scramble for supposed benefactions from a supposed benefactor who, as in the case of Maryland, returns to her people only $1 for every $1.71 taken from them for such purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge our Representatives in Congress to adopt a policy of limiting Federal expenditures strictly to Federal Government needs and purposes and to make no unnecessary expenditures of any kind that would further mortgage the future of ourselves, of our children, or of the men and women in military service.

RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF GEORGIA—POST-WAR MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT AND STATUS OF NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD, under the rule, and appropriate reference a resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia relating to the post-war Military Establishment and the status of the National Guard.

There being no objection, the resolution was received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

Resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Georgia memorializing the Congress of the United States on the post-war Military Establishment and the status of the National Guard

Whereas the Congress of the United States is now confronted with the task of enacting future legislation which has as its purpose post-war military organization; and

Whereas the military policy and the character, composition, and size of the Military Establishment of the United States is a matter of vital importance to the people of Georgia, the several States and Territories of the Union, as well as to those of the Nation; and

Whereas the decisions to be arrived at by the Congress in this matter will be predicated upon the powers granted to the Congress under the "militia clauses" as well as the "Army clauses" of the Constitution, and will directly affect the military establishments of the several States and the relationship of these State forces to the Army of the United States; and

Whereas the legislation to be enacted in this matter by the Congress will apply to a post-war America and when America is at peace: Now be it, therefore,

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Georgia (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress in considering military organization is respectively urged to retain the basic principles and policies as promulgated by the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, and in cogent acts, especially the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 relating to the status of the National Guard as an integral part of the first line of defense of the Nation; that the three civilian components of the Army of the United States, the National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves, be preserved and expanded in the post-war military organization; be it further

Resolved, That we advocate, in the event that a system of universal military training be included in the post-war plan for the Military Establishment, that such training be integrated with the civilian components of the Army, and specifically the National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves; and be it further

Resolved, That in the discussion of the post-war military policy and the form of the Military Establishment the fullest opportunity consistent with existing conditions be accorded the officers and men of all components of the Army who are or who have been serving with the armed forces in time of war to express their views on this most important matter, to the end that this Nation will adopt a sound military policy consistent with our traditions and which will afford the utmost security to the Nation.

Approved this 2d day of February 1945.

ELLIS ARNELL,
Governor.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, the Legislature of South Dakota, which has recently adjourned its biennial session, adopted three concurrent resolutions, covering three matters. The first was the coordination of the National Guard with the national military forces. The next was a resolution in regard to the Federal gasoline tax. The third was on the subject of the disposal of surplus war material.

I ask that these resolutions be printed in the body of the RECORD, under the rule, and referred to the appropriate committees. I should like to say that I heartily concur in the policies which have been adopted and approved by the legislature of my State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolutions presented by the Senator from South Dakota will be received, printed in the RECORD, under the rule, and appropriately referred.

To the Committee on Military Affairs:

House Concurrent Resolution 3

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America on the post-war military policy and Military Establishment and of the National Guard

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring):

Whereas the experience of the United States in the two World Wars, and more particularly World War No. 2, demonstrates that

it is desirable that our Nation should adopt a definite military policy so patterned that it will meet the post-war needs of the country; and

Whereas it is of vital importance to the Federal Government, and to the several States and Territories of the United States, as to what that policy shall be, and as to what the character, size, and composition of the Military Establishment; and

Whereas the decisions of the Congress which will be reached in this matter will directly affect the Military Establishment of the Nation and of the several States and Territories, and the relationship between those forces; and

Whereas the Congress now has before it plans and suggestions as to what the post-war policy and the future Military Establishments shall be; and it is believed that the basic principles of the military policy proposed by Gen. George Washington to the Continental Congress, and more recently approved by our present military authorities, then were and still are basically sound and should be given serious consideration by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (and concurred in by Senate of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota):

That the Congress respectfully is urged to preserve in the post-war military policy the basic principles of the policy laid down by Gen. George Washington, the National Defense Act of 1916, as amended, and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, insofar as they relate to the civilian components of the Army of the United States, and more particularly the National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves; and

That we fully endorse and subscribe to the position taken by the Secretary of War relative to the place which the National Guard should have as announced by him on November 23, 1944, in which he stated:

"It would be the mission of this reserve component (the National Guard), in the event of a national emergency, to furnish units fit for service anywhere in the world. * * *

"This conception of the mission of the National Guard of the United States would interfere in no way with the traditional mission of the National Guard of the States and Territories to provide sufficient organizations in each State, Territory, and the District of Columbia, so trained and equipped as to enable them to function efficiently at existing strength in the protection of life and property and the preservation of peace, order, and public safety, under competent orders of the State authorities.

"National Guard units have played a vital role in the mobilization of our present Army and they have made a brilliant record on every fighting front. We are counting on them as a bulwark of our future national security."

That we do endorse and fully approve the statement of Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, as set forth in War Department Circular No. 347, August 25, 1944, to the effect that the post-war Military Establishment should consist of a professional army in peace, large enough to meet the normal requirements of the Nation, to be reinforced in time of emergency by units drawn from the civilian components of the Army of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That in the event a system of universal military training is included in the post-war plan for a Military Establishment, we favor that such training should be integrated with the civilian components of the Military Establishment, and more particularly with the National Guard, the Officers' Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves; and

That the personnel of all components of the Army, both officers and enlisted personnel, be given full opportunity to express their views relative to the post-war military policy of the United States, and the form of the Military Establishment which should be provided, to the end that the Congress adopt a sound military policy consistent with the traditions and experiences of our Nation, and which will afford the greatest security of the United States of America; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Senate, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, Hon. CHAN GURNEY, Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, and Hon. FRANCIS CASE, all in Washington, D. C.

The Vice President laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

To the Committee on Finance:

House Concurrent Resolution 5

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America not to increase the Federal gasoline tax and Federal lubricating oil tax and to discontinue the same as soon as possible and refuse to reenact such taxes.

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the twenty-ninth legislative session of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring):

Whereas the Congress of the United States did during the session of the Seventy-sixth Congress increase the Federal gasoline tax one-half cent per gallon making such tax now a total of 1½ cents per gallon despite the fact that every State in the Union now imposes a sales tax on gasoline averaging in excess of 4 cents per gallon; and

Whereas such Federal gasoline tax during the past calendar year of 1944 has taken from the people of the State of South Dakota in excess of $1,875,000, which largely comes from the producers and from agriculture of South Dakota; and

Whereas such tax at 1½ cents per gallon amounts to a 10 percent retail sales tax on such product which is a necessity of the residents of this State; and

Whereas the Federal lubricating oil tax is 6 cents per gallon, and is likewise an enormous retail sales tax upon a product necessary to the production of food for the country, and is an unfair and unreasonable imposition upon such necessity; and

Whereas it is the sense of this legislature that it is inequitable and unfair to impose such an enormous sales tax upon a single commodity of this type which is a necessity to persons engaged in agricultural and producing pursuits; and

Whereas such gasoline tax is a revenue measure peculiarly adapted for the individual States for the purpose of construction and maintenance of adequate highway systems and means of transportation, and administrative machinery is well established in every State in the Union: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States should not increase such Federal gasoline tax or Federal lubricating oil tax or consider any increase in such taxes, and should discontinue the same at the earliest possible time, and should refuse to reenact the same upon their expiration, and should thus leave the field of revenue entirely to the individual States for use in construction and maintenance of the various States' highway systems; be it further

Resolved, That the Members of the Congress of the United States from the State of South Dakota be, and they are hereby, urged by the legislature of this State to use their best efforts in opposing any suggested increase in the Federal gasoline or Federal lubricating oil tax, or the reenactment or continuance of said taxes; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to each Senator and Representative of the State of South Dakota in the Congress of the United States and to the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives to be by them presented to the proper committees in Congress considering or determining such aforesaid legislation.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

House Concurrent Resolution 6

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to requisition certain material, equipment, and supplies not needed for the prosecution of the war and for the national defense, and to use such material, equipment, and supplies in soil and water conservation work and to distribute such material, equipment, and supplies by grant or loan to public bodies, and for other purposes

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring):

Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives, first session, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, H. R. 538, by Mr. POAGE, which is in the following language:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized, empowered, and directed to requisition any materials, equipment, or supplies which constitute surplus property under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 and are suitable for use in carrying out erosion control and soil and water conservation work and operations in furtherance of the act approved April 27, 1935, entitled 'An act to provide for the protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for other purposes.' Upon receipt of such requisition from the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to any such property, the head of the Government agency having control of such property shall transfer such property to the Secretary of Agriculture without reimbursement.

"SEC. 2. Material, equipment, and supplies requisitioned by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 1 shall be distributed through the Soil Conservation Service, by grant or loan, to soil conservation, drainage, irrigation, grazing, and other districts and public bodies organized under State laws with powers to promote and carry out soil and water conservation operations and related public purposes. Such distribution shall be made in accordance with such standards, conditions, rules, and regulations as to use and disposition as may be recommended by the Soil Conservation Service and may be established for such purpose by the Secretary of Agriculture."

Whereas South Dakota is extremely interested in such legislation and deems it wise and expedient that Congress enact such legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring), That Congress be respectfully urged to enact H. R. 538, first session, Seventy-ninth Congress; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the Senate, the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, Hon. CHAN GURNEY, Hon. HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, Hon. KARL E. MUNDT, Hon. FRANCIS CASE, all in Washington, D. C.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SUSPENSION OF THE LIQUOR TRAFFIC DURING THE WAR, ETC.—LETTER AND PETITION FROM KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred a letter from the Reverend Peter W. Goering, of the Methodist Church at Linn, Kans., approving the closing down of horse racing, the midnight curfew for night clubs, and suggesting that the Government complete the job of limiting nonessential activities by curtailing the sale, production, and transportation of liquor.

I think his suggestion is a good one. Present shortages of manpower, foodstuffs, war materials, transportation, and many other things, it seems to me, justify the cutting out of these nonessentials for the duration of the war—and if there is anything which is nonessential, as I see it, it is the liquor business and its attendant rackets. I ask also that a petition reinforcing the points made in the Reverend Mr. Goering's letter be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as part of my remarks and properly referred.

There being no objection, the letter and the petition, without the signatures attached, were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LINN, KANS., *February 26, 1945.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
House of Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: Enclosed is a petition signed by a number of citizens of Linn, which is a progressive little town in Washington County. The names include the foremost of her citizens. We realize that the liquor situation is such that our national leaders should curtail its sale, production, and transportation.

We are, therefore, asking you if you would please forward it to War Mobilization Director Byrnes. We are glad for his recent announcement of the midnight curfew. We are greatly in favor of the restriction placed on nonessential enterprises, such as baseball. We are also pleased to note in the Topeka Daily Capital your efforts at attempting to do something about this very thing which the enclosed petition seeks to accomplish.

Gratefully yours,

Rev. PETER W. GOERING,
Methodist Church.

To the honorable JAMES F. BYRNES,
War Mobilization Director,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned, parents and friends of sons in the armed services, commend your action stopping dog and horse racing as an aid to the war effort by conserving transportation and manpower.

We endorse your suggestion to restrict all large conventions to relieve overcrowded railroads by reducing travel and dim-out of electric advertising to save coal.

We observe the President's request for universal manpower control by law and also his order to General Hershey to draft farm labor. Though working long hours, the farm industry is now dangerously understaffed; farm foods, meats, canned goods, sugar, etc., cannot now be bought freely. Shoes, cotton goods, lumber, hardware, farm implements, and other elemental necessities are also scarce. However, it is possible to buy beer and liquor at all hours without restriction. Railroads and farm producers have to date done a magnificent job, but face the possibility of a break-down.

We, therefore, in behalf of our men under arms, respectfully petition: to aid the manpower shortage, to relieve overburdened carriers, to help our understaffed farms, that you immediately order all beverage liquor transportation stopped, just as you have racing and other nonessentials to the war effort.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES—THE SO-CALLED AUSTIN AMENDMENT

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD three telegrams from the heads of labor organizations in Kansas, and a letter from the joint conference board of local unions of the International Brotherhood of Bookbinders in the District of Columbia, protesting against the so-called Austin amendment included in pending manpower-control legislation.

The telegrams are from H. S. Scott, president of the Salina (Kans.) Allied Printing Trades Council; Roy J. Rankin, secretary-treasurer of the Allied Plumbing Trades Council of Topeka, Kans.; and J. V. Wolf, president of Topeka Typographical Union No. 121.

It seems to me that authority for the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to exercise the powers granted under the War Powers Act, including repeal of all laws and parts of laws in conflict with such orders as he may see fit to issue, is entirely too broad to be granted. I send the telegrams and the letter to the desk for appropriate reference.

There being no objection, the telegrams and letter were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., *February 28, 1945.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Topeka Allied Plumbing Trades Council at special meeting voted unanimously to strongly protest enslavement of American labor by adoption Austin amendment or language comparable thereto, which is now pending as part of House Resolution 1752, reported Friday by divided vote of Senate Military Affairs Committee, and request you vote against Austin amendment for compulsory service of labor as provided for which is neither necessary nor helpful, and will, we believe, actually impede war effort.

ROY J. RANKIN,
Secretary-Treasurer, Allied Plumbing Trades Council.

SALINA, KANS., *February 26, 1945.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate Chambers,
Washington, D. C.:

We oppose passage of the Austin amendment or related bill. We do not believe it beneficial to war effort and we think it decidedly unfair to labor.

THE SALINA ALLIED PRINTING TRADES COUNCIL,
H. D. SCOTT, *President.*

TOPEKA, KANS., *February 27, 1945.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Topeka Typographical Union, No. 121, through its executive officers asked that you vote against the Austin amendment or any compulsory service of labor which is now pending as part of House Resolution 1752.

J. V. WOLF, *President.*

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF BOOKBINDERS,
Washington, D. C., February 27, 1945.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senator from Kansas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Bookbinders' local unions Nos. 4, 42, and 69, representing approximately 2,500 American families express opposition to the Austin amendment to H. R. 1752.

This amendment is viewed by organized labor as no more than a serious construction of the present manpower situation. By such language we mean the attitude that most certainly will be created by the passage of the Austin amendment is that organized labor would react to the sting of defeat.

Reports from over the Nation show many conflicting statements that leave the impression there is both a surplus of labor and a manpower shortage at the same time.

We feel that a vote against the Austin amendment is imperative as we feel that the manpower situation does not require such drastic measures.

Yours truly,

SEABORN D. JONES,
Chairman, Joint Conference Board.

NOTE.—Dear Senator, this is most certainly the attitude of Local Union No. 4.

OTIS CHAPPELL,
President, Local No. 4.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 645. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 481), as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 84); and

S. Res. 48. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs to inspect naval establishments in the Western Hemisphere; without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. Res. 79. Resolution to investigate the treatment by the Japanese of prisoners and civilians in the Philippines; without amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GUFFEY:

S. 674. A bill to fix the salary of the Director of the Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

(Mr. GUFFEY also introduced Senate bill 675, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 676. A bill to extend the privilege of retirement to the judges of the District Court for the District of Alaska, the District Court

of the United States for Puerto Rico, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 677. A bill to provide a correctional system for adult and youth offenders convicted in courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 678. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John A. Schaertzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

S. 679. A bill to amend the act of April 18, 1940, relating to the furnishing of markers for certain graves; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY introduced Senate bill 680, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

S. 681. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and myself I introduce a bill to amend Public Law 712, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, to facilitate voting by members of the armed forces and certain others who are away from their places of residence, and ask that the bill be referred to the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] (for himself and Mr. LUCAS) will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. LUCAS):

S. 682. A bill to amend Public Law, 712, Seventy-seventh Congress, as amended, to facilitate voting by members of the armed forces and certain others absent from the place of their residence; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 683. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Arizona to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the estate of Earl W. Nepple; and for the relief of Marie Nepple; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 684. A bill for the relief of Ida M. Raney; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BILBO (by request):

S. 685. A bill to amend section 36 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 686. A bill to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 687. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes M. Segall; and

S. 688. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Blanchard; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 689. A bill for the relief of Harry M. Frazee; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 690. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability from whatever cause for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. MOORE introduced Senate Joint Resolution 42, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution to provide for the construction of a suitable memorial to those who served in the armed forces in World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, to be known as World Wars Memorial Temple; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 433. An act to grant a nonquota status to certain alien veterans and their wives; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 534. An act to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 914. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado and Kansas to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Arkansas River; and

H. R. 1534. An act to amend the Fact Finders' Act; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 1439. An act to prohibit proof of acts done by an inventor in foreign countries; and

H. R. 1654. An act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

H. R. 2125. An act to amend the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

H. R. 2284. An act to eliminate the practice by subcontractors, under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable contracts of the United States, of paying fees or kick-backs, or of granting gifts or gratuities to employees of a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee or cost-reimbursable prime contractors or of higher tier subcontractors for the purpose of securing the award of subcontracts or orders; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

INVESTIGATION OF FOOD PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 92), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized (a) to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to any matters relating to the production, transportation, distribution, exportation, utilization, and consumption of food and allied products produced within or imported into the United States and its Territories and possessions, and of all products, commodities, and factors involved therein, including farm prices and shortages of farm labor, machinery, fertilizer, and feed or other commodities necessary to crop and livestock production; and (b) to make inquiries into any policies and practices of the Government which appear to imperil the production and distribution of adequate supplies of food for our armed forces, our civilian population, or our allies. The committee or subcommittee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the result of its investigations, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the remainder of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—SUGGESTED REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 555 TO COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask consent to submit a resolution on behalf of myself and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 93), as follows:

Resolved, That when the Committee on Commerce shall have concluded its consideration of the bill (S. 555) to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the promotion of family-type farming, the development of the recreational possibilities and the promotion of the general welfare of the area, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes, and shall have reported thereon to the Senate, such bill shall thereupon be referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be printed and lie on the table, and I especially invite the attention of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, to the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY—REFERENCE OF HOUSE BILL 37

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask consent to submit another resolution, and request that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 94), as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 37) to amend section 77 of the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be printed, and, in view of the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], that it lie on the table until a future date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator whether this matter has been taken up with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce and has received his approval.

Mr. McCARRAN. It has not. Therefore, I ask that the resolution lie over until the Senator from Montana is present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nevada will be received and lie on the table.

POST-WAR MILITARY POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HICKENLOOPER

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on post-war military policy delivered by Senator HICKENLOOPER before the thirty-sixth annual Governors' Conference, at Hershey, Pa., May 31, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN AS COMMANDER IN CHIEF—ARTICLE BY WALTER P. ARMSTRONG

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Lincoln as Commander in Chief," written by Walter P. Armstrong, of Memphis, Tenn., and published in the Saturday Review of February 10, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BRETTON WOODS MONETARY PROPOSALS

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum entitled "The Bretton Woods Monetary Proposals," issued by the National League of Women Voters, which appears in the Appendix.]

VALUE OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY TO THE CITY OF BUFFALO

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Seaway Would Be of Great Aid to Frontier, Says C. I. O. Leader," from the Buffalo Evening News of February 26, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NIGHT—POEM BY PVT. (1ST CL.) ALBERT T. YOUNG

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem by Pvt. (1st cl.) Albert T. Young, Seventh Army, Thirty-sixth Infantry Division, entitled "Night," which appears in the Appendix.]

GROWTH OF BUREAUCRACY—EDITORIAL FROM MILES CITY (MONT.) DAILY STAR

[Mr. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Cancerous Growth of Bureaucracy," written by W. S. Flinn, general manager of the Miles City Daily Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] as a substitute for the amendment reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, as amended.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hatch	Overton
Ball	Hawkes	Pepper
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Burton	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Kilgore	Smith
Butler	La Follette	Stewart
Capehart	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McFarland	Taylor
Chandler	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Magnuson	Tobey
Donnell	Maybank	Tunnell
Downey	Mead	Tydings
Eastland	Millikin	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wagner
Fulbright	Moore	Walsh
George	Morse	Wherry
Gerry	Murdock	White
Green	Murray	Wiley
Guffey	Myers	Willis
Gurney	O'Daniel	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a delegate to the Inter-American Conference in Mexico and therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is attending the funeral of the junior Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses, and is therefore necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on official business as a delegate to the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, during last week there were printed in the RECORD as well as in the Appendix of the RECORD many quotations from the extended hearings held by the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate in connection with the pending manpower legislation. On January 16, 1945, Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, and Admiral Ernest J. King, Chief of Naval Operations, wrote a joint letter to the President of the United States. The following day, January 17, the President wrote a letter to Representative ANDREW J. MAY, Chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee. On February 11 the President of the United States sent a memorandum to our majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], which the Senator from Kentucky brought to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs just before the committee favorably reported the bill.

Mr. President, it seems to me so important to have printed in the RECORD the joint letter from General Marshall and Admiral King to the President of the United States, and the letter from the President to Representative MAY, as well as the memorandum from the President to the Senator from Kentucky, that I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the body of the RECORD, in the hope that the pending legislation, so sorely needed for our armed forces, may be passed promptly.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 16, 1945.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As the agents directly responsible to you for the conduct of military operations, we feel that it is our duty to report to you the urgent necessity for immediate action to improve the situation relative to the acute need for young and vigorous replacements for the Army and Navy and to provide the necessary manpower to increase the production of critical items of munitions, accelerate ship construction, and effect the rapid repair of damaged vessels.

Personnel losses sustained by the Army in the past 2 months have, by reason of the severity of the weather and the fighting on the European front, taxed the replacement system to the breaking point. The Army must provide 600,000 replacements for overseas theaters before June 30, and, together with the Navy, will require a total of 900,000 inductions by June 30. Losses or wastage in equipment due to the German offensive and winter fighting conditions must be made good, and there must also be provided the equipment for 8 French divisions and for the accumulation of reserves in equipment which do not exist at the present time. It is estimated that 700,000 industrial workers must be added to the force producing Army and Navy munitions and to supporting industries in the next 6 months if our urgent needs are to be met.

The increased intensity of the operations in the Pacific, particularly the operations of the fleet in support of the Philippine operations, has resulted in extensive damage to naval vessels, many of of which will require major repairs. Due to the over-all shortage of shipworkers, this increased repair load is already being reflected in a slow-down in the construction of new ships which have been counted on for future operations. New devices and weapons in production and ready for production require additional facilities and civilian labor. The fast tempo and increased damage has introduced demands for additional naval personnel in the way of replacements. Items of particular moment are replacements for casualties and war-fatigued men, particularly pilots and crews for aircraft. The Navy also requires a considerable number of additional Medical Corps personnel.

Due to ever-increasing demands for the support of the large forces, Army and Navy, deployed overseas and for the minimum relief of liberated areas, the availability of shipping

also presents problems calling for early solution. The building, repair, and manning of ships of the merchant marine require to be taken fully into account in the over-all military situation.

You are intimately familiar, Mr. President, with the great importance of regaining the offensive on the western front and pressing it, together with operations against the Japanese, with constantly increasing intensity in the months to come. To this end, therefore, we feel that the United States should make every conceivable effort to enable the armed forces to carry out your instructions.

G. C. MARSHALL,
Chief of Staff.
E. J. KING,
Chief of Naval Operations.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 17, 1945.

Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
Chairman, House Military Affairs Committee,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MAY: In my recent message on the state of the Union, I pointed out the urgent need of a national service law, and recommended that, pending action by the Congress on the broader aspects of national service, the Congress immediately enact legislation which will be effective in using the 4,000,000 men now classified in IV–F in whatever capacity is best for the war effort.

The urgent need of this legislation has not lessened but has increased since the sending of my message.

It is true that there has been a trend toward increased placement of manpower in the last 2 weeks, but there is danger that this trend, which was unquestionably due to the belief that Congress contemplated prompt action, will be reversed by reports now current in the press that congressional action is likely to be delayed.

I am familiar with the provisions of H. R. 1119, on which hearings are now being held before your committee. While this bill is not a complete national service law, it will go far to secure the effective employment in the war effort of all registrants under the selective-service law between the ages of 18 and 45.

While there may be some differences of opinion on the details of the bill, prompt action now is much more important in the war effort than the perfecting of detail.

As the United Nations enter upon a truly total offense against their enemies, it is vital that that total offense should not slacken because of any less than total utilization of our manpower on the home front.

I hope that you will impress upon the members of your committee, and that your committee will impress upon the Congress how important it is that action be taken without delay on H. R. 1119, so that news may go to our fighting men that they can go all out with confidence that they cannot exhaust the supplies we are sending them and that information may come to our enemies that there will be no slackening of our total offense until they lay down their arms.

I enclose copy of a letter signed by General Marshall and Admiral King which I have just received.

Sincerely yours,
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
February 11, 1945.

Memorandum for Senator BARKLEY from the President:

I hope that legislation embracing the principle of the May bill can be speedily enacted. It will assure the armed services they can rely on the flow of necessary supplies and greatly contribute to the success of our arms.

F. D. R.

CONTINUATION OF PAY OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES FOR 12 MONTHS AFTER DISCHARGE

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, next in importance to the winning of the war, which we now seem to be well on the way of doing, is the matter of the relocation into jobs of the millions of men who will return from the fighting fronts.

That will be a large and necessary part of the winning of the peace.

We know that our social and economic order will be determined largely in accordance with the way in which this situation is met.

Vague promises have been made that men will be given the opportunity to return to the positions from which they were taken when called into the armed service.

Yet we know that by reason of the many changes which have taken place and will continue to take place in business and industry, such jobs will not always be immediately available.

Further, there will be many who will not wish to return to the same work.

Again, there will be the vast number of younger men who went from school and college directly into the service.

Let us assume that it will take at least a year for business and industry as a whole to change and to make over machinery from war to peace production, even if we start now, as is being contemplated.

It will not take less time for the Federal Government, for States and municipalities actually to get started on programs of public works which only in a few cases are now in the blueprint state. That such programs will be necessary as a supplement to all that private enterprise can do would seem to be a foregone conclusion.

By such programs I do not mean another W. P. A. or anything that would savor of that, but rather work that will be done under regular contract procedure. for which men will be paid the going rate of wage for such work.

Any Government works program should be considered as secondary in importance to that of getting men back into suitable jobs in private industry.

We boast in this country, and we have reason to do so, of our great industrial plants, our far-flung transportation systems, our great mercantile establishments, our sound and tremendous financial institutions, our farms and our mines and our great natural resources but they are not our most valuable possession.

Our most valuable possession is the manpower of this country—the millions of men and women who constitute the physical and the nervous system of our body politic.

And among them none are more valuable than the brave and heroic men and women, keen of mind, sound of body, and inspired by love of our great democratic ideals, who have served and are serving this Nation in the greatest crisis in our history.

We owe it to them, but even more we owe it to our country and to our future destiny, to see to it that when they leave the armed services their reconversion into civilian life, their transition from the pursuits of war to the pursuits of peace, shall be in an atmosphere of sympathy, of practical helpfulness, of considerate and mutual aid.

We know how difficult a period that period of transition will be for sons and daughters, brothers and sisters now serving their country.

We know that even now, while they so bravely and unselfishly devote themselves to the single task of winning this war, they too are concerned as to what the post-war period holds in store for them when they take off their uniforms and return to civilian life.

For millions of them there is great and disturbing uncertainty and anxiety as to their future.

At least 2,000,000 of our boys and girls have never had jobs in civilian life.

Millions of others have come from farms, mercantile establishments, and financial institutions, and from employment in which there was no organized labor group.

I have heard it estimated that of the 11,000,000 men and women in our armed services, less than 2,500,000 belong to labor unions.

As I have said, while we have by legislation done what we possibly could to assure their return to their pre-war jobs, we must recognize that as a practical matter the accomplishment of our aim will be impossible.

It is imperative, therefore, that we strive to the utmost to do everything possible to preserve the self-respect and to assure the welfare of these heroic servicemen and servicewomen.

To that end I propose that the Congress of the United States enact legislation which will permit the continuation of pay of members of the armed forces up to 12 months—in monthly installments—following the date of their honorable discharge from service.

Such legislation will contain the provision that the period of payment shall in no case exceed the period of active military service performed during the 6 months following.

In the event that any serviceman or servicewoman takes advantage of the provisions of the existing servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—which is a serviceman's unemployment compensation act—the sum so received shall be deducted from payments due under this proposed act.

The proposed act will in no way affect the existing law as to mustering-out allowances, nor will it affect the G. I. bill of rights, particularly with respect to educational aid for discharged servicemen.

Since all things must have a name, I should like to designate this proposed act as the "Veterans' Readjustment Pay Act of 1945."

I know that there will be many who will view with alarm the expenditure involved. On that score, I can only say that during 1944 we spent $86,000,000,000

to wage war so as to preserve our Nation and to assure our future. When the war comes to an end and this $86,000,000,000 expenditure is reduced to perhaps one-tenth of that sum, is it too much to spend another $4,000,000,000 a year to assure those who have been willing to give their all against want and the depression of body and of mind that may naturally come as they reenter civilian life?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Has the Senator any estimate as to what the total cost would be?

Mr. GUFFEY. I will answer that question in a moment.

Mr. OVERTON. Let me ask the Senator another question. As I understand, the only deduction to be made from the sum to be paid to the returning soldiers would be the unemployment compensation which they receive.

Mr. GUFFEY. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. If a man received no unemployment compensation, what he would receive would be in the nature of a bonus, would it not?

Mr. GUFFEY. I call it deferred pay. I do not like the word "bonus."

Mr. OVERTON. There is not much distinction, except in the name.

Mr. GUFFEY. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator is discussing a matter in which I am very much interested, and in which I believe all other Senators are interested. Is there any provision in the Senator's bill as to what the soldier shall do with the funds thus given to him? Must he invest them?

Mr. GUFFEY. There is no provision at all.

Mr. OVERTON. Could he do as he pleased with them?

Mr. GUFFEY. He could do as he pleased with them.

Mr. OVERTON. Could he spend the money as soon as he received it?

Mr. GUFFEY. He would receive it in 12 monthly payments. The total amount cannot exceed $15,000,000,000. I do not think it will run that high.

Mr. OVERTON. That is the limitation.

Mr. GUFFEY. That is the limitation, because that is the total pay of all men in the service for 1 year.

Mr. OVERTON. Could it not possibly exceed $15,000,000,000?

Mr. GUFFEY. No; it could not exceed $15,000,000,000.

Mr. OVERTON. That would depend on how long the war lasts.

Mr. GUFFEY. I agree with the Senator; but the maximum amount that could be paid, on the present basis, is calculated upon what we paid last year to the men in the armed services, and it would not exceed $15,000,000,000. That is 5 percent on the $300,000,000,000 which I anticipate we will owe by the time the war is over. To me that is a very small contribution to those who have fought and won the war.

Mr. OVERTON. What percentage would it be?

Mr. GUFFEY. Five percent on $300,000,000,000.

Mr. OVERTON. What total payments to returning servicemen are contemplated by the bill?

Mr. GUFFEY. Four billion dollars the first year; and they could not possibly exceed $15,000,000,000 in all.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. Does the Senator contemplate covering all the military and naval forces, including commissioned officers?

Mr. GUFFEY. Every officer and every enlisted man who is honorably discharged.

Mr. MEAD. Every officer and every private?

Mr. GUFFEY. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. That would include all noncommissioned officers.

Mr. GUFFEY. Absolutely; but no allowances are made.

Mr. OVERTON. A general would receive a general's pay.

Mr. GUFFEY. That is all.

Mr. MEAD. Provided he left the service and was honorably discharged.

Mr. GUFFEY. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. If he remained in the service he would not come under the provisions of the Senator's bill; is that correct?

Mr. GUFFEY. That is correct.

Mr. President, these men and women merit this treatment from a country which they have saved from the suffering, agony, and wanton destruction which the Old World countries have experienced; deserve it from those of us, who, by their giving, have been able to go on living normally in entire comfort and security, while they endured the dangers and the sufferings of war.

We are being told that we are at least 6 months nearer the end of the war than was expected a year or more ago. If that be true, then the Government is being saved a vast amount of money, to say nothing of human lives. Can we not well afford to spend some of those money savings in this manner?

Secondly, it would be treating all alike and would remove the whole group from any necessary temporary charity, either private or public, no matter how well intentioned that might be, for this payment would go to them as a right for services rendered.

Its practical effect will be to make unemployment compensation unnecessary, the administration of which is difficult and costly, and which is bound to be uneven and cumbersome.

Third. It will be a simple matter of administration, by and through the War and Navy Departments, requiring no new commissions or bureaus, no army of investigators and welfare workers to carry on their endless inquiries and investigations to determine the social and economic need of Tom Smith, as compared with Jim Brown, and as to whether this or that relative could be counted upon to help through the adjustment period.

It would give opportunity to men and women to make their own readjustments as to occupation, as, undoubtedly, the large majority would prefer to do rather than to be under constant supervision of this or that Government agency.

They did not need before the war, they will not need after the war, an army of welfare workers and rehabilitators to rehabilitate and orient them into civilian life and pursuits.

To those who say to me, as one United States Senator has said, "You will never get men back to work even if jobs are available, so long as they are kept on such a pay roll," my only answer is:

"You are thinking only of the few. You have no faith in the great army of common men who are fighting and dying that you may live."

Fourth. With this part of the task undertaken by the Federal Government, the States and municipalities would have more funds available for the public-works programs now being thought of and, in some cases, already planned.

I have discussed this proposed legislation with Mr. William H. Matthews, an experienced welfare worker, who is now located in New York, and whom I have known and worked with for the better part of 40 years. In writing to me endorsing this proposal, Mr. Matthews said:

> I am not writing as one ignorant of relief procedures, either private or public.
>
> I have known from first-hand observation the bitterness, the humiliation, and hopelessness, the loss of self-respect that is engendered in men's hearts when they are required to resort to bread lines, to hours of waiting on relief benches, or even to the better made work-relief programs, such as were carried on under private auspices in 1920 and 1921, and again in 1930 and 1932 and which later blossomed into the W. P. A.
>
> Commendable as may have been the motives of those who supported and directed such attempts to ameliorate the sufferings of unemployed men and women, they offer nothing which should suggest their repetition in the difficult years directly ahead of us.

Mr. President, we are a mighty country. Government, industrial management, and labor have, over the past 3 years, performed a miracle. They have accomplished what seemed impossible

Now this other seemingly impossible task, the early post-war period, awaits them, calling on their strength, intelligence, and integrity to make certain that there will be as little confusion and distress as possible during the period of reconversion.

What could be of greater aid during this trying period than a year's pay to every man and woman in the armed services?

Mr. President, I ask consent to introduce the bill for appropriate reference and ask that it be printed and put on every Member's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 675) to provide for continuing the pay of

members of the armed forces for 12 months following the date of discharge from the service, introduced by Mr. GUFFEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

VIGILANCE IN TREATY MAKING

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, some time back, a fellow Senator, commenting on a debate here, remarked that the "human mind is a queer contraption."

Fortunately, in America, we realize that with different backgrounds and mental perspectives, people can see things differently and still be honest. I know of no better example of that than what we are now witnessing and have been witnessing in the Senate during the last week.

The other day, that distinguished statesman from North Carolina, Senator BAILEY, made a great talk, championing the May-Bailey bill. As one listened to the logic and elcquence of his expression, his subtle humor, and his classic references, one was prone to ask, "Can there be another side?"

Then we heard the scholarly dissertation of the esteemed junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] taking the position that the committee substitute was the appropriate measure, and outlining 14 points or reasons to substantiate this position.

After that we had proposed to us the substitute to the committee bill. This proposal was offered by my genial and versatile friend, the eminent Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. He advanced cogent arguments on why his bill was the answer to the situation. I understand there are many Senators who are going to support his position.

Several days later, the amiable junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] made the steel rafters ring in his plea against all three of these measures, asking that the Senate vote them down one at a time.

The Senate Military Affairs Committee has spent some 3 weeks considering this subject, and at last reported out the substitute to the May-Bailey bill by a vote of 15 to 4. I am not a member of the committee, nor have I had sufficient time to attend its sessions as an interested party in order to hear at first hand its important deliberations. I have been very busy with work in other committees.

This whole situation is all too common. Our time is so taken up with matters before our own committees that we cannot devote entirely adequate attention to the vast amount of important and controversial legislation.

Let me give another example of how the human mind, even after years have elapsed, can interpret history differently:

In Collier's of March 10, 1945, an article by our genial friend the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] is prefaced by the statement, "26 years ago a little group of willful men prevented our entering the League of Nations."

In the Sunday Washington Star of March 4, 1945, there is an article by Judge Irvine L. Lenroot, a former United States Senator from Wisconsin, in which he says: "The truth is that President Wilson himself was the cause of our failure to become a member of the League of Nations." Judge Lenroot, it should be remembered, was present in the Senate and participated actively in the League of Nations debates. Every Senator may read his article with profit. Mr. President, I had expected to request unanimous consent to have the article by Judge Lenroot printed in the RECORD, following my remarks. However, I find that it has already been printed in the Appendix of the RECORD of March 5, so I will not make that request.

Out of this bit of philosophy on the diverse workings of the human mind there comes this thought, Mr. President:

In the months ahead the Senate will have submitted to it a number of treaties relating to world affairs. Hearings will be held by the Foreign Relations Committee, the Banking and Currency Committee, and perhaps other committees. These treaties are of such significance and importance that it seems to me that, for the time being, many minor hearings of other committees might well be condensed, dispensed with, or postponed. Thus, the Senate could practically en masse attend the relatively more important hearings. Virtually all of its members could get first-hand information rather than have to rely on hearsay as to the testimony which was given.

Moreover, it seems to me that the Senate might even resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole and hear the testimony on such important matters as the Bretton Woods agreements and the Dumbarton Oaks proposals after the latter have been revamped at San Francisco. Let us attend to first things first.

Parenthetic to the suggestion above, let me say that everyone here appreciates the indispensability of the committee system and the faithfulness with which committee members formally and informally report their findings. I do, however, call to your attention the fact that every Senator will regard it as his sacred obligation to make the fullest analysis at the closest hand of the forthcoming treaties.

Each of us wants to be positively sure that everything to which we affix our signature on the dotted line will protect America, American rights, American principles, and American interests and territory. We do not want to sell America short in any way.

Twice within a generation our great country has given of its lifeblood and treasure. In this war America has already suffered many times the human casualties and many times the financial cost of World War No. 1.

We have every right to expect that our partners, the other members of the United Nations, in these great adventures will bear in mind what we have done for them, particularly when we offer our humble but legitimate claims.

We ourselves must bear in mind our contribution to our allies; for example, in building and improving numerous bases in the Atlantic and Pacific, and in capturing, at fearful cost, island strongholds in the Pacific.

If we need these bases for future air travel or shipping of a commercial or military nature, neither Britain nor any other nation should hesitate to give us the necessary rights. After the First World War we did not need those bases because air transportation was not sufficiently developed. But we need many of them now for our commercial lines, and for our own protection in the world of tomorrow.

We proceed into this wider international field—world conditions have made it imperative that we do—with the hope and the prayer on our lips that we may prove adequate to find the way to world peace and prosperity. We do so with humbleness of spirit, but with firmness of conviction that those who deal for us must have sharp wits, and far vision, and must not forget American requirements and needs.

ENCOURAGEMENT AND PROTECTION OF SMALL OIL REFINERIES—STIMULATION OF OIL PRODUCTION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the General Leasing Act, which governs the disposition of land in the public domain, carries a provision with respect to the disposition of royalties derived from the leasing of oil lands that the Secretary of the Interior may receive such royalties in cash or in kind. In other words, the Secretary may call upon the producer to deliver the oil as oil to the Government for such disposition as the Government may desire to make of it.

In the past the control of the disposition of royalties has been exercised by the Department of the Interior through the sale of the oil to the highest bidder. The result of such practice has been that for the greater part the larger oil companies, particularly the so-called integrated companies, that is, the companies which have producing units, refining units, and marketing units, have succeeded in buying the Government oil. In many instances the oil so purchased amounted to tremendous quantities. As a consequence, small refiners, that is to say the refiners who do not own and operate their own producing leases, have found on occasion that it was very difficult to obtain the necessary oil with which to operate. The general philosophy of the Leasing Act, when it was originally adopted by the Congress back in 1920, was that wherever possible the Government should sustain the efforts of the small producer, the small-business man in the oil business, in carrying on his operations.

It has occurred to me, Mr. President, that the objective to which I have referred could be attained by an amendment of the terms of the General Leasing Act whereby a preference would be granted to the refiner who is without an independent or a known source of crude oil to purchase at the market price Government royalty oil for processing and use in that particular refinery.

I have, therefore, drafted a bill which I now introduce and ask to have referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys. I also ask that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The bill (S. 680) to encourage and protect small oil refineries by extending preference to such refineries and disposing of royalty oil under the Mineral Lands Leasing Act, was read twice by its

title, referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 36 of the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 451, U. S. Code, 1940 ed., title 30, sec. 192), is amended by adding before the first proviso in the second paragraph thereof the following: "*Provided*, That inasmuch as the public interest will be served by the sale of royalty oil to smaller refineries not having their own source of supply for oil, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to grant preference to such refineries in the sale of oil under the provisions of this section, for processing or use in such refineries and not for resale, and in so doing may sell to such refineries at private sale at not less than the market price any royalty oil accruing or reserved to the United States under leases issued pursuant to this act, as amended."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may add, Mr. President, that in December 1942, with the active and able assistance of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], there was passed by this body and sent to the President a bill which I introduced for the purpose of holding out an incentive to stimulate search for oil upon the public domain by granting a flat royalty of 12½ percent to lessees who discovered oil during the period of the war. The flat royalty of 12½ percent was granted in lieu of the sliding scale which the Department of the Interior had adopted, running from 12½ percent to 32 percent, and was provided to extend over a period of 10 years. The thought back of the bill was that it would result in promoting the discovery of oil upon the public domain at a time when the Government very greatly needed new sources of oil supply.

It is known to every person interested in the oil business, and to each one who has any knowledge of the oil business, that during the present war, as in the First World War, the petroleum sources of the United States were drawn upon in a substantial manner to carry on the war. That was true in the First World War, and it is even more true in the present World War. Our reserves have been the principal sources of the petroleum supply with which the present great global struggle is being fought. It indicates why it is of importance that the search for oil in the United States be stimulated.

Since the act to which I have referred, of December 24, 1942, was signed by the President, 29 new discoveries of oil have been made on the public domain in the Rocky Mountain region and in California. Of those new discoveries 14 were made in Wyoming, 8 in California, 5 in New Mexico, and 1 each in Colorado and Montana. Of course, a very lively search was made for oil, and during the war more wells have been drilled on private land than on public land. A substantial increase has been made in the production of oil in Wyoming, Colorado, and Montana since the enactment of the act of December 24, 1942, and according to the information available to the Geological Survey there is every reason to believe that many important new tests will be made during 1945 throughout the Rocky Mountain area. Many wells will be drilled to a depth in excess of 10,000 feet. In Montana the production of oil increased from 497,503 barrels in 1943 to 658,430 barrels in 1944. Production fell off slightly in New Mexico in 1944; but there was a substantial increase in both Colorado and Wyoming. In Colorado the total production in 1944 was 2,187,474 barrels, as compared with 1,571,546 barrels in 1943, and the reserve of oil in Colorado was estimated on January 1, 1945, by the Oil and Gas Journal as amounting to 57,920,000 barrels, as compared with 30,779,000 barrels the year before.

In Wyoming the crude-oil production from public lands increased from 19,586,250 barrels in 1943 to 20,693,483 barrels in 1944. There has been a substantial draft upon the oil resources of the State of Wyoming, but, in spite of that, the reserves are estimated at this moment to be about 600,000,000 barrels of oil.

Reports of the United States Geological Survey show that there has been a tremendous increase in the number of new wells drilled in the Rocky Mountain area since the passage of the act of December 24, 1942. Wyoming, New Mexico, and Montana saw the greatest amount of activity, and there was a substantial increase in Colorado. In Wyoming 316 wells were drilled on public lands, Indian land, and private land in 1944, as compared with 179 in 1942. New Mexico showed an increase from 345 in 1943 to 536 in 1944. Montana jumped from 265 to 497, and Colorado from 55 to 94.

Mr. President, when the bill which I have just introduced was in preparation I requested Assistant Secretary Chapman, of the Interior Department, to have a memorandum prepared from the records of the United States Geological Survey on oil development in this general region. That statement has been prepared and has been handed to me, and I ask unanimous consent that it and the attached tables may appear at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Without objection, the memorandum and tables will be printed in the RECORD.

The memorandum and tables are as follows:

Reference is made to a verbal request by Mr. Doty for information on new oil production developed on public land since January 1, 1943. The information contained in the Geological Survey files has not been assembled exactly under that definition and estimated reserves by fields have not been received. They are normally computed as soon after the close of the calendar year as possible without interference with the routine supervisory activities.

In discussing with Mr. Doty the information that may be desired, it is believed that you are interested in the discoveries of new fields or deposits of oil under the act of December 24, 1942, sponsored by Senator O'MAHONEY. There is attached a tabulation of the new discoveries, by States, on which applications have been or are expected to be filed for the benefit of the so-called 12½ percent discovery act. Applications for discovery benefits are filed with the General Land Office; however, the tabulation is believed to represent all discoveries to date under the O'Mahoney Act that may be entitled to a favorable report by the Geological Survey. It is of interest to note that in several instances the lessees are not filing applications for discovery benefits if a new discovery is made on a 5-percent royalty rate lease unless a field is unitized, consequently a few new discoveries may have been missed in assembling the information.

WYOMING

Valuable new discoveries of oil have been made in Wyoming since January 1, 1942, such as Golden Eagle (private land), Wagonhound, Little Buffalo Basin, Crooks Gap, Bailey Dome, Little Buck Creek, and Big Sand Draw, embracing public lands, and Steamboat Butte and Winkleman in the Wind River Indian Agency. Development of old fields, such as Oregon Basin, Elk Basin, Garland, Byron, Werts, Lost Soldier, Pitchfork, Fourbear, Cole Creek, and East Lance Creek have added materially to new production and the ability of the fields to maintain a reasonable rate of production without damage to the productive zone.

Wyoming reserves remain well above 600,000,000 barrels (Oil and Gas Journal, estimate all lands 619,810,000 barrels January 1, 1945), even with withdrawals for the past 3 years exceeding 33,000,000 barrels per year. The sustained reserves are in part due to new discoveries, readjustment of acre content, and area and formation characteristics. Drilling has been particularly active in Wyoming for the past 3 years, as evidenced by the following:

	Calendar year—		
	1942	1943	1944
Wells drilled on public land	100	116	166
Wells drilled on Indian land	17	11	21
Wells drilled on other land	62	100	150
Total wells drilled	179	227	316

It is believed that the act of December 24, 1942, was an added incentive to drill on the public lands in Wyoming for new deposits of oil.

New pipe-line outlets, refinery requirements to meet the war demands, and subsidy payments for production and transportation have likewise aided in developing old and new areas alike thereby maintaining the sustained yearly production for the State.

The total production of crude oil from public lands in Wyoming for 1943 was 19,586,250 barrels and for 1944, 20,693,483 barrels.

COLORADO

Colorado has witnessed an increase in wildcat drilling for discovery of new fields but the number of new discoveries on public lands is very limited. The Wilson Creek unit, embracing only public lands, has been actively drilled to meet market demand and a deep prospecting test to Granite expected at approximately 10,000 feet is now drilling. Several exploratory wells were drilled in the State, including one in the White River unit on public land without obtaining commercial production.

Two interesting developments have been the reopening of producible wells and extension of the producing area by drilling in the North McCallum field and the renewed activity in the Rangely field. The major portion of the productive acreage in the North McCallum field is on public land. The real development in Colorado is in the Rangely field in western Colorado where an active drilling campaign is starting. This field, while developed in the shallow zones for years, has had deep production shut-in on public land in the Weber sand since 1932, due to lack of a satisfactory market. Late in 1943, the one well resumed production and additional drilling on public land commenced. Because of depth and unknown sand conditions, several hundred feet in thickness, drilling was slow in 1944, however, it is predicted that as many as 25 or more rotary

rigs will be operating in 1945 with one major operator alone having 12 rigs in operation. If structural conditions are as predicted, the Rangely field will be one of the primary sources of crude oil in the Rocky Mountain area. Pipe-line facilities now being constructed will permit transportation of the oil to rail or direct to refineries. The area is not controlled by public-land oil and gas leases.

Drilling in Colorado for the past 3 years does not compare in magnitude with the other major producing public-land States. The following tabulation shows the wells drilled and evidence of increased activity.

	Calendar year—		
	1942	1943	1944
Wells drilled on public lands	32	37	44
Wells drilled on other lands	23	41	50
Total wells drilled	55	78	94

The total production of crude oil in Colorado from public lands in 1943 was 1,575,146 barrels and for 1944 the production increased to 2,187,474 barrels. Production and reserves in 1945 should show a substantial increase. The estimated oil reserve for all lands in Colorado, as of January 1, 1945, as published by the Oil and Gas Journal, is 57,920,000 barrels and on January 1, 1944, were 30,779,000 barrels.

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico development on public lands has been active since January 1, 1943, and some new production has been discovered in deep horizons or by extensions to old producing areas. In many cases the new production has been developed by merely expanding old fields, more or less classified as semiwildcat territory. Stratigraphic conditions are not in evidence at the surface similar to most of the presently producing areas in Wyoming and Colorado. Development of proven or semiproven areas has added materially to sustaining producible reserves both on public and other lands. The following tabulation furnishes evidence of increased drilling activity in New Mexico.

	Calendar year—		
	1942	1943	1944
Wells drilled on public lands	217	178	276
Wells drilled on other lands	128	110	260
Total wells drilled	345	288	536

Production from public lands has decreased slightly from 11,267,253 barrels in 1943 to 11,115,832 barrels in 1944. The estimated oil reserves for all lands was 582,049,000 barrels January 1, 1944, and 541,926,000 barrels January 1, 1945.

MONTANA

Montana has had a large number of wildcat wells drilled on promising structural features, but the number of new discoveries of oil has been very disappointing for the past 2 years. A new discovery of undetermined value was made late in 1944 on public land in the Clarke's Fork field, in southern Montana. Additional drilling and testing will be necessary before estimating the reserve or importance of the field.

Drilling in the State, developing new sources of oil, has been largely in or adjacent to areas already defined as proven for production, although any drilling in the Kevin-Sunburst field or area is highly speculative as to the final results, and consequently nearly every well is a new source of production. Drilling on public lands is only a small percentage of the State total, as shown by the following tabulation:

	Calendar year—		
	1942	1943	1944
Wells drilled on public lands	44	47	82
Wells drilled on Indian lands	40	65	69
Wells drilled on other lands	181	261	346
Total wells drilled	265	373	497

Production from public lands increased from 497,503 barrels in 1943 to 658,430 barrels in 1944. Practically all of the increase came from the part of the Elk Basin field located in Montana. Estimated oil reserves for all lands published by the Oil and Gas Journal decreased from 103,317,000 barrels January 1, 1944, to 92,680,000 barrels January 1, 1945.

OTHER PUBLIC LAND STATES—CALIFORNIA, UTAH, OKLAHOMA, LOUISIANA

No important new production was developed on public land since January 1, 1943. Drilling and production on public land in any of these States is very limited compared to the State totals. Production from public lands in California for 1944 was 19,844,103 barrels and increased to 21,104,030 barrels in 1944.

GENERAL

New gas discoveries on public lands since January 1, 1943, have been included in the tabulation. The calendar year promises many interesting wildcats in the Rocky Mountain area with several projected to be drilled below 10,000 feet. Two important wildcats will be drilled on the Church Buttes and Pinedale structures in southwestern Wyoming, one deep well is proposed in the Worland area, Wyoming, and several deep wildcats will be drilled in Colorado and New Mexico. In practically all instances prospective areas are unitized.

The Geological Survey reports new discoveries on individual leases issued under the amendment of August 21, 1935, to the Mineral Leasing Act for determination of rentals. Since January 1, 1943 reports have been made on 8 oil and 1 gas in California; 1 oil and 21 gas in Colorado; 5 oil in Montana; 20 oil and 1 gas in New Mexico; 19 oil and 3 gas in Wyoming; and 2 gas in Kansas. The total new discoveries reported are 53 oil and 8 gas on the so-called new form leases.

The Survey will endeavor to supplement this hurried report with additional facts if desired and will attempt to assemble information as directed either by fiscal or calendar years.

H. J. DUNCAN,
Chief, Conservation Branch.

New discoveries on public land leases for which applications have been filed or are expected for royalty benefits under the act of Dec. 24, 1942

Date of discovery	Field	Operator	Lease No.	Well No.	Location	Total depth	Initial production	Producing formation	New field or zone
	WYOMING					Feet			
Feb. 6, 1943	South Oregon Basin	Yale Petroleum Co.	Chey. 066528	4	5-5 N-100 W	4,663	300 barrels per day.	Madison	New pool.
Nov. 5, 1943	Little Buffalo Basin	Fred Goodstein	Chey. 052236	1—Pedley	13-47 N-100 W	4,965	150 barrels per day.	Tensleep	Do.
May 9, 1944	do	Stanolind Oil & Gas Co.	Chey 045855	3	1-47 N-100 W		168 barrels per day.	Embar	Do.
Oct. 8, 1943	Gebo Dome	Continental Oil Co.	Chey. 066982	1—unit	23-44 N-95 W	4,845	413 barrels per day.	do	Do.
Nov. 3, 1943	do	do	Chey. 066982	do	do	4,845	268 barrels per day.	Tensleep	New zone.
Mar. 3, 1944	Wagonhound Anticline.	Broderick & Gordon	Chey. 065997	1—unit—Christianson.	6-44 N-98 W	4,700	504 barrels per day.	Embar	New pool.
June 8, 1944	Little Buck Creek	Continental Oil Co.	Chey. 064741	1—Wright	25-36 N-64 W	4,100	546 barrels per day.	Dakota	Extension.
Aug. 12, 1944	Spindletop	Wyalta Oil Co.	Chey. 037004(a)	1-D	32-30 N-81 W	2,445	250 barrels per day.	Tensleep	New pool.
Sept. 26, 1944	Half Moon	Husky Refining Co.	Chey. 063922		23-51 N-102 W		200 barrels per day.	Embar	New field.
Oct. 7, 1944	Big Sand Draw	Sinclair-Wyoming Oil.	Chey. 044150	1	14-32 N-95 W	7,381	17,000 M cubic feet.	do	New pool.
Nov. 20, 1944	Big Sand Draw	Sinclair-Wyoming Oil.	Chey. 044150	1	14-32 N-95 W	7,381	804 barrels per day.	Tensleep	New zone.
Oct. 26, 1944	Crooks Gap	do	Chey. 033009	1—unit	18-28 N-92 W	5,315	1,478 barrels per day.	Cloverly	New field.
Nov. 22, 1944	South Elk Basin	Continental Oil Co.	Chey. 067559	1—tp	20-57 N-99 W	4,390	2,800 M cubic feet.	Second frontier	Do.
Dec. 19, 1944	Bailey Dome	Sinclair-Wyoming Oil.	Chey. 077671	1	21-26 N-89 W	5,232	634 barrels per day. 1,250 M cubic feet.	Sundance	Do.
	COLORADO								
June 26, 1943	Douglas Creek	Superior Oil Co.	Denver 034909	1—Hellman	5-3 S-101 W	8,564	5,865 M cubic feet.	Dakota and Lakota.	
	CALIFORNIA								
Dec. 27, 1943	Poso Creek area	D. G. Vedder	Sac. 019288	1	18-27 S-28 E	2,470	5,300 M cubic feet.	Vedder	Do.
Feb. 3, 1944	do	do	Sac. 019288	3	do	2,462	148 barrels per day.	Vedder (Miocene)	
Apr. 27, 1944	Aliso Canyon	Standard Oil Co.	LA—055641	1—Frew	29-3 N-16 W	9,291	86 barrels per day. 50 M cubic feet.	Frew (Eocene)	New zone.
Oct. 26, 1944	Round Mountain area.	E. A. Bender Drilling Co.	Sac. 034892	14-1	14-28 S-28 E	2,660	150 barrels per day.	Vedder (Miocene)	New pool.
Oct. 15, 1944	Oak Canyon	Western Gulf Oil Co.	LA—042151 cons.	Wickham—1A.	31-5 N-17 W	7,017	127 barrels per day.	Weaver sand	New zone.
Nov. 2, 1944	do	do	LA—042151 cons.	do	do	7,017	323 barrels per day.	Maxwell sand (Miocene).	Do.
Mar. 17, 1944	Aliso Canyon	Barnsdall Oil Co.	LA—052994	1—Roosa	29-3 N-16 W	6,627	63 barrels per day.	Roosa (Pliocene)	Do.

New discoveries on public land leases for which applications have been filed or are expected for royalty benefits under the act of Dec. 24, 1942—Continued

Date of discovery	Field	Operator	Lease No.	Well No.	Location	Total depth	Initial production	Producing formation	New field or zone
	MONTANA								
Nov. 29, 1944	Clark Fork	Julius Peters	Billings 034268	1	25-9 S-22 E	Feet 6,531	20 barrels per hour	Second frontier	New field.
	NEW MEXICO								
May 12, 1944	Not named	The Texas Co.	LC—029446	1—Bashkin	22-19 S-33 E	8,586	142 barrels per day	Seven Rivers	Do.
Nov. 7, 1944	Dublin Field	Humble Oil & Refining Co.	LC—062384	1—Leonard	12-26 S-37 E	11,909	207 barrels per day	Ellenberger	New pool.
May 20, 1943	South Maljamar	Maljamar Oil & Gas Co.	LC—029401	2X—Chessman.	22-18 S-32 E	4,840	75 barrels per day	Grayberg	New field.
Dec. 20, 1944	Skaggs Field	Continental Oil Co.	LC—031620 (b).	2—Skaggs	23-20 S-37 E	10,465	269 barrels per day. 150 M cubic feet.	Abo (Permian)	New pool.
June 10, 1943	Fenton Pool	Schuster & Mersinger.	LC—033171	1—Page	15-21 S-28 E	2,650	25 barrels per day	Delaware (Permian).	New field.

LIQUIDATION OF PETROLEUM RESERVES CORPORATION

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution to liquidate and dissolve Petroleum Reserves Corporation, a Government corporation, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, which I think is the proper committee to consider it.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I ask the Chair with reference to the committee to which the joint resolution should go.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks it should go to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it should be referred to the committee where it ought to go regardless of any request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution refers to powers under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act.

Mr. MOORE. Of course, Mr. President, I cannot argue the matter of jurisdiction. Is it the holding of the Chair that the joint resolution should be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair refers the joint resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MOORE. I may say to the Senator from Kentucky that a similar resolution which I introduced at the last session was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. That might not have been the proper committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. What we are trying to do is to get away from the practice, which was announced here some years ago in an informal way, that a bill would be referred to any committee to which the Senator introducing it desired it to go, which abrogates all the rules of committee jurisdiction. So I think the joint resolution ought to go to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to liquidate and dissolve Petroleum Reserves Corporation, a Government corporation, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I have just introduced a joint resolution to liquidate and dissolve Petroleum Reserves Corporation, a Government corporation. Petroleum Reserves Corporation was organized, pursuant to section 5 (d) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, on the last day on which said powers might be exercised.

The act authorizes the organization of corporations confined to the production and transportation of critical and strategic materials for war. The asserted purposes for which this Corporation was organized was to build and operate the so-called Arabian oil pipe line.

The language of the corporate charter reflects a definite purpose to engage the United States in the petroleum business, both at home and abroad, as a permanent industrial program, contrary to the affirmative expressions of the statute under which the Corporation was created. In fact the act provides that no such corporation shall have succession after January 22, 1947. Because of the attempted perpetual purposes and character of this Corporation, its legal existence is seriously challenged.

After a penetrating investigation by a special committee of the Congress and after wide and vigorous opposition to the proposed activities by the petroleum industry and by the various industry trade associations and condemnation of the objectives of the Corporation by the Petroleum Industry War Council, the active personnel of the Corporation resigned their positions, and as of today I am informed that the Corporation exists in name only, with the possible exception of one employee. It is my further understanding that although the Corporation originally secured a commitment for the loan of $30,000,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, it has used less than $100,000 of its credit.

Other than the Secretary of the Interior, who still holds to the ambition of becoming petroleum czar in the new order of American bureaucracy, I know of no one who now defends the existence of the Petroleum Reserves Corporation. It is one of the many Government corporations which certainly can and should be dissolved by the Congress.

Mr. President, while the joint resolution I have introduced today is directed only at the dissolution of Petroleum Reserves Corporation, I feel it is appropriate to discuss some of the aspects of Government corporations in general. The time has come when the Congress must either accept the totalitarianism of the corporate state, which can only be supported by a permanent system of planned economy, or support the democracy of a free and competitive system of private enterprise.

These Government corporations are divided into three general classifications: First, 40 corporations directly owned by the Government and supervised by governmental agencies; second, 4 wholly owned Government corporations independently operated under direct statutory authority; and, third, 11 corporations in which the Government has a proprietary interest, or a contractual relation. In addition, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures lists 13 Federal Government agencies engaged in the fields of credit, banking, and other business enterprises.

The dimensions and scope of the activities of these corporations and agencies are of infinite proportions. In practically every case they have trespassed far beyond the outer boundary of the most liberal interpretation of the congressional powers intended for them. I dare the assertion that there is not a single Member of the Congress or a single committee of the Congress that has a complete grasp of the manifold machinations of this group of economic giants.

A glaring example of the almost limitless activities of these Government corporations was exposed in an address by the able Representative from Wisconsin, Mr. FRANK KEEFE, appearing in the RECORD of February 20, concerning the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Representative KEEFE'S remarks should arouse us to the dangers inherent in these uncontrolled corporations.

The recent testimony of the learned Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] before the Commerce Committee of the Senate in support of his bill to divorce various lending agencies from the Commerce Department is a startling and chilling revelation of the long distance which American democracy has moved toward economic totalitarianism. In some countries it is called communism, in others national socialism, and in still others fascism. Its name is immaterial. Whatever name may be applied to the system, it all adds up to a controlled economy by governmental edict administered by an unresponsive bureaucracy. In each case the individual is made subservient to the state, and the lives of the people affected are regulated for the benefit of the government, instead of having a government regulated for the advantage of its people.

Those who would harness our democracy with a planned economy are no longer deceptive. They firmly believe that government can blueprint our economy without totalitarianism. The planners believe that in times of business recessions and periods of unemployment government should come to the rescue with government financed projects, made work, and other artificial stimulants. Conversely, they believe, in times of prosperity, labor shortages, and inflationary trends, that government support should be withdrawn, and tax burdens increased, and thus a brake applied to the wheels of business.

For more than a decade we have experienced this philosophy of government and have witnessed its failure, but the effectiveness of the plan to accomplish the objectives claimed for it is not the question. The question is, What does it do to democracy, what does it do to our freedom, what does it do to our constitutional guaranties? No plan or scheme that arbitrarily directs the national economy, however good the result may be, can function without a master mind in the driver's seat. Someone, somewhere, must be supreme, and that means dictatorship and totalitarianism. I do not believe that America is ready to sacrifice individualism for a planned economy at the expense of freedom.

It has long been recognized by the Congress and the people at large that the operation of this great corporate division of Government was completely out of hand, but few attempts have been made to do anything about it. Under our present inadequate controls and supervision, the Congress has been helpless even to find out what these corporations are doing, and, consequently, has not indicated its approval or disapproval of their actions. I seriously doubt that the full significance of these corporate activities is appreciated by our people. Without any effective control by the Congress, Government through these corporate instrumentalities is engaged in practically every industrial field known to the economic life of the United States.

Too many Americans have permitted themselves to be fitted with rose-colored glasses. We have become saturated with talk of new social schemes, bold social engineering, security from the cradle to the grave, and other catch phrases. Although couched in the language of democracy and constitutional government, the fact that our democracy is being throttled through bureaucratic control of business and administrative regulations cannot be disguised. All roads to destruction have been paved with good intentions and pretty promises. The tempting bait now held out to us is subsidies, price supports, ceilings, minimum and maximum prices, Government guaranties, and other equally attractive sugar-coated pills. Government is now subsidizing the petroleum industry at the rate of $250,000,000 a year, sugar at the rate of eighteen million, and coal at the rate of twenty-five million.

The report of the Secretary of Commerce to the President and Congress, dated January 15, discloses total subsidy disbursements by Reconstruction Finance Corporation subsidiary corporations under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, have amounted to $1,400,000,000. It should be remembered that these disbursements are exclusive of agricultural subsidies and money spent to support prices by the various corporations and agencies under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. Only recently the Senate passed a bill to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation a billion and a half dollars, to a total of four and a half billion dollars. The House bill proposes to expand Commodity Credit Corporation credit to five billion.

German labor, agriculture, and businessmen took the same bait. Hitler bribed his way to power with the same kind of counterfeit promises, but, once having gained dictatorial prerogatives, Hitler had no hesitancy in letting the people know that the structure of his compulsory state had not been built for the benefit of the individual.

Does labor realize that it is being liquidated by these corporations? Is it possible that the farmer does not now realize that he is living in a state of badly diluted freedom? Does the merchant know that his business is literally being dried up? Does the banker understand that he is being definitely driven from the field of finance? From January 1, 1942, to January 1, 1945, 162 banks in 11 Midwestern States were voluntarily liquidated.

Labor cannot survive without an employer, and employers cannot survive the competition of Government corporations that operate with capital directly drawn out of their business. These Government corporations pay no income or other business taxes. Their boards of directors are responsible to no stockholders. A deficit merely means another sale of bonds to the Federal Treasury and a corresponding increase in the tax rate on private business. The margin between private income and tax payments is constantly growing thinner. Already some branches of industry are operating on 20-cent dollars, and still we hear the proponents of a "planned economy" with all profundity loudly proclaim the necessity of "holding the line" against inflation.

Eighteen of these corporations and lending agencies are engaged in the field of credit and banking. Twelve are in the field of commodities and supplies; four in the field of insurance; six in transportation. Four are engaged in construction; four in economic and social rehabilitation. One is in the power business. Some are in the wholesale and retail business; others in manufacturing and the operation of distilleries, breweries, hotels, and mines; and one in publicity.

Nine of these corporations are organized under and are subject to the laws of the State of Delaware. Two were created under and subject to the laws of the State of Maryland; one under the provisions of the laws of Tennessee; two under and pursuant to the laws of New York; one under the laws of New Jersey; three under and pursuant to the laws of the District of Columbia; one under the laws of the State of Washington; and one pursuant to the Colonial Council for the Municipalities of St. Thomas and St. John of the Virgin Islands. Why these corporations were not organized under the Federal law with Federal charters is not clear.

While the regular departments of Government must secure annual appropriations from Congress, these corporations have been able almost entirely to evade the financial controls of the Congress. Three procedures make this possible.

First. Many of them have invested the capital provided for them by the Congress in interest-paying Government bonds, for the purpose of creating an annual operating income to the corporation, and thus the necessity of returning to Congress for an appropriation to cover administrative expenses is avoided.

For example, the January 1943 bulletin of the Treasury Department showed that as of November 30, 1942, the banks for cooperatives owned $33,800,000 of Government securities and $61,000,000 of other interest-bearing investments. The Federal home-loan banks, as of the same date, showed an investment of over $105,000,000 in United States securities.

Second. Most of these corporations have authority to issue their secured or unsecured obligations and by this method are able to borrow directly from the Treasury or from more prosperous corporate kinsfolk. If the authority is not directly granted by the Congress, the organizers of the particular corporation assume the authority by merely writing the power into the corporate charter. In the case of Petroleum Reserves Corporation, the charter expressly provides that the Corporation shall have unlimited power to borrow money and to issue its secured or unsecured obligations in aid thereof. The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures lists the total authorized limit of this power at $33,000,000,000, and shows that as of March 31 of last year over $12,000,000,000 was outstanding in Government corporation bonds. We wonder what the attitude of the Department of Justice and the Securities and Exchange Commission might be toward a private set-up of stair-step holding companies and related operating corporations paralleling the financial activities of these holding companies and relating operating corporations of the Government.

Third. Many of these corporations are actually engaged in enterprise for profit. Since they do not have the responsibility of taxes and other burdens peculiar to private corporations, they have been able to show profits sufficient to sustain their administrative and operating expenses and, thus again, are evading the financial controls of Congress.

The December Bulletin of the Treasury indicates that this group of Government corporations and credit agencies, as of September 30, 1944, had combined assets of $55,154,700,000, including $6,998,300,000 of outstanding loans. As of June 30, 1944, the 14,553 banks of the United States had total outstanding loans of nearly $25,500,000,000. Thus, Government corporations through the use of money taken from American industry and the individual taxpayer is

conducting 22 percent of the banking and credit business of the country.

Among the assets of these corporations is listed $2,165,000,000 in interest-bearing obligations of the Federal Treasury. Witness the spectacle of the Treasury paying interest out of the taxpayers' pockets to Government corporations on Federal securities purchased with capital originally furnished these corporations by the Treasury itself.

Has the provision of the Constitution that "*no money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law*" been thrown overboard?

It is entirely appropriate, of course, to point out that the Treasury's investment in these Government corporations and credit agencies has been substantially augmented by the war. It is true that 16 of these corporations and agencies have been brought into being exclusively as instrumentalities of the war, but I think it highly important to call attention to the significant fact that 50 of these peacetime Government-owned corporations and credit agencies as of the end of the first half of the fiscal year 1941 already showed gross assets of nearly $32,000,000,000, as compared with the $55,000,000,000, shown by the Treasury's statement of September 30, 1944. These peacetime assets included over $8,000,000,000 of outstanding loans, as compared with less than 7 billions of loans outstanding on September 30, 1944.

Although some of these corporations and agencies have been brought into existence for war purposes, the dollar investment in the Government corporations for war purposes has been small in comparison to the over-all war cost. From June 30, 1942, to September 30, 1944, total gross assets of all Government corporations increased approximately $23,000,000,000. During the same period, war appropriations totaled approximately $235,000,000,000. From these figures, it will at once be apparent that although our war activities are substantially reflected in the size and operations of these Government corporations, they are, to a very large extent, actually peacetime organizations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator feel that the governmental lending agencies which have been created because of the war will continue to operate after the war is over; has provision been made within organizations of these agencies whereby the lending agencies will be terminated after the war?

Mr. MOORE. I think the law provides that they must be terminated after the war.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Oklahoma care to make an observation as to whether he feels that these lending agencies have made loans that now become so much a part of our economic system that such agencies cannot be terminated? I refer, for example, to the milk subsidy we pay which now totals over a half a billion dollars. Do not our milk producers now rely on this payment for their milk production? How can they be returned to the retail price system without the payment of a subsidy?

Mr. MOORE. I most certainly think that unless there is a change of sentiment and a more intensive study made of the situation with reference to what I consider the building of the corporate state, there will be very little likelihood of discontinuance of these corporations. I hope, however, the subject will be studied and considered, and I have abundant hope that something will be done before it is too late.

Mr. President, another method by which this fourth division of Government evades the constitutional prohibition that no money shall be drawn from the Treasury, except in consequence of appropriations made by law, is illustrated by the fact that between 1938 and March 31, 1943, the Secretary of the Treasury canceled over $2,784,000,000 of Reconstruction Finance Corporation peacetime obligations, including among other items $1,782,000,000 for relief, $260,000,000 advanced to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Land Bank Commissioner for crop loans and loans to farmers, and $33,000,000 in interest.

Not a single penny of this money was appropriated by the Congress. Disbursements were made under authority delegated to the various agencies by the Congress. The Secretary of the Treasury canceled these obligations under an act of the Congress authorizing cancelation of notes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and all sums due and unpaid in connection with such notes in an amount equal to the outstanding funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation theretofore or disbursed under certain provisions of law.

The Congress thus finds itself in the ludicrous position of having authorized the Treasury to open its doors to certain agencies and then later directing the cancelation of all past as well as all future obligations created under the authorization.

The December Bulletin of the Treasury further discloses that it had invested in these agencies approximately $37,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money as of September 30, 1944. Eleven billion dollars of this is represented by loans from the Treasury to the corporations and agencies. A check of the over-all operations of these corporations and agencies to September 30, 1944, shows that 35 of them had a total deficit of fifteen and one-half billion dollars. Eighteen of them had accumulated a surplus totaling $684,000,000, or a net deficit for the American taxpayers of $14,745,000,000.

The fact that the over-all operations of this governmental venture into the field of competitive enterprise have resulted in a deficit which could well be the last straw that breaks the back of the already overburdened war-weary taxpayer, although bad enough, in itself is not the vice. The vice lies in the fact that the Congress has permitted power-hungry and ambitious bureaucrats who live in the starlit world of theories to engage this Government in the field of competitive enterprise, in violation of the supreme law of the land. It is as iniquitous in principle for these Government corporations and lending agencies to engage in business at a profit as it is to show a deficit. Our Government was not organized as a business institution. It was not designed as a profit-making organization. Who wants to see Government operate for profit, except the bureaucrats who dictate the operations?

The Congress cannot escape the responsibility for having permitted the creation of this gigantic and complicated governmental business machine, to which, over the last decade, so many gears, cogs, wheels, and wheels within wheels have been added, that those who oil the machine have no comprehensive idea of its operations. This great business machine is manned and operated by thousands of engineers, assistant engineers, directors, managers, trustees, and administrators, all engaged in issuing commands, orders, and directives for different purposes and different objectives.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was originally organized for a 2-year period with limited powers to extend financial aid to designated industrial enterprises affected with a public interest, and only after it was shown that financial aid could not be obtained from private sources, but has now grown into a permanent organization much larger than the largest of our private industrial corporations. Its manifold activities are so varied and far reaching that neither the Congress nor the people have any conception of its far-flung operations. It operates through subsidiaries and subsidiaries of subsidiaries. It controls, through the medium of finance, hundreds of businesses and Government agencies and, although the Congress may suspend some of these operations at one point, they immediately pop out in a different form through the activities of another agency.

The distinguished Senators from Virginia and Nebraska have introduced the Byrd-Butler bill—S. 469—designed to place Government corporations and lending agencies under the same congressional controls as other Government departments. As I understand the proposed legislation, it would require such corporations to submit their operations to the Bureau of the Budget. Their proposed expenditures would be included in an annual appropriation bill for the consideration of the Congress. In addition, these corporations and agencies would be subject to audit by the General Accounting Office in the same manner as other departments of Government, and the General Accounting Office would be required to report to the Congress on their operations.

The proposal is, of course, a wholesome and necessary step in the effort of Congress to regain its constitutional authority. The mandate of the Constitution that "no money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of Appropriations made by law; and a regular Statement and Account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time," cannot in any other manner be safeguarded.

As the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], while Secretary of the Treasury, once commented:

> Nothing promotes so rapidly an atmosphere of laxity as a removal of the legislative restraints long and zealously imposed by the Congress with respect to appropriations from the public funds or a weakening of the established requirement that public moneys shall be deposited in the Public Treasury and withdrawn only in consequence of legislative authorization.

The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation is an excellent example of the necessity for congressional control of these Government corporations. The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation is one of the few corporations required to secure an annual appropriation for its administrative expenses and submit a report to the Congress. It was discovered by Congress that this Corporation had received $51,795,000 in premiums and had paid out $32,945,000 in losses and indemnities. In addition to this operating deficit, it had piled up administrative expenses of $31,963,000. As a result, the Congress abolished the program and a new program has been substituted. But without the controls to which this Corporation was required to submit, how long would such past operation have continued?

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I have been impressed with the Senator's comments as to the burden which this system of financing is placing on the present generation. Is it not true that it also places a burden on future generations, and will create a handicap to our future recovery, unless something is done to stop it?

Mr. MOORE. I most certainly think so; and I thank the Senator for making the suggestion.

Mr. President, I shall support the Byrd-Butler bill because I am hoping that it will be the beginning of the end of government in business. I appreciate the necessity of bringing these corporations and agencies under congressional control in order that the Congress may have some understanding of their operations and formulate a program that will eventually free the people and private business enterprise of this country from the devastating effects of these ever-growing Government monopolies and Government activities in restraint of free and competitive trade. The Byrd-Butler bill is a necessary first step but, in my opinion, it is not the answer. The answer can lie only in withdrawing government from business. We cannot hold to democracy with one hand and engage in the practices of a totalitarian corporate state with the other. The two are unalterably incompatible. There is not room enough in this country for the exercise of both philosophies of government.

A PLAN FOR PEACE

Mr. BUSHFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hatch	Overton
Ball	Hawkes	Pepper
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Burton	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Kilgore	Smith
Butler	La Follette	Stewart
Capehart	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McFarland	Taylor
Chandler	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Magnuson	Tobey
Donnell	Maybank	Tunnell
Downey	Mead	Tydings
Eastland	Millikin	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wagner
Fulbright	Moore	Walsh
George	Morse	Wherry
Gerry	Murdock	White
Green	Murray	Wiley
Guffey	Myers	Willis
Gurney	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, the American form of government has functioned well for a century and a half. So successful has it been that it is the model upon which most of the nations of the earth have at one time or another attempted to form their governments.

Its three equal parts, the legislative, the executive, and the judicial, have so nearly balanced each other that our citizens have found little fault with its operation, and occasional attempts at sabotage have always failed.

For generations the eyes of every people on the earth have been turned toward America. For the poor and less-favored peoples, America has been a mecca toward which their hopes have turned. While our physical and material growth have been phenomenal, they have been possible only because of the things for which America stands, namely, opportunity, freedom, and prosperity.

For thousands of years we humans have been striving for more liberty and less government. Sometimes we gained. Sometimes we lost ground, but the final result has always been a gain. If we slipped back in one decade, we pushed forward to a new high in the succeeding one. Because of the opportunities afforded under our form of government we have been able to forge ahead more rapidly and more soundly than the people of any other nation.

Until a century and a half ago the human race had never learned to produce enough food to meet its needs. The founding of the American Republic brought a new day to mankind. We learned how to produce food and so release part of our people to other work. Long centuries before America, history records an unbroken succession of famines and pestilence, and the world was always hungry. We began making machines to do the work of man. And so, by the expanding cycle of intellectual development, we have delved more and more into the discovery of processes and methods whereby the standard of living for all people could be and has been raised.

The problem before us today is a grave one. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] said on January 10:

> There are critical moments in the life of every nation which call for the straightest, plainest, and most courageous thinking of which we are capable. We confront such a moment now.

This is a critical moment in human history as well as in American history. It behooves us, therefore, to examine the problems that confront us with the best intelligence of which we are capable, with the calmness and resolution which will bring us to the right solution, and with a determination not to be swayed by caprice, hatred, or emotion. There are many who have some particular ax to grind. Many idealists urge that this is an opportunity to remake the world. Many, with sincere motives, are swept off their feet in the belief that they have discovered the final and only answer to our problem. It is our duty in the Congress to study all those proposals, sift out the wheat from the chaff, and steel ourselves from emotionalism.

Hysteria has no place in this picture. We have solved every problem with which we have been faced, and we will solve this one. Freedom is not going to disappear from the earth. The American constitutional form of government will not be destroyed. Desperate though the times may seem, the sturdy, well-founded judgments of our people will prevail. We will succeed, because our decisions represent the combined wisdom of many men rather than the conclusions of one man.

We are in war today—a terrible war. Nothing that we do will ever justify its cost. It is our duty to make sure that war will not come again, but our decision must represent the combined wisdom of a free people.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should prefer to wait until I have finished my speech and then I shall be glad to answer questions.

Mr. BAILEY. Very well.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, lest there be misunderstanding or misinterpretation of my position, let me make it crystal clear.

For years, by speech and written word, I have favored the creation of an association of nations which would abolish war. It can be done and must be done, but it must be done without destroying America.

The Government under which we have lived and prospered has proved the soundness of my thesis. The American people have advanced further than has any other nation. We are not now going to discard the things that have made that progress possible.

America has no monopoly of brains. Every nation in the world has produced men of intellectual attainments equal to those of our own. We do not possess a monopoly of natural resources. A gen-

erous Providence has distributed those resources all over the earth. We do not claim or possess a monopoly of inventive genius or of scientific skill. Every civilized nation has produced men of attainment equal to ours.

We have no monopoly of religious beliefs. In our Republic all religions are recognized. Church and state have never been combined. Freedom of religion as well as freedom of speech are freedoms which American civilization demand. What, then, is the secret of our success?

Individual freedom is the answer. Freedom for each man to develop his talents in his own way without interference or oppression has been our policy. It must continue to be. Government is not for the benefit of government but for the benefit of the people; and when the day comes that the government is master instead of servant, then will come the decay and final destruction of the things we call America.

The latest plan for peace is Dumbarton Oaks. It will presently be before us as a treaty. Is it a peoples' plan? Or will it destroy America? I wish to speak of that proposal, in the hope that what I say will bring discussion which may help us all.

Last September, in a debate on Dumbarton Oaks upon this floor, I said:

> Under that plan the President will have the power to declare war without the knowledge, the consent, or the approval of Congress.

In section B of the official Dumbarton Oaks agreement, later released to the public, and particularly in subsection (6) thereof, we find these words:

> In order to enable urgent military measures to be taken by the organization, there should be held immediately available by the members of the organization national air-force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action should be determined by the Security Council.

Thus, Mr. President, we do not decide even the size of our contribution. The Security Council, composed of Britain, Russia, China, ourselves, and seven other members selected from the small nations, will determine when, where, and how our soldiers shall fight.

On October 9 an Associated Press representative, John H. Hightower, published the following statement:

> It was said on high authority that the means by which the United States would furnish its share of forces remained to be decided, but the administrative branch is expected to press for blanket authorization to obviate the necessity of asking for congressional authority each time forces were to be used.

This statement has now been verified in a statement printed in the Christian Science Monitor, February 21:

> The specific authority to be delegated to the American representative on the United Nations Security Council, determining the extent to which he will be able to commit the United States to prompt armed action against any future aggression, will be fixed by a separate statute, which the administration intends to submit to Congress as a supplement to the Dumbarton Oaks Charter.
>
> The essentials in President Roosevelt's plans on this point can now be stated authoritatively:
>
> The White House favors investing the American delegate with broad authority to enable the Security Council to act promptly and effectively in face of either a threat or an actual breach of the peace.
>
> The administration proposes to establish this authority for the American member on the council by a specific act of Congress to be passed by both Houses, since it will be an act of domestic legislation, not a treaty commitment.

It is generally known in Washington that that is the position taken by the President and that when this treaty is finally presented to the Senate for action a demand will be made that such authority be granted to him, either in the treaty or by statute, which will require only a majority vote of Congress, thus making it easier to secure passage than if a treaty vote were required. Granting this power to the delegate of the United States is the same as granting it to the President, because the delegate will be the appointee of the President and subject to him at all times.

If this power is granted to the President or to the American delegate, it will be a delegation of power to an individual to act instead of Congress. Can this be done? Definitely, I assert that it cannot.

Raymond Moley said on December 4:

> In clothing the American representative with power to act, Congress is delegating one of its greatest prerogatives.

Alexander Wilson, noted author, writing in the Commercial and Financial Chronicle, has this to say:

> Will the American people willingly leave it to the security council to send troops into battle on the authority and initiative of the security council?
>
> Will the one member representing the United States on the security council be empowered to decide on his sole judgment for the 130,000,000 Americans whether the armed strength of this country should be used to suppress aggression anywhere in the world and thus plunge us into another war?
>
> Will Congress by constitutional amendment abdicate its exclusive right to declare war to a solitary representative?

What does the Constitution say about this power?

Article I, section 1, of the Constitution provides:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives.

Section 8 of article I provides that Congress shall have power—

> To declare war * * *;
> To raise and support armies * * *;
> To provide and maintain a navy;
> To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.
> To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

No one will seriously dispute the statement that Congress alone has power to declare war. Attempting to delegate such power is in direct violation of our Constitution.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Not at present; no.

Mr. President, it may be contended that giving the President or his delegate authority to consent to the use of the armed forces of the United States to preserve the peace is not a declaration of war. Such a statement is pure bunk. The sending of armies or navies or air forces against a foreign country is war.

Dr. Wright, in his book Control of American Foreign Relations, says:

> The President cannot declare war.

On page 289, we find this statement:

> Acts of war, such as those committed by Germany from 1915 to 1917, would not justify Presidential recognition of war.

On page 290, we find this statement:

> Where acts of violence or reprisal alone are in question, Congress is the only authority that can put the country in a state of war.
>
> Where no war exists in fact, Congress is the only authority in the United States that can declare one, and Congress cannot delegate this power.

In a Senate debate of 25 years ago Senator Stone of Missouri spoke these significant words:

> The Constitution vests the war-making power alone in the Congress. It is a power that Congress is not at liberty to delegate.

Thomas Jefferson, in his message to the Congress in 1801, said:

> I communicate to Congress all material information on this subject, that in the exercise of the important function, confided by the Constitution to the legislature exclusively, their judgment may form itself on a knowledge and consideration of every circumstance of weight. (P. 169, U. S. President, Speeches and Message, Congressional Library, J 81, A 25.)

Mr. President, the Dumbarton Oaks plan is simply a new league of nations, which three, or at the most four great powers will completely dominate and control. There will be peace by force. That force will be administered by three or four men. They will have full power to investigate every instance, whenever in their opinion there is a threat to peace, and they will be the sole judges of how and when to act. The life of such an agreement will depend upon how long those three men can get along together. Fifty or more nations will be ruled by three men. Do we want that kind of world government? Would any of the three great nations consent to a police force that could control it? We know they will not.

The Tablet, influential Catholic weekly, in its editorial commenting on President Roosevelt's estimate of the Dumbarton Oaks plan, said:

> Granting whatever good points the Dumbarton Oaks proposals may be credited with, it must be conceded that even as machinery the entire program, as it stands, here and now, is useless.

What faith, Mr. President, can we, the American people, have in the reliability, the promise of the individual leaders of three great powers or their governments, when Japan and Germany are concerned?

Let me refer to the record. I quote from George E. Sokolsky, gifted writer in the New York Sun:

> Let us take a leaf out of the past. In 1917, before this country entered World War No. 1, precisely on February 16, 1917, the British Government addressed a note to the Japanese

Government which contained the following paragraph:

"His Majesty's Government accedes with pleasure to the request of the Japanese Government for an assurance that they will support Japan's claims in regard to the disposal of Germany's rights in Shantung and possessions in islands north of the equator on the occasion of the peace conference, it being understood that the Japanese Government will, in the eventual peace settlement, treat in the same spirit Great Britain's claims to German islands scuth of the equator."

This is the formula of the secret treaty by which China, soon to be an ally in the war, was to be robbed of essential territory. The Japanese agreed to support the claims which the British would put forward at the peace conference. The French and Russians concurred in this proposal, each stipulating schemes of their own and the Italians said that they had no objection regarding the matter.

William Hard in the December 1943 issue of the Reader's Digest, speaking of continued Japanese aggression, said:

Two treaties forbade that aggression. One was the League of Nations Treaty, which the United States had not signed. The other was the Nine-Power Treaty of 1922, which the United States had vigorously signed; and so had China, Japan, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, Portugal, France, and Britain. It pledged all signatories to respect "territorial and administrative integrity" and "sovereignty" of China.

In 1937 the League met at Geneva to stop Japan under the League of Nations Covenant Treaty. It arrived at nothing that could be called action. Japan went on.

In that same year 1937, the United States went to a Nine-Power Treaty Conference at Brussels to stop Japan. The conference orated It adjourned. It arrived at nothing that could be called action. Japan went on.

I really seriously inquire: How can anybody believe that what the United States failed to do at Brussels it would have been willing and able to do at Geneva?

So complete was the failure at Brussels that 2 years later Britain went right over from the side of China to the side of Japan and signed an agreement with Japan declaring that "the Japanese forces in China have special requirements for the purpose of safeguarding their own security; and His Britannic Majesty's Government have no intention of countenancing any act prejudicial to the attainment of that object.

I quote Mr. Hard further:

In 1882 we signed a treaty with Korea whereby we undertook to take diplomatic steps if any third country should deal "oppressively" with Korea. In 1905 Japan dealt with Korea certainly "oppressively" by conquering it; and in 1910 it further dealt with Korea certainly "oppressively" by annexing it. Did we take any diplomatic steps against Japan? Absolutely none. On the contrary, we were the very first government to recognize the Japanese conquest of Korea by withdrawing our diplomatic legation from Korean soil and by thus proclaiming to the world that Korea, our "ally," had ceased to exist as an independent country.

Still quoting Mr. Hard:

In 1846 we signed a treaty with Colombia whereby we undertook to "guarantee" the "sovereignty" of Colombia over the Isthmus of Panama. This commitment was in full force and vigor in 1903. In that year there was an artificially concocted revolution on the Isthmus. Did we then help Colombia to restore its sovereignty over the Isthmus? We did the reverse. We used our armed forces to prevent Colombia from itself restoring its sovereignty over the Isthmus? For doing so we ultimately paid Colombia an apologetic indemnity of $25,000,000. We acknowledged that in changed circumstances we had violated a commitment given in circumstances long gone by.

It is also interesting to note President Roosevelt's former attitude in connection with our entrance into a league of nations. On December 28, 1933, he said of the League of Nations:

We are not members and we do not contemplate membership.

On January 3, 1934, he said:

I have made it clear that the United States cannot take part in the political arrangements in Europe.

On October 2, 1935, he said:

Despite what happens to continents overseas, the United States of America shall and must remain untangled and free.

On August 4, 1933, he said:

Both sides agree that this Nation should agree at all times to avoid entangling alliances or involvements with other nations.

Lord Winstor, speaking in the House of Lords on October 11, 1944, said:

The Dumbarton Oaks proposal is an organization for keeping small boys in order by prefects, who would themselves be exempt from the rules they would have to administer.

Will Dumbarton Oaks succeed? History answers for us.

For more than a thousand years there have been almost continuous wars in the Balkans and in the small states bordering Russia on the west. An attempt to intermingle racial groups and religious groups has never succeeded. Peace treaties, conferences, and various commissions have been set up for the purpose of bringing peace to the Balkans. None have succeeded. None of them ever will succeed as long as those mixed issues of religion and nationality continue to exist.

C. A. McCartney, in Hungary and Her Successors, Oxford University Press of 1937, says:

Practically all these minorities are discontented with their position, and must always remain so.

Stoyan Pribichevich, in World Without End, says:

The Balkanite has survived all who oppressed him. Hordes of aggressors have vanished into nothing, empires have fallen to dust, but the tiny Slav nations tenaciously cling to the soil they occupied more than a thousand years ago.

Two world wars have come out of those small states along the western border of Russia. Millions of human beings have been slaughtered in the search for racial equality among divergent peoples.

Do the Big Three intend to declare perpetual war against these small nations? Do they propose to permanently locate American troops within the boundaries of those nations for the so-called purpose of preserving the peace?

To those who say that the President must have power to use force without approval by Congress I cannot agree. There are many on this floor who cannot agree to such delegation of power no matter by what verbal legerdemain it may be presented. We will not assent to any treaty or law that has for its purpose the destruction or emasculation of the Constitution or of Congress. The President has authority under the Constitution for defense in case of attack and for the suppression of bandits, but sending the Army into a foreign country in an attack upon the people of that country is war.

Whether the invasion is made by the big bad wolf or the kindly, humanitarian Big Three, it is still war.

It is said that the President must be given the power to declare war without referring it back to Congress. The only argument which has been made from any source in support of this demand is that of time.

In no international trouble in which we have engaged has there been any question of time. President Roosevelt called Hitler an aggressor and demanded that he be quarantined 5 years before the beginning of the European war. When the President asked Congress for war it acted in less than 2 hours.

He called Japan an aggressor in 1934. When he asked Congress on December 8, 1941, for war, Congress acted in 33 minutes. Aggressors do not arise overnight. They require months and often years to commit the overt act.

Can Senators point to any necessity for speedier action than we have taken in these two last wars?

The decision for war is the most serious and terrible step that a nation can take. It should never be made by one man. In a republic like ours, it should be made by the constitutional processes provided only after open debate and without secrecy.

Can anyone suggest that attacking Germany would not mean war? If we send a fleet of our warplanes over Berlin or Frankfort or Hamburg indiscriminately destroying property and human beings, is there anyone so naive as to suggest that that does not mean war?

If we were ordered, in the enforcement of our alleged police control, to destroy German factories or to seize German soil, does any Senator suggest that such action would not mean war?

I am not willing to leave it to one man's decision to bring the United States into such a crisis. Policing a foreign nation means war against that nation and against its people, and no polished words will cover that ugly fact.

Civilization practically disappeared during the Dark Ages. It may disappear again. Our own civilization could be destroyed by a continuation of wars such as this one. One man may and can again reverse the march of civilization for a century or more. We cannot afford to place the future of mankind, to place civilization itself in the hands of one man or a small group of men.

Some there are who assure us that all we need is a token police force, and merely to wave the policeman's club or blow his whistle to insure immediate obedience. That is wishful thinking. If a large nation starts a war in this day and age it means total war. War is not divisible. We cannot measure it with a yardstick and say we will go this far and no farther. The nation attacked and the

attacking nation will put every resource and every strength and every man they have in the struggle, to win. You cannot say to your opponent that you will black only one eye and no more. The fight must go on until one is down and out. No, wars are not conducted that way. One side must win. There must be a victor. Whenever this proposed United Nations police force crosses the boundary of a foreign country it asks for war. Dare we permit one man to make the decision?

If the security council proposed by the Dumbarton Oaks agreement decides to disarm any nation, how is the order to be enforced? How many men will it take? How many guns? How many ships? How many airplanes? There is no limit to such a proposal. In dealing with nations we are not dealing with drunks. Do we, holding most of the facilities in the world, consent that Russia and Britain disarm us or perhaps order us to attack some friendly nation?

A military alliance with Great Britain and Russia now will bring only disappointment and loss of friends. Only once in our entire history has the United States been a party to a military alliance. That was with France over a hundred years ago and it was completely unsatisfactory. France kept her agreement. We did not. Are we now to enter a military alliance with Great Britain and Russia to rule the world?

Instead of alliances, let us endeavor to build an association of nations along the lines of the Pan American Union. All nations, big and little, should be in it with equal rights for all.

But Russia has unofficially stated that it expects to take certain foreign territory. The Yalta Conference apparently has agreed to that. Is there anyone so simple as to believe that Russia, with the largest army in the world, is not going to take what it wants; and when it does so, who is going to say no to it? Will Great Britain and the United States immediately declare war upon Russia? Will several million American boys be sent to Europe to engage in that war, which is none of our concern?

We want nothing out of this war, except peace and security. We have no desire for a single acre of land. We have no wish to impose our will either politically or governmentally upon any other people in the world.

We must learn to work together as neighbors, peacefully. Without the milk of human kindness and Christian forebearance there is little hope of permanent peace. "Speak softly and carry a big stick and we will go far."

Under the American form of government, no Congress has power to bind any succeeding Congress. We in America have seen public opinion shift from one side to another on public questions. We know not today what the Eightieth or Eighty-first Congress may do. Our acts, whatever they be, must be governed by that knowledge.

The League of Nations under President Wilson created the machinery for peace. It has functioned for nearly a quarter of a century. It is still in force. To say that it failed because the United States was not in it, is not supported by the facts.

Russia recognized the independence of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania in 1920. Within a year they were admitted to the League of Nations. The following year the United States recognized their independence.

The League of Nations is still in existence. All its commitments are still binding upon all its members. Britain, Canada, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, Sweden, South America, and France are members.

Article 10 of the League binds its members to preserve the independence and sovereignty of the Baltic States. President Roosevelt has committed us to the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live. Now Russia says she is going to annex the Baltic States.

The League of Nations failed not because of what we did not do, but because of what Great Britain and France refused to do when the time for action came. It failed because they refused to carry out their bond in Manchuria, in China, in Germany, and in Ethiopia.

The Connally resolution expressed our foreign policy definitely and forcibly when we declared the position of the United States. Its provisions control today. Let me quote you what it says:

That the United States cooperate with its comrades in arms in securing a just and honorable peace.

That the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

That, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Winston Churchill made the oft-quoted remark, now famous throughout the world:

I am not the King's first minister to liquidate the British Empire.

Personally, I am not a member of the United States Senate to liquidate the American Republic, and I do not propose to give away our property or our liberty through some altruistic dream that we must solve all the problems of mankind. Let us make the best agreement we can. Let us take every step forward that is possible, but let us be realistic while we are doing so.

Secretary Hull went to Moscow and returned with an agreement which he pronounced an important step in our program toward a post-war world. He declared:

There will no longer be need for spheres of influence, or alliances, or balances of power.

Today, upon the morning after Yalta, we are presented with spheres of influence covering central Europe. Germany is to be divided in three or more parts. Poland is betrayed and the Balkans are under the sphere of Russian influence.

By what pattern of reasoning or justice can the Big Three choose the form of government under which other nations live just because those nations are small and cannot resist?

We either mean what we say or we do not. There has been too much double talk in world diplomacy. The American people are entitled to know exactly the destiny planned for the 54 small nations of the world. We have no fear of serious war from them. Only the Big Three will ever start a major war.

Our talk of free elections by free people for all countries has just been made, by the Yalta Conference, a living lie.

America has once more been outtraded by men smarter and more able than those we sent to the mill to bring home our grist.

As David Lawrence said under date of February 16:

The same high-sounding phrases have been given to the world again this week as were issued at Moscow and Tehran Conferences in November and December of 1943. The same promises of military coordination and the desire to work together in peace as well as war were promulgated then. The same European advisory commission was pointed to in 1943, as a pious body to examine questions arising day by day out of the liberated countries, and joint action was pledged. But that pledge was broken by Britain through her single-handed action in Greece and in Italy, and by Russia in her encouragement of and setting up of the Lublin government in Poland.

In the decision to destroy Germany's economic life and make it impossible for her for many years to come to live as a peaceful partner in the European family, the Crimean Conference has condemned Germany to a life of underground gangsterism and outlawry.

On February 12, 1945, President Roosevelt in his message to the Congress said:

The cornerstone for international political cooperation is the Dumbarton Oaks proposal for a permanent United Nations.

The Dumbarton Oaks proposal, if it means anything at all, means freedom and liberty from oppression for all peoples. But the Crimean agreement issued under the same date abandons the small nations to their fate.

There is much wishful thinking in this country to the effect that it is our duty to police the world, that our resources dug out of the soil and out of the factory by the hard-working laboring men and women of this country, are to be distributed like Christmas gifts to anyone who asks for them.

Any way in which we approach this proposal for a new league we find three, and only three, great nations dominating it. China was formerly referred to as one of the Big Four. China never has been and probably never will be a great nation. The inclusion of her name in the Security Council was fantastic.

Three nations—Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin—will, under this proposal of Dumbarton Oaks, absolutely run the world.

This proposed league is just as impossible as one formed for the United States of our States, with New York and Pennsylvania controlling it. Were New York and Pennsylvania to adopt such a course they would have the bitter enmity and hatred of every other State in the Union. This new league will have the enmity and hatred of every small nation in the world.

I repeat, we want an association of nations, but let us have an association of equality, of sincere honest-to-goodness participation by every nation, each having one vote, regardless of its size, regardless of its constituent parts.

When the time comes, let us gather around the peace table and with our cards in front of us, see if it is not possible for civilized men to agree upon a workable plan by which we can live together in peace. But on one thing I am certain. We must make our allies accept democracy in principle by whatever name we call it. Unless we approach the peace table with that conviction in our hearts, there will be no permanent peace.

The principles upon which the American Nation has grown great and strong are those prescribed in the Constitution, and upon which we have developed our civilization. We hold the cards. We are the most powerful Nation in the world. Every country in this war looks to us for aid and assistance, and has received it. We must not overplay our hand by overpromising what we will do. The man who is a 60-day borrower from the bank is more polite to his banker and more amenable to reason that the one who has a 10-year loan.

For a thousand years Russian rulers have dreamed of and schemed for a warm-water outlet to the sea. Peter the Great built St. Petersburg on the Baltic Sea to have an ocean outlet, but the Baltic is frozen most of the year. Today is Russia's opportunity. Does anyone doubt that she will make the most of it? If she does, who is going to stop her? Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, even the Balkans, or Turkey, cannot prevent her. Is it our job to do so? You and I know that it is not, and we are not going to do so. Thus ends the keystone of Dumbarton Oaks, and we gain the hatred of every small nation to which we break our promise for self-determination.

Other problems that confront us, and which should be proposed for discussion, are our future policy for lend-lease, for U. N. R. R. A., and for the fantastic plans of the President's Food Conference.

What, it may be asked, will we agree to? What are we willing to ask other nations to subscribe to? Briefly, they are:

No coercion by any nation upon another.

Self-determination by all people.

Conflicts of nationalities within separate countries shall be settled by majority vote of the people of that country.

Any limitation of armaments must be voluntary, except with respect to Germany and Japan.

There must be free access to the sea and air at the expense of each country demanding it.

No invasion of another country or crossing its boundaries with armed forces except to suppress the Axis from rearming.

There shall be no destruction of Germany as a country, except to prevent preparation for military activity.

There shall be no changing of boundaries except by mutual agreement.

There shall be a complete return of all loot taken by the Axis countries or payment for it.

There shall be a return of all people, held under bondage or force, to their own homes.

There shall be immediate restoration of legislative bodies of the various countries and free elections without coercion.

There shall be an armistice and peace immediately, whenever this war ends.

There must be a complete surrender of all arms and war material by the Axis at once.

If we enter the agreement proposed by Dumbarton Oaks, will England, Holland, and Russia insist that the management of their conquered colonies is a domestic question, and cannot be brought before the league? What about the people of those conquered countries? Have they no right to be heard? Have they no appeal to the league for protection?

As Alexander Wilson, noted author, said:

> Perhaps it is almost axiomatic to say that it is not the small nations that need a world peace organization to keep them from starting world wars, for it was the big powers which fell out with each other and have been directly responsible for the world wars.

Woodrow Wilson, in an address to the Senate, January 22, 1917, stated:

> And there is a deeper thing involved than even equality of right among organized nations. No peace can last or ought to last which does not recognize and accept the principle that governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that no right anywhere exists to hand people about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property.

In my opinion, the only plan which will insure peace is the total disarmament of all the nations of the world, but it is a foregone conclusion that the big nations of the earth would not at present agree to such a proposal.

The future of this world agreement to preserve peace will depend upon the personalities who control the three or four big nations, and we must not forget that personalities change. Each of the three important leaders of the Big Three today is past 60. Inevitably, death will remove all of them within a comparatively short time. Who, then will follow in their steps? Who then will be the rulers? Will their differing personalities combine in complete agreement, as those of the present leaders have done?

Walter Lippmann, famous author and columnist, said recently:

> There is no way of committing any nation in 1945, least of all this one, to wage a theoretical war in say 1955 against an unknown power under unforeseeable conditions. If and when a threat of war arises in 1955, the man who will then be President, the Congress then in session, and the people then in active life will decide our action.

Most of the proposals and discussion heretofore have related to and dealt with the military angle. But in this picture there is a larger, broader question than any military arrangement. What about the economic settlements for the European populations? People must have food. Is it not a major portion of our job to see that the opportunity be granted to the people of crushed Europe to have sufficient food and an opportunity to work out their own destinies? Men will surrender their liberty, and have done so, in order to secure food and a chance to work. They may do so again unless they are helped over the first rough spots.

There are, to me, two paramount questions to be determined at the peace table.

First. We must insist with all the power we have that a peace be made upon democratic principles—a peoples' peace.

Second. We must secure the material welfare of the people who are bankrupt and crushed by war. I do not mean to say that the financial burden rests upon us alone. It should be shared equally by our allies. All peoples are looking to America for leadership, for succor. Unless we provide ways and means by which those people may be given an opportunity to work out their own destinies, to have food, to have an opportunity to prosper in their own way, we shall have failed in the leadership which we have assumed, and we shall have anarchy and, probably, chaos.

When the sun goes down for the last time upon this bloody, ghastly war in which supposedly civilized men have sought to destroy their fellow men, when guns have ceased to roar, and the exhausted world turns wearily to bind its wounds, let us hope and pray that the gleaming sunrise of a better day will lead us hopefully, prayerfully, to a peace table at which all people join in a solemn determination to work out the plans that will forever banish war from the earth.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] as a substitute for the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capehart	Green
Bailey	Capper	Guffey
Ball	Chandler	Gurney
Bankhead	Chavez	Hart
Barkley	Cordon	Hatch
Bilbo	Donnell	Hawkes
Brewster	Downey	Hayden
Briggs	Eastland	Hickenlooper
Buck	Ferguson	Hill
Burton	Fulbright	Hoey
Bushfield	George	Johnson, Calif.
Butler	Gerry	Johnson, Colo.

Johnston, S. C.	Murray	Taft
Kilgore	Myers	Taylor
La Follette	O'Daniel	Thomas, Okla.
McCarran	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Utah
McFarland	Overton	Tobey
McKellar	Pepper	Tunnell
McMahon	Radcliffe	Tydings
Magnuson	Reed	Vandenberg
Maybank	Revercomb	Wagner
Mead	Robertson	Walsh
Millikin	Russell	Wherry
Mitchell	Saltonstall	White
Moore	Shipstead	Wiley
Morse	Smith	Willis
Murdock	Stewart	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope we can now get down to serious consideration of the measure under debate and can begin to vote on some of the amendments. We have now been debating the pending bill for more than a week, and the only thing we have done is to vote on the Tydings amendment, although one other amendment was voted on and rejected. I regret to say that there seems to be more confusion in the minds of Members of the Senate over the different provisions of the bill now under consideration than there has been regarding any legislation of which I have any recollection. We have the House bill; we have the committee amendment; we have the Revercomb substitute. Up to now, no one has drawn a very clear distinction between any of them, as to what they mean or where one impinges upon the others. Certainly we could clarify the situation at least by beginning to vote on some of the amendments and substitutes, and I hope that now we can start on that process.

Amendments to the text of the committee amendment are, of course, in order to perfect it before voting on the substitute. I hope that we may limit our discussion now. I have thought of undertaking to bring about a limitation of debate. I do not wish to do that; of course, I could only do it by unanimous consent. But I hope that we can get down to consideration of the merits of amendments so that we may conclude the discussion and consideration of the pending legislation.

If this bill must be written in conference, then it is our duty to get it to conference as soon as possible so that the conferees may begin to write it there, if it must be written there. If we can pass here an acceptable bill, we should begin to try to do that.

I hope that Members of the Senate will restrain themselves from now on in the delivery of addresses which are not connected with the subject matter before the Senate.

I understand that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] has an amendment which he desires to offer. It would be in order before the Senate voted on the Revercomb substitute. I hope that any Senator who wishes to offer an amendment to the text of the committee substitute will offer it so that the Senate may vote upon it. If any Senator wishes to offer an amendment in the nature of a perfecting amendment—if the committee substitute can be made perfect, or more nearly perfect than it is—let us vote on it so that we may have a clear understanding of the committee substitute in order that we may vote on something which we understand. Up to now we have not been able to do that. I hope that in a good-natured way I may urge the Senate to refrain from presenting extraneous matters until we have disposed of the pending legislation. Let us get action upon it. Let us vote on something. If we are not to pass any form of legislation let us let the country know that we will not do so, and then it will not expect anything from us.

I do not make these remarks in captious criticism of any Senator, but I think we will all agree that we have spent a great deal of time "messing around" on the subject without getting down to any concrete proposal with regard to what we intend to do.

Mr. WHITE rose.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I listened to the Senator from Kentucky I could not repress a desire to express my complete concurrence in what he was saying. I believe that everything which the Senator said in the nature of suggestion or criticism is wholly justified by the lack of progress which the Senate has made on the pending bill.

I understand that a number of amendments to the committee substitute are now lying on the desk. I suppose they should be disposed of before the Senate votes on the Revercomb substitute. I think it would be very helpful if Senators who have sent amendments to the desk would speedily make up their minds whether they wish to press them for consideration by the Senate so that we may dispose of all amendments to the committee substitute at the earliest possible time consistent with a respectful consideration of them. If we succeed in getting them out of the way I assume that the Revercomb amendment will then be disposed of with reasonable speed.

Mr. President, again I say that I concur in the statement the Senator from Kentucky has made.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Maine. I believe the country has a right to expect something from the Senate in the way of concentrated consideration of the important subject now pending. I could go on indefinitely and expatiate on the sacrifices which our men are making in snow, sleet, and mud in their efforts to cross rivers where bridges are being blown up. We could all talk about such things, but it is not necessary to emphasize what is going on anywhere else except in the United States Senate. I hope that we may reach a speedy conclusion to do what we will do with the pending legislation so that we may terminate consideration of it sooner or later, at least before the war is over, or before the San Francisco Conference takes place and a treaty is sent to the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, as Senators know, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent, attending the funeral of his colleague, the late Senator Moses. I have received a telegram from him asking me to call up in his behalf two amendments which he has offered to the bill and have them voted on. I will do that at this time if the Senator from Kentucky wants something for the Senate to vote on.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will give my full cooperation in calling up those amendments and having them voted on.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not have them before me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that if we could start the process of voting we could make some progress.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senate now has an opportunity to vote twice.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I desire to offer a short amendment to the Revercomb substitute. I trust that it will be satisfactory to the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. On page 6, beginning in line 12, I move to strike out the words "other than a place of entertainment and amusement."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the language referred to by the able Senator from California was discussed with me a few days ago. At that time I believe I indicated that if there were objection to the language I should not oppose striking it from the amendment, and I now do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has the right to modify his amendment, and the modification will be made.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I have heretofore submitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, line 17, in section 7, it is proposed to strike out "(5)", so as to make section 7 read as follows:

SEC. 7. Paragraphs (3), (4), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), as amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, shall be applicable with respect to this act to the same extent as such paragraphs are applicable with respect to such subsection (a), except that, for the purposes of this act, the word "President," wherever it occurs in such paragraphs, shall be deemed to refer to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, my amendment relates to section 7 of the amendment reported by the committee to the pending bill, House bill 1752. Section 7 of the bill as originally reported from the Committee on Military Affairs reads as follows:

Paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act of June 28, 1940—

And so forth. My amendment would eliminate the reference to paragraph (5). The paragraphs referred to in the bill are from the Second War Powers Act. I invite the attention of the Senate to paragraph (5) of the Second War Powers Act, reading as follows:

(5) Any person who willfully performs any act prohibited, or willfully fails to perform any act required by, any provision of this subsection (a) or any rule, regulation, or order thereunder, whether heretofore or hereafter issued, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor,

and shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

Mr. President, the bill as reported by the committee referred to the paragraph which I have read only as "(5)". It is known as the penalty clause of the bill. My amendment is for the purpose of eliminating the penalty provision. I do not believe the Congress or the people of the country favor putting a man in the penitentiary as provided in the committee substitute. I therefore hope that the chairman of the committee will agree to the elimination of the reference to paragraph (5) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the Second War Powers Act.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the reference to paragraph (5) was put into the bill after it was referred to the committee and after the committee had considered the bill. The original O'Mahoney-Kilgore bill did not contain a reference to paragraph (5). The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota is in keeping with the wish of the authors of the substitute to strike out reference to the paragraph. But it should be remembered that paragraph (5) was deemed by the committee to be necessary because otherwise there would be no penalty whatsoever.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I understood that another amendment to the section was adopted the other day whereby a lesser penalty was provided. Am I wrong about that?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The penalty adopted the other day has to do with the Tydings amendment and covers only the agricultural worker who has been deferred because of an agricultural occupation.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Then it does not refer to section 7.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; it does not refer to that section.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. If it had not been for placing in the bill the so-called Tydings amendment, I do not believe that the committee would ever have put into this bill the reference to paragraph (5). As I recall, it was offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and was only adopted by a vote of 7 to 5. That is the reason for the opposition of some of us to that section, as well as the farm-penalty section. I think that if the Tydings amendment had not been inserted in the bill this provision would not have been put in, and it ought not to be in.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It becomes my duty to explain why the amendment was put in, and the reason the Senator from Vermont had for putting it in and to attempt to make it plain to the Senate exactly what will be the effect if they vote to strike out paragraph (5).

The last statement which the Senator from South Dakota made that someone might be put in the penitentiary as the result of breaking a regulation issued by the War Manpower Commission and enforced by the War Mobilization Board is hardly correct. I realize that it is loose language, but there is no penalty except the penalty for a misdemeanor in paragraph (5) and then the penalty applies only when there has been a willful act to try to avoid the action of the War Manpower Commission.

Because paragraph (5) starts out with the words "Any person," it might therefore be assumed that by the use of the broad term "any person" all persons might come under this penalty as a result of the way in which the paragraph reads; but the penalty will fall only upon the willful employer who refuses to abide by an order of the War Manpower Commission. So, the penalty is not so broad and so stringent as might be assumed. The penalty would be controlled by the regulations the War Manpower Commission would have to draw up and enforce, and those regulations would be made within the limits of the act itself. So, the penalty will fall, according to the theory of the sponsor of the amendment, upon the employer only and would not reach the employee.

I emphasize that because there is another amendment pending to be considered later on which would extend the penalty to any individual, and an employee might thus be caught if that amendment were adopted. But this amendment would merely relieve the employer of the penalty.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee as to whether, in his opinion, the provisions of paragraph (5), which on their face are directed to a willful violation by an employer, might not also reach the employer's employee who by virtue of remaining on a job or taking a job in violation of the regulation thereby aided and abetted his employer and ordinarily would be deemed an accomplice and subject to the same penalty as his principal.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. He would not be subject to it, according to the opinion of the sponsor of the amendment and according to the opinion as set forth in the report of the committee. Of course, these provisions are highly speculative. I wondered, as the Senator from Oregon wonders, whether the penalty would not extend beyond the employer. I was told that the penalty would not so extend, and I am now attempting to support the position of the sponsor of the amendment.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Utah, then, as is the Senator from Oregon, is somewhat in doubt about it. I confess I am.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am sure that anyone who entered into a conspiracy would be held under some other law, because there is a general conspiracy statute, of course. So, a willful violator might, through other circumstances and other laws, be held, and he should be punished if he is contributing to the breaking of the law of the land. But, so far as the penalty in the amendment is concerned, it extends only to the employer.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In the case of willful violation it is manifest that the case could be taken to the United States district court, and would then be subject to appeal to the court of appeals and finally to the Supreme Court of the United States. Am I correct about that?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should think that an employer could carry his case up in the ordinary way. I imagine it would be governed by statute in the ordinary way.

Mr. MAYBANK. The thought has been expressed that perhaps bureaus or Government agencies might have the final determination under the section, but it is my understanding—and I trust the Senator will correct me if I am in error—that the understandings we had were that the final determination would be in the hands of the courts of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is as I understand it. I know no administrative tribunal at all that is set up to carry on such functions.

Mr. MAYBANK. In other words, then, any willful violation of the law would be carried before the district judges, subject to appeal to the circuit judges, and then subject to appeal to the United States Supreme Court, and those judges have all been confirmed by the United States Senate, and constitute the judiciary of America.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield again?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon and then I will yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Utah suggests that if this provision should be deleted from the bill there would be no other penalty provision in it, and I am in entire accord so far as any criminal penalty is concerned. But if it were deleted there would remain the provisions of section 8 which would prohibit the deduction as an expense from income-tax returns of wages paid in violation of the act or prevent the inclusion of wages so paid in any cost-plus contract. Those provisions would still apply and be in the nature of civilian compulsion. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. They would apply only to the employer.

Mr. CORDON. Definitely so, and they would continue to apply even

though paragraph (5) were deleted, and would be a compulsion on the employer.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I do not know of any bureau that may be called upon to enforce this proposed statute that could put a man in jail or levy a fine. As the Senator from South Carolina has well suggested, a case is usually carried into the district court, with all the rights of appeal, just as in any other criminal case. There would also be the right of trial by jury, would there not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I assume so.

Mr. HILL. Certainly a defendant would have the right of trial by jury and all rights of appeal he has today under any other criminal statute.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] for bringing out the additional point to which he referred, because I have seen it indicated in articles and in letters I have received that bureaucracy in Washington or somewhere else will be clamped down, whereas, as I understand it, as it was understood in the committee, and as the legislative counsel told us in the committee, the penalty is imposed only for willful violation of the law in a case tried in the district court, by jurors from the district of the man who violates the law, subject to appeal to the circuit court, and subject to appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true; and the prosecuting official would be the ordinary prosecuting official.

Mr. MAYBANK. The United States district attorney.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I am sure that the violators of the law would be greatly consoled by and grateful for being given the right to trial by jury.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. HILL. While we are speaking of penalties, the most severe penalty under the provision being discussed can apply only where there is a willful violation, and the measure used the word "willful." The provision is that such a person found guilty under this provision shall be found guilty of only a misdemeanor, and be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than a year, or both. We should bear in mind that under the Selective Service Act any selectee who is guilty of a violation of any of the provisions of the act is subject to prosecution for a felony, with the possibility of a fine of $10,000 or imprisonment for 5 years. Furthermore, under section 9 of the Selective Service Act, which gives to the President, the head of the War Department, or the head of the Navy Department the right "to place an order with any individual, firm, association, company, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry" for war production, if such an order be given by the President through the War Department or the Navy Department and any individual, firm, company, association, corporation, or organized manufacturing industry, or the responsible head or heads thereof, fails to comply with the order, such action is also made a felony, subject to punishment by imprisonment for not more than 3 years and a fine not exceeding $50,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, it is deemed by the committee that the bill would be stronger with the penalty provision which has been explained. I trust the Senate will vote down the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, and stand by the committee amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on the amendment as offered. Some question has been raised because it was thought that the penalty provided later in the bill as reported by the committee was unconstitutional, under the provision of the Constitution that any bill intended for the raising of revenue must originate in the House of Representatives.

When that penalty was drafted—a penalty which, together with the penalty sought to be stricken by the Senator from South Dakota, constitutes a double penalty—it was thought advisable to penalize employers in two ways. In the first place, an employer who was operating on, shall we say, the unit-price system, frequently found himself encumbered by an employer in the same area who was operating on a cost-plus-fixed-fee system, whose pay rolls were met out of the taxpayers' pockets, and the first employer was unable to compete for labor. Therefore, he felt he must have some protection if he were to be able to meet his production schedule. Consequently, we drafted a section, which was in the bill originally reported, which provided, first, that any employer of labor who persisted in hoarding labor by keeping labor over and above the fixed ceiling could not claim reimbursement from the United States Government for such labor if he were operating on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis, when it was shown that he was so operating. Secondly, that producers of war material, under Government contract or otherwise, including the nonessential men, who failed to comply with price ceilings, could not claim in their income-tax returns as deductions wages wrongfully paid to workers employed in excess of the ceiling.

Question has been raised and has been brought to my attention as to the constitutionality of that provision in that it applies to income tax and also to the saving of money. We were impelled to the course which we followed by the employer who felt that there must be a rather drastic penalty to keep the employer who was, shall we say, employing on a Government pay roll, whose entire pay roll was met by the Government, from overemploying. That was to protect the man who was competing with him on a unit-cost basis. Secondly, in order to prevent people who were operating on a unit-cost basis, or who were engaged in nonessential industry, from employing unnecessary labor, we refused to give them income-tax credit, and, as I have said, the constitutionality of that was questioned.

I am certain that the constitutionality of that section was determined by the Supreme Court of the United States in 1897, in the case of *Twin City Bank* v. *Nebeker* (167 U. S. 196), in an opinion written by Mr. Justice Harlan on a very similar provision, under very similar circumstances. In that case in the National Banking Act which had been passed by the House the Senate inserted certain clauses very similar to the clause in the pending bill under discussion, by which certain charges to be covered into the Treasury were made against those who did not comply with the National Banking Act. In the opinion in that case Mr. Justice Harlan said:

> The Journals of the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States for the first session of the Thirty-eighth Congress were put in evidence by the plaintiff.

I may add, in passing, that this was purely a test case, instituted by the Twin City Bank against Nebeker, in which the total sum involved was only $56. It was merely to test the constitutionality of such an amendment made by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. Justice Harlan continued:

> The bank claims that these Journals show that the National Bank Act originated as a bill in the House of Representatives; that when it passed the House it contained no provision for a tax upon the national banks, or upon any corporation, or upon any property, nor any provisions whatever for raising revenue; and that all the provisions that appear to authorize the Treasurer of the United States to collect any tax on the circulating notes of national banks originated in the Senate by way of amendment to the House bill.

To boil it down to the syllabus of the decision, we find this statement:

> Section 41 of the National Banking Act imposing certain taxes upon the average amount of the notes in circulation of a banking association, now found in the Revised Statutes, is not a revenue bill within the meaning of the clause of the Constitution declaring that "all bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives," but the Senate may propose or concur in amendments as on other bills.
>
> Whether in determining such a question the courts may refer to the Journals of the two Houses of Congress for the purpose of ascertaining whether the act originated in the one House or the other is not decided.

In the decision on appeal, which reviewed the case, it was held that the tax provision was inserted by the Senate by way of a penalty to make sure that the law was enforced, that it was not intended particularly for revenue, but merely as a penalty imposed by the Senate on the banks of the United States. That is the reason for the later clause in this bill, and that is the reason why I am impelled to support the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota, because I believe the subject matter is adequately taken care of by the penalties affecting income-tax returns and reimbursement for expenditures for wages imposed in excess of the ceiling and in violation of the act.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I simply wish to reply to the last statement made by

the Senator from West Virginia. I do so not in the sense of argument at all, but merely to point out one or two facts respecting the bill, for the reason that the committee provided both penalties referred to by the Senator. Before I do so I wish to thank the Senator from West Virginia for bringing up the point of the constitutionality of the provision. We should remember the point which has been made, and in discussing the constitutionality of the provision remember the case of the Twin City Bank.

Mr. KILGORE. If any Senator wishes to check on the case I wish to say that the decision from which I read appears in One Hundred and Sixty-seventh United States Reports, page 196. It is the case of Twin City Bank against Nebeker.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to have the citation.

Mr. President, the provision contained in the bill is not new, and is not unique. Such a provision already appears in the Stabilization Act. Having made that statement, I may go one step further and point out that the provision has worked successfully in the Stabilization Act, has been successfully administered, and has brought about respect for that law.

Mr. President, the point I want to make in reply to the argument put forth by the Senator from West Virginia is that the Stabilization Act contains the same two penalties which are contained in the pending bill. The reason for inclusion of both penalties in the Stabilization Act is exactly the same reason as that which prevails for their inclusion in the pending measure. The penalty for infraction of the law which involves income taxes would not cover all the situations arising from the placing of ceilings and concerning employers generally. For instance, if an individual were operating a business from which there was no income, of course there could be no penalty. In the second place, in spite of what we are ordinarily told, all the employers of the United States do not have contracts with the Government of the United States, so it would be necessary to place a penalty also on the employers who do not have contracts with the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, I trust that neither penalty will be stricken from the bill as it was reported by the committee, and I say again that I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] will be voted down.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I may say in reply to the Senator from Utah that I always have great deference for his views on such matters as this, but I may state frankly that the leaders of industry and labor who talked to me about the bill did not complain about it containing both penalties. Inasmuch as those representing industry, in conjunction with the labor group who furnish the manpower, had agreed upon the original provision I felt I should support the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], because I felt that the one penalty was sufficient. I do not desire to enter into a discussion with my good friend the Senator from Utah on this matter, but I did want to assure the Senate that the action taken by the Military Affairs Committee with respect to the one penalty I spoke of is entirely constitutional, and the penalty is perfectly enforceable in the courts of the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to mention, in line with what the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], has brought out, that, in the opinion of some of us on the committee, the income-tax provision did not reach far enough into all categories. I also wish to suggest, and I trust the chairman of the committee will agree with me, that punishment provided with respect to income taxes is extremely delayed punishment. Income-tax returns are not made out until after the year in which the income is received, and it may perhaps be 2 or 3 years before the return has been thoroughly checked. Whereas if we add the other penalty contained in the bill for willful violation of the law, we make it possible for whomsoever may be placed in charge of administering the law to go into the courts and prevent such willful violation, so that what the bill is designed to accomplish may be accomplished, and that is, Mr. President, to have whatever is to be done, done as soon as possible for the assistance of our armed forces, because now is when our armed forces need materials of war, not when the time comes for preparing the income-tax returns for 1947 and 1948.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, with all due deference to the Senator from South Carolina, I may call attention to the fact that the bill provides, by inference, for the utter shutting down, by way of injunction, if necessary, of any plant that violates the provision with respect to ceilings or does not properly conform.

I may also call to the Senator's mind that worry concerning the correctness of an income-tax return, even though it be prepared by an expert, is something which would deter certain persons from violating the law.

I may say further to the Senator from South Carolina that there is one thing in connection with the particular penalty referred to with which I am impressed. In their investigation numerous Members of the Senate have found that one of the greatest handicaps under which the war program has suffered is the hoarding of labor at the expense of the American taxpayer, by the cost-plus-fixed-fee contractor operating in competition with the contractor who is selling what he produces at a fixed unit price, and who cannot afford to hoard labor in his plant, because he, not the taxpayers of the United States, is paying the bill. I want that penalty provision to remain as a weapon to protect the perfectly patriotic and absolutely sincere contractor who is making the gadgets, the parts—I may say the subcontractor who makes the carburetors, who makes the springs, who makes the screws, and such things, on a fixed-fee basis. I want the penalty provision to remain to protect him against labor recruiting encroachment by the man who can charge his employment bill up to the taxpayers of the United States for refund, not 3 years later, but within 30 days. I wish to give the contractor who is not operating on a cost-plus basis a little assistance from the Government in the battle which he has been so successfully waging all through this war.

Mr. President, I may say that 75 percent of the production of the United States is by such contractors by men who make items for the Government, and who themselves gamble the labor and material against the charges which they make. That is the type of contractor I am trying to help. I wish to make sure he is protected under this bill against the encroachments of—may I say with all due deference—the contractor whose manager or whose personnel chief is all too frequently a bit careless respecting the number of employees he keeps upon the pay roll, because contrary to common belief, he does not receive any additional percentage by holding such employees, but they do not cost him anything. By placing this provision in the bill we give the other contractor a little leeway, a little help in securing labor without encroachment being made upon him by the other type of contractor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I think my good and distinguished friend the Senator from West Virginia will admit that neither he nor I have any argument with respect to the hoarding of manpower.

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. We have done the best we could to stop such practices. But in view of the fact that the Senator brought up this subject, I wish to say that it is my opinion that a law which would place an over-all board in charge, such a board as was provided for in the original bill the committee voted favorably upon by a vote of 7 to 2 more than a month ago, a board of which the Director of War Mobilization would be the head and which would channel the contracts, and have supervision over the Army and the Navy, and so forth, insofar as employment in navy yards and factories is concerned, is the answer to the question of hoarding manpower and the rivalry with respect to manpower, not in the armed forces themselves but in the agencies of government which represent the armed forces.

I think the Senator from West Virginia will agree with me on that point.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I am compelled to disagree with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, because the bill which he so ably attempts to defend touches such a small percentage of the manpower of the United States engaged in the war effort as to be almost futile.

I also disagree with him, as numerous other Senators will, when I say that the armed forces themselves are not blameless in the hoarding of manpower, as has been plainly evidenced on numerous occasions.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator ought to understand that the Senator from South Carolina is for the May-Bailey bill, which was rejected in the committee by a vote of 12 to 6. He voted for it there.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to remind the Senate that on a certain Saturday 5 or 6 weeks ago, when a quorum of the committee was present, that bill was approved by a vote of 6 to 2. Later it was determined to have open hearings, and the Senator from Kentucky is eminently correct in saying that after the hearings were held, I was on the losing end, by a vote of 12 to 6. I have no regrets, Mr. President.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, on the question of the hearings, Senators may remember the old political story about the cats whose eyes were opened. Possibly the hearings opened the eyes of the committee.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think it is well for the Senate to know that while those in the Senate who favor the May bill have been temporarily defeated, they are still wide awake, and hope that if the Senate does pass a bill ultimately we may have the same bill back here again. That is the reason why I have fought so hard during the past couple of weeks to defeat all these bills. If we do defeat all of them we will not get back the May bill, which was rejected by a vote of 12 to 6, after hearings were held.

So far as I am advised, no substantial testimony was given by anyone which indicated the need of this sort of bill at the present time. I wish to refresh the recollection of my friend from West Virginia with respect to the reason for inserting the penalty provided in section 5 of the Second War Powers Act. It was inserted upon motion by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], after the committee had adopted the so-called farm penalty. The farm penalty provides that if a man on the farm is called for induction and is declared to be IV–F, he must go back to the farm immediately. If he leaves the farm he is subject to a $10,000 fine and 5 years in jail. But if he has reason to believe that he will be declared IV–F, and he knows that a call from the draft board is imminent, he may leave the farm and go downtown to wait for the call. Then if he is called from the courthouse steps, or from Main Street, and is declared IV–F, he is free to go anywhere and no penalty attaches to him at all.

I wish to refresh the recollection of Senators who were present. After the so-called farm penalty was adopted, some of us thought that if we were to have a penalty bill we might as well put in penalties against everyone. If my recollection is correct, the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont was agreed to in the committee by a vote of 7 to 5. I helped to have it adopted, because after we adopted the penalty of a $10,000 fine or 5 years in jail for the farm boys, it seemed to me that if we were to vote for that kind of bill we ought to penalize everyone.

I repeat, this is a terrible bill. It ought to be sent back to the committee. If I were not a member of the committee I would repudiate the action of the committee in reporting such a bill as this to the Senate. But if Senators wish to go ahead with it and suffer through it, they have a right to do so. I will suffer along with them, but I will not vote for it.

The Senator from West Virginia may recall that the amendment in question was put in after the adoption of the farm penalty amendment. Neither of them should have been put in the bill; and this is the first opportunity I have had to vote to take one of them out. I shall vote to eliminate the penalty provision, and if it remains in the bill, I shall vote against the bill. I think probably I shall vote against the bill anyway.

I ask the Senator from West Virginia if the statement which I have made is in accord with his recollection?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I thank my friend the Senator from Kentucky for his statement. I was not present on all the occasions to which he refers. I was present after the insertion had been made.

Let me also invite attention to the fact that the agricultural amendment was inserted in the bill at the instance of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. Since the insertion of this amendment, the Senator from Maryland, who was the proponent of the amendment, has seen fit to propose, with the agreement of the Senate, to strike therefrom the penalty clause, and to propose certain other amendments in the bill, because the Senator from Maryland felt that his own amendment was too drastic. As the Senator from Kentucky has so ably stated, the committee, after noting the penalty of 5 years in the penitentiary and a $10,000 fine, decided that the other penalty might as well follow along, because it was a lesser penalty.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield the floor, if the Senator wishes to obtain the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask this privilege merely to continue the discussion of the point which has been under discussion between the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Kentucky.

The memory of the Senator from Kentucky is quite correct. The so-called Austin amendment, putting the penalty under the Second War Powers Act in the committee bill, was the result of the adoption of the Tydings amendment. I voted against the Tydings amendment, and I also voted against the Austin amendment.

We are now in this position: The provision of the Tydings amendment which gave such concern to the Senator from Kentucky has been eliminated, and there is no penalty on the farm boy who leaves the farm; but we now have the penalty under the Second War Powers Act. That provision was adopted not because a majority of the committee wanted it, but because some members of the committee who were against any penalty voted for the Austin amendment because the other penalty was in the bill.

The consequence is that if our friends who are against any penalty had voted against the Austin amendment it would not now be a part of the committee bill, and we should have had a committee measure sufficiently good to have attracted the support of the Senator from Kentucky, whose name was attached to the bill just before the penalties were added.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his absolutely correct statement of the situation. I voted against reporting the bill because I disagreed with the majority of the committee on those two amendments, and those two amendments only.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to my colleague from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am delighted that this amendment has been offered by the Senator from South Dakota, because it illustrates the confusion which exists on the floor of the Senate with respect to penalties.

I joined with my colleague and other members of the Military Affairs Committee in voting against placing this particular reference in the bill.

As I say, this discussion shows better than anything else the confusion which exists in the committee report with respect to penalties.

With due modesty, I invite my colleague's attention to section 10 of the substitute which I have proposed, which does away with all reference to the provisions under discussion, and spells out distinctly what the penalty shall be, and where it shall be placed.

This is the provision, and the only provision, with respect to penalties on the placing of ceilings. Section 10 is on page 10 of the substitute. It reads as follows:

> Any employer who violates any regulation or any order made pursuant thereto as provided in section 6 of this act—

Section 6 provides for the placing of an employment ceiling—

> shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof in the district court of the United States for the district in which such violation occurred, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or by a fine not to exceed $10,000, or both.

Mr. President, I wish to say that there is no other reference to punishment with respect to the fixing of ceilings in the substitute measure. There is no confusion in the substitute about it. There is no doubt where the penalty lies, nor is there any doubt as to what the penalty will be. I call the attention of my colleagues to this section, in support of the substitute, which will shortly be voted on, and as another reason which I offer to them in all sincerity for support of the substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] to section 7, on page 19 of the committee substitute.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I should like to understand whether the vote is to be on the Revercomb amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] to section 7, on page 19 of the committee substitute.

Mr. BAILEY. Then, I shall wait.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state once more, for the information of Senators, that the pending vote is on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] to section 7, on page 19 of the committee substitute.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a delegate to the Inter-American Conference in Mexico, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses. I am advised that if present and voting the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

I further announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is detained in one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to the State of Mississippi.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. I am not advised how either Senator would vote, if present and voting. I vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] has a special pair on this question with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. I am informed that if the junior Senator from Indiana were present he would vote "yea," and that the senior Senator from Vermont, if present, would vote "nay." The senior Senator from Vermont is absent on official business as a delegate to the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—44

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Briggs	Hoey	Reed
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Capper	Kilgore	Taft
Chandler	La Follette	Taylor
Chavez	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McFarland	Tobey
Downey	Mead	Wagner
Ferguson	Millikin	Walsh
Gerry	Moore	Wherry
Hart	Morse	Willis
Hawkes	Murdock	Wilson
Hayden	Murray	

NAYS—35

Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Russell
Bankhead	Hill	Saltonstall
Barkley	McKellar	Smith
Brewster	McMahon	Stewart
Burton	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	Maybank	Tunnell
Eastland	Mitchell	Tydings
Fulbright	Myers	Vandenberg
George	O'Daniel	White
Green	Overton	Wiley
Guffey	Pepper	

NOT VOTING—16

Andrews	Capehart	McClellan
Austin	Connally	Scrugham
Bilbo	Ellender	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	Glass	Wheeler
Brooks	Langer	
Byrd	Lucas	

So Mr. BUSHFIELD's amendment to section 7 of the committee substitute was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I think I should say that with the adoption of the Bushfield amendment, and with the Tydings amendment to the committee substitute, making a change in regard to penalties, the bill, with the exception of the Tydings amendment, is now practically in the form submitted to the Senate committee by the sponsors of the committee substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I shall ask to have read. It is an amendment to what has been designated as the Revercomb substitute. It would amend the amendment in the nature of a substitute proposed by the Senator from West Virginia for himself and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] by striking out the words "in a lawful occupation" on page 3, in line 3, of the Revercomb substitute and inserting in lieu thereof the words "in an activity, profession, occupation, or industry essential to the war effort."

Before sending the amendment forward I will read the sentence beginning in line 1, on page 3, as it would then appear:

> Any such registrant between the ages of 18 and 45 who is not performing substantial work in an activity, profession, occupation, or industry essential to the war effort as determined by the selective-service local board, shall forthwith be ordered by said local board to report on a designated date, fixed by said local board, for induction into the land or naval forces.

Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate. I am in complete sympathy with what was said by the leaders on both sides of the Chamber. We have delayed the pending measure long enough. We should proceed to complete it one way or the other.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I correctly understood the Senator's amendment, its effect would be to substitute language which would indicate that if the registrant were not performing substantial work in a capacity essential to the war effort, rather than engaging in some vague "lawful occupation" as now provided in the language which the Senator seeks to strike out, he would forthwith be ordered by the local board to report, and so forth.

Mr. BAILEY. That is the point. I thank the Senator.

As the Revercomb amendment now stands, it would be possible to find some men engaged in gambling, or in the white-slave traffic, highway robbery, or burglary, and compel them to do certain things. That is about all that could be done. But that would not meet the situation. It would not begin to meet it. It has a little virtue, in that it does invoke the compulsory principle. But if we invoke the compulsory principle we should invoke it with a view to accomplishing the objectives of the legislation, and meeting the demands of the authorities who have called upon us to help them produce materials essential to the war effort, and provide the necessary forces in the Army and in the Navy.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should not rise at this time except for the statement made by the able Senator from North Carolina that the amendment in its present form would reach only those engaged in some illegal occupation. Perhaps there would be a few of them. They were thought of when the substitute was drafted; but the substitute was designed to reach the men who were not working, that is the loafers, and not those who were engaged in illegal occupations.

Mr. BAILEY. If we include the loafers as well as violators of the Mann Act we will meet the situation. But I never before heard that a loafer was engaged in an unlawful occupation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The language of the bill does not contain the term "unlawful occupation."

Mr. BAILEY. If unlawful occupation means substantially to engage in loafing, I fear that it might not be included. But we either must take the matter seriously, or not take it seriously. I think the amendment which I am about to offer frames the existing issue with respect to the Revercomb substitute, and I think it frames it very well. The issue is not in doubt here. There are those among us who believe in the compulsory principle. We intend to invoke it. That principle was invoked with respect to more than 10,000,000 American young men. Now is not the time to abandon

it. If the principle was fair with respect to them, it is fair with respect to those whose efforts are needed to produce war materials. But, Mr. President, I do not intend to go into that matter. There are those who believe in what is known as the voluntary principle. The Revercomb amendment is consistent with the voluntary principle except as to loafers and the other classes to which I have referred.

My whole case against the voluntary principle is that it will not do the work. Heaven knows I would try to stick to the voluntary principle, but when I am told by the military authorities of our needs, and, what is more, when the committee itself, reporting the substitute, tells me, in the very plainest language, that the military authorities are right, then I am bound to invoke the same principle that was invoked with respect to the fighting men. I think they are entitled to it.

Let us see what the committee said. This is the report on the war manpower bill made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] for the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. President, I shall wait until Senators around me stop talking.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not mean to complain. I myself violate the rule at times, and I think I should be very tolerant, but the matter before us is of the very greatest importance. I must say that addressing the Senate of the United States is no pink tea business ordinarily, but right now it is a matter of the very gravest importance.

Let us hear what the committee said. This is the language of the committee report:

> In January the President, in his message to the Congress on the state of the Nation, recommended the enactment of a national service law to accomplish the total mobilization of all our human resources for the prosecution of the war.

So the President is on the compulsory side, and, Mr. President, when war was declared, we pledged to our country and our fighting men all the resources of the country.

Let us see the next paragraph in the committee report:

> Prompt and extensive study of the manpower problems which confront the Nation at this critical period of the war has convinced both the House and this committee that because of the past drains upon our manpower resources and intensification of our military effort, legislation is now essential to assure that critical manpower needs during the remaining months of the war are met promptly.

That is what the committee says. That is the report of the Committee on Military Affairs:

> Our armed forces must be furnished, on time and in ample amounts, the supplies that will be needed for final victory at the earliest possible time.

That is what the committee says. Now, notice this:

> Any other course of action on the home front is unthinkable.

I think the committee report is predicated upon the necessities of the situation, and it predicates, not voluntary action, but involuntary or compulsory action. It relates directly back, in this language, to what the President said, and that was compulsory.

Now let us go a little further. On page 2—and this is from the committee report again—I read:

> But within the past few months there has been a sharp reversal in the trend of our war program. The rate of inductions into our armed forces is rising sharply in order to bring our Navy up to its full strength and to provide replacements for casualties, losses through normal attrition, and men released because they were not fully qualified for the exacting requirements of battle.
>
> After full-scale military operations were commenced, several production programs required sharp adjustments in order to take advantage of battle experience. The Italian campaign resulted in a greatly expanded artillery program. D-day and the sweep of our armies across France called for enormous increases in the production of heavy trucks, tires, and tanks. The German counteroffensive and rapid advances now occurring and planned in the Asiatic area require the immediate stepping up of production of numerous other military items.

Mr. President, that is what we are called upon to do, and I am saying that neither the Revercomb amendment nor the committee substitute remotely has anything to do with just this language; it is not remotely responsive to just this language of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

Again I read from the report:

> Because of the increased tempo of military operations, our total munitions production must be restored quickly to the level of operations achieved in late 1943 and early 1944. Despite the remarkable and steady increases shown in the rate of production per man-hour, to attain that goal, our capacities will be taxed to the utmost because the required rise is not distributed uniformly among all munitions items. About half of our total war production scheduled for 1945 is in expanding programs.

It is rising, it is increasing:

> These call for the speedy delivery of the most effective weapons most urgently needed. The increased requirements are, in many instances, for new or hard-to-produce weapons or materials, new and special planes, heavy trucks and heavy-duty tires, heavy ammunition and heavy artillery, and new secret weapons of the greatest urgency.

I omit a few lines:

> The success of immediate operations on the battlefields depends upon the prompt delivery of these critical items.

Mr. President, that is from the Committee on Military Affairs. It is not a lot of sentimental talk. If we know any reality in the situation, there is the reality. Are we going to meet it or not?

Mr. President, I propose this amendment, applying the principle of the Selective Service Act and the act itself to all between 18 and 45 who are not engaged in essential war production. That will state the issue, at any rate.

Vote it down, and that will end my hope, so far as the Revercomb amendment is concerned. It will probably signalize our sentiment to the Nation, and I hope to the young men who have just taken Cologne. Cologne fell today, and in Cologne many young American sons fell also. Our soldiers may have to go on through into Germany. Let them go, with the understanding that here at home we will do just as we please—that is the voluntary principle—that we will fold our hands and say, "We are free. You are under compulsion, but we are free. You may get munitions and you may not, you may get ships and you may not. We are free."

Mr. President, that is what the voluntary principle means right now. I am motivated by the same consideration which induced me to sit here and vote for the Selective Service Act, in all its compulsion, in all that it meant to the mothers and fathers of this country, as well as to the boys. By the same considerations and under the same conditions and for the same profound motives I shall vote for every possible compulsory provision which can be wrought into the pending bill. If that is not done, I shall take it as having at least convinced me, and, I fear, the country and the fighting men, that we are determined to be free ourselves, that we are determined to do what we please. God forbid.

Mr. President, I shall ask, and do ask, for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] to the substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. The clerk will state the proposed amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 3, of the amendment of Mr. REVERCOMB it is proposed to strike out the words "in a lawful occupation" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in an activity, profession, occupation, or industry essential to the war effort."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I do not at this late date and late hour in the discussion of this subject desire to review the conflict, and the differences, and the reasons for the differences between the theory of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the theory of the substitute measure which I have offered. I will say, Mr. President, that the substitute measure I have offered is based upon the voluntary theory, namely, that the working people of this country shall not be placed under the domination of a Government administrator. The theory of the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina is the theory and the basis of the May bill itself. The Senator from North Carolina, as he always does in these matters, has fairly stated his position, that he will vote for any measure of force, and that is what he seeks to do in offering the amendment to the substitute measure when he would place in the bill the language:

> Any such registrant between the ages of 18 and 45 who is not now performing substantial work in an activity, profession, occupation or industry essential to the war effort.

The Senator leaves in the hands of some tribunal, of some agency of the Government, the right to say who is performing work essential to the war effort.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Is not that precisely what we did in respect to the selective-service bill?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Exactly so. But we have drawn a distinction here, which has been debated now for several days, as to why the Senator stands for one theory in dealing with this matter and why others of us are against the compulsory features placed upon the working people of this country. Must we sum it all up again? If we must, let us put it this way, and I speak for myself and I believe for others, in view of their expressions on the floor of the Senate and certainly in the meetings of the Military Affairs Committee. If I believed for a moment that compulsion, that the taking of the workers, the free people of this country, and placing them under the control of a Government agency to say where they should work, and when they should work, and drafting them into labor, would help shorten the war and to win it, I would be for such a measure, however distasteful it might be to me. But, Mr. President, the evidence has been overwhelming to the effect that not only has America produced in great abundance for her own armies and navies, but for the armies and navies of the Allies.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I gather from what the Senator says that the committee sat and heard evidence and that the military men had already gotten the evidence which they produced and on which they reached their conclusion. Now, in dealing with this great matter, a group of civilians, in the character of Senators, set themselves up above the experts, the admirals and the generals and the Commander in Chief, who did find from the evidence that this legislation is necessary.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may say that not an admiral, not a general, or the head of the War Department or the head of the Navy Department—not one of them said that industrial labor of this country has not performed a magnificent piece of work.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me finish my statement and then I shall yield. Let me say that I recognize the high position of the Army chief and the Navy chief in time of war. They are going to fight this war, and we have backed them, and will continue to do so. We have given them authority over military affairs, but I do not believe the time has come when the military should fix the civil policies of the Government. That policy is fixed by the Congress of the country as the representatives of the people—a free people, I am thankful to say. But if we engraft into the law of this land such measures as are advocated here—and I say, with all respect to my friend, the Senator from North Carolina, such measures as I believe are contained in the May bill—then, Mr. President, we shall have taken the farthest step toward control by government, so often called a totalitarian state. That is why we are opposing this proposal. We oppose it not only for that reason but because we feel it is not necessary. Our position is based upon the evidence adduced before the Senate Military Affairs Committee in its long series of hearings and shown in the record before the Military Affairs Committee of the House, not only by the military men and the heads of the War Department and of the Navy Department but shown by the manufacturers—by the men who know the work done by labor.

In addition to that, I, for one, have received letters from men who are working in war plants—men whom I know personally and whose word I respect very highly—who time and time again have said that plants are overmanned, that there is loafing, that there is not enough for workers to do.

I may say to the Members of the Senate that the War Manpower Commission itself has said that if the efficiency of the workmen and the use of labor were stepped up from 5 to 10 percent, as I recall, it would be equal to the addition of from 500,000 to 800,000 men to the workers in the plants of this country. When such a condition exists I do not feel called upon to place upon any segment of our population the shackles of Government control, particularly so in the face of the record which has been made by the workers.

We have been all over this matter in the course of the debate. I am repeating it in a way because it has been repeated by the able Senator who is advocating the amendment to the measure I have proposed. If the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina is written into the substitute it will destroy the whole purpose of the substitute, because the substitute in substance is like the bill reported by the committee, with three distinct differences.

One is that it reaches out and gets the loafer, the man who will not work at anything. I am not going to place the shackles of control in time of war, if it is not necessary, upon the willing worker of this country, but I am willing to place control upon the man who is not willing to perform his work. I am willing to go that far. That is what section 2 of the substitute provides. It goes no further than to say to the man who will not perform any lawful work, "You must hunt a job or you will be put to work." We owe that to the soldier and to the willing worker. If the language proposed by the Senator from North Carolina is written into the substitute the whole purpose of the substitute is ended.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to call the Senator's attention to a portion of the testimony of Mr. Krug, the War Production Board Chairman, appearing at the top of page 127. How does the Senator answer this question? After praising the voluntary system and saying that it had produced amazing results, Mr. Krug proceeded to say:

> On the other hand, the actual evidence of the last 3 months demonstrates that the voluntary plan is not working in this present crisis.

How does the Senator answer that statement?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I believe I have answered it. Certainly I have tried to answer it. I tried to answer it in the discussion of this subject several days ago, but I will repeat the answer.

I believe that the sudden rush to control the workers of the country grows out of a situation which was created in the latter part of 1944, when we were all led to believe, and earnestly believed, that the war in Europe was about to end. Senators may recall that in the earlier discussion of the pending legislation I read statements made by the commander of the armies, by the Under Secretary of War, and by others. They said that the war in Europe was about at an end. What did that lead us to believe? It led many Members of this body, and certainly many workers in the plants, to believe that the war in Europe was about to end, and the workers wished to leave the war plants and find peacetime jobs.

Let me say further that Congress enacted a measure relating to the termination of war contracts. At the time we were discussing it and considering it, we wondered what effect such discussion might have on the people of the country. We know that that legislation was properly enacted, because we must have such legislation to terminate war contracts, regardless of whether the war is in process or not. However, the effect on the people, when we are enacting legislation providing for the termination of war contracts, is to lead them to believe that the war must be near its end.

Again, we enacted a law relating to the disposition of surplus property. It is only natural that workers in the plants should feel that when we are disposing of surpluses the Government must foresee an early end to the war. They were led so to believe when they left the plants.

Further, I am advised that in the month of January 50,000 persons returned to employment in the plants of this country.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. I invite the attention of the Senator to that portion of Mr. Krug's statement in which he says that the shortage in the "must" plants, as he described them, was much greater on the 12th of last January than it had been in any of the preceding 3 or 4 months.

I should like to know whether the Senator has any evidence, in this record or any other record, which refutes what Mr. Krug testified, or what the other men upon whom we rely to conduct the war have testified. I am referring to the Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt. I am referring to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. I am referring to General Marshall and to the Chief of Naval Operations. I am referring to Mr. Krug, Mr. McNutt, and all the others who have been placed in charge of the conduct of this war. What evidence is there to refute what they say? We are deciding this question on the basis of evidence—not on theory, not on imagination, not on guesswork, not on conclusions drawn from newspaper

reports, but on evidence. Where is the evidence?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the Senator—and he knows it as well as I do—that the evidence in most cases consists of conclusions by various officials as to what may happen.

Mr. STEWART. How does the Senator know they are conclusions? I am talking about facts.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not dispute the accuracy of the figures cited. I know that the Senator is espousing the theory of the May bill, passed by the House.

Mr. STEWART. Yes; I am for even stronger legislation than that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In the face of the facts as we have them as to the production today and in the past, there is no reason to saddle upon the people of this country a "force" measure such as this.

Mr. STEWART. Except for the fact that the needs of the future will be greater, and that the voluntary system will not suffice. That is what those who are conducting the war say. I ask the Senator, What is the difference between drafting a soldier and drafting labor, money, or any other utility we may need in this war, whether it be manpower or what not?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that there is a vast difference between the organization of an army and the organization of the civilian life of America.

Mr. STEWART. There is no need to organize an army if we do not furnish it with the things it needs with which to fight.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Surely the Senator does not believe that we have not furnished our armed forces with the things which they need with which to fight.

Mr. STEWART. That is exactly the situation. They have not enough. According to the testimony of our experts, within 60 days there will actually be a shortage.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Then I say to the Senator that that statement refutes the statements of the ones upon whose testimony he is relying, because they have stated time and again that we have done a magnificent job in furnishing equipment, not only for our own Army and Navy but also for Russia and Great Britain. No one doubts that. Everyone knows it to be so.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, if the Senator——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. Those who testified in behalf of the bill told us that the good effect, if any, except as to morale, would not be felt on the war fronts for 6 or 7 months. The test is this——

Mr. STEWART. What is more important than morale?

Mr. CHANDLER. Just a moment. I do not even concede that it is that important. That is the only argument made for the bill.

The test is this: Our high peak of production in this country was in December 1943. Notwithstanding anything Mr. Krug has said in his testimony, the American people, by free, voluntary methods, produced $64,000,000,000 worth of war equipment last year. Mr. Krug asks them to produce 64.5 billion dollars worth of war equipment this year. That is not a significant increase. The boys who took Cologne today took it with weapons made by the voluntary free labor of the American people.

Mr. STEWART. Still Mr. Krug says that we must have——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor. Does he yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. The complete answer is that every witness who appeared before the Military Affairs Committee admitted that there was no over-all shortage of manpower in the United States. The witnesses admitted that the shortage, if any, was scattered and spotty. They admitted that it was not more than 200,000 men, at the most, and they admitted that it could be met by using the present methods.

If we produced $64,000,000,000 worth of war equipment last year, I should like to have someone tell me why we cannot produce $64,500,000,000 worth this year, using voluntary methods. When we do that, we shall have reached the peak production of December 1943. I should like to have an answer to that question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I have been asked a question, and I should have an opportunity to answer it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, if there is complaint on the part of the Senator from Tennessee that he has not had an opportunity to answer the question, I yield to him.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator from Kentucky turned to me and asked me to answer the question.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to have an answer from any source.

Mr. STEWART. I answer the question by using the same argument which I have been using. The same men whose statements have been quoted say that the voluntary system will not suffice in the months to come.

Mr. CHANDLER. Oh——

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator wish to have me read the statement of Mr. Krug again?

Mr. CHANDLER. The record speaks for itself.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Krug said:

> On the other hand, the actual evidence of the last 3 months demonstrates that the voluntary plan is not working in this present crisis. I do not think it is working at the present time, because we drained away so much of the working force into the armed forces and we have heaped on our productive machine such a load that that plan alone no longer works.

That is as plain English as I ever heard spoken.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. Just a moment. Let me make one further observation. I shall not turn back to the record to read the testimony of Judge Patterson, Secretary Stimson, or any of the other witnesses. It is all in the record. The Senator is just as familiar with it as I am. That is the evidence. Where is anything to refute it?

Mr. CHANDLER. That is opinion. That is not evidence.

Mr. STEWART. That is the opinion of experts, based upon their information. That is the opinion of the men whom we have selected to manage this war.

When one is ill and requires the services of a physician, he calls a physician, and takes the medicine which the physician prescribes.

Ordinarily, if a man is in his right mind, he does that. We do not manage the war from this Chamber; at least, I will venture the assertion that we are not going to manage it very successfully if we go into the war-managing business. We have at the head of our armies and navies men in whom I have confidence, and we have at the head of the various other Government agencies men in whom I have confidence. They are all of one accord; they say this bill is essential.

We have drafted millions of American boys and men. We have taken them from the coal mines, the farms, and the business houses of the United States. They are citizens of our country who are not professional soldiers. They are businessmen, laboring men, students—all Americans, every one of them, white or black. I wish to see them backed up 100 percent.

If we make a mistake, I would rather make it on their side of the ledger than on the other side of the ledger. It is no argument to say that because those in charge of the armed forces made a mistake in guessing that the war in Europe would come to a close early fast fall, therefore we should say they are not now correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, we have heard repeated time and time again the statement that the leaders of the armed forces want this particular law, that they want the Congress to enact a measure such as the May bill, under which, under the direction and dictation of the Government, they can move labor from place to place; and we have heard it stated that that is needed. With all respect to those military men and their views upon military questions, I do not accept their expert opinion upon this question. I should prefer to take the evidence of persons who have dealt with production and have dealt with the working people of this country, and who testified before our committee, one after another, that they could do the job.

Now I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, a while ago the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] read from the report of the committee. I was one of the Senators, with the Senator from West Virginia, who did not agree to the report or to the bill. What is said in the report is not intended to be said in support

of the original May-Bailey bill, because the report is based on the Kilgore bill which was reported to the Senate.

I am glad the Senator made the issue he did make, because he really thinks and believes that it is time to put compulsion on the people of America. I do not think so. That presents the issue squarely here. I am glad the Senator makes the issue, because that gets away from all the nondescript bills which Senators have offered. I do not mean to cast any reflection on the Senators who have offered them, but they are just a hodge-podge of bills.

The Senator from North Carolina will vote for the maximum amount of compulsion. I will vote for the maximum amount of freedom. On that issue the Senate should take a clear position, one way or the other. If I did not sincerely believe that the American people in this crisis, in these tragic days, have not only put in the hands of American boys guns with which they have captured many cities and towns, including Cologne, but have put in the hands of the Russians and our other allies all over the world guns without which they could not have made a successful stand, I would not take the position I now take.

If we are going to say to them now, after all this magnificent effort, that we will put compulsion on them, in my opinion that is a pitiful reward for all the fine work which has been done by the people of America. I am not going to do it. But I am glad the issue is drawn, and I wish to say to the Senator from North Carolina that he and I are absolutely in agreement as to the issue as it is drawn. He will vote for the fullest amount of compulsion. I will vote for the fullest amount of freedom. Let the issue be decided on that basis.

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. In connection with the present discussion, I wish to state that the fact is that the committee's report from which I am about to read was made, not on the Kilgore bill, but on the letters and records offered to the committee with reference to the May-Bailey bill. I agree with the Senator from West Virginia that the labor force did increase in January. But, Mr. President, why did it increase? Let us see what Mr. Krug said in that connection. I read from his letter:

> During the past 3 weeks we have had the most successful results since 1942 in men voluntarily offering themselves for war work. There are undoubtedly a number of reasons which cooperated to bring about this satisfactory result. In my view, not the least important have been the hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee. Men offered themselves for transfer not because they feared that they might be driven into jobs which they did not want, but because there was new and fresh evidence that production was critically needed for our armed forces and that more men were required if the production schedules were to be met.

Mr. President, that is the issue faced by the Senate of the United States. Much has been said about what the leaders of the War Department and the Navy Department have had to say; much has been said about what our Commander in Chief has had to say; but little has been said about what the House of Representatives has had to say. The House of Representatives passed the bill. Those who are closest to the people under our constitutional system passed the bill long ago.

This is what Mr. Krug had to say, and this is what those of us in the Senate face:

> If this legislation is passed, these forces will continue. But I say in great seriousness that if Congress were not now to legislate on this matter, the men and women of the Nation would have very good reason to believe that this has been nothing but a false alarm, that the situation is really not serious, and that it is perfectly all right for able-bodied men to continue in their less-essential jobs.

We are faced with the fact that General Marshall, Admiral King, President Roosevelt, the Secretaries of War and Navy, and other public officials, in addition to the House of Representatives, say it is necessary. If the Senate says it is not necessary, what will be the result in the shipyards and in the factories producing munitions of war?

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say that of course we have heard the names of these military leaders mentioned over and over again, and we have heard their views on this matter expressed. I was very glad to hear the able senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] read from the testimony of Mr. Krug. If Mr. Krug thinks there is danger in the future, if he comes before us and, in unison with all the other representatives of Government agencies, urges that this force measure be enacted, if he really believes we are facing a danger, let me ask why the workers quit the factories. They did not quit them in 1944 until they were led to believe that the war in Europe was almost over. They did not quit them in 1943. Mr. Krug himself said that they were returning to work because of the war needs.

Mr. President, in debating this question we should consider the evidence and the history of production and the work of the people of this country, and then we should consider whether we will let them continue to be free men and women or whether we will put them in the hands of a Government agency. To my mind, in view of the great production record our people have made, there is no question as to what we should do.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, referring to the language on page 3, which is sought to be amended by the Senator from North Carolina, namely, "any such registrant between the ages of 18 and 45 who is not performing substantial work in a lawful occupation," let me say that I understand that, by means of that language, the Senator is seeking to reach the loafers. Suppose that language is left in the bill, and suppose it should become the law, does the Senator have any doubt that every so-called loafer who can get any sort of a job, so long as it is lawful, will flock to the nonessential jobs which are lawful? If that happens, what good will the Senator have done the war effort? What contribution will that make to the production of the guns, ammunition, airplanes, and trucks our boys need on the battlefields?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky speaks of essential work. Of course, the most essential work is the production of the materials of war needed by our soldiers, sailors, and marines. But today other work in this country is essential, namely, the operation of the stores, the operation of restaurants, and so forth. If we are going to maintain our Government and our civil life in this country free, all such work is necessary. I do not care very much whether the loafer gets into a nonessential war industry. But there is something further.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. REVERCOMB. Allow me to continue answering the question which was asked me. The person to whom the Senator refers should go to work and work where he can. I realize that if he is loafing he is not working. But there is something else to consider. I dare say that the majority leader has heard about it from his own State. I know I have heard about it from many persons in my community. There has been talk about morale. There is nothing more destructive in this country today of the morale of the mothers and fathers of boys who have been inducted into the armed services than for them to see men loafing around pool rooms and stores, performing no work whatsoever. I do not want the Government to put its stamp of approval upon such persons, and I am willing to go far enough to insure that penalties of force shall be applied in order to compel those men to work.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator speaks about men loafing around pool rooms. Of course, I can appreciate the lack of essentiality of loafing around pool rooms, but under the Senator's amendment we could not even reach the fellow who operates the pool room.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator is correct; so long as the operation of the pool room is lawful.

Mr. BARKLEY. So long as the operation of a pool room is legalized—and most of such operations are legalized—we could not even reach its operator.

From letters which I have received from fathers and mothers who have boys in the Army, I judge that their resentment is not limited to someone who is loafing and doing nothing while their boys are fighting, but it extends also to those who claim they are in some essential work when their neighbors, who know them, do not believe they are so engaged. Many of them do not understand why we can take one of their boys and put him in the Army, but we cannot take another man on the same street, or in the same block, and put him in a war plant where he can help furnish material for the boys who are fighting.

I take it for granted that we are trying to enact legislation which will help produce material needed by our fighting men all over the world. We know that the

fighting has been stepped up. The fact that we reached a peak in production in December of 1943 is not, to my mind, necessarily a point one way or the other. We all know, of course, that last summer and early in the fall we indulged in the hope that the war was about over.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. After a brief recess we returned to the Senate and were in almost a panic to enact reconversion legislation, because it was said that peace was just around the corner. We were almost in a panic to enact some law for the control and disposition of surplus property. We in the Congress of the United States contributed as much to the optimism of the American people at that time as was contributed by the admirals and the generals. They did not say anything about reconversion or surplus property. We ourselves were of the belief that the war in Europe would end before we could enact the Reconversion Act and the Surplus Property Act.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the subsequent events did not happen as we had expected. Under the spell of the optimism to which I have referred, a recession took place in employment in wartime industry. The workers thought that the war was about over, and they wanted to obtain good jobs so that they would be in on the ground floor when civilian employment was reduced. Then the breakthrough of von Rundstedt occurred, and the situation did not look so rosy as it did back in September and October. We then began to talk about the needs of the Army, and a spurt in employment followed. But no increase in employment is taking place at the present time. There is a falling off in employment as compared with what it was in December and January. So I think that we should look forward to the circumstance that when another spell of optimism comes there may be an exodus of men from our war plants which will make the exodus of last fall look like a stationary army. I cannot help having that possibility in mind when I vote on the pending legislation. I think I am about to land, but I have not completely burned my bridges behind me. I do not see what good it will do to say we will take the loafers who are not engaged in lawful work in order that they may be rushed into lawful work, or certify them to the Army and Navy, and if they are not taken by the Army or Navy because of physical defects, have them certified for employment elsewhere. For that reason I think the language of the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] as a substitute for the language proposed by the Senator from West Virginia is much to be preferred, and I intend to support it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, it is always a pleasure to listen to the able majority leader. I was impressed by his appeal not to delay consideration of the pending bill, but I think his remarks have contributed very much to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator means that as a criticism, I may say that this is the only time I have opened my mouth about the bill since last week.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am sure the Senator contributed very much to the argument.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator for that concession.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, it all comes down to the question of use of force on those who are lawfully engaged in work. The question is whether we shall exercise force upon them, as my able friend the majority leader seems to want to do, and as my able friend the Senator from North Carolina proposes to do by his amendment, or whether we will leave the workers and the other people of America free. That is the issue. It has already been stated here. If the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina is adopted I am sure it will destroy the theory of free labor and put the stamp of approval of the Senate upon the theory of forced work in America at this time. That is the sole issue. I hope the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina to my amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has made reference to poolroom loafers. To me, there seems to be an inconsistency between the power of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion to close country fairs, night clubs, and race tracks, and his lack of power to handle in a similar way other groups of people. Why in heaven's name must he have control over the life of every man, woman, and child in this country in order to close a poolroom? The situation seems to me to be inconsistent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, when I rose to address the Senate, I did not expect to engage in extended argument. I may say briefly, in respect to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina, that if the amendment is adopted we shall thereby be putting our stamp of approval upon the very thing to which the majority of the members of the Military Affairs Committee have been opposed. We would be making a "force" measure out of the proposed legislation which is meant to keep the workers of the country free and uncontrolled, with the exception only that we would be saying to persons who will not work, "You get to work." I therefore hope the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina will be defeated.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have not taken much part in the debate, and rise now to say, from a very slight knowledge of modern warfare, that I believe the debate to a large extent has proceeded upon a false premise. It has been repeatedly stated by those who favor and those who oppose the Bailey amendment that the industrial leaders and the industrial workers of America have done a great job. I agree that they have; but that is not what is at issue in this dispute. The question is, have they done a great enough job?

I heard in the old days, before war broke out, when Hitler was getting ready to launch his first attack, and when he had put a man in charge of producing and equipping his coming army with sufficient weapons and munitions to wage a successful campaign, that men would come to him and say, "We have plans for 5,000 airplanes. We think we will need 5,000, and therefore we are planning to build 5,000 airplanes of a certain type." Hitler would say, "Build 20,000." Another man would come and say, "We have planned to manufacture 20,000 cannon of a certain caliber. We feel they will be required for an army of five or six million men." Hitler would say, "Build 60,000." Why? Because in warfare the amount of matériel available at the spot, in time of need, very often determines the difference between success and failure. There is no such thing as producing a sufficient amount to fill the maw of war. When gentlemen rise and say that industry and labor have done a good job, that is a sort of a political pat on the back; but from the standpoint of the soldier and sailor, the question is, "Have you produced all that is needed to win this war, and shorten it by every conceivable minute?"

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a moment. When we started out we could not make an attack on the coast of Europe until the 6th of June 1944, two and a half years after we went into the war. Why? We could not make an attack on the Philippines until 3 years from the time the Japs sank our fleet at Pearl Harbor. Why? We could not make an attack on Japan herself until nearly 3 years after Pearl Harbor. Why? Because we did not have the equipment, in spite of all that industry and labor had done, with which to manufacture the supplies and transport them to the spots where they would make the difference between defeat and victory. We do not have them yet, and the war in the Pacific, yea, the war in Europe, will not be decided finally until they are there.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should prefer to wait until a little later, then I shall yield to every Senator who wishes to interrupt me.

If there is any man who doubts what the verdict would be if there were 531, either officers or enlisted men, sitting in this body and voting on this question, let him stand up and give his verdict. Those 531 men would say, "Every additional gun, every additional shell, every additional ship, you make available, saves life and shortens the war."

What happens while the men stand and wait? What happens is that we see Douglas MacArthur leave Corregidor and go to Australia, and with a handful of men and a handful of equipment, plus his brilliant strategy and tactics, hold the enemy at bay while we begin to produce. After a while, because we are producing faster and faster, he turns the tide and gradually drives the enemy back, until one day he is back on the very soil he had to leave in defeat. Why is that? Because finally, after 3 long, hard years, we could put the ships and the equipment at his disposal to turn the tide. If we could have done it 2 years ago, the war

in the Pacific would have been just that much shortened, and God knows the thousands who are dying and will die might have lived.

When the troops get ready for a battle on the western front, as even every layman knows, they do not take just enough ammunition for 1 day, they have to build up ammunition dumps of every conceivable kind higher than this room, piles of bread as high as this room, piles of shells, more arms and ammunition, machinegun replacements, and the like. Why? Because no man knows, even General Eisenhower does not know, when he goes into a battle, that he is sure of success. He has to have plans and he has to have matériel and equipment in case he does not succeed.

It was only 60 days ago—what a mercurial country we are—when we were standing in the marble room yonder with the newspapers trembling in our hands, while Von Rundstedt was raging toward the ports whose fall would have cut off the meager supplies which up to that time had trickled through to our Army. Now, because in the fortunes of war, 2 months afterward, we are at the banks of the Rhine, we are ready to say that the war is over.

Go and tell that to a man who has been fighting forward over there for the last 60 days, who is standing on the steep bank looking across the half mile of water, the other side bristling with all kinds of artillery and machine guns and mortars, and who must some day cross it before the struggle will be over, and tell him that back home it is proposed to let certain men do the best they can under the voluntary system. The answer is, "Why am I picked out, drafted, and sent over here under the involuntary system? Where is the justice, the righteousness, the fairness in the system which takes me from my wife and children, from my job, and puts me in uniform, at a pittance, and sends me over here, perhaps to die, and then lets the army of men back home do as they please in the field of producing the things I must have in order to have a chance to come back to those I am defending?"

The reason why the great German Army rolled through Poland in 19 days, and the following year through France in a couple of months, and then stormed a thousand miles toward Moscow, was that it had the stuff with which to do it, not only enough, but more than enough.

Our task is not to do merely a good job, our task is to do a complete job, so that these men—God bless them, who utter a little prayer and wonder what will be before them tomorrow morning—may have a chance to shorten the war and save their lives.

Mr. President, this is not emotional talk, it is grim reality in the tragic and stark days of warfare. Think of the men standing on the battle fronts in the dark learning that back home the great Congress of the United States has said that the people at home are doing a good enough job, nobody is to be bothered, a man can loaf if he wants to, and there will be no penalty. If Senators think that is helping the fighting man the next day to face the terror that is there before him—and it is terror—then they are mistaken.

No man wants to vote to take away anything from the people. No one likes to vote for high taxes; no one likes to vote for rationing; no one likes wartime controls on gasoline and travel and tires and trucks and farm machinery and all that. Well, if we do not want control and do not want hardship, then let us declare peace, and stop this nonsense of saying, "Unconditional surrender," while we strut out to the night club and spend our money at the race tracks, and drive where we please, go to work when we want to, and stay away when we do not want to go to work.

Thirteen million American men are out there somewhere. My God, have we come to the point where we do not care? Are we simply going to point to a pile of munitions somewhere and say, "Look at that. Is that not wonderful?" without considering all the if's and and's and possible changes of warfare? It was only 2 years ago that Rommel stood at the gates of the Suez Canal, and had the fortune of fate laid the feather of victory on his cap, God knows what the future would have been. How was the tide turned then? It was turned in large measure by the production of the American workingman and the American businessman—the mere trickle, as it were, of tanks and guns and planes and materials which gave to General Montgomery the balance of power he had to have in order to win and without which the whole fate of mankind might have been changed, for had the Suez Canal fallen into German hands it would have cut off the flow of supplies by way of the Indian Ocean to Russia, and a junction of the Japanese and the German forces might have taken place on the plains of Persia. That was quite possible, when we consider the scope of the ebb and flow of this World War.

Yes; I say this debate has proceeded on false premises. It is not enough to produce a great quantity of munitions and war materials. It is our duty, within the limit of human considerations, to produce the greatest supply of them we can produce and make them available to the men who depend on us not only for their own lives but for the lives of their families and the welfare of the country and the perpetuation ultimately of our democratic institutions.

Strange though the statement may seem, we can lose the war even yet, though, of course, I do not believe it will happen. We have not won it in the Pacific yet to the extent that we are winning it in Europe. We may have to land a great army in Japan proper, and one in Manchuria proper, and one on the China coast. And I want to tell you, Mr. President and Senators, although you already know it, that the Japanese do not surrender. It is necessary to kill and exterminate them in order to conquer. If anyone doubts that statement let him ask the marines on Iwo Jima.

Then, the word "totalitarian" seems to frighten many people. I myself do not like it. I do not like the Nazi system or the Fascist system or the Communist system, all of which are totalitarian. For my part, I like democracy, and I know that the sooner the war is over the greater the chance democracy has to survive, and the longer the end of the war is postponed the less chance democracy will have to survive. The longer it lasts the more it will cost in money, the more it will cost in blood, the more it will cost in the relinquishment of liberty and in the imposition of a centralized governmental control. Those things are twins or quadruplets, if you please. It is totalitarian to draft men to serve in the Army. A certain amount of totalitarian philosophy is inescapable in time of war. But when we adopt totalitarian philosophy, as we did in the Selective Service Act, and put the State in ultimate control of a man's individual life, ordering him where to go, telling him what he can eat, what he can wear, where he can live—can those of us who claim to be Democrats, who believe in special privilege to none and equal privilege to all, after sending the soldiers forth with a complete totalitarian philosophy covering their every movement, rightfully permit those who remain at home to do as they please and say "you cannot do that to us"? If that is going to be the division on which our philosophy splits it would be a great deal better to call off this war right now.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I should perefer to continue, if the Senator will withdraw his request.

Mr. CHANDLER. Very well.

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly all government is totalitarian even in a democracy. It is only different in degree. The imposition of a speed limit is totalitarianism. Every law we put on the books is totalitarianism. The imposition of the will of a government on the freedom of the individual is totalitarianism. But it is the minimum of totalitarianism, and when we impose a reasonable minimum we call it democracy. When war comes, however, what Senator on this floor has not with great emphasis shaken his finger and made the gesture downward and said that this is total war? Is it total war? Well, the word "total" has taken on a strangely new connotation here in this debate. It is total for those who wear the uniform, but completely untotal for those who do not wear the uniform.

One final thing we must keep in mind as to the quantity of goods we are to produce. Let me recall the old nursery rhyme:

For want of the nail the shoe was lost,
For want of the shoe the horse was lost,
For want of the horse the rider was lost,
For want of the rider the message was lost,
And for want of the message the battle was lost.

Senators, there is no one in this country, in this body, or in the humblest home in America, who is not hoping and praying—and when loved ones are in the service, praying fervently to Almighty God—to bring this terrible, unholy holocaust to a speedy and a victorious end.

Even though labor and management have done a good job, can we in this Chamber afford to be content with "good enough" when it is not our best? Is there a Senator in this body who will rise on this floor and say that either labor or capital or the Senate or the House or the Government or anybody else has done his or its best—anything in reasonable comparability to that grand best which the man in uniform does every passing second of every passing hour of every passing day?

One final thought comes to my mind. I read it in an account of a war correspondent who had just spent a year abroad, and who came back to this country after seeing the men engaged in combat and the great piles of supplies we had shipped abroad. The question of whether we were doing our level best permeated the philosophy of his argument, and he said, "Some day those men in Washington will look the survivors of this war in the eye when they come back." Mr. President, when we do look them in the eye we are bound to admit faults and shortcomings, we are bound to admit mistakes, but, Mr. President, there is one thing we cannot do: Here in this Congress we cannot fail to do our best to formulate policies which will give the men at the front the last full measure of our devotion and support.

We have appropriated nearly $30,000,000,000 for lend-lease. Were the things we thus provided needed? I have been told by Members of this body, by writers on the spot, and by employers by the thousands, that lend-lease determined the difference between success and victory in the critical days of the Russo-German campaign. Had we had more production than we had, think how much more quickly the tide could have been turned. Think how many lives could have been saved, the lives of our own boys.

I do not blame business for not wanting to have the restrictions contained in this bill; I do not blame labor. On the whole, judged by any ordinary rule of conduct, both have done a great job. But, Mr. President, a great job is not enough in this war. It is all-out or nothing. It is total or nothing. It is the difference between the United States being on top or being at the bottom; and we cannot afford to calculate, to the fourth decimal place, whether or not it is democratic or totalitarian. The question is, Is it necessary to victory? This is the yardstick by which I think we should decide this question.

I think we are remiss here. Probably I shall be very severely criticized and called a Fascist for making this statement; but I will hazard the observation nonetheless. I think we are cowardly in this Congress, when we read of the casualty lists, when we read that up to this time 1,000,000 men have been killed, wounded, or are missing, and permit unlawful strikes to take place in this country in the face of that great and growing casualty list.

I believe that we should have a policy. Labor and capital are bound to have grievances. There should be a board on which each of them should be represented, and perhaps in the community where the grievance arises there should be a third member,—a Federal judge, for example. The three of them ought to talk over the grievances and try to iron them out. If they cannot do so, the decision of any two of the three ought to be binding; and after such an impartial finding of justice and the facts, any man who strikes, whether he be a laborer or a capitalist, ought to be drafted for service in the armed forces, as a general policy, or otherwise made to serve in this war. I know that if a bill were introduced to carry out such a policy it would not have a chance; and yet I advocate it with all the candor I possess. I believe that all of us, from the top of the administration down, have a load on our conscience and a blot on our escutcheon when we draft men to go forth and die, and then permit thousands of men to go out on strike for a week or two, perhaps in the midst of the production of the most critical materials needed by our Army and Navy. Such strikes are, for the most part, over trivial things. If my oppenents wish to defeat me at some time in the future for making this statement, I am perfectly willing to take my medicine; but every man, including the workingman, knows of the inherent justice of the proposal which I have advanced.

We now come to a proposal to continue the voluntary system. Voluntary in the midst of war? Do our people object to being told, "Men who are dying need certain things, and there is not enough of them. You are doing something which has no relation to the great drama which is being played on the world's stage, and we must ask you to go into this factory and make alarm clocks for 60 days, or a year." Shall we listen to that man when he says, "I do not want to make alarm clocks. I do not want to work. I am getting along all right. Why do you want to bother me. Is not this a democracy?"

Perhaps the war in Germany will be over in the next 30 or 40 days. Perhaps it will not be over for another 30 or 40 months. From now on the expenditure of men—the most important thing—and the expenditure of tanks, planes, shells, guns, and everything else, will proceed at a terrifically accelerated rate. When fighting takes place in the Pacific on a grand scale, it will proceed at an enormously accelerated rate. Is our production machine geared to stand the impact of both those loads should an unkind fate postpone the happy ending of this war with victory for our side? Have we great stock piles?

To go back for just a moment, if a year ago General MacArthur had only had what he had 60 days ago, what a difference it would have made in thousands of homes all over this country. If a year ago General Eisenhower had only had what he had on June 6, 1944, grief would not have come to many a saddened home.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is there any evidence that lack of manpower had the slightest thing to do with the failure to have munitions a year ago on the same scale that we have them today? There is not an item of evidence to that effect. There was no shortage of manpower then in the United States. No manufacturer had trouble finding men to do the work he had to do. The Senator's argument is entirely fallacious.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator's tirade is over, let me answer. First of all, there is abundant evidence from Mr. Krug, who is charged specifically by the Congress with the job of production.

Secondly, I believe that General Marshall knows more about what is needed for the Army than does either "General" TAFT or "Admiral" TAFT.

Furthermore, I repeat that we should have stopped strikes in their incipiency when men were dying. We asked the men on the battlefront to show the highest degree of courage, while we were not willing to show a modicum of it in this Government, from the top all the way down the line of those in authority.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Under Secretary Patterson made the following statement:

> Last year, which brought D-day in Normandy, and the landing in the Philippines, there were workers to produce and sell flowers and potted plants of the value of $400,000,000—

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator read that again?

Mr. MAYBANK. Under Secretary Patterson stated as follows:

> Last year, which brought D-day in Normandy—

When the boys about whom the Senator speaks were dying—

> and the landing in the Philippines—

Which the Senator has so eloquently portrayed—

> there were workers to produce and sell flowers and potted plants of the value of $400,000,000, and toilet and cosmetic goods selling for $1,000,000,000.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; we must have our lipstick. We must not do without Jergens lotion, or Sweetheart soap, or Camay, or whatever it may be. We must not do without those things. God! I wish we could all, with the promise of survival, spend 24 hours under fire, and then come back to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I know that my friend the Senator from Maryland will not disagree with me when I say now that I would vote for any bill which I believed in my heart would shorten the war one second or would save one life.

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly; I concede that.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think it should be said that something more than that is involved. Certainly my friend from Maryland knows that if we were to pass a bill providing for the strongest form of compulsion, there would not be, as a result, any more material flowing to the

battlefields, according to the testimony of the experts, for 6 or 7 months.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator know that we will not need it six or seven months from now?

Mr. CHANDLER. Let me go on for a moment, please. I do not say we will not need it in 6 or 7 months; but I do say that we are asked to change our system now. If I thought such a change would bring about improvement, I would vote for the change, because I am not afraid to vote for anything which I think is good for my country.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know that. Let me say that I do not clash with the Senator, because I know he will do whatever he thinks is best for the country; but I think we have heard so many slogans that we are confused. I have heard it said that labor and capital have done a magnificent job. Of course, both labor and capital vote. I do not think the statement that they have done a magnificent job has been made because they vote, but somehow it helps us to express our conscientious beliefs.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will my friend yield further to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I say that we are asked to change the system which not only produced, last year, $64,000,000,000 worth of war materials—materials which have been used not only by the United States but by our allies, as well——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator has forced me to take up a subject which I hoped I could avoid discussing.

Mr. CHANDLER. But we are asked to produce this year $64,500,000,000 worth of such materials—an increase which is scarcely significant. That request is made of us after the strikes in our country, bad as they were, involved only one-tenth of 1 percent of all the workers in our country. Then I am asked to take chances and to adopt a system which the British adopted, and which in their case has worked much worse than the voluntary system in America has worked. Therefore, I do not think the voluntary system under which we have done so well should be changed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, what is the percentage the Senator mentioned?

Mr. CHANDLER. One-tenth of 1 percent.

Mr. TYDINGS. Did it ever occur to the Senator that if we had had one-tenth of 1 percent extra production, we might have had one-tenth of 1 percent less casualties?

Mr. CHANDLER. I would not quarrel with the Senator about that; but England experienced a 16-percent increase in strikes, last year, under the system which it is now proposed that we adopt.

Mark Twain said there are two times when a person cannot afford to speculate. One is when he can afford it and one is when he cannot afford it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think we should take England as an example for this country. I am not fond of taking England as an example.

Let us touch on the matter the Senator inadvertently raised.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, let me say that if I thought enactment of this bill would put a single gun in the hands of a single man so that he could shoot a single enemy quicker than he could if the bill were not enacted, I would join now with the Senator in supporting the bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know that; I am not arguing with the Senator on that ground.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand the Senator is not. I sincerely believe, and I am bound to say it if I do, that at present the labor situation in the United States is better than it has ever been at any other time in the history of our country.

Mr. TYDINGS. Now let us tell the truth about the situation.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let me tell it. I say that at present the labor situation in the United States is better than it has ever been at any other time in the history of our country, and I say that by using the present methods we can get the men we need. I have ample evidence and messages to that effect in my pocket.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, let me continue. I shall yield later to the Senator.

Let me develop just one thought at this point. Let us settle the truth about this matter. I have heard it charged on this floor that this Government was the greatest hoarder of labor in the world. And here is the body which, with the House of Representatives, regulates everything which takes place in this Government. I ask what have we done about it. If we cannot clean out our own house, how in the name of common sense are we going to clean out the surplus of manpower in this, that, or the other plant.

Secondly, I have heard fervid statements on this floor about men of draft age who have been mothered and coddled by this Government. So far as I know, if they were blasted out it was months and years after the finger of public attention was pointed to that situation. Every one knows that in addition to many fine persons who went into the war plants as a patriotic endeavor or who were regularly employed there before the war started, there were also in those plants thousands of persons who went there in order to evade military service. Am I wrong? If so, let some Senator contradict me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a minute; I will give the Senator another statement to contradict, so that he can make his statement a double-barreled one. Everyone likewise knows that one of the reasons for the Tydings amendment was, not to stop men from being drafted from the farms, but to keep them from going from the farms to war plants, primarily, because then they would have the feeling that if they were working in some essential activity they would not be drafted.

Now I yield to the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maryland for yielding to me.

The record before the Committee on Military Affairs is clear that there are very few deferments among the civilian employees of the War Department and of the Navy Department.

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not say the War Department and the Navy Department.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to say that I think the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is the chairman of the committee for the Senate which acts upon deferments, will also testify that with respect to the matters which come under his attention there has been a studious effort to make certain that all persons in the employ of the Senate and the House who are within the draft age shall perform their service in the armed forces.

I will say to the Senator from Maryland that my point is that when the Senator implies that the Government of the United States has been harboring in civilian employment in the executive branch of the Government men who should be in the Army or the Navy he is making a statement which is not in accordance with the evidence which has come to my attention.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will give the Senator some definite evidence which will come to his attention; and if he will investigate, he will find it to be accurate.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. In just a minute. Let us proceed with one thing at a time. I shall be glad to yield to my friend in a moment.

Let us take the Rural Electrification Administration. There was a time when the deferment of 35 junior engineers was requested by that organization, and it was granted until publicity brought about a change. Does the Senator take issue with that statement?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no knowledge about the Rural Electrification Administration and its departments; but I know that the evidence which came to the Committee on Military Affairs was that deferments in the executive branch of the Government have been materially reduced.

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh. I am talking——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am talking; if the Senator will permit me to answer his question——

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is not answering it. I said that in the early days of the war men went into the war plants to escape the draft. They went there from the farms to escape the draft, and they went there from the Government to escape the draft. And I said it had taken years to shake them out. Everyone who knows his A B C's knows those statements to be true. The Senator is not answering the question. Does he not know that up until a year ago there were not many deferred Government employees in the service?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I shall say to the Senator——

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to answer "Yes" or "No."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall say to the Senator, if he will permit me, that the evidence which was presented before the Appropriations Committee, of which the Senator is a member, was clear that the

executive branches of the Government were studiously refraining from requesting the deferment of civilian employees.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Maryland yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield first to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] have been discussing two entirely different subjects. The present status in deferment of employees in the legislative branch of the Government is, I should say, excellent. The present status with regard to Government deferments is good. So the Senator from Wyoming is correct in his statement of the evidence before the Military Affairs Committee. The Senator from Maryland said that some time ago certain things had occurred which made it necessary for him to submit the so-called Tydings amendment, which I supported and voted for in the Senate. The situation then was very unsatisfactory and legislation was needed to correct it. I am happy to be on the side of both friends, even though they apparently differ. [Laughter.]

Mr. TYDINGS. I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland is a member of the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Wyoming, and I also are members of that committee. We know that at the present time there are many Government employees being deferred who should be deferred as there were a year ago.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am now thinking about deferments connected with congressional committees. I am a member of some of those committees, but I do not know of any one of them, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, the Committee on Education and Labor, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, which has had an employee under congressional deferment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have one further thought which I should like to express. I assert to the Senator from New Mexico that we have had no complaints regarding any deferments of men connected with congressional committees of which I know, and if the Senator will submit the name of any employee in the legislative branch of the Government who has been wrongfully deferred, I believe I can speak for the committee in assuring him that the matter will be attended to, not at some time during the pendency of the bill now before the Senate, but by tomorrow night.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I cannot yield any further. What I said was that all of us know that during the course of the war men in Government, industry, and otherwise had in many cases taken positions of the kind to which reference has been made in order to escape military service, and that we had great difficulty in getting them out of those positions so that they could bear their full share of the cost of being citizens in a democracy.

Of course, if while I am speaking the Germans ask for peace, or an armistice is reached, or the Germans surrender unconditionally, perhaps what I have said would not carry as much weight as it would if the opposite should occur. There is no guaranty in the world that a quick surrender will take place. We think we are on the road to certain victory. We all hope, and many of us believe, that victory is not too far distant, so far as Europe is concerned. But are we certain we shall not repeat the very mistake which it is now being suggested that we make? Many people thought that the war was about over when von Rundstedt ordered his troops forward and we had a new offensive on our hands. Who is the military expert in the Senate who knows what the cost in blood and in treasure will be before the Japanese will have been defeated? We do not have two fronts in our fight with the Japanese because the Chinese are not equipped sufficiently. We do not have much with which to equip them. And on the Pacific front we have not yet an ally like Russia, and we have no certainty that we shall have one, though we may hope to have one.

Suppose that 6 months from now things are not going so well, and there is a shortage at some place. Whose fault will it be? It will be the fault of each one of us if we do not do what we can to avoid such a catastrophe. The blood of many innocent men will literally be upon our hands. In my opinion, the blood of many innocent men is already upon our hands because of our—I will use the polite word—nonchalant treatment of the strikes. It is important to remember that if there had been no strikes whatsoever—and there have not been many, for which labor deserves a great deal of credit—the war would have been immeasurably shortened, and many soldiers who are now dead might be alive.

I think we owe it to the men in the service to do everything that is within our power to give every measure of support of which we are capable. Many Senators have loved ones in the service, and it may be that they will be the ones who will die because of a loss of production here and there which might have been furnished by logistics. The primary consideration of this Congress should be to shorten the war by every conceivable second.

I cast no reflection upon those who think that the voluntary system will accomplish that result; but I do assert that their premise that we have done a magnificent job, while accurate and while true, and while it is something which labor, capital and all others concerned may be proud of, is not the criterion for fighting the war. The criterion is, Have we done the best job we can do?

Recently I attended a meeting with businessmen of my State. They came to ask me to vote against the compulsory feature of the bill. I listened to their arguments, and discussed with them some of the facts which I have discussed here. I came to the conclusion that they had not made out a case, and I told them I could not go along with them; that I considered the American Congress must keep an eye single to one thing, namely, not whether a legislative act hurt or did not hurt them, or whether it gave them every measure of consideration which all of us would like to accord them, but whether it was transcendentally essential to the successful prosecution of the war, the support of the men who are dying, and the hastening of a quick victory in a sick world already threatened with revolution in many places after the war shall have come to an end. I told them that all their troubles were infinitesimal, but would be aggravated to mountain size unless we could terminate the war quickly and victoriously ahead of everything else; that I was willing, so far as I could, to defer wherever possible; but that it was not fair to go into the city from which they came and take the sons of citizens of that city and place them before the enemy's shot and shell, and then have every one else in America do as he pleased, when there was a critical shortage of material, when the war in the Pacific was only in its genesis, and revelation was many, many, many chapters ahead in the war bible.

So, while I criticize no man who may differ from me, I consider it the highest privilege to stand by the men in uniform 100 percent. They are entitled to it, and, in my opinion, nothing else will do.

Mr. BARKLEY obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BARKLEY. In a moment I will yield. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the Bailey amendments, I believe.

The VICE PRESIDENT. They have not been ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought they had been. If we could vote on the Bailey amendment, which is a simple proposition, I should like to have the Senate do so this afternoon. If we cannot vote on it without further discussion, I am ready to move a recess.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I certainly desire to speak on the Bailey amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wonder if we could not arrive at an understanding about limiting debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Kentucky is trying to get an agreement on a limitation of debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that during further debate on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] to the substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 20 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. Does the request apply only to the Bailey amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. That no Senator shall speak more than once or longer than 20 minutes?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not more than once or more than 20 minutes on the Bailey amendment to the substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to try to obtain another agreement?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will pardon me, I shall not block his obtaining the agreement. I desire to add only one or two words, and I press for the opportunity to offer them now because I think they should be said immediately following the speech of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Everything the Senator from Maryland has said is based upon the assumption that the so-called May-Bailey bill would increase production, and would be of aid to the soldiers and sailors who are fighting the war. I say, Mr. President, in words which I cannot emphasize too strongly, that in my judgment the passage of that bill would result in delaying the delivery of munitions to the men on the fighting fronts. I say that the bill which has been reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, after the committee had diligently and carefully listened to the hearings and studied the terms of the bill, will do more than any other measure which has been proposed to the Congress to expedite delivery of munitions of war to the men who need them. There is no question in my mind whatsoever, Mr. President, that if the Senate were to approve and the President were to sign the bill which was passed by the House, it would cause much confusion in our war factories and reduce, not increase, production.

I say that the evidence before the committee is clear that the bill which the Senator from Maryland has so eloquently defended is not the measure which the public has been led to believe it is. It is not a national service act; it is not an act which calls upon all the citizens of America to rally to the cause and to produce. It is a partial act, which deals with only a fraction of the working population, with only one-third of our labor forces. It is not in any sense susceptible of the description which is to be found in the phrase bandied around here, "If we can draft men to fight, why cannot we draft them to work?"

When we draft men to fight, we draft them to fight for their Government. When we draft them to work under the terms of any bill which has been proposed, we draft them to work, not for their Government, but for some organization that is making profit from their labor.

Mr. President, I can read the list of those who have made millions out of the production of war materials sent to the soldiers. Am I to vote, are you to vote, to take a young man and send him to work for the United States Steel Corporation, or the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, or for any of the other great organizations which are today in a better financial position than ever before in the whole history of the United States, and then have Members of the Senate stride up and down the floor and say that our action rests upon the ground that equal service is demanded of those who are to be drafted for work and those who are being drafted to fight? In my judgment, that is altogether irrelevant and beside the point, and altogether unsupported by any fact which can be adduced.

Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland said, in the course of his very eloquent speech, that we are accustomed to use catch phrases upon the floor of the Senate. I say there is no catch phrase I have heard which has less basis in fact or in logic than the catch phrase upon which the speech of the Senator from Maryland was based.

The members of the Committee on Military Affairs in reporting the bill do so in the firm conviction that by improving the system which has worked so well to date we shall speed the delivery of munitions of war for the fighting forces and strengthen the hands of those boys who are carrying the flag for us upon the fighting fronts. They support the bill in the conviction, Mr. President, that to do otherwise would be to introduce confusion and delay into the machinery whereby the people of the United States have produced the greatest quantity of materials of war in all history.

I have been very glad to point to the magnificent record which has been made, not because I think it is sufficient, not at all; not because I think we are doing the best that can be done, not at all; but because I know that it is a record of production of which America can be proud, that the production has been accomplished by our present system, and is the type of production which can be improved and increased. If with good sense, if with consideration for the facts, if instead of appealing to catch phrases, we read the language which is before us, if we improve the system we shall do more indeed for our fighting soldiers than if we produce confusion and delay and uncertainty and injustice, as would inevitably be the case if we should undertake to draft men to work for the profits of other men.

The way to proceed, Mr. President, is along that glorious road upon which we have been traveling, and I have no hesitation to say to my friends of the Military Affairs Committee and to other Senators who have thus far sponsored the work of the Military Affairs Committee, that that work has been done in good faith. After diligent study it is presented here in the conviction that it will do more good for our soldiers than anything that is supported and held together by the catch phrases which have just been uttered upon this floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Fred M. Vinson, of Kentucky, to be Federal Loan Administrator.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Pay Director William J. Carter to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral for a term of 4 years; and

Pay Director Horace D. Nuber to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, to continue while serving as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William A. Brophy, of New Mexico, to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs, vice John Collier, resigned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the United States Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

FEDERAL LOAN ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, today, by unanimous vote, the Committee on Banking and Currency reported favorably the nomination of Judge Fred M. Vinson to be Federal Loan Administrator to succeed the Honorable Jesse H. Jones. In view of the situation which exists with respect to the loan agencies and the desire that Judge Vinson take charge as soon as possible in order that he may go forward with the work, I ask unanimous consent that his nomination be now considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, in all ordinary circumstances I should feel like

insisting that the nomination go over; but this is a most important position for which Judge Vinson has been nominated, and it is highly essential that the work should be picked up and carried on as quickly and effectively as possible. Therefore, so far as I personally am concerned, I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 7, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 6 (legislative day of February 26), 1945:

FEDERAL LOAN ADMINISTRATOR

Fred M. Vinson, to be Federal Loan Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

COMMISSIONER OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

William A. Brophy, to be Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be passed assistant surgeons, effective dates indicated

Walter B. Quisenberry, April 18, 1945.
Alfred H. Lawton, April 17, 1945.
Henry D. Ecker, April 10, 1945.
Phillip H. Best, August 8, 1944.
William R. Rosanoff, March 3, 1945.

To be surgeons, effective March 6, 1945

Harry Eagle
George H. Hunt
Carroll E. Palmer

To be temporary surgeons effective February 1, 1945

Selwyn H. Drummond
James L. Baker
Richard K. Winston
John F. Oesterle
John C. Grier, Jr.
Benjamin Wolfman
James M. Hundley
Robert E. Miller

To be temporary senior surgeon, effective February 1, 1945

Harold R. Sandstead

POSTMASTERS

MICHIGAN

Mabel D. Hartman, Baroda.
Kathleen I. Adams, Lachine.
Martha Compeau, Munger.

TENNESSEE

Sam Spencer, Burns.
Creed B. Shockley, Spencer.
Etta E. Jones, Strawberry Plains.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 6, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork; day unto day uttereth speech and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard; their line is gone out through all the earth. Blessed Lord, as Thou hast many voices in the earth with their many ways and with their many messages of reaching the human heart, O let us hear the whisper of Thy grace.

Open our minds and attune our spirits to receive the interpretation of Thy holy World. Enable us to join ourselves to an invisible truth, to a righteous cause, to stand by it, and to thrive by the love of it. O God, may we ever carry the sacred flame of love in our breasts; free us from pride and weakness, forgetting not that which is great and good. Gird us with prayer and holy contemplation and let the voices of the spirit world be vocal, permitting not our secret faults to have dominion over us but cleansing us from all our sins and serving Thee with quiet minds. In Thy name, O Master, may we learn how to conquer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 91):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Hon. JOHN MOSES, late a Senator from the State of North Dakota.

Resolved, That a committee of five Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Senator.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the above resolution, the President of the Senate had appointed Mr. LANGER, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. SHIPSTEAD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. TAYLOR members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Interior.
3. Department of Justice.
4. Department of Labor.
5. Department of the Navy.
6. Department of State.
7. Office of Price Administration.
8. Selective Service System.
9. United States Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration.
10. War Manpower Commission.

DEFERMENT OF COAL MINERS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, time may prove that the Selective Service or Congress was not wise in deferring individuals or groups in our manpower effort. However, we did defer individuals and in a measure groups; particularly did we select the farm group for deferment. Now that we are in actual practice deferring farmers because of their need on the farms to keep the war effort in high pitch, the time has arrived when it is just as necessary for the draft boards to use the same discretion in deferring coal miners. This should be put in practice at once. In my county, Fayette County, we are 3,000 coal miners short today.

I understand the new selective-service regulations will take 70 percent of all the coal miners in Pennsylvania between the ages of 18 and 29. This means another 12-percent reduction in manpower in the industry. Practically 30 percent of the coal miners have been drafted into the service—a higher percent, we have been told, of any other one trade.

We need no law to correct this. The draft boards back home can correct it if they choose. If they think they cannot correct it under the present laws or rulings, General Hershey has the power to issue them authority to defer these coal miners.

We must not take any more of them away from the mines. We cannot make steel without coal and coke. We cannot make tanks without coal. We cannot make planes without coal. We cannot make guns without coal and we cannot make munitions.

We have been getting tens of thousands of Mexicans, Jamaicans, and Cubans each year to help the farmers. This year we will have 70,000 German and Italian prisoners working on farms. We have nobody—no groups—no help—in the mining industry.

I appeal to you to be with us in our plea for deferring the miners and getting help for the mining industry—I mean help to bring the coal out from under the hills.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the statements of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]. There should be no particular industry picked out from which to draft a certain percentage of men—especially the coal industry—for these men will be irreplaceable. It is entirely different from other industries in that coal mining requires skill; it is arduous, dangerous employment. It takes several years to become an experienced, skilled miner. Some States have a statute which requires apprenticeship for new employees. In Pennsylvania they must serve a 2-year apprenticeship before they are awarded a certificate as qualified miners.

To take 70 percent of the men under 29 years of age would mean a reduction of the coal production in the State of Pennsylvania of 12,750,000 tons in 1 year. Up until October 1944 the number of miners taken from the mines of the Nation was 130,000. In spite of this, the tonnage was kept within the range of consumption. Any further reduction would be hazardous to all industry.

I am well aware that we cannot win the war without troops, but neither can you place the implements of war in the hands of the troops without coal. I have many telegrams pointing out the danger of such a procedure from the loss of production. I would advise the Selective Service to review this order and instruct the local draft boards not to induct essential men from coal mines.

HON. FRED M. VINSON

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Judge Fred M. Vinson as Federal Loan Administrator should please every Member of the House, where he served so long and made such an outstanding record, as well as the entire country.

For 8 years Mr. Vinson was a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I have never known anyone who brought to the discharge of his duties a higher degree of efficiency, or who performed his service in a more patriotic and satisfactory manner. A man of outstanding ability, of highest integrity, level headed, and sound in his governmental philosophy; in fact, a giant among public men. Fred Vinson is big enough to fill any public position in our Government. His appointment should be approved by the entire country—especially all forms of business, large and small, borrower and lender, and I bespeak for Mr. Vinson a most brilliant and successful career, bringing, as he will, to his new position all those splendid qualities and qualifications which have characterized his work in every position he has held up to the present time.

I congratulate Judge Vinson, the President, and the whole country on his appointment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday several Members made 1 minute speeches. Among them was the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], and your humble servant.

Without consulting the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER] or the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] or me, somebody down the line inserted our speeches in the Appendix of the RECORD and left the speech made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] in the body of the RECORD where it should be.

As I understand the rules of the House, nobody in the Printing Office has any right to change this RECORD. One reason I am raising this question is this: The Speaker is familiar with the fact that a short time ago, I made a short address on the floor and when it was sent down to the Printing Office it had a heading on it, and Mr. Battaglia, one of the Official Reporters in the well of the House here called down there at midnight and had that heading changed.

It seems to me that we have come to the time, if Congress is going to control the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that we might as well find it out. I understand it has been the ruling of the Chair that where a Member makes a 1-minute speech, if he asks to insert extraneous matter that contains more than 300 words, the speech must be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. But where a Member makes his own speech and extends his own remarks, he has the right to have that speech appear in the RECORD at that point.

I call attention to the fact that on the 5th of February a Member made a speech that covered several pages, under the 1-minute rule, and his entire speech went into the RECORD at that point. It does not cost a dime more, it probably does not cost as much, it does not take as much paper, it does not take as much ink, to print them in their sequence in the body of the RECORD where they are made as it does to transfer them to the Appendix of the RECORD.

Many people who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which, as I have said before, is one of the few free and uncontrolled publications left in the world, regard everything that is printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as merely an extension of remarks.

I listened very carefully to the very able speech of the gentleman from Nevada, a former Senator from that State, Mr. BUNKER, on yesterday. My recollection is that he completed his entire speech, to the last word, and I submit that it should have been printed in the RECORD at that point.

I am propounding this parliamentary inquiry in order that we may find out just what the rule is and whether or not, when Members make 1-minute speeches, some of them are to be transferred without authority of the Member to the Appendix of the RECORD, and others printed in the body of the RECORD at the point at which they are made.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can reiterate what he has said many times. If he can go back, there was a time here when Members rose the day before and asked unanimous consent that after the approval of the Journal and disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk they might proceed for 20 minutes or 30 minutes or an hour. As chairman of a committee in those days I would sit here ready to go along with my bill, and probably it would be 3 o'clock in the afternoon before legislation was reached.

When I became majority leader, I made the statement to the House, after consulting with the minority leader, who I think at that time was Mr. Snell, of New York, that if anyone asked to proceed for more than 1 minute before the legislative program of the day was completed we would object. Since then Members have not asked to proceed for more than a minute before the legislative program.

Then Members began speaking for a minute and putting into the RECORD a long speech, so that 10 or a dozen pages of the RECORD was taken up before the people who read the RECORD would get to the legislative program of the day, in which I would think they would be the most interested. So we adopted the policy—there is no rule about it—of asking that when Members speak for a minute, if their remarks are more than 300 words, which many times can be said in a minute, their remarks or any extension of their remarks go in the Appendix of the RECORD. The Chair has on numerous occasions spoken to those who control the RECORD and asked them to follow that policy.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I take issue of course with that policy, because these 1-minute speakers do not abuse the RECORD, as a rule. The only question that has been raised about any abuse of the RECORD in regard to these 1-minute speeches was with reference to a speech made on the 5th of February, I believe, wherein the 1-minute speaker used several pages.

The SPEAKER. The Chair might state also that when there is no legislative program in the House for the day, such speeches may go in, and they will go in as 1-minute speeches.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, verifying the statement, which, of course, needs no verification, I remember going to the Speaker and asking if it would be proper to put the speech in the body of the RECORD, and the Speaker said that there was no legislative program for the day and there was no reason why a Member could not do it. I assume that was on the 5th of February.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that on yesterday one of the Members made a speech that you will find in the RECORD almost or quite as long as the speech of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], or the

one of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS], or the one that I made. It was placed in the body of the RECORD, and it was in excess of 300 words. I can go back through the RECORD here and find numerous occasions.

If we are going to adopt the policy that everybody who speaks in the well of the House and uses over 300 words must have his speech printed in the Appendix, it should apply to all of us.

I notice sometimes the Presiding Officer occasionally allows some people more than a minute. Some people have long minutes. We had one rise to speak the other day. I drew my watch. I believe it was 3 minutes. If you will check back you will find every word of it went in the body of the RECORD. I think this should be a matter to be settled by the membership of the House. Where they make these 1-minute speeches with the right to extend their own remarks, it should go in the body of the RECORD and not be shifted to the Appendix of the RECORD to make it appear as if it were an extension of remarks.

The SPEAKER. The House has that within its entire control at any time it desires to act upon the question.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, if I may make a short observation, the complaint of the gentleman from Mississippi is due to the fact that some of the Members who make the 1-minute speeches withhold their speech and correct it and hold it until it is very late. I know that I myself have made some speeches, not under the 1-minute rule, but regular speeches on the floor of the House, and I have found them in the Appendix. That is because I withheld that speech and it was too late to be placed in the body of the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, no; that does not apply here. I watched Senator BUNKER yesterday, the gentleman from Nevada, and I heard every word of his speech. I submit it should have gone in the RECORD at that point.

The SPEAKER. Of course, the Chair can only make suggestions to the Printing Office. The Chair cannot read the RECORD in the Printing Office before it is published. Therefore, until the House itself takes further action, that will be the procedure.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me ask the Speaker now, I want to know, because the Members of the House are all interested, if Members, when they make a 1-minute speech, use more than 300 words, it is to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD and not in the body?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. So the rule will be applied to all alike?

The SPEAKER. The Chair tries to apply that rule.

Mr. RANKIN. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the rule is going to be applied to one, it should be applied to all. When we make these 1-minute speeches, I submit we ought to have 1 minute apiece, no more and no less.

Now, there is another question I have been thinking I would raise. I propound another parliamentary inquiry at this time. Some time ago the Official Reporters of Debates ceased to take down the demonstrations that are made in the course of debate, the only parliamentary body in the world that prints a RECORD in which that has been done, that I have been able to find. I occasionally get the Record of the British House of Parliament. I read it and in these trying times there is applause, cheers, their cries of "hear, hear," laughter, and other demonstrations that are made. You get the RECORD of the United States Senate and, as a rule, they do not have probably so many there to applaud, but when there is applause or a demonstration, it is placed in the RECORD. Our demonstrations have been cut out of our RECORD and I think it is a serious mistake because now a man can make a speech and extend his remarks and you have no indication as to where his speech left off and where his extension of remarks begins. I know it has been contended by a few Members in the House that the extension of those demonstrations in the RECORD have been abused. But that was done very seldom, and where the Member did abuse that privilege by inserting laughter or applause he has been subjected to the most drastic criticism and ridicule and, as a rule, has never attempted it again.

I submit that from this time on I, for one, am going to insist that whatever demonstrations are made on the floor of the House during debate be reported by the Official Reporters of Debates as it was for more than 140 years. Then if a Member desires to strike it out, and has permission to revise and extend his remarks, he may do so.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not intend to be facetious, but the Chair would like to give the House his reaction to the expressions "Hear! Hear!" and "Applause" in the RECORD. When I came here 32 years ago on Sunday last, a gentleman had been elected by a split in the Republican Party in a particular State, and he had come here with Democratic and Progressive votes. He made a speech in the House. Whether it went into the permanent RECORD I do not know, but I know it went into the temporary RECORD. It closed in this fashion: "Loud and prolonged applause among Democrats and Progressives, followed by much handshaking."

In times past there appeared in the RECORD the word "Applause" where a Member spoke. In another place there was "Loud applause." In another place there was "Loud and prolonged applause." In another place there was "Loud and prolonged applause, the Members rising." If I had made a speech and had received "applause," and some Member had followed me immediately and had received "loud and prolonged applause, the Members rising," my opponent in the next primary might have called attention to how insignificant I was because I only received "applause" and the other Member had received "loud and prolonged applause, the Members rising."

The Chair has held that demonstrations in the House are not a part of the RECORD, and shall continue to hold that until the rules of the House are changed.

Mr. RANKIN. The unusual cases to which the Speaker refers were exceptions and not the rule and, in my opinion, do not justify excluding all demonstrations on the part of the Members from the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY. On yesterday I offered an extension of remarks which contained more material than is allowed by the rule. Since then I have obtained an estimate from the Public Printer, and I am informed the cost will be $145.60. I renew my request that I may extend the remarks to include the document, notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. COFFEE asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks on three topics and to include newspaper articles in connection therewith.

Mr. LANHAM asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks and to include two articles in regard to increasing the price of gold.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House under a special order after the legislative business on Wednesday, March 7, for 15 minutes, and also on Thursday, March 8, for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday after the regular business of the day and after all special orders heretofore made I be allowed to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix and to include a radio address on George Washington.

Mr. MANASCO asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Philadelphia Record.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on a bill which he introduced to amend the Federal Trade Act.

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

HON. FRED M. VINSON

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. If nobody objects except the Chair, the gentleman may proceed for one-half minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rejoice, I am sure the Kentucky delegation in the House of Representatives where he served with great distinction for 14 years rejoices, and Kentucky itself is honored in the appointment of Judge Fred M. Vinson as Federal Loan Administrator.

Judge Vinson resigned his seat in Congress to become judge of the Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. In that position he made a reputation as a profound jurist. After the war was declared he willingly gave up his life tenure of the judgeship to assume the larger and more onerous duties as Director and Chairman of the Economic Stabilization Board.

He has now been appointed Federal Loan Administrator, where he will direct and manage the great lending institutions of the United States, the greatest financial institutions in the world.

Judge Vinson is a man of outstanding abilities with an infinite capacity for work. He will bring to the powerful position to which he has been appointed those same high talents and efficiency which have characterized him in the discharge of the duties of the other positions of trust and importance which he has held. His appointment has met with public and congressional approval that is seldom seen.

We wish him success and happiness in carrying out the great trust which has been imposed upon him. We know he will take advantage to the fullest extent of this great opportunity to render service to his country.

NATIONAL INSURANCE POLICIES

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute on a very important piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair stated to the gentleman from Kentucky, if nobody except the Chair objects, the gentleman may proceed for a minute.

There was no objection.

[Mr. McDONOUGH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Harvard Business Review. It exceeds the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that it will cost $299. Notwithstanding the cost I ask unanimous consent that the article may be extended.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wish to say to the gentleman from California who has just spoken that the insurance legislation to which he referred was re-referred to the Committee on Ways and Means by virtue of an amendment placed on it in the Senate. The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation did not have control of that legislation or it would not have been in the condition of which the gentleman complains; we would have made it the same as the insurance legislation for veterans of the First World War.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, the extension requested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a speech by Donald Sullivan, national champion of the 4-H Clubs at a victory breakfast this morning.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short talk made by Anne Lee Tipton, who has been 10 years a member of the 4-H Clubs.

Mr. TOWE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a short resolution.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the New Jersey Taxpayers' Association, entitled "New Jersey Earthquake." It has to do with the proposed canal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] may address the House for 40 minutes on Monday next after the legislative program of the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

"APPLAUSE" IN THE RECORD

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of the House to the fact that on March 1 an address appears in the RECORD in which the word "applause" appears 20 times. It seems to be a part of the proceedings of the House.

The SPEAKER. The present occupant of the chair was not here; and, furthermore, that was a joint session of the two Houses of Congress. Both Houses were in recess.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the farm labor draft.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an article by Marquis Childs on international peace control.

Mr. HENRY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of a joint resolution adopted by the assembly and senate of the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the National Rural Letter Carrier.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter from the New York Times, and also to extend his remarks in connection therewith.

Mr. RICHARDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject Sale of Surplus Property, and to include a short newspaper advertisement.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and to include an editorial from the Washington Star.

Mr. GRANGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and to include an editorial.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Indianapolis Star.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in five instances, in three to include portions of an article about cartels and in the other two, brief editorials.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and to include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. BELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include an editorial by Henry J. Haskell appearing in the Kansas City Star.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and to include an address delivered by Mr. William J. Neal, Acting Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

ASSOCIATED PRESS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been inaugurated by the Associated Press a new service to newspapers and radio stations in India. The Associated Press is entitled to the highest commendation for the establishment of this new service. There is thus established a wondrous bridgehead of good will between the people of this country and of India. There will be a mutuality of news extended between the two countries and there will be created a great medium for increased trade with India.

The 400,000,000 East Indians represent a great untapped trade reservoir. There exists over there a great demand for American goods, particularly as a result of lend-lease. We need a great increase in our export trade after the war in order to create new jobs and the new Associated Press service will aid materially in this regard. There is presently great lack of mutual information between the two countries. A. P. will now spread light where there is much darkness.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

WASTE AND EXTRAVAGANCE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my 1-minute speech at this point in the RECORD and to include remarks made by a former Democratic Congressman who was associated with us in the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker—

I want to congratulate both of you gentlemen for the fight you are putting up to stop this racketeering in public affairs and industry. The waste and extravagance cries to high heaven. Can't something be done to stop this thing? Here our farmers are working from 12 to 15 hours per day because they can't get help, and because they can't pay these outrageous high wages paid by industry.

How long is our Nation to survive with this thing going on? Will our country have to go through a revolution before this thing can be stopped? Cut down on the appropriations for these departments. That ought to help some. The people here are with you in this fight.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

ENSIGN FREDERICK MATTHEWS McCORD, UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 211) for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $187.90, to Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property destroyed as the result of a fire in officers' quarters, Ferry Inn Annex, at United States Naval Base No. 2, on December 14, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING AN ADDITIONAL SUM FOR PAYMENT OF A CLAIM FOR PROPERTY LOST IN THE FLOOD AT PARRIS ISLAND, S. C., ON AUGUST 11-12, 1940

The Clerk called the bill (S. 212) to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $1,333.33, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, Lt. Col. Frank P. Snow, United States Marine Corps, for the value of personal property lost or damaged in the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING REIMBURSEMENT FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST, DAMAGED, OR DESTROYED AS THE RESULT OF AN EXPLOSION AT THE NAVAL MINE DEPOT, YORKTOWN, VA., ON NOVEMBER 16, 1943

The Clerk called the bill (S. 214) to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $2,000, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to pay claims, including those of naval and civilian personnel of the Naval Establishment, for privately owned property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MADDEN: Page 1, line 6, after the word "exceed", strike out "$2,000" and insert "$3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSING CERTAIN NAVY PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST OR DAMAGED AS THE RESULT OF A FIRE AT THE NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR FACILITY, ASTORIA, OREG., ON APRIL 2, 1944

The Clerk called the bill (S. 215) to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $780; as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEVE HLASS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 205) for the relief of Steve Hlass.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Steve Hlass, of Russellville, Ark., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of his minor son, Robert Hlass, when struck by a Government vehicle operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps, while said vehicle was on official business, on October 14, 1940, on United States

Highway No. 64, near Russellville, Ark.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED CLOUSE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 945) for the relief of Fred Clouse.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Fred Clouse, Harrisburg, Pa., the sum of $5,690. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Fred Clouse against the United States for the death of his son, Charles Clouse, and for expenses incurred in connection with such death, which resulted when the motorcycle on which the said Charles Clouse was riding along Highway Route No. 307 near Scranton, Pa., was struck on August 18, 1943, by a United States Army truck being operated by an enlisted man in the United States Army.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Clouse", insert "and Mrs. Emily G. Clouse."

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "of the said Fred Clouse."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "his" and insert "their."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Fred Clouse and Mrs. Emily G. Clouse."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE TO OR LOSS OR DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY ARISING PRIOR TO MAY 27, 1941, OUT OF ACTIVITIES OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT OR OF THE ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 981) to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising prior to May 27, 1941, out of activities of the War Department or of the Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mayburg Chemical Co., $370.46; Roland C. McNaughten, $37.25; Daniel Ossa, $9.43; Antoinette Labas, $41.22; C. O. Hatcher, $15; American Central Insurance Co., $179.79; Imperial Assurance Co., $343.95; C. W. Elsea, $555; Mrs. Ethel L. Harrington, $97.90; Service Fire Insurance Co. of New York, $152.29; Carl E. Stonebarger, $691; Andrew Svets, $25; Motors Insurance Corporation, $102.57; Agostini Bros. Building Corporation, $253.83; George C. Scheetz, $146.50; Jessie S. Pugh, $50.50; American Automobile Insurance Co., $52.53; Edwin R. Chantler, $25; Home Insurance Co., $23.16; Hilde Christensen, $356.03; J. C. Tune, $85; William J. T. Yancey, $136; Fred H. Merrill, $121.50; Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific R. R. Co., $12.50; Central Vermont Ry., Inc., $15.62; David W. Barry, $75; Allemannia Fire Insurance Co., $63.30; Francis Best, $87.13; Benjamin Allen Albro, $197.75; George E. Townshend, $536.75; Alfredo Sicon, $136.50; Sinforoso L. Ordona, $48.25; Alihio B. Ayuban, $71.50; Feli S. Abarca, $341.75; Eulogio Sevilla, $131; Salvador A. Caballero, $286; Hans Buhman, $93.75; Aurelle Proul, $292; Christino Magasi, $188; Vernon Lams, $137.50; Ralph V. Reese, $201.70; Domingo Dalman, $124; William J. Hellstrand, $128.50; Alfred Kirlew, $327.50; Alejo Estigoy, $75.50; Isabelo F. Elison, $121.50; Crispin B. Arevalo, $79; Stanley Robert Scott, $153.25; Lyman J. Crockenberg, $153.90; John T. McDonough, $166; Juan M. Isturis, $173.50; Ruth P. Dennis, $25; United Mutual Fire Insurance Co., $59.80; Wisconsin Telephone Co., $110.88; General Exchange Insurance Corporation, $182.29; M. R. Stephenson, $25; Earl L. Hutchinson, $150; Mary A. Marlett, $12; State Automobile Insurance Association, $79.49; John Wesley and Hazel Wesley, $500; Samuel Olmedo, $112.50; Wheeler & Dusenberry, a partnership, $321.50; James M. Noel, $400; in full settlement of their respective claims against the United States for damage to or loss or destruction of property incident to noncombat activities of the War Department or of the Army, determined by the Secretary of War to be meritorious, which by reason of having arisen prior to May 27, 1941, are not payable under the provisions of the act approved July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372; 31 U. S. C. 223b), entitled "An act to provide for the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or civilian employees, or otherwise incident to activities, of the War Department or of the Army," which repealed or rendered inapplicable to the War Department various statutes under the provisions of which such claims could have been paid: *Provided*, That prior to receiving payment each of the said claimants shall file with the Secretary of War, in such form as he shall prescribe, an agreement to accept the sum so to be paid in full satisfaction and final settlement of his claim.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERNICE B. COOPER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 988) for the relief of Bernice B. Cooper, junior clerk-typist, Weatherford, Tex., rural rehabilitation office, Farm Security Administration, Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. McGREGOR objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN CIVILIAN PERSONNEL FOR PROPERTY LOSS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 990) to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost as a result of the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong and Manila.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $5,079, as may be required to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, Arthur J. Campbell, James J. Saxon, and Keneth Q. N. Wong, each employed or formerly employed by the Treasury Department, and William Henry Taylor, formerly alternate American member of the Stabilization Board of China, for the value of personal property lost or destroyed at their posts of duty as a result of the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong and Manila: *Provided*, That the reimbursement on account of any item of said property shall not exceed the purchase price of the particular item less such amount as may be considered appropriate on account of its depreciated value at the time of its destruction or loss: *Provided further*, That if any of the beneficiaries under this act shall have died before the payment herein authorized is made to him, said payment shall be made to his estate: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. MILLARD L. TREADWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1016) for the relief of Capt. Millard L. Treadwell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Millard L. Treadwell, captain, United States Army Air Forces, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $89.52, representing the cost to the United States of rail transportation furnished to him during the period September 3 to 8, 1940, by the War Department incident to his being ordered to proceed from Fort Moultrie, S. C., to Vancouver Barracks, Wash., for the purpose of assuming his duties as company commander, Civilian Conservation Corps. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Millard L. Treadwell the sum of $21.25, representing per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence authorized to be paid the said Millard L. Treadwell while making such journey from Fort Moultrie, S. C., to Vancouver Barracks, Wash.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWRENCE MOTOR CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1148) for the relief of the Lawrence Motor Co., Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. DOLLIVER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

DR. WALTER L. JACKSON AND CITY-COUNTY HOSPITAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1260) for the relief of Dr. Walter L. Jackson and City-County Hospital.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $130 to Dr. Walter L. Jackson; to pay the sum of $48 to the City-County Hospital, of Ranger, Tex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for medical and hospital expenses rendered David C. Arterburn (586-669), machinist's mate, second class, United States Coast Guard Reserve, as a result of an emergency operation while on furlough May 10, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ALMA MALLETTE AND ANCEL ADKINS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1558) for the relief of Mrs. Alma Mallette and Ancel Adkins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Alma Mallette, of Quincy, Mo., the sum of $5,000, and to Ancel Adkins, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries to Ancel Adkins, and as compensation to Mrs. Alma Mallette for the death of her son Harry Stewart who was killed as a result of an accident involving an Army truck at Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., on or about March 11, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000", and strike out "Ancel" and insert "Ansel."

Line 7, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$1,000."

Line 9, strike out "Ancel" and insert "Ansel."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alma Mallette and Ansel Adkins."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. WILLIAM PEYTON TIDWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1877) for the relief of Maj. William Peyton Tidwell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Maj. William Peyton Tidwell, District of Columbia, the sum of $770. Such sum represents compensation at the rate of $8,000 per annum for services rendered as secretary of the Surplus War Property Policy Board for a period of 35 days ending on May 29, 1944. The said Maj. William Peyton Tidwell was assigned to the Surplus War Property Administration on March 27, 1944, on a military detail and since such date has functioned as secretary of the Surplus War Property Policy Board. Under War Department Special Orders No. 95, he was granted leave of absence for 35 days commencing April 24, 1944, and released from active military service effective on May 30, 1944. The compensation of the said Maj. William Peyton Tidwell as secretary of the Surplus War Property Policy Board commenced on May 30, 1944.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$770" and insert "$254.47."

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GROWERS FERTILIZER CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2092) for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. McGREGOR objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

DANE D. MORGAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1149) for the relief of Dane D. Morgan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of Dane D. Morgan on account of the increased costs incurred in the performance of his architectural-engineering contract No. WA-1197, dated February 9, 1942, with the Federal Works Agency by reason of unavoidable delays in the construction and completion of the defense-housing project at Burlington, Iowa, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim the amount of not to exceed $8,400. There is hereby appropriated the sum of $8,400, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the said claim.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUBELL BROS., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1630) for the relief of Lubell Bros., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lubell Bros., Inc., 806 Broadway, New York, N. Y., the sum of $104,511.12. Such sum represents liquidated damages for delay in deliveries of certain shirts under contracts between the said Lubell Bros., Inc., and the United States of America (contracts Nos. W-669-QM-10585, W-669-QM-10618, W-669-QM-10697, W-669-QM-10759, W-669-QM-10787, and W-669-QM-10980) entered into between January 6 and February 11, 1941. Such delay in deliveries resulted in no loss or damage to the United States, and on March 3, 1944, the Quartermaster General recommended to the General Accounting Office the allowance of this claim. Such allowance cannot be made by the General Accounting Office under existing provisions of law.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OSCAR GRIGGS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 177) for the relief of Oscar Griggs.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Oscar Griggs, of Lauderdale County, Tenn., the sum of $4,505.14, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him and for medical and hospital expenses incurred when he was shot on the night of December 29, 1943, by members of a party of soldiers of the United States Army, when, in the performance of his duties as sheriff of Lauderdale County, Tenn., he was attempting to quiet a disturbance by such soldiers in the town of Ripley, Tenn.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof

shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GALEN E. WALTER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 243) for the relief of Galen E. Walter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE and Mr. MADDEN objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

CHARLES R. HOOPER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 249) for the relief of Charles R. Hooper.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles R. Hooper, of Washington, D. C., the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by Charles R. Hooper while employed in the United States navy yard at Washington, D. C., in the year 1894: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOUTHERN BITUMEN CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 266) for the relief of the Southern Bitumen Co., of Ensley, Ala.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency is hereby authorized and directed to relieve the Southern Bitumen Co., of Ensley, Ala., of all claims of the Federal Works Agency, amounting to $13,500, covering liquidated damages for delays due to unusual labor shortages, low priorities, failure to obtain rights-of-way, and exceptional inclement weather conditions, in connection with the completion of work under a contract entered into between the Federal Works Agency and the Southern Bitumen Co. for the construction of an outfall sewer at Anniston, Ala., project No. Ala. 1-160 (F).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVAL AUXILIARY AIR FACILITY, ASTORIA, OREG.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 778) to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, an identical Senate bill, S. 215, has just been passed. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this bill be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MURRAY B. LATIMER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 787) for the relief of Murray B. Latimer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Murray B. Latimer, Hobbs, N. Mex., the sum of $884.91. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Murray B. Latimer against the United States on account of the destruction by fire of household goods, clothing, and other personal property while in transit from Roswell, N. Mex., to Fort Sumner, N. Mex. The said Murray B. Latimer, an aircraft sheet-metal worker employed by the War Department, was transferred on September 24, 1942, from the Roswell Army Flying School to the Fort Sumner subdepot. The War Department, which arranged for the shipping of such property, placed such a low valuation thereon that the said Murray B. Latimer sustained such loss of $884.91.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 8, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED LOWER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 904) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Fred Lower.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any provision of law to the contrary, the claims of Fred Lower, Wichita Falls, Tex., against the United States for damages alleged to have been sustained as the result of the discharge of sewage by the sewage disposal plant at Sheppard Field, Tex., into a creek flowing in close proximity to (1) the machine shop owned by the said Fred Lower and operated by him under the name of the Wichita Gas Engine Works, and (2) the home of the said Fred Lower. Any suit brought under this act shall be instituted within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. The liability of the United States in any suit brought under this act shall be determined upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases between private individuals.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Fred A. Lower, of Wichita Falls, Tex., the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of property damage and personal injuries resulting from the flow of sewage waters from Sheppard Field, Tex., into a certain creek, which runs through the land of the said Fred A. Lower: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Fred A. Lower."

GLADYS STOUT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 980) for the relief of Mrs. Gladys Stout.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to remove from the records of his office the debt which has been raised therein against Mrs. Gladys Stout, cashier-bookkeeper for the Baltimore defense housing project, Middle River, Md., in the sum of $264, together with interest due thereon from date of loss of the public funds for which she is accountable and which were stolen from the safe in the defense housing project office, Middle River, Md., without her fault, sometime between Saturday, March 28, 1942, and Monday, March 30, 1942.

SEC. 2. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $85 to be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to Mrs. Gladys Stout: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIDNEY B. WALTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1069) for the relief of Sidney B. Walton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized

and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $9,835.50, to Sidney B. Walton, of Irrigon, Oreg., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and damages sustained by him when he was struck by an Army vehicle at the Umatilla Ordnance Depot, Hermiston, Oreg., on November 23, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "$9,835.50" and insert "$4,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAY TAYLOR CATTLE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1094) for the relief of the Jay Taylor Cattle Co., Amarillo, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, to the Jay Taylor Cattle Co., Amarillo, Tex., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,814.50. Such sum represents the value of 33 grade Hereford steer yearlings, the property of such company, which died during March 1943 as the result of arsenic poisoning suffered from grazing on land upon which arsenic was used in connection with the mesquite eradication project conducted by the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture, and medical expense incurred in the attempt to save the lives of such steer yearlings.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 4, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MURPHY AND WISCHMEYER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1150) for the relief of Murphy and Wischmeyer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. DOLLIVER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

CONTINENTAL CASUALTY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1307) for the relief of Continental Casualty Co., a corporation, and Montgomery City Lines, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Continental Casualty Co., a corporation, Chicago, Ill., the sum of $9,202.12, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States, resulting from payments made by it to the following persons for personal injuries sustained as the result of a collision involving an automobile bus operated by Montgomery City Lines, Inc., and a United States Army truck in the city of Montgomery, Ala., on September 30, 1940; Lena Buffington, $6; Mrs. M. P. Warr, $5; J. D. Lee, Jr., $5; Frances Burch, $7.75; Jean Hall, $5; Catherine L. McCue, $77.22; Bessie Bunn, $35; Alfred F. King, Jr., $150; Mrs. Grace King, $100; Pauline Ellis, $75; Inez Miller, $29; Mary Wash Burks, $65; Mrs. G. Hall Walker, Jr., $27.50; Florence Radford, $2,500; Caroline Norman, $20; Ruth Burnett, $55; Joe Mac Walker, $23.50; Tom Golsby, $250; Pauline Cherry, $825; Mildred McCue, $1,600; Mrs. Sara D. Cobb, $130; Gertrude Jackson, $122; Lillian Earnest, $145; Joe Guthrie, $271; Arthur S. Townsend, $1,297; James Stinson, $124; W. M. Castleberry, $358.15; Daisie Cook, $400; J. E. Long, $200; Aubrey A. Lewis, $125; Herbert Mainor, $15; Eleanor Walker, $4; and George H. Rowan, $150.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Montgomery City Lines, Inc., Montgomery, Ala., the sum of $266.49, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for property damage sustained by it as the result of the said collision: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST BY AN EXPLOSION AT THE NAVAL AIR STATION, NORFOLK, VA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1309) to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., on September 17, 1943.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $28,000, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to satisfy claims, including those of insurance companies and of naval and civilian personnel of the Naval Etsablishment, for privately owned property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., on September 17, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEE GRAHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1347) for the relief of Lee Graham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lee Graham, Elizabeth City, N. C., the sum of $1,170. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Lee Graham against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by him on July 23, 1943, when the bicycle on which he was riding in Elizabeth City, N. C., was struck by a United States Navy truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BESSIE I. CLAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1598) for the relief of Mrs. Bessie I. Clay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Bessie I. Clay, of Pueblo, Colo., the sum of $353, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained to her automobile as a result of a collision between her car and an Army jeep from Goffes, an Army post near Needles, Calif., in the service of the United States, on October 10, 1943, near Fontana Junction in the vicinity of San Bernardino, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT LEE SLADE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1602) for the relief of Robert Lee Slade.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert Lee Slade, Dendron, Va., the sum of $8,125.35. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert Lee Slade against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained on December 5, 1943, when the automobile owned and driven by him was struck by a United States Army truck at the intersection of State Route 31 and State Route 460, near Wakefield, Va.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$8,125.35" and insert "$3,625.35."

Page 2, line 2, insert ": *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MURRAY W. MORAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1707) for the relief of Murray W. Moran.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Murray W. Moran, Route 1, box 21–C, Spring Hill, Ala., the sum of $2,055. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Murray W. Moran against the United States on account of the loss of his minor son, Milton Moran, who was struck and killed by a United States Army truck on October 13, 1943, while he was crossing the highway leading from Spring Hill, Ala., to the State of Mississippi, at a point approximately 2 miles west of Spring Hill.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the words, "Spring Hill", insert ": *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAUGER CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1842) for the relief of the Mauger Construction Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Mauger Construction Co., Columbus, Ohio, the sum of $7,323.83, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement for the amount of gross sales tax paid by such company to the State of West Virginia in connection with work performed under a Government contract dated May 14, 1941, in the construction of the Cumberland (Md.) Municipal Airport near Wiley Ford, W. Va.: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEO GOTTLIEB

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 259) for the relief of Leo Gottlieb.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Leo Gottlieb, of Cedarhurst, N. Y., the sum of $16,010.54, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and expenses as a result of being struck by a vehicle of the United States Army on Hempstead Avenue, Elmont, N. Y., on May 29, 1943: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$16,010.54" and insert "$5,709.50."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL T. THOMPSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 905) for the relief of Paul T. Thompson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,750 to Paul T. Thompson, St. Jo, Tex., for personal injuries and medical and hospital expenses incident to and sustained as a result of a collision between the farm tractor on which he was riding and a United States Army automobile on Highway No. 82 near Nocona, Tex., on July 1, 1942: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "Texas", insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "expenses", insert "and property damage."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 987) for the relief of the New England Telephone and Telegraph Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co., Boston, Mass., for the payment of a portion of the cost of the removal and relocation of the telephone cable lines of the said company which were located in the Shawme State Forest, Mass., such removal and relocation of the cable lines being a result of the extension of the military reservation at Camp Edwards, Mass., and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim the sum of not to exceed $27,000. There is hereby appropriated the sum of $27,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the said claim: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. P. SCARBOROUGH AND J. D. ETHERIDGE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1012) for the relief of A. P. Scarborough and J. D. Etheridge.

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. TRIMBLE objected; and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

FLORENCE J. SYPERT, ADMINISTRATRIX

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1492) for the relief of Florence J. Sypert, administratrix of the estate of Leona Connor Childers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated,

to the estate of Leona Connor Childers, Florence J. Sypert, administratrix, of Kansas City, Mo., the sum of $3,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Leona Connor Childers, who was killed on February 27, 1943, when a twin-motored Army plane plowed through the wall of a mess hall of the Missouri Aviation Institute at the Municipal Air Terminal of Kansas City, having done so because of the negligence of the Air Force in making the landing: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated", strike out the balance of the page and down to and including line 5, on page 2, and insert "to Florence J. Sypert, of Kansas City, Mo., as administratrix of the estate of Leona Connor Childers, deceased, the sum of $3,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States of the said estate for the death of Leona Connor Childers, which occurred as the result of an accident involving an Army airplane on February 27, 1943, at the Municipal Air Terminal at Kansas City, Mo."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EFFIE S. CAMPBELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1540) for the relief of Mrs. Effie S. Campbell.

Mr. TRIMBLE and Mr. MADDEN objected and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

KATHERINE SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1567) for the relief of Katherine Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Katherine Smith, of Pleasant Street, Marion, Mass., the sum of $4,722, in full satisfaction of her claim for damages against the Government of the United States on account of personal injuries of a permanent nature suffered by her on April 20, 1942, when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by Government vehicle numbered W-427233, belonging to the War Department and operated by a private of said department on Route No. 28 in the town of Wareham, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$4,722" and insert "$4,772."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "full" strike out the words "satisfaction of her claim for damages" and insert "settlement of all claims."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "Government of the."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. DOROTHY STOWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1669) for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Stowell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Dorothy Stowell, Bruning, Nebr., for the benefit of said Mrs. Dorothy Stowell and her minor children, the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Dorothy Stowell and children against the United States on account of the death of her husband, Ralph A. Stowell, who was killed on November 19, 1943, when his automobile was struck by a United States Army ambulance near Bruning, Nebr.

With the following committee amendments:

The amendments are as follows:

Line 5, after the word "to" strike out "Mrs. Dorothy Stowell" and insert in lieu thereof "the estate of Ralph A. Stowell, of."

Line 6, strike out "for the benefit of said Mrs. Dorothy Stowell and her minor children, the sum of $10,000 and insert in lieu thereof "the sum of $5,000."

Line 8, after the word "claims" strike out "of the said Mrs. Dorothy Stowell and children."

Line 10, strike out "her husband."

At the end of bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARDY H. BRYANT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2005) for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and, under the rules, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

BOYD B. BLACK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2006) for the relief of Boyd B. Black.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Boyd B. Black, the sum of $20,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government for injuries sustained by him when struck by an Army truck on May 24, 1943, at Jasper, Tex.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 5, after the name "Black", insert "of Jasper, Tex."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following committee amendment:

Line 6, strike out the figures "$20,000", and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$7,146.40."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER: Strike out "$7,146.40," and insert "$6,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following committee amendments:

Line 7, after the word "against" strike out the balance of the bill and insert the following: "the United States for personal injuries, medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred as a result of being struck by a United States Army truck on May 24, 1943, at Jasper, Tex.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, was passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

PENNSYLVANIA COAL & COKE CORPORATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2186) for the relief of the Pennsylvania Coal & Coke Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. DOLLIVER objected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman reserve their objection?

The SPEAKER. Objections cannot be reserved on the call of individual bills on the Private Calendar.

Two objections having been made, the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

GEORGE WEBB

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1344) for the relief of George Webb.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George Webb, the sum of $79.20, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for services rendered by him as an employee of the Bonneville Power Administration from July 14, 1942, to July 28, 1942.

With the following committee amendment:

After the figure "1942" in line 9, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. P. SCARBOROUGH AND J. D. ETHRIDGE

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 106, H. R. 1012, for the relief of A. P. Scarborough and J. D. Ethridge. The objections have been withdrawn.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request to return to Calendar No. 106?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to A. P. Scarborough, of Chauncey, Dodge County, Ga., the sum of $1,000, and to J. D. Etheridge, of Chauncey, Dodge County, Ga., the sum of $1,500. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of the injury of A. P. Scarborough and J. D. Etheridge, who were burned on September 13, 1943, while attempting to rescue a pilot from a fallen United States airplane on the farm of J. D. Etheridge near Chauncey, Ga.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the figures "$1,000", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$509."

Line 7, strike out "Etheridge", insert in lieu thereof "Ethridge."

Line 8, strike out the figures "$1,500", insert in lieu thereof the figures "$906."

Line 11, strike out "Etheridge", insert in lieu thereof "Ethridge."

Line 13, strike out "Etheridge", insert in lieu thereof "Ethridge."

At the end of bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLLIVER: Page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", strike out "$509" and insert "$300"; and on page 1, line 8, after the words "sum of", strike out "$906" and insert "$600."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the amendment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, having heard no explanation of the amendment, I am at a loss to understand why it is proposed.

This bill arises out of an occurrence in my district that was brought to my attention by the American Red Cross. They have made frequent appeals to me in the last 2 years to give some relief to these two gentlemen.

It appears that on September 13, 1943, an Army plane, operated by a cadet on a routine training flight, developed engine trouble over the farm of J. D. Ethridge. The pilot bailed out and parachuted to safety and the plane went into a dive, crashing into a field on the Ethridge farm. Mr. Ethridge heard the crash, and he, with Mr. Scarborough, who was living on his farm, rushed to the scene of the accident, with the purpose of giving aid to any person who might be trapped in the wreckage. When they reached a point near the plane its gasoline tank exploded and both men were enveloped in flames, sustaining severe burns.

These two gentlemen, as best they could, were trying to do a service to humanity. They saw the plane crash, they rushed to the plane to render aid, but, fortunately, the pilot had previously gotten out of the plane. These men were burned very severely and the amounts involved here are the doctors' bills, with only a very small amount for pain and suffering.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Has the gentleman disclosed to the House the recommendation of the War Department?

Mr. PACE. I have not.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Will the gentleman do so, please?

Mr. PACE. I do not have that recommendation before me.

Mr. DOLLIVER. May I read it?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. This is taken from the report on the bill:

The War Department recommends the sum of $300 to Mr. Scarborough and the sum of $600 to Mr. Ethridge.

It is in line with that recommendation that the amendment is offered.

Mr. PACE. All I can say about that is that it will hardly be sufficient to cover the medical bills. The original amounts requested were $1,000 and $1,500 as I recall it. The committee studied this and voluntarily cut it down to this figure. It seems to me the gentleman might withdraw the amendment.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have no desire to quibble over a small amount like this. I merely offered the amendment to comply with the recommendation of the War Department.

Mr. PACE. I have no desire, either, to quibble. I do not know these gentlemen, I have never seen them in my life, but, as I said, the American Red Cross has appealed to me for 2 years to do something for these two gentlemen who rushed to this plane to perform an act of humanity and they were terribly burned. The Congress should compensate them for what they did. I hope you will vote down the amendment under the circumstances.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of A. P. Scarborough and J. D. Ethridge."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, that completes the call of bills on the Private Calendar.

NURSES' SELECTIVE SERVICE BILL OF 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2277), to insure adequate nursing care for the armed forces.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2277, with Mr. PACE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, general debate had been concluded and the first section of the bill had been read, which section is now open to amendment.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Do I understand that the Clerk has read just the first six lines of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. That is section 1 of the bill.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"SEC. 2. Hereafter male as well as female nurses may be members of the Army Nurse Corps and the Navy Nurse Corps, and male nurses may be commissioned in such corps to the same extent as is now provided by

law in the case of female members of such corps."

Renumber the remaining sections of the bill.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, when the war-manpower bill was debated I presented this same amendment but it was ruled out on a point of order. Now that we are considering the Selective Service Act I believe that this is apropos and should be adopted.

I further believe that no woman should be drafted until every male nurse has been made available for duty. This amendment contemplates such a move. It simply provides that male nurses may take the same position in the armed forces as women nurses. It has long been a subject of favorable consideration on the part of nurses' groups and organizations in my district. I know that the House is hesitant to draft the women of the country until every man has been made available in the nursing facilities of this Nation. Already there are 6,000 male nurses in the armed forces of the United States serving as "buck" privates, whose talents could be put to the same end as the female nurses in the Army Nurse Corps and the Navy Nurse Corps.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. Can the gentleman give us any good reason why male nurses should not be drafted along with female nurses, if there is to be a general draft of nurses?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I will say to the gentleman that my amendment answers his question. It contemplates the taking of male nurses from civilian life and placing them in the same category as female nurses.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman knows, of course, that they are registered and classified under the Selective Service law and subject to induction already.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman also knows that no utilization is being made of the services of the male nurses of this country. There are, as I have said, 6,000 male nurses in the armed forces of the United States serving as "buck" privates.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. At the present time there are 2,500 males serving in the armed forces. They are utilizing their services as nurses as far as possible.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. May I answer the gentleman by saying that he is referring to the so-called medics connected with the armed forces. According to a distinguished news analyst and radio commentator the other night, there is no further consideration given to those medics, and they are not even paid the regular Army pay that the men in combat receive. I think I am right in that statement, and I think this radio commentator will back me up on that.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. If we have that number of nurses serving as buck privates, while they may be inducted into the service are they being inducted as nurses? That is the gentleman's point?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is exactly the point. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

When I offered this amendment to the war-manpower bill the technicality seemed to be that we were not dealing with the Selective Service System and the armed forces of the United States. This is an opportunity for the House to adopt this amendment to include male nurses in the service and put them where they will do the most good, where they can attend to the wounded, the maimed, and the other persons who need them, the casualties on the war front.

I do hope the House will give favorable consideration to this amendment and that it will be adopted, because I think there is a definite need for it. I am sure we are here today to give every possible consideration to the drafting into the nursing service of people who can do the most good for the greatest number of wounded men and casualties.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. May I ask if the effect of the gentleman's amendment would not be to commission the 6,000 men who are in the service now and use them as nurses?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot answer the gentleman's question, but I do know that the effect as far as those drafted into the service is concerned will be to recognize them as male nurses. I hope that some consideration will be given the male nurses already in the service. I know we have a great opportunity to increase the number of persons connected with the nursing service. I urge the House to adopt this amendment.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the number of male nurses is very small. The best estimate I can get is that there are about 8,000 registered male nurses throughout the country, and presently probably not over 50 percent of them are active nurses doing actual nursing.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It might be pointed out also that a great majority of the male nurses in the country are over 45 years of age.

Mr. DURHAM. That is true.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Is it not a fact that under the existing Selective Service law they can take these men as male nurses and use their services as nurses?

Mr. DURHAM. They are doing that as far as possible.

We must not forget that the nurse course is made up of different types of studies. Some of these male nurses do not take courses like obstetrics and pediatrics. There are five or six subjects along those lines that they do not take.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not anticipate any great number of casualties along that line, does he?

Mr. DURHAM. I will leave that to the gentleman, about the casualties. I think this amendment will confuse the bill, if we try to put this small number of men into this large group. I am in sympathy with the objective of the gentleman from New York, but I think it is a matter that should be dealt with entirely separate. I think we are confused about it, if we try to put into this measure this small group of nurses. I do not know what we could do at the present time about these 2,500 who are already in the service. They have been drafted under the Selective Service law.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have an amendment to the same effect which takes care of those men who are in the service. If I can obtain recognition, I want to explain my amendment which I think covers the situation. Also, does the gentleman remember we one day in committee voted by a big majority to include male nurses?

Mr. DURHAM. I do not recall that vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not know whether the gentleman was present, but we voted in committee on that one day.

Mr. DURHAM. If the gentleman has an amendment which takes care of these 2,500 already in the service, it is certainly worthy of the consideration of the committee, if we are going to consider this amendment. I hope that the committee will consider it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MAY. As I have already stated, these men are already registered and are inducted, many of them, under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act. The Army is utilizing them to the full extent of their qualifications just as female nurses are being utilized. The only misfortune about it is that many of them do not have the qualifications that the average female nurse has who goes through nursing school.

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. MAY. To that extent, they are not utilized because of their incapacity, in that respect.

Mr. DURHAM. Another fact is the Navy is using these nurses at the present time.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. There may be 2,500 male nurses in the services of the United States, but there are not 2,500 being used as nurses in the Medical Department. I think there are less than 800. The special work which they do, and which they do so well, and where they are so desperately needed, is in the neuropsychiatric wards and in the closed wards and in some of the special wards.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentlewoman is correct.

Mrs. BOLTON. Therefore, they would be of invaluable use to the Medical Department.

Mr. DURHAM. They are at the present time. I served with nurses in the last war.

Mrs. BOLTON. They are used as ward technicians. They are used as medical technicians, sir.

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mrs. BOLTON. They are not used wholly for nursing except incidentally.

Mr. DURHAM. They are not used much for bedside nursing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am in entire accord with the purpose of the amendment submitted by the gentleman from New York. But I do not think, in the first place, that the amendment is in the right place in the bill; and, furthermore, the way the bill is drawn, that amendment would require the redrafting of the entire bill.

I have drafted an amendment to the same effect, which should be section 5 of the bill. At the appropriate time I intend to present that. I might say the hearings disclosed there are about 8,500 male nurses in the United States. The estimate of the witnesses was that about 2,000 or slightly over that number of these male nurses would be available and able to qualify for service as nurses in the Army. In addition to that, there are about 2,500 male nurses in the Army. Probably a great majority of those would also be available for service as nurses. Of course, we have always thought of the nursing profession as being primarily a profession for women. But in view of the extreme need of the Army as disclosed by this record, I feel we should utilize every available resource to take care of this need. Certainly, the male nurses in the Army ought to be on the same footing as lady nurses of the Army will be if this bill is passed. Also, the Surgeon General pointed out that some of the men who are nurses are allowed to go to the officers' candidate school. In all justice, the objection to that is they are only commissioned for administrative work, and a very small fraction of those male nurses able to get into the candidate school will be commissioned and the rest of the men who are doing primarily nursing work will not be taken care of. Therefore, I want to read my amendment for the consideration of the House, and I hope it will consider it favorably. The purpose of my amendment is to add a new section, section 6. It reads as follows:

This act shall include male as well as female nurses and wherever the words "female" or "she" are used, it shall be deemed to include male nurses. The intent is that all nurses shall be registered but in the case of male nurses now in the armed services the President may provide by regulation that they may be inducted into the Nurses' Corps under the provisions of this act without registration with any local selective-service board.

You can see that with probably 2,000 to 2,500 male nurses in the armed services, it would be very cumbersome, if not impossible, to get them registered with the local selective-service boards, but by empowering the President to make regulations, he can provide by his rules and regulations how all those nurses in every theater of war and in every part of the Nation can be picked up and taken directly into the service without the cumbersome machinery of registration.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I want to congratulate the gentleman on this very carefully thought-out amendment, because I believe it will, without question, do the very thing we want to do. I hope we will vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York and then vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman see any reason why a qualified male nurse should have any more difficulty otbaining a commission as a second lieutenant than a qualified female nurse?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I cannot. That is why I have offered the amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Why are they not commissioned at the present time? I refer to those now in the service.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I simply wanted to get the parliamentary situation straight if I could. Is the gentleman offering his amendment at this point?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No. I am just striking out the last word to get my thought before the House. The amendment will come as a later section. It should come after section 5 of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it virtually the same as the Hall amendment?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No. It is not the same. It is quite different. I think it handles the situation in a better way. I am in full accord with what the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is trying to accomplish, but I doubt if his amendment would accomplish it. It would make it more difficult to administer the law.

Mr. RANKIN. I wanted to know if there was enough difference so that it would not be subject to a point of order.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not believe it would be subject to a point of order, because in the committee we struck out the word "female" in the first section and included the word "qualified." The Chairman will remember he stated "that will take care of the male nurse situation," which I had in mind. Instead of taking up all the rest of the bill and making technical amendments, I assumed the drafting of the bill would take that in; but it did not do so.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman, of course, would not be in favor of passing any amendment that would require the commissioning of male nurses in the Army Nurse Corps, indiscriminately, without regard to their qualifications?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. My amendment takes care of all that. They have to be qualified the same as female nurses.

Mr. MAY. If the gentleman's amendment does take care of that matter, it ought to come up at this time on the merits, instead of putting in an amendment that is defective.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. Originally the Army Nurse Corps, as now constituted, consists of females only.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is true, but when we are in such dire need of nurses I want to get every nurse possible, irrespective of sex. Perhaps after the war we may have to readjust the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] should offer his amendment as a substitute for the pending amendment.

I am very much disturbed about this legislation, for several reasons. There are some elements in this country who want us to draft all women for all kinds of work.

Of course, I am not in favor of that policy. That would be communism or fascism at its worst.

In my opinion, if we will pay these nurses what they are entitled to receive, we will get their services without drafting them. If you will raise their pay to the level of what you are paying people in defense industries, for instance, in my opinion, you will not have to draft any nurses at all. They are just as patriotic as the men of this country, or as anyone else.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Do I understand the gentleman means that if in these various army hospitals and naval hospitals in the United States they will use the registers locally, and call those nurses into the service of those hospitals, they could then release the Army and Navy nurses for service with the troops in the field?

Mr. RANKIN. And pay them commensurate with the value of their work.

Mr. BROOKS. Is the gentleman familiar with the pay scale given to nurses inducted into the service?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I am not as fully advised as I ought to be, perhaps.

Mr. BROOKS. Nurses brought into the service are given the rank either of ensign or second lieutenant.

Mr. RANKIN. By this bill?

Mr. BROOKS. By this bill. That is the policy of the Department under this bill.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand.

Mr. BROOKS. That gives her a salary of $1,800 base pay plus commutation of quarters and rations.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS. Altogether it adds up to $2,590 per year that she is receiving.

Mr. RANKIN. How does that compare with the ones working in defense plants?

I wish to say to the gentleman from Louisiana that, as chairman of the Veterans' Committee, I have had a great deal of experience with legislation of this kind for the last few years. We have had to consider this question of nurses in our veterans' hospital legislation.

I am of the opinion that you are likely to do more harm than good by this bill. I have supported all legislation of this kind since we first got into this war, when we lifted the embargo in 1939. I told you then that we were getting into the war, and since that time I have voted for everything the Army and Navy said would help win the war.

Here is what you are likely to do by passing this bill: Instead of raising the pay sufficiently to induce these girls to come in voluntarily, I am afraid you are going to discourage young girls from studying to be nurses and bring about a greater scarcity of nurses than we have today; I am afraid that by this bill you are going to discourage not only the girls but their parents as well.

If you pass a measure of this kind male nurses should certainly be included.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I feel very strongly that unless this section 2 (b) goes out which drafts girls not because they are graduate nurses but because they are members of the Nurse Cadet Corps, will not only discourage the girls, but frighten their parents and a lot of 17- and 18-year-old girls will not take up nursing.

I wish to advise the gentleman that at the proper time an amendment will be offered which will permit this draft to go into effect only if the number of volunteer qualified nurses falls below the quotas. Then it is up to the girls to come in.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota that I am favorably inclined toward that amendment. But what I am afraid of here is that you are going to frighten not only the girls themselves but their parents, and many young women who would otherwise study to become nurses will not do so if this measure becomes a law.

You are going to cause a great falling off in the number of young women who will prepare themselves to be nurses and thus bring about a greater scarcity of nurses than we have today. That is the fear I have about this bill.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly.

Mrs. BOLTON. Just to correct the gentleman's opinion of the bill and of the situation with regard to the Nurse Corps, I may say that the Nurse Corps consists of commissioned officers of the American Army. The pay, therefore, is that of an officer. It is not a question of raising pay to get them; it is a question of a very different type of thing.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the lady from Ohio that after the last war the nurses were not cared for as the disabled servicemen were; and for that reason we have had more trouble getting the nurses we need. But I do not believe this is the remedy.

If we will pay these nurses what their services are worth we will not have to draft them; they will volunteer their services.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. There has obviously been considerable confusion in this argument. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may again be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL to H. R. 2277: On page 1, line 6, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 2. Hereafter male nurses as well as female nurses may be members of the Army Nurse Corps and the Navy Nurse Corps, and male nurses may be commissioned in such corps to the same extent as is now provided by law in the case of female members of such corps."

Renumber the remaining sections of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had in mind the offering of an amendment to this bill which would provide against discrimination so far as persons belonging to any particular race, color, or creed were concerned; however, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has advised me that he also has prepared an amendment which he intends to offer on page 2, line 17, at which point he would insert the following words:

In the selection, induction, voluntary recruitment, and commissioning of nurses by the land and naval forces, there shall be no discrimination by reason of race, creed, or color.

In view of the plan of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to offer this amendment and because it is along the same lines that I also had in mind, I intend to support his amendment when offered.

Mr. Chairman, this bill to a great extent has to do with the Bolton Act, which we have heard a lot about during debate that has been going on.

Under the Bolton Act providing for the training of nurses through grants to institutions, there is the provision:

Provided, That there shall be no discrimination in the administration of the benefits and appropriations made under the respective provisions of this act on account of race, creed, or color.

Under this proposed bill, the cadet nurses are to be drafted first. It is easy to say that the Army and the Navy will not discriminate against the colored members of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps. However, history over a period of years does not warrant such a conclusion. Further, the data compiled in connection with this bill shows that only 330 colored nurses have received commissions out of a group of 8,000 Negro graduate nurses. The ratio of colored nurses in the Army, based upon the number of Negro graduate nurses who are qualified and competent for the positions, is not more than one-fourth the number who should have received commissions already if they had been granted to colored nurses as freely as to white nurses. It is no answer to say that they have not applied. Their services have not been sought and the services of the white nurses have been sought.

The head of the American Nurses Association, Miss Densford, testified that her association considers the colored nurse as the equivalent of the white nurse. The Army doctors have testified that they are excellent nurses and are giving equally good service with the white nurses. They are being used in the care of both white and colored servicemen. Perhaps 2,000 more of these colored nurses are available by volunteer methods if they believe that they are wanted and if, in fact, no discrimination is practiced against them.

Our duty to see to it that there is no discrimination against the colored cadet nurses is more important in this bill than in the Bolton Act. By the terms of the Bolton Act, they have entered into the training schools for nurses in large numbers. They are protected by an antidiscrimination provision in the Bolton Act which we voted for. Today we should see to it that, having secured their entrance into the Cadet Corps, they are protected against any discrimination due to war conditions. So far as this bill is concerned, it is possible that they might have the same treatment as the male nurses. They would end up as enlisted personnel without commissions. They may be turned down or disqualified for trivial reasons.

This bill is far different from the "work or jail" bill which we recently passed. At that time it was urged against a similar amendment which I offered that it would cause loss of votes necessary for the passage of the bill. Certainly that was not a very profound argument for or against the amendment. It is not possible to argue here that the amendment is not necessary. All of us know that there have not been a proportionate number of colored nurses in

the Army and Navy even under the stress of this terrible war and the great need for nurses. Certainly since this bill provides for the drafting of all qualified nurses, it is more necessary that this amendment be a part of this bill than that it should have been included in the cadet nurse law. I hope that the leader of the majority will feel that he can support this amendment, offered in good faith, for the encouragement of the Negro nurses in our country who are giving splendid service in many of the great hospitals of New York, Boston, and other large cities. I hope that the gentleman from New York who opposed a similar amendment to the "work or jail" bill will, on this second occasion, support this antidiscrimination amendment. In fact, I believe that a large majority of the membership of this House are against discrimination in connection with the drafting of colored nurses.

If they cannot qualify, do not take them. If they can qualify and render efficient service at a time when our men need that service, let us treat them just as we would want to be treated ourselves. Let us make certain that insofar as this House can prevent it, no discrimination shall be practiced against them.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, we are asked to vote for this legislation on the theory that it is in furtherance of the war effort. As I recall, practically everything that has come before this House in the last 2 years has had the same label tacked to it. A few weeks ago the majority leader asked us to vote for a bill then pending here—the work-or-jail bill. That bill is still pending in the Senate. The Speaker of the House took the floor and it was stated at that time that the action was necessary and that we should put through that bill that day. The majority leader stated in his argument that we were attempting to undo something which we should not have done back in June of 1933. If we pass this kind of legislation, or the type of legislation so often requested by the administration, we may find that again we are doing something that we should not do. That legislation—and I am talking about the work-or-jail bill—we were advised, was absolutely necessary at that particular time, yet the bill went over to the other end of the Capitol and there it is buried today. So, it could not have been necessary because certainly the Senate would back up the administration's worth-while war efforts.

Now we are told that the purpose of this bill is to get nurses into the Army. When I remember that for more than 2 years the people of Australia and New Zealand and South Africa and Canada, all integral parts of the British Empire—and if ever a war was being fought for the existence of a nation, this war is being fought for the continued existence of the British Empire—refused to draft their men for service abroad, I am asking why we should draft women for war work.

We have been told that we should cooperate with other nations. I will be happy to cooperate, but as I understand that word it is not a one-way word. All of the things are not to be done by one party when people are trying to cooperate, and yet we are the only nation that is asked to draft its women. We are told that we need nurses. I will tell you what my opinion, at least, is, and that is this, that in most of this legislation which Congress has been asked to adopt, the purpose is not the avowed purpose, but the purpose is to give to the administration—and here are the two things that it always has wanted—more money and more power. Greedy for power, this administration, if it has its way, will leave our citizens without liberty and with a debt that will enslave them for hundreds of years.

Just a few days ago I talked with a gentleman on the majority side who is in a position to know, and this has reference to the amendment which was proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON], who just left the floor. He said that the Government, the administration, went down to one of the factories where there are 5,000 employees making shells, and insisted that that company take on a certain percentage of the members of a certain race. The question was put up to him, and he said, "Now, what do you want? Do you want jobs for a certain group or do you want shells?" The Government finally said it would take shells.

In this particular situation I am wondering whether the Army wants nurses or whether it wants to bring under the control of the administration—for our experience with General Hershey shows that the administration, the President himself, tried to change the law when it came to the drafting of agricultural workers; that experience is in your mind—I am wondering whether the administration wants nurses or whether it wants control over another segment of the population. It has the young men over 18. Shortly it will be asking for the 17-year-olds. In my judgment, that is what it is after—control of the women so it can send them to foreign lands to serve under the Russians and the British as well as with our forces. I will not vote to make our women, our young girls, subject to the orders of either Russian or British officers. I do not propose to be frightened by this cry that if you do not vote for a certain bill you are opposing the war effort. I do not propose to vote for a bill just because someone says it is in furtherance of the war effort.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] who is on his feet over there, asked just a moment ago that if you tell all the women in this country that when they become nurses they will be drafted into the armed services and put under the orders of some admiral or general or subordinate, do you think those girls are going to take up nursing and become qualified? If you do, in my judgment you are mistaken.

The women will volunteer whenever needed. This administration has been very successful in destroying our hard-won freedom and independence but there is a limit, and it may be found if the daughters and sisters of servicemen are grabbed by the thousand and sent to aid the political ambitions of a Stalin or a Churchill.

Those in authority cannot always fool the people as to their purpose.

If the sole purpose of this bill was to get nurses, the authorities would have accepted many of those who have volunteered; they would not discriminate against male nurses; they would not limit the age to 45, for they know very well that many a woman over that age is fully capable of rendering aid to the sick and the wounded.

If this bill becomes law and those who are at present qualified as nurses or are in training to become nurses are drafted, those who do not want to serve in the armed forces will escape the draft by choosing some other occupation or profession.

Only those who have more than the average amount of charity, of self-sacrifice, volunteer to become nurses. Nursing, as everyone with experience knows, is one of the most arduous and at times disagreeable, exacting, and heart-rending occupations or professions.

There will be no scarcity of nurses, if they are given full opportunity to serve, rewarded with compensation somewhere near approaching that paid workers in war industries.

Part of the fault for the present scarcity of nurses grows out of the fact that, after Normandy, while the political campaign was on last year, the people were given to understand that the war would shortly be ended and the Army itself reduced its estimate of nurses needed by 10,000.

Given opportunity, the sisters, the wives, and the mothers of those in the service will see that the sick and wounded are given proper care, and a draft of nurses will not be needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Every female residing in the United States who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration under this act, has reached the twentieth anniversary of her birth but has not reached the forty-fifth anniversary of her birth and (1) who has been, or on such day or days is, a registered nurse in any State, Territory, or possession of the United States or in the District of Columbia, or (2) who on such day or days is (A) a graduate of a school of nursing and (B) eligible to apply for examination for registration as a registered nurse in the jurisdiction in which such school is situated or in which she resides, is hereby made subject to registration and selection for and induction into the land and naval forces of the United States under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. Except as provided in this act, and except as may be provided in regulations issued pursuant to this act, such registration, selection, and induction (including the classification and deferment of such females) shall proceed in accordance with the same procedures and be subject to the same ex-

emptions, rights, penalties, and obligations provided for male registrants by said act and regulations thereunder.

(b) No person registered with a selective-service local board under this act shall be ordered by such board to report for induction until after all qualified graduates of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps registered with such board, who are not deferred pursuant to the provisions of this act, have been ordered to report for induction. A graduate of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps may be deferred from service under this act in the land or naval forces only on grounds described in section 5 (e) (1) (other than the first sentence thereof) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

(c) (1) In order to assure that the Nation's limited nursing skills are wisely utilized and that the national health and safety is protected against unwarranted depletion of essential nursing services, no person shall be classified by any selective-service local board as available for induction into the land or naval forces of the United States under this act, if she has been declared by the Procurement and Assignment Service, functioning through its local, State, and National committees and appeal agencies, to be engaged in essential nursing services and not available for such induction, and no person employed as a nurse in a hospital facility operated by the Veterans' Administration shall be classified by any selective-service local board as available for induction into the land or naval forces unless and until she has been released by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. This paragraph shall not apply to graduates of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps.

(2) No provisions of this subsection shall be construed to deny to any persons covered by this act a right to a hearing and determination by a selective-service local board and to an appeal from such determination in the same manner as provided in the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: On page 2, line 17, after the period, insert "No person shall be inducted into the land or naval forces under this act unless she is acceptable to the land or naval forces as a commissioned officer, and no person shall be inducted into the land or naval forces under this act except as a commissioned officer."

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the draft of women for the military services to serve as nurses is a drastic move, and I think that most of us reluctantly support the measure only because of the immediate pressing need. If we must resort to this method of obtaining nurses, it is only fair that we provide in the bill that those inducted through the draft be given commissions in the Army and Navy Nurses Corps. The amendment does not infringe upon the prerogative of the Executive in commissioning people in the armed forces, but does preclude the selective-service boards from drafting a woman who does not meet all the qualifications of the Army and Navy Nurses Corps, and who could be inducted and forced to serve in a noncommissioned grade. The amendment also would make it mandatory for the services to tender commissions to those women inducted. War Department officials promise that the women inducted under this authorization will be commissioned, and I have no reason to believe that that policy will not be carried out. However, by writing that policy into the law will give greater assurance to the women covered by the act, and I hope and believe will encourage voluntary enrollments.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. I think the gentleman's amendment is perfectly in order. As a matter of fact, every representative of the War Department who testified before our committee said that the intention of the Department was to grant a commission to any nurse inducted under this act.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes, I understand that is the War Department policy as of today. That policy could be changed tomorrow by the War Department, however, if it is not written into the law as proposed in this amendment.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentleman on his amendment. I think it meets a situation which should be met here. For my personal information, I desire to make inquiry as to whether or not all the nurses now serving in the Army Nurse Corps are commissioned, that is, if the gentleman knows.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. So far as I know, they are, if they are serving in the Army Nurse Corps. There are a number of women serving as WAC's and WAVES and in other capacities who are doing some nursing or aide work.

Mr. SPRINGER. Are they serving in the regular Nurse Corps?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. No, I do not believe so. I think they are merely auxiliary to them.

Mr. MOTT. I agree that the gentleman's amendment is good as far as it goes. I do not agree that the amendment will assure the commissioning of all nurses drafted into the service. There is no limit in the number of nurses which may be drafted under this bill. I think under the gentleman's amendment the War Department would be precluded from drafting any person who was not a qualified nurse. She would not be sure of getting a commission.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Oh, yes; I will read the amendment again:

No person shall be inducted into the land or naval forces under this act unless she is acceptable to the land or naval forces as a commissioned officer, and no person shall be inducted into the land or naval forces under this act except as a commissioned officer.

They cannot use this act for obtaining any nurse unless the woman is a qualified nurse and will be commissioned.

Mr. MOTT. That may cure it. I would like to ask another question. Is there anything in this bill, including the language of the gentleman's amendment, which would require that these women shall be drafted as nurses? The language of the bill is that they shall be drafted as members of the naval and military forces of the United States.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes. The bill itself provides for the drafting of qualified nurses.

Mr. MOTT. It does not provide for the drafting of women as nurses?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman's amendment have any effect on the drafting of colored nurses? I am wondering if, under the present regulations and policies of the War Department, if it is required that the nurses be drafted, there will be any tendency to take a lesser number of colored nurses than otherwise?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. It does not.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not think it would have any bearing if the amendment would provide that there be no discrimination because of race or color. I think that both amendments should be adopted.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Certainly this amendment would have absolutely nothing to do with color or creed.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I am in favor of the gentleman's amendment. It would appear to me that the gentleman's amendment would be stronger if he would omit the first sentence. Who is going to determine what the qualifications are?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I would suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that it is quite difficult to write into law a direction to the War Department to commission certain individuals without infringing the prerogative of the Executive. Here we seek to limit the induction of women to that class qualified as nurses and commissioned officers.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The Selective Service will not be able to take women who are now doing regular and essential nursing service at home, and put them in as medical WAC's or orderlies, under the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. They can be taken out of essential nursing service if taken in as nurses in the nursing service?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes. We all remember the rigid and silly regulations of the War and Navy Departments that rejected otherwise qualified nurses from commissions because the women were a half inch too short or tall, or because of a few pounds over or under weight. This amendment will prevent the drafting of women who do not meet all the qualifications of nurses and commissioned officers, and protect such

drafted nurses from serving in noncommissioned status and in performing duties other than nursing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, of course, this amendment sounds very desirable and very simple, but before you vote on this you must understand how this amendment will fit into the law which controls the commissioned personnel of the Army.

This amendment, if adopted, will eliminate from the bill all compulsory features and all ability to draft nurses into the armed forces, for this reason: No one can be compelled to accept a commission. A commission does not become effective until it has been accepted. The only case in which that is not true, is under the law which was passed at the last Congress, because our commissioned personnel was scattered all over the world. We passed the law under which he is presumed to have accepted the promotion unless he files a rejection. That is the only instance in which you can have a commission without specific acceptance. That applies only to promotions. But you cannot commission a person who does not voluntarily accept a commission.

Under the amendment as written the Department is prohibited from inducting into the land or naval forces anyone they are not willing to commission, and that they shall be inducted in no status other than as commissioned officers.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield for the purpose of correcting any misquotation of the gentleman's amendment, and for no other purpose.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Of course, I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. KILDAY. Did I quote the gentleman's amendment correctly?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I do not know whether the gentleman correctly quoted me or not, I just want to take issue with the gentleman.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman may take issue in his own time. I will not yield for the gentleman to make another speech. He has had more than his allotted time.

If you cannot take them in any capacity other than commissioned officers then you can take nobody but those who volunteer to enter the service, because you cannot induct a person as a commissioned officer; you cannot induct a person who does not voluntarily accept a commission. So, if you want to put this provision in the law the thing to do is to vote down the bill entirely, because under it anyone who does not voluntarily enter the service cannot be taken into the service. We have gone as far as we are able to go to secure commissions for these women by getting the unqualified commitment from the Surgeon General of the Army that he proposes to use them in no other capacity under existing law and under the law controlling all of the commissioned personnel of the Army. This kills the bill entirely and it would leave it entirely on a voluntary basis as in the past.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the chairman.

Mr. MAY. It is also discriminatory in that we have taken several groups of women into the service already without guaranteeing any commissions to them.

Mr. KILDAY. I agree that these women should be commissioned because that is the policy of the armed forces, and those who have come in their professional capacity have been commissioned. We cannot make it any stronger than it is under existing permanent law. We have done all we can in securing the unqualified commitment of the officials of the Army that they will use them in that group.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman does not mean to say—I hope he does not mean to say—that he wants to give the Army the authority to draft nurses and not commission them, or to use them in any capacity other than that of a commissioned officer.

Mr. KILDAY. I am facing the situation that exists and the law as it is written, unless you are going to change existing law. The amendment the gentleman offers nullifies this proposal entirely.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman knows that is not true, because it gives them the right to draft a nurse if she is qualified to accept a commission.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the proposition is not that she is qualified, but if she is acceptable. There is no qualification in it.

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman is correct. There is no doubt about it. This provision removes all compulsion from the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask one of the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, either the chairman or the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], a question: Suppose a woman who is a qualified registered nurse is drafted under the procedure that has been set up in this bill, but for reasons of her own, whatever they may be, decides that she does not want to become commissioned in the Nurse Corps; what disposition is intended to be made of that woman?

Mr. KILDAY. I may say to the gentleman that I believe the disposition made in such a case would be exactly what one would expect when so many members of the nursing profession have already volunteered and are now discharging such important duties. If a qualified woman is tendered a commission and just arbitrarily refuses it, insists upon being recalcitrant about participation in the war effort, they ought to be able to use her where they see fit, as an attendant in a hospital, or anything else. Such a case as the gentleman supposes is conceivable, of course, but I doubt if any such cases occur.

Mr. HINSHAW. I want to know what disposition would be made in such a case. Would the person concerned be assigned to the WAC's or the WAVES, as the case might be, as an enlisted person? Or what disposition would be made?

Mr. KILDAY. If this amendment is adopted she would become a member of the Medical Department of the Army in an enlisted capacity.

Mr. HINSHAW. As a WAC, as a member of the Women's Auxiliary Corps?

Mr. KILDAY. Not necessarily in the WAC's. They could assign her to whatever they wanted to. They could assign her to the WAVES or to the SPARS or to any of the others.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman mean she would have to wash dishes or to scrub floors or to do any of the other work that they do?

Mr. KILDAY. If she refuses to do anything in the nursing line. Of course, I think she ought to do that.

Mr. HINSHAW. I want to find that out.

Mr. KILDAY. I have a much higher regard for the nursing profession than the gentleman seems to indicate he has.

Mr. HINSHAW. Well, that is not fair to me, nor is it fair to the nursing profession, because certainly a lot of women have applied under this Nurse Corps program and they have not been accepted by either the Army or the Navy, but not all of them have applied, and I assume, if they all wanted this service they all would apply.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say, in reply to the gentleman's question, that this will work out more or less as the induction of physicans has worked out under the present practices of the Army and Navy. When the requirements are such that a physician may be released from civilian life for the armed services, the armed services then go to the man and offer him a commission to come in voluntarily. In practically 100 percent of the cases the physicians have come in voluntarily and have accepted commissions and are serving their country today in the capacity of commissioned officers in the Army or Navy. I think the matter in reference to nurses will work out in the same way.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman for his observation, but I know of a number of instances where qualified physicians have been drafted into the Army and are serving as privates in any capacity other than a medical capacity and whose medical services are being completely lost.

Mr. BROOKS. They are serving as privates?

Mr. HINSHAW. They were inducted as privates.

Mr. BROOKS. Were they offered commissions?

Mr. HINSHAW. They refused commissions because they perhaps believed that with their experience and their reputation they were of a higher quality and character than the small commission of-

fered to them justified. In other words, they might have been offered a commission as first lieutenant where they would be serving under men with commissions of majors and lieutenant colonels who had worked under these same physicians in hospitals or elsewhere.

Mr. BROOKS. Does not the gentleman think that when a physician refuses to accept a commission he ought to be inducted?

Mr. HINSHAW. No, I cannot agree with the gentleman on that score. With the shortage of qualified physicians their services as physicians are far more important than any other service they could perform.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the House to another thing. I have looked over the hearings on this bill and nowhere in the index of those hearings do I find that the Committee on Military Affairs has consulted with the Selective Service System of this Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not detain the membership of the committee very long in discussing this bill. I wish here and now to state my views so that they will be forever after known in regard to this particular legislative measure.

This is the first time in the history of the world that it has been alleged to be necessary, if at all necessary, to draft "angels of mercy." I know something about the service of nurses during the last war. I saw nurses who were not drafted. I saw them in action in the last war in various hospitals in France. I saw nurses working over the boys in large rooms, about half as large as this, where there were cots that were placed close together. All of the boys at times were under an anesthetic. Some were just coming out, some crying for their mother or father. I saw the nurses working in the operating rooms where the blood was over the soles of their shoes, where they worked until they dropped in their tracks in an effort to save those boys, sleeping for a short time, then getting up and going about their work again. Now it is said that these "angels of mercy" have to be drafted, when the finest young men of this country or any other country are over there fighting and being killed, maimed, and murdered. I cannot imagine the Congress of the United States indicting, prejudging, and precondemning a patriotic group of women in this country by such legislation as this.

The figures all show that you will have an ample number of nurses long before July. They will be available. They are being trained to get into this work. It is just about as sensible as it would be to try to draft the mothers of this country and say, "Your son is sick; you will have to go to his bedside." These nurses are good samaritans, and they will respond to the call for patriotic duty. They will not have to be dragged in by the heels by any such draft bill as this. As far as I am concerned, I am ashamed of this attempt to brand the followers of Florence Nightingale as "slackers."

I would be willing to venture that when the splendid and patriotic Mrs. BOLTON walked down the corridors of the hospitals abroad, as she did recently, more than one injured soldier in his agony said to himself, "Here comes my mother." That is what the nurses mean to our injured fighting men. Our patriotic women are willing to go, and they always have gone where duty and patriotism called for sacrificial service. There is no evidence here that they will not go now, go without legislative coercion.

I, for one, will not by my vote place this proposed indictment against the patriotic nurses and the patriotic women of this country. If adopted, it will be a blot on their record forever afterward. Their children or their grandchildren will say, when they look at the record, "So my grandmother or my mother had to be drafted, did she? Yet she was pledged to humanity when she entered the nursing profession." No, gentlemen, I glory in the record of the nurses of this country throughout all wars, and I am not going to be a party to smearing the reputation and character of our patriotic nurses by casting a vote for this iniquitous bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAY) there were—ayes 107, noes 69.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MAY and Mr. HARNESS of Indiana.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 135, noes 98.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELSTON: Page 3, line 7, after the word "services", strike out the remainder of line 7, all of lines 8 to 13 inclusive, the first two words of line 14, and substitute the following: "in the classification, reclassification, or deferment of any individual under this act, the selective-service local board shall give consideration to the recommendations, if any, with respect to whether such individual is engaged in essential nursing services, filed with such board by the Nursing Division of the Procurement and Assignment Service of the War Manpower Commission, functioning through its local, State, and National committees and appeal agencies."

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is very simple. As subsection (c) of section 2 is now written, no person shall be classified by the Selective Service until the Procurement and Assignment Service in the War Manpower Commission has passed on the question of whether or not such person is available for induction. In other words, as the act is now written, if the Procurement and Assignment Service should say that a nurse is not available for military service, that ends it so far as she is concerned. On the other hand, if the Procurement and Assignment Service decrees that she is available for induction, she then is turned over to Selective Service, whose only function is to see that she is inducted into the service. As it now stands, there is no appeal whatever on the part of the nurse on the question of her availability or nonavailability for military service. I appreciate that in the section reference is made to "appeal agencies." That obviously refers only to such appeal agencies as might be set up by the Procurement and Assignment Service itself. I cannot conceive of a more iniquitous practice than for any Government department to make a decision and then set up its own appeal agency to pass on its own decisions. Yet that is exactly what will happen here if my amendment is not adopted. I think it was the intention of the Military Affairs Committee that nurses should have all of the privileges accorded a man under the Selective Service Act, including the right of appeal. Any man who is not satisfied with his classification under the Selective Service Act may appeal to a district appeal board; he may appeal to the State director; and finally to the President of the United States. Section 2 (2) provides for an appeal under the Selective Service Act, but that applies only to those nurses who are referred to a selective-service board by the Procurement and Assignment Service. Moreover this section refers only to appeals on questions on dependency or physical, mental, or moral disabilities.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I am very happy to yield to my chairman.

Mr. MAY. As a matter of fact, under the section to which the gentleman has offered this amendment, no nurse who is not made available by the local committees of the Manpower Commission can be inducted by the Selective Service Board until she has been passed upon by the Procurement and Assignment Service functioning through its local State and national committees and appeal agencies.

Mr. ELSTON. That is correct. I do not think any Government bureau should be given the power to say who shall or shall not be inducted without some provision for appeal.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman's amendment cure that?

Mr. ELSTON. My amendment cures that and gives the nurse and her employer the right to appeal her classification by the Procurement and Assignment Service to the appeal agencies of selective service. If this amendment is not adopted, it would mean, for example, that nurses could be taken from one hospital and sent into the armed services, while those from another hospital, doing the same kind of work, could be retained in a civilian capacity.

The hospital could not appeal nor could the nurse appeal. Certainly it is only fair that an amendment of this kind be adopted so that a nurse has the same rights accorded a man under the Selective Service Act. If we are going to adopt legislation of this kind, I feel we should throw every possible safeguard around those who are going to be subjected to its provisions.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. As I understand, the gentleman agreed the nurse now has the right of appeal to the Procurement and Assignment Service, but in addition the gentleman wishes them to have a further appeal.

Mr. ELSTON. No. The nurse does not now have the right of appeal from any decision of the Procurement and Assignment Service unless that Service sets up its own appeal agency. If my amendment is adopted, it will not dispense with the Procurement and Assignment Service. I think that is a good service, provided it confines its efforts to making recommendations. It should not have authority to make a final decision.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The testimony of all nurses themselves would reveal the fact that the Procurement and Assignment Service of the War Manpower Commission has done a most excellent job.

Mr. ELSTON. I am not objecting to the retention of that Service. I think it should be retained. I am sure its recommendations will be helpful to selective-service boards.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The Procurement and Assignment Service will furnish the evidence on which the local boards will pass? They will determine whether a lady will be available for induction?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes. Selective Service is entitled, and I believe will be glad, to have the benefit of the advice of the Procurement and Assignment Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. But the Selective Service Board will have the entire say as to who shall be inducted?

Mr. ELSTON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the heart of this bill, in my opinion. In writing this bill, the committee, of course, was concerned as to essentiality and who should pass on the essentiality of the nurse in the immediate community. I think we must have this in mind: At the present time where are we going to get these nurses? There are 54,000 of them in private nursing. Practically all of that group are in the doctor's offices in this country. One hundred and eighty thousand are in the institutions of the country. Twelve thousand are in industry and about 15,000 are in the Public Health Service. What has worried me all the time is, who is going to pick out this one, who is essential and not essential, which you are going to have to do somewhere along the line. Either the draft boards will have to do it or the 867 procurement and assignment boards back in the local communities, who have selected most of the doctors and nurses and placed them in the service, are going to take that responsibility.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] and I have disagreed somewhat on this. I do not have as much objection to his amendment at the present time as I did when he first offered it, because I think it is absolutely necessary to keep the Procurement and Assignment Division of the War Manpower Commission in the position of selecting these nurses.

On the question of appeals, I think the gentleman is right; that there would probably be no appeal from the doctor's decision. But the doctor would have a right to appeal his case under the present language as written in the bill, if that nurse was said to be not essential by the Procurement and Assignment Board. But I take the position that the doctors and nurses are more familiar with the medical services than any other group of people. When a doctor and a nurse in Procurement and Assignment pass on the essentiality of that individual, that is the end of it. When the draft board passes on the essentiality of an individual and takes this doctor's nurse and does not take this one over here, you know good and well who they are coming to to argue about it. They are coming to you as Congressmen. They will say, "You have taken my nurse. Why do you not take the other doctor's nurse?" That is why I feel there is not so much difference between the gentleman's amendment and the present provisions of this act.

He seems to be alarmed about it. I am willing, of course, to take his judgment on the matter and go along with him on the amendments, provided he feels that the Procurement and Assignment Division is still in and will be able to pass on—certainly their judgment—as to the essentiality of that individual in the doctor's office and in the hospitals of this country.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I stated in my remarks that I did favor the retention of the Procurement and Assignment Service. I feel that it is entirely optional with the draft boards and the Selective Service as to whether they take their recommendation but I want to see that no injustice is done, that these people have the right of appeal that is afforded by Selective Service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking a few questions of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] about his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment touches on the question of classification; and as I understood the gentleman's argument in support of the amendment, it is his contention that it not only gives the right of appeal to those who are classified or inducted contrary to what they think their rights are, but it also makes it possible for the Selective Service local boards to determine the question of whether or not the local procurement agencies set up under State laws have determined rightly or wrongly whether the man should be inducted. Does it go that far?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes; that is correct; and it is up to the person who is aggrieved by the decision, if she wishes, to appeal to the agency set up in the Selective Service Act.

Mr. MAY. Then, according to the gentleman's contention, the only thing that the local procurement agencies will have to do with the matter will be to determine whether or not the person is a nurse eligible for induction.

Mr. ELSTON. Yes; they will make recommendations to the selective service board, and I think the Selective Service will be very glad to have their recommendation.

Mr. MAY. Suppose they do not make a recommendation; what happens?

Mr. ELSTON. They are not obligated under the law now to make a recommendation. The Procurement and Assignment Service as you know has been set up by Executive order rather than by law.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman knows very well that I opposed in the committee the entire provision relating to the State procurement agencies, taking the position from the very beginning that it would hinder the induction of nurses rather than help, because it leaves to the local interested parties, in this instance two physicians and a civilian who may be employees or owners of a hospital where they are at work, to determine first of all whether or not they are available to be inducted through the Selective Service System.

What I want to get clear is that the gentleman's amendment does enable the Selective Service System to get them regardless of the recommendation of the local committee.

Mr. ELSTON. My amendment would permit that, but it requires that the selective service board give consideration to the recommendations, if any, with respect to whether such individual is engaged in essential nursing services, and so forth. It requires them to give consideration to the recommendation.

Mr. MAY. But they are not bound by the recommendation.

Mr. ELSTON. No; they are not bound, because there may be unfairness or discrimination. There may be a number of reasons why the recommendations of the Procurement and Assignment Service may not be followed.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. Do I understand from the gentleman's answer that someone other than the nurse they are undertaking to draft can appeal from the decision?

Mr. ELSTON. The employer can appeal under present provisions of the Selective Service Act. For example, a hospital might want to appeal against the induction of a nurse from that hospital.

Mr. THOMASON. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman that the nurse her-

self ought to be permitted to appeal from any decision that she is not satisfied with; but does the gentleman believe that some doctor who has a nurse in his office and may for selfish reasons want to keep her, should be allowed to appeal from that ruling?

Mr. ELSTON. I believe he could if he were the employer; but, of course, if he did not have a good case he would not get very far with his appeal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio is not adopted, this act will have established a precedent that an interested group will have final say as to which of that group shall be deferred. In other words, it is not fair for the Procurement and Assignment Service or the local medical group to itself have the say as to whether or not a particular person should be inducted first. In connection with appeals boards and selective-service boards, as I understand it, any employer who is a board member has been prohibited from sitting on the case of one of his own employees; is that not correct? I believe that is a correct statement of fact. If it is not correct, I would like to be corrected.

Mr. ELSTON. That is my understanding.

Mr. HINSHAW. The members of this Procurement and Assignment Service who sit on these cases and decide whether or not a nurse is available are themselves employers of nurses or else some representative of the nurses' group. It is entirely unfair that they be the ones to determine whether or not the person is inducted because they have an interest in the case. The gentleman's amendment, I believe, corrects that situation and does not permit the establishment of such precedent.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I presume the following statement is correct, because it comes from all of the nurses' associations. Using voluntary methods 867 procurement and assignment committees, hospitals, and medical authorities have, since July 1, 1943, classified 235,000 nurses in one of the following categories: Available for military service and potentially eligible, available for relocation into more essential positions, essential in present position for limited time, essential for unlimited duration and, No. 5, not available for military or civilian duty. I assume it is the failure to be put in the proper one of those classifications that might raise the question of appeal?

Mr. HINSHAW. Perhaps.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Any nurse has the right today to appeal assignment to any one of those categories.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand the local units of the Procurement and Assignment Service of the War Manpower Commission for nurses are in fact the local units of the National Nurses' Council; hence they would be interested parties.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio and in support of this paragraph of the bill as presently written.

Mr. Chairman, Members have asked me certain questions and I think they are due an explanation on the point. There is a procurement and assignment board, local, State, and national, set up under the War Manpower Commission's directive. When it became necessary to draft doctors we set up local boards of doctors to decide which doctor and how many from each local area should be drafted by the local selective-service board. That procurement and assignment board sits on the eligibility of doctors in that area and they have functioned without any complaint at all. There have been no complaints of undue influence or unfair eligibility certificates.

It seems to me we are dealing with a problem here which is technical. How can a local selective-service board make its determination on the eligibility of a nurse without knowing something of the nature of the service which the nurse is required to perform? In other words, we are concerned with the drafting of technical people and it seems to me technicians should sit in on the eligibility of the people involved, taking into consideration local health needs.

In this particular case the board, composed of a procurement and assignment board of local nurses working with local doctors, will say that this nurse should stay for the good of the community in the community or that there is a surplus of nurses in that particular community, therefore these nurses are available to the local selective-service board. They do the same thing in the case of hospital needs in the local communities. They are the ones who have the technical knowledge as to whether a hospital needs the nurse itself or has a surplus of nurses. The selective-service board cannot sit in on the determination of a technical point like that. It has to be some one who knows the issue involved, and I say that the doctors and nurses are the ones who know that particular issue. I think the gentleman's amendment makes the procurement and assignment board a very weak thing. It takes out, you might say, the authority of the determination as to what nurse is eligible for drafting and what nurse is necessary for community service.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Does not the gentleman feel that the nurses should have the right of appeal?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They have that right under the Selective Service Board. They can go through with their appeal there.

Mr. ELSTON. Through the Selective Service Board?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes; they have appeal rights through the Selective Service Board.

Mr. ELSTON. I am sorry to disagree with the gentleman, but that is the very thing I am trying to accomplish by my amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am sure that they have the same rights under the Selective Service Board that any other draftee has.

Mr. ELSTON. No; if they had that right I would not be offering the amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I disagree with the gentleman. He may be right, but I disagree with him on that point.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think the provision now in the law gives the right of appeal on the question of availability to the Procurement and Assignment group.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is where it should be.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is where it should be as far as availability is concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The point is this, that that group makes the determination first and then they pass on their own appeals. They correct their own mistakes. That is contrary to all fundamental principles of law to have interested parties pass on their own cases.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I know the argument is made that interested parties are involved. To be sure the doctors are interested in obtaining and keeping nurses in their particular offices, but the gentleman does not have such small faith in the doctors' profession that he would say they would deliberately hold nurses out of the available draft quota when the war needs are so urgent in the military theaters.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It is not a matter of technical knowledge. It is a matter of having an independent party pass on the rights of these nurses, and the very group that has that right under the law as written is the group who has already classified that nurse.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is as far as the appeal for availability is concerned, but as far as the appeal of Selective Service is concerned, it is not.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We want to transfer that power to the local boards who can listen to all of the evidence and make a correct determination.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a slight correction of what I think is misapprehension on the gentleman's part?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. In the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio the words "the Nursing Division of Procurement and Assignment" are used. That is different from the Doctors Division. It is the Nursing Division.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentlewoman.

I believe that procurement and assignment boards of the Nursing Division will render determination of availability certificates just as honorably and efficiently in their profession as similar boards have in the Doctors Division. I

believe they will be of great help to the local selective-service boards.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, when this bill was first talked about several weeks ago, I got in touch with General Hershey's Office of Selective Service. I mention this because one of the gentlemen on my left a few minutes ago mentioned that no one had been in touch with Selective Service. My purpose was to inquire whether or not Selective Service would be interested in the suggestion that since this drafting of women was revolutionary, that they be placed on the local draft boards. I might add that I am going to very reluctantly support the bill, but I suggest that consideration should be given to the placing of women upon the local draft boards or, at least, if the members would not agree to that, on the appeal board.

I was going to incorporate this statement of mine as an amendment, but I have just talked to Selective Service headquarters in the last 10 minutes, and they tell me—and I have a tendency to agree—that the administration of the Selective Service System Act as written would permit that to be done. But I do say to the gentleman who offered this amendment and to the committee that a woman should be sitting on the Appeals Board who can understand, should I say, the peculiar problems of the sex.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Just to put a woman on the board because she is a woman might not help the situation at all. She must be a woman very well aware of all the problems that are bound to arise.

Mr. FLOOD. I agree with the gentlewoman and thank her for her contribution to my proposal.

I had in mind, since the drafting of women is such a revolutionary thing, that certainly, in fairness to the nurses, there should be a woman on the appeals board, either under the amendment offered by the gentleman or under the next section of the act providing for appeal, if and when they are referred.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I only ask the gentleman to yield because in the first sentence of his remark, I believe, he referred to a statement I made. I did not aver in that remark that they had not complied with the Selective Service System. I simply stated that the Selective Service System did not appear in the testimony in the hearings.

Mr. FLOOD. I understood the gentleman then and now. Now, I bring this matter to the attention of the House for the specific purpose of placing in the record of the debate on this bill the statement of Selective Service that the fullest consideration will be given within the administration of the Selectice Service Act, to the appointing of women to local draft boards and if for the reason of the small number of women to be drafted as nurses this is not considered practical in all local board cases then women should be designated as advisers to the local boards directly concerned—but that in all cases women should be appointed on all appeal boards. This should be done in fairness to the women who are nurses and subject to the act and to guarantee that one of their sex will be considered when their cases and problems are before the selective service local and appeal boards.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask the author of the amendment a question or two to clarify in my own mind, and perhaps in the minds of the Members, one or two points.

Under the gentleman's amendment, the Selective Service appeal machinery could be brought into operation only on somebody's appeal; is that right?

Mr. ELSTON. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. If the Procurement and Assignment Service determined a girl to be essential here at home because she is superintendent of a nurses' training school or something of that sort, and she accepted that classification and did not appeal, there would be no way that the Selective Service Board could overrule that finding of essentiality by the Procurement and Assignment Service? They could not go get that woman?

Mr. ELSTON. I would say they could, if they were not satisfied that the Procurement and Assignment Service in finding her essential had placed her in the proper classification.

Mr. JUDD. But what would inaugurate that machinery unless somebody appealed? The girl would not be likely to appeal if she were put in class IV and held to be essential here. If she did not appeal, how would the Selective Service Board go after her?

Mr. ELSTON. I have every reason to feel that the Selective Service Board would in every case accept the recommendation of the Procurement and Assignment Service unless some complaint was made about it, although technically they would have the right to overrule the Procurement and Assignment Service.

Mr. JUDD. As a matter of fact, is it not likely that practically always the appeals would be from persons who were put in class I but who thought they were more essential here at home, so that the appeal board in most cases would be deciding whether or not the Procurement and Assignment Service erred in putting them in the "available" classification when it should have put them in the "essential" classification?

Mr. ELSTON. Obviously it would not come up on appeal unless somebody was dissatisfied.

Mr. JUDD. I am glad for the gentleman's assurance. I feel that removes the danger of the Selective Service going over the head of the Procurement and Assignment Service to get nurses whom the doctors and nurses feel are essential here, unless the individual in question appeals.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. It seems to me more than passing strange that we should apply this innovation in our law of drafting women and not give them the same rights that men have to appeal through the same machinery that is set up for the benefit of draftees who are about to be taken into the Army.

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. JENNINGS. This amendment puts them on an equality with men.

Mr. JUDD. More than an equality.

Mr. JENNINGS. They ought to have more. They have all the rights that men have and one more, that is, to be protected.

Mr. JUDD. It is more than an equality in this sense: that men draftees are passed upon by only one agency, a selective service board, while the nurses are to be passed upon by two agencies, first, the Nursing Division of the Procurement and Assignment Service, and, second, a selective-service board. This amendment properly gives the right to appeal from the decisions of both of these agencies, instead of just from one.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio: On page 2, line 17, after the period, insert "In the selection, induction, voluntary recruitment, and commissioning of nurses by the land and naval forces there shall be no discrimination by reason of race, creed, or color."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply strengthens this bill as far as any discrimination is concerned for any reason of race, creed, or color. I feel certain that if any argument is made against this amendment it will be on the ground the bill covers all classes, races, creeds, and groups alike. However, in actuality we have here in America approximately 9,000 Negro nurses—accredited, registered nurses who are graduates of training schools or colleges or universities—who meet exactly the same standards as to qualification as are required of white nurses. While there has been no complete discrimination, the fact remains that in the armed forces today only a very few Negro nurses have been accepted and used.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think it is only fair that the House should know that until sometime in December the ratio of white nurses to Negro nurses was somewhat according to the number of Negro troops. That has been waived, and now that method of apportionment is not being used any more. I think that accounts for the small number actually in service.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution. But by my arithmetic the ratio just does not work out that way. According to the mathematics that I was taught in school, the number of Negro nurses accepted in the armed forces is in no way comparable in ratio to the number of white

nurses or nothing near as heavy in proportion as the number of Negro men serving in the armed forces.

Mrs. BOLTON. It is in ratio of numbers.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is not, either in ratio or in percentage. These Negro nurses are just as loyal and patriotic as any white nurse dares to be. I have letters from many Negro nurses in my district and State, college graduates who are desirous of serving their country and their fellowmen in this hour of crisis. Yet they are not permitted to do so for one reason or another. Their applications have been on file for a long time. This amendment will simply speak the desire of Congress and write into law the provision that there must be no discrimination against those women. As a matter of fact, I am told by those who should know that many colored nurses are every bit as well suited for military service as are white nurses. I know some people may argue against the greater use of colored nurses in the armed forces, but I can see no reason why these loyal, capable, and especially trained citizens of the United States who want to perform their duty to their country and to give of their ability and skill to the wounded and suffering fighting men of this war, should not be permitted to do so.

Mr. BENDER. I commend the gentleman from Ohio for his excellent statement.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. May I inquire of the gentleman from Ohio if he does not understand there is already a provision in the original Selective Training and Service Act which covers the very question covered in the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, yes.

Mr. MAY. And it is proposed to put this in as title 2 of that act.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Oh, yes; I understand fully that such an amendment is there with all the provisions you have mentioned, and I also understand it has been disregarded to a great extent by the military leaders of this Nation. I would be very happy if the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of this House, having under his authority an investigating committee set up by this body, would see to it that the provision of the law he has mentioned is obeyed. I think it would be very helpful, Mr. Chairman, if you would see to it that the law we have already passed is enforced. Perhaps if it had been, amendments such as this would be unnecessary. I hope this amendment is adopted.

Mr. BROOKS. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to the fact that the bill itself as written permits induction into the nursing service of any qualified nurse. There is no stipulation in the bill which permits discrimination of any kind. In addition to that, I want to read to you a portion of section 4 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. This act writes into the law the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. In addition to this, we have the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that he is going to present this as a part of the original Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended. The provision which I vigorously opposed at this time of this act is as follows; it is section 4 (a):

> *Provided*, That in the selection and training of men under this act, and in the interpretation and execution of the provisions of this act, there shall be no discrimination against anyone on account of race or color.

I do not believe the law could go further than that. The provision is there. To rewrite it is mere duplication. Duplication in the same act, and there certainly is no necessity for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I rise in support of this amendment. I rise in support of it because when we had a similar amendment before this body in connection with the so-called work-or-fight bill I opposed it because there was an order by our Commander in Chief, Executive Order No. 8802, which assumed that in war industries there would be no discrimination, and that order has been obeyed, more or less, in increasing numbers in our war plants. However, as regards the nursing picture in this crisis, it is deplorable. It is absolutely unbelievable that in times like these, when the world is going forward, there are leaders in our American life who are going backward. It is further unbelievable that some of those leaders have become so blindly and unreasonably un-American that they have forced our wounded men to face the tragedy of death rather than allow trained nurses to aid them because those nurses' skins happened to be of a different color. Yet this is the inescapable conclusion forced upon anyone who will objectively consider the facts.

Our Commander in Chief, backed by the Secretaries of War and Navy, told us that we are facing a crisis in the nursing care of members of our armed forces. Steps could be taken immediately by the Secretaries of War and Navy to help solve this problem. Those steps were not taken. It is impossible to estimate how many lives of American men have been jeopardized and, in fact, are being jeopardized now as we deliberate, because of blind, unreasonable un-Americanism.

In World War No. 1 Negro nurses were assigned to the Army Nurse Corps, and the American Red Cross book, written after the war, called The History of American Red Cross Nursing, reads:

> Since white and colored patients were not assigned to separate wards, Negro nurses were assigned to the general wards and they were serious-minded, quiet, and businesslike young women.

On January 18 I wrote Mr. Forrestal and Mr. Stimson and I asked them why Negro nurses were not used. Mr. Forrestal replied on January 26, "They are given consideration."

Mr. Stimson replied on January 29, "The Army is receiving all Negro nurses who qualify physically and professionally." But this is not true. There is not one Negro nurse today in the United States Navy Nursing Corps.

This is not true as regards the Army Nursing Corps. No later than last week the Cleveland Call-Post reports that a Negro nurse who graduated as valedictorian in the Central High School of Cleveland made an application and Maj. Edna B. Groppe of the Army Nurse Corps replied:

> The Surgeon General directs me to inform you that your application is rejected because there are no facilities for colored cadets in the Army hospitals.

I repeat that was just last week.

The number of Negro nurses in the armed service to date is seventy-five one-hundredths of 1 percent. When this limited number is admitted it is admitted without segregation. For instance, in North Carolina at Fort Bragg, Negro nurses are nursing white patients. In Camp Livingston, La., white and Negro nurses are giving nursing care to both Negro and white patients on an integrated basis.

I ask this question: Are the lives of the men of this Nation less important than blind prejudice?

The truth of it is that the American people and the peoples of the world are far ahead of some of its leaders. It is time, therefore, that we reassume the leadership of the kind of a government that will "never perish from the earth," a government of the people—black and white—by the people—Jew and Gentile—and for the people—Protestant and Catholic.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think this amendment does much one way or the other. As the gentleman from Louisiana so well pointed out, in the Selective Training and Service Act we have already the provision that there shall be no discrimination so far as race and color are concerned. The only word that is omitted that the gentleman from Ohio includes in his amendment is the word "creed," and I do not suppose anybody assumes that anyone has been discriminated against because of his creed. In other words, it gets right down to the point of race and color.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If it makes no difference why not adopt it and not waste any more time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The law as it stands is working satisfactorily. I call attention to the fact that according to the testimony before us there are 9,000 Negro nurses. The same qualifications apply alike to white, black, or any other color. Only 2,000 of the 9,000 are eligible under present requirements. A breakdown of the 9,000 colored graduate nurses shows only 2,000 have been eligible for service. According to the testimony before our committee, out of that 2,000, 390 I believe it is—it is three hundred and something—have been commissioned and are being used by the service. If you figure out the number of Negro

nurses that have been commissioned in proportion to the number eligible and compare them to the number of white nurses you will see that they have been taken in just about the same percentage. I roughly estimated that it was about one out of every seven for both white and colored that have been taken; and, therefore, I do not believe that insofar as the Army is concerned, the charge of discrimination because of color is quite fair. When it comes to the Navy it may be. The Navy has not heretofore taken them in; but we have assurance before our committee and it is to be found in the hearings that have been printed assurance by the Navy that hereafter colored nurses will be taken in.

And there is this point to be remembered: It is not at all certain that the Navy is going to get its nurses under this bill, that is under the draft provisions of this bill. The Navy testified before our committee that they needed only about 2,000 nurses, I believe, and most of them had already been provided for, and that just a small increase from now until July 1 would meet all of their needs. They testified that they did not need them. Insofar as the procurement of their nurses is concerned, therefore, it seems to me that you are not going to get much out of adding this amendment. I do think, however, that the facts should be presented to this Committee of the Whole to the effect that insofar as the Army is concerned when one considers the number that have been taken in and commissioned as compared to the total number eligible, there is no great discrimination, if any at all.

According to my figure it is about 1 to 7, both white and colored.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I have been advised by authorities in the Navy Department that their estimate has been changed and that they really need 4,000 instead of 2,000, therefore they have got to get 2,000 more nurses on account of the future operations of the war in the Pacific, for instance.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If that is true they will have to use this act.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. First, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs where he got that information since the hearings have been published that the Navy needs more nurses than they at first thought?

Mr. MAY. I said they needed 2,000 in addition to the ones that they have estimated.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I decline to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PFEIFER. The gentleman recalls the statement made by the gentleman from Louisiana, when he read the amendment to the Selective Service Act to the effect that any men selected under this act shall not be discriminated against because of race or color. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that if an amendment were adopted here in committee calling for induction of male nurses that would leave out female nurses insofar as discrimination is concerned?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, because the gentleman from Kentucky has announced that he proposes after we have perfected this bill, to offer an amendment incorporating this as title II of the Selective Training and Service Act and making all of the provisions of that act applicable to this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was very happy that the gentleman who preceded me brought out the fact so clearly that the testimony before the Military Affairs Committee shows that the Navy has no need for this bill. The complement of Navy nurses has always been up to the Navy requirements. The Navy has always had all the nurses it needed and the Navy will always be able to procure all the nurses it needs under a purely voluntary system.

If, as the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs remarked a moment ago, it now appears the Navy will need 2,000 more nurses, I can assure the gentleman it will get the 2,000 additional nurses through the voluntary system and that it will not have to alter its present requirements as to age, experience, or other qualifications. I may say also that so far as the Navy is concerned even the general draft act would not be needed, because it could get its entire quota of Navy personnel in all branches by the voluntary system.

The testimony of Navy witnesses before the Committee on Military Affairs will disclose that the Navy favors this bill only because the Army needs it. In this connection I may say to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that if the War Department had used the same care, the same skill, and the same foresight that the Navy used in recruiting its nurses it would not be necessary now to bring in a bill of this kind.

I hope that an amendment which will be offered, I understand, by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], providing for an intensive national nurse recruiting campaign, and providing, further, that the actual drafting of nurses shall not commence unless the voluntary system, aided by this campaign, fails to recruit a sufficient number of nurses within a specified time, will be agreed to. I know the Army needs the number of nurses it says it needs. If that amendment is adopted and the nurses of this country are shown the need for immediate voluntary recruitment, I believe we can get all the nurses the Army needs, and that we can get them as fast as the Army can process the applications for enlistment. I hope that amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman know, as a matter of fact, that the National Nurses Association passed a resolution endorsing this bill and requesting its enactment at an early date?

Mr. MOTT. With certain amendments, recommended by the association; yes. And I may say to the gentleman from Kentucky that although it is most unfortunate, largely through the delinquency of the War Department itself, that the bill had to be brought in, nevertheless, in my opinion we must pass the bill and I shall vote for the bill. We must have these nurses, even if we have to draft them, but I would much prefer to vote for the bill with the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON], incorporated in it, because I believe that that amendment will enable us to get these nurses immediately without resorting to the draft.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. Does the gentleman appreciate the fact there are approximately eight and one-half million men in the Army, while there are only about 3,000,000 men in the Navy, and that about 75 percent of the casualties are coming from the Army?

Mr. MOTT. The Navy, of course, is only about one-third as large as the Army; therefore it needs only one-third as many nurses. There is nothing significant in that. The significant fact is that the Navy has always procured its nurse personnel by the voluntary system, and I think that the Army could have done it also, had it not made so many mistakes and miscalculations in calculating its nurse requirements, and if it had pursued a vigorous, consistent voluntary recruitment policy, from the very beginning, as the Navy did. It is because that was not done that we are now confronted with the necessity of drafting women.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in agreement with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. Conceding all that the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee has said, I still believe that the amendment will give emphasis to the fact that the Members of this body, on both sides of the aisle, are determined that we intend to have this bill administered without discrimination as to race, creed, color or national origin, and to bring in all available nursing facilities that we can reasonably get, with justice toward all and malice toward none.

I feel, from some of the studies that I have made, that in actual practice discrimination has been practiced. It should be stopped. I do not believe that we should limit that charge to just color. You have Catholics, Protestants, Mexicans, colored, Jews, gentiles, and so on, down the line. It is about time that we recognize the fact that they are all Americans and the protection of their civil liberties as guaranteed to them under the Constitution will become a thing of fact. It does not make any dif-

ference to the wounded, suffering veteran either on or off the battlefield what creed a nurse belongs to or what color she is, or whether she is Jew or gentile as long as that angel of mercy is administering aid to him in need. The battlefield is a great leveler. One only need talk to those who have been under fire and they will tell you that bigotry passes out as the bullets fly and the bombs fall. As the gentleman from Ohio said, I think that in order to be sure let us adopt his amendment. Certainly the adoption of his amendment will not in any way interfere or in any way take anything from the effectiveness of this bill. It will just make more emphatic the fact that this Congress is truly dedicated to the proposition that the administration of this law and all laws will be such that all people, regardless of race, creed, color, or nationality, shall be treated justly and honestly in the American way.

I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BULWINKLE: Beginning with line 18 on page 2, strike out down through line 3 on page 3; and on page 3, line 4, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; and strike out the sentence beginning in line 19.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I spoke about yesterday. All it does is to take any stigma away from the nurses of the Cadet Nurse Corps. It puts them on an equality with the other registered nurses under the draft provision of the bill.

I call to your attention on page 3 that the last sentence as follows:

This paragraph shall not apply to graduates of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps.

I cannot understand why these women should not be in the same class as other women. It was never the intention of the Congress when the Bolton Act was passed that these women who were to graduate, in this high and great profession should in this emergency be placed upon a different footing from other nurses. That is all there is to it. That is all that is in this amendment that I have offered.

May I ask the chairman of the committee whether or not he will accept this amendment.

Mr. MAY. I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I prefer to leave it to the Committee to determine what they want to do.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Then I ask that the Committee approve the amendment by an overwhelming majority.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr Chairman, I rise in oppositon to the amendment

Mr. Chairman, this matter is not quite as simple as the gentleman from North Carolina would have it appear. If this amendment is adopted, it means simply that the provision requiring the utilization of cadet nurses first will be stricken out.

Before debate on this amendment is over, you no doubt will hear that the young women of the Cadet Nurse Corps were made a promise when they went into the Corps that they had their choice of selecting civilian service or military service. That promise, I am informed, was made by the Public Health Service. If so, it was never authorized by Congress. When we passed the Nurse Cadet bill we enacted the following purpose clause:

To provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes.

Later on in the act we stipulated that before a nurse could be taken into this corps she had to sign an application indicating that in consideration of the benefits of the act, she was available for these services. The application which these nurses have signed contains, among other things, this provision:

In consideration of the training, payments, and other benefits which will be provided me if I am accepted as a member of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps, I agree that, if accepted, I will be available for military or other Federal governmental or essential civilian services for the duration of the present war.

Since the passage of this act 110,000 young women have enlisted in the Cadet Corps. All of their expenses, excepting the few who were already in training, have been paid by the Government, including uniforms and tuition. In addition, cadets receive spending money of from $15 to $30 per month, depending on the period of time they have been in that service.

The nurses who did not enter the corps—that is, the nurses who have financed their own training—received no promise of any kind from anybody. So if this unauthorized and illegal promise that cadets can select their service should be recognized, it means that nurses choosing civilian service would not be referred to the Selective Service for induction.

It means they could go right on with their civilian service although the Government paid their expenses. The other nurses who paid their own way would necessarily be taken first. Therefore, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina should prevail, it means that those nurses who did not enter the corps and who have not the benefit of any promise from anybody, will be referred first to the Selective Service, and they will be the ones who will be taken first.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman surely does not mean to say that the Public Health Service made an illegal promise to any one of them?

Mr. ELSTON. I shall leave it to the Members of the House whether we ever authorized anything of that kind.

Mr. BULWINKLE. May I ask the gentleman if he has read the hearings on this bill before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. ELSTON. I have read the hearings, certainly.

Mr. BULWINKLE. There is not a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce who will not tell you that this bill was passed primarily, and the first bill was introduced, for civilian purposes entirely.

Mr. ELSTON. I also read the act. The act speaks for itself and its terms are very plain. The act provides that cadets, after training, shall be available for the armed forces and the other services mentioned in the act. The armed forces are mentioned first. Certainly, the Cadet Corps was not created for the purpose of supplying civilian needs over military needs. Congress decreed they should be available for military use or civilian use, whichever one might be of greater urgency. This corps was trained for the purpose of meeting just such an emergency as we have today.

Let me say further, the cost to the Government, so far as to the 110,000 who are now in the corps are concerned, will be approximately $132,000,000. Of course, it will amount to more as others come in. Yesterday the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] asked the question whether or not this might discourage women from entering the Cadet Corps. In this connection I am informed that in January there were 2,759 applications filed for admission to the corps. In February there were 8,027 applications, and the proposed admissions for March are only 4,977. This latter figure is the estimated requirement of the civilian hospitals. Therefore, the enlistments in the corps in February were almost twice what the requirements are in the month of March. That indicates very clearly that these young women have not been discouraged because of this provision in the bill.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. Is it not true that although the Government has spent $132,000,000 on the education and training of these young women, except for a tacit moral obligation, there is no compulsion of any kind upon them to render any services back to the Government, notwithstanding that the Government has paid for their education?

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The girl can take her training at the expense of the Government and walk out. She can leave at any time during her course of training and there is nothing that can be done about it. I will say to the Members of the House that if these girls are taken first, this will be less of a draft act than if we are going to let the young women who paid their own expenses be taken first.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON. Members of the Cadet Corps have obligated themselves to serve either in the military services or the civilian service of the Government, or in any civilian hospital. Having taken that obligation, having accepted the benefits, why should they not be drafted first, now that we are in a state of emergency? I say it is less of a draft act if these young ladies are used than if we reach out and take the nurses who got all of their training at their own expense. A nurse who does not go into the corps has to pay anywhere from $175 to $3,000 tuition alone and also has to buy all her own books and pay all her other expenses; she gets no spending money from the Government as cadet nurses do. Therefore, I submit this is not the trivial amendment the gentleman from North Carolina would make it appear.

It is a very important amendment and if we take the present provision out of the bill we will be doing an injustice to every nurse who has taken training at her own expense, certainly no injustice to the cadet nurses.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Does not the gentleman feel that when you single out any single group of eligibles for induction and require that they be first inducted, it will delay the induction of others that are not in a particular group?

Mr. ELSTON. No. On the other hand, I think it would speed it up, because cadet nurses are already registered. You are not picking out a particular class, because they said they would be willing to serve if accepted as cadets; they accepted the benefits with that understanding.

Mr. MAY. I know they said all that, but they are going to have to get 2,000 or 10,000 or 25,000 within that group before they can touch any other nurse.

Mr. ELSTON. If they are graduate cadet nurses registered with a draft board they have to be utilized first. You do not have to take every cadet graduate in the country first.

Mr. JUDD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Is not the primary purpose of this bill to get more nurses?

Mr. ELSTON. Certainly.

Mr. JUDD. Why should we encourage nurses who are already graduates to sit around and wait to be put in later because we must take these other girls first? I want nurses. I want these girls to be taken on the same basis as all graduate nurses in the United States. The main thing is to take care of the wounded and not just to get our money back.

Mr. ELSTON. I do not disagree with the gentleman on that. That is why I am opposing this amendment. Any qualified nurse can enlist, and they are enlisting. They have made a magnificent contribution in this war. But if this amendment is adopted and we do not take the cadet nurses first, the result will be you will take the other nurses first, and every one of these cadet nurses who received the promise, to which I referred, can sit back and watch the other nurses being taken knowing that she cannot be taken at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, this is the most important amendment to the bill. That portion of the bill calling for the drafting of cadet nurses first runs absolutely contrary to my own view of the matter of conscription. During the build-up of our conscription program we started with men from 21 years of age. Later we had to lower the draft age. I opposed that lowering of the draft age until I was convinced we had struck the bottom of the manpower barrel. You are getting the echo back now from death on the battlefields of a number of 18-year-old boys. That echo will be even greater in the matter of the hazards extended to the young womanhood of the country. I cannot, for the life of me, see the logic of turning that barrel upside down and starting in with the 20- and 21-year-old girls first. While we did postpone the drafting of young boys until we had reached the bottom of the barrel, here you have the barrel upside down and start with the young girls first.

In World War No. 1 we did not draft any man under 21. The testimony before our committee is that these nurses are 18 and in some cases 17 years of age when they start their training, which means that there are very few nurse graduates of this cadet-nurse program available at this time who are over the age of 22. Why do you reach down to the 20- and 22-year-old girls to start your conscription for women?

There is another point I would like to call to the attention of the House. I have a niece serving in the European theater of operations with the Red Cross. My niece had to wait until she was 25 before she could enter that service. Do you not think there is some sound reason for the Red Cross adopting a 25-year-old age limit before they will send girls out to the battlefields? If you have smelled powder on the battlefield at all, I think you will agree with me there are many objectionable things in the way of going down to the 20-year-old girls in your first forced service in the Nurse Corps. There are many factors that are sound and there is good logic and sound reasoning for the rule adopted by the Red Cross. There has not been an idea set forth here today to counteract the wisdom of the policy of the Red Cross in restricting service for girls in overseas operations to age 25 and over.

In my opinion, reaching down and forcing girls of the age of 20, 21, and 22 to be the first ones conscripted is the weakest and most unsound and most dangerous policy of the bill we now have under consideration.

I am very strongly in favor of the motion to strike this provision from the bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I merely want to point out that accurate figures show that 80 percent of the members of the Nurse Cadet Corps are below 23 years of age.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. That is right.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. I may say to the gentleman that the Public Health Service reports that there is not a single girl who has graduated from the Nurse Training Corps under the age of 20. Their ages range from 21 to 35.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Has the gentleman examined the record of the 9,000 to become eligible in the next 3 months.

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Will every one be over 21?

Mr. ELSTON. They will be 21 or more after graduation.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. There were some exceptionally brilliant girls who entered the Cadet Corps at age 17.

I am opposed to going down under age 25.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The exact figures from General Parran's office show that of the Nurse Cadet Corp 25 percent are 20 and younger; 43 percent 21 or under; 15 percent 22 or under; 7 percent 23 or under; and from that on the percentage gets very small.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for his figures; they are a real contribution to my remarks and I appreciate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, there are grave doubts in the minds of the Membership of this House as to the necessity for the enactment of this drastic and unprecedented measure which reaches out with the strong arm of the Government and seizes the women and girls of this country for nursing duty in the armed services. Whatever necessity or excuse exists for the drafting of women and girls for nursing duty cannot be charged to the nurses. If the armed forces are now confronted with an emergency, such a situation is wholly chargeable to the policies adopted by the War and Navy Departments and to their refusal to accept the services of thousands of competent nurses who have volunteered for service both in the Army and in the Navy. The applications of trained and experienced nurses have been turned down for no sensible reason whatever.

We are all in favor of furnishing the members of our armed forces who are wounded and who are sick adequate nursing service. And not only the Congress and the public favor this but the nurses of the country wholeheartedly favor such a policy.

The nurses of this Nation have not failed their country in this war.

At this time, by voluntary enlistment, more than 53,000 of the self-sacrificing, heroic women of this great profession

are now in the nursing service of the Army and Navy. Thirty thousand of this number are serving overseas. They are ministering to our wounded in hospitals all over the world; when necessary they attend them when they are flown from across seas to hospitals in this country.

We are not dealing with inanimate objects when we talk of laying the hands of the Government upon the young women of this country.

We have heard with amazement some of the arguments advanced on the floor of this House to the effect that when the Government contributed money for the education of these girls as nurses that the girls thereby, in a measure, became chattels of the Government and no longer had the right of the free choice given them by the statutes and the promises made to them when they were induced to enter the hospitals of the country for training.

Let us turn to the law itself and let us take a look at the facts under which these girls received this training. We are now considering the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE]. This amendment strikes out of the bill the provision in section 2 thereof which provides that all qualified graduates of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps shall be first inducted into the service before any other qualified nurse is required to enter the service under the terms of this proposed law. In other words, this act, as written and reported to this House, discriminates against the young girls who have graduated and who are about to graduate as members of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps, fences them in and marks them for induction through this proposed draft measure before any other nurses in the country can be drafted. This feature of this provision of the law puts the Government in the attitude of asserting a lien against these girls for the small amount that it has contributed toward their education and attempts to make of this act a foreclosure procedure by which it enforces its lien for a recovery of the contribution it has made toward the education of these young nurses.

We now propose by this bill as it is written to place a stigma upon these cadet nurses, these girls who have been educated in the hospitals of this country; and we say to them in effect: "You do not intend to carry out your obligation to the Government; you intend to get your education under false pretenses; and to prevent that sort of thing occurring we intend to make certain that the Government obtains your services. We will put you out in front and induct you into the service before any other nurse is called."

This harsh treatment of these girls is advanced upon the theory that when they entered upon their training and education to qualify themselves as nurses they obligated themselves to enter the armed services of the country. There is absolutely no foundation either in law or fact to support this insistence.

Let us look to the law and the facts under which the Government made a contribution to the cost of educating and training these cadet nurses. By the act of June 15, 1943, Congress provided "for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training." The act provides that the sums appropriated for this purpose should be used for making payments to schools of nursing or other institutions which are in a position to give such training. The statute further provides that no student nurse shall be included under the plan unless in the judgment of the head of the institution undertaking the training of such nurse she would be available for military or other Federal, governmental, or essential civilian services for the duration of the present war and such nurse so states in her application for inclusion under the plan. Pursuant to the terms of this act, Surgeon General Parran of the Federal Public Health Service issued an appeal to the girls and young women of the country to enlist in the nursing profession in which these words were used:

ENLIST TODAY IN A PROUD PROFESSION

The corps requires you to make but one promise: that you will remain in essential nursing—civilian or military—for the duration of the war. The choice is yours.

That the girls educated under the terms of this act did not thereby become members of the armed forces and primarily liable for nurse duty in the armed services, ahead of all other nurses in the country, is established by the fact that those who wish to impose this liability upon them seek to do it under the terms of the present bill. They do this because under the act of June 15, 1943—Public Law 74—these cadet nurses upon their graduation have the right to choose between service in the armed forces and service in civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries. What will be the inevitable effect of pushing these girls out in front and subjecting them to the draft before it applies to any other nurse in the country?

The evidence is overwhelming and undisputed that these girls and their parents will justly resent this treatment. Most of these young women entered training when they were minors, 17 and 18 years of age. They could not legally enter upon this course of training without the consent of their parents. And if this measure is enacted as written, parents will hereafter refuse to permit their daughters under 21 years of age to enter nurses' training schools and thereby subject themselves to induction into the armed services through a draft law.

There are three great hospitals in my home city of Knoxville. The Knoxville General Hospital, owned and operated by the city of Knoxville; Fort Sanders Hospital, owned and operated by public-spirited physicians and surgeons of the city; and St. Mary's Hospital, founded, promoted, and managed by members of the Catholic faith in our city. I have a telegram from Mr. T. H. Haynes, superintendent of Knoxville General Hospital, urgently requesting that section 2B of this measure, the section stricken out by the amendment offered by the distinguished Member from North Carolina, be eliminated from the bill. This telegram reads in part as follows:

KNOXVILLE, TENN., *February 27, 1945.*
Congressman JOHN JENNINGS:

I respectfully but urgently suggest that section 2B and section 5 be taken out of nurses' draft bill so as to eliminate discrimination.

T. H. HAYNES,
Superintendent,
Knoxville General Hospital.

I also have a telegram from Mr. H. L. Maloney of Fort Sanders Hospital Training school, dated March 2, addressed to myself in which he states:

Please oppose preliminary draft of Cadet Nurse Corps graduates. These girls were promised before joining the corps that any draft law affecting them would be the same for all nurses of their age. This legislation if passed will ruin further enrollment of student nurses.

H. L. MALONEY,
Fort Sanders Hospital Training School,
Knoxville, Tenn.

I insert at this time as part of my remarks a telegram dated March 2, 1945, which reads as follows:

Representative JOHN JENNINGS,
House of Representatives:

Please protest preliminary draft of Cadet Nurse Corps graduates because: First, it would seriously affect present enrollment, many students will leave because it is unfair and contrary to their agreement; second, it will slow up future enrollment because even parents will object to students being enrolled under an agreement which is unstable; third, the Bolton Act provides "Your services are pledged to essential nursing, either civilian or military as you choose, for the duration of the war"; fourth, section 5 excludes married cadets. Cadets who did not avail themselves of the privilege of marrying are being discriminated against.

Yours truly,

Sister MARY LEO,
Director, School of Nursing,
St. Marys Hospital.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. I cannot yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAY. I just want to show the gentleman about 25 telegrams I have.

Mr. JENNINGS. These telegrams from the directors of the schools of nursing in Knoxville's three great hospitals together with the thousands of other protests that have come to the Members of the House from the great nursing schools of the hospitals of the country demonstrate the fact that we cannot look forward to the recruiting of any more girls for training as nurses if we pass this kind of a law.

Mr. Chairman, this is a subject of far-reaching importance. It crosses the thresholds of the homes of the country. We are dealing with the daughters of our people. These student nurses who have entered this great humanitarian profession in my section of the country, and I am sure this is true of all other sections, come from the best homes among our people, the homes of the finest citizens in my district and in my State. They entered this great profession to serve not only in the Army and Navy but also in other essential fields where their services are needed. The majority of these cadet nurses have brothers and other relatives in the armed services. They are entitled

to fair treatment and to be put on an equality with every other qualified nurse in the country. And it is my belief that this House will overwhelming support the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina. This bill will pass the House and it will go from here to the Senate. And it is my firm belief that before it ever becomes a law the nurses of this country will volunteer as they have heretofore in such numbers as that there will never be any necessity for putting this measure into effect.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the pending amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Chairman, in supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, I am convinced that it is discrimination to restrict the draft of nurses to members of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps upon graduation in the hope of securing the desired quota before inducting nurses from the profession as a whole.

We are all in agreement that adequate nursing care must be provided for the gallant members of our armed forces.

The members of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps comprise a loyal and patriotic group of young women eager to serve humanity in the best possible manner. They are not seeking exemption from being drafted but are entitled to take their chances as members of the nursing profession in the event that nurses are to be drafted for military service.

It is estimated that 80 percent of the care of patients in the 1,300 hospitals in the United States with nursing schools is provided by student nurses, and these hospitals contain 57 percent of the total number of patients in the 4,000 general hospitals in the United States.

Since the United States Cadet Nurse program was established the number of student nurses has increased 76 percent, and of the 1,300 hospitals with nursing schools, 1,110 of them are participating in the Cadet Nurse Corps program. The marked increase in student enrollment has aided the war effort immeasurably by releasing for war service graduate nurses formerly employed for care of hospital patients.

It is interesting to note that from July 1, 1943, to December 30, 1944, 10,000 cadet nurses were graduated and that approximately 5,000 of these graduates completed their training during the month of September 1944. Between January 1, 1945, and June 30, 1945, it is expected that 6,000 cadet nurses will graduate. From July 1, 1943, to December 30, 1944, 40 percent of cadet nurse graduates had applied for or had been assigned for military service.

At the present time the Cadet Nurse Corps strength is 105,000 and the small ratio of graduates is due to the fact that only a small percentage of the older student nurses in school when the cadet program was established joined the Corps. Then, too, the typical student nurses' school and various State laws require a 3-year course for graduation and the Cadet Nurse Corps has been in operation only 20 months.

The adoption of an amendment specifying that the drafting of nurses must first be confined to graduates of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps before such a provision is made applicable to the nursing profession in general will serve to seriously impair the cadet nurse program with the result that the 1,110 hospitals participating in the program will suffer greatly in their efforts to provide adequate nursing care for over half of the hospital patients in general medical and surgical hospitals in the United States.

We should bear in mind that when the recruiting program for the United States Cadet Nurse Corps was launched applicants were led to believe that upon graduation they had the choice of being available for military or other Federal governmental or essential services for the duration of the present war. The applicant subscribed to the statement, "I agree that, if accepted, I will be available for military or other Federal governmental or essential civilian services for the duration of the present war." On the form the applicant pledges by her signature to remain active in nursing or civilian service if her health permits her to do so, for the duration of the war.

While the applicant at time of enrollment was not asked her choice between military and civilian nursing, applications were accepted from those who upon graduation might be available only for essential civilian nursing in Federal or other hospitals, and the publicity used for recruitment of cadet nurses emphasized that the type of nursing service after graduation was optional and that is the impression that cadet nurses had when they completed their enrollment.

Parents and legal guardians of applicants who had not reached the age of majority under State law had a similar concept when they affixed their signatures to applications, and it is not to be doubted that if they had known that compulsory military duty was possible they would have declined their permission for the enrollment of those applicants under legal age. The result would have been reflected in a sharp decrease in the number enrolled in the Cadet Nurse Corps if the cadet, her parents, or legal guardian understood the applicant was making herself liable for service overseas.

I firmly believe that it is a breach of faith to enact legislation that is nothing short of gross discrimination against the splendid young women in the United States Cadet Nurse Corps. That is exactly what will happen if we restrict the drafting of nurses to the Cadet Nurse Corps before drafting nurses from the profession as a whole.

A recent break-down of the age groups in the Cadet Nurse Corps reveals that 25 percent are not over 20 years of age, 43 percent are under 21 years, and 15 percent in the 22-year age bracket. Thus, 83 percent of the total enrollment does not exceed the age of 22 years, while an additional 10 percent are between 23 and 24 years of age and 7 percent between the ages of 25 and 30 years.

The American Red Cross has a minimum age limit of 25 years for women sent overseas for recreational programs and as entertainers and ambulance drivers.

It is my opinion that it is morally wrong to expect the Cadet Nurse Corps to furnish an overwhelming percentage of the nurses to be drafted for military duty, since it means the sending overseas of a vast number of cadet nurses barely over the teen-age limit and would of necessity force them to undergo the severe hardship of becoming accustomed to nursing battle casualties from front-line duty. Equal distribution of the liability for military duty should be sought by eliminating the proposal to draft cadet nurses before inducting nurses generally.

It is the opinion of many that the shortage of nurses could have been relieved by modifying the War Department requirements for the Army Nurse Corps at the beginning of the war, as it is reported many experienced nurses were rejected who could have been accepted by the waiver of defects not of a serious nature.

The commissioning in the armed forces of experienced male nurses would no doubt have assisted greatly in relieving the shortage of nurses and would have aided greatly in providing adequate nursing care for battle casualties in oversea theaters of operation.

I repeat that the cadet nurse is not lacking in patriotism, but in simple justice to this vast army of loyal and splendid American women they should be expected to answer the summons of the draft on an equal footing with all nurses in view of the fact that when the recruiting program was in effect for the United States Cadet Nurse Corps they were led to believe they had the choice of military of other Federal governmental or essential civilian service for the duration of the war.

I am in receipt of scores of letters from cadet nurses in my congressional district in which they state that they joined the Cadet Nurse Corps with the understanding that they would have the choice upon graduation of applying for military duty or selecting service in a civilian capacity at a Government hospital or in some essential war activity.

Time does not permit the reading of these score of letters from cadet nurses, but I do feel that the following letter from Mr. Robert L. Gill, superintendent, Altoona Hospital, Altoona, Pa., clearly explains the situation with regard to the rank discrimination that will result if cadet nurses are asked to supply the greatest number of the quota for nurses that will be established in the event that legislation is approved drafting nurses for military duty. Superintendent Gill's letter is as follows:

THE ALTOONA HOSPITAL,
Altoona, Pa., March 5, 1945.

The Honorable D. EMMERT BRUMBAUGH,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BRUMBAUGH: I am quite certain that all the members of the United States

Cadet Nurse Corps in our hospital have the impression that they would not be subject to draft if they joined the Cadet Nurse Corps any more than any other woman in the United States.

I also feel quite sure that the cadets in our school believe that they would be permitted to choose between essential civilian and military nursing. They were told this when the corps was started at the hospital. This was the understanding given in meetings with officials of the Cadet Corps.

In a communication dated August 12, 1943, from Thomas Parran, Surgeon General, the last paragraph reads in part as follows:

"In the enclosed memorandum from Mr. James Hamilton the need for your assistance is further explained. In the accompanying material full details are given as to how your participation can be made effective. I am sure I can count on your enthusiastic help."

With this letter from Dr. Parran we received a letter from James A. Hamilton, at that time President of the American Hospital Association, and accompanying material mentioned in Dr. Parran's letter. In this accompanying material, on page 2, is the section "What to tell applicants," from which I quote:

"4. The pledge of the United States cadet nurse is to remain in the type of essential nursing service of her choice for the duration of the war, either civilian or military. They are not required to pledge themselves to military service only."

"5. Nurses will not be drafted unless a national service act is passed affecting all women. Student nurses will not be more vulnerable to such action merely because they are members of the Cadet Nurse Corps."

In view of the official nature of these instructions, we read them to the nurses who were eligible to join the Cadet Corps. As far as I know, these instructions have not been revised.

There are other communications which bear out this information, but I believe the above is sufficient for you to feel sure of the understanding which the cadets have, not only in this school but probably throughout the country.

On a fact sheet published by the Public Health Service, dated October 1, 1943, one paragraph reads:

"In return for advantages received through the corps, cadet nurses promise that, health permitting, they will remain in nursing—either essential civilian or military—for the duration of the war. They are not required to pledge themselves to military service alone."

Another paragraph in the same document reads:

"All graduate nurses will be subject to any subsequent legislation affecting womanpower, whether or not they were members of the United States Cadet Nurse Corps."

We all wish to give everything possible to the boys in the service, as they so richly deserve. We are most anxious that the men in the armed services have the number of nurses they need. Many of our girls have enlisted and we shall do everything to encourage them to join the armed forces.

We do believe, however, that consideration should be given, when it is necessary to change policies, which will allow us to plan as early as possible for civilian needs in a proper manner.

I trust that the above information will help you in your decision on this very vital question.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. GILL,
Superintendent.

In conclusion, I make a fervent appeal for justice and fair treatment for the cadet nurse and urge you to oppose any legislation that specifies they must be drafted first in an effort to obtain a quota before the draft is extended to the nursing profession as a whole.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

Mr. Chairman, there is no disagreement in principle among the Members of this House. None of us likes this kind of legislation. In peacetimes, or even in Wartimes, unless there is presented a very emergent situation like we are in now, this kind of a bill would not survive for 10 minutes. We all want to do what is best to solve the problem.

But we have to be practical about the matter. We do not want to draft anybody, and we want to be sure that we treat those who are called into service with absolute fairness. But there are a few things that I would like to call attention to here if you adopt the pending amendment, which I think you will. The Bolton law is a very fine one and I actively supported it, but it was passed in anticipation of war needs. It was urged to meet the very situation we are now confronted with. We were already in the war at the time of its passage. The situation was then getting more serious every day. Everybody knew we had to have more nurses and were sure to need many more than were available at that time. So at a cost of $132,000,000 we set up this corps, and 110,000 worthy, active, ambitious, patriotic young women, anxious to get a free education and also learn a profession, joined the Nurses Cadet Corps. Out of that 110,000 young women, about 9,000 have thus far graduated and about 2,500 as of today are actually in military service.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Most of those girls are still in training.

Mr. THOMASON. Certainly they are in training, and I am sure many will enter the service when they graduate. I am talking about those who are actually in the military service now. It is right now, today, when we must have more nurses.

Mrs. BOLTON. All right, but you cannot expect student nurses to go into the service, so will the gentleman kindly change his figures?

Mr. THOMASON. I am sticking to the figures that 9,000 have graduated, and out of the total number only 2,500 are thus far in active military service.

Mrs. BOLTON. That is different.

Mr. THOMASON. That is exactly the statement I made, and I will stand by what I said. I tried to illustrate it in perhaps a crude way yesterday that there is probably not a Member of this body who does not have 100 applications for West Point and Annapolis pending at all times.

Thousands of fine young men at West Point and Annapolis are educated and graduated at the expense of the taxpayers of the country. They obligate themselves not to resign from the Army or the Navy for 2 or 4 years. I am not questioning the patriotism or the good motives of these fine young women, but at the same time to say that those healthy, active, and ambitious young nurses who have sought to come under this program that was set up for this specific purpose do not have to render any kind of service in return except that which is voluntary makes the program not quite consistent, I think, with the purposes for which the law was passed. I have an idea they would not object to being called first. They entered the corps with that expectation.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman knows that the language of the law we are discussing states, "To provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries." It was set up for four groups, not just for the military.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman is correct. I actively supported the Bolton bill and I believe in it. Nevertheless, in our present emergency, I see no good reason why these young women should not be called first. Do not forget that under the terms of this bill no nurse under 20 years of age is even considered, and with the 3 years' training she would probably be 23, 24, or 25 years old. That is probably the average age. Most of them are unattached, unmarried, with no small children or other dependents. In most cases she should go before the woman 35 or 40 years old who is perhaps usefully employed in some civilian hospital, or who may be doing essential nursing in a private home or doctor's office. We cannot let sentiment run away with us. I do not want these women placed in a separate group or separate class, but they sought this kind of service and they are being educated at Government expense. I repeat that we are spending $132,000,000 on the program with no obligation upon the part of the beneficiaries. They can quit, resign, seek other employment, or do nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman knows full well that week after week, month after month, there has been a campaign to recruit girls for this purpose.

Mr. THOMASON. I would say the campaign has been quite successful.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman ought not to put it that the girls were seeking it. The Government was seeking the girls.

Mr. THOMASON. The girls wanted the training and counted themselves fortunate to get it. It was an opportunity to get a free education and learn a profession. I contend there was a reciprocal obligation for them to enter the military service if and when needed.

The gentleman does not mean to say there was any coercion in getting them into this service?

Mr. BULWINKLE. No.

Mr. THOMASON. There are 110,000 of those active, healthy young women in the service now. It seems to me that it is a peculiar thing to continue the program which has already cost $132,000,000 if there is no kind of obligation in return.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman's position would certainly be unassailable if the original law had stated that they had any such obligation.

Mr. THOMASON. I grant that there was no compulsion in that law. Nevertheless, the war was on then, and getting worse every day. I think most of the Members of this body must admit that the purpose of that law, its real purpose and intent, was to get some young women trained for perhaps an emergency just like this, but it did provide that they might be used either for military or civilian purposes. The great need now is for the military—succor for our wounded men. We civilians can struggle along some way.

A very small percentage of the women between 30 and 45 years of age can pass the physical examination, especially for overseas service. Thousands in that age bracket are needed in our civilian hospitals and in private homes. These are all young women in perfect health, or they would have never been inducted into the Nurse Corps. They are ambitious and will be trained and efficient by the time they graduate. I dare say most of them want to go into military hospitals, and many would like to go overseas. They will join the 42,000 now in service, most of whom are mature and seasoned women of wide experience. They will be integrated with their seniors just as young soldiers who are placed in outfits with older men. They have few dependents or family ties that would interfere with their service. They have been trained at the taxpayers' expense to meet this very emergency. They have at least a moral obligation, and I am sure they want to do their full duty. It is only right and proper that they should go before older women, many of whom have children and who are not as physically fit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas is ordinarily more complete in his thinking and more logical in his arguments than he was in the speech just concluded. You cannot apply the rule on these cadet nurses that the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Ohio have suggested unless you set up a different principle than Congress has already followed in providing medical education for young men. There is no requirement that the boys who are getting a doctor's education today at the expense of the Government serve even 1 year of internship in a Government hospital. Personally I believed there should have been—but I am not in favor of setting up retroactively a requirement that was not made for cadet doctors.

When the Committee on Military Affairs provided authorization for putting boys into the medical schools, they made no such requirement. The Committee on Military Appropriations finally became a little discouraged with that procedure and provided that no more men would be started in medical courses unless they had already been taking medicine. But the fact remains that hundreds of young men have been given a course in medicine with no requirement that they give any professional service to the Government in return. Therefore, you cannot apply this rule of economy or this rule of obligation, unless you set up a different rule than is now in force so far as men getting a medical education through the Army or Navy is concerned.

And that is the only argument which has been advanced for retaining this nurse cadet provision in the bill. On the contrary, there are three good arguments for taking it out.

In the first place, this provision in the bill is not necessary. As soon as those girls are graduated, they go into the pool of graduate nurses and are registered and are available for selection by the local boards.

In the second place, there is the question of the moral obligation, the good faith on the part of the Government. That is the representation made by the Surgeon General when these cadets were recruited. There is a moral obligation to make good the word, the understood word, of the Surgeon General, that the nurse cadets would have a choice between military or other essential nursing service. Take out this requirement of drafting them first and they remain on a basis of equality, at least, with other nurses.

The third objection to retaining this provision is that it means taking the youngest girls first. And to me that is the most persuasive reason of all. It is the argument that was made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]. We lowered the draft age for boys last of all; shall we begin drafting girls by taking the youngest first? To send to front line duty? I hope not.

I had a letter from the Surgeon General's office on my desk this morning. In it he said that the passage of this bill will tap a pool of 46,000 registered graduate nurses in the country. If that be true, many of them, most of them are older than these girls who are just getting out of this Cadet Nurse Corps.

If in the wisdom of some selective-service board they pick first the graduate cadet nurses in their particular community, all well and good: it will be because the board conversant with the situation confronting the available nurses makes an understanding decision. But let us not tell these boards that they are required to send the youngest girls first. Let us strike this nurse cadet paragraph from the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

By all means this provision relating to graduates of the Cadet Nurse Corps should be stricken from this bill. There are not a great number of these girls who would feel the impact of this amendment, because it is to be expected that those who graduate hereafter will come under the effect of the bill, because of the very fact that they will have freshly graduated into the nursing profession and will not be attached to some essential work.

The use of West Point as an example, I think, is not very good. Certainly there is no analogy. When a boy is appointed to West Point or the Naval Academy he goes there with the definite understanding that he is pledged to the service. But these girls who go to the nursing schools under the Bolton Act, go there for the purpose of being trained at the expense of the Government for any of several various services. There is nothing new about this. All through this war we have been training boys in vocational trades. We have spent not $130,000,000, but many times that amount training our boys, giving them training in mechanics and all of the various trades in order that they might help carry on civilian production. I venture the assertion that had anyone come on this floor and proposed that those boys be lumped together in a special category to be drafted in a block before other boys throughout the country were drafted, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] would have been the first to oppose it.

Mr. THOMASON. They were not entering a profession.

Mr. SPARKMAN. They were trained at Government expense, and entering a trade. I am not going to split hairs over the definition of "trade" and "profession." It does not matter. They are trained at Government expense, and I think by the gentleman's answer he implies that he would not agree to have them put at the head of the list and drafted before other boys in the country are drafted. Yet that is what he proposes to do with these girls who are trained in exactly the same way.

If we want to change the requirements under the Bolton Act, let us amend the Bolton Act. Let us amend it so as to require one of these girls when she goes into training to sign a contract agreeing to go into Government service in the event her services are needed. If you want to go further than that, let us say to all of those who are in training now, "You came in under a contract under which you pledged you would prepare yourself to enter into the armed services or into the Public Health Service or in Veterans' Administration or into essential private nursing. No particular place did you promise you would take. We have decided that is not the proper policy. If you want to continue taking this course you must sign a new contract. If you do not want to sign it, you just drop out." I think that would be fair; I think that would be reasonable; I think it would be in keeping with what we have done in other programs as we have gone along.

Let me tell you what will happen in the event the Bulwinkle amendment is not agreed to. General Hines testified before our committee that he was having a very difficult time getting and keeping nurses in the Veterans' Administration. Remember it is only a short step from treatment of the wounded in Army and Navy hospitals to treatment of the disabled veteran in the Veterans' Administration hospitals. Certainly one is just as necessary as the other. Yet, if you defeat this amendment you are providing that none of these nurses can go into the Veterans' Administration. Of those who have gone heretofore, every one of them must be taken out, because you provide they must be drafted first. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], relating to the Procurement and Assignment Service, left in it the last sentence in section 2, subsection (c), which provides that that provision shall not apply to graduates of the Cadet Nurse Corps.

I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I believe there is a little confusion on the whole matter of the Cadet Nurse Corps which should be cleared up.

Let us go back to the year the bill was proposed. If you will read the testimony before the committee at that time you will find that the Army played a very small part in all the considerations. Several of the witnesses mentioned it at that time but many did not speak of it at all, but emphasis was laid upon the tremendous need of the entire country of nurses for total war. In 1940 the Army had opportunity to open up its nurses "West Point," the Army School of Nursing and refused to do so. I think this fact makes a definite contribution to the present discussion.

It then became necessary to find a way for civilian hospitals to enlarge their student facilities and so to supply additional nurses. It took 2 years to develop a plan which could raise the whole level of nurse procedure and methods of education and sufficiently increase the Nation's student body. It was as a result of that national need that the Congress passed what became Public Law 74. The statute as enacted included no provision for the assignment of students upon graduation. Proposals had been made for a federalized corps as I said a moment ago, the members of which would have been subject to direct Government control, but these were abandoned in the plan of enrollment in the various schools which furnished training. Then, in the hearings before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor an amendment was proposed establishing priorities of availability for military, Veterans' Administration, and essential civilian nursing service in the order named; but that was rejected. The act does provide for a definite preference at one point only where it provides for the compulsory transfer of students to Federal hospitals in the final period of training. Here, however, the compulsion was upon the school, not upon the student.

I have a letter which I wish to read from a cadet nurse:

CADET NURSES' DRAFT

NEW YORK HOSPITAL,
New York City, March 3, 1945.

MY DEAR MRS. BOLTON: In just a few days my class will enter its senior cadet period here at the New York Hospital Cornell University School of Nursing. I am president of our senior class. This letter is a small attempt to carry to you our thoughts on the nurse-draft bill as we understand it, about to appear before the House.

We were the first class to enter training after war was declared. With few exceptions we are composed of girls who would have entered training regardless of the acute world situation. At the end of our first years' training the Cadet Corps was established because "the armed forces required thousands more graduate nurses, and many hospitals had been forced to refuse patients due to insufficient number of nurses."

The girls in our class did not join the corps for either of these reasons, or for the financial benefits to be received, because we had passed this stage as we began to serve as we learned.

We enlisted in the Cadet Corps to assure the Federal Government that we would remain in essential nursing. When we enlisted we asked if our right to decide the branch of essential nursing we would be of the most use and do our best work in would be hindered in any way. We were always told that we signed to remain in essential nursing and this was all that would be expected of us.

Most of us plan to enter the service after we take State board examinations; but we feel that it is not fair to discriminate against cadet nurses for, after all, we signed to remain in essential nursing in good faith with firm intentions of contributing our best to the war effort.

The graduations from the United States Cadet Nurse Corps prior to January 1, 1945, were 10,000. Graduations between January 1 and June 30 of this year will amount to 6,000, a total of 16,000. None of these young women has received more than a part of her training from the Government.

Four thousand failed to meet Army standards, mostly for physical reasons. Four thousand entered military service prior to January 1, 1945, and 1,500 married. That is a total of 9,500.

The net available number of graduates from the United States Cadet Nurse Corps to June 30, 1945, will be 6,500. Many of these young women are volunteering for service. Many more will do so.

It seems to me that we have heard some very moving reasons for not taking this youngest of all of our groups. I wish you all could have been abroad with me, I wish you could have seen the situation into which this would plunge the very youngest, the most inexperienced in nursing and in life. I feel quite certain if you had you would vote in favor of the pending amendment.

I submit Mr. Chairman that the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] should be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, may I say just a word about this amendment in addition to what was said yesterday. These girls were recruited under this little brochure which was put out by the United States Public Health Service portraying what its legal counsel advised the Bolton law we had passed really meant. On the back of this brochure it says:

Enlist today in a proud profession. The Corps requires—

And the word is italicized—

you to make but one promise, that you will remain in essential nursing, civilian or military, for the duration of the war. The choice is yours.

In view of that language, how can it be maintained that these girls are already under obligation to go into military nursing and are slackers if they don't?

I agree thoroughly with what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] said. If the girls should have been required to pledge themselves for military service, then it was the mistake of Congress not to say so plainly in the law. We should not punish the girls for our mistake. They entered in good faith on the assumption that we meant what the law and the brochure said. If we want to modify and amend the Bolton Act so that those who join the corps hereafter or who are now in the corps must take a pledge to go into the military service first of all, otherwise drop out, that is legitimate; but it seems to me for us to change the rules in the middle of the game and make the change retroactive is a plain breach of faith. I do not like a breach of faith, even if it would have some practical advantages, and I like it even less when I believe it will give poorer rather than better results.

That is the second objection I have to section 2 (b) of the bill, and the second reason why I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, namely, that under the bill as it is written it will not get all the nurses we need as quickly as it is said we need them. There will be only 6,500 of these Cadet Corps graduates available, if you take all of them, and the services want 18,000 or 20,000 nurses. Why should we tell all the other nurses who are available, thousands of them in this country, many of whom have even volunteered and have not yet been accepted, that they do not need to hurry, it is to be our plain policy not to take them until all the graduates of the Cadet Nurse Corps who are under their particular Selective Service Board's jurisdiction are taken first?

The main objective of this whole legislation is to get more nurses quickly. And yet here we say to one group, "Wait until we take all in this other group." That, it seems to me, would defeat the very objective that we have in mind.

The third objection to the provision of the bill is that it endangers the whole

future supply of nurses in this country, in my opinion. The students in this corps are doing today about 80 percent of the nursing in the civilian hospitals of the country and if they are discriminated against and many of them withdraw, as they can and have a perfect right to do, it will greatly endanger our work in war industries, in our health agencies, in the civilian hospitals, and in the veterans' hospitals as well as in the military forces.

We can grab this one particular egg of 6,500 nurses but I do not want to risk killing the goose that laid that egg, and which, if we leave it alone, will lay a great many more eggs for the years ahead. Our nursing needs are going to be acute not only this year but next year and during the next 5 years, and we must not, in my judgment, jeopardize the flow of highly qualified and high-grade girls into this nursing corps. A spot check last week in 13 Washington hospitals revealed that 85 percent are intending to apply for military service. Last January a poll of the cadet nurses at the University of Minnesota Hospital, the largest unit in the United States, showed that almost 100 percent intended to go into military service. Thus, we will get all qualified girls anyway, either by volunteering or when they are inducted by their Selective Service boards—inducted just like other graduate nurses and not because they have been cadet nurses.

Thus, I cannot see any real advantages in keeping this provision in the bill. It will not get us as many nurses or as quickly as we need them, and it will not give our men as good nursing service as if these young girls had more experience or at least were taken along with older, more mature nurses. On the other hand I can see some real disadvantages to our essential civilian nursing services, now and in the future. Well, if there are no real advantages, and there are some real disadvantages in retaing section 2 (b) in the bill, then surely common sense dictates that we should strike it out by supporting the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. PFEIFER].

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] striking out that provision demanding immediate service for these graduates in the Cadet Nursing Corps. Please remember that the majority of these young ladies are very immature. Some are still children. They are all active, all want to be loyal. They are undergoing a course of instruction that is far inferior to the graduate nurses of today; in fact, their instructors and instructresses are handicapped due to the war and they are going through an accelerated course, many of them getting out in 2 years or 2½ years on the average. Some will be taken out of their instruction courses within 6 months of graduation, and the Lord knows what is going to happen to these youngsters when they are taken and sent overseas according to this bill.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PFEIFER. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. Yesterday I talked with the supervisor of a very large medical school, and she told me that it would be tragic if this bill passed without this amendment. The average age of the girls is 19 to 20.

Mr. PFEIFER. That is true. Many of them are only 18 to 19. They are still so immature. Something must have happened to our young ladies of today because they are so anxious to serve; to see the girls in high school 15, 16, and 17 years of age speaking of and ready to go into the Nurse Corps. Our men overseas want experienced women. They want women who know how to take care of those where help is necessary. These girls are inexperienced and will be inexperienced for some time to come. They are inexperienced and inferior in the same proportion as we are turning out inferior doctors today. Many of the doctors cannot get internships, and if they do, they are taken out and given service overseas. Their accelerated course at college and lack of training, certainly does not make a good doctor and that comparison holds true as to the cadet nurse.

Let us be serious about this. Every one of the registered nurses I know of is only too anxious to serve if given the proper recognition. I feel if some more power had been given to the Procurement and Assignment Division of the War Manpower Commission, this bill would never have been before the House, for the Army would have had their quota.

I am in favor of incorporating in this bill the selection of male nurses, because there is a field for that particular group. They are highly trained, they are skilled, and why not recognize them as such? I hope the Members of this House will give it deep consideration and thought and adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], also the amendment that will be offered tomorrow to include the male nurses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I know of no particular disposition to rush this matter through, but I have had so many inquiries that I should like to ask if it is the intention of the Committee to finish the bill today.

Mr. MAY. As far as I am concerned, being in charge of the bill, I have concluded that we shall probably not get all of the amendments disposed of by 5 o'clock, and it is my intention to move that the Committee rise at 5 o'clock. I hope to get as many amendments disposed of between now and then as possible.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Is it the gentleman's idea that if a separate vote is demanded on any amendment the vote will go over until tomorrow?

Mr. MAY. Of course, that vote will be taken in the House, after the Committee has completed its consideration of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 2, lines 1 and 5, strike out "registered" in each such line and insert "graduate registered professional"; and on page 4, after line 2, insert "As used in this section, the term 'graduate registered professional nurse' shall be deemed to include the following designations which are in official usage and are protected by law in the various States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia: 'Registered nurse,' 'graduate nurse,' trained nurse,' 'certified nurse,' 'licensed nurse,' and 'professional nurse.' "

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, under the laws of the several States there are different designations of graduate nurses and the nurses who are registered under the laws of the different States are designated by the several terms embraced in this amendment. The only purpose of the amendment is to make it certain that whatever the designation is, whether "registered nurse" or "graduate nurse" or "professional nurse," or whatever it may be, it shall be included in the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 2, line 4, before "school", insert "State accredited."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, this merely means that these nurses must be graduates of some State accredited school. This amendment has been requested not only by the services but by the nurse organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'HARA: On page 2, line 17, after "thereunder", insert "No person who, as a member of any religious organization, association, or sect, has taken a vow or vows, consecrating her life to religious service, shall be classified by any agency as available for induction into the land or naval forces under the provisions of this act."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I am sure I have no objection to this amendment. There is one question I would like to raise as to the proper place for it in the bill. There has been an amendment adopted following the word "thereunder" and I do not know just what shape it will get the bill

into so far as draftsmanship is concerned.

Mr. O'HARA. As the gentleman from Kentucky will appreciate, I had prepared the amendment taking into consideration the language of the bill as it was presented to the House. I think this amendment should be contained in section 2 (a).

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment being adopted at this point with the understanding, of course, that if it is out of place it can be put in the proper place.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOBBS: On page 8, line 14, after the comma, insert "and in each and every case before making any such decision the Procurement and Assignment Service shall ascertain and give full consideration to the number of nurses who were engaged in essential nursing services on September 16, 1940, in the territorial jurisdiction of the local board having jurisdiction of the case under consideration, the number so engaged on the date of the last prior available report thereof (which must be not more than 30 days old), and the number of nurses of the area who have been inducted into the land or naval forces of the United States; so that no such area shall be penalized because of an unusually large number of its nurses who have responded patriotically to the call for volunteers for nursing service in the land or naval forces of the United States."

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is just to make sure that no area under the jurisdiction of the local board will be penalized for the patriotism of its nurses. In other words, this bill covers all nurses in the age limits. In Dallas County, Ala., and there may be dozens of others, though Dallas County leads the Nation, we have a situation where more than half of all the nurses in that county have already volunteered and are already in the land or naval service of our Government in this war. Therefore, when you say that all nurses in that area shall be subject to induction without taking into consideration the number of those nurses who have already volunteered, it simply wipes the slate clean and takes away all of the few remaining nurses now doing double duty to meet civilian necessities. I understand that the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], has in mind to offer an amendment a little later which will take care of such situations. If that be true, and if the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] will accomplish the same purpose this amendment seeks to subserve, then, of course, I have no objection to withdrawing my amendment. But I would like to have an official declaration by the committee.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Alabama that I have already announced a couple of times on the floor, I believe, that at the appropriate time and place in the consideration of this bill and after I have completed my amendment, I will offer an amendment, as an amendment or in the form of a substitute, as the parliamentary situation may require, which will put this legislation into the Selective Service Act as title 2 of that law, which as I understand takes care of the question of quotas. That will be done.

Mr. HOBBS. The opinion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs is that that will cover the ground and cause Procurement and Assignment Service and the Local Selective Service Board to take into account, in ordering the induction of nurses, the number of nurses who have already volunteered and are in the military or naval service of our country?

Mr. MAY. Yes; that is the situation exactly.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOBBS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. It seems to me if we rely on this being put in as title II of the act, that we may lay this open to the same condition which now pertains, namely that it is a question of quotas by local boards, assigned to it by some State headquarters or some Federal headquarters to a State, and so many for each local board. I would believe that the gentleman's amendment is good at this point, and in order to obviate exactly the thing he is talking about it should be agreed to.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman for that contribution, but in accordance with the assurance given by the chairman that this identical amendment would be covered by one he proposes to offer, and the further knowledge that my amendment is in line with the general practice under the Selective Training and Service Act, I have no desire to press the point, knowing full well that if it should be construed otherwise later, we will have the support of you and other members of the Committee on Military Affairs as well as the chairman in making the meaning of the law clear, that no such inequity and unjust discrimination against any patriotically cooperaitve area is to be practiced or tolerated.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. In view of the fact that the Selective Service System is known to have issued rules and regulations pursuant to an agreement in the course of debate on the floor of one of these two bodies, it is quite possible that the Selective Service System may recognize that the House has agreed to the position of the gentleman from Alabama, but I am sure that the present regulation under title I, or what will be title I, will not be adequate for the gentleman's purpose.

Mr. HOBBS. As I understand, this bill is to become title II of the Selective Training and Service Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so happy to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. MAY. On page 4 of the bill it provides for regulations and reads:

Such regulations may provide for the classification, selection for induction, and induction of females pursuant to this act under procedures and quotas different from those governing men.

At that point I expect to offer this amendment:

But the quotas shall be determined in a manner similar to that covering the determination of quotas for men, and in filling such quotas there shall be allowed credits similar to those governing the fixing and filling of quotas for men.

When that provision is adopted it will certainly take care of the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman. May I request further the gentleman's statement with regard to the Procurement and Assignment Service? Is not the purpose of that Service primarily to do this job in accordance with the manifest intent and purpose of my amendment?

Mr. MAY. My understanding is that that is the way it is done by the Procurement and Assignment Service, based on quotas, and that they take all those considerations into account when they make them available to the Selective Service System.

Mr. HOBBS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I yield, gladly, to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. On page A963 of the Appendix of the RECORD you can find this information in regard to quotas for the entire United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am so glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Then I understand the gentleman's amendment proposes that the quota of nurses in the community on a certain date be retained so that there will not be an excess as between different communities?

Mr. HOBBS. Not exactly. I merely ask that on any given date the Procurement and Assignment Service be directed to ascertain what the facts are and then to give them consideration before they induct any additional nurse from the

area as to which the facts have been ascertained and fully considered.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Would that be equitable in all parts of the United States?

Mr. HOBBS. I believe it would be, sir; absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, under the assurance that has been given, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to section 2? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Any registrant under this act inducted into the land or naval forces shall be assigned only to duty in which her professional nursing skills and training will be used in accordance with military requirements. No registrant under this act shall be considered disqualified for nursing service in the land or naval forces merely because the school of nursing in which she received her training was affiliated with a hospital not having a specified minimum number of beds or patients.

SEC. 4. The President is hereby authorized and directed to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. Such regulations may provide for the classification, selection for induction, and induction of females pursuant to this act under procedures and quotas different from those governing men. The provisions of section 10 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, are hereby made applicable to the power of the President under this section. For the purposes of section 11 of such act, regulations issued under this section shall be deemed to have been issued under such act.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to section 4.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 4, line 17, before the period insert ", but the quotas shall be determined in a manner similar to that governing determination of the quotas for men, and in fixing and filling such quotas there shall be allowed credits similar to those governing the fixing and filling of the quotas for men."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAY. I yield; yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What will be the effect of the language the gentleman suggests in this amendment in counties that have a very small number of nurses? I refer particularly to the language that states that the boards shall follow the methods used in selecting men. It presents to my mind the fact that some counties, especially those with no hospitals, may have a very small number of nurses, possibly only one or two. If they have any quota at all it might take the only nurses they have.

Mr. MAY. No; the quotas established for men under the Selective Training and Service Act were based on the number of registrants available in the various communities. In some communities of course where the population was dense more were taken and where it was sparse fewer were taken. This will apply to nurses in the same way. If there were a nurse population in the community of 15, their pro rata number would probably be 5.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it the population of the community or the population of nurses that is used as a base?

Mr. MAY. The population of nurses available for induction.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Even so in counties or communities having very few nurses it might take the only nurses they have.

Mr. KILDAY rose.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. Under the existing law the quotas are based on those registered and not deferred. If you are going to fix your quotas on the basis of nurses that you have under the Selective Training and Service Act it will be based entirely on those registered with the local board and not deferred.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think possibly the point the gentleman brings up on deferment will take care of the situation.

Mr. MAY. That is the way I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DURHAM) there were—ayes 123, noes 3.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. This act shall apply to unmarried women only but shall not affect the voluntary recruitment of any qualified women for the Army Nurse Corps, the Navy Nurse Corps, or the Nurse Corps of Naval Reserve, or the appointment of members of such corps as commissioned officers as now provided by law.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. BOLTON: On page 4, beginning in line 23, strike out "shall apply to unmarried women only but."

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, my proposal is that this act shall apply to married women as well as unmarried women. The married women who would be included would be those not deferred under the Selective Service Act because under section 5 (e) there is very ample recognition of dependence and home responsibilities.

The last thing in the world the Army wants to do or that any of us who are so reluctantly accepting the possibility of the need for a draft bill wants to do is interfere with woman's first responsibility, which is definitely her home, but homes today are subject to the war. In many instances married women are living alone, they are nursing here and there, perhaps they have put their children, if they have them, under the care of mothers and fathers, and they are going to be just as carefully screened as it is humanly possible to screen them.

We recognize that there is a great deal of mail coming back from overseas. The men are writing to their wives and sweethearts, "Do not join up. We do not want you to come over. We married you to have a home. That is what we are fighting for."

That is such a human reaction that one has intense sympathy with it, but war is not a human thing; it is truly inhuman. There are a great many women who are married whose one longing is to get into it too. They want to do their bit beside their men, knowing that out of it is going to come a wholly new companionship and understanding, for each will speak the other's language. That language will be the language of tomorrow's world.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The bill as written now would not prevent the voluntary enrollment of married women as nurses?

Mrs. BOLTON. No, it would not prevent the voluntary enrollment of married nurses, but it might suggest marriage as a means of avoiding induction. It would not seem wise to open that up as a method of deferment.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does the gentlewoman not believe that that might be corrected by a simple amendment putting in the date on which they could be inducted?

Mrs. BOLTON. I think that is a very complicated thing to do.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am just fearful that the draft boards will do what they have done with the farmers and take them regardless of replacement or their necessary essential occupations.

Mrs. BOLTON. I recognize the dangers very well, but I do believe that we are not justified in taking only unmarried women. I think the scope of the bill should be broadened to include all nurses within the age bracket.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I am one of those who has been concerned with what might be the effect if married women are subjected to the provisions of this bill. Would the gentlewoman point out to us specifically the protection that would be left in the bill, if her amendment prevails, to reach those cases of married women who have dependency responsibilities or family responsibilities who should be deferred?

Mrs. BOLTON. To answer the gentleman's question: Of course, in the bill as written it is subject to the Selective Service Act. Under section 5 (e) are the provisions to protect the home. I know that selective-service groups are working very earnestly, determined that adequate protection shall be given.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentlewoman from Ohio has, as we all know, been very studious and diligent in her investigation of this whole matter. Is it her opinion that if her amendment prevails, the provisions of the Selective Service Act generally apropos of deferments are sufficient to reach this particular type of selective-service action which undertakes to bring to the armed services the women who are registered nurses and for the first time proceeds to draft people by classification or skill?

Mrs. BOLTON. May I say to the gentleman that I cannot guarantee that, but the extent of the study I have been able to make of it and the talks that I have had in relation to it inclines me to say, yes; I think the protection is there.

Mr. HALLECK. One further question. In line with what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] has inquired about, he inquired as to whether it might not be possible to fix the date at which time a woman, to be deferred, must be married. Would it not be a perfectly simple matter to write such language into the bill and thereby reach those cases where it is said that registered nurses now unmarried may become married for possibly the only purpose of avoiding induction under this bill?

Mrs. BOLTON. Does the gentleman mean that that would exclude all other married women?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; it would exclude women who are married today and who would be married, say, up to the effective date of the act.

Mrs. BOLTON. That is just exactly what I feel is unfortunate, because there is a wealth of good nursing material that wants to go in and which should go in and should be taken in under a draft law if we have one, who would be exempted under that suggested specification as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman be allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, as I understand the situation which presently exists, a married woman who can meet the qualifications can now enlist in the Army or the Navy Nursing Corps.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes; she may volunteer.

Mr. HALLECK. So that the thing we are dealing with here and now is induction rather than voluntary enlistment?

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I have an amendment which would be in order if the gentlewoman's amendment fails, fixing the effective date when unmarried women who subsequently marry can be inducted.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I am opposed to this bill. May I ask the gentlewoman this question? I have noticed in the hearings and in the RECORD yesterday and in the proceedings today that several times the gentlewoman has spoken as if she were reluctant to accept the idea that this draft is necessary. Is that right? If the gentlewoman does not mind answering, does she really think this is necessary, or can we get the required number of nurses by voluntary enlistment?

Mrs. BOLTON. May I answer the gentlewoman in this way: I understand we may have an amendment before us which would make the draft effective only if and when voluntary enlistment does not provide the required number of nurses. I think there is no one in the House as reluctant as I to draft the nurses, who have been so magnificent in their response; but our boys are dying overseas.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Is there a doubt in the gentlewoman's mind that they have given women an adequate chance to get in by voluntary methods?

Mrs. BOLTON. The difficulty is, as others have said, that had we done this and that and the other we would have had enough nurses: Had the War Department never said last year that it did not need more than 40,000 nurses, and had the administration never led us to believe that peace was practically here, we would have had the nurses. But that is all water over the dam. We are in a situation where we do not have the nurses and we must have them.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentlewoman knows they will never make a serious attempt as long as they think they can get conscription and use force.

Mrs. BOLTON. A serious attempt is being made at this moment, one that will bring all possible information to all who need it and which should apply the peculiarly American method of social pressure. I refer to the campaign formally launched on Monday of this week which began on the air several weeks ago.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KILDAY as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mrs. BOLTON: On page 4, lines 23 and 24, strike out the words "shall apply to unmarried women only" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "(other than the provisions requiring registration) shall not apply to married women."

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to make the provisions for registration apply to married women as well as unmarried women, but prevent their induction at this time. In other words, we would provide the armed services and the other associations interested with a complete inventory of the nursing profession in the United States, married as well as unmarried, but would not at this time permit the induction of married women.

It is true that this bill carries into the provisions affecting nurses the provisions for deferment, and so forth, of the Selective Service Act, but we have had very unfortunate experiences with the Selective Service System, especially when under the control of the War Manpower Commission, which will have certain controls under this act. Our experience has been such that I do not believe we should rely upon them to enforce those deferments as we intend them to be and as we hope they will be enforced.

The gentleman from Indiana has mentioned our experience with them in connection with the Tydings amendment as to farmers. We also had the same and even a sadder experience, I think, with them in connection with granting deferments to men with families. I say we have not yet reached the condition that we should be disrupting families in the Nation. When you consider the alarming rate at which juvenile delinquency is increasing, in spite of all the efforts to control it, I say at this time we should not place it in the power of any administrative bureau to further disrupt family life in the United States.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield briefly.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. May I ask the gentleman if I understand correctly that his amendment seeks to make it mandatory that all women within these ages shall also register?

Mr. KILDAY. All qualified women or nurses.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. All qualified women should register?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is, married or single?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. But that only the unmarried women would be obligated under the provision of the law?

Mr. KILDAY. That is correct. In other words, if our experience shows that we cannot get an adequate nursing force, then all the information is available, the registrations are there, and it is a simple proposition to include them under the provisions of the law.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Does not the gentleman believe, even though we leave it as in the bill today, that only unmarried women are taken, that we should fix the date of enactment of this act as the date on which they must be unmarried?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not remember the position that the gentleman took in 1940 when we were working on the Selective Service Act, but the gentleman will recall at that time, even though it was especially true in time of emergency, a majority of the committee, and I think of the House, refused to include such a provision relating to men. I do not know why such a provision should be incorporated into this act at the present time. I think that the number of professional women who would marry for the purpose of avoiding service under this act would be negligible. But I do know some old boys down in Texas to whom you had better not say you are going to draft their wives. I know some down there who will take pretty quick personal action against a local board who sends out word that there is any

intention on their part of drafting the wife out of the home until such time as we find ourselves to be in that dire necessity. I think this is a mighty poor position for us to take—that we are going to draft the wives of soldiers who are at the front and for the soldier to come back from the war and find that his wife has been sent to the opposite end of the world for military service. At this time our situation is not so stringent as to demand this action.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. Does not the gentleman believe that the married women without children should be included in this induction?

Mr. KILDAY. No, I can not agree that married women without children should be. I think at this time we do not need to go any farther than the unmarried women. Many of these women without children are wives of soldiers who are serving at the various war fronts. Those soldiers are hoping to come home and find their wives. I think when they come back home they should not be confronted with a situation brought about by the action of Congress by which the Congress has sent their wives to another theater of operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas be given 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the gentleman have any objection to an amendment which would put in a date so as to not make it possible for someone to marry after that date and thereby avoid coming under the provisions of the law?

Mr. KILDAY. I discussed that in response to a question by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]. It was not done with the Selective Service Act generally, even though it was at that time proposed. I do not think you are going to face any great deluge of these professional women rushing to the altar in order to avoid service under this act.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I would like to say something that is not generally known. The gentleman is speaking of breaking up families. I agree with you, they should not be broken up. As a returned veteran, I would like to say there is a rule in the Army that a woman is not allowed to be in the same area where her husband is. So if you are going to draft these married women, we had better look into that rule that is quietly in effect, that if you are married, you are kept out of any combat area, but if you are single you can go into that same area with the same qualifications.

Mr. KILDAY. Which might result in a returned veteran finding his wife in the opposite theater.

Mr. FULTON. She might be in the Pacific theater while he is in the European theater. I have been trying to say that these people want to go over and join their husbands and work in the same combat area. I ask the Army—"Why not, if they have qualifications?"

Mr. KILDAY. May I say to the gentleman that under my amendment, that class could still volunteer.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does not the amendment more or less penalize those who may now be unmarried? If they get married, would it not be implied that they are getting married in order to avoid service in the nursing profession?

Mr. KILDAY. No; I do not believe that at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has again expired.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I simply wanted to say to the gentleman from Texas that I am heartily in agreement with him on this amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. I am glad to hear that. It is the first time in 6 years that we have agreed.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think we have been in agreement on other things, but I hope the House will adopt this amendment. I think it would be disastrous to the legislation if you strike out the clause in the bill or do not adopt the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. I know of many organizations of highest repute who will oppose this bill if married women are taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have an amendment. I do not know how many other amendments there are. I should like to know before we agree to this.

Mr. MAY. I will modify it to make it 10 minutes after 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close at 10 minutes after 5 o'clock.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, it has been my understanding that the committee was to rise at 5 o'clock. Already there is an amendment and a substitute. The matter is complicated. The question has been raised as to whether or not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas should not have added to it some provision relative to the date upon which it might be effective.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman from Indiana have any suggestion as to how much time we should take on these amendments?

Mr. HALLECK. My understanding was that the committee was to rise at 5 o'clock. It is now 10 minutes until 5 o'clock.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman suggest the length of time for this amendment?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know. It would seem to me that this is an inopportune time to undertake to limit debate.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendment thereto close in 30 minutes. I will make this explanation that I do not expect to insist that they be disposed of this evening.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, there are 3 separate amendments pending.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PACE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2277, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of a speech I made on Sunday which was proclaimed Poland Day by the Governor of Maryland, and also a copy of the Governor's proclamation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I have just received from Judge Vinson, and several other newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein certain telegrams and letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD an article relating to the debt limit. It exceeds the limit established by the Joint Committee on Printing. I have an estimate from the Public Printer to the effect that it will

cost $104. Notwithstanding the cost I ask unanimous consent that it may be extended.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the estimate, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent to the Attorney General of the United States in reference to the Petroleum Administration for War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial with reference to Hon. Fred M. Vinson, a former Member of this House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow I may address the House for 10 minutes after the completion of the legislative business for the day and the other special orders already entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, our newspapers of late have been pouring out a veritable torrent of misrepresentation and abuse about Poland, her past and present history, as well as her government. The great bulk of this detraction and venom has been published by high-priced and supposedly well-informed columnists, although many editorials, too, have been written which are as unfounded and unfair as those which are written by prompted and sadly deficient column scribblers. That those articles are in error could be proved here in countless instances but rarely, if ever, do you see published an admission of error or a correction.

In the interest of fairness, therefore, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement of His Excellency Jan Ciechanowski, the Polish Ambassador, published in the Washington Post of March 5, 1945, and I trust it will be read attentively by Poland's defamers before adverse and unfounded comment is made for American consumption.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may extend his remarks as indicated.

There was no objection.

REPLIES TO MR. LIPPMANN

I have hitherto refrained from reacting to inaccuracies concerning Poland in some of Mr. Walter Lippmann's articles. However, the importance and number of Mr. Lippmann's misstatements concerning my country in his article Poland After Yalta which appeared in your paper on March 1 compel me to ask you in the name of fairness kindly to publish the following facts in rectification of Mr. Lippmann's assertions.

In his Poland After Yalta Mr. Lippmann writes about Poland's eastern territory—"territory which Poland conquered in 1922."

This statement is untrue; Poland came into possession of this territory not in 1922, but on March 18, 1921, by virtue of a freely negotiated peace treaty between Poland, Soviet Russia, and the Ukrainian Soviet Republic, signed at Riga. The official Great Soviet Encyclopedia in its edition of 1940 (after the Ribbentrop-Molotov partition of Poland) states verbatim on pages 247 and 248:

"On March 18, 1921, the peace treaty was signed. * * * The new Polish-Soviet frontier meant for the Poles much worse conditions in comparison to those which the Soviet Government suggested to Poland * * * in April 1920. The frontier determined after the Polish-Soviet War runs 50 to 100 kilometers to the west of the line which was suggested at the beginning of the war. This means that Soviet Russia emerged victorious also from this struggle against the forces of counterrevolution."

Mr. Lippmann continues:

"In 1935 this military dictatorship" (in Poland) "transformed itself into a totalitarian state."

This statement is likewise untrue. In reality the Pilsudski regime functioned from 1926 until 1935 under the Polish Constitution of 1921, which Mr. Lippmann himself called democratic. Twice free elections were held during that period, a fact which obviously disproves the author's accusation regarding the existence of a military dictatorship. During both these elections all political parties, including the Communist Party, and, obviously, the Ukrainian, Jewish, and White Ruthenian minorities, put forward and elected their own candidates to the house and to the senate. In the 1928 elections the parties opposing Pilsudski won a large majority. In 1930 these parties introduced into the house and senate a minority only slightly smaller than the pro-Pilsudski majority.

Contrary to Mr. Lippmann's assertion, even after 1935 Poland never became a totalitarian state. The new constitution of April 23, 1935, in article V, guaranteed to its citizens, "liberty of conscience, speech, and assembly"; in its article VII, stated that "the right of citizens * * * cannot be restricted by origin, religion, sex, or nationality"; in its article VIII, stated that "labor is the basis of the development and power of the republic. The state extends protection over labor and supervises its conditions."

The chief aim of the 1935 constitution, as compared with the one of 1921, was to strengthen the power of the President of the Polish Republic. The corresponding part of the new constitution was patterned upon the American Constitution without, however, extending the powers of the President of Poland as far as those of America's Chief Executive. To quote one basic instance, both the house and the senate had the right to demand "the dismissal of the cabinet or of any of its ministers" (vote of lack of confidence—Articles XXXI and XLVI of the Polish constitution).

Mr. Lippmann further states:

"All political parties were outlawed except one, known as the Camp of National Unity."

This statement is totally untrue. No political party was outlawed and all of them continued to function until the occupation of Polish territory by Germany and Russia in September 1939. Freedom of press likewise was maintained throughout the peace period, each political party freely publishing its daily, weekly, or monthly organs. This fact disproves Mr. Lippmann's gratuitous misstatement that Poland was a totalitarian state. Elections for mayors of cities and all other officeholders of local self-government were freely held both in the period preceding as well as after the enactment of the 1935 constitution. Many townships and communities had mayors and other officers elected on the opposition party tickets. To quote one outstanding instance: In the second largest Polish city of Lodz, the Social Democratic Party, a party strongly opposed to the government, won an overwhelming victory in free elections held in 1938, when Mr. Jan Kwapinski, chairman of the Polish Trade Unions' Federation and now a member of the Polish Government in London, was elected mayor of Lodz.

Mr. Lippmann writes that:

"The present Polish Government in London * * * was not created by free elections."

I must leave it to Mr. Lippmann to devise the means by which a government in exile could be freely elected by the people of a country under enemy domination.

Mr. Lippmann states: "Poland of 1939 with * * * its antagonism to all its neighbors, not only Germany and Russia, but also Lithuania and Czechoslovakia * * * with its totalitarian constitution, etc."

Every word of this statement is untrue. Poland had signed pacts of nonaggression which had not lapsed when she was attacked in 1939, namely, with Russia in 1932 and 1934, and with Germany in 1934. Poland reestablished diplomatic relations with Lithuania in 1938 and remained in friendly relations with Czechoslovakia during the whole time of the independence of both states until the occupation of Czechoslovakia by Germany in 1939.

Mr. Lippmann's assertion that "Poland with its feudal landlordism" * * * is flatly disproved by the irrefutable statistical fact that due to the parcellation of large estates by the Polish Government in the prewar period from 1922 to 1939—five-sixths (over 81 percent) of Poland's farmland consisted of small farms of under 125 acres in size.

J. CIECHANOWSKI,
Ambassador of Poland.

WASHINGTON, *March 2.*

THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SABATH from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report on the bill (H. R. 2023) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 267), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and

the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 45 minutes.

SHALL UNCLE SAM AGAIN BECOME THE FINANCIAL SCAPEGOAT FOR THE WORLD?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, after World War No. 1, Uncle Sam permitted himself to become the financial scapegoat of the world. Is history about to repeat itself? Is Uncle Sam again to become the financial scapegoat of the world—again destined to assume the financial sins of all the peoples of the earth? These questions are troubling me. They are questions that this Congress must face and answer in the days ahead. In the time allotted to me today I propose to review the past—especially the part we played as the financial scapegoat for the world after the last war, to take stock of the present, and to look forward to the future. I do this in the hope that, to some extent at least, I may impress upon the membership of this House the seriousness of the financial problems that confront us, and perhaps warn the Members against the financial dangers that lie ahead.

Mr. Speaker, mass delusions are not rare, but a delusion affecting the mentality of the entire world at one time was unknown until the First World War. That universal delusion affected the financial world. It pertained to the subject of international credits. It was a delusion which caused us to lose, in Government loans to foreign nations, $14,523,593,627.73, and many billions of dollars more in private loans floated through the banks by our former allies, as well as by our former enemies. In addition to this, our South American and Central American neighbors floated other dollar loans which are in default. Altogether it has been estimated that something in the neighborhood of $29,000,000,000 worth of goods and services were exported from the United States to foreign nations in the period from 1917 to 1930. When we ceased to give other nations the credit with which to buy our goods they quit buying the goods. This resulted in a depression greater than any hitherto known in America, and our debtors, with the exception of brave little Finland, proceeded to default on their loans. That was an expensive delusion for us.

The general shape of that world-wide delusion can be indicated by three of its familiar features:

(a) The idea that the cure for debt is more credit.

(b) A social and political doctrine, now widely accepted, based upon the false premise that people are entitled to certain betterments of life and must be permitted to secure them on credit, if they have not the cash to buy them with.

(c) The argument that prosperity is a product of credit; whereas from the beginning of economic thought it has always been supposed that prosperity results from an increase in and an exchange of real wealth.

The idea that the cure for debt is more credit began with the First World War. Without credit that war could not have continued longer than 4 months. With benefit of credit it lasted more than 4 years. Victory followed the credit, but the price was an appalling debt.

In Europe the war debt was both internal and external. In America the war debt was internal only. While engaged in that war we loaned our associates more than $10,000,000,000. We do not know today how many billions of dollars we have given and loaned to our allies during this war, but we do know that the money we have loaned will not be repaid, that it will all be canceled or defaulted, just as the First World War debts were. Europe's method of meeting her debt, both internal and external, was a resort to further credit. She called upon this country for immense sums of private credit, sums which before the war were unimaginable. With one voice the European nations cried out that unless American credit provided them the ways and means to begin moving their burden of debt they would be unable to move it at all. We are hearing the same deafening chorus today.

Mr. Speaker, after the First World War when credit failed, when the United States was unable longer to keep sending its goods and services to foreign countries on credit, the standards of living of those countries fell from the planes on which credit had for awhile sustained them. Political dismay and disruption followed in those countries. Government itself was put in jeopardy because the peoples of these countries had been encouraged by this endless credit doctrine to live beyond their means. Again we hear the governments will be in jeopardy all over the world unless the United States pours more billions into these countries in goods and services, the same to be produced out of the sweat and energy and intelligence of America. We are told that social chaos will be the sure result if we do not extend credit. "How shall the people live as they have learned to live, and as they are entitled to live, without benefit of credit?" Uncle Sam is asked. "They will rise first," Uncle Sam is told. These emotional rhetoricians are careful not to say that what the people will rise against will be the payments of the debts for the goods they will have devoured.

As President Roosevelt said in the 1932 campaign, the credit of a nation is like the credit of a family. When either a nation or a family lives on credit beyond its means, debt overtakes it. If the people tax themselves to pay for it, that means they must lower their living levels. If they repudiate their debt, that is the end of their credit. Now, the President tells us, in the face of the repudiation of the debts due us, we must again extend unlimited credit—which means an unlimited flow of American goods and services to other countries—lest they fall into social chaos and go communistic.

Mr. Speaker, the argument that prosperity is a product of credit is as fallacious as the idea that we can borrow ourselves rich or spend ourselves into prosperity. Credit is a product arising from the increase and exchange of wealth. It is merely a method of facilitating that exchange. Every dollar of credit that has been extended or will be extended to other countries of the world by the United States will be so much goods and services, human energy and national resources, raw materials and finished products, which we shall be denying our own people in order to send them out to the other peoples of the world, and for which we will receive no pay.

The idea that unlimited credit can be extended by the United States to other countries because we in the United States will merely owe the debt to ourselves is at the bottom of this whole fallacious scheme. It is used to rationalize the delusion as a whole. It became unorthodox after the First World War to doubt that by use of credit in progressive quantities to inflate international trade, the problem of international debt would be solved. All debtor nations were going to meet their foreign obligations from favorable balances of trade—but they did not do so.

The same fallacy lies behind the Bretton Woods scheme of today; namely, that all of the countless billions of dollars' worth of goods and services these foreign countries are going to get from us will be paid back in goods—which is the only way they can be paid back. Under such a condition, what would become of the American farmer and American labor? Their American market would be literally flooded—would have to be flooded—with such an avalanche of low-wage, low-living-level labor products from the countries of Europe and the Orient that our whole economy would be swamped.

Mr. Speaker, a favorable balance of trade comes when a nation sells more than it buys. Is it possible for all nations to sell one another more than they buy from one another, so that every nation may have a favorable trade balance? The endless credit boys say, "Certainly." I ask, "How?" The endless credit boys cry, "By selling on credit. By lending one another the credit to buy one another's goods." They tell us that we must lend other nations credit during and after this war so they can buy our goods. After the last war they said all nations would not be able to lend equally, but each should lend according to its means. That meant that Uncle Sam was to be the principal lender—and he was. The Bretton Woods scheme of today is that some old plan all over again.

Following the First World War, the question was often asked: "Where is the profit in trade for the sake of which you must lend your customers the money to buy your goods?" The endless credit boys had an answer ready. It was: "Unless we lend them the money to buy our goods, they cannot buy them. Then what shall we do with our surplus?" When it appeared after the First World War that European nations were using enormous sums of American credit to build industrial plants to compete with our own, the question was asked: "Is this wise?" The answer of the endless credit boys, the international "do-gooders," was: "Of course it is wise. You must

remember that these nations you speak of as competitors are also our debtors. They owe us a great deal of money. Unless we lend them the credit to increase their ability to produce for export, they will never be able to pay us their debts."

That is exactly the refrain we hear again today as Bretton Woods and the international bank scheme are urged upon us. America loaned billions of dollars of American credit to her debtors after the First World War. We even loaned credit to our competitors, who in turn loaned it to their customers. We loaned credit to Germany who loaned credit to Russia for the purpose of enabling Russia to buy German things, including German chemicals. We are now asked to lend $7,000,000,000 to Russia, in addition to lend-lease; $5,000,000,000 to England; $3,000,000,000 to France; $1,000,000,000 to the Netherlands and $6,000,000,000 to our Latin-American neighbors. This adds up to a total of $22,000,000,000, to be used for the purpose of buying products from each other, while they all owe us debts which they can only repay, if at all, by producing a surplus of their commodities for export into the American market in competition with the products of our own farmers and wage earners.

The result after the First World War tells us what the result will be after this war if we follow this fallacious delusion. So much of our goods and services will be flowing out to other countries on credit that we will, in spite of ourselves, exhaust and prostrate our own internal economy, as soon as the false prosperity of an export business done on credit falls to the ground.

Those who plead that we should give some thought to the welfare of America are branded today as "isolationists" and are condemned to the nethermost hell of public scorn because they are sensible enough to want to keep their own country sound. We followed the doctrines of the internationalists after the First World War. What was the result? The result was that something like $29,000,000,000 worth of American credits were defaulted, and the United States went into the worst depression we ever had in our history. Are we to repeat that experience?

Mr. Speaker, international-mindedness today has come to mean thinking not of ourselves first but of the world first; of our responsibilities to other people ahead of our responsibility to our own people. No other nation ever did think that way. Does England think that way today? Where would you find a more complete British Empire nationalist than Winston Churchill? And who blames him for it? Does Russia think that way today? Where would you find a more complete Russian nationalist, or realist, than Joseph Stalin? And who blames him for it? Should not Uncle Sam take a leaf out of Churchill's book or Stalin's book and place the welfare of our people first? Today all of the sharpers, the schemers, the planners, and the dreamers of all the other nations in the world, and of the United States as well, are planning to make Uncle Sam again the financial scapegoat for the world following this war. Is history about to repeat itself?

Now, Mr. Speaker, what of the present? What about the Bretton Woods agreements now before this Congress, which the President requests that we implement by legislation? What about the international T. V. A., suggested by Sir Walter Citrine, especially the financial part Uncle Sam is expected to play in electrifying the world? What about Sir William Beveridge's new plan to guarantee full employment for all, which the President approved when he announced he would guarantee 60,000,000 jobs for Americans, and which Henry Wallace has so enthusiastically and energetically adopted as the program for Uncle Sam? Let us scan these current congressional problems, one by one, to determine, if we can, the social and economic pattern that these well-meaning, idealistic, impractical "do-gooders" are trying to weave for us. If we decide to take the leftist road we should at least do it with our eyes open, realizing what our final destination will be.

THE BRETTON WOODS MONETARY AGREEMENTS

Mr. Speaker, the Bretton Woods plan is described as a program for international financial consultation and cooperation, aiming at stable exchange rates, with orderly adjustment when necessary. It is a program described as making for enduring peace, world-wide economic exchange and full employment everywhere. The Bretton Woods agreements fill 85 printed pages. In a nutshell, however, the Bretton Woods program is a lending program. It calls for an international fund or pool of currencies to be managed by 44 countries, and for an international bank under similar management, but with better lending safeguards. We are told the reason the administration backs this program is that the purchase of American goods, even when paid for with borrowed American dollars, will create jobs. However, we are beginning to ask ourselves the question, Jobs for whom?

Mr. Speaker, reasonably stable exchange rates facilitate foreign trade. But the value of a local currency, since the universal abandonment of the gold standard, can be measured only by its domestic purchasing power. This purchasing power is fundamentally affected by domestic monetary policies, entirely beyond the powers of an international organization, unless such an organization becomes an international government with supreme authority to direct the domestic affairs of every member nation. At present we, the Congress, have before us for consideration a number of bills carrying provisions which would affect the value of our dollar. One would reduce from 40 percent to 25 percent the reserve in gold certificates required to be held by Federal Reserve banks against their deposits and Federal Reserve notes in circulation. Another would authorize an increase in the Federal debt from $260,000,000,000 to $300,000,000,000. A third would authorize banks and other financial institutions to hold Federal securities at par; and a fourth would authorize the Federal Reserve Board to guarantee financial loans made by private institutions. This proposed legislation adds up to a pattern for increased inflation and further devaluation of the dollar. Such a process would affect the exchange rate of our money with every other currency. When we plan such actions, we can expect less prosperous and less well-intentioned countries to carry out currency fluctuations and manipulations that would render our huge contribution to the Bretton Woods monetary fund utterly useless.

What do we get out of the Bretton Woods fund and bank? We agree to put in at the start $6,000,000,000. If the fund and bank use up that money we get $6,000,000,000 of export business. When this is done, we shall have equivalent I O U's of foreign countries. To collect these I O U's two things are necessary.

First. The foreign debtor must be able and willing to pay.

Second. We must be willing to receive payment.

Concerning the foreign debtor's willingness to pay, we have a record of experience, every nation defaulting with the exception of Finland.

And what about our willingness to accept payment? We have all the gold and silver we shall ever need buried in Treasury vaults, so payment can be made only in goods. But we like to make goods for the home market ourselves. If we are not willing to admit foreign goods here in competition with our own goods, then we must face the fact that the new loans and investments we are being urged to make will not be paid.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to try to make jobs at home by huge exports financed by loans we should keep in mind the ultimate cost to us in the event the loans are not repaid. The first cost, of course, is an increased public debt which means still higher taxes. The second cost of financing exports by long-term loans is the depletion of our natural resources. When we export oil from our wells, or copper from our mines, what we have left is a hole in the ground and a foreign I O U, which, judging by past experience, would not be worth the paper upon which it is written. The gentleman from New York, Congressman REED, in describing the Bretton Woods agreements, said:

> Boiled down to the lowest common denominator the Bretton Woods agreements propose the establishment of an international bank, Uncle Sam to furnish most of the money, but the borrowers to control the bank.

Perhaps the key to the Bretton Woods agreements is to be found in the personality and background of the man who was its guiding spirit. The agreements arrived at were for the most part the proposals of Lord Keynes, a British economist. This is the same Lord Keynes who persuaded President Roosevelt early in 1933 to discard his economy program and embark upon the spend and spend and spend program of the New Deal. The Bretton Woods agreements, if accepted by Congress and implemented by law, would start us off on a spending spree to rebuild a war-torn world in the face of our $300,000,000,000 debt. Why

should Uncle Sam follow the lead of Lord Keynes, a discredited English economist, one whom the English themselves refuse to follow?

THE PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL T. V. A.

Mr. Speaker, another titled Englishman, Sir Walter Citrine, in a speech at the recent London World Trade Union Conference, proposed an international T. V. A., which would include a Rhine Valley authority and a Danube Valley authority to develop electric power for European use. As usual, the only point about the whole plan that is clear is that Uncle Sam would be the fellow who would put up all the money. The method by which Uncle Sam would put up the money for these projects is set forth in the London Economist of December 9, 1944, in the following language:

> Who would finance an international T. V. A.? If the proposed international bank of reconstruction and development materializes, its funds might be used either as direct loans to countries planning cooperative development, or as a supplement to private long-term investment in such projects.

One can easily see, therefore, that the Bretton Woods monetary scheme of Lord Keynes and the international T. V. A. scheme of Sir Walter Citrine are very closely related. The President's message to the Congress urging the passage of legislation to implement the Bretton Woods agreements came immediately after Sir Walter's speech at the London Conference. Can it be possible that the proposals of these two titled Englishmen add up to the fact that John Bull again wants Uncle Sam to pull England's financial chestnuts out of the fire, and once again get our fingers burned while doing it?

THE NEW BEVERIDGE PLAN

Mr. Speaker, the idea of "jobs for all" did not originate with President Roosevelt, although he stated in his economic bill of rights that every man had a right to a job. Neither is Senator MURRAY its creator, although in his full employment bill, he proposes that the Government provide jobs if private industry fails to employ everybody. Not even Henry Wallace with his much-advertised prophetic vision can be credited with the full-employment idea although in a speech before the American Statistical Association, he said:

> "Jobs for all" should and will be the economic battle cry of all people of the world for the next 20 years.

Mr. Wallace, however, is the only one of our international "do-gooders" who is honest enough to tell us who originated the administration's plan for the expansion of Government economic activities. Mr. Wallace said:

> Sir William Beveridge has just published a report on Full Employment in a Free Society, which I think transcends in importance his masterpiece on social security 2 years ago.

Wallace then goes on to show that every thought embodied in the President's economic bill of rights, in Senator MURRAY'S full employment bill, and in Mr. Wallace's own Utopian plans for the future of America, are based upon the assertions and assumptions found in Sir William's new book. In this new book Mr. Beveridge is frank enough to call his scheme a revolution. His American imitators are trying to bring about the same revolution in this country. We should be prepared for it, remembering that Mr. Wallace has told us before, "What we are experiencing today is not a war but a revolution." And we must not forget that in his testimony before the Senate committee in connection with his appointment as Secretary of Commerce Mr. Wallace very plainly said he would use the $40,000,000,000 lending powers of the R. F. C. and the other Government loaning agencies to carry out his world-wide utopian plans.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is confronted today with the question: "Shall we accept and approve the dreams, the theories, the plans, and the demands of the Keyneses, the Beveridges, the Wallaces, the Hillmans, the Browders, and the Frankfurters?" Upon the answer we give to that question rests the fate of our American economy, our American Government, and our American liberties. In endeavoring to arrive at a proper answer to that question we must admit at the outset that the people of the United States cannot possibly work hard enough or long enough to support the other peoples of the world, to rebuild all of the war-devastated countries of the world, or to restore all of the destroyed agricultural and manufacturing structures of the world. We can exhaust our resources until we are pauperized without raising the rest of the peoples of the world to appreciably higher levels of living. And, unless we undertake an imperious policy of controlling the economic and the social government of all other countries, we cannot possibly impose upon them our American system of government, our American economy, or our American way of life.

After the First World War, we tried to rebuild the countries and the economies of our allies, and of our enemies, under the fallacious reasoning that they would be grateful and that they would pay their debts to us as soon as they were able to get on their financial feet. That program did not work out. Instead of paying their debts to us, they defaulted, and jeered at us for expecting repayment. Just as we are told now that it is impudent and insolent and unjust and un-Christian and selfish for us to expect any repayment on our vast lend-lease contributions to the rest of the world, so we will be told again, if we continue to pour out credit to the rest of the world, that we are "Uncle Shylock" if we ever expect any repayment.

Mr. Speaker, it is not possible to change or to raise the cultural, living, or governmental levels of other peoples by the simple device of lending them money, or goods, and services. Religious beliefs, age-old traditions, lack of capacity for self-government—all of these considerations enter into the reasons why, regardless of any amount of credit we may extend to the peoples of other nations, we cannot impose upon them or persuade them to adopt our system of government, economy, and society. The so-called credits which we are asked to extend these other countries are the very same kind of goods and services we are extending now. American people are not eating bacon today because we are sending the bacon abroad not only to our armed forces but to the peoples of other countries. Every shortage we have in America today is the result of sending our goods out to other countries as well as to our armed forces. We lend-leased to our allies last year 873,924,576 pounds of American meat. If America is willing to continue to be rationed and to go without and do without, or to go with much less and to do with much less for generations to come, then perhaps we can listen to the Keyneses, the Beveridges, the Wallaces, the Hillmans, and the Browders. If, on the other hand, we do not want holes left in the ground where our minerals and our oil have been taken out and shipped away to be consumed in other countries; if we do not want impoverished soil left from the growing and giving away of crops to other peoples in the world; then we must safeguard ourselves against the theory that upon the United States of America rests the whole responsibility for rehabilitating all of the blasted industrial and agricultural economies of the world; for raising all of the peoples of the world to an American level of wages, working conditions, and living conditions. It doesn't require a prophet to discern that if we accede to these schemes of the Keyneses, the Beveridges, the Wallaces, the Hillmans, and the Browders, our American living levels, our wage levels, our working conditions, will be dragged down much farther than we will be able to lift similar conditions in the other countries of the world.

Mr. Speaker, America has a very proper and a very important place to fill in helping the peoples of the world to help themselves back to normal life and sanity. America has no desire, and has never had any desire, to avoid her full duty in that regard. It is one thing, however, to help an unfortunate neighbor who needs a little of what you have, but it is something else again to help a neighbor, who will not help himself, by giving him all you have.

We are told by these "international do-gooders," these "give-away theorists," that unless we impoverish ourselves and give away our goods and services and energy and resources to all the other peoples of the world, they will become discontented and will hatch another world war which will cost us more than it will cost us to give them now a great portion of what we have. That is a defeatist theory. It is the theory that unless we give away now what we have, somebody will later take it from us. The American people had better keep in mind the fact that if they give it away now it will have been taken from them anyway.

Mr. Speaker, the only kind of an America that can help lead the rest of the world back to sanity and a normal existence is a safe, sound, free, and solvent United States of America. We must see to it that America is kept safe, sound, free, and solvent. As Members of Congress that is our responsibility. We must always keep that responsibility uppermost in our minds. Shall Uncle Sam again become the financial scape-goat for the world?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

LOYALTY TEST

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, recently I have heard the word "treason" bandied upon the floor of this House and in the columns of some of the least responsible newspapers in this Nation.

A recent incident, which I intend to discuss, causes me to recall to the Members of this House some earlier facts which too many of us tend to forget.

On December 11, 1941, a gangster, named Adolf Hitler, came before his Reichstag and read from an American newspaper. This newspaper, Hitler told the Reichstag, revealed a plot by the President of the United States to invade Germany.

Waving the paper, he demanded that the Reichstag declare war against the United States.

War was declared.

The newspaper which Hitler used to bring about his declaration of war was the Chicago Tribune, published by Robert Rutherford McCormick. The McCormick story, most of which was an outright fraud and fake, was published in the Tribune on December 4—3 days before the stab in the back at Pearl Harbor.

Actually, said Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, the so-called secret document which the Tribune used as the basis for its fraudulent story was simply "unfinished studies of our production requirements for national defense in this emergency."

And the Secretary asked the American people: "What do you think of the patriotism of a man or a newspaper that would take those confidential studies and make them public to the enemies of this country?"

But the Chicago Tribune not only publicized and distorted our defense plans. Its action became Hitler's justification for a declaration of war against the United States.

Another Tribune story came on June 7, 1942—6 months after—and I emphasize after—Pearl Harbor. We were at war with Japan.

This time the Tribune published "secret information" about the battle of Midway, declaring that the United States was fully informed in advance of the disposition of the Japanese war fleet.

What purpose could this story serve? It told the Mikado that our intelligence had been able to develop a leak inside the Japanese naval forces. It told the Japanese to change battle plans.

The Union for Democratic Action made a painstaking investigation of the facts in this case. It reported:

> The story purported to come from naval intelligence and was date-lined Washington. Faced with the menace of severe punishment, the Tribune now swallowed its own words and claimed that its miraculously accurate list of Japanese ships was simply a deduction by its correspondent, Stanley Johnston, arrived at in Chicago. It never explained how it was possible to guess names and categories which are so secret that they are not included in Janes' Fighting Ships. Then it insulted its own profession by asserting that such fakery is "common practice, and newspapermen all over the United States follow it."

What do our enemies think of this Chicago publisher?

How do they value his services?

I now quote from the Japanese commentator, Yasua Yamida, who told our troops via the Tokyo radio in 1943:

> There is no doubt that Robert McCormick is an extremely charming character. I think America today needs many more dynamic characters like this Chicago veteran.

Thank God that the great majority of American newspapers are as devoted to the cause of America—to the winning of this war—to the defeat of our enemies—to a devotion to true freedom of press—as any of us in this land. Thank God there are only a few newspaper publishers whose praises are beamed by Tokyo and Berlin to our troops overseas.

That is why when, on February 19, the Chicago Tribune, with its fellow Axis helpers, the New York Daily News and the Washington Times-Herald, published another of its "secret documents" we may be shocked but not surprised. Publication of secret Army regulations relating to handling of personnel whose loyalty is suspected could only have been intended to reveal to internal enemies the methods by which our Army Intelligence Service ferrets out those who are disloyal. It could only have been intended to tell those under suspicion the full story of the manner by which the War Department discovers their anti-war and anti-American activities. It could only have been to arm them so that they could more easily avoid the traps which our intelligence system sets for them.

And, like Hitler, the Tribune cloaked its own treason in a righteous indignation that the Army's procedure might result in the commissioning of Communists. The Tribune, of course, is well aware of how Hitler used the Red scare to spread fear, mistrust, and suspicion. The Tribune editors have read history. They know that it was the flames of the Reichstag fire and the fear of communism which this Hitler-faked "Red plot" created, which burned the Nazi swastika into the heart of Germany and plunged the world into war.

The indefensible disclosure of secret security procedure by Tokyo's Chicago darling has unfortunately been followed on the House floor itself by imputations of treason or near treason to the War Department; and the regulations whose purpose was to make for a more accurate sifting of loyal from disloyal personnel have been represented here and to the country as though their purpose were the opposite, as though the War Department were ordering the elevation of disloyal persons into positions from which they could sabotage the war and undermine the security and liberty of our country.

It is hardly necessary to state on this floor that the War Department, under that great American patriot, the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, and under America's Commander in Chief and greatest world statesman, our President, is not guilty of treason or of anything like or near treason.

It is regrettable that the heat of expressing a point of view in opposition to a War Department directive should have given rise to such language on the floor of this body.

What the War Department actually did was, after long study of relevant legal precedents and theory, and after a tremendous experience in the handling of inductees suspected of disloyalty, to issue on December 30, 1944, the simple clarifying directive:

> The basic consideration is not the propriety of the individual's opinions, but his loyalty to the United States.

That was all, just a plain, clear statement of the fundamental American truth that thought is free in this country.

Implementing this basic consideration, the directive continues:

> Membership in, or strict adherence to the doctrines of, the Communist Party organization is evidence that the individual is subject to influences that may tend to divide his loyalty. However, many good soldiers are subject to conflicting influences. Such influences must be appraised in the light of the individual's entire record. No action will be taken under the reference letter that is predicated on membership in or adherence to the doctrines of the Communist Party unless there is a specific finding that the individual involved has a loyalty to the Communist Party as an organization which overrides his loyalty to the United States. No such finding should be based on the mere fact that the individual's views on various social questions have been the same as the views which the Communist Party may have advanced. Except in clear cases, no action should be taken against persons who are being trained for combat assignments and have demonstrated a high degree of ability to serve the United States in that manner, including a willingness to accept combat duty.

Testifying before the subcommittee of the House Military Affairs Committee, the Honorable John J. McCloy, Assistant Secretary of War, said:

> The Army has not knowingly appointed as officers any individuals who seek the overthrow of the United States Government, or whose disloyalty has been otherwise established, and it does not propose to do so. The Army has not knowingly assigned to any sensitive duty any individual who seeks such objectives, or who is justly suspected for any other reason of any disaffection, and does not propose to do so. The War Department has not issued any instructions under which any such appointment or assignment could be properly made, and does not propose to do so.

Again, he testified:

> The keystone of the entire structure of the Army is loyalty, and its preservation is a matter which must be handled with the greatest care. It must be done with vigilance but if procedures become overzealous and unfair, reactions set in which are detrimental to the Army and to the causes for which our armies take the field. It has been extremely gratifying that, out of the thousands of cases investigated by the Army, only a very small number of persons who have come into the service have been found to be disloyal or have been even suspected of disaffection.

And a third time, he emphasized:

> The basic consideration remained, as before, the individual's loyalty to the United States of America, a loyalty to be measured not in terms of allegiance to any one alien belief, such as communism, but in terms

of all beliefs that might supersede his devotion to America.

The fair and reasonable application of loyalty tests to Army personnel is not just a "matter of justice to the individual," the Secretary continued, but necessary also "to avoid the obvious possibility that action on inconclusive proof might afford a ready means for numerous persons, without just cause, to avoid the hazards of combat service. At a time when the Nation's critical need was for expanding manpower, such an escape corridor was intolerable."

As long as this question has been opened, it should also be understood that the Army confronted some serious legal problems as to whether Communists actually do advocate the violent overthrow of the United States Government.

The Supreme Court of the United States, in Schneiderman against United States (320 U. S. 118 (1943)), testified Mr. McCloy:

Stated that it had never passed on the question of whether the Communist Party advocated the overthrow of our form of government by force.

And he added:

The language of the opinion cast such further doubt upon the administrative finding made by the Attorney General in 1942, * * * as to render it inadvisable thereafter for the Army to rely thereon as a basis for exclusion from military service. Indeed, the Judge Advocate General of the Army in an opinion to the staff, called attention to the dictum in this case and the doubt it cast on the prior ruling.

But—

The Assistant Secretary continued—

beyond any questions of legal theory, a study of the question and our experience convinced me that we were not on sound ground in our investigations when we placed our emphasis solely on Communist affiliation.

With such emphasis, investigations were prone to drift off into questions of alleged attendance, in the years before the man came into the Army, at meetings alleged to have been Communist meetings or at meetings of so-called "Reds," whereas the obvious need was to determine whether the man actually was loyal or disloyal to the United States in the light of all the circumstances which could be adduced.

A man's willingness, and in many cases his eagerness, to train himself for and to engage in hazardous employment in the Army, the testimony of his commanding officer, the judgment of his fellow soldiers after observation and questioning of the man himself all afforded in my judgment more reliable material on the issue of the man's loyalty than the generally doubtful evidence of membership in an organization or attendance at meetings alleged to have been Communist. Long experience in handling cases of this character finally convinced the War Department that mere sympathy with a given ideology or suspected membership in a given organization neither legally nor as a matter of abstract justice furnished sufficient justification for adverse action. It concluded that the only sound, though difficult, solution of this problem was to base action on the attitude and actions of the individual rather than on his alleged connections. For that reason a comprehensive restatement of the Army's basic policy was issued on February 5, 1944, which, without specific reference to any ideology, made unquestioned loyalty to the Government of the United States on the part of the individual the yardstick.

The concluding portions of Secretary McCloy's testimony is worth the serious attention of every Member of this House. He said:

Certainly neither this, nor any antecedent instruction on this subject has resulted in placing any person who, after thorough investigation is proved to be disloyal or disaffected in a sensitive position where he might have access to secret Army equipment or vital Army information. It is worthy of note that the instruction of December 30 has been for nearly 2 months in the hands of a large number of responsible commanders. It is these men who are most alert to detect, and are directly affected by evidences of disloyalty in their commands. Not one of them has reported to the War Department that the instruction is having or will have any tendency to weaken the Army's controls over subversive or disaffected personnel.

Clearly, the War Department is putting first and foremost the individual loyalty, ability, and performance of its personnel and will continue to do so.

Our Army is doing a magnificent job all over the world, and it has America's whole-hearted support.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LECOMPTE (at the request of Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. KELLY of Illinois, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 7, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Wednesday, March 7, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings on Wednesday and Thursday, March 7 and 8, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 173, 1548, 1624, and 2256.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, March 8, 1945, at 10 a. m., at which time hearings will be had on parcel-post rates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

275. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Goshute Indian Reservation was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 776. A bill to authorize the naturalization of Filipinos; without amendment (Rept. No. 252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1104. A bill to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917; without amendment (Rept. No. 253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2346. A bill to provide for the coverage of certain drugs under the Federal narcotic laws; with amendment (Rept. No. 254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McCOWEN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 385. A bill to amend section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1156–1157; 8 U. S. C. 734); without amendment (Rept. No. 255). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 388. A bill to amend section 201 (g) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1138–1139; 8 U. S. C. 601); without amendment (Rept. No. 256). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 434. A bill to provide that nationals of the United States shall not lose their nationality by reason of voting under legal compulsion in a foreign state; without amendment (Rept. No. 257). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 2013. A bill to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended; without amendment (Rept. 259). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 167. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 2023, a bill to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 267). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WEAVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1270. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd; without amendment (Rept. No. 258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 268. A bill for the relief of Filip Nicola Lazarevich; without amendment (Rept. No. 260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 816. A bill for the relief of Morris Burstein

and Jennie Burstein; without amendment (Rept. No. 261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 271. A bill for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas; without amendment (Rept. No. 262). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 840. A bill for the relief of Toby Lena Rosenberg, alias Maria Louisa Nasco, alias Alejandro Nasco Echegaray; without amendment (Rept. No. 263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 846. A bill for the relief of the alien Michael Soldo; with amendment (Rept. No. 264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1402. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 269. A bill for the relief of Charles Molnor; without amendment (Rept. No. 266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 2491. A bill to increase the maximum monthly payment made by States to individuals for old-age assistance which will be matched by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 2492. A bill to permit direct sales of surplus property consisting of vehicles and small machinery to veterans for their use in earning a livelihood, and to give veterans a preference for 10 days in the purchase of such property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 2493. A bill to permit direct sales of surplus property consisting of vehicles and small machinery to farmers for their use in earning a livelihood, and to give farmers a preference for 10 days in the purchase of such property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 2494. A bill authorizing appointments to the United State Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy of sons of members of the land or naval forces of the United States who were killed in action or have died of wounds or injuries received, or disease contracted, in active service during World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2495. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 2496. A bill to prohibit use of the mails or instrumentalities of interstate commerce for the sale or delivery of certain fabrics or materials containing explosive substances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

H. R. 2497. A bill to improve salary and wage administration in the Federal service; to provide pay for overtime and for night and holiday work; to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. NEELY:

H. R. 2498. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to the States for surveying their hospitals and public health centers, and for planning construction of additional facilities, and to authorize grants to assist in such construction; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2499. A bill to permit the admission as nonquota immigrants into the Territory of Alaska of Finnish persons or persons of Finnish descent who have served honorably in the land or naval forces of the United Nations; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 2500. A bill to provide pay for certain enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps, retired after 30 years of service, Active or Fleet Reserve, who have served honorably as commissioned officers during both World War No. 1 and World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 2501. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to continue administration of and ultimately liquidate Federal rural rehabilitation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2502. A bill readjusting the rates of postage on fourth-class mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 2503. A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act so as to require that the origin of vegetable seeds, if known, be stated on the label; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 2504. A bill to discontinue certain reports now required by law; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 2505. A bill to make certain legally adopted children eligible for child's insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2506. A bill to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MANASCO:

H. R. 2507. A bill to authorize relief of the Chief Disbursing Officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2508. A bill to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as result of a fire in the training building at the Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, N. C., on June 3, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States on post-war military policy and Military Establishment and of the National Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to requisition certain material, equipment, and supplies not needed for the war effort for distribution to public bodies; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States urging efforts in behalf of national and international agreements guaranteeing freedom of access to and transportation of news; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EARTHMAN:

H. R. 2509. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Jimmy Martin, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 2510. A bill for the relief of A. F. Fitzpatrick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 2511. A bill for the relief of Patricia M. Kacprzyk and Alex D. Leontire; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 2512. A bill for the relief of Helen Alton; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2513. A bill for the relief of Edwin Alton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2514. A bill for the relief of Chesley Brazil; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2515. A bill for the relief of Harland Bartholomew & Associates, St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 2516. A bill to provide that the name of Fred S. Knisley be added to the emergency officers' retired list of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2517. A bill granting a pension to Charlie Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 2518. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Eastern Contracting Co., a corporation, against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

137. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of Taxpayers' Local Option Committee, protesting the enactment of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

138. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Memorial of the twenty-ninth legislative session of the State of South Dakota not to increase the Federal gasoline tax and Federal lubricating oil tax and to discontinue the same as soon as possible; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

139. Also, memorial of twenty-ninth legislative session of the State of South Dakota, urging consideration and favorable action on House bill 538, empowering the Secretary of Agriculture to requisition certain materials not needed for the prosecution of the war effort; to the Committee on Agriculture.

140. Also, memorial of twenty-ninth legislative session of the State of South Dakota, urging that the post-war military policy and military establishment include the National Guard, Officers Reserve Corps, and the Organized Reserves; to the Select Committee on Post-War Military Policy.

141. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition signed by Mrs. Essie H. Pearce and 27 other representative citizens of Clay City, Ill., and surrounding community, requesting action to prevent the alcoholic beverage industry from directing high-pressure campaigns to increase

its profits at the expense of the home and of the youth, by prohibiting it the use of air, periodicals, newspapers, motion pictures, or any other form of advertising; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

142. By Mr. LANE: Petition of the board of aldermen, city of Chelsea, Mass., adopted at their meeting February 26, 1945, urging that Chelsea Creek, Mass., be changed to Chelsea River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

143. Also, petition of the board of aldermen, city of Chelsea, Mass., in connection with the designation of Brotherhood Week in February 1945, by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, congratulating the President on his timely proclamation, praying for his continued health and strength to carry on his great life, and urging that the spirit of brotherhood should not be for 1 week only but should be for 52 weeks of the year; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

144. By Mr. MUNDT: Memorial of South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to requisition certain material, equipment, and supplies by grant or loan to public bodies the war and for the national defense and to use such material, equipment, and supplies in soil and water conservation work and to distribute such material, equipment, and supplies by grant or loan to public bodies and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

145. Also, memorial of Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America on the post-war military policy and Military Establishment and of the National Guard; to the Select Committee on Post-War Policy.

146. Also, memorial of South Dakota State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America not to increase the Federal gasoline tax and Federal lubricating oil tax and to discontinue the same as soon as possible and refuse to reenact such taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, February 26, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Father of all mankind, whose paths are mercy and truth, before the white splendor of whose purity every vileness must shrink away, lift us above the immediate and set our lives in the wide horizons of abiding verities. Take the mistakes of all our yesterdays, even the sins whose memory shames us, and by the mystery of Thy forgiveness transfigure our failures to love Thee and our fellow man with all our mind and heart into the jeweled mosaic of Thy redeeming grace.

With high resolves and selfless endeavors that take counsel, not of our fears but of our hopes, may we match these epic days with daring deeds that will clear a highway across all the nations for the feet of God. By all the pain and loss of these evil years, bind all peoples in a fellowship of suffering. In a world-wide fraternity of contrition, lead us all to hearty repentance for the sins which have brought this blighting conflict. As servants of the common good, turn our feet diligently to seek the paths of righteousness which alone are the paths of peace. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Tuesday, March 6, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 177. An act for the relief of Oscar Griggs;

S. 211. An act for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 212. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11–12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941; and

S. 215. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 214) to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 205. An act for the relief of Steve Hiass;

H. R. 249. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper;

H. R. 259. An act for the relief of Leo Gottlieb;

H. R. 266. An act for the relief of the Southern Bitumen Co., of Ensley, Ala.;

H. R. 787. An act for the relief of Murray B. Latimer;

H. R. 904. An act for the relief of Fred A. Lower;

H. R. 905. An act for the relief of Paul T. Thompson;

H. R. 945. An act for the relief of Fred Clouse and Mrs. Emily G. Clouse;

H. R. 980. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gladys Stout;

H. R. 981. An act to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising prior to May 27, 1941, out of activities of the War Department or of the Army;

H. R. 987. An act for the relief of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.;

H. R. 990. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost as a result of the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong and Manila;

H. R. 1012. An act for the relief of A. P. Scarborough and J. D. Ethridge;

H. R. 1016. An act for the relief of Capt. Millard L. Treadwell;

H. R. 1069. An act for the relief of Sidney B. Walton;

H. R. 1094. An act for the relief of the Jay Taylor Cattle Co., Amarillo, Tex.;

H. R. 1149. An act for the relief of Dane D. Morgan;

H. R. 1260. An act for the relief of Dr. Walter L. Jackson and City-County Hospital;

H. R. 1307. An act for the relief of Continental Casualty Co., a corporation, and Montgomery City Lines, Inc.;

H. R. 1309. An act to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Va., on September 17, 1943;

H. R. 1344. An act for the relief of George Webb;

H. R. 1347. An act for the relief of Lee Graham;

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of Florence J. Sypert, administratrix of the estate of Leona Connor Childers;

H. R. 1558. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alma Mallette and Ansel Adkins;

H. R. 1567. An act for the relief of Katherine Smith;

H. R. 1598. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie I. Clay;

H. R. 1602. An act for the relief of Robert Lee Slade;

H. R. 1630. An act for the relief of Lubell Bros., Inc.;

H. R. 1669. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Stowell;

H. R. 1707. An act for the relief of Murray W. Moran;

H. R. 1842. An act for the relief of the Mauger Construction Co.;

H. R. 1877. An act for the relief of Maj. William Peyton Tidwell; and

H. R. 2006. An act for the relief of Boyd B. Black.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hart	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hatch	Overton
Bankhead	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hayden	Reed
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Brewster	Hill	Robertson
Bridges	Hoey	Russell
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Burton	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Bushfield	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	McCarran	Taylor
Capehart	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McMahon	Tobey
Cordon	Magnuson	Tunnell
Donnell	Maybank	Vandenberg
Downey	Mead	Wagner
Eastland	Millikin	Walsh
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wherry
Fulbright	Moore	White
George	Morse	Wiley
Gerry	Murdock	Willis
Green	Murray	Wilson
Guffey	Myers	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and

the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a delegate to the Inter-American Conference in Mexico and therefore is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on official business as a delegate to the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR VANDENBERG ON ACCEPTING INVITATION TO BE DELEGATE AT THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the statement I made yesterday accepting the President's designation of me as an American delegate to the San Francisco Conference.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Following an exchange of cordial and satisfactory personal letters with the President, clarifying my right of free action, I am glad to say that I have accepted his invitation to be an American delegate at the San Francisco Conference. I deeply appreciate his high consideration.

I wish to do everything within my power to establish a practical system of collective security as a basis for effective peace. I believe it indispensable in this scarred and foreshortened world. I believe it indispensable in American self-interest. An excellent start has been made.

I am frank to say that my chief anxiety about the tentative Dumbarton Oaks formula is that—except in its brief World Court chapter—it does not once mention justice as a guiding objective or a rule of conduct.

In my opinion, no permanent peace is possible without a constant, conscious mandate to seek and to maintain justice as a basis of peace.

I shall have concrete proposals to submit to my colleagues along these lines. It will be my prayer that the San Francisco Conference may be successful in promoting dependable peace, with organized justice, in a free world of free men. Civilization cannot survive World War No. 3.

PROMPT TERMINATION OF ACTIVITIES OF THE OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION AND EMERGENCY WAR AGENCIES—MEMORIAL OF OREGON LEGISLATURE

Mr. CORDON presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Joint Memorial 4

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas the rules and regulations of O. P. A. are generally in derogation of the natural rights of all residents and citizens and contrary to the American way of life and democratic processes; and

Whereas O. P. A. can only be justified because of the national emergency resulting from the war, making the regulation and control of certain businesses and persons essential to the war effort; and

Whereas regimentation of our citizens and bureaucratic control is too often by incompetents, laws by edict, curbstone trials without jury before individuals given the power of courts by executive decree but wholly unqualified and incompetent as judges, paid high salaries to enforce edicts unfitted to local situations and contrary to economic laws; and

Whereas an alarming number of persons are now upon the Federal pay roll under O. P. A., further depleting the National Treasury, with many of these in high places indicating the selfish desire to have the regimentation of our people and employment of these thousands of bureaucrats continue after the war is over and the emergency ended: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized and requested, and the Forty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon does urgently petition the Congress of the United States, to terminate the activities of the O. P. A. and all other agencies established for the war emergency as soon as is reasonably possible; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon transmit copies of this memorial to the Oregon Senators in Congress, the Honorable GUY CORDON and the Honorable WAYNE L. MORSE, and Representatives in Congress, the Honorable JAMES W. MOTT, the Honorable LOWELL STOCKMAN, the Honorable HOMER D. ANGELL, and the Honorable HARRIS ELLSWORTH.

PEACETIME MILITARY CONSCRIPTION—LETTER AND PETITION FROM KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Dean John Warren Day, of Grace Cathedral, Topeka, Kans., in which he stated 5 reasons why he is opposed to military conscription during peacetime. I also present a petition signed by Betty Stephens and about 50 other Topeka citizens, protesting against the enactment of military conscription legislation.

While I have the floor, Mr. President, I desire to reiterate that I am opposed to the consideration of military conscription for peacetime until after this war is over. After the war is over, and we know what steps are to be taken to promote world peace, and can have a more definite idea of what our defense program will be in the post-war world, it seems to me we can legislate more intelligently.

We have some ten or twelve million men and women in the armed services, most of whom we hope will return to the United States and to civilian life. I believe they should have some say in what kind of a military program the United States will have after World War No. 2.

I send the letter and the petition to the desk and ask that they be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter and petition were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached to the petition, as follows:

GRACE CATHEDRAL,
Topeka, Kans., February 28, 1945.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your letter and for the enclosed copy of S. 101. I was delighted to find that you were one of the sponsors of this F. E. P. C. statute and congratulate you upon your position in regard thereto. I hope the Taft amendment is defeated.

I read, I think in the Capital, that you were not in favor of the enactment of a compulsory military training bill for 18-year-olds while the war is still on. I hope you are receiving much support in regard to this attitude. It seems to me that there are five good reasons that can be used against the enactment of such legislation:

1. Compulsory military training is a symbol of militarism and is no doubt partially responsible for the "modern mass army and total warfare."

2. Conscription in peacetime seems to me to reflect an exaggerated nationalism. The military mind inflates it so that the people accept the economic and social hardships connected with such an institution.

3. When once peacetime conscription is introduced, it becomes a "monster whose appetite is never satisfied." Conscription may begin on the basis of 1 year's training but is easily extended to 2 or 3 years.

4. Such an institution would involve great waste of human resources, delaying men who would naturally go to college or university and in many cases divert them into other channels.

5. Peacetime conscription is based upon a false idea of equality and unconsciously leads to a position in a government which would demand that all citizens serve in the ranks, regardless of their calling and their aptitudes.

I sincerely hope that this peacetime conscription bill proposed for enactment during the war will be defeated.

With warm personal regards and every good wish, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN WARREN DAY.

TOPEKA, KANS., *November 21, 1944.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned voters, petition you as our representative in Congress to oppose the present bill now pending providing for a year's compulsory military training for our youth.

The purpose of this plan, as set forth to the public, is to raise the general level of physical fitness of our young people, such lack of fitness having been brought forth in the high percentage of rejections of young men during physical examinations for duty with the armed services. We feel that the time to accomplish this worthy purpose is not between the proposed young adult years of 18 to 23, but rather during the formative years of childhood.

We believe that this purpose can be better accomplished by improving conditions under

which our children mature, raising the standard of living and providing adequate supervised diets for all children. A rigorous physical training program should be instituted in our schools, which in combination with improved living conditions would be more effective in reaching a higher standard of health among our youth than a military program such as that which is now being proposed to Congress. Of equal importance, it would be keeping faith with our democratic ideals which we are now fighting to save from just such a militaristic influence.

We wish to make it clear that we are not protesting against such organizations as the R. O. T. C., the National Guard, or privately operated military schools, as we are not in any sense of the word pacifists. We believe wholeheartedly in this kind of military training but we feel it can be carried out to a better advantage in the public schools and in home-town organizations rather than by sending our youth to military camps conducted by the Federal Government.

In addition, we feel that said organizations should be enlarged and that our young men receive training from them, such training being locally supervised and locally conducted by the State government, instead of the proposed national regimentation. One suggestion would be to conduct such training along the plan used by the National Guard in peacetime. What we are protesting is a national regimentation of youth in Government military camps. We do not believe in any kind of compulsory military training for girls.

We most earnestly protest against this present military training bill and ask that you make known our opinions and that you vote against this bill.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 691. A bill for the relief of Sidney B. Walton; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 692. A bill to amend section 211 of the Criminal Code, as amended (relating to certain nonmailable matter); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 693. A bill for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 694. A bill for the relief of Dan C. Rodgers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 695. A bill for the relief of Charles P. Leek, John E. Leek, and Cecil G. Leek, trading under the name of Lower Bank Boat Works;

S. 696. A bill for the relief of S. H. Brown and M. Brown, also known as the Universal Steamship Co., a Georgia corporation, to cover the loss of their bark *Brown Brothers*, destroyed by a German raider during the World War;

S. 697. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Charles J. Culligan; and

S. 698. A bill for the relief of Universal Steamship Co. for losses sustained due to the interruption of a voyage of the American schooner *Ninetta M. Porcella*, by reason of a Presidential proclamation, effective September 28, 1917, forbidding sailing vessels from entering the war zone; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 699. A bill granting a pension to Ralph L. Taylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McCARRAN (by request):

S. 700. A bill amending the Judicial Code and authorizing the Supreme Court of the United States to prescribe a uniform rule for admission of attorneys to practice in the courts of the United States, excepting the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 701. A bill to provide a method for the wartime reduction of temporary grades held by general officers of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 702. A bill for the relief of Nettie E. Stone; and

S. 703. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William Trebing; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 704. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to continue administration of and ultimately liquidate Federal rural rehabilitation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 705. A bill providing for the removal of certain restrictions on financial transactions with foreign governments in default on obligations to the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 706. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended, so as to increase the limit of amounts payable thereunder in connection with the funeral and burial of deceased veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 707. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to make such act applicable to officers and employees of national farm-loan associations and production credit associations; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 708. A bill authorizing the State of Alabama to lease or sell and convey all or any part of the Salt Springs land granted to said State by the act of March 2, 1819; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution to facilitate the execution of subsection (d) of section 13 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 205. An act for the relief of Steve Hlass;

H. R. 249. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper;

H. R. 259. An act for the relief of Leo Gottlieb;

H. R. 266. An act for the relief of the Southern Bitumen Co., of Ensley, Ala.;

H. R. 787. An act for the relief of Murray B. Latimer;

H. R. 904. An act for the relief of Fred A. Lower;

H. R. 905. An act for the relief of Paul T. Thompson;

H. R. 945. An act for the relief of Fred Clouse and Mrs. Emily G. Clouse;

H. R. 980. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gladys Stout;

H. R. 981. An act to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property arising prior to May 27, 1941, out of activities of the War Department or of the Army;

H. R. 990. An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost as a result of the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong and Manila;

H. R. 1012. An act for the relief of A. P. Scarborough and J. D. Ethridge;

H. R. 1016. An act for the relief of Capt. Millard L. Treadwell;

H. R. 1069. An act for the relief of Sidney B. Walton;

H. R. 1094. An act for the relief of the Jay Taylor Cattle Co., Amarillo, Tex.;

H. R. 1260. An act for the relief of Dr. Walter L. Jackson and City-County Hospital;

H. R. 1307. An act for the relief of Continental Casualty Co., a corporation, and Montgomery City Lines, Inc.

H. R. 1344. An act for the relief of George Webb;

H. R. 1347. An act for the relief of Lee Graham;

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of Florence J. Sypert, administratrix of the estate of Leona Connor Childers;

H. R. 1558. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alma Mallette and Ansel Adkins;

H. R. 1567. An act for the relief of Katherine Smith;

H. R. 1598. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie I. Clay;

H. R. 1602. An act for the relief of Robert Lee Slade;

H. R. 1630. An act for the relief of Lubell Bros., Inc.;

H. R. 1669. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Stowell;

H. R. 1707. An act for the relief of Murray W. Moran;

H. R. 1842. An act for the relief of the Mauger Construction Co.;

H. R. 1877. An act for the relief of Maj. William Peyton Tidwell; and

H. R. 2006. An act for the relief of Boyd B. Black; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1309. An act to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval air station, Norfolk, Va., on September 17, 1943; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 987. An act for the relief of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.; and

H. R. 1149. An act for the relief of Dane D. Morgan; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES—AMENDMENT

Mr. BALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GEORGE ON FREEDOM OF RELIGION

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Freedom of Religion," delivered by Senator GEORGE on Sunday morning, March 4, 1945, at Station WINX, on the program the Baptist Hour, which appears in the Appendix.]

PUBLIC HEALTH AND THE DOCTORS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Public Health and the Doctors," delivered by him at the New York Times Hall, New York City, on February 7, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT—STATEMENT OF THE NIAGARA FRONTIER

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a joint statement of the Niagara Frontier opposing the proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUFFER LITTLE CHILDREN TO COME UNTO YOU—ADDRESS BY GEORGE E. STRINGFELLOW

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Suffer Little Children To Come Unto You," delivered in West Orange, N. J., on March 6, 1945, by George E. Stringfellow, vice president of Thomas A. Edison, Inc., and member of Salaam Temple's Crippled Children Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

FIRST AMERICAN PATROL TO CROSS THE RHINE—ARTICLE FROM CHARLESTON (S. C.) NEWS AND COURIER

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Captain Youngblood Leads First American Patrol Across Rhine," published in the Charleston (S. C.) News and Courier, of March 5, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

COLUMBIA RIVER AUTHORITY—ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Columbia River Authority," written by Richard L. Neuberger, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE STAR AND THE PEACE—EDITORIAL FROM THE KANSAS CITY STAR

[Mr. BRIGGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Star and the Peace," from the Kansas City Star of March 5, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CARTELS: WHAT SHALL WE DO ABOUT THEM?—ARTICLE BY MILO PERKINS

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Cartels: What Shall We Do About Them?" written by Milo Perkins, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN OPPOSITION TO PRIVATE CARTELS—ARTICLE BY HERBERT B. ELLISTON

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "United States Opposes Private Cartels, Clayton Explains to Latins," written by Herbert B. Elliston and published in the Washington Post of March 7, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

REIMBURSEMENT FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST BECAUSE OF AN EXPLOSION AT THE NAVAL MINE DEFOT, YORKTOWN, VA.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, may a message from the House, setting forth a House amendment to a Senate bill, be laid before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 214) to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943, which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$3,000."

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator offer a brief explanation of what is involved?

Mr. WALSH. The House amendment increased the amount which was originally in the Senate bill from $2,000 to $3,000, to pay various claims as the result of loss of property suffered by persons in the Navy because of a fire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] to the so-called Revercomb substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Bailey amendment to the Revercomb substitute proposes to permit every selective-service board to order any man between 18 and 45 to leave his occupation and accept such employment in war work as the War Manpower Commission may indicate. It would make the Revercomb substitute practically the same as the May bill, and is, in effect, a national service act, except that it does not apply to boys under 18, men over 45, or women.

The question we have to consider is whether the adoption of that principle will increase production or endanger it. The chiefs of the armed forces recommend it. It is opposed, as far as I know, by all those who are actually engaged in the job of production, including employers and employees, all of whom believe it would interfere with production rather than increase it. The question we have to consider is not an emotional question or a patriotic question. It is a hard, practical problem. The Army officers know how to organize an army and they have done a great job in organizing the Army. Now they want to apply their methods to the great production machine at home, in which 125,000,000 people are engaged, instead of 12,000,000. I do not believe any principle of Army organization applies to the organization of that production. Incidentally, Mr. President, the manpower problem with which we are dealing here is only one factor of the great production problem.

In the beginning, the question was one of organization, and undoubtedly there was a waste of time in that organization, because the Government did not get around to a single-headed War Production Board for 2 years after the time it should have been set up. I think the administration and Congress should have set up an efficient form of organization, and we might have had the materials we now have somewhat sooner. But all the talk about the length of time between the beginning of the war and the bringing to bear against Germany and Japan of the full weight of our production has nothing whatever to do with this bill or with the question of manpower.

When the war began, 10,000,000 people were unemployed in this country. Up until last year the War Manpower Commission was telling us that it could get the few additional men who were needed without any compulsory provision. Certainly there is nothing whatever in the argument that we could have had greater production if the pending bill had been on the statute books. Up to this time all production schedules have been met. We had to organize our industries. We had to build a four-ocean Navy, and it takes 2 or 3 years to build such a Navy. We had to design the equipment, much of it never conceived of before the war, or in many cases until part way through the war. Perhaps it could have been done faster, but the length of time taken certainly was not the result of any lack of manpower in the factories. If we could have had three times the manpower we had 2 years ago, we would not have been ready any sooner to meet the Germans or the Japanese.

It is equally irrelevant to talk here about justice to the soldiers. Obviously, opposition to this amendment cannot be based, and is not based, on the part of any Senator, on the ground that it is unjust to some employer or employee. Certainly, if it is just to take a boy out of his home or occupation and send him to die on the field of battle, it is just to take any other man's labor or any woman's labor or all the property of any man or woman. We cannot be completely just, if justice is what we are seeking, unless we do all this and put the whole country on a completely Government-operated basis, giving everyone $50 a month plus expenses. That program, however, would not only change the whole nature of America and abolish, at least temporarily, the freedom for which we are fighting, but it would create a confusion which would certainly interfere with production more than it could possibly assist it. We cannot exaggerate the debt which we owe to the men who are fighting at the front, but we do not pay that debt by installing a system of forced labor in this country. No sacrifice required of labor at home would be full justice to the soldier. The question is not one of justice; it is one of production.

From the beginning of this war we have been faced, as every other nation has been faced, by the labor problem. It is always difficult in time of war and no nation has solved it. I doubt if 100 percent success can be achieved. I have no doubt that this country is capable of greater production than at present. But I am quite convinced that whatever the faults of the voluntary system may be, a compulsory system would produce less rather than more. The testimony of every witness who has been actually engaged in production supports this view. The American Manufacturers Association, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the A. F. of L., and the C. I. O. all express the opinion that the adoption of the May bill would reduce production instead of increasing it. If the bill were successful, it might conceivably increase the amount of manpower by 5 percent, but it would be the poorest type of labor, and certainly more inefficient than voluntary labor. I doubt if it would result in a real increase of more than 3 percent, and nearly all of that can be acquired by voluntary methods. Our experience with Government bureaus leads me to think that men usually would be

sent from jobs they have learned to do all their lives, to something for which they are wholly unqualified. Certainly the Army cannot point to any efficient use of manpower. Case after case has come to my attention of men assigned to one job when they were experts at some other job for which the Army actually was seeking men. With perhaps 2,000,000 men on the fighting front, the Army has over 6,000,000 behind the lines, and I venture to think that these are probably as inefficiently used as any labor in the United States.

On the other hand, if we create dissatisfaction and destroy the morale of workmen and the spirit of voluntary cooperation shown by the labor leaders, it would be very easy indeed to lose 10 or 20 percent from present production. I have talked with employers and they say in effect, "The problem of handling our labor is difficult enough today. Do not send us hundreds of men by compulsion who do not want to work for us. Do not put a lot of troublemakers into my labor force."

The Senator from Maryland asks, "How would we feel if 6 months from now production was down because we failed to give this power to impress labor?" I ask, How would he feel if 6 months from now we had passed the May bill and destroyed the cooperative spirit between employer and employee which now generally exists? It would produce strikes which would really wreck production, for this kind of legislation has no effect on the real problem of reduced production.

It does not prevent strikes or slowdowns. In England they have had a complete national service act for, I think, at least 3 years, and yet a serious strike is now in progress on the London docks, interfering directly with the shipment of supplies to the front in Germany and Belgium. We denounce strikes in time of war. We know they are wrong, regardless of the best efforts of responsible labor leaders. They emphasize the fact that production depends upon cooperation and wise Government policy—not soft treatment of employers or employees, but just, considerate, and firm treatment. The whole thing is a delicate machine, and one thing is certain, if the Army had been permitted to run it, they would long ago have wrecked it.

Why is it different from an army? I suppose because it is made up of millions of people living at home, and scattered throughout a great country, under conditions which are basically normal. The discipline of any Army is impossible, and you lack the ultimate sanction of force. You could not put 1,000 men in jail and improve your production situation. The machine must be run on a cooperative basis.

I have thought that the Government could be more firm. With the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] I proposed, in 1941, a legislative system of mediation, arbitration and decision by a War Labor Board. I think we could have done something without imposing a compulsory system. The administration opposed the enactment of the legislation at that time. When the Smith-Connally Act was before the Senate, I proposed that we attempt to impose legal penalties against a strike, pending the decision of a dispute. It was rejected by the Senate.

I recognize that the handling of the labor problem in time of war is primarily an administrative matter, no matter what the law may be. I have criticized the administration for not being sufficiently firm in their dealing with strikes. But I recognize that it is a tremendously difficult problem, and that the problem of dealing with slowdowns is even more difficult, and it cannot be solved by legislation. It would be very easy to destroy the cooperation which generally exists today if we begin to turn from voluntary employment to forced employment. For the May bill does nothing about strikes or slow-downs, except to stimulate them.

The greatest difficulty today is not inability to get labor. It is hoarding by employers, slowdowns by employees. Incidentally, one encourages the other. I believe the Revercomb amendment, like the committee amendment, hits squarely at this hoarding question. I believe the handling of slowdowns must be by administrative action. I believe we must not interfere with the underlying basis of cooperation as the best method of securing the most production.

The statements of the Secretary of War published in the newspapers and the arguments of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] both seem to relate not to production, but to the contention that we must not let down the boys at the front, or injure their morale. I should like to read a short quotation from a letter from a sergeant in the Field Artillery, written to his parents. He says:

> I don't know too much about the work-or-else bill, but I hear that one of the main reasons for passing it is to bolster the morale of the soldiers. I wish to report that my morale would suffer a severe shock to know that the only way our Government could get the country to produce sufficient material for this war, was to force them to do so.

The best way to help the soldier, in my opinion, is to reject the draft of labor principle, defeat the Bailey amendment, and adopt the Revercomb substitute, on which I shall speak when that question arises.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Does the Senator feel that what he has just read represents the general impression among the boys at the front?

Mr. TAFT. I have no means of knowing that. With respect to the question of morale I feel that once it comes down simply to the one argument, "We should do something to increase the morale of the soldier," and if the soldier knows that we do it to increase his morale, it loses all effect. He does not want us to do things to increase his morale. His morale is high enough. But what he wants us to do is to enact legislation which will result in increasing production and give him the materials he needs in fighting at the front the wars of his country.

Mr. MURRAY. I have just received from a boy at the front a letter, in which he asks this question:

> Have you any stakes in the work-or-fight bill? What a revolting phrase—it conjures up a vision of recalcitrant workers being herded and regimented by mallet-bearing henchmen. Which, of course, can't be true.

It seems to me that the morale of the boys at the front will not be increased as the result of the passage of the proposed legislation.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator from Montana.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I do not want Senators to get the idea that I am trying to put my oar in on every occasion. I realize that I am a new Senator. On this particular question, however, I feel that I am peculiarly qualified to speak. The last job I had before coming to the United States Senate was in a defense plant. I was not one of the managers. I was not there on behalf of the Government to oversee the work that was done. I was working at a bench as a workman and mechanic for some 16 months. I left the job only to campaign for the United States Senate last spring, almost a year ago. So I should like very humbly to advance my opinions on this question. As the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] pointed out, our sole object is to increase production if possible; and certainly we do not want to do anything that would decrease production.

My experience in the war plant was this: We could have done the work with 50 percent of the men we had. To be really conservative, let me say 75 percent, or that at least 25 percent of the labor was wasted. There was a great deal of loafing; but lest Senators receive a wrong impression, let me say that I do not want them to think that the workers were at fault. I, too, loafed. It was simply because we did not have enough to do. I do not attempt to place the blame for that condition.

The plant in which I worked was not a gigantic concern. It was a comparatively small plant, with approximately 200 employees. At any given time we probably had a dozen different contracts going through the plant, which, of course, would put from 8 to 10 men up to 25 or 30 men on each job. I do not know where the fault lay, but the contracts did not come along consecutively. There would be periods between contracts when we would have nothing to do. Naturally, when we were near the end of a contract, word would come to us—I am not prepared to say where the word came from, but it would come to us from our leader man—that there was no contract to take the place of the one which was nearing completion. So we would start slowing down, and sometimes we would make one day's work last a week. Sometimes when we did not have any work to do we would stand around and count rivets or hit a piece of metal with a hammer once in a while. The unpardonable sin, as I saw it, was not to look busy. It did not make any difference whether one had anything to do or not; but a man was damned forever if he did not look as though he were doing something.

I found that it was useless to try to correct the situation. I was not a Sena-

tor. I was only a worker at a bench. I remember one particular occasion when I came to work in the morning, and there seemed to be a shortage of tools. On the job to which I was assigned I had to have an electric drill. At the tool room where we drew the tools each day, there was not a drill left. Frankly, the best tools went to the workers who knew the man in the tool room best, and perhaps brought him a little token once in a while, liquid or otherwise.

On the day in question I did not get a drill. I was standing at my work bench, and I saw a Navy inspector coming up the aisle some distance away. This time I said to myself, "I will be damned if I will try to look busy," so I just stood there. The inspector came along, and when he reached me he said, "What is the matter with you?" I said, "Well, sir, I have no drill. There does not seem to be any available, and I cannot do my work without a drill." He did not say another word, but went directly to the office, and I presume he raised thunder with those in the office. Very shortly I had a drill, but as soon as the inspector had gone my leader man, who was a very fine man and a conscientious worker, came to me and said, "Glen, for goodness sake, do not ever do that again. It does not help in any way, and it only gets me in a jam. They have had me over in the office giving me hail Columbia for allowing this to happen in my department." So I saw that that procedure did not correct any fault. It simply made trouble for my leader man, who was a nice fellow.

At other times there would be a shortage of material. I do not know whose fault that was. It seems to me that instead of more workers, what we need is better expediting of contracts and better procurement, to see that the materials come along. I can say in all truthfulness that I never heard any worker in the plant where I worked complain because he was overworked. The only complaint I ever heard was that there was not enough to do. A good many workers quit their jobs at the plant and went somewhere else. They would say, "I cannot take this. I came here to do an honest day's work. I have always done an honest day's work." Perhaps a worker would say, "I have a son in the service, and I am leaving." Workers would leave, and in a week or 2 they would come back. They all gave the same explanation of their reason for returning: "The place I went to was a great deal worse than this." Possibly it was one of the big shipyards or steel mills. So they would come back.

I stayed at the plant. I was there for a definite period of time. I was not anxious to shop around. If one of the workers had returned to the plant and said, "I have found a place where a man can do a real day's work," probably I, too, would have left.

In connection with the question of compulsion, I was in the war plant when labor was frozen to the job. There were men in that plant who had been there for 10 or 15 years. They were good workmen, and were perfectly happy at their work. When the freeze order went into effect, many of them said, "They can not keep me on a job if I do not want to stay here. I will show them." So they asked for releases just to show that they could do it, to prove that they were independent and free Americans.

There was a management committee to adjudicate disputes. For a while they attempted to hold the men, but that plan did not work, because the men would simply refuse to work. They would stand around doing nothing, so the management let them go. I saw more than one good workman who had been there for many years pack up his tool-box and leave simply because he did not like the idea of being frozen to his job.

Mr. President, I feel certain that we shall accomplish no good by drafting labor. As has been pointed out on the floor of the Senate, all we would get would be the dregs, the rag-tag and bobtail element, those who have no patriotism, skill, or ability. We could get them into the plants; but regarding the drafting of that kind of workers, my only suggestion is not to draft them and put them in the plants. I should like to see them forced to do something, but I do not see how such a program could be handled without hitting also the conscientious worker. If we are to draft them, I would suggest that they be put into labor battalions with a guard over them, as is done in the case of German prisoners. They should be sent out to do agricultural work, or work in the woods, where they could be worked in gangs and put on bread and water if they did not do an honest day's work. I am convinced that that is the only way to get an honest day's work out of them.

The Senator from Ohio called attention to the fact that it has been said that the morale factor is the reason for enacting a law to draft labor. As the Senator has pointed out, while we are considering the morale of the Army, consisting of only approximately 12,000,000 men, we ought to consider the morale of the workers, because if such a law should result in even a minute lessening of their morale, it might result in a great reduction in the output of armaments, which have been found to be so necessary for soldiers fighting modern mechanized wars.

The other day the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], in urging the enactment of some form of draft bill, called attention to the fact that during the latter stages of the invasion of France, possibly shortly before or during the period of the Belgian break-through, when Von Rundstedt made his great effort, 200 ships loaded to the guards with munitions, were in the English Channel and unable to discharge their cargoes because our soldiers had not captured the ports.

Certainly I am not blaming the soldiers. But let us not draft the workers because a place could not be found where the munitions which labor had produced could be unloaded from the ships. Drafting labor will not solve the problem.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I am very much interested in the Senator's remarks. His statement is a very straightforward one; and since it is his first speech in the Senate, I wish to congratulate him and commend him on it.

With respect to the particular matter which he last mentioned, let me say that I referred to the opening of the Port of Antwerp as an illustration of the difficulties. I stated that it was not the fault of the soldiers. I stated that 200 ships were waiting to be unloaded there. In order to have the date correctly stated, let me point out that it was in September; and in October 200 ships, loaded with the materials of war, were in the channel; but the munitions could not be delivered to the soldiers in Belgium or to those on the way to Germany or to those on the borders of Germany, because there was no available port. That is what I meant to say. It is an illustration of what the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] said yesterday, namely, that we cannot fight the war without the greatest abundance of materials.

So there is no complaint about the failure to capture Antwerp at that time. We did everything we could to capture it then; but the Germans saw what the situation was and they kept us off. Consequently, we had to send our goods down through southern France and across France, and that made for delay. We even reached the point on some fronts during that period when we had to ration our shells. If a shortage occurs now, we shall have to ration our shells once more.

I wish the Senator to understand that situation. We now have an abundance, we are told; but our troops must go on; and in order to go on, it may be necessary to increase production.

I also wish to say to the Senator that he seems to think the compulsory amendment of mine relates to putting men to work. But that is not the case at all. They are already producing. The amendment relates only, under the May-Bailey bill, so-called, to preventing the undue shifting of workers from one plant to another. Really, the compulsory feature of the measure is that it would result in putting into war work persons who are not now engaged in such work.

Mr. TAYLOR. I understand that.

Mr. BAILEY. I thought the Senator spoke as if he did not understand that point.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I have only 20 minutes' time, and I should like to complete my remarks. I think I have already said everything of any importance which I have in mind to say. Anything else will be simply by way of observation.

I have stated the facts as they existed in a war plant. I say to the Senate that I am not in favor of having anyone drafted, but that if we must draft someone we should draft the managers and those engaged in procurement and the allocation of contracts those who have failed to coordinate the contracts and have failed to have the materials brought to the factories on time. Certainly the workers have not been to blame.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] pointed out that he did not want to draft the workers who are presently working. Nevertheless, the stigma would fall upon them. Mr. President, just imagine if someone who had the power to do so were to place a machine gun in each corner of this Chamber, and were to say to all Members of the Senate, "You have been doing a good job, but there is a war going on, and we want some better laws, and want them quicker. Now, get to work and turn them out here." Would such a situation make the Members of the Senate work better? Would it make their brains work faster? Or would Senators be inclined to sulk a little, and to say, "To thunder with you; you cannot tell me how I should think; you may think I am just sitting here, but I will be sitting here and thinking, and you will not be able to tell what I am thinking." [Laughter.]

Frankly, Mr. President, I know that when I was a worker in a factory, I could appear to be the busiest man in the plant, if I wished to make a pretense of being busy, when as a matter of fact I did not have a thing in the world to do.

The fact that the Army endorses the proposed draft does not bear any weight with me, because, suppose management and labor, which condemn the bill, were to get together and were to start telling General Eisenhower how to run the Army. What would the generals think about that? I think there is no more sense in having the generals tell industry how to run industry.

Mr. President, I think I have nothing further to say. I simply wished to take this opportunity to set forth my views as one who has worked in a defense plant.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I rise to voice opposition to the amendment of the distinguished and able Senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. This amendment, if adopted, would in my judgment completely nullify the substitute amendment under consideration. It is, I take it, a test as to whether this body favors the voluntary system of labor in the production of war materials—a system which has brought such excellent results—over the experiment of a new and untried system of compulsion.

To a certain extent, we have compulsion today in all Government plants and factories and in most private plants, particularly the larger ones which are working on Government contracts. This compulsion is applied under a series of clauses relative to the conditions under which operations on the basis of the contracts are to be conducted. I believe, and I shall endeavor to show, that these conditions are such that the result is an excessive waste of manpower and, in consequence, a most inefficient operation. I believe that any further restrictions or compulsory labor laws or regulations would tend to increase the labor wastage, rather than decrease it.

I am a believer in voluntary production, and I am satisfied that voluntary production will out-produce involuntary production.

During the debate on this bill, much reference has been made to the loafer. Other references have been made to the man who sought war work in order to obtain deferment, with a view to evading the draft. There are loafers, and there are men who have gone into munitions plants or other war work to try to escape the draft; but I believe they are an infinitesimal portion of the men who produce the sinews of war.

On the voluntary side of the picture we have the growing determination of the boy of 18 to get into the armed forces at the earliest possible moment, regardless of the natural desire of many parents to delay the induction of their sons. Since the drafting of 18-year olds, in all the correspondence I have had from my State regarding it there has been only one case in which the parents of the boy succeeded in having him deferred. I am convinced that even in that case the boy was somewhat ashamed of the steps that were taken to keep him from answering the call. Finally, when this matter came to a head the father and mother called me on the long-distance telephone, and talked 35 minutes, begging and begging me to do something to help them keep the boy out of the Army. The boy was in every respect physically fit and able. After the father and mother had finished talking to me, I talked to the boy. I told him what in my opinion was his duty. That night he took the train to Cheyenne, and enlisted. I say that is the only case that I have had from my State.

On the other hand, I have had countless evidences of the desire of young boys, not to go into war work, but to get into the armed forces as soon as they could. I cite the case of a boy, a nephew of mine, but not living in my State, who recently arrived at the age of 18. About 6 to 8 months prior to that time, the boy—whose father, by the way, is a farmer and stock grower—suffered an injury in a football game. As a result the nerves of one of his eyes were affected. When he went for his physical examination last December, he was rejected. It nearly broke that boys' heart to think that his schoolboy friends were going, and he, too, could not go along and do his part. He is a powerful, husky boy, and the only physical defect that could be discovered was in connection with the injury of the muscles or nerves of his eye, which resulted in a slightly impaired vision. This boy now is undergoing treatment, in the hope that in 6 months' time he may overcome his trouble and will be able to go into the armed forces and do his bit.

I believe that this boy is typical of the boys of this country. I think the shirkers and the loafers are few and far between.

As we look back over the year 1944 we must be very conscious that from spring, or early summer of that year, every effort was made to convey the impression that the war with Germany was entering its final phase, and that victory was in sight. Our distinguished colleague, the able junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] in his opening speech in support of this amendment, pointed out a number of conditions existing in 1944, which led the people of the Nation to believe the optimistic statements which had been made. But the effort to convey optimism went even deeper. During the late summer, releases advised the Nation that as things were going so well in connection with the war with Germany, it was considered no longer necessary to draft men over the age of 25.

Naturally, many men between the ages of 25 and 33, who had been waiting for their draft calls, made arrangements to continue their businesses, go into business again, or seek some stabilized work, or position.

Those men have been rudely awakened to the fact that conditions have so changed that once again it is necessary to sell their businesses and leave their jobs to answer the draft call.

I do not think any evidence has been presented before the Senate which would justify the assumption that a labor shortage now exists. Evidence was offered that the manpower situation has been mishandled; but figures have been cited here which show that, in spite of a reduction in the number of war workers, there was actually an increase in the output of implements of war.

The American workingman is not fundamentally lazy; and if we find in war production work that there are groups of men on pay rolls who are not working, it is safe to assume that such a condition has not been brought about by any slackness on the part of the workingman, but instead, is due to conditions under which the work is being performed.

In like manner we can to some extent absolve the employer from being finally responsible for the condition which exists.

There appears to be but one conclusion as to the cause of the hoarding of excessive labor at some points, and a shortage of labor at other points. One is inevitably forced to the conclusion that those excesses and shortages occur in plants owned and operated by the Government, or in plants where Government contracts are being carried out under conditions set forth by the Government.

The American workingman wants to work; he is not by nature a loafer. The man on the farm does not loaf. The farmer and his hired hand, or hands, the farmer's wife and their children, from a very tender age, all work. They have their chores to do, and they could not, by the greatest stretch of imagination, ever be accused of loafing. In normal times such a family would be up at 5 o'clock in the morning. The farmer and his boys would be getting the day's chores done, after which they would go into the field with their teams or tractors, and perform whatever duties the season of the year made necessary. Women on the farm would be doing their share of the work, and in many cases would be taking the place of the young men who had gone to war, by operating tractors, driving teams, or performing other work on the farm.

No law is required for the workers on the farm. They work all day and every day; in good weather and in bad weather; in snow and in sunshine.

There are other classes of labor or manpower in which loafing is an un-

known quantity, and in which working conditions do not and cannot produce an excess of men. As a result, there are no idle men who might be moved elsewhere. An illustration of the worker in this class is the miner. Day after day hundreds of thousands of those men go down into the pits to extract much-needed coal. I venture to say that the drafting of such labor to date has caused a shortage of at least 200,000 men. From the time a miner enters the portal until he gets to the bottom of the pit, and then to the point to which he must go in order actually to mine the coal, and leaves at the end of his shift, he is working all the time. One never sees a group of 20 or 30 miners sitting around talking, or, as was stated by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], pretending to work when they are doing nothing. Those men are engaged in one of the most hazardous of jobs. When we draft the experienced miner and replace him with an inexperienced miner, no matter how willing he may be to work, we are increasing the hazards of the mine.

The production of coal in the United States has dropped considerably. It is not because the miners on the job are not working; it is not because the miners are loafers. They are not loafers. It is because essential men from that industry have been drafted into the armed forces.

Let us consider the man who works on a railroad; he does not loaf. If, as many of us do, we travel up and down the country, go into the railroad shops and into the yards, we do not find a group of a dozen or 20 railroad men standing or sitting around doing nothing. But if we go into a Government-controlled plant we find the man who is not working.

A few weeks ago the Senate's Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program reported to the Senate a visit to the Norfolk Navy Yard. The able junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the able junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] reported conditions which amazed the Senate and the country. They reported seeing numerous men sitting around doing nothing and indifferent to whether they worked or not. The members of the committee reported on work of various characters being performed which had nothing whatsoever to do with the war effort.

There were four great battleships on one construction program, namely, the *Iowa*, the *Massachusetts*, the *Indiana*, and the *Alabama*. The *Alabama* was built at the Norfolk Navy Yard, which is a Government yard. The *Indiana* was built by the Newport News Shipbuilding Co., a private concern. They were sister ships and were built on the same plan. It is general knowledge that the *Alabama*, from the Government yard, cost the people of this country approximately $9,000,000 more than the sister ship—the *Indiana*, which was built a few miles away. Materials which went into the construction of those two ships were the same. They were built from the same plans, and were of the same weight of iron and steel. Identical equipment went into both of them. That $9,000,000 difference can mean only one thing, namely, that the cost of labor on the *Alabama* was $9,000,000 more than the cost of labor on the *Indiana*. In addition, the Newport News Shipbuilding Co. is reported to have supplied practically all of the plans for the *Alabama* and to have ordered a great deal of the material, a service which is estimated at approximately $1,000,000.

Here, Mr. President, is your manpower wastage. What goes on at Norfolk goes on in thousands of other construction plants throughout the country. It is not the fault of the men; to a certain extent, it is not the fault of the management; the fault lies in the conditions under which the contract places no restrictions on the employer as to cost.

I am not saying that the employer will deliberately hire an excess of workers in order to increase the cost of work, thereby benefiting himself; but I do say that in the contracts all elements to promote such a situation are present.

When the profit incentive is removed, efficiency is also removed; and no bill for compulsory drafting of labor is going to change this.

It has been pointed out time and again during the course of this debate that the United States should adopt total conscription, or draft, of every able-bodied person in the Nation, just as Russia has done, as Britain has done, and as Germany and Japan have done.

The production figures do not bear this contention out. In addition to the equipment of our armed forces, we have at the same time helped to equip the armed forces of our allies. Our contribution has been staggering.

We have been producing almost to the limit of our resources of materials. The able junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] has pointed out that last year we produced $64,000,000,000 worth of war materials. That was what the Army and Navy asked us to produce. He further pointed out that those responsible for military and naval operations called on us to produce sixty-four and five-tenths billion dollars' worth this year, which is just five-tenths billion dollars' worth more than we produced last year. If we produced so successfully in 1944 and in 1943, we can do it in 1945, and we can do it readily if a little more efficiency is brought about in Government-operated plants.

No two nations together are capable of producing, nor have they produced under the total draft system, what the United States has produced and can produce under the voluntary system. Every Senator is determined that our armed forces shall have all the equipment, all the munitions, and all the means of transportation necessary to complete victory. If the Army, the Navy, and the Air Forces will tell us what they need the Nation will produce it, but I cannot subscribe to the theory that the Army and Navy should say how this quantity of material is to be produced.

We did not need the Army and Navy to tell us how to produce the material and equipment which was supplied to the Russians and which enables them today to be within 30 miles of Berlin. We did not need the Army and the Navy to tell us how to produce the vast equipment which we supplied to Montgomery at El Alamein, which contributed so much to the success of the great drive against Rommel and the German Africa Corps.

We are proud of our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force, but we are also proud of our great production units. The fact that some of those units are inefficient and the demand for manpower in the Army has brought that inefficiency to light, is no reason why we should turn the entire responsibility of production over to the Army or the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, may I use the remaining few minutes on the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that he may use a few minutes more.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, when I proposed yesterday that a limitation of 20 minutes be imposed on all Senators to speak on the pending amendment, it did not carry with it any provision for speaking on the bill. It is limited to the Bailey amendment, and of course all speeches made now are made on the Bailey amendment, no matter what a Senator may talk about.

I dislike to object to further time being accorded the Senator, but he will understand that if we do it in one case it will be impossible not to do it in others.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I realize the force of what the able majority leader says. I should like about 2 minutes to finish what I have to say.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall not object, but I do not want it to be considered a precedent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator from Wyoming may proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, we are conscious of the fact that there have been abuses by both management and labor and that there has been hoarding of labor.

American free labor and American free enterprise, and the competitive system under which it has been developed, constitute the one great factor that Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito failed to take into consideration. Had they realized that American free labor and free enterprise could equip the greater part of the world, had they realized that American free labor and American free enterprise could build in 2 years the greatest navy the world has ever known, the most perfectly equipped army, and an air force beyond the dreams of the most imaginative, they would have hesitated.

That is American free labor and free enterprise; that is what we in the Senate must strive above all else to protect and maintain.

I believe that the substitute amendment which my distinguished friend, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], has asked me to join with him in presenting to the Senate, is possibly the most complete answer to this very complex and complicated situation.

The amendment which we are considering at this time would defeat the objectives of the substitute, and I hope

the Senate will vote down the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	Overton
Bailey	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Hoey	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Bushfield	La Follette	Taft
Butler	McCarran	Taylor
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Capehart	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McMahon	Tobey
Chavez	Magnuson	Tunnell
Cordon	Maybank	Tydings
Donnell	Mead	Vandenberg
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Mitchell	Walsh
Ferguson	Moore	Wherry
Fulbright	Morse	White
George	Murdock	Wiley
Gerry	Murray	Willis
Green	Myers	Wilson
Guffey	O'Daniel	
Gurney	O'Mahoney	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished and able senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] to the bill. I rise to challenge some statements which have been made on the floor of the Senate during the course of this debate. The first statement I wish to challenge is the one that America has failed in production. All our experience and all the records and all the victories we have achieved on many fronts refute that statement. Never in all history has such a record of production been made as has been made by free industry and free labor of America during the present wartime. Today the only question before the Senate is how we can best promote that production to meet the increased demands which will be made. Certainly it cannot be promoted by threatening men with sentences of jail imprisonment or with sending them to places in which they will not for many and obvious reasons be at peak in production. Production cannot be increased by the enactment of a law requiring a man to work or go to jail.

Mr. President, the production of America has confounded the totalitarian leaders of the world. It has refuted the efficiency of their philosophies of government. I felt a sense of shame when I heard it said on the floor of the Senate yesterday in effect that if making our Government over into a totalitarian form of government would win this war, then let us make this a totalitarian form of government. With a sense of shame I have heard it said that what we need in America is a dictator. For what are we fighting on the various battle fronts? Why are we spilling the blood of our finest young men, if it is not to save this free America and our form of free Government with which we have been blessed so many years? If we should turn to totalitarianism with the thought that we have failed in America—with the thought that America's future destiny is doomed—then governments of free people can not survive on the face of the earth.

Mr. President, we shall win this war completely and successfully only if we maintain the certainty that free governments can successfully fight wars with totalitarianism, with dictatorships, or with any authoritarian powers in this world. Therefore let us not turn aside from the program which we have established. Let us not lose sight of our objective. Let us not betray America in these final days of conflict.

Mr. President, the second statement which I wish to challenge and refute is the statement that it is necessary that we turn to a totalitarian form of production because it will raise the morale of the boys on the fighting fronts. Those who make such a statement ask, "What do the boys over there think about us?" We are asked, "What are the boys thinking about the loafers here at home? What are the boys thinking about what we are doing here in America to help win the war?"

I want to read to the Senate what one American soldier thinks about that. The soldier is 39 years of age. He has three fine children and a loyal American wife working on the home front. This man is in the Philippines fighting to keep this land of ours free for his children. This is what he has written to me this week:

> I sure hope this bill now up in Congress, "fight or be drafted," gets knocked in the head. From what little experience I have had in factory work and in experience in the Navy, I feel that if they would use a little common sense and try to utilize their manpower instead of wasting it that there would be little cause for a manpower shortage. Anyway what I have seen out here sure makes me feel that our industries have really done one great job and should receive plenty of credit for it. When you see the enormous amount of equipment out here you know d—— well somebody has done some work, and it sure as hell wasn't done by Santa Claus. Of course, I realize that there are some people back home who are selfish enough to just look out for their own interests, but I am sure 95 percent of the folks are doing the best they can do to help the war cause.
>
> I for one do not want to see people back in the States have to be under the same regulations as a serviceman. For that matter, when I was drafted in this affair I thought one of the main things I was fighting for was to keep our standard of living and independence we were enjoying. I believe if our Government would tell the folks exactly what they needed and what kind of help they needed, that the majority of the people would be more than willing to cooperate.

This, my colleagues, is the voice of a man on the fighting front who is giving everything for the war effort. His morale is not shaken nor is his faith in America faltering.

Today we are told that we have to support the pending bill or stand accused of impeding the war effort; that perhaps some boys will lose their lives if we delay to pass the force bill. I challenge that statement. I say such a statement comes from those who do not think thoroughly. They do not remember that war is waged by two specific departments. First, there is the department of production. The work of production is done by men and women back home. Second, there is the department of destruction. The work in that department is done by the men on the fighting fronts. Men who are charged with leadership in the art of destruction are not best equipped to advise us how to operate the vehicles and the instruments of production. Industry, labor, and agriculture, all divisions of which are engaged in production, are unanimously opposed to the bill, and they are the ones who are responsible for producing the materials we so greatly need. Industry wants to do it by free labor. Labor wants to keep its hands unshackled. Industry and labor say that forced or slave labor is not only worthless labor but that it poisons everything it touches and undermines the productivity of freemen. The heads of our great labor unions have taken a strong stand against this bill. They say, "We can produce. Let us know what you want. Make plain what our needs are, and industry will produce."

We must recognize this fact, and we must recognize that production and destruction are two different arts. Let the men dedicated to the art of destruction devote their energies to the purpose for which they are chosen, and let the men who are dedicated to the art of production manage production in this country, and then we will march forward together, certain of the victory which awaits us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] to the substitute proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], as modified.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	Overton
Bailey	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Hoey	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Bushfield	La Follette	Taft
Butler	McCarran	Taylor
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Capehart	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McMahon	Tobey
Chavez	Magnuson	Tunnell
Cordon	Maybank	Tydings
Donnell	Mead	Vandenberg
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Mitchell	Walsh
Ferguson	Moore	Wherry
Fulbright	Morse	White
George	Murdock	Wiley
Gerry	Murray	Willis
Green	Myers	Wilson
Guffey	O'Daniel	
Gurney	O'Mahoney	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not intend to detain the Senate long, and I do not propose to make an argument. I meant to say a word or two, and I spoke to the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill. He said he preferred to speak last. I think that is appropriate; I think the chairman of a committee in charge of legislation should make the last speech. So, on that account, I am speaking a little out of order.

My sole purpose is to call attention to the statements made under date of January 29, 1945, in a letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], signed by Robert P. Patterson, Acting Secretary of War. I think I might appropriately say something about Mr. Patterson. He is, or at least he was, the Acting Secretary of War. For a long time now he has been the Under Secretary of War. From the outset he has had especial charge of war production. I believe he is universally recognized as an able and faithful public servant, regardless of party and of views and of the so-called ideologies of which we hear lately. I believe I will stop long enough to say that I believe the word should be pronounced ideologies, and that pronunciation is not a joke. I believe it is sound, and I am satisfied from the derivation of the word that the proper pronunciation is ideology, not ideology. But I will not go into that. I simply made the remark because if at some time in the future I refer to it as an ideology, I want Senators to know that such a pronunciation of the word is not altogether the result of ignorance.

Regardless of views and ideologies, Mr. Patterson is held in the highest regard in the official circles in Washington, and he is held in the highest regard in the State from which he comes and, I think, by the people generally, now that he has served them with such distinction. I would prefer to have his advice and his views on this matter—and I say this with all respect—than to have those of any of our highly honored Senators. He is the specialist in charge; we are not. He is in touch both with the war and with production. We are rather in the nature, I fear, of middlemen. At any rate, we are not in charge. I have the view that the executive department of the Government is much more directly responsible for the conduct of the war than is the Congress. It calls on us for money; it calls on us for authority. In the executive branch are to be found the men dealing directly with the armed forces, and in our behalf.

For example, I would not think of undertaking to say where an attack should be made. Frankly, I did not know whether we should undertake to put all the pressure we were capable of exerting in the Philippines or in France. I had very great misgivings about that problem, and I must say I did not wish to have the responsibility of making that decision. I heard it said that if we undertook to land on the western coast of France, in the very operation of landing we would lose half a million men; and I heard it said that, instead of doing that, we should undertake to invade Japan or the eastern shores of Asia, notwithstanding the fact that at that time we did not have a base within 2,500 miles of where it was proposed to land.

Well, that may be all right. I am simply saying that I know very well that the conduct of war is a great science, the most responsible of all sciences. I really believe that, with all due respect to the soldiers who do the fighting, it is the brains that conducts an army that has most to do with victory. For instance, no one has ever understood why Stonewall Jackson was so successful. He could take a few men and do more with them than most generals could do with many men. I do not understand it, except in the sense that he was a military genius. He could rise to the military occasion. He knew when to move. What would happen if I or any other Senator had had his responsibilities?

In that war President Lincoln had the greatest difficulty in finding the right general. Robert E. Lee said that McClellan was the best of the generals he met and fought against. But, after all, McClellan lost the Peninsula campaign almost at the outset of the war, and thereafter President Lincoln tried one general after another. Finally he selected Grant. It is true that Grant did not succeed so well as President, and he himself said so. He had no gifts of a political character. But the whole world knows he was a great general. I pass by his monument at the foot of Capitol Hill and I feel like taking my hat off to Ulysses Grant. In the South, as you know, Mr. President, they have been taught to hate Sherman. I have read the story of his life. I often thought I would make a speech about William Tecumseh Sherman. I think the statue of him in this city is the finest statue in Washington. It shows him with the appearance of a great soldier and with a beautiful poise on his horse. He had a strange conception of war, but it turned out to be a sound one. In 1862 the northern press said he was insane, and that he was a subject of pity, rather than of criticism. But they said nothing like that after Shiloh, and they were very silent after Atlanta. When he brought his troops through, from my home town—for they camped in Raleigh 6 weeks, and they did not do us any harm, either; there was not a scar on that city—and came to Washington, after his men had traveled 2,500 miles on foot, the foreign Ambassadors who saw the great, triumphant parade said of Sherman's troops that they could whip any army on earth, that they were the finest-looking men they had ever seen.

All through the fall and all through the winter Sherman's men made a long march. They did a great deal of damage in the South. But General Sherman explained it. He said that war was hell. It may be that he said it lightly, but he said it by way of reproach. He was attending a meeting of veterans in Cincinnati. The veterans were hurrahing, as veterans do, and were celebrating. General Sherman said, "No, my friends; do not look at it in that way. War is hell."

Sherman had his own peculiar view of what to do in the South. He cut it in two. Strangest of all, he was the only general of whom I have ever heard who cut his lines of communication. When he left Atlanta he cut the wires to Washington. He did not want to receive any orders. He was not consulting the Senate of the United States. He was not concerned about the House of Representatives.

Along toward the 1st of December President Lincoln was heard to say, "There is a man down South. I should like to hear from him." He was asked to whom he referred, and he answered, "Sherman." He did not know where Sherman was. On Christmas Day Sherman sent him a telegram which stated: "I present to you, Mr. President, as a Christmas present the city of Savannah and 25,000 bales of cotton." Then he came up through South Carolina and North Carolina.

There was considerable complaint about what General Sherman did. I know what Sherman said about it. He had had correspondence with General Hood, the Confederate commander, after the fall of Atlanta. Sherman had suggested an armistice for certain purposes. An armistice was necessary to both sides. Hood agreed that an armistice was necessary, but replied, "I do not want to deal with a man who has been burning the cities of Georgia in the way you have been burning them." Sherman wrote back: "I am glad to agree to an armistice; but as to what my men and I have been doing in Georgia, you can tell that to the marines. You cannot tell it to us. We were present and we know better." That is where we got the expression "Tell it to the marines"—tell it to the folks who are at sea.

All of that was on General Sherman's side. I would not say that he and his soldiers did not do considerable damage in the South, because I know that they did. But if we get into a war, we must expect that damage will be done. We should be careful about condemning General Sherman for what he did in the South lest we reflect on what our own soldiers are doing abroad. War is hell. That phrase explains everything. But it takes a military man to conduct a war. General Sherman succeeded because he had genius. Grant succeeded because he had genius. Lee succeeded because he had genius, and Jackson succeeded because he had genius. They all had genius beyond compare in matters military.

I like the story which is told of the soldier who visited the grave of Stonewall Jackson on the night after he had been shot at Chancellorsville. A Confederate soldier came to his grave and said, "General Jackson, if you see Caesar tonight tell him we still make war."

Mr. President, we make war now. If we hope to succeed we must make war just as all nations have made war in the past. We must find leaders. We must find great captains and follow them.

I think the President has done well in that regard. I hear no complaint about General Marshall. I hear no complaint about General Eisenhower. I

hear no complaint about Generals Hodges and Patton. I hear no complaint about King, or Arnold. They are our captains. In their presence we know nothing.

I should feel a little ashamed of myself if I pretended to know anything about matters military. The only military connection I have is that my father was a Confederate private soldier, and my son is engaged in the present war as a captain. But that does not qualify me as a military expert. No Senator is qualified on military matters. The sooner we all realize that the better. Entire armies may be silenced. In the midst of armies, laws are silent, and lawmakers might well be silent. That is an ancient maxim. Having said that, and having said it apropos of one of our great leaders, Judge Patterson, a man of great diligence, I now quote from his letter of January 29, a recent date.

Production must be increased in the face of an increasing tight labor supply.

That statement is no reflection on labor. Judge Patterson merely says that we do not have enough labor.

In the first half of 1945, 900,000 additional men will be inducted into the Army and Navy. Most of these men will be taken from jobs in industry—

He is not expressing an opinion; he is stating a fact. The statement which I have read was made by a man who will do the administering—

and their places must be filled promptly. Over and above this, 700,000 more workers must be found for war industry and supporting industry in the next 6 months.

I am reading this statement because I want it to appear in the RECORD in justification of my position and my vote. I want the people of the country to know it.

Judge Patterson's statement continues:

On a number of critical programs we failed to meet the production schedules in the last half of 1944. In the last half of 1944, production of mortar ammunition was 12 percent below the schedules of June 30, and June 20 schedules had already scaled requirements down to fit what was then considered feasible production.

That statement is from Robert P. Patterson, Acting Secretary of War.

We have tried in every way possible to make headway against recurrent shortages of manpower.

They have tried everything. They have tried the voluntary principle. Earlier today I put into the RECORD a speech which had been made to the Baptists by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] on the subject of religious liberty. It happens that I grew up in that atmosphere. I am devoted to the voluntary principle. I have resisted a great many movements in this country because I am a voluntary man. When we fail in the midst of war we must begin thinking about relinquishing those considerations, and afterward do whatever is necessary to recover our voluntary principle. When we come to that point I hope that no Senator——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. BAILEY. May I not have 2 or 3 minutes on the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator would have to ask unanimous consent for that purpose. The agreement provided for 20 minutes on the pending amendment only, and there was no statement as to time on the bill.

Mr. BAILEY. I would rather keep the rules than to get unanimous consent to violate them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is sorry that he was compelled to advise the Senator that his time had expired.

Mr. BAILEY. I have only one or two small matters to add to what I have said, but I will rest the case, so far as I am concerned, right here.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, probably, as representing the committee in charge of the amended committee bill, it is not necessary for me to talk about the pending amendment because it is an amendment to a substitute for the committee substitute, and it will of course be my task to attempt to defeat the so-called Revercomb substitute for the committee substitute whether it contains the Bailey amendment or not.

There are, however, one or two things that should be said. First as to the general situation with regard to the bill. Without the Bailey amendment and without the Revercomb substitute, due to the action taken by the Senate in removing the penalty provision, the committee substitute now stands as it was proposed by its sponsors in the committee, the penalty having been put into that substitute against the will of the sponsors by a majority of the committee. The committee bill therefore now stands in the position in which its authors wished it to come before the Senate. I think that much should be said so that when the vote is taken Senators will understand why members of the Military Affairs Committee did not vote in favor of all the amendments in the substitute as it was reported.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to point out that if the Bailey amendment is adopted and if in turn it becomes a part of the Revercomb amendment and that amendment is accepted by the Senate, the Senate will again reverse itself, and put into the bill it will pass the compulsory theory after once having taken it out, thus adding greater confusion, more trouble and uncertainty, and, as a result, interfering with production in the ordinary processes of our economic life.

Some of the greatest troubles we are having in America today as a result of the directives of the War Production Board are those incident to the determination of what is essential; yet this amendment carries the word "essential" in place of the words "in a lawful occupation," which, of course, a local board could quite readily pass upon, because, as the sponsor of the amendment pointed out, there are very few unlawful occupations. So when the local board has to pass upon an occupation or an activity or a profession or an industry essential to the war effort, there is imposed upon the board a task which is above their ability.

I say that advisedly; it is not a reflection upon the local board, but it is a fact that the local boards in urban communities, in large cities, have tasks very different from those of local boards in farming communities. The local board in a farming community is probably not able to decide what is essential. The local board in a city such as New York knows nothing about where those who come under its jurisdiction work or how they work or what their work is. In crowded cities the local boards cover a block or two; no one works within the confines of their jurisdiction; the persons who come before the board are strangers, their families are not known, and to impose on such a board the task of passing upon industries essential to the war effort is to impose upon it a task which is even greater than that imposed by the May bill. In practice it would probably turn a board which is wholly civilian in nature—in no sense military and, above all, in no sense a board with police power—into a board, if I may use the expression loosely, with tremendous police power, because of the duties imposed upon it.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote against the pending amendment, and I shall urge, of course, those who are standing for the committee bill as it has now been amended also to vote against the amendment.

I think, out of fairness to what has been stated here, I should also read a little more from the committee report than was read yesterday by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY]. All that we said in the report we stand by. This bill would not be here if we had not gotten down to the bottom of the manpower barrel. There is no question about the need, the necessity, and the desire to provide all the munitions and all the war matériel and all the reserves and all the support for completing and winning this war. The difference between us rests upon merely the question of wisdom—how we are going best to accomplish the ends we seek to attain. In writing the report, that was the theory. If the Senator from North Carolina had read on, he would have come to these words:

In recommending to the Congress the enactment of national service legislation, the President in his message of January 6, 1945, said:

"It is not necessary to discard the voluntary and cooperative processes which have prevailed up to this time. * * * We must build on the foundations that have already been laid and supplement the measures now in operation, in order to guarantee the production that may be necessary in the critical period that lies ahead."

The committee's careful study and extensive deliberation have borne out the soundness of that recommendation. The committee is convinced that unless legislation enacted at this time takes advantage of the experience, understanding, facilities, and cooperation that have been developed, confusion and controversy in the manpower situation may result and instead of promoting the prosecution of the war during the crucial months immediately ahead, our legislation would impede the objectives we all seek to attain.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Did not the Senator write a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, Representative MAY, in which he stated that he approved the May bill in principle?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Did I write a letter?

Mr. BAILEY. Did not the President write such a letter?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The President did write a letter.

Mr. BAILEY. The May bill in principle is compulsory.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That appears in the report.

Mr. BAILEY. I thought the fact should be made plain.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The point raised by the Senator makes all the clearer what I was trying to indicate, that in spite of the recommendations of the Chief of Staff, in spite of the recommendations of the Undersecretary of War, in spite of the recommendations of the President, in spite of the recommendations of the group which met at the White House and urged the passage of what became the May bill, though the May bill was not perfected at that time and had not been written in the form in which it finally appeared—in spite of all that, the evidence presented before our committee convinced the committee, if I may so assume from the way in which it voted, of the lack of wisdom in the compulsory method, and especially in the administrative methods provided by the May bill, because all the departments united in recommending to the consideration of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs an amendment to that bill. So that never at any time have we had from the Government a complete acceptance of the May bill as it passed the House of Representatives.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it probably is not shown in the report that 25 Members of the House of Representatives who voted for the May bill sent us a communication urging that the amendment be inserted. That amendment completely changes the theory of administration of the May bill.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah would not leave the impression, I am sure, that the responsible authorities, including the military authorities, in supporting the mere amendment to the May bill, undertook to alter its character as a compulsory measure.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; the compulsion is still in it, but the committee and the men I have mentioned did see the confusion and the retarding of the very thing they were trying to accomplish which would be caused by the sort of bill passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, no matter how strongly one may support a proposal, if he repents of his support and places a statement of his repentence before a jury or before another committee that is asked to act, the jury or committee will probably do exactly what the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] did when he offered his substitute; it will act on the basis of the wisdom gained from its own experience, and on its own judgment after it has heard the testimony; and that is exactly what our committee did.

Mr. President, some arguments have been made in the Senate that were the type of argument I never make and cannot make. The bill before the Senate is a labor relations act, as well as a military measure, and, as I have had actual experience with the distress caused by strikes, with the evil of them, with what takes place, the loss of life, the loss of time, and the uneconomic conditions which result, and as I have been in a position where my decision would make all the difference in the world, I made up my mind that when it came to industrial labor relations I would never argue from the standpoint of one's right to do a thing, whether he had a right to shoot a man, whether he had a right to starve babies, or whether he had a right to evict people from their homes. That was not the question at all.

After I first saw men die in war I made a resolution that never would I deliver a flag-waving Fourth of July oration under any circumstances. I have seen war all my life and in more lands than I can recount in the 20 minutes I have. War is not a heroic affair. From the standpoint of the administrator of the war it is a sordid business, as it is from the standpoint of those who have to send men to their death; though, indeed, they do not send them to their death, they lead them to their death. We hear much of compulsion. The idea that we have compulsion in the Selective Service Act as a method of war is just as wrong as it can be. The officer who succeeds at the front is not the one who says "Go forth," but the one who says "Let's go." Anyone with experience knows that to be so.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have only a minute.

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly the Senator is not going to leave the impression that there is no compulsion in the Selective Service Act?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Certainly not. I was one of the sponsors of the Selective Service Act. But let me say that it was assumed that approximately 16,000,000 men would register for selective service in the United States and that it would be hard to get them all to register. Nearly 18,000,000 persons registered. One district attorney came to me and said, "What shall I do with these few violations?" I said, "Find out about them. Do not start prosecuting. Do not start forcing." When the Census Bureau and the Army tell us that there are available only 16,000,000, and yet 18,000,000 actually registered, we know that compulsion is not working in this country. The "must" is present, but the voluntary idea is not abandoned.

How many men have been arrested for not responding? The voluntary system is still functioning. Two million men are in the Army and the Navy by enlistment, and every officer is in the service on a voluntary basis. The merchant marine has been developed on a voluntary basis. We have not gone over to compulsion.

It is true that I said to the Assistant Secretary of War, "Answer this question in order that I may defend the bill: Can you not say to a manufacturer, 'You must do this, you must make that, you must charge so much,' and then you may renegotiate a contract, after you tell him he must"? He replied, "Yes, we can do all that." But where has been the compulsion? How many men have had to be arrested, how many factories have had to be taken over, how many contracts have been forced on industry?

Some went so far yesterday, Mr. President, as to state that all government is totalitarian. When we argue by using slogans, we make great mistakes. I would not have slogans used on either side. I cannot say that slave labor is inefficient when I know that the pyramids were built by slave labor. I cannot say that slave labor is inefficient when I know that half the economy of America up to the time of the Civil War was based on slave labor. I would not argue by using slogans. American industry is being affected and American habits are being affected. It is the American way of doing things that is being affected; and when we find the American people acting in accordance with the American spirit, and going forward in that spirit, then we get the results which are now being obtained. When we are discussing compulsion in connection with industry do not let anyone say that there is not a difference between forcing a man to defend his country and forcing a man to work for some other person. There is a difference, and the difference must always be kept in sight.

I hope the pending amendment will be voted down, and that ultimately the committee bill will be passed.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it would appear that those of us who feel we must have some additional stiffening in our legislation for war production are in some mysterious way indicting the American working man and his amazing achievements. Such is obviously not the case. It is entirely true that 90 percent of American labor and American industry has done a magnificent job, although still inadequate, as all efforts must be inadequate in war. But it is also true—and this is what it seems to me those who favor voluntary cooperation entirely ignore—that all Americans are not heroes and all are not perfect patriots. When one reads the record of a quitting rate of from 5 to 10 percent in the plants of this country, amounting to between 80 and 90 percent in the course of a year, one cannot conceive that the men who are guilty of that are primarily concerned with supporting our sons who are at the front. The proposed legislation is directed simply and solely to that comparatively small minority of 5 or 10 percent of our population who need something more than the statuesque figure of Paul McNutt to persuade them to do their duty, and particularly since he has been operating overseas. It is to that small minority that the pending legislation is properly directed—to encourage them by something more than moral suasion that their duty lies in the place

where their lot may have unhappily fallen.

There are fox holes in industry as well as on battle fields. There are places which are unpleasant. It is with the jobs that pay the least and are most unpleasant that we have difficulty. But that is true in the war. The lot of the 11,000,000 men in the service is most unequal. Some are here in Washington. Some have been overseas for 3 years. Some of them have been in action for more than a year. They do not have any choice as to whether they obtain a soft assignment or a tough one.

So it is in industry. Unfortunately it is necessary that the several hundred thousand men now required in some of the less attractive industries should be persuaded that it is their duty to take and hold those jobs. That, at any rate, is the reason why I support a stiffening of the pending legislation. In many areas this legislation will never be required. For 90 percent of American labor this law will have no effect.

I am going to finish by yielding 3 minutes of my time to one representative of the 11,000,000 boys at the front. I think their voice has not been sufficiently heard. To be sure, they do not know of the problems back here, but they do know enough to realize that we seem to hesitate about applying the same kind of persuasion to the people who are privileged to live here at home that was applied to them in sending them to the front. I shall conclude by reading a letter which arrived 2 days ago from my own son in a field hospital in France:

We six officers in the ward have some great political discussions. Two big questions of moment which are in every day's Stars and Stripes are:

1. Nurse bill: We are all agreed some way must be found to get the necessary quota because a hospital ward without a nurse is not a hospital ward. We leave the formula up to you, but the draft of single nurses looks like a good compromise. Male nurses will not be a sufficient substitute. It takes the female touch to care for patients from Florence Nightingale down to 1945.

2. Work-or-fight bill: Everybody here was pretty darn mad at HAPPY CHANDLER's statement—

I am sorry the Senator from Kentucky is not present, but perhaps he will come in—

HAPPY CHANDLER's statement—

If the Presiding Officer and the Senate will pardon the personal reference in the letter—

that the House bill was "as dead as Lazarus."

This had appeared in the Stars and Stripes evidently—

In the first place, tell HAPPY for me that he picked the wrong Bible verse as Jesus said: "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth; and I go that I may awake him out of sleep." In other words, we're hoping the work-or-fight bill is no more dead than was Lazarus. The prolonged argument over this bill is as big a damper on the morale of the Army overseas as the famous John L. Lewis controversy.

I may say that the writer of the letter volunteered for service 4 years ago and has been overseas 3 years.

The boys are getting the feeling that our shortage of tires for trucks and shortage of ammunition and other shortages is due to the lack of workers in factories back home. Even if this isn't true, something must be done, or the boys overseas are going to feel the home front has let them down. They want a work-or-fight bill, not some "voluntary cooperation" formula; and even if the work-or-fight version resulted in only a 1-percent or 5-percent actual increase in production over other methods, it is still a necessary thing to prove to the 6,000,000 Americans overseas that the home front is 100 percent behind them and is willing to make every sacrifice to win the war. A work-or-fight law would be the biggest morale booster our soldiers overseas could get at the present moment.

One further statement, and I am done. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] suggested yesterday that with the ending of the European phase the production picture might rapidly change. As a matter of fact, in the 8 months in which I have advocated legislation of this character, in cooperation with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] in the bill we introduced last May, it has always seemed to me that the ending of the European phase was going to present us with our most critical problem. Then it is going to be like the fire alarm in a crowded theater. The boys here at home are going to say, "Now is the time to look for a permanent peacetime job." It started last summer when we thought we were near victory in Europe; but with the actual collapse of Germany, which we hope for within the next few weeks or months, then it is really going to be a challenge. What is going to happen? In the next few months 75,000 men in the San Francisco area alone must be taken from the work of constructing ships and put into the repair yards there, and 12,000 additional, or 87,000 altogether, will be required to repair vessels. The Senator from Massachusetts cannot reveal the extent of our naval damage, but it is substantial. It has not been a picnic in the Pacific.

How is that transfer to be accomplished? How are those men going to be taken from the shipyards where they are building ships and put into the repair yards? Anyone who has the slightest experience with a similar situation knows that the difficulties are going to be terrific. That is why I feel that—confident as we are of the collapse of Germany within the next few weeks or months—then is going to be the time when more than ever some work-or-fight legislation will be absolutely imperative if our boys in the Pacific are not to be crucified upon the cross of the demoralization of our home front by the attitude, "Somebody is going to get reconverted to permanent peacetime occupation, and I might as well be the one."

The boys in the trenches are not going to have that opportunity. They must stay where they are put. But the boys here at home, under the voluntary cooperation plan, have, every one of them, a right to think of their families and their future, and say, "Well, they can run the war without me now, and so I will look for a peacetime job."

That is why, Mr. President, I hope and pray that we will furnish support to the boys by giving them something more than voluntary cooperation in the great challenge they must meet and the great sacrifice which they are being compelled to undergo.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hesitate to consume the time of the Senate at this hour in discussing the amendment which is now pending.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me so that I may make a brief observation?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will yield the floor so that my colleague may make a statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The junior Senator from Kentucky is recognized; and the time will not be charged against the senior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, during my temporary absence from the Senate my good friend the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] referred to a note which he had received from a boy overseas, who referred to something I had said about the work-or-fight bill. The writer of the letter stated that I had made the statement that the House bill was as dead as Lazarus, and asked that I be informed that, in the first place, I had selected the wrong Bible verse, because Jesus had said: "Our friend Lazarus sleepeth; but I go, that I may awaken him out of sleep."

The writer of the letter expressed the opinion that the bill is no more dead than was Lazarus.

Mr. President, I am not a profound student of the Bible, but I believe that this point should be called to the attention of the Senate, because if the bill is as dead as Lazarus, it is beyond redemption, or I do not read the Book aright.

I refer to chapter 16 of the Gospel according to St. Luke, beginning with the nineteenth verse:

There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day:

And there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores,

And desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table; moreover the dogs came and licked his sores.

And it came to pass, that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died, and was buried;

And in hell he lift up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom.

And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame.

But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things: but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented.

I said that the House bill was as dead as Lazarus. I hoped it was as dead as Lazarus; and if it is, it cannot be any deader than that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think the Senator should complete the Bible quotation, because I think it is rather clear that Lazarus later was raised, whether from the dead or from sleep. At any rate, he came back to life.

Mr. CHANDLER. That may be.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. CHANDLER. Let me conclude. I am speaking in my own time.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I may interject, my colleague from Kentucky and the Senator from Maine are speaking of two different Lazaruses.

Mr. CHANDLER. If I read the Book aright, the Lazarus of whom I was speaking is dead, and has been dead for quite a while. The colored folks say that if a man dies, he shall live again. I did not say that he was not later resurrected, as we all hope to be some day; but if the House bill is as dead as the Lazarus of whom I spoke, it is dead beyond redemption.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules, with the senior Senator from Kentucky, that there were two Lazaruses, and that the Senator from Maine and the junior Senator from Kentucky were speaking of two different men.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am glad to have the Chair confirm and fortify my parliamentary point. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, nothing is ever dead in the Senate until it is completely buried.

In the few moments I shall occupy, I shall not discuss in detail the merits or demerits of the House bill known as the May bill, or the substitute reported by the Committee on Military Affairs. I desire to direct my remarks chiefly to the amendment which is now pending, which proposes to change the language of the so-called Revercomb substitute on page 3, where it is provided as follows:

Any such registrant—

That follows a provision in section 2 of the Revercomb substitute, providing for substantial work in some lawful occupation.

Any such registrant between the ages of 18 and 45 who is not performing substantial work in a lawful occupation as determined by the selective service local board shall forthwith be ordered by said local board to report on a designated date, fixed by said local board, for induction into the land or naval forces.

The Senator from North Carolina proposes to change that language by striking out the words "in a lawful occupation" and inserting in lieu thereof the words, "in an activity, profession, occupation, or industry essential to the war effort."

Mr. President, I did not inject into this debate the word "loafer." The Senator from West Virginia himself injected that word into the debate by telling us that his amendment was intended to catch the loafers, and he illustrated the type of loafer he had in mind by referring to those who hang around poolrooms.

I do not know how many loafers there are in the United States. I hope there are comparatively few. I am not so certain that our Army or our Navy would be materially improved by the injection into their midst of a large number of those who are so indifferent to the welfare of their country or their community as to be professional or habitual loafers.

There is not a loafer, if there are such, who might be contemplated by the Senator from West Virginia who could not escape the provisions of the Senator's own substitute by changing his status from that of a loafer to that of a man who was lawfully occupied or was substantially engaged in some lawful occupation, no matter how unimportant it might be. A man does not even have to be compensated in order to be engaged in a lawful occupation. If he is engaged in some occupation that is not unlawful, he would be exempt from the provisions of this section of the Senator's proposal. If we might take again, as the Senator did, a poolroom as an illustration, and a man who was loafing there, doing nothing but sitting in a chair watching other men play pool, all he would need to do would be to say, "I am going to come here every day and sweep out this poolroom." That would be a lawful occupation, and he would thereby escape the provisions of the Senator's own amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sorry I cannot yield. I have only 20 minutes in which to speak.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Simply in order to correct the Senator regarding the use of the illustration of a man sitting in a poolroom, I call attention to the language of the substitute reading "is not performing substantial work in a lawful occupation."

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. Well, Mr. President, what is "substantial work" in a poolroom? [Laughter.] I myself do not know. The Senator drew our attention to a poolroom as a focal point for loafers. There are many others who do not hang around poolrooms, but I am using the Senator's own illustration.

I am supporting the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], because I believe that, instead of trying simply to put into the Army or into a war plant those who are loafing, those whose services may be of questionable value, if we are going to deal at all with them we should deal with those who are doing substantially nothing to contribute to the war effort. We are told that we should not vote for any tightening of the law, because it would be a change in our national policy. I have supported that national policy. I have supported the theory that we can get along without any compulsion imposed on the voluntary system.

I was a Member of the House of Representatives when the United States became involved in World War No. 1. We had a long and acrimonious debate in the House of Representatives on the question whether we should abandon the voluntary system of raising an army in the United States. I recall that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives refused to follow the recommendation of the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, who asked us to enact a selective-service law. The ranking Democratic member of that committee in the House of Representatives likewise refused. They fought with all their ability and their influence to retain the voluntary system of raising an army in World War No. 1. They used as their argument that we always had been able to raise armies by the voluntary system. It fell to the lot of a Republican member, a minority member, of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Julius Kahn, of the State of California, to lead the fight in the House of Representatives for the selective-service law which finally was enacted, under which we raised an army of 4,000,000 men.

To say that we cannot now change our course because we have always pursued a different one is to use the argument of the man who said, "'I have always gone where I wanted to go by means of horse and buggy, and I refuse to ride on a train or in an automobile or in an airplane, because I have always done it the other way."

Mr. President, I realize how disagreeable the word "compulsion" is. I listened to my eloquent friend the junior Senator from the State of Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] a while ago, as he detailed to us how in the plant where he worked men loafed and "soldiered" on the job because from some mysterious source the word came down to them that they should do that because a contract was about to be completed and there was no other contract in sight—and let me say that the Senator's speech was a beautiful one, and I pay tribute to the eloquence of my young friend—yet, Mr. President, while he was making that speech I wondered whether the United States Government, after all, should not have some power to deal with a situation such as that, whether it should not have the power to say to men who are loafing on the job while engaged in making guns and airplanes just what would be said to men in the uniform of the Army or the Navy if they were found loafing on the job.

I do not know who is responsible for shortages; but I read in the morning Post, published in the city of Washington, the statement that the airplane output has fallen short of schedule in the months of December, January, and February. I do not know who is responsible for that situation; but that falling short in the schedule of what the War Production Board, the Army, and the Navy said we needed may mean that we may be short of airplanes on the battle fronts. We know how important airplanes now are in the conduct of war. In Detroit a strike is now going on. I shall not enter into a discussion of the merits of antistrike legislation; but in Detroit 9,000 men are now out of their places of work because 15 men in the plant had been fired. I shall not discuss the merits of that controversy. But somewhere up or down the line some persons have thought more of those 15 men who have been fired in Detroit than they have of a million men who are being fired at in the valley of the Rhine.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sorry, I cannot yield. I have only 20 minutes. I should like to yield, especially to my friend the Senator from Tennessee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is that all?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, Mr. President, I suggested this rule, and I am going to

abide by it, inasmuch as I initiated its imposition.

Mr. President, we may have our minds fixed on the men who are in this country. We may wonder what they are thinking about what we are doing here in the Senate. We have heard much about the morale of our men on the fighting fronts. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] read a very appealing letter from his own son, who for 3 years, I believe he said, has been overseas on the battle fronts. It does not make any difference whether he has been there 3 years or 3 months; what he said, I think, should make a strong appeal to us.

I do not know how seriously the morale of the men on the other side of the two oceans might be affected by our votes here. I have great confidence in their morale. They are there to do a job, and they are doing it in a magnificent way. I do not know whether they are taking note now of what we in the Senate do. But I know when they get back here they will take note of what we are doing in the Senate, and they will have a right to do so. They will have a right to take note of whether we are now more concerned about the safety or convenience of those who are in this country than we are about those who are fighting or perhaps dying at this very hour.

It is not necessary that there should be any inconsistency between the two. We have been told that England and Russia, under what has been called the compulsory system, have not done as well as we have done in the production of war material. Mr. President, in my judgment, it is not fair to draw a comparison between the United States and Great Britain in the matter of production. In the first place, we have marvelous and inexhaustible natural resources. With the exception of coal, Great Britain must import nearly everything which she uses in the production of war matériel. She must bring it from all parts of the world, assemble it, and make it into war material. We have it on the ground right here at home. Our industrial manpower and our natural resources are infinitely greater than those of England. Furthermore, our citizens and our homes have not been bombed, and our families have not been murdered. Our workmen have not been compelled to attend funerals of their own children who were bombed from the sky by enemy airplanes. It is unfair to make a comparison between our production and that of Great Britain.

While Russia has great and inexhaustible natural resources, she has not been an industrial nation to the extent that the United States has been. Russia has great manpower, and a great range of territory, but only within the past 25 years has she made any effort to industrialize her people. Russia had to import from our country engineers, scientists, and other skilled men in order to be taught how to produce industrial products. When we consider that only within the past 25 years have the present industrial capacities of Russia been developed, we must agree that Russia is entitled to a great deal of credit. So it is not fair to say that we have outstripped Russia and England, because such a comparison is not fair.

Mr. President, I have rejoiced at the marvelous performance of our people. No one would care to disparage the performance of industry or labor, whether organized or unorganized. But, Mr. President, when we are told, as we are being told today, that between now and the 1st of July 250,000 men engaged in the production of ships will leave the shipyards of the United States, and when we realize that when we finally reach our maximum speed in the Pacific more and more ships, and more and more guns and ammunition will be needed in order to defeat the Japs, and that the munitions of war will have to be carried three times as far as we have been carrying them to our armies in Europe, how can we say that 250,000 men will not be needed? How do I know that 4, 6, or 12 months from now we shall not need more matériel than we can now produce, or calculate to produce under what we have undertaken to call the voluntary system?

Mr. President, I want to reach the loafers, so called by the Senator from West Virginia. I am certain that we should have power to wage war successfully, as rapidly, and as speedily as possible, and transfer men from one occupation in civil life to another, just as men are transferred from the Air Corps, for example, to the Infantry. We took about 25,000 men and trained them as aviators. Later it was discovered that we had more pilots than were needed, and they were transferred to the Infantry. They were not asked whether they wanted to be transferred, but were transferred without being consulted.

If there are more men in the plants than are needed, and they are loafing, certainly the Government of the United States, under the obligation to supply men all over the world—12,000,000 of them—should have the right to say whether a man who is loafing, or doing nothing, or working in a nonessential job, can be directed toward the production of things which are so essential in achieving the great victory for which we pray day by day.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have consumed my allotted time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 1 minute left.

Mr. BARKLEY. For the reasons which I have expressed, and for others which I do not have time to express, I shall support the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] to the substitute for the committee amendment which has been offered by the Senator from West Virginia. It is not now necessary for me to discuss how I shall vote on the Revercomb substitute, no matter how the pending amendment may be disposed of. I may discuss that phase later. I do not know; and I cannot hug to my breast the delusion than anything which I may think, or anything which I have said or might say, would influence a single vote in this Chamber, but I have been impelled to say it because that is the way I feel, and it is the way I shall vote.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, it is my hope that within a very few minutes I may bring the debate, so far as I may take part in it, to a close. I feel that the views expressed on the amendment of the able Senator from North Carolina to my amendment in the nature of a substitute have brought fully before this body a very clear understanding of the issue involved. During the course of the discussion which has taken place in the last few days a tendency has developed toward a somewhat acrimonious form of debate and, perhaps, extreme statements.

Mr. President, the sole question is whether, by agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina we shall place within the hands of those administering the government of this country the power to use force upon willing working people who have performed well the job of producing matériel for the fighting men whom we have sent into the war.

This is an occasion when one might appeal to sentiment. It is no time, however, in this serious hour, and in the discussion of such a serious subject, for draping the flag about us in this body. We must approach the question seriously, in earnestness, and meet it in a practical way. We owe a duty to the men on the fighting fronts, wherever they may be, to furnish them with materials necessary to wage the war successfully to its early termination.

Mr. President, I believe I express the sentiment of every Member of this body who may oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina to my substitute when I say that if I believed for one moment that it would be of help to the civilian structure of the country, I should support it readily. But I cannot bring myself to believe that enforced labor in the United States would produce as much as does free labor. The system of forced labor may work in Russia. It may be used temporarily in Britain, where the shot and shell have been falling on the civil population, but it would not make the American worker produce more than he now produces. I would still rather appeal to his patriotism.

So far as the morale of the men at the front is concerned, can you believe, Mr. President, that it can improve their morale to know that back here at home in the land where their Government functions, their fathers, their mothers, their brothers, their sisters, and their wives are to be forced into factory work? I say if it is needed, do it; but I submit to this body that, upon the record of production which has been made, it is not needed.

I hold in my hand a letter from a boy at the fighting front in Italy, a soldier. I read the letter into the RECORD last week, in which he says that the fighting men at the front do not want this kind of legislation placed upon those whom they have left back here at home.

If this amendment is adopted, it places upon all, including the ready worker and the willing worker, the control of Government. I am ready to go so far as that with those who will not work in any lawful occupation, but not beyond that point.

I am charged with injecting the term "loafer" into this debate. Yes; I used that term; but the language of the substitute as sought to be amended is:

> Any such registrant between the ages of 18 and 45 who is not performing substantial work in a lawful occupation as determined by the selective-service local board, shall forthwith be ordered by said local board to report on a designated date, fixed by said local board, for induction into the land or naval forces.

The local selective-service board knows better than any other group in this country who is working in the locality. I do not think we can compare the man who does not work, who willfully refrains from working, with the one who willingly gives his service in support of the war effort. Therefore, I am willing if he refuses and fails to seek work and perform service in some lawful occupation that the Government should say to him through the selective-service board, "You are coming up to be examined and your services are going to be offered to the armed forces and if they will not accept you, then a place in work will be found for you." That, Mr. President, is as far as we should go.

I have no more to say; but I submit to the Senate that if the amendment now pending as offered by the Senator from North Carolina is adopted, we, in essence, turn to the principle of the May bill, which places upon the workers of this country so needlessly, so wrongfully, the force of Government.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], an amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BAILEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	Overton
Bailey	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Hoey	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Bushfield	La Follette	Taft
Butler	McCarran	Taylor
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Idaho
Capehart	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McMahon	Tobey
Chavez	Magnuson	Tunnell
Cordon	Maybank	Tydings
Donnell	Mead	Vandenberg
Downey	Millikin	Wagner
Eastland	Mitchell	Walsh
Ferguson	Moore	Wherry
Fulbright	Morse	White
George	Murdock	Wiley
Gerry	Murray	Willis
Green	Myers	Wilson
Guffey	O'Daniel	
Gurney	O'Mahoney	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] to the substitute amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

Mr. BAILEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have not been privileged to be preseht during all the debate on the pending bill. I regretted that I was compelled to be absent from the Senate yesterday when a very important discussion was had.

I have been in a quandary as to how I should vote on the issue before us. It has been the most difficult problem for me to decide since I have been a Member of the Senate. The truth is, I think I feel more inadequate and incompetent to pass upon this question than upon any on which I have voted since I have been a Member of this body.

Mr. President, one thing I resolved to do when I came to the United States Senate, and I think that up until now I have kept that resolution. It was to support the Commander in Chief in the war effort. I shall certainly continue to do that and vote accordingly, respecting all legislation requested by him which has a direct bearing on the prosecution of the war, until such time as I know that he is wrong, and I doubt that that time will come. I do not anticipate that it will come.

My understanding is that the President, our Commander in Chief, who is better informed as to the progress of the war and what is required, to whom we must look for guidance, to whom we must look for leadership, and whom we must follow in the prosecution of the war, has concluded that such legislation is needed to support the boys on the battlefields who are giving their lives in order that we might gain the victory.

Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the able leader on the Democratic side of this body. I should like to ask our able leader whether it is true that the Commander in Chief desires the enactment of the measure now under consideration, and the measure to which I refer embodies the amendment now pending.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will permit me to give a chronological statement as to the President's attitude on a legislative proposal of this kind, I might answer him by saying that more than a year ago, in his annual message, the President asked the Congress to enact universal-service legislation. In his message to this Congress in January he repeated and emphasized that recommendation.

While the bill before us was pending in the Committee on Military Affairs, and while the President was absent in the Mediterranean Sea, I received from him a message which I transmitted to the Committee on Military Affairs, and, if the Senator will permit me, I shall be glad to read it to him.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should be very glad if the Senator would do so, and I shall be glad to have him take part of my time to incorporate it in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. BARKLEY. This is a message dated the 11th of February. It is marked a "Memorandum to Senator BARKLEY from the President." This is what he said:

> I hope that legislation embracing the principle of the May bill can be speedily enacted. It will assure the armed services they can rely on the flow of the necessary supplies and greatly contribute to the success of our arms.

If I may add a sentence, when I received that message from the President while he was overseas it seemed to me that he must have received information over there, or must have come under the influence of observations he made over there, which impelled him to send this message to be delivered to the Committee on Military Affairs, and, through it, to the Senate. He mentioned specifically the May bill, which had already been passed by the House. In his messages to Congress in January 1944 and January 1945 he did not mention any particular bill because none had been introduced. But he did mention the May bill specifically in his message after the House had acted.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the able Senator. At this time, Mr. President, in my vote on the measure before us, and particularly on the amendment now pending, I am yielding my judgment in favor of that of the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, and I am yielding it in the hope that what we may do, if we enact the proposed legislation, will be in support of our fighting men and actually make a contribution to bringing about a speedy end of the war.

I heard the able Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], when speaking this morning about conditions which obtained in the war plant where he worked, say that some of his fellow workmen went away to other plants, but returned, and said their reason for returning was that conditions were worse in other plants than they were there. If it is true that conditions were worse in other plants, than what the able Senator described as those existing in the war plant where he worked, all I can say is that it is a national disgrace, and something should be done about it. I do not know whether the proposal before us is the correct answer or not, but this is what the Commander in Chief says he wants and what he needs and what our armed forces need in the prosecution of the war.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I gladly yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I said that there was loafing in the plant—and I was one who took part in it—not because we wanted to loaf, but merely because the work was not provided, contracts were not coming consecutively, and materials were not on hand at the time they were needed. I do not believe in drafting the workingman for the fault of management and the War Department, the Ordnance Department, or whoever it is that supplies the contracts. I do not believe that the workingman who does the job should pay the penalty for someone else's shortcomings.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I certainly have no intention of reflecting on the workingman, but I understood the Senator in his remarks this morning to say he did not know where the blame lay,

Nor do I, and I am not now attempting to place it, but when such a condition obtains, when we are in an all-out war, and thousands of the best of our Americans are dying every day, I say it is a national disgrace, there is something wrong. There is blame somewhere, and it should be corrected. The proposal before us is part of what the President says should be done to correct the condition, and I am going to support it on that theory.

I hope the President is right, I hope the legislation to be enacted will give us the answer. I do not always follow the President. I vote on domestic issues as I think I should vote, and I am not sure at this hour that the proposal now before us will actually bring the result hoped for, but it is the best I know of to do in a time of crisis, the greatest in the history of the country. Something should be done, the President says, and this is what he recommends. He is our Commander in Chief. He knows, or should know, more than I have the opportunity to know on this particular issue. If this were an issue regarding domestic affairs, I certainly would be willing to risk my own judgment, but this is an issue which involves the very lives, possibly, of hundreds of thousands of our best young men. Therefore, I am supporting the President, our Commander in Chief, and our boys in the service.

Mr. President, I am going to support the proposal for another reason. We have already consumed a great deal of time on this legislative proposal since it was first introduced, and if it is needed, it is needed now, not a month or two from now. I am ready to vote today in order to get this legislation in conference, where the conferees will have an opportunity to go to work immediately and try to bring out legislation which will better present manpower conditions and make a contribution to the cause of victory.

Mr. President, I have no thought of reflecting upon labor. No remarks of mine should be so construed. We all know that in labor we have many individuals who are just as patriotic as any others—and when I say "many" I mean more than 99 percent of labor. I know that. I know also that in management we have some who are not patriotic. And I say with equal emphasis that I have no respect for the fraction of the percent of either labor or management that will not get in here and give its best in the war effort.

I have no quarrel with either. All I want, Mr. President, is to mobilize America to the maximum of her strength. Let us throw all our force and all our power against the enemy which is murdering and spilling the blood of the youth of our land. Let us bring this war to a conclusion at the earliest minute possible, and if it takes a little control over me and over mine, if it takes a little control over the fellow you talk about who loafs around the pool hall, if it takes a little control over the man who may be in what is a lawful employment but whose services are needed somewhere else to obtain full mobilization, I am ready for a little more control to be exercised. I am ready for America to be mobilized to the fullest, and to strike with all her might in order that victory may come more quickly. We cannot fail our fighting men. We must not. Mr. President, I vote to support them as they give their all for us.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], as the author of the pending amendment, allow me to address an inquiry to him pertaining to another part of the bill? Or should such an inquiry more properly be addressed the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]? In his amendment, on page 3, in lines 17, 18, 19, and 20, occur the following words:

Provided, however, That such registrant so certified for work by the selective-service local board is physically and otherwise able to perform the work assigned to him.

That follows earlier language in the proposed substitute which provide that anyone between 18 and 45 years who, if the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina is adopted, is not engaged in substantially essential war work, is liable to induction, and if the armed forces do not require his services, or they are not acceptable to them, then he is certified to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. Then the amendment provides:

Any registrant so certified——

Mr. BAILEY. To what page is the Senator referring?

Mr. PEPPER. Page 3, and I am now reading lines 12 to 17.

Mr. BAILEY. Is that the Revercomb amendment?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; the Revercomb amendment.

Any registrant so certified to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall be required to accept such employment, and to work at such employment, as shall be designated for him by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, through such agencies as said Chairman may designate.

The question is: Does the amendment in any other place guarantee to the worker who will be assigned under the direction of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and who is physically and otherwise able to perform the work assigned to him—that he will receive fair compensation and will be required to work only under fair labor conditions?

Mr. BAILEY. No. The Senator has asked the question, and I say, "No." We are not even thinking about those phases of the matter. It is assumed that he will receive pay according to his skill and according to his value. But I think the Senator has now suggested that, having submitted my amendment, I should write a national labor wage and hour act.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the able Senator from North Carolina accept an amendment as follows:

Provided, however, That it shall be within the power of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to see to it that the worker so assigned has the advantage of fair labor conditions and fair compensation for the work to which he is assigned.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the Senator is asking me to go very far on the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] to the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. It would require unanimous consent to have any modification made of the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina before it is voted on.

Mr. BAILEY. I will say to the Senator from Florida that as I understand the situation, if the Senator will vote for the pending amendment, and then introduce a bill, which will not complicate the present situation, and submit the measure to the proper committee, if the measure then comes before the Senate I shall undertake to do the fair and right thing about it. But the Senator from Florida cannot commit me here and now on a national-labor policy in order to obtain a vote on this amendment. I am not now thinking about that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina. The amendment cannot be modified before a vote is taken on it, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. While there is nothing in the bill about compensation, I think it must be assumed that if a man comes within the purview of this legislation and is assigned to work in a plant, he would, of course, receive comparable wages and be accorded comparable working conditions, along with all others working in the plant. I should not say that it is necessary to stipulate in the law itself that that should occur. I think it is probably assumed.

Mr. PEPPER. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that what caused me to raise the question is that I have known of many industries, for instance, the textile industry is one, and there are many others, where it has been pointed out that wages paid are substandard. Before I vote for the amendment I want to know whether a workman is to be condemned to work at a wage which is substandard. If the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission has the authority by law to assign a worker to a job, we owe the worker the duty to protect him as to working conditions and as to at least minimum standard wages. That is the reason why I say, so far as my individual vote is concerned, that if the Senator from North Carolina and the others in charge of the pending legislation are willing to accept an amendment which will assure the worker so assigned fair working conditions and fair wages according to the ability of the employers to pay them, I am willing to vote for the amendment, because I do want to help in any way I can, but I shall not vote to give the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission the authority to stick a man in a substandard-wage job without giving the worker some legal protection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose a single worker were assigned to a given factory producing war materials, or half a dozen men were assigned to the factory which, we will say, employs 500 or 600 or even 1,000 persons, how could we frame an amendment or agree to an amendment which would give to the single worker or to the half dozen who were sent into that factory under this proposed statute higher wages than are being paid to those who have been working there all the time?

I appreciate what is in the Senator's mind and I am sympathetic with his viewpoint and his objective; but it seems to me that if we write into this bill any provision that would give to any one or half a dozen or 50 men who are sent into a factory under the provisions of the law wages which are higher than those paid men who have been working there all along, it would create a situation within the plant which would be worse than if the individuals were not sent there at all.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Just this further word. As was pointed out on the floor of the Senate the other day by some of the able Senators, we are not assigning men to work for the United States Government, where working conditions are prescribed by the Government and the compensation is fixed by law. We are giving the War Manpower Commission Chairman authority to assign one man to work for another man. When we do that, I believe we impose an unfair obligation upon one citizen unless we provide a board to supervise his working conditions and wages, or establish for him some principle of protection so that he will be fairly dealt with by the man to whose labor he is assigned.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Utah rose first. I yield first to him.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I shall be glad to help the Senator from Florida a little. No one can answer his question as he has put it; but time and again in the hearings the question was asked the witnesses who came before the committee whether this was a labor bill, or whether it attempted to change any of the fundamental labor laws. The answer was always in the negative. There is nothing of that type in the bill.

Of course, some work is more difficult than other work. Everyone knows that to be so. In the textile industry probably heavy-duty tires made from cotton represent the hardest work of all; and to transfer certain workers from easy cotton work into very difficult work would bring about an injustice. However, it is assumed that there would be a differential in pay to take care of that situation, and the contracts would surely take care of it. Under the provisions of the committee substitute, an industry-labor committee would be set up, which, of course, would take care of any evil of that type.

Mr. PEPPER. I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, amid all the hysteria and the appeals to passion which we have heard in the past 2 days, we are supposed to get the impression that we are asked to enact legislation to force a few thousand, or a few hundred thousand civilians, at most, who are unwilling to do their utmost for their country in time of war, to perform their duty.

I should like to point out that what we are actually asked to do is to enact legislation which would put every discharged serviceman under the control of Government the day he leaves the service. The Government could tell him where he must go, what he must do when he gets there, and even how much he shall be paid for the work when it is done. This bill, if enacted into law, would control every discharged serviceman just as much as it would control the few who are now unwilling to perform their duty to their country.

Mr. President, I believe we should take into consideration the prospect that 12,000,000 or more of the boys are coming back. Over 1,000,000 have already been honorably discharged. I am not willing to vote to put those boys under the absolute control of a military or totalitarian government here at home after they have offered their lives and done the best they could for their country fighting overseas.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the able Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No one would object to legislation requiring the War Manpower Commission to assign any individual to work for the Government, but we do object to the War Manpower Commission assigning an ex-serviceman, or any free citizen of this country, to work for someone who is making a profit from a Government contract. That is the whole question. If we want to enact legislation in order to win the war, let us do it, but, as the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] said yesterday, why assign a free American to work for Bethlehem Steel, the Grace Steamship Lines, Kaiser, Higgins, or anyone else? Why not assign him to the Government? Why assign him to work for someone who is making a large profit?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. That situation could be cured by those who are worried about it, by voting for the Langer amendment, which would limit all profits to 5 percent.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is more than the soldier is making now. He is not making 5 percent.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. If we ultimately get the House bill or some version of it, I want my friend from Florida to realize that an order will be issued, and it will be the duty of the registrant to whom the order is directed to comply therewith. His only consolation, if such an amendment is adopted, will be a proviso to the effect that the order must give him a reasonable choice of employers for whom to work.

This proposal is based on the British law, under which there were 1,000,000 certifications in 5 years. Under that law 5,400 violators were prosecuted and about 4,700 of them were put in jail. The British had a 15-percent worse strike rate than we had.

An effort is being made to change our whole system of government and to pattern it after the law which the British adopted when they were in extreme circumstances, and under which they made a much worse showing than we have made under the voluntary system. This proposal would change the whole concept of the American Government from one of freedom to one of compulsion.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in the second place, I have never understood why the pending legislation was limited to those under 45 years of age. If we are going to have universal service, I want to see a universal service law which will make the man in overalls, as well as Mr. Sewell Avery, the lawyer, and everyone else who may be needed for his country's service, alike amenable to his country's call. But I shall certainly not vote to give the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission authority to place an individual citizen in a job without giving him the protection of some kind of labor conditions which are decent and wages which are reasonable, considering the job he is called upon to perform.

As an afterthought, there is a proviso to the effect that the worker must be physically able to do the work to which he is assigned. If we are to impose a mandatory duty upon the citizen, he ought to be clothed with certain protection when he is called upon to work for another man.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] to the substitute proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], as amended. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a delegate to the Inter-American Conference in Mexico and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is detained in one of the Government departments on business pertaining to the State of Mississippi.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on official business as a delegate to the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay" if present. He is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 60, as follows:

YEAS—23

Bailey	Gurney	Overton
Bankhead	Hart	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hatch	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hoey	Stewart
Byrd	McClellan	Tydings
Eastland	Maybank	White
George	O'Daniel	

NAYS—60

Aiken	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Reed
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Burton	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Bushfield	Kilgore	Shipstead
Butler	La Follette	Smith
Capehart	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McFarland	Taylor
Chandler	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Magnuson	Tobey
Donnell	Mead	Tunnell
Downey	Millikin	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wagner
Fulbright	Moore	Walsh
Gerry	Morse	Wherry
Green	Murdock	Wiley
Guffey	Murray	Willis
Hawkes	Myers	Wilson

NOT VOTING—12

Andrews	Connally	Lucas
Austin	Ellender	Scrugham
Bilbo	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Langer	Wheeler

So Mr. BAILEY's amendment to Mr. REVERCOMB's substitute, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I have previously submitted and which now lies on the desk. It is an amendment to the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, after line 9, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. —. Notwithstanding the provisions of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age assistance), and of appropriations for payments thereunder, in any case in which any State pays old-age assistance to any individual at a rate not in excess of the rate of old-age assistance paid to such individual during the month of February 1945, any failure to take into consideration any income and resources of such individual arising from labor performed by him as an employee after the date of enactment of this act and prior to the seventh calendar month occurring after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, shall not be a basis of excluding payments made to such individual in computing payments made to States under section 3 of such title, of refusing to approve a State plan under section 2 of such title, or of withholding certification pursuant to section 4 of such title.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, this amendment in effect would enable those who were on the old-age-assistance rolls in the month of February 1945, to get jobs without having the money they earn used as a basis of excluding the payments made to them in computing payments made to States under section 3 of such title. This amendment is the same as the one which has twice been adopted with regard to farm labor. It would not mean that a single person would be added to the old-age-assistance rolls.

The amendment I have offered to the so-called manpower bill is designed to serve and would serve a twofold purpose.

First, and of primary importance, it would aid greatly in accomplishing the very objective of this legislation, namely, to increase available manpower. It would do so very simply by permitting the men and women who are now receiving old-age assistance payments to engage in remunerative employment without jeopardizing their old-age assistance payments, either by being cut off the rolls or by having the payments reduced. I think it is important that we understand that it is no easy thing to get on the rolls for old-age assistance, and that once on the rolls these people quite properly fear the delay and red tape attendant to being restored to the rolls or having their payments increased. There can be no question that great numbers of the people now receiving old-age assistance would accept work, either whole time or part time, if it were not for the fear of actual hunger and lack of shelter which they might face later in attempting to get back on the old-age assistance rolls.

I think it is important to emphasize that it is no small pool of potential manpower that we are talking about. As of November 1944, there were 2,067,600 men and women in this country receiving old-age assistance. I do not contend that all of them would be able to or would want to accept employment; but if even half or one-fourth of them secured employment, which would release more able-bodied and vigorous persons for more strenuous employment, we could add 10,000,000 to 15,000,000 manpower-hours a month to our manpower output in this country. Many, of course, would not be physically able to work more than a few hours each day, but they would do so if their old-age-assistance payments were not jeopardized.

It seems to me that if this amendment was valuable in making available additional agricultural labor—as it must have been in view of the fact that the Congress has twice adopted it as an amendment to legislation providing a supply and distribution of manpower for farm labor—it would be equally valuable in the present situation.

The second advantage of the amendment is that it would enable the older people to earn money in order to supplement their present very inadequate incomes derived from old-age assistance payments. I do not believe there can be any serious question of the necessity of some such program in view of the much higher cost of living. There can be little question that many of those 2,000,000 aged persons are currently forced to live on below-normal subsistence, simply because the rate of old-age assistance has not kept pace with the increased cost of living.

In this connection I think it is important to remember that only one State in the Union pays as much as $50 a month. My own State of Arizona is one of several whose maximum payment is $40 a month, and certainly it is obvious that, with the present high cost of living, such an amount is insufficient to supply the needs of the older citizens. Most States make payments which are less than $40 a month.

I have always believed in, advocated, and worked for a program of adequate old-age assistance payments, to be paid entirely by the Federal Government, and not based on need or a means test. I regard the means test as medieval and prehistoric in an enlightened social community. Such legislation would eliminate the present trend of migration of citizens from State to State, in search of the most favorable and bountiful old-age assistance laws to protect them in old age. Such a situation creates a lack of adequate manpower in some States, and an oversupply in others, and its ultimate effect is to create an unfair burden for the State with the most favorable old-age law.

I have heretofore sought to eliminate the need clause as a measuring stick for old-age assistance, but was unable to secure favorable action in the last Congress.

Moreover, the investigative work entailed in searching out the financial status of older citizens is tremendous. The investigators' questions of whether an elderly couple has a cow, or some hens, or some egg money in the cookie jar are a constant source of needless embarrassment to decent frugal people who have a right in this country to be free from such type of personal prying by Government agents. I do not doubt that if the money spent as wages for those thousands of investigators all over the country was devoted to old-age payments, the cost to the taxpayers would not be greater, the aged would receive more adequate pensions, and the thousands of snoopers could be shifted to more essential work in the solution of our manpower problem. The present amendment will at best eliminate some of the investigators and make them available for other work.

However, in view of the present manpower situation in which we find ourselves, I believe there can be no sound objection to the amendment, as at least a duration measure which would add to our manpower pool without incurring any additional expense to the Federal or State treasuries. At the same time it would afford more than 2,000,000 aged citizens an opportunity to supplement their present meager incomes. Let us give those old people a chance to help in the war program.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Do I correctly understand that the Senator is proposing that a recipient of old-age pensions shall maintain his status and his rights, but shall not draw his pension while engaged in private employment?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; he would continue to maintain his status and draw his pension. The old people to whom I refer are not able to work all the time. The

difficulty arises because if they get work for a month or two, and then have to quit permanently and are cut off the old-age assistance rolls they have difficulty getting reinstated. The amendment which I am submitting is the same as the one which we adopted in regard to farm labor. I hope that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] will accept the amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am glad the Senator has raised the question. What he proposes to do is in line with what many States are now doing, namely, adopting legislation so far as State contributions are concerned. Provision should be made so that persons who work in war plants or do other types of work which may not be quite so necessary, will not be cut off and lose their rights. In my State when an old-age pensioner had obtained a job in a restaurant, for example, or had worked at some other employment for a short while and had received a small pittance, some social worker came to him and asked him where and how he had made the money. He had to go off the old-age pension rolls because he had been a recipient of some other form of income. The State of Washington has recently enacted legislation correcting the situation, and the amendment of the Senator from Arizona would be in line with what many States are attempting to do. I think the amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. As stated by the Senator from Arizona, his amendment is consistent with what is already the law of the land with regard to agricultural labor. It would produce more workers at a time when the existing situation should be corrected, and I shall be glad to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment to the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee substitute, and I hope the Senator from Utah will take it to conference. After the period in line 20, page 17, of the committee substitute as amended, I offer to amend by adding the following: "The chairman shall by regulation provide for the establishment of such administrative tribunals as may be necessary for the purpose of this section."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, was the amendment of the Senator from Arizona agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). It was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Did the Chair announce that the amendment had been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was agreed to without objection.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I wish to say a word about it. I believe there is no doubt in the world about the justification for the liberalization of the old-age section of the Social Security Act in some aspects along the line to which the Senator from Arizona has proposed. However, I should not want the adoption of the amendment which the Senator offered purely as an emergency matter, to be terminated with the end of the emergency, to be construed, as evidently the able Senator from Washington proposes to construe it, as a precedent to be binding for permanent application. We are proposing to make a survey of the act this year and make a recommendation with reference to expanded benefits. I very much prefer that the subject have the total consideration, so far as permanent legislation is concerned, without any suggestion that we have prejudged it by the action which the Senate has now taken.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not know what value as a precedent the amendment may have, but it is for the duration of the war. I was afraid I would run into difficulty if I offered it as permanent legislation, inasmuch as I have been unable to secure the passage of permanent legislation. I should like to see it become permanent legislation, but, for the reason I have stated, I offered it as a duration measure.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Very well.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, section 5 is very important, and I think we should provide in the section for the appointment of an impartial administrative tribunal. Therefore, I propose as an amendment, on page 17, line 20, after the period, to insert the following:

The chairman shall by regulation provide for the establishment of such administrative tribunals as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I admit that the amendment should be considered as a perfecting amendment. I shall be glad to accept it and take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] as amended.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks before the amendment is acted on.

Mr. TAFT rose.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield to the Senator from Ohio, if he wishes to speak.

Mr. TAFT. No; the Senator from West Virginia may wish to speak before a vote is taken on his amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I desire to say a word or two before the vote is taken.

Of course, I hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia will not be agreed to. In the first place, as I view it, all the good provisions of the Senator's amendment are already in the committee substitute. Furthermore, the Senator's amendment pays no attention at all to section 2 (b) on page 13, which provides for the very things which the Senator from Florida wants in this kind of legislation. It provides for the establishment of a national management-labor policy committee, and regional and local management-labor committee of the sort that have already helped so much in the manpower program. That section is an extremely strong and good section in the committee substitute, which the Revercomb substitute does not include.

In the second place, section 3 (a) of the committee bill, on page 14, is not included in the Revercomb substitute, and it is perhaps on that account that the greatest objection could be made to the Revercomb substitute, in that it fails to provide for the coordination of production schedules and contracts with manpower requirements and the availability of manpower. The effective coordination of the work of our Government agencies in this field is of the utmost importance and is provided for by this section of the committee bill.

Section 8, on page 20, is not included in the Revercomb substitute.

In that section is provided the penalty, the only penalty which is left, which I am sure is the type of penalty to which the Senator from West Virginia would find no objection. It is not the sort of penalty that was stricken out, and against which he has argued so strongly.

The Revercomb amendment also omits section 7, on page 19, which is the section which deals with the penalty, and also includes many of the accepted and necessary provisions concerning investigatory and administrative powers, which the whole committee decided should be in the bill. The penalty under paragraph (5) which was incorporated by this section of the committee bill has already been stricken out by the Senate.

Mr. President, I trust that the Revercomb substitute will be voted down, and that we may therefore come to a vote on the committee substitute as reported to the Senate.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia. It will be section 8, which appears in the substitute as reported by the committee, and I ask that that be inserted in the Revercomb amendment at the proper place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

Mr. CORDON. I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator withdraws the amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hatch	Overton
Ball	Hawkes	Pepper
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Kilgore	Smith
Butler	La Follette	Stewart
Byrd	McCarran	Taft
Capehart	McClellan	Taylor
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Magnuson	Tobey
Donnell	Maybank	Tunnell
Downey	Mead	Tydings
Eastland	Millikin	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wagner
Fulbright	Moore	Walsh
George	Morse	Wherry
Gerry	Murdock	White
Green	Murray	Wiley
Guffey	Myers	Willis
Gurney	O'Daniel	Wilson

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. REVERCOMB obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I offered to the committee amendment, and which was unanimously agreed to, be added as an amendment to the Revercomb substitute. The amendment would come in after line 21, on page 11, and would insert a new section 16, as follows:

SEC. 16. Notwithstanding the provisions of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age assistance), and of appropriations for payments thereunder, in any case in which any State pays old-age assistance to any individual at a rate not in excess of the rate of old-age assistance paid to such individual during the month of February 1945, any failure to take into consideration any income and resources of such individual arising from labor performed by him as an employee after the date of enactment of this act and prior to the seventh calendar month occurring after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, shall not be a basis of excluding payments made to such individual in computing payments made to States under section 3 of such title, of refusing to approve a State plan under section 2 of such title, or of withholding certification pursuant to section 4 of such title.

I offer that as an amendment to the Revercomb substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB].

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have advised with the Senator from Arizona, and there is no objection on my part to his amendment being placed in the substitute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona to the Revercomb substitute.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, at this time I desire to modify the pending substitute measure which I have offered by adding, after line 25 on page 10, certain language, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair may state to the Senator from West Virginia that his substitute is not open to modification. It may be modified by unanimous consent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I then ask unanimous consent to modify the substitute by inserting the language which I have sent to the desk. I may explain at this time that the language I now propose is subsection (b) of section 2 of the committee's bill, and I ask unanimous consent to modify my substitute by the insertion of that language, in view of the statement of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proposed modification will be read.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the modification.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proposal may be considered as having been read. It is a part of the committee substitute, and I am sure every Senator is familiar with it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and the proposed modification will be considered as having been read.

Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from West Virginia to modify his substitute by the insertion of the language he has proposed, after line 25, on page 16? The Chair hears none, and the Revercomb substitute is modified accordingly.

The Revercomb substitute was modified by the insertion of the following language, after line 25, page 16:

(b) The Chairman shall provide for the establishment of a national management-labor policy committee, regional management-labor committees, and State or local management-labor committees consisting in each case of representatives of labor, industrial management, and, where appropriate, agriculture, the members of which shall be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923. These committees shall be consulted on basic policy decisions made at their respective administrative levels in the course of the administration of the functions vested in the Chairman by this act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the Revercomb substitute, as amended.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, it is my desire now to point out to the Senate the difference between the substitute and the committee amendment or the committee bill. I do so in view of the statement made by the able chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], when he said that the committee substitute or bill included apparently several good provisions which were not in the substitute I have offered. I now wish to point out distinctly, so that there may be no misunderstanding in the mind of any Senator, the exact differences between the committee bill and the substitute I have offered. They may be summed up as four, and I intend to state them as briefly and as pointedly as I can.

In the substitute which I have offered a 50-percent limitation is placed upon the power of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission in fixing ceilings. The substitute is the same as the committee bill with four differences. The first one is as follows: Under the substitute which I have offered the War Manpower Commission cannot go into a plant or into a place of employment and place a ceiling there below 50 percent. There is no provision in the committee bill placing such limitation upon the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. In other words, under that bill he can fix the ceiling at zero. The purpose of this change in the substitute is to place a limitation upon his power to close out small businesses.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will yield in a moment. We have discussed for a long time the matter of small businesses, and in the committee's bill there is placed an absolute power in the War Manpower Commission to close up any business by fixing a zero ceiling on it. I feel that that power should be limited, and I consider that the best way to approach it is to fix an arbitrary ceiling of 50 percent of the persons employed at the time this measure goes into effect.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The purpose of the committee amendment is to obtain production, and in order to obtain production today, as I understand, it is necessary that we deal with but a few thousand men compared to the number of men actually employed. They are men skilled or semiskilled in particular trades.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, if my able friend the Senator from Michigan is going to discuss that particular question at this time, I must ask that I be permitted to proceed to state the differences, after which the other question may be discussed. I prefer to have it that way, if the Senator pleases.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well.

Mr. REVERCOMB. So the first difference is the placing of the limitation upon the power of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to close out businesses by fixing a ceiling on the maximum number of persons who may be employed in a plant.

The second difference consists in the provision contained in my measure which gives to a man or woman who has been thrown out of employment by the fixing of a ceiling, after such individual has sought employment for 30 days, and cannot secure employment, the right to return to his or her original place of employment and to seek again his or her job there, regardless of the ceiling which has been fixed.

Mr. President, if this provision is not included in the legislation finally passed, then we will have certain unemployment in this country, because when the ceiling is fixed by the War Manpower Commis-

sion it will throw a number of persons out of employment.

The best example I can give is this: Let us consider a department store which may employ 50 clerks. We know that today in this country in any store most of the employees are older persons, many men and women who have not heretofore worked. Suppose the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission says to the owner of a store, "You need only 30 clerks here." Twenty clerks are going to be thrown out by the fixing of a ceiling. Those individuals may be able to find jobs or they may not be able to. If the committee bill is passed as it is written, 20 persons, some of them unable to work in war plants or other industries, are going to be thrown out of employment, their services will be lost, and their method of making a living taken away from them.

My measure permits anyone who has been deprived of his employment by the fixing of a ceiling to come back after 30 days, if a place of employment has not been found for him, and recover his old job. That job is open to him regardless of the ceiling which has been fixed.

Let us take another example. In a plant where 5,000 persons are employed, if the ceiling is fixed at 3,000, 2,000 will be thrown out of employment. Some may find employment elsewhere, but many may not be fit for employment at other places. With that ceiling fixed, those who cannot find jobs cannot return to their old jobs, under the terms of the committee amendment. Under the provisions of my substitute, those persons could return to their old jobs.

The third difference, of course, is the provision of the substitute which applies to men between the ages of 18 and 45, who are not substantially engaged in a lawful occupation. We have discussed that question in the discussion upon the Bailey amendment. I have felt that those who are not employed and will not work should be called upon by the Government to go somewhere and seek a job. If they will not do so, they should be called up by the local selective-service board, the arm of the Government closest to them, and the one which knows them best. They should be called for service and offered to the armed services. If they are rejected upon a physical examination, they should be placed in jobs found for them by the War Manpower Commission.

The fourth difference—and this is the one which has been pointed out by the able chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs—deals with the subject of penalties. It will be recalled that under the committee amendment the penalty against an employer is that he is not permitted to deduct from his income taxes expenses, wages, or salaries of persons employed in violation of the ceiling fixed. That is a new kind of penalty to be placed in legislation by Congress. In my substitute I have provided a direct penalty, which covers the subject of punishment for the violator of the ceiling. Of course, we must reach out and touch the employer, because it is through the employer that the ceiling will be fixed and controlled. In section 10 of the substitute will be found the following provision, which is similar to the language usually employed in Federal legislation:

SEC. 10. Any employer who violates any regulation or any order made pursuant thereto as provided in section 6 of this act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof in the district court of the United States for the district in which such violation occurred, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 12 months or by a fine not to exceed $10,000, or both.

That is the punishment. It is in clear and unmistakable terms. No one can have any doubt about the meaning of that language, or any doubt about the penalty, or upon whom it falls.

In summary, let me say to my colleagues that my proposed substitute is the committee amendment plus three further provisions—first, a limitation upon the power of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission; secondly, the right of a man thrown out of employment by the fixing of a ceiling to go back to his old job within 30 days if another job cannot be found for him; and third, the provision dealing with men between the ages of 18 and 45 who will not work at anything, and who have been referred to as the loafers of the Nation.

Let me say in all candor that I have no pride in authorship in the substitute. I added these provisions because I did not believe that the amendment of the committee went far enough. If we place in the hands of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission the right to fix ceilings at zero, we give him the right to go into any community of this Nation and say to the operator of a butcher shop, a store, a little shop where 20 or 30 men may work, or any other place of employment, "I will place a zero ceiling on you and close up your business." I do not believe that we have yet reached that point. I do not believe that the need yet exists in this country; and I do not believe that this legislative body ought to place in the hands of any individual, whoever he may be, the power without limit to close up any business by saying, "I fix a zero ceiling upon your business."

This provision is a safeguard found only in my substitute. It is not found in the committee amendment. The purpose of it is to protect the little fellow who cannot protect himself. It is to prevent any administrator of the law from closing any business, and it affects every town and village in the country. I feel that it should be written into the law. It is a measure to protect the people of the country—not only the workers, but the small-business men of America.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to have an understanding with my friend. I object to the zero ceilings in the committee amendment, and I voted against the committee amendment, as the Senator knows. I shall vote for the Senator's amendment; but even if the Senator's amendment is adopted, I shall vote against it finally. I intend to use the Senator's amendment as a device to defeat the committee amendment; and then I intend to vote against the Senator's amendment. On the next to the last vote I will be with the Senator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator from Kentucky, with his usual candor and fairness, served notice on me the other day that he would give me the next to the last vote. I thank him even for that.

Coming to the question of what will result from the fixing of zero ceilings, or the fixing of any ceilings, when a ceiling is fixed thousands of persons may be thrown out of employment. Certainly some will be thrown out of employment. There is no guaranty that they will be able to find work; and unless we give those people the right to go back to their old jobs, regardless of ceilings, the enforcement of the law proposed by the committee will result in unemployment throughout the country.

We all know that there are many persons employed in stores and shops, or even in small factories. When they are turned out of a job by the fixing of a ceiling, they may not be qualified or equipped to go somewhere else and find a job. They may not be able to perform the duties of another job. Shall we say to those people, who are today performing good service, earning a living, and taking care of families, some members of whom may be absent, "You cannot work. The ceiling is fixed. You cannot find a job. It is too bad?" Under the provisions of my substitute this addition is made to the amendment of the committee to enable persons who cannot find a job after 30 days, and who have not been furnished a job by the War Manpower Commission, to return to their old jobs and continue in employment there, regardless of the ceiling which has been fixed.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Under the circumstances described by the Senator, must the employer reemploy the worker?

Mr. REVERCOMB. No; there is no provision that he must be reemployed; but as a practical matter, if the employer were employing him when the ceiling was fixed, it is reasonable to believe that he would want him back after the ceiling was modified. However, there is no obligation to take him back. The right is given him to go back and apply for that job on the issuance of a certificate of reemployment. It is controlled. But the War Manpower Commission must issue a certificate of reemployment if the person has not found a job or if he is not given a job in 30 days' time after he has lost his original job.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad to yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I do not wish to presume that the Senator from West Virginia is arguing against his own bill, but I am afraid the last statement he made is an argument against it. In the first place, a person who has been moved by the Government into war work is protected by the general Selective Service Act which guarantees that such a person may be returned to his job.

As I read the Senator's own substitute, his answer to the Senator from Louisiana should be that the employer must take the man back, instead of saying that the employer need not take him back.

Mr. REVERCOMB. No, Mr. President; there is no obligation on the employer to take him back. But if the bill reported by the committee should be enacted, such a man would not even be able to get his job back, because immediately a ceiling would be fixed and the employer would not be able to employ any additional workers.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That limitation would not hold as to a person who had been moved from such employment, because such a person is guaranteed a job by the provision of the Selective Service Act which provides that a person going into war work may have his old job back.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under that provision, perhaps that would be the case; but I am speaking of the provisions of the substitute proposal now before the Senate.

Mr. President, I feel that we have discussed this matter at length. I wish to say again to the very patient Members of the Senate that the adoption of the substitute will mean the adoption of the committee amendment or the committee bill, plus the three things I have enumerated; namely, first, a limitation upon the power of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to close a business and fix a zero ceiling; second, the right of an employee who is discharged to return in 30 days and get his old job back if he applies for it, regardless of the ceiling fixed; third, the selective-service board's power to reach out for those who are not employed in any gainful occupation and to offer them to the armed services, the Army or the Navy; and if they will not take them, then if such persons are found to be physically fit, on the basis of a physical examination, the board will have the power to place them in jobs.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is there not one other difference? Yesterday the Senate eliminated from the committee substitute the penalty for failure to comply with the regulations of the War Manpower Commission. I voted to strike it out, because I thought the attempt to incorporate it by reference would result in so much confusion that such a provision should not remain in the measure without more explanation.

Is it not true that in the substitute measure the Senator from West Virginia has written a direct penalty for failure to comply with the ceiling regulations of the War Manpower Commission, so that now that feature presents another difference as between the two measures?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad the Senator raised that question. I referred to it earlier in my statement. The three differences I have stated are the principal ones between the effect of the substitute and the effect of the committee bill, insofar as they relate to control of the workers in our country. It is true that there is a difference regarding the treatment of the question of penalty. In the bill reported by the committee there is confusion as to where the penalty would fall. Such confusion existed until the amendment was adopted.

As I have pointed out, the penalty proposed is an unusual one; indeed, it is proposed that an employer be punished for violation of the ceiling by saying to him that he cannot deduct from his income taxes the amount of money he spends as wages to persons employed in excess of the ceilings. That is a freakish sort of punishment; it is an unusual one.

In the substitute which I support provision is directly made that any employer who violates the ceiling which is fixed will be guilty of a misdemeanor and will be tried in a Federal court having jurisdiction over the area in which the offense occurs, and provision is made that the punishment shall be fixed as to him.

It seems to me that if the committee bill is to be passed it might well be passed with these additions to it, which I submit in all earnestness are additions which will be protective of the workingmen and protective of the businesses which will be closed by the use of the zero ceilings provided in the bill reported from the committee.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wish to say that I think we should modify the power of the War Manpower Commission as suggested, by having only a 50-percent reduction of employment. But when we grant the power to make regulations, I think they should be subject to being enforced once the power is properly delimited.

Therefore, on the whole, taking the substitute as the Senator from West Virginia has offered it, I think it meets my objections, at least, to the committee bill; and I think it should be adopted.

Mr. HAWKES and Mr. THOMAS of Utah addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor. To whom does he yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield first to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to ask my distinguished friend the junior Senator from West Virginia a question regarding section 8 (a). Provision is made there that if a man has been released from employment because of the ceiling which has been established for a given business, if he cannot obtain new employment, and is out of employment for a given time, he can return to his former employer, after giving him notice, within 30 days. Is that correct?

Mr. REVERCOMB. No. After an employee has been forced out of employment by the fixing of a ceiling, if he is not provided a job by the War Manpower Commission and if he cannot find a job in the locality in which he lives or in a locality to which he voluntarily goes, and if he is out of a job for 30 days, the War Manpower Commission must issue him a certificate of reemployment.

Mr. HAWKES. That is correct. Then, when he returns to his former employer, the employer will not be compelled to give him back his job.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The employer will not be compelled to do so, under my proposed substitute. The employee can seek his old job.

Mr. HAWKES. Very well. That clears up that point.

If the employer gives back to the man his old job, that will mean that the employer will have violated the ceiling which has been set by the War Manpower Commission; but I understand he will not have violated the law. Is that correct?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct. The effect of the reemployment provision contained in the measure is to prevent the employer from being held liable for violation of the ceiling.

Mr. HAWKES. Yes. The point I should like to have the Senator clear up is this: Suppose an employer has 1,200 men employed in his plant, and suppose he is ordered to reduce that force to 900 men; suppose he does so, and suppose that a very substantial portion of the 300 men who then are discharged return and request employment, under proper certificates. Is it the Senator's belief that such an employer, being entitled under the law to reinstate, let us say, 150 of the men, and thus to employ 150 more men than would be permitted by the ceiling which had been established, would not be held to interfere with other businesses in the community or in the area which had ceilings which were still effective?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Persons could go to such places for employment, as well as they could go back to their old places for reemployment.

Mr. HAWKES. I understand; but suppose they did; would not that make a great deal of trouble?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I cannot see that it would. I am trying to provide that a man who has been forced out of a job by Government mandate shall be given a chance to make a living.

Mr. HAWKES. I know what the Senator is trying to do, but will not that result in a great deal of confusion?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not think that it would.

Mr. President, I believe that is all I have to say unless some other Senator has a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to conclude the questions I had, if the Senator will yield to me.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. As I understand the bill, the purpose of imposing the ceilings is to enable the War Manpower Commission to obtain sufficient men to produce all the materials needed in the war effort. Accordingly I understand that it is intended to allow the employer discretion to retain the employees allowed him, and to do so according to consideration of the factors of age, sex, and qualification. I take it that the War Manpower Commission would not impose a ceiling which would result in throwing out of work persons who, as a result of the imposition of such a ceiling, would have no chance to do the job the Commission desires to have done. So I assume that if the ceiling is placed at 50 percent we will be handicapping the ability of the War Manpower Commission to do the very job we want to have done under the provisions of the pending bill.

Under section 5 protection would be afforded to any person on whose business a ceiling had been placed. The section to which I refer reads as follows:

SEC. 5. The Chairman shall by regulation provide an opportunity for a hearing before an impartial administrative tribunal to any person who claims that any action taken with respect to him under this act, or any regulation or order thereunder, is unreasonable as applied to him or is inconsistent with such act, regulation, or order. Subject to such further administrative review as may be provided in regulations under this section, the determination made after such hearing shall be final. To the extent practicable and appropriate, such regulations shall provide for such hearings to be accorded in local areas and for such hearing tribunals to be so constituted as to permit the ascertainment of the views of persons selected as representatives of management, labor, and agricultural interests in the locality.

The Senate today amended that section by providing that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall appoint the administrative tribunals. If we limit control of the ceiling to 50 percent, we shall thereby handicap the War Manpower Commission in doing the job we expect them to do, namely, to increase necessary production. While I am loath to grant any power beyond that which is necessary to the winning of the war, I think that at this time such power is essential. I am willing to vote for any bill or amendment which will result in full production of war material to be used in winning the war, but I think we are asked to place an unnecessary restriction upon the War Manpower Commission by adopting a substitute limiting control of the ceiling to 50 percent.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, it is very apparent that my able colleague from Michigan is willing to place in the hands of the War Manpower Commission unlimited power to go into any business and take anyone in it. That is what is called a zero ceiling.

I may say to the Senator from Michigan that he was not present when we discussed this matter in the Military Affairs Committee. The question was raised there with regard to giving the War Manpower Commission power to fix zero ceilings. Does the Senator know of any place of employment where labor is hoarded to a greater extent than 50 percent? I do not know of any. A 50-percent limitation would permit the War Manpower Commission to obtain much of the labor needed. Certainly a 50-percent protection to the business of this country would not be an unfair limitation to be placed upon any agency of the Government which might attempt to close businesses with zero ceilings.

Mr. President, I feel that I have discussed this matter sufficiently. My only purpose in discussing it now is to point out the differences between the substitute and the amendment as reported by the committee. I believe that the Senate is ready to vote, and I hope the differences to which I have referred are understood.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I am wholly in sympathy with the purposes of the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia, I had made up my mind to vote for it. But I have been testing it by the only rule which I know, namely, that of determining, as best I can, not what we want done under the proposal, but what can be done under it. Frankly, a grave question has arisen in my mind, and I hope the Senator from West Virginia will help me in determining it.

On page 3 of the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia, appears the following language:

Any such registrant between the ages of 18 and 45 who is not performing substantial work in a lawful occupation as determined by the selective service local board, shall forthwith be ordered by said local board to report on a designated date, fixed by said local board, for induction into the land or naval forces.

The question which bothers me at the moment is, What local board is referred to? Is it the local board with whom the individual is registered, or the local board of the vicinity in which he happens to be? Which board would have jurisdiction for the purposes set forth in the language which I have read?

Mr. REVERCOMB. It would be the board with which the registrant was registered, the board which would call him into the armed service.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, if it is intended to be his local board, I submit that perhaps a slight amendment should be made in order to perfect the language. But before proceeding to that point, I am confronted with another quandary. If it is the individual's local board which is to make the determination, we are faced with the fact that the registrants are now scattered all over the United States, and that the local board know where its registrants are. Unless we provide some requirement for reporting or obtaining information, I am wondering how, as a practical matter, the language to which I have referred could function with respect to some reasonable equity as between all those whom the Senator from West Virginia intends—and properly so—to reach.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Each local selective service board knows at all times where its registrants are. Every registrant who is registered with a local selective service board must, under the law as it stands today, notify the board where he is, or where he may be, and in that way he can always be reached.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, would such a requirement reach registrants above the age of 38?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am not certain as to that, but I think it would apply to all registrants who are subject to call.

Mr. CORDON. If that is the case, and the boards could determine where their registrants are located, I am wondering how they would reach them.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is a matter about which one would have to make inquiry. I think the board could reach out for a man. It knows where he is and what he is doing, and could very easily check up on him at all times.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am entirely in sympathy with the objective of the Senator from West Virginia. However, I think there would be a considerable lapse of time before the proposed machinery could function.

I have one further question. Situations have arisen and are arising in various parts of the United States involving the termination of war work. For example, in the Wall Street Journal of March 2 there appears an article to the effect that in the city of Portland, in my State of Oregon, approximately 7,500 war workers have been released within the past 5 weeks. Those war workers, when they are dismissed, become individuals who are not then employed in substantial lawful work. Under the terms of the amendment, would they be required to go into the armed services under the selective-service provision which appears in section 2?

Mr. REVERCOMB. They would be required to go into the armed services even without the passage of the pending bill, if they were subject to call and were fit for service; but certainly any selective service board would be expected to administer the law with reason, and if one had worked and was known to be a worker and was temporarily out of work, the board would certainly not be calling him up under the provisions of the proposed act. Even without the act such a man would be subject to call anyway.

Mr. CORDON. That, Mr. President, as I understand, would be if he were 38 years of age or under, but there are many men between 38 and 45, and I am endeavoring to determine to my satisfaction just how we can make the provision function to do the thing which the Senator from West Virginia wants done and which I want done.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Oregon, and certainly we can expect the selective-service boards to administer the law with reason in all cases.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, there are calls for a vote and I am in hearty sympathy with the call, and I now submit and ask consideration of the substitute.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish, if I may, to refresh the recollection of the Senator about the testimony which the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission gave in the hearings. Does the Senator recall having heard him say that the labor situation in the United States on the first day of January in his opinion was the best in all its history?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I was not present during that testimony, but I read the record, and I understand that statement was made.

Mr. CHANDLER. That the cooperation between management and labor was the best it had ever been in all the history of the country?

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is my understanding that that testimony was offered before the committee.

Mr. CHANDLER. That he could take the present procedures of the War Manpower Commission and supply the approximately 170,000 workers who were urgently needed for war factories at this time?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am glad indeed to have the Senator from Kentucky call this matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then I ask, What is the reason for such a law as is proposed?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator is getting to the reason for any action?

Mr. CHANDLER. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The only reason for any legislation, and the approach to it by this method, is the call for legislation in the control of labor, and particularly fixing ceilings so that there will not be too many employed in the particular plants which we have in mind.

I now submit the substitute to the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am as anxious as anyone to have a vote, but at the same time I do not want the Senate to vote improperly, or with a lack of information.

It has been pointed out by the Senator from West Virginia that he has four additions to the committee bill, but he has left out two very important provisions, section 3 (a), found on page 14, and section 8, on page 20. Both provisions are vital to the whole scheme of the bill. It is true that the Senator from West Virginia has amended his substitute to include section 2 (b) of the committee bill, but he did not include the other two, so that what he says about it being a committee bill with four points of difference would not be entirely true until he accepted section 3 (a), on page 14, and section 8, on page 20.

Mr. President, in urging that the substitute be voted down let me point out that if there is malice in the War Manpower Commission and a desire to put any industry out of business it can do it quite as well by a ceiling of 50 percent as by a ceiling of zero. There is no business in the United States today that amounts to anything that cannot be put out of business by a ceiling imposed under the Senator's substitute. I am trying to show that the substitute in no sense saves the situation which the Senator from West Virginia is trying to save.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield, although I am trying to get the vote for which the Senator from West Virginia asked.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; but when the able Senator says that the provision putting a limitation on is not effective, I cannot follow him, because if we adopt the committee bill, we give to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission the power to close up any business, the power to fix a zero ceiling and cut off every employee, regardless of the place of the employment involved. If the bill should be passed as reported by the committee, it would be left entirely to the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If I accepted that kind of argument I would say that the Senator from West Virginia had given the War Manpower Commission the power to half close every business in the United States, and the Senator from West Virginia does not mean that.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course I do not.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Does not the Senator know that taking half the employees would kill a business?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Not necessarily.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Surely that is true of practically all businesses. If for instance the War Manpower Commission started out to kill businesses, instead of finding manpower, it could do it quite as readily with a 50-percent ceiling as it could with a 100-percent ceiling, because the technique which could be used in imposing a 50-percent ceiling could take the key workers. But if the Chairman of the Manpower Commission deliberately closes any business merely for the purpose of destroying it, or does not study long enough to know when he is interfering with a man's business, then he is not worthy of the position which he holds.

We can only test the War Manpower Commission by what it has done. In what it has done so far it has never tried to impose even a voluntary ceiling of any kind, except where there has been need for labor elsewhere. That is the way it will work in the future, as it has worked in the past.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I would rather not yield, because I do not want to be accused of delaying the vote, and I do wish to make one further statement, and then I shall be through. I wish to speak of the right to return to work after being released from employment when a ceiling is imposed. This is a guaranty which the Senator has provided. But of course, if ceilings are not put on until there is need for workers elsewhere, and the workers are not released under the ceiling until they are given other jobs, the protection which the Senator from West Virginia attempts to give is of course protection which is not necessary. The War Manpower Commission, of course, will not force employees from their jobs unless other work—more essential work—is available for them.

Now with regard to those from 18 to 45 years of age, the committee bill makes no distinction on the basis of age, and of course it will work better.

The aim to attempt to legislate in order to reach loafers is one of those extremely righteous ideas which we have never been able successfully to put into practice and never will be. That is, it is not possible to legislate a loafer out of existence. In the Army loafing is called "soldiering." Certainly the Vice President, the President of the Senate, knows that, and even in the Army, the terrible place we are forcing men to go, soldiering is indulged in, and is a practice which is understood by everyone. It is not possible to do anything with those practices, and there is no use of passing a great piece of national legislation designed to find manpower if we have in mind a loafer in some town pool hall, who could not be reformed. He cannot be gotten by this sort of an arrangement. It cannot be done. If he were gotten, it would take two decent, honest, hard-working people to make the loafer work, and we would lose even if we got him to working, under those circumstances.

Mr. President, I wish to say a word with respect to penalties, and then I am through. The Senate yesterday voted to remove the penalty provisions from the bill. The provisions in the substitute of the Senator from West Virginia with respect to the penalties are in effect exactly the same as those which the Senate yesterday voted to remove. So the Senator's measure would restore penalty provisions worded in a different way from those which were removed from the committee measure but which would have exactly the same effect.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, we ought to be frank with each other about this measure. If the committee bill is adopted by the Senate it will contain a provision fixing zero ceilings, and any employer whom it is desired to put out of business can be put out of business simply by taking away from him the men in his employ. Under the committee bill, if an employer had but one man in his employ the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission could take that one man from him, and the employer would be put out of business. If the employer had two employees the two employees could be taken from him and he would be put out of business. If the employer had two employees, then under the Revercomb measure the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission could take only one of his employees from him, and the employer might continue in business. The committee bill, if adopted, could result not only in putting a man out of business, if his employees were taken from him, but it would "regulate the hiring, rehiring, solicitation, or recruitment of new workers by employers," and "no employer shall hire or retain in his employ any individual in violation of such regulations."

So, Mr. President, let us be fair about the matter. If, firstly, it is desired to pass a bill containing a zero ceiling, which would permit the War Manpower Commission to put an employer out of business, and, secondly, to keep him from going back into business, that is what would be obtained by passing the committee measure as it now stands. It is no answer to say that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission will not do it. He can do it. That is the reason why the measure offered by the Senator from West Virginia is 50 percent better than the committee bill, and that is why I am going to vote for the Revercomb substitute. In the committee I offered an amendment to strike out the provision in question, because I did not want a zero ceiling, and I did not want to give the War Manpower Commission authority to establish a zero ceiling, and to have the authority, after establishing a zero ceiling, to keep a man from going into business again. The committee bill would absolutely keep him from hiring new workers. The amendment of the Senator from West Virginia to that extent is just 50 percent better than the committee bill, and I shall vote for the 50 percent better bill, as I told the Senator from West Virginia, and then if his bill

is adopted, I shall finally vote against the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I wish to make just one explanation by reason of the statement made by the Chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, because I do not desire to mislead anyone, and I know the Senator from Utah does not desire to mislead anyone. The substitute measure applies to any workers, men and women of any age, to the same extent that the committee bill applies in the fixing of ceilings. It is only upon those who are not working at all that the age limits of 18 to 45 apply.

Mr. President, I am ready to submit the matter to a vote. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], as amended, to the committee amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a delegate to the Inter-American Conference in Mexico and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on official business as a delegate to the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has a pair on this question with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS]. The Senator from Ohio would vote "nay" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea." Both of these Senators are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—27

Ball	Donnell	Saltonstall
Brewster	Gurney	Smith
Bridges	Hart	Taft
Buck	Hickenlooper	Vandenberg
Butler	Moore	Wherry
Capehart	Overton	White
Capper	Reed	Wiley
Chandler	Revercomb	Willis
Cordon	Robertson	Wilson

NAYS—54

Aiken	Bilbo	Chavez
Bailey	Briggs	Downey
Bankhead	Bushfield	Eastland
Barkley	Byrd	Ferguson
Fulbright	McCarran	O'Daniel
George	McClellan	O'Mahoney
Gerry	McFarland	Pepper
Green	McKellar	Radcliffe
Guffey	McMahon	Russell
Hatch	Magnuson	Shipstead
Hawkes	Maybank	Stewart
Hayden	Mead	Taylor
Hill	Millikin	Thomas, Utah
Hoey	Mitchell	Tobey
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	Tunnell
Johnston, S. C.	Murdock	Tydings
Kilgore	Murray	Wagner
La Follette	Myers	Walsh

NOT VOTING—14

Andrews	Ellender	Scrugham
Austin	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	Langer	Wheeler
Connally	Lucas	

So Mr. REVERCOMB's amendment as amended, to the committee amendment, was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 177. An act for the relief of Oscar Griggs;

S. 211. An act for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 212. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11-12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941;

S. 215. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944;

S. 217. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States, and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine;

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Duke Power Co. a 180-foot perpetual easement across Camp Croft, in the State of South Carolina; and

S. 290. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Orange & Rockland Electric Co. a 150-foot perpetual easement across the West Point Military Reservation in the State of New York.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I had thought of attempting to obtain a limitation of debate in the further consideration of the bill to final passage. I shall not seek to do so now, but I hope that Senators will cooperate fully so that we may conclude consideration of the bill tomorrow. I see no reason why we should not do so. There are three or four prospective amendments which may provoke considerable discussion. For that reason, I think we may as well suspend at this point. I hope that we may dispose of the bill and all amendments thereto tomorrow.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination, which was referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nomination this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William J. Carter to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts of the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral for a term of 4 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Horace D. Nuber to be Pay Director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, to continue while serving as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all nominations confirmed today.

That completes the calendar.

HINTON H. HUNTER, POSTMASTER AT LAMAR, COLO.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, earlier in the day the nomination of Hinton H. Hunter to be postmaster at Lamar, Colo., was reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is this a nomination which in the regular order should go over?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It should not necessarily go over.

Mr. WHITE. When was it reported?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It was reported earlier in the day.

Mr. WHITE. In the usual course it would go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is true; but this is only one nomination.

Mr. WHITE. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hinton H. Hunter to be postmaster at Lamar, Colo.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 8, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 7 (legislative day of February 26), 1945:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

John J. Quinlivan, of Toledo, Ohio, to be collector of internal revenue for the tenth district of Ohio, to fill an existing vacancy.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 7 (legislative day of February 26), 1945:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

William J. Carter to be Paymaster General and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral for a term of 4 years.

IN THE ARMY

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Corps

Emery Ernest Alling
John Allison Worrell

To be captains, Pharmacy Corps

Bernard Korn
Ennis Dallas Sandberg
James Thomas Richards

To be chaplains with rank of captain, United States Army

Alfred Charles Longley
Maury Hundley, Jr.
John Porter Fellows

IN THE NAVY

Horace D. Nuber to be pay director in the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, to continue while serving as Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

POSTMASTERS

COLORADO

Hinton H. Hunter, Lamar.

DELAWARE

Roy R. Veasey, Farnhurst.

GEORGIA

William Haralson Simons, Social Circle.
Edgar J. Stapleton, Stapleton.

ILLINOIS

Harris L. Bone, Bethany.
Frank F. Donagh, Compton.
Walter F. Wilbourn, Olive Branch.
Herbert Shibe, Winchester.

KANSAS

Sue V. Hemphill, Clay Center.
Fred R. Wilson, Jetmore.
Clarence M. Fitzwilliam, Wichita.

NORTH DAKOTA

Harold R. McKechnie, Calvin.
Margaret H. Houghton, Hurdsfield.

VIRGINIA

Glessie L. Martin, Big Stone Gap.
Joseph D. Murden, Londonbridge.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful Father of all mankind, Lord of all governments, lift us nearer the stature of Jesus, that His inspiration may fall upon our pathways. Grant that sincerity may inspire our motives, serving our people without flattery and without bowing to their emotions. We beseech Thee to make our public service a sacrament, approaching our duties with clear minds and courageous hearts.

Forbid that ambition, prejudice, or jealousy should keep us apart; let us make friends one of another, and bid remembrance hold them fast, and thus enjoy a most helpful fellowship. May we be as those who broaden and deepen life by word and deed that none shall suffer loss because of us. O bring the leaven of our Elder Brother back into America that it may be a pattern of unity and sacrifice; thus this generation shall receive the blessing of our Lord and righteousness of the God of our salvation. In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXPENSES OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 168), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective from March 1, 1945, the expenses of conducting the studies and investigation authorized by House Resolution 5 adopted January 3, 1945, amending the Rules of the House of Representatives for the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the standing Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, unless otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. With pleasure.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is to defray the expense of the investigation by the new Committee on Un-American Activities, I understand.

Mr. COCHRAN. It is.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is this amount, $50,000, agreeable to the committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART], stated his committee was unanimous, when he came before the Committee on Accounts yesterday to make the request. Other members of the committee were present at the time. The full amount they asked for has been allowed. There seemed to be no objection from any source. There is no reason, therefore, why the resolution should not be passed so that the committee can proceed to prepare its staff to carry out its duties as provided under the rule.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Was it a unanimous report from the gentleman's committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; it was.

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HART. I would like to have it made clear to the House that in asking for the amount named in the resolution the Committee on Un-American Activities did not specify for what period of time that amount would be required. After all, we are a sort of experimental body. I can pledge the House that the committee will judiciously expend, and only judiciously, whatever funds may be allotted to it. But I wish to say to the Committee on Accounts that when the amount appropriated now is near exhaustion we will feel free to return to the committee, if it is necessary, and ask for additional sums.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think that is the sensible way for the gentleman to proceed.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. For the record, I understand this $50,000 is for the investigatory aspect of the duties of the standing committee and does not cover the clerk hire which the committee receives, which goes with this particular standing committee. Is that correct?

Mr. COCHRAN. That has already been taken care of in a special resolution and is being paid out of the contingent fund of the House until the legislative appropriation bill is brought in. Then it will be carried in the regular appropriation bill permanently, as all other clerks to standing committees are carried.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that is correct but I just wanted the record to be clear.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I just wanted to restate what the chairman of our committee has said, that this is an experiment. We do not know how much we will need or how long it will last. I wish to suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Accounts it would be a nice thing if we would have a roll call on this measure so that the country will know the Congress is unanimously behind this procedure.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not think so. I have been recognized to call up this resolution with the understanding that it would not take any time. I do not believe a roll call is necessary. We have a full program for the day. I think I can state to the House, because I made the announcement on the floor that the Committee on Accounts would meet yesterday, and invited any and all Members who desired to appear to come before the committee, there appears to be no opposition. Not a single Member of the House came before the committee to voice objection. So I think we can say the House is practically unanimously behind this committee. I do not feel a roll call is necessary, because we have confidence in the chairman and other members of the committee, that their affairs will be conducted in the American way, and the committee will be a credit to the House of Representatives.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not think the Committee on Un-American Activities needs any lecture on the American way.

I wish to say first in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that when I prepared the amendment creating this Committee on Un-American Activities I went into it very, very carefully from every standpoint.

My amendment made it a standing committee of the House with the power of legislation; and I may say in that connection that it has the power to recommend impeachments. Impeachment, of course, is a privileged matter.

But my amendment gave this committee the power of legislation, and, therefore, from that standpoint, put it on a plane with every other standing committee of the House. Its clerk hire is taken care of in the same way as is clerk hire for the Veterans' Committee, of which I am chairman, or the Committee on Ways and Means, or the Committee on Military Affairs, or any other standing committee.

In addition to that it gave this committee powers the other standing committees of the House do not have, the power of investigation and the power of subpena.

This resolution, now under consideration, is to cover the expense of these investigators, and other expenses to be incurred in carrying on these investigations.

As the gentleman from New Jersey the chairman of the committee [Mr. HART] has stated, this is merely the beginning. We do not know how long this $50,000 will last, we are not saying how long it will last, but it will be used judiciously, it will not be wasted; and when we need more money to carry on these investigations we will come to the House and ask for it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 74, noes 0.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present, and make a point of order there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present. The roll call is automatic. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 315, nays 54, not voting 62, as follows:

[Roll No. 30]

YEAS—315

Abernethy	Chiperfield	Goesett
Adams	Church	Graham
Allen, Ill.	Clason	Grant, Ala.
Allen, La.	Clements	Grant, Ind.
Andersen, H. Carl	Cochran	Gregory
Anderson, Calif.	Cole, Kans.	Griffiths
Anderson, N. Mex.	Cole, Mo.	Gwinn, N. Y.
Andresen, August H.	Cole, N. Y.	Gwynne, Iowa
Andrews, Ala.	Colmer	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Andrews, N. Y.	Cooley	Hall, Leonard W.
Angell	Cooper	Halleck
Arends	Corbett	Hand
Arnold	Courtney	Hare
Auchincloss	Cox	Harless, Ariz.
Bailey	Cravens	Harness, Ind.
Baldwin, Md.	Crawford	Harris
Barrett, Wyo.	Cunningham	Hart
Barry	Curtis	Hartley
Bates, Ky.	D'Alesandro	Hays
Bates, Mass.	Daughton, Va.	Heffernan
Beall	Delaney, James J.	Hendricks
Beckworth	Delaney, John J.	Henry
Bender	Dolliver	Herter
Bennet, N. Y.	Dondero	Heselton
Bennett, Mo.	Doughton, N. C.	Hess
Bishop	Drewry	Hill
Blackney	Durham	Hinshaw
Bland	Dworshak	Hobbs
Bolton	Earthman	Hoch
Bonner	Eberharter	Hoeven
Boykin	Elliott	Hoffman
Bradley, Mich.	Ellis	Hope
Brehm	Elsaesser	Horan
Brooks	Elston	Howell
Brown, Ga.	Engle, Calif.	Izac
Brown, Ohio	Ervin	Jarman
Brumbaugh	Fallon	Jenkins
Bryson	Fellows	Jennings
Buck	Fenton	Jensen
Buffett	Fernandez	Johnson, Calif.
Bulwinkle	Fisher	Johnson, Ill.
Bunker	Flannagan	Johnson, Ind.
Burch	Folger	Johnson, Okla.
Butler	Forand	Jones
Byrne, N. Y.	Fulton	Jonkman
Byrnes, Wis.	Gamble	Judd
Campbell	Gardner	Kean
Canfield	Gathings	Kearney
Cannon, Fla.	Gavin	Keefe
Cannon, Mo.	Gearhart	Kefauver
Carlson	Gerlach	Keogh
Carnahan	Gibson	Kerr
Case, N. J.	Gifford	Kilburn
Case, S. Dak.	Gillespie	Kilday
Chelf	Gillette	King
Chenoweth	Gillie	Kinzer
	Goodwin	Knutson
Kunkel	O'Neal	Smith, Va.
Landis	Pace	Smith, Wis.
Lane	Patman	Snyder
Lanham	Peterson, Fla.	Somers, N. Y.
Larcade	Peterson, Ga.	Sparkman
Latham	Pfeifer	Springer
Lea	Philbin	Stefan
LeFevre	Phillips	Stevenson
Lewis	Pickett	Stigler
Ludlow	Pittenger	Sullivan
Lyle	Plumley	Sumner, Ill.
Lynch	Poage	Sumners, Tex.
McConnell	Price, Fla.	Sundstrom
McCormack	Priest	Taber
McCowen	Quinn, N. Y.	Talbot
McDonough	Rabaut	Talle
McGehee	Ramey	Tarver
McGregor	Ramspeck	Taylor
McMillan, S. C.	Randolph	Thom
McMillen, Ill.	Rankin	Thomas, N. J.
Madden	Reece, Tenn.	Thomas, Tex.
Mahon	Reed, Ill.	Thomason
Maloney	Reed, N. Y.	Tibbott
Manasco	Rees, Kans.	Torrens
Mansfield, Mont.	Rich	Towe
Mansfield, Tex.	Richards	Traynor
Martin, Iowa	Riley	Trimble
Martin, Mass.	Rizley	Vinson
Mason	Robertson, Va.	Voorhis, Calif.
May	Robsion, Ky.	Vorys, Ohio
Merrow	Rockwell	Vursell
Michener	Rodgers, Pa.	Wadsworth
Miller, Nebr.	Roe, Md.	Walter
Mills	Roe, N. Y.	Wasielewski
Monroney	Rogers, Fla.	Weaver
Morrison	Rooney	Welchel
Mott	Russell	Whittington
Mundt	Ryter	Wickersham
Murdock	Sabath	Wigglesworth
Murphy	Sasscer	Wilson
Murray, Tenn.	Schwabe, Mo.	Winstead
Murray, Wis.	Schwabe, Okla.	Winter
Norrell	Scrivner	Wolcott
Norton	Shafer	Wolfenden, Pa.
O'Brien, Ill.	Sharp	Wolverton, N. J.
O'Brien, Mich.	Short	Wood
O'Hara	Sikes	Woodruff, Mich.
O'Konski	Simpson, Ill.	Worley
	Smith, Ohio	

NAYS—54

Baldwin, N. Y.	Gorski	Neely
Barrett, Pa.	Granahan	Outland
Biemiller	Granger	Patrick
Bloom	Hale	Powell
Bradley, Pa.	Healy	Price, Ill.
Buckley	Holifield	Rabin
Coffee	Holmes, Wash.	Rayfiel
Crosser	Hook	Resa
Dawson	Huber	Rogers, N. Y.
Dickstein	Hull	Rowan
Douglas, Ill.	Jackson	Savage
Doyle	Kee	Sheppard
Engel, Mich.	Kelley, Pa.	Smith, Maine
Feighan	Kopplemann	Spence
Flood	LaFollette	Stockman
Gallagher	Link	Weiss
Geelan	McGlinchey	Woodhouse
Gordon	Miller, Calif.	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—62

Barden	Gross	Patterson
Bell	Hagen	Ploeser
Boren	Hancock	Powers
Burgin	Havenner	Rains
Camp	Hébert	Rivers
Celler	Hedrick	Robertson, N. Dak.
Chapman	Heidinger	Robinson, Utah
Clark	Holmes, Mass.	Rogers, Mass.
Clevenger	Johnson, Luther A.	Sadowski
Combs	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sheridan
Curley	Kelly, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.
Davis	Kirwan	Slaughter
De Lacy	LeCompte	Starkey
Dingell	Lemke	Stewart
Dirksen	Lesinski	Tolan
Domengeaux	Luce	Welch
Douglas, Calif.	McKenzie	West
Eaton	Marcantonio	White
Ellsworth	Morgan	Whitten
Fogarty	O'Toole	Woodrum, Va.
Fuller		
Green		

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Camp for, with Mr. De Lacy against.

General pairs:

Mr. Luther Johnson with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Ploesser.
Mr. Patterson with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Slaughter with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Hancock.
Mr. Green with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.
Mr. Sadowski with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Powers.
Mr. West with Mr. Lemke.
Mr. McKenzie with Mr. Gross.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Marcantonio with Mr. Heidinger.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.
Mr. Burgin with Mr. Welch.

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICTORY OF AMERICAN ARMED FORCES ON THE WESTERN FRONT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the American people are not only thrilled but proud and inspired by the news of the bravery, the advance, and victory of our armed forces on the western front and the capture by them of the largest German city taken up to date in the present war.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be requested to send an appropriate telegram in the name of the House of Representatives in such manner as the Speaker may see fit, conveying congratulations to Gen. Dwight D Eisenhower and the other officers and enlisted personnel of our armed forces over there, including the officers and enlisted personnel of the United States Air Forces who have contributed so much to our victories and to our advances on the western front.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—may I assure the majority leader that he speaks for everyone on this side of the House so far as this timely message to our armed forces is concerned.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts that there be included in the telegram our thanks and appreciation, to be conveyed to the commanding general of the British and Canadian forces under General Eisenhower.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that they all come under General Eisenhower.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have submitted the unanimous-consent request, and, in my opinion, it is so broad that the Speaker may exercise his judgment and cover the situation adequately.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] that he include Gen. George S. Patton, whose armies have made a gain of 25 miles in 2 days, especially in view of the fact he has been so unjustly attacked by the "smear bund" in Washington and in New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RYTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and include an address delivered by him on the subject of the Atlantic Charter and the Crimea Conference.

Mr. HEFFERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on the death of the Honorable William M. Calder appearing in the Brooklyn Eagle of March 5, 1945.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and in one to include an address delivered by himself, in one to include a poem, and in one to include an editorial appearing in the Boston Sunday Post.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a clipping from the Akron Beacon-Journal.

Mr. COFFEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from a mass meeting in the interest of the independence of India.

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the Honorable Henry Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, before the Committee on Banking and Currency, on the Bretton Woods proposal.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter written to him by Corp. Rufus E. Webb, somewhere in France, and an article appearing in the Stars and Stripes, February 23, 1945, edition.

CARBON BLACK PRODUCTION

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked to read in the press that shortages of carbon black threaten seriously to disrupt our timetable of military operations.

As my colleagues have noted, serious charges have been made in the press that W. P. B. has failed to gear expansion of carbon black production to the tremendously increased production of military tires.

Representing a district that centers about the tire capital of the world, I am painfully aware of the consequences of these shortages to the war effort itself and to employment in Akron, Ohio, and in rubber companies elsewhere throughout the Nation.

In substance, it was reported in the Akron Beacon Journal on Sunday that the Chemicals Division of W. P. B. failed to authorize carbon black expansions sufficiently to keep pace with expanding military tire production.

Yet, the Beacon Journal reports without denial, the blame lies squarely with the War Production Board's Chemical Division. Further it quotes War Department officials as saying that this shortage is a serious blow to operations and planning.

For want of carbon black in quantity, the rubber industry is being compelled to lay off Sunday shifts. It is dipping so deeply into carbon black for nonmilitary tires that it is seriously curtailing supplies for busses, trucks, and passenger cars.

You have noted that the implications of this shortage are so serious that the matter has become the subject of an investigation by the Mead committee of the United States Senate.

I take occasion here to suggest that the Mead committee hold to strict accountability the person or persons who failed to supply carbon black on schedule, after repeated warnings of impending shortages.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MORRISON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

RED CROSS MONTH

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FLOOD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

VETERANS' INVESTIGATION

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PHILBIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short poem.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address on the nurse bill delivered by him over the Columbia network on March 6.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an overseas broadcast delivered for him and in the other an editorial.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ADAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received by him from the commissioner of agriculture of the State of New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the San Francisco Monitor.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Daily Missoulan, of Missoula, Mont.

VICTOR H. HANSON

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, Alabama and the entire South, in fact, the whole country, has sustained a great loss. Victor H. Hanson, of Birmingham, Ala., owner and publisher of the Birmingham News and Age-Herald, is dead this morning. He was a man who loved action and endeavor, and who grew more and more charitable to his fellow men and liberal in outlook until the day of his death. He was a man of unquestioned integrity. His energy was indefatigable. He stood like a rock for what he believed. I do not know of a man in the channels and activities of the press in the South whose passing will be felt more seriously and more sympathetically throughout our country than Victor H. Hanson. The Birmingham News and the Birmingham Age-Herald, two great liberal newspapers, will continue to live as a monument to the career of this great Alabamian.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. GORE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

NANCY JEANNETTE STAFFORD

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, last night at the Statler Hotel here in Washington winners of the fourth Westinghouse talent search were named. One of the winners was Miss Nancy Jeannette Stafford, 17, of Watertown, N. Y., which is located in my district. Miss Stafford was named first alternate for the first prize, which was a $2,400 Westinghouse science scholarship, and, in addition, she was the recipient of a $400 scholarship.

Miss Stafford, who is a senior in the Watertown High School, was one of the 30 finalists who came here last Friday to vie for top honors in the Nation-wide contest sponsored by Science Service and Westinghouse.

All of us from northern New York are proud that this fine and attractive young lady won this great Nation-wide distinction.

NURSES' SELECTIVE SERVICE BILL OF 1945

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2277) to insure adequate nursing care for the armed forces.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2277, with Mr. PACE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, there was pending the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] to which a substitute amendment was offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned yesterday afternoon we were considering the question of whether or not the married women should be exempted from the terms of forced induction under this statute or whether they should be included. As I recall the parliamentary situation, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has offered a substitute which will have the effect of causing the married women to be exempted from the terms of the act except as to registration. The reason for registration is that such action will provide a complete tabulation of the over-all nursing strength, and all nurses will then be registered under the terms of the proposed substitute amendment. Mr. Chairman, I am very enthusiastically in support of the Kilday substitute amendment because I think the Army and Navy can easily obtain the nurses they need without the necessity of inducting into the service by draft of the married nurses throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, according to the figures produced in the hearings before the Committee on Military Affairs, there are approximately 280,000 registered trained nurses in the United States. In addition to that, there is an unaccounted number of trained nurses who are not registered. I would assume that this number of unregistered nurses, when added to the number of registered nurses, will bring the over-all total of skilled nurses that meet the requirements of the Army and Navy, up to something like 300,000. Out of that group must come approximately 18,500 nurses to fill the present needs of the Army and the Navy.

I submit in all fairness that the needs of those two services can be amply filled out of a total reservoir of almost 300,000 nurses without taking married women——

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Suppose there are married women who have small children who are registered nurses, will they be taken from their families to act as nurses when they are now house mothers?

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, that depends on the final terms of the bill, but under the Kilday substitute they would not be taken out of their homes.

Mr. RICH. Under the terms of the bill, does the gentleman think they would?

Mr. BROOKS. Under the terms of the bill as presently drawn, they would not, because the bill does not seek to cover married women, as the bill is presently drafted.

Mr. RICH. With reference to nurses in responsible positions in hospitals, how will they be affected? Will nurses who have responsible positions in hospitals be taken from those hospitals where they are probably as sorely needed for the local communities as they would be in the Army or the Navy?

Mr. BROOKS. Under the bill as presently drawn, the Procurement and Assignment Service can certify the needs of the local communities. It is assumed the local draft board will then take the advice of the local committees as to what is needed locally. Therefore the needs of the local communities will be fully met.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, if the Kilday substitute is not adopted, and the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] is adopted, then married women would all be subject to registration and induction. I join in the gentleman's support of the Kilday amendment for this reason: It will bring about the registration of all registered nurses within the age limit. It will provide for the immediate induction of the unmarried nurses. I think there will be plenty of nurses available in that category.

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentleman will allow me to proceed a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. MAY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, and I will not object, I think when the 5 minutes is concluded I will submit a unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to conclude what I was attempting to say. After all of the nurses are registered, if it should develop there are not enough available in the ranks of the unmarried women to take care of our needs, it would be a very simple matter to so amend the act to make married women likewise available for induction. But at this time it seems to me the Kilday amendment will carry us far enough to achieve the end we seek.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman.

Now, I want to proceed further at this point. I heard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] yesterday afternoon deliver what I think was a splendid presentation of his substitute. When I went home last night I heard of an instance of a young doctor who had married a trained nurse some years ago. He has spent the last 3 years in uniform in the Pacific, returning home only last Friday from India. If you amend the bill so as to include married women as well as single women, it will mean that this young woman after having been separated from this young doctor for over 3 years could easily be drafted and sent to the Atlantic or some other distant area after his return for a well-earned rest and a well-earned furlough.

If it were necessary to break up families and to disrupt domestic relations of that sort in order to win this war, I would follow along with those who urge that we go the ultimate limit; but I submit, Mr. Chairman, in all fairness, that it is not necessary to do that in order to give the armed services the 18,000 nurses they need.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I have only a few minutes. If the gentleman from Kentucky will permit me to get these figures in the RECORD, I shall be very happy to yield to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana declines to yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to put these figures in the RECORD: There are now 44,000 nurses in the Army and Navy. Of this number 29,500 are currently serving overseas, and 14,500 are serving in the United States. This shows the relative needs of the services.

Out of the 18,500 nurses to be inducted into the service under the terms of this act, 8,100 will be needed overseas; and I daresay in working out the details of this act when it becomes law the armed services may even go further than the Kilday amendment and may see to it that no woman forcibly inducted into the service under this act should be sent overseas against her own will. There is an ample reservoir to meet the needs of the overseas supply out of those who have already volunteered in the service.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs; I am always delighted to yield to him.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. In the event the Kilday amendment is adopted what will be the position of a widow with dependent children?

Mr. BROOKS. If the Kilday substitute is adopted, all nurses will register, but only those nurses who are not married may be inducted into the service. The others may come voluntarily. A woman with dependents would still have the right to come into the service voluntarily if she so desired. That would be the situation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAY. On yesterday afternoon when the Committee rose I had propounded a unanimous consent request that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be limited to 30 minutes. There was apparently a notion among the membership at that time that I intended to carry on for the 30 minutes and go beyond the 5 o'clock period that had been agreed to. That was not the intent, and but for that misunderstanding I think my request would have been agreed to.

I renew my request, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 45 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman if it might not be wise to ascertain how many Members wish to submit amendments and wish to speak? A member of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] has an amendment he wishes to offer to this section.

Mr. MAY. I do not want to cut off anybody from offering any amendment he wants to offer; but I understood there were only about three amendments. One has been debated here for 30 minutes already.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman's request end debate on the entire bill?

Mr. MAY. Oh, no; my request applies only to debate on the pending section and all amendments thereto, limiting the debate to 45 minutes.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I state to the chairman that the amendment I intend to offer may take a little more time than the gentleman seems desirous to allow.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and now ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, why does not the gentleman from Kentucky finish the proposition we have before us? There is pending at the moment an amendment and a substitute, and we are going to have an amendment to the substitute. Why not finish that and let us see where we are. If the gentleman does not do that, I will have to object.

Mr. MAY. I hope the gentleman will not object. The House is waiting to consider another bill and I would like to get this out of the way as soon as possible. We have had 30 minutes debate on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Kilday substitute which I would like to have read for the benefit of the Members who want to discuss the whole subject and I will ask for recognition a little later.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment proposed by Mr. THOMASON to the Kilday substitute: Strike out the words "married women" and insert "women with dependent children and married women whose marriage occurred prior to March 15, 1945."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] seek recognition?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, if I may have the attention of the House for a moment I will be glad to speak a little further about this whole question of married women. You will notice that the pending amendment amends the Kilday amendment by striking out the words "married women" and inserting "women with dependent children or married women whose marriage occurred prior to March 15, 1945."

There are a good many married women in the armed forces today and we still make it possible for married women to join who wish to do so voluntarily. It is necessary that we make it possible to reach into the number of married women without dependent children who do exist. As I understand the amendment, it would make that possible. May I ask the gentleman from Texas whether this should not read "whose marriage occurred after March 15, 1945"?

Mr. THOMASON. No.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I think it should remain as it is because the Kilday substitute changed the form of the amendment from "it shall apply only" to the language "shall not apply." It means the act shall not apply to women with dependent children, whether they are widowed or under other circumstances. It shall not apply to married women who married prior to March 15, 1945. If they get married from now on it applies to them, which is as it should be.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Do I understand now that the gentlewoman from Ohio takes the position that the Thomason amendment would be an improvement on the Kilday substitute and if approved in that way will be acceptable to the gentlewoman from Ohio instead of her amendment?

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes. May I explain also that this is all dependent, as you know, on Army regulations and on the methods of the Army. The Army today under this bill is not forced to take any-

one not acceptable to them. Married women with dependent children are not acceptable to the Army, so that as a matter of fact they are deferred as they are under this bill. But as we have done in many other parts of the bill, to make assurance doubly sure, we wrote into the bill the provision that married women with dependent children shall not be subject to the bill. But we need married women without dependent children and it is my understanding that this amendment to the Kilday amendment leaves them in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The purpose is also to prevent marriages to evade nursing service.

Mrs. BOLTON. Very definitely. It would prevent marriages of convenience to escape the draft, and it would make a very much saner way of handling the whole bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. That, of course, will be effective only after March 15.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. What does the word "dependent" mean? Does that mean financial dependency?

Mrs. BOLTON. It would mean both things.

Mr. KEAN. We do not want to break up a home where a mother is taking care of small children, even though the father might have left some money to those children.

Mrs. BOLTON. You may remember that there was a change made in the Selective Service Act which removed the financial qualifications and left it as you would desire it; psychological and spiritual responsibility.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Suppose a nurse was drafted, and she was a good nurse in a little hospital or in a home, but she was of nervous disposition and one who was not able and qualified and capable to be sent over to the battle front to nurse the boys over there. If she is so nervous and hysterical that she cannot perform her duties, would you want to take a nurse like that?

Mrs. BOLTON. Certainly not. She would not pass the physical qualifications.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman be allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. May I ask the gentlewoman this question? How will the amendment as presently drawn affect the young woman who is married after the date set in the act, and who subsequently develops a family?

Mrs. BOLTON. Then, of course, the Army does not keep her.

Mr. BROOKS. She would then be released from the service and sent back to civilian life?

Mrs. BOLTON. She would be treated as are all nurses who have babies.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. Of what merit is the date March 15? Why should it not be today?

Mrs. BOLTON. Because the bill will not be passed today.

Mr. BUCK. Is this action to prevent marriages of convenience?

Mrs. BOLTON. We do not believe there will be any.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, as so frequently happens, some people are becoming a little bit too enthusiastic about the legislation that we have pending here. I want to discuss the various sections of this amendment to my amendment. The first one is with reference to a woman with dependent children. You must bear in mind that this is going to be a part of the Selective Training and Service Act; that that act contains a provision that in passing upon the issue of dependency the income in the service and any allowances authorized by law shall be taken into consideration. Therefore you have a situation in which a widow, with minor children needing her care and attention, can be taken from that family and placed in the armed forces if the Selective Service System regards her income as a nurse in the service as being sufficient for their financial support.

I realize that those who support this amendment have probably overlooked that provision which went into the Selective Training and Service Act. The gentlewoman from Ohio has mentioned the question of what they call social dependency. It is true we adopted such a provision as that with reference to a man who maintained a home for his family even though his daily income was not requisite for the maintenance of that home, but I doubt that there has been a single instance in the United States in which the Selective Service System has observed that positive provision of law.

That is the reason I offer my substitute amendment here, which this attempts to amend, to leave married women out of the proposed enactment. Let us not get too enthusiastic about this. You are providing everything in the world that is needed or that can possibly be needed in the immediate future if you accept the amendment I have offered without this amendment to the substitute.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. May I point out that, according to the regulations, at the present time the Army will not take any nurse, married or otherwise, who has a child less than 14 years of age.

Mr. KILDAY. We have found in recent attempts at legislation here on the work-or-fight bill that the Army and the War Department are not able to maintain the position they take, that there are higher authorities in Washington which reverse them quite frequently.

As to the provision to the effect that a marriage must have been contracted prior to March 15, I say that the establishment of a family is still an important thing in the social structure of the United States. I say further that these young professional women are not going to look so lightly upon marriage as some Member speaking here indicated they would. But more important than that, those of you who were here in 1940 recall that there was a concerted effort in many localities to evade service under the Selective Service Act, that traffic was blocked in streets of the United States with men attempting to get into marriage license bureaus. The proposal was made in the committee and here that that not be permitted, but the Congress of the United States refused to put a stop to that. Now you are coming to a profession that has done all that could be expected of it by those who have volunteered, a group of fine professional women in the United States, and you are going to write in here a provision which says, "We know that you, this fine group of professional women in the United States, are so devoid of an idea of obligation to your Government in time of war that you would go so far as to contract a marriage of convenience, if you want to call it that, in order to avoid service to your Government.

I resent that attitude with reference to this. It is time for us to take a firm stand that we are opposed to the administrative agencies disrupting family life in the United States, and that is exactly what my amendment does. I think it should be adopted without amendment.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. If the gentleman will yield further, I may say that I had an amendment at the desk similar to that offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] making the effective date for marriage the date of enactment of this act, but upon second thought, following the offering of the gentleman's amendment, I have withdrawn it in the belief that the gentleman's amendment will adequately take care of the situation.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to be frank about this amendment. I do not know what is best. We all want to get the job done and our wounded and sick men cared for. I have no pride of authorship about this amendment. The truth of the matter is that it was suggested to me by Dr. A. C. Scott, of the Scott and White Clinic, of Temple, Tex., who is one of the outstanding doctors of my State and has one of the finest hospitals in the country. I also collaborated with the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] to try to work out something to meet the situation.

It ought not to be forgotten that yesterday the House by an overwhelming vote said, "We do not want to take these young nurse cadets," when we are educating at Government expense 110,000 of them. If the Kilday amendment is adopted or the bill stands as originally submitted to the House, you will not take any married woman.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Except volunteers.

Mr. THOMASON. I am in agreement with the general principles outlined by my colleague from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], but I think we must make some exceptions about some married women, many of whom, perhaps, are in their thirties, and have no dependent children or no home ties such as would prevent them from serving as nurses in the military hospitals of the country. I favor the registration of all nurses, but we should not close the door so that no married woman, under any conditions, could be accepted under this bill.

In addition to that, if you let that provision remain just as it is, I predict we will have a regular epidemic of marriages. There ought to be some time limit put on that to make sure we get married women who are qualified; and also to prevent a possible epidemic of marriages.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

To get around the point which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has raised, which certainly has some merit, would the gentleman object to changing the wording and instead of saying "women with dependent children," to have it read "women with children under 18"?

Mr. THOMASON. No; I would have no objection. I just feel that some kind of fair legislation can be worked out on this subject by which we can get the married women who are qualified and who are not tied down with home and family duties.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

May I say to the gentleman it was developed in the hearing by the Committee on Military Affairs that there are thousands of women within the very age limits mentioned by the gentleman from Texas, who are not married and who will probably be permitted to avoid this if they want to marry. Of course, there is a leeway here of 1 week for all of them to get married if they want to. I do not think that question is particularly pertinent, but I do think there is a large group of nurses whom we will not be able to get unless the amendment of the gentleman is agreed to.

Mr. THOMASON. That is the way I feel about it. I repeat I have no pride of authorship about this amendment. I will accept any suggestion that will add to its strength and fairness.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Why does the gentleman not eliminate the married women altogether, because unless I miss my guess you are going to get enough nurses from the single women. And another thing, we will not be giving the opportunity here of drafting everybody and regulating everybody and everything in the whole United States. It is about time we quit it.

Mr. THOMASON. I do not think we will get enough nurses without taking some married women, especially when the nurse cadets are eliminated.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Would the gentleman accept a change in his amendment so that it would read "shall not apply to women with dependent children or children under 18 years of age?"

Mr. THOMASON. All right.

Mr. JUDD. That solves the problem.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to change the amendment I offered by adding "or children under 18 years of age."

Mr. Chairman, the amendment would read as follows:

Strike out the words "married women" and insert "women with dependent children or children under 18 years of age, or to married women whose marriage occurred prior to March 15, 1945."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be modified accordingly.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment. When this amendment was considered by the committee, I think the committee was in full agreement, as I recall, on this amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]. I think the substitute that he has offered is a better amendment than the original amendment in the bill. Now what are we trying to get at here? There is a possibility or a probability that out of the 280,000 nurses there are not over 10 percent of them who are married. No one knows. We also have beyond the 280,000 nurses supposedly in this country about 120,000 or 125,000 who are inactive. Practically all of those are married. The procurement and assignment division of the nurses have been endeavoring in every way they could to call these nurses back into the service, and have been quite successful.

They have recovered in the last 12 months something like 15,000 nurses from this group of inactive nurses. We can get all the nurses we need for the military service from this group of 280,000 without this amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. MAY. If I understood the gentleman correctly, it is his estimate that there are about 125,000 nurses.

Mr. DURHAM. Inactive nurses.

Mr. MAY. Inactive, not on duty as nurses. Under the Kilday amendment, every one of those would not be subject to induction.

Mr. DURHAM. That is what I am trying to get at.

Mr. MAY. But under the Thomason amendment they could be utilized.

Mr. DURHAM. If you will adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], which will register all of these inactive nurses and all the rest of them, we will have something that the Procurement and Assignment Division of the War Manpower Commission can work on and bring those nurses back into active duty in local nursing.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. In section 5, on page 4 of the bill, it is provided that this act shall apply to unmarried women only.

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. So that no married women are considered under the terms of the bill as presented to us?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct, but there is an amendment pending at the present time which would place married women in the service.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think, if you will read the classifications made by Procurement and Assignment, you will find there are a little less than 30,000 single nurses. They were not thought to be adequate, so married nurses were seriously culled; and there is another classification, II–A, which consists of both married and single nurses. Then there is a third classification which consists of those both married and single, who are in essential positions but can be made available. I am interested in what the gentleman said about the 125,000 inactive, of whom he speaks, being useful, because a great many of them have been fine-tooth-combed, and 2 months ago the feeling was that practically all that could be brought back into active duty had been brought back into active duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to approach this matter from the other angle, from the voluntary angle. You have heard all about the Army today by the committee that has control of military affairs. You have not heard a word about the Navy. Of course, they got the Navy to come in here with the Army, so they could presumably share in this legislation. Two thousand nurses are supposed to be supplied by this draft method that the Navy cannot get any other way. I say that is a false assumption. The

Navy is getting all the nurses it needs under the method that we have in vogue today, and I think we will get all we need for the balance of the war. There is no unanimity among the members of the Committee on Military Affairs. They do not know whether they want married women; whether they want single women of a certain age, and so on. I have lost patience with our handling of this whole thing. Now, I contend we have one group of women in our country who should be considered above all others, those who have gone out and made a vocation of this thing which is helping to cure the ills of humans, both physical and mental. They have made that their profession.

Members of that profession—it is a calling, it is a little more than just an avocation—are the only people we say we are going to have to draft. Why do you not draft all of the women in this country if you are going to draft any? Why take those who are serving humanity better than any other group in this country?

Mr. Chairman, we do not have to do this if we advance the age to 50 years and let it be voluntary, and tell these older women: "You in Washington can serve out here at Walter Reed Hospital. You in Virginia can go down to Richmond. You out at San Francisco can go into a hospital there. We are not going to send you out of the country; we merely need you where you can best serve. These younger nurses who are already in we will send outside the limits of the United States, but you older nurses may remain here." You would be surprised how many women would respond to such a call.

And in your hospital aides, you accept the WAC's up to age 50. Why do you not do the same with nurses? Mind you, here is a group that has the most disagreeable menial work for 3 or 4 years of their lives, a work of humanitarianism, yet we have the nerve down here in Congress to propose to draft them and nobody else in this country.

We can get 18,000 if that is what they need, on a voluntary basis if the War Department will use some common sense and go out and try to get these people regardless of whether they are married or not. They will come in if you make it possible for them to remain with their families under the conditions I have outlined.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am not taking the floor for the purpose of speaking to this particular amendment. I asked the gentleman from California to yield to me because I thought he made a statement that was very unfair to our committee. It is only just that it be straightened out. I am not saying the gentleman from California intended to be unfair, but certainly the implication contained in his statement was very unfair.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me finish this statement, if the gentleman will; then I will yield.

His statement left the implication that we were trying to ride the Navy in order to get this bill through.

If one will read the hearings before our committee he will see that Admiral Agnew testified before our committee that the Navy needed 2,804 nurses to meet present requirements and to take care of normal attrition to June 30, 1945. Furthermore, he showed what the procurement program was and stated that by the 1st of July of this year the Navy could get all of the nurses required for naval service on a voluntary basis.

On day before yesterday when I spoke on this bill I pointed out the fact that the Navy, based upon its own needs as of the time of the hearings, would not have to use this bill; and I believe no member of the committee has ever contended that we had to bring the Navy into this in order to pass the bill.

We are today telling you that the Army, the Army which is three times as big as the Navy, is the one that has the great shortage of nurses. The Navy can get its nurses on a voluntary basis between now and July 1 provided there is not an increased demand for nurses; but there is no one on this floor who does not think the Navy is going to have an increase in the demand for nurses, that it must have such an increase if we have many repetitions of casualties such as we have had on Iwo Jima.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. With the utmost respect and confidence in the gentleman from California, may I say that there is a much worse statement in his remarks than the one the gentleman refers to, and I mean the one to the effect that the House Military Affairs Committee did not know whether it wanted this group of women or that group of women or some other group of women. It is merely a difference of opinion here as to what ought to be done. We are all trying to get nurses for the Army as quickly as possible.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the purpose of considering a bill in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. Let me say, first, the reason I did not yield to the gentleman was because for 2 days I have been trying to get 5 minutes to speak on this bill and have been unable to do so. The gentleman and other members of the committee have bandied back and forth here three different amendments in the last hour, while some of the rest of us have been trying to get a few minutes to speak on the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not criticizing the gentleman for not yielding.

Mr. IZAC. It just happens that when you bring in a bill here which has to do with the Army and Navy it never comes before the Committee on Naval Affairs of which I am a member.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The hearings are available. I do not know whether the gentleman was on the floor Monday when I spoke on the bill or not, and I refer the gentleman to the RECORD of that date. I know the gentleman would not willfully make any misstatements or leave any inferences that were unfair and unjust and it is for the purpose of calling his attention to this implication that is unfair to our committee that I take this time to speak.

Mr. IZAC. I concede that, but let me say to the gentleman that whenever the Navy is short of anything, whether it is nurses, battleships, or anything else, it comes before the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Navy has never come before our committee with any request for additional nurses or for legislation to get additional nurses.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The reason for that is that when legislation comes up affecting both services the Military Affairs Committee, being the senior committee, has precedence, and this bill happens to fall in that category. I can point out a dozen different pieces of legislation that have been handled in the same way.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. It may well be that if the Navy were in the same position as the Army is, the Navy would be in here asking for additional nurses.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, and if the Navy were as big as the Army it would be confronted with the same kind of problem.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The Navy is not concerned about their ability to get nurses in sufficient number. They had a quota set in December that at the end of this year they would need 11,500 nurses and at the present time they have 9,300 applications in the Bureau in process. In other words, taking the nurses now in the commissioned service plus the applications on file it has more than it needs to meet its quota by the end of this year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Every bit of that information is in the hearings and I refer the committee to those hearings. When I spoke on this bill last Monday I stated then that the great need for this legislation was to supply a shortage in the Army now. I did say, and I think we might keep it in mind, that while the Navy has sufficient nurses and applications on hand to supply its needs now we do not know whether it is going to be able to get them in the future or not. We are not riding the Navy in order to get this bill through. We are pointing out the fact that we have thousands of boys who

are dying on the battle fronts all over the world. If they need nursing care, they should have it, and the purpose of this bill is to get nursing care for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FENTON. I have an amendment that I want to offer in the nature of a new section which I have labeled as section 6. Does that come under this time limitation?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's amendment would not come within the time limitation fixed inasmuch as it is an entirely new section.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, for a number of years there have been people agitating for the removal of the annual Army-Navy football game to the Capital. After the Army-Navy demonstration here, during the remarks of the last speaker, I think it might be a good idea. There would be plenty of competition and it would be worth the money to see it.

Mr. Chairman, there is considerable to be said for one point that was mentioned by the gentleman from California, namely, that considerable nursing aid can be given by older women in the local hospitals. It was for that reason the other day, when we were considering the deficiency appropriation bill that I offered the amendment, which was accepted, that permits women who are receiving old-age assistance to engage in nursing, and in caring for the sick, and not have deductions made on their old-age assistance checks, and not be thrown off the rolls for reinvestigation. That extends to these older women who are capable of helping out in home nursing the same benefit that was extended to agricultural labor 2 years ago.

I particularly asked for this time, Mr. Chairman, to read as I understand them, the way in which these amendments fit into the picture, and the way the bill will read if any of these pending amendments are adopted. We are in the position where we have an amendment to section 5; we have a substitute to that amendment, and we have an amendment to the substitute. Those of you who have section 5 before you will notice that the first part of it reads:

> This act shall apply to unmarried women only but shall not affect the voluntary recruitment—

And so forth. The first amendment, the Bolton amendment, strikes out the words "shall apply to unmarried women only but," which makes the section read:

> This act shall not affect the voluntary recruitment of any qualified woman—

And so forth. The Kilday amendment brings in a new feature in parentheses to provide for registration of married women. In place of the Bolton amendment it would make section 5 read:

> This act (other than the provisions requiring registration) shall not apply to married women but shall not affect the voluntary recruitment—

And so forth. Then we have an amendment to the substitute, offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]. It will make the section read as follows:

> This act, other than the provisions requiring registration, shall not apply to women with dependent children, or children under 18 years of age, or to married women whose marriage occurred prior to March 15, 1945, but shall not affect the voluntary recruitment of any qualified women—

And so forth. In other words, the Thomason amendment to the substitute preserves the feature of the Kilday amendment that provides for the registration of married women but exempts from other operations of the act married women with dependent children, or children under 18 years of age, or married women whose marriage has occurred prior to March 15, 1945.

I thought that a reading of the amendment in place might help us as we proceed to vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, to me it appears that this House is getting so close to the bushes that it cannot see the birds. What is the consideration of this House for that famed old institution, the American home? Why, this is a shock. We have juvenile delinquency in this country today that is at an all-time high at 17 years of age. What has caused it? The raid on the American home. Yes, we have a war on, and we expect to pay for it, but I am afraid we are going to extraordinary additional and unnecessary payments for it for years and years to come, with a wrecked morality evidenced by our present juvenile delinquency. Not satisfied with the condition that exists today, we want to march farther.

We now propose forcibly to take the wife out of the home and thus give insult to the husband who returns from the fighting front to find that his wife is in another theater of the war. Are we mature men and women? What are we thinking about? It is absurd, positively absurd. It is a reflection on a profession that devotes itself to the ills of humanity. Select those who are accustomed to making sacrifices, and then after they have entered the marriage state, take them away, take them away for a further wreckage of the home? I tell you, if this bill is to provide for the drafting of even one married woman, I shall be proud to vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. PFEIFER].

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Chairman, it is useless for any man of common sense and good judgment to sit here and believe it is necessary to pass this bill for the selection of nurses in order to render aid to our armed forces in the proportion requested by this bill, which is 18,000. Eighteen thousand is a small number. You have heard the statement of the gentleman from Michigan as to the ease with which the Navy Department procures its nurses. There is a waiting list, it has been mentioned, numbering 28,000. There is no question about it. I know many who have applied and others willing to apply, and I know of many who have applied to the War Department but have been rejected for minor defects. You know as well as I that all of us are eager to serve. Personally, I would rather serve in the Navy than in the Army due to its method of selection of candidates for its various branches of its service.

Let us not forget the responsibility and aftermath resulting from the breaking up of the home, as the previous speaker mentioned. It is a greater loss to take a woman out of a home than it is to take a man out of the home. We have already disrupted the home by taking the man. We are now breaking up the home much further by taking the woman, when it is not necessary. Let us not do that.

We will get our 18,000 nurses. It will be a simple matter. Our girls are graduating everywhere. This would accelerate it, of course. Every few months thousands of them are graduating, and they are eager to serve. Lower your requirements insofar as physical qualifications are concerned and you will get them. Recognize them, give them the right and proper recognition, and you will get them. You will even get them without this bill if the selection of these girls is placed in the hands of the proper authorities. I know it. I have taught thousands and thousands of them. I have seen them out in the world for over 30 years. I know in the institution I have charge of they are willing to serve. There is a waiting list there. They are eager to serve. But, for heaven's sake, must we stoop so low as to resort to a bill to draft them, when the fault lies in the administration? We will have enough girls in the single group. Why should we stoop so low as to take the married women?

If you want 30,000 nurses, you will get 30,000 single girls. You will get them in 6 months' time and thereafter every month if you want them, from the Nurses Cadet Corps. They are anxious to serve and they are willing to serve. But no one wants to see a girl or young woman whipped at the post.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PFEIFER. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I agree thoroughly with the gentleman's statement that enough nurses would have volunteered long ago if they had been given a fair deal and a real and adequate effort had been made to inform and recruit them. But does the gentleman think it is fair to the girls who do not get married and who therefore remain eligible for being drafted—is it fair to them to allow other girls to get married on the way to the induction station—even if there be only 10 such in the whole country—and thereby escape military nursing service?

Mr. PFEIFER. That is their own responsibility. They will have to live with that throughout life. There would be such a small number doing that. I do not believe these girls, understanding what the situation is, would be as foolish as all that. I have great respect for them.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman say then that a woman who gets married while in the service should be separated from it?

Mr. PFEIFER. That is entirely up to her. Married women may volunteer if they wish to do so or remain in service if they so desire.

Mr. JUDD. After the passage of this bill, to all intents and purposes the unmarried nurse is subject to the draft, is she not? It is our idea, that after the passage of this act, or after March 15 if this amendment carries, she is potentially in the service even though she is not actually in, and if she marries thereafter she ought still to be considered as liable for the draft. But the amendment exempts all those who are married prior to the given date.

Mr. PFEIFER. It is not necessary to go that far.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is recognized.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I am desperately afraid that in our anxiety and our desire to take special care of the women nurses of this country we are forgetting the other side of the picture. I recall, and every man who was a Member of this House on the 8th day of December 1941, and who sits here today, voted to put into the armed forces every eligible man and all of the resources and money and property of every citizen in this country. We have selected, through acts of the Congress, a leadership for the armed forces. We have compelled the men of this country between the ages of 18 and 45 to go into the armed services. You do not find them on the western front or on Iwo Jima not following the leaders whom we have designated for them. They are obeying orders. They are patriotically and heroically fighting the battles of this country to preserve the freedom of our homes and the women of America. They are not halting and talking about whether they are married or single. I daresay there is not a man who has been brought back from the battle front with his bowels cut out, lying on a table or in a field hospital in Germany today who would say, "My wife, a young, married nurse, is too good and too grand to serve somewhere in the war effort." I say to the gentlemen here who argue that they would resent it, you are mistaken. They will not lie there and see their buddies dying and then say, "My wife is too good because she is a married nurse with no children. She won't play the part of an angel of mercy to the wounded and dying." He will not object to her serving while his comrades suffer and die.

She is too good to go. No, he will not say that. That is not true. I tell you today there are 125,000 married, childless nurses in this country. I do not want this House to make the mistake of withholding the hands of the draft boards that may defer all hardship cases, by passing the Kilday amendment. I want the Thomason amendment that will ameliorate it to some extent. To me it is unthinkable that there is a man here who wants to let out an unmarried nurse, or who wants somebody to get married to escape service in the Nurse Corps. It is my understanding of the Thomason amendment that we can reach that sizable group of married nurses without children who are now not actively engaged in nursing. Every one of them will be commissioned upon acceptance, as a second lieutenant in the Army of the United States. Every one of them will be paid a base pay of $1,800 a year. Every one has an allowance for housing, board, and clothing, which brings their salary up to about $2,500. Then you tell me that a married nurse cannot do something to take care of the fireside at home with that much money, and at the same time carry water to the burning lips of a dying boy in some hospital in this fair land. You vote today for the Kilday substitute and fail to adopt the Thomason amendment to the substitute and you open the doors for the escape of 120,000 to 130,000 able-bodied active nurses who are not engaged even in a civilian hospital anywhere in America. I appeal to you not to make that mistake of adopting the Kilday substitute without the Thomason amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

The Clerk will report the pending amendment, the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], and the amendment to the substitute, offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

The Clerk again reported the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

The amendment to the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the substitute as amended.

The substitute amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio as amended by the substitute.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. For the benefit of the Committee the Chair will state that there remain 8 minutes of the time fixed on this section. The gentleman from Minnesota has 5 minutes, offering an amendment; and the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the committee, has 3.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On page 4, line 25, after the word "women", insert the words "who are not deferred under this act after classification."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, this is not a life-and-death amendment, but it is important for two reasons: First, to bring this section into harmony with the amendment we adopted yesterday offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON]; and, second, it will take the heat off a great many nurses who are working in very essential nursing positions in this country but who have been made to feel they are slackers if they do not leave their jobs to go into military service. This will make it clear they are not expected to volunteer if, after classification, they have been deferred by the proper agencies.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAY. I have a similar amendment pending on the desk. I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment; I think it is all right and ought to be adopted.

Mr. JUDD. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. May I inquire if all amendments to section 5 have been disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. Consideration of section 5 has been concluded. There are pending at the desk several amendments adding new sections.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment adding a new section to the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FENTON: Page 5, after line 3, insert the following:

"SEC. 6. No individual shall be inducted into the land or naval forces under this act for 30 days after the date of the enactment of this act, or thereafter so long as the number of volunteer qualified (graduate registered professional) nurses declared available for services in the armed forces by the Nursing Division of the Procurement and Assignment Service of the War Manpower Commission and certified by the Red Cross is equal at least to the number of nurses declared by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to be required for the land and naval forces. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are directed for a period of 30 days after the enactment of this act, to conduct an intensive campaign to recruit the additional nursing personnel required for the armed forces."

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate what I said on Monday, that this is not an attempt on my part to thwart the securing of nurses as provided under the pending bill.

On Monday afternoon during the debate on H. R. 2277, I made reference to this amendment.

At that time, you will recall that I said that I concur in the objective of this bill which is designed to obtain nurses for our wounded and sick servicemen. I am still of that opinion.

However, I do not think it is quite fair to the nursing profession in resorting to such an unprecedented method as drafting women. Certainly we would have no complaint if the draft included all

women. But, as yet, that has not happened in this country.

I also stated that as one of the members of the Military Affairs Committee who had been on the battle fronts recently, I had the opportunity of seeing for myself the need for additional nurses to adequately supply our present hospitals overseas and supply hospital units now being sent over without nurses.

My colleagues, we do need nurses and I am convinced that we can get them quicker by the method outlined in my amendment. If the War and Navy Departments will put on a concentrated recruitment drive such as using all the machinery that they have for recruiting WAC's and WAVES in conjunction with that going on right now, I believe we could get more than is needed in 30 days. Yes, we would get them months in advance of June 30. And of course that's what we want—we want them now and not dilly-dally.

The gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] in her statement to our committee says, "A well-organized, country-wide campaign in an all-out effort should obtain results." The gentlewoman from Ohio as you know, has devoted much time and energy to the problems of the nurses and is quite qualified to advise us.

When Dr. Stone, vice chairman, directing board, Procurement and Assignment Service, War Manpower Commission, testified before our committee he stated that as of January 1, 1945, there were 234,949 nurses classified and notified of their classification. This registration was accomplished by voluntary methods throughout the States of the country through the various State chairmen and 867 volunteer State and local committees. On these committees were representatives of every branch of the nursing profession with representation from the hospitals, public, and so forth. It took 18 months to accomplish this registration, and, of course, they are adding to it continuously.

Now, of these 234,949 classified nurses, 46,415 are listed as available for military service. In other words, they could be released from their present positions without impairment of civilian service. And of this number 31,803 are unmarried.

Dr. Stone also stated that as a result of the lag in recruitment they took additional action in that they—

First. Extended classification of nurses to include senior student nurses so that they could be followed up after graduation.

Second. Nurses considered essential until replaced were in many cases reclassified to make them available for military service.

Third. Practically all nurses graduating after August 1, 1944, were classified as available, and

Fourth. An up-to-date roster of all available nurses was being sent to the Army Service Command Headquarters.

In response to questioning, Dr. Stone stated very emphatically "that there never has been a consistent, sustained effort to apply all possible methods to the voluntary effort." With Dr. Stone I am in accord.

So, you can see, a real concentrated drive instituted by the War and Navy Departments could, by the information available in the various service command headquarters, be easily accomplished in a short time. A good portion of the machinery is already set up, and all it needs, in my opinion, is a little stimulation to put a successful drive across.

Miss Katharine Densford, R. N., president of the American Nurses Association, with 178,000 members, in concluding her testimony before our committee said:

I have tried to show you the deep concern of the American Nurses Association and organized nursing that safe and adequate nursing care be provided our soldiers and sailors. I have tried also to show the feeling of responsibility which the American Nurses Association and organized nursing has toward our civilian population.

It is the belief of the American Nurses Association that the problem now presented may be dealt with by some Federal agency, adequately implemented with funds, personnel, and authority, and a federally financed recruitment program properly instituted—this program to be at least comparable in scope to those employed in the recruitment of WAC's and WAVES. The War Manpower Commission has in the past, together with the Red Cross Nursing Service, provided an effective mechanism for the selection of nurses for the armed services on a voluntary basis and for the stabilization of civilian nursing services, and we think it can do so in the future if properly strengthened.

With Miss Densford I am also in accord.

Now, Members of the House, when testimony is given by such outstanding people as Dr. Stone, of the Procurement and Assignment Services, and Miss Densford of the American Nurses Association, two people who really know what they are talking about, especially when it has to do with nurses, and they believe a proper recruitment drive has never been conducted and that they have confidence it would be successful if properly managed, I repeat that the nurses have been dealt with in a discriminatory manner.

Those now in the service have done and are doing a wonderful job. Those on the battle fronts are really "angels of mercy." Give our nurses a chance to volunteer and I am confident that they will, and I ask for the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The House knows, of course, that the gentleman who has just addressed us is a member of the medical profession. May I ask the gentleman if it has been found necessary to draft the WAVES?

Mr. FENTON. They have not done so.

Mr. DONDERO. Or the WAC's?

Mr. FENTON. They have not done so.

Mr. DONDERO. Or the dentists or the members of his own profession—the doctors? Have they not all volunteered their services to the Government without a draft law? Take the gentleman's own profession, and the dentists, and the WAC's, and the WAVES—have they not all been recruited without a draft law?

Mr. FENTON. I would not go so far as to say that. I think in the great majority of instances they have. But there is, as you know, a Selective Service Act, and, of course, the doctors come under that act.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. As I understand it, should the gentleman's amendment be adopted, the registration and classification would go ahead, but the induction would be held in abeyance as long as the necessary number of nurses could be obtained through voluntary methods?

Mr. FENTON That is correct.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Whether it be 30 days or even beyond that, the induction would be held in abeyance?

Mr. FENTON. I am convinced that in 30 days we will have gotten the required number of nurses.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. But I mean, even in the future, as long as they get the required number of nurses they would not enforce this induction provision of the law?

Mr. FENTON That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

Mr. VURSELL. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill becomes law, it will be an innovation in legislative enactment in our country. For the first time the United States will have drafted women for military service in time of war. In these circumstances, it is prudent to proceed with caution. Only the exigencies of the occasion and the demands of the hour can justify this proposal.

For weeks the Military Affairs Committee has held hearings, considered the legislation from all angles, weighed the evidence, and finally, upon the insistence of those charged with carrying on the war, reported this bill. For days the House has debated and argued. It would seem that all relevant suggestions for and against have been made.

No one wants to draft women nurses unless it is absolutely necessary. As I have read the hearings, followed the debate, and voted for or against the views of individual members as expressed in amendments, I am impressed with the seriousness of what we are about to do.

First, we drafted men for the military service. Later, we were told that the drafting of 18-year-old boys spelled the difference between winning or losing the war. Recent events have proven the accuracy of this prediction. A majority of the Congress accepted this statement and the 18-year-olds were taken into the service. I voted to draft these boys, and it was one of the hardest votes I have ever cast in the Congress.

We all know the sacrifices now being made by those in the service. Daily we receive on our desks ever-increasing casualty lists. Thousands of the flower of American manhood have already

made the supreme sacrifice and thousands more are in our hospitals—and all this, we are told, for the purpose of making a better world in which to live.

This bill does not contemplate any addition to our fighting forces. Its purpose is to provide the requisite number of those angels of mercy who have done so much for, and who mean so much to, the men in the service needing care and attention because of the rigors of battle. The fact that there are insufficient nurses in the service today is admitted. The fact that we should have more nurses at once is conceded. Our problem is to determine upon the best, most expeditious, and surest method of replenishing the Nurse Corps now. Time is of the essence, and courageous and realistic action is demanded.

Some are of the opinion that compulsion is not essential and that when the need is realized trained nurses will immediately volunteer in adequate numbers. This same argument has always been made whenever a draft is proposed. It seems to me that the requirements have been stressed to such an extent that the time has arrived when a draft is advisable. Are there any of us who feel today that we would have an adequate Army and Navy to cope with the present situation if this philosophy had prevailed when the Congress authorized the drafting of the 18-year-olds? Certainly not. The question answers itself.

It has been urged in this debate that this is class legislation, and that Congress has no legal right to single out the nurses from all the other groups. I do not concur in this conclusion. Rather I agree with the court decisions presented by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] in his argument. The same might have been said about singling out the 18-year-olds. This is all very distressing, yet to me it seems essential. The Congress is charged with the duty of raising and maintaining armies. I cannot conceive of sending men and boys to the battle front, and then refusing to provide adequate care and treatment when they are struck down in battle.

Some are opposed to drafting nurses because of previous bungling mistakes on the part of those who are carrying on the war. These mistakes have been made and many of them seem at times inexcusable. Nevertheless, that is water gone over the dam. Talking about it now will not help suffering servicemen. We are confronted with a desperate condition. Faultfinding, and even just criticism, will avail us nothing.

Yes; there is a shortage of nurses on the home front, but regardless of this is it possible, is it conceivable, that we will not furnish nurses, equipped and prepared to care for these wounded men, when the stretchers bring them back from the firing line? These casualties must be given priority. Is it possible that we will not furnish trained nurses to administer to them and contribute, insofar as we can, to restoring them to health? Of course if these nurses are taken, there will not be as many of this trained group in our civilian hospitals and in our homes, but the spirit of the American people is such, and the conditions are such, that the local communities can and will, meet local demands. To me, there is but one choice. The men in the service must come first.

Mr. Chairman, it is hard to vote for legislation of this kind, yet I feel it is my duty and my responsibility to do each and every thing within my power to keep faith with our wounded veterans, and with their wives and fathers and mothers at home. Gentle, skillful nursing and care will save thousands of lives and I for one am not going to let any technicality or prejudice against administrators stand in the way.

This bill will pass the House overwhelmingly. It will then go to the Senate. In the meantime, if nurses volunteer in sufficient numbers, there will be no necessity for drafting. On the other hand, if the necessity does still exist, the Congress will have made proper provision—voluntary in the first instance but compulsory if necessary.

In short, the passage of this bill by the House will receive wide publicity, and will be the best kind of a campaign to secure voluntary nurses. This will answer the argument that the nurses of the country are not advised they are needed in the Army and the Navy. This bill will furnish the incentive as well as the information, and will only be used as a last resort if the voluntary system fails. Under these conditions, I shall therefore vote for it.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand the purpose of the section just offered, it is to give 30 days in which to try out the voluntary method of securing the additional 18,000 nurses the Army thinks we will need shortly. Testimony has further been given, and it has been said repeatedly on the floor of the House, that there are 250,000 to 300,000 registered or competent nurses. I am inclined to believe that out of a pool of that size, of people who have dedicated their lives as angels of mercy, one of the most patriotic and competent groups of women in the country, certainly, if they are given the opportunity, 5 or 10 percent of them will volunteer their services in this time of their country's great need. In fact, more will volunteer than is being called for or than the military forces can use.

I only wish this section would require the suspension of the drafting of nurses for 60 days rather than 30 days. However, I am definite in my belief that if an intensive campaign is put on by the Army and the Navy and those in our Government responsible, in order to bring to the people of the country, and particularly the nurses, the necessity of their going into this service, we shall secure a great many more nurses than are necessary, and we will have found that this legislation that has been taking the time of the House for the past weeks has never in fact been necessary.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Does not the gentleman think that apparently they did not make a serious effort to get these nurses before this bill was introduced—that was said repeatedly in the hearings—because they wanted a draft bill? If we adopt an amendment like this, is the gentleman sure they will want to make a serious effort now? I do not believe they will ever make a serious effort unless we vote down the forced labor of women.

Mr. VURSELL. I am inclined to believe the gentlewoman may have a rather pertinent suggestion in the remark she has just made. That is why I should rather have the section amended to provide 60 days. The thing that alarms me is that there is a disposition on the part of people high in authority in Washington to make it tough for the American people on the home front.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I submit this Government is hoarding nurses just as they are hoarding manpower. The day before yesterday I called up the Civil Service Commission, or had my office call them up, and they told me that in 1938—they did not have the figures since then—there were 5,000 working here for the Federal Government. You know what they are doing, swabbing throats, or advising somebody about their headaches, or something. I do not see how this Government has the audacity to force nurses into service. If the soldiers need care and our women know it, they will get out and take it; I assure you.

Mr. VURSELL. I thank the lady for her contribution. I wish she would get 5 minutes' time and make a real speech because I know she is competent and she has her heart in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should perfect this bill and cure it as much as we can. Then, in the last analysis, vote against it, because in my judgment there is no place for the drafting of women at the present time. The need is not sufficient and they can get plenty of them through the old American volunteer method and not resort to the draft.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I now renew my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this matter close in 15 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how much time will that accord each Member who wants to speak on this matter?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not know how many Members want to speak.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. MAY. I move that all debate on this amendment close in 20 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield to the gentleman to make a parliamentary inquiry. I have made a motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAY) there were—ayes 89, nays 94.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. MAY and Mr. ARENDS to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 125, nays 116.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. In order that there may be no mistake the Chair will announce the names of those the Chair has recorded as requesting time:

Messrs. HOFFMAN, HINSHAW, MILLER of Nebraska, SCRIVNER, DONDERO, JOHNSON of California, MARTIN of Iowa, and MAY.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, in view of the limited debate and gag rule I wish to have my name taken off the list.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In order that others may have more time I now withdraw my request for time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I did not ask to speak on this amendment. I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, in view of the shortness of the time I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the new section proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

This bill contains the same fundamental question which was involved in the recent work-or-jail bill that was before this House last month. Like that bill, it substitutes force for freedom.

For the first time in the history of the world, a proposal is before us to draft into the service angels of mercy. For the first time, at least in the history of this Republic, it is proposed to stigmatize one group of loyal and patriotic women as being unpatriotic and lacking devotion to their country in its hour of need.

I am in complete accord with the views of the distinguished and able Member the gentleman from New York [Mr. PFEIFER], who can see no necessity for the passage of this bill.

Many Members of this House, like myself, will chloroform their consciences and vote for this bill, because there is not anyone in this Chamber who is not ready and willing at all times to provide everything necessary for the protection, the health, and the care of the men in the armed services of our Nation; but we will vote for it reluctantly because there is no necessity for it.

We must all admit that the nurses of this country are not to blame, and neither are those in the armed services to blame for an inadequate number of certified nurses to care for the wounded and sick of our armed forces. The difficulty lies in the confusion and lack of foresight in the War Department of the Nation. I am emphatically opposed to in any way casting any reflection on this splendid section or group of the womanhood of this Nation, who have chosen to give their lives to administering to the sick and wounded.

We all know that care, kindness, mercy, and patriotism can never be legislated. By the passage of this bill, we practically admit to the world that patriotism and devotion are lacking in the trained womanhood of our country.

I hope that this amendment or new section to the bill will pass by an overwhelming vote. It will make this legislation more palatable, besides providing an opportunity to our splendid women to volunteer in the service of their country. I predict that none will have to be drafted if the Army and the Navy will at once make known their needs. The Navy has already presented its views and has informed the House that it can obtain all the nurses it needs by the time-tested American way of the volunteer system. I have no fear that the Army, too, will obtain the required number of nurses for its needs if it will make its needs known promptly.

When the work-or-jail bill was before us, the necessity for its passage was urged with great enthusiasm before this body. It has been nearly a month since it passed this House. It is still in the realm of uncertainty in another body, with a strong possibility that the very heart of that legislation—namely, the substitution of force for freedom—will be entirely eliminated before it ends its journey through the legislative channels of this Congress. I will not be surprised if the same fate awaits the legislation of the bill before us today.

This bill ignores the very foundation on which this Nation stands—namely, freedom of action. Are we advertising and giving notice to the people of the world that this Nation, founded on freedom, can no longer sustain it when it is most needed in time of war? Liberty is a precious thing. We can destroy it by a want of faith.

It is to be regretted that an intensive and intelligent effort has not been made by those charged with the conduct of this war, to recruit the nurses required, through the voluntary method.

I hope that the response on the part of our loyal and devoted women of the nursing profession will be so overwhelming as to shame those who sponsored this legislation and advocated its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, on February 13 on page A608 of the Appendix of the RECORD I put some remarks from a nurse. We have heard from the "brass hats" and we have heard from members of the committee, but I do not think anybody has quoted a nurse. I propose to quote one here. She writes:

Do you know, Mr. HINSHAW, that the nursing abilities of many nurses both in the Army and in the Navy are not being utilized? Are you aware of the fact that nurses are acting as dietitians, that nurses are working in linen rooms where they never see a patient, that nurses are used for clean-up detail? Do you know that nurses are overseas for many months before their nursing services are put in use?

I quote from the same page of the RECORD in the same connection an article from the B-Bag, which seems to be a periodical of the nurses. In one of these articles this statement is made:

Nursing power is definitely wasted in the European theater of operations. Hundreds of nurses are sitting around in replacement pools, camps, etc.

It seems to us strange that nurses who have spent some time in Army hospitals at home, and are familiar with Army routine and procedure, must wait about for many weeks in muddy camps before doing nursing.

Here is another article from the B-Bag:

We are a general hospital and we heartily second the "common sense in hospitals" letter. May we add that in some cases patients are neglected. Nurses can only do so much, as the human body can only generate so much energy.

On arrival in this "slap-happy" European theater of operations we were told by the orientation officer—a doctor and a lieutenant colonel—"We are not interested in the nursing care you can give; that is taken for granted; we are primarily interested in how clean you can keep the wards."

Then from a captain in the Eighth Army Corps comes a statement that calls attention to the fact that nurses must stand retreat even after working from 7 a. m. until frequently as late as 8:30 p. m.

Mr. Chairman, I can say to you from these and statements of others made to me that these nurses are not utilized as efficiently as they utilize them in the civilian hospitals in this country. Many of them, as the gentlewoman from Illinois said a moment ago—I do not know how many—are here swabbing the throats and attending the minor ailments of Government employees in Washington. We have a number of them attending to the little difficulties of Members of the House, as you well know, in the treatment rooms that are made available for that purpose; and, likewise, they take care of the Capitol employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, we have had expressed here various views about nurses, as well as a remark or two from the nurses and from the G. I.

One night early last fall an Army nurse after a long day lay in her tent at a field hospital near the fighting lines, reflecting on the discussions among the nurses during the day regarding the men who were being brought to them from the front, bloody, dirty, and exhausted.

At 2 o'clock in the morning she rose, and by the aid of a flashlight wrote a letter to Stars and Stripes in which she said:

We wade ankle deep in mud, but you have to lie in it. * * * Sure, we rough it, but in comparison to the way you men are taking it, we can't complain, nor do we feel that bouquets are due us. But you, the men behind the guns, the men driving our tanks, flying our planes, sailing our ships, building bridges, and the men who are left behind, it is to you we doff our helmets. To every G. I. wearing the American uniform—for you we have the greatest respect.

Yes, this time we are handing out the bouquets, but only after taking care of some

of your buddies, comforting them when they are brought in bloody, dirty with the earth, mud, and grime, and most of them so tired. Somebody's brothers, somebody's fathers, and somebody's sons, seeing them gradually brought back to life, to consciousness, and to see their lips separate into a grin when they first welcome you.

These soldiers stay with us but a short time, from 10 days to possibly 2 weeks. We have learned a great deal about our American soldier and the stuff he is made of. The wounded do not cry. Their buddies come first.

The patience and determination they show, the courage and fortitude they have, is sometimes awesome to behold. It is we who are proud to be here. Rough it? No, it is a privilege to be able to receive you, and a great distinction to see you open your eyes and with that swell American grin say, "Hi ya, babe."

The writer of that article was Second Lt. Frances Y. Slanger, of Roxbury, Mass, the first American nurse to be killed by enemy shells in the European theater when she was hit by a German shell on October 21, 1944, just a few weeks after she had written this tribute from the Army Nurse Corps to the American soldier.

Out of thousands of letters hers was printed as an editorial in the Stars and Stripes on the 7th of November. Hundreds of letters in tribute to the courage and the devotion of the Army nurse flooded the editorial rooms replying with the soldiers' feeling toward these ministering angels at the battle front. From them was selected the following by Pvt. (1st cl.) Millard Ireland, of Kansas City, Kans., which was published as the responding editorial in the issue of Stars and Stripes of November 23, 1944:

The editorial of November 7 was such as to bring a lump to a dogface's throat. It is more than touching to be told you are made of good stuff by somebody who ought to know, with such obvious sincerity as that of Second Lieutenant Slanger. Nobody turns down bouquets and we eat that kind up—but:

I wonder if the good nurse was deliberately overlooking the real reason for our deep-seated respect and regard for her and her sisters? Maybe in the throes of her passionate pen, she actually forgot the one factor which lifts her character above the level of the men she attends. Maybe it has never occurred to her at all. We want your respect, admiration and love, dear nurse, but we want it with your eyes open.

We men were not given the choice of working on the battlefield or the home front. We cannot take any personal credit for being here. We are here because we have to be. You are here merely because you felt you were needed. So, when an injured man opens his eyes to see one of you lovely, ministering angels concerned with his welfare, he can't but be overcome by the very thought that you are doing it because you want to.

It does not matter that we lie in mud—yes, crawl in it, while you only "wade ankle-deep," or that you possibly enjoy a few more conveniences over here than we. The important thing is that you could be home, soaking yourselves in a bathtub every day, putting on clean clothes over a clean body, and crawling in between clean sheets at night, on a soft, springy mattress. Instead, you endure whatever hardships you must to be where you can do us the most good.

I had better stop now, because I'm getting sentimental, but I want you to know your "editorial" did not change, but only confirmed, my deep respect for you modern Florence Nightingales. If the world had a few more people like you in it, there wouldn't be any wars.

Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering will take nurses from the pedestal upon which they have been placed by the men they serve. They deserve this place on that pedestal, they deserve to remain on that pedestal. If this bill is passed the pending amendment should be adopted. These women who have done so magnificently will demonstrate to all concerned, if given an opportunity to come in on a voluntary basis, their desire to enter service in any number that may be necessary. They will continue to do the job in the future that they did in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, my remarks on the pending amendment will be very brief. May I express my hearty approval of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON] because, in my opinion, it will have a very wholesome effect on the armed services if enacted into law. It will require the War and Navy Departments to cooperate in putting into effect a real appeal for volunteering by the nurses. If the War and Navy Departments do this wholeheartedly, enthusiastically, and vigorously, I believe the need for actually drafting nurses will be very greatly lessened and may be entirely eliminated. It will make the bill a much more desirable bill to have this provision in it. The system should provide for the draft if it is needed, but not unless it is needed after their wholehearted and vigorous effort to raise the quota of nurses by voluntary means.

I have a prejudice against the drafting of women, and this amendment would make this bill more acceptable to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that everybody in the House, whether he intends to vote for or against the bill on final passage, should vote for this amendment, because it cannot possibly do any harm and it will surely improve the bill. First of all, it clears the air. Many nurses have been reluctant to volunteer because they did not know just what and how much was expected of them. One thing was said by officials one day and something else was said the next day. This makes it clear that we do not want to be compelled to draft nurses, but that we do have obligations to these wounded men, and that we are arranging to have inductions automatically begin whenever the nurses by volunteering fail to meet the needed quotas. It directs the Army to lay the facts fully before them, how many nurses will be needed at what times. Then it is up to the nurses. Whether they are to be drafted or not depends strictly on them.

It also makes it easier for us, because when we vote for the bill we will be discharging our duty to our men who are wounded and ill, and at the same time we will not be drafting a single woman unless the recruiting falls below the quotas established. With this 30-day vigorous recruitment campaign, with the quotas announced so that the nurses know exactly what is expected of them, I am sure that this bill, although duly enacted, and the registrations and classification mechanism put into operation, will never need to be put into full effect, because the volunteering will more than meet the quotas, and earlier than if we have to wait until all the induction machinery is put in order.

I have just talked with the gentleman from Pennsylvania who introduced the resolution about accepting an amendment inserting two words, "per month." He said he would. It would provide that inductions under this act will not go into effect for 30 days, or thereafter, so long as the number "per month" of volunteer qualified nurses declared available by the Procurement and Assignment Service and certified to the armed forces by the Red Cross is equal, at least, to the quotas established. Inserting the words "per month" makes it clear that quotas cannot be suddenly upped and the necessary nurses be expected to be on hand the next day. It gives them 30 days of grace in which to meet any increased quotas, which of course is as early as they could be procured under selective-service machinery. I feel that the Fenton amendment should make this bill acceptable to practically everybody.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman intend to offer this amendment to the pending amendment, or is he going to ask unanimous consent for it, because it ought to be done right now?

Mr. FENTON. I certainly will accept it.

Mr. HINSHAW. The House must do that. The amendment has already been reported.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's amendment be modified to include after the word "number", the words "per month", so as to read:

or thereafter, so long as the number per month of volunteers—

And so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification requested by the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. As a member of the medical profession, does the gentleman consider that 30 days is a sufficient length of time in which to obtain the quotas that may be required?

Mr. JUDD. I would prefer 60 days, but I will not quibble on that, because it is not possible for the bill to be passed and be in operation within 60 days. Anyway they could not start actually inducting girls under this bill within 60 days, even without the amendment. When we give them a definite command to put on a real recruitment campaign during the first 30 days, my judgment is

that they will have enough volunteers for the immediate future.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman not feel that if that campaign was put on without a bill, the required number would be obtained?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; and I said so here on the first day of this debate. This is the amendment about which I spoke that first afternoon. It will be fair to all and get the greatest number of nurses in the shortest time, and with the best morale because they will be given a chance to show they can and will do the job without any draft.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. If this amendment is adopted, it will only delay induction for 30 days.

Mr. JUDD. Registration will begin at once, as soon as the bill is passed. The machinery for induction will be all set up. But nobody will be inducted as long as the number of qualified volunteers is sufficient. Inductions will begin when, and only when, the number of qualified volunteers per month falls below the declared needs of the Army and Navy. Is there a single good reason why they should begin a day earlier?

If the advocates of this legislation refuse to accept this amendment, one is forced reluctantly to fear that some of them want the voluntary system to fail so that they can get their nurses by compulsion, and further extend control over the lives of the people of this country. I want only that we get the needed number of nurses in the quickest way possible, and I am dead sure this amendment is the way to accomplish that end.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I can only speak for myself, because after all this is largely a matter of individual responsibility. But I remember when we had up the Selective Service Act there was an amendment offered to delay the enforcement of that act for 6 months. I wonder what would have happened had that amendment prevailed.

Lawyers have a favorite expression, that time is of the essence. More than 500,000 of our boys are in hospitals all over the world. A careful reading of the hearings will disclose that the Surgeon General of the Army, the Surgeon General of the Navy, General Hines of the Veterans Administration, and practically all the heads of the nurses' associations have said that they have exhausted every possible effort within their means to get these nurses by voluntary effort. It is admitted we must have them and if we cannot get them by the volunteer method there is nothing left but legislation. This is an all-out war. We can take no chances. Every man and women must do his or her part.

I repeat, nobody wants to draft these women, but I hope there is one thing we do not forget, and that is that we drafted the boys whom these nurses are to nurse back to health. We set up the machinery to draft the very men who are suffering and who are wounded today. By the same token, we should act just as promptly as we can to see to it that the necessary number of nurses is provided to take care of our sick and wounded.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is it not a fact that the peak load and the most urgent need for nurses will come within the next 60 days?

Mr. THOMASON. That is true. The situation is tragic. We do not have to keep talking about Iwo Jima or the western front, where the big drive is on now. This thing brooks no delay, in my judgment. This amendment ought to be defeated.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the War Department this morning had figures showing that 1,600 of our men are being wounded and sent to the hospitals every day. This very day 1,600 of our men will be wounded and sent to our hospitals.

Mr. THOMASON. The casualties are already more than 30,000 a month, and the official records of the War Department show we are at least 20,000 nurses short. We can still go on with this effort at a voluntary campaign, but why delay another 30 days in the face of this appalling situation?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I do not for a moment subscribe to the idea that this approach will delay the getting of nurses.

Mr. THOMASON. It will delay it at least 30 days, and probably longer. This legislation must be passed at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true that under section 5 the voluntary method is still allowed?

Mr. THOMASON. Absolutely, that is taken care of in the bill. The drive for volunteers can and will proceed.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Even after this bill is passed it is allowed.

Mr. THOMASON. Of course. You can tune in on your radio most any hour of the day, and on almost any program there will be an appeal for nurses; yet the applications have been dropping off for the last month. So I say there is no other recourse. I do not know what you are going to do about it, but I say the responsibility is ours, and as for me I am going to vote to pass this bill so it will become law just as soon as possible. I feel sure there will be a very fine and patriotic response by the nurses all over the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired.

In the course of the debate the amendment was modified by unanimous consent. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FENTON: Page 5, after line 3, insert the following:

"SEC. 6. No individual shall be inducted into the land or naval forces under this act for 30 days after the date of the enactment of this act, or thereafter so long as the number per month of volunteer qualified (graduate registered professional) nurses declared available for services in the armed forces by the Nursing Division of the Procurement and Assignment Service of the War Manpower Commission and certified by the Red Cross is equal at least to the number of nurses declared by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to be required for the land and naval forces.

"The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are directed for a period of 30 days after the enactment of this act, to conduct an intensive campaign to recruit the additional nursing personnel required for the armed forces."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 112, noes 93.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. MAY and Mr. FENTON to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 133, noes 139.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of California: Add a new section to the bill to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. This act shall include male as well as female nurses and wherever the word "female" or "she" is used it shall be deemed to include male nurses.

"The intent is that all nurses shall be registered, but in the case of male nurses now in the armed services the President may provide by regulation that they may be inducted into the Army Nurse Corps under the provisions of this act, without registration with any local selective service board."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, there should be no controversy over this amendment. We have all heard about the tremendous need for nurses, and I believe it is our duty to support every possible effort to get them.

My amendment will bring into the Army a potential 4,000 male nurses. About 2,000 of these nurses are already in the armed services, used not as nurses but as enlisted men in all kinds of work. The other 2,000 male nurses are registered in various States throughout the United States, some engaged in nursing, some in other occupations.

The purpose of this amendment is, first, to register and obtain as many of the male nurses as possible that are now in civilian life; and, second, that the male nurses already in the Army of the United States may be taken into the Nurse Corps by regulations promulgated by the President and given the benefits here provided to the female nurses in the Army Nurse Corps. It means that they will take these men in, every single one

of these nurses, and add them to the Nurse Corps. The services of these men are badly needed by our troops at the present moment.

A great many questions have been asked by Members who have not had the benefit of listening to the hearings or who have not read the hearings. Let me say that it is my unqualified opinion, after listening to every single witness on this question, that we are in dire need of nurses now. This bill is the only way we can be sure to get them at this critical time. The peak of the casualties in our Army will be reached in the next few months during the big European drive, and I certainly hope we shall not overlook an opportunity to get 4,000 male nurses to augment the very limited number of nurses we now have to care for our wounded.

I cannot see why there should be objection to this amendment, and I hope it will be passed without a dissenting vote.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I wish to ask the gentleman if male nurses can volunteer at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No; neither the ones in civilian life nor in the Army, because at the present time only women are taken into the Nurse Corps.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Does not the gentleman believe that male nurses should at least have the opportunity to volunteer before they are drafted?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If this law is passed, they will have the opportunity to volunteer, because the bill provides for all the volunteering that can be had. Talking about volunteering, I wish we did not have to draft an army. The WAVES have not made their allotment; the WAC's have not made their allotment. So far as I know, the only group that has ever made it by volunteer methods is the marines. I feel just as does the gentleman; I wish we could obtain these people by the volunteer method, but we simply cannot do it, in my opinion. We listened to those charged with the responsibility for caring for these thousands of wounded men. I do not believe a man like Judge Patterson would have anything to do with anything he did not believe was required to get the personnel needed. He told us emphatically—and he made a most marvelous statement—what the need was, and that this type of a bill was the only sure way to get it. I want to be assured that the men who are wounded—1,600 every single day, and the number will climb as the days go by—are cared for. I believe we have to resort to this method to be absolutely certain we have the number of nurses needed. We might get enough nurses by the volunteer method, but again we might not; and I want to be sure we get them.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I will.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I agree with the gentleman's amendment. I think it is a splendid contribution, but I wish to inquire why it is that the Army itself has not permitted these male nurses to enlist or volunteer at the present time? And why they have not taken the colored registered nurses in this country on a volunteer basis?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. They have taken some colored nurses. Perhaps if there has been discrimination it can be avoided. No other service has ever taken men nurses, but the Navy——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No other service has taken men nurses, but I feel that since we have the trained men we should use these people for the particular thing for which they are trained. There are about 8,165 of them in the United States, approximately 2,000 of whom are in the Army. These are trained registered nurses under the laws of the various States. It may be an innovation to take these men in but the need justifies it at the present time.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Does the gentleman know that there is a hospital in Pittsburgh that is training men nurses, giving them a 2-year course, also one in Chicago doing the same thing? Does the gentleman also know that there are over 200 men nurses at Perry Point nursing wounded men up there and men who are suffering from injuries?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I did not know about institutions for training men nurses but I do know that in the county hospital of the county where I live that they have men nurses.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. Is it not a fact that there are ways in which male nurses can be used more effectively and in ways in which female nurses cannot be used at all?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is a very good point and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I offered an amendment similar to this in the committee and it was adopted, but through some confusion it did not get into the bill. I hope that the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and the committee will support my amendment which is a very worthy one and will provide some of the needed nursing help that we will have to have in the next 30 days to satisfy the demand.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does the gentleman have any figures with reference to the number of male nurses who are not now in the service and available?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The number of male nurses in the United States in 1940 was 8,169. The approximation made in the evidence was that 2,000 of those have been taken into the Army. So there are about 6,200 nurses, or there were on the basis of the 1940 figures, who are now available and upon whom we can draw. The estimate is that we could probably get one-third of those under this law. In other words, we would add a little over 2,000 nurses from civilian occupations to the nurse complement, and in the Army we would take men who are not doing nursing now to the extent of 2,000 and get those into specific nurse work.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman has quoted Judge Patterson.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield for a question. I do not yield for a speech or any extend remarks.

Mr. VURSELL. I will ask the gentleman a question. Does he think that Judge Patterson's word now ought to be almost the last word on the need for this bill in view of the fact that he was sure we had to continue the Canol project and in view of the fact he was sure we ought to have the short ballot and that we ought to have the work-or-fight bill, in all of which he has been proven wrong? Does the gentleman think that he is right on this bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I think he was absolutely right in his analysis before our committee as the need for this law as the only sure means of getting the nurses our wounded men will need, and I think the Surgeon General of the Army, who has the responsibility for the care of these men on his hands, is right. I think the nurses who testified before our committee that they thought this bill would make it sure that we would get these nurses were right. You know, wounded men cannot wait. I lived alongside of an evacuation hospital one time during the other war, and when those men come in they have to have immediate attention. Their very life is at stake. I lost a man one time that I brought back in my plane after he had been wounded in an air fight, because there was a delay of 5 minutes in getting him to the hospital. That is why I am so emphatic. I am not criticizing anyone for his views, that is his responsibility, but I do want to say here with every ounce of sincerity I have that we do need these nurses to take care of the situation before us today in view of the fact, especially, that we are having 1,600 wounded men come in every way. This bill will assure those men the nursing they deserve and that they must have.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. The fact we are in such dire need of nurses at the present time is the most potent reason for the amendment which the distinguished gentleman has offered to the bill, and I

compliment him for offering this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank my colleague for his complimentary observation. That is my basic reason for being so earnest in my advocacy of this bill. Our men need the nursing help now and in the next 90 days. That is why I am so terribly anxious to make available these 4,000 male nurses.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the objective of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] as I said yesterday, is good. In discussing this matter before the committee we did not hold any hearings. We did not know how many of these male nurses would be available, and we had no figures at all as to how many at the present time would be covered under this bill. Two thousand five hundred male nurses was the best estimate we had of those in the service today. Those men are being used in the medical administrative branch of the Army. Many of them have highly technical positions that they would not move out of if we pass this bill and give them the opportunity. I do not believe that many of them would change their positions. The best figure we have is that approximately 8,169 men are registered in the United States. We have no figures at all as to how many of those are overage or how many have other obligations and who are holding positions in hospitals and other places of importance in the nursing profession.

I feel that this amendment would complicate the bill, and I do not see at the present time how it would be workable. I am just as much in favor of getting nurses as the gentleman from California is, but I think that we should proceed under a different procedure. If we adopt his amendment we adopt the policy of commissioning a certain group of men in the Army, something which has never been done before by this House. I do not believe that the amendment should be adopted, and I hope the committee will see fit to vote it down.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. This bill would certainly get those in civil life. Why would not this be a good way to find out how many there are in the Army that ought to be doing nursing work instead of doing other jobs that are not so important?

Mr. DURHAM. I would be in favor of the gentleman's amendment if it did only this one thing; that is, register the male nurses to see how many are registered and qualified, and get some information on the number. I think in that way we could secure some information on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does the gentleman favor the amendment?

Mr. DURHAM. No; I am not in favor of the amendment. I do not think it should be put into this bill. I am in favor of the gentleman's objective, but you are commissioning a certain group of men here who are in the service today amounting to 2,500, if they all accept the commission.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What is the objection?

Mr. DURHAM. We have never done that before to any special group of men in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What is the objection to it when you give it to the women? Their work is identical. They are all registered.

Mr. DURHAM. These men have the same opportunity of going to the Officers' Candidate School of the Medical Administrative Corps and receiving a commission the same as any other man that is drafted in the service.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. But they are only commissioned as administrative assistants and not as nurses. Also, only a small number get to the O. C. S.

Mr. DURHAM. Many are holding administrative positions.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. There are already registered under the Selective Training and Service Act hundreds and thousands of them. But 2,500 are in the service. They are given an opportunity to enter the Officers' Training School and qualify for positions in the Medical Corps, and every one is given an opportunity to serve who wants to.

Mr. DURHAM. And they are today in important positions, because practically all of them are specialists.

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment. I am in favor of this amendment for the simple reason that this bill is a nurse-draft bill. Those words themselves mean that you are drafting nurses, and these men who qualify and register as nurses come under that category. Whether they are in the Army or outside the Army, it matters not. It is not a question of how many there are in service or how many men will be available for service. It is a question of supplying nurses to the armed forces. Since the request came in for help, we are offering this amendment. If it takes in only 10 nurses, that is 10 nurses to the advantage of the services. These men are qualified. We cannot sit here and say they are not qualified. Theirs is special training. Their services are for selected cases—cases that number in the thousands, as far as our Army is concerned—and in certain cases they are more favorable than are the women nurses. You must realize that. I realize that. I have seen them in action. I wish they had more male nurses, so that they can be available to take care of the selected cases. They are competent men. They are recognized as nurses. This is a nurses' draft bill. If you want to stoop so low as to take the single girls in the teen ages, and you have men who are capable and available for service, then why not support this amendment? You will be doing the right thing. If you do not adopt this amendment, I do not see how you can sit back and let your conscience rest.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I think a nurse is a nurse, regardless of sex and if the individual has had the proper training should be accepted by the military without discrimination. I have had some experience in working with male nurses in hospitals. One very fine hospital in Chicago is made up entirely of male nurses. There was never a finer group of nurses any place than these men.

If this bill is designed to get nurses for the Army, nurses who can take care of the sick soldiers, then why discriminate against the man who has taken the same training that the female nurses have taken and is qualified to take care of the sick and wounded?

In many instances there are cases where a male nurse can be more efficient and can do a better job for the wounded man than the female nurses. Some of the young girls are just a little bit timid, even after they come out of hospitals, as to the type of nursing they might do for some of these severely injured men. Some of our soldiers have terrible yet delicate injuries, which you men would hesitate to have your daughter attend—yes and your son would prefer an experienced, qualified male nurse. There are certain types of treatment where the male nurse will be preferred.

Getting nurses into the Army is what we want, and here is a group of men who are qualified and who ought to be recognized.

I am unhappy, of course, that the committee saw fit to vote down the question of the time limit on getting nurses. As a physician, I think the nurses of this country have rendered a very fine service. They have volunteered to the Procurement and Assignment groups in every section of this country. They would have continued to do so if the military authorities had not become quite so optimistic a few months ago and refused to follow the Surgeon General's advice when he asked for 50,000 nurses. He said that was what we needed. They said, "No, we need only 40,000. Forget about the 50,000." We would have had these nurses now if that had not happened. There was optimistic talk in high military places that the war would soon be over and there was a let down in securing nurses.

I think also the military ought to reduce some of the high standards they have for nurses. Heretofore they have not taken nurses who graduated from hospitals having fewer than 50 beds. Their standards for age, weight, height, and other qualifications have been entirely too high. There is now a very large group of nurses who want to serve yet are denied that right for many trivial reasons. The Army can get all the nurses they need by following the accepted and tried methods of recruiting. They have taken few nurses beyond 30 years old.

They have not taken married women. I know three nurses who used to work with me in the operating room. They were fine nurses. They saw fit to marry men going overseas and the Navy kicked

them out. Those nurses are still good nurses and they are still willing to take care of the wounded boys, because that is what they want to do. I think, too, that the colored nurses ought to be given more consideration. There has been some discrimination in the matter of colored nurses in the Army. There is a place for them. I hope that in the consideration of this amendment the House will look at it as a question of: Do you want nurses? Do we have the reservoir of nurses, male nurses who are qualified and who can be of service? If so, let us get them.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. TRAYNOR. I have just received these figures: The Selective Service in the 1940 census showed 8,169 nurses, some of them graduate nurses and others student nurses.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Male nurses?

Mr. TRAYNOR. Male nurses. The gentleman is talking about male nurses, and so am I.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; the gentleman makes a very fine contribution with reference to the male nurses.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, that number is probably 25 percent more because that is the figure for 1940. I want to compliment the doctor on the very fine discussion he has made on this amendment. It has been a very fine contribution.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I have worked with the male nurses in hospitals. I know they are competent. I do not think we should discriminate against them. That is my feeling in the matter. I also feel confident the nurses would rally to meet the demands of the military if they are just given a chance. The physicians of this country were obtained through Procurement and Assignment, and the nurses were doing the same until we had this let-down. Mr. Patterson said that the wounded men cannot wait. I agree with him. I was in England and I saw some wounded men coming in there from the beaches. They need some help. I saw cases where I thought male nurses could have done a much better job than female nurses. Some of our boys, your boy and mine, might perhaps be just a little bit timid about having a female nurse taking care of certain injuries which they have received. Let us make this bill broad enough to include the competent male nurse.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This amendment, if adopted, does only one thing, and that is to require the Army to commission certain of the male nurses who are in the services. Instead of being noncommissioned officers, they would be commissioned officers. It also does another thing. It does not add a single nurse to the Nurse Corps because these men who are in the service, approximately 2,500 of them, have been used so far in the Medical Administrative Corps as aides in the medical service. They are doing good service there. The Army has an Officers' Candidate School to which they have been admitted if qualified. They can go to that school and earn a commission. A few of them have been commissioned upon graduation from the Officers' Candidate School.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. With reference to the matter of commissions, and I am very heartily in favor of taking the male nurses, so that the House may understand my position with reference to that, those commissions are for administrative jobs. They are not for nursing jobs.

Mr. MAY. That is exactly what I said. That is the only thing they have been able to qualify for. Further, you are picking out a group here of just a few hundred people to give them commissions by this amendment and you are not giving commissions to another part of the same group. There will be discrimination in favor of a small group as against all other groups. It will be doing something that the Congress has not yet done, and that is to direct the Army as to whom they should commission. Let it be understood nurses are not inducted into the Medical Corps. They are all commissioned. That is the function of the Executive under the Constitution of the United States, as to who shall be appointed an officer. This would interfere with that, likewise.

Mr. DURHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I call attention to the fact that if you take these 2,500 men out of the Medical Administrative Corps, which is doing all the teaching in the Medical Corps, you will wreck the teaching staff entirely.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In my amendment I provide that these men in the service may be taken in by regulation of the President. They will be taken in so that they will not disrupt the service. As a matter of fact, the hearings showed that a small fraction of them are included in any kind of medical work. They were doing clerical and menial work and things of that kind. Every one of these men, under my amendment, is a registered nurse in some State in the United States.

Mr. MAY. You do not propose to draft them twice, do you?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No.

Mr. MAY. That is what you will do if you put your amendment in this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Those in the service will not have to register. The President can make proper regulation.

Mr. MAY. You will be drafting them twice. I think that is too much.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Do you want nurses or do you not want nurses?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the debate on this bill. This is the first time I have felt it necessary to enter into the discussion of this bill. However, in view of the argument just made by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, I am beginning to wonder whether the purpose of this legislation is to secure nurses or whether some other purpose is involved.

We have the argument made before the House now by all the proponents of this legislation that there is a critical and urgent need for nurses. It is stated this is a bill designed to provide nurses to take care of the men who are wounded in our armed services. Does it make any difference to a wounded man whether that service is provided by a man or by a woman, if they are both competent and meet the tests and standards of the Army and the Navy?

Let me ask you, Mr. Chairman, of these 8,169 men who were registered and certified in the year 1940, as shown by the hearings, 2,500 approximately have been drafted into the Army under Selective Service and Training. There is no showing in the hearings to indicate the type and character of the service that all of those 2,500 are rendering. My information is that while there may be some of them serving in a commissioned or noncommissioned status, they are not serving as nurses in the field for which they were trained. I am likewise reliably informed there are hundreds of them who are performing mere clerical and menial services in the Army, and not performing the service for which they were trained. If you need nurses, why, in the name of conscience, are these people not used to perform the services which you admit they are capable of performing?

It seems to me that the objection to their use lies in the Army regulations which heretofore have provided that these male nurses will not be accepted as a part of the Army Nurse Corps. All the Congress is doing today is saying to Judge Patterson and Mr. Stimson that if the need for nurses is as critical as they say, then they should make available to the men in the armed services who are wounded all of these nurses who are available, men and women alike.

Can you justify the taking into the Army Nurse Corps these young women, if you please, and giving them commissions yet denying to a man equally trained, but who is taken through the processes of Selective Service, the right to function in the field for which he was trained, and deny him that right because you say it is improper to grant commissions to the male nurses although you propose to grant commissions to these 18,500 young women who are taken into the Army Nurse Corps?

I believe what we want is nurses, and this amendment will make available to your son and mine who are over there on those fighting fronts the services of these people who are trained to care for the wounded.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I confess to you that I cannot understand the opposition to it. It is not a question of commissioning somebody or not commissioning somebody in the Army or the Navy, if you put that in, but it is a question of obtaining nurses that are badly needed by our armed forces at home and abroad; it is a question of meeting a requirement and demand that is high at this time but which will continue to grow in the months that are to come.

We are trying to provide nurses. How we can persuade ourselves that it is logical for us to draft female nurses into this service and refuse to take the male nurses is more than I can understand. What difference does it make to the man who is injured on the battlefield whether a man has been commissioned and perhaps had his pay raised a little bit if the man is a qualified and competent nurse and the soldier needs his services?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. If these male nurses are commissioned into the Army Nurse Corps they are taken into the Army of the United States and those commissions will terminate at the termination of the war. Is that right?

Mr. FOLGER. That is my understanding of it.

Mr. KEEFE. Why, of course.

Mr. FOLGER. The suggestion is made that some of these men are now in the services. This amendment recognizes exactly that.

The intent is that all nurses shall be registered, in the case of male nurses now in the armed services, the President may provide by regulation that they may be inducted into the Army Nurse Corps. If in the opinion of the commanding general in the field the man should not be taken out of his present activity and placed in the Nurse Corps, it will not be done.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand the opposition to this amendment. I believe that for the protection of the men and to serve the purposes that have been called to your attention, to render service that men probably can render better than women, there should be no discrimination, and this amendment ought to be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday an amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] was adopted by the committee. After careful consideration of the amendment and discussion of it with the leader on the minority side, with the ranking member of the Committee on Military Affairs and others, we have agreed that there should be a certain modification of that amendment agreed to by the committee. I have reference to the provision which requires that all nurses shall be commissioned on induction into the service.

Mr. DINGELL. Both male and female?

Mr. MAY. Yes. We have prepared an amendment which will carry out the idea that they be tendered commissions and not required to take them as a prerequisite to their being inducted into the service. I have agreed with the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] and the ranking Members will agree, that it should be modified.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may include in the substitute which I shall offer presently the provision that has been agreed upon as a substitute for the Harness amendment. That is the provision that we have discussed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the amendment as amended by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, should be read so that it will be understood by the members of the committee.

Mr. MAY. I will read it.

There shall be inducted into the land or naval forces under this title—

That is to conform to the new amendment which will make this title II of the Selective Training and Service Act—

only such persons as have prior thereto been tendered a commission in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy or the United States Naval Reserve.

That is the proposal I wish to offer as a substitute.

Mr. STEFAN. How will that affect one who wants a commission?

Mr. MAY. That simply gives them the right to receive it. It will be tendered to them, but it does not require anybody to take a commission.

Mr. STEFAN. They do not have to take a commission?

Mr. MAY. That is the point. We do not want to make somebody take a commission who does not want to take it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the exact language of the Harness amendment as adopted by the committee on yesterday was as follows:

No person shall be inducted into the land or naval forces under this act unless she is acceptable to the land or naval forces as a commissioned officer, and no person shall be inducted into the land or naval forces under this act except as a commissioned officer.

The committee agreed to the Harness amendment, but it is in direct conflict with military law. The proposition as submitted to the minority members and to the committee alters the purpose of the Harness amendment not in the slightest extent. It changes the Harness amendment to read as follows:

There shall be inducted into the land or naval forces under this title only such persons as have prior thereto been tendered a commission in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, or the United States Naval Reserve.

It thereby gives anyone coming in the right to refuse a commission if they so desire and is in direct compliance with military law.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. May I ask the gentleman a question? Since the adoption of this recent amendment, covering men as well as women, and since the men are already registered under the general draft law, would that mean that a man who is registered as a nurse could not be inducted into the service in any capacity until he is tendered a commission in the Army of the United States?

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. So any man registered as a nurse could not be inducted at all unless he is tendered a commission even in another classification.

Mr. MAY. No; you could not put him in unless you first tendered him a commission.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Is not the gentleman from Kentucky in error about that, because the proposal he has made says, "inducted under this act"? Male nurses can still be inducted in the Army under the Selective Service Act.

Mr. MAY. Oh, yes; I did not understand the question.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SCRIVNER. What would happen in case the commission is tendered and is not accepted?

Mr. MAY. If they do not accept the commission they are inducted. It does not make them take a commission, that is all.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Inducted into what?

Mr. MAY. Into the Army of the United States and into the Nurse Corps, if they are nurses.

Mr. SCRIVNER. The bill does not say so.

Mr. MAY. As a nurse.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. As I understand, the purpose of the Harness amendment is to provide that a nurse who is inducted into the Army Nurse Corps should not be forced into the Nurse Corps unless she received a commission.

Mr. MAY. Yes; with the provision that she must be tendered a commission before being taken.

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope the gentleman has an agreement with the gentleman from Indiana on this matter.

Mr. MAY. I do not have any agreement with the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I say that I have consulted with

the members of the Committee on Military Affairs who helped draft this amendment, and they are in agreement with me that the change in no way affects the purport of the amendment; rather, it improves it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I want to make sure that this is as broad as it is long; that it applies to men as well as to women.

Mr. MAY. It applies to the men just as well as it does to the women.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SASSCER. May I ask the gentleman a question? If a commission is tendered and the selectee does not accept that commission, it does not preclude his induction into the service, does it?

Mr. MAY. No.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 5, after line 3, insert the following:

"SEC. 6. Nurses in the land or naval forces shall, to the extent compatible with military requirements, be assigned in accordance with their requests for assignment, and no nurse shall be denied any assignment by reason of the fact that she would be in the same theater of operations as her husband."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified so that the last word will be "spouse" instead of "husband", in view of the amendment that was adopted a few moments ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I may not use all of my 5 minutes, but what I want to say I think will be directly to the point.

We people who have come back from the service do not look at these service items as so many figures and so many computations; we look at it as so many people. I have come back only recently, and I still look at it as a group of people. In those people there are personal relationships, there are husbands and wives, there are families.

I do not know whether you know it or not, but there is a general under-cover rule that in case you become married to anyone in the service, as soon as you come back from your 3-, 5-, or maybe 7-day honeymoon, within 24 hours you are dispatched to some other area. You are not permitted to serve near or in the same theater or area with your spouse. Why is that? I say that is a rank discrimination. I say to the service people that that is the hand-down of an old military rule—a Spartan code. I do not want them in the same fox hole; I am not far lace curtains in fox holes; but I certainly am for having the serviceman or servicewoman have a chance to have his or her spouse in the same general area, so that they can come back to the supply bases and meet and have their leaves together or their 3- or their 5-day passes together. I think it is an outrage for the Army and the Navy under the present rules, as they now can do, to put a husband in the Pacific and the wife in Europe. I say to you let us put this amendment through and see that this injustice does not occur.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FULTON) there were—ayes 120, noes 94.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON, of Pennsylvania: On page 5, at the end of line 3, insert a new section, as follows:

"No member of the land or naval forces shall be assigned or transferred for the purpose of preventing such member, and the husband or wife of such member, from being in the same theater of operations in the same area.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment as I believe the sense of it has been carried in the previous amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. This act may be cited as the "Nurses' Selective Service Act of 1945."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the bill.

May I make the explanation that this substitute is the bill as agreed upon in the Committee of the Whole. It contains every amendment that has been adopted, and it merely makes the bill, as completed by all of the several amendments, title II to the Selective Training and Service Act.

The purpose of that, first of all, is to bring about an orderly procedure in legislative dealings by making it a part of the act relating to induction for military service. It also gives the nurses who are included by this legislation the benefit of the rights and privileges of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. It gives them the right to reemployment, and other rights that they would not otherwise have under the bill as passed if it is not made a part of the selective-service law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended (1) by inserting before the first section thereof a title heading reading as follows:

"'TITLE I—TRAINING AND SERVICE IN LAND AND NAVAL FORCES

and (2) by inserting at the end thereof a new title reading as follows:

"'TITLE II—SERVICE OF NURSES IN LAND AND NAVAL FORCES

"'SEC. 21. Congress hereby declares that to provide adequate nursing care for the armed forces of the United States it is imperative to secure immediately the services of additional trained and qualified nurses.

"'SEC. 22. (a) Every female residing in the United States who, on the day or days fixed for the first or any subsequent registration pursuant to this title, has reached the twentieth anniversary of her birth but has not reached the forty-fifth anniversary of her birth and (1) who has been, or on such day or days is, a graduate registered professional nurse in any State, Territory, or possession of the United States or in the District of Columbia, or (2) who on such day or days is (A) a graduate of a State-accredited school of nursing and (B) eligible to apply for examination for registration as a graduate registered professional nurse in the jurisdiction in which such school is situated or in which she resides, is hereby made subject to registration and selection for and induction into the land and naval forces of the United States under this act. Except as provided in this title, and except as may be provided in the separate regulations (authorized by section 24) applicable only to females to which this title applies, such registration, selection, and induction (including the classification and deferment of such females) shall proceed in accordance with the same procedures and be subject to the same exemptions, rights, penalties, and obligations provided for male registrants by this act and regulations thereunder. There shall be inducted into the land and naval forces under this title only such persons as have prior thereto been tendered a commission in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, or the United States Naval Reserve. In the selection, induction, voluntary recruitment, and commissioning of nurses by the land and naval forces there shall be no discrimination by reason of race, creed, or color. No person who, as a member of any religious organization, association, or sect, has taken a vow or vows, consecrating her life to religious service, shall be classified as available for induction into the land or naval forces pursuant to the provisions of this title.

"'(b) (1) In order to assure that the Nation's limited nursing skills are wisely utilized and that the national health and safety is protected against unwarranted depletion of essential nursing services, in the classification, reclassification, or deferment of any individual under this act, the selective-service local board shall give consideration to the recommendations, if any, with respect to whether such individual is engaged in essential nursing services, filed with such board by the Nursing Division of the Procurement and Assignment Service of the War Manpower Commission, functioning through its local, State, and National committees and appeal agencies, and no person employed as a nurse in a hospital facility operated by the Veterans' Administration shall be classified by any selective-service local board as available for induction into the land or naval forces under this title unless and until she has been released by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

"'(2) No provision of this subsection shall be construed to deny to any persons covered by this title a right to a hearing and determination by a selective-service local board and to an appeal from such determination in the same manner as provided in title I.

"'(c) As used in this section the term 'graduate registered professional nurse' shall be deemed to include the following designations which are in official usage and are

protected by law in the various States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia: "Registered nurse," "graduate nurse," trained nurse," certified nurse," "licensed nurse," and "professional nurse."

"'SEC. 23. Any registrant under this act inducted into the land or naval forces pursuant to this title shall be assigned only to duty in which her professional nursing skills and training will be used in accordance with military requirements. No registrant pursuant to this title shall be considered disqualified for nursing service in the land or naval forces merely because the school of nursing in which she received her training was affiliated with a hospital not having a specified minimum number of beds or patients.

"'SEC. 24. The President in the exercise of his authority to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, may prescribe separate regulations providing for the classification, selection for induction, and induction of females pursuant to this title under procedures and quotas different from those governing men, but the quotas shall be determined in a manner similar to that governing the determination of quotas for men, and in fixing and filling such quotas there shall be allowed credits similar to those governing the fixing and filling of quotas for men.

"'SEC. 25. This title (other than the provisions requiring registration) shall not apply to women with dependent children or with children under 18 years of age, or to married women whose marriage occurred prior to March 15, 1945, but shall not affect the voluntary recruitment of any qualified women who are not deferred after classification, for the Army Nurse Corps, the Navy Nurse Corps, or the Nurse Corps of Naval Reserve, or the appointment of members of such corps as commissioned officers as now provided by law.

"'SEC. 26. This title shall include male as well as female nurses and wherever the word 'female' or 'she' is used, it shall be deemed to include male nurses. It is the intent that all nurses shall be registered under this act, but, in the case of male nurses now in the armed services, the President may provide by regulation that they may be inducted into the Army Nurse Corps under the provisions of this act without registration with any local selective-service board.

"'SEC. 27. Nurses in the land or naval forces shall, to the extent compatible with military requirements, be assigned in accordance with their requests for assignment, and no nurse shall be denied any assignment by reason of the act that she would be in the same theater of operations as her spouse."

Mr. MAY (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the substitute amendment be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Kentucky if it now contains the Fulton amendment?

Mr. MAY. It contains every amendment that has been adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. POAGE. Including the Fulton amendment which we just adopted?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PACE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2277) to insure adequate nursing care for the armed forces, pursuant to House Resolution 153, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. I am, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McGREGOR moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs with instructions to report the same back forthwith, with an amendment as follows: Insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 6. No individual shall be inducted into the land or naval forces under this act for 30 days after the date of the enactment of this act, or thereafter so long as the number per month of volunteer qualified (graduate registered professional) nurses declared available for services in the armed forces by the Nursing Division of the Procurement and Assignment Service of the War Manpower Commission and certified by the Red Cross is equal at least to the number of nurses declared by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to be required for the land and naval forces.

"The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are directed for a period of 30 days after the enactment of this act, to conduct an intensive campaign to recruit the addditional nursing personnel required for the armed forces."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The question was taken; and on a division demanded by Mr. McGREGOR there were—ayes 117 and noes 161.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAY. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 347, nays 42, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—347

Abernethy	Doyle	Kelley, Pa.
Adams	Drewry	Keogh
Allen, Ill.	Durham	Kerr
Allen, La.	Earthman	Kilburn
Andersen, H. Carl	Eberharter	Kilday
Anderson, Calif.	Elliott	King
Anderson, N. Mex.	Ellis	Kirwan
Andrews, A'a.	Elsaesser	Kopplemann
Andrews, N. Y.	Elston	Kunkel
Angell	Engel, Mich.	LaFollette
Arends	Engle, Calif.	Landis
Auchincloss	Ervin	Lane
Bailey	Fallon	Lanham
Baldwin, Md.	Feighan	Larcade
Baldwin, N. Y.	Fellows	Latham
Barrett, Pa.	Fenton	Lea
Barrett, Wyo.	Fernandez	LeFevre
Barry	Fisher	Lewis
Bates, Ky.	Flannagan	Link
Bates, Mass.	Flood	Ludlow
Beall	Fogarty	Lyle
Beckworth	Folger	Lynch
Bell	Forand	McCormack
Bender	Fulton	McDonough
Bennet, N. Y.	Gallagher	McGehee
Bennett, Mo.	Gamble	McGlinchey
Biemiller	Gardner	McMillan, S. C.
Blackney	Gathings	McMillen, Ll.
Bland	Gavin	Madden
Bloom	Gearhart	Mahon
Bolton	Geelan	Maloney
Bonner	Gerlach	Manasco
Boykin	Gibson	Mansfield, Mont.
Bradley, Pa.	Gifford	Mansfield, Tex.
Brooks	Gillie	Marcantonio
Brown, Ga.	Goodwin	Martin, Iowa
Brown, Ohio	Gordon	Martin, Mass.
Brumbaugh	Gore	May
Bryson	Gorski	Merrow
Buck	Gossett	Michener
Buckley	Granahan	Miller, Calif.
Buffett	Granger	Miller, Nebr.
Bunker	Grant, Ala.	Mills
Burch	Grant, Ind.	Monroney
Butler	Green	Morgan
Byrne, N. Y.	Gregory	Morrison
Byrnes, Wis.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Mott
Campbell	Gwynne, Iowa	Mundt
Canfield	Hale	Murdock
Cannon, Fla.	Hall, Leonard W.	Murphy
Cannon, Mo.	Halleck	Murray, Tenn.
Carlson	Hancock	Murray, Wis.
Carnahan	Hand	Neely
Case, N. J.	Hare	Norrell
Case, S. Dak.	Harless, Ariz.	Norton
Celler	Harness, Ind.	O'Brien, Ill.
Chapman	Harris	O'Brien, Mich.
Chelf	Hart	O'Konski
Chenoweth	Hartley	O'Neal
Chiperfield	Hays	Outland
Church	Healy	Pace
Clason	Hébert	Patman
Clements	Heffernan	Patrick
Cochran	Hendricks	Peterson, Fla.
Coffee	Henry	Peterson, Ga.
Cole, Kans.	Herter	Pfeifer
Cole, Mo.	Heselton	Pickett
Cole, N. Y.	Hess	Ploeser
Colmer	Hill	Plumley
Cooley	Hinshaw	Poage
Cooper	Hobbs	Powell
Corbett	Hoch	Powers
Courtney	Hoeven	Price, Fla.
Cox	Holifield	Price, Ill.
Cravens	Holmes, Wash.	Priest
Cunningham	Hope	Quinn, N. Y.
Curley	Horan	Rabin
Curtis	Howell	Ramey
D'Alesandro	Huber	Rampeck
Daughton, Va.	Hull	Randolph
Davis	Jackson	Rankin
Dawson	Jarman	Rayfiel
De Lacy	Jenkins	Reece, Tenn.
Delaney, James J.	Jennings	Reed, Ill.
Delaney, John J.	Jensen	Rees, Kans.
Dickstein	Johnson, Calif.	Resa
Dingell	Johnson, Ind.	Richards
Dolliver	Johnson, Okla.	Riley
Dondero	Jonkman	Robertson, Va.
Doughton, N. C.	Judd	Robsion, Ky.
Douglas, Calif.	Kean	Rockwell
Douglas, Ill.	Kearney	Roe, Md.
	Kee	Roe, N. Y.
	Keefe	Rogers, Fla.
	Kefauver	Rogers, N. Y.

Rooney	Stevenson	Voorhis, Calif.
Rowan	Stigler	Vorys, Ohio
Ryter	Stockman	Wadsworth
Sabath	Sullivan	Walter
Sasscer	Sumners, Tex.	Wasielewski
Savage	Sundstrom	Weaver
Schwabe, Mo.	Taber	Welchel
Shafer	Talbot	Weiss
Sharp	Talle	White
Sheppard	Tarver	Whitten
Short	Taylor	Whittington
Sikes	Thom	Wickersham
Simpson, Ill.	Thomas, N. J.	Wigglesworth
Smith, Maine	Thomas, Tex.	Wilson
Smith, Va.	Thomason	Winstead
Smith, Wis.	Tibbott	Winter
Snyder	Tolan	Wolverton, N. J.
Somers, N. Y.	Torrens	Wood
Sparkman	Towe	Woodhouse
Spence	Traynor	Worley
Springer	Trimble	Zimmerman
Stefan	Vinson	

NAYS—42

Andresen, August H.	Havenner	Rabaut
Arnold	Hoffman	Reed, N. Y.
Bishop	Izac	Rich
Bradley, Mich.	Johnson, Ill.	Rizley
Brehm	Jones	Rodgers, Pa.
Crawford	Kinzer	Russell
Dworshak	Knutson	Schwabe, Okla.
Fuller	McConnell	Scrivner
Gillespie	McCowen	Smith, Ohio
Gillette	McGregor	Sumner, Ill.
Graham	Mason	Vursell
Griffiths	O'Hara	Wolcott
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Philbin	Wolfenden, Pa.
	Phillips	Woodruff, Mich.
	Pittenger	

NOT VOTING—43

Barden	Heidinger	Rivers
Boren	Holmes, Mass.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bulwinkle	Hook	Robinson, Utah
Burgin	Johnson, Luther A.	Rogers, Mass.
Camp	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sadowski
Clark	Kelly, Ill.	Sheridan
Clevenger	LeCompte	Simpson, Pa.
Combs	Lemke	Slaughter
Crosser	Lesinski	Starkey
Dirksen	Luce	Stewart
Domengeaux	McKenzie	Welch
Eaton	O'Toole	West
Ellsworth	Patterson	Woodrum, Va.
Gross	Rains	
Hagen		
Hedrick		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gross for, with Mr. Lemke against.

General pairs:

Mr. Luther A. Johnson with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Patterson with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.

Mr. West with Mr. Welch.

Mr. McKenzie with Mr. Heidinger.

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, this morning I was unavoidably detained. Consequently I was absent on the vote on the appropriation for the Committee on Un-American Activities. If I had been present I would have voted "no."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there is some misunderstanding as to which bill is to be taken up tomorrow, the Commodity Credit Corporation bill or the debt-limit bill. As I understand it the debt-limit bill must come up tomorrow because the House has designated that day for its consideration.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct. The debt-limit bill will be taken up tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an eloquent radio address from Guam delivered on February 25 by our distinguished Secretary of the Navy, Hon. James Forrestal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

NATION-WIDE SUPPORT FOR JACKSON HOLE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and include certain editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the Jackson Hole National Monument, Wyoming, established by Presidential proclamation on March 15, 1943, I thought a short statement would be of interest. We passed in the Seventy-eighth Congress, H. R. 2241, introduced by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]. This bill would have abolished the monument but would not have solved the problem. The President withheld his approval and filed a memorandum to which I refer a little later. With a sincere desire to protect the existing rights and after a careful study of the hearings and numbers of conferences, I have introduced H. R. 1292 for the purpose of clarifying the whole situation as well as definitely providing for rights-of-way, stock drives, and reimbursements for tax losses. It is my sincere belief that H. R. 1292 will protect the rights of existing property owners and will reimburse the county affected for the loss of taxes and will definitely solve the problem without injustice to anyone.

As chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands, I would like to see this problem definitely worked out in the interest of the Government and all concerned. When the President withheld his approval to the Barrett bill, he issued a memorandum disapproving it on December 29, 1944, giving the reasons why he believed that continuation of the monument is in the national interest In his memorandum, the President stated:

> I believe that whatever reasonable objections may exist to the continuance of the monument can be overcome without depriving this area of the protection to which it is justly entitled under the Antiquities Act of June 8, 1906, and under the other laws relating to national monuments. Therefore, it would seem to me that the proper remedy in this situation is not the undoing of what has been done, but the making of such adjustments as may be appropriate to meet the local conditions.

With respect to the tax problem of Teton County, Wyo., and to certain administrative policies concerning the monument, the President's memorandum states as follows:

> I would be sympathetic to the enactment of legislation whereby revenues derived by the Federal Government from the national park and monument system could be used to offset, on an equitable basis, any loss of taxes due to the Federal acquisition, by donation or purchase, of private lands within the monument. I would also be sympathetic to the enactment of legislation that would incorporate into law the administrative policies with respect to the private utilization of Federal lands within the monument to which I have already referred. Among other things, such legislation might provide assurance for private landholders within the monument who now have grazing privileges on Federal lands that these privileges will be continued to them, and to their heirs and assigns, so long as the lands to which these privileges are appurtenant remain in private ownership.

I find that as the real facts on the subject of the Jackson Hole National Monument become known, there is growing evidence of the support on behalf of the monument by the press in the country generally and by those who are thoroughly informed on the subject matter,

and I felt that the number of editorials and articles showing this would be of interest to you, and I therefore ask consent to include them in these remarks.

The articles and excerpts are as follows:

The Times, Louisville, Ky., December 6, 1944, from the editorial, Kill the Barrett Bill:

The Barrett bill abolishing Jackson Hole National Monument is on the House Calendar this week. It should be killed. The national monument was created by President Franklin D. Roosevelt under the Lacy Antiquities Act, under which sundry Presidents have acted with regard to other scenes deserving preservation. The drive against Jackson Hole National Monument seems part of a privilege-seeker's drive against sundry national reserves which are more valuable as such than the land they occupy would be if used otherwise.

December 18, 1944, from the editorial, Political Maneuvering:

The Jackson Hole controversy about which the Times has said much is not merely a wrangle about a prospective national park which under customary procedure is held under authority of the Federal Government in the technical position of a national monument. It reveals a far-flung battle line of western exploiters who plan a mass attack upon national reserves, utilizing Congress.

The Barrett (abolition) bill, passed by the House, now before the Senate, is part of political maneuver. Before the discussion ends, falsehoods told by opponents of the Coolidge-Hoover-Roosevelt idea about Jackson Hole may be nationally known as such.

Virginian-Pilot, Norfolk, Va., excerpt from an editorial of December 13, 1944:

Jackson Hole in Wyoming is a magnificent valley on the headwaters of the Snake River surrounded by the towering Teton range. * * * It has all the attributes for a valuable national monument. * * * It was Republican President Coolidge who got John D. Rockefeller, Jr., started buying up land in the area for the specific purpose of deeding it to the Government for a national monument. Republican President Hoover added his endorsement later and his Interior Secretary, Ray Lymon Wilbur, made a special inspection tour in 1929, assuring conservationists that the project would be completed. When Congress first turned it down, soon after the Democratic sweep in 1933, the move had a strong flavor of repudiation of anything Republican. Now it is very definitely a Democratic project and Congress still doesn't like it.

In logic the only valid reason for continued congressional opposition, played up in the House debate, is indignation that President Roosevelt had done by Executive action what Congress has refused to do by statute in the past. That is scarcely an adequate basis for blocking an important addition to the national park and monument system. Congress should swallow its pride and give the Jackson Hole Monument legislative sanction.

San Angelo Standard-Times, San Angelo, Tex., December 13, 1944, in its editorial, Ranchmen Win—The Public Loses, says:

For the sake of a few acres of grazing land, the ranchmen have won another battle with those who are conscientiously planning for good sport and wholesome recreation after the war.

The House has voted to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument in Wyoming, long coveted by ranchmen. Whether this will finally end the 221,610-acre national monument, established by proclamation of President Roosevelt, is not yet known.

The fact remains that purely commercial interests have triumphed, in the House at least, over the people at large. For the national monuments, parks, and forests are the one guarantee the people have of continued hunting, fishing, and outdoor recreation. * * *

Rather than retrenchment, the Nation now should be thinking in terms of how best to enlarge hunting and fishing prospects. Movements such as the abolition of the Jackson Hole National Monument are steps in the wrong direction. * * * Every effort should be made to create more areas—call them preserves, parks, or monuments—where every American can enjoy the heritage of the great outdoors.

From the Chicago Daily Times of December 14, 1944:

JACKSON HOLE "GRAB"

(By Robert E. Kennedy)

WASHINGTON.—It's unfortunate that a political label has been pasted on the Jackson Hole Monument in Wyoming and that some of our Republican brethren from Chicago have allowed their animosity toward anything Rooseveltian to influence their independent judgment on the controversy.

The Jackson Hole Monument has a misleading title. It is actually a large plot of ground—221,000 acres—which would be a national park, for the enjoyment of all Americans, such as the Yellowstone National Park. But because national parks must be approved by Congress—and there are congressional elements opposed to the present set-up—the President took a short cut and by Executive order designated the area a "monument." This he is entitled to do, by law.

There is plenty of precedent for such an action. Eighty-eight such monuments have been established by Presidents of all political colors, and eight or nine of them are larger than Jackson Hole. This particular monument was created to take advantage of a gift to the Government of 33,795 acres of land by John D. Rockefeller, Jr. Terming the project a New Deal grab is just pure political talk. The originator of the idea, in fact, was Harold Fabian, who was Republican national committeeman of Utah when he sold Rockefeller the idea 20 years ago.

When Gov. Thomas E. Dewey was in Wyoming last September he talked to stockmen who objected to the plan. With characteristic presumption, Dewey promptly termed the Jackson Hole Monument "characteristic of the deviousness of the New Deal, which shows lack of respect for the rights and privileges of the people affected."

But here is what Kenneth A. Reid, executive director of the Izaak Walton League of America, and no New Dealer, says: "The many dramatic stories about dispossessing the ranchers, ruining the cattle business, and taking upwards of 200,000 acres off the tax rolls, amount to nothing but hysterical or malicious bunk."

Actually, of the land affected, 76.9 percent is already owned by the Government and 15.3 percent by Rockefeller. Private lands amount to 7.2 percent and State school lands to .6 percent.

There will be no change in the private land status. When and if the ranchers are ready, they can sell their land (probably at a nice profit) or they can continue cattle raising with definite assurance of grazing rights on Federal land.

The House on Monday passed, 178 to 107, the Barrett bill, which would rescind the Presidential proclamation setting up the monument. The vote was largely on party lines. If the monument is killed, Rockefeller may weary of the wrangling and sell his land to private or State interests. Someone may make a real estate killing thereby. A glimmering of why local ranchers and others are interested begins to be seen.

The Washington Post, December 20, 1944, from the editorial, Jackson Hole:

We doubt that the House had the whole picture of the Jackson Hole controversy before it when it voted last week to abolish the national monument in that area created by Executive order. The House seemed to be chiefly interested in spanking the President for what it believed to be a usurpation of legislative powers. But the facts do not seem to bear out such an interpretation, and, in any event, loss of this national monument would be contrary to the national interest.

The only ground for complaint about the project that we can see is the fact that the President stepped in and did what Congress had failed to do * * *.

* * * The remedy is not a ruthless undoing of what has been done, but careful adjustments to overcome legitimate objections. * * *. Congress * * * could properly pass the Peterson bill guaranteeing grazing privileges and stock driveway privileges to ranchers owning land within the monument.

In other words, there seems to be a good chance of meeting all reasonable objections without depriving this scenic area of protection from the National Park Service.

The Washington Post on December 31, 1944, stated editorially:

President Roosevelt's pocket veto of the bill to abolish the Jackson Hole Monument at least has the virtue of giving Congress a new start toward solution of the problem at which the bill was aimed. We did not favor the bill, because it seemed to us that it was negative in its approach. What is needed, in our opinion, is not a sweeping undoing of what the President did in creating this national monument, but rather an adjustment of the legitimate grievances.

Fortunately, the President has now made two concessions to the viewpoint of the legislators who put through the abolition bill. He says that he will be sympathetic to legislation permitting the use of revenues from the national park and monument system of this area to offset the loss of local taxes resulting from Federal acquisition of private lands. Likewise, he will approve legislation guaranteeing to the cattlemen within the area the grazing privileges and rights of passage over Government lands they now have through administrative action. These concessions remove two of the most formidable local objections to the monument. * * *

It is well to remember that Senator O'MAHONEY and the late Senator Carey, of Wyoming, got a bill through the Senate back in 1935 to add most of the area now in dispute to the Grand Teton National Park. The bill failed because the Budget Bureau opposed its provision to compensate local governments for loss of taxes.

St. Louis Star-Times, December 21, 1944:

THE JACKSON HOLE ISSUE

One of the final acts of the expiring Congress was to pass a bill abolishing the 221,610-acre Jackson Hole National Monument in Wyoming, set up last year by an Executive order of President Roosevelt.

The measure was praised as an example of proper revolt against Federal encroachment on the rights of States and private landowners. But from this distance it is hard to see that it was anything but an expression of personal peeve against the President and Secretary Ickes and a bowing to the loud demands of selfish interests.

From the day the monument was created, ranchers of the Jackson Hole vicinity had been loud in protest. Their interest is in grazing rights and other privileges which might be lost if the monument is developed. But the plan has been widely supported by organization devoted to the preservation of

natural beauty spots and their development for public enjoyment.

The interest of the whole Nation in the case is emphasized by the fact that most of the land involved already is owned by the Federal Government. Another reason why local interests should not prevail is that much of the privately owned land was acquired over a period of years of the Rockefeller interests with the understanding—between President Calvin Coolidge and John D. Rockefeller, Jr.—that eventually it would be turned over to the Federal Government for park purposes.

President Roosevelt, in his order creating the monument, was not stepping on the toes of private ownership nearly so much as some congressional orators and others have charged. Neither was he taking away from the State of Wyoming enough land to make serious difference in State tax receipts. He was carrying out a program which was endorsed many years ago by Calvin Coolidge and later approved by Herbert Hoover. If those great champions of private rights could see the value of placing the Jackson Hole region at public disposal, surely Mr. Roosevelt was not so far out of line as some would have us believe.

The President has a chance to save the monument by a pocket veto. We hope he exercises that privilege.

In its editorial, The Tetons and Jackson Hole, the Journal, Milwaukee, Wis., stated on December 28, 1944:

The little park of 150 square miles needs enlargement and protection for the land in the Hole against cheap and undesirable forms of tourist exploitation. With this in mind, President Roosevelt by proclamation created a "national monument" setting aside an area already nine-tenths publicly owned.

There was outcry from some cattle owners who want free grazing. There is complaint in Jackson Hole that land would come off the tax rolls. But the Hole is not really good grazing country. Its elevation is too high; cattle that cannot be put in barns must be driven out in winter. When the snow is very deep and the cold intense, 25,000 elk come down from the surrounding mountains to Government feeding stations.

The House of Representatives this month voted to abolish this national monument, though it had once voted to add this area to the Teton park. It had heard some of the local complaints by short-sighted men who did not realize that the park and the Hole are far greater assets than a bit of grazing land.

Conservationists who know the grandeur of the mountains and the natural beauty of Jackson Hole need to get busy and talk to their Congressmen and Senators. Wyoming has no greater resource. Huge in area, the State has a population of only 250,000; in normal years the summer population is far larger, made up of tourists drawn largely by the Big Horn mountains and the Tetons.

If Congress must show its authority, the way is open to act without injuring this unique bit of American landscape. It would be better to add the region in question to the Grand Teton park than to leave it as a national monument, of course drawing the boundaries carefully to include as little actual grazing land as possible. The idea of denying so great a resource to the future for no good reason is abhorrent to those thinking Americans who have welcomed every bit of national beauty saved from destruction and preserved as a source of delight to hundreds of thousands of Americans every year.

The New York Times stated in its editorial, Jackson Hole, on December 30, 1944:

President Roosevelt's pocket veto of the bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument in Wyoming was accompanied yesterday by a statement of policy which might serve as a model in future controversies of this sort. The reasons for setting aside this area forever for all the people of the United States are compelling.

One can easily understand the State patriotism which resents Federal "encroachment" on State territories. There must be limits. No one would wish to see the entire State of Wyoming or the entire State of Arizona bought up and set aside as a national park or monument. But this is not threatened. By eastern standards, Wyoming is vast. It will never be thickly populated. Parks and monuments may bring it more wealth in the end than grazing, and the two are not incompatible. Beyond the State's borders are millions of Americans who will benefit if the few notable spots of scenic and historic significance can be set aside for the general use. It does seem that in this, as in many similar instances, the good of the greater number will be served if the reservation stands, and that no injustice will be done to anyone.

The Tribune-Herald, Casper, Wyo., on December 29 carried the following statement in its column, Brass Tacks:

MONUMENT ISSUE

The President has exercised his Executive prerogative in vetoing the bill to abolish the Jackson Hole National Monument, and his reasons conform to those he gave for creating the new reserve. They are based on what he regards as adequate "nationalistic, historic, scenic, and recreational" values of the area.

Hopes that the monument can be abolished have thus been dissipated for the present, unless it is done by court order. There is also little prospect that the bill can be passed and repassed by the new Congress over another veto.

Facing temporary, if not ultimate, defeat, opposition forces might do well accordingly to take advantage of the President's proposal for legislation to reimburse Teton County and the State for lost taxes and to protect grazing rights within the reserve. It might be possible also to include provisions for State control of wildlife resources.

The State should enjoy the benefits of this protection, regardless of whether the monument is temporary or permanent.

New York Herald Tribune, December 31, 1944, excerpt from an editorial entitled "The Jackson Hole Veto":

The memorandum of disapproval with which the President pocket-vetoed the bill to abolish the Jackson Hole Monument is an important state paper in the field of conservation. It states that: "The effect of this bill would deprive the people of the United States of the benefits of an area of national significance from the standpoint of naturalistic, historic, scientific, and recreational values."

* * * the President points out that he will be most receptive to legislation safeguarding private rights, expressly mentioning compensation from park revenues for tax losses, and welcoming statutory support for present administrative practices which permit the grazing privileges to continue. * * * the President's position is sound and reveals no irreconcilable clash of national and local interests.

The Salt Lake Tribune on January 4, 1945, carried an item containing the following:

A new note in the controversy over the Jackson Hole National Monument was sounded Wednesday after a group of taxpayers had appeared Tuesday before the Teton County commissioners at their regular meeting in Jackson, and demanded that the commission reimburse Teton County for all of the county moneys they had expended for "propaganda and expenses in supporting the Barrett bill in the most recent session of Congress."

* * * At the request of the commissioners, this request was made in writing, and entered on the minutes of the meeting. The written request follows: "We, the undersigned, taxpayers of Teton County, request the county commissioners to reimburse Teton County for the money they have expended fighting the Jackson Hole Monument and not to use any more county funds either for or against same." Signed: William Wallace, Ben F. Goe, Cecil Jensen, H. C. Richards, and Jess Wort.

A spokesman for the group said that they were prepared to go into the courts, if necessary, to determine whether or not the county officials have authority to spend the taxpayer's money for such purpose when "a large number" of the taxpayers feel that the Jackson Hole National Monument is a great asset to the country.

It was also declared at the meeting that "many people of Jackson Hole, believing that all of the furor raised nationally over the monument was largely for political purposes, bided their time, thinking the matter would be ended with the veto of the Barrett bill."

The taxpayers also revealed that a telegram, signed by nine Jackson businessmen, was sent to Senator CARL A. HATCH, chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, at the time the bill was before the Senate committee. The telegram read: "Passage of Barrett bill would be a great mistake. Consider it dangerous to remove protection afforded this area by Jackson Hole National Monument, even pending more comprehensive legislation by Congress. Suggest you investigate source of funds which paid for propaganda to misrepresent this conservation move all over United States. We are local businessmen and consider Barrett bill against our best interest."

The telegram was signed by John Wort, W. L. Spicer, Ben F. Goe, H. C. Richards, William J. Wallace, G. Brown, Wallace Brundage, V. M. Hess, and A. Martin.

"With the recent statements in the press that FRANK A. BARRETT (United States Representative from Wyoming) will again introduce his measure, and the announcement that the Committee for the Preservation of Teton County will again go into action, the Jackson businessmen have indicated that another committee will be formed for the preservation of the Jackson Hole National Monument, so that the misleading statements put out locally by paid publicity agents will not go unanswered," a statement signed by Mr. Goe read.

The Sacramento Bee, January 10, 1945:

JACKSON HOLE COUNTRY BELONGS TO THE PEOPLE

Some of the most spectacular peaks in America are contained in the range of mountains known as the Grand Tetons, in northwestern Wyoming.

Those who have stood on the shores of the chain of beautiful lakes at the foot of the range have an unforgettable memory of nature's handiwork on the grandest scale.

Lying immediately to the south of the range is a level plateau area known as the Jackson Hole country.

There are 98,000 acres in the Grand Teton National Park. To preserve the adjacent Jackson Hole area as a permanent recreation ground for all the people of America President Roosevelt set aside 220,000 acres in 1943 as a national monument.

Nine-tenths of the 220,000 acres already was in the pulic domain.

But private interests which own the other one-tenth—largely dude ranchers—have been bitterly antagonistic to the monument idea from its inception.

They even prevailed on Governor Dewey to take up their cause during the last campaign, and succeeded in getting through Congress last year a measure rescinding the President's action with the intent of throwing the Jackson Hole country open to private exploitation.

This measure the President vetoed recently on the ground the national interests in the preservation of this area as an integral part of the Grand Teton National Park was superior to any private claims of pocketbook damage.

The President did, however, point out that he would approve legislation to compensate Wyoming for any tax losses suffered and to protect existing cattle grazing privileges in the area.

Yet so persistent are those who would undo the President's action that it is announced they will seek to have the new Congress abolish the authority of the Executive to establish national monuments or in some other way reclaim this area for private control.

That effort should prove just as futile as all others which have preceded it. This unique area of American landscape justly belongs to the people as a heritage worthy of protection and continued preservation for their enjoyment.

Capital Journal, Salem, Oreg., January 11, 1945, states editorially:

The creation of every national park and monument has met with violent opposition unless the area was without other than tourist, recreational, and scenic values. Lumbermen, stockmen, hydroelectric and commercial interests lead the opposition as a rule, backed by local officials fearing loss of tax revenues in the future—few of them ever on record for conservation of natural resources and most of them practicing a depletion that has made similar regions a desert waste.

The scenic Jackson Hole National Monument in Wyoming is a typical instance. Lobby pressure induced the recent Congress to pass a bill abolishing the reservation, which received a pocket veto from the President. In his memorandum of disapproval the President said the legislation would have deprived the people of the United States of the benefits of an area of national significance from the standpoint of naturalistic, historic, scientific, and recreational values. * * *

The reasons for setting aside this area forever to all the people are compelling: the unique and majestic nature of the geological formation; the fact that it is a breeding and feeding ground for rare types of birds and animal life; its historical association with the fur trade.

In the long-range view the veto was justified, for the good of the greater number will be served by the preservation of the monument, for millions of tourists will visit the place and spend millions of dollars, and no injustice will be suffered by anyone.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the business of the day and any other special orders I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report from Barrons on lend-lease.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include a letter from the Federal Housing Administration.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PALESTINE ENCIRCLEMENT

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I present some animadversions against some of the results of the Yalta Conference. I voice criticism reluctantly and more in sorrow than in anger. I do so in the hope that mistakes that have been committed will be rectified.

It is passing strange that Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin have met at Yalta in the Crimea and have now announced the proposed solutions of many knotty problems involving frontiers, boundaries, bases, and rehabilitation of the liberated, but they could not find it in their hearts and minds to spend a few of these precious moments in an attempt to ease the age-old problems of the persecuted Jews of Europe. They have agreed to a conference in San Francisco at which, undoubtedly, a broad facultative charter for the United Nations will be developed, but the status of Palestine is lightly shunted aside. Churchill and Roosevelt even reached a meeting of minds with regard to the treatment of post-war Japan, but they could not find the time to do something constructive with regard to the reopening of the doors of Palestine, in pursuance of the terms of the Balfour Declaration, the mighty pledge now treated so lightly by Great Britain. England was not reminded of the duties of trusteeship, which she seems to have interpreted as "to have and to hold." Under the provisions of the Balfour Declaration it was never intended that England hold Palestine in the pocket of her expansive imperialist's apron but rather to tend it with all the foresight traditionally connected with stewardship.

I wonder whether our good President reminded his good friend Churchill that the so-called MacDonald White Paper is a violation of the solemn treaty entered into by Great Britain and the United States in 1924 wherein in article 15 it was agreed "The mandatory shall see that no discrimination of any kind shall be made between inhabitants on the ground of race, religion, or language. No person shall be excluded from Palestine on the sole ground of religious beliefs," and wherein it was further agreed that no modification may be made in the terms of the mandate unless such modification shall have been assented to by the United States.

Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin have found it possible to agree on such involved topics as the demilitarization and the disarmament and the reparations program of post-war Germany. Yet, Palestine, the pawn of the Middle East—the gateway to empire—has been bypassed. Poland, Greece, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Italy—apparently the nations of the world—all were on the agenda at Yalta—yet not a word of encouragement goes out to the trapped Jews in Festung Europa. It seems completely unbelievable.

Churchill and Roosevelt met with King Ibn Saud. Churchill expressed to this reigning potentate the thanks of Great Britain for "his steadfast, unswerving and unflinching loyalty to our country." Unflinching loyalty, indeed. "Applesauce." Mr. Churchill must have been temporarily blinded by the strong rays of the noon-day sun as this is clearly a case of bestowing praise on the wrong personality. Ibn Saud renders loyalty only to those who give him bakshish. The more bakshish the more loyalty. He did not offer as much as a camel or a donkey to aid the Allies when their cause was so crucial in north Africa. What did the Jews of Palestine do? It is a matter of historical record—they gave to the limit of their strength—many thousands volunteered for military service—and many of these youths passed through the fateful Valley of the Shadow in the Allied struggle against Rommel. Our great President says of his conversation with Ibn Saud, "I learned more about the whole problem, the Moslem problem, the Jewish problem, by talking with Ibn Saud for 5 minutes than I could have learned in an exchange of two or three dozen letters." That is a queer observation and needs explaining. Ibn Saud is hardly unbiased, to say the least. But what of the many conferences that our great President has held over the years with many Jewish leaders of note? Certainly, he must have gotten some impressions of an appropriate solution of these problems.

It is no secret that Ibn Saud is endowed with the moral scruples of a tiger. In those 5 minutes he probably disparaged the wondrous efforts of the Jews in Palestine who have made the desert bloom like a rose. It is more than a likely conclusion that Saud threatened that the Moslems would rise in wrath if any more Jews enter Palestine. That threat is the usual duststorm to hide sinister motives.

It is strange how the Moslems are always used as a cat's-paw. When difficulties arise in India, the alleged militancy of the Moslems is asserted, and so in an attempt to scuttle our claims to Palestine we are fed frightening tales of a militant Arab unity. A student of international affairs puts it well. He writes:

It is curious how the name of the Moslems crops up wherever if is profitable for a third party to utilize it. Britain says she has to remain in India because of the Hindu-Moslem antagonism. In Palestine, British power has to be maintained, we are told, because the Jews and Moslems cannot get along when left to themselves. Giraud abrogated the Cremieux decree in French North Africa because, he said, voting rights for the Jews annoyed the Moslems. Since the Moslems are the common denominators in all these places, one might suspect that they can never live peaceably with the members of any other religion. Yet 50,000,000 Moslems in China get along quite well with Buddhists, Taoists, Confucians and Christians. Moslems in the Philippines had no conflict with Christians; and in the Soviet Union Moslems live harmoniously with members of many other religious faiths. Can it be that the fault lies with imperialism, which is the other common denominator in the countries where religious antagonism takes an acute form?

Relative to Ibn Saud, I think it is incumbent upon the President to disclose

to an anxious, waiting people the conclusions reached with that potentate of the desert.

The President and Churchill met King Farouk of Egypt. This young man of 24 is so inhumane, he thinks nothing of catapulting through the crowded thoroughfares of Cairo and Alexandria in his high-powered cars at the rate of 90 miles an hour, maiming and killing as he speeds to some undoubtedly pointless destination. This is the same Farouk who, when Rommel was at the gates of Alexandria, offered a toast to the coming Axis victories. One does not need much imagination to conjure up the tale he could tell in 5 minutes—or less.

The Jews are politely, but none the less decisively, told that they must await a solution of their problem until after the peace conference. We are told that it is unpatriotic to speak up now in the midst of world turmoil and that the peace table holds the answer to the question that vexes us. But, when hostilities cease, the peoples that they now seek to silence shall be presented with a fait accompli. Then, I fear, Palestine shall be closed to the Jewish people. The Jew will continue his 2,000-year-old trek while rehabilitation committees seek for new havens—everywhere—but in the one place where the Jew would be most welcome—Palestine.

I wish to stress the fact that there is no need to wait for a so-called peace conference after the war. Peace conferences have been taking place now for sometime—when Churchill met Roosevelt at Casablanca, when they were joined by Stalin at Teheran and most recently at Yalta. These meetings, to my mind, were a form of peace conference in that the future of the post-war world was closely analyzed, agreements made, settlements reached, and blueprints charted.

Even when the Big Three disperse—hundreds of subordinates in their respective countries are assiduously carrying out the instructions—in Washington, London, Moscow. The same type of activity goes on in Cairo, Bagdad, and in Jidda, at Jerusalem.

One thing is certain. We must not allow this crucial moment to pass unheeded into the chronicles of history. We are told "one generation opens the road upon which other generations travel." This generation cannot countenance betrayals, broken pledges, and immoralities.

I voice this criticism because the extremity of European Jewry is so severe that we cannot understand this retreat, this apparent retreat, on the part of Roosevelt and Churchill from such a pressing problem. It must still be explained. Churchill when on the opposition bench called the foul MacDonald white paper "the filing of a petition in moral bankruptcy."

On October 15, 1944, Roosevelt reaffirmed the Democratic platform pledge that the doors of Palestine be reopened to the hapless, homeless Jews of Europe. Four hundred Members of the House and Senate indicated their support and approval of this solution of the problem and with such evidence of nonpartisan support, the Wright-Compton resolution was approved only to be withdrawn at a later date. All paths seem to lead down a blind alley.

Let us turn to another facet of the same problem. Despite intense opposition, the State Department appointed a short time ago, Harold Hoskins, as economic adviser to our Minister to Egypt, Mr. S. Pinkney Tuck. Little or no publicity had been given to the appointment of Hoskins, but when the information leaked out, the opposition to Hoskins became more virile.

Hoskins was born in Beirut and has lived many years in the Levant. He has taken on entirely too much of the color of his Arab surroundings. Jewish leaders bitterly complained about the appointment. At every twist and turn he disparaged the Jewish effort in Palestine. For the longest time he has been known as an avowed Arabphile. Jewish leaders feel they would never get a square deal from such a one as he. He has never raised his finger to aid the Herculean efforts of the Jews in Palestine; on the contrary, he has hindered. To whom is he persona grata? Only to the Arabs upon whom he has bestowed great benefits.

In his position as economic adviser, he will be compelled to make a choice between Arab interests and Jewish interests. It is a foregone conclusion that the scales will always be tipped in the interest of the Moslems.

His intense Arab bias was known or should have been known to the State Department. Likewise his well-known hostility to a Jewish national homeland in Palestine should have made the State Department hesitate before appointing him.

The State Department rendered a genuine disservice to the Jews and their cause when it asked deferment of the Wright-Compton resolution, seeking to open the doors of Palestine to Jewish immigration. It now adds an additional disservice by maintaining Harold Hoskins in this important position in the Middle East where he can do irreparable harm. His influence will not be confined to Cairo; it will permeate the entire Middle East. It would be most baneful.

Assuredly, the State Department should not make appointments of this character without viewing all possible repercussions.

I repeat, the appointment of Hoskins is but another manifestation of the negation of the pledge made by the President that he would do all in his power to aid in the establishment in Palestine of a democratic Jewish commonwealth.

I am reluctant to voice this criticism of our great President. I know him to be a stalwart and firm friend of the people, but we are puzzled and I speak out of our need for clarification. It is incumbent upon him to speak out lest we are led to believe that a platform is something to get in on and not to stand on. I remind myself of the bewilderment endured by Alice in Wonderland while she attended the Mad Hatter's tea party. To her amazement, one of the most desirable ingredients seemed to be missing. She wanted some jam. Upon inquiring, she was told firmly by the White Queen: "The rule is: jam tomorrow, jam yesterday, but never jam today."

Must it always be so with the Jews, Mr. President? Succor yesterday; relief tomorrow, but none today. Must the hope of Jewry always be deferred? I know deep down in your heart, Mr. President, you think differently. But we want action, Mr. President—not merely words.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the chairman of local draft board No. 22 relating to the drafting of farm labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I have offered a resolution today asking for the appropriation of funds to a committee of Congress, on a basis which is a new departure in congressional procedure. I am part of the new blood elected to Congress, brought in from the distant galleries of the service to do a job, which is to give this body a transfusion of energy and new life. How long has it been since we have heard a rousing song or a cheer in this body; how long since we have carried some leader down the aisles on our shoulders as evidence of his leadership and support?

It amazes me that our body has permitted such a great portion of its duties to be taken over by bureaus and the bureaucrats, merely through failure to use Congress' own powers. I am therefore going to put life into a committee of Congress and let me hear the first to vote against it.

I have offered a resolution as a Republican to appropriate $500,000 to the Civil Service Committee of this Congress to investigate the whole civil-service system. That amount is only a beginning considering the responsibilities of the committee.

The committee supervises the spending of $7,000,000,000 a year and controls upward of 2,800,000 employees. They now have only 7 investigators, 1 per billion dollars, 1 for every 400,000 employees. I would sell my stock in any company run on that basis, but I am not willing to sell my stock in the United States.

Give me $500,000 to put on a real survey and investigation of the facts, and I will save you a billion dollars—a billion dollars is only a 14 to 15 percent reduction in this tremendous pay roll. We all know this is possible in the interests of good business administration.

Are the American people interested in efficiency? They surely are. Let us put efficiency back in the Government. The committee has tried with small resources in the Seventy-eighth Congress, but Congress has killed it at its roots. They tried to save you money, but were stopped by this Congress for their efforts. I am speaking as a concerned citizen.

By this action to its own children, its own committees, Congress is gradually committing suicide in the eyes of the American people and the armed services.

I was elected to the place where they make the laws, but when I as a poor relative look across to the rich fields of the bureaus and the bureaucrats and see how easily they make a sweeping law by a letter with a date at the top, and have millions of employees, maybe I should have been elected to O. P. A. or a similar agency.

You have put me on the Civil Service Committee when I came in lately from the service. You ask for honest, sincere service, and in the name of the boys whom I represent and whom I left, I am willing to give it without partisanship. Try me out and see.

Let us plan in this committee for the changes and savings that can be made when VE-day arrives. Let us be ready. Let us start in to obtain a Government career service that is no prison for abilities—and no lock step to pensions and the grave. Let us give our efficient employees a good name and a chance. Let us have the armed services and public know that Government employees are giving a good day's work for a good day's pay.

I say to you—civil service at the present time is a pious front for a lot of loafing.

Let congressional committees start acting now—stop being so generous with every bureaucrat, and stop treating Congress like a poor relative. Wake up, Congress, you are the boss.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. May I say to the gentleman that I am amazed to find out that this committee has only seven investigators for some 3,800,000 employees in the Federal Government?

I am one of the new Members of Congress also, coming from Los Angeles County, where we have a personnel of about 17,000 employees. To supervise, investigate, and reclassify that number of employees we have more than seven investigators. Certainly the proposal of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is worthy of consideration, because the public is certainly looking for an opportunity for economy and efficiency in the personnel now employed by the Government, and for a reduction in the taxes the people are being overburdened to pay.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, no one who listened to the debate on the May-Bailey bill could have failed to be impressed with the number of stories of alleged wastage of manpower in Government departments and bureaus under the jurisdiction of civil service.

Most of these stories were based upon rumor or personal observation in specific offices but there was evidently no careful study made of this situation.

The Civil-Service Establishment costs the taxpayers over $7,000,000,000 per annum and even the small staff of investigators now employed by the Civil Service Committee, of which I am a member, reports that it has been able to save over a million dollars by the elimination of duplication of effort. If the proposed resolution for a full-scale investigation is adopted, I am confident that it will not only pay its cost many times over in effecting savings, but, what is even more important, will result in bringing about greater efficiency in the operation of the Government.

Businessmen whose service in war agencies has brought them into contact with civil service for the first time are appalled at its rigidity and are almost unanimous in stating that no private business could profitably operate on the basis used by the Government. A system originally devised to prevent favoritism and the operation of the spoils system has, indeed, pretty well accomplished that result, but at the expense of hampering initiative. Business executives dislike to work under an arrangement which often compels them to hire several low-paid employees to perform tasks which could be better done by one or two well-paid men or women. I believe that the time has come for a thoroughgoing revision of civil service in the interests of procuring better pay for employees and better service for the Government, and I believe that the proposed investigation will show us how to accomplish this desirable objective.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I too am a new Member of the House. One of the things that is bothering and disturbing the people of my district and my State is the vast expenditure of public funds and the many, many unnecessary Federal employees. If the resolution that is being introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] will accomplish the end of reducing public expenditures, as he suggests, by a billion dollars, and cut down the vast army of public employees, I am for it, and I know the people of my district and State are for it.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. As another new Member of Congress, I endorse highly the suggestion that has been made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It seems to me it is the sort of suggestion that could well be endorsed by all the Members of the House. It is the sort of thing that means a great deal to the taxpayers of this country. It is doing something about this thing we have all been talking about. I hope the gentleman will succeed in his efforts.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. ADAMS. I am sure the gentleman is well aware that as of the 31st of December 1944, there were on the Federal pay roll 2,859,737 employees. These employees were within the continental limits of the United States. Outside of the continental limits of the United States there were 449,800 employees, or a total of 3,309,537 employees on the pay roll of the Federal Government as of that date, according to figures given me today by the Civil Service Commission.

On January 31, 1945, there were 2,888,900 Federal employees within the continental limits of this country. Thus, the number of Federal employees increased by some 30,000 during the month of January. Although, Mr. Speaker, this may not be an alarming increase in these times, I think we must keep in mind we have a colossal problem ahead of us in the reduction of Federal pay rolls. This job will take more than hopeful aspirations and wishful thinking. It will take investigation, determination, and intelligent planning. The resolution offered by the gentleman deserves the careful consideration of all of those who would see the Federal Government once more reestablished on a firm financial foundation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

SAFEGUARD LEND-LEASE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, as the time draws near for the renewal of lend-lease, which already has cost this Nation some $36,000,000,000, it is important that we reexamine the safeguards which common sense dictates should be present in all lend-lease transactions.

I am not at all convinced that there have been sufficient safeguards in former lend-lease transactions. As a matter of fact, I sometimes wonder whether there has been a real effort to secure, in return for American goods, guaranties of equal participation in the war effort or of free and open cooperation after the war.

We furnish most of the supplies and three-fourths of the men on the western front. We furnish a substantial part of the supplies used on the eastern front. We furnish practically all of the men and the supplies in the Pacific war. And in addition, we are having presented to us a constant stream of proposals by which the United States would pay the bills and insure the prosperity of the postwar world.

I know that much of this is water under the bridge. In the main the billions expended for lend-lease are gone. Lend-lease is something to be charged off to war, to a war that we intend to win and win conclusively. The principle of lend-lease has paid dividends in the saving of American lives. Although its cost in dollars may have been high, such costs fade in significance when compared with the importance of saving the lives of our people.

But I do not think that America wants to go on paying the bills of lend-lease after the job of winning the war is accomplished. I do not think that America ever placed its approval on a program of lend-waste. I realize that lend-lease will be continued at least for the duration of the war, and I shall vote for its continuation, just as I voted for its inception and for its continuation in the past. But I ask that the American people receive stronger guaranties than in the past that we shall receive services or goods or coop-

eration commensurate with the moneys and materials which are being taken from our Nation.

I do not wish to be critical. But I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that America intended for its fighting men to be loaned to Britain for a house-building program. Yet a lend-lease house-building program was inaugurated in Britain in December 1944. At that time 3,400 American soldiers were detailed for this work. I do not know whether the number has since advanced or been reduced. Presumably, with these men went the materials needed for house construction, as well as bulldozers, excavators, and other equipment which had left the States tagged for the fighting front.

I do not speak from hearsay. The London Sunday Dispatch for December 10, 1944, carried a picture of the men at work with this caption: "Minister greets United States sappers at work on bomb damage." Then followed this comment:

Mr. Duncan Sandys, Minister of Works, talked yesterday to some of the first of the 3,000 Americans who are to help clear up London's V-wreckage. Some of the sappers in the background are evidently so keen that they won't look up from their work * * * by next week end more than 1,000 United States soldiers will be on the job of erecting 500 Nissen houses on 32 different sites in the Borough of Lambeth.

With roaring bulldozers smashing into crumbling walls, and rumbling excavators filling lorries with debris, bonfires of waste timber from blitzed timber and wall laths sending clouds of smoke over the roof tops Mr. Duncan Sandys, the premier's son-in-law, and the man charged with the job, the colossal job, of rehousing Britain as well as Brixton, arrived to say thanks to the Americans for the latest piece of lend-lease.

From the London Star for Monday, December 18, 1944, I quote:

United States sappers get first huts up after 8 days' work. Two hutments took shape today on the Loughborough Road, Brixton, site, which is being cleared by United States sappers. This is within 8 days of the beginning of the work. Since then the shells of old bombed houses have been cleared away by bulldozers, the ground leveled by mechanical shovels, foundations laid by great concrete mixers, and all bricks, timber, and rubbish carted away.

All this work is being done by United States sappers, even the surveying. The officer in charge, Captain Brockdorf, declared himself well pleased with the work of his men, but he stressed the fact that they were in the first place combat troops. They could be as handy in blowing up places as in putting them up, he declared.

I was told that the first tenants have not yet been chosen, but there are plenty anxious to move in. Preference would be given to those from the district.

The Stars and Stripes, London edition, for December 19 carried a picture of United States engineers at work with the caption, "United States engineers repairing bomb-damaged homes in London, Lambeth area, cleared this blitzed site and erected a temporary house in 7 days."

As we might have anticipated, the project was quite favorably received in Britain.

It may be interesting to some if I point out the confusion which came out of the order for lend-leasing American soldiers. These orders were to assign sufficient men who showed a background of experience in carpentry and brick masonry, regardless of their military duties at the time the order was issued. Some company clerks showed up, leaving their own work to be figured out and carried on as well as possible by others. Some enlisted men who had responsible positions in the finance offices, in the supply warehouses, and in other important activities were called. The case of one top sergeant was specifically brought to my attention. He had a very responsible assignment in one of our London military offices. His knowledge of carpentry was most elementary; yet he received orders to report for lend-lease house building. His commanding officer pulled every string that he knew, but the order stood. Several days later this man found himself in charge of a kitchen detail on the lend-lease project while his old command tried vainly to untangle the complicated records which he had formerly supervised.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I call attention to an interesting account of lend-lease operations which was reported to the United States Senate by two of its able Members after a first-hand study of lend-lease in action. I wish to quote their own statements which were carried in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 15, 1944:

LEND-LEASE AND REVERSE LEND-LEASE ACCOUNTING

Lend-lease and reverse lend-lease accounts are in such condition that it is impossible to tell with certainty the exact status of balances for intratheater transactions. There are two serious discrepancies between the methods used by our forces and those used by the British, which have contributed to this confusion.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator permit an interruption for a question?

Mr. TUNNELL. Certainly.

Mr. BREWSTER. Before the Senator leaves the matter of the radio station, let me inquire whether he has informed himself regarding what legislation, if any, would be appropriate to be enacted in order to determine a policy of this character?

Mr. TUNNELL. I have not done so; but I thought, and I still think, that this matter should be handled through the State Department. I understand that the State Department does not think that at the present time it has all the authority which I have suggested or which has been suggested in this report. So it seems to me that the State Department itself should make some suggestions regarding what increased authority it should have.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator agree that in connection with our general constitutional function of advising in respect to questions of foreign policy, it might be appropriate for Members of the Senate to bring to the attention of the appropriate committees of this body dealing with such questions the related matters of policy, with the idea that the departments downtown would realize that we also are concerned about this matter and that we would welcome constructive suggestions from them?

Mr. TUNNELL. Our chairman suggests that we will do that.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think that would be most appropriate.

Mr. TUNNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, there are two serious discrepancies between the methods used. The first is the refusal of the British to price invoices on materials and services lend-leased to us in the theater. The second is the policy of the British to charge 42 percent on their cost for transportation, insurance, and handling charges on material and equipment turned over to us under reciprocal aid in the theater, whereas the charges of the American forces for such items have been 25 percent. Perhaps this is the result of some agreement between our State Department and the British, but our information came particularly from those in Abadan, where they were not familiar with what had been done on lend-lease from Washington. Washington was familiar with what they had done but Abadan was not familiar with what Washington had done.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did the committee ascertain the reason why the British would not price these invoices at the present time?

Mr. TUNNELL. I understood it was because of a lack of clerks; they could not hire a sufficient number of clerks.

Mr. FERGUSON. That was the reason which was assigned, was it?

Mr. TUNNELL. That was the reason which was assigned. That procedure has been followed, in that the number of items is charged, without any total.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I flew west 2 days ago with one in command of an air base in England, who said a report was very widely circulated there—and I think the matter should be cleared up, regardless of whether the report is accurate—affecting the item of gasoline, in particular, the intimation being that for gasoline secured from the British a charge was made very considerably in excess of the charge made for the gasoline when it was delivered to the British. Did that matter come to the Senator's attention at all?

Mr. TUNNELL. The only thing along that line which I remember having come to our attention was at Abadan, where some of the witnesses protested that on articles which had been handed from our lend-lease authorities to the British, and which subsequently had been taken back by us from the British, because we needed them—as sometimes happens, we were told—to the original cost a charge of 25 percent for transportation was added by us.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator was informed that our people had added that charge?

Mr. TUNNELL. Yes; we were informed that our people had added a charge of 25 percent, and that when the article was later handed back to us there was a disagreement between the British and our people regarding the charge which they should add to the 25 percent. I did not hear gasoline specifically mentioned, but there was a difference between them.

I may say, in order to be perfectly fair, that I understand that our State Department has been satisfied, at least in part, to have the matter of pricing go over. But regardless of whether it goes over, our committee did not think the method used was the proper one.

Mr. President, the more serious of these two discrepancies is the first. Both the Army and the Navy have been seeking to persuade the British to price their invoices. The British have consistently refused to do so on the basis that they did not have sufficient bookkeeping manpower. After extended negotiations, the Navy secured from the British Admiralty an understanding, which became operative on January 1, 1945, that they would price invoices on all transactions subsequent to that date, and would assist the Navy in going over invoices on transactions prior to that date, so that they might also be priced.

The Army has as yet been unable to secure a similar commitment from the British, so we were informed. In lieu of such pricing it has been the practice of the Army to place its own estimates of values.

The seriousness of the foregoing can readily be appreciated when it is realized that warehouses full of unpriced invoices will be accumulated, and that if such articles are ever priced, they will undoubtedly have to be priced by persons not familiar with the original transaction—persons who possibly will not have the proper catalogs or other reference sources to enable them to determine accurately the value of such lend-lease transfers. Apparently the British maintain prices for their own records; and unquestionably there will be a discrepancy between our estimate of the total value of British reciprocal aid in the theater and the estimate which the British will have. As an example, the British presented in their official documents a report of some $175,000,000 worth of material transferred to us on lend-lease, but it was appraised by our Navy at a value of only $10,000,000.

I understand that what really has happened is that our people have obtained valuations on only $10,000,000 worth of material. At any rate, there is a great deal of difference between the bookkeeping methods and between the total figures obtained.

In negotiating for the settlement of obligations under the Lend-Lease Act, it is obvious that this confusion as to accurate balances between our governments will make lend-lease settlements much more difficult than they would have been if invoices on such transactions had been priced.

As to the difference between the 25 percent charged by our Army and the 42 percent charged our Army by the British for transportation, handling charges, and insurance, our officials have expressed the feeling that there should be no such differential; that it is an arbitrary estimate of a factor to be used in all cases regardless of the actual costs for such items; that the costs are probably the same for the British as for ourselves, and that such factor should likewise be the same.

Mr. Speaker, we hear much about reverse lend-lease. I find that much of reverse lend-lease, actually a substantial majority of it, arises from costs absorbed, or partly absorbed, by other nations in transporting and basing our troops and equipment. For instance, if a ship carries 15,000 officers and men overseas—and this has been done many times—at the rate of approximately $100 per enlisted man and $150 per officer, the return to the British, who own most of the troop transport ships, is fabulous. If the food consumed by these men is lend-lease food—and this is usually the case—the net gain to ourselves in reverse lend-lease is correspondingly reduced.

We have bases and airports, literally hundreds of them, on foreign soil, for some of which we are paying extremely high rentals. The costs of billets for our officers and men run into enormous sums. I am reliably informed that claims have been presented by the British Government for royalties on our fighting equipment moving to the front, but these claims have not been honored for payment. So I find myself unexcited by the statements that much is being done for us through reverse lend-lease.

I do not seek to appear sensational. Frankly, I have heard of many practices in lend-lease operation which caused me concern, but those cases which I have presented are sufficient to emphasize my one interest, that of obtaining an even break for the American fighting men and for the American public. American officialdom can honorably do no less than to work conscientiously and determinedly for the best interests of our people while it continues to work for victory and world peace.

COFFEE HOUR IN THE NAVY DEPARTMENT

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, again I call attention to the policy of too little and too late. For years millions of man-hours of labor have been lost to the Government and to the war effort because of the so-called "coffee hour" on Government time. I read an Associated Press dispatch as follows:

The Navy Department's midmorning coffee hour is a casualty of war.

Can you imagine that? A casualty of war. Yes; the mere fact that these night-roving, day-sleeping, unessential Government employees have to have a coffee hour in order to stay awake during the day verifies the fact that they are absolutely of no necessity in the war effort. Justice Byrnes, in a very much belated order, closed the speakeasies and thereby contributed a lot toward alleviating the need of this coffee hour. But now the Navy Department comes along and says that some years ago they gave this privilege to their employees only as an experiment. Now I am not in any way referring to the thousands of hard-working conscientious Government employees who do their bit or even those who would were it required of them. I am thinking of those who will not or will not let those under them and those who encourage overstaffing, loafing, and mismanagement. After more than a year they have found that it has worked out in a very bad way and proven to be the cause of the loss of millions of man-hours of work. Anyone who cannot do two to four hours work at a time without coffee or tea should be lend-leased to the British.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. THOMASON), for all of this week, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. KINZER), indefinitely, on account of death in the family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Bedford Daily Times-Mail.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders on Wednesday of next week I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 177. An act for the relief of Oscar Griggs;

S. 211. An act for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 212. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the Act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11–12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941;

S. 215. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal propertly lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944;

S. 217. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States, and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine;

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Duke Power Co. a 180-foot perpetual easement across Camp Croft, in the State of South Carolina; and

S. 290. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Orange & Rockland Electric Co. a 150-foot perpetual easement across the West Point Military Reservation in the State of New York.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 8, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Thursday, March 8, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold hearings on Thursday, March 8, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 173, 1548, 1624, and 2256.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, March 8, 1945, at 10 a. m., at which time hearings will be had on parcel-post rates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

276. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmittting a draft of a proposed bill to provide a method for the wartime reduc-

tion of temporary grades held by general officers of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

277. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the second quarterly report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the education and training of defense workers, covering the period beginning October 1, 1944, and ending December 31, 1944; to the Committee on Education.

278. A letter from the secretary, American Chemical Society, transmittting the annual report of the American Chemical Society for the calendar year 1944; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 168. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on un-American Activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 268). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 510. A bill granting to Galveston County, a municipal corporation of the State of Texas, certain easements and rights-of-way, over, under, and upon the San Jacinto Military Reservation in Galveston County, Tex.; with amendment (Rept. No. 286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SPARKMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1701. A bill to amend section 5, Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2388. A bill to provide for enlistments in the Regular Army during the period of the war, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 288). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 72. An act for the relief of Antonio Ruiz; with amendment (Rept. No. 269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 77. An act for the relief of Lindon A. Long; without amendment (Rept. No. 270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 201. A bill for the relief of the Dempsey Industrial Furnace Corporation; with amendment (Rept. No. 271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 202. A bill for the relief of Angelina Bourbeau; with amendment (Rept. No. 272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 206. A bill for the relief of St. Vincent's Infirmary and Dr. Alvin W. Strauss; without amendment (Rept. No. 273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 209. A bill for the relief of David B. Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COLE of Kansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 802. A bill for the relief of Camp No. 1, Alaska Native Brotherhood, Sitka, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 933. A bill for the relief of Margaret Gudzin; with amendment (Rept. No. 276). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 993. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen C. Burnett; without amendment (Rept. No. 277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1009. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mae E. Sutton; with amendment (Rept. No. 278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1079. A bill for the relief of Ray L. Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1135. A bill for the relief of Gus A. Vance; with amendment (Rept. No. 280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1668. A bill for the relief of the estates of John C. and Ann K. Keegan; with amendment (Rept. No. 281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1846. A bill for the relief of James H. Hiler; without amendment (Rept. No. 282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2129. A bill for the relief of Edward Lawrence Kunze; with amendment (Rept. No. 283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. H. 2320. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Christoffer Hannevig, through his trustee in bankruptcy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2378. A bill to amend Public Law 537, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 2, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 2453) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Morton; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 2482) for the relief of Reuben J. Solomon; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 2519. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Charlevoix, Mich.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2520. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Rogers City, Mich.; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 2521. A bill to provide for the construction of a veterans' hospital in Broome County, N. Y.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 2522. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State to continue to completion the collecting, editing, and publishing of official papers relating to the Territories of the United States; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2523. A bill to provide for lump-sum payment of compensation for accumulated annual leave and current accrued annual leave to certain officers and employees, and authorizing the appropriation of funds for that purpose; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2524. A bill to provide, during the present war, for certain additional compensation for star-route contractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 2525. A bill to include stepparents among those persons with respect to whom allowances may be paid under the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution relative to determination and payment of certain claims against the Government of Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. J. Res. 116. Resolution to facilitate the execution of subsection (d) of section 13 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. Res. 169. Resolution authorizing the passage of H. R. 2521; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Res. 171. Resolution providing not to exceed $500,000 for the expenses of conducting the investigations heretofore authorized by the Committee on the Civil Service; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Res. 172. Resolution to investigate alleged intolerable conditions affecting the hospitalization, care, and rehabilitation of veterans and service men and women; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the post-war construction of an adequate tuberculosis sanitarium for Indians at a suitable location within the State of Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact Senate Joint Resolution 8, establishing a procedure by which Federal spending and Federal income would be balanced except in specified emergencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 2526. A bill for the relief of Joseph Roig; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 2527. A bill granting a pension to Daniel W. Perkins; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan:

H. R. 2528. A bill for the relief of James Sherry; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 2529. A bill for the relief of Earl J. Shows; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 2530. A bill for the relief of Abraham Gaber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 2531. A bill for the relief of Norman C. Albrethsen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2532. A bill for the relief of Rita V. L. Flaherty; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2533. A bill for the relief of Joseph M. Boyd, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2534. A bill for the relief of Solon P. Haun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2535. A bill to facilitate the supplying of the war needs for beryllium and beryllium alloys and to further insure a just and equitable relationship between the Alien Property Custodian, holder of certain German patents, and the Beryllium Corporation of Delaware whose contract with Siemens & Halske and the Heraeus Vacumschmelze, dated January 16, 1934, expiring on March 28, 1944, and which contract is now under the control of the Alien Property Custodian; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

147. By Mr. LANE: Petition of the Eastern Diocese of the Polish National Catholic Church, Springfield, Mass., in conference February 20, 1945, and sent me by the Very Reverend Augustine E. Krauze, pastor of the Immaculate Conception Polish National Catholic Church of Lawrence, Mass., urging every possible assistance in connection with the final settlement of the Polish question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

148. Also, petition of the Peabody, Mass., City Council, adopted at their meeting February 23, 1945, requesting the President of the United States to reaffirm the tenets of the Atlantic Charter in regard to Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

149. By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana: Memorial of Montana State Legislature concerning construction of tuberculosis sanitarium for Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

150. Also, memorial of Montana State Legislature requesting the Government to establish a procedure by which Federal spending and Federal income would be balanced except in specified emergencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

151. Also, memorial of Montana State Legislature requesting the Government at the earliest possible date to restore standard time throughout Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

152. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the rally of the Polonia Society of International Workers Order at New Castle, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to ratification of the aims of the Crimean Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

153. By Mr. RICH: Petition of Methodist Men of the Jersey Shore Subdistrict of Pennsylvania urging those in authority to use their influence and their power to prevent the further manufacture, sale, and transportation of beverage alcohol and in behalf of the bill introduced by Senator CAPPER to curtail mass propaganda for alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, February 26, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor, Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the light of all that is true, the strength of all that is good, and the glory of all that is beautiful, from whom to turn away is to fall, but in whom to trust is to find courage and victory, we thank Thee for this day.

Grant that as faithful stewards we may use every hour in such a way that Thou canst hallow it with Thy benediction. May there be nothing in this day's work of which we shall be ashamed when the sun has set or at the eventide of life when Thou dost call us to Thyself.

Show us how our beloved country, so richly endowed by Thy grace, may be the unimpeded channel through which there shall flow, as a mighty stream, the blessings of freedom for the oppressed, enlightenment for those who walk in darkness, joy and hope for the weary and heavy laden.

We pray that our President, our Vice President, and all the chosen representatives of our Republic may be the honored instruments of the Lord whereby the spirit of good will and brotherhood shall be mediated to the heart of humanity.

In Christ's name we offer our praise and petitions. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day, Wednesday, March 7, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2277) to insure adequate nursing care for the armed forces, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 214) to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS (S. Doc. No. 27)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting three supplemental estimates of appropriations, fiscal year 1945, amounting to $10,307,500 for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION (S. Doc. No. 26)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting two supplemental estimates of appropriations, fiscal year 1946, amounting to $80,000 for the Federal Power Commission, in the form of an amendment to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a revised estimate of personnel requirements, under the Department of Commerce, for the Civil Aeronautics Administration, Federal Airways (working funds), for the quarter ending March 31, 1945 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF WAR PRODUCTION WORKERS

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second quarterly report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the education and training of defense workers covering the period beginning October 1, 1944, and ending December 31, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORT OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD—STABILIZATION OF WAGES

A letter from the Chairman of the National War Labor Board, transmitting, in further response to Senate Resolution 130 (78th Cong.), the twenty-first monthly report of the Board relating to the stabilization of wages, covering the month of November 1944 (with accompanying papers); ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President and referred as indicated:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the postwar construction of an adequate tuberculosis sanitarium for Indians at a suitable location within the State of Montana

"To the President of the United States and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:

"Whereas there is within Montana a large Indian population on numerous Indian reservations; and

"Whereas the people of Montana are deeply concerned with the extremely high death rate of Montana Indians from tuberculosis; and

"Whereas there are no existing special facilities within the State for their treatment and hospitalization: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of Montana, and the House of Representatives concurring, strongly urge that the Congress

of the United States include in the Federal post-war building program an appropriation for the construction and equipment of an adequate tuberculosis sanitarium for Indians at some suitable location within the State of Montana; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

"Approved February 25, 1945.

"SAM C. FORD, *Governor.*"

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Memorial 6

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact Senate Joint Resolution No. 8, establishing a procedure by which Federal spending and Federal income would be balanced except in specified emergencies

"Whereas the Federal Government debt and need for operating funds in the post-war period will strain the fiscal foundations of our Government; and

"Whereas fiscal stability under these conditions demands a constitutional directive which would restrict and limit expenditures to the income provided to meet and take care of the same; and

"Whereas Senate joint resolution, introduced in the Senate of the United States, January 10, 1945, proposes to submit to the legislatures of the several States for their ratification a constitutional amendment with the following provisions:

" 'On the first day of each regular session, the President shall transmit to the Congress his estimates of the receipts of the Government during the ensuing fiscal year under the laws existing on such date, together with his recommendations as to the purposes for which such receipts shall be expended, and, except in time of war or during the period ending on the date of the expiration of 1 full fiscal year after the termination thereof, the Congress shall not appropriate money for expenditure during such fiscal year in excess of such estimated receipts, as transmitted or as modified or revised by the President, except by a vote of three-fifths of each House taken by yeas and nays, unless prior to the making of such appropriation the Congress shall have imposed such taxes, duties, imposts, or excises as will raise additional revenues equal to the amount by which such appropriation exceeds such estimated receipts, or unless such appropriation be for the purpose of paying the expenses and contingencies of the Congress or the courts, or for the payment of claims against the United States, the justice of which shall have been judicially declared by such tribunal as may be established by the Congress for the investigation of claims against the Government:' Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Montana Legislative Assembly urges the Congress of the United States to enact Senate Joint Resolution 8; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Montana Members of the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress.

"Approved February 28, 1945.

"SAM C. FORD, *Governor.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Finance:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to permit old-age pensioners to earn wages without penalty

"Whereas the American people are engaged in a war which has utilized the services of younger men and women throughout the entire Nation; and

"Whereas, because of this condition, an acute labor shortage has developed to such an extent that it has become the No. 1 problem of our Government; and

"Whereas many old-age pensioners are able to perform many types of work that would relieve the labor situation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to amend the present restrictions in the Social Security Act to the end that any person who receives or is eligible to receive old-age assistance shall be permitted to do and perform odd jobs of labor, caretaking, and similar classes of casual work not in the general course of a trade or business, at such rates of pay commensurate with their abilities to perform the same, but in any event, in an amount not to exceed $25 in any one month without being penalized therefor; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this joint resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Nevada to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to our congressional Representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to the presiding officers of each State legislature now in session.

"State of Nevada, executive department, approved February 28, 1945.

"E. P. CARVILLE,
"Governor."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 1429. A bill to permit the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and the United States Maritime Commission, during the national emergency, to pay the tax imposed under section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code without regard to the $3,000 limitation in section 1426 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 85).

By Mr. MURDOCK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 502. A bill to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments with respect to strategic metals and minerals and petroleum and petroleum products; with amendments (Rept. No. 86).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 709. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Peter A. Condelario a patent in fee to certain land; and

S. 710. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Winnie Left Her Behind a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 711. A bill for the relief of Ernest L. Fuhrmann; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. ANDREWS):

S. 712. A bill for the relief of William B. Scott; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. WAGNER):

S. 713. A bill to provide for the distribution of motor-vehicle tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 714. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 715. A bill to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy; and

S. 716. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the outlying degaussing branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MEAD (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 717. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States in more adequately financing education and in removing substandard conditions in education; to aid in establishing and maintaining education services; to eradicate illiteracy; to preserve and promote the national security in peace and in war; to raise the educational level of the Nation; and to promote the general welfare; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 718. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2277) to insure adequate nursing care for the armed forces, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS AND REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 95), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises authorized by Senate Resolution 28, Seventy-ninth Congress (extending S. Res. 298, 76th Cong.), be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed for its use not to exceed 5,000 additional copies of each of its hearings and each of its reports.

AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of America's foreign policy, delivered by him over radio station WRC, Washington, D. C., on March 2, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of international security, delivered by Senator MORSE before the Independent Citizens' Committee of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, in New York City on February 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS EDUCATIONAL TRUST FUND—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WALSH

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him with respect to the Knights of Columbus educational trust fund for the benefit of orphaned sons and daughters of members of the Knights of Columbus, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BREWSTER

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of American foreign policy, prepared by him on March 2, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE AT SAN FRANCISCO—STATEMENTS BY SECRETARY OF STATE

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two statements issued by the Secretary of State with respect to the United Nations conference to be held at San Francisco, which appear in the Appendix.]

OPERATIONS OF THE F. H. A. IN UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Abner H. Ferguson, Commissioner, Federal Housing Administration, relative to the operations of the F. H. A. in the State of Utah, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE GERMAN CHARACTER—ARTICLE BY COL. S. G. SHARTLE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Our Knottiest Problem: The German Character," by Col. S. G. Shartle, from the Miami Daily News, which appears in the Appendix.]

THREATS FROM NATIONAL SOCIALISM—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHARLOTTE OBSERVER

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Threats From National Socialism," published in the Charlotte Observer of February 13, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment reported by the Committee on Military Affairs, in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

Mr. GUFFEY obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Chandler	Hayden
Bailey	Chavez	Hickenlooper
Ball	Cordon	Hill
Bankhead	Donnell	Hoey
Barkley	Downey	Johnson, Calif.
Bilbo	Eastland	Johnson, Colo.
Brewster	Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.
Bridges	George	Kilgore
Briggs	Gerry	La Follette
Burton	Green	McCarran
Bushfield	Guffey	McClellan
Butler	Gurney	McFarland
Byrd	Hart	McKellar
Capehart	Hatch	McMahon
Capper	Hawkes	Magnuson
Maybank	Radcliffe	Thomas, Utah
Mead	Reed	Tobey
Millikin	Revercomb	Tunnell
Mitchell	Robertson	Tydings
Moore	Russell	Vandenberg
Morse	Saltonstall	Walsh
Murdock	Shipstead	Wherry
Murray	Smith	White
Myers	Stewart	Wiley
O'Daniel	Taft	Willis
O'Mahoney	Taylor	Wilson
Overton	Thomas, Idaho	
Pepper	Thomas, Okla.	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a delegate to the Inter-American Conference in Mexico and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on official business as a delegate to the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] has the floor.

POLITICAL CONDITIONS IN PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, the Republican leaders in Pennsylvania are preparing to buy or steal the election of 1946.

For that purpose they have accumulated a corruption fund of $875,000 for which they do not expect to account.

This corruption fund was contributed by the Pews and the other oily fat cats of Pennsylvania politics as part of the 1944 campaign fund, but has been held over for future use.

They plan to spend this money in an unblushing attempt to buy the next election and do not intend to report its use to the public or to the appropriate committees of the Congress.

They dare try to do this because they got away with murder in South Dakota in 1942, when they let Senator BUSHFIELD use the $18,000 of Republican money left over from the 1940 campaign.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield for a question, or for a request to have something inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to inquire whether the Senator uses the word "murder" figuratively?

Mr. GUFFEY. Yes. Senator BUSHFIELD, by the way, was financed in his own campaign by Joe Pew and the other oily fat cats of Republican politics, as well as the Du Ponts, Alfred Sloan, and Colonel McCormick, of the Chicago Tribune. That this is the case is shown by the financial history of the Republican Party in the State of Pennsylvania during the election of 1944.

In that election the various Republican State organizations have reported expenditures to a total of $2,367,539.12. These figures are admittedly incomplete, since there are no reports of the Republican expenditures in eight Pennsylvania counties. In one of these eight missing counties the Republican organization is known to have spent $80,000.

Under these circumstances we can assume that the Republicans spent an average of at least $40,000 a county in these missing eight counties, or a total of $320,000 not reported.

These figures do not include the liberal sums of money in cash, amounting to $150 per voting division in Philadelphia alone, handed to the Republican ward workers on election day.

Adding all these items, we find that the Republican Party spent in the 1944 election in Pennsylvania over $3,300,000, a sum considerably in excess of the total spent by the Democratic National Committee for the entire national campaign to reelect President Roosevelt.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to ask the Senator in what way such a tremendous amount of money was spent. Can the Senator give us an idea as to what the purposes were, or through what means the purposes were accomplished?

Mr. GUFFEY. The Senator will have to analyze in detail the reports from 67 counties. Permit me to finish giving the figures, and I shall try to answer the question.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to have an answer to the question.

Mr. GUFFEY. I mention these facts primarily to remind the Senate and the country that the Republican Party, State and national, is primarily the party of the multimillionaires, the "fat-cats," who seek to buy political power by spending money on politics.

Just to make the point clear, it would seem that the 1,835,048 votes they garnered for Governor Dewey in Pennsylvania last year cost them almost $2 a vote.

The various Democratic committees in Pennsylvania spent a total of $520,000 in 1944, to which I will add the $92,000 spent by the State Political Action Committee, making a total of $612,000. This sum includes all Democratic and P. A. C. campaign expenditures in my State last year.

This was used to produce a total vote for Roosevelt of 1,940,479, or little more than 30 cents per vote.

If we had had more money I do not know what we could have done with it

unless we had used it to corrupt the voters.

What I want to know is why the Republicans needed $2 a voter to lose the election while the Democratic Party needed only 30 cents a voter to win the election.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. In the opinion of the distinguished Senator, was the sum of money spent by the Republicans in Pennsylvania at the last election unusually large, or was it about the normal amount they have been spending heretofore?

Mr. GUFFEY. I think the amount spent during the last campaign was unusually large. In 1940 it was as large, if not larger. They had more committees this time, which I shall analyze in a few moments.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. In Maine we are comparatively innocent of dealing with any such sums as the Senator is now mentioning. I would certainly recognize the Senator from Pennsylvania as an authority on political corruption.

Mr. GUFFEY. I grew up in that atmosphere and am used to it; but not in my party, for we never had such sums.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to inquire whether the Senator feels that in this instance the Republican Party in Pennsylvania is the pot or the kettle?

Mr. GUFFEY. Both.

In my judgment 50 cents a vote is the maximum that can be spent in any political campaign unless it is proposed to engage in wholesale corruption. I know of any number of voters who were paid $20 for staying home and not voting, and the same thing occurred in Illinois, if I am correctly advised by one or two Representatives from that State.

The most significant thing about this picture is that the Republicans in Pennsylvania ended up with a cash surplus amounting to $875,208.64, as reported.

The absence of financial returns from the missing eight counties might well increase this sum.

On the precedent established by Senator BUSHFIELD, of South Dakota—with his little $18,000 nest egg from the 1940 campaign—this immense sum is now available for use in the coming election of 1946.

They will not spend it this year, since the only State-wide election in 1945 is for two judges of the superior court, and it seems doubtful that the Pennsylvania Republicans will spend more than $50,000 a judge—or a total of $100,000—leaving about $800,000 balance from 1944 to be used in 1946.

In that year the voters of Pennsylvania will elect a United States Senator, a State Governor, 32 Congressmen, and numerous other State legislators as well as local officials.

And the Republican Party in Pennsylvania has the enormous sum of $800,000 in hand for that purpose.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I have been listening attentively to the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania. He says that this fund will not have to be accounted for. Why will it not have to be accounted for?

Mr. GUFFEY. The precedent has been set in the South Dakota case. The Republican Party there carried over $18,000 from the 1940 campaign and did not account for it in 1942.

Mr. HATCH. I am not thinking about precedents. I am thinking about the law. Does the Senator agree that a political organization can lawfully carry funds not used in one campaign over to another and use them without accounting for them?

Mr. GUFFEY. No; I do not think it can lawfully be done, but I am calling the attention of the Senate to what has happened. If the present law does not cover such a situation, the law should be strengthened. I should like to finish my statement, if the Senator will permit.

These facts are presented to warrant an investigation by the appropriate committee of the Senate, with a view to recommending legislation which will limit both the amount of money to be raised and the amount of money to be spent by all political committees within a State on the basis of registration.

All the attempts of the Democratic Party to guard the sanctity of the ballot by the Hatch Act, the Corrupt Practices Act, and similar legislation will be nullified if such huge, unnecessary piles of slush money can be accumulated by party leaders.

The surest way to insure fair elections is to limit the amount of receipts and expenditures to not more than 50 cents for a registered voter in any one State.

The issue is clear: Shall money or shall men control our political decisions?

We all know that money is needed in a political campaign for legitimate expenses.

We also know, on the basis of experience, that the maximum legitimate expense required to bring out the vote is not more than 50 cents a voter.

We can infer that any collections or expenditures above this limit is designed for political corruption.

All the circumstances point to the conclusion that in 1946 and again in 1948 the Republican Party—local, State, and National—will be rolling in money as never before in history.

Not only have the profits from war contracts been lucrative, particularly as concerns the 200 big business corporations which have received 90 percent of the war contracts and which are traditionally the fat cats of the party of the multimillionaires, but the stake of national power in the post-war world is higher still.

We can all remember the enormous political funds raised by the Republican Party in 1920 and we can all remember the unsavory pay-off.

The Teapot Dome scandal, Elk Hills Naval Oil Reserve, the defrauding of the veterans, and the Mellon tax-reduction measures, which returned to the Republican industrialists all that they had chipped in to elect Harding and the Ohio gang—all and much more.

For this reason, and because we owe it to the veterans of this war and to the people of the United States that the elections of 1946 and 1948 shall be fair and free expressions of the public will, I not only invite, but I insist on the Senate's action on this matter.

For the information of the Senate and the public I will read a table showing the expenditures of the various units of the Republican organization in the State of Pennsylvania:

Expenditures of the various units of the Republican organization in the State of Pennsylvania

ELECTION CAMPAIGN OF 1944

Republican State committee expenditures	$379,480.51
Republican finance committee expenditures	934,698.06
Various Republican committees in Pennsylvania	684,895.70
Total	1,999,074.27
Republican county expenditures [1]	901,125.74
Less receipts from State and finance committees [1]	573,298.48
Total county expenditures (less State and finance and with 8 missing counties out)	827,827.26
Expenditures of 33 congressional districts by individual Congressmen	40,647.59
Total expenditures of State, finance, miscellaneous, Congressmen, and county committees [1]	2,367,539.11
Republican organizations show balance on hand as follows:	
Republican State committee	137,082.79
Finance commitee	313,648.16
County committees [1]	147,574.46
Various State organizations	276,903.23
Total	875,208.64
Total expenditures [1]	2,367,539.12
Balance on hand [1]	875,208.64
Total [1]	3,242,747.76
Included in Republican Finance Committee of Pennsylvania expenditures are disbursements to:	
Republican National Comtee	195,100.00
Republican Congressional Committee	8,361.60
Republican Senate Committee	6,000.00
Republican State Committee of New Mexico	2,500.00
Republican State Committee of South Dakota	2,500.00
Republican State Committee of Wyoming	2,000.00
Total	216,461.60

[1] Eight missing counties out.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, has the Senator finished?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I rise merely to pursue the statement made awhile ago in which it was at least implied by the Senator from Pennsylvania that under either existing law or precedent any political party can accumulate a fund and carry it over from one election to another, and not account for expenditures from that fund. I do not believe that is the law.

Mr. GUFFEY. The precedent has been established, and furthermore, eight counties refused to comply with the law by filing statements.

Mr. HATCH. I realize what the Senator has said; but I merely wish to make the record clear on the floor of the Senate, that, at least in my opinion, the law does not permit expenditures of that kind without accounting for them. I do not know what the precedent is, but I am sure that the law requires expenditures from a carry-over fund or any other fund to be accounted for.

Mr. GUFFEY. I am warning the Senate what they plan to do, and stating what they did in 1942 in South Dakota. We must have some way of checking the expenditures. It required the services of many expert accountants to check the 67 counties. They worked for three or four months. I knew that correct statements were not being filed.

Mr. HATCH. I am in accord with what the Senator is trying to do; but I wish to add the further warning that if the plan referred to is carried out, it will constitute a violation of law.

Mr. GUFFEY. Who is going to prosecute?

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I wish to pursue the inquiry which I started a few minutes ago, as to what information the Senator has been able to obtain with reference to the expenditures. How was the money spent? Was it spent for the purchase of votes, or was it spent for advertising?

Mr. GUFFEY. They are too smart to admit that it was for the purchase of votes. The great item in Pennsylvania politics is the transportation of voters. Since we got rid of the poll tax, there is no poll tax to pay. That used to be one of the expenses of every campaign. Occasionally, in order to save money, a tax book would be stolen from the county treasurer's office.

Mr. TUNNELL. Did the Senator state where this fund came from? Was that disclosed?

Mr. GUFFEY. It was disclosed in the accounts filed. I did not give that information. If the Senator wishes that information, I can show where every dollar came from.

Mr. TUNNELL. Was it from Pennsylvania contributors or was it sent in from other States?

Mr. GUFFEY. From Pennsylvania and other States.

Mr. TUNNELL. I understood the Senator to refer to contributions to committees in other States. Were those made by the finance committee?

Mr. GUFFEY. Contributions to other States were handled by the Republican finance committee of Pennsylvania.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then Pennsylvania is a sort of distributing point for funds.

Mr. GUFFEY. It was in the last campaign.

Mr. TUNNELL. And they could not spend all the money.

Mr. GUFFEY. No; they could not spend it all.

Mr. TUNNELL. Does the Senator have any suggestion as to how this sort of thing can be checked in his State?

Mr. GUFFEY. I think it must be checked in every State. I think there should be proper accounting by the officers of the various political organizations.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I can make a suggestion in that connection. I think it is well known that the process of organizing various committees is for the purpose of evading existing law, which places a total limitation of $3,000,000 on a national committee for a national campaign. To evade that limitation, it has been common practice to organize separate committees, and let such committees expend the funds. Then the national committee does not have to make an accounting, and those funds are not included in the limitation. That is a weakness of the law which should be corrected.

Mr. GUFFEY. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his clear explanation.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should like to suggest that, as I understand the Senator's statement, the amount collected by the Republican Party in Pennsylvania for campaign purposes was greater than is permitted to be collected in the whole United States by any party.

Mr. GUFFEY. That is correct.

Mr. TUNNELL. Or at least more than can be spent by any party.

Mr. GUFFEY. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Representing in part a fairly sizable constituency of Republicans in my State, let me say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I cannot help but feel a little resentment over the fact the Pennsylvania committee sent only $2,500 to my State. Even during territorial days Pennsylvania used to send more than that to New Mexico.

Mr. GUFFEY. I remember very distinctly when "Bull" Andrews, formerly Quay's henchman from Pennsylvania, was a Republican leader in the Southwest.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Has there been any prosecution in any county in Pennsylvania for violation of the Corrupt Practices Act?

Mr. GUFFEY. Not recently. The only prosecution was for collecting from office holders, in violation of the Hatch Act. The Superintendent of the Bureau of Health and some of his assistants were removed from office. I intend to take up some other cases. In compiling these data we came across some other violations of the law which should be prosecuted.

Mr. TUNNELL. Does the Senator intend to call the attention of the prosecuting authorities of Pennsylvania to this situation?

Mr. GUFFEY. I will if I can have the prosecution brought in the Federal courts. The Pennsylvania courts are rather friendly and liberal toward Republicans in interpreting the election laws.

Mr. TUNNELL. The election laws of Pennsylvania do not make a distinction, in language, between Republicans and Democrats, do they?

Mr. GUFFEY. Not at all. I am referring to the interpretation by the judges. One of them recently had to go back to a case in Italy in 1652 to justify his opinion.

Mr. TUNNELL. Did he find any such expenditures in Italy?

Mr. GUFFEY. No; he did not.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I feel that my colleague is rendering a great public service by bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate; and in view of the fact that it has been mentioned as a possible violation of the Corrupt Practices Act, and because of its sordid influence on Pennsylvania and other States in the Union, I hope the Senator will bring it to the attention of the Attorney General. In the interest of honest elections, such activities ought to be suppressed.

I conclude as I started, by commending my colleague for bringing this matter into the open.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will Senators who are engaged in this debate speak loud enough so that we can hear? They are carrying on a quiet conversation, and none of us on this side of the Chamber can hear what is being said.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I have concluded my remarks unless some Senator wishes to ask me a question. I thought I was speaking loud enough.

CREATION OF NEW PROVISIONAL POLISH GOVERNMENT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to read from a United Press dispatch from London this morning. It is headed "Eden warns Lublin Poles against persecution."

LONDON, March 7.—Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden today warned the Soviet-backed Polish Lublin regime against persecuting Poles loyal to the London Polish Government.

Speaking in Commons, Eden, who has expressed strong dislike of the Polish regime at Lublin, told it bluntly to avoid persecutions if the present negotiations in Moscow for a new Polish provisional government are to have British confidence.

"In the view of the British Government," he said, "if the necessary atmosphere of confidence is to be created, which alone can insure the success of the present consultations

in Moscow, it is imperative both that the Lublin administration should take no measures against Poles merely because they do not recognize their authority and that such Poles should cease active resistance to local authorities which endangers the lines of communications of the advancing Russian armies."

Mr. President, both these warnings are imperative. The Government of the United States should be equally frank about this situation. There is no escaping the fact that the treatment accorded Poland, symbolizing generally the attitude of the United Nations toward our smaller allies in this war for liberation, will have a large effect upon the success of our ultimate plans for collective security and organized peace. It might also have a controlling impact upon American public opinion and its attitudes toward these plans.

I do not at the moment discuss the entire Yalta program as it affects Poland; but, as did Eden yesterday in British Commons, I emphasize the dreadful importance of the decisions now being made in Moscow by a committee, in which Americans are participating, to create a new provisional Polish Government. Of course, at best it is a curious process when an American, a Britisher, and a Russian, with no Poles present, sit down together to create any sort of a government for Poland—remembering that the preservation of Polish independence and self-government was the world's springboard into this war and remembering also what the Atlantic Charter had to say upon related subjects. But the fact that we have imposed this current trusteeship upon Poland and are participating in it ourselves simply accentuates and magnifies the importance of our share of this responsibility to see to it that this new provisional Government is truly a representative Polish coalition.

Senators know that heretofore Moscow has recognized the Lublin government; they know that Britain and America have recognized the constitutional Polish government-in-exile in London. The recent Yalta Conference resolved this dilemma by constituting a committee of three—Molotov for Russia, Kerr for Britain, Harriman for us—to create a new, temporary provisional government, presumably representative of all the Polish parties in interest. It is to these negotiations that Mr. Eden referred yesterday in British Commons. It is to these negotiations and our part in them that I now similarly refer.

Let me give one simple example of what I mean. Except for the total good faith in which this and other arrangements are carried out to create a truly independent Poland, except as the decisions of this committee currently sitting at Moscow evidence the total good faith in this aspect, it is asserted that General Anders and most of his Polish patriots who bore the brunt of the ghastly Cassino battles, and who are our comrades-in-arms on the battle fronts of Italy at this moment, will be virtually homeless and men without a country. It is asserted that General Bor and most of his brave and sacrificial underground will find themselves in a similar status. They have all been outlawed by the Lublin government. In whatever degree this is true, it seems perfectly clear to me that one of the acid tests which must be applied to the character of the new provisional government which we are now participating in creating—and that is the whole point of what I say—will be whether General Anders, General Bor, and their Polish patriots once more have a country and have a home.

My general view, Mr. President, respecting all the temporary decisions which are being made in the midst of war is well known. Inevitably many of them unavoidably consult expediency. Expediency and justice frequently are not even on speaking terms with each other. The hopes of men for permanent peace, however, cannot subordinate basic justice to expediency. Therefore, it is my dearest desire that all these decisions made under the pressure of war shall be temporary in fact as well as in name; that they shall pass in full review at the final peace table; and that if injustices still remain—rankling injustices which are the seeds of friction and ultimately of war itself—they will fall squarely within the asserted jurisdiction of the new peace league for full, free, fair study and for recommended correction. As the permanent Inter-American Juridical Committee, sitting at Rio de Janiero, has bluntly indicated, if the peace league is to be merely a guaranty of the status quo after the peace treaties, then its other purposes cannot be attained unless and until the moral value of justice becomes the animating purpose of the whole new organization.

The three great military powers, Mr. President—Russia, America, and Britain—must work in harmony toward these ends. Each of us, as a matter of intelligent self-interest, must recognize the sensibilities of the others. The quicker we can all acquire this habit the safer will be our peace hopes for tomorrow.

It is for this reason, Mr. President, that I have taken the liberty of referring with complete approval to Mr. Eden's speech in British Commons yesterday, wherein he spoke of what must happen if the present negotiations in Moscow for a new Polish provisional government "are to have British confidence." I have taken the liberty of also suggesting certain other criteria if these negotiations shall deserve American confidence. I am not assuming that any of these essential considerations will be ignored by us or by our great allies. I am only earnestly emphasizing the incalculable importance of these immediate decisions.

AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, for the purpose of the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a statement I issued on January 31, 1945, with respect to the appointment of Mr. Wallace to the position of Secretary of Commerce.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The speech made by Henry Wallace last night in New York epitomizes very clearly the issues confronting the Senate in his confirmation. Again he emphasized his urgent desire to control the vast resources of the R. F. C. to finance and promote his social reforms. He threatened to carry the issue to the people unless the Senate confirms his appointment with the powers of the loaning agencies now grouped under the Department of Commerce intact.

This challenge I hope the Senate will accept without equivocation or compromise. This can be done by considering the Wallace nomination before the George bill.

Mr. Wallace was appointed by the President to perform the full duties as Secretary of Commerce which include the control of the loaning agencies. It is in this form the Senate should perform its constitutional duty to consider and then either confirm or reject the appointment. The George bill should be passed, but the only logical procedure is for the Senate to act first upon the nomination.

The nomination is acted on by the Senate alone, while the George bill requires three actions to make it a law—passage by the Senate and by the House, and the signature of the President. The Senate can pass the George bill and the House could reject it, or both Houses could adopt it, and the President veto it, then requiring a two-thirds vote to override the veto.

To those who are willing to confirm Mr. Wallace only after divesting him of certain powers performed by his predecessor, it is well to point out that the George bill relates only to those Government corporations now grouped under the control of the Secretary of Commerce; namely, the R. F. C. and its subsidiaries. It does not relate to, nor will it prevent the President from transferring to the Secretary of Commerce, some 34 other Government corporations, which, in the aggregate, have as great a borrowing capacity as the R. F. C. Under Public Law 354, Seventy-seventh Congress, he has full power to transfer any and all functions or agencies of the Government, with the sole exception of the General Accounting Office.

The President could transfer to Mr. Wallace the Foreign Economic Administration, formerly administered by Mr. Wallace as Vice President in such a manner as to occasion the President to transfer this function to other hands. The F. E. A. has five subsidiary corporations. Among other functions and activities, he could transfer the control of all surplus war supplies, including hundreds of war factories.

If the President had not desired Mr. Wallace to exercise the powers granted to the R. F. C. and its affiliates, he could have issued an Executive order transferring such agencies before he presented Mr. Wallace's nomination to the Senate. The President did not do this. It follows that he desires such power to borrow and loan, or some similar power, to be an activity of the office of Secretary of Commerce, so that the policies and functions of government, as favored by Mr. Wallace, can be implemented.

It seems clear to me that whatever action the Congress may take—unless it be the complete repeal of the war transfer powers of the President as given to him in the First War Powers Act—no guaranty or assurance can be given, either to the Senate or to the country, that even though the George bill is first enacted, Mr. Wallace will not otherwise be given authority by Presidential order to borrow and loan for the same purposes for which he desires control over the R. F. C.

The issue is therefore clear-cut.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I made the request to have printed in the RECORD the

release issued by me on January 31, because of the publication in the Baltimore Sun, which is supported by current rumors, of a statement that it is proposed to transfer to Mr. Wallace the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

I pointed out in my statement of January 31 that the George bill closed only one door to the increase of the powers of Mr. Wallace over his normal authority as Secretary of Commerce. That door was the control of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries. Of course, that should have been done; but, as I pointed out in my statement, under Public Law 354 the President has full power to transfer any and all functions or agencies of the Government without the consent or approval of Congress, with the sole exception of the General Accounting Office.

Under that power, which continues for the duration and 6 months thereafter, the President can transfer to Mr. Wallace any existing functions and agencies of the Federal Government, and the Congress can prevent such transfer only by the passage of a law, which would then be subject to Presidential veto, thus requiring a two-thirds vote of Congress to prevent a transfer of functions and agencies, of which the Congress disapproves.

There are, Mr. President, 1,141 agencies of the Government performing different functions, and any and all, excepting the R. F. C., are subject to transfer to Mr. Wallace's control.

As to the accuracy of the special article written by Paul W. Ward, the representative of the Baltimore Sun, I am unable to say; but I regard Mr. Ward as one of the most accurate and trustworthy correspondents in Washington. It is said by him that the technicians in the Budget Bureau have been working intensively for a month upon plans to transfer to the control of the Commerce Department the four agencies which I have enumerated.

Since the day on which the Wallace nomination was sent to the Senate I have urged that the Senate meet the issue squarely, and either reject or confirm Mr. Wallace in the form in which the nomination was sent by the President. The question of the divorcement of the R. F. C. from the Secretary of Commerce is one which should have been determined, but, first, the Senate should have met directly the issue of the Wallace nomination. It was very evident that both the Senate and the House did not desire Mr. Wallace to have duties in addition to those which are normally performed by the Secretary of Commerce, but the situation has now been created whereby other duties as vital and as important as the control of the R. F. C. can be transferred by the President to Mr. Wallace without the approval of Congress. A two-thirds vote on the part of Congress would be required should any law prohibiting such transfers be vetoed by the President.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the article written by Mr. Paul W. Ward and published in the Baltimore Sun of March 5, 1945.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR AGENCIES SEEN ON WAY TO WALLACE—PLANS BEING DRAWN FOR TRANSFER OF S. E. C., I. C. C., F. T. C., F. P. C.

(By Paul W. Ward)

WASHINGTON, March 4.—Deprived by Congress of control over the R. F. C., Henry A. Wallace may soon be consoled by a substantial expansion in other directions of his new domain as Secretary of Commerce.

Technicians in the Budget Bureau, it was learned today, have been working intensively for approximately a month on plans to transfer to the control of the Commerce Secretary several heretofore independent Federal agencies, including:

1. The Interstate Commerce Commission, which dates back to 1887 and exercises regulatory control over rail, truck, bus, and pipe lines.

2. The Federal Trade Commission, which was set up by Congress in 1914 and is charged primarily with policing the competitive operations of business with an eye to unfair trade practices.

3. The Federal Power Commission, which was set up in 1920 and charged with regulation of interstate electric and gas utilities.

4. The Securities and Exchange Commission which, since its creation in 1934, has policed Wall Street and other sections of the financial world.

Work upon a Presidential Executive order putting the afore-mentioned independent agencies under Mr. Wallace's wing is going forward, it is known, in the fiscal and administrative management sections of the Budget Bureau. But whether it was initiated at President Roosevelt's request could not be ascertained. The Budget Bureau is itself a White House adjunct.

PRESS-CONFERENCE QUESTION

Mr. Roosevelt was given an opportunity at a press conference Friday to deny that he intends to expand the jurisdiction of his new Commerce Secretary. He did not seize the opportunity.

Asked if he contemplated transferring the Foreign Economic Administration to Mr. Wallace's control, Mr. Roosevelt said he had given no thought to the matter for a month and 4 days—that is, since he left Washington to meet with Stalin and Churchill at Yalta. He did not, however, deny such intentions.

The prospective Executive order affecting the I. C. C., F. T. C., F. P. C., and S. E. C. would be based, it is understood, on the same wartime powers which the President utilized in February 1942 to transfer to the Commerce Secretaryship the powers and functions of Federal Loan Administrator.

CONGRESS SEPARATED F. L. A.

Congress insisted on divorcing the two jobs as a prerequisite to Senate confirmation of Mr. Wallace's nomination as Commerce Secretary.

The precise degree of jurisdiction Mr. Wallace would have over the I. C. C., F. T. C., F. P. C., and S. E. C. under the prospective order is one of the problems, it is said, which has been delaying its completion. It is understood, however, that the Commerce Secretary's actual control over the four would be as nominal as his present control over the Civil Aeronautics Administration and Civil Aernoautics Board.

The C. A. A. and C. A. B. are parts of the Commerce Department but are, otherwise, independent, neither their orders nor their budgets being subject to alteration or review by the Commerce Secretary.

BUILD-UP FOR 1948 SUGGESTED

There is some reason to believe that the plan to put the I. C. C., F. T. C., F. P. C., and S. E. C. under Mr. Wallace's wing is part of a larger intraadministration plan to build up Mr. Roosevelt's Vice Presidential discard as a Presidential contender in 1948.

The latter plan involves supplementing the organized-labor support Mr. Wallace already enjoys with the support of the small business community.

It was as a champion of small business rather than as an ardent seeker of the Commerce secretaryship that Mr. Wallace recently appeared before the Senate Commerce Committee, while it was considering the George bill that took control of the R. F. C. and its subsidiaries away from the office of the Commerce Secretary.

FIRST OFFICIAL ACT

Mr. Wallace's first official act, after being sworn in Friday as Commerce Secretary was another bid for small-business support. He announced the appointment of a committee of eight businessmen to advise him on ways to help small business play its full share in post-war employment.

The commerce secretaryship provides Mr. Wallace with a rostrum from which he can keep himself and his views before the electorate. It does not, however, provide him with much machinery for putting his views into operation.

BECOMES MEMBER OF W. P. B.

The only agencies, besides the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, that at present come directly under his jurisdiction are the Census Bureau, Patent Office, Bureau of Standards, Weather Bureau, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Inland Waterways Corporation, and National Inventors Council.

In addition, as Commerce Secretary he automatically becomes a member of the War Production Board and a director of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Wallace's selection of small-business advisers, it was noted today, was not likely to cause any apprehension in the ranks of big business.

He chose all eight from the personnel of the Commerce Department's business and advisory council, which has been in existence since 1933, and served not only Mr. Wallace's predecessor, Jesse H. Jones, but also the late Daniel C. Roper and his successor, Harry L. Hopkins.

The group of eight includes Prentiss M. Brown, former Democratic Senator from Michigan, who, since he quit as O. P. A. chief, has become chairman of one of his home State's biggest utilities, Detroit Edison Co.

STACY MAY AND E. E. BROWN

It also includes Stacy May, former W. P. B. research division chief, now with the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.

It includes, too, Edward E. Brown, chairman of the First National Bank of Chicago, who enjoyed a brief favor among New Dealers some years ago when they discovered that in his youth Mr. Brown had been a Socialist and that his father had won some fame as a Mi western radical.

Feeling that a free-thinking banker would be useful, some of the New Deal coterie courted Mr. Brown on the basis of his past until they found his present was much different. He is pictured today, as—like the other members of Mr. Wallace's committee—a man inclined to be puzzled, if not alarmed, by some of the new Commerce Secretary's public pronouncements.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to ask the Senator from Virginia to enumerate the agencies to which he has referred.

Mr. BYRD. The agencies which are being proposed for transfer to the control of the Department of Commerce are the Interstate Commerce Commission, Fed-

eral Trade Commission, Federal Power Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. As the Senator from Georgia may have noted, Mr. Ward stated that the Bureau of the Budget had been working for some time on the details of making such transfers.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I so understood.

THE GOVERNMENT'S WASTE OF MANPOWER

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have said time and time again that the United States Government itself is the chief hoarder of manpower in this country. Exclusive of all those who are in uniform, today there are 3,372,710 civil-service civilian employees, including those in foreign lands. Little, if any, effort has been made on the part of any Government agency to reduce the personnel of the Government, and to utilize this vast reservoir of manpower in order that unnecessary employees may be diverted to essential war work. Every other industry in America is being stripped of manpower to aid the war. It has now become more urgent than ever to adopt the same measures with respect to Federal personnel. There is no reason why the vast army now working for the Government should be exempt from the regulations which apply to those in private industry.

I have already introduced legislation to reduce Federal workers by 300,000. Next week, Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures will summon Mr. McNutt and other Government officials to explain to that committee why Federal employees have not been utilized in the same measure and to the same degree for the winning of the war as other workers have been.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article entitled "The Government's Waste of Manpower," written by me and published in the April issue of the American Magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GOVERNMENT'S WASTE OF MANPOWER

(By HARRY F. BYRD, United States Senator from Virginia)

One of the most pressing jobs ahead of the new Congress and the administration is to reduce sharply the army of civilian Government employees who have been sitting out the war. Today there are more than 3,000,000 Federal civilian employees in the United States, and in addition there are 262,281 War Department civilian employees outside the continental United States.

Out of this number, at desks in Washington and scattered throughout every State in the Union, there are 300,000 men and women in jobs created artificially. They draw approximately $700,000,000 in Government pay each year. These nonessential employees serve no useful purpose and should be dismissed at once. In addition, if the war in Europe ends by the time this article appears, another 500,000 Government employees can and should be demobilized to save taxpayers' money and release needed manpower.

Although our manpower shortage is still so desperate that we draft fathers and, through War Manpower Commission regulations, force men and women into war work, official Washington does nothing about its own surplus of manpower. In the midst of war, top executives have shown that they do not want to eliminate such waste in government. Some actually encourage it. Others have clearly indicated that when the war in the Pacific ends they intend to have even more men and women in their respective bureaus. This is one more step along the road to state socialism.

Recently Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, Chief of the Army Services of Supply, stated that over 300,000 was the number of additional workers our critical programs needed to get up to schedule. He stated that more may be needed later. General Somervell called upon former war workers to return to work, and more or less blamed them for the decline in production. I say he can get many of the needed employees from the Federal Government.

In the American magazine for January 1943, I disclosed the waste of manpower in Government bureaus, and that article helped the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, of which I am chairman, to save American taxpayers millions of dollars and to furnish more manpower for essential work and for American business.

While no power could instantly stop Government hiring, gradually the force of public opinion was felt in the bureaus, and by July 1943, the total Federal civilian employment actually dropped. At the end of the year the trend definitely was down. However, the effect was only temporary.

In January 1944, Government officials evidently decided the general public had forgotten about waste of manpower. They started again to build up their pay rolls. In the first 7 months of 1944, while war plants and other employers were short handed, the Government increased its total employment by nearly 70,000, reaching a record peak of 3,366,780 in July 1944—surpassing by 17,502 the high-water mark reached during 1943, the highest Federal civilian employment figure in the history of the Nation.

The War Manpower Commission tells us that war workers are as essential as fighting men, that more men may die in battle unless more men and women leave nonessential jobs and help in war work. Yet the War Manpower Commission calmly ignores the shocking state of affairs in the Federal family.

On September 18, 1943, as chairman of the joint economy committee, I wrote to Paul V. McNutt, War Manpower Commissioner, asking:

"To what extent have you investigated the various Government departments so as to utilize, in the fullest measure, available manpower in a manner most efficient to promote the war effort?"

The War Manpower Commission was investigating possible waste of manpower in private business in every section of the United States, and I fully expected that it would at least cast an inquiring glance at government. Two weeks later Mr. McNutt replied:

"In the field of maximum utilization of manpower in the Federal service, I rely upon the United States Civil Service Commission. * * * The Commission will be glad to give you full details of their work and achievements in this field."

Since a year ago last October I have been waiting for the Civil Service Commission to make the move that will force one bureau of the Federal Government, which is composed of more than 1,100 component parts, to disband. To date I can find no record of any such action.

Instead, with no protest, the Civil Service Commission has continued to recruit intensively all over the United States, filling the orders from bureaus for more and more employees. It does so in competition with industrial employers. In 12 months, while War Manpower Commission rulings were crippling and destroying the business of many so-called nonessential firms by denying them workers, even the Civil Service Commission increased its staff from 6,356 in May 1943 to 7,736 in May 1944.

The total number of paid Federal civilian employees, according to the committee's report for October 1944, was 3,300,783, including 262,281 civilian employees of the War Department outside the continental United States. This figure does not include the 146,621 county and community committeemen and compliance checkers of the Department of Agriculture, paid on a per diem basis, scattered throughout 3,070 counties of the 48 States.

About 50 percent of the paid employees are in mechanical war production, but thousands of men in uniform and WAC's, WAVES, and other women in uniform are performing clerical duties. These are not included in the figure reported for Federal civilian employment.

Hundreds of thousands of Government employees sit around with nothing to do, and the United States Government, while urging civilians to further effort, continues to take much needed employees away from private employers all over the United States.

An example just came to my desk, a letter from a businessman in Virginia. He deals in fuel, certainly a necessary business. He wanted to give his experienced secretary a raise of $10 a month, but the War Labor Board refused the request. "So," he writes me, "She went upstairs in this building to a Government office and got a job at an increase of $40 a month."

War Labor Board and Treasury Department regulations that forbid salary increases do not affect Government bureaus. Our committee has found innumerable cases in which Government employees have received raises that under no circumstances would be allowed by the W. L. B. in private business. A man who worked for W. P. A. for $1,200 a year in 1943, now earns $3,200. Six employees in the Office of War Information have received raises of $1,500 in the last year. In the Foreign Economic Administration, 104 employees received $8,000 a year, and 40 percent of them received an average increase of $1,790 in the first 11 months. A college professor who was earning $2,000 a year joined the Government when war started. Today, although he has never had any business experience, he is getting $8,000 as "a business specialist." I could recite similar cases for pages and pages.

In one department the top man wanted to raise an employee's salary from $4,700 to $5,600. To justify the raise, the employee had to have an assistant, so an unnecessary assistant was hired at $3,600 a year and the employee got a $900 raise.

Nongovernment white-collar workers, refused raises by Government orders, are struggling desperately to meet the increased cost of living. Even though their employers want to raise their salaries, it can't be done. On the other hand, many Government employers and employees, who know the ropes, find that their raises are eagerly approved. I want to give full credit to the thousands of Government workers who are laboring long hours at essential work. Some departments, such as the Post Office, are undermanned. Many an executive works all day at his office and many hours at home in the evening.

Most of these conscientious Americans join me in my protest, for they realize the state of affairs in the majority of the departments. They know that men and women whom they need desperately, and who are needed as well in war work from coast to coast, are sitting idle on the floor above, or in the building across the street, but that since their bureau chiefs won't give them up, the employees can't be used elsewhere. If these chiefs employed only as many as they actually needed

they would lose face, and perhaps be forced to take a reduction in salary, and thus would have to accept only what they are worth.

Our committee has long advocated a complete unification of the 10 farm-loan agencies of the Department of Agriculture, at a tremendous saving in personnel and Federal funds. Great savings could be brought about by combining many of the 134 agencies engaged in research work in various departments.

A Chicago businessman, engaged in war work, writes me: "We are not getting many questionnaires from researchers in Washington, but, instead, there is a great increase of young men of draft age who come to inspect our books and records. At one time seven young men from seven different Government departments were working on our books. The young men have become more of a nuisance than the questionnaires."

Our committee has believed that, through our investigation of useless questionnaires, we had eliminated some waste. But now we find the bureaucrats cleverly evaded our efforts. Instead of sending out questionnaires, they hired more men and are sending them through the country, helping to crowd railroad trains and hotels, to annoy businessmen even more and at greater expense.

Our files are jammed with letters from Government employees who volunteer information about waste in manpower. Our investigators report that when they talk with any group of employees from various departments who aren't afraid to tell the truth, 9 out of 10 will state that their department is overmanned. Many left good jobs in their home towns, believing that in a Government position they could help in the war effort. Thousands return home. One of them writes:

"For days after I arrived in Washington I sat and looked out a window. Finally I couldn't stand the waste, disorganization, and idleness, and resigned. When I did so the head of the department said, 'You're a fool. You might as well have some of this money. If you don't take it, someone else will.'"

Further waste is indicated in a letter from a clerk who writes: "We have so little to do that when one of the department investigators who is out in the field telephones in on business, sometimes from as far away as California, we all gather around and take turns on the long-distance phone for a personal chat," while the Government pays the tolls!

From an office outside Washington, an employee writes: "In our office is a $6,500-a-year lawyer who comes in for an hour or two every day, and the rest of the time is in his own office taking care of his private practice. He was with W. P. A. and was supposed to be eliminated, but he was transferred to our department, although we already had lawyers sitting around with nothing to do."

A stenographer in the War Department in Washington told one of our investigators: "In my office there were nine officers and each had a secretary—nine girls, but there wasn't really enough work for three. Another officer moved into the office, and do you think he was willing to use the nine girls? I should say not! He had to have his own secretary. He wouldn't be a big shot if he didn't."

According to the latest available figures, there are over 6,000,000 on public pay rolls, which means that 1 person for every 11 employable persons (ages 18 to 64, inclusive) is employed by the Federal, State, and local governments, eliminating those now serving in the armed forces. Likewise, 1 person for every 2 persons in the armed services of our country is on a public pay roll.

Excluding the teachers, in every State except West Virginia, there are more Federal employees than there are State or local workers. Look in your telephone book under United States Government, and if you are in a city of any size you will be astonished by the number of Government agencies that are taking up office space and using workers right in your own neighborhood. In some States the great concentration of Government employees, of course, is caused by war work—navy yards, arsenals, camps, airfields, and shipping centers—but our investigations show that most of these are overmanned and the executives are hoarding labor that is needed elsewhere.

It is possible that if Mr. McNutt made a serious effort to streamline Government activities, as he has business and industry, the recent drastic hiring controls which regiment every worker under the authority of Mr. McNutt's United States Employment Service might not be necessary. And if Government offices were forced to follow War Labor Board rules which control raises in salaries, it would be a considerable contribution toward the effort to stop inflation.

I say confidently that 300,000 civilian employees could be dismissed as of the day this article is written, with a resultant improvement in governmental operations. As soon as the war is over, hundreds of thousands more could and should be promptly severed from the public service.

On September 19, 1943, I addressed a communication to Government departments and agencies requesting information as to their post-war plans and their personnel requirements. A careful review of the replies to this letter revealed the amazing fact that nearly all except war agencies plan to increase, rather than decrease, their personnel in the post-war era.

An analysis of the replies disclosed that the decrease in the work of certain programs and the expanded work of other programs will result in a proposed increase in the post-war era of approximately 95,000 employees in nonwar agencies.

It is apparent that reduction in personnel has been given little, if any, thought by the many Government agencies in their consideration of post-war plans and that a huge pay roll will continue to drain the Federal Treasury. This will enable governmental bureaus throughout the Nation to further harass the citizens of our country with various forms of Federal regimentation.

So long as the Government operates under war emergency powers the quickest procedure would be to make the personnel reductions under these powers in the same manner as the Government directs private business. As this is written, I am still waiting for Mr. McNutt to act. If Mr. McNutt does not act, I will call up for consideration my resolution, introduced last June, which provides for a mandatory reduction of 300,000 Federal employees.

It is monstrously unfair to the millions who are on the outside looking in for the Government to have one rule for itself and another completely opposite rule for private business and citizens.

RETIREMENT OF JESSE JONES

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I rise only for the purpose of saying a word in appreciation of the services of Hon. Jesse Jones, who for several years has served as chairman of the board of directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is an immense institution with almost unlimited financial responsibility. Mr. Jones presided over the R. F. C. almost from the outset of the present regime, 12 years ago the 4th of this month.

He testified before the Committee on Commerce that the total loans of the R. F. C. under his administration had amounted to the inconceivable sum of $40,000,000,000. None of us has the remotest conception of what such a sum implies. It is forty thousand million dollars.

I believe that Mr. Jones stated that the fund available to him was approximately $18,000,000,000. He stated further, in response to a question—and his statement surprised his critics—that the loans to small business, including small war industries, were approximately $2,000,000,000.

On this day, when his excellent successor, Mr. Vinson, qualifies, I think it is due Mr. Jones that some remarks be made in an expression of appreciation for his very extraordinary services.

Far from losing money in connection with the immense operations conducted under Mr. Jones' supervision, he stated in his testimony before the Committee on Commerce that he thought the profit had been approximately $500,000,000. Such losses as were entered on the books were losses resulting from loans to Government bureaus, such as the W. P. A., which losses were canceled by an act of Congress. To be sure, in transactions so great, so widespread, and so varied, losses may have occurred here and there; but on the books themselves the financial aspect of the situation indicates that the gain is a half billion dollars, over and above the losses. That represents a remarkable achievement. It shows something of the acumen of Mr. Jones, and something of his fidelity to his great task.

When Congress created the R. F. C. it was required that loans should be well secured, that they should be made to banks, railroads, insurance companies, building and loan associations, and similar institutions, in order to aid depositors and policyholders and relieve the general situation and the general welfare. But we relaxed the standard of safety. I think, as the law now stands and as it stood for a number of years, Mr. Jones has had a very broad discretion described by the word "reasonable."

I think the R. F. C. was needed. I voted for it. I think it has done good; I think it has been a success; I believe the good it has done and the success it has achieved is due more to Jesse Jones and the very able men whom he has assembled around him than to any others. So, as he takes his departure from the official life of our Government, I bid him farewell with gratitude and praise. Well done.

Mr. President, I wish to say something else about the R. F. C. I was here when that measure was enacted in 1932. It was proposed from the other side of the Chamber. It was a measure of the Hoover administration. It came to the Congress as a White House measure when President Hoover was in the White House. Its sponsor on the floor of the Senate was Senator Wolcott, of Connecticut, a very fine man. Its chief spokesman on the floor of the Senate was Senator Reed, of Pennsylvania. But we made a nonparty matter of it.

I well remember how I came to vote for it. We were in the very depths of the depression, and not only had 10,000,000 unemployed but the number was increasing every week, and the prices of farm commodities were doing down. We were in despair, due to loss of confidence

in the Government and confidence in ourselves. I do not think I have ever been in such a situation. I have been in storms at sea and found myself in the maw of a hurricane in a small boat; but I think the Senate and the whole country at the time the R. F. C. was brought forward were in the worst state of despair and consternation that I have ever seen anywhere. There was panic in the country and there was panic in the Congress.

Some of us thought at the time that the R. F. C. was fundamentally a mistake. I did, but I voted for it. I remember what Senators said. One of them who has since been elevated to a very lofty position—I shall not call his name—a man who stands very high as a liberal, so-called, using the word in the current sense in which it is so loosely used, said to me, "This is Pandora's box; open this box, and all the evils will fly out"—going back to the ancient legend, the mythological story of the box which contained all the evils, and when it was attempted to open the lid out they might fly to plague the world forever. "This is Pandora's box. Pass this measure, and you will have to pass a thousand like it. Throw the Government into the vortex of the depression, and you will never extricate it."

There was a great deal in what he said. The answer to that was, "This is a great and extreme emergency; we cannot sit here and let the people perish; we cannot undertake to perform our functions as Senators and see the Government shaken down to its foundations. We must do something." The only thing we could think of doing was to take the credit of the country and place it in institutions that would scatter it out amongst the people, first, to relieve the depression, and then we hoped it would encourage industry, and to go on with its work and increase employment. Well, we did it. We knew very well why we were doing it. We did it because we felt that we must do it; that there was nothing else to do. It was an emergency measure; but now it is a perfectly normal operation.

That is a thing that appalls me. All the measures which we put forward here in the name of emergency and under the lash of necessity, are now advanced as the normal means of providing the economic welfare of whoever wants his economic welfare looked after. This Government is devoted to the general welfare, and the emphasis is on "general" as well as on "welfare"; but we have moved away from that idea. This Government was intended to provide national defense, to preserve order, and unite the States; but we now have undertaken to follow a different course. And here is the character of the American revolution. We have had one, and we now have one. I do not say it in an offensive sense; but our country, nationally speaking, has been transformed from a republic, devoted to order, to unity, to national defense, and to the general welfare, into an economic institution, pledged to take care of the individual and the general economic responsibilities of the people.

That has happened and all we do about it is to borrow so much money and lend it here and there in the hope of getting it back. We seem to overlook the simple fact that there is no security on earth, and none in heaven, either, in borrowed money. All that is borrowed must be paid back. There is no security whatever in the Government lending money. It cannot administer it. In a democracy we have to respond to the demands of the voters. It ceases to be a commercial or business transaction and becomes a political responsibility. That has happened, and now it is normal. If anyone should move to abolish any lending agency, he would be immediately answered by saying "How can we get along without it?"

All of us confront the post-war situation. None of us has sufficient imagination to know just what its character will be, but we can see 10,000,000, 11,000,000, or, as I suspect, 13,000,000 young men coming back to find their places in life, to make their living, establish their homes, and carry on after all of us have gone. We wish them well. Are we going to provide for them? Yes. We are not planning to give them a good Government, oh, no. We are not going to provide opportunities, we are not planning to preserve liberty, we are not proposing to maintain courts of justice in which they can have equality under the law, oh, no. We are going to lend them some money.

Mr. President, there is the trouble about this whole business: We are going to provide 60,000,000 jobs, according to Mr. Wallace. Of course, all of us would like to provide 60,000,000 jobs. I can outbid him. I could run for President on a ticket urging that we provide 160,000,000 jobs. That is a simple matter of talk. I give Mr. Wallace credit for meaning what he says, but he cannot mean it any more than anyone else who stands on the street corner and promises with the words "sixty million" in his mind. How are we going to do it? Borrow some money and lend it out.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator to yield because it happened that the moment he was speaking I had open in my hand the March 1945 issue of Manpower Statistics, prepared by the War Manpower Commission, on page 5 of which there is a table showing the total labor force for the years 1942, 1943, and 1944, with the divisions of those working in agricultural occupations, those working in nonagricultural occupations, and the unemployed.

In January 1945, the total labor force is given as 50,960,000, of whom 6,690,000 are employed in agriculture, 43,430,000 in nonagricultural occupations, and 840,000 are unemployed.

The Senator knows that there are between ten and twelve million men in the armed forces. Let us assume it is 11,000,000. If we add 11,000,000 who are in our armed forces to the 59,960,000 in the labor forces, we have a total of 61,960,000 who are now employed in the Army, the Navy, and in other occupations.

I suggest to the Senator that the talk about 60,000,000 jobs is altogether realistic, and is based upon statistical information, and if the Senator were trying to outbid Secretary Wallace, or the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who is the author of the full employment bill, I suggest that if he employed some other figure than 60,000,000 he would be altogether unrealistic.

Mr. BAILEY. If I were in the position to do the employing, I would engage the Senator from Wyoming as my statistician, and he would bring it out all right.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; the Senator would employ the War Manpower Commission, whose statistics are reliable. We appropriate money for the Bureau of the Census to gather the information.

Mr. BAILEY. I did not think Mr. Wallace merely got the figure 60,000,000 out of his mind and said it. I was sure there was some justification. I remember he also said that if we ever fell below 57,000,000 we should immediately proceed to lend out money in what he called risk capital, or equity investment. That is what I am talking about. The whole idea is that, having started by way of the R. F. C., when it was needed in a great emergency, the Federal Government must now proceed in normal times, in good and bad, by way of having citizens put dependence on the Government to the extent of billions and billions of borrowed money. If we have any problem, the answer to it is to borrow more money and lend more money.

Mr. President, I am just saying that that is very alluring in its way, very easily said; it sounds good to the average man who has no money, and likes to think that there is some place where he can get it at very low interest, and from a lender who is not going to press him too hard; but, after all, that is no remedy, there is no permanence in it, and the American people should be told that.

I was criticized for opposing Mr. Wallace until we could get the lending powers separated, because, it was said, "Here is the man who is going to pour it out." Are we going to make that the test here in America, that we will vote only for Senators who will borrow money and lend it out, that we will vote only for governors who will borrow money and lend it out, that we will say that no one shall come to the House of Representatives unless he is willing to borrow money and lend it out? My point is that, regardless of the statistics, none of which I question, there is no economic foundation there, and there is no sanity there, either. That is the road to ruin, paved with good intentions, paved with gold, and adorned with the prospect of paradise itself; but, after all, to change the metaphor, the foundations are foundations of sand, and in the first storm the house will fall, and great will be the fall thereof.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator may recall that both the Senate and the House, by overwhelming votes, separated the loan agencies from the Department of Commerce precisely because it was the opinion of Congress that no one in the United States should have any reason to believe or to charge that the great fiscal powers of the loan agencies should be used for the purposes of economic reform. I was one of those who supported that bill because of a conviction that no such use should be made of our fiscal powers, and that if any policy is to be determined, it must be determined by the Congress. I quite agree with the Senator that we cannot establish a sound economy of a capitalistic system upon any theory of pouring out red ink from the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. And by "red ink" the Senator means borrowed money?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Borrowed money.

Mr. BAILEY. Deficit financing.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to take my seat, but I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am greatly interested in and very much impressed by the remarks of the Senator from North Carolina. He does not need anyone to interpret what he says, because his remarks are plain, and to me his statement is a very honest one. Someday someone is going to tell the truth about where all the jobs are to come from. I am very much interested in jobs, and if someone were to say, "I want to make available 60,000,000 jobs, and this is the way I am going to do it", and the American people would have an opportunity to pass on it, he would be in a much better position than to delude them by promising all this number of jobs without ever indicating in anyway just how furnishing them was going to be brought about.

I wish to tell the Senator how sincerely I appreciate the honest statement he is making. I like to make issues with people when there is some ground for argument. I do not like to have the American people ever deluded by promises of things which someone says he is going to do for them, without ever having the bravery to say, "This is the way I am going to do it," and giving the American people opportunity to say whether they want it done that way or not. Deficits piled on deficits year after year eventually will ruin this Government.

Mr. BAILEY. I will tell the Senator where the jobs are to come from. I have no doubt about it; and I do not pretend to be an economist, either. I have lived quite a while, and have observed a good deal. There are only two sources of jobs for the American people. The first source, now in dim prospect, I hope, but I do not think it is so distant, is in a State society, or a communistic form of government. We will have to recognize that under communism it is possible to employ everyone. It is done in Russia, and I would not say the Russians do not do it admirably. I think they do. I have no quarrel with Russia about her ideology. It is here, and it seems to suit her. I bid her Godspeed, but at the same time I say God forbid that it should come here, that we should ever get the foolish idea that we can do it. It will never work here. It is against the American habits of mind and the American sensibility. That does not mean that that it is not a fine thing in Russia, but of course if we have communism, in order for communism to be successful here there must be a man like Stalin or Lenin at the head. It is all dependent on one great strong man. And probably when the historian comes to write the history of this period he will say that both Stalin and Lenin were such men as those of whom the poet speaks:

> Beneath the rule of men entirely great,
> The pen is mightier than the sword.

They are entirely great men. I have great admiration for them. We cannot be sure of such a thing, however, over here in a democracy. We do not know when the democrats—I am speaking of democrats with a little "d" now—might fall from grace and elect a Republican President. It would never do to have a Republican run as a Communist. And the Republicans might fall from grace and elect a Democrat, and the two might be overcome and the P. A. C. might get us. If that occurred, it would result in coming nearer to bringing a proper dictator than either one of the other two results. I do not think the Democratic Party could elect a dictator, and I do not think the Republicans could, but I think the P. A. C. is headed right in that direction. And I take notice of the fact with great solemnity that they are trying to capture the party of which I have been a member for many years, whose ticket I voted ever since I voted for any ticket at all, since 1894. The members of the P. A. C. do not say they are Democrats; they say they are not Democrats; but they are proposing to capture my party. What is a poor fellow like me to do? It reminds me of the fellow who said: "Shut the door; they are coming in the window. Shut the window; they are coming in the door."

And the other fellow said: "Shut your mouth, you fool; they are coming through the floor."

I sometimes feel that way, and I hope I am not in any delirious state of mind either. I see the movement all over the country. I do not have any question about what is going to happen in 1948. The P. A. C. is going to make a desperate effort to name the Democratic candidate for President, and they themselves say they are not Democrats, they are not members of our party. Well, I am going to meet them at Philippi. I do not know what the result will be, but I shall meet them, and I know what I will do, too.

Let us now go back to the main theme I was talking about. The other way of employment is by way of encouraging men like you and you to invest your money, build your store, build your factory, run your farm, and be sure that so long as you keep the law and work hard your savings will be your own, and no man shall make you afraid. That does not start simply with the American Republic. That goes all the way down to rock bottom, and hundreds of millions of dollars of savings in this country, due to the excess expenditures necessitated by the war. Pursue a national policy which will cause people to put that money into enterprise and you will have your employment and you will not have to borrow any money at all. You will not need an R. F. C. That is a little bit more difficult than simply saying to the banks, "You have got to lend me so much money and then I am going to hand it out." That is the easy way, and there is temptation to do it the easy way. The American Republic was founded on the hard way. We kept the moral law. We kept the great standards. The reason for yielding to such temptation is all due to the opening up, as has been said, of Pandora's box by the R. F. C. legislation.

I am willing to accept my responsibility for voting for the R. F. C.; but God knows, when I voted for it I thought it would last about 2 years, and here it is now going to last forever. Why do I mention it? I do so wholly to warn our people that we have gotten into a habit of mind of saying, "Well, we did it before and we can keep on doing it. It did a lot of good, and we must keep it up." We all forget that the R. F. C. was founded in the greatest emergency of our country, and practically one of the greatest in the world.

I can tell the Senate how it works. It was said here in the debate on the question "If we do this thing we will have to do more." Yes; but we then said in reply, "We will have nerve enough to stop." But this thing is just like the case of a drunkard drinking liquor. He always thinks he will stop, but the liquor continually breaks down his will. He keeps drinking, and the more he drinks the less capable he is of stopping.

O Mr. President, we thought we would have the nerve to stop it. The late Senator Robinson, my friend, whose memory I will always honor, asked me to vote for the R. F. C., and he told me something by way of argument which made a very powerful impression on me. I said to him, "Senator, I am doubtful about the matter. I am a young Senator, and all this is new to me. I am doubtful about it. The measure provides for furnishing a billion dollars or two. That is mighty big money to me." I said, "If I thought it was necessary to do this to save the country from going down into the pit of ruin, of course I would vote for it, but I hope we may escape that. I do not see any end to that sort of thing." "Well," he said, "let me talk to you," and he took me through that door into the cloakroom. He said, "Now, let me tell you something. If we do not pass this bill by 12 o'clock tonight 530 banks will fail to open tomorrow morning in New York State alone." "Well," I said, "now, Senator, if it is that bad, when the roll is called I will vote for it," because I knew the closing of 530 banks would mean that the whole thing would sweep over the country like fire in a forest. I hoped to avert it. We did avert it for a few months. But it was too late. Probably we never could have averted it by that method, but we did the best we could.

But, Mr. President, 530 banks are not about to close in New York State tomorrow morning. We are no longer threatened with a panic. We are no longer in the pit of the depression. If I under-

stand America, she is up and about and ready to go, and all the American people need is a little encouragement. Tell a man that if he invests his money he can obtain a fair return on it, no more. Tell him it will not be confiscated. Tell a man if he saves his money, it shall be his own, and no one else's. Tell him if he lays out a farm and builds him a home he shall dwell, as the Bible says, "under his (own) vine and under his fig tree, and none shall make him afraid."

That is the picture of civilization we receive from the Almighty. That is the picture in Holy Writ. Encourage the American people that way and you will be amazed at how many jobs will be created, and you will be amazed how much better wages we will be able to pay than we are paying on borrowed money, and you will be amazed at how much easier it will be to conduct your Government.

On the other hand, Mr. President—now hear me just one word—there is an end to the capacity of any institution on earth to borrow money. America is a great country, but she is not so great that her credit is inexhaustible. No man ever did this country a worse disservice than did the Secretary of the Interior when he said that this country was worth $3,000,000,000,000. It is deluding the people to say that that much wealth is available to them. We know what the annual wealth created in this country is. We know about what the capital investment in the country is.

I happened to look at the New York Times financial sheet this morning. I suppose that could be considered a crime in some quarters. I am guilty. I find that the stocks on the Big Board as it is called, or the New York Stock Exchange, consisting of stock of most of the larger corporations in this country—I think the number is about a thousand—all together are selling today at a price which indicates a total value of $59,000,000,000. That does not suggest for the whole country anything like three trillions. I do not believe there is a man here who knows what a trillion is. I do not. I am not going to try to find out. It would be perfectly useless information. I am never going to have a trillion of anything. I never want a trillion of anything. A trillion is child's talk. There are no trillions of wealth. There are no trillions of anything, except microbes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Is it not true that we now owe approximately one-third of a trillion dollars?

Mr. BAILEY. I do not know. A thousand billion may be a trillion. I know that we are approaching the $300,000,000,000 mark.

Let me say, with a great deal of modesty, that I believe I know what will happen if we go much further. We shall reach the point where, the more money we borrow the less we shall have. That is a very simple proposition. We may borrow $1,000,000,000, but it will not be worth more than 25 cents, and we shall not really be getting the $1,000,000,000. That is what is called inflation.

I think I can tell the American people what inflation will be like if it comes. One of our Senators is a grower of apples. That is greatly to his credit. Who makes two blades of grass grow where one grew before has done more for mankind than all the politicians. Who makes two apples grow where one grew before has done more for mankind than all the politicians except the former Governor of Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is now a United States Senator. I think he has made great contributions on both accounts.

At the rate we are borrowing money, we may live to see the time when apples will sell at $100 apiece and the man who picks them will be paid $1,000 a bushel to pick them. That is inflation. Or apples will sell at a dollar apiece, and the worker who picks them will be paid $1,000 a day to gather them. That is inflation. That adds nothing to our wealth. It only adds to our confusion, to our folly, and to our ruin. It gains no wealth. Dependence upon borrowed money leads down that road.

At one time we thought that a $50,000,000,000 debt was something to be abhorred. The war came on just as we reached a debt of $50,000,000,000, and we were trying to pass a resolution to stop it. We could not have stopped. We were on the downward path. Then the war came on.

I do not protest against borrowing money to carry on the war. That is the only way we can carry it on. I am willing to spend every dollar we have, and impoverish every one of us to win this war and bring our boys back in triumph; but I will not delude anyone with the deception that borrowed money is the means of prosperity. That is our trouble. We have a sort of prosperity now, but it is built on the sands of wartime financing. It is based on borrowed money, which must be paid back. We must stop borrowing. We can carry on the war and get through, but when we are through we must pay the debt and stop borrowing. We must have a balanced Budget. We must reduce the tax burden. We must encourage our people. A man must be encouraged to believe that if he builds a home and plants a vine, he shall live under his own vine and fig tree, and none shall make him afraid. That is the way to build America.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In addition to borrowing money, in substance we are borrowing it from the men who are doing the fighting for us, and from their children and grandchildren.

Mr. BAILEY. I am glad the Senator mentioned that point. The situation is worse than that. I shall not have to pay very much of this money back. The debt should not bother me very much. I am in my seventy-second year. If I live to be as old as the oldest Senator, I shall live not many years longer. An old man has nothing to fear about what we are doing. The future is not his. Our boys are fighting over yonder today. They are scattered all over the world—in the air, on the sea, and on the land. We long for them to come home. We want to see them; but there is more to it than that. I should like to have them come home to a fair country, to a happy land, a land of real opportunity, the true America that once I knew. I should like to have them breathe the air of that freedom for which they are fighting. But when they come home we are going to say to them, "You fought the battle, but you must also pay the debt." I may be dead and gone, and I shall not have to pay the debt; but the young men will be paying the debt.

We have to pay as much of it as we can; and we ought to be perfectly willing to impoverish ourselves to do so. Income tax time is coming on the 15th of March. Every decent man will pay every dollar the Government asks him for, and he will not try to down his tax, either. If the Government asks for more, he will pay more. But after all, we are spending money so fast that it cannot be raised by taxation. We know that such a course would result in breaking down the economy here at home. We could not support the war itself under such a plan. When our boys come back they will have to pay the debt. They will live for 20, 30, 40, or 50 years longer, and they will be paying the debt all the time. Those who fought the battle will also bear the debt burden.

That may be part of the necessity of things; but God knows that it is not necessary that we should continue to borrow money for domestic and civil uses, and make future generations pay that too. That is wrong. It is unjust. It is insane.

Mr. President, I ought to take my seat. I rose mainly to say that Mr. Jesse Jones is now leaving us. He has done a great work and is entitled to the gratitude of the Nation. I am sorry he is going. I am not blaming the President at all. I voted for Henry Wallace after the lending powers were separated. I had no misgivings about my duty. I think more of Mr. Wallace, I believe, than do some other Senators. I know him personally. I would not say that I admire his politics or intend to follow his policies; but he a very fine man. He made a good Vice President. I wish to speak in all fairness. I am wishing him well. But I am not following at all his ideas about providing jobs by borrowing money or carrying on the economy by borrowing money. I am glad the lending functions have been separated from his department.

Mr. President, while I have the floor I will say that I, together with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], went to see the President about 4 or 5 days before the appointment was made. I know what we said to the President. I will not say what he said. But I will say he was very patient, he was very gracious, he was very reasonable. We said to him, "Mr. President, we did not come down here to interfere with you in regard to appointments to the Cabinet; not at all. That is your right, and we recognize it." I think I implied right

there that if the bureaus were ever separated, I would vote for Mr. Wallace. I should certainly have felt I was in a strange situation, after having said that to the President, to come here and vote against the nomination, once the George resolution had passed. We said, "We want you to separate the R. F. C. from the Commerce Department. We think a great mistake was made when they were united. That will make a very happy solution all the way around. You can appoint Mr. Wallace Secretary of Commerce; you can also appoint Mr. Jesse Jones to be head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; and all will be smooth sailing." Having said that much, I think the least I could do was to come back here, when those agencies were separated, and carry out the assurance I had given the President.

But, Mr. President, I do not say that by way of apology. I am rather inclined to think that the President of the United States has a right to appoint the members of his Cabinet, not altogether above challenge, but not to be challenged except for the gravest reasons and under the most serious circumstances. I have always pursued that policy. I will not go into that argument.

Mr. President, I shall take my seat with saying that Mr. Jones proved to be a faithful servant, an admirable steward. He has handled our money, I think, better than Joseph handled Pharaoh's money back in the days of the great depression in Egypt. Certainly he has done as well. Now that he goes to private life he goes with my gratitude and with profound expressions of appreciation.

I think the President has appointed a magnificent man to succeed him. I think Mr. Jones will leave that man a great staff. I have no criticism whatever to make of the President for notifying Mr. Jones that he wished him to be out of the Cabinet. I think the President had a right to do that.

Since I have been speaking so well of Mr. Jones, I believe I will say, just for myself, that if I were a member of the Cabinet and if I received a note from the President suggesting that I get out, I would write him a nice letter saying, "Mr. President, I am very happy to have served with you, and of course I fall in line with your wishes."

I believe I will say something about that. I did receive a note of that sort from Mr. Andrew Mellon at one time. I was a collector of internal revenue, and subsequently the administration changed and the Republicans came in. I was appointed under Woodrow Wilson, probably one of the noblest figures who ever walked this earth, and a living exposition of my understanding of liberal democracy. Well, Mr. President, my time came to go. I did not have anyone to say anything to me about going. So one day I received a note: "Dear Mr. BAILEY: In view of the change of the administration, the Department would be glad to have your resignation." So I wrote back to him, telling him that I understood the situation and that I was very happy to respond. I think that is what a man in the Cabinet should do. I did not print Mr. Mellon's letter, and I did not write him anything which would stir up any trouble.

So, Mr. President, I wish the recent matter had been handled that way. But, after all, all of us are fallible. I tried cases in the courts for a long time; and after I had gone through certain experiences when I sat down at the table to try a case, I would say to myself, "That judge up there is a fallible judge. That jury over there is a fallible jury. Your witness is a fallible witness. Your client is a fallible client. And you are a fallible lawyer." And then I would say to myself, "Thank God, the fellow on the other side is just as fallible, and his witnesses also."

So we all make errors, and we can defend one another for making them. Of course, the only way I know how to get through life at all is to make the most liberal allowance for the other fellow's performance. It may not be a blunder; but if you find that it is, make allowance for it; do not condemn him. If someone states, I say to my friend, that only one man named Lazarus is mentioned in the Bible, and if the speaker is confronted with the fact that there were two, we can overlook that. After all, one of them was said to be dead, and I think that was a figure of speech. So we can get around those things. The man who was thought to be dead had lived. The man of whom it was said that he had died and went to heaven was merely used as a figure of speech. He had never lived. Why debate about that? If someone else says there were two, all right. If someone else says there were three, all right. If someone blunders about it, all right. The world is a blundering world. We can all afford to be forgiving. If a man asks for your cloak, give him your coat also. If a man asks you to walk 1 mile, walk 2. It is better to do that than to have a quarrel.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he takes his seat?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to take this opportunity to say that I have counted it as one of the greatest privileges of my life that I have had the opportunity for more than 11 years to listen to the discourses of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] both on the floor of the Senate, in committee rooms, and elsewhere, particularly at the luncheon table. I have never known a time when the Senator has not added to my information and enlightenment. I think that every Member of the Senate will likewise pay tribute to the senior Senator from North Carolina.

What he has said today is so important and so moving that I venture to add just a few words.

It is altogether true that this Government and the whole world are involved in one of the greatest crises of all human history. I think it is something bigger than borrowing money for the Government; it is something more fundamental than Government debt. It is not only a question of inflation; it is a question of the organization of our economic and political systems in such fashion that human beings can live freely. It seems to me that no one can take account of the tremendous conflicts which are taking place in the world without realizing that they are the result of something deep and fundamental. It is true that our debt is climbing now to $300,000,000,000. As the Senator from North Carolina has said, no one can understand a trillion dollars. I doubt whether anyone can understand a billion dollars. Yet those are the figures which we toss around here very lightly.

A few weeks ago the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Mariner Eccles, was talking to the Industrial Conference Board, in New York. The Industrial Conference Board, as Senators may know, is an organization of industries in the United States.

The Senator from North Carolina has doubtless talked to that board, and perhaps other Members have talked to it. Mr. Eccles pointed out that in 1940 the corporations of the United States, exclusive of banks and insurance companies, had in cash and liquid assets in excess of $23,000,000,000. In 1944 they had in excess of $66,000,000,000.

While the Senator was talking, I happened to have in my hand a statement which was issued by the Securities and Exchange Commission on Tuesday, November 28, 1944, upon the subject of working capital of United States corporations. I recommend it for reading by Senators. The first paragraph of the statement is as follows:

> Corporate net working capital reached a new high in the second quarter of this year, estimated at $44,300,000,000 as of June 30, 1944, according to the quarterly analysis made public today by the Securities and Exchange Commission. During the 3 months, April through June 1944, working capital increased by $1,300,000,000, about the same rate as in the preceding quarter. This increase in working capital was approximately equal to retained profits.

I shall not read all the statement; but on the inside page there appears a table showing current assets and liabilities of United States corporations, excluding banks and insurance companies, from 1939 to 1944. Current assets of these companies in 1939 amounted to $54,600,000,000.

On March 31, 1944, their current assets had increased to $95,700,000,000. Liabilities had also increased. In 1939 they were $30,000,000,000. On March 31, 1944, they were $52,700,000,000. The net working capital, however, had increased from $24,600,000,000 in 1939 to $43,000,000,000 on March 31, 1944.

I now look at a chart which shows the contents of those current assets. In 1939 the cash constituted in excess of $10,000,000,000, and United States Government securities constituted approximately $2,000,000,000. It may have been a billion and a half dollars. I am not sure because I am looking only at the chart. It would have to be measured. In 1943, however, the cash assets of those same corporations were in excess of $20,000,000,000, but the United States Government securities seem to have been in an amount varying from $12,000,000,000 to $15,000,000,000. In other words, the assets of those corporations in 1943 in United States Government securities

were greater than the cash assets in 1939.

What I am saying merely emphasizes what the Senator from North Carolina has pointed out; but it also emphasizes something else which seems to me to be of the utmost importance. We are prone to think of what a man can do. The Senator from North Carolina eloquently described the historic principle upon which democracy is based, namely, that a man may work, save the product of his labor, and invest his savings for the purpose of creating new work, or for any other purpose which suits his fancy. No one will disagree with that ideal; but unfortunately, Mr. President, the facts with which we are confronted in this world dispute that principle. It is not because any one in government or in business decided to wreck the economic system by which a man could work, save, and invest his savings, that the condition which confronts us has been brought about. Not at all. Our crisis has come by reason of the fact that the investment of individual savings was rendered impossible long before the late Senator Joe Robinson asked the Senator from North Carolina to vote for the R. F. C.

On February 12, 1945, I obtained consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several tables. One of them was taken from the volume entitled "Recent Social Trends," which was published by a commission appointed by President Hoover during his administration to study the developments which caused the Senator from North Carolina to take the floor this morning. President Hoover wanted to know, and wanted the country to know, what was going on, what change was taking place, and the direction toward which the country was trending. So he appointed a committee to study the problem and prepare a report.

According to the table which appears in the volume entitled "Recent Social Trends," a copy of which may be obtained in the Congressional Library, the committee reported that the gross revenues of the United States Steel Corporation back in 1928 or 1929 amounted to $1,201,377,367. Next to that company was the Great Atlantic and Pacific Tea Co. Next to that company was the General Motors Corporation. Next to that company was the Pennsylvania Railroad system.

No State or city in the Federal Union had obtained revenues equaling the revenues of any one of the corporations to which I have referred. New York City came next in line, however, with a total gross revenue of $611,571,726.

The table also showed the number of persons employed. At that time the United States Steel Corporation employed 211,055 persons. I had the table brought down to date by the Library of Congress. The United States Steel Corporation in 1942 earned gross revenues of $1,862,951,692, or an increase over 1928 or 1929 of considerably more than $600,000,000. Whereas under the Hoover administration the United States Steel Corporation employed 211,055 persons in 1928 or 1929, in 1942 it was employing 314,144.

If one were to go through this table and pick out the five corporations with the largest number of employees, one would find that the five leading companies were the United States Steel Corporation, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Bethlehem Steel Corporation, General Motors Corporation, and General Electric Co., and that all of them together employed more than 1,500,000 persons.

What is wrong with the situation is that the managers of any one of those corporations, acting in perfect good faith, acting wholly within their rights, and acting in defense of the interest of their stockholders, could make a decision in the company headquarters which would affect thousands of communities throughout the land. If at the end of this war—on V-day to be specific—the United States Steel Corporation, the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, and General Motors Corporation because of the loss of war contracts, should decide, to close down their plants, as did General Motors when the depression came in 1929, those companies could lay off 500,000 or a million workers and those men would not find it possible anywhere in the United States successfully to invest their savings to create jobs and opportunities for them, because, Mr. President, we are living in an age in which organization rather than individual activity dominates our economy.

I had the pleasure last September to be a guest at a dinner given by Mr. Floyd Odlum, of New York City, whom everybody in the official and business world knows. At that dinner his uncle, General Odlum, the Canadian Ambassador to China, was present. During the dinner I inquired of General Odlum how long it had taken him to come from Chungking to New York. It happened that he had made that trip with Donald Nelson who returned about the same time. He made the trip from Chungking to New York in 64 hours. He flew over almost every continent and every sea, over Asia and Africa, a part of Europe, South America, and North America. He covered almost every nation in which the long history of mankind has been developing, when human beings as individuals were investing their savings and making their profits. And he made the trip in a commercial transport plane which cost about $350,000 to build, a plane that could be constructed only by an organized economy. The capital of thousands, to say nothing of the Government loans that went to the corporation which built the plane, and the labor of thousands of individuals went into the construction of that plane.

It illustrates, Mr. President, that the instrumentalities which we are using in this age are the instrumentalities which are produced by economic organization. We are not living in the days when a worker could control his own economic destiny. In our time the workers are dependent upon huge aggregations outside themselves. The tremendous sums which must be invested in the development and construction of the thing we need are beyond the capacity of individuals.

Senators on this floor have given great consideration to the problem of reclamation and the construction of public power projects. I am reminded, Mr. President, that a former Senator from the State of Wyoming, Joseph M. Carey, was the author many years ago of a bill which was intended to make it possible for individual capital to reclaim the arid lands of the West. The Carey Act was passed, and is still on the statute books. The Carey Act provided that upon the application of a State the Federal Government would set aside an area of arid lands upon which private investors would have the authority to construct reclamation projects and deliver water; and, when the project was constructed, then, under that plan, the lands segregated by the State would be occupied by settlers and the water company would be free to sell water to the settlers and thereby recoup its investment and earn a profit.

There were some Carey Act projects, but not many. They did not succeed in reclaiming western arid lands, and it was not until 1902, under the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, when the Reclamation Act was passed and Government investment was authorized in the construction of reclamation projects that successful settlement took place.

Because the Government has made an investment of Government money in a productive reclamation enterprise in the West, Mr. President, in the public-land States, in arid-land States, there have been brought into existence many towns which afford opportunity for profitable employment to professional men, doctors, lawyers, dentists, real-estate agents, mechanics, and laborers, such as bricklayers, carpenters, and others, numbering thousands who have never been on a farm in their lives. I am happy to say that the records of the Bureau of Reclamation show that the farmers who have settled upon these reclamation projects are practically current in the repayment of their obligations to the Treasury of the United States and in their maintenance and operation costs. It has been a successful investment of Government money in the creation of productive enterprise and of opportunity not only for agricultural settlers but for business of all kinds.

I point it out, Mr. President, because it illustrates one aspect of our organized economy and how futile it is to talk and act and pass legislation as though we were still living in the era when investments could be successfully made by individuals out of their savings.

The things which the modern world needs cannot be built or created by individual investors. Need I point out that 50 or 75 years ago Members of the House of Representatives and of the Senate of the United States obtained all the transportation they needed from the horse and wagon? Our great-grandfathers could go down to a corner wheelwright and buy four wheels, take them back to the farmyard, and build a wagon which, when it was hitched to Old Dobbin, afforded ample transportation. The instruments, the tools, were all available in the local community. They are no

longer so available. Now we want transportation of a very different kind. We want the automobile, and an automobile cannot be built in anybody's back yard. It must be built in some great manufacturing establishment which, like General Motors, has an income which can be computed only in the billions, and which has a force of employees who can be numbered only in the hundreds of thousands.

Mr. President, that is what has happened to our economy. That is why it was necessary for President Hoover, when he sought to prevent the depression, to create employment, and to prevent the closing of the banks, of which the Senator from North Carolina spoke, to ask Congress to pass an R. F. C. bill and pour millions of Government money in at the top of the economic machine. It was an attempt to deal with a transformation of our economy.

This matter, Mr. President, is of such great importance and of such far-reaching effect that we cannot solve it by picking out John Doe and saying, "There is the man who ruined us." We cannot rise and point to Henry Wallace and say, "You are the man who is doing this." Wallace has come on the scene in our time, in conditions which are existing now. If we are to determine why it is that the R. F. C. now is dealing in Government funds in figures which are beyond the imagination of any Member of Congress, we have to realize what is the economic cause of the conditions which surround us, and unless we are willing to deal with that cause, all our efforts will be utterly futile, because we have passed from an individual economy to an organized, corporate economy, and until we realize that, and deal with the facts as they are, instead of as they used to be, 75 years ago, we shall not be able to solve our economic problems.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if it will give no offense to any of the rules of the Senate, I should like to address myself briefly to the pending question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would be a grievous offense to the rules of the Senate, but I believe the Senator could get unanimous consent now to proceed on the subject before the Senate, and I hope he will bring us back to the consideration of the bill which we now have before us, even if it is a violation of the rules.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair assures the Senator from Georgia that he will be entirely in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield for a moment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely rise to say that every word which I have uttered upon the floor of the Senate today, and I think every word which was uttered by the Senator from North Carolina before I took the floor, had a direct bearing upon the bill which is now before the Senate, upon the measure which came from the House of Representatives, which would lay the hand of government upon the shoulders of all the male citizens of the United States between 18 and 45 years of age, and force them to labor for the economic organizations of which I have been talking.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no desire to debate that detail.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia will proceed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the votes which we had yesterday on the pending bill indicate beyond any peradventure of doubt that a large majority of the Senate hold the feeling which is expressed by the Senator from Wyoming, that the Government should not employ any compulsion whatever in dealing with individuals on the home front in this great war in which we are now engaged. It seems that the Senate has made up its mind that it will pass no measure which involves any degree of compulsion, and I am rather dubious as to whether even the so-called committee substitute will get a majority vote.

To my mind the committee substitute is wholly inadequate to deal with the problem before the American people today. I think it is totally ineffective. It embraces, if I understand and comprehend it, merely orders which have been heretofore issued by various agencies of the Government, and the action of the Senate will merely give approval to these orders, and express the pious hope that those who are engaged in work in the production of the tools of war, and those who may hereafter be needed to furnish the tools of war to the men who are carrying on this conflict all over the world in our behalf, will stay on the job, come what may, and produce those tools. As an instrument that will assure that that result will be achieved, I do not believe the committee substitute would be much more effective than a resolution passed by the ladies' sewing circle of Squedunk, or of any other town in the Union.

Mr. President, the grimmest days of my lifetime were December 7 and December 8, 1941. I shall never forget the look of bewilderment that was on the faces of my colleagues, which I know was reflected from my own face, when I walked into the Senate Chamber on December 8. We knew that a tremendous task lay before us. We were determined to do all that was in our power at that time to accomplish that task to the best of our ability. We did not know the extent of the damage at Pearl Harbor. Rumors were afloat that the Japanese were preparing to land upon the Pacific coast. We knew that a declaration of war would soon be made against us by Germany and Japan, and in that hour the Members of this body all felt the strain of the responsibility which was imposed upon us as the representatives of the American people.

I wish to recall, Mr. President, and read the resolving clause of the declaration of war that was voted by the Senate on December 8, 1941:

> *Resolved*, That the state of war between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Imperial Government of Japan; and to bring the conflict to a successful termination all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

Similar resolutions, in identical words except for the insertion of the words "Germany" and "Italy" where the word "Japan" appears in the joint resolution I have just read, were adopted unanimously by the Senate on the 11th day of December 1941, and we had then formally embarked upon this great war for survival as a free people, into which we had been thrust by the treacherous action of our enemies.

Mr. President, the declaration of war did not say that the Congress of the United States pledged, in order to bring the conflict to a successful termination, part of the resources of the United States, it did not say that we pledged only the blood and the bone of the young men of this Nation who would be sent overseas; it said that we pledged all our resources, and we directed the President of the United States, as the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, to utilize and to bring to bear against our enemies all the resources of the United States.

Mr. President, I conceive that to mean that we pledged the efforts and the abilities and the capacity of every man, woman, and child within the United States, that it meant all the material, all the wealth, all the industry, all the talent and the capacity and the genius that is America, to bring this war to a successful termination.

We are asked here today to pass a measure which makes a modest requirement that people in this country who have not heard a shot fired in anger, who have not heard an exploding bomb, shall make some contribution within their capacity to the war effort, and be well paid therefor. It seems that we will refuse to take this timid step and we now undertake to qualify the declaration of war. We say, "We did not mean this. We will use some other method. We did not mean we are going to compel these men to work in a plant, and we are not going to enact any restriction that is not approved by industry and by labor in this country. That is excepted from our expression which was made here in our hour of sorrow and necessity when we pledged all the resources of the United States to the speedy termination of the war."

Mr. President, this is the bloodiest and most violent war the world has ever seen. American boys are fighting on all the continents where our enemies may have entrenched themselves. They are fighting and dying on and above these continents and on and above and below all the seven seas. It is the toughest war for our soldiers the world has ever seen.

Yet we insist on fighting a soft war here on the home front. As a matter of fact, with the exception of those families that have received the fatal telegrams advising them of casualties of their loved ones, the American people at home have made no real sacrifices to the cause of victory.

We are enjoying today the highest standard of living this country has ever known, and we have pledged the income of generations in the future, including that of the boys who are doing the fighting, to maintain the highest standard of living the world has ever known. The average man in this country has more money in his pocket and in the bank and in his weekly pay check than he has ever had before. Oh, we at home have suffered a few annoyances. You cannot get all the gasoline you want to drive all your cars as far as you want to. You cannot get a filet mignon and a T-bone steak, but by and large the people on the home front in this war have not made any real sacrifices in anywise comparable with those which have been made by the civilian population of every other country that has engaged in this war, as well as the few countries which have managed to remain neutral.

The proposal which the House has sent over here to us is a mild and modest one. The restraints which are imposed cannot possibly be construed as a reflection on any man or woman who is today working in any war plant anywhere. They cannot be construed as any reflection on them, and they do not affect them. The people who have made the production records which Senators have referred to here again and again and again are in nowise placed under any shadow if we shall defeat the committee substitute and enact the House bill into law. The House bill merely says that whatever future commitments of supply are necessary to furnish the weapons to the men who are fighting and dying, that we will say that, come what may, labor union or any aggregation of capital to the contrary, so far as the power of the Government of the United States is concerned, we will attempt to bring that power to bear to see that they do not die for lack of the proper tools of war.

Everything in this country, according to my concept of a democracy, should be made available for its defense in time of war upon exactly the same standing or footing. There should be no exception. Therefore, everything, whether it be men or money or soldiers or civilians or industry, should be made available to the common effort to see that we win the war at the earliest possible date and with the least possible cost of life.

That is no new viewpoint of mine, Mr. President. When the Selective Service Act was pending in 1940, long before Pearl Harbor, I was for that act, and I likewise offered and fought for an amendment, which will be found in section 9 of that act, which empowers the President of the United States to take over any industry in this Nation that refused to accept a war-material contract at terms which were fixed by the President, and to devote itself to the construction of arms with which to equip the men whom we were voting by that act to draft. I believe in that principle today to a greater degree than is embraced within this House bill. The amendment I offered grew out of testimony which was offered in the Appropriations Committee when an admiral in command of supply in the Navy Department said that they were trying to buy antiaircraft guns to arm our ships but they found that the contractors who were qualified to make the antiaircraft guns would not make them because they had civilian business which was more profitable. I knew that these boys whom we were sending into the Army could find civilian businesses which were more profitable. I saw no reason why industry should not be compelled to equip these men if we were to call them away from the normal pursuits of civilian life and put them in uniform and train them for war.

I think that even the House bill is weak, but if we can have only crumbs in this situation instead of a slice of real bread, I hope that we shall be able eventually to secure the passage of the House bill and at least get a crumb.

Mr. President, we are told that our production figures are amazing. That is absolutely true. It is a great tribute to the men and the women who are toiling in our war plants. Our production has been great. We have the greatest industrial plant the world has ever seen. We have always stood far above any other nation of the earth in the efficiency of our industrial production. I do not regard the fact that our production has been great as a fair test in dealing with this question. The question in my mind is: Can we truthfully say that the production in the war plants of this country is as great as it would have been if we had utilized every resource of the Nation to the same extent that we have utilized the services of our men who are fighting in the front lines? I submit that that is a fair test in a democracy when the time comes for the people to move in its defense.

It all has not been easy. Oh, I know about the "no strike" pledge, and it is perhaps true that there have not been as many hours lost in strikes proportionately in this country as there have been in other countries. That is no consolation to me, Mr. President. To my mind, it is a disgraceful thing for this country to have a strike in a war plant in time of war in any circumstances, and particularly for such trivial causes as I have seen set forth from time to time, as for instance, where a workbench was 2 inches lower or higher than certain men in the plant thought it should be, that a matter of that kind eventuated in several thousand individuals being out of production for days, failing to do their part in furnishing these tools of war.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator just a moment ago, before he began to talk about strikes, was dealing with precisely the issue. I always know that when the Senator from Georgia takes the floor he will deal with the issue.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the statement made by the Senator. I hope it does not precede some statement which is perhaps not so favorable.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say first that, of course, this is not a no-strike bill. This is a bill dealing with the best method of increasing the production for the war fronts.

I have in my hand a report by the War Manpower Commission. It is report No. 16, on manpower statistics, for March 1945. This shows, in a chart on page 46, that the issue raised by the Senator, namely, whether or not we can get better production, is being successfully met under the present system. This chart shows that in 1942 production began with an index of about 26, while employment began at an index of about 65. Employment rose only gradually in 1942, but production rose almost vertically. In 1943 the rate of production increased so rapidly that it exceeded the rate of employment, and in 1944, although there had been a decrease in the rate of employment, the rate of production remained substantially at the highest level in history.

Those of us who have supported the committee substitute and opposed the bill which came from the House do not do so because we want to fight a soft war, as the Senator assumed.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not make such a statement. I said that in my opinion the effect of the action of the Senate meant that we would fight only a soft war at home while we were fighting the toughest war of all history overseas.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is what I meant. I believe that if the Senator from Georgia had had the opportunity which members of the committee have had to hear all the testimony, including the testimony which was given off the record, he would be inclined to adopt the conclusion which we have reached, that to change the system now instead of perfecting it, as the committee attempts to do, would bring about a decrease in production. Our position is simply this: It is much more important for the boys on the fighting front in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, when they raise the flag of the United States upon the scattered islands of the Pacific, to have the most efficient method of production that we can have in the United States. The committee is of the opinion that to ruin the system of efficiency which has been developed by gearing our production enterprise to the loafer instead of to the patriotic worker, would be a fatal mistake.

Mr. RUSSELL. I heard the remarks of the very able Senator when he previously addressed himself to the committee substitute. I did not have the privilege of remaining to hear all his remarks, but I heard him make practically the statement which he has just made. I am well aware of his position in regard to this legislation. He is always persuasive, even when I heartily disagree with him; and I have to retain the firmest sort of control on my own powers of reasoning when the Senator from Wyoming is armed with a chart. He is by all odds the most effective man with a chart that I have ever seen in any legislative body anywhere; and I have never seen him

fail to have a chart which adapted itself to any issue which he desired to discuss.

Of course, I did not have the privilege of hearing the off-the-record testimony which was given before the Committee on Military Affairs; but I saw the record which the Committee on Military Affairs brought to the Senate with this so-called bill. I find not a word of testimony from any responsible official of the Government, which through our democratic processes has been charged with the responsibility of producing these tools for our servicemen, which would indicate that the committee substitute was in anywise adequate to deal with the grave situation which we are told, through the hearings before the Senator's committee, is upon us today.

I know that when the administration, in the eleventh hour—and I confess it was in the eleventh hour—came around to this legislation, there had been what was practically an exodus from the war plants of this country because of the optimistic remarks which had been made by those in high authority. There was a falling off in production because of the fact that those in high places were saying that the war would soon be over. I take that as one test for the voluntary system, which it is said can accomplish its purpose through any storm which may overtake us.

I know further that as soon as legislation was introduced in the House to provide some measure of compulsion which would bring a man within the purview of his draft board if he were not engaged in war work, there was a turning of faces back to the war plants on the part of thousands of those who had left them when it appeared there was to be no bill. Thereafter production figures went up.

The Senator says that this bill is in nowise connected with strikes. I am not so sure about that. It is not antistrike legislation, but in my judgment it would have a very definite effect upon walk-outs and strikes in the war plants of this country, because if a man were off the job he would be subjected to the terms of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator has been reading the dispatches from Great Britain, he has read that within the past 2 weeks the British Government, which is operating under a forced labor law, was compelled to send soldiers to the docks to load vessels going to the fighting front in France because of a strike in Great Britain in spite of such legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have read the dispatches; and I have heard it iterated and reiterated upon this floor, at least two dozen times, that there have been approximately 5,000 prosecutions and 4,700 convictions in England under a similar law, and that the English system had not measured up to what we had done here under so-called free enterprise. I am not for this bill because the British have such a bill, if in fact they do, but I should like to point out that that is not the only thing involved in this question. Why does not the Senator tell us the wages which dock workers in London are paid, as compared with the wages paid in the United States? There might be something in that information which would throw some light upon the question of why there were more strikes in Great Britain than we have had in the United States. I think that would have as much to do with the question as would compulsory legislation of this kind. I predict that if the news goes out from this Chamber that the Senate of the United States is prepared to proceed without any compulsion, and that the bill to stop the movement from the plants back home in anticipation of VE-day is dead, we shall see that we shall not measure up to the schedules which have been fixed, and which the Senator says can be so easily attained under the provisions of the committee substitute.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I rose in the first place to ask a question. As the Senator and I both agree, this is not an antistrike bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not an antistrike bill; but I say it would have a deterring effect on strikes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator believe that all those who have gone back to the war plants have done so because of the threat of the pending bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator cannot put me in that position. Of course, I do not say that every one of those who went back to the war plants did so because of the threat of the pending bill. A great many of them went back because they learned that the officials who said that the war was almost over were wrong, and they wanted to do their part.

I will not say anything to reflect on the integrity, patriotism, and wonderful achievement of those who labor in industry in this country. They have made a mark of which we can all be proud. However, what they have done is not the test. The test is what we could have done if we had had available all those who were not as patriotically inspired as those who have stayed at their work benches.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am happy to have the Senator from Georgia say that he does not mean to have the country understand that he believes that those who have gone back to the war plants since Von Rundstedt's drive have done so because of fear of being drafted.

Mr. RUSSELL. No. I believe that some of them have done so for that reason.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That may be true, of course.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe that the overwhelming majority of American workingmen are just as patriotic, and have as much desire to serve, as has the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from Wyoming, or any other individual in the United States.

Mr. President, I cannot conclude without expressing my utter amazement at the composition of the forces which have apparently doomed to death the administration program which has been submitted by the President, and which he has requested time and again. Yesterday we saw the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] join hands here in crucifying a proposal which was in line with what the President has advocated and which has been urged upon us by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, among the civilian officials; also our highest military officials, including General Marshall, the Chief of Staff; Admiral King, the head of our fleet; and all the other officers who are in command of our armed forces in this war.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I recall that at one time it was charged by one of the able Senators whose name the Senator from Georgia has just mentioned that when such an alinement was made it was an unholy alliance.

Mr. RUSSELL. I intended to refer to that. The Senator not only said it was an unholy alliance, he also said it was an unpatriotic alliance.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes; he also said it was an unpatriotic alliance.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I said I was amazed to see the nature of the forces which were joined together here to defeat this administration proposal and to deny the President of the United States the powers he says he must have if he can assure the termination of this war at the earliest possible date with the least possible loss of human life. But yesterday when these generals—General GUFFEY, General TAFT, and General PEPPER—wheeled their battalions into line they dealt this proposition the most resounding defeat that I can recall having been administered to any proposal the President of the United States has sent to the Senate since I have been a Member of this body. When that occurred I had to say to myself, in the common parlance of the day, "Now I have seen everything." However, Mr. President, I must confess, having seen telegrams from various sources in support of the Taft amendment, telegrams coming from labor organizations and from other forces which have been brought to bear here, that I have been in some doubt as to whether the P. A. C. has taken over the G. O. P. or whether the G. O. P. has taken over the P. A. C. But whatever has happened, it has been a most disastrous defeat for the administration, and in my opinion, for the cause of earlier victory in this great war.

Mr. President, I scarcely ever pick up a metropolitan newspaper published in any of our larger centers of population that I do not see some editorial or a news column which carries some article speaking very disparagingly of what have come to be known throughout the United States as the southern Democrats—a term which is often used as one of scorn or odium. I am not ashamed of being a southern Democrat. I am proud that I am a southerner, and I glory in the history and traditions of the people of the South. However, there are times when I do not boast very loudly about being a Democrat. But I can point out that yesterday, of 17 so-called southern Dem-

ocrats who voted on the bill requested by the President of the United States, 13 of them voted in favor of it—a majority of over 3 to 1—whereas the bill was defeated by the Senate as a whole by a vote of approximately 3 to 1.

I wish to say further, Mr. President, for the benefit of my colleagues, because I know that nothing along this line would ever reach any of the metropolitan newspapers to which I have referred, that it is an interesting thing to analyze the progress of war legislation which has been brought to this body since the storm clouds first gathered back in 1939. We can examine the vote on the passage of the first selective-service bill, for instance. If we consider the vote in the House of Representatives and the vote in the Senate of the United States on that measure, we find that if the votes of these terrible southern Democrats had just been wiped out, the bill would have been defeated in both bodies of the Congress, and there would not have been a Selective Service Act in 1940. We would have been utterly unprepared when the blow fell in 1941 with the foul and treacherous attack at Pearl Harbor.

If we consider the issue of the proposed disbanding of the Army, which was before the Congress in 1941, just on the eve of the attack which was made on us at Pearl Harbor, we find that if we eliminate the votes of southern Democrats in the House and the Senate, our Army would have been disbanded, in accordance with a majority vote of both the House of Representatives and the Senate. That would have happened if these "contemptible southern Democrats" had not been in Congress, supporting the cause of national defense. The same situation exists in connection with the bill designated as the lend-lease administration bill, which some persons think has had a great deal to do with the advantageous position in which we now find ourselves in this war. Southern Democrats often differ violently on domestic problems; but, whatever our feelings may be, we cannot be accused of not having supported every measure which has been brought to the Congress which showed any possible promise of helping us in this war effort.

Mr. President, as was stated by the Senator from Arkansas, it has not been so long since the charge was made that an unpatriotic and unholy alliance existed between the southern Democrats and the Republicans to thwart the views of the President of the United States regarding the method of permitting the soldiers to vote. The members of that alleged nefarious combination were attacked in the columns of the press most vigorously, even to the point of viciousness, for having fought, according to their concept of the Constitution of the United States, for the right of the States to prescribe the ballot, rather than to have the Federal Government do so. I just wonder what kind of a combination it is when other Democrats join with the Republicans to defeat a measure which the President of the United States and those who occupy positions of power say is not only necessary and is not only more important than the question of voting, but involves the very life of the men carrying our flag overseas. I cannot believe that the former alliance which has been charged can possibly be as unholy, if that is the proper term to apply to either one.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In connection with what the Senator has been saying, let me state that I have been a little puzzled by his reference to 13 southern Democrats.

Mr. RUSSELL. There were 13 of them who voted for the measure yesterday. There are 22 southern Democrats in all, and 17 of them voted. Five were absent.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator did not mean to exclude any of his colleagues from the South, I take it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no. Of course there are times when a question of geography does not determine such matters altogether. But I was discussing the matter from a geographical standpoint, not from the standpoint of views or respect for traditions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me say to the Senator that I have not considered the bill from the point of view of General TAFT, General GUFFEY, or General PEPPER.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be glad to promote the Senator to be the General from Washington, if he so desires.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But if I believed that passage of the May-Bailey bill would have the effect of causing confusion in the country and decreasing production, rather than increasing it, would I be to blame for voting against the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, I am not saying that the Senator should take any certain position on the bill. My reference to the action taken yesterday was solely for the purpose of showing that the President of the United States was not always confounded in his desires and defeated in his wishes for legislation by Southern Democrats. The Senator's position is a matter for his own conscience. I do not criticize his position.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wish to point out that many of us who voted against the bill yesterday voted, I think, our independent convictions.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be the last person to reflect on the vote of any Member of the Senate. I have disagreed wholeheartedly with the Senator from Washington, and I do so in this instance. But, of course, I am glad to say that I believe the Senator from Washington voted his honest convictions, and did so in good faith.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the Senator from Georgia will not object to my remarking with a smile that we liberals must stand together even though we are outvoted by reactionaries and Republicans. [Laughter.]

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I may remind the Senator that a rose by any other name smells as sweet.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as I stated at the outset, I think the pending legislation involves a great deal. I think it involves the basic principle of democracy, that is to say, whether we shall have equality of service in time of war. Many persons cannot fight in the war. Many of us are too old, or have physical disabilities which disqualify them for military service. But every person can contribute in some way. Senators may say that to talk about men who are fighting this war is merely to appeal to emotions. I assert that nothing on earth affects as many human emotions as does war. No country, the people of which do not feel a great emotional appeal, can fight and win a war.

Senators may speak of free labor and free industry in this country, but I should not like to go to a parent who had received a telegram from the Government informing him that he had lost a son, and tell him that it is too bad, but that the Senate has saved freedom of labor and capital of this country in order during this war to pursue with very few restrictions, the paths they see fit, and that they have been left free to contribute only as much to the war effort as they may wish to contribute.

Mr. President, I have seen fit to leave the military direction of the war to men who are trained and selected to head our military forces overseas, and lead our American sons into battle. I do not now propose by my vote to leave the equally important question of supply for the men in uniform to any labor group, or any group in industry. We have been told by every official from the President of the United States down that they apprehend grave dangers in the future if legislation of this nature is not enacted. I propose to vote against the committee substitute. If it is adopted I may vote for it finally with the utmost reluctance, but with hope that the House of Representatives will be resolute enough to stand by their bill so that if the hour becomes as dark as I fear in my heart it will become in the next 90 or 100 days, the Senate will then have an opportunity to enact a law which will meet the needs of our fighting men in this grave hour.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, it is now 5 minutes to 3. Our leader has asked us to attempt to expedite matters, and reach a vote on the pending bill. I rise in an attempt to carry out our leader's wishes.

Mr. President, I desire to pay tribute to Mr. Jesse Jones, former Secretary of Commerce. I completely endorse everything which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] said in regard to Jesse Jones. Not only do I endorse what he said, but I should like to add my own type of tribute.

I believe that one of the most unfortunate things which has happened in the history of our country happened in regard to the work of that great man. His labor will be recognized throughout the breadth and length of our country as having been good and worth while. It has given a new faith and understanding to people all over the world who have learned to have respect for what we call democracy, and who have acquired a new

understanding of what can be done with money when the proper technique of handling it is followed. I believe that no doubt exists in the mind of any American that Jesse Jones has done a great job by contributing to the saving not only of our economic life, but of our great political fundamentals.

Probably Mr. Jones will never read the remarks which we have made concerning him, but I should like to have him know that there is gratitude and thankfulness in the hearts of people throughout the country who have been blessed by his wise administration.

Mr. President, since the subject has been referred to, a word should be said—it is related to Jesse Jones' life and his work—about what has come to be known as the full employment ideal. Perhaps because of the fact that many great events are taking place in the world from day to day few persons realize the origin of the subject of full employment. Throughout the recent political campaign we talked about 60,000,000 jobs, but no one told us of means of providing that number of jobs. It should be remembered that not only has the United States accepted the thesis that the attempt to maintain full employment should be a national policy, but 52 other nations of the world have accepted the thesis, and in the recent political campaigns both candidates accepted it.

I may say, as of concern to those who have spoken in regard to the pending bill, that if its consideration is to hinge upon arguments not germane to it, the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee can participate in discussions on almost any subject which has been mentioned here though they are not germane to the pending legislation. If the discussion is to relate to the war record of America, I should not be opposed to starting with 1939, for example. Much constructive defense work was done before 1939. But, Mr. President, that is not my purpose or desire.

Yesterday I made a plea for staying with the bill, not running off or assuming that only those who take one stand with regard to the bill are patriotic and are supporting our fighting men abroad, and that only those who are taking one stand or viewpoint with regard to the bill have studied the questions involved. The members of the Military Affairs Committee had only patriotic ideals and aims in connection with the work before them; but there was not unity in the committee at the beginning with regard to the philosophy of the bill. The House bill has been given credit by Senator after Senator as being the bill which the President desires. Since some have made the plea that we should all stand by our Commander in Chief, I inquire, Just how strongly did the administration stand by the bill which came to the Senate?

I shall read only 1 statement. I might read a half dozen or 8 or 10, but I turn to a statement made by the Acting Secretary of the Navy because I opened the report at that place. Every department which sent us a report in regard to the May bill, with the exception of that headed by General Hershey, asked for amendment to that bill. Included in that were the War Mobilization Office, the Department of War, and the Department of Navy. The Selective Service Chief, even before he had a chance to give his name to the reporter, was asked in no uncertain terms to state what he was going to testify about. The chairman said, "General Hershey, you are the only one of the administrative group who has handed in a report that did not ask for an amendment to the May bill. Are you opposed to the amendment or do you stand with your colleagues?" He said, "I can explain that." I said, "I do not want an explanation. I want you to answer my question." He said, "I stand shoulder to shoulder with my colleagues."

I am not now answering the Senator from Georgia; I am trying to show that there was not grand and glorious support for the bill which came to the Senate from the House, but for the bill if amended.

Here is what the Acting Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Bard, said—and it is typical:

> It is very important to note that during the past month or more the cognizance given to the critical manpower problem by directives of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and the hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee has resulted in the voluntary transfer of many workers from less essential to urgent war production.

That is to say what the Senator from Georgia has just told us that there had been, just as long as there was consciousness of the need, a rushing back to munitions plants.

> This movement was not wholly occasioned by fear of compulsion, but also by a conviction stimulated by these actions that their services were critically needed in the production of war materials. The failure of the Congress to take positive action may well be construed by these new war workers, as well as many others employed in war production, that there is no emergency and no critical labor need.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should prefer not to yield. Yesterday when the Senator from Maine was speaking I wanted him to yield so that I might ask him a question. I wanted to ask him as a father if he had been square to his Government and square to the people of the United States when he read a letter from his son and if he had informed his son of the facts in regard to the nurse situation in our country. Now, Mr. President, I am going to press on.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah declines to yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I will let the Senator from Maine speak in his own time.

I think, Mr. President, when we are dealing with a complex measure that the worst kind of argument which can be brought forward is one which casts aspersions upon what is going on or brings in questions which are not germane. The nurse bill will be here soon enough. It will be here after hearings, and we will know what the program is with reference to it, as we have known the program with respect to the pending bill. It will come before the Senate, if it is referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, exactly in the same way as the pending bill has come, with nothing to hide, and everything in the open. The Senate Military Affairs Committee will scrutinize the bill and will ask questions, Mr. President, because we know very well what is taking place in regard to the nurse situation in our country on the part of certain governmental officials.

I continue to read from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Bard:

> As a result, the exodus to more attractive and more secure less-essential production may be resumed and intensified.
>
> The Navy Department believes the provisions contained in H. R. 1752, if amended—

That was the injunction the Senate Military Affairs Committee received; that was the injunction on which the committee proceeded; that was the injunction which, after study and after hearing, changed men's minds and convictions about what should be done—

> if amended to eliminate duplication of administrative responsibility—

When duplication of administrative responsibility in government is provided in a law there ensues confusion in government and the worst way on earth to carry on war is to legislate more confusion and more chaos. The Senate Military Affairs Committee assumed the minute it read that statement that it had a real responsibility, and it has tried to meet that responsibility—

> to eliminate duplication of administrative responsibility and to assure the utilization of existing facilities for meeting our civilian manpower needs, will materially help to solve this Nation's manpower problem, including the vital problem of labor turn-over, and, accordingly, earnestly recommends the immediate enactment of this bill. Informal advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of the proposed legislation, so amended—

"So amended." Even the Budget Bureau did not give it approval without amendment—

> so amended would be in accordance with the program of the President.

Mr. President, I think I need not say more about that but since the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is present—and I am very glad he is—I shall refer to another subject. Sometimes the Senator from Virginia and I see eye to eye and work to a given end. I do not know for sure, without study, whether the Government of the United States is the greatest hoarder of labor or not. I accept the statement as given this morning by the Senator from Virginia. But the Senate Military Affairs Committee is trying to do something about it. Testimony taken by what is called the Mead Committee in regard to one Government plant in Virginia was sufficient to cause us to be cautious and to induce us to ask questions. We asked questions and we were cautious and we realized that if the Government is doing that sort of thing, if it is neglecting one plant and another plant and is hoarding labor, as has been charged, we ought in this bill to attempt to do something about it and we did attempt to do something about it.

In the discussion yesterday of another proposed substitute I pointed out that

a certain provision in the committee bill was entirely left out of the substitute, and yet that substitute got the votes of many of the very Senators who have been praised here today for voting as they did on the substitute. I will read the provision, Mr. President, because it ought to be in the RECORD. Every Senator has a copy. I read from page 14 of the bill:

SEC. 3. (a) The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall, subject to the direction of the President—

There is where we put unity into the administration of this proposed law, and we put the responsibility where it belongs, not in the local draft boards, of which there are many more than a thousand throughout the country. Neither the Senator from Georgia nor any other Senator wants to add to the local draft boards the duty of policing. They are not equipped for it, and yet that is the only way under the May bill by which the provisions of that bill can be carried out. It would simply be bad government, bad administration, and if Senators will think the thing through, they will discover that the Committee on Military Affairs discovered it and realized it. I am reading from page 14 of the committee amendment:

The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall, subject to the direction of the President, provide for coordinating the activities of all departments and agencies of the Government responsible for production, procurement, or manpower in such manner as to carry out most effectively the purposes declared in the first section of this act. The Director shall provide, among other things, that manpower requirements and the availability of manpower shall be given due consideration in determining where production schedules shall be increased or decreased and where contracts shall be awarded, terminated, or permitted to expire, and that notice shall be given to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission at the earliest practicable time of all changes or anticipated changes in war-production schedules, all awards or anticipated awards of war contracts—

Mr. President, that was necessary. Let me call attention to what occurred within the last month in the most crowded city in the United States, a city into which more people could not possibly be put, a city where workers are traveling 50 or 60 miles to their employment. I do not refer to information which we got from any official source, but it is a condemnation of the way in which contracts are let. Those charged with the power to let contracts let to a given plant in this city, a contract which required 8,000 more laborers than were already employed there, when there was not a single place to put one of that 8,000, and when at the same time there was unemployment somewhere else.

Mr. President, to say that the bill has not constructively gone into the question sought to be settled, that it has not attempted to attack the question, that it cannot be constructively used, that it cannot contribute to the war effort, is utterly ridiculous.

After study, a plant designed to employ 15,000 people, was built in a town of 2,000 inhabitants, with only one road leading into the town. Those in charge forgot that the 15,000 people had to have houses, that sewerage, waterworks, and other facilities must be provided for the people and for the plant. Those who erected the plant wondered why it did not work. The building and making of material means planning, not merely the letting of a contract.

Speaking of contracts, one member of the committee suggested that probably if the Government took over Washington hotels and made them places for housing the WAC's and the WAVES, and if the traveling salesmen, who now have all the rooms, were removed from Washington, perhaps the contracts would be let in a more sensible way, and one contractor would not be given a contract which he could not possibly fulfill. Those are small matters, Mr. President, but the bill provides that the man who is responsible for the industrial coordination of our war effort shall be informed and shall be kept informed about letting contracts.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It would be unfair to yield after I have refused to yield to others. I shall be through in a moment. I desire to conclude, and to make the point the Senator from Virginia gave me the opportunity to make.

I read further from the committee amendment to the bill:

and all terminations or anticipated terminations of war contracts, which are likely to result in any substantial increase or decrease of the manpower requirements of any employer or any area

This is the part which I think the Senator from Virginia should hear:

All departments—

All departments, Mr. President—

and agencies—

And that means all agencies—

of the Government shall comply with orders and regulations issued by the Director under the authority of this section.

A ceiling can be put on a Government plant under this arrangement, just as one can be put on any other plant, if it is discovered that the Government is erring. Everything that can be done to private industry in the way of avoiding the employment of excess labor can be done in a Government plant; so the evil of which the Senator from Virginia speaks can be corrected under the bill as reported by the committee, if it is properly administered.

Can that be done under the May bill? Study it, and discover whether it can be. That has been said to be the greatest evil in all the manpower-shortage situation, and the bill we are urged to pass, instead of the one which the committee reported, forgot all about correcting that evil.

Mr. President, was there thought, was there study, was there anything but hearings and a desire to press on when this bill was voted on by the committee and ordered reported to the Senate? Did not 25 Members of the House of Representatives who voted in favor of the May bill send a message to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs stating that the bill passed by the House was inadequate? I shall not quote them, but the letter is available.

Mr. President, we had more than one injunction. We had an injunction from the departments which were to be affected, and which were to administer the act. We had an injunction from the War Department, the Navy Department, the Manpower Commission, and the Selective Service, and I could go on down through the whole series. The committee were not able to accept the bill which the Senator from Georgia wants the Senate to pass instead of the bill as reported.

Mr. President, we had to organize the industry of the United States and to give it adequate facilities for enforcing the remarkable declaration of war which we have heard read, about which I knew, and with the writing of which I had something to do. It was not necessary to tell me that we had pledged all the resources of America to carry on the war. I knew about it, just as other Senators knew about it. But what in the wide world is the good of pledging all resources of the country if there is set up an inadequate medium for having those resources contribute to curing the very ills which are incident to the present situation?

Mr. President, Senators should not fail to realize the study, the concern, almost the zeal with which the committee worked. There was not a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs who did not day after day sit and work and discuss and try his very best to ascertain the governmental needs. We became converted to the belief that our method of approach was the one which would solve the problem. We accepted the thesis of the Government and its responsible officials that that which had been sent to us was inadequate, wholly inadequate, unless it were amended. I wish to say further that we greatly amended it, and properly. We did not change the philosophy of the bill, to be sure, but we did amend so as to make it a workable measure.

Mr. President, I apologize to the Members of the Senate to whom I failed to yield. It is not often I do not yield as often as requested; but it is my hope that we may conclude the debate on the bill and get to a vote on it. I am sure that we have gone over practically every proposition connected with it, that we have advanced arguments to support all we have done, and I am sure that every Senator from day to day has heard the arguments. I trust we may have a vote.

Mr. O'DANIEL obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am sure it is the universal desire of the Members of the Senate, regardless of their attitude on the bill or any amendment to it, that a vote be had on the bill. Senators are coming to me constantly and asking, "When are we going to vote? When can we finish this bill?" I expressed the hope yesterday that we might dispose of it today. We

have repeated today what we did yesterday. Nearly 3 hours have been spent in discussing matters which have no connection with the bill. I will say that I do not think any amount of debate here now is going to have any effect on the final result, on what the Senate does with respect to the proposed legislation. I do not understand that any amendment to the substitute reported by the committee is now pending. If we can obtain a vote on the substitute and on the bill I shall not seek to limit debate, but if there are to be any further amendments offered and any further debate to be had, I shall attempt to secure a limitation of debate in the hope that we may draw consideration of this bill to a conclusion as soon as possible.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the majority leader that the Chair recognized the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] and the Senator from Texas yielded to the Senator from Kentucky. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. If there is going to be any further discussion I wish to propose a unanimous-consent request for limitation of debate. Therefore, if the Senator from Texas will yield to me——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of this bill no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 20 minutes on the bill or on any amendment which may be offered or pending thereto.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further——

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that during the further consideration of this bill no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 30 minutes on the bill or on any amendment thereto. That would give any Senator an hour, if he desired it, to discuss the measure and any amendment offered or pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. As the Senator who is in charge of the bill since it came to the Senate, I should like to make a brief statement. If another measure is to be offered as a substitute for the bill, as is our understanding, I cannot, Mr. President, consent to any unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate, if it means that the Senator who is in charge of the bill will be estopped from answering questions concerning it and from correcting Senators who make misstatements about the bill. I am through speaking about the bill. I am ready to vote on it now, and I should like to have the debate on it concluded now, but the chairman of a committee owes an obligation to his committee when he is in charge of a bill, and I think it is proper that the Senator who owes that obligation should be given a chance to deal with situations as they arise. It would not be fair to the Senator in charge of the bill if he were limited to 20 or 30 minutes, or could speak only once, if situations should arise which made it necessary for him to reply to a statement or correct misstatements. In such event I should be obliged to remain in my seat and take the consequences.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to shut off the chairman of the committee. It seems inconceivable, though, that any amendment can be offered which the Senator from Utah, with his great ability and erudition, cannot explain in 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I can explain it to my satisfaction in 2 minutes; but I think our leader, out of fairness to the Senate and to the committee, should make some provision in his unanimous-consent request so I may be able to answer questions without it being called a speech.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, any agreement limiting debate must be applied to all Senators alike, and we can make no exception. Therefore, I withdraw the request for limitation of debate. I wish to say, however, that if the Senate does not dispose of this proposed legislation at least by tomorrow I shall attempt to secure a session on Saturday in order that it may be disposed of this week.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am ready to vote on the bill immediately. I do not like to have anyone suggest that we are trying to delay, when, as a matter of fact, we have endeavored to force a vote on the measure. I am ready to vote now, Mr. President; but I am not ready to vote if my hands are to be tied when something may be attempted to be done which should not be done, and which, in fairness to the bill, I should endeavor to combat, or in connection with which I should make a statement or explanation or correct a misstatement. If that is unfair, if it has never been done in the history of the Senate, it is time to work out the kind of unanimous-consent agreement which will not make a Senator completely dumb, in the sense of not being able to make a noise. There are two ways in which to interpret the word "dumb," Mr. President. It is the attempt to make dumb, in the sense of not being able to make a noise, that I object to. I object to being placed in the position of not being able to carry out the command of the committee. I think I can make such a unanimous-consent request, Mr. President, and I think it could be acceptable and that it would work and would result in being fair to the Senator in charge of the bill. If the majority leader would like me to offer such a request, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have made my effort, and it has been objected to, and for the time being I have no further effort to make toward securing a limitation of debate.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I can save my friend the Senator from Kentucky some trouble in trying to obtain unanimous consent to limit debate by announcing that I shall object to any such request. I will tell the Senate how such limitations work. Yesterday, we agreed to a limitation of debate in that no Senator should speak more than once nor longer than 20 minutes. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] raised a controversy over a quotation from the Bible, and I found it necessary, at least I thought it was necessary, to explain that Lazarus was dead, because I had insisted that he was dead. I had to take my time in my one opportunity to speak, to undertake to explain to the Senate that Lazarus was really dead. After that I was estopped from speaking again.

All Senators know that I want to defeat this bill if I can, because I think, if the bill is defeated, a service will be rendered to the country, and in undertaking to defeat it I do not want to sacrifice any of my rights. I want to have the opportunity, if a Senator makes a statement to which I think exception should be taken, to answer it. I do not wish to be foreclosed.

Mr. President, I have not missed a single session which the committee held on this bill. I do not know how long or how much time the committee spent on it. The chairman of the committee knows exactly. But it seems to me the committee has dealt with the bill for a month or 5 or 6 weeks. I have not missed a single session of the Senate during the discussion of the bill. I am not in such a hurry now, after having spent all this time in trying to defeat this bill, which I say is not worth anything and ought not to be passed. I am ready to vote now. I can vote against it now just as well as at any other time. If Senators have decided they have talked enough about the bill and want to vote on it, I am ready to vote. I have no objection to the majority leader trying to obtain unanimous consent to limiting debate, but while I am present unanimous consent will not be obtained.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am very anxious for the immediate consideration of and prompt action on the bill. It is now 3:30 and I have been endeavoring since 12:30 to obtain the floor in order to try to have considered and disposed of two amendments which I have previously announced by intention to propose. However, I think Senators should have ample time to discuss every phase of this important bill.

The subject before the Senate is indeed a complex and very confusing one, and I want to make very clear, to the best of my ability, my position with respect to the problem.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make an announcement which I am sure will be received with approval and happiness by all Members of the Senate?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to advise the Senate that a dispatch from Paris just handed to me announces that the

American First Army crossed the Rhine to the east bank last night. [Applause.] I am sure we are all happy to know of that.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, that is very encouraging news, and we are all glad to hear it.

Mr. President, we are asked here to enact compulsory legislation of a kind which, I understand, has never before been enacted in the history of this Nation, legislation which would force civilians to work for other civilians who accept and make profits from their labors, and to work wherever they are told, at whatever work they are told to do, for whatever money they are told they shall receive. I consider that very dangerous and wholly unnecessary legislation.

I am opposed to that kind of legislation, Mr. President, unless it is absolutely necessary, unless there is something sufficiently important in the affairs of our Nation to justify it. I do not believe that we have yet reached that point. I believe that other legislation should be enacted removing restrictions on labor and industry, which would increase production more than would the pending legislation, which would impose further restrictions. I have long ago introduced such legislation, but I realize the difficulty in getting that kind of legislation enacted.

So we come to the consideration of the measure before the Senate. It is my understanding of the Constitution of the United States that the President is the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, and as such has the exclusive responsibility for the conduct of this war solely on his shoulders. It is not on the shoulders of any other individual.

With that understanding, and with the further knowledge that the Congress of the United States in declaring war not only authorized but directed the President and Commander in Chief to use all the resources of our Nation. I think we should provide him with whatever resources he says are needed in order properly to prosecute the war. Here we have a situation in which the Commander in Chief, who has the sole responsibility for the conduct of this war, has asked Congress to enact legislation embodying principles similar to those of the May bill. I yield to his judgment. I yield to his judgment, even though I think he is entirely wrong, because it is his responsibility to conduct this war. It is not the responsibility of any other individual except the Commander in Chief. That is a responsibility which belongs exclusively to the Commander in Chief. Therefore, while I am opposed to this kind of legislation, under those circumstances, and with my avowed determination to support our Commander in Chief in every war measure, whether I believe he is right or wrong, I expect to continue to follow that policy and vote for this bill, the May bill, or any bill similar to the May bill, or which closely resembles or includes the principles of the May bill. That is what he has requested. I am ready to vote for any such measure, for the sole reason that it has been requested by the Commander in Chief, who says that it is absolutely necessary that he have such legislation in order properly to prosecute the war.

I refer to the statement made yesterday on the floor of the Senate, at the request of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] by the majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] who stated that the President, in his annual message a year ago, asked for universal service legislation, and in his message to this Congress in January repeated and emphasized that recommendation. The majority leader went further and brought this matter up to date by reading a message which was sent by our Commander in Chief while he was engaged in the conference at Yalta, where he was surrounded by the Chiefs of Staff of all our allies, and was in a position to know more about the urgent needs of our armed forces for the prosecution of this war than he could have known here at home.

Mr. President, under the conditions existing in Yalta our Commander in Chief considered this matter to be of such grave importance that he took time to send an urgent message to our majority leader, as follows:

> I hope that legislation embracing the principle of the May bill can be speedily enacted. It will assure the armed forces they can rely on the flow of the necessary supplies and greatly contribute to the success of our arms.

Those are the words of our Commander in Chief, who has charge of the prosecution of this war, and I pay more attention to them than I pay to statements made by others who do not hold the office of Commander in Chief.

Mr. President, it is well known that I have opposed the President of the United States on some domestic issues, and I expect to continue to use my own judgment in deciding all matters of a purely domestic nature. But let me say that when it comes to matters dealing with the vital war issue, in which the lives of our boys are at stake, I intend to follow what I consider to be the policy of this Government as laid down in the Constitution of the United States, and recognize the fact that one man, our Commander in Chief, is responsible for the conduct of this war. Whether he is right or wrong, his wishes should be respected when he asks for any of our resources which he says are vitally necessary in the conduct of the war.

Mr. President, I wish to hasten the consideration of this bill. I now propose two amendments which I have previously announced I intended to propose. The two amendments are now printed and lying on the desks of Senators. I offer one of the amendments, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the committee amendment it is proposed to insert the following:

> SEC. —. That section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 is amended to read as follows:
>
> "SEC. 7. Every employer shall pay to any of his employees who are engaged in commerce, or in the production of goods directly or indirectly for commerce, compensation at the same rate for all hours worked by such employee during any pay period."
>
> SEC. 2. Until the termination of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, (a) no provision of Federal or State law which limits or restricts hours of employment shall be applicable with respect to employees of any contractor who are engaged in the performance of work directly or indirectly necessary for the fulfillment of any contract between such contractor and the United States, and (b) no provision in any contract heretofore or hereafter made with the United States restricting or limiting the hours of employment of employees employed under or in connection with such contract, and no penalty or forfeiture for violation of any such provision, shall be enforceable by any officer or agency of the United States.
>
> SEC. 3. The act entitled "An act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1936, is amended by adding at the end of the first section thereof the following new paragraph:
>
> "(f) When the wage rates for regular hours of employment have been determined for the purposes of this act, the same hourly wage rates shall apply with respect to all hours worked during any day or workweek or other work period in employment with respect to which wages are determined under this section."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am taking the Senator at his word when he says that he would like to expedite consideration of the bill. I hope we can vote on the amendment at once, and that it will be rejected.

This amendment is in reality an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act. It should not be attached to a military bill. It has had no consideration by the Committee on Education and Labor. It would overcome completely practically all the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. It would not be fair to legislate on such an important question by an amendment to a military bill.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have previously explained the effect of the amendment, if it were adopted and if the bill as thus amended were enacted. I have explained the effect it would have in increasing the production of vitally needed war materials.

I shall not again take the time of the Senate to explain those benefits. I assure the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that I am sincere in desiring to hasten the conclusion of consideration of the pending bill. Therefore, I ask that we vote on the amendment without further discussion.

I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Would one effect of the Senator's amendment be to abolish differences in overtime rates of pay, as compared with standard wages?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; the effect would not be to reduce wages. The adoption of the amendment would result in having all employees receive no less per hour than the average of the base rate, and the overtime they are now receiving. There would be no reduction of wages.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I send to the desk another amendment, which I now offer. I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the committee amendment it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. —. That the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 be amended as follows: At the end of the act, insert the following: "That during the wars in which the United States is engaged no employer shall enter into any contract or arrangement, or enforce or carry out the provisions of any contract or arrangement, which provides that with respect to employees engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods directly or indirectly for such commerce, or engaged in performing work under any contract with the United States, there shall be any discrimination against any person because he is or is not a member of a labor organization. No employer who violates the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall, for a period of 2 years after such violation occurs, be eligible to enter into any contract with the United States; and no officer or agency of the United States shall enter into a contract with any such employer during such 2-year period. The Secretary of Labor shall keep the various contracting officers and agencies of the United States informed as to the names of employers who are ineligible by reason of this section to enter into contracts with the United States."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in an attempt to economize time, I shall ask the Senator from Texas to yield to me. Of course, it is perhaps rude to make such a request before he discusses the amendment, but I desire to speak against it.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I simply wish to request a vote on my amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should like to say that I think the amendment should be rejected. It is out of harmony with the spirit of the bill, and it would cause utter confusion throughout the entire country, inasmuch as it would interfere with hundreds and hundreds of contracts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Texas to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, for which I request immediate consideration.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, before the amendment is read, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. BALL. I yield to the Senator from Maine for a moment.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to clear the record as to my friend the Senator from Utah, inasmuch as I was entirely unconscious of the fact that yesterday he requested me to yield. I am somewhat reassured by the fact that there is no record by either the clerks or the official reporters of the Senator's rising. I certainly would have yielded, as there is no Member of the Senate for whom I have greater respect.

The Senator asked whether I had informed my son of the conditions here. I had relied on the several millions of dollars which we have appropriated for our men overseas, and I was assured by the stipulation in the appropriations that they would be fairly and fully informed. My son was dependent on the Stars and Stripes. I share with him the concern about the maladministration of many of our affairs. I think we could well have a change.

But with the vast respect I have for the intellectual integrity of the Senator from Utah, I have been unable to understand how one could reconcile the committee substitute with the request of the President for the principles of the May bill. If the Senator from Utah finds it possible to reconcile them, I shall feel that it indicates my own mental limitations, rather than his. I wish to have the RECORD, at least, clear on that score.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I apologize for any hasty remark I made. I would not offend the Senator from Maine. But soldiers' letters on both sides of this question have been read. So the soldiers are just as divided as any others are. How else could it be? They are American boys, and they come from all kinds of homes. Sometimes the boys are only half informed about the real facts of the case; and that statement holds true for those on both sides of the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, after line 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

(d) Any employer who willfully violates any regulation or any order made by the Chairman under paragraph (b) of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof in the district court of the United States for the district in which such violation occurred, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 12 months or by a fine not to exceed $10,000, or both.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield to the Senator from Utah for a question.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Did I correctly understand the clerk to read the word "willfully" after the word "who", in the first line of the amendment?

Mr. BALL. Yes. That is the only change from the printed amendment which lies on the desks of Senators.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BALL. Is the Senator going to take very much time?

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator will yield to me, I will promise not to trespass upon his time. I do not want to take any of his time if he does not desire to yield any of it.

Mr. BALL. I wish to proceed with consideration of the amendment and the bill.

Mr. CHANDLER. So do all other Senators. But the Senator will not proceed very far, that way.

The Senator from Maine just made a statement. While we are on that subject, I hope the Senator will give me an opportunity to make a point. The Senator asked whether the bill for which the President asked and the May-Bailey bill are not total strangers to each other. As one member of the committee, I wish to go on record as saying that I think they are.

I hope I have not taken too much of the Senator's time.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the pending amendment is an attempt to reinsert in the committee substitute a strong penalty provision. The other day the Senate adopted the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] striking out paragraph (5) of the Second War Powers Act as applied to this bill. That paragraph provided for the imposition of a penalty; it would have made a violation of any order or regulation issued a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment for not more than a year, or by a fine of not more than $10,000, or both.

I think one reason why many Senators voted to strike out the penalty was the intricate way in which it was to be applied and the considerable doubt regarding the violations for which the penalty would be imposed.

The amendment I have offered would apply only to violations of orders and regulations issued by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission under paragraph (b) of section 4 on page 15. I will read that paragraph:

(b) To the extent necessary to carry out the purposes and means declared in the first section of this act and also for the purpose of keeping activities and places of employment essential to the war effort in productive operation, the Chairman is authorized and directed, by regulation (1) to prescribe employment ceilings in designated areas, activities, or places of employment fixing the maximum number of workers, by age, sex, or occupational qualifications, who may be there employed and prohibiting the employment of workers beyond such maximum number, and (2) to prohibit or regulate the hiring, rehiring, solicitation, or recruitment of new workers by employers. No employer shall hire or retain in his employ any individual in violation of such regulations.

Mr. President, I believe the committee substitute, insofar as it strengthens and makes effective the controls over the minority of 5 or 6 percent of employers or employees who are not now cooperating under the system worked out by the war agencies and the War Manpower Commission to channel available manpower where it is most needed in the war effort, is the best answer to the problem of assuring for our armed forces the

greatest production of which we are capable.

I think the committee substitute as it now stands is weak, because the only compulsion provided under it is the very indirect penalty provided in section 8, whereby if the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission certifies to the Treasury that an employer has employed individuals in violation of regulations, the salaries or wages paid those employees shall not be deductible from his income taxes. I do not believe that the provision would reach effectively the contractors who have been offenders in hoarding labor, namely, those operating on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis. They will have had their pay rolls approved, and will have received compensation from the Government. It would be difficult for the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to have those payments refunded if there should be a violation of the law by the employer.

Mr. President, in order to make the law effective, it seems to me that we should give the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission authority to strike directly at violators. I am convinced that such a penalty provision in the act would be effective. The penalty would apply only to violations of ceiling orders, violations of priority referrals, and violations by employers who hire discharged employees, or to employees who had quit and had not received a certificate of availability. It is those tools which I believe will solve the manpower problem if we wish to make the act effective.

Mr. President, on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, at first blush it might appear that the amendment is not in order. It is in order, because, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, it affects only one penalty provision of the bill, while the other penalties probably extend further. Since the committee has reported the bill with penalties, and since the Senate has voted to strike the penalties from the bill, it seems to me that it would be proper to say that I shall be glad to take the bill to conference and defend with my utmost ability any decision which the Senate may make in regard to the wisdom of including the penalty provision proposed by the Senator from Minnesota. I think that whichever way any Senator may vote on the amendment, his vote will be consistent with what has happened already with regard to the bill.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I believe that in conference it will be difficult to reach an agreement between conferees on the part of the House and conferees on the part of the Senate; but I urge adoption of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota. In the Senate Committee on Military Affairs it was difficult to reach an agreement between some of the supporters of the National Service Act, such as the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY]; but when the penalty provision was inserted those Senators agreed to the committee amendment and voted for it. I think that situation may serve as a possible basis for believing that an agreement will be reached between the conferees on the part of the House and the conferees on the part of the Senate if the bill goes to conference with the proposed amendment in it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to the committee amendment as amended. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Overton
Bailey	Hayden	Pepper
Ball	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hill	Reed
Barkley	Hoey	Revercomb
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Burton	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Bushfield	La Follette	Shipstead
Butler	McCarran	Smith
Byrd	McClellan	Stewart
Capehart	McFarland	Taft
Chandler	McKellar	Taylor
Chavez	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	Maybank	Tobey
Downey	Mead	Tunnell
Eastland	Millikin	Tydings
Ferguson	Mitchell	Vandenberg
George	Moore	Walsh
Gerry	Morse	Wherry
Green	Murdock	White
Guffey	Murray	Wiley
Gurney	Myers	Willis
Hart	O'Daniel	
Hatch	O'Mahoney	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to the committee amendment, as amended. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in regard to the proposed penalty clause. I believe that most of the employers of whom I know in the United States would not object to the penalty clause being included in the bill. I think they are all trying to do a fine job. I believe that so long as the words "willfully violates" are in the amendment it will be accepted with good grace by employers throughout the country. I shall vote for the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] to the committee amendment, as amended. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a delegate to the Inter-American Conference in Mexico, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is detained at a Government department on business pertaining to the State of Mississippi.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on official business as a delegate to the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] is detained on official business. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—40

Aiken	Hatch	Russell
Bailey	Hawkes	Saltonstall
Ball	Hickenlooper	Shipstead
Bankhead	Hill	Smith
Barkley	McClellan	Stewart
Brewster	Maybank	Taft
Burton	Myers	Taylor
Byrd	O'Daniel	Tobey
Donnell	Overton	Tydings
Eastland	Pepper	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Radcliffe	White
George	Reed	Wiley
Gurney	Revercomb	
Hart	Robertson	

NAYS—36

Briggs	Hoey	Mitchell
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Moore
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Capehart	Kilgore	Murdock
Chandler	La Follette	Murray
Chavez	McCarran	O'Mahoney
Cordon	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Gerry	McMahon	Tunnell
Green	Magnuson	Walsh
Guffey	Mead	Wherry
Hayden	Millikin	Willis

NOT VOTING—19

Andrews	Connally	Scrugham
Austin	Ellender	Thomas, Idaho
Bilbo	Fulbright	Wagner
Bridges	Glass	Wheeler
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Wilson
Buck	Langer	
Capper	Lucas	

So Mr. BALL's amendment to the amendment of the committee, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 23, line 5, after the date "December 31," it is proposed to strike out "1946" and to insert "1945."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I disagree entirely with those who say that the pending bill is a mild measure. In my opinion, it gives some of the most arbitrary power to prevent labor hoarding and to regulate employment that Congress has ever granted. The part of the bill granting that power, of course, is contained in section 4 (b), which gives the War Manpower Commission Chairman, in his individual discretion, power to prescribe employment ceilings in any form, to impose zero ceilings, and to close down any industry. The second part is even broader—to prohibit or regulate the hiring, rehiring, solicitation, or recruitment of new workers by employers.

Mr. President, that is an extremely arbitrary power and might be arbitrarily used.

The bill before the Senate is an experimental measure. To provide, as is provided at the end of the bill, that this power is to be granted until the end of 1946, seems to me wholly unnecessary. If Senators will look at the last section of the bill they will find that it provides that the act "shall cease to be effective upon termination of hostilities in the present war"—which means, of course, not the end of the German war, but end finally of the Japanese war—"as declared by the President or by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, or upon December 31, 1946, whichever is the earlier."

It seems very likely that the war with Germany may end in a fairly short period. Whether we shall need this requirement while only the war with Japan is proceeding no one can possibly tell. It seems to me that in all these emergency measures—and the more arbitrary the power given the more important it is—there should be a limitation of 1 year on the continuation of such power. By that time we can review the question as to whether we should or should not continue the power. We can tell then whether what we have done has worked successfully. We can tell whether the fears of those who are against the proposal are justified, and we can continue the power very easily by passage of a joint resolution. It seems to me obvious that at this period in the war, when we are so near the end, and when conditions may be completely different at the end of next year from what they are today, a power so arbitrary as is this power ought to be limited definitely in time, and that we can then take up the question of renewing it if we wish to do so.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the question is such a simple one that I think the Senate ought to act on it immediately. It will be my duty, of course, to stand by the December 31, 1946, date, because the bill was reported by the committee with that provision in it. I personally am so happy that the Senator from Ohio has pointed out that the bill is a strong bill, that I am almost willing to accept his amendment, in gratitude to him after what has been said against the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, let me make a suggestion to the Senator from Utah, and perhaps he will accept my proposal. We are now in the month of March. A period of 1 year would bring us to April 1, 1946. I wonder if the Senator from Utah is willing to accept the date April 1, 1946, and take it to conference as the date for the termination of this provision in lieu of December 31, 1946.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I wonder if the Senator from Ohio would not be willing to make the date June 30, 1946, inasmuch as we have been so in the habit of fixing the date of June 30 in other measures? I shall be happy to accept that date.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I am willing to trade with the Senator from Utah. I modify my amendment by making the date June 30, 1946.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope the Senator understands that though the amendment may be taken to conference, there is no likelihood that the bill will come back in anything like its present shape. The date will not be acceptable.

Mr. TAFT. I disagree with the Senator. I do not think the subject was given particular consideration, and I think the logic of the situation is such that in all likelihood there will be a shortening of the time.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, the Senator merely expresses a hope.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator that the subject was given careful consideration, and the committee inserted the date December 31, 1946, precisely because it believed that there ought to be a calendar limitation upon the power. The committee felt, as the Senator from Ohio has stated, that these are very great powers, very arbitrary powers perhaps, as the Senator has said, and that they should be terminated by a specific calendar date. When the date December 31, 1946, was chosen, it was chosen in the belief that that was a fairly reasonable time, but, like the Senator from Utah, I have no objection at all to making the date June 30, 1946.

Mr. TAFT. I may point out that while a power such as that relating to price control is probably going to be necessary in the intervening post-war period, a power of this kind, I think, can be ended the moment the emergency is over.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That was the belief of the committee.

Mr. TAFT. I modify my amendment by making the date June 30, 1946.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, as modified to the committee amendment, is agreed to.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, the problem involved in the subject before the Senate is not one which is easy for any man to solve in a manner satisfactory to himself. I agree with the statements which have been made in that respect on both sides of the aisle. The distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] the other day in his very eloquent speech stated that he had debated this question with himself for many days. I have done the same thing. I shall not have any feeling against, or any quarrel with, anyone who votes differently on this subject from the way I do, because I am firmly convinced, from my knowledge of the Members of this body, that there is not a single Senator who is not patriotic and sincere and intently interested in doing what we should do, as the representatives of the people, to back up the boys on the firing line. I have no question about that. I do not think any of us have a monopoly on patriotism or a monopoly on sincerity in connection with the great issue which is before the Senate today.

There is no Member of the Senate for whom I have a more wholesome respect than the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and because of my respect for his patriotism and ability and sincerity, I have argued this question with myself and brought into it every experience I have had in my business life and in my dealings with men. I cannot bring myself to believe that the boys on the firing line want us to go further in regimentation of the people back home than is necessary in order to produce the results which are required and to put the war materials in their hands on time.

I am not unmindful of the men who are conducting the Government agencies, and the testimony they have given in connection with this matter. I have a very deep respect for practically all of them. I have a very wholesome respect for General Marshall. I have been touched by this war so that I do not think anyone in this Chamber, will, when I talk about voluntary cooperation, ever dare to suggest that I am unpatriotic. If I did not believe that voluntary cooperation is the only way to obtain maximum results I would vote for the May-Bailey bill.

I have spent 40 years in industry with men. I have had manpower which had been ordered by a superintendent who took the men by the back of the neck and told them what to do. Such a superintendent did not get the necessary result. I have removed such a superintendent, and put in his place a man who had the human understanding, and who talked to the men and showed them what was the objective which we were trying to accomplish, and the men have willingly taken up their tasks and produced the desired results.

The truth of the matter, my fellow Senators, is that what we want is production on time. I do not believe there is a Member of this body or any man in the United States, or any man in the armed forces, who cares how we get the production so long as we get it. But I do feel very sincerely that every man on the firing line would much prefer to know that the members of his family back home were having as much freedom in the choice of positions as it is possible to have and at the same time accomplish the objective which they know must be accomplished.

War is dirty business at the best, but we are in it clear up to our necks. Let

us not forget that the men on the other side are fighting to preserve the freedom of the individual. In due respect to them I believe that they want to see just as much freedom preserved to this country as is possible, and yet accomplish the job which must be done.

The Senator from Maryland the other day made a very impassioned and eloquent and logical speech. He almost swept me out of the bounds of voluntary cooperation, but I had to think it over. He said perhaps we have not done a great job. I do not want to quote the Senator incorrectly, but I believe he said we had not done a job of which we could brag. Perhaps he said we had not done a great job. Let us put it that way. Or perhaps the Senator will tell us just what he said.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I said we had done a very great job; but the question was, "Had we done a great enough job on time?"

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator from Maryland for correcting me.

I think we have done a great job, I think we have done a very wonderful job, I think we have done a job, which when we look back upon it, will be found to be such as to astound the world in that we could have done it to the extent we have done it and in the time we have done it. I feel very strongly that if it had not been for our great free enterprise system and its tools, we could not have accomplished what we have accomplished. Mind you, Mr. President, I do not say that capital alone is free enterprise. Capital and labor together make free enterprise. Capital is no good without labor. Labor is ineffective without capital and management. Capital and labor combined under the American voluntary system have done one of the greatest jobs that has ever been done in the history of the world.

Mr. President, in voting on this question today or tomorrow let us not overlook the fact that we can interrupt the cooperative relationship which has been established; we can unbalance it enough to delay the issue, or delay the forthcoming of the demanded goods on time, which may do a great deal more injury than would be offset by any benefits which might come from the full control of the individual. I still believe that our voluntary cooperation system, under the direction of the War Manpower Commission, augmented by the committee substitute with the penalty clause for willful violations which has just been adopted, will do a remarkable job.

Mr. President, I remind the Senate of what I said the other day. I talked with one of the most eminent men from Britain, whom I have known for many years. I laid this whole situation before him. He said to me, "Al, if you had done this a year ago it would have been fine, but I do not think you can go the whole distance which the May-Bailey bill would take you at the present time, because it took us 7 or 8 months to install our system, and that system is very similar."

I should like to leave this idea with Senators: I still believe in the patriotism of the American workman. I feel very definitely that if we make known the requirements from this great body, as well as from the Executive Mansion, if we make known the needs of our boys and the requirements on management and the workers, they will pull together, and with these added powers in the War Manpower Commission, we will surprise ourselves. I predict that 6 months from today every Senator who votes for the committee substitute will be very glad that he did so.

Robert E. Lee, whom I respect as much as any man this country ever produced, made a simple statement. He said:

> "Duty" is the sublimest word in the English language. No man can do more, and none should seek to do less than his duty.

Mr. President, I have been told at least 10 times in the past 2 days that the people are suspicious of the committee substitute because the National Association of Manufacturers, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the American Federation of Labor, and the C. I. O. have lain down together under one roof. What are we trying to do in the United States? Are we not trying to get them to live and work together under one roof and function in cooperation? I believe that that is the strongest argument in favor of the committee substitute. It has the support of all those organizations. When those great organizations in the manufacturing and industrial world, as well as the labor world, place their stamp of approval on this measure, it leaves a great responsibility on them to see that the law is a success and the results are accomplished; and I should like to leave this responsibility with them.

As I have stated, this has been a most difficult decision for me to make. There is nothing in the world that I would not do to perform my function and accept my full responsibility to support our men and women on the firing line. I know that there is nothing that other Senators would not do. I have given the question very careful consideration. I have talked with hundreds of manufacturers. I have just as many troubles as has any other Senator. To be perfectly frank, I will say that some of the very best friends I have in the United States are in the manufacturing business. Some of them have been calling me and urging me to vote for the May-Bailey bill. Others are equally strong against it. Therefore I must use my own judgment.

I should like to leave this thought with my colleagues: I cannot go along with the reasoning of some of my very distinguished friends in the Senate, who contend that, because the President of the United States, or the heads of all the Government agencies, including the great generals and admirals, whom I respect and admire very much, and who know a thousand times better than you or I how to direct this war; therefore they know better than you or I how to bring into existence the production of the war materials which are required.

The deficiencies in our war-production program are chargeable to all at home, and not to any one group. The incorrect impression created last year by representatives of the Government that the war would soon be over, the normal mistakes in allocations of orders under pressure, the canceling of orders last summer and fall, and the lack to some degree of patriotism and full appreciation of the vital necessity of the case on the part of some employers, some labor leaders, and possibly some workmen, all have contributed to lost production, which has created the apparent deficiency. We could not have been successful in this war and staved off the defeat of our allies had it not been for the fruit of the free enterprise system, which fruit is produced by both capital and labor.

Management and ownership do not need to take second place to any other group in American life in connection with the war effort. They work hard, day and night. I know whereof I speak. Neither does labor have to take second place to any other group, because it has done an outstanding and patriotic job, so far as we have made it possible for labor to do so. Labor will do an even better job in the production of materials for our fighting forces if we make the necessity of the situation clear. Let us know all the truth—that the war is not over until it is over, and that when it is over all America will help those who require help to adjust themselves to peacetime pursuits with the least possible hardship, under a system of freemen. We are all seeking the same objective, namely, the production of vitally needed war materials on time. No one in this great representative body has a monopoly on the way to accomplish this purpose, nor has anyone in the administration. Those charged with the conduct of the war or the administration of the Government do not necessarily know the only way or the best way to have the things we need produced on time.

Mr. President, we have a responsibility. We have no right to say that we will do something because some administrative officer wishes us to do it. There are 135,000,000 people in the United States, and there may be 1,000,000 lives involved in this question. Why should we trust any one man? We are required to exercise our judgment, regardless of anyone who tries to twist us this way or that way.

Those who have done a fine job can do a better job in the future if they understand the need, and we all cooperate to let them do the job as free men, permitting them to function, as nearly as possible, as freemen in time of war. Freedom of the individual is what our men are fighting for and losing their lives to preserve. No one can make me think that because they have been taken in under the selective-service law and ordered to do certain things, they wish those back home to be regulated one iota more than is necessary for thorough and full support to them in the field.

I shall have no doubts in my mind regarding any Senator who votes differently on this question than I intend to vote, because it is a debatable issue, on which honest and sincere men can properly differ. I shall vote for the substitute amendment of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, hoping that it will come out of conference retaining its important principles, because I believe that, taking

everything into consideration, it will produce the best results in the shortest possible time, and in accord with our American traditions.

Let us remember that even though the President of the United States and the heads of all the agencies of our Government and the leaders of our armed forces have asked us to do certain things and have suggested certain ways of doing them, the true question is how to get the material on time; because that is the only thing they are interested in and it is the only thing our boys on the other side are interested in, except to preserve here at home all the liberty and freedom that are possible.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I know how anxious the Senate is to dispose of this matter, perhaps this afternoon. I certainly shall not trespass upon the Senate's kindness by delaying the vote more than very briefly.

Naturally, one who is only a mild sinner in offending by taking action against the wishes of the President feels chagrined and almost unjustly accused by being included with those who are considered almost habitual criminals. At least, Mr. President, the Federal officials at Tallahassee, in my State, have established an institution which is not so much a prison as a house of correction, where it is possible to segregate those who are still so tender in their criminality that they should not be associated, perhaps to their detriment, with those who have been hardened by a long career of crime. [Laughter.]

So, Mr. President, by my good friend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] I have been included among those who are labeled offenders because in this particular matter they have not exactly conformed to the supposed recommendations of the President.

Mr. President, I appreciate, however, the promotion which I have received from my friend; because to be a general is a great honor, and, particularly, to have been included upon a staff which included such eminent colleagues as the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] and the able senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is a mark of distinction which I never expected to attain out of this war. Mr. President, I will say that I also derived much satisfaction therefrom, because I never got out of the rear rank in the short time I served in the last war, and I never ventured to believe that I should ever be entitled to the appellation of general, an honor which my distinguished friend has accorded me and some of my colleagues this afternoon.

My able friend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] yesterday afternoon, with deep sincerity, turned to me after the vote was had here upon the Bailey amendment. The Senator said, "How can you reconcile that vote with some of the speeches you used to make here about total mobilization?" I was very grateful that the Senator appeared to remember a seven-point program of preparation which I ventured to offer in the Senate on the 17th of June 1940, the second point of which was universal defense service so that every citizen might be best trained and placed for the country's defense.

I mean by that just what I say, namely, a universal service law enacted just as soon as the Congress can enact it, calling to the colors of their country the men of this Nation—young men, middle-aged men, and older men—every one of them to take his place where his Government may judge that he may best serve—in the Army, in a factory, on a highway, building ships, building forts, or whatever the Government of this blessed country may require.

Perhaps the Senator honored me by referring to a nine-point program which I had the temerity to suggest in the Senate on the 26th of March 1942, the second suggestion of which was as follows:

> My second suggestion, Mr. President, is universal manpower mobilization, so that every citizen, every man and woman, may be best trained and placed to win the war in the shortest possible time and with the least loss of lives and money.
>
> Mr. President, I think the time has come for us to decide—I am sure we shall have to decide it sooner or later—whether we mean total all-out mobilization of the strength and the resources of this country, or whether we do not; whether we are going to impose the burden of this war upon a few of our people, and let the rest be exempt; whether we are going to pick out a peculiar class and thrust the responsibility directly upon them, or whether, in the name of America's liberty, in furtherance of America's freedom, we as America's Congress are going to have the courage to challenge the whole American citizenry, men and women, boys and girls, to take their assigned places where they can serve best in the defense of their country, and gladly and enthusiastically perform their several duties.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I well remembered, of course, the remarks of the distinguished Senator. I could never forget the very fervid eloquence with which he espoused the cause of total mobilization. Of course, the Senator was the first protagonist of intervention in the war, and the Senator had a program to match his plan. I had always subscribed to those theories. But the Senator from Florida with his eloquence confirmed me in the faith that I had always held and still believe in—universal service in time of war. I have not changed my position.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator has been very kind in the tribute he has just paid.

I also said yesterday that I would vote for a universal service law. That is what the American Legion has advocated since the last war, namely, a total mobilization of property and a total mobilization of the citizenry, to further the war. I will match any Senator in the support of that kind of a program if it is offered here.

Mr. President, I also said yesterday afternoon that I had never understood why the May bill was confined to those from 18 to 45, if it is going to impose universal service. I still do not understand that, Mr. President. If it is to be made a punishable offense not to work when one is called upon to work in an essential industry, when one is not so employed, I do not understand why we should apply such a law to a man 45 years of age, but not to a man 46 years of age.

However, Mr. President, the question yesterday afternoon was not the application of a rule of universal service which would equally command Mr. Sewell Avery and John Smith, in overalls, out in our country somewhere, to enter their country's service—men and women, too, if necessary. The question on the Bailey amendment was whether we were to accept the principle of compulsion as applied—all of us know at whom the bill is primarily aimed. It is aimed at the man in overalls. That is substantially what it is.

I will say to my friend the Senator from Georgia that I must also say that a good many of our colleagues have been far readier to embrace an all-out program when labor was the work horse than they have been on other occasions when for example, other issues were involved.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure the Senator will absolve me from taking such a position as that, because when the first selective-service bill was pending I offered an amendment to authorize the Government to take over industry—not labor, but industry—in order to arm these men.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator is absolutely correct in that statement. However, when we think in terms of compulsion it is very easy to think of the worker who ought to be the work horse in the factory. We do not think of the white-collar man, the professionalman, the businessman, or the idle rich.

Imagine calling a man off his job or calling him out of his private car, or calling him from an executive position in an air-conditioned office, and telling him that he was amenable to the compulsion provided in the May bill. He would think it was a case of mistaken identity. He would think that the provision was applicable to the workers of the country, and not to persons in his class.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I had hoped sincerely that we could make the issue here one of choosing between the strongest possible bill with the greatest amount of compulsion in it or a bill which would definitely indicate to the people of the country that we were reasonably satisfied with the magnificent job which the workers of the United States have been doing during the past few tragic years.

We took paragraph 5 out of the penalty clause of the Second War Powers Act. Today we have put it back in at another place in the bill. Senators who voted against the penalty provision day before yesterday have voted for it today. They should understand the positive prohibition against employment of workers in certain endeavors as provided for in this measure. An employer may be absolutely put out of business and be prevented from going back into business. If

the Senate wishes to vote for that kind of a measure, it should give the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission authority over every person in the United States.

I want my friend from Florida, if he will, to give us a comparison between this country and any other country in the world. I repeat what I said the other day. If I thought this bill would put a single gun in the hands of any soldier which he otherwise would not receive, and shorten the war by a second, I should vote for it. But the cooperation which now exists between management and workers in the magnificent job which has been performed in this country is not only great but it is magnificent. It has never been duplicated in any other country in the history of man.

Mr. President, I wish Senators would draw the issue. Let us have the strongest bill, providing the maximum compulsion, or let us have one allowing the greatest amount of freedom to continue this great country's free enterprise and productive spirit.

I do not wish to trespass upon the Senator's time, but we are undertaking to depart from traditions which have taken a long time to build up in this country. I do not wish to predict what may happen to Senators who vote for such a bill, but they will live to regret it. They will not accomplish any good purpose, although some of them may think differently. But they will live to regret having voted for such a bill as this unless it is framed to apply to everyone in the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say to the Senator from Kentucky that the Senate cannot pass a bill strong enough for me. I believe in universal service. I have believed in it in the broadest sense of the word and have believed in it all my life. However, I go on the theory that if I cannot have a whole loaf of bread I will take as much of a loaf as I can get.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida further yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I fear that something weaker than the strongest bill will confuse the situation. If I felt as does my friend from Georgia, I should not work for this "clabber" bill. The Senator knows the difference between clabber and good old-fashioned sweet milk. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. The committee substitute is not strong enough for clabber.

Mr. CHANDLER. Very well. It confuses the situation. It would undertake to interrupt the relations between employers and employees. That relationship is better now than it has ever been before.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I wish to keep my promise to the Senate of brevity. I say to the junior Senator from Kentucky that I am not one of the Senators who changed their position relative to the penalty amendment. I voted for removing the reference to the penalty paragraph from the bill, and a moment ago I voted for restoring the Ball penalty to the bill.

Yesterday we voted on the Revercomb amendment to the committee amendment as modified. That amendment would have made it obligatory on any person who had been directed by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to take a job to take it. I raised the question of whether or not the sponsors of that amendment would be willing to afford some measure of protection to the worker in order to assure him a minimum wage or a fair degree of security, and the sponsors said they were not interested in that subject.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I think the Senator is overlooking one clause in the bill which would provide an adequate safeguard. It has been represented—or shall I say "misrepresented"—to the Senate that the operation of the bill——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have been speaking about the Revercomb substitute.

Mr. KILGORE. Very well. The measure which we are now discussing would be administered, it has been said, by a group of tyrannical fools who would tear up everything as they went along. That could be done with regard to any act. As one person ably said, "Give me the administrator and you can pass the law." There is one phrase in the pending bill which meets the objection of the Senator from Florida, namely, that ceilings shall be placed by age, sex, and skill. Therefore people may be assigned to meet needs in any particular area. Young men or old men may be selected according to age. Women may be selected according to whether they can do the particular work to which they may be assigned. We must pass the bill with the idea that it will be administered, as manpower laws have been administered in the past, by men of sense and experience.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida allow me further to trespass upon his time?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Suppose a man whom the Senator knows in Tallahassee ran a small newspaper and employed one man. Suppose, further, that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission took that man. Perhaps he should be taken. But he is a linotype operator, and it is impossible to find another man to take his place. When that man goes the employees of the newspaper owner go to zero; he does not have any left.

Under the second section of the bill——

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. Wait a moment. Under the second section of the bill, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission can take that man. It makes no difference what his age may be. Unless the operator of the plant can find another man to take his place, he will be out of business, but the operator will be unable to find another person, because, if the bill is passed, it will contain the words beginning in line 6, page 16, reading as follows: "to prohibit or regulate the hiring, rehiring, solicitation, or recruitment of new workers by employees."

Mr. President, I want every Senator to understand what he is asked to vote on. The language which I have quoted is in the bill. What does the Senator say about it?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia, but, Mr. President, I want my colleagues to know that some of my colleagues are particeps criminis to my not keeping my promise of brevity.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me say that we are not particeps, we are criminis, we are taking up the Senator's whole time, for which I apologize. But I must say, in all fairness, to the Senator from Kentucky that I believe he is misconstruing the matter, because there are some preliminary steps to taking the linotype operator. First, they would have to say that the paper was nonessential, and that would have to apply to all the newspapers in the area.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is talking about something they may not do; I am talking about something they may do.

Mr. KILGORE. No; I am not. Under this bill we must figure on plants on the basis of essentiality and nonessentiality.

Mr. CHANDLER. But, Mr. President, if my friend from Florida will yield——

Mr. KILGORE. Just a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. The Chair means I am the conduit of the argument.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct. [Laughter.]

Mr. KILGORE. Let us use a much easier illustration.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let the Senator select another one. Will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield, and apply the promise of brevity to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to be brief, but I wish to make this point: The Senator said the action to which he referred was based on some ruling of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. He has already made the ruling in the case of some newspapers, that information they sent out to Government agencies should not be sent, and therefore the men should be taken, because they could get the information somewhere else; and if he takes a notion to take all the papers—and he can take them all—he can put them out of business.

The proprietor of the paper says, "I know where a fellow lives whom I can get to work for me, but I cannot invite him, I cannot solicit him. I have to stay in the position the War Manpower Commission put me in under the authority of this act, and if I do not do so, I go to jail

for 12 months, or I am fined $10,000, or have both jail sentence and fine." I say the Commission can do that under the proposed act.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky that under the proposed act the Commission may do what he visualizes; they may abuse the power given them; but I wish to point out that the War Production Board has had the power to do that for the last 3 years. They could at any time have found that a paper was nonessential, they could have cut off the newsprint upon which the operation of the paper depended; but they have not abused the power. I have not felt that in the bill before us we were doing much more than applying to manpower the same rationing principle under which we have authorized other departments of the Government to exercise power over raw materials and commodities which were scarce and were needed for the war effort.

My justification for voting for that power comes from the fact that we have already done it, we have already granted the power, and we are not proposing to give it to another body in which I have not the same confidence I have in the War Production Board. I do not think it is anything new to close any business in the United States. Many small concerns in Ohio have been put out of business already by the War Production Board because commodities were short. The theory of the bill before us is that we shall apply to manpower the same principle of rationing that we have applied to commodities.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Ohio was so much interested that he offered an amendment a few days ago to take newspapers out of the operation of the proposed law.

Mr. TAFT. And I think they should be taken out; but I was defeated in that particular. I do think that power which has rested in the War Production Board has not been abused.

Mr. CHANDLER. It does not rest in the War Manpower Commission, and will not rest in the Commission until we vote by this bill to give it to them, and, if I recall correctly, the Senator from Ohio has complained frequently about the power that has been given. Now it is proposed that we give more power, and I shall not vote to give more power. I regret some I have already voted to give.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am grateful to those of the "unholy alliance" who have contributed to the discussion, and particularly because one of my fellow generals has seen fit to make his own particular invaluable contribution.

Mr. CHANDLER. If I may trespass on the time of the Senator for 1 more minute, I wish to ask the Senator always to remember that the Book says there is more rejoicing over the one who is lost and returns than over the other ninety and nine. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. I have often wondered, Mr. President, what would be the effect in the Senate if we were to have one of those good old-fashioned summer revivals we have down South, what effect real, genuine conversion, not mere immersion, but baptizing, would have upon the Senate.

Mr. President, let me say a further word. I rose to say that the amendment voted upon yesterday, to which my able friend from Georgia referred, made it the duty of the individual worker to go to the individual job to which he was assigned. Even the May bill did not put that requirement on him, for on page 5 of the May bill, as it appears in H. R. 1752, it is provided:

> It shall be the duty of the registrant to whom such an order is directed to comply therewith, provided the order gives him a seasonable choice of employers for whom to work.

Not even the May bill was as rigid and gave as arbitrary power to a gentleman who claims no infallibility, Mr. Paul McNutt, who is the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, to assign individual fellow citizens to jobs where he might wish to have them work, as I pointed out yesterday, regardless of the fact that that might be one of those substandard-wage jobs, of which there are hundreds of thousands, even today, in our lush economy.

Just this last word. While I opposed the amendment yesterday—and I would oppose it today—I favor the committee substitute, and I believe it is a good bill. I believe it will do good in supplying many manpower deficiencies, because it, in substance, gives the War Manpower Commission jurisdiction over every aspect of our economy, to shear away unnecessary labor, to go into plants and make surveys which will make the working conditions there more effective and efficient, and which will call into idleness, by compulsion, every man not found to be necessary in any other facility. It can take the people engaged in any nonessential work, by its own definition, and put them in the pool of availability. It will at least make them idle, and therefore available.

Mr. President, my able colleagues would say that it is not enough to take them out of nonessential industry and put them in a pool where they will be idle, but remember, if we take them from their nonessential work they cannot get jobs unless they are channeled to their new jobs through the Employment Service under the direction of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. So that if they should not take other war essential jobs when they are pulled out of a factory which has too many workers, they will have to stand idle, to be the victims of their fellow citizens.

We are asked, What can be done with them? All those who are between 18 and 45 can be pulled into the armed services by the law now on the statute books and put to work by Army or Navy command in any factory in America. But they will not be put into a factory at substandard wages, which some have not been so ready to raise as has the junior Senator from Florida. Nor, Mr. President, will they be put to work in substandard wage jobs. They will have the protection of the United States Government around them when they are assigned to work for another man. I think the present rule is that they will get both the civilian pay and the Army pay, but, leaving out civilian pay, they at least will be in the uniform of their country, they will get $50 a month, their wives will have allowances, their children will have allowances, and they will be entitled to veterans' benefits. If we are to draft men to work, let us put around them protection comparable to that. This bill does not do that. So, Mr. President, it is not that we do not want to advance the war effort. It is because we think, as many Senators have better said here on the floor, that the best way to advance the war effort is to require these indirect pressures and to leave a sphere in which there would be individual choice for the worker.

The bill, in my opinion, will do great good. I can say that I have heard it said in high sources that if this measure were passed and a power given to the War Manpower Commission really to declare certain industries nonessential, they might close up a great many things. They closed up the race tracks in my State and other States in the Union because they were not essential. I did not make any political protest about it, either. I said, "If you are going to do that, apply the principle fairly." Some of my people said, "It is strange to me that you close up the race tracks but you do not close up a lot of other things." I am not complaining about closing up the race tracks. I would complain, however, if the principle of compulsion were not applied fairly. That is the essential democracy of selective service. It did not simply draft the boys in overalls. It drafted the rich and the poor alike.

Mr. President, there was the farm amendment. I did not vote to defer the farm workers. There are many who conscientiously think that the farm workers should be deferred. But if I were to be critical of those who have the opinion that farm workers should be kept from going to the battle fronts to face the fury of the guns, I would say that if you live in a little town and your son works in a little factory they will take him and send him to war to go into the very mouths of the cannon, but if he lives on a farm, then under the law which some Senators who are here today no doubt have voted for, he is given immunity from going into the military service, because he is needed on the farm. One day you may see a boy walking along the street dragging an empty breeches' leg. He was a boy who lived in a town. And the sturdy fellow who lives on the farm will be the deferred man who worked on the farm.

So, Mr. President, I have not been critical of those who disagree with me about that matter. They thought in the long run it was better to keep boys who were essential to agriculture on the farm because it would further the war effort to produce food. And so there is room for an honest difference of opinion as to whether that is the better policy. But I am not quarreling with those who in the exercise of their better judgment chose to defer the farm boy and to send the city man to war. Mr. President, there is room for an honest difference of opinion about all these matters. There is room for an honest difference of opin-

ion about which of these measures is the better bill. I think all of us will discharge our duty when we follow the course we believe to be right.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I feel out the sense of the Senate in regard to this matter? Many Senators wish to know whether there is a possibility of voting tonight. If we stay here 30 minutes or an hour longer and complete the measure so that we might adjourn until Monday, I would be willing to do that. If there is no possibility of doing that I see no need of going any further today.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. BARKLEY. The verdict of the Senate is that we vote today.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee and other Senators who have participated in drafting the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, so that I may bring to their attention, for the purpose of the legislative record, a situation concerning a certain type of employment which has been brought to my notice. It affects a factory which is located in my home city and devoted exclusively to the production of dry-cell batteries for the armed forces. The memorandum furnished me says:

> In connection with the proposed manpower control bill designed to meet the shifting war production demands, we respectfully call to your attention a major point apparently missed, and which if not given the utmost consideration would, in our opinion, defeat in many instances the main intent of the bill by seriously handicapping especially the part-time employee.
>
> Consideration and protection should be given to a man-hour basis rather than the man-day proposed basis. As an example: At one of our dry-battery plants at Madison, Wis., we employ approximately 2,000, both male and female. They range from high-school children to elderly men and women. Many work 1 hour a day, some 4 hours, others 8, often they can spare but 1 day a week. We pay them as they leave each day. If we should be ceilinged on an individual on the man-day basis instead of the proper consideration to a man-hour effort, it would have disastrous effect on production of our war effort in the manufacture of dry batteries for communication (radio, telegraph, and telephone) owing to the many disadvantages encountered under this day basis resulting in elimination of most part-time employees who would no longer be allowed to willingly help.

Having made that statement, Mr. President, I should like, for the record, to ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether or not in his opinion, as the substitute of the committee is now framed, the War Manpower Commission would have authority to draw their regulations in such a manner that this part-time employment of an intermittent nature which has been made necessary because of the shortage of manpower in this particular area could be taken into consideration and covered and thus permitted to continue.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, there is no doubt in my mind that the bill is flexible enough to take care of such conditions. Furthermore, there is almost a mandate in the bill to look out for the part-time employees as the result of the amendment which was offered yesterday by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and adopted by the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am very glad to have the Senator's statement. That was my interpretation of it, but I wanted it on the record for the purpose of the legislative history of the measure.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to assure the Senate that I do not rise to make a speech at this late hour, but I do rise to seek some information from the chairman of the committee in regard to certain sections of the bill which, in my judgment, have not received the adequate consideration of this body which they should receive before the vote is taken. I refer specifically to section 5 on page 17. I want to point out that, in my judgment, section 5, like similar provisions in so many pieces of legislation, involves a very important principle of government. It involves a question of procedure and the realtionship between the three branches of the Government. It involves a question which I do not think we should ever lose sight of, namely, that we cannot separate substantive rights from procedural rights.

I wish to suggest to the Senate that there is growing up in this country a trend toward the development of administration of law by the executive branch of the Government, through administrative officers who, in my judgment, do not have their opinions and views sufficiently checked by other branches of government. I think it is a dangerous trend, even in emergency legislation; and although I should very much like to vote for the pending bill, I cannot vote for it in its present form unless the committee can give me some assurance that the arbitrary powers which it seems to me are possible of exercise under section 5 will be more properly checked than they are now checked under the language of the section as I read it.

As has been pointed out over and over again in this debate, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission will exercise great power—I think awful power, in the true dictionary sense of that term. I am perfectly willing to give him such power if it is necessary for the more effective prosecution on the home front of the war. However, I believe that we ought to pause and determine whether or not we should apply some very definite checks upon the power of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission under section 5. What does it provide? It provides that—

> The Chairman shall by regulation provide an opportunity for a hearing before an impartial administrative tribunal to any person who claims that any action taken with respect to him under this act, or any regulation or order thereunder—

What regulation or order? The regulations and orders devised by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission himself in carrying out the purpose of the act. In other words, it is proposed that the man whose regulations may be challenged by a citizen of this country as being unreasonable shall be given the power to set up his own tribunal to judge whether or not he, in fact, has been unreasonable in the exercise of his duties under the act.

Although I would much rather see in legislation of this type the power of review vested clearly in the judicial branch of government, I think the least we should do in this bill, if I correctly interpret that section, is to place the review power in the hands of an administrative agency such as the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. Certainly I think it is a very bad principle of government to continue in legislation to give the power to pass upon rules and regulations to a tribunal appointed by the Administrator himself, and coming under his jurisdiction, at least to the extent of appointment.

So I should like to ask, first, whether or not my interpretation of section 5 is correct; and second, if it is correct, if the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee would be willing to agree to an amendment whereby the procedure for passing judgment upon the reasonableness of the rules and regulations of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission would be transferred to some other agency. I suggest the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think the point raised by the Senator from Oregon is a proper point. I think the committee took into consideration the fact that while in the bill itself there is no provision for appeal to the courts, there is the regular provision for getting into the courts by the process of injunction. It was deemed that so far as this bill is concerned, citizens would be protected to that extent.

By the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] yesterday providing for the establishment of a tribunal to review such rules and regulations, the tribunal would be established under the direction of the War Manpower Commission.

At first blush it seems that the Commissioner would be setting up his own court to judge of his own acts, and that for that reason the point which the Senator makes is valid. However, in reading the bill as a whole, I think it will be found that the entire process is to be under the direction of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and that actually in practice there would be the type of check which the Senator seeks, so that one person within the War Mobilization Board or the Manpower Commission could not be completely and absolutely arbitrary, without a check, at least by his superior.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the Senator to say, then, that, taking the bill as a whole, if Mr. X should object to a rule or regulation issued by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, his first appeal would be to one of the so-called impartial administrative tribunals provided for in section 5; and if he did not like that decision, his next appeal would be to the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That statement is not accurate. The point is that everything done by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission would be under the direction of and within the power granted to the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. Reference to page 13 will probably bear out what I have said. The language on page 13 provides that the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission—

Shall perform the functions vested in him by this act under the direction and supervision of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

Then, on page 14, under section 3 (a), the language is:

The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall, subject to the direction of the President, provide—

And so forth. So, while it is in the realm of the administrator almost entirely, except for appeal to the courts for injunction, there are sufficient checks so that the committee feels that the bill is not an invitation to arbitrary action.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to be convinced. May I press the question further so that I can be convinced, if possible?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should like to say further that there is no objection on the part of the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee to the amendment which the Senator has in mind. Personally I think it would greatly improve the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. The theory behind the bill is the one so frequently used, under which an appeal tribunal is established within an agency to clarify administrative mistakes which may be made by local administrators, obviating ultimate appeal to the courts whenever possible. In other words, if the application of a rule to a particular individual has been made arbitrarily, there is an appeal tribunal within the agency to afford a hearing. If that appeal tribunal should not act properly, then the individual, of course, would have the right of appeal to the courts for injunction, both as to the rule and as to its application to him.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the Senator from West Virginia that as a result of my experience with some of the appeal tribunals or agencies, I have no illusions with regard to them; and I should like to prevent the repetition of such a mistake in this particular bill. I think it is very desirable that jurisdiction over appeals from orders of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission be denied any tribunal which he himself may appoint, and at least be placed in the hands of a tribunal appointed by some other agency, and to that extent responsible to that agency, rather than to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me so that I may ask the Senator from West Virginia a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia if I understood him correctly, and if his understanding is the same as mine. The language beginning in line 12, on page 17, is as follows:

Subject to such further administrative review as may be provided in regulations under this section, the determination made after such hearing shall be final.

Does that mean final from an administrative standpoint?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, there is necessarily an appeal to the courts, inasmuch as such appeal is not barred.

Mr. KILGORE. Necessarily there would be an appeal to the courts, because it is not specifically barred.

Mr. TAFT. In an injunction proceeding or in a criminal case one could still question before a court the validity of the regulation under the powers given in this bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say further in regard to the statements made by the Senator from Utah that if he is willing to accept my amendment I will press it. I wish to point out that under the language referred to on page 13, after all, the powers granted are those usually granted to an administrator under a specific act. We know how they work in practice. We know that in practice the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission would, by and large, call the shots under the proposed act. I believe we should protect the citizen who comes under the terms of a bill which gives to an individual the power which this bill would give to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, irrespective of who occupies the position. I intend no personal reference. The citizen should have protection from the arbitrary exercise of power, which I think is possible, and may develop under the terms of section 5 of the bill. I think it is very desirable that at least some check be placed on the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission by the adoption of an amendment providing that it shall be the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion who shall set up these tribunals to pass judgment upon the reasonableness of the acts of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. Although I do not have such an amendment in written form, I should like to press for its adoption.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, such an amendment is very easy to phrase, because it merely means a change in the wording of an amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan and adopted yesterday. It appears on page 17, following line 20.

I have no objection to the adoption of an amendment to that amendment, reading as follows:

The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall by regulation provide for and establish such administrative tribunals as may be necessary for the purpose of this section.

Mr. President, I imagine that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] will accept such an amendment to his amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I accept it. I think it strengthens the bill. Because of the experience of the Senator from Oregon, I think it is clear that the bill should be so changed.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the amendment should also provide for a corresponding change in line 7, so that the language will be consistent.

Mr. MORSE. I accept the suggested amendment to the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment was adopted?

Without objection, the vote by which the amendment was adopted is reconsidered; and, without objection, the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan is agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in line with the amendment just agreed to, I now offer the following amendment to the committee amendment:

On page 17, in line 7, strike out the word "Chairman", and insert "Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who is out of the city attending the funeral of the late Senator Moses, requesting me to offer two amendments which have been printed. In offering the amendments I am not endorsing them. I send the first amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the committee amendment it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. (a) Except as provided in subsection (c), the profits to be retained by any employer for whom services are rendered pursuant to a request of the Chairman under this act shall not, for the period during which such services are utilized, exceed an annual rate of 5 percent of the value of the assets of such employer.

(b) Any profits realized for any such period by such an employer in excess of the rate specified in subsection (a) and not in excess of an annual rate of 10 percent per annum of the value of the assets of such employer shall be distributed among the employees thereof.

(c) Any profits realized for any such period by such an employer in excess of an annual rate of 10 percent per annum of the value of the assets thereof, shall be divided equally between such employer and the employees thereof. Any profits allocated to employees under subsection (b) or this subsection shall be distributed among them in proportion to their respective rates of compensation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the next amendment which I offer on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and which likewise I do not endorse, provides for a capital tax. I believe it is clear that the amendment is out of order. Nevertheless I offer it, and I request that action on it be taken.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the amendment has been on the desks of Senators for several days and they have all read it, I ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, without being read at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. That suggestion is agreeable to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment proposed by Mr. AIKEN, on behalf of Mr. LANGER, to the committee amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the bill add the following new sections:

"SEC. —. (a) There shall be levied, collected, and paid for the calendar year 1945 and each calendar year thereafter a capital tax, computed as provided in subsection (c) of this section, upon the net capital of every individual, resident, or nonresident.

"(b) The tax provided for in this section shall apply to net capital as computed in accordance with the provisions of this act; but in the case of a nonresident individual not a citizen of the United States shall apply only to the net capital computed on capital located within the United States.

"(c) The tax referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall be as follows:

"There shall be levied, collected, and paid for each taxable year upon the net capital of every individual a capital tax as follows:

"If the net capital is:	The capital tax shall be:
"Not over $100,000	0
Over $100,000 but not over $200,000.	2 percent of excess over $100,000.
Over $200,000 but not over $300,000.	$2,000, plus 4 percent of excess over $200,000.
Over $300,000 but not over $400,000.	$6,000, plus 6 percent of excess over $300,000.
Over $400,000 but not over $500,000.	$12,000, plus 8 percent of excess over $400,000.
Over $500,000 but not over $600,000.	$20,000, plus 10 percent of excess over $500,000.
Over $600,000 but not over $700,000.	$30,000, plus 12 percent of excess over $600,000.
Over $700,000 but not over $800,000.	$42,000, plus 14 percent of excess over $700,000.
Over $800,000 but not over $900,000.	$56,000, plus 16 percent of excess over $800,000.
Over $900,000 but not over $1,000,000.	$72,000, plus 18 percent of excess over $900,000.
Over $1,000,000 but not over $1,500,000.	$90,000, plus 28 percent of excess over $1,000,000.
Over $1,500,000 but not over $2,000,000.	$140,000, plus 38 percent of excess over $1,500,000.
Over $2,000,000 but not over $2,500,000.	$184,000, plus 48 percent of excess over $2,000,000.
Over $2,500,000 but not over $3,000,000.	$424,000, plus 58 percent of excess over $2,500,000.
Over $3,000,000 but not over $3,500,000.	$714,000, plus 68 percent of excess over $3,000,000.
Over $3,500,000 but not over $4,000,000.	$1,054,000, plus 78 percent of excess over $3,500,000.
Over $4,000,000 but not over $4,500,000.	$1,444,000, plus 88 percent of excess over $4,000,000.
Over $4,500,000 but not over $5,000,000.	$1,884,000, plus 98 percent of excess over $4,500,000.
Over $5,000,000	$2,374,000, plus 99 percent of excess over $5,000,000.

"SEC. —. The term 'net capital' as used in this act means the total value of all property, whether real or personal, tangible or intangible, owned by the individual at the close of the calendar year, less the amount of any indebtedness outstanding on such date.

"SEC. —. (a) Any individual having a net capital for the calendar year of $100,000 or over shall make a return under oath in duplicate. Such return shall set forth (1) a detailed report of all items of property owned by the person making the return at the close of the calendar year and a statement of their value; (2) the items of indebtedness claimed and allowable as deductions; and (3) such further information as may be required by regulations made pursuant to law.

"(b) The return shall be filed on or before the 15th day of March following the close of the calendar year with the collector for the district in which is located the legal residence or principal place of business of the person making the return, or if he has no legal residence or principal place of business in the United States, then with the collector at Baltimore, Md.

"(c) Any person required under the foregoing provisions of this act to pay any tax, or required by law or regulation made under authority thereof to make a return, keep any records, or supply any information, for the purposes of the computation, assessment, or collection of any tax imposed by such provisions, who willfully fails to pay such tax, make such return, keep such records, or supply such information, at the time or times required by law or regulations, or any person who attempts by any device whatsoever to avoid liability for any tax imposed by this act while retaining control of his property, shall, in addition to other penalties provided by law, be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000 and imprisoned for not more than 2 years.

"SEC. —. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is hereby authorized to make and publish such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I trust that the amendment will be voted down.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. On this vote I understand the Senator from New York would vote as I am about to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. MEAD (when Mr. WAGNER's name was called). I announce that my colleague the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is unavoidably absent. As has already been announced, if he were present, he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. PEPPER. My colleague the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is in Florida recuperating from an illness. Consequently he is not able to be present today. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I make the following announcements:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a delegate to the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City, and therefore is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent because of illness. I am informed that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is absent on official business as a delegate to the Inter-American Conference at Mexico City. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—63

Aiken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hayden	Overton
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Bilbo	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Burton	Kilgore	Shipstead
Butler	La Follette	Smith
Capper	McClellan	Stewart
Chavez	McFarland	Taft
Cordon	McMahon	Taylor
Donnell	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	Mead	Tobey
Ferguson	Mitchell	Tunnell
George	Morse	Vandenberg
Gerry	Murdock	Walsh
Green	Murray	White
Guffey	Myers	Wiley

NAYS—16

Bailey	Hart	Robertson
Bushfield	McCarran	Tydings
Byrd	McKellar	Wherry
Capehart	Millikin	Willis
Chandler	Moore	
Gurney	Radcliffe	

NOT VOTING—16

Andrews	Fulbright	Thomas, Idaho
Austin	Glass	Wagner
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Wheeler
Buck	Langer	Wilson
Connally	Lucas	
Ellender	Scrugham	

So the bill H. R. 1752 was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for the most effective utilization of the manpower resources of the Nation in support of the war effort, and for other purposes."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill as passed by the Senate be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H. R. 1752) entitled "An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes," do pass with the following amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That (a) every individual is obligated to serve the Nation in that capacity for which he or she is best qualified, and to continue in such capacity so long as his or her services are required, to the end that the Nation may make the most effective use of its manpower resources in support of the war effort.

"(b) The purposes of this act are to provide the most practicable and effective means to accomplish the fulfillment of such obligation and to provide for making the most effective use of the manpower resources of the Nation by the following means, among others: (1) By providing for the accurate determination of manpower requirements and supply, and of the relative urgency of the needs of employers for workers; (2) by reducing wasteful labor turn-over and unnecessary labor migration; (3) by channeling available manpower to employments in which workers will contribute most to the war effort; (4) by making available, for work in essential activities, workers presently employed in activities of relative unimportance to the war effort; and (5) by promoting the maximum utilization by employers of their available work force.

"SEC. 2. (a) The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, an agency of the Government created pursuant to Executive Order No. 9139, dated April 18, 1942, as amended and supplemented (hereinafter referred to as the 'Chairman'), shall perform the functions vested in him by this act under the direction and supervision of the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion.

"(b) The Chairman shall provide for the establishment of a national management-labor policy committee, regional management-labor committees, and State or local management-labor committees consisting in each case of representatives of labor, industrial management, and, where appropriate, agriculture, the members of which shall be appointed without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923. These committees shall be consulted on basic policy decisions made at their respective administrative levels in the course of the administration of the functions vested in the Chairman by this act.

"(c) To the maximum degree consistent with this act and with its purposes, local initiative and cooperative efforts of management, labor, and agriculture shall be encouraged and utilized and use shall be made of existing hiring channels such as private employers, labor organizations, professional organizations, schools, colleges, technical institutions, and Government agencies.

"SEC. 3. (a) The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall, subject to the direction of the President, provide for coordinating the activities of all departments and agencies of the Government responsible for production, procurement, or manpower in such manner as to carry out most effectively the purposes declared in the first section of this act. The Director shall provide, among other things, that manpower requirements and the availability of manpower shall be given due consideration in determining where production schedules shall be increased or decreased and where contracts shall be awarded, terminated, or permitted to expire, and that notice shall be given to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission at the earliest practicable time of all changes or anticipated changes in war-production schedules, all awards or anticipated awards of war contracts, and all terminations or anticipated terminations of war contracts, which are likely to result in any substantial increase or decrease of the manpower requirements of any employer or any area. All departments and agencies of the Government shall comply with orders and regulations issued by the Director under authority of this section.

"(b) The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall make or cause to be made in-plant surveys and other investigations of the use of manpower by the War Department and the Navy Department, to determine the extent to which such Departments are making the most effective use, in activities relating to production, procurement, or repairs, of individuals in their employ or subject to their jurisdiction as members of the armed forces, and shall take or cause to be taken, appropriate measures to eliminate labor wastage and labor hoarding, and otherwise to promote the full utilization by such departments of individuals in their employ or subject to their jurisdiction as members of the armed forces, and otherwise to carry out the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 4. (a) Except as to the cases covered by subsection (b) of section 3, the Chairman shall provide for such in-plant surveys and other investigations of activities and places of employment, as may be necessary to determine the extent to which such activities or places of employment are making the most effective use of individuals in their employ, to the end that appropriate measures may be taken to eliminate labor wastage and labor hoarding, to promote full utilization for purposes essential to the war effort, by employers of their available work force, and otherwise to promote the purposes of this act.

"(b) To the extent necessary to carry out the purposes and means declared in the first section of this act and also for the purpose of keeping activities and places of employment essential to the war effort in productive operation, the Chairman is authorized and directed, by regulation (1) to prescribe employment ceilings in designated areas, activities, or places of employment fixing the maximum number of workers, by age, sex, or occupational qualifications, who may be there employed and prohibiting the employment of workers beyond such maximum number, and (2) to prohibit or regulate the hiring, rehiring, solicitation, or recruitment of new workers by employers. No employer shall hire or retain in his employ any individual in violation of such regulations.

"(c) In the case of any individual who, in response to the request of the Chairman, agrees to accept employment outside the locality where he is then residing, the Chairman, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, may furnish transportation to the location of such employment, and, if such individual complies thereafter with the requests and requirements made under this act with respect to his accepting and continuing in any employment or employments in the same locality until the Chairman determines that he is no longer needed in such locality for work essential to the war effort, may furnish transportation back to the locality from which transportation was originally furnished for such individual under this subsection, or to any other locality selected by the individual which is not farther distant. The cost of such transportation shall not exceed the amounts allowable for individual civilian employees in the executive branch of the Government and shall not include any per diem allowance. The Chairman shall exercise the authority conferred by this subsection only to the extent that he deems the exercise thereof necessary to aid in relieving manpower shortages which substantially impede the war effort.

"(d) Any employer who willfully violates any regulation or any order made by the Chairman under paragraph (b) of this section shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof in the district court of the United States for the district in which such violation occurred, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 12 months or by a fine not to exceed $10,000, or both.

"SEC. 5. The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall by regulation provide an opportunity for a hearing before an impartial administrative tribunal to any person who claims that any action taken with respect to him under this act, or any regulation or order thereunder, is unreasonable as applied to him or is inconsistent with such act, regulation, or order. Subject to such further administrative review as may be provided in regulations under this section, the determination made after such hearing shall be final. To the extent practicable and appropriate, such regulations shall provide for such hearings to be accorded in local areas and for such hearing tribunals to be so constituted as to permit the ascertainment of the views of persons selected as representatives of management, labor, and agricultural interests in the locality. The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall by regulation provide for and establish such administrative tribunals as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.

"SEC. 6. (a) The Chairman shall provide for the issuance of a certificate to any person with respect to whom he finds that such person (1) has been released by his employer from a position (other than a temporary position) pursuant to a request or requirement made under this act and (2) has complied thereafter with the requests and requirements made under this act with respect to his accepting and continuing in any employment or employments until section 4 (b) ceases to be in effect or the Chairman determines that he is no longer needed in work essential to the war effort, whichever first occurs. Any person to whom such a

certificate is issued under this subsection shall be entitled to the benefits of section 8 (b) (except the last paragraph thereof and except that in lieu of the 90-day period therein specified, the time within which application for reemployment in his former position must be made shall be 30 days), 8 (c), and 8 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to the same extent as if he had left such position in order to be and had been inducted into the land or naval forces for training and service, had been relieved therefrom on the day on which such certificate is issued to him, and had been given the certificate referred to in section 8 (a) of such act: *Provided*, That this section shall not be construed to confer greater employment rights than the individual would have had if he had remained employed in such position during the period of the employment or employments accepted by him upon the request of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

"(b) Section 8 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'If such person, within 90 days after having been relieved from such training and service or from such hospitalization, has become employed in an employment accepted by him at the request of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission under the War Manpower Act of 1945, any period (before section 4 (b) of such act ceases to be in effect) while he is employed in an employment so accepted by him (and any period, not exceeding 15 days, between leaving one such employment and entering upon another such employment) shall be disregarded in computing the 90-day period within which application for reemployment in his former position must be made and shall be counted as training and service in the land or naval forces for the purposes of subsection (c).'

"SEC. 7. Paragraphs (3), (4), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), as amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, shall be applicable with respect to this act to the same extent as such paragraphs are applicable with respect to such subsection (a), except that, for the purposes of this act, the word 'President' wherever it occurs in such paragraphs, shall be deemed to refer to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

"SEC. 8. No wage or other compensation paid for services rendered in any employment commenced or continued in violation of this act, or of any regulation or order of the Chairman thereunder, shall be allowed or allowable as a deduction from income, or as a cost or expense, for the purpose of computing the tax payable under any act of Congress or for the purpose of determining the amount to be paid to or recovered from any person with respect to the performance of any contract with the United States. The provisions of this section shall not be applicable with respect to any case of a violation of a regulation or order by any person unless such regulation or order has been published in the Federal Register, has been published in a newspaper of general circulation in the community for 3 consecutive days, or has been served upon such person by personal service or by registered mail. The Chairman shall transmit to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and other agencies of the Government responsible for the administration of any functions under this section copies of such regulations and orders issued under this act, and such additional information, as the Chairman deems will be useful to the Commissioner and such other agencies in administering their functions under this section.

"SEC. 9. The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall submit reports to the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives on the 1st days of January, April, July, and October, on the activities undertaken or contemplated by him under this act. Such reports shall summarize and appraise manpower mobilization activities and problems.

"SEC. 10. (a) As used in this act, the terms 'employment', 'work', 'hire', 'rehire', or words of similar import shall include any contract, arrangement, undertaking, or relationship whereby or under which an individual undertakes to perform a service or services for another, irrespective of the resulting legal relationship between the parties.

"(b) The provisions of this act shall not be applicable with respect to the employment of persons by any State or any political subdivision thereof, without its consent.

"SEC. 11. Section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'In carrying out the provisions of this subsection (except the proviso of the foregoing paragraph) the selective-service local board in classifying the registrant shall base its findings solely and exclusively on whether the registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort and whether a satisfactory replacement can be obtained, without reference to the relative essentiality of the registrant to an agricultural occupation or endeavor as compared with any other occupation, service, or endeavor; and the foregoing provision of this sentence shall apply upon any appeal or review of a decision made thereunder by a selective-service local board. Such deferment shall be made by said board without consideration of any other circumstance or condition whatsoever; and during the period of such deferment for such purpose, no other classification, of said registrant, shall be made by said board.'

"SEC. 12. Notwithstanding the provisions of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age assistance), and of appropriations for payments thereunder, in any case in which any State pays old-age assistance to any individual at a rate not in excess of the rate of old-age assistance paid to such individual during the month of February 1945, any failure to take into consideration any income and resources of such individual arising from labor performed by him as an employee after the date of enactment of this act and prior to the seventh calendar month occurring after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, shall not be a basis of excluding payments made to such individual in computing payments made to States under section 3 of such title, of refusing to approve a State plan under section 2 of such title, or of withholding certification pursuant to section 4 of such title.

"SEC. 13. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances, other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 14. The provisions of section 2 (b) and section 4 (a) and (b) of this act, and all regulations, orders, or requirements thereunder, shall cease to be effective upon termination of hostilities in the present war, as declared by the President or by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, or upon June 30, 1946, whichever is the earlier.

"SEC. 15. This act may be cited as the 'War Manpower Act of 1945.'"

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement in connection with the vote which was cast on the work-or-fight bill, together with an editorial entitled "Of Whom Do They Think?" from the Baltimore Sun of February 28, 1945.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, after listening for more than a week to the discussion of the Senate substitute for the work-or-fight bill, I am convinced that this legislation is practically without power of enforcement. The name "work or fight," as applied to this legislation, is certainly a misnomer, as the Senate bill provides for no control whatsoever over those who do not now work. It should be called the milk-and-water bill. There is nothing in the bill that will compel the loafers and laggards, who are not contributing their full measure to the war effort, to go to work.

The bill, as first introduced, contained what was, in fact, an absurdity when it placed a penalty on the employer without providing any penalty for the employee.

Both the German and Japanese wars are today in their most critical stages. The Senate should either pass a real work-or-fight bill or none at all. The milk-and-water measure, as presented by the Senate Military Affairs Committee, will do more to confuse the situation than any possible good it can accomplish. We are told by our military leaders, in whom the country has the utmost confidence, that a work-or-fight measure is essential to win the war quickly—to save the lives of our boys—and I, for one, will not hesitate to vote for such a law. I voted against the Military Affairs Committee substitute, because I think it would be a mere gesture, and I believe it beneath the dignity of the Senate in this hour of great crisis to adopt such a measure when every impulse of patriotism should compel the Senate to act firmly and courageously, as well as promptly.

Mr. President, a brilliant editorial writer, Mr. John W. Owens, has written a signed editorial in the Baltimore Sun, which was published on February 28, 1945. This so ably presents the issue that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

[From the Baltimore Sun of February 28, 1945]

OF WHOM DO THEY THINK?

(By John W. Owens)

Some months ago the mother of a young man, handsome and gentle, trained and competent, received one of those telegrams from Washington which have taken heartbreak into thousands of homes in this land. The mother found her loss hard to sustain. Two of her friends, women without children, talked of her condition. One said that she quite understood. The war was terrible. Indeed, what with all the troubles of this rationing, she often felt that she did not know what to do. The second woman, usually the soul of courtesy, straightened in her chair and asked: "What in hell are you talking about?"

Unfortunately, in larger but similar circumstances, no way seems to be open to put that question directly to the Senate of the United States. But some people would like to know. What are the Senators talking about and what are they thinking about in their consideration of national-service legislation? Are they thinking of those men on Iwo Jima who give us a revelation, beyond the powers of a Dante or a Milton to describe, of the tortures which human spirit can command human flesh to suffer? Are they thinking of the 45,000 families at home who follow in anguished concentration every scrap of news that comes from that small, far-off island where 45,000 marines have been put ashore in low land to overcome an enemy scientifically fortified in caves and dugouts on high ground? Are they thinking of the soldiers who fought their way, house to house, through burning Manila? Are they thinking of the soldiers who push their way,

in the winter of northern Europe, through the German defenses west of the Rhine?

Or are the Senators thinking of the men and women at home, groaning under the hugest pay rolls known on this earth and the hugest profits known on this earth? Are they thinking of the men and women who have crowded the provision stores and the dining rooms of great hotels, the neighborhood bars, and the insanely expensive night clubs? Are they thinking of the men and women who have debated the procedure of closing down the race tracks and who have studied the prospects of the stock market? When the Senators talk of rights, whose have they in mind? Have they in mind only the rights of people like the woman whose mind passed instantly from contemplation of the agony of a mother to contemplation of her own agony in coping with this terrible rationing?

Little argument is heard as to the reality of the crisis. We must call to the colors this year hundreds of thousands of additional men. But exactly the same conditions which compel us to call up hundreds of thousands of additional men compel us to increase production for war. This makes a large increase in war workers imperative. We have, therefore, the simultaneous necessities of taking men out of industry and putting more men into industry for war. The only way both necessities can be served is to get men out of secondary occupations and into war work. Next to nothing is heard in controversion of that conclusion. Senators who have been squirming for days to find some substitute for the May-Bailey bill do not deny the reality of the crisis. They admit the crisis in their own efforts to find a substitute that they can offer the Nation.

The question is this: Shall the Congress move in a straight line between two points or shall it twist and wobble? We have the crisis. It is admitted. That is one point. We have the remedy of giving the Government power to order men to tasks of production for war analogous to the power that the Government has to order men to tasks in prosecution of war. That is the other point. In the May-Bailey bill, passed by the House, a straight line is drawn between two points, between the crisis and the remedy. Shall we move in that straight line? Or shall we move in the twisting and wobbling line drawn by the Senate's Committee on Military Affairs? Bear in mind again that few deny the need of a line between the two points. The Senators fighting the straight line of the May-Bailey bill do no more than to argue that the line between the crisis and the remedy ought to be one of ins and outs, a bit of pressure, a bit of pause, a bit of pressure, a bit of pause.

We hear talk of slavery of the workers if this wobbling line is not followed. We can support the thought of slavery, it seems when our young men are ordered to move straight into the inferno of modern battle and no questions asked. But at home, suffering from shortages of cigarettes and sometimes whisky, for which we can still find room in our overstuffed pockets, we must shudder and squirm at the thought of the "slavery" that will be imposed on the workers if we give the Government authority to order them straight into war production.

Some of the Senators may be squirming in sincere doubt. Some of them may be squirming under pressure. The American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Grange, and some other agricultural interests, are all fighting slavery. Between them they should be able to bring quite a tide of humanitarian logic to bear against slavery. But some people in this country are like the woman who had enough when the conversation passed down the agony of a mother to the agony of the rationing system. Listening to the squirming Senators, some people would like to straighten in their chairs and ask: "What in hell are you talking about?"

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO SUBMIT REPORTS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations expects to be ready to report two bills to the Senate tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent that the committee be allowed to submit the reports during the adjournment which I understand the Senate is about to take until Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLARE M. REILLY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 85, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, is the resolution in the usual form of those submitted with regard to widows of officials or employees of the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is in the customary form and relates to Clare M. Reilly.

Mr. WHITE. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 85) submitted by Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. LA FOLLETTE) on February 26, 1945, was considered and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the financial clerk of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Clara M. Reilly, widow of James D. Reilly, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, before we proceed to the consideration of executive business, I ask the able majority leader if he is in a position to make any statement with respect to what will be in order on Monday next.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has just announced the likelihood of two appropriation bills being reported to the Senate between now and next Monday. They will be in order, and I am sure they will be taken up as soon as possible. If we have time, I hope to have a call of the calendar. Bills are accumulating on the calendar. Beyond that statement I cannot say.

SERVICE OF 18-YEAR-OLD BOYS AT THE FRONT

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, some days ago I spoke in the Senate in approval of the protest which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] recently made in opposition to the practice of the Army in sending into combat boys in their teens before they have been given adequate training. The brief statement made by me resulted in receiving a large number of letters, and I understand that the Senator from Ohio has also had the same experience, indicating a widespread public interest in this matter.

The letters which have come to me are from all parts of the country and indicate that the parents of these youths have been greatly disturbed over the situation, and their anxiety and grief in being separated from their sons has been increased by the fact that they have felt that insufficient training has been given their sons prior to being sent overseas and into conflict.

I know of no better way of showing public sentiment in regard to this matter than by having inserted in the RECORD brief extracts from a few of these letters. Not having permission from my correspondents to use their names, I have omitted them. I submit extracts from a few of these letters and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From North Dighton, Mass.:

"Your statement in today's Boston Herald expressed the feelings of many people that I have talked with. At this stage of the war it should not be necessary to send into combat men with only 5 or 6 weeks of training in infantry work. Practically all East Coast Harbor Defense units have been stripped of men in the last few months, also many Air Force units. Many thousands of these men have been sent to Camp Howze, Tex., for Infantry training, 200 from the Boston harbor defense area arrived there the first week in February. After a course of only 6 weeks infantry training, these men who previously had no infantry training or very little of it, are sent overseas as combat troops.

"We have a large number of casualties in our hospitals and due to the use of inexperienced troops, especially during the Von Rundstedt drive in December and January. Men should know how to take care of themselves before going into combat and it isn't possible to learn the complex business of modern warfare in 6 weeks."

From Belmont, Mass.:

"You are reported in yesterday's Boston papers as supporting the position of Senator TAFT on the matter of the Army sending 18-year-old boys into combat service improperly trained. I have waited a long time for such senatorial criticism and I highly commend you for your position."

From Mercersburg, Pa.:

"I was delighted to read in the morning papers that you have joined with Senator TAFT in requesting an investigation of the length of the training given to 18-year-old Infantry replacements. You have earned the undying appreciation of all the parents of these boys."

From Haverhill, Mass.:

"Thank you sincerely for your effort in behalf of our 18-year-old sons. Please bring all possible pressure to bear to lengthen their time of training. All parents will back you to the limit."

From Woburn, Mass.:

"I was very pleased to read in last night's paper that you are in favor of legislation to require our boys to have at least 8-month's training and be 19 years of age before going into active combat duty. I think it is most urgent that this be pushed forward as rapidly as possible and hope that you will do everything possible in this respect."

From Atlanta, Ga.:

"I want to congratulate you, and I hope you continue the good work in calling the

Army to account for their practice of sending 18-year-old boys into combat after having completed but 13 to 17 weeks of basic training. I thought that when the Selective Service Act was passed it was understood that no 18-year-old boy would be sent into action without at least a year's training.

"My own son, 18 years of age, was inducted in August of last year, and the last I heard from him he was at Hawaii, on the way to the South Seas. Several of his 18-year-old friends are already fighting in General Patch's Seventh Army. All the training that any of them had was the basic training.

"The Army says the 18-year-olds make good soldiers. True enough, they are brave and easily trained, but I cannot see that the Army is justified in throwing them into combat to learn how to be a good soldier or die."

From Haverhill, Mass.:

"We heartily agree with your protest of February 27, 1945, criticizing the sending of boys of 18 years of age into combat without the minimum training of 8 months.

"Parents of these boys were assured that if boys of 18 were drafted they should be 19 years of age before they were sent into combat.

"Under the circumstances, 13 weeks of training is totally inadequate for these younger boys."

From East Braintree, Mass.:

"Please accept my hearty thanks for your stand in regard to sending untried and untrained 18- and 19-year-old boys into combat. It is good to know there are some people in Washington who care what happens to our boys."

From New Bedford, Mass.:

"I wish to take this means of expressing my approval of your criticism of the War Department for sending 18-year-old draftees into combat without at least 8 months' training. I agree that these boys should not be sent out of the country until they are 19 or have had at least 8 months' combat training here at home."

From Fort Wayne, Ind.:

"Our son was inducted August 16, 1944, at Fort Benjamin Harrison; from there he was sent to Camp Hood, Tex. He finished his basic training December 24, 1944, after which he was granted 5 days' furlough. Then he reported to Fort Meade for embarkation. Received his A. P. O. number on January 6, 1945. The next and only report from him after arriving at La Havre, France, was dated January 22, 1945. Like a thunderbolt we received the cablegram on February 12, informing us that our son, Milton, was killed in action January 30, 1945, only 8 days after landing on French soil."

From Worcester, Mass.:

"I wish to bring this one case to your attention—my own son who will not be 19 until the 2d of June 1945, and who has received only 4 months' training.

"He is now serving in actual combat with the Ninety-fourth Division, which is part of General Patton's Third Army. He joined the Paratroops and was not allowed to finish.

"I don't feel too good about it at all and think that something should be done to prevent the boys being pushed into actual combat without proper training, to agree with the law."

From New York, N. Y.:

"My 18-year-old boy received 4 months' basic training in the armored division and was immediately sent to the European theater as a replacement in the tank corps. He was told that the training course would be continued in England or France. He left about 7 weeks ago and we have had no word of his arrival at destination and only hope that he and his comrades are not prematurely exposed to enemy action."

From Ware, Mass.:

"At the present time, my son is at a training replacement center in Camp Blanding, Fla. He has almost finished his reduced training basic course and in his letters he has mentioned how little he has been allowed to fire a rifle or mortar during his training. Yet youths with so little training and with so little experience are being sent overseas."

From Worcester, Mass.:

"My son Robert, age 18, has had 14 weeks at Camp Croft, and now has been sent to Fort Meade, which we all know is the last stop before overseas duty. To quote his orders, 'Your stay at Fort Meade will be brief.' I doubt if he will receive any further training at Meade."

From Revere, Mass.:

"There was a regiment which left Fort Bragg, composed partly of 18-year-olds, which had only 14 weeks' training recently. Not only did they have a short training period but their last furlough in this country was cut from 10 to 5 days."

From Boston, Mass.:

"I am particularly disturbed about my own boy who is 18 years old, and after 6 weeks of intensive infantry training is apparently to be shipped within a very few days as an Infantry replacement. He went into the Army in September 1944 and was in the Signal Corps for 4 months. The 1st of January he was transferred to the Infantry and supposedly is ready for combat service."

From Revere, Mass.:

"When the drafting of these boys became necessary, they were promised verbally they would receive at least 1 year's training before leaving this country. It is common knowledge that this promise has not been kept.

"Citing one of many cases I know, there is a boy who reached his eighteenth birthday in September, was drafted in November, and placed in Field Artillery. The boy has completed but 6 weeks of basic training; has now started the Artillery cycle which has been cut from a meager 17 weeks to an 11-week period. When this cycle is completed, his entire training period will have been 17 weeks and he will be ready for combat service. Field Artillery being a protective shield for our foot Infantry, should, to my mind, require exceptionally well-trained men. It is quite impossible for these boys to receive any more than a smattering of the knowledge required to operate their duties satisfactorily.

From Indianapolis, Ind.:

"I am the mother of an 18-year-old boy serving in the United States Army. I am very much opposed to the shipping of these 18-year-old boys across seas with only 13 to 15 weeks' training. Although I am not opposed to my boy being shipped across seas, I am in favor and make the suggestion that some of these older boys and men who have been in the service 2 or more years be shipped across and keep these 18-year-old boys here and give them additional training."

From Indianapolis, Ind.:

"I have an 18-year-old son. He was inducted into the Army in January of this year, and has been told 15 weeks' training is all he gets and then he has to go across. I am not opposed to his going across but we mothers were promised when they started drafting the 18-year-olds that they would get 1 year's training in the United States before being sent across and they are not getting it."

From Orlando, Fla.:

"Would like to express to you my appreciation for your support of Senator TAFT's proposal for longer training for our 18-year-old draftees. In my opinion, this should be applicable to older boys as well.

"My son has already gone across, after only 17 weeks' basic training at Fort McClellan, Ala., and such a measure as proposed by Senator TAFT is too late in my particular case, but it will mean some other mother's boy may be spared.

"I feel very strongly about this, for I feel that if the Army needs boys this badly, why shouldn't they take the ones who have been lying around camps for 2 or 3 years?"

From Hudson, Mass.:

"Won't you please try to obtain for these boys of 18 at least 16 weeks' training, which the Navy is always advertising."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

William T. Sherwood, of Washington, D. C., to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, to fill an existing vacancy.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 12, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 8 (legislative day of February 26), 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Walter H. McKinney, of Michigan, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Christian T. Steger, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Thomas McEnelly, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

James K. Penfield, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a

consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers, unclassified, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

V. Harwood Blocker, of Texas.
William H. Christensen, of South Dakota.
Jack G. Dwyre, of California.
Harold Sims, of Tennessee.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve to be second lieutenants in the Regular Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of the Naval Aviation Personnel Act of 1940, as amended, to rank from the dates stated:

Gordon E. Gray, from the 14th day of March 1942.
Lowell D. Grow, from the 17th day of March 1942.
Harold F. Brown, from the 3d day of April 1942.
Floyd C. Kirkpatrick, from the 3d day of April 1942.
Henry P. Huff, from the 18th day of June 1942.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of August 1944:

Dwayne E. Mears, a citizen of California.
William R. Bennett, a citizen of California.
James O. Hickman, a citizen of Colorado.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 8 (legislative day of February 8), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

George Bigler, Clarendon Hills.

KENTUCKY

Holland B. Hedgepeth, Canmer.

MASSACHUSETTS

Arthur I. Brown, South Lee.

MONTANA

Martha P. McCrory, Kevin.

VIRGINIA

Joseph F. Suttle, Dahlgren.

WASHINGTON

Wayne Ballard, Cle Elum.

WEST VIRGINIA

Alice B. Kidd, Burnwell.
Willie I. Shaver, Handley.
Bernice E. McDonald, Mount Clare.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 8, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art eternal goodness, the most permanent truth in this world is Thy Fatherhood; enable us to stand erect and free as becometh Thy children. We pray for a larger girding of that life which makes men and women strong and compelling in the confusion and uncertainty of these difficult times. So cleanse our powers that they may work in the simplicity of a chivalrous faith.

Let calmness of spirit prevail that progress may not be paralyzed or strength wasted by disorder. Make the weak strong, and keep the strong from impetuous action that the whole body of citizens may be honored and have a just share in the prosperity of our country. Impress all that the rule of worthy citizenship is devotion to duty and to labor on in the bond of unity.

O Spirit Divine, our sky is again clouded; the night of affliction has thrown its shadow across the altar of a dear home; an honored member and brother is bereft and laden with grief. As a loving mother stills her child, as the faithful shepherd shields his fold, help sorrowing hearts to look beyond the disappointments of earth and give them peace. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 214. An act to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Interior.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of War.
4. Federal Works Agency.
5. Office of Defense Transportation.
6. Office of War Information.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a resolution (H. Res. 173), which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby designate Saturday, April 14, 1945, for the celebration of Pan-American Day, during which no other business except that appropriate to such an occasion may occur.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a copy of a bill I am today introducing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the United Polish Press of America, Chicago, Ill., appealing to the Government of the United States, the Congress, and to the public opinion of the American Nation and the whole world that the unjust decisions of the Yalta Conference concerning Poland be revised in a spirit of equity and good conscience.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DISCONTINUANCE OF CERTAIN REPORTS NOW REQUIRED BY LAW

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been directed by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to report H. R. 2504, a bill repealing certain laws requiring reports to be made to Congress, many obsolete. There are 330 reports now required by congressional acts, and this bill would repeal 64. With the assurance that the report will fully explain the bill, all items therein, I ask unanimous consent, in order to save money, manpower, and paper, that the requirements of the Ramseyer rule be waived insofar as H. R. 2504 is concerned.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman going to ask to have these reports discontinued at this time, or is he going to file that resolution later?

Mr. COCHRAN. This request simply asks permission for waiving the Ramseyer rule when the report on the bill is filed, because if the Ramseyer rule must be complied with we will have to print 64 statutes in the report.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not object to that, but I think we ought to know more about what reports will be discontinued.

Mr. COCHRAN. That will be explained fully in the report on the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Let us know about that now.

Mr. COCHRAN. Well, the committee held hearings for 3 days, and we eliminated several items where there were objections. We circularized the chairmen of the committees of the House to let them know what was in the old bill, and only one chairman offered an objection, and that was to one report. That is not in the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. A number of Members of the House do not know anything about it at all.

Mr. COCHRAN. That will be fully explained in the report and in debate. All I am asking now is to waive the Ramseyer rule.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not quite understand the waiving of this Ramseyer rule.

Mr. COCHRAN. The Ramseyer rule would require us to show all changes in existing law, and we would have to print 64 statutes. I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants to save paper and money.

Mr. RICH. The only trouble with this bill is that it does not go far enough. In fact, if you will take all the Government

publications that are published, we ought to include a lot of them in this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a short advertisement.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial entitled "Is Communism a Threat?"

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

THE OHIO RIVER

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the word "Ohio" means "beautiful river." I am sorry to report that the Ohio is not very beautiful today unless there is beauty and majesty in irresistible power. I am glad to report, however, that the floodwaters of the Ohio are not as devastating as at first we thought they might be; but it will be terrible. Further, I want to bring this good news to you from my home town of Ironton, Ohio. I have a telegram from City Manager Ralph Mittendorf of that city in which he wishes to convey to the Congress of the United States and those in authority the thanks of our city for having had the opportunity to be the first city in the United States to avail itself of the laws passed by this Congess providing for the construction of a flood wall around the city so that the Ohio River, in spite of its flood condition, flows on in majesty past that city but leaves no damage.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wish to say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] that if the Congress will pass the bill (H. R. 1824) which I have introduced, the regional authorities it would create will control these devastating floods, provide navigation, and develop the water power in every navigable stream in the United States.

It is the greatest program for postwar employment yet proposed. It would furnish profitable, useful, and constructive jobs for hundreds of thousands of our returned servicemen.

It would prevent untold millions of dollars in flood damages and save scores of human lives these floods are now destroying every year.

It would generate 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydro-electric power that is now running to waste in those streams every year. That is more electricity than the people of this country used last year, generated by coal, oil, gas, and water power all put together.

It would add more to the Nation's wealth than any other development ever proposed. It would double the amount of electricity now available for every home, every industry, and every commercial establishment, and enable us to electrify every farm home in America at rates the farmers can afford to pay.

It would take 115,000,000 tons of the finest bituminous coal every year to generate that amount of electricity by steam. Suppose coal would float and 115,000,000 tons of it were floating to waste down these streams each year, or 310,000 tons a day, there would be such a scramble to recover it that it would make the banks of these streams look like the Battle of the Rhine.

Think of 5,000,000 tons of the finest soft coal floating to waste every year down the Ohio, the Missouri, the Arkansas, or the St. Lawrence, to say nothing of the smaller streams, and you will have an idea what this waste of water power means.

At the rate we are going our coal, oil, and gas supply will probably be depleted in another hundred years.

So it behooves us to develop this water power now, save this vast wealth that is now going to waste, control these disastrous floods, provide navigation, and make this the richest, the brightest, and the finest country on earth in which to live.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 2013

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file my minority views on the bill H. R. 2013, which involves extension of land-lease, and also that certain other minority members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs may file their views in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

OHIO RIVER FLOOD

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, the past 48 hours has brought the distressing news of another disastrous flood in the great Ohio Valley.

Cities and towns from Pittsburgh to Cairo are inundated and the rising water is bringing serious damage to life and property. Thousands are being driven from their homes and hundreds of war plants have ceased operation.

While this news is very distressing, I am pleased to inform my colleagues that my home town, Huntington, W. Va., is safe and dry under the protection of a sturdy flood wall, constructed through the industry and foresight of our people.

In this city of 85,000 people no home has been disturbed, life and property are unimpaired, and not 1 man-hour has been lost to our war production because of the flood condition.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following the gentleman from Indiana, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered March 7 by the former Governor of Minnesota, Commander Harold E. Stassen.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, first, to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Sunday Washington Star, and second, to include some tables in the statement I expect to make this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

NURSE DRAFT BILL

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend most heartily the President of the United States for his views on the matter of drafting nurses, as set forth in his letter of yesterday reported in todays' press. His views are essentially those expressed in the Fenton amendment, which was defeated here yesterday by six votes, including an almost solid vote by the members of the President's party against the amendment, that is, against the President's expressed views. I only regret that he did not get the letter down to the Democratic leadership of the House earlier so that it could have gotten its signals straightened out, and the Democrats could have discovered the Commander in Chief's views in time to support him.

The amendment would have gotten the needed nurses in the most rapid way and effective way. It would have brought the draft into effect when, and only when, the volunteering of qualified nurses failed to meet the established quotas. I am unable to think of any good reason

why we should draft them a single day earlier than that.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman knows that the bill contains a provision for maintaining volunteers.

Mr. JUDD. But it does not give the nurses assurance of a real chance to make good, with the knowledge that the draft will not come into effect unless or until they fail to make good. I hope the Senate will put in this or a similar amendment.

LIAISON AND PUBLICITY PAY ROLL

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a survey by the Bureau of the Budget shows about 39,000 on the pay roll in liaison and publicity work in 1939. In my opinion, directly and indirectly, this costs the Government $200,000,000, or $5,000 apiece. At the present time I estimate, on the basis of what I can gather together, that there are 100,000 of those people on the pay roll at the present time, costing $7,500 each, and that the cost of that operation is $750,000,000 a year. I think it is about time that we began to pare down some of these things.

SERVICEMEN'S WIVES

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to report very satisfactory progress in getting the wives of servicemen overseas. Mrs. MacArthur has now arrived in the Philippines. She arrived on a refrigerator ship, the first one to land since 1941. Her 6-year-old son is also with her.

My statement is this: If it is fine for a general to have his wife and his son in the combat area, let us see why we cannot have that same privilege extended to the lowest buck private and the lowest apprentice seaman. General MacArthur, let us hear from you. Why not?

I hope that the General is going to be courteous and generous and say to all his men that they can have that same opportunity. I hope that the Army and the Navy will say that all over the world that privilege will be extended to the families of the servicemen, and especially to those wives and sweethearts or relatives who can make themselves genuinely useful and contribute actively to the war effort in the particular theater.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EARTHMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

HON. FRED M. VINSON

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MAY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COL. EDGAR S. GORRELL

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, it is not often in this body that Members call attention to the death of an individual who is not a Member of the House or of some branch of our Government. I feel, however, that it is most appropriate that I take this moment to say to my colleagues, many of whom knew him well, that in the passing of Col. Edgar S. Gorrell, the Nation has lost a courageous citizen.

He was the president of the Air Transport Association of America, and in that capacity testified on many occasions on Capitol Hill before committees dealing with the subject of aviation.

Colonel Gorrell was slight of stature, but stanch of soul. He was credited with being the first American Army officer to volunteer for a parachute jump, the first United States pilot to fly a plane in radio experiments, and also the first Army officer to make a successful night flight. He was in charge of aerial strategy for the American Expeditionary Forces in World War No. 1.

This afternoon funeral services are to be held at the chapel at Fort Myer. No doubt a transport plane will wing its way across the sky above those who will gather from official and private life, to pay tribute to this worth-while man, who gave so fully of himself during a fruitful career.

With the poet let us say:

We pray Thee, Lord, Thou who art wise,
Be Thou our fliers' guide;
Keep steady, Lord, their ships that rise,
And pilot them across the skies;
With them, O Lord, abide.

Direct them as they wing their flight;
Protect them, Lord, we pray;
Let them not wander from Thy sight,
But through the darkness of the night,
Go with them all the way.

If storm and strife they must endure,
Surround them with Thy care;
Be near and make their safety sure,
Defend them, Lord, and keep secure
Our fliers in the air.

We pray Thee, Lord, Thou art on high,
Sustain our men who dare;
Give strength to them who for us fly,
And follow them with Thine own eye;
Hear, Lord, for them our prayer.

Colonel Gorrell was the spokesman for the air carriers of our country. He never forgot, however, to take the broad look worthy of a true airman. As he himself said, in speaking of the air-transportation industry:

It means bringing the markets of the whole world next door to every American farm and village and city. But it means something more than all that. It means a fresh guaranty of national security in a world which requires such guaranties as long as the lust of conquest lurks in the hearts of men.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I voted in favor of the appropriation of $50,000 for the newly constituted Committee on Un-American Activities. I had very grave doubts as to the advisability of the establishment of such a committee. Nevertheless, the Congress having decided by a decisive majority to establish such a committee, I felt it was proper to give it some funds. In addition, I have entire confidence in the true Americanism and the soundness, fairness, and discretion of the chairman of that committee the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HART]. I felt it was right to give him and his committee a chance. Also, I felt it was not fair to vote against funds for the newly constituted committee because of the alleged indiscretions and unfairness and the other charges that were made against the so-called Dies committee. I have not in the past, nor will I in the future, oppose bringing to light any group or activity which is subversive to American interests.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include a letter, and in the other an editorial.

Mr. JARMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from yesterday's Washington Star.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by David Lawrence.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM PLANK OF 1932

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the House one plank of the Democratic platform of 1932. It is as follows:

We favor the maintenance of the national credit by a Federal Budget annually balanced on the basis of accurate executive estimates within the revenues raised by a system of taxation levied on the principle of ability to pay.

Mr. Speaker, since 1932, 12 years have gone by, and this administration has not carried out that plank in their platform. They have repudiated every item of it, and they are not trying in any sense to do anything that would in any way bring that to pass. By cutting down expenses of government, we are today going to consider the increase of the national debt from $260,000,000,000 to $300,000,000,000, it behooves every man in this House to remember what we are going to do today and to try and get some economy in the operation of this Government. Let the New Deal do what it promised the country it would do. Do you have any regard for your word? Your promises?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, March 19, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and other legislative matters, I may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes. This is to take the place of the special order I have granting me permission to address the House for 40 minutes on March 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

LT. GEN. GEORGE S. PATTON SWIMS ICE COLD RIVER

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and revise and extend my remarks and include therein a short newspaper article which appeared in this morning's paper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this morning's paper contains the following headline: "Patton swims river twice to inspire his men."

That was Gen. George S. Patton whom Drew Pearson and Walter Winchell of the communistic radio smear bund, were trying to destroy a year ago.

When his army came to this river, there were 8 inches of snow on the ground. He undertook to get his men across it in boats, but they furnished such conspicuous targets that the Germans were destroying them. General Patton said if the men could swim across, their heads would furnish a much smaller target, and that more of them would escape; and in order to show that it could be done, and to inspire his men with a personal example, he plunged in and swam across and back. When he did that, his men followed him, and he soon had his army across.

General Patton has never sent a man where he was unwilling to go himself.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am inserting a news article concerning this incident. It reads as follows:

PATTON SWAM RIVER TWICE TO INSPIRE MEN

BALTIMORE, March 7.—The story of how Lt. Gen. George S. Patton twice swam the 150-foot Sure River in Germany in January under heavy machine-gun and artillery fire, inspiring thousands of troops to follow him, was told today by one of the men who did.

Staff Sgt. Thomas J. Defibaugh, of Cumberland, Md., said, "There was about a foot of snow on the ground when we got to the Sure River."

"We learned that we had to take the town of Bettendorf on the opposite side and did it quickly," said Defibaugh, a member of the Fourth Infantry Division.

STARTED IN THREE-MAN BOATS

"The Germans began firing machine guns and artillery at us as we came up to the river bank," continued Defibaugh, now touring war plants in the Baltimore area with other heroes of Bastogne.

"Just before dawn we started going across in three-man boats. The river was very swift and had pieces of ice floating in it.

"After a while though, General Patton called the boats back and ordered the men to swim across with rifles, bazookas, and everything they could carry because they were 'sitting pigeons' for the Germans in the boats."

HEADS ONLY TARGETS

"He figured the men would have a better chance swimming since they would then present only the tops of their heads as targets to the enemy gunners.

"To show us it could be done and to inspire the troops, General Patton jumped into the water and swam across to the opposite bank, then swam back. Thousands of troops followed him."

Inspired by Patton's daring, the soldiers fought like madmen for Bettendorf, Defibaugh related, and they took it after a bitter day-and-a-half battle.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon tomorrow after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

OHIO RIVER FLOOD

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was very glad to hear the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] and the gentleman from West Virginia making a favorable report on the Ohio River, as it concerns their cities.

It brought to my mind a thought that I have always entertained as a Member of this body, that whatever flood dangers exist throughout the country, in connection with rivers which flow through two or more States, constitute a Federal challenge. I come from a district where there is no flood-control problem. The Members will remember that I introduced a bill which is now a law providing for 100 percent Federal contribution on flood control, for the construction of dams.

I hope that the Congress will watch the present situation closely and that as quickly as possible in future years Congress will make appropriations for flood control wherever dangers exist throughout the United States, to bring safety to our fellow American citizens, no matter in what section of the country they live. I come from a section with no flood-control problems, but I am in favor of protection in the West, the North, the South, the East, wherever that danger exists.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the majority leader takes the position he does take in supporting the gentlemen from Ohio and West Virginia. I am preparing a bill providing for an Ohio Valley Authority, but not along the pattern of the T. V. A. Ohio and our part of the country has paid most of the freight for some of these eleemosynary institutions in other parts of the country. I think the power feature should be eliminated from the consideration of this proposition and that we should consider it from the standpoint of flood control only.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

DETENTION OF ITALIAN SAILORS AT ELLIS ISLAND

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I call attention of the House to a very tragic situation that has existed at Ellis Island. Over a hundred Italian seamen who have been sailing Italian ships to the United States are confined at Ellis Island for the following reasons: One ship was transported to the United States and converted into a hospital ship. I shall not give the name of it because of military reasons. The men were taken off that ship and told they would be permitted to find work. Later they were informed that could not be done, and they have been confined at Ellis Island for over a month. As these men are not American citizens they were not permitted to man the hospital ship. In the meantime they are forced to rot on Ellis Island. They could be used in aiding our war effort. Instead they are confined. Nothing is being done to transport them back home. I am sure those men are ready, willing, and most anxious

to serve the United States and the Allied cause in any manner in which we will permit them to serve.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement by Senator CAPPER.

INCREASING THE DEBT LIMIT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2404) to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2404) to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes, with Mr. THOMAS of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is recognized for 2 hours, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] 2 hours.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JENKINS. The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] is not here but is expected shortly. Until he comes I know of no reason why we should not proceed. Since I am the ranking minority member of the committee I will act for him.

The CHAIRMAN. In the absence of the gentleman from Minnesota, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the bill H. R. 2404 was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means and has for its purpose the increasing of the authorized debt of the United States from $200,000,000,000 to $300,000,000,000. This bill imposes no additional taxes, does not increase taxes. Its primary purpose is to extend the borrowing power whereby the Treasury may be enabled to take care of expenditures made necessary by acts of Congress.

The gross debt of the United States on March 1, 1945, was $233,700,000,000-plus. This amount, however, must be increased for purposes of debt limitation by about $9,000,000,000 in unearned discounts on savings bonds, making a total debt for the purpose of debt limitation of around $242,700,000,000. This leaves us, there being $260,000,000,000 now authorized as the debt limit, with a borrowing power of only $17,500,000,000.

Each year since our entry into the war Congress has been called upon to increase the debt limit in order to enable the Treasury to borrow amounts over and above collections to meet necessary expenses in the prosecution of the war. I hate war; there is nothing about war I do not deplore. I have, however, nothing but the highest praise for the courage, patriotism, and devotion of our men in the glorious victories they are achieving on land, sea, and in the air, as well as the magnificent achievements on the home front in outproducing the whole world and providing means whereby we and our allies can hasten the end of the war. It is indeed gratifying that we are now beginning to see the effects of this great effort which should result in our forever putting an end to tyranny and aggression.

The Treasury is now asking Congress again to increase the debt limit from $260,000,000,000 to $300,000,000,000 in order to meet the demands of the war up to and including the fiscal year 1946. At the present time we are paying about 46 percent of our total expenditures from current taxes, leaving approximately 54 percent to be provided by the issuance of bonds.

We were advised by the Treasury that plans are now being completed for the Seventh War Loan Drive, to be started sometime after April 1. At the present time, as I have stated, the Treasury has remaining approximately seventeen and one-half billion dollars of borrowing authority, which will be considerably less by the time the war-loan drive is completed; so it is necessary to increase the authorized limit at this time. Other war loans may be necessary in the near future, and your committee unanimously recommends the increase to $300,000,000,000 in order to fully provide for our war needs during the fiscal year 1946.

In granting this increase, your committee deemed it advisable to bring within the limitation those obligations of Federal corporations in the hands of the public, amounting to approximately $1,500,000,000, which are guaranteed by the Federal Government both as to principal and as to interest. Since 1941 it has been the policy of the Treasury to purchase these guaranteed obligations and approximately $11,500,000,000 are now held by the Treasury and included in the present debt limitation. About $1,500,000,000 additional will be brought in if this bill is enacted into law. The bill also contains several administrative provisions. In order to provide adequate and convenient facilities for the redemption of savings bonds, the Treasury recommended, and the committee approved, section 3 of the bill, which provides that in addition to incorporated banks and trust companies the Treasury may be allowed to utilize certain other financial institutions, such as savings and loan associations, building and loan associations, credit unions, and others. Adequate safeguards are contained in the bill so that only responsible institutions will be used and the public interest will be adequately protected.

Section 3 also provides that in the event there should be losses in the redemption of savings bonds through no fault or negligence of these financial institutions, such losses shall be replaced out of the losses-in-shipment fund provided under the Government Losses in Shipment Act. Provision is made under existing law for such losses by the Government or by incorporated banks and trust companies and this extends the same to the additional financial institutions previously mentioned.

The Government Losses in Shipment Act has been in force during the past 8 years, during which time securities of a value of nearly a billion two hundred million dollars have been shipped, and the amount of claims which have been made under the act have amounted to $1,413,000, of which only $104,000 have actually been paid during these 8 years. I repeat, only $104,000 have been paid during the 8 years. Had the Government paid premiums on all of these shipments at the same rate paid in 1937, before this act went into effect, the Treasury would have paid out $11,400,000, whereas there was actually paid out only $104,000 during that period.

The Treasury also recommended and the committee approved inclusion of section 4 of the bill. This would facilitate the payment, exchange, or issue of United States securities in the event of death of members of the armed forces. It would permit the Treasury to accept the finding of death made by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy where a person has been listed as missing in action for 1 year. This provision would relieve the Treasury and the Federal Reserve banks of financial responsibility in the event of the return of a person presumed to be dead.

Provision is also made in section 4 of the bill to permit the expeditious and orderly handling of certain gifts to the United States. The Under Secretary of the Treasury testified that the number of gifts and bequests to the United States is increasing. There are instances where certain local taxes are due on the gifts and bequests. In order to permit the Treasury to accept such gifts, authority is given so that the taxes may be paid out of the proceeds of the gifts and the remainder placed in the general fund of the Treasury. If this provision were not made, it would be necessary for the Secretary to ask the Congress for specific authority each time this situation arose.

The section makes it clear that this provision will not conflict with other statutes creating trust funds which have provided for such a situation.

Section 5 of the bill would enable the Secretary of the Treasury to take advantage of favorable market conditions for the disposition of bonds, notes, and other securities acquired under judicial process or otherwise, by removing the requirement of existing law which permits the disposal of such securities only after advertising for 3 months. It would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to sell, at market, without advertisement for bids, subject to the limitation that the amount of the securities of any single issuer held by the Treasury Department at any one time shall not exceed $1,000,000.

Many throughout the country feel that immediately after cessation of hostilities Federal expenditures will more nearly approach pre-war levels, and that sub-

stantial tax reduction can be made. This, I fear, will not be realized to the extent hoped for.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I would just like to make a statement in that respect, and I take this from the President's acceptance speech in Chicago on July 2, 1932:

> I know something of taxes. For 3 long years I have been going up and down the country preaching that government—Federal, and State, and local—costs too much. I shall not stop that preaching.

Does the gentleman not think that if he would start to preach reduction of tax for the good of the country, that we would be able to cut down on the spending that we are doing now?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. There might be some saving effected in that way. The Treasury or the executive departments of the Government cannot expend any money except as authorized and appropriated by Congress.

I would say to my good friend that for the fiscal year 1944 only about 5 percent of the total expenditures were for nonwar purposes, leaving about 95 percent for war purposes.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman may get some satisfaction out of making that comparison, but it does not give me any satisfaction.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I do not know that it will give the gentleman any satisfaction, but it will give the House some information. I do not know whether it would be possible to give the gentleman information. I admire the gentleman's zeal for economy. He is very persistent, as far as I know.

Mr. RICH. When Mr. Roosevelt came into power the national debt was $22,538,672,164. From that time up until the war you increased the national debt to $48,961,443,536, and we did not have a war.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Yes; but we resurrected the country from the economic slough of despondency in which it was left when we inherited the responsibility of government.

Mr. RICH. I will say you resurrected the country, and the resurrection is not over yet.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The increase in the national income from 1932 to 1944 was many times the increase in the national debt during that period.

I do not want to talk politics, even if the gentleman does.

Mr. RICH. I am not talking politics.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. You are right on it.

Mr. RICH. I want to talk sound business and finances. When we increase our income in business we naturally increase our debt, but we get away from our deficit, we get a profit; and that is what you should have done.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. In this case "we" applies to a Democratic and not a Republican administration, I will remind the gentleman of that. We increased the national income.

Mr. RICH. No Republican administration has ever done what this administration has done.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I cannot understand what the gentleman from Pennsylvania means. Does he mean to criticize the war effort when he talks about expenditures? Is that what he means when he says no Republican administration will do that?

Mr. RICH. I will answer that.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I do not have the floor.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is the gentleman making an observation or asking a question?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I am asking a question of the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The nonwar expenditures were not so staggering from 1941 to 1945. The total nonwar expenditures during this period were approximately $21,000,000,000, while the total expenditures for war and nonwar purposes were $237,000,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think it would be very interesting if the gentleman would insert in his remarks at this point what the expenditures of the Government were between 1933 and 1940. I think the House would like to have those figures.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The gentleman has as much time as I, and can insert those figures if he wishes to do so.

Mr. KNUTSON. I thought the gentleman was trying to make an informative speech, and I was trying to make suggestions.

Mr. BULWINKLE. If the gentleman is going to insert any of that, I suggest that he insert also the reason why there was the necessity for making these expenditures, after 4 years of the Hoover administration.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I have tried since the war began in 1941 to avoid partisan discussion. Sometimes I may be provoked into making a partisan statement but, during the war, where all our efforts are united, I desire to not engage in partisan discussion. The less partisan politics and the more patriotism we have, the sooner we will win this war.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, because there is nobody for whom I have higher regard than the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]; but when we think of what is happening in the creation of this great national debt, it does not make any difference what party is in power—I would not care if the Republicans were in power, I would fight them just as hard as I am trying to fight now for economy in government. I would use the last ounce of energy I had to fight for economy—does not the gentleman believe that in the operation of our Government now we ought to economize in every item of expense of the Government that does not pertain to the furtherance of the war effort?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I do not think there is any question about that.

Mr. RICH. There is no political question involved there.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I have great respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He is very consistent. His voice is the voice crying in the wilderness. I agree that we should attempt to effect more rigid economy. We have tried to do so. I will have something to say on that score before I complete my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I am informed that there have recently been more than 1,000 bills referred to the Veterans' Administration proposing to increase the expenses of the Veterans' Administration over that now provided by present law. I am also informed that recently a Member of the other distinguished Body has introduced a bill which would increase the expenditures of the Veterans' Administration some $7,000,000,000 in 1 year over and above that provided in the present law. As to what Congress will do in the future which will affect expenditures, no one can tell. But I am perfectly in accord with the sentiment of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania so far as it is reasonably possible. With reference to all this heavy debt and interest charge, let me put that in the RECORD so that we may know something about what the nonwar expenditures may be and which we will be compelled to have. The interest on the public debt and expenses of the Veterans' Administration are nonwar expenditures. As the expenditures and the national debt increase, the interest on the national debt increases, and makes for an increase in the nonwar expenditures. The same thing is true of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I would say that the gentleman is absolutely right. That is the reason why Congress should give every consideration to not increase the debt more than necessary because as we increase the debt we increase our interest rate, and we will eventually come to the point, if we keep on without some economy in government, where we will not be able to stand the expenses of government.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I will say to my friend the debt is only increased by expenditures and not by the amount of the debt limitation.

Mr. RICH. The only thing I would say in that respect is that when a man

finds he cannot borrow any more money he will start saving his dollars. That same principle ought to apply to the Congress. Whenever we know that we are approaching our debt limit, we ought to try to grip our hands tightly and try to save.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I agree with the gentleman. It is often said, "Agree with thy adversary quickly"; therefore, I agree with the gentleman.

The interest on the public debt for the fiscal year 1945 is $3,750,000,000. The interest on the public debt for 1946 is estimated at $4,500,000,000, and by 1947 it will be $6,000,000,000.

If the public debt is $300,000,000,000 by 1947, at 2 percent the interest charge on that $300,000,000,000 public obligation will be $6,000,000,000.

Now, getting down to the Veterans' Administration: For the fiscal year 1945 the expense of the Veterans' Administration was $1,518,000,000, plus. In 1946, $2,707,000,000. The estimated amount for 1947 is $4,189,000,000. That is under existing law. As to how much that may be increased by future legislative enactments lies with the Congress. No one can tell what the increase will be. But for the fiscal year 1946, beginning the 1st of next July, the expenditures for the Veterans' Administration and the interest on the public debt alone will be $7,207,119,000, which is much more than the total expenses of the Government before the outbreak of the war.

For 1947, it is estimated that these expenditures for the Veterans' Administration and interest on the public debt will be $10,189,000,000.

Those are some of the nonwar expenditures that we must necessarily meet.

Even for the period following the first year of demobilization, the prospects will be for a large budget; a large budget at least if compared with the pre-war budgets. Of course, the more distant the period for which we try to estimate expenditures, the more uncertain the figures must be. Various experts have estimated post-war Federal expenditures within a range all the way from a minimum of $15,000,000,000 to a maximum of $36,000,000,000. The size of the post-war Budget will depend largely on our domestic economy, international policy, and many other unforeseen factors impossible at this time to determine.

During the first post-war years we probably shall still have large forces of occupation overseas. War expenditures may amount to something like $10,000,000,000 to $15,000,000,000; interest on the national debt, $6,000,000,000 to $7,000,000,000; veterans—under existing legislation—$3,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000; aids to agriculture—under the present mandatory price support and other programs—$1,500,000,000 to $2,000,000,000; social security—present programs—$500,000,000; public works, $1,000,000,000 to $1,500,000,000; government, general, $1,500,000,000. Total expenditures during this immediate post-war period may therefore amount to from $30,000,000,000 to $35,000,000,000 or more.

When we can withdraw most of our forces of occupation, war expenditures, I hope, can further decline to, let us say, somewhere between $5,000,000,000 and $10,000,000,000. By that time I think that a Budget total of perhaps $25,000,000,000 can be expected.

In contrast with the fiscal condition of the Federal Government, the States have been able, in many cases, to reduce their debts and accumulate a surplus.

I will ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] to take particular notice of this.

Every reasonable effort should be made to keep the credit of our country secure, and the payment of its obligations certain. Therefore, we must make every reasonable effort to curtail unnecessary expenditures by the Federal Government. A real contribution can be made in this connection by our States and local communities providing for expenditures which are of State and local character and not connected with the prosecution of the war, or primarily the responsibility of the Federal Government.

The States and local governments are coming to Washington asking for too much money, and for large expenditures which are primarily the responsibility of the States and the local authorities. Does not the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. RICH. From the very start, since I have been in Congress I remember people back home, State governments, city and municipal governments, and various service clubs and various groups coming here to Washington, all trying to get what they could out of our Government. I was not a party to it. That is where you made your great mistake, because instead of trying to curb those fellows and let them go back home and work hard, they came here for the reason that they thought they could get anything they wanted, and you just encouraged them to do that. It is going to be hard to break away from that. However, there are many States today which are operating, as well as municipalities. When they know they cannot get it from the Federal Government they buckle down and tighten their belts and they try to get a balanced Budget. If we would only take an example from some of those States and some of those municipalities, right here in Congress, we would do a wonderful job. I hope the Members of Congress will tighten up their belts and say "We have got to do something to cut down these expenditures or we are going to sink the ship."

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Special groups should refrain from urging the expenditure of large sums by the Federal Government for pet projects of a nonessential character. Expenditures of this nature are burdens which the Federal Government can ill afford and should not be expected to carry in view of its unbalanced Budget, its huge debts, and its high and oppressive taxes. Unless we are able to bring our receipts in line with our expenditures when the war is over we will not be able to reduce either Federal taxes nor the Federal debt; we can do neither unless we bring our expenditures in line with our revenue receipts.

Promiscuous spending by the Federal Government must stop if we are to maintain the security of our credit. Only by reducing the cost of Government can we ultimately reduce the taxes levied by the Government. It is only because of our immediate necessity caused by the war expenditures that I feel obligated or justified to ask for further extension of the public debt at this time.

I will now make just a brief summary of what the bill contains.

SUMMARY ON H. R. 2404

Section I: The enacting clause.

Section II: Amends section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act limiting the face amount of obligations issued under this act and the face amount of obligations guaranteed by the United States to $300,000,000,000.

Section III: Amends subsection (h) and (i) of section 22 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, adding to subsection (h) certain financial institutions to the list of those that may be authorized or permitted to redeem savings bonds, providing these institutions meet certain qualifications. Section (i) provides that any losses resulting from payment made in connection with the redemption of savings bonds shall be replaced out of the funds established by the Government Losses in Shipment Act, providing the paying agent is free from fault or negligence.

Section IV: Amends the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, by adding sections 23 and 24. Section 23 provides that the finding of death authorized to be made by law or by the Secretary of the Army and Secretary of the Navy is to be accepted as sufficient proof of death by any accountable officer of the Treasury Department and any Federal Reserve bank without risk of financial responsibility in connection with the payment, exchange, and so forth of United States securities. Section 24 authorizes the Treasurer of the United States to redeem certain direct obligations of the United States which may become the property of the United States by gift or bequest, and out of the proceeds thereof, to pay gift or inheritance taxes as may be due.

Section V (a): Authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to dispose of certain bonds and securities, not in excess of a million dollars of any single issuer, acquired by him under judicial process or otherwise on behalf of the United States, without notice as provided by section 3749 of the Revised Statutes. (b) Authority to dispose of bonds, and so forth, granted by other laws is not impaired or superseded by section 5 (a).

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. While this bill limits the national debt to $300,000,000,000 I see in the report where it is anticipated that the national debt will likely be $304,000,000,000 by June 30, 1946.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. It may be a little more than the $300,000,000,000 provided for by the pending

bill by June 30, 1946, and if next June this appears to be the case further extension will be necessary. The actuaries of the Treasury Department feel that this increase of the borrowing authority of the Government up to $300,000,000,000 will take care of the obligations and expenditures up to the end of the fiscal year 1946, based upon the present Budget.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Can the gentleman from North Carolina tell us what proportion of this $300,000,000,000 public debt is related directly to the war?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Yes; I can tell the gentleman. It is estimated that 84 percent of all expenditures for 1946 will be for war purposes.

For the fiscal year 1944, 94 percent of all expenditures were for war purposes. For 1945 the figure was 89.3 percent; and the estimate for 1946 is 84.2 percent, leaving approximately 16 percent of the total estimated expenditures for that fiscal year for nonwar purposes.

Mr. STEFAN. I believe the gentleman misunderstood me. I wish to ascertain the percentage of the total of $300,000,000,000 that will represent war expenditures.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. As I say, it is estimated that for 1946 the expenditures for war purposes will amount to $70,000,000,000. For the fiscal year 1945 it will be $89,000,000,000.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is talking about fiscal years; I am inquiring about the bulk, the total, $300,000,000,000. Of this what percentage will be for war purposes?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman will bear in mind you are not creating an authorization here by the public debt limit of $300,000,000,000 to provide $300,000,000,000. The public debt is already $232,000,000,000 and by next year it will be $292,000,000,000.

Mr. STEFAN. I realize that, but what percentage of the $232,000,000,000 would represent war expenditures?

Mr. COOPER. About 95 percent.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The borrowing is to take up the difference between the expenditures and receipts that we will receive. That is what we are borrowing for. Our debt since Pearl Harbor has risen from a gross debt of fifty-five billion to a gross debt of two hundred and thirty-three billion plus. This total increase can be attributed to the war. On the basis of a three hundred billion debt the increase will amount to two hundred and forty-five billion. All of this increase can be attributed to the war, so approximately 82 percent of the total debt of three hundred billion would be caused by the war.

Mr. COOPER. You must also bear in mind that in the nonwar budget is included such items as interest on the public debt, part of which is due to the war.

Mr. STEFAN. The 95 percent of the $232,000,000,000 would be for war purposes, including interest?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The interest on the public debt, I may say to the gentleman, has increased. The interest on the public debt for the fiscal year 1945 was $3,750,000,000, whereas for 1946 it is estimated at $6,000,000,000.

Mr. STEFAN. We started out with a public debt of $50,000,000,000 before the war.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. How much?

Mr. STEFAN. Fifty billion dollars. Now, I am interested in that 16 percent involved in nonwar expenditures because of my membership on the Appropriations Committee. I am tremendously interested in what the distinguished gentleman had to say about the 16-percent nonwar expenditures. Would the gentleman suggest to the members of the Appropriations Committee where we can cut further in nonessentials?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I would not feel qualified to do that. However, I believe our gross debt was fifty-five billion at the time of Pearl Harbor.

Mr. COOPER. I may say that three of the largest items in the nonwar budget is, first, interest on your public debt; second, refunds of taxes; and third, cost of the Veterans' Administration. They are the three big items.

Mr. STEFAN. Part of the interest could be referred to the war effort?

Mr. COOPER. Why, certainly. The cost of the Veterans' Administration is certainly the result of the war.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman made the statement that the national debt is now $232,000,000,000, but I call his attention to the fact that on March 3, 1945, the national debt was $234,936,241,834.64.

Mr. COOPER. The $232,000,000,000 was as of January 31, 1945.

Mr. RICH. I am calling attention to the fact this is as of March 3, 1945.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. In my statement I said that the national debt as of March 1 was $242,700,000,000.

Mr. RICH. I was referring to the statement made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], but he corrected it, giving the date. Now, we are going to increase this debt limit from $260,000,000,000 to $300,000,000,000. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] made the statement a while ago that we are within $17,500,000,000 of the $260,000,000,000. I am going to propose an amendment at the proper time to change this $300,000,000,000 to $290,000,000,000, which will give you the $17,500,000,000 that you now have and $20,000,000,000 additional, or a total of $37,500,000,000. Does not the gentleman think if we put the limit now at $280,000,000,000, and if they have $37,500,000,000 that might be an incentive for the Members of Congress when they are voting for appropriations to hold down a little bit and cut these expenditures? I think it would.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Those remarks would be more appropriate if addressed to the Appropriations Committee. I would not feel qualified to advise the great Committee on Appropriations. I know that committee has to struggle with these appropriations.

Mr. RICH. I wish the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee were chairman of the Appropriations Committee because I think we would get some results so far as cutting these expenses down. That is my observation and opinion because the Appropriations Committee does not know when to stop spending. That is what I want to drive at right here and now; that is, get the Committee on Appropriations to stop its ruthless expenditure of Government funds.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The gentleman realizes that the Committee on Appropriations can only recommend appropriations, and Congress is not bound to approve the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee. But I do not have time to scrutinize these various appropriations; consequently I would not feel qualified to advise the Committee on Appropriations. When I hear these different bills discussed, when I hear the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] on one side and the ranking Republican Member, the gentleman from Now York [Mr. TABER] on the other side, debate the question, then I have some idea about how I should vote. But up to that time I have not had the opportunity to secure the information that would qualify me to advise, instruct, or criticize the great Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. May I just make this statement to the distinguished gentleman, which he well knows, and I think every Member of this House knows, that the normal expenditures of this Government have been cut down in recent years, and that this expenditure which is so large and shocks us so much is due entirely to the war activity?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. The gentleman from North Carolina is a distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations, and he is qualified to express an opinion and tell us about that committee.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just want to make this observation for the benefit of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. My conception of the duties and functions of the Committee on Ways and Means is to find ways and means of raising the money by revenue; raising money that is recommended by the Committee on Appropriations. It is not our function to try to compel the Committee on

Appropriations to cut down their appropriations. We would be invading their jurisdiction. So the gentleman from Pennsylvania should not try to put the onus of these appropriations on the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RICH. But I am doing that. May I ask the gentleman this question?

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman from North Carolina has the floor.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I appreciate that. But are you finding it easy to get money enough to furnish the money for the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in answer to that, I will say that we are not finding it easy. We are finding it tremendously hard, and that is why I do not want the gentleman to blame the Committee on Ways and Means for Government spending.

Mr. RICH. I want the gentleman to join me to get after this Committee on Appropriations. That is what I want. I want him to help me compel the Committee on Appropriations to cut down these appropriations. I served on that committee, and I know they are not doing what they ought to do.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I hope this colloquy is not being taken out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just want to say that we have plenty of trouble raising enough money, and that is the reason I do not want the gentleman from Pennsylvania to suggest that we take on more troubles, troubles that really belong to the Committee on Appropriations, of which he was a valued member for many years.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Responding to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, who advises that he has an amendment to offer that will decrease the limit from three hundred billion, as provided in the bill, to two hundred and eighty billion, I do not think anything could be accomplished by that. Under the present estimates, the debt will be around three hundred and four billion by June 30, 1946. If we are able to hold the $300,000,000,000 limit, we will have accomplished a great deal. If such an amendment is adopted and we are required within a few months to bring in another bill, the Committee on Ways and Means will again have to hold hearings, lasting for 3 or 4 days, and then go into executive session for maybe a week, all of which requires stenographers and clerks, and there will be more expenditures. That is my honest opinion.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. There is one thought in reference to the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], which I believe merits consideration, and that is that this Budget of the Government was made on the theory that the war would continue for the entire year 1945–46, I believe.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I think the Budget estimate was based on the war in Europe ending by the end of this fiscal year and the war with Japan ending by the end of the next fiscal year. However, here is what the President said in his Budget message:

> I have not made in the past, and I shall not now make, any prediction concerning the length of the war. My only prediction is that our enemies will be totally defeated before we lay down our arms. Depending upon various assumptions which may reasonably be made with respect to the course of the war, estimates of war expenditures for the fiscal year 1946 range from less than sixty to more than eighty billion dollars. I propose to use $70,000,000,000 as a tentative estimate of war expenditures for the fiscal year 1946. I repeat, however, the rate of actual spending must depend on developments on the battle fronts.

Mr. KEAN. I do not think so.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. That is my understanding.

Mr. COOPER. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman from North Carolina, the chairman of the committee, is exactly right about that.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. If the war in Europe ends earlier than was anticipated in making up the Budget figures, a further extension of the debt limit would not be necessary.

Mr. KEAN. I doubt the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee. That is not the way I understood it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we have just listened to a very interesting and informative explanation of the measure before us. I consider the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] one of the most valuable men in the House, who is respected by friend and foe alike for his intellectual honesty, ability, and sterling Americanism. It was my pleasure to read an editorial that recently appeared in the Charlotteville Observer paying him a tribute such as I have never before read concerning a living man, and it is my purpose to place it in the RECORD at an early date.

The bill we now have before us is the seventh of its kind, that is, raising the debt limit, since the New Deal came into power. Notwithstanding the fact that we have had seven increases in the national debt limit since 1933, we have also had 13 general revenue bills, each of which made the tax burden of the American people heavier and heavier.

I presume in all the history of parliamentary and other forms of government there has never been such an orgy of spending of the people's money as we have witnessed in the last 12 years. The motto has been, "Spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect."

No one has criticized expenditures that have been made for the prosecution of the war, although it is my recollection that a responsible New Deal official not long ago stated that the war was costing the American people anywhere from 25 to 40 percent more than it should. I do not think there is any question about that, but I am not criticizing it, because if I did, I would lay myself open to the criticism of impeding the war effort. It is unfortunate, however, that we do not get 100 percent value for every dollar we spend.

May I say at this point that the war is costing the American people more than the combined expenditures of Great Britain, Russia, Germany, Japan, and Italy, when Italy was in the war. These figures are indisputable. Today the national debt of the American people is approaching the $250,000,000,000 mark. That is a lot of money. It represents more than the total wealth of our farms, and all the homes, apartments, factories, shops, and stores in all the cities. As a matter of fact, the national debt today is perilously near the assessed valuation of the United States. Now we are asked to increase the national debt for the seventh time, raising the limit to $300,000,000,000, which represents an amount equal to $300 for every minute since the dawn of the Christian era. No other country in all the world could stand the drain that we are called upon to bear. It is to the everlasting credit of the American people that they have bought bonds time after time without question and without complaint.

It speaks volumes for their patriotism and their determination to win this iniquitous war. When the limit of $300,000,000,000 is reached, it will mean a mortgage of $10,000 on every family of four in the United States. Yea, more than that, it will mean the future babes born in this country will come into the world with a $2,500 debt tag hanging around their necks. The unfortunate and the discouraging part of it is that notwithstanding the enormous drains which are being made upon us, there is not the least effort on the part of the President and his followers to practice even reasonable economy in the conduct of the Government. Since Pearl Harbor, the number of Federal employees has increased from a trifle less than 1,000,000, to over 3,000,000—all in the name of the war effort.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has informed the House that he is going to offer an amendment to reduce the proposed limit of $300,000,000,000, as proposed in this bill, to $280,000,000,000. Unfortunately, I was in Minnesota when this measure was before the Committee on Ways and Means, hence was not present when that able group had their deliberations.

It is my information that we have $17,000,000,000 yet to go on under the present limit, which is $260,000,000,000. That, together with the $20,000,000,000 which we propose to increase under the suggestion of the able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], would give us $37,000,000,000. When I came to Congress 29 years ago, $37,000,000,000 would have run this Government 37 years. Now we are told that we must have $40,000,000,000 increase, plus the $17,000,000,000 unspent of the present allowance, all of which will probably be spent by the beginning of the next fiscal year, July 1, 1946.

Of course, we have to go along with this. You know it on that side of the

aisle, as well as we know it on the other side of the aisle, that much of it will be wasted; but we cannot help it. Under a succession of grants the Congress has divested itself and has invested in the hands of the President, powers so great that no court and certainly not the highest court, as it is now constituted, can tell just how much power the President has; but we do know that he has powers that approach those of Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito. There is nothing for us to do. We are all in the same boat. We are in the midst of a turbulent stream, headed for the rapids that may destroy us. We do not know. All we can do is to hope for the best. We have to win the war. There are no two ways about that. If it takes every dollar that we have or hope to have, we must win this war. But I call upon the party in power to begin practicing economy, to release from the Government service those hundreds of thousands of clerks and satraps that are not necessary to the war effort. We have a right to ask of the party in power that it practice rigid economy, and pare nonwar expenses down to the bone. It must be done if the solvency of the country is to be maintained.

Before I conclude I would like to serve notice on the States that they must stop coming to Washington asking for grants for this, that, and the other thing. The time has come when the Federal Government is no longer able to grant hundreds of millions and millions of dollars to the States to spend. There is not a State in the Union whose treasury is not in better shape than that of the Federal Treasury at the present time. We are just one step ahead of the sheriff, and unless we take cognizance of the situation as it exists now, and unless we determine that henceforth every dollar spent will be spent wisely, economically, and judiciously, we are sunk. Why this administration does not cut out the 10-percent-plus system of awarding contracts, which is an incentive to waste and squandering, is beyond the comprehension of any sane man who holds his country above his party.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. While the gentleman is discussing the question of cost-plus contracts, I have understood that it has been stated in the press and over the radio that Mr. Lindsay Warren, former able Member of this House and now Comptroller General of the United States, stated that there are at least $50,000,000,000 of fraud and unnecessary expenditures in those contracts. That is a tidy item in itself.

Mr. KNUTSON. No one, of course, knows. The cost-plus system has cost the American people more than it should, and all are agreed that under the cost-plus system of letting contracts we have created a new and a large crop of war millionaires.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Warren does condemn in unmeasured terms the cost-plus system, and those of us who know his ability, his courage, and his honesty appreciate statements coming from a man like that.

Mr. KNUTSON. Let me say to my good friend from Kentucky that we on this side of the House have no corner on patriotism or on the desire to see this Government and its war effort conducted in the most practicable economical manner. We are all animated and inspired by the same hopes, the same ideals. Those who are on the majority side, of course, in view of the fact that their party is in power, cannot speak out as plainly as we for obvious reasons that I need not remind you of, but at least the minority can speak out, because there are no postmasterships or judgeships involved.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I had determined that I would keep away from partisan discussion, but if the statement is made that there are unnecessary expenditures in the conduct of the war we must admit the truth of it, for you can no more conduct a war without waste than you can put out a great conflagration that threatens to wipe out a city without some waste of water. We know that things have to be done hurriedly, and we cannot always get the most capable and efficient men.

We do know, however, that the President of the United States made every effort to divorce the prosecution of war from politics by naming a distinguished outstanding Republican, Mr. Stimson, as Secretary of War and the previous Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Knox, was a Republican.

If there is waste and extravagance in the prosecution of the war under the War and Navy Departments, it is as much the responsibility of the distinguished Secretaries who were Republicans as it is of the Democrats. Mr. Roosevelt could not follow up all those things.

Mr. KNUTSON. My good friend from North Carolina is not exactly fair when he states that the President took the war out of politics when he made one Republican the Secretary of War and another Republican the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. I said he made the effort.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the President had been sincerely desirous of putting the whole thing on a nonpartisan basis I believe he would have chosen a younger Republican to head such an important effort as that conducted by the War Department. I believe the gentleman will agree with that.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. How much time have I used, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 16 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I wish to ask the gentleman from Minnesota or the chairman of the committee whether the Ways and Means Committee is planning a new tax bill for this year.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman will have to direct his question to the chairman, and I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. We are making a study of the subject of post-war taxes; but certainly I believe I can say to the gentleman that there will be no new tax bill that will apply to this year's business; I am sure that if we have a new tax bill it will not apply to this year's business.

Mr. STEFAN. Not a tax bill that will apply to this year's business.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. That is, general tax bill, I am sure.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. It has been rumored around that this Nation has been committed or will be committed to lend some $22,000,000,000 to various foreign countries in the post-war era. Did the gentleman's committee take that fact into consideration in asking an increase of the debt limitation of this Nation to $300,000,000,000?

Mr. KNUTSON. Again I will have to refer to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. The gentleman wants to know whether we took into consideration in the discussions on this bill while it was in committee rumors that the administration has entered into commitments with foreign countries whereby we will have to advance them twenty-odd-billion dollars after the war is over?

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. We did not hear any rumor of that kind that was brought to the attention of our committee.

Mr. KNUTSON. I did not think the gentleman had.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. We cannot legislate on rumors.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I feel sure that the gentleman from Minnesota as well as every other member of the Ways and Means Committee will bear me out in the statement that the Ways and Means Committee never legislates on rumor. We make an effort to get the facts.

Mr. DONDERO. Let us hope that the rumors are unfounded.

Mr. KNUTSON. May I say to the gentleman from Tennessee and to the gentleman from North Carolina that they are undoubtedly aware of the fact that Britain has told us that she is going to need six and one-half billion dollars for rehabilitation after the war is over. That is a matter of official record.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to nail this down as best we can. We know that at the present time the fund we shall have to put up through the Treasury in connection with the Bretton Woods agreement and the stabilization of currencies and the creation of the International Credit Bank capital structure is not rumor. That bill is now before the

Banking and Currency Committee of this House and certainly within due course, 60, 90, or 120 days, it will have passed on through the legislative machinery. To be very plain, there is nothing in this estimate of $304,000,000,000 which has anything to do with commitments we may make under the Dumbarton Oaks proposals, under the Export-Import Bank proposition and under the stabilization plan for currencies or the International Credit Bank. That is true, is it not?

Mr. KNUTSON. How much are the commitments that you folks are considering, the possible commitments under the Dumbarton Oaks and Bretton Woods plans?

Mr. CRAWFORD. On the part of the United States, anywhere from five or six billion dollars up to $20,000,000,000 or more. I have not mentioned the things that are being discussed under lend-lease with respect to long-term loans under which category you can bring the proposition—we will call them rumors if you please—I do not think they are rumors—$6,000,000,000 to China or $10,000,000,000 to Russia or eight or ten billion dollars to Great Britain. My question is this: The $304,000,000,000 estimate does not include any of those items, does it?

Mr. KNUTSON. No. From what the gentleman says there are more than rumors to the figure $20,000,000,000 mentioned by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Congress will unquestionably go along with the Bretton Woods proposal and use $1,800,000,000 of gold profits plus whatever other money is necessary to put up.

Mr. KNUTSON. Woods suggest trees, mostly oaks, the fruit of which is nuts.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I know the gentleman wishes to be fair. I have the proposal of Bretton Woods here and the subscription of the United States to the bank is $3,175,000,000 and to the stabilization fund $2,750,000,000. I do not believe the rumor of $20,000,000,000 is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman had been listening to me, he would know what I said. I have the text and I said from five and one-half up to twenty billion dollars. Where am I in error?

Mr. MONRONEY. There is no place in the testimony that our committee has heard any suggestion of $20,000,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman said anywhere from five to twenty billion dollars. He did not specify any definite amount.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Of course, it ought to be perfectly clear that in the figures just quoted there is not included the proposal for the expenditure of money that may ultimately be translated into public debt transactions under lend-lease. When you include the proposed expenditures that are involved in the capitalization of the international bank, together with the proposed expenditures under commitments that may last for 20 years under lend-lease, you can easily have $20,000,000,000 involved.

But what I wanted to say, if the gentleman will yield further to me is this: This bill involves a question of public debt. When you consider the proposals that are now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency to reduce the gold content of the dollar down to 25 cents, and further to increase the price of gold to some $56, as it has been alleged, I understand, thereby creating an artificial profit on the books of the Treasury that they can spend for these purposes, it may be that neither the Bretton Woods proposal nor lend-lease may ultimately be translated into actual public-debt transactions. So I think the question that is involved here involves a question as to what are the prospective actual expenditures that will be translated into actual public-debt transactions.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, we will continue to give and give until we take Santa Claus into the barber shop and give him a shave.

Mr. MONRONEY. Just to keep the record straight, there is no bill that is being heard or considered seriously by the Committee on Banking and Currency that is going to devaluate the gold or set up any artificial profit on the gold.

Mr. KNUTSON. That has not been discussed here.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman was just charging us with doing that.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not know whether there is a bill up or not, but when the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma says it has not been discussed, he is not keeping up with the times and he has not read the statement of Mr. Eccles and others, to which statements I can refer the gentleman if he wants to know. The matter is under discussion. It is under discussion today, very definitely.

Mr. MONRONEY. If the gentleman has read the hearings, he would know we are not discussing the gold content of the dollar. We are talking about the reserve of gold behind the currency.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. There has been a bill introduced, I believe, to increase the value of gold to $56 an ounce, but it has not been considered. Somebody has introduced it. No member of the committee has introduced it.

Mr. KEEFE. It is before the gentleman's committee though, is it not?

Mr. SPENCE. It is before the committee.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. SPENCE. It is before the committee as all the other bills are before our committee. Under the Bretton Woods agreement the ultimate liability of the United States is a little over $5,000,000,000, and only 20 percent of that is callable, which is less than $2,000,000,000. I cannot see how the gentleman can say that there is a potential liability of $20,000,000,000, because there is no foundation for such a statement.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Kentucky must remember that in these days the sky is the limit.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that statistics available in our Treasury Department show that our national debt during the last 6 months of the calendar year 1944 increased by approximately $30,000,000,000, while during the same period of 6 months the national debt of the United Kingdom increased only about six and one-half billion dollars?

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, we like to do things in a big way. When we go to spending, we like to spend more than anybody else.

I have often thought that we ought to set Coal Oil Johnny up as the national emblem, rather than Uncle Sam.

Mr. Chairman, I am taking more time than I had intended, and I thank the House for the very courteous treatment it has given me.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, my colleague the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota has made what I think is a very convincing and plausible speech. He has emphasized what everybody in the United States knows well—that we are staggering under the most colossal debt any nation ever staggered under in the history of the world, and that that debt is fast increasing.

The present administration has prided itself on the fact that it has broken many precedents in the 12 years of its incumbency. With reference to the increase in the national debt it has more than maintained its record for breaking precedents. I cannot see how it can take pride in the fact that it has loaded the United States Government with the most colossal debt under which any nation ever struggled in the history of the world.

I have watched the gradual and astronomical growth of the national debt with much trepidation. When Woodrow Wilson left the Presidency 24 years ago he left what then was considered a terrific public debt amounting to twenty-seven and a half billion dollars. During the first 10 years of Republican administration following Woodrow Wilson this national debt was reduced at the rate of $1,000,000,000 per year. This was the greatest debt reduction ever recorded in the history of the world. This was accomplished by a program which now would appear to be absolutely impossible. The Republican administration during those 10 years reduced taxes three or four times, and every time a tax reduction was voted it was followed by a larger tax collection.

After the Republican Party had been in power 10 years a Democratic House was elected, and for the last 2 years of the Republican administration the debt increased from seventeen and a half billion to twenty billion dollars. When the present administration came into power the debt was slightly above $20,000,000,000.

In his first campaign for election, President Roosevelt made a great play on what he considered at that time the terrific national debt and the terrific waste in Government expenditures. He promised that he would reduce the number on the public pay rolls by many thousands and that he would reduce public expenditures by at least 25 percent. It was then that the President said: "Many nations have been wrecked on the rocks of loose financial policy."

Immediately upon the election of President Roosevelt, the national debt began to climb. In a year or two it had passed the limit reached under the Wilson administration. In 1935 the debt limit was increased to $25,000,000,000 for bonds and twenty-billion for certificates and short-term obligations. At that time I promised myself that I would never again vote for an increase in the National debt. I thought it was preposterous and would surely ruin the country. It is too early yet to determine whether I was right in my position.

In 1935 the debt limit was again raised to forty-five billions under the Liberty Loan Act. In 1941 the limit was increased to sixty-five billion. In 1942 it was increased to one hundred and twenty-five billion. In 1943 it was increased to two hundred and ten billions. In 1944 it was increased to two hundred and sixty billions and in 1945 it will no doubt be increased to three hundred billions. How much further it will be necessary to go apparently no one dare prophesy.

There are some New Dealers who would have us believe that there is no danger in this colossal debt. I am afraid that they are those who subscribe to the policy of "spend, spend, spend; elect, elect, elect." Elections accomplished at such a terrific expense may prove to have been very disastrous before this debt has been liquidated.

There are three ways by which this great debt will most likely be paid. One of them is by straight-out repudiation. Another is by wild inflation and another is by patient taxation.

Repudiation would mean the end of our republican form of government. The sinister progress of totalitarianism in the country is dangerous, but surely it cannot succeed. Repudiation of all debts might be the vehicle on which it might ride into power.

Wild inflation might pay all debts, but it would bring terrific devastation which might also carry down our system of government. Surely our financiers will be smart enough to avoid this pitfall.

Sensible taxation, therefore, is the only American method. We can pay this colossal debt if we abandon this program of spend, spend, spend, elect, elect, elect. We can pay this debt over a long period of years if we recognize the fact that taxes must come from those who are able to pay. When the Government starts out to punish business and to oppress labor and initiative we cannot pay out. On the other hand, if the American people are again freed from punitive government and spiteful programs, we will enter into an era of faith and hope from which we can pay our just obligations.

When Mr. Bell, the Under Secretary of the Treasury, came before the Ways and Means Committee a few days ago as a proponent of this measure asking that the national debt limitation be increased to $300,000,000,000, he made the statement that the national debt at the present time is $232,000,000,000. The hearings will disclose the fact that immediately after he had made this statement I expressed the opinion that the real national debt was far in excess of $232,000,000,000. A most interesting colloquy followed in which I expressed the belief that the national debt was now in excess of $300,000,000,000. I maintained that the obligations of Government corporations guaranteed by the Federal Government were probably $20,000,000,000 in excess of the amount given by the Under Secretary and that contingent obligations of the Federal Government were at least $60,000,000,000. Mr. Bell admitted that there were outstanding obligations of $1,529,933,661, which might well be considered as a part of the national debt. He inserted into the record a table which will appear on page 6 of the record whereby he admits that there are other public debts which the Government owes in the amount of $1,083,473,992. These two sums taken together amount to $2,613,407,653.

By reason of the showing concerning these two items, Mr. Bell was willing to have the original bill amended by the addition of the language shown in section 2 of the bill now before us. The language to which I refer is as follows:

> And the face amount of obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest (except such guaranteed obligations as may be held by the Secretary of the Treasury).

In addition to the amounts that I have heretofore mentioned I maintain that the following are just obligations of the Federal Government and should be considered as a part of the national debt:

On credit of the United States:	
United States Postal Savings (Oct. 31, 1944), including $59,480,481.85 interest	$2,316,420,843.85
Canal Zone Postal Savings System (Nov. 30, 1944), including $216,581.61 interest	9,246,021.61
Tennessee Valley Authority bonds	6,300,000.00
Total on credit of the United States	2,331,966,865.46
Other obligations:	
Federal Reserve notes	21,136,913,126.25
Total contingent liabilities	23,468,879,992.71

Mr. Bell took the position that in the past the words "the national debt" did not include all the debt of the Nation. As I understood it, he gave the impression that the national debt had a somewhat restricted meaning and was restricted to the written obligations of the Government. Of course, these would be principally Government bonds and long and short term notes. If we are to follow this theory then we must consider that the Government owes two kinds of debts. One is the fixed debt shown by written obligations and the other in the contingent debts. Many of the debts that would be thrown into this contingent class should in reality be considered as part of the national debt because there can be no question about their permanence. Many of these are obligations of Government corporations, which obligations the Government has guaranteed. In this list would be contained the obligations of the Government with reference to the payment of Federal Reserve notes which amount to $21,136,913,126.

I recognize the fact that it would hardly be proper to consider every minute and detailed account which the Government owes as a part of the fixed national debt. In fact, however, every obligation which the Government owes is a debt of some kind. It is in fact a national debt. And is in fact a part of the national debt. Assuming, however, that we classify debts into two classes: Those subject to the limit and those not subject to the limit. There is no question but that the debt not subject to the limit is a tremendous debt and that it can easily be estimated without going into great detail. For instance on page 1298 of the hearings on the independent offices appropriations bill by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives held in this present session of Congress, the national debt has been summarized. In group 3 we find the following:

Unliquidated obligations incurred against appropriations and contract authorizations	$67,057,064,000

In the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on this bill Mr. Bell testified that the unliquidated obligations on contracts on December 31, 1944, totaled, $62,983,000,000.

I appreciate these are not definite figures and I do not claim that they are definite figures, but I do claim they show that the national debt of the Government is at least $60,000,000,000 more than that included in the statement which says that the national debt is $232,000,000,000.

I maintain, therefore, that it is not fair to the American people for us to put out the statement that the national debt is only $232,000,000,000 when we know from the figures that I have already given that the national debt is at least a hundred billion dollars more than the figures given out by the Treasury.

While it is true that some of these obligations represent real value to the Government, it must be remembered that most of them will represent no value when the war is over. Tanks and munitions of war that are located across the seas, and railroad tracks and railroad engines, and buildings erected by the Government on foreign soil will be of little value when the war is over.

It also must be remembered that much of our national debt has been incurred through wasteful experiments which will probably be of little value. The Good Neighbor program has been a most expensive one and our country will be compelled to lose many millions of dollars that are not now contemplated.

Likewise we must not forget the fact that we have dozens and dozens of Government agencies set up and in operation

all over. I shall not bother you to read you all this list, but I have here a list of 41 different Government agencies, many of which have authority to borrow money and to assume obligations for which our country will be bound. If all these agencies were compelled to make public statements as to their financial obligations, I am sure millions of dollars could be saved by the Government every month. If our country was ever in danger of being broken up on the rocks of loose financial policy, it surely is now.

The list to which I refer is as follows:

GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

(Source: Text of Senate bill 469 (79th Cong.), CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 5, 1945, p. 796)

SEC. 101. As used in this act the term "wholly owned" Government Corporation means—

1. Commodity Credit Corporation.
2. Federal Intermediate Credit Banks.
3. Production Credit Corporations.
4. Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations.
5. Farmers Home Corporation.
6. Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.
7. Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.
8. Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
9. Defense Plant Corporation.
10. Defense Supplies Corporation.
11. Metals Reserve Company.
12. Rubber Reserve Company.
13. War Damage Corporation.
14. Federal National Mortgage Association.
15. The R. F. C. Mortgage Company.
16. Disaster Loan Corporation.
17. Inland Waterways Corporation.
18. Warrior River Terminal Company.
19. The Virgin Islands Company.
20. Federal Prison Industries, Inc.
21. United States Spruce Production Corporation.
22. Institute of Inter-American Affairs.
23. Institute of Inter-American Transportation.
24. Inter-American Educational Foundation, Inc.
25. Inter-American Navigation Corporation.
26. Prencinradio, Inc.
27. Cargoes, Inc.
28. Export-Import Bank of Washington.
29. Petroleum Reserve Corporation.
30. Rubber Development Corporation.
31. United States Commercial Company.
32. Smaller War Plants Corporation.
33. Federal Public Housing Authority (or United States Housing Authority) and including public housing projects financed from appropriated funds and operations thereof.
34. Defense Homes Corporation.
35. Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.
36. Home Owners' Loan Corporation.
37. United States Housing Corporation.
38. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
39. Panama Railroad Company.
40. Tennessee Valley Authority.
41. Tennessee Valley Associated Cooperatives, Inc.

I wish to comment on three or four of these to show how easy it is to spend Government money.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is a gigantic organization. It was set up under Republican administration. It has a borrowing power and can issue notes to the extent of $17,000,000,000. These notes are guaranteed by the United States of America and are approved by the Secretary of the Treasury. This is a great sum of money and no one knows just when its issues will reach the maximum amount.

The Export-Import Bank of Washington has a borrowing power of $700,000,000. It, too, can issue notes or preferred stock subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Federal land banks had borrowing power by virtue of which they could issue bonds and notes up to 20 times paid-in capital and surplus. National farm loan associations could subscribe to the capital stock. On June 30, 1943, this amounted to nearly $95,000,000. The Government at the same time owned capital stock amounting to nearly $122,000,000. The Government had an additional investment in the sum of nearly $142,000,000.

The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation had a borrowing power of $2,000,000,000, for which it could issue its bonds and which would be guaranteed by the United States.

The National Housing Agency also had a borrowing power. It is controlled by the officers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at the direction of the Federal Loan Administrator.

I give these illustrations to show that it is little wonder that our national debt has reached such a colossal figure.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to sum up what I have tried to say by again emphasizing the fact that when the Ways and Means Committee began the consideration of this bill the national debt as presented by the Under Secretary would have appeared as $232,000,000,000. By reason of the action of myself and other Republican members on the committee, we convinced the Under Secretary that at least $2,613,407,653 was a legitimate portion of the national debt and should be added. When we talk in billions, this is not a large sum, but when we talk in millions it means two thousand six hundred thirteen millions. As I have heretofore stated the bill was changed so as to cover this extra amount. I hope I have also proved that we should not accept the statement that $232,000,000,000 is the present national debt for I think I have proved conclusively that the item of $23,468,879,992.71 is a legitimate portion of the national debt because it represents credit obligations especially entered into by the Government. Likewise, the $67,057,064,000 item which I have shown to be genuine obligations of the Government should also be considered as a part of the national debt. In addition, there are billions owing on open accounts which I have not included.

When the hearings were being conducted before the Ways and Means Committee, I offered the following amendment:

SEC. 5. Within 30 days after the final passage of this act the Secretary of the Treasury shall report to Congress the exact public debt of the United States, including obligations covered under section 2 of this act, and including all obligations owing by the United States by reason of contracts entered into by the United States and all obligations of Government corporations and Government agencies guaranteed by the United States and all other financial obligations of the United States.

I want to compliment Mr. Bell on the very splendid manner in which he reacted to this amendment. Mr. Bell agreed—and I quote his testimony:

Mr. BELL. That is right.

It does not include unliquidated obligations to which Mr. Jenkins called attention. We have attempted to keep current on them, although you recognize when you have the Army and the Navy all over the world it takes weeks for them to get reports in of their obligations. The President did issue an Executive order about 4 years ago in which he made it the Treasury's duty to undertake to compile financial statements, and we have been in the process of developing that, and I think we can give you something. It is quite an undertaking. But I would object to including in the term "public debt" all of those other obligations, because since the foundation of our Government "public debt" has meant formal securities issued by the Treasury. I would hate to see that changed.

However, if you want this information, you do not need to attach an amendment to this bill. If this committee would like to have it, I assure you I will get you something in 30 days—the best I can get.

I shall await with interest for this report from the Treasury. Not until then can we know the exact national debt.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the very close and respectful attention that the House has given me in my discussion of this very important matter. The finances of the Nation are its very lifeblood. The financial system to the Nation is what the blood circulatory system is to the human body. When the financial system breaks down, the health of the Republic becomes precarious. I plead for honesty and sincerity in Government and for economy in expenditures.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. The pending bill H. R. 2404 has for its purpose the increase of the debt limit of the United States from the present $260,000,000,000 to $300,000,000,000, and is a most important war measure. It is recognized that the enactment of this bill is necessary to finance the war and provide the required implements of war for our fighting forces and to insure victory over our enemies.

The public debt of the United States as of January 1, 1945, was about $232,000,000,000. That left $18,980,000,000 balance of borrowing power.

It is estimated that the public debt on June 30, 1946, will be about $292,000,000,000.

The cost of the war for the fiscal year 1945 was $89,000,000,000. It is estimated that the cost of the war for the fiscal year 1946 will be about $70,000,000,000. The cost of the war from Pearl Harbor to January 31, 1945, amounted to about $237,982,000,000.

Other Government expenditures during the period of time from Pearl Harbor to January 1 of this year amounted to about $21,673,000,000, or a total from Pearl Harbor to January 1 of this year of about $259,655,000,000.

Our tax receipts during the period of time from Pearl Harbor to January 1 of this year amounted to about $99,933,000,000.

The amount of money borrowed from Pearl Harbor to January 1, 1945, amounted to about $177,188,000,000.

About 95 cents out of every dollar spent by the Federal Government is for the cost of this war.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I think the gentleman is making a very important presentation, and that the Members of the House ought to know what he is saying. Does not the gentleman believe it would be a good thing if we had a quorum call to bring the Members to the Chamber to hear it?

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate the gentleman's kindness, but I would not do that.

Mr. RICH. I would be glad to do it. I think the Members ought to know the facts the gentleman is giving us.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate the gentleman's kindness very much.

The deficit for 1945 was about $53,183,000,000. The deficit estimated for 1946 is about $41,276,000,000.

Our revenues for 1945 were about $45,730,000,000. The estimate for 1946 is about $41,255,000,000.

The interest of the members of the committee may be challenged, as mine was in the Ways and Means Committee, by the fact that these figures show an estimated drop of about $4,000,000,000 in revenue in 1946 as compared to 1945, with the same revenue laws on the statute books for both years. The answer is that the national income is affected by war spending, and we are expecting to spend less on war activities and the war effort in 1946 than we spent in 1945; in other words, the cost of the war for 1945 was $89,000,000,000, and the estimated cost for 1946 is $70,000,000,000. The amount of Government spending is naturally going to be reflected in the income of the people which is reflected in our revenues.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I will tell the gentleman how to get back that almost $5,000,000,000 if he wants to know, and for fear he does not want to know, I am going to tell him anyway. That is, stop these subsidies and cut-backs and you will get in $10,000,000,000.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman's observation is interesting. It brings me to an expression of this thought: I have frequently heard the interesting observations made by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and others. But I do not know of any way that you can get a dollar into the Federal Treasury without an act of Congress, and I do not know any way you can get a dollar out of the Federal Treasury without an act of Congress. The Congress has the power to pass legislation, to levy taxes to provide revenue, and the Congress has to pass on the appropriation of money to be paid out of the Federal Treasury.

Mr. RICH. I may answer that by a sign I saw in a restaurant one day, and I will put it this way: "Why the New Deal was soon old and so long dumb."

Mr. COOPER. Of course, I do not think it is entirely a Democratic question. When it comes to voting for appropriation bills the distinguished Members on the gentleman's side of the House have been about as liberal and about as generous as most Members on this side of the House. All of these war appropriation bills which make the enactment of this pending legislation necessary have been passed by a practically unanimous vote of the House of Representatives. So the Congress is the body appropriating the money and it is made necessary by this terrible war in which we are now engaged. I am unable to see how any man who sat here, as most of us did, on December 8, 1941, and voted for the war resolution, could ever entertain the idea that the most terrible war in human history is not going to cost a tremendous amount of money. That is what this money is for. It is for the prosecution of this war.

Reference has been made to the fact that we are probably spending more money than some other countries in this war. Yes, and we are saving more human lives in this war proportionately than any other country engaged in it. We have been willing to pay more and provide more equipment in order to save human lives and have a smaller casualty list.

Mr. RICH. Then how does the gentleman explain the action of the administration from 1932 when we had a debt of twenty-two and one-half billion dollars to the time of Pearl Harbor when it was increased to forty-eight and one-half billion dollars? What has the gentleman got to say about that?

Mr. COOPER. Of course, 1945 is quite a number of years removed from 1932. The gentleman was here in 1932 as I was. The gentleman knows the condition of this country in 1932. The gentleman knows the situation that existed at that time. The gentleman doubtless voted as a majority of the House had to vote for the expenditure of large funds or sums of money for relief in this country. Why, as I recall, the W. P. A. relief appropriations amounted to about $13,000,000,000. The bill was enacted by the Congress, the money was appropriated, and it was necessary to save the economy of this country.

Mr. RICH. I may say to the gentleman that there was a lot of unecessary spending then just the same as we have a lot of unnecessary spending in the Government right now. The gentleman knows that and every Member of Congress knows it. We ought to stop that and that is the thing I am trying to drive home now. I hope I can impress on the membership of the House the necessity for cutting down on these unnecessary expenditures. Let us win the war, let us spend the money for war purposes, but let us stop the unnecessary expenses in the operation of the Government, especially for the things that have been referred to the House by Lindsay Warren, his being the best suggestion the other day that has ever been made. Let us carry out that suggestion.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman speaks of unnecessary expenses. Of course, all of us subscribe to that. The gentleman's idea of unnecessary expenses may not be the idea of the majority of the Members of this House. After all, we have a democratic form of government, and we are fighting all over the world to preserve that form. Although the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania entertains some splendid ideas and fine views, yet they are frequently not in accord with the majority of the Members of the House. As I recall in connection with one of the last appropriation bills considered here the gentleman offered an amendment to reduce an item, and as I remember he received about four votes in support of his amendment.

After all this is a democratic body, and the fact that a majority of the Members here do not entirely agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania certainly would indicate that he may not be entirely in step with the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RICH. I agree with the gentleman that I am not in step with what this administration does, and you will find out that there are going to be heaps of fire upon the heads of the American people when they pay taxes after taxes for years and years to come and, further, we might bankrupt this Nation, and then I will be mighty glad that I kept on fighting, and I am going to keep on fighting as long as I am in this body, and I want you to know that.

Mr. COOPER. I do not think the administration was responsible for the gentleman only getting three other votes besides his own.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman to give us the benefit of his observations on this question? With the war expenditures estimated to be reduced from about $89,000,000,000 to about $70,000,000,000, with a consequent reduction in Federal revenues of about, say, three and one-half to four billion dollars, if we could adjust our movement back into peacetime or civilian production and spending sufficiently fast, we might maintain the national income and thus still recover the three and one-half to four billion dollars drop in revenue.

Mr. COOPER. Of course, if we can do that, we will naturally accomplish that result. These estimates were based upon the usually accepted estimate of national income that we have been considering in the Committee on Ways and Means and the gentleman has been considering in his great Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield for one more question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. COOPER. Gladly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. When the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] was on the floor, he made an observation, and I did not get it exactly clear in my mind. As I understand, it was something to the effect that there was something like

$9,000,000,000, we will say, accrued value on the savings bonds, A and E, that were sold on a discount basis. What figure is reflected in the public debt, the momentary cash surrender value of those savings bonds or the maturity value?

Mr. MILLS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman has reference to what the Treasury calls the gross public debt on the one hand and the maturity or face value of the public debt on the other. The maturity or face value of the public debt is approximately $241,000,000,000. The gross public debt is approximately $232,000,000,000. The limitation in the bill is upon the face or maturity value of the securities issued.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, on a $100 bond sold for seventy-five, the limitation would be on the $100?

Mr. MILLS. On the $100.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is reflected in the public debt, the $75 plus a little accrued interest, or the $100?

Mr. MILLS. The public debt, referred to by the Treasury always as the obligations of the Treasury, is the gross amount of the securities.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Or the face value.

Mr. MILLS. When the Treasury starts to issue new securities in relation to the limitation placed upon the amount of securities that can be outstanding, it issues them in relation to the face value or maturity value of the public debt.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That explains it for me.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, may I point out one thing that I think is important for us to bear in mind, and that is the tremendous cost of this war, greater perhaps than has ever been conceived of by the mind of man. The expense of this war is tremendous. The total appropriations and contract authorizations for defense and war purposes from June 30, 1940, to January 31, 1945, amounted to about $400,000,000,000, about $372,782,000,000 of appropriations and contract authorizations and about $26,500,000,000 of Reconstruction Finance Corporation commitments; defense plants and various activities; so that the total appropriations and contract authorizations by Congress from June 30, 1940, to January 1 of this year amount to about $400,000,000,000. Of that amount about $252,000,000,000 has been spent on the war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Let us bear in mind that one of the main items we now have to consider is the interest on the public debt. The interest on the public debt for 1945 is about $3,750,000,000. For 1946 it will be about $4,500,000,000. For 1947 it is estimated to be about $6,000,000,000, more perhaps than all of the ordinary running expenses of the Government.

In addition there is a very important item in the nonwar budget that will have to be paid, and that is the tax refunds provided under our revenue laws. The tax refunds for the fiscal year 1945 amount to $2,500,000,000. The tax refunds for the fiscal year 1946 are estimated to amount to $3,000,000,000.

Then, of course, a very important item and an ever-increasing item in our nonwar budget is the cost of the Veterans' Administration. The cost of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year 1945 is $1,280,000,000. The cost of the Veterans' Administration for 1946 is estimated to be $2,705,000,000. That is an item that will increase and continue to grow larger.

Therefore, these three large items in the nonwar budget account for a considerable part of that budget, namely, the interest on the public debt, tax refunds provided under our revenue laws, and the cost of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. With reference to the expenses of the Veterans' Administration, it has been called to my attention that the amount estimated for the year 1947 is $4,189,812,900.

Mr. COOPER. I believe it is correct to state further, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means pointed out, those estimates are based upon the veterans' legislation as it now exists.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. That does not take into account the hundreds of bills which are now pending providing for additional benefits.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the question comes back to the Congress, to the House of Representatives. When we vote these appropriations, when we pass legislation authorizing expenditures of funds, those debts have to be paid. There are only two orthodox ways by which your Government and mine can secure money to pay those debts. One is by imposing taxes to provide revenue and the other is to borrow the money. Of course, we cannot levy taxes enough to pay the enormous cost of this war as it goes along. Not being able to do that, the only other thing we can do is to borrow money. The purpose of the pending bill, therefore, is to provide for the borrowing of the money necessary to finance the war.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman call the attention of the Committee to the statement made unofficially by General Hines as to the potential amount the Veterans' Administration may be called upon to loan to the veterans under the G. I. bill of rights as it now exists? I think it was up in the billions of dollars. If I remember correctly, he said they may be obligated to loan to the veterans something totaling $20,000,000,000.

Mr. COOPER. The sum is a very large amount. I heard the speech of General Hines to which the gentleman refers.

May I point out something else that General Hines stated on that occasion; that is, there are already more men on the compensation rolls for World War No. 2 than for World War No. 1. That gives you some idea of how this cost is mounting and how it will continue to mount throughout the years to come.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. I think most Members of Congress will readily concede the truth of the principal thesis of the gentleman's speech. We must pay these bills. The incurring of obligations does not reflect itself in the public debt until the bills are paid. Some people question whether or not it is necessary at this time to raise the debt limit to $300,000,000,000. They say we can get along with a $280,000,000,000 debt limit. The Congress has a complete check on the situation at all times, whether the debt limit is $280,000,000,000 or $300,000,000,000, because no money can pass out of the Treasury without appropriations made by this Congress. Therefore, if we want to save money, we ought to do it in the matter of authorizations and appropriations rather than a restriction of the public debt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 more minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I want to agree very heartily with the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin. That is absolutely true. The cutting down of the amount provided in this bill will not save a dollar for the Federal Government. This bill is not where you spend money. The appropriation bills that are passed is where the money is spent, and the authorizations passed by the Congress providing for the appropriation of funds is where the money is spent. It is not spent in a bill such as this.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. There are some people who adhere to the philosophy that if you fix the debt limit at $300,000,000,000 you are thereby opening the door to gross, excessive and lavish expenditures of money.

If you fix it at $280,000,000,000 rather than the $300,000,000,000 requested, it will operate as a brake upon spending. I personally do not subscribe to that philosophy.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. KEEFE. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations and as a Member of this House I know that the check we have as Members of Congress is when appropriation measures come before the committee and before the Congress. You cannot get out of the necessary obligations to carry on this war and pay the expenses of the Government regardless of what the debt limit may be set at.

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. As the gentleman from Tennessee has so ably and effectively conveyed to us by evidence that we cannot escape and that is indisputable 95 percent of the money appropriated and spent since Pearl Harbor has been to win the war and save our country and to retain liberty for all of us, without regard to our race, to our color, our creed, or our political party, but as Americans, all of us.

Mr. COOPER. Of course, there is no doubt these vast sums of money have been spent to save this country of ours. Saving this country of ours and preserving freedom and liberty for the American people cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I assure you it is a pleasure to follow the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], who has so ably discussed the proposed bill.

Our national debt is reaching astronomical figures. Three hundred billion dollars is a sum so large that the human mind cannot grasp it. We have not only grown callous to the term "billions" by repeating it again and again, but we have mesmerized ourselves into the thought that we can actually comprehend its magnitude. Efforts have been made to dramatize the enormity of this amount of money by various comparisons. We have reached the place where the comparisons are beyond comprehension.

For instance, a national debt of $300,000,000,000 would be twice the assessed valuation of all the property in the United States. It is a debt burden of $6,000 for each of the 50,000,000 people who now pay income taxes. Assuming there are 30,000,000 families in the United States, it would be a debt burden of $10,000 against each family in the Nation, rich and poor, high and low, black and white. It would bring our per capita debt to $2,172.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I think perhaps if the gentleman wants to convey the thought to the House, we will just show the House some comparisons. The gentleman says he wants a comparison. [Mr. KNUTSON displaying chart.] In World War No. 1 President Wilson spent this much. Roosevelt has spent that much. Those are figures that cannot be disputed.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just wanted to make the observation to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] if it were necessary to spend twice that much to win the war every Member of Congress would vote for it.

Mr. KNUTSON. Absolutely, but we are not condoning the waste and the squandering.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader and then I want to continue.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to ask the gentleman from Minnesota one question. Has the gentleman voted for all appropriations for war purposes?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; but I have not had anything to do with the spending of them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the gentleman voted for them?

Mr. KNUTSON. Why, certainly, but unlike the gentleman from Massachusetts, I am not very proud of my vote.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, I am proud of my vote, because I voted for appropriations to save America.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I cannot refuse to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. I just wanted to make the record a little easier to read. I suggest that the gentleman from Minnesota place in the record the comparative length of the lines he used to represent the different expenditures.

Mr. KNUTSON. I may say to the gentleman from California that not having studied astronomy I cannot very well do it.

Mr. GEARHART. I suggest that the gentleman at least put the contrasting length of the lines in the record. The comparison would be illuminating.

Mr. CARLSON. I was about to say that we had reached the place where these comparisons are beyond comprehension. I did not know that the gentleman from Minnesota had this particular article, which was certainly an interesting comparison of the difference between expenditures during the past 100 years.

Last Friday evening I listened to a radio program on a Nation-wide hook-up entitled "Double or Nothing." Here is the question that was submitted to all the contestants. If you stacked 1,000,000,000 $1 bills together how far would they reach? Various answers were received ranging from a few feet to over 500 miles. To my amazement the correct answer was 60 miles. This seemed almost unbelievable to me and therefore I verified it. Thus, a $300,000,000,000 debt would be a stack of $1 bills reaching 18,000 miles or two-thirds the circumference of the earth. It means that each year our people would be required to pay as interest on the national debt a stack of $1 bills totaling a distance of 360 miles.

Our national debt and our post-war expenditures may assume proportions so large that they will be an unbearable burden on our people. This high cost of government is greater and greater inflation. It means a lowered scale of living. Of course there are some people who contend that the amount of our national debt should have no effect on our economic life, as we owe it to ourselves. Unfortunately, I did not attend a school that taught this type of economics on finance. I believe our national debt has reached proportions that threaten our domestic economy and is a real threat to our form of government. The germ of totalitarian government is ever present and grows rapidly in a highly inflated economy.

In my opinion it is time that Congress takes steps for the proper financing and retirement of our debt. All of us realize that it is essential that we vote every dollar needed for a victorious conclusion of this war. Our military forces are progressing so satisfactorily that certainly the end must be in sight.

It was with this thought in mind that I presented an amendment providing for an automatic reduction in our national debt limit as we reduce our bonded debt at the conclusion of the war. If some such amendment is not adopted the debt limit would remain at $300,000,000,000 until Congress reduced it, regardless of the actual debt.

The amendment I offered reads as follows:

Provided further, That whenever the President, by proclamation, or the Congress, by concurrent resolution, declares the cessation of hostilities or the termination of the present war, whichever is the earlier, that reductions of bonded indebtedness by the Federal Government be accompanied automatically by a reduction in the national debt limit of like amount.

I realize that the language of this amendment would have to be revised in order to provide sufficient leeway for the successful operations of funding and refunding of government obligations. The amendment was considered by the Treasury and the legal counsel of our committee and after a general discussion it was agreed that we request the Treasury to make further studies of this proposal and submit a report to the committee at a later date.

I want to call your attention to a statement on this matter from page 9 of the committee report, which reads as follows:

The committee gave careful consideration to a proposal for a flexible procedure from a continuous readjustment of the debt limit, after the termination of the present war, to reflect the reduction in the public debt which it is hoped will be possible at that time. After discussing this proposal with the Under Secretary of the Treasury, the committee decided that it would not be desirable to attempt to formulate such a provision for inclusion in this bill. Instead it requested the Treasury Department to study the proposal and be prepared to submit at a later time its views with respect to a program of debt reduction and an automatic reduction in the limitation provided by the Congress.

It seems to me that it is essential that we make some provision for an automatic debt retirement as we are able to reduce our national indebtedness. I have

no illusions about a rapid reduction in our national debt but I am concerned that we reduce our debt limit as we are able to take care of our indebtedness. If we should decide to retire the debt in annual installments over a period of 100 years it would involve a charge of $3,000,000,000 per year. This, together with the $6,000,000,000 interest charges would be a load of $9,000,000,000 the first few years. When the war ends we will no doubt have large unexpended balances in several of our Federal funds.

On December 31, 1944, we had an unexpended balance in the agencies that are strictly war activities of $120,421,000,000. Included in this total was an unexpended balance of $70,660,000,000 in the War Department. The Navy had an unexpended balance of $31,941,000,000. It is necessary to carry large unexpended balances in these war agencies so that the Army and Navy can proceed with a program of planning for full prosecution of the war. However, when the war ends many contracts would be immediately canceled. These contracts would total billions of dollars.

If we use ordinary business sense we will retrieve these funds from these agencies and reduce our Federal debt by that amount. Following are tables submitted by the Treasury to our committee giving complete information on these items as of December 31, 1944, for the fiscal year 1945.

Summary of obligations, expenditures, and balances, fiscal year 1945, as of Dec. 31, 1944

I. OBLIGATION BASIS—APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	Available during fiscal year			Obligations incurred, July 1–Dec. 31, 1944	Unobligated balances of appropriations and contract authorizations, Dec. 31, 1944
	Unobligated balances from prior year	Appropriations, appropriation transfers, and new contract authorizations (net) for current year [1]	Total		
War activities:					
War Department	33,533	15,346	48,879	12,755	36,124
Navy Department	13,545	18,085	31,630	10,034	21,596
Other agencies	4,849	11,241	16,090	2,932	13,158
Total war activities	51,927	44,672	96,599	25,721	70,878
Other activities	2,476	8,718	11,194	4,560	6,634
Total, budgetary items	[2] 54,403	53,390	[3] 107,793	30,281	[3] 77,512

[1] Reduced by amounts carried to surplus fund. Includes permanent-indefinite appropriations in revised amounts carried in 1946 Budget.

[2] Includes $3,512,000,000, representing appropriation balances that have expired for purposes of obligation but have not yet been carried to the surplus fund.

Summary of obligations, expenditures, and balances, fiscal year 1945, as of Dec. 31, 1944—Continued

II. EXPENDITURE BASIS—APPROPRIATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	Available for expenditure during fiscal year			Expenditures, July 1–Dec. 31, 1944 [4]	Unexpended balances of appropriations, Dec. 31, 1944 [4]
	Unexpended balances of appropriations from prior year	Appropriations and appropriation transfers (net) for current year [1]	Total		
War activities:					
War Department	79,112	15,346	94,458	23,798	70,660
Navy Department	20,655	26,945	47,600	15,659	31,941
Other agencies	10,693	11,917	22,610	4,790	17,820
Total war activities	110,460	54,208	164,668	44,247	120,421
Other activities	3,052	8,641	11,693	4,270	7,423
Total, budgetary items	113,512	62,849	176,361	48,517	127,844

III. UNEXPENDED BALANCES—APPROPRIATIONS AND CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	Unexpended balances, Dec. 31, 1944			Represented by—	
	Unexpended balances of appropriations (as above)	Unappropriated contract authorizations	Total	Unliquidated obligations	Unobligated balances
War activities:					
War Department	70,660	-------	70,660	34,536	36,124
Navy Department	31,941	10,490	42,431	20,834	21,597
Other agencies	17,820	1,918	19,738	6,581	13,157
Total war activities	120,421	12,408	132,829	61,951	70,878
Other activities	7,423	243	7,666	1,032	6,634
Total, budgetary items	127,844	[5] 12,651	140,495	[6] 62,983	77,512

[3] Expenditures are net of reimbursements, and are stated generally on the basis of approved vouchers entered in the accounts of the various agencies as final charges against appropriations. The figures do not agree with those published in daily Treasury statements, which are on the basis of checks paid.

[4] As this total relates to unexpended balances of appropriations, excluding contract authorizations, it is not susceptible of break-down between unliquidated obligations and unobligated balances. The departments and establishments are required to report the amounts of obligations incurred each month to the Treasury, but without distinction as to whether such obligations are chargeable to appropriations or to unappropriated contract authorizations. In this connection see "III. Unexpended Balances—Appropriations and Contract Authorizations."

[5] Not available for expenditure until Congress provides appropriations to liquidate contract authority.

[6] The greater part of this total represents contracts under which work has not been completed and deliveries have not been made.

NOTE.—This table is based upon reports submitted by the various agencies of the Government to the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget, under the provisions of Executive Order No. 8512, as amended.

Congress has created the Surplus Property Disposal Agency and during the debate it was brought out that we may have $100,000,000,000 worth of surplus war material at the conclusion of the war. Should it be possible to realize five or ten billion dollars on this vast amount of property it should be applied to the reduction of our national debt. For the past several years we have been accumulating a sinking fund for debt. While this fund is strictly a paper item I understand it reaches a total of about five and one-half billion dollars. When it is available for use, it, of course, should be applied to a debt reduction. The reduction of our national debt is going to be burdensome at best. We should begin now planning for its orderly retirement and the carrying charges on it. We have had 15 years of deficit financing in this Nation. Deficit financing for our Government did not begin with World War No. 2. It began in the year 1930. Little effort, if any, has been made to balance the National Budget. In the 10-year period from 1930 to 1940 the Government debt was increased approximately $27,000,000,000, or an average deficit of $2,700,000,000 a year. A continued unbalanced Budget with deficit spending will eventually destroy the confidence of our citizens in their own Government.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I want the Members of the House to know that the gentleman from Kansas, who is now speaking, deserves a lot of credit for proposing this amendment or change, because if his wishes and his ideas are followed out it may result in a tremendous saving to this country financially. The gentleman should be given a great deal of credit by the Nation for his activity in this respect.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman certainly does not believe we are going to realize $100,000,000,000 out of the surplus war material, does he? If we get 25 cents on the dollar we will be doing mighty well.

Mr. CARLSON. I said if we realized five to ten billion dollars out of $100,000,000,000, or whatever we get, it is money we voted for the war effort and it should be used to apply on the debt adjustment.

During a war it is comparatively easy to stir up patriotic emotion and float large issues of bonds. It is easy to place burdensome taxes on our people. After the war it will be practically impossible to conduct bond drives for deficit financing, and more than that, our people are not going to carry the present high burden of taxes for the purpose of boondoggling in every other nation on the face of the earth.

I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet but I am predicting now that

there is going to be a general revolt in the post-war period against the present high tax burdens. Imagine if you can a man drawing $3 a day for a 7-day week, or $21 for the week, and paying $4 in taxes on that amount—or what about a widow living on an income of $100 a month who is now paying $138 in taxes annually. Corporate taxes are so high that a tax revision is necessary in order that we may furnish employment for our returning veterans and others now employed.

An urgent problem facing our Nation today is a revision of our entire tax structure. It is urgent because the action taken by Congress on that important matter will largely determine the economic condition of our Nation and the type of Government under which we may expect to live.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The very fact that the Treasury agreed to accede to the gentleman's request indicates that they realize the merits of the gentleman's contention. May I say in that same connection with reference to the fight that I and others have made, that the Treasury also indicated a fair attitude. The Treasury indicated it would be glad within 30 days to come forward with a complete statement of the obligations incurred; so I think, taking it altogether, we can expect the Treasury to fall in line, and if it does not, why, of course, that is another day.

Mr. CARLSON. I may say also that Mr. Bell, the Under Secretary, who appeared before our committee, and who is a very able man, studied this matter very thoroughly, and I feel certain he will submit a report to the committee on my proposed amendment and a program for refunding the debt. I know that our committee will give it consideration when he does.

Previous to the hearings on the bill, I went through my mail and found that our people are becoming concerned about the debt burden. They are beginning to realize the annual cost of carrying it and the difficulty of its amortization. They understand that there is a relation between the debt burden and the probable scale of living. Veterans and their dependents who draw compensation fear that the payments they now receive will have a low purchasing power in an inflated economy. Millions of our citizens who are building social-security accounts are also concerned. Anxiety is becoming prevalent among our people about a program of lend-leasing billions of their dollars for economic uplift of every people in every clime.

The following questions were taken from my mail and submitted to Mr. Daniel Bell, Under Secretary of the Treasury, during the hearings on H. R. 2138. I refer you to page 63 of the hearings:

1. What is the relation between the amount of the debt of the United States Government and the probable scale of living of the people of the United States henceforth?

2. What is the effect upon the value or purchasing power of the money of the United States of the amount of the debt of the United States Government?

3. What is the effect on the general price level of the country, present and prospective, of the present and prospective debt of the United States Government?

4. When the Federal debt is $300,000,000,000 will not the proportionate share of each of 30,000,000 families be $10,000?

5. I see that Mr. Eccles says that further devaluation of the dollar in terms of gold is necessary and I also note that the bill introduced last week to implement the Bretton Woods scheme contains a provision which will permit further devaluation of the dollar. What is the effect of devaluation of the dollar on the debt and credit of the Federal Government, and the general price level of the country?

6. How do you explain the effect of devaluation of the dollar on the purchasing power and the savings of the people?

7. If the scale of living of the American people has been going down for more than a decade what relation has the upward trend in the Federal debt to that fact?

It had been my hope that we might have the Treasury viewpoint on these questions for the printed hearings. However, in a later discussion with Mr. Bell it was agreed that the Treasury would submit to me personally answers to the questions. There will be general interest in their answers and I expect to give the House a report on it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. May I just make this observation? There has been a great deal of horror expressed by many members of the committee over this great debt that we are piling up, and the great expenditure of money. It is my contention that if we had not spent this money as profusely as we did, if we had not supplied our Army and Navy with everything that they needed, and even with more than they needed, we would not be making the progress that we have made across Germany today.

Just a few minutes ago I received word of a dispatch that came in this afternoon, which has not as yet been published in the newspapers. Here it is:

PARIS, March 8.—American First Army crossed Rhine to east bank last night, launching from west climatic battle for Germany.

"First Army infantrymen spanned quarter-mile river against rather light opposition before startled Germans could grasp what had happened," Associated Press' Wes Gallagher said.

Mr. Chairman, if we had been niggardly in the appropriations, if we had been afraid of this great debt, we would never have received a dispatch like that. I say that Congress is to be congratulated for giving the Army and the Navy everything that they wanted, everything that they needed, and that is one reason we have been making this progress as shown by this Associated Press dispatch.

Mr. CARLSON. May I also state that I, together with every Member of Congress, am proud of the progress made by our armed forces. We glory in their achievements and are praying and hoping for an early victory. Yet I do not think that excuses the Army or the Navy or any branch of the military for wasting public funds. I think there has been plenty of proof that money has been wasted, and wasted when they should have known better. I am going to cite one instance because I am somewhat familiar with it.

A year ago there was a general discussion of the construction of an oil project in Canada. Our Committee on Military Affairs held a hearing on it. We had spent $30,000,000 at that time. I thought for a while the War Department would certainly discontinue spending further funds on that project, but what happened? They continued on through until 2 weeks ago, but now they are discontinuing it and have decided its construction served no useful purpose. It cost us $134,000,000. We should have saved at least $100,000,000.

I think we have a right as Members of Congress when we vote this money to expect at least reasonable judgment to be used in making these expenditures. That does not go for supplies on the battlefront. They can waste all of them there they want to.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The fact was developed in my subcommittee that it cost $100,000 a mile to build the road into Alaska. When I asked the general in command why it cost $100,000 a mile, he said, "Material." I said, "Didn't you build the road out of gravel?" He said, "Yes." "Where did you get the gravel?" "Close by." They spent $100,000 a mile for a gravel road, and it is costing us this year $8,000 a mile to maintain it. It is my prediction that it will not operate 2 years after the war is over. Waste will never win the war but waste can lose the war.

A year ago the War Department kicked back into the Treasury $32,000,000,000 which they had more than they could spend. That sort of appropriations—and I am on that committee—is not conducive to economy. They got $90,000 apiece for medium tanks that cost $60,000. They got $800 for 81-millimeter trench mortars that cost about $560. They got $500 for 60-millimeter trench mortars that cost $280. There is now before the War Department a project for over $1,000,000,000, and nobody can find out what in the world they are going to do with the money. I am not going along with it any longer, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. CARLSON. The gentleman from Michigan is entitled to much credit for the fine work he has been doing along this line.

As to the construction of the highway to Alaska, a very personal friend of mine was an engineer on that road and I am somewhat familiar with the expenditures we made there.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. Since we are cataloging these wild expenditures that have occurred in the last few years, we must add to the list, in addition to the Canol project and the Alcan Highway, the Shipshaw Dam and generating plant in Canada, built in the wilderness behind Quebec at an expense of hundreds of millions of dollars of American taxpayers' money; also mention should be made of the building of the largest aluminum plant in Canada at a further expense of hundreds of millions of dollars to the same American taxpayers, all this to create post-war competition for United States industries, at our expense but for Canadian profit. If these are not wasteful expenditures I do not know the meaning of the word.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The announcement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania should have impressed itself upon the Members of the House, and I have no reference to waste of expenditures or anything else; but if it is true that American forces have crossed the Rhine River, it seems to me we have cause for profound and deep gratitude, which I think the House should realize fully, because that event will mean not only the end of the destruction of American lives in Europe, perhaps, but it might mean the greatest saving in every respect that we could hope for. I am sure the gentleman agrees with that.

Mr. CARLSON. I agree with the gentleman, and I share his sentiments. I am glad he expressed them here on the floor. I think we all share those sentiments, and that we are all praying and hoping for an early conclusion of this war.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. We all heartily agree with the effort put forth to save money, and the accomplishment to which the gentleman from California has just alluded would never have been accomplished through the waste of public funds.

A moment ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] said something about the payment of subsidies. To my desk this week has come a communication from the Milk Producers' Association of Michigan protesting a subsidy payment of $568,000,000 to be made to the milk producers because the O. P. A. has cut back the price of milk and will not permit them to go into the open market and obtain a fair and reasonable price for milk. Is that saving public funds?

Mr. CARLSON. There are, no doubt, many ways in which public funds can be saved. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

While the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] had the floor someone on the majority side sought to use Secretary Stimson and Secretary Knox as alibis for the great wastes. I ask the gentleman if that is not just like blaming the bank messenger when the bank goes broke because the cashier has run away with all the funds?

Mr. CARLSON. I do not care to get into a controversy on that. I deplore waste in any branch of the Government. I fully understand we will have waste in these large operations. There is no question about it. But I still contend those responsible for those operations, and who have had confidence and trust placed in them by Congress and the country, must be held accountable.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Of course, we are all pleased to hear the news that American Armies are crossing the Rhine, particularly those of us who crossed the Rhine in 1918. However, these very men crossing the Rhine today, these young men, are going to have to come back here and pay the taxes for the rest of their lives to pay back the money which is being spent and to pay for this waste. Let me give the gentleman just one more illustration. I was visiting a powder plant in Indiana, and I saw a beautiful picture on the wall of a beautiful city with streets, highways, trees, and everything. I said, "What is that? Why, that is a housing project." To make a long story short, there were 2,900 houses built there, 2,900 of them, with streets, utilities, and everything, and not more than 300, I was told, had ever been occupied. The rest are being torn down and taken away. Therefore, waste is not confined to the War Department alone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in discussing the pending war bill, which provides authorization for the increase of debt limitation, is centered upon one premise, and that is the elimination of reckless and unwarranted expenditure of the taxpayers' money, whether for war or ordinary running expense of this Government.

Ever since we entered the war and ascended to the firmament of wartime finance, it seems quite logical that all our calculations and expenditures should be measured by an astronomical yardstick. We are expected to follow the recommendations of the War and Navy Departments without question and told that their figures must be accepted as we do our religion, on faith. While I have seen some of the finest examples of economic spending among our military commanders in peacetime and could cite specific examples of which we can all be proud, yet I am convinced that a great deal of waste could be eliminated if unwarranted recklessness, inexperience, and inefficiency could be weeded out of the Army and Navy. Nothing I say here and now should be interpreted as an aspersion upon our combat commanders or the many officers serving in executive capacities here in Washington and elsewhere, behind the lines. For on the whole they are doing a good job. What I have in mind is the application of prudent economy, and by that I mean the wise expenditure of money to the extent only that it is necessary to save the lives of our fighting men and shortening the war while restricting all frivolous and unnecessary spending. To do this Congress must hold back the finance bulldozers that are constantly pyramiding the mountain of authorized and unexpended moneys projected too far in advance and because there is no policy of reappraisal of needs or periodic recalculations, this heap of gold, entirely outside of the authority of Congress, is a constant source of temptation to recklessness. Once before when the Committee on Ways and Means came before you, I believe it was disclosed that the war cache contained an amount equal to about 30 months of maximum calculated expenditure. Only a small part was obligated and a lesser part allocated out of a sum which reached the astounding figure of something like $210,000,000,000. Was it any wonder that the agencies charged with the expenditure of this huge amount raced with the Congress in spending the golden horde before another and greater appropriation was made? Recklessness is not confined directly to the Departments handling war expenditures. Much of the blame, maybe most of it, can be charged to cost-plus inflated manufacturing costs, and this in turn to loafing, lagging, and job stretching.

I was shocked when I read sometime ago that because of the urgent need for shells and guns that the War Department and War Production Board decided upon a program of immediate plant expansion. The amount recommended by Mr. Krug for the purpose, if I recollect correctly, was to be $750,000,000—it may have been a billion seven hundred and fifty million dollars. The policy is loose enough to allow the greatest amount even at this late date. Now, my objection to this contemplated expenditure is not based upon the size of the amount nor the lateness of the plan but because I consider it absolutely wrong to do so since we have not used available idle plants. On two different occasions I raised the question of use of existing plant before new outlays were to be approved by the war agencies, and I was assured, and a year or so later reassured, by authorized spokesmen that no new plants would be constructed as long as suitable plants are idle and available. This assurance never has been carried out in specific instances too well known and of record. I furnished a list of such plants which are ideal for the manufacture of shells and guns, but despite assurances some still remain idle and unused while we are told plans are being made to spend an additional $750,000,000 for new plants which will not, in all probability, be finished before the war is over. We need the shells and guns so we can blast the tottering Hun into hell now. Why build new plants when suitable

buildings are ready and waiting? There are many such opportunities for reasonable economy where the war effort will be aided, not retarded, by the sensible expenditure of taxpayers' money. I hope this is the last time we are forced to come before you with a recommendation for lifting the debt limit; however, we must be ready to spend every dollar needed to win the war at the least expenditure in the lives of our boys. To arrest or at least to retard this spending orgy—the Committee on Appropriations should henceforth scrutinize new requests for expenditures, more diligently than ever. The Congress should peer into and reappraise the plan and policy hidden deep in the greatest unexpended gold pile ever dreamed of. There is too much temptation to spend all that is available, the greater the amount available the greater the desire to spend. I hope I have been able to contribute just one constructive thought in this debate that of application of prudent economy in all expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 5 minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, it seems to be the unanimous opinion that this bill must be passed as presented. I offer you a toast by Artemus Ward, "Let us live happy and within our means even if we borrow the money."

I think that applies at this moment. I have heard a billion dollars measured so many times this afternoon, and I have also read that a billion dollars is a dollar a minute since the birth of the Christ. So I can hardly visualize $300,000,000,000, but do acknowledge the necessity of voting for that amount at this time. However, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] ought to be considered.

The Treasury has advanced most of the money to purchase the securities of the R. F. C. and other Government agencies. These agencies have some $53,000,000,000 supposedly invested in properties and goods on which they should get a return of at least 50 percent. I am looking forward, as the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is looking forward, to contemplated methods of disposing of this debt. In the carrying on of war there is enormous waste. We realize it. We have seen it. But after the war criticisms will be disposed of in similar manner as Charles Dawes disposed of them before an investigating committee. He simply stated: "Hell and Maria! We were fighting a war." It was of little use to hold hearings after that. However, it is wise to be looking forward as the gentleman from California is doing to find ways to control or to dispose of this enormous debt. I am wondering at the promise of 60,000,000 jobs and just how they are figuring to finance such a proposal. Is it only a rumor that this administration will still further lower the gold content to 25 percent? It is more than a rumor; it is being talked of so much that the Treasury itself has declared that they have not as yet considered making such a proposal.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Do not take too much of my time; I have only 15 minutes, but I have such admiration for the gentleman that I will at once answer his question: "Where are you going to get the money?" I simply say: "By printing it." Keep that in mind; that is the intention.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Where are we going to get the money to buy the printing presses?

Mr. GIFFORD. We have a great many printing presses on hand. We have already printed so much money. We even printed a special brand of money for the soldiers, called invasion money—about which we can get but little information. Is it to be redeemed in United States currency? Is it reckoned as money in circulation?

I might wish I had an hour to talk about devious and peculiar methods of financing, such as those being considered by the New Dealers to guarantee those 60,000,000 jobs. With that $33,000,000,000 empire under the R. F. C. perhaps they intend to see to it that the revolving funds as they come back into the hands of the R. F. C. will be lent to business if the banks require more interest than United States securities.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. They call that invasion money, because it invades the solvency of the invaded countries.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am glad the gentleman can define it. I have been unable to find anyone who could. I have been in touch with some of the experts on these matters. I want to remind the gentleman from California and others who have often referred to Abraham Lincoln's issue of fiat money, that that went to 30 cents on the dollar.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Only part of it went down to 30 cents on the dollar, only that portion which was not made full legal tender and as to which there was an exception that it was not to be acceptable for interest on the public debt or for the payment of import duties. All the rest of that issue, which did not bear that limitation, circulated at par all the time.

Mr. GIFFORD. I will place in the RECORD my authority for the statement made about this matter. I want the House to understand about that printed money during Abraham Lincoln's administration, as it has been so constantly referred to in this body. If he did it, why cannot we? Let us not risk doing it, profiting by that experience. I quote from a letter which I received recently:

VOORHIS said: "Mr. Speaker, may I conclude by pointing out that in view of the fact that there was $450,000,000 of United States money issued to help finance the Civil War, there has been a saving even at a simple-interest computation at 4 percent, let alone compound interest, to the people of this Nation since that time of $1,476,000,000."

Although it is not clear why he would calculate a saving of interest "to the people of this Nation since that time," it is pertinent to point out that, instead of the issuance of the greenbacks saving the people interest, it cost them a pretty penny. Perhaps the most reliable study on our experiences with the Civil War greenbacks is Wesley C. Mitchell's A History of the Greenbacks (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1903). If Mr. VOORHIS would consult that work, for example, chapter X, especially page 419, he would find that the issuance of approximately $449,000,000 of greenbacks increased the financial burden of the Federal Government alone, from 1862 to 1865, by hundreds of millions of dollars, one of the most widely accepted estimates being $589,000,000. There are no reliable estimates as to the increased costs to State and local governments and to people in general, but this additional burden in these respects must have been many hundreds of millions of dollars, beyond that experienced by the Federal Government, since the greenback depreciated to 35 cents on the dollar in terms of gold by 1864 and sharply in terms of various other goods and services.

As to the gentleman from California, may I say that I really love him, and appreciate him so much that I read every thing I can that he advocates. I sometimes wonder if he will ever be able to convince me. He is a man of vision, but no man is a real man of vision unless, of course, he agrees with me. He has ideas as to the retiring of one-third, and perhaps the whole, of this $300,000,000,000 debt. I listened to and have read and reread his recent address on this floor. I have it marked up here, but I have not the time to comment much. He would get rid of part of the debt of $300,000,000,000, namely, $100,000,000,000 of it by printing money to pay matured bonds and having the money circulating without interest. But money is a promise to pay. Does it really reduce the debt? Certainly it avoids payments of interest.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Has any Member of Congress given the gentleman any good reason or any good idea as to how this country is going to survive and pay this great national debt that we have?

Mr. GIFFORD. I dislike to answer the question because I am a little pessimistic. There is a road to ruin. I do not say that we have taken it. I would not like to say that, although I might fear it. The road to ruin is always kept well paved. They are paving that road constantly so that we can travel it safely, at least temporarily. There are dozens of paving jobs, such as further gold clipping and manipulation of the Federal Reserve notes. I recently read the conversation between the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and Chairman Eccles of the Federal Reserve, in which the latter had to agree that the Federal Reserve note was really fiat money. If we could only understand this money business, but we do not. I have argued here on this floor a good deal about it during the last few years, but I confess I have difficulty

in finding people who seem to be able to explain this subject of money to me. My curiosity at times has been aroused. I do not like to be misled with my eyes open. But "Mother knows best." We have heard much of that.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman think a man who does not understand money and refuses to study the money question has any business representing the American people in this Congress?

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman's question may be all right, but the answer would be very indiscreet.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to have that in the RECORD.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Might there not be a difference between the man who understands money and the one who thinks he understands money?

Mr. WHITE. May I say to the gentleman the statement should be blazoned across every newspaper in the United States that the man who does not understand money and who refuses to study the money question has no business representing the American people in this Congress.

Mr. GIFFORD. I used to think I understood a certain subject. Finally someone remarked, "Oh, he is only a crank," and when you get to the cranky stage then people begin to lose faith in your advocacy of that particular matter. I advise the gentleman to go slow on this money question.

Mr. WHITE. May I say to the gentleman, since the question of silver has been brought up, we would not be putting a $300,000,000,000 debt limit on the United States today if it would have been used sensibly.

Mr. GIFFORD. You can use the same legerdemain with silver as with gold and other devices. But I would like to see something tangible received for printed money—gold or silver, or other commodities of real value.

The gentleman from California wants to stop private banks from creating money. If I give my note, I create money.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. My point is that the Government itself ought not to have to pay interest upon its own credit when that credit is created by a private institution. When the bank loans the gentleman money on his note the bank is monetizing the gentleman's note the same as the bank monetizes the bond of the Government, but it is the credit of the Government that stands behind it.

Mr. GIFFORD. If my Government goes into forms of private business, it should have no advantage. If I have to pay interest, the Government should pay interest also.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would be perfectly willing to settle the matter on an even basis if the sovereign American Nation exercises only the same right that the banking system exercises. I do not ask any special favors.

Mr. GIFFORD. May I ask you to read the speech of the gentleman from California on February 21? It will start you thinking. Of course, it set me to thinking, but like many matters presented here lately, it set me to thinking with a challenging attitude. The advocacy of 100-percent reserves back of demand deposits interests me. Where are we to get money to keep business going? The savings departments of the banks would not suffice. We should then get it from the Government, of course. I have said before, and I say it now, get the Government out from underwriting everything. Think of the vast sums of this borrowed money that we spent to relieve unemployment. If there had been one year of confidence in government, the public would have taken care of that unemployment. Again I call attention to the speech made by the gentleman from California. It was really a thought-provoking speech, and perhaps gives us a hint of future methods of finance. Taxes may finally pay the debt and I tell my people it all depends on our courage to tax them to pay it. But we cannot tax them beyond ability to pay.

Every nation that has printed much money on the promise to pay and on the credit of that nation has gone on the rocks. A man who owns a dollar bill wants to be able to say, "I want something of definite value." Jesse Jones has gone. We all had confidence that he would account for the money that he loaned. But there seems to be a constant attempt on the part of this administration to see that people get in control who have so-called liberal views and who feel that debt is fully justified if it is used to make 60,000,000 jobs.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. With reference to using printing-press money to pay the debt, I hold here a piece of paper that was printed by the Japanese Government, apparently for use in the South Pacific. All that is on it is "the Japanese Government, one shilling." It is undated. It bears no signatures. What would be the difference between that form of printing-press money and the kind the gentleman has discussed for paying our national debt?

I am attempting to get information relating to the so-called invasion money.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to pay my sincere respect and express my genuine affection for the gentleman from Massachusetts who has just preceded me. I want to thank him for making reference to my speech, and to say that whatever differences of opinion may exist between him and me do not becloud my sincere admiration for his character. When I attain his age, if I can look back on a life as full of integrity and character as our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] I will be well content.

Now, first with reference to what the gentleman from Oregon referred to, the value of that Japanese currency depends entirely on what that Japanese currency will buy which I expect is just about nothing today. The gentleman from Massachusetts made reference to the change in the gold content of the dollar. I call his attention and that of the House to the fact that when the gold content of the dollar was cut, as it was, it made almost no difference whatsoever in the price level of the United States. The thing that people were interested in was not how many grains of gold were in the dollar but rather the amount of food, clothing, and shelter each of those dollars would buy, and that in turn depends upon how many dollars were in active circulation relative to the supply of goods and services to be purchased. That Japanese currency will be worthless unless it will perform its function in the purchase of goods. An American dollar issued against the credit of the United States will be of value to the extent that there is a sound, solid, and stable relationship from month to month and year to year between the number of those dollars that are in circulation and the volume of actual physical production of goods and services that takes place in the United States.

May I say that as far as my position on this matter is concerned, I have never asked or advocated anything except that we should have the right as a Nation to keep in circulation continuously a volume of money which would correspond on a stable basis to the increase in our productive capacity. All I have said is that it ought not to be necessary, when actual physical production is increasing or could readily be increased, for the sovereign nation to permit any private institution whatsoever to usurp its basic constitutional right to be the only source of new money in this country, and then to have to turn around and contract an interest-bearing debt to those private institutions, namely, the banks, when it borrows back from them its own credit.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me there?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am so anxious to have this cleared up. The gentleman will remember in his speech he said that would take care of one-third of the national debt.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to explain what I said it would take care of, and I will do that right now, sir. I, furthermore, have been advocating for many years a 100-percent reserve behind demand deposits in the banking system. I have believed it a poor bargain for the American Nation to fail to pay the banks honestly and squarely for services which they perform in handling our checking accounts, which are nothing more or less than our cash money, and then to permit the banks to try to make a profit by increasing and destroying all the medium of exchange of the Nation in the form of demand deposits. I have considered that a poor bargain. I have believed, and I do today, that a sound

banking system would be one where the demand deposit part of banking would be handled purely as a warehousing of money proposition; and where every time a depositor deposited $1 in that bank, that dollar would remain there for that depositor until he called for it, and where there would not be an expansion and contraction of the volume of demand deposits by action of the banks; and where the savings department or the loan and investment department of the bank would be separated from the demand deposit department. Today, as the gentleman knows, the Government requires reserves amounting to an average, I should judge, of about 20 percent of demand deposits. On that basis the banks have today about $12,000,000,000 of reserves with the Federal Reserve and something over $50,000,000,000 of demand deposits. I believe those demand deposits should be covered 100 percent by cash reserves.

The one-third of the national debt to which I made reference had to do with that portion of the national debt which has been held by banks and which has been purchased by banks with new money. It has been purchased by banks with money created in the form of bookkeeping entries in the war loan deposit accounts of the banks. That is where I got to the one-third of the national debt part of it. It is actually more than one-third of the debt.

As a matter of fact, my proposal for 100-percent reserves might or might not take care of one-third of the outstanding debt. It would take care of a considerable portion of the debt in this way: If Congress permitted the banks to count as eligible reserves Government bonds which they now hold until the time that those bonds mature and if we required 100-percent reserves, then when the time came for those particular bonds to mature, they ought obviously to be replaced with an equivalent amount of currency, and that currency would become a portion of the required reserves behind the demand deposits in the banks. That currency, I think, ought to be created by a Government agency without debt or interest charge in order to replace the interest-bearing bonds as a portion of the reserves of the banks. If that were done that part of the national debt, whatever it might be, would be paid off without either taxation or refinancing being necessary.

Mr. GIFFORD. Would it amount to one-third?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not believe it would, I will say to the gentleman. I expect that proportion would be high.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman said that it would.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think I may have been a bit optimistic. No one could tell how much it would amount to without knowing what the volume of demand deposits will be at the end of the war; and I do not know how much that will be. It is true that well over one-third of our present outstanding debt is held either by commercial banks or Federal Reserve banks. In fact it was more than 40 percent as of last June. As of June 1944, out of a total debt of $201,000,000,000, $83,000,000,000 was so held. Most of that $83,000,000,000 became debt against the American people because those banks created money without cost to themselves upon their own books in order to buy the bonds.

Mr. GIFFORD. When those bonds mature, and they mature quickly, you would have to furnish the money to pay for them.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right, you would.

Mr. GIFFORD. You would have to print that money.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In the same manner as it has heretofore been printed on the bank's books; yes, except that in this case it would be the Congress not the private banks that would be creating the money. That money could not possibly be inflationary money because if it is required as a portion of the reserves in the banks it would merely replace bonds which in the meantime we had permitted the banks to count as reserves. It would not increase by one single dollar the money available as a circulating medium.

Mr. GIFFORD. I agree with that. I agree with that; it ought not to, anyway.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And it would not. Furthermore, that would merely be replacing by Government creation of a similar amount of money, bonds which had been purchased through the inflationary creation of money by banks.

Now, I have a chart here, and this is what I want to say in the remainder of my time. Member after Member has risen upon this floor and has expressed concern over the huge national debt, and properly so, though every Member knows we could not do otherwise. Everyone of us feels the same way about it. I do not agree that the national debt is of no concern. I do not believe we "owe it to ourselves," in any real sense. As a matter of fact, I had already told the House that about 40 percent of it is owed to the Federal Reserve banks and commercial banks. Less than 25 percent of it is owed to individuals. The American people all owe the debt, but they owe the bulk of it to a few large institutions. I think the debt is a very great problem. And what is worse, under the present monetary system, and until we cut the knot that at present ties the supply of money to the debt, public or private, of the American people, we cannot have a full-production economy; we cannot have a prosperous condition in the Nation unless the debt of the people is being increased. This chart proves it.

The red line on this chart is industrial production. The blue line is public and private debt, the total debt of the Federal Government and the local governments and corporations and private individuals of the United States. There must be a freeing of the Nation to create money when it is needed by the business life of this country, without acquiring debt. Otherwise the line of production will continue to be subject to the increase in the debt of the Nation, and we will be unable to pay down this colossal war debt unless, indeed, we contract an increasing amount of new debt in the process.

Here we have the inflation of the First World War. Prices increased to twice what they were before. This shows the rise in debt. We have a fairly steady line here on production, which means the increasing debt of the period, taking inflation into account, was just sustaining the level of production. As soon as that debt leveled off in 1920, through the action of the Federal Reserve Board in deliberately bringing on deflation, we have a slump in production. As soon as the debt commences to increase again we have a period up to 1929, when we have an increase in production. In 1929 the bubble of debt collapsed. So did production.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Everybody knows what happened in 1929. The thing that frightened the people was not the policies introduced after 1933, but the thing that happened to them in 1929, in the very heyday of the Andrew Mellon system of government. As a matter of fact in 1929 the debt bubble burst. It was partly a debt bubble that had resulted from the sale of foreign bonds in the United States. It was partly a debt bubble from the creation of billions of dollars of demand bank deposits to enable people to speculate on Wall Street. Production declined until 1933, when there was only about $56,000,000,000 of national income.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. What effect did the First World War, which we were promised we would be kept out of, have upon the creation of that bulge?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will say that I was not in a very authoritative position at that time, personally. What was the gentleman's question?

Mr. KNUTSON. I say, what effect did the First World War, which we were promised we would be kept out of, have upon the creation of that bulge?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. On the debt?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. When we entered the First World War we had a debt of about $1,500,000,000. We came out with a national debt of $25,000,000,000. I shall not go into any detailed explanation of the slump that took place between 1929 and 1932. In 1932 the debt began to increase again, and it has continued to increase. Since the outbreak of war it has soared, and so has production. Why? Because of unlimited demand backed by the money to pay for the things produced. That is the way full production is made possible. It is the key to our post-war problem. But it must not have to be based on continually increasing debt. That is my plea. Note how from 1933 to date production continues to increase, with one exception, and that is in 1937. In 1937, just because the debt did not continue

to increase, it did not even go down, but because it failed to continue to increase we had what was called a recession. As a matter of fact that recession saw a decrease in production equal to about three times the decrease in total debt.

Why do I tell all this? Am I arguing that we must always have more debt in order to get more production? No. I do not argue that at all, unless we are so lacking in understanding as to perpetuate this debt-money system. But the problem has a great deal more to it, and is something much more fundamental than simply a saving of twenty-five or thirty thousand dollars on an appropriation for Japanese beetle control, for example. It is the question whether we will listen to the men who wrote the Constitution of the United States, people like Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln. What are we going to do when it becomes necessary in the interest of maintaining a volume of buying power which will correspond to our capacity to produce when all are employed? Will we require this great Nation to continue to go into debt to private creators of money? Or will this Congress authorize some agency of the Congress set up by the Congress for that specific purpose, and operating under a mandate to prevent both inflation and deflation to create the money needed to maintain stability without debt, interest free.

The national money of America must never be created in unlimited amounts, not to pay the national debt, but to maintain a parity between the available supply of money to purchase goods on the one hand, and the supply of those goods in physical volume on the other.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Bell testified before our committee that 59 percent of the deposits of the banks of this Nation were in Government bonds. I wish the gentleman would discuss what effect that may have on the future.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think it means that the banks who have those bonds have become manufactories of money for the United States rather than true banking institutions accepting deposits which people put into those banks for investment purposes and making loans with that amount of money. I think it means that the welfare of the banking system is all tied up with the Government. I do not think it ought to be that way. I think those demand deposits ought to be monetized by action of this Congress. I think they ought to be turned into 100 percent actual deposits of physical money. I believe that in the future when money is to be created and it is necessary to be created that it should be the Government that does it; and I believe correspondingly that if we do that and maintain a balance between the supply of purchasing power on the one hand and the volume of physical and potential production on the other, we could keep the Government out of the banking business, that is the business of lending money, and leave that real banking business to the banking system where it belongs. There are exceptions, of course, such as cases of farmers who cannot possibly obtain credit on fair terms any other way except by means of some Government lending agency. But as a matter of actual fact the Federal Government today gets its money by selling its securities to banks, and they create the money to buy the securities; and in many instances the R. F. C., for example, turns around in the bank's local community and makes a loan that the bank should have made itself. But such a change necessarily waits upon the time when we take the banks out of the essentially public business of creating the Nation's money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, during the speech of the able chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means there was a discussion with reference to an amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and during that discussion I made the statement that the Budget was based on the assumption that both wars would continue during the next fiscal year. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] denied my statement. I have since talked to the Budget Bureau and found that the gentleman from Tennessee was entirely incorrect. Mr. Martin of the Budget Bureau told me, and told me I could quote him, that the Budget for 1946 did not contemplate that the war in Europe would be over at any specific date. That, of course, is good sound Treasury budgeting; it is the proper way to do—estimate what is the worst possible thing that may happen.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. In further corroboration of what the distinguished gentleman says, may I say that in every budget estimate that has come before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on which I am privileged to serve, there has not been a single Budget estimate but what contemplates that the war will continue all through 1946. It may or it may not, we hope it does not; but in planning the Budget for the year 1946, the Budget Bureau as the gentleman has so well said has not reduced the amount of the Budget in contemplation that the war with Germany or Japan might end in the year 1946.

Mr. KEAN. Continuing the discussion of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I started to say when I was interrupted by the gentleman from Tennessee that I thought there was some merit to the suggestion, for the reason that it does look possible that the European war may be over in the middle of the fiscal year and that therefore we may not have to spend the money we think we may.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Did the gentleman get any information as to what the necessary Budget would be for 1946 in the event the war with Germany terminated by the end of this fiscal year?

Mr. KEAN. The President in his Budget message mentioned that under certain circumstances over there we might require only $60,000,000,000 for war expenditures as against the $70,000,000,000 that he estimated.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. That would only be the possibility of a difference of $10,000,000,000?

Mr. KEAN. That is right. In further consideration of the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania I want to read what the President said in his Budget message as follows:

> If the war develops favorably, unobligated balances of war appropriations no longer required for authorized purposes will be placed in reserves and reported to the Congress for repeal or other action under the provision of present law.

It is a particular pleasure for me to have guaranteed bonds made subject to the debt limit as provided by this bill, for I have harped on this subject for years. Way back in 1939 I introduced a bill to prevent the further issuance of bonds guaranteed by the United States by Government corporations. And in 1941 I called attention to my hearty approval of the fact that the Treasury had finally come over to my viewpoint and had announced that their future policy was to sell no more of these bonds to the public and to retire them as they matured by issuing Treasury obligations.

But so long as it is possible to sell these bonds, 12 billions of which are held by the Treasury to the public outside the debt limit, there will always be a temptation to do so, and a mere policy of the present Treasury Department is not sufficient. Policies can be changed over night.

The selling of guaranteed bonds to the public is an easy way to fool the people as to what is our actual debt, therefore, this provision of the bill not only is sound, but very welcome.

It is with real reluctance that I support this rise in the debt limitation. But there is nothing that members of the Ways and Means Committee can do except to approve the rise, for the money has been appropriated by Congress.

Perhaps we should have levied more taxes. In time of war, taxes should be as high as the national economy will stand. We should place as little burden as possible on our returning veterans—our future taxpayers; for we should not ask them to fight this war and pay for it too.

And in this respect I was pleased to note in Secretary Bell's testimony, as appears in the hearings before the committee, that for the first time since the war started, it is estimated that in the fiscal year 1945–46 more than half of our expenses will be met through current taxation.

The real necessity for this bill stems from the action of the Appropriations Committee and the House in the spending that they have authorized. Non-

war expenditures of the Government remain at a very high level.

I doubt if these expenditures have been cut to the bone as they should have been.

Let us get down to earth and realize that Uncle Sam is no longer the rich uncle able to spread largesse everywhere, but that he is in reality in serious financial trouble.

By this time next year interest on the public debt alone will reach approximately $6,000,000,000. Continued spending will inevitably lower the standard of living of our people. Do we want this to occur?

Let us here have the courage to resist pressure groups; to resist the temptation to ask for special favors for the people in our districts; and let us hope that next year at this time the Committee on Ways and Means will not be forced to come back and ask you to raise the debt limit to $350,000,000,000.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. Speaking of the per capita indebtedness and the present-day trend, is it a fact that the wage trends on one hand coming up from below and the tax burden coming down from above are gradually wiping out the small business of this country and will, in the end, reduce employment?

Mr. KEAN. The New Deal policies have favored big business and it is very hard for small business to get along under the policies of this administration. There is no question about that.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I think we are dealing with one of the most important issues and a plan of the greatest import to the American people today in raising this debt limit to $300,000,000,000 that has ever come before this Congress, except probably the declaration of war. When this country finally sinks into hopeless insolvency the Congress of the United States will be responsible. Under the system of government that has been given us by the founding fathers, by the people who established this Government and adopted the Constitution, the responsibility was placed on the people of managing and operating their Government, by their Representatives elected to Congress; now, under that plan, the Senators and Representatives chosen by people to formulate the policies of the Government have the responsibility of levying taxes and appropriating all the money raised by the Government, and when this country goes into hopeless insolvency the Congress cannot put aside its responsibility for the Government's financial condition.

We have fought a number of wars in this country, and I took the occasion today to obtain some figures as to the expenses of past wars. We find that in 1865, after the close of the Civil War, the total indebtedness of this country was $2,677,929,012. The per capita debt burden of the American people was $77.07. In 1866, at the peak of the national indebtedness of that period, it amounted to $2,755,763,929 or a per capita indebtedness of $77.69. Remember that of that $2,000,000,000 of national indebtedness there were $500,000,000 of Treasury notes, the so-called greenbacks, which were circulated without interest. President Lincoln and his Cabinet were more considerate of posterity when they put this country into debt in fighting a war by issuing Treasury notes, noninterest bearing, than the present-day administration that puts the country in debt by obtaining interest bearing bank credit and by issuing banknote money secured by Government bonds on which is piling up an unpayable and unbearable interest load.

Today we are dealing with a program to put $300,000,000,000 of indebtedness on 138,941,000 people, this country's population today as stated by the Treasury which will bring about an indebtedness of $2,159.12 for every man, woman, and child in this country. That goes to every kind of inhabitant of the United States. Each of them will have an indebtedness of $2,159.12 if this debt limit is reached. Do you think there is any business plan or taxation scheme that can be evolved that will reduce that indebtedness or pay it off? Will this generation or any other generation ever see it paid?

Our monetary and fiscal program has been mismanaged from way back yonder, and we are still mismanaging it. We must work out some plan whereby the national business can be protected and the national debt reduced.

I said on the floor a while ago and I repeat, "The man that does not understand money and refuses to study the money questions has no business representing the people in Congress."

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Apropos of the colloquy that took place here this afternoon with reference to legislation pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency, I call the attention of the Members to the fact that the Second Liberty Loan Act, upon which all this debt limitation is built up, is now being considered for amendment by this bill pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency. I think it is a very serious situation for that committee to take jurisdiction over amending the Second Liberty Loan Act, which is the foundation of all this legislation, and thereby take it away from the Committee on Ways and Means. I call this to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, because this is surely going to be an invasion of the jurisdiction of that great committee.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman refers, I take it, to the so-called Bretton Woods bill?

Mr. JENKINS. Yes. I refer to the so-called Bretton Woods bill.

Mr. CURTIS. I have not studied that measure, but a hurried reading of it indicates that it does that very thing. Certainly the public should take notice that the Bretton Woods measure does increase the debt limit of the United States, and that the financing of that proposal has a direct bearing on the obligations of the United States. It is a concrete illustration that there are many forces working to increase the debt of the United States, some of which we do not know about.

I wish to call attention to a sentence in the minority report on this bill:

> The credit risk of a nation is like that of an individual—it depends not only on the amount he owes, and his receipts, but also on his attitude toward payment of debt.

No doubt you will all agree that there are people of your acquaintance who are poor credit risks for a very few dollars. Their attitude is such that they do not care when or how it is paid, or, if it comes to a showdown on paying it, they look for a slicker scheme to get it settled without actual payment. Some men are a poor credit risk for $20, others with no more assets are good risks for thousands of dollars. Their attitude toward payment makes a difference.

We have had certain apostles of destruction going up and down this country preaching the doctrine that the size of the national debt does not matter because we owe it to ourselves. Certainly those people are not doing the credit of the United States any good. We have had others who have written at length about the great wealth of the Nation; they say it runs into trillions and trillions of dollars, and that we do not need to worry. They, too, are like the man who owes a few dollars and trys to figure out a "skin game" to wipe out his debts. They are hurting the credit of the United States.

A certain Cabinet member, a few years ago, went out to the Great Northwest and talked to a group of farmers. He told them in substance, "Now, you men do not need to get alarmed about these expenditures. We are not going to tax you. We are going to tax powerful interests back east and bring the money here and spend it with you." He was deceiving those men. Now all the farmers have to make an income-tax return and pay income taxes. That individual was tampering with the facts and he was and is hurting the credit of the United States. It is not the necessities of war alone that are imperiling the financial structure of this Republic. False doctrines are dangerous.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. When Governor Kerr, of Oklahoma, spoke in my home city this fall, a delegation of high-school students interviewed him and expressed apprehension about the national debt. He said, "You young men do not need to worry about it as long as you do not have anything."

Mr. CURTIS. Yes; and we all know that his statement was not correct. The national debt is a greater handicap to the youth than to any other group. The heavy tax burden caused by the New Deal makes it impossible for a poor boy to amass a fortune or become a captain of industry. A big portion of his earnings throughout his lifetime will be taken

from him to pay the debts incurred in the Roosevelt administrations. The reactionary New Deal has been a great force in destroying opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to extend my remarks by including the minority report on this bill:

SUPPLEMENTAL MINORITY VIEWS

This will be the seventh time since 1934 that the Congress has been asked to raise the limit on our national debt. These increases were made necessary despite the enactment of 13 major revenue bills during that period, each one increasing the tax burden carried by our people.

When the New Deal regime took over back in 1933, the national debt was twenty and nine-tenths billions. Today it is $233,000,000,000. By a succession of increases the debt limit was raised from forty-five billion in 1935 to sixty-five billion before our entrance into the war in December 1941. During the same period annual Government spending increased from three and eight-tenths billions to about thirteen billion. These enormous increases in expenditures were brought about by profligate and wasteful spending which Republican Members of Congress denounced and protested against time and again, to no avail.

Today the national debt limit is $260,000,000,000 which we now are asked to increase to $300,000,000,000. The Federal debt alone, at three hundred billion as contemplated in this bill, will be a charge of close to $10,000 on each of the estimated 30,000,000 families in the United States. It means that every newborn American babe starts life tagged with a debt to the Federal Government of nearly $2,500.

Through the insistence of the minority members of the committee, the Treasury Department has been instructed by the committee to bring in a report on ways and means of reducing our Federal debt.

In addition to extending the Treasury's borrowing authority this bill also contains certain important restrictions to the Second Liberty Loan Act, of an administrative character which were sponsored by the Republican Members. Not the least of these improvements is the provision requiring inclusion of certain guaranteed and contingent liabilities of the United States within the debt limitation of $300,000,000,000. Again, through the efforts of the minority a necessary and vital restriction was placed on the power of the Treasury to sell odd lots of securities without publishing notices of sale.

The Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee, and of the Congress as a whole, realize full well that the credit risk of a nation is like that of an individual—it depends not only on the amount he owes, and his receipts, but also on his attitude toward payment of debt. The exigencies of war, as well as the necessity for protecting the national credit which vitally concerns those who are patriotically investing in War Savings bonds, compel us to acquiesce. We vote to increase the debt reluctantly because we are unable to prevent the continued shameful waste by the administration in public spending of all kinds.

HAROLD KNUTSON, DANIEL A. REED, ROY O. WOODRUFF, THOMAS A. JENKINS, BERTRAND W. GEARHART, FRANK CARLSON, RICHARD M. SIMPSON, ROBERT W. KEAN, CHARLES L. GIFFORD, CARL T. CURTIS.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, a great deal of discussion has taken place here this afternoon in reference to the bill (H. R. 2404), to raise the debt limit from $260,000,000,000 to $300,000,000,000. It is contended that there is nothing in this bill which in any way pertains to increasing our national debt. In a sense and in a measure, I quite agree, because we do not have a bill here by which we are authorizing the expenditure of any funds. On the other hand, I quite disagree with the proponents of this measure because of the fact that when there is a limit on the spending of individuals they will probably try to keep within that limit. When the limit is placed so high that there really is no chance of approaching it within a short time, they might think there is no use in trying to conserve funds. I remember many times when I went to my father and I said, "Dad, give me $5," my father would think it over and he would say to me, "You want to be careful, Robert, with your money." Then, after I talked with him a good while, he would go into his pocket and give me a dollar. He did not want me to squander $5 if he thought a dollar would do. I know of many mothers and fathers throughout the Nation who have tried to be conservative in years past with their children and who have tried to teach their children the value of a dollar. They taught them the value of a dollar. I realize today it takes 10 pennies to make a dime and 10 dimes to make a dollar. I know eventually when our boys come back home after they have won this war, they are going to be very much upset and very much surprised when they see how much of a debt they will have to pay. A debt created by the Congress, by the New Deal. They will realize what the responsibility of the Congress is to those boys for trying to keep this country in a good financial position. In my judgment financially we are in the worst position our Nation has ever been.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but read to the Committee a couple of quotations, from the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt. Unkept promises, promises repudiated, wrecked promises.

This is from the President of the United States, in a speech made at Sioux City, Iowa, on September 29, 1932, before he was elected the first time.

This is a quotation from the President: I quote:

We are not getting adequate returns for the money we are spending in Washington, or to put it another way, we are spending altogether too much money for Government services that are neither practical nor necessary. And then in addition to that we are attempting too many functions. We need to simplify what the Federal Government is giving to the people. I accuse the present administration of being the greatest spending administration in peacetime, in all our history. It is an administration that has piled bureau on bureau, commission on commission, and has failed to anticipate the dire needs and reduced earning power of the people. Bureaus and bureaucrats, commissions and commissioners have been retained at the expense of the taxpayers.

The Chief Executive made that statement during the Hoover administration. I wonder when he goes to bed at night and closes his eyes and begins to think, what he can think of his own administration in the past 12 years. When I show you that the indebtedness of the Government at the time he came into power was twenty-two and one-half billion and up until Pearl Harbor it was forty-nine and one-half billion, the greatest debt this Nation ever had up until that time in peacetime, and he has had a deficit every year ranging from one and one-half billion to $15,000,000,000, I wonder what he thinks. I wonder what the Congress thinks. I wonder what the American people think. I know what I think and I would not like to have it printed here, or you would think I did not like Mr. Roosevelt. That would not do.

Let me give you another quotation from the same gentleman on March 10, 1933, after he was President of the United States:

And on my part I ask you very simply to assign to me the task of reducing the annual operating expenses of your National Government. We must move with a direct and resolute purpose now. The Members of Congress and I are pledged to immediate economy.

Oh, Members of Congress today we say to that, "What a joke"—oh; how he fooled the American people.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I do not yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to know the date of that.

Mr. RICH. March 10, 1933. After he assumed office. He repudiated it—every word—I will quote further. I quote the President:

The Members of Congress and I are pledged to immediate economy. When a great danger threatens our basic security it is my duty to advise the Congress of the way to preserve it. In so doing I must be fair, not only to the few but to the many. It is in this spirit that I appeal to you. If Congress chooses to vest me with this responsibility it will be exercised in a spirit of justice and of sympathy to those who are in need and of maintaining inviolate the basic welfare of the United States.

I say to you, Mr. Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, I consider you a fine gentleman, but I say that when I came to Congress we had a debt limit of $45,000,000,000.

On January 30, 1934, you increased that $10,000,000,000 by permitting the increasing of notes. In 1940, you increased and the President increased the national debt limit to $40,000,000,000. In 1942, you and the Congress and the President of the United States increased the debt limit up to $65,000,000,000. In 1942, Mr. Chairman, you and the Congress and the President increased the debt limit to $125,000,000,000. Mr. Chairman, you and the Congress and the President in 1943 increased the debt limit to $210,000,000,000 and on June 9, 1944, you and the Congress increased the debt limit of this great country to $260,000,000,000. Now you hike it again to $300,000,000,000. Where, oh, where is the limit? Such extravagance, such recklessness with the other fellow's money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

POST-WAR LEND-LEASE

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, while we are discussing the increase in the debt limit, we should remember we will have before us next week the extension of lend-lease until June 30, 1949. That means 4 years more of lend-lease—into the next Presidential administration—if the bill reported by the majority is adopted. Under the Lend-Lease Act we have already concluded a French post-war agreement which may add two and one-half billion dollars to the top of our public debt. We will carry this in our national debt unless and until the French make their payments over a 30-year period. If the committee bill is adopted in the form in which it is brought to the floor, we may have further post-war agreements under lend-lease which would add very largely to our national debt. The minority who oppose the use of lend-lease as a post-war mechanism are not opposed to the continuation of the lend-lease policy of mutual military aid among our allies for the duration of the war, but we are opposed to using the lend-lease mechanism for the post-war period for relief, rehabilitation, or reconstruction. The minority have filed a report today, which will be found in the Appendix of the RECORD, under leave given to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD], who inserted it in the RECORD. I urge you to read this analysis of the possibility of post-war lend-lease at a time when we already have U. N. R. R. A. for post-war relief, when we have the Bretton Woods reconstruction bank before Congress, at a time when we are increasing the national debt, and at a time when we are looking forward to entering post-war security organizations. I urge that you study this minority report with an open mind as we approach consideration of this bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Assuming that this bill becomes law fixing the maximum national debt at $300,000,000,000 and that next week we pass the bill to which the gentleman has referred, which would carry two and one-half billions; would not that mean that the later legislation passed would be added to the debt authorization passed today?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I think the debt limitation under consideration today has not been reached at the present time. If, however, we go into a vast program of post-war lend-lease, we may be faced with a proposition of increasing the debt limitation again, for that reason alone.

Mr. MICHENER. That is not my question. My question is: If the Congress fixes the debt limitation, which it has a right to fix today, but next week passes legislation which would necessarily increase that limitation, would not the later act of Congress control over the action today?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to answer the question?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I will yield if the gentleman will arrange a little more time for me.

Mr. MILLS. I do not have it, but will not the gentleman yield anyway?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I think the answer to the question of the gentleman from Michigan would be yes; that the later legislation, if it meant modifying earlier legislation, would have that result.

I think the enactment of extension of lend-lease would not necessarily affect our debt limit, as this would be an authorization only. I have studied this legislation and I cannot tell you where the lend-lease commitments come into our debt limit at all. For instance, there is a revolving fund of $489,000,000 under the lend-lease act that can can be respent without appropriation by Congress and I do not know where that would come in. You may be sure, however, that all of our lend-lease expenditures must be paid for by our Government, through money raised either by taxes or borrowing, whether other governments pay us or not, and the difference between what we pay and what we receive from other governments and our own taxpayers is going to be added to the public debt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

DANGER OF INFLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill to increase the debt limit to $300,000,000,000. That is a large amount, yes, yet I am not afraid that the debt will not be paid if it is increased to $300,000,000,000 and we actually use it. I regret exceedingly it is necessary to have a national debt that large or one-half that much or one-tenth that much; yet we are in a war, and it is necessary to spend more money in time of war than in time of peace and we are not economical when it comes to spending money for war because we know that it is our duty to send a machine where a machine can go and do the work that a human can do regardless of the cost of that machine. We are spending a lot of money for machines to save the lives of American boys. On the other hand, we are spending a lot of money for lend-lease because we know every time we send food to China and a Chinese uses that food to go out and kill a Japanese, there is one less Jap to kill an American soldier; every time we spend our money for food and send it to Russia and a Russian goes out and kills a German, there is one less German to kill an American soldier. So when we spend money for lend-lease we are helping to save the lives of American boys and we are not going to be stingy or even economical in the expenditure of public funds for the prosecution of this war to a successful conclusion.

On the question of the domestic front, it is true that we should be just as economical as possible and spend just as little money as possible for any purpose outside the purposes of war. I believe that is the policy of this Government, for the very good reason that, out of every dollar we are now appropriating, 96 cents of that dollar goes for purposes of war, only 4 cents of that dollar going for all other purposes. I think those facts alone are pretty good evidence that we are reasonably economical in the expenditure of public funds.

The thing I fear more than anything else in a huge debt is inflation. It is true that our debt today is sufficiently large that we would probably have ruinous inflation were it not for our stabilization and price control program. So as to whether or not we protect our country will depend upon the success of those programs, stabilization and price control.

I just returned from Texas a couple of days ago and while I was down there a friend of mine had just returned from Nuevo Laredo, a little town in Mexico just across the Rio Grande from Texas, and he told me about the price of different things. One thing he referred to was the price of an automobile tire just across the line into Mexico, within a stone's throw of the Texas border. He said he could get an automobile tire, and he found one down there, the same kind of a tire he could have gotten on the Texas side for $16.95 on priority if he had one, but he would have had to pay $200 in American money for that tire on the Mexican side. There were many other things in proportion.

I have a number of figures I want to invite your attention to for the reason that what we have got to watch more than anything else is the effect of these inflationary pressures upon our stabilization and price control program.

If that price program dam does not hold, we are all ruined. If it does hold we can pay this national debt just a little bit easier than we could have paid a debt one tenth this size in 1932. In 1932 our national debt was just one tenth as big as it is today. Our interest rate, you would think, would be ten times as high too, since our debt is ten times higher, but it is not. Our interest rate is only three times as high, because we have been reducing interest rates along as we increased the size of our national debt, so we can pay off this public debt—we are not afraid of that—if we can prevent runaway inflation.

There is a lot of talk today about Manila. Meat there costs $100 a pound; eggs, $18 a dozen; bananas, $1 each; fish, $50 a pound; automobile tires, $10,000.

Take China. Ice cream cones, costing a nickel here, cost $3; ham sandwich, $96; lemonade, $2; used refrigerator, $32,500.

Down in Greece just an ordinary cotton work shirt costs $80,000; a loaf of bread, $260.

In Paris, France, eggs cost 36 cents each; butter, $12 per pound; in Normandy shoes cost $50 a pair.

In Mexico 24 pounds of flour cost $24.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Can the gentleman inform us who is buying this stuff at these prices?

Mr. PATMAN. That is the trouble about it. Very few people can buy it, only people of great wealth, and they cannot do so well by it, so that is the reason it is necessary for us to keep price control here that will be effective against enormous inflationary pressures caused by a high public debt.

Mr. McDONOUGH. But the gentleman has no figures to show who is buying. The gentleman has no figures to show how many articles are being sold or what the wealth of the individual is who is buying these things.

Mr. PATMAN. Obviously, there could not be too many sold, because when commodities are scarce and limited, necessarily a small amount is sold and the number of customers are probably in proportion very limited.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman make reference to American dollars?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, yes; American dollars like you use here every day, is what I make reference to.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman put in the scale of wages paid measured in American dollars?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not have all that information.

I have information here from Bulgaria, for instance, showing that sugar costs $3 a pound; butter, $6 a pound; men's suits, $144.

In France a man's suit that cost $50 before the war, now costs $250. Shoes cost from $75 to $150. They cost $12.50 before the war.

In Italy sugar costs from $4.50 to $8.75 a pound; soap, $7.50 to $10 a cake.

I will not give you all the figures, but I will give you enough to show that it can happen in any country on earth, and it can happen here, and as we increase our inflationary pressures by increasing our national debt it is our duty to pay more attention to and support more vigorously this stabilization and price-control program in our country.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I think we want to centralize on price control, but I might suggest to the gentleman that if he can get $7.50 for a cake of soap, and we have lots of soap here, why not send a shipload over and get enough money to pay off our national debt.

Mr. PATMAN. There is nothing to stop the gentleman. However, there are other more important things for us to discuss.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman's figures are very interesting. Does the gentleman have information relating to the ability of the individuals in these countries to pay these increased prices?

Mr. PATMAN. No; that is where inflation works the hardest. It wipes out the middle class of people. They do not have the ability to pay. That is the reason we owe a great debt to the wives and children of our fighting men in holding down prices, so that the amount of money that we have made possible for them to receive, while their fighting husbands and fathers are on the 55 battle fronts of the world, will afford them a decent standard of living. The only way to do it is to support the price control and stabilization program. We owe a duty to the loved ones of the men who have already fallen in battle. They are gone. We are giving their dependents a small amount each month, comparatively. It is our duty to make that amount purchase just as much as possible in order to give them a decent standard of living. It is necessary that we keep prices under control in order to keep the millions of people who are on wages that have not been increased, which are frozen, people whose incomes are fixed, from suffering from inflation, and they would be the first to be wiped out in the event of the least kind of inflation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman is not arguing that because of price control we should increase the debt of the Nation?

Mr. PATMAN. No. I am sorry. The gentleman did not get my point at all, I am afraid.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman used that as an argument to justify it.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. I said that as we increase our national debt that increases the inflationary pressures. That means that there will be many more dollars to buy things than there will be things to buy; therefore, there will be greater competition among the people to buy the limited and scarce supplies of goods; therefore, it is necessary that we give more attention and consideration to price control because the inflationary pressures become that much greater.

DESPITE GREAT WARTIME INCREASE IN NATIONAL DEBT, AMERICAN TAXPAYER BETTER ABLE TO CARRY HIS SHARE OF DEBT RETIREMENT LOAD TODAY THAN IN FORMER YEARS—INCREASED NATIONAL INCOME AND PRUDENT MANAGEMENT OF GOVERNMENT'S FINANCIAL PROGRAMS COMBINE TO MAKE THIS POSSIBLE

The prophets of gloom and the critics of this administration would have us believe that the great size of our present national debt creates a tax load under which the American taxpayer must eventually stagger and fall into personal and national bankruptcy. A careful analysis of the true facts in the case shows the utter falsity of this assumption. We must keep the debt down as much as possible, but we should continue to use money and machines to save men. We should not, in this war, send a man to do a hazardous job against the enemy when a machine could be sent, regardless of the cost of the machine.

It is true that the Federal debt in 1944 is nearly 10 times its amount in 1920, nearly 13 times its 1928 total, about 7 times its 1936 total, and more than 5 times its 1940 pre-war amount. Without further examination of other pertinent data one might readily jump to the conclusion that the individual taxpayer and wage earner was being subjected to a personal tax load which he could not possibly support. Again I point out that this does not coincide with the true facts.

In 1920, for example, the United States Government was obliged to pay an annual average interest rate of more than 4.3 percent on its bonds and other borrowings. Through the administrations of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, the annual average interest rate paid by the Government declined only slightly from this figure and, in 1928, the year of alleged great prosperity, we were still obliged to pay more than 3.9 percent for our Federal obligation interest rate.

FIFTY PERCENT REDUCTION IN INTEREST

During the administration of the present incumbent in the White House, under the able management of Mr. Henry Morgenthau, this interest rate has been steadily reduced until today we can look back and see that we only paid an average annual interest rate of 1.919 percent on all Federal borrowings outstanding during 1944. This reduction of more than 50 percent in the Government's cost of money hire is one of the great offsetting factors to the fears of the prophets of gloom and is a tribute to the prudence and foresight of a great Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau. It is an obvious fact that the amount of the interest charge is the greatest single factor in determining the total amount of the annual over-all debt service charge. With low interest rates at the Government's command, more of the principal can be retired each year and the burden upon the individual taxpayer is proportionately lessened thereby. Full production and full employment will keep our national income up which will make our large national debt easier to pay.

In 1920 the Government paid out $1,032,000,000 in interest charges on the public debt. In 1944, with the debt nearly 10 times greater, but with greatly reduced interest rates, the Government paid out only $3,002,000,000 for interest.

BURDEN LIGHTER ON TAXPAYERS IN 1944 THAN IN 1932

In 1920, the national income per capita was $656. In 1932, under the Hoover administration, the per capita national income was only $320. In 1944, this figure rose to a per capita income of $1,132. How much easier it is for the average wage earner and taxpayer to carry his pro rata share of the national debt burden under these circumstances is obvious to all. It is easier for a wage earner who receives $1,132 a year to pay 1.91 percent of it, or $21.62, as his part of the annual interest on the national debt than it was for a $320-a-year wage

earner in 1932 to pay 1.59 percent, or $5.08, as his share of the interest on the national debt for that year.

This increase in the Federal debt has been matched by the increase in savings of consumers, business, State, and local governments and the debt is a safe place in which consumers have invested their savings. These savings will obviously increase the demand for goods after the war, thus increasing the production of civilian and other goods and concurrently helping us to maintain the present high level of national per capita income so essential to the easy liquidation of the public debt and for other purposes. I am not advocating a huge debt, I am showing it is not as bad as some believe. Personally I favor paying more of the debt than we are paying during this war.

As Mr. James H. McGraw, Jr., president of the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., and a noted writer on business subjects from the viewpoint of the businessman, writes, "A huge debt may so draw out the hidden powers of a people that it makes the nation wealthier rather than poorer, stronger rather than weaker."

Of course, as the President points out in his Budget message, the manner in which the public debt is retired is the essence of this matter. As he so clearly states it, I quote as follows:

> The management of the public debt is bound to have a profound influence on the economy for a long time to come. Retaining high taxes on the masses of the consumers for general reduction of debt held by financial institutions may destroy purchasing power and create unemployment. But the use of progressive taxes for the redemption of bonds held by millions of individual savers may have a stabilizing influence on incomes and employment. I favor a policy of orderly but steady debt reduction, consistent with the objectives of long-run economic policy. The mistakes in debt management and tax policy after the last war should not be repeated.

In his long-range view the President is supported by a well-known business expert on taxation and debt retirement, Mr. Beardsley Ruml. A few months ago Mr. Ruml, who is generally credited with reflecting the taxation views of large business interests, had the following confirmatory statement to make:

> The retirement of the debt and its liquidation should in every case be consistent with the maintenance of a high level of employment and production. If we keep that as our cardinal feature, we will have no problem with respect to the management of the debt, except technical problems I am sure can be overcome.

Thus I say, as has been better said before me, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," and I trust that taxpayers, one and all, will examine all of the facts before accepting at face the doctrine of the prophets of gloom who would have us believe that the great wartime debt of today is a crushing load and cannot be borne by the American taxpayer.

In conclusion, I submit pertinent statistics in support of my personal optimistic view of this situation. These statistics are computed from information contained in the various publications of the Treasury Department and the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and may be easily checked by those who desire to verify them. The figures are as follows:

Population, national debt, national income, and interest on the debt for selected dates, 1920–44

Year	Population	National debt at end of the year		Interest paid		Average interest rates at end of year	National income		Interest on national debt as percent of national income
		Millions of dollars	Per capita	Millions of dollars	Per capita		Millions of dollars	Per capita	
1944	138,710,000	230,630	$1,662.68	8,002	$21.64	1.919	157,000	$1,132	1.910
1940	131,970,224	45,030	341.21	1,078	8.17	2.566	77,574	588	1.390
1936	128,053,180	34,407	268.69	795	6.20	2.570	64,924	507	1.224
1932	124,840,471	20,806	166.66	638	5.11	3.407	39,964	320	1.596
1928	120,501,115	17,310	143.66	708	5.87	3.903	88,200	666	.882
1924	114,113,463	20,979	183.84	917	8.04	4.134	70,100	614	1.309
1920	106,466,420	23,982	227.39	1,032	9.69	4.311	69,800	656	1.478

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I fear that I cannot add much to this discussion. Sometimes we reach our goal more securely and more rapidly if we get down to cases and simplify the problems that are before us. I came down here a couple of years ago having two sons, our only children, in the war, hoping that I might be able to render a service, and when that service was rendered and the war was over, probably retire to my business. I think a number of people feel the same way about it. But it rather appears to me that the day of settlement is rapidly approaching this Congress, a time when they are going to have to give an account of their stewardship. Frankly at times I am discouraged with our lack of progress in holding down expenses.

The speeches on the floor of the House, talking about the dangers that may follow within the next short period, the dangers of inflation, the tremendous load of taxation that is on the people now and increasingly will be, show that we are beginning to wonder what is going to happen not very many months or years ahead. The time to think and act, in my judgment, is every day we as Members sit here on the floor of the House.

Without being personal, may I say that I have tried to vote for and have loaned my support to economy in government. I thought, even though our expenditures are so great and so necessary, that that within itself made it necessary for us to practice what economy we could in order to prevent the national debt from getting too high.

It has been said on the floor of the House today that we do things here in this country in a big way. I am fearful that we shall have an inflation in a big way, maybe in the biggest way the world has ever seen, after this war is over, an inflation that may wipe out the hopes and ambitions and opportunities of the men who are permitted to come back, who have won this war for us on the battle fronts of the world.

It is our duty as Congressmen to forget that we are Republicans or Democrats and try to help guide the ship of state so that we can maintain representative constitutional government in this country. There have been remarks about democracy in action on the floor of the House. I would like to see a time when democracy could really function on the floor of Congress year in and year out, without the dictation and without the great power influence and force of the administration in power in the executive department of the Government. We have not had democracy in action on the floor of this House for the past 12 years. We have had too much executive interference. We have had democracy to a certain extent for the past 2 years, when the parties on both sides of the aisle were nearer even than they were for the past 10 years prior thereto. The very able gentleman from Tennessee gave us the information that there had been expended something like $267,000,000,000 in the war effort since Pearl Harbor. What an enormous sum of money. How wisely has that money been expended? We are talking today about increasing the national debt from $260,000,000,000 to $300,000,000,000. I wonder if that great amount of money had been economically and wisely expended, whether we would be called upon today to increase the national debt. Is there anyone in Congress who believes that less than 15 percent of that money has been wasted in the most reckless expenditure that has ever been known in the history of the world? Fifteen percent saved on the $260,000,000,000 would amount to over $40,000,000,000, which is the amount it is proposed to increase the national debt at the present time—$40,000,000,000 wasted of the taxpayers' money.

The executive department has failed to initiate the proper control of the expending of this vast sum of money. Many freely estimate that 25 percent of this sum has been wasted in cost-plus contracts and in wild ventures like the Canol project in Canada where we expended and wasted $130,000,000 in an attempt to get oil on Canadian soil. Twenty-five percent of a saving on the $260,000,000,000 would amount to $65,000,000,000. Then you can add to this the findings of Senator BYRD's committee, which cannot be accused of being political, that the Administration has continued to keep on the pay rolls of this country in these war times, 300,000 people more than are necessary.

It is discouraging to Members of Congress who want to see the strictest economy applied to Government and who

vote to reduce appropriations to find that the power of the Executive so often intervenes and beats down the minority groups in Congress which try to effect these savings. It is a time when each individual Member of Congress should do a little soul-searching and attempt, even at this late date, to try to prevent the financial wrecking of this country that will wipe out representative government and the liberty that goes with it and install after it is too late, the very totalitarian system of government with all of its controls that this Nation has dedicated itself to help banish from the earth.

Let me give you a recent illustration. In the recent debate on the manpower bill, the War Manpower Commission under its signature, stated that if labor was fully utilized and labor hoarding was stopped it would be equivalent to adding 800,000 people to production without putting any more people on the pay roll. This Commission has a right to know whereof it speaks, yet, the administration, in a desperate effort prevented the passage of the Barrett substitute by only 10 votes which sought to carry out the wishes of the Manpower Commission to find work for and to utilize the labor of 800,000 men and women who are already drawing high wartime wages.

Multiply 800,000 by $10 a day and you will have a saving of $8,000,000 a day. Multiply that by 365 days and you will have a saving of $2,520,000,000 annually in the war effort.

Carrying this conclusion a little further, with this bill defeated and with preparations for taking out of civilian production 800,000 more men and adding them to the war plants you run up an additional loss of $2,520,000,000 a year. Totaling these two savings this bill would have brought about reaches the enormous amount of $5,000,000,000 a year. This saving could have been made if the Members of Congress would have thrown off administration influence and voted for the Barrett substitute, provided it was enacted later in the Senate, which, had it passed this House by a big majority would doubtless have been passed by the Senate promptly.

There are numerous illustrations where the Members of Congress have failed to practice economy in voting on appropriation bills. Congress can stop, to a great extent, the waste and expenditure that is piling up the debts of this country to such a dangerous height if it will resolve to do so. There will be no excuse when the evil day comes to this country for the Members of Congress to plead that it was their duty to appropriate the money but they were not responsible for expending it. The evil day will come to this country and it may now be too late to prevent it. It will be impossible to prevent it unless the individual Members of Congress realize their full duties and courageously discharge such duties.

Reluctantly, I shall vote for this bill. I shall so vote because I think it better to set a definite goal than to refuse such legislation and have no limit set for expenditures.

I shall vote for it because the mere voting for it does not expend any money as such expenses must be appropriated through the Appropriations Committee. I hope the Appropriations Committee will reduce every request for money to the lowest possible amount so that we shall not again be called upon to increase the debt limit above the figure we set today.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address my remarks primarily to an amendment which I understand may be offered to the bill to reduce the authority of the Treasury to issue obligations from the amount carried in the bill at $300,000,000,000 to $280,000,000,000. During the course of the discussion on the matter in the committee the thought occurred to me that we might properly reduce the amount carried in the bill to $280,000,000,000. If the Members will read the record of the hearings, they will notice on pages 43 and 44 of the hearings that I asked Mr. Bell, of the Treasury, certain questions which clearly indicate that I might have had in mind the offering of such an amendment. I asked Mr. Bell whether or not it would interfere with the war effort for the total amount of the lending authority of the Treasury to be reduced to $280,000,000,000. In fairness, as Mr. Bell always answers questions, he said that such an amendment would not handicap the war effort. I thought I had won a big point in my favor. But I began to analyze the results that would follow the adoption of such an amendment. I asked myself whether such action would reduce the possibility of any Federal funds being wasted on the home front.

I looked at the record and saw that if we did not appropriate this year for the coming fiscal year 1 cent for the domestic affairs of our Government, and confined our appropriations entirely to those appropriations that all agree are related to the war effort, it would take more than a debt-limit of $280,000,000,000 to finance the expenditures of the Government for the next fiscal year. In other words, if we did not appropriate 1 penny for the domestic affairs of Government we could not get by the next fiscal year with a debt limitation of $280,000,000,000 instead of $300,000,000,000 as carried in H. R. 2404. So I realized then that by offering such an amendment, with the necessities of the Treasury as stated, we could only accomplish one result, and that would be to bring Mr. Bell and the members of his staff back to the committee, and back to the Congress sometime around Christmas of this year and have them ask us to increase the debt limit in order to permit them to issue securities sufficient to take care of the obligations that the Congress itself this spring, between now and June 30 this year, will authorize the departments of Government to spend.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. And in all probability when that request was made, instead of requesting us to go to $300,000,000,000 we would then be requested to go to $325,000,000,000.

Mr. MILLS. At least to include whatever deficit there is in the next budget.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Are we to understand from the gentleman from Tennessee that those in charge of this Government are paying so little attention to the taxpayers of the country that you would come back and ask for more than could possibly be used by the wildest stretch of imagination?

Mr. MILLS. Let me ask the gentleman, does he want this administration, this Government of ours, if men are on the battlefronts of the world and the war is not over, to say to them when we reach the debt limit of $300,000,000,000, "We have finally arrived at a point where we will not raise the debt limit any further even if it is necessary in order to supply you with the munitions of war?" Now, certainly, if this war is not over by the time the debt of the United States reaches $300,000,000,000, the gentleman, himself, as will I, will vote to increase the debt limit to whatever figure is necessary to successfully win the war.

Mr. KNUTSON. Of course, I realize the Congress is in no position to supervise the spending and to prevent waste. That is up to the executive branch.

Mr. MILLS. Certainly. But when we make appropriations this year for the coming fiscal year, that will bring the debt of the United States, after payment of taxes, to $292,000,000,000, at gross value, and at face or maturity value, $304,000,000,000, are we then going to say, "Although we have appropriated a given amount of money, we are only going to authorize the Treasury of the United States to pay the appropriations to the extent of a $280,000,000,000 debt limit?" Or shall we go on and keep faith with the commitments that we make through the appropriation of funds, and let the American people know that for the fiscal year within which we are appropriating money we are also making it possible for the Treasury of the United States to pay those appropriations?

After I analyzed the facts, I decided I would not offer an amendment to reduce the amount which the Treasury of the United States can have outstanding at any one time in securities below the amount that all estimate the Treasury will have to have to pay the obligations created by us when we appropriate funds. As a result of that decision on my part, I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] will likewise yield, as I did, and not insist upon offering an amendment to the bill under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I wish to advise the gentleman that I expect to offer that amendment because I am going to do what I can to try to get the Members of Congress, and especially the ones who are not here—but we are going to bring them back before this day is over—try to get

them to realize what it means to keep this country solvent, if it is possible at all.

Mr. MILLS. H. R. 2404 serves to inform all of us of the necessity of rigid economy, where possible, in Government. It takes us to financial heights from which we can escape only by the use of the greatest care in post-war expenditure of Government funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Public Debt Act of 1945."

SEC. 2. Section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 21. The face amount of obligations issued under authority of this act, and the face amount of obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States (except such guaranteed obligations as may be held by the Secretary of the Treasury), shall not exceed in the aggregate $300,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 1, line 11, strike out "$300,000,000,000" and insert "$280,000,000,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee this afternoon made mention of the fact that I offered amendments for economy in Government but could get very few votes. I agree, you don't want economy. I have no idea that I am going to succeed in having this amendment adopted, but I offer it notwithstanding that belief, because I feel with all my heart, with all my soul, with all my mind, with all my body, and with everything I possess that we ought to make this $280,000,000,000 rather than $300,000,000,000. It is good sense and wise. That will give you $20,000,000,000,000 over and above the national debt limit as is now on the books. The chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], stated that we have seventeen and one-half billions to go on according to the books. This will give you thirty-seven and one-half billions before you will have to consider this question again of increasing the debt limit again. Think of such a great amount of money.

It is not a life or death matter to have 20 or 30 men spend an afternoon on a bill like this, then finally raise the number to 40 or 50 present in the Chamber; we should have 300 Members present. It is not going to hurt any of us, but it is going to hurt the taxpayers of this country in years to come when they have to foot the bill for the things we do here, pay taxes until their backs bend and ache trying to raise the money this Congress is spending.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the gentleman upon reflection must realize that this bill does not spend a dollar.

Mr. RICH. I know that it does not spend a penny. A blind man can see that it does not sepnd a dollar. If the gentleman thinks I am that ignorant then I do not know what to say. I know that it does not spend money. I said a while ago on the floor that it did not spend money. But to have a limit on the national debt does put a damper on those Members of this Congress who want to spend. I criticize the Republicans or anybody who spend recklessly the money of the taxpayers. We should be careful of spending the other fellows money just as if it was our own.

I want to get a little common sense into the Members of Congress, the Members right here in our own body now and also in the body at the other end of the Capitol, and in the President of the United States. There is the trouble. The taxpayers back home are beginning to feel this and you are making them feel it. Four times a year they have to pay, and weekly a fixed amount is taken from their pay checks by industry. Who do they blame for that? And is that all caused by the war? Certainly not; certainly not. I want to win this war, and I want to save the country financially and in every way. You—I speak of the New Deal by you or should I say new dealers—who are squandering the taxpayers' money and now taxing them to death. Taxing them till they holler "ouch." Taxing them till they cry aloud, "Stop it, stop it, tax me no more. Relieve my tax burden." It is time to put the screws on the Congress, it is time to put the brakes on here if we are not going to run into difficulties; into bankruptcy. I will venture the opinion that you are going to run into the greatest trouble in the next 3 or 4 years you have ever seen in this great country of ours. You spenders will be to blame. Those boys who are lying over across the seas in fox holes and doing everything they can to win the war will come back some day. We are furnishing the money for them and we are not criticizing for spending that money. It is money well spent. I am saying here that we need to cut out the waste back here at home. You are not doing it and I see very little incentive on the part of the Members of Congress to do it. You have opportunity after opportunity after opportunity, yet you let your opportunities to save go by like water over the mill dam. When the opportunities are gone they are gone forever. What do you do? You are creating this national debt I am so much concerned about. I am worried about it. It worries me, else I would not stand up here and stay here all afternoon trying to fight this thing and trying to hold it down. It is like the boy who goes and asks his father for money and he wants four or five times more than the father wishes to give him. If the father says he will only give him so much, the boy will be conservative with the use of that amount of money. But if you raise the debt limit by forty or fifty billion dollars at a time you are only borrowing more trouble. I herewith give you a statement of the spending of our Presidents and you judge the record of F. D. R. after his promises to balance the Budget:

Fiscal record of all the Presidents

President	Number of fiscal years served	Receipts	Expenditures	*Surplus −Deficit	Cumulative public debt at end of administration
George Washington	8	$32,665,765	$34,068,506	−$1,422,741	$83,762,172
John Adams	4	34,984,839	34,262,668	*722,171	82,976,294
Thomas Jefferson	8	113,400,835	72,424,299	*40,976,546	65,196,318
James Madison (War of 1812)	8	130,311,080	176,473,974	−46,162,894	127,334,934
James Monroe	8	171,895,953	147,237,899	*24,658,054	90,875,877
John Quincy Adams	4	94,831,286	65,427,037	*29,404,249	67,475,044
Andrew Jackson	8	252,061,371	152,969,098	*99,092,273	336,958
Martin Van Buren	4	102,219,579	122,325,262	−20,105,683	5,250,876
Harrison and Tyler [1]	4½	104,430,540	108,904,688	−4,474,148	15,925,303
James K. Polk (Mexican War)	4	123,139,658	175,477,220	−52,337,562	63,061,859
Zachary Taylor	1	43,603,439	39,543,492	*4,059,947	63,452,774
Millard Fillmore	3	163,993,174	140,088,047	*23,905,127	59,804,661
Franklin Pierce	4	282,172,928	255,154,264	*27,018,664	28,701,305
James Buchanan	4	197,716,370	272,933,490	−75,217,120	90,582,417
Abraham Lincoln (Civil War)	4	763,026,123	3,352,380,410	−2,589,354,287	2,677,929,012
Andrew Johnson	4	1,825,248,460	1,578,557,655	*246,690,805	2,545,110,590
Ulysses S. Grant	8	2,670,906,586	2,253,386,783	*417,518,803	2,107,759,903
Rutherford B. Hayes	4	1,225,899,968	1,032,268,057	*193,631,911	2,019,285,728
Garfield and Arthur	4	1,474,023,408	1,027,742,757	*446,280,651	1,578,551,169
Grover Cleveland (first administration)	4	1,474,150,137	1,077,629,099	*396,530,038	1,249,470,511
Benjamin Harrison	4	1,536,450,844	1,412,315,899	*124,134,945	961,431,766
Grover Cleveland (second administration)	4	1,316,948,887	1,441,674,184	−124,725,297	1,226,793,713
William McKinley (Spanish-American War)	4	2,078,208,146	2,093,918,534	−17,710,388	1,221,572,245
Theodore Roosevelt	8	4,676,747,962	4,655,450,515	*21,297,447	1,148,315,372
William Howard Taft	4	2,794,065,060	2,799,211,874	−5,146,814	1,193,047,745
Woodrow Wilson (World War No. I)	8	24,375,781,688	46,938,260,143	−22,562,478,455	23,976,250,608
Warren G. Harding	2	8,116,239,632	6,667,235,429	*1,449,004,203	22,349,677,758
Calvin Coolidge	6	23,959,941,899	18,585,549,136	*5,374,392,763	16,931,197,748
Herbert Hoover	4	11,453,002,513	15,490,476,656	−4,037,474,143	22,538,672,164
Total, Presidents before F. D. Roosevelt	144½	91,586,076,130	112,203,367,065	−20,617,290,935	22,538,672,164
Franklin D. Roosevelt	12	160,073,270,777	369,791,906,466	−209,718,695,689	238,000,000,000
Grand total, all Presidents	156½	251,659,346,907	481,995,333,531	−230,335,986,624	258,000,000,000

[1] Until 1843 the fiscal year coincided with the calendar year. In the administration of President Tyler, however, it was changed to run from July 1 to the following June 30, thus making President Tyler accountable for 4½ fiscal years instead of 4.

F. D. Roosevelt's fiscal record

Fiscal year	Receipts	Expenditures	Deficit	Public debt
1934	$3, 115, 554, 050	$6, 011, 083, 254	$2, 895, 529, 204	$27, 053, 141, 414
1935	3, 800, 467, 202	7, 009, 875, 312	3, 209, 408, 110	28, 700, 892, 625
1936	4, 115, 956, 615	8, 665, 645, 422	4, 549, 688, 807	33, 778, 543, 494
1937	5, 028, 840, 237	8, 177, 408, 756	3, 148, 568, 519	36, 424, 613, 732
1938	5, 854, 661, 227	7, 238, 822, 158	1, 384, 160, 931	37, 164, 740, 315
1939	5, 164, 823, 626	8, 707, 091, 581	3, 542, 267, 955	40, 439, 532, 411
1940	5, 387, 124, 670	8, 998, 189, 706	3, 611, 065, 036	42, 967, 531, 038
1941	7, 607, 211, 852	12, 710, 629, 824	5, 103, 417, 972	48, 961, 443, 536
Total peace	40, 074, 639, 479	67, 518, 746, 013	27, 444, 106, 534	48, 961, 443, 536
1942	12, 799, 061, 621	32, 396, 585, 098	19, 597, 523, 477	72, 422, 445, 116
1943	22, 281, 642, 709	78, 178, 885, 241	55, 897, 242, 532	136, 606, 090, 330
1944	44, 148, 926, 968	93, 743, 513, 214	49, 594, 586, 246	201, 003, 387, 221
1945 (official Budget estimate)	40, 769, 000, 000	97, 954, 236, 900	57, 185, 236, 900	258, 000, 000, 000
Total war	119, 998, 631, 298	302, 273, 220, 453	182, 274, 589, 155	258, 000, 000, 000
Grand total, F. D. R	160, 073, 270, 777	369, 791, 966, 466	209, 718, 695, 689	258, 000, 000, 000

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I can agree with much that my very distinguished friend from Pennsylvania has just said, but it seems to me we should confine our statements today to this specific bill. If my good friend will remain on the floor of the House from now on, as I know he will, and as these appropriation bills come before the Congress, if he will make the same fight and the same plea, then it may have some effect in reducing the expenditures of our Government; but the effort to reduce the expenditures of the Government by reducing this debt authorization from $300,000,000,000 to $280,000,000,000 will not be effective.

Let us see what we are doing. What does this bill propose to do? It is an amendment to the Second Liberty Bond Act. That act, as amended by act of this Congress, presently provides a statutory debt limit of $260,000,000,000. All that this particular legislation and the section now under consideration does is to raise this statutory limit to $300,000,000,000.

I ask anyone who gives to this subject consideration, if you reduce the statutory debt limit to $280,000,000,000, how in common sense and justice will that in any way reduce a single expenditure of Government? Why, it will not stop the necessity for paying interest on the public debt, it will not stop the necessity for paying veterans' claims under authorization and laws passed by this Congress, it will not reduce the pay rolls of Government that must be met under bills passed by this Congress, and it will not provide for the reduction of any of the expenditures of Government of which my very dear friend complains.

I recall not long ago standing in the well of this House and pleading as hard as I knew how to try to stop the expenditure of $15,000,000 and postpone the taking of an agricultural census.

You people took the responsibility to spend that money in time of war and to add 15 million to the public debt. There is the place, if you please, where effectively you could make a contribution in reducing public expenditures. But the vote on this amendment, it seems to me, is perfectly puerile and idle to reduce this debt limitation when we all know that if the public debt was computed and cut off today and the war was to stop it would perhaps level off at a figure under present commitments in excess of $300,000,000,000. That is all there is to the situation as I see it. I see no partisanship or no party politics involved. We must pay the expenses of this Government as determined by the Congress. We, the Congress, make those appropriations. If they are too great we, the Congress, are responsible, and the greater responsibility rests upon the majority that has the votes. We will protest as we can against reckless and improvident expenditures of public money, but when the die is cast and the votes are counted the majority in a republican form of government determines whether the expenditure is good or bad.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Therefore it seems to me perfectly obvious that whatever the expenditures of government are they can only be as great as the Congress of the United States itself permits them to be. Nothing becomes a public debt until the money is spent and is translated into a public debt transaction.

May I call your attention to this? We must be very careful in the consideration of the great bills that are shortly to come before this Congress to see to it that the expenditures of billions of dollars that are to be used in this international monetary fund and bank and other proposals are kept within the public debt of the United States, and are not permitted to be considered as transactions outside of the public debt transactions. We must see to it that the public is kept informed, and I am glad to note that the Committee on Ways and Means has now taken action in this legislation so that all of the public debt transactions, Government corporations and otherwise, are now included within the debt limitations provided under this bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If my amendment would do nothing else but have the gentleman make a speech on trying to get the Members of Congress to cut down the appropriations, it has done a wonderful lot of good, if it accomplishes anything, and I hope that it does.

Mr. KEEFE. I hope for that purpose it will have some effect.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. May I state to the gentleman that the Committee on Ways and Means went into this matter carefully and unanimously reported the bill feeling that the amount provided here was necessary; and may I further point out that next month there will be another War bond drive in the country, and the Treasury Department needs this authorization now.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

I just want to say this, that when this Commodity Credit Corporation bill comes before this House, I am going to give the Members on this side and the Members on that side an opportunity to determine whether or not they mean exactly what they say.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEEFE. Very well, thank you very much. I am very glad. I will remember that.

Mr. DINGELL. I withdraw the objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. What I have said is apparently of little interest to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, but let me say to you that the subject matter under consideration——

Mr. DINGELL. I withdrew my objection, so you ought to stick to your hole.

Mr. KEEFE. I will stick to my hole and I will stick to my guns, too, make no mistake about that.

You are going to have an opportunity soon——

Mr. DINGELL. So will you.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, am I going to be given the protection of the plain, simple, ordinary rules of this House?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed, and the Committee will be in order.

Mr. KEEFE. The Committee on Ways and Means has now bought by the provisions of this bill all of the notes and obligations growing out of the issuance of securities by Government corporations. They are issued as public debt transactions, and they are now added to the total limitation under this bill.

I want to say to you who are complaining about bureaucracy in Government that the time has come for you to give consideration to taking back into the hands of the Congress the power to determine the payment of subsidies, the

payment of all these things that are being carried on by these giant corporations which by your previous acts you have practically placed without the scope of control of the Congress of the United States.

What good does it do for you as Members of Congress to sit here and talk about retrenchment of public spending, when the Commodity Credit Corporation through the activities of one man can spend a billion and a half dollars in subsidy without a vote of the Congress, either as to the amount or the character of the subsidy? Why do you not bring that power back to the Congress and let the Congress determine whether there shall be subsidies paid? Let the Congress determine the amount, and let the Congress determine the time of the payment. You can do it if you only will.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PATMAN) there were—ayes 26, noes 71.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Subsections (h) and (i) of section 22 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, as added by the Public Debt Act of 1943, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(h) The Secretary of the Treasury, under such regulations as he may prescribe, may authorize or permit payments in connection with the redemption of savings bonds to be made by commercial banks, trust companies, savings banks, savings and loan associations, building and loan associations (including cooperative banks), credit unions, cash depositories, industrial banks, and similar financial institutions. No bank or other financial institution shall act as a paying agent until duly qualified as such under the regulations prescribed by the Secretary, nor unless (1) it is incorporated under Federal law or under the laws of a State, Territory, possession, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands; (2) in the usual course of business it accepts, subject to withdrawal, funds for deposit or the purchase of shares; (3) it is under the supervision of the banking department or equivalent authority of the jurisdiction in which it is incorporated; and (4) it maintains a regular office for the transaction of its business.

"(i) Any losses resulting from payments made in connection with the redemption of savings bonds shall be replaced out of the fund established by the Government Losses in Shipment Act, as amended, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The Treasurer of the United States, any Federal Reserve bank, or any qualified paying agent authorized or permitted to make payments in connection with the redemption of such bonds, shall be relieved from liability to the United States for such losses, upon a determination by the Secretary of the Treasury that such losses resulted from no fault or negligence on the part of the Treasurer, the Federal Reserve bank or the qualified paying agent. The Post Office Department or the Postal Service shall be relieved from such liability upon a joint determination by the Postmaster General and the Secretary of the Treasury that such losses resulted from no fault or negligence on the part of the Post Office Department or the Postal Service. The provisions of section 3 of the Government Losses in Shipment Act, as amended, with respect to the finality of decisions by the Secretary of the Treasury shall apply to the determinations made pursuant to this subsection. All recoveries and repayments on account of such losses, as to which replacement shall have been made out of the fund, shall be credited to it and shall be available for the purposes thereof. The Secretary of the Treasury shall include in his annual report to the Congress a statement of all payments made from the fund pursuant to this subsection."

SEC. 4. The Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following sections:

"SEC. 23. A finding of death made by any official or agency of the United States authorized by section 5 of the act of March 7, 1942, as amended (U. S. C., Supp. III, title 50, Appendix, sec. 1005), or by any other law to make such a finding, or by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, shall be a sufficient proof of death to support the allowance of credit in the accounts of any Federal Reserve bank or accountable officer of the Treasury Department in any case involving the transfer, exchange, reissue, redemption, or payment of bonds and other obligations of the United States, including those obligations guaranteed by the United States for which the Treasury Department acts as transfer agent.

SEC. 24. Whenever any direct obligation of the United States, bearing interest or sold on a discount basis, is donated to the United States, is bequeathed by will to the United States, becomes the property of the United States under the terms of a trust, or is by its terms payable upon the death of the owner to the United States or any officer thereof in his official capacity, the Treasurer of the United States upon receipt of such obligation shall effect redemption thereof. If under applicable law such gift, bequest, or other transfer to the United States is subject to a gift or inheritance tax, the Treasurer shall pay such tax out of the proceeds of redemption and shall deposit the balance in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts or as otherwise authorized by law. If no tax is payable the entire proceeds shall be so deposited."

SEC. 5. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3749 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell, exchange, or otherwise dispose of any bonds, notes, or other securities, acquired by him on behalf of the United States under judicial process or otherwise, or delivered to him by an executive department or agency of the United States for disposal, or to enter into arrangements for the extension of the maturity thereof, in such manner, in such amounts, at such prices, for cash, securities, or other property, or any combination thereof, and upon such terms and conditions as he may deem advisable and in the public interest. No such bonds, notes, or other securities of any single issuer having at the date of disposal an aggregate face or par value, or in the case of no-par stock an aggregate stated or book value, in excess of $1,000,000, which may be held by the Secretary of the Treasury at any one time, shall be sold or otherwise disposed of under the authority of this section.

(b) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to supersede or impair any authority otherwise granted to any officer or executive department or agency of the United States to sell, exchange, or otherwise dispose of any bonds, notes, or other securities, acquired by the United States under judicial process or otherwise.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2404) to increase the debt limit of the United States and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 356, nays 4, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll Call 32]

YEAS—356

Abernethy	Cox	Green
Allen, Ill.	Cravens	Gregory
Andersen, H. Carl	Crawford	Griffiths
	Crosser	Gwinn, N. Y.
Anderson, Calif.	Cunningham	Gwynne, Iowa
Anderson, N. Mex.	Curley	Hale
	Curtis	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Andresen, August H.	D'Alesandro	
	Daughton, Va.	Hall, Leonard W.
Andrews, Ala.	Davis	Hancock
Andrews, N. Y.	Delaney, James J.	Hare
Angell		Harless, Ariz.
Arends	Delaney, John J.	Harness, Ind.
Arnold		Harris
Auchincloss	Dickstein	Hartley
Bailey	Dingell	Havenner
Baldwin, Md.	Dolliver	Hays
Baldwin, N. Y.	Dondero	Healy
Barrett, Pa.	Doughton, N. C.	Hébert
Barrett, Wyo.	Douglas, Calif.	Hedrick
Barry	Douglas, Ill.	Heffernan
Bates, Ky.	Doyle	Hendricks
Bates, Mass.	Drewry	Henry
Beall	Durham	Herter
Beckworth	Dworshak	Heselton
Bell	Earthman	Hess
Bender	Eberharter	Hill
Bennet, N. Y.	Elliott	Hinshaw
Bennett, Mo.	Ellis	Hoch
Biemiller	Ellsworth	Hoeven
Bishop	Elston	Holifield
Blackney	Engel, Mich.	Holmes, Wash.
Bland	Engle, Calif.	Hook
Bloom	Ervin	Hope
Bolton	Fallon	Horan
Bonner	Feighan	Howell
Boykin	Fellows	Huber
Bradley, Pa.	Fenton	Hull
Brehm	Fernandez	Izac
Brooks	Fisher	Jackson
Brown, Ga.	Flannagan	Jarman
Brown, Ohio	Flood	Jenkins
Bryson	Fogarty	Jennings
Buck	Folger	Jensen
Buckley	Forand	Johnson, Calif.
Bulwinkle	Fuller	Johnson, Ill.
Bunker	Fulton	Johnson, Ind.
Butler	Gardner	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Byrne, N. Y.	Gathings	
Byrnes, Wis.	Gavin	Johnson, Okla.
Campbell	Gearhart	Jones
Canfield	Geelan	Jonkman
Cannon, Fla.	Gerlach	Judd
Cannon, Mo.	Gibson	Kean
Carlson	Gifford	Kearney
Case, S. Dak.	Gillespie	Kee
Chapman	Gillette	Keefe
Chenoweth	Gillie	Kelley, Pa.
Church	Goodwin	Keogh
Clements	Gordon	Kerr
Cochran	Gore	Kilburn
Coffee	Gorski	Kilday
Cole, Mo.	Gossett	King
Cole, N. Y.	Graham	Kinzer
Colmer	Granahan	Kirwan
Cooley	Granger	Knutson
Cooper	Grant, Ala.	Kopplemann
Courtney	Grant, Ind.	

Kunkel	Patrick	Smith, Ohio
LaFollette	Peterson, Fla.	Smith, Va.
Landis	Peterson, Ga.	Smith, Wis.
Lane	Pfeifer	Snyder
Lanham	Philbin	Somers, N. Y.
Larcade	Phillips	Sparkman
Latham	Pickett	Spence
Lea	Pittenger	Springer
LeFevre	Ploeser	Stefan
Lesinski	Plumley	Stevenson
Lewis	Poage	Stigler
Link	Powers	Stockman
Ludlow	Price, Fla.	Sullivan
Lyle	Price, Ill.	Sumner, Ill.
Lynch	Priest	Sumners, Tex.
McConnell	Quinn, N. Y.	Sundstrom
McCormack	Rabaut	Taber
McCowen	Rabin	Talbot
McDonough	Ramey	Talle
McGehee	Remspeck	Tarver
McGlinchey	Randolph	Taylor
McGregor	Rankin	Thom
McMillan, S. C.	Rayfiel	Thomas, Tex.
McMillen, Ill.	Reece, Tenn.	Thomason
Madden	Reed, Ill.	Tibbott
Mahon	Reed, N. Y.	Tolan
Maloney	Rees, Kans.	Torrens
Manasco	Resa	Towe
Mansfield, Mont.	Richards	Traynor
	Riley	Trimble
Marcantonio	Rizley	Voorhis, Calif.
Martin, Iowa	Robertson, Va.	Vorys, Ohio
Martin, Mass.	Robsion, Ky.	Vursell
Mason	Rockwell	Walter
May	Rodgers, Pa.	Wasielewski
Merrow	Roe, Md.	Weaver
Michener	Roe, N. Y.	Welchel
Miller, Calif.	Rogers, Fla.	Welch
Miller, Nebr.	Rooney	White
Mills	Rowan	Whitten
Morgan	Russell	Whittington
Mott	Ryter	Wickersham
Mundt	Sabath	Wigglesworth
Murdock	Sadowski	Wilson
Murray, Tenn.	Sasscer	Winstead
Murray, Wis.	Savage	Wolcott
Neely	Schwabe, Mo.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Norrell	Schwabe, Okla.	Wolverton, N. J.
O'Brien, Ill.	Scrivner	Wood
O'Hara	Shafer	Woodhouse
O'Neal	Sharp	Woodruff, Mich.
Outland	Sheppard	Worley
Pace	Short	Zimmerman
Patman	Smith, Maine	

NAYS—4

O'Konski	Thomas, N. J.	Winter
Rich		

NOT VOTING—72

Adams	Eaton	Norton
Allen, La.	Elsaesser	O'Brien, Mich.
Barden	Gallagher	O'Toole
Boren	Gamble	Patterson
Bradley, Mich.	Gross	Powell
Brumbaugh	Hagen	Rains
Buffett	Halleck	Rivers
Burch	Hand	Robertson, N. Dak.
Burgin	Hart	
Camp	Heidinger	Robinson, Utah
Carnahan	Hobbs	Rogers, Mass.
Case, N. J.	Hoffman	Rogers, N. Y.
Celler	Holmes, Mass.	Sheridan
Chelf	Johnson, Luther A.	Sikes
Chiperfield		Simpson, Ill.
Clark	Kefauver	Simpson, Pa.
Clason	Kelly, Ill.	Slaughter
Clevenger	LeCompte	Stewart
Cole, Kans.	Lemke	Starkey
Combs	Luce	Vinson
Corbett	McKenzie	Wadsworth
Dawson	Mansfield, Tex.	Weiss
De Lacy	Monroney	West
Dirksen	Morrison	Woodrum, Va.
Domengeaux	Murphy	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Luther A. Johnson with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.

Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Simpson of Illinois.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Case of New Jersey.

Mr. Weiss with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Clason.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Buffett.

Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.

Mr. Rogers of New York with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Brumbaugh.

Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Clevenger.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Lemke.

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Corbett.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Gross.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. West with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Burch with Mr. Elsaesser.

Mr. Patterson with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN] was unavoidably detained and could not be present at the roll call just concluded.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 62) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct an investigation of the progress of the defense-housing program, with a view to determining whether such program is being carried forward efficiently, expeditiously, and economically, and with a view to determining whether the authorization of additional appropriations for defense-housing purposes is necessary.

For the purposes of this resolution, the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation, or otherwise, as the committee deems desirable.

MAKING OF TREATIES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 174), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 60) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 2 days to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF LEND-LEASE ACT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 175), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2013) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 4 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the resolution for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and include in one a letter sent to me by Mr. Frank E. Lawrence, in another a very interesting article on Major General Littlejohn, and in the third an article on Henry H. Crompton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial that appeared in the Washington Post of March 8.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article that appeared in the Washington Post of March 7.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the national debt bill and include some brief excerpts.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter written to him by a former Member of the House, Mr. Calvin D. Johnson, together with a letter written by Mr. Johnson to Hon. James S. Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial; and, further, to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire what the legislative program is for tomorrow?

The SPEAKER. The rule and general debate on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The bill will not be read until Monday?

The SPEAKER. Only the first section of the bill will be read tomorrow.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the completion of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE WALSH-KAISER SHIPYARD, PROVIDENCE, R. I.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, recently a Senator caused to be placed in the RECORD the contents of a letter which the Senator had received from one whom the Senator termed "an honest man." I have no reason to doubt the Senator's sincerity in so characterizing his friend—but I do question the gentleman's knowledge of the facts and I doubt sincerely that the gentleman expected or intended to do anything except vent some personal spite when he addressed the letter in question to the Senator.

Every man here has engaged in political campaigns. Every Member here is familiar with the type of mud slinging to which some unscrupulous men will sink in order to satisfy a personal ambition. We are all familiar with crackpots—and it is to the credit of this House that rarely do the utterances of crackpots find their way into the official record of this legislative body. I have always found among my colleagues here a determination to first learn the facts, before giving publicity to unwarranted and unfounded accusations, such as are contained in the letter to which I have referred.

This letter, written by an unidentified person, is couched intentionally in such language as to give the impression that the Walsh-Kaiser shipyard in Providence is presently the hang-out of racketeers, bookmakers, and ne'er-do-wells; the yard is vastly overmanned, and that production there is at a standstill. This is the impression this undisclosed person would give of a shipyard working 24 hours a day—a shipyard that the coveted emblem of efficiency and production, the Maritime M, awarded by the United States Maritime Commission. This letter, then, is not intended as an honest criticism of management at the yard—but is an attack on the Government which recognized the worth of the management and the laborers alike—it is an attack on the planners and the producers, almost all of whom are fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, of men who fight and die all over the world for the preservation of their country.

Directly contrary to the impression which this letter seeks to convey are the facts relating to this shipyard. Its accomplishments border on the astounding. It is a result of the country's frantic need for ships—of the country's determination to produce ships on a scale never before dreamed of. It is the result of the determination of men and women, who but a few years ago worked in clothing stores and markets, to learn to build ships, ships, ships. And the result of their labors is a credit to them and a credit to the State of Rhode Island. They need apologize to no man.

This shipyard was built out of a river and a hill. The river was pumped dry, and the hill was leveled. The shipyard started from scratch and fought to overcome obstacles which would long since have discouraged men with less tenacity.

The yard was started under the management of the Rheem Manufacturing Co. They built the ways, the fabrications shops, the storage facilities, spur tracks, and the usual appurtenances of such an enterprise.

The yard was taken over in 1942 by the Walsh-Kaiser Co., Inc., and from that day to this the story of the yard has been one steady program of increased production at lowered costs.

At the time the Walsh-Kaiser Co., Inc., assumed operation of the Providence shipyard, in addition to coping with all the complex problems associated with the taking over and reorganizing of a shipyard in operation, the company had additional difficulties of constructing its facilities while building ships.

When the Walsh-Kaiser Co. first took over, the company acquired 5 Liberty ships in various stages of completion. This limited number of ships did not permit the yard to acquire efficiency comparable to that of yards building 50 to 100 or more similar ships. However, although handicapped, the Providence shipyard did make excellent progress both in production efficiency and reduction of costs. During the year 1944 the yard delivered 30 vessels, of which 15 were frigates, 5 were Libertys, and 10 were combat cargoes. Obviously this was a diversified program. Conversion from one type of vessel to another in a shipyard, required because of the urgencies of war, necessitates the conversion of facilities to the specific requirements of the type of vessel. It requires reorganization of procedures and the special training of labor.

In addition to the diversified program, it happened that the frigates and combat cargo vessels were of a new design. It was sometime after the shipyard had been awarded its contract before the design agent had been able to furnish sufficient plans, and even then the plans, because of research and experimentation, had to be revised from time to time. As can be expected when manufacturers were already loaded with a backlog of orders for ships of previously approved design, there were delays in the delivery of material. These factors contribute very materially to the additional man-hours and costs. Results of repetitive operation are most important, and the results are clearly indicated on progress charts of yards having long programs of one type vessel.

Walsh-Kaiser, in spite of the short programs, in spite of the difficulties experienced in research work, conversion, and establishment of new procedures, and in spite of delays in materials, cut the man-hours of building the frigate vessel from 2,267,680 for the first frigate to 812,442 for the twelfth frigate. At the same time the yard cut the cost of the twelfth vessel, as compared with the first, by 50 percent. This is an indication of what the yard might accomplish had it been favored with an extended program of similar ships.

Pending the award of an additional contract, which proved to be a contract for the building of 32 combat cargo vessels, Walsh-Kaiser was awarded a contract for the building of 5 additional Liberty ships. Once more the yard was required to reconvert its facilities so as to function properly for the construction of the Liberty-type ship. Naturally, not much could be done in the way of establishing efficiency of procedure and operations with a 5-ship program which would permit comparison with records set by yards having constructed more than 50 similar type vessels. However, the cost and man-hour record is comparable to that of other yards for the construction of the first 5 Liberty vessels. The purpose of awarding the yard 5 Liberty ships was to keep the shipyard force intact until the design of the new combat cargo vessel had advanced to the point where all the productive capacity could be concentrated on the new ship.

The combat cargo vessel is far more intricate in every respect than the frigate or Liberty. There is 75 percent more welding than on a Liberty and 240 percent more than on a frigate; six times the length of electric cable of a Liberty and three times that of a frigate; seven times the complement of a Liberty and four times that of a frigate. The Providence Shipyard has maintained the delivery, with a six-way yard, of three combat cargo vessels per month all during an unusually severe winter. Inasmuch as the combat cargo is approximately twice as difficult to build as a Liberty ship, the progress can safely be compared to a Liberty per way per month, which I believe is a record comparable to that of the best yards. The first combat cargo vessel delivered took 280 days from keel laying to delivery; the sixteenth vessel

took 100 days from keel laying to delivery. No other yard in the country has beaten the performance of delivering a similar type vessel within 100 days.

Not satisfied with improvements which normally come from repetitive operations, management has gone further and adopted a job assignment system for welders. Shipyard engineers, in conjunction with a consulting engineering firm, have been developing a system for nearly 6 months. An ambitious and far-reaching plan, the assignment system prearranges each welder's daily task both as to instruction as to its accomplishment and the equipment and material with which to do it. Welding production soared as a result of the system and will reach even greater heights as the forces become adjusted to new duties brought about by the change in method.

Compare the welding output of 2 years ago, when Walsh-Kaiser took over the management of the shipyard, to that of today. Figures for the months prior to the change in management are not adequate and, therefore, cannot be considered a comparison. Within 6 months after Walsh-Kaiser took charge, welding production had increased 71 percent and continued its rise until it was more than twice its figure before the end of the year. Conversion from one type of ship to another slowed the output temporarily, but as production kinks were ironed out, welding output in 1944 climbed to a figure 35 percent greater than any achieved in 1943. Even the severe winter of 1944–45 failed to hamper the determined effort to produce at high level. In February 1945 welding increased to another 20 percent over 1944's best record.

This, in February 1945, while the people of Providence were going through one of the most bitter winter months in history. Does that reflect a devil-may-care attitude? Does that indicate the shipyard in Providence is the hangout for racketeers and ne'er-do-wells. Most vicious and ignorant of all this so-called honest man's mouthings is his reference to the yard as a haven for draft dodgers. Such an accusation brands the character of this miserable criticism. Here is a shipyard producing vessels that have carried men and materials through the storm-tossed waters of the oceans that border our shores—vessels that were vital to victory—vessels without which our great plans would have been worthless, and while these valiant and hardworking people struggled against difficulties to get the ships down to the sea on time, they struggled to meet draft quotas, and they paused occasionally in their labors for a momentary hail and farewell, as one more of their buddies trudged through that gate for what might well be the last time. In the service flag that hangs over the main gate at the shipyard there are 3,038 blue stars, and hanging there, too, is a flag with 31 gold stars. There are 31 mothers in Rhode Island who resent this so-called honest man's charge that their sons worked in the shipyard to escape the draft.

There are others there who resent it also; there are soldiers and sailors there. Yes, soldiers and sailors, who took their chances with all the rest, 1,005 of them who have come back, some maimed for life; they took up their old tasks as well as they might, and today they, too, fight time in order to get one more ship down to the sea for their buddies who await for the guns and the munitions and the food and the clothing these ships of Walsh-Kaiser will bring them.

Gentlemen, we sound splendid talking about cooperation and brotherly love. We expound lofty phrases when we discuss what we plan to do for all the world. It is noble—it is right that we should think of these things—but how much better if we practiced a little of this brotherly love—if we show a little of this inclination for justice here at home. I think the Senator would not have given such publicity to the letter I have mentioned had he known the facts. It is difficult to understand why he did not seek to know the facts beforehand.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 25 minutes.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the subject which I am interested in this afternoon is House Resolution 172, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], pertaining to the investigation of the Veterans' Administration. Several times during the past year I have called to the attention of the membership of the House some of the deplorable conditions existing in some of our veterans' hospitals. I read from the Washington Times-Herald of today an article referring to, and I quote:

Alleged intolerable conditions and other irregularities in treatment of veterans in veterans' hospitals.

My own experience with some of these veterans' hospitals, and with some of my constituents who have been there, has proven this quotation to be very true. Again I quote:

Harsh discipline, poor food, unreasonable restrictive regulations, inadequate treatment and inconsiderable attitudes on the part of superiors.

I recently made public a letter received by the wife of a veteran constituent of mine confined to a veterans' hospital, stating in effect that this veteran had a poor chance to live, and that it was necessary for them to make arrangements for the burial of the veteran. You can imagine how the wife of this World War No. 1 veteran felt when she received that letter. I happen to have been sent to her apartment the afternoon she received the letter. She had, just a couple of days before, taken him to the veterans' hospital, and remained with him for a time. While the doctors were coming down the line looking over the patients for treatment, he overheard one of the doctors say, "There is no use to waste medicine on that guy. He is going to die anyway." A few weeks later he did die. But I am very much opposed to that way of handling our World War No. 1 veterans, and I hope we will be able to arrive at a much better method of caring for the veterans of World War No. 2.

One of the patients in a hospital in Arizona read in a paper the remarks I had made on this matter. His mother had been notified that he was in a very critical condition, and making arrangements for his burial were discussed. His mother wrote him to that effect, and upon reading my statement in the paper he left the hospital without the consent of the officials and hitch-hiked his way to Washington. He came into my office and told me that the veterans' hospital where he had been had been trying to make arrangement for his burial, and he felt that about the only thing they were interested in was to get rid of him, get him buried and out of the way.

Naturally, this did not make the family very happy.

Our veterans' hospitals at their very best are doing an awfully poor job. Our hospitals treating the boys of World War No. 2 are doing much better. But these hospitals are not open to the veterans of World War No. 1, although I have noticed, Mr. Speaker, that one of the very best of those hospitals for treating World War No. 2 soldiers, Walter Reed Hospital, has recently been opened for the treatment of dogs. Mind you, closed to veterans of World War No. 1, open to dogs and soldiers of World War No. 2.

I have before me an article appearing in one of our magazines, the Cosmopolitan, which I will not have time to read, but I will later quote a few brief extracts.

In the first place, I hope that this resolution offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] for investigating the Veterans' Administration will be adopted, and I hope that it is sufficiently broad in scope to cover a complete investigation on up to General Hines himself, the Director of the Veterans' Administration.

I notice here an article which may cause some suspicion:

Falls Church sailor gets first G. I. business loan.

I notice that he obtained his loan from a bank here in Washington of which Mr. Hines is a member of the board of directors.

Now I want to read you some remarks which are the result of much research work and which were prepared by Joseph Leib, third vice commander of the Costello Post, American Legion, Washington, D. C.:

GENERAL HINES, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATOR, DRAWING PAY FROM PRIVATE CORPORATIONS, INSURANCE COMPANY, AND NATIONAL BANK

(By Joseph Leib)

A major scandal exists within the Veterans' Administration.

On a number of occasions I have had inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD sharp criticisms aimed at the Veterans' Administrator.

Now I shall prove why my criticism of Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, is justified. I trust in the intelligence of the American people. I ask the indulgence of every father, mother, wife, sister, and relative who have had or now have dear ones in the armed services.

In the hands of General Hines rests or will rest to a great extent the future welfare of every person who has worn the uniform of Uncle Sam. I respectfully request the deliberation and judgment of everyone concerned regarding the foregoing:

1. General Hines is drawing pay as a board director of five Sperry Gyroscope Corporation subsidiaries. (Source: Standard & Poor's Corporation Record, p. 5922.)

This corporation is engaged in war production. The amazing thing about this, however, is the fact that Nazi and Jap fighting planes are equipped and perfected by Sperry cartel products. Is it not ironic that when our heroes shoot down an enemy plane they find Sperry trade-marks and patents written all over the ship? The effectiveness of Sperry instruments played havoc with our installations at Pearl Harbor and now on the battlefields throughout the world.

In the name of decency, how can General Hines conscientiously accept board of directors pay from this corporation? The Sperry Corporation was indicted by the United States Government for having cartel agreements with German and Jap firms. Later the Sperry Corporation pleaded guilty to the charges through the medium of a consent decree. (Source: United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. Complaint filed September 1, 1942, consent decree entered September 1, 1942.)

Furthermore, the president of the Sperry Corporation is Thomas A. Morgan. Mr. Morgan in 1934 was president of both the Sperry Corporation and the Curtiss-Wright Corporation. Mr. Morgan knows his way around the Navy Department. Through his contacts in that Department his company was able to divulge to our enemies vital military secrets.

Under his direction, the then vice president of the Curtiss-Wright Corporation, Mr. J. S. Allard, wrote this sensational letter to a Curtiss-Wright sales representative in Europe, who during this very time was helping to arm Hitler for this war.

Here is the letter, in part:

"We have been nosing around the (Navy) bureau in Washington and find that they hold as most strictly confidential their dive-bombing tactics and procedure, and they frown upon our even mentioning dive bombing in connection with the Hawks or any other airplanes to any foreign powers.

"It is also unwise and unethical at this time, and probably for some time to come, for us to indicate that we know anything about the technique and tactics of dive bombing. It may be all right to put on a dive-bombing show to show the strength of airplanes, but to refer in contracts to dive bombing or endeavor to teach dive bombing is what I am cautioning against doing." (Source: Senate Munitions hearings, pt. 4, pp. 852–3. Exhibit 449, p. 1005, September 1934.)

Here was Thomas A. Morgan and his corporation willing to sell America short for private gain, and now Mr. Morgan and General Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on his pay roll as director of the Sperry Corporations.

Thomas A. Morgan is still closely connected with the Curtiss-Wright Corporation. Here is what the Truman report on Aircraft had to say about the Curtiss-Wright Corporation on July 10, 1943; page 18:

"The committee found that the company was producing and causing the Government to accept defective and substandard material. This was accomplished in the following ways:

"1. By the falsification of tests.

"2. By destruction of records.

"3. By improperly recording results of tests.

"4. By forging inspection reports.

"5. By failing to segregate substandard and defective material.

"6. By failing to promptly destroy or mutilate such defective and substandard material.

"7. By orally changing tolerances allowed on parts.

"8. By circumventing outside tolerances.

"9. By allowing production to override the inspection force, thereby destroying morale of both company and Army inspectors.

"10. By skipping inspection operations."

Yet, this corporation still enjoys spectacular and unprecedented success in obtaining war contracts. According to the (Truman) committee this organization with the single exception of General Motors, received more war contracts than any other manufacturer in the Nation.

Another amazing feature about the Sperry Corporation is the fact that Robert Hinckley, who resigned as Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and as Assistant Secretary of Commerce to become associated with Thomas Morgan, is now Director of the Office of Contract Settlement, and a member of the War Production Board.

In this capacity Mr. Hinckley will have charge of all contract settlements including those of the Sperry Corporation and the Curtiss-Wright Corporation.

This is not all.

2. General Hines has allowed no grass to grow under his active feet. He is also a director of both the Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co. and the Hamilton National Bank of Washington, D. C. (Source: Moodys, vol. Bank and Insurance, 1944; p. 1057.)

Here are some more facts:

It must be pointed out that the Veterans' Administration handles insurance policies covering 16,650,000 beneficiaries with a face value of over $127,000,000,000. Therefore, is it proper that General Hines should in any way be connected with a private insurance company as a board director?

I think that the American people have a right to know why the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is on the pay roll of this private company. It would be illuminating to know just what services he has rendered to this insurance company.

Then there is another amazing factor.

Through the tremendous power granted General Hines by legislation known as the G. I. bill of rights, the Administrator of Veterans Affairs is engaged in approving financial loans through banking institutions or lending agencies.

3. General Hines, it will be recalled, is a director of the Hamilton National Bank of Washington, D. C. (Source: Moody's volume, Bank and Insurance, 1944, p. 830.)

On February 14, 1945, the Washington Daily News, page 2, carried a story announcing that the first G. I. business loan to be guaranteed by the United States Government was negotiated through none other than the Hamilton National Bank. The recipient of this Government-guaranteed loan was a discharged sailor who lives in Falls Church, Va.

Bear in mind also that under the G. I. bill of rights a veteran can borrow up to $2,000 from private banking institutions.

Under these circumstances, is it proper for General Hines to be in any way officially connected with corporations or banking institutions that are or may be seeking Government contracts or business transactions?

In fact, the duties of the Veterans' Administrator are in themselves a monumental task requiring every minute of his time. In addition, General Hines was recently appointed Administrator of Rehabilitation and Reemployment.

Needless to say, I will continue to criticize the Veterans' Administrator as long as he attempts to serve two masters and devotes his time to private business functions and for private financial gain. I leave it to the intelligence of the American people to decide whether this criticism is justified or not in face of the evidence I have presented herewith.

The question remains, Should General Hines be allowed to continue to represent private institutions who are doing business with the Government either directly or indirectly?

I hope that the Congress of the United States and the American people will demand that General Hines either resign from the private corporations or from his position as Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

I desire also to call to the attention of the Congress the following statute, which may or may not apply to this particular situation. If it doesn't apply, a law should be passed immediately forbidding any permanent Government official from holding any type of office in private business. I quote the statute (sec. 66, title 5, U. S. C.):

"RECEIVING SALARY FROM SOURCE OTHER THAN UNITED STATES

"No Government official or employee shall receive any salary in connection with his services as such an official or employee from any source other than the Government of the United States, except as may be contributed out of the treasury of any State, county, or municipality, and no person, association, or corporation shall make any contribution to, or in any way supplement the salary of, any Government official or employee for the services performed by him for the Government of the United States.

"Any person violating any of the terms of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than $1,000 or imprisonment for not less than 6 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment, as the court may determine." (March 3, 1917, ch. 163, sec. 1, 39 Stat. 1106.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. HAND (at the request of Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey), for 3 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. CASE of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. KEAN), for 2 days, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 214. An act to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 9, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Friday, March 9, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Friday, March 9, 1945, at 10 a. m., to continue hearings on parcel-post rates.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold a hearing on Tuesday, March 13, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 173.

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold a hearing on

Wednesday, March 14, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1624 and H. R. 1746.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

279. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, notifying Congress that no leases which expired during the calendar year of 1944 were extended beyond their initial terms under the provisions of section 17 of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

280. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the outlying degaussing branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

281. A letter from the Associate Director, United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, transmitting a copy of quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1945, covering the appropriation "Maintenance, Executive Mansion and Grounds, 1945"; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

282. A letter from the administrative assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting revision 1 of the estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending March 31, 1945, for "Working funds, Federal airways"; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 62. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to investigate the progress of the defense housing program; without amendment (Rept. No. 290). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 174. Resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 60, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; without amendment (Rept. 291). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 175. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 2013, to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 292). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 2013. A bill to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 259, pt. II). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KEARNEY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 1356. A bill for the relief of Elias Baumgarten; without amendment (Rept. No. 289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 2536. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2537. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims and the district courts of the United States of claims for damages resulting from the operation of aircraft by or for the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 2538. A bill to incorporate the Mothers of World War No. 2, to set forth and establish the purposes and aims of the organization, fixing its corporate powers and establishing the rights of membership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 2539. A bill to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments and certain purchase and sale operations by corporations created pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 2540. A bill to establish an Ohio Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Ohio River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the promotion of family-type farming, the development of the recreational possibilities and the promotion of the general welfare of the area, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2541. A bill to provide a method for the wartime reduction of temporary grades held by general officers of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2542. A bill to amend an act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to make certain disposition of condemned ordnance, guns, projectiles, and other condemned material in their respective Departments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2543. A bill to require weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to permit old-age pensioners to earn wages without penalty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 2544. A bill for the relief of Willie Hines; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2545. A bill for the relief of Florida Rhone Burch; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 2546. A bill for the relief of Salvador Lorenz Fernandez; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WASIELEWSKI:

H. R. 2547. A bill for the relief of John J. Doherty; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

154. By Mr. GAMBLE (by request): Two petitions signed by 53 residents in the Twenty-eighth Congressional District of New York, opposing the enactment of H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

155. By Mr. LANE: Petition of the resolution committee of the lastmakers' union, Local 28, Lynn, Mass., urging modification of the Little Steel formula; to the Committee on Labor.

156. Also, petition of the delegates of eastern region of Massachusetts, members of the Polish-American Congress, at a meeting February 18, 1945, in Boston, Mass., urging assistance to the people of Poland and voicing disapproval of the results of the Crimean Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

157. By Mr. MOTT: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon memorializing the Congress of the United States to terminate the activities of the Office of Price Administration and all other agencies established for the war emergency as soon as is reasonably possible; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

158. By Mr. MURDOCK: Memorial of State of Arizona, House Memorial No. 4, requesting the establishment of a Government general hospital at Fort Huachuca; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

159. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry citizens of Racine, Wis.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Christ, we pray for the spirit of service to possess us, for the gift of thoughtfulness and for the power of sympathetic fellowship that will cast out sorrow and fear. Too often ambition clouds the outlook; clear our vision and teach us that no one comes to true greatness who has not felt in some degree that his life belongs to others. The more we help and bless those in need, the more nearly we approach the likeness of Him who is chiefest among ten thousand and the One altogether lovely.

Inspire us with Thy truth and wisdom from on high; may we repent of whatever is evil, turn away from it, and put our trust in a good God. Thou dost succor the ill-deserving, causing Thy sun to rise upon the good and the bad; Thou dost send the rain upon the just and the unjust, filling the earth with Thy bounty. Blessed Lord, may Thy name be magnified in human hearts and homes that it

may be known more clearly and gratefully among our people and thus become worthy witnesses of Thy parenthood. O speed that great and glorious day when our Master shall take unto Himself His power and rule over the earth even as He does in heaven. In His holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COVERAGE OF CERTAIN DRUGS UNDER THE FEDERAL NARCOTIC LAWS

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2348) to provide for the coverage of certain drugs under the Federal narcotic laws.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the distinguished gentleman from Virginia explain the purpose of this legislation?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is outlined in one paragraph on the first page of the committee report, which reads as follows:

The purpose of this bill is to provide a prompt and convenient method for bringing under the control of the Federal narcotic laws any newly discovered synthetic drug which is determined, after appropriate inquiry, to possess the same or similar dangerous, habit-forming, or habit-sustaining qualities as morphine or cocaine.

Mr. KNUTSON. The purpose of this legislation is to fortify the existing Narcotic Act?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Absolutely. We found that there is on open sale a new synthetic product similar in effect to opium which our present opium laws do not reach. When our committee found that this measure had the unanimous endorsement of all Federal agencies dealing with narcotic laws, the committee unanimously reported the measure to the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Yes; the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3228 of the Internal Revenue Code (containing definitions of terms used for purposes of certain provisions relating to narcotics) is amended by adding the following new subsection (f) at the end thereof:

"(f) Opiate: The word 'opiate' as used in this part and subchapter A of chapter 23 shall mean any drug (as defined in the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act) found by the Secretary of the Treasury, after due notice and opportunity for public hearing, to have an addiction-forming or addiction-sustaining liability similar to morphine or cocaine, and declared by the Secretary to have been so found. The Secretary is authorized to issue necessary rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this subsection, and to confer or impose upon any officer or employee of the Treasury Department, as he shall designate or appoint, the duty of conducting any hearing authorized hereunder."

SEC. 2. Section 2550 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (tax on certain substances) is amended by inserting after the phrase "levied, assessed, collected, and paid upon opium, isonipecaine, coca leaves," the word "opiate,",

SEC. 3. Paragraphs 5 and 6 of section 2557 (b) (penalties for violations of certain provisions relating to narcotics) are hereby amended by inserting in each immediately following the words "or conspiring to sell, import, or export, opium, coca leaves, cocaine, isonipecaine," the word "opiate,"; by deleting in each the word "or" from the phrase "preparation of opium, coca leaves, cocaine, or isonipecaine," and by inserting in each immediately following such phrase the words "or opiate,".

SEC. 4. The first sentence of section 2558 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (providing for confiscation and disposal of seized narcotics) is hereby amended by inserting immediately after the word "All opium, coca leaves, isonipecaine," the word "opiates,"; and by deleting the word "and" before the word "isonipecaine" in the phrase "all salts, derivatives, and preparations of opium, coca leaves, and isonipecaine," and inserting immediately following such phrase the words "and opiates,".

SEC. 5. Section 2565 of the Internal Revenue Code (cross-reference to definitions) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Opiate:

"Subsection (f)."

SEC. 6. The first paragraph of section 3220 of the Internal Revenue Code (occupational taxes) is hereby amended by striking out the word "or" in the phrase "gives away opium, coca leaves, or isonipecaine," and inserting immediately following such phrase the words "or opiate,".

SEC. 7. Section 1 (a) of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 21, sec. 171), is amended by inserting after the phrase "The term 'narcotic drugs' means opium, coca leaves, cocaine, isonipecaine," the word "opiate,"; by deleting the word "or" from the words "preparation of opium, coca leaves, cocaine, or isonipecaine," and inserting the words "or opiate"; and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting the following: "; and the word 'opiate' as used herein shall have the same meaning as defined in section 3228 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code."

SEC. 8. Sections 1 and 2 of the act of August 12, 1937, as amended, entitled "An act to increase the punishment of second, third, and subsequent offenders against the narcotic laws" (ch. 598, 50 Stat. 627; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 21, secs. 200 and 200a), are hereby amended by inserting in each immediately following the words "or conspiring to sell, import, or export, opium, coca leaves, cocaine, isonipecaine," the word "opiate,"; by deleting in each the word "or" from the phrase "preparation of opium, coca leaves, cocaine, or isonipecaine," and by inserting in each immediately following such phrase the words "or opiate,"; and by adding a new sentence at the end of each section to read as follows: "The word 'opiate' as used in this section shall have the same meaning as defined in section 3228 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code."

SEC. 9. The second paragraph of section 584 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 19, sec. 1584), is hereby amended by deleting in the first sentence the word "or" from the phrase "If any of such merchandise so found consists of heroin, morphine, cocaine, or isonipecaine," and by inserting immediately following such phrase the words "or opiate,"; and by inserting in the last sentence of the paragraph immediately following the word "isonipecaine" the word ", opiate" and inserting immediately following the reference "sections 3228 (e)" the following: ", 3228 (f)".

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 4, strike out the words "and declared by the Secretary to have been so found", and insert "and proclaimed by the President to have been so found by the Secretary."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Commitee on the District of Columbia have until midnight tonight to file reports on two bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the completion of business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUNKER asked and was given permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Nevada State Legislature.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article by Capt. Richard L. Neuberger.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein an address delivered by Prof. Edwin Borchard, of Yale University, on the subject Two-thirds Rule as to Treaties—A Change Opposed.

Mr. Speaker, I have submitted this to the Public Printer and I am informed that it will take three and a quarter pages at a cost of $169. Notwithstanding, I ask unanimous consent that the extension be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be printed.

There was no objection.

HARRY BRIDGES' VICTORY COMMITTEE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to a letter which we probably are all receiving from the Harry Bridges' Victory Committee, with national headquarters at 602 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif. I looked up the names on this list in the Dies committee, and I see that they are all listed there. Their names are George Wilson, executive secretary; Sherman H.

Dalrymple, chairman; David J. McDonald, secretary; Joseph Curran; Emil Reive; Reid Robinson; and R. J. Thomas.

I want to say here that whenever the men who are listed in the communistic group in the publication that lists communistic travelers, it seems to me that when they are out trying to get Harry Bridges to be kept in this country after the Attorney General and others in this country have determined that the thing for him to do is to get out, and also in view of the fact that he has never been naturalized, if we do not stop the Communists in this country, then, gentlemen, beware of what will happen to us.

RODGER YOUNG

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WEICHEL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on this valiant foot soldier and to include the story of Rodger Young from Life magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include a memorial from the State Legislature of Oregon and in the other an editorial.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution from the Common Council of the City of Fort Wayne, Ind.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an item entitled "The Mail Man's Code, Service That Brings a Smile."

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Frank Scully to the President of the United States as published in the Hollywood Press-Times.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Federal housing.

Mr. GREEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include some observations and information on the record of troops in the Territory of Hawaii and the European theater of war which have come to my attention as the result of my tour of the battle fronts in this area as a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs. I understand this may exceed the limit. I have submitted it to the Public Printer, but as yet have not received an estimate. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a speech by Commander Stassen, which I am advised will require two and three-fifth pages and will cost $124.80. Despite the extra cost, I ask unanimous consent that the speech may be printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from Gen. Frank T. Hines, of the Veterans' Administration, together with some material which he has supplied me with reference to the criticism of the treatment of the veterans in our veterans' hospitals.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a nurse in his district with reference to the problem of the recruitment of nurses.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 33]

Adams	Fellows	Murphy
Barden	Fogarty	Norton
Barrett, Pa.	Gamble	O'Toole
Beall	Gardner	Patterson
Bennet, N. Y.	Goodwin	Powell
Boren	Granger	Rains
Bradley, Mich.	Gross	Ramey
Buckley	Gwinn, N. Y.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Burgin	Hagen	Robinson, Utah
Camp	Halleck	Rogers, Mass.
Cannon, Fla.	Hand	Sadowski
Case, N. J.	Hart	Sheridan
Case, S. Dak.	Hartley	Simpson, Pa.
Celler	Heidinger	Slaughter
Chelf	Hess	Starkey
Clark	Hobbs	Stewart
Clason	Holmes, Mass.	Talbot
Clements	Johnson, Luther A.	Taylor
Combs	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Traynor
Corbett	Kelly, Ill.	Wadsworth
Curley	King	Weiss
Dawson	Kunkel	West
Dirksen	Landis	Wood
Domengeaux	Luce	Woodrum, Va.
Doyle	McGehee	
Eaton		
Elsaesser		

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-six Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. COOPER, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OUTLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial on Bretton Woods.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 167, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later on I shall yield, with a great deal of pleasure, the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. Speaker, this rules make in order the consideration of H. R. 2023, known as the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. It is an open rule providing for 3 hours of general debate, after which amendments may be offered under the 5-minute rule.

The bill extends the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for 2 years—up to June 30, 1947. I think it is the sixth of seventh extension of the legislation.

It increases the borrowing power of the Corporation from $3,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000. It provides for a revision of the date of annual appraisal of assets and liabilities from March 31 to June 30 annually. It changes the basis of valuation of assets, as will be explained by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]. I shall vote for the rule notwithstanding my critical remarks on the underlying principle of this legislation.

LEGISLATION ORIGINALLY INTENDED TO AID FARMERS AND RELIEVE UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. Speaker, in 1933, realizing the unfortunate condition of the farmers and workers, the President recommended and urged the establishment of this Corporation to aid the farmers by bringing about

an increase in the price of farm products to bring about the reemployment of the millions of unemployed and, in general, to help the economy of the Nation. I know that at that time it was the object of the President to help the farmers and the consumers of the Nation, and that he did not urge the passage of the legislation to aid speculators and manipulators who, unfortunately, have gradually become and are today the great beneficiaries under this act. As I stated, I voted for the original extension and for all further extensions, and am supporting the rule to make this bill in order so that the House may have an opportunity to hear of the transactions and activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Lest I forget, I do not wish to be understood as not having confidence in the Administrator of the War Food Administration, Mr. Marvin Jones, or his assistants; my criticism goes to those who have been imposing upon them, and to those who continue to urge and demand still greater aid notwithstanding the fact that it is not necessary at this time.

FARMERS' FINANCIAL CONDITION VASTLY IMPROVED SINCE 1932

When the President issued the Executive order creating the Commodity Credit Corporation the price of cotton, as you know, was down to 5½ cents a pound, wheat was something like 35 cents a bushel, and corn ranged between 19 and 25 cents a bushel. Those are typical of the generally low prices prevailing for all farm commodities. Cattle on the hoof and hogs were selling for about 5 cents a pound. But today, Mr. Speaker, we have a different picture: Cotton is selling for 21½ to 22 cents a pound; wheat and corn are selling at a price nearly four times higher than they were.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it may be well to refresh the minds of some of the Members as to then prevailing prices and to that end I have prepared some figures giving the prices of some grains, cotton, livestock, vegetables, and fruits, comparing them with the prices charged today. I believe they will be enlightening and of interest not only to the membership but to the country as well. The figures have been prepared in table form as follows:

A comparison of commodity prices

Wheat:		
Dec. 1932	per bushel	$0.42
Dec. 1944	do	1.63
Corn:		
Dec. 1932	do	.23
Dec. 1944	do	1.144
Rye:		
Dec. 1932	do	.31
Dec. 1944	do	1.139
Barley:		
Dec. 1932	do	.29
Dec. 1944	do	1.149
Cotton:		
Dec. 1932	per pound	.0572
Dec. 1944	do	.2138
Hogs:		
Dec. 1932	per 100 pounds	3.04
Dec. 1944	do	14.14
Cattle:		
Dec. 1932	do	5.44
Dec. 1944	per 100 lbs. (steers)	15.78

RETAIL PRICES

Eggs:		
Dec. 1932	per dozen	$0.399
Dec. 1944	do	.669
Milk:		
Dec. 1932	per quart	.104
Dec. 1944	do	.156
Butter:		
Dec. 1932	per pound	.298
Dec. 1944	do	.50
Bread:		
Dec. 1932	do	.066
Dec. 1944	do	.088
Corn meal:		
Dec. 1932	do	.035
Dec. 1944	do	.064
Cabbage:		
Dec. 1932	do	.025
Dec. 1944	do	.058
Potatoes:		
Dec. 1932	do	.015
Dec. 1944	do	.045
Tomatoes (canned):		
Dec. 1932		.087
Dec. 1944		.121
Oranges:		
Dec. 1932	per dozen	.285
Dec. 1944	do	.437
Prunes:		
Dec. 1932	per pound	.089
Dec. 1944	do	.17

All other commodities in 1932 were in like proportion as to price. What is the picture today? The condition of the farmers who were burdened with mortgages approximating $11,000,000,000 has continuously improved for the last 8 or 10 years until today prices of farm products have increased from 200 percent to 400 percent, and correspondingly the wealth of the farmers has increased and they enjoy a prosperity greater than they ever enjoyed in the history of our country.

In 1943 the net income of farmers was 162 percent above the 1935–39 average, according to the Federal Reserve Bulletin of December last year, and a survey of agricultural conditions by the Office of War Information late last year said that cash farm income rose 119 percent in the 3-year period before 1943, or more than $10,000,000,000. Farm real-estate values have increased 36 percent in 4 years, according to the Department of Agriculture, and farm operators' reserves of about $12,000,000,000 in cash and other liquid resources are the largest in history.

From January 1, 1940, to January 1, 1944, agriculture as a whole rose from a $49,000,000,000 industry to a $70,000,000,000 industry, or if certain intangibles, such as cash deposits, War bonds, and the like, owned by farm operators, are added, it was, on January 1, 1940, a $54,000,000,000 industry, and, on January 1, 1944, an $83,000,000,000 industry, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics reports.

But when we consider the agricultural industry as a whole, we must bear in mind the distinction between the farmer, who is the original producer, and those through whose hands his products must pass before they reach the ultimate consumer. Though the farmers have received many benefits and good profits, they cannot be compared to the greater profits of the packers, the dairy people, the cotton hoarders, and manipulators.

Mr. Speaker, we are today holding on to a tremendous surplus of some ten million bales of cotton on which we are paying high carrying charges. It is my belief that not only the surplus cotton but all surpluses should be gradually disposed of so that in the future they may not be hanging over the heads of the farmers and growers of the Nation as a threat to their markets.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Is the gentleman advised of the fact that in the program for cotton the Commidity Credit Corporation has accumulated a profit to the Government of $93,000,000?

Mr. SABATH. I have heard that before, but I would like to have the figures as to what it is costing the Government in warehousing charges, and I presume it is taking into consideration the present-day price of cotton. However, I am beginning to feel that we cannot support the market to maintain the high prices. I do not want that profit to get away from us because when the Corporation made loans and started to buy, cotton was selling for 5, 5½, and 6 cents per pound. The Congress, at the request of the President, was justified in passing the legislation to help the farmers of this country in view of the unfortunate conditions that existed at that time.

We all remember that in 1932, yes, and in 1931, many of the farmers were losing their homes and their farms by foreclosure, because the prices they were receiving did not compensate them in many instances even for the fertilizer and for the seed, to say nothing about the work and labor involved. What applies to cotton applies also to wheat. Wheat, in December 1932, was selling for about 39 cents per bushel. Now it is selling for $1.70, according to the last reports which I have seen. Of course, it is selling high because we have from year to year increased the loans on wheat. For instance, in 1938 the amount of loan set on wheat was 53 cents a bushel; in 1939, 64 cents; in 1940, 65 cents; in 1941, 98 cents; in 1942, $1.14; in 1943, $1.23; and now in 1944, $1.35. We have more than doubled the loans on wheat and on many other commodities.

What I cannot understand, perhaps I cannot grasp it fully, is that the farmer today is receiving higher prices than he has ever dreamed of for his crop, and, if that be the fact, why is this legislation now necessary? I think it is obviously unnecessary for us to continue to authorize additional appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, it is urged that we must keep faith with the farmers to stimulate production. Have we not done enough and are we not doing enough for them? The C. C. C.—Commodity Credit Corporation—and other agencies have paid out many millions of dollars in furnishing them with labor, providing transportation of this labor and even now are arranging for war-prisoner labor to help them. And just a few days ago we adopted an amendment that will defer the induction of the younger farmers into the military service. The record of farm production

speaks for itself and in the coming year we will have still greater production, weather permitting, than in 1944. Actually the need for farm labor has been reduced with the advent of improved farm machinery—electric milkers, mechanical cotton pickers, and various other types of improved machines that have reduced farm labor in many instances by 80 percent. With the amount of labor having been reduced tremendously it consequently follows that there has been a corresponding reduction in the cost of production, so the farmer's lot has been appreciably made much easier and he is enjoying these benefits to a greater degree than ever in the history of our country.

Mr. Speaker, last year it cost the Government about $1,200,000,000 and, in addition, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation aided the "poor" packers and the meat industry to the extent of about $860,000,000. Then it aided the milk and dairy industry to the extent of approximately $622,000,000. Notwithstanding the tremendous subsidies the dairymen have received, milk that formerly sold for 95 cents per 100 pounds is selling now for $2.75—more than three times the former price, and they are now seeking $568,000,000 for subsidy payments for the coming year.

I heard the able Representative from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who spoke and shed tears in behalf of the dairy industry, say that they sadly needed the additional millions to encourage them to stimulate production. But I know this: It is unreasonable even to ask us to appropriate and authorize the vast sum of $568,000,000 to that industry when it does not aid the consumer. When the subsidy amendment to this law was passed it was intended, as I have said, to help not only the farmers and the producers but also the consumers. A subsidy was paid in many instances for the purpose of holding the prices of these commodities down to enable the consumers to obtain the food they needed at a fair and reasonable price. As it is today, the milk that sold for 8 or 9 cents a quart is now selling for 14 cents; butter is twice as high, and cheese three times as high, and the farmers are making more money than they ever expected or even dreamed of receiving. Therefore, I do not see why it is necessary that this borrowing power should be increased from three to five billion dollars. Perhaps some of the many intelligent Members on the floor may be able to enlighten me during the debate as to its necessity.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Do I understand from the gentleman's remarks that he is opposing the rule which he is now presenting to the House?

Mr. SABATH. If the gentleman had been on the floor he would have heard what I said.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have listened very carefully to the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. SABATH. Then I am sorry the gentleman did not hear me state that I advocated the passage of the rule and that I shall vote for it in order to give the membership of the House the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the existing conditions. I believe, during the 3 hours of debate, that a great deal of intelligent information will be forthcoming, and I hope the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, with his able member assistant, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] and others, will be able to convince the House that this legislation, even now, is needed.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. May I remind the gentleman that on all basic crops and on all nonbasic crops covered by the Steagall amendment the Government has made money; $93,000,000 on cotton, and on the over-all picture they have made $23,000,000, and the only loss is the loss sustained in the war program. So far as the loss on food and cotton is concerned, it cannot compare with the large loss in making implements of war.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for the information he has given me and the House. I am familiar with it more or less. But we did not pass this law for the purpose of making money for the Government. This law was passed for the purpose of aiding the farmers and the consumers and holding the cost of living down so that the nearly 20,000,000 white-collared people can live and exist decently. As it is, the producers, the farmers, and even the Government has made a lot of money. But unfortunately the white-collared man's increase in salary and wages has been nil, and he cannot afford to continue to pay the high prices for his foodstuffs when his salary and his small wage has been frozen.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think that statement should be corrected that the Corporation was originally set up for the purpose of maintaining consumer prices. I do not think the gentleman wants the record to stand that there is anything in this program which the Congress has ever set up which would authorize the Corporation to pay consumer subsidies.

Mr. SABATH. What I had intended to say is that the subsidies we are paying have been intended to hold down prices. I realize the Commodity Credit Corporation does not have the jurisdiction the O. P. A. has to hold down prices and impose ceilings.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Corporation was set up and is continuing now for the purpose of insuring the maximum amount of production. The money which we make available is for the purpose of assuring the farmers that they are going to get an adequate price for their commodities so that there will be adequate production. It was never intended that this money would ever be used to maintain maximum prices under the Price Control Act.

Mr. SABATH. I fully appreciate that. I thank the gentleman for his observation. I fully appreciate that the verbiage of the bill and the intent and the efforts of those who have been trying for years to extend and enlarge the appropriations were based upon the fact that we wanted to increase production and bring about the maximum production of farm products. However, in view of the very large crops produced in 1941, 1942, 1943, and 1944, and in consideration of the high prices, I do not believe additional inducement is needed. I think the prices the farmers are receiving, the wealth they are accumulating, and the money they are making is sufficient inducement for them to continue to produce the needed food.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I was surprised to hear the gentleman say that even the Government had made a lot of money in this program. The gentleman undoubtedly knows that the Government has lost over $1,200,000,000, but it has lost that money in the part of the program intended for the benefit of the gentleman's constituents and others like them throughout the country, not in the part that has been of benefit to the farmer.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman. I believe myself that it will help the consumers and the people I represent, and the millions of workers in the United States, but it is not doing so. I concede that the prices are not as high in many instances as they were during the last war. Nevertheless, in view of the amount of money we have appropriated and expended for subsidies and in providing other aid to the farmers, I feel that the prices of foodstuffs are altogether too high and should be brought down. We should not by legislation or with our votes continue to aim at higher prices. Let us be candid. I have no objection to a farmer making a real profit, to his making money. I want him to be prosperous. But I do not want it all at the expense of the underpaid wage earner. What I object to, and I shall call attention to it, is the manipulators and speculators who under this bill have been able to manipulate and acquire tremendous profits at the expense of the consumer.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

I repeat, I have every confidence in Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator, as well as the Chairman of the Commodity Credit Corporation. But I know that the various advisory committees that they appointed in good faith have been taking advantage of conditions. No one can prove otherwise. I have evidence of many instances where these various advisory committees, not only in this instance, but in many other instances, have known beforehand what they were going to recommend or what they were going to urge, and many of their former employers or friends have taken advantage of it to such an extent that I feel something should be done to eliminate these unfair activities on the part of these advisory committees. That is the purpose of my statement today. I want to call attention to the fact that we should look into these various ac-

tivities on the part of many advisory committees, who unfortunately represent the big industries and the big producers and who somehow or other cannot forget their former relationships with the corporations and companies with which they were connected. I feel that should be looked into, not only by the Committee on Banking and Currency, but by all of the committees of the House, because what applies in this instance applies also to the War Production Board. I know that Donald Nelson tried honestly and faithfully to do his job. He, too, was imposed upon by these various boards. That applies also to the Quartermaster General, in whom I have the utmost confidence. He is an able and sincere man, but he has advisory boards that have misled him in many instances.

For weeks I have heard of rumors and charges and investigations on the part of the Committee on Appropriations relative to some of these charges—some that there has been a great deal of butter spoiled—some that there has been thousands of cases of eggs spoiled, and some other perishable commodities. As to that, if there has been any spoilage naturally I regret it but the Quartermaster General has a duty to keep the Army supplied. He was obliged to make allowances for losses in transportation by the sinkings of our ships; therefore, to play safe, he was obliged to acquire surpluses of commodities greater than were actually needed for which commodities he was unable to find sufficient storage facilities. If we had disposed of at least a million bales of our great surplus of cotton no doubt that would have relieved the situation and aided in properly storing the vast amount of supplies that he was obliged to purchase and accumulate. So, as to those charges, I do not find wherein anyone can be justly accused or charged. What I have called attention to is the activities of these advisory boards who have and are taking advantage in the matter of purchase and sales to the disadvantage and best interests of the Government as well as of the people.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Do I understand the gentleman from Illinois is not particularly discussing the question of subsidies having been paid, but he is really interested in the fact that as the result of the freezing of certain commodities at certain prices to the producer, the spread between the producer and the consumer has grown so much that in many commodities it is more than the commodity brought before the war. Do I understand the gentleman correctly?

Mr. SABATH. That is one phase of it. But there are other reasons. There are the packers in my home town. They have made 200 percent greater profits in 1944 than they made in 1940. Why should they be entitled to receive $862,000,000 from the Government when, in fact, it does not aid the consumer in obtaining meat—even the cheapest cuts—at reasonable prices?

PACKERS' PROFITS

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House and the country I insert at this point a table showing the profits of the principal meat packers for the years 1932 and 1935 and from 1939 to 1944, inclusive. They are as follows:

	Armour	Cudahy	Swift	Wilson
1932	[1]$2,526,042	$905,985	[1]$5,337,789	$51,336
1935	5,626,795	1,211,073	8,767,302	1,453,739
1939	3,265,167	890,293	10,321,523	3,215,840
1940	4,560,539	2,116,223	11,183,484	3,619,281
1941	11,354,408	3,652,316	17,808,725	7,036,056
1942	11,112,069	3,352,282	16,972,721	7,299,468
1943	11,445,409	3,431,454	17,431,372	7,403,182
1944	11,250,348	3,190,061	15,662,635	7,353,791

[1]Deficit.

It can be seen from these figures that in 1932 two of the large packers had a deficit and the others had a very small profit. In 1940 they enjoyed a profit of $21,000,000 and in 1944 their profit skyrocketed to $37,000,000. I should mention that these profits were after the payment of taxes. Mr. Speaker, it stands to reason that no one intended originally—and surely the President did not intend—that we should expend millions to help those who are making millions of profits out of the Government and out of the consumers of this Nation.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that wartime subsidies with reference to meat are from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and not from the Commodity Credit Corporation. It has nothing to do with the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. SABATH. I know it is being paid by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and they paid out nearly $862,000,000, and I cannot know why. When your wife or my wife or any other woman goes to market she does not get meat, even the cheapest cuts, at a half decent price.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. In order that the record may be meticulously accurate I think the gentleman might say that the meat subsidy and the butter subsidy is paid by the Defense Supplies Corporation, another artificial vehicle set up out of funds supplied from the borrowing power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. SABATH. But it comes out of the Government and the taxpayers.

Mr. KEEFE. Ultimately from the taxpayers; yes. What I want to ask the gentleman is this: Am I to understand from the argument the gentleman has made up to this time that he is opposed to this program of subsidies?

Mr. SABATH. I was for it for 8 long years, and I think we should stop. What we should do now is give a little more power to the O. P. A. to hold down prices. I do not say we should cut prices in half. I feel that it is not necessary to hold up prices at this time when they are now so extremely high.

SUBSIDY ABUSES SHOULD BE ELIMINATED

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that if the President were cognizant of what is transpiring—that the payment of these subsidies is not aiding in the manner in which he anticipated—the holding down of the costs of living—I feel that he would insist and urge the elimination of the abuses that have crept into the subsidy program. Unfortunately, we all must realize and recognize the tremendous task that has and is still confronting him and the almost unbearable burden and responsibility that is his. He appointed to high Government places experienced businessmen, most of whom are Republicans, in the hope that they would have the interest of the people at heart. There is a growing feeling that many of them have abused their responsibility for their own interests and benefit.

Actually what is happening under this situation is that we are holding the line against the little fellow while the special interests, with their representatives planted in Government agencies either as advisers, consultants, or dollar-a-year men are fixing policies and prices which give them the biggest profits.

I hope that within a short time the President in his great leadership and with the cooperation of Russia and Great Britain will have completed his great international undertakings; that the Hitler and Nazi butchers in Europe, and shortly thereafter the treacherous Japs as well, will have unconditionally surrendered. And thereafter, in view of the splendid foundation that has been prepared with respect to reconstruction, the rehabilitation of the nations and the people the world over, and the establishment of a permanent peace, our great President will be able to devote a larger measure of his great ability and energy to domestic affairs. I know that these domestic conditions will then be righted, that unnecessary appropriations will cease to be made, and all departments of government will be economically and efficiently administered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Permit the Chair to advise the gentleman from Illinois he has used 30 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. I am sorry. I did not want to use all that time.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that I may revise and extend my remarks and insert some figures bearing on the subject of this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the able and affable chairman of the Rules Committee the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has discussed at length, and complained about many things that have happened and many things that have not happened within the Government during the last 12 years. I am a little surprised at his indictment of these numerous New Deal agencies, corporations, and commissions which beset us

on every side at this time. I am more surprised to learn the attitude of the chairman toward this administration-sponsored bill. After all, open confession is good for the soul, and that the conversion of the chairman is commendable even though it comes so late in the life of this experimentation.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is the vehicle by which legislation is brought from legislative committees to the floor of the House. The rule is all we have before us at this time. May I, however, call the attention of the House to page 4 of the committee report. There, by virtue of the Ramseyer rule, the Members can visualize the changes made in existing law. Especially for the benefit of the newer Members may I say that if they will turn to that page they will see just what the proposed changes are. That will be of much assistance to them as they hear the debate as it progresses.

Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to say other than to express the hope that this rule will be adopted, and I feel sure it will be because, as I understand, it is not contested.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I know the entire membership of the House of Representatives was thrilled over the news that American troops have crossed the Rhine. This morning I was notified that the lieutenant leading the first company of infantry across that river was Lt. Carl Timmerman, of West Point, Nebr. This Nebraska hero comes from my congressional district in Nebraska, and I know that my colleagues are as thrilled as I am over this announcement. Lieutenant Timmerman and his company of American heroes represent those fine American G. I.'s who are so frequently described by Ernie Pyle. This company commander and his chiefs have been congratulated for their daring exploit by General Eisenhower. I am proud to report this news to the membership of this House.

The report reaching me indicates that in an amazing new-born D-day which surprised American Army commands as much as it did the Germans, this Infantry company commanded by this Nebraska officer, carved the first foothold on the east bank of the Rhine on Wednesday. From what I can learn Lieutenant Timmerman's company suffered no casualties from the fire of the enemy.

On behalf of all Members of the Nebraska delegation in Congress I make this brief report to the Congress, and I know that the entire membership of this House join us today in paying tribute to this fine Nebraska officer and his comrades in arms.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the two committees of the House having the most information concerning the bill H. R. 2023 are the Committee on Banking and Currency, reporting the bill, and the Committee on Appropriations, which has had to do with furnishing the money for the administration of the law by this Corporation.

I now yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the purpose of speech in the well of the House is to try to clarify thinking on issues, and in what I shall say this afternoon I do not want it to be considered as controversial or partisan but as an attempt on my part to see if I cannot make a worth-while contribution to the thinking of the people of this country and of the Congress on what appears to me to be one of the most outstanding public questions we are called upon to solve.

My friend from Illinois has just made a 30-minute statement. I regret to say that after listening to it very carefully I find difficulty understanding his contentions. I asked him whether or not we were to understand from his statement that he is now opposed to the payment of subsidies. I gathered from his reply that, although he has consistently voted for the payment of subsidies for 8 long years, he now, because of his great interest in the consuming public and the working people of this country, has reached the conclusion that the whole program of subsidies is responsible for commodity price rises and that the consuming public that he speaks for has been compelled to pay unreasonable prices in the market places. He, therefore, believes this program should be abandoned. If this is the position of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], may I state that I am in complete disagreement with his conclusions. The economy of the country has been geared to the subsidy program. This is especially true of the milk-production program. To be sure, we have opposed subsidies as a national policy, but in view of the position the producers have been placed in through the administration's adoption of this policy we must now support the program and continue payment of subsidies or the whole agricultural economy will collapse. I feel reasonably sure that even the gentleman from Illinois will concede this fact. The milk producers of Wisconsin and the Nation who are asked to assume the burden of producing 120,000,000,000 pounds of milk must have a decent return or go broke. The latter is unthinkable. The subsidy merely absorbs some of the spread between ceilings established by O. P. A. and a minimum return to the producer. While the consumer is paying advanced costs, the farmer producer does not get it. The increases to the consumer are made necessary by the increased costs of delivery and processing.

So I say to my friend from Illinois that in his appraisal of increased consumer costs of dairy products he should allocate the increases where they properly belong.

Let us see what is facing us today. We have before us a rule to consider the extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I shall support this rule, although I think the rule ought to provide 10 hours of general debate instead of the limited period of debate that is given. This subject is one that should be explored by this Congress all during next week in order that the Members of the Congress and the people of the Nation may understand this great octopus that has the power to control the economic destiny of the entire people of the United States.

I know there may be some people who will challenge that statement, but if you will read the speech I made here on February 20 and take the time to analyze it you will see that the statement is amply justified. Here is a private corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, the Commodity Credit Corporation, organized pursuant to Executive order which this Congress has repeatedly recognized by legislative enactment as an agency of the Federal Government. You are called upon by the enactment of this legislation to again recognize this private corporation organized under the laws of Delaware as an agency of the Federal Government, a corporation that in its structure or operations is subject to only minor control by the Congress. Why, it was not until an Executive order was issued that it was even required to come to the Congress to get an appropriation to pay its administrative expenses; it was not until the Congress acted that it was made subject to the civil-service law or the Classification Act; it was not until Congress recently acted that it was brought within the provisions of the General Accounting Office. So we have the situation of this Corporation organized under the laws of Delaware with powers so supreme that if the Corporation so determined there is nothing in the whole gamut of economics that this Corporation could not be engaged in. The only limitation is the amount of money available which at present is $3,000,000,000, plus its capital. They are asking that this borrowing authority be extended to $5,000,000,000.

On this subject of subsidy that the gentleman from Illinois has talked about, it is true that the Commodity Credit Corporation is administering a subsidy on dairy products, milk if you please. May I say to my distinguished friend and to the Members of this House that the overwhelming majority of the farmers that I have the honor to represent have time and time again opposed the subsidy program. They did not want subsidies. They do not want subsidies today. They have asked simply that they be permitted to receive in the market places of the Nation a fair, a decent, a just price for their products, which will enable them to receive a wage on the farm that is on a parity of relationship with the wages paid in industry.

This administration, in the enactment of the price-control law and in its efforts to secure increases in production, has placed limitations and ceilings upon milk. In the face of those ceilings, and in the face of increased labor costs on the farm, increased costs of feed and everything else, the War Food Administration came to those farmers and said, "We need 120,000,000,000 pounds of milk to feed our soldiers and our allies, and feed the people of America." The farmers went

out last year under a program that involved 119,000,000,000 pounds, and they produced that milk. They had to work 16 and 18 hours a day 365 days in the year pulling the teats of these cows to get that milk. It is not like raising wheat or corn or cotton. It is a specialized business. After they produced that milk the price for their product was fixed by O. P. A. ceilings. In order to stimulate these farmers to enable them to meet this production schedule and to meet the increased cost of labor and the increased cost of feed, the Commodity Credit Corporation stepped into the picture, and under the direction of the War Food Administration announced a schedule of subsidy payments, and they have been paying the farmers that subsidy to make up this differential.

Oh, yes; the gentleman from Illinois can talk about the great prosperity of the farmer by showing the percentage of increase in the farmer's income resulting from the price of milk. But let me tell you this: Those figures are simply fantastic and unbelievable, because other increased costs have compelled the farmers of this country to leave their farms at the direction of the sheriff in foreclosure proceedings in such number that hundreds and thousands of farmers lost their farms because they had no income.

The farmers are getting a decent income today. The farmers in the milk production business are getting a decent income today, and one of the reasons they are getting it is because of the subsidy checks that are paid to them out of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Let that be understood. So far as I am concerned, speaking for the milk producers in the greatest milk-producing State in the Union, the great State of Wisconsin, we have been forced into the position of accepting the subsidy program, and we cannot meet the production goals of the War Food Administration if there is any attempt to cut or curtail the present subsidy program. That is not what we are complaining of. That is not the thing I am complaining of as a Member of Congress. What I am complaining about is the situation that exists legally whereby, due to the inactivity or inattention of this Congress, you have delegated to the War Food Administration, subject only to the approval by the Economic Stabilizer, the power to control the economic life of the farm population of this country.

What do I mean when I say that? Marvin Jones, one man, decides to pay a subsidy of 60 cents a hundred on milk. The only check on him, if you please, is the borrowing authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which he also runs in addition to being War Food Administrator. The only check on him is the Economic Stabilizer, now Mr. Davis. Now, then, Mr. Jones, one man, can say to the farmers of this country, "We intend to pay you 60 cents a hundred for your milk in New York, 40 cents a hundred in Wisconsin, 45 cents in Arkansas," scattered all over the country. The payment of a milk subsidy or the nonpayment of a subsidy is dependent upon the whim or the caprice, if he sees fit to exercise it in that direction, of just one man. It is true that while Judge Jones would not use the payment of subsidies as a political weapon, yet under the present set-up the power is there. Some other man might not hesitate. When any man has the power to determine to pay or not to pay subsidies, when any man has the power to determine the amount by States or by counties, he has control of the economic life of the farmer who is dependent upon subsidies for the major part of his income.

Such power should be exercised only by the Congress. Congress can determine the policy and leave it to Judge Jones to administer and carry out the program. At present he practically makes and administers the dairy program of the Nation.

This is too much power for any one man or any two men.

I am not opposed to the payment of subsidies, but this Congress took a position when it passed the amendment to the Price Control Act of 1944 known as the Taft amendment, and said, "There shall be no more subsidy payments without approval by the Congress." Now you pass this bill, and as far as the Commodity Credit Corporation is concerned you emasculate the Taft amendment and make it inapplicable. You thus have marched up the hill seeking to regain some power under the Taft amendment, which is the law, and now you march down the hill, and you say the Taft amendment shall not apply to the payment of subsidies under the Commodity Credit organization. I suppose when the Reconstruction Finance Corporation legislation comes before the Congress you will march down the hill again as far as the R. F. C. is concerned.

I should like to see the Congress assert its responsibility. I should like to see the War Food Administration present a subsidy program, or the Defense Supplies Corporation present its subsidy program to the proper committee of the Congress, and let the Congress determine what the program is to be. Then you will be acting as Members of Congress. Then let the Congress appropriate the money and have it spent under the direction of the Congress out of appropriated funds, rather than to utilize this artificial vehicle of borrowing power through the creation of these so-called Government corporations. To carry out the program in this manner would not destroy the present program but would merely put it more directly under the control of the Congress.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GALLAGHER. This subsidy is for the benefit of the consumers. Does the gentleman want the consumer always to be the goat? He pays all tariffs and other subsidies.

Mr. KEEFE. Evidently my distinguished friend from Minnesota was not listening or did not hear what I said. I stated very definitely that we cannot abandon the subsidy program. It has to be kept up. We have been forced into that position.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I should like to ask the gentleman the question he propounded to the gentleman from Illinois. Is the gentleman from Wisconsin for this bill?

Mr. KEEFE. After it has been suitably and properly amended, I am, because there is no other legislation before this House. But if I had my way, and if I were a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I would submit a bill to this House immediately that would impose upon a Federal agency to be controlled and governed by the Congress of the United States the same power and authority that is now exercised by a private corporation of Delaware as an agency of the United States. I would bring the employees of that agency by that act subject to the Classification Act, subject to the civil service and all the other laws that are applicable to Government or private agencies. By that act we would not destroy the subject of subsidies, but we would compel that agency to come here to the Congress and submit its program. We would be Congressmen instead of just mice delegating our authority to some Federal agency, because we have neither the time nor the inclination nor the desire to perform what I conceive to be our full function.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman stated to the House that in the operation of this program the Commodity Credit Corporation had suffered a loss to the extent of $1,200,000,000. I wonder if the gentleman will be kind enough to tell the House and the country what part of that money was received by the dairy industry of America.

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot tell what part of it was received by the dairy industry as a whole. As to milk, it amounted to $344,620,127 in the calendar year 1944. Under the present program as it has been announced, it will be in the neighborhood of $568,000,000 for 1945. That part of it is a direct and absolute loss to the Treasury of the United States. But you have made it necessary by your actions in other directions to compel us to accept that situation.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not a fact that the dairy industry received more than half of the total amount of the loss?

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman speaking only about the Commodity Credit Corporation now? Or is the gentleman talking about subsidies generally?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. Is it not a fact that the dairy industry received the benefit in excess of $700,000,000 of the money?

Mr. KEEFE. Is the gentleman talking about subsidies generally, subsidies paid by the Defense Supplies Corporation as well as the Commodity Credit Corporation, or is he only talking about that portion of the subsidies which is paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. COOLEY. I am talking of the amount that the gentleman used himself, $1,200,000, whether it was paid through the Commodity Credit Corporation or the Defense Supplies Corporation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have made a study of all the subsidy programs and I might suggest my figures show approximately 80 percent of all subsidies that have been paid during the war program have gone to the livestock and dairying and animal industries.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not think there is any use in speculating about it because I have the exact figures to a penny as to the amount that has been paid up to December 31 for every subsidy program that is now in force.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. In addition to the various programs of interest to the dairy industries, to which the gentleman has made reference, there was a program in connection with hay for dairy cattle.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. The program in connection with hay for dairy cattle was also a dairy program. The total amounts of the subsidies to the dairy industry are over $700,000,000, all a total loss to the Government.

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentlemen want to get into the question of subsidies, I do not want to be personal or partisan or sectional, but if you were to see the subsidies that have been paid, not in the form of direct subsidies but in the form of the purchase of commodities, critical and otherwise, that have been sold at a loss by these agencies of the Government in connection with the war effort, it will make the subsidies to the milk producers look puny and insignificant indeed. And it is a subsidy, nevertheless, that has been paid out of the Treasury of the United States. I am trying to get the entire list of subsidies paid, and then you will make the comparison, if you will.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in order to save the gentleman from Wisconsin some trouble on the matter of these figures, may I suggest that if the Members who questioned him on the amount of losses will turn to page 39 of the hearings they will get a break-down of the losses and potential losses.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. May I point out to the gentleman these subsidies are in fact consumers' subsidies to hold down the prices and that the farmers are just reimbursed for the amount consumers are allowed throughout the country.

Mr. KEEFE. Why, the gentleman is absolutely correct. These are, in effect, intended to increase production and, in that respect, they are incentive subsidies. They are in reality consumer subsidies although they are designated merely as subsidies, because they have kept the prices down to the consumer of dairy products.

There is one phase of this situation that I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is correct about. Somebody asked, I think it was the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], did he not know that this Commodity Credit Corporation had made a profit of some $90,000,000. Yes; they have in their market arrangements and market rigging transactions, made a profit, but on the recapitulation, when they got through with their subsidy program they came here just a week or two ago and asked for $256,000,000 to make up the impairment in their capital, and I am advised the loss next year will be at least $1,200,000,000. I think the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] touched briefly upon one phase of this situation that should demand the attention of this Congress. I am advised, on reliable authority, that if an examination of the records of certain brokerage houses in this city, as well as in the city of Chicago were made, they will find large purchases of grain on the grain markets at prices below parity, and within 3 or 4 days those same records will show an announcement was made by Commodity Credit Corporation that it is going to support those prices at parity, and the same records will show that those people on the inside, who bought the grain at a cheap price, with knowledge that that announcement was to be made, cashed in within 3 days and made themselves millions and millions of dollars. Those facts should be gone into.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MAY. If the statement of the gentleman is correct, and I do not doubt it, that means that the Commodity Credit Corporation is engaging in the protection of a lot of speculators.

Mr. KEEFE. You can take it as you want to. In certain instances there is no question but what they are, and certainly under their power, they can go the complete limit in that regard. It does not do to say that Judge Jones does not have notice of it, or that the head of Commodity Credit Corporation does not have notice of it. The fact is that it has been accomplished, and I think the Congress of the United States ought to know who those people on the inside are, who have been able to make millions out of these market-rigging transactions, when they have inside notice as to what the Commodity Credit Corporation intends to announce.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am very much interested in what the gentleman has to say and I trust he will give the House the complete advantage of the information he has by putting the names of those parties and brokerage companies in the RECORD so that the committees of the Congress can have an opportunity to look into it.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the distinguished gentleman I am advised that the F. B. I. is now investigating that very activity, along with a lot of other activities of this outfit in its operations, which may be described in greater detail before we get through, by the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. May I inquire of the gentleman how he became advised of the investigation by the F. B. I.? From what source did he receive his information?

Mr. KEEFE. Well, I got the information from sources I consider to be extremely reliable.

Mr. TARVER. But the gentleman is unwilling to answer.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman from Georgia is chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Committee on Appropriations. Does the gentleman deny what I have said?

Mr. TARVER. I am asking the gentleman how he received such information.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, the gentleman declines to answer. Does the gentleman deny the truth of what I have said?

Mr. TARVER. May I say to him that he could not have received it from any source which could honorably have disclosed it to him?

Mr. KEEFE. Well what the gentleman means to say is this: He is chairman of the Agricultural Subcommittee on Appropriations. In his judgment no other member of the Committee on Appropriations is supposed to know anything that goes on in his subcommittee. It has been my experience that once in a while other members of the committee find out a little about what is going on. May I say to the gentleman that recently the Appropriations Committee refused to make an appropriation of $256,000,000 to provide for an impairment of the capital of the C. C. C. In the report of the committee the Congress and the public were advised that action on this item was postponed until the investigation being made of C. C. C. was completed. Is this a dishonorable source of information? All I can say to the gentleman is this: I have found out some facts, not gossip, and I have investigated them and at the proper time you will get them with both barrels.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the charter of incorporation of the Commodity Credit Corporation and the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

EXECUTIVE ORDER No. 6340

AUTHORIZING THE FORMATION OF A CORPORATION TO BE KNOWN AS THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Whereas the Congress of the United States has declared that an acute emergency exists by reason of widespread distress and unemployment, disorganization of industry, and the impairment of the agricultural assets supporting the national credit structure, all of which affects the national public interest and welfare; and

Whereas in order to meet the said emergency and to provide the relief necessary to protect the general welfare of the people, the Congress of the United States has enacted the following acts:

1. The Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933.
2. The National Industrial Recovery Act, approved June 16, 1933.
3. The Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933, approved May 12, 1933.
4. Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, approved January 22, 1932.
5. The Federal Farm Loan Act, approved July 17, 1916.
6. The Farm Credit Act of 1933, approved June 16, 1933.
7. The Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, approved July 21, 1932.

And whereas in order, effectively and efficiently, to carry out the provisions of said acts it is expedient and necessary that a corporation be organized with such powers and functions as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of said acts.

Now, therefore, under and by virtue of the authority vested in me by the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933, it is hereby ordered that an agency, to wit, a corporation, under the laws of Delaware, be created, said corporation to be named the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The governing body of said corporation shall consist of a board of directors composed of eight members, and the following persons, who have been invited and have given their consent to serve, shall be elected by the incorporators as such directors:

Henry A. Wallace, Secretary of Agriculture.

George N. Peek, Administrator, Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

Oscar Johnston, Director of Finance, Agricultural Adjustment Administration.

Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Governor, Farm Credit Administration.

Herman Oliphant, general counsel, Farm Credit Administration.

Lynn P. Talley, assistant to the directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

E. B. Schwulst, special assistant to the directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Stanley Reed, general counsel of the directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The office and principal place of business of said corporation outside the State of Delaware shall be in the city of Washington, and branch offices may be established in such places within the United States as the said board of directors shall select and determine by and with the consent of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration.

The capital stock of such corporation shall consist of 30,000 shares of the par value of $100 each.

The Secretary of Agriculture and the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration are hereby authorized and directed to cause said corporation to be formed, with such articles or certificate of incorporation, and bylaws, which they shall deem requisite and necessary to define the methods by which said corporation shall conduct its business.

The Secretary of Agriculture and the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration are authorized and directed to subscribe for all of said capital stock for the use and benefit of the United States. There is hereby set aside for the purpose of subscribing to the capital stock in said corporation the sum of $3,000,000 out of the appropriation of $100,000,000 authorized by section 220 of the National Industrial Recovery Act and made by the Fourth Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1933, approved June 16, 1933 (Public No. 77, 73d Cong.).

It is hereby further ordered that any outstanding stock standing in the name of the United States shall be voted by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration jointly, or by such person or persons as the said Secretary of Agriculture and the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration shall appoint as their joint agent or agents for that purpose. The board of directors (other than the initial board of directors elected by the incorporators) shall be elected, and any vacancies thereon shall be filled by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration jointly, subject to the approval of the President of the United States.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 16, 1933.*

PURPOSES OF ACTS REFERRED TO IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 6340

Purposes of the Federal Emergency Relief Act, approved May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 55): To establish more effective cooperation between the Federal Government and the several States and Territories and the District of Columbia in furnishing relief to the needy and distressed people within the District of Columbia and such States and Territories.

Purposes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, approved January 22, 1932 (47 Stat. 5): To aid in the financing of agriculture, commerce, and industry, including the facilitating of the exportation of agricultural and other products, and to make loans to aid in the temporary financing of railroads and railways engaged in interstate commerce, railroads and railways in process of construction, and to receivers of such railroads and railways.

Purposes of the Federal Farm Loan Act, approved July 17, 1916 (39 Stat. 360): To provide a system of credit for persons desiring to borrow money on farm mortgage security.

Purposes of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, approved June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 257): To establish a system of credit for farmers under which they could obtain loans for general agricultural purposes, and for the purpose of making home alterations, repairs, and improvements.

Purposes of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, approved July 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 709): To furnish relief and work relief to needy and distressed people and to relieve the hardship resulting from unemployment; to establish a system of credit for the purpose of providing housing for families of low income and for reconstruction of slum areas; to provide aid in carrying out the construction, replacement, or improvement of bridges, tunnels, docks, viaducts, etc.; to assist in the financing of sales of surplus agricultural products in the markets of foreign countries, and to assist in financing the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities and of livestock produced in the United States.

National Industrial Recovery Act, approved June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 195):

SECTION 1. A national emergency productive of widespread unemployment and disorganization of industry, which burdens interstate and foreign commerce, affects the public welfare, and undermines the standards of living of the American people, is hereby declared to exist. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to remove obstructions to the free flow of interstate and foreign commerce which tend to diminish the amount thereof; and to provide for the general welfare by promoting the organization of industry for the purpose of cooperative action among trade groups, to induce and maintain united action of labor and management under adequate governmental sanctions and supervision, to eliminate unfair competitive practices, to promote the fullest possible utilization of the present productive capacity of industries, to avoid undue restriction of production (except as may be temporarily required), to increase the consumption of industrial and agricultural products by increasing purchasing power, to reduce and relieve unemployment, to improve standards of labor, and otherwise to rehabilitate industry and to conserve natural resources.

Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 31):

That the present acute economic emergency being in part the consequence of a severe and increasing disparity between the prices of agricultural and other commodities, which disparity has largely destroyed the purchasing power of farmers for industrial products, has broken down the orderly exchange of commodities, and has seriously impaired the agricultural assets supporting the national credit structure, it is hereby declared that these conditions in the basic industry of agriculture have affected transactions in agricultural commodities with a national public interest, have burdened and obstructed the normal currents of commerce in such commodities, and render imperative the immediate enactment of title I of this act.

SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress—

(1) To establish and maintain such balance between the production and consumption of agricultural commodities, and such marketing conditions therefor, as will reestablish prices to farmers at a level that will give agricultural commodities a purchasing power with respect to articles that farmers buy, equivalent to the purchasing power of agricultural commodities in the base period. The base period in the case of all agricultural commodities except tobacco shall be the pre-war period, August 1909–July 1914. In the case of tobacco, the base period shall be the post-war period, August 1919–July 1929.

(2) To approach such equality of purchasing power by gradual correction of the present inequalities therein at as rapid a rate as is deemed feasible in view of the current consumptive demand in domestic and foreign markets.

(3) To protect the consumers' interest by readjusting farm production at such level as will not increase the percentage of the consumers' retail expenditures for agricultural commodities, or products derived therefrom, which is returned to the farmer, above the percentage which was returned to the farmer in the pre-war period, August 1909–July 1914.

CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AS AMENDED APRIL 28, 1936

First. The name of this Corporation is Commodity Credit Corporation.

Second. The principal office of this Corporation in the State of Delaware is to be located at No. 100 West Tenth Street in the city of Wilmington, county of New Castle, and until otherwise designated by the board of directors its resident agent shall be the Corporation Trust Company, No. 100 West Tenth Street, Wilmington, Del.

Third. The objects and purposes for which and for any of which this Corporation is formed are to do any or all of the things herein set forth to the same extent as natural persons might or could do, viz:

(a) To do any and all things which may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of

the following acts of Congress of the United States of America, and any amendment or amendments heretofore or hereafter made thereto:

1. The Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933.

2. The National Industrial Recovery Act, approved June 16, 1933.

3. The Federal Emergency Relief Act of 1933, approved May 12, 1933.

4. Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, approved January 22, 1932.

5. The Federal Farm Loan Act, approved July 17, 1916.

6. The Farm Credit Act of 1933 approved June 16, 1933.

7. The Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932 approved July 21, 1932.

(b) To purchase, or otherwise acquire, to hold, or otherwise to deal in, to sell or otherwise dispose of any and all agricultural and/or other commodities, and/or products thereof and to loan and/or borrow money upon the same.

(c) To enter into and to encourage farmers, producers, and others to enter into marketing plans and agreements and to cooperate in any plan which provides for reduction in the acreage or reduction in the production for market of agricultural commodities.

(d) To engage in any activity in connection with or involving the production, carrying, shipping, storing, exporting, warehousing, handling, preparing, manufacturing, processing, and marketing of agricultural and/or other commodities and/or products thereof.

To borrow money and to draw, make, accept, endorse, warrant, guarantee, transfer, assign, execute, and issue bonds, debentures, mortgages, promissory notes, bills of exchange, warrants, and all kinds of obligations and nonnegotiable, negotiable, or transferable instruments without limit as to amount, and for the security of any of its obligations to convey, transfer, assign, deliver, mortgage, and/or pledge all or any part of its property or assets upon such terms and conditions as the board of directors shall authorize.

(e) Without limiting the generality of the foregoing, to borrow money for the purpose of (1) purchasing, storing, handling, and/or processing agricultural and/or other commodities and/or products thereof or any surplus of the same and (2) disposing of or removing the same through orderly marketing in the United States and/or elsewhere.

(f) To loan money, to buy, discount, sell, rediscount, or otherwise deal in notes, warehouse receipts, pledges, bills of lading, freight receipts, trust receipts, open accounts, mortgages, and other similar evidences of debt, or to loan money and to take notes, warehouse receipts, pledges, bills of lading, freight receipts, trust receipts, open accounts, mortgages, and other evidences of debt as collateral security therefor.

(g) To take and hold for any of its purposes, by bequest, devise, gift, purchase, lease, or otherwise, either absolutely or in trust, any property, real or personal, in the District of Columbia, any of the States, Territories, or colonies of the United States and in foreign countries, without limitation as to amount or value; to own, operate, manage, lease, mortgage, pledge, sell, assign, and transfer or otherwise dispose of and exercise all privileges of ownership over such property and to invest and reinvest any principal, and deal with and expend its income and principal within or without the State of Delaware in such manner as in the judgment of its directors will best promote its objects and purposes.

(h) To guarantee, purchase, hold, sell, assign, transfer, mortgage, pledge, or otherwise dispose of shares of the capital stock of, or any bonds, securities, or evidences of indebtedness created by any other corporation or corporations organized under the laws of this State or any other State, country, nation, or government, and while the owner thereof to exercise all the rights, powers, and privileges of ownership, including the right to vote thereon.

(i) To enter into, make, perform, and carry out contracts of every kind and description for any lawful purpose without limit as to amount, with any person, firm, association, corporation, municipality, county, State, body politic, territory, or government or colony or dependency thereof.

(j) To sell, deal in, store, handle, process, transport, deliver and/or accept delivery of agricultural and/or other commodities and/or products thereof and/or to make contracts for the purchase or sale of the same by itself or through subsidiaries or other agencies or to act as agent, broker, shipper, consignee, consignor, trustee, or factor with respect thereto and as such agent, broker, shipper, consignee, consignor, trustee, or factor, to buy, sell, deal in, hypothecate, pledge, mortgage, store, handle, process, transport, manufacture, deliver, or accept delivery of the aforesaid commodities and/or products thereof and/or to make contracts for the purchase or sale of the same on behalf of the owner thereof, and to fix and collect and deduct all charges for such services.

(k) To acquire by purchase, lease, or construction, or in any other manner, storage and other physical facilities for the handling, carrying, processing, manufacturing, storing, preparing for market, and marketing agricultural and/or other commodities, and/or products thereof.

(l) To have one or more offices, to carry on all or any of its operations and business and without restriction or limit as to amount, in any of the States, districts, Territories, or colonies of the United States, and in any and all foreign countries.

(m) In general, to have and to exercise all the powers and privileges conferred by the General Corporation Laws of Delaware upon corporations, and to do all and everything necessary, suitable, and proper for the accomplishment of any of the purposes or for the attainment of any of the objects or for the furtherance of any of the powers herein set forth, either alone or in association with other corporations, firms, agencies, or individuals, and to do every other act or thing lawfully incident or appurtenant to or growing out of or connected with any of the aforesaid objects, purposes, and/or powers.

The objects and purposes specified in the foregoing clauses shall, except as otherwise expressed, be in no wise limited or restricted by reference to or inference from the terms of any other clause in this certificate of incorporation, but the objects and purposes specified in each of the foregoing clauses shall be regarded as independent objects and purposes.

The foregoing clauses shall be construed both as purposes and powers, but no recitation, expression, or declaration of specific or specified powers or purposes herein enumerated shall be deemed to be exclusive, and it is hereby expressly declared that this Corporation shall have and exercise all powers conferred on it by law.

Fourth. The total number of shares which this Corporation shall have authority to issue is 100, without par value, of which 3 shares shall be designated at first series shares and shall be issued in lieu of the 30,000 shares heretofore issued and outstanding on April 28, 1936, and 97 shares designated as second series shares. Each share, of whatever series, shall be equal in all respects with every other share, whether of the same or a different series, except that in the event of liquidation or dissolution of the Corporation, whether voluntary or otherwise, the holders of second series shares shall be entitled to receive the full amount paid to the Corporation for such second series shares before any distribution is made to the holders of first series shares, who, thereafter, shall receive the full amount paid for the stock in lieu of which such first series shares are issued. Any assets remaining after all holders of the first series shares and second series shares have received the sum hereinbefore provided shall be distributed to the holders of shares of each series, share and share alike.

Fifth. The minimum amount of capital with which the Corporation will commence business is $1,000.

Sixth. The names and places of residence of each of the original incorporators are as follows:

Henry A. Wallace, Washington, D. C.
Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Washington, D. C.
Oscar Johnston, Washington, D. C.

Seventh. This Corporation is to have perpetual existence.

Eighth. The private property of the stockholders shall not be subject to the payment of corporate duties to any extent whatever.

Ninth. The business of this Corporation shall be managed by its board of directors except as in this certificate of incorporation or in the bylaws otherwise provided. The numbers of directors of the Corporation shall be as specified in the bylaws and such number may from time to time be increased or decreased in such manner as may be prescribed in the bylaws, provided the number of directors of the Corporation shall not be less than three. Directors need not be officers or stockholders of this Corporation. The election of directors need not be by ballot unless the bylaws so provide. In furtherance and not in limitation of the powers conferred by statute, the board of directors is expressly authorized—

To make and alter the bylaws of the Corporation.

To authorize and cause to be executed mortgages and liens upon the real and personal property of the Corporation.

To set apart out of any of the funds of the Corporation available for dividends a reserve or reserves for any proper purpose or to abolish any such reserve in the manner in which it was created.

By resolution or resolutions, passed by a majority of the whole board, to designate one or more committees, each committee to consist of two or more of the directors of the Corporation, which, to the extent provided in said resolution or resolutions or in the bylaws of the Corporation, shall have and may exercise the powers of the board of directors in the management of the business and affairs of the Corporation, and may have power to authorize the seal of the Corporation to be affixed to all papers which may require it. Such committee or committees shall have such name or names as may be stated in the bylaws of the Corporation or as may be determined from time to time by resolution adopted by the board of directors.

When and as authorized by the affirmative vote of the holders of a majority of the stock issued and outstanding having voting power given at a stockholders' meeting duly called for that purpose, or when authorized by the written consent of the holders of a majority of the voting stock issued and outstanding, the board of directors shall have power and authority to sell, lease, or exchange all of the property and assets of the Corporation, including its goodwill and its corporate franchises, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration, which may be in whole or in part shares of stock in, and/or other securities of, any other corporation or corporations, as its board of directors shall deem expedient and for the best interest of the Corporation.

The Corporation may in its bylaws confer powers upon its board of directors in addition to the foregoing, and in addition to the powers and authorities expressly conferred upon it by statute.

Tenth. Stockholders shall not have the preemptive right to subscribe to any new or additional issue of stock of this Corporation or any part thereof.

Eleventh. Both stockholders and directors shall have power, if the bylaws so provide, to hold their meetings, and to have one or more offices within or without the State of Delaware, and to keep the books of this Corporation (subject to the provisions of the statutes) outside of the State of Delaware at such places as may be from time to time designated by the board of directors.

Twelfth. The Corporation reserves the right to amend, alter, change, or repeal any provision contained in this certificate of incorporation, in the manner now or hereafter prescribed by statute, and all rights conferred upon stockholders herein are granted subject to this reservation.

CONTINUING THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AS AN AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SPENCE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2023) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

EXPLANATION BY SECTIONS

Section 1 of the bill amends the act of March 8, 1938, so as to provide for an increase from $3,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 in the amount of the bonds, notes, debentures, and other similar obligations which the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to issue and have outstanding at any one time. This increase in the borrowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation is considered essential in order fully to assure that the Corporation will have ample funds with which to carry out its operations. In this connection it may be noted that in the event of a partial cessation of hostilities in the present war and a curtailment of the purchase of agricultural commodities and foods for the armed forces and lend-lease, a considerable expansion will be required in the operations of the Corporation for the purpose of supporting the prices of agricultural commodities in fulfillment of commitments to farmers.

Section 2 of the bill would substitute for the existing provisions of section 381 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, which contains restrictions on the sale of cotton, new provisions which would, for a period of not less than 2 years after the present war, prohibit, with specified exceptions, the sale of any farm commodity owned or controlled by the Corporation at less than the parity or comparable price therefor. Such prohibition against sales of farm commodities below the parity or comparable price therefor and the exceptions thereto are, for the most part, now included as provisos to the Commodity Credit Corporation item (for administrative expense) in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945, and, for a number of years, have been so included in the annual appropriation act for the Department of Agriculture. Section 2 of the bill, if enacted, would render unnecessary the reenactment of these provisions each year in the annual appropriation act. Under the existing provisions of section 381 (c) the Commodity Credit Corporation may not sell cotton held on behalf of the United States unless the proceeds are sufficient to reimburse the United States for all amounts paid out with respect to such cotton, or sell more than 300,000 bales of cotton in any calendar month, or more than 1,500,000 bales in any calendar year. As amended by section 2 of the bill section 381 (c) would, until the end of the 2 year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date on which hostilities in the present war have terminated, prohibit the Commodity Credit Corporation from selling any farm commodity owned or controlled by it at less than the parity or comparable price therefor, except that this restriction would not apply to the following sales:

(1) Sales for new or byproduct uses. (2) Sales of peanuts for the extraction of oil. (3) Sales for export. (4) Sales for seed or feed, but no wheat or corn may be sold for feed at less than the parity price for corn at the time such sale is made, and, in making regional adjustments in the sale price of corn or wheat for feed the minimum price need not be higher in any area than the United States average parity price for corn. (5) Sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or of nonbasic perishable commodities where there is danger of loss or waste through spoilage. (6) Sales for the purpose of establishing claims against persons who have committed fraud, misrepresentation, or other wrongful acts with respect to the commodity. The method that is now used for the purposes of Commodity Credit Corporation loans for determining the parity price or its equivalent for ⅞-inch Middling cotton at the average location used in fixing the base loan rate for cotton must also be used for determining the parity for ⅞-inch Middling cotton at such average location for the purposes of the prohibition against sales of cotton below parity.

The exceptions to the prohibition against sales of farm commodities below the parity or comparable price contained in section 2 of the bill which are not contained in or differ in any substantial respect from the exceptions contained in the Commodity Credit Corporation item in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945, are those relating to sales of nonbasic perishable commodities, sales to establish claims against persons who have committed wrongful acts with respect to the commodity being sold, and sales for export. The appropriation item permits the sale of perishable fruits and vegetables if there is danger of deterioration or accumulation of stocks. Section 2 of the bill, as noted above, permits the sale of any nonbasic perishable commodity if there is danger of waste or loss through spoilage. The appropriation item does not contain an exception permitting sales of commodities in order to establish claims against persons who have committed wrongful acts with respect to the commodity. Also the appropriation item does not contain an exception for sales for export. The exception of sales for export is consistent with section 21 (c) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, which authorizes Commodity Credit Corporation to make sales for export at competitive world prices.

Section 3 of the bill makes it clear that the last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944 (which, if the Price Control Act is further extended in its present form, would prohibit the payment directly or indirectly of subsidies after June 30, 1945), is not to apply to operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation designed to support prices or obtain production of agricultural commodities. Section 3 also permits the continued absorption of abnormal costs in connection with the transportation of agricultural commodities and foods which have resulted from the war emergency. Section 3 of the bill would permit the continuation after June 30, 1945, of all operations of the character now being carried out by Commodity Credit Corporation, involving the making of subsidy payments or the absorption of losses through the purchase of commodities for resale at a loss, such as the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to fruits for processing, vegetables for processing, dry edible beans, soybeans, peanuts, cheddar cheese, fluid milk, shortening, peanut butter, feed wheat, and the dairy production payment program. These operations are all designed to support the price or obtain the production of agricultural commodities, the making of the subsidy payment or the absorption of the loss being for the purpose of supporting prices and obtaining production without an increase in price ceilings established pursuant to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended and supplemented.

Section 4 of the bill provides for a revision in the date and basis of the annual appraisal of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation by the Treasury. The appraisal date is changed from March 31 of each year to June 30, the close of the fiscal year, thus putting the appraisal on a fiscal-year basis. The section also changes the basis of the valuation of the assets to the cost or average market price during the last month of the fiscal year, whichever is lower. The present basis is the average market price for a 12-month period or cost, including not more than 1 year of carrying charges, whichever is lower. The revision made by section 4 will simplify the appraisal, give a more accurate indication of the financial condition of the Corporation as of the date of the appraisal, and facilitate the use in making the appraisal of the report of the Comptroller General's audit, which is on a fiscal-year basis. Section 4 is substantially the same as section 1 of H. R. 3477, which was passed by both Houses of the Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, but which was, because of its provisions relating to subsidies, vetoed by the President.

Section 5 of the bill extends the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the Government through June 30, 1947, or such earlier date as may be fixed by the President by Executive order.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 2a of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as introduced, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

Section 4 of the act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. III, 713a–4):

"SEC. 4. With the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to issue and have outstanding at any one time, bonds, notes, debentures, and other similar obligations in an aggregate amount not exceeding [$3,000,000,000] *$5,000,000,000*. Such obligations shall be in such forms and denominations, shall have such maturities, shall bear such rates of interest, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and shall be issued in such manner and sold at such prices as may be prescribed by the Commodity Credit Corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such obligations shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed both as to interest and principal by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face thereof, and such obligations shall be lawful investments and may be accepted as security for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds the investment or deposit of which shall be under the authority or control of the United States or any officer or officers thereof. In the event that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be unable to pay upon demand, when due, the principal of, or interest on, such obligations, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holder the amount thereof which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and

thereupon to the extent of the amount so paid the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holders of such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, is authorized to purchase any obligations of the Commodity Credit Corporation issued hereunder, and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of the Commodity Credit Corporation's obligations hereunder. The Secretary of the Treasury may at any time sell any of the obligations of the Commodity Credit Corporation acquired by him under this section. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of the Treasury of the obligation of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States. No such obligations shall be issued in excess of the assets of the Commodity Credit Corporation, including the assets to be obtained from the proceeds of such obligations, but a failure to comply with this provision shall not invalidate the obligations or the guaranty of the same. The Commodity Credit Corporation shall have power to purchase such obligations in the open market at any time and at any price."

Section 381 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1940 ed., 1381 (c)):

"SEC. 381. * * *

"(c) [The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized on behalf of the United States to sell any cotton of the 1937 crop so acquired by it, but no such cotton or any other cotton held on behalf of the United States shall be sold unless the proceeds of such sale are at least sufficient to reimburse the United States for all amounts (including any price-adjustment payment) paid out by any of its agencies with respect to the cotton so sold. After July 31, 1939, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not sell more than three hundred thousand bales of cotton in any calendar month, or more than one million five hundred thousand bales in any calendar year. The proceeds derived from the sale of any such cotton shall be used for the purpose of discharging the obligations assumed by the Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to such cotton, and any amounts not expended for such purpose shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.] *During the continuance of the present war and until the expiration of the two-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it at less than the parity or comparable price therefor, except that the foregoing restriction shall not apply to (1) sales for new or byproduct uses; (2) sales of peanuts for the extraction of oils; (3) sales for export; (4) sales for seed or feed: Provided, That no wheat or corn shall be sold for feed at less than parity price for corn at the time such sale is made: And provided further, That in making regional adjustments in the sale price of corn or wheat for feed, the minimum price need not be higher in any area than the United States average parity price for corn; (5) sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or of nonbasic perishable commodities where there is danger of loss or waste through spoilage; or (6) sales for the purpose of establishing claims against persons who have committed fraud, misrepresentation, or other wrongful acts with respect to the commodity. The method that is now used for the purposes of Commodity Credit Corporation loans for determining the parity price or its equivalent for ⅞-inch Middling cotton at the average location used in fixing the base loan rate for cotton shall also be used for determining the parity price for ⅞-inch Middling cotton at such average location for the purposes of this section."*

Section 1 of the act of March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. III, 713a-1):

"SECTION 1. [As of the 31st of March in each year and as soon as possible thereafter, beginning with March 31, 1938, an appraisal of all the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of determining the net worth of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury. The value of assets shall, insofar as possible, be determined on the basis of the cost, including not more than one year of carrying charges, of such assets of the Corporation, or the average market prices of such assets for a period of twelve months ending with March 31 of each year, whichever is less, and a report of any such appraisal shall be submitted to the President as soon as possible after it has been made.] *As of the 30th of June in each year and as soon as possible thereafter, beginning with June 30, 1945, an appraisal of all of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of determining the net worth of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury. The value of assets shall be determined on the basis of the cost of such assets to the Commodity Credit Corporation, or, insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower, and a report of any such appraisal shall be submitted to the President as soon as possible after it has been made.* In the event that any such appraisal shall establish that the net worth of the Commodity Credit Corporation is less than $100,000,000, the Secretary of the Treasury, on behalf of the United States, shall restore the amount of such capital impairment by a contribution to the Commodity Credit Corporation in the amount of such impairment. To enable the Secretary of the Treasury to make such payment to the Commodity Credit Corporation, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually, commencing with the fiscal year 1938, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an amount equal to any capital impairment found to exist by virtue of any appraisal as provided herein."

Section 7 (a) of the act of January 31, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. III, 713, as amended by the act of February 28, 1944, Public Law 240, 78th Cong., 2d sess.):

"SEC. 7. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Commodity Credit Corporation, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware as an agency of the United States pursuant to the Executive order of the President of October 16, 1933, shall continue, until the close of business on [June 30, 1945] *June 30, 1937*, or such earlier date as may be fixed by the President by Executive order, to be an agency of the United States. During the continuance of such agency, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration are authorized and directed to continue, for the use and benefit of the United States, the present investment in the capital stock of Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Corporation is hereby authorized to use all its assets, including capital and net earnings therefrom, and all moneys which have been or may hereafter be allocated to or borrowed by it, in the exercise of its functions as such agency, including the making of loans on agricultural commodities: *Provided, however,* That the Corporation shall at all times maintain complete and accurate books of account and shall determine the procedures to be followed in the transaction of the corporate business."

For the information of the House there is set forth below the text of the last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944 (Public Law 383, 78th Cong., 2d sess.), which is referred to in section 3 of the bill:

"After June 30, 1945, neither the Price Administrator nor the Reconstruction Finance Corporation nor any other Government corporation shall make any subsidy payments, or buy any commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss and thereby subsidizing directly or indirectly the sale of commodities, unless the money required for such subsidies, or sale at a loss, has been appropriated by Congress for such purpose; and appropriations for such purpose are hereby authorized to be made."

CONTINUING THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, with Mr. THOMASON, of Texas, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 1 hour and 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] also is recognized for 1 hour and 30 minutes.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will be given fair consideration and that its merits will not be discredited or the issue clouded by rumors. I know nothing about the truth or falsity of the charges that have been intimated and rumored. It is my conception of the duty of the Committee on Banking and Currency that they should not follow rumors up every alley in the town. If charges have been made against some of the employees of this Corporation, I am not here to defend them. If there has been dereliction of duty, they should be punished. I believe that Marvin Jones, who served with us for many years, a man of high character and fine purpose, will see that those guilty of any irregularities or derelictions of duty will be punished. In an organization of the magnitude of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which has handled $3,000,000,000, it would not be unusual that some employee might be found who would betray his trust. To punish just such people, criminal laws have been enacted. They fall upon few men, but they fall heavily upon those who incur their penalties. I hope that if there has been any crim-

inality the guilty ones will be punished. But that certainly should not be the basis upon which we will meet this issue.

What has the Commodity Credit Corporation accomplished for the farmer? You can talk about the farmer wanting a fair price in the market place—and I represent farmers. Of course he wants that, and I would like to see him get it. But when the Commodity Credit Corporation was organized in 1933 there was no fair price in the market place. Cotton was selling at 4 or 5 cents a pound, tobacco was selling at about the same, corn was selling at about 15 cents, and wheat was less than 30 cents. There was no fair price in the market place then, and the farmers of our land eagerly sought the help that was given by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

What did this Corporation want to give the farmer?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. Not right now.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I just want to correct a statement the gentleman made. I would like to have him put in the RECORD those prices that he just quoted for the years he stated them and see how near they are to the facts.

Mr. SPENCE. They are pretty near to the facts. I got them from the agricultural authorities.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman do that?

Mr. SPENCE. I will put in the actual figures. Does the gentleman mean to say the farmer was getting a fair price in 1933?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No; and I do not think he was in 1939, either.

Mr. SPENCE. In some instances corn was being burned for fuel. They did not take it to the market at all. I know of men who took their tobacco to the market and hauled it back because there was no sale for it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman can put those prices of 1939 beside them, and there will not be so much difference.

Mr. SPENCE. In the light of what it has done for the farmer, I think this Corporation should be held in affectionate regard by every man who is in that business in America.

I have heard constant complaint that the Commodity Credit Corporation is a private corporation organized under the laws of the State of Delaware. The Government of the United States has no power to organize a corporation. Corporations are organized under the laws of States. They have attributes of the person and of citizenship, and if a citizen of one State sues a corporation of another State, it may plead diversity of citizenship and have the cause removed to the United States court. It also has a situs for taxation.

This is not a private corporation. This Corporation was organized for the very purpose it is doing business now. It derives its being from the State of Delaware. The State of Delaware granted to it powers that it can exercise if made an agency of the United States Government. The United States Government has made it the agency to carry out those great powers for public purpose for which it was organized. How could the United States have operated in a more efficient manner than to create an artificial person given the powers that it desired to have exercised, and then make it the agency of the United States Government?

The gentleman from Wisconsin says that appropriations ought to be made for each expenditure. Well, this is not a matter of first impression. This is a matter that has been ratified and approved by the Congress seven consecutive times. I have heard Members rise on the floor and say that it had doubtful authority. It was originally created by Executive order of the President under powers granted him in those deplorable times of 1933, and since that time the Congress has seven times given it the power to act as the agent of the United States Government. Again we are asked to do that.

It is inconceivable to me that you are going to destroy this agency. Eventually I would like to see some of these agencies abandoned when they are no longer needed, but we came from a depression into war. There have been emergent times ever since this Corporation was created. Now you who denounce it and say all manner of evil things about it do not dare destroy it. If you do destroy it you destroy the agriculture of your people and of your own State. You know that.

You know that is a fact, and you do not dare destroy it, and when the tumult and the shouting dies you are going to vote for this bill to continue this Corporation.

Some gentlemen attempt to make an issue between the farmer and the city man. I represent them both. I do not think there should be any diverse views between them. I want to see the farmer obtain a fair price and a good price for his product. I want to see it maintained. It means production. Without a fair price for the farmers which means production, America could not be prosperous and could not survive. I want to see the laborer in the city obtain a high wage because without it he cannot pay a fair price for the product of the farmer. All of this attempt to incite antagonism between the employee in industry and the farmer is not based upon fact and is not based upon reason. Did you ever see any spotty prosperity in America? Did you ever see the farmer prosperous and the industrial worker without a decent wage, or the employee in industry prosperous and the farmer poor? Of course you have not. It is an impossibility. The farming industry is the great basic industry of the country. It must be preserved, and this is a means to preserve it. And in supporting farm prices and making the farmer prosperous you are helping bring prosperity to every city in the land and to our country.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-eight Members have answered to their names; not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 34]

Adams	Gerlach	McGregor
Barden	Goodwin	McKenzie
Beall	Granahan	Morgan
Bell	Gross	Murphy
Bender	Gwinn, N. Y.	Norton
Bennet, N. Y.	Hagen	O'Toole
Boren	Hall,	Patterson
Buckley	Edwin Arthur	Ploeser
Burgin	Halleck	Powell
Camp	Hand	Rains
Celler	Hart	Ramey
Chapman	Hedrick	Robertson,
Cheif	Heidinger	N. Dak.
Clark	Hobbs	Robinson, Utah
Clason	Holmes, Mass.	Rogers, Mass.
Combs	Howell	Sheridan
Corbett	Johnson,	Sikes
Courtney	Luther A.	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson	Johnson,	Slaughter
Dickstein	Lyndon B.	Starkey
Dirksen	Kelly, Ill.	Stewart
Domengeaux	Kinzer	Traynor
Durham	Kunkel	Wadsworth
Eaton	LaFollette	Weiss
Ellsworth	Lane	West
Elsaesser	Lea	White
Elston	LeCompte	Wood
Gamble	Luce	Woodrum, Va.
Gardner	McGlinchey	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COOPER) having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2023, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 346 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, perhaps the thing that the American people most expect from their Government is competency and integrity. When we are considering a bill of this type and the bill is for an agency which has not been operated with that idea in mind, it is time to take stock and to consider whether or not we should pass the bill at all, pending a cleaning up.

Those are some of the things that I believe the Commodity Credit Corporation should answer and explain before it is given any more authority or any more money.

First. I believe that there have been leaks from the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Chicago grain speculators. The whole trend of the price situation on the market and the whole development of that sort of thing bears this out. I quote from the Chicago Journal of Commerce for September 26, 1944, page 13, column 8. I am reading prices for September 25. Before the grain market opened, the Government announced that it would buy on May 1, 1945, at full parity price all wheat under loan that remained unredeemed. This came as a surprise and caused a 5-cent advance in

wheat that day. From September 9 to September 25, there was a steady rise in the price of wheat, and the spread reached a height of 14⅓ cents per bushel. There was a very large volume of purchases and those purchases were dropped on the market immediately after the announcement on the 25th at a very large profit. Is it possible to infer anything other than that there had been a leak in the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation and that those with the tip-off made an enormous profit in getting rid of the wheat at the high prices?

It is the same old manipulation story, and it is the kind of a story that reminds one of the old wild speculation on tip-offs in the grain market.

Second. The egg market situation indicates a leakage and a profit on the part of speculators. In the first few days of 1944, the War Food Administration made an announcement that it was going to sell 200 carloads of eggs. Four days prior to that the egg market dropped 2 cents per dozen on the Mercantile Exchange and after the announcement, it dropped another 2 cents. I understand that there was a large short sale of eggs just before the announcement and immediately before that the sellers picked up their eggs at a very substantial profit.

Third. There have been and are enormous inventories of merchandise which do not check with the figures that the Washington office has. Enormous quantities of lard have been bought and sold for a very low price because of spoilage.

Fourth. Why did they buy 450 tons of raisins from a particular New York broker in 1943—raisins were rationed from March 1 to March 29, 1943, and from September 5, 1943, to March 5, 1944? These raisins were not bought to take care of military camps. They must have been bought for some purpose not in the public interest.

Fifth. I understand that they have quantities of grain on hand in Chicago. Perhaps the most interesting item is the rye picture where I understand all the grain in Chicago belongs to one concern. That concern has made a huge profit out of the rise in the price of rye from about 70 cents to a present price of $1.16. The price rise, with the exception of a very small part has been taken advantage of by the speculators and not by the farmers. An artificial requirement has been made that there should be a 10 percent amount of rye going into industrial alcohol, when there is a shortage of rye for the bread of the workingman and a surplus of wheat. No farmer-owned rye can now come into Chicago because of the regulations of the War Food Administration and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Sixth. A charge has been made that 20,000,000 pounds of lard were allowed to spoil in Cincinnati about a week ago and instead of having it renovated and turned over to the bakers and other producers of food who could use it for that purpose, it was sold for soap and now we are faced with a situation where the lard is again rationed and it is impossible to buy it.

Before the Commodity Credit Corporation bill is extended, there should be an immediate, high-powered investigation of this organization and its methods of management. We who are here in Congress should insist upon integrity in the operations of the Government.

For instance, I understand from the newspapers that there was 20,000,000 pounds of lard stored in warehouses in Cincinnati in late 1943. I further understand that the lard in those warehouses mildewed and spoiled. Instead of protecting the consuming public and our food supply, that outfit, in place of having the lard renovated and turned over to manufacturing bakers and that sort of thing, sold the lard for a song.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. I have asked for the statistics of the spoilage of perishable commodities from the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is two and one-half hundredths percent, which is lower than in the ordinary trade circles. I will get that official statement from Judge Jones. The gentleman has served with Judge Jones and knows the character of man Judge Jones is, I am sure.

Mr. TABER. I want Judge Jones to get into this thing, and I want an investigating committee of this House to get into it to the bottom. I shall insist upon it if it is within my power. When you find that the records here in Washington and when you know that the records here in Washington do not gibe with the records in the field, you cannot tell what the spoilage has been. Where in that list of spoilage in the records here in Washington will you find the record of last year's potato crop? I can give you the detail of it.

Mr. SPENCE. Would the gentleman rather believe idle rumors or statistics of the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. TABER. I would rather believe the records in the field in the warehouses than the records in Washington, when the records in Washington do not gibe. That is the picture with which you have to contend. You might just as well face it honestly as try to hide. The sooner the House of Representatives faces the music and cleans up this picture, the better off the House of Representatives and the Commodity Credit Corporation will be.

Mr. SPENCE. May I ask the gentleman if he thinks the Committee on Banking and Currency is attempting to hide any of these things?

Mr. TABER. I have not made any such statement.

Mr. SPENCE. Does he think the officials in charge of the Commodity Credit Corporation are attempting to hide it? Does the gentleman charge that Judge Jones is attempting to hide it?

Mr. TABER. I do not think Judge Jones is aware of the picture that is under him. I do not think he has been until quite recently. I think he has had reason to be quite recently.

Mr. SPENCE. Does the gentleman believe some man on the street can get a better picture of it than Judge Jones, who is charged with the management of it?

Mr. TABER. No; but I understand and I know what I am saying.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is the gentleman from New York who now has the floor at liberty to say whether or not the 20,000,000 pounds of lard alleged to have spoiled were stored in proximity to the Procter & Gamble soap factory in Cincinnati?

Mr. TABER. That is the understanding I had.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If that is substantially the fact, I am not concerned with whether the spoilage is one-tenth or one one-hundredth percent. What I am interested in as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency and one who has always supported the Commodity Credit Corporation—one who has on two occasions, recently, specifically warned them against such bucketshop operations as here charged today—I do not want to go along any further with the Commodity Credit Corporation until we have more information on the supposed-to-be confidential report that is being passed around, more or less, and which was referred to by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. I join with the gentleman from New York in demanding a clean-up of this whole matter.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Not at this time.

Mr. TARVER. I referred to no confidential report.

Mr. TABER. I am not referring to nor am I basing my statement on any confidential report. I am basing what I say on facts that I have investigated.

Let me give you another illustration. We do not have to stick to soap, we do not have to stick to lard, although we all know what a distressing situation America is in today with reference to lard. I call your attention to potatoes. You all know of the distressing situation we are in with reference to potatoes. Those of you who keep house find it almost impossible to go to the store and buy anything of that kind. Last year in one particular place in Winchester, Va., 100 cars of approximately 400,000 sacks were spoiled.

At Berryville Va., 50 percent of that amount was spoiled. In Philadelphia and West Virginia areas, the dose was repeated. Up in my own territory, the dose was repeated. So that upwards of a thousand carloads of potatoes have been spoiled. The result of that mismanagement and carelessness is that we are shy on potatoes. There you are.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLEVENGER. In my district last year, may I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] hundreds of cars of potatoes were shipped in from Maine. Seven tons of them were converted into a ton of cow feed that sold for about $15 per ton, after the labor was added. Those would probably not be called spoiled potatoes, but you know how difficult it was to get potatoes during the preceding months when this was done.

If, to the $60 a ton that the Government guaranteed for those potatoes, there is added the cost of transporting and the cost of converting the potatoes into cow feed, God knows what it costs.

Mr. TABER. That is the kind of thing that disturbs one. You know, when you get that picture, these percentage figures cannot be the figures we have to count on.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman tell us what the effect has been of the heavy snow in our country which has kept our freight cars and refrigerator cars on the sidetracks and prevented them from moving and the effect of the shortage of labor which has prevented them from getting the ice out of the refrigerator cars? Will the gentleman tell this body what effect this has had on the potato situation?

Mr. TABER. It may have had some effect. On the other hand, the big effect has been the impossible kind of management, and dealing with people without experience, and bureaucrats, instead of the people who know the business. Now, there is the situation in the chicken business on the Eastern Shore in Maryland. You got into a situation where an enormous quantity of chickens, which were valuable for food at this time, exceedingly valuable, were spoiled.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield further for an observation?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I have taken it upon myself to take this matter up with the Association of Railroads in our country and also with the War Food Administration. They have pointed out, and I am surely in a position to give the gentleman information if he wants it, which will conclusively prove to him that the trouble concerning the inability of our people to get potatoes, which he mentioned today, has been due to the fact that these freight cars are not available; and due to the terrible snows in certain sections of our country, they have been tied up and kept from moving; and also because of the fact that they cannot get the ice out of hundreds and thousands of these cars which are now standing on the sidetracks.

Mr. TABER. I think I understand that situation. The results have been caused by filling up the warehouses in places where they raise the potatoes that are dug in the late fall and which should go into the warehouse, with spring potatoes, and the spring potatoes spoiled. That is where your trouble is.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. The illustration which the gentleman from Missouri has given has nothing to do with the illustration of the gentleman from New York, because the situation with reference to the railroads has only existed in the last 2 or 3 months. I can give the gentleman an illustration. Last year, there was an instance where 1,000 carloads of potatoes were moved from the Carolinas up into New York to make starch out of them. Two or three weeks after that, a thousand carloads of potatoes were taken from Maine and New Jersey and moved down to New Orleans to make starch out of them—and the railroads moved them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to another item. Why did they buy 450 tons of raisins from a particular New York broker in 1943? Raisins were rationed from March 1 to March 29, 1943, and from September 5, 1943, to March 5, 1944.

Those raisins were not all to take care of military camps. They must have been bought for some reason not in the public interest.

I understand they have quantities of grain on hand in Chicago. Perhaps the most interesting item is the rye picture, where I understand all the grain in Chicago belongs to one holder. That concern has made a huge profit out of the rise in the price of rye from 70 cents to the present $1.16. The price rise, with the exception of a very small part, has been taken advantage of by speculators and not the farmers. An artificial requirement has been made that there should be 10 percent rye going into industrial alcohol where there is a shortage of rye for the bread of the workmen, and a surplus of wheat. No farmer-owned rye can come into Chicago because of the regulations of the War Food Administration and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, this whole picture makes me think that the Congress must get on the job. I think the situation here transcends Teapot Dome. I think it demands a most thorough investigation, and just as far as I am able to do it I intend to push for a complete and thorough investigation of the operation and management of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Prior to January 5, did the Commodity Credit Corporation handle these transactions directly or through an agent known as the Office of Distribution?

Mr. TABER. I would not be able to answer that.

Mr. COOLEY. I understand that prior to January 5 the Commodity Credit Corporation or the War Food Administration had an agency known as the Office of Distribution and that these transactions to which the gentleman has referred occurred during the period prior to January 5, and that on January 5, the Office of Distribution was merged with the Commodity Credit Corporation and thereupon became a part of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. TABER. I do not know anything about that proposition. If an agency did this business and did the things I have referred to, the principal, according to the education I received, is responsible for the acts of his agent. He should not have an agent that he cannot trust.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows whether or not since January 5, 1945, Mr. Jones has terminated the employment of personnel who may have been responsible for these transactions?

Mr. TABER. Well, I hope that has been done.

Mr. COOLEY. I understand it has been done, and it is to be regretted that the gentleman did not go a little further in his investigation.

Mr. TABER. I would like to be sure it has been done.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I suggest that with reference to the change made on January 5, prior to that time all of these men and agents were under the War Food Administration.

Mr. TABER. They were under Judge Jones.

Mr. COOLEY. But on January 5, was not the Office of Distribution merged with the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What difference does it make?

Mr. COOLEY. Well, you are denouncing the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. TABER. But they were all under the same set-up and under the same management, because the War Food Administration is charged with the management of Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I heard yesterday by wire from California that there are 226,000 workingmen in the shipbuilding and aircraft industries who are unable to obtain meat in that area because the Army has taken 60 percent of the meat supply of the packers in that area.

There is an investigation on now to find out how much of the 60 percent that is stored in warehouses for the Army is spoiling. The answer I got was that if this meat were not made available they would have to resort to fish, which would bring fish into the meat-market area, because the meat that is now in warehouses is spoiling. It does not make any difference what agencies have been handling it, these charges are made, and they should be investigated and reviewed.

Mr. TABER. This whole thing should be cleared up; and that is the position I feel obliged to take with reference to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to insert a table I have prepared with reference to the prices of grain.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to by the gentleman from New York follows:)

Chicago Board of Trade, Sept. 9 to 25, inclusive, 1944

	Sept. 9	Monday, Sept. 11	Tuesday, Sept. 12	Wednesday, Sept. 13	Thursday, Sept. 14	Friday, Sept. 15	Saturday, Sept. 16
Wheat:							
September	$1.54–$1.55	$1.55–$1.56	$1.55–$1.56	$1.56–$1.57	$1.56–$1.57	$1.57–$1.57	$1.57–$1.58
December	1.49– 1.50	1.50– 1.52	1.51– 1.52	1.52– 1.53	1.51– 1.53	1.51– 1.52	1.52– 1.52
May	1.46– 1.46	1.46– 1.49	1.48– 1.49	1.49– 1.50	1.48– 1.50	1.47– 1.49	1.47– 1.48
July	1.36– 1.38	1.37– 1.40	1.38– 1.40	1.39– 1.41	1.39– 1.40	1.38– 1.40	1.38– 1.39
Oats:							
September	.55– .57	.56– .57	.56– .58	.57– .58	.58– .60	.61– .62	.62– .64
December	.55– .56	.56– .57	.56– .58	.57– .58	.57– .58	.57– .59	.58– .59
May	.54– .54	.54– .57	.55– .57	.56– .57	.56– .57	.56– .58	.57– .58
July	----------	.53– .54	.54– .56	.54– .56	.54– .55	.54– .55	.55– .55
Rye:							
September	.93– .94	.94– .97	.95– .96	.94– .96	.93– .94	.92– .94	.93– .96
December	.93– .95	.95– .97	.95– .97	.95– .96	.94– .95	.93– .95	.94– .96
May	.94– .96	.96– .98	.96– .97	.96– .97	.94– .96	.94– .96	.95– .96
July	.90– .92	.92– .94	.91– .93	.91– .92	.90– .91	.90– .91	.91– .92
Barley:							
September	1.02– 1.02	1.02– 1.04	1.00– 1.03	.99– 1.02	.99– 1.00	1.00– 1.02	1.02– 1.03
December	.96– .97	.96– .98	.94– .96	.94– .96	.93– .95	.94– .95	.95– .96
May	.91– .92	.91– .93	.89– .91	.88– .91	.87– .89	.88– .89	.89– .91
Cotton:							
December	21.35–21.48	21.20–21.28	21.36–21.46	21.32–21.45	21.24–21.36	21.28–21.38	21.30–21.38
May	21.16–21.26	20.63–20.79	20.89–20.99	20.84–20.97	20.80–20.91	20.84–20.96	20.92–21.02
Corn:							
December	----------	----------	----------	----------	1.07– 1.09	1.07– 1.08	1.07– 1.08
May	----------	----------	----------	----------	1.05– 1.07	1.05– 1.06	1.05– 1.06
July	----------	----------	----------	----------	1.04– 1.06	1.04– 1.05	1.03– 1.04

	Monday, Sept. 18	Tuesday, Sept. 19	Wednesday, Sept. 20	Thursday, Sept. 21	Friday, Sept. 22	Saturday, Sept. 23	Monday Sept. 25
Wheat:							
September	$1.57–$1.59	$1.59–$1.59	$1.59 $1.59	$1.59–$1.59	$1.58–$1.59	----------	----------
December	1.52– 1.54	1.54– 1.55	1.54– 1.55	1.54– 1.55	1.55– 1.55	$1.55–$1.56	$1.60 –$1.61
May	1.48– 1.50	1.50– 1.51	1.50– 1.51	1.50– 1.51	1.50– 1.52	1.52– 1.53	1.57– 1.58
July	1.39– 1.41	1.41– 1.43	1.41– 1.42	1.41– 1.42	1.41– 1.43	1.43– 1.45	1.49– 1.50
Oats:							
September	.63– .65	.64– .66	.62– .64	.61– .64	.58– .63	----------	----------
December	.59– .60	.59– .60	.58– .59	.57– .58	.57– .58	.58– .59	.61– .64
May	.58– .58	.58– .59	.57– .58	.56– .57	.56– .57	.56– .58	.59– .62
July	.55– .56	.55– .56	.54– .55	.53– .54	.53– .54	.54– .55	.57– .60
Rye:							
September	.95– .97	.95– .97	.94– .96	.95– .96	.95– .97	----------	----------
December	.95– .97	.96– .98	.96– .97	.96– .97	.96– .98	.98– 1.00	1.03– 1.05
May	.96– .97	.96– .98	.96– .97	.96– .97	.96– .98	.98– 1.00	1.03– 1.05
July	.92– .93	.91– .93	.92– .93	.91– .93	.92– .93	.93– .95	.98– 1.00
Barley:							
September	----------	----------	----------	----------	1.03– 1.05	----------	----------
December	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	.97– 1.00	1.03– 1.04
May	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	.92– .94	.97– .98
Cotton:							
December	21.35–21.44	21.38–21.50	21.37–21.46	21.28–21.36	21.26–21.35	21.31–21.41	21.92–22.26
May	21.02–21.10	21.10–21.19	21.02–21.15	20.88–21.01	20.87–20.99	20.98–21.17	21.80–22.14
Corn:							
December	1.07– 1.09	1.08– 1.09	1.09– 1.10	1.09– 1.10	1.09– 1.10	1.10– 1.11	1.12– 1.16
May	1.05– 1.06	1.06– 1.07	1.06– 1.07	1.05– 1.06	1.06– 1.07	1.07– 1.08	1.11– 1.13
July	1.04– 1.05	1.04– 1.05	1.04– 1.05	1.03– 1.04	1.03– 1.05	1.04– 1.05	1.07– 1.10

Sept. 25, 1944, before the opening of the grain market, the Government announced that it would buy on next May 1, at full parity price, all wheat under loan that remained unredeemed. This came as a surprise and caused a 5-cent advance that day. (See Chicago Journal of Commerce of Sept. 26, 1944, p. 13, column 8.)

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I have been requested by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] chairman of the committee handling the pending bill, to take this time for the purpose of making certain statements to you which I think may be of interest.

I have been disturbed, as I am sure most of you have, by recent rumors and newspaper items concerning alleged investigations said to be in progress under the direction of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations of which I serve as chairman, and with reference to the actions or alleged actions of that subcommittee in having requested an investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of several alleged criminal acts on the part of some of the employees of the War Food Administration. I desire to read to you, in order that you may fully understand the circumstances which restrict me in submitting this statement to you at this time, one paragraph of the rules of the Appropriations Committee governing the carrying on of investigations under the jurisdiction of one of its subcommittees:

PAR. 4. Any information obtained by the staff shall be reported to the chairman of the subcommittee requesting such study and examination, and to the chairman and ranking minority member of the full committee—

That is to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and to myself—

shall be made available to the members of the subcommittee concerned, and shall not be released for publication until the subcommittee so determines. Any hearings or investigations which may be desired aside from the regular hearings of appropriation items when approved by the full committee shall be conducted by the subcommittee having jurisdiction of the matter.

You will therefore readily observe from the reading of this rule of the Appropriations Committee that I am not in position even to say to you that any investigation is being conducted by the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, or to detail to you any evidence that may have been developed thereby or any actions which may be within the contemplation of the subcommittee in that connection.

I may point out to you, however, that if any investigation of the War Food Administration is going on under the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, that investigation was not started by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. The investigation was not started by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and such disclosures as may have come about as a result thereof are not due to the activities of either of these gentlemen but are due to such action in the premises as may have been taken by the subcommittee of which I happen to be chairman. It is the duty of our subcommittee to investigate and to use the investigatory staff which you have provided for the Appropriations Committee to investigate any allegations of inefficiency or administrative irregularities or of culpable conduct of any kind or character on the part of any officials or employees of the Department of Agriculture or of the War Food Administration; and while I cannot state to you anything with regard to any investigation that is pending, I ask you to assume that your Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations will fully discharge its duties in those particulars.

I ask you now whether you desire to take action upon the basis of rumors and publications made in newspapers con-

taining some news of alleged malfeasance or nonfeasance or culpability on the part of officials and employees of the War Food Administration, or do you prefer to await the action which I think under the rules of the committee and the action heretofore taken by the House in providing funds for an investigatory staff for the committee you may reasonably apprehend will be taken in ascertaining what the facts may be with reference to these charges and what evidence there can be submitted or may be procured in substantiation thereof. I think you may rest assured that upon the completion of any investigation made by or under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee the House of Representatives will be fully apprised of all of the pertinent facts which may be developed. Any investigation which may have been had and not completed is confidential in nature until all the evidence is disclosed to the subcommittee first, thereafter to the full committee, and if by its direction and if thought appropriate to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say regarding the pending bill that my statement is not intended to apply particularly as an argument either for or against the pending bill. I think you ought to pass on the question whether you desire to furnish the Commodity Credit Corporation proper facilities with which to carry on the programs which have been carried on and are now under way under its jurisdiction without regard to whether or not there may have been negligence, even criminality, on the part of some few of the thousands of employes of the War Food Administration and its subsidiaries. There may be some rascals in the War Food Administration. To be frank with you, from all of the reports I have heard, I am inclined to think there are. I know that the War Food Administration has recently, and you can judge whether it is upon the basis of evidence for which our subcommittee is responsible or not, removed at least two men with criminal records from among its personnel. I think that your observance of the work of the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations has been such as to justify the hope on my part that you will believe that our subcommittee will do its full duty in connection with any subject matter coming within its jurisdiction and that you will not feel that you should either pass or fail to pass legislation here pending increasing the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation because you do or do not believe any charges which are still in the status of rumors so far as you are concerned with regard to alleged misconduct on the part of the officials of the Commodity Credit Corporation. In other words, the work of that Corporation should either be authorized to continue or it should be discontinued. If you people from the dairy States who are getting most of this money do not want these subsidies, vote against the bill, vote it down. It is of far more interest to you than to my section of the country. If you want it, then provide for it. If there are rascals in charge of any parts of the organization that is carrying out the law, let us get rid of the rascals, but let us not burn down the house in order to destroy a few rats.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman addressing the House is the chairman of the subcommittee of which I am a member. I have the utmost faith in his integrity and in his ability regarding the manner in which certain things are to be accomplished. May I ask the gentleman if it would not better serve the purposes of the House today if we recommit this bill temporarily until the House itself becomes better aware of the situation that existed?

Mr. TARVER. I cannot conceive of any possible good to be done by the recommittal of this bill. In my own personal judgment—and, of course, I am speaking only for myself—there is no matter pending before the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations, and there has not been a disclosure of any facts before that subcommittee in connection with any investigation which may be conducted—and I am not saying whether it is conducting an investigation or not—that would in any way warrant the House in recommitting this bill to the committee.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the members will keep in mind in the consideration of this bill that the matters referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the matter referred to by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] were not before the Committee on Banking and Currency when the bill was before the committee. Some few days after it was reported out, certain of these matters came to our attention. When the deficiency bill was before the House last week we asked some questions as to why the Committee on Appropriations did not appropriate something like $256,000,000 to the Treasury to reimburse the Treasury for the money it had advanced to the Commodity Credit Corporation for capital impairment.

The law, if you will recall, provides that the Treasury must maintain the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation at $100,000,000, and if there are impairments in that capital, then the Treasury pays sufficient moneys to the Commodity Credit Corporation to keep its capital at $100,000,000. That is a very simple way of putting it. Then the Bureau of the Budget recommends to the Committee on Appropriations that certain sums be provided to repay the impairment. You will notice, if you read the report on the deficiency bill last week, that the reasons given for the failure of the Committee on Appropriations to act on the $256,000,000, which was necessary to restore Commodity Credit Corporation capital, were that certain investigations were being made, and that they did not think they should appropriate this $256,000,000 until their investigations were completed.

I am not so sure but what the Committee on Appropriations owes a duty to the House and to the Committee of the Whole House in the consideration of this bill to make known to this Committee as many of the facts as have been established. I understand from very good and unimpeachable authority that there are facts which do not have to be investigated any further. They are known. If there are facts that are known and it develops from those facts, if they are presented to us, that the Committee on Banking and Currency should give further consideration to this bill, I do not think there is any question but that the bill should go back to the Committee on Banking and Currency if for no other reason than to reconcile the known facts in whatever report has been given to the Committee on Appropriations with certain provisions of the bill which we have reported out.

Of course, until we do know those facts, the doubt and uncertainty with respect to the advisability of passing this legislation exist and will continue to exist until they are removed.

I do not believe there are very many Members in the House who want to defeat the Commodity Credit Corporation. There may be a few who think we should start here in a retrenchment program against subsidies, against collectivism, back perhaps to democratic processes of doing business; but they are willing to postpone any efforts along that line to some later date. But we should not have to postpone any attempts for too long a period.

This bill, as it was reported out of committee in opposition to certain of the minority, continues the Commodity Credit Corporation for 2 years.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I did not understand there was anybody against voting this bill out of committee.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Possibly I misspoke myself, I should have said that a strong minority of the committee was against the continuance of the Commodity Credit Corporation for 2 years, but unfortunately those of us who believe that were not in the majority. We did think we would get perhaps more sympathetic consideration for our position in that respect here in the Committee of the Whole than we got in the Committee on Banking and Currency, under the theory, of course, that they always have the votes in the Committee on Banking and Currency to defeat any amendments, I sometimes think, whether they are good or bad.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman means by impairment of capital the word "loss"?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. Any loss that accrues to the Commodity Credit Corporation. If their capital is impaired, if they have to use any of their capital for any losses which they have sustained, the Treasury repays them. If their losses have been $10,000,000, then the Treasury

gives them $10,000,000 and we appropriate $10,000,000 to the Treasury to reimburse it. In the deficiency bill those accumulations in the aggregate I believe are $256,000,000.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I heard very recently that the Commodity Credit Corporation had made $20,000,000 on a particular transaction, whether it had to do with sugar or wheat I do not now recall. Was that $20,000,000 covered back into the Federal Treasury, or is it a case of "heads I win, tails you lose"?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I suppose it will be chargeable against capital. I am not too familiar with the bookkeeping operations or how profits are handled. But if they had not made that $20,000,000 in profits we might assume that we would have been asked to appropriate $276,000,000 instead of $256,000,000. That is as close as I can get to it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I have received a telegram from the Milk Producers of Michigan protesting the payment of $568,000,000 as a subsidy on milk. What reason could you give the House or the country why milk producers should not have a fair price for their product in the market place without the payment of a subsidy?

Mr. WOLCOTT. We fought that quite extensively on three different occasions within the last 2 years. But, if I may proceed, I will come back to that later.

I want to get to this point of the 2-year extension and stay on it long enough to explain that there are many of us who believe we should take a look at all of these agencies at least once a year, preferably, perhaps, every 6 months, because our economic position in world affairs is going to change more rapidly during the next 1 or 2 years than it ever has before.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

If Germany were to collapse tomorrow, we might decide to set up new standards and perhaps new machinery for the management and control of all these agencies. Therefore, I think, in all fairness, and in the proper consideration of our duty to the people of this Nation, we should have a look at all of these agencies at least once a year.

The other body reduced the amount from $2,000,000,000 to $1,500,000,000. They seek in the bill to raise this sum from $3,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000. The other body raised it from $3,000,000,000 to $4,500,000,000. I, personally, cannot see any necessity for raising it any more than $1,000,000,000. Even then, I think we are giving them about $150,000,000 to play with. They actually need probably $800,000,000 to $850,000,000 to pay all of the subsidies, including the so-called consumer subsidies. If we give them a billion dollars, we are apparently giving them $150,000,000 merely as an assurance that they are not going to run short of funds and thereby impair their capital by that amount. The less we give them, the more control we have over their functions. I think, in view of what has gone on here today, it has proven, if anything, that we should keep our eyes on this Corporation. We should be able to check it occasionally. I think 1 year is a short enough time to elapse before we check it again.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. If, under existing laws, the Treasury Department would make up any deficiency in the capital, what difference does it make how much you appropriate for them? If they lose $50,000,000, the Treasury makes it up.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Well, you have got to make it up to the Treasury.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. It is made up in the deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. So long as Congress keeps appropriating money to make up the deficiency to provide for the impairment of capital, of course it does not make any difference whether you give the Corporation any money. So, even if they are on the border here, it does not impair their legal operations in any respect because we will always give them enough to restore their capital.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. THOM. Is it not true that unless the capital impaired is restored, there will be no showing in the Budget of the losses sustained by the Corporation? If the method suggested by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] is pursued, the losses would be covered into the public debt and would not be reflected in the Budget, and that is the reason the showing of impairment of capital is necessary.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I assume we are going to restore this capital as long as there are losses.

So there will be two amendments offered, one to reduce the extension period from 2 years to 1 year. There will be another amendment offered to substitute $4,000,000,000 for $5,000,000,000, which leads me to another problem which confronts us that is perhaps less easy to understand unless we get some background for it. It will be recalled that many of us have never taken the position that Commodity Credit Corporation, or any other agency of the Government, ever had the legal right to pay subsidies for the purpose of maintaining maximum prices established under the price control acts. To shorten that a little and to refresh your memories it was never contended that the Commodity Credit Corporation, or any other agency of the Government, had any legal authority whatsoever to pay consumer subsidies, but we fought, and I hope valiantly, at least three fights in that respect until now, especially the milk producers of the Nation, being assured that the administration is not going to give them a fair price, a price which will give them a fair return, have come to rely upon these subsidies. So we have to give some consideration to them.

Last year when we passed the Price Control Act the so-called Taft amendment provided that no subsidies would be paid after June 30, 1945, unless and until the Congress made specific appropriations for definite purposes. In this bill the other body, in its wisdom, lifted the lid a little and said that the provisions of the so-called Taft amendment, if it may be referred to as such, should not apply to operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation except—and then it went onto make exceptions aggregating, as I recall, in the neighborhood of $900,000,000.

When the matter was presented to the Committee on Banking and Currency that matter was given some consideration. Because an amendment was not offered section 3 of the bill, as it is reported out, provides that the Taft amendment shall not apply to the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation designed to support prices or obtain production of agricultural commodities, or to absorb abnormal costs in connection with the transportation of agricultural commodities and foods. There has been prepared an amendment which is along the lines of the amendment which was adopted in the other body which will be offered. As I understand, it is satisfactory to the milk producers, it is satisfactory to the Commodity Credit Corporation, it is satisfactory to the O. P. A. Senator TAFT has been consulted and I understand it is satisfactory to him. It seems satisfactory to the members of the committee who have been consulted about it. Inasmuch as the committee, unfortunately, because of other matters, could not be called back to consider this amendment, it does not appear in the form of a committee amendment but I do not know of any opposition to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

If I may be indulged long enough I will read the amendment into the RECORD so that on Monday the Members may have it before them when the bill is read:

In lieu of section 3 it is proposed that the following language be inserted:

"SEC. 4. The last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, shall not apply to the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946: *Provided*, That the making of subsidy payments and the buying of commodities for resale at a loss, by the Commodity Credit Corporation, shall be limited as follows: Obligations for making such payments and absorbing such losses may be incurred and paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation (a) in such amounts as may be necessary (1) to complete operations with respect to 1944 and prior year crop programs and (2) to fulfill obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1945, with respect to 1945 and prior fiscal year noncrop programs; and (b) in amounts which do not involve subsidy payments or losses in excess of (1) $568,000,000 for operations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, with respect to the dairy production payment program, (2) $120,000,000 for operations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, with respect to other noncrop programs, including the feed-wheat program, and (3) $225,000,000 with respect to the 1945 crop program operations: *Provided*, That not

to exceed 10 percent of each amount specified in clauses (b) (1), (2), and (3) shall be available interchangeably for the operations described in such clauses but in no case shall the total subsidy payments and losses absorbed under any one of such clauses be increased by more than 10 percent.

"*Provided further*, That in carrying out the dairy production payment program, beginning April 1, 1945, the rate of payment per pound of butterfat delivered shall not be less than 25 percent of the national weighted average rate of payment per 100 pounds of whole milk delivered."

Mr. Chairman, I believe these three amendments should be considered before any action is finally taken on the bill. If the Congress thinks the presumptions which have been raised here are strong enough to influence further committee action, then, of course, the committee will be very glad to consider them.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. While we have not had an oportunity to consult the committee in regard to the amendment the gentleman has just read, I believe it is entirely satisfactory to the Commodity Credit Corporation and that there will be no objection to its adoption.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. In enumerating those who favor this amendment of the Taft amendment I think the gentleman should also state that the American Farm Bureau Federation has wired their approval.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I intended to include the Farm Bureau Federation; and I am reasonably certain that it has been approved by the Grange. I do not know whether it has been approved by the Farm Union or not, but as far as I am able to learn, the majority of the farm organizations, including the Farm Bureau Federation, have approved the proposed amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that the provision with respect to butterfat is drawn with the idea of securing an increase for the production of butter for the American people by equalizing the payments as between butterfat and whole milk?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I believe that if the members of the committee will read the last provision they will find that in all probability it will result in an increase in butter production if it is enacted.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Our colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] called attention to a telegram which we all received from the Milk Producers Association of Michigan protesting against the general principle of subsidies; but I call attention to the fact that the second sentence in the telegram asks us to vote for this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. As I understand it, in lieu of an increase in price to give them a fair return, they want the subsidy.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. All the dairy farmers of this country would rather have a fair price in the market place than to pay hundreds of millions of dollars out of the United States Treasury.

Mr. WOLCOTT. They have always insisted on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this bill merely carries out existing law. We have had a scrap here for the last 2 years about a certain type of subsidy. I have never been in favor of a consumer subsidy and I helped lead the fight, but we lost out because the bill was vetoed, although the proposition was carried by the Members of this Chamber by 3 to 1. We have gone along with this program since a year ago and we have made commitments to the farmers of America that we must carry out. Therefore, when this bill was introduced it was backed by the farmers and the leaders of the farmers of this land. We must carry it through and we must do that at once. We must pass this bill.

There are only two basic purposes of the Commodity Credit Corporation. One is to stabilize the price of agriculture in order that the farmer may have a fair profit. That was the original program and that was the only program until war came. When war came, it was necessary on account of a scarcity of labor to induce people to plant certain war crops and in order to do that we had to guarantee a certain price. We made those guaranties That is what the programs are that we seek by this bill to continue.

If you are going to recommit this bill you might as well kill it. Why recommit it? Because somebody has heard a rumor that some one has made an error down here in an office? Recommit it because some man somewhere is alleged to have gambled on the stock market? As long as he does not gamble with Uncle Sam's money that is his business, although I am against any type of gambling myself. Would you recommit it for those reasons? Would you recommit the bill after the farmer has bought his fertilizer, after the farmer has bought his implements to make his crop, after the farmer has engaged his labor, and, in some instances, has planted his crops? This Congress has a solemn obligation to carry out its commitments to American farmers.

It is silly to talk about recommitting this bill. It makes me sick when I hear sensible men talking about recommitting the bill just because we hear some talk about a fellow down here who made a mistake. What has the farmer got to do with that? The farmer is not to blame. You made a promise to him, you promised you would give him a support price and you must do it regardless of whether some fellow down here by buying a little lard had some of it spoil, or we lost some money on soap. If a bank makes a bad investment or an officer of a bank goes wrong we do not close the bank, for to do so would injure innocent people. As long as you are dealing with perishables, may I say to my good friend from Chicago, you will have spoilage, you will have losses, but you are on record as voting for that principle in order to get food for the armed forces and for the civilians of this country. It is too late to change and turn back. We cannot turn back because we made a solemn contract with the farmers of this country to produce, and God knows, they have made the greatest record that has ever been made in the history of this country.

Recommit for days and days, weeks and weeks. Recommit for what? It means when you recommit you are going to absolutely destroy the effort of producing the food to supply the armed forces of our country. I well remember as many of you remember the terrible economic situation of the farmers of this country in 1932; the agricultural losses, the foreclosing of farm mortgages, the loss of agricultural profit and the loss of purchasing power. Corn was bringing less than 32 cents a bushel in 1932; cotton, 6 cents a pound; wheat, less than 50 cents per bushel; and in 1932 farmers' profits were the lowest in 22 years—that is, from 1910 to 1932.

In the early twenties and prior to that time 59 percent of the cotton was exported to foreign countries. At the same time 40 percent of the wheat was exported to foreign countries. Then the exportation of wheat, cotton, and corn began to drop. What happened? The farmers of the South and the farmers of the West went down. What else happened? After that the industrial cities went down and we had chaos all over the country because the people in the cities depend upon the prosperity of the man that grows the food and grows the cotton to clothe us.

Then, at the height of the depression, in 1933, the Commodity Credit Corporation was organized. What happened? Up to 1941 we only had Commodity Credit loans on the basic commodities of this country, but under the Steagall Act we went further and added the nonbasic commodities, and directed the Secretary of Agriculture to give support prices of not less than 85 percent of parity so that the farmers could produce abundant crops—to assure production to feed our gallant soldiers on the fronts, as well as the civilians at home. Since that time and up to the present time, with the basic commodities and nonbasic commodities added together, the Government has made net profits of $23,000,000.

That is, since 1933 to the present time, on the regular support programs, the Commodity Credit Corporation has made $23,000,000. Losses in some commodities have been canceled by profits on other commodities. For example, cotton operations have resulted in total profits of approximately $93,000,000. In addition the Corporation today holds title to approximately 3,500,000 bales of cotton with a possible profit of $20 a bale, which would make $70,000,000 more in profits.

This Corporation has done a magnificent job, and I said that advisedly regardless of any unfounded rumors. It

has loaned the American farmers since 1933, $4,500,000,000. It has loaned to the cotton farmers of the country $2,000,000,000 on 30,000,000 bales of cotton. It has loaned to the wheat growers of this country $1,500,000,000 on 1,500,000,000 bushels of wheat. It has loaned to the corn growers $700,000,000 on 1,200,000,000 bushels of corn. It has loaned to the tobacco growers $28,000,000 on 200,000,000 pounds of tobacco. It has loaned on naval stores of this country approximately $45,000,000; and so on down the line of commodities. Who wants to do away with this Corporation? Who wants to postpone it? Who wants to kill the goose that laid the golden egg, just to get even with somebody who made a mistake or who speculated a little bit with their own money?

There are five sections to this bill. The fifth section deals only with extending the life of the Corporation by striking out "June 30, 1945" and inserting "June 30, 1947."

The fourth section deals with a change in the date of the appraisal of the assets of the Corporation—namely by changing the date from March 31 to June 30, the end of the fiscal year. It also changes the basis of the valuation from the cost of the commodity or the average price for the 12 preceding months, whichever is lower, to the cost or the average price for the last month of the fiscal year, whichever is lower. This will result in a more accurate estimate of the real value of the assets.

And while we are considering this appraisal section, I would remind you that we have now a Comptroller General, Mr. Lindsay Warren, who is at present engaged in auditing this Corporation pursuant to recent legislation by Congress. Who can object to this procedure? We have every safeguard around this Corporation because this recent law requires this audit of all the Corporation's transactions. If somebody has violated the law, send him to the penitentiary. If somebody has made an error, have him correct it. If he has no ability, throw him out. I would remind you that these charges of alleged irregularities do not involve employees of the Commodity Credit Corporation but of the former Office of Distribution. I would also remind you that as of January 1, 1945, these functions of the Office of Distribution were placed in the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I am confident that if there is anything to these charges of irregularity Judge Jones, Lindsay Warren, and Frank Hancock will straighten them out.

As long as the Corporation is required to buy perishable commodities, some will spoil. But this Corporation is on record, by mandate from Congress, to buy to stimulate production, so that we can get production to feed our boys in the armed forces and the civilian population of this country.

How much have we spent? How much have we lost? On what crops have we lost? What does it amount to? On January 1 of this year the losses on wartime subsidy operations, that is operations to obtain food for war purposes, were $838,000,000. They are a little more up to date. What is $838,000,000 compared with the billions and billions the Government has lost in trying to get production of implements of war?

I have heard from both sides of this aisle that it is as necessary to produce food to feed the armed forces as it is to produce the implements of war, yet the amount that has been lost in producing food is very small compared to the amount this Government has lost in producing implements of war. I imagine that when you investigate the production of implements of war, including all types of transactions, you will find that in the production of such implements mistakes have been made and that a lot of money has been lost. Why put the blame on the farmer? It is just as necessary for him to produce food as it is to produce the implements of war, financed by Government agencies such as the R. F. C. Does it make sense to say "We are willing to lose on producing implements of war but we are not going to let you lose a dime on producing food?"

Section 3 of the bill would make it clear that the antisubsidy provisions of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Act of 1944, are not to apply to operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation designed to support prices or obtain production of agricultural commodities. Section 3 also would permit the continued absorption of abnormal costs in connection with the transportation of agricultural commodities and foods. This provision is, I believe, desirable so as to remove any doubt as to the authority of the Corporation to use its funds to support prices and obtain production of agricultural commodities, and to absorb abnormal costs in connection with transportation of such commodities and foods which have resulted from the war emergency.

I am not opposed to the so-called Taft amendment in the Senate bill, S. 298, and I understand that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] expects to offer a similar amendment, different only in a few particulars. I have read this amendment and I expect to support it.

Section 2 of the bill is intended to incorporate in one act and to amend in certain respects the existing restrictions on the sale of farm commodities by Commodity Credit Corporation. At present, such restrictions are found in section 381 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and in the Commodity Credit Corporation item, for administrative expenses, in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945. As found there, they prohibit the Corporation, with certain exceptions, from selling any farm commodity owned or controlled by the Corporation below the parity or comparable price therefor, and, in addition, prohibit the sale of cotton, unless the proceeds are sufficient to reimburse the United States for all amounts paid out with respect to such cotton. They also prohibit the sale of more than 300,000 bales of cotton in any one month or more than 1,500,000 bales in any calendar year. Section 2 of the bill would remove the restriction on the number of bales of cotton that can be sold and would, with specified exceptions, establish the parity or comparable price as a single standard for determining the minimum price at which all farm commodities may be sold by the Corporation.

Turning now to the exceptions to the requirements that sales of farm commodities be made at not less than the parity or comparable price, under existing law the following sales are not subject to the minimum price restriction: First, sales for new or byproduct uses; second, sales of peanuts for the extraction of oil; third, sales for export which are authorized by section 21 (c) of the Surplus Property Act to be made at competitive world prices; fourth, sales for seed or feed, except that no wheat or corn may be sold for feed at less than the parity price for corn, and in making regional adjustments in the sale price of corn or wheat for feed the minimum price need be no higher in any area than the United States average parity price for corn; fifth, sale of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality; and, sixth, sales of perishable fruits and vegetables if there is danger of deterioration or accumulation of stocks. Section 2 of the bill would amend the last-named exception so that it would apply to any nonbasic perishable commodity where there is danger of loss or waste through spoilage. It would reenact the other exceptions and would add one new exception for sales made for the purpose of establishing claims against persons who have committed a fraud, misrepresentation, or other wrongful act with respect to the commodity.

Section 2 of the bill would also reenact the requirement that in determining the parity price of ⅞-inch Middling cotton, at the average location, Commodity Credit Corporation shall use the same method for the purposes of this section as it now uses for the purpose of fixing the base loan rate for such cotton.

Section 2 of the bill would make the prohibition against the sale of farm commodities at less than the parity or comparable price effective until at least 2 years after the end of the war. Heretofore, the prohibition has appeared in the annual appropriation acts for the Department of Agriculture, and for that reason had to be reenacted each year.

I believe that the provisions of section 381 (c) of the A. A. A. Act of 1938 should be suspended only for the period ending 2 years after the war, and, while I believe it was intended that this amendment should so provide, I am not entirely satisfied with the wording. However, since the comparable provision of the Senate bill only suspends section 381 (c) for this period, I think that suitable clarifying language can be worked out in conference.

Section 1 increases the borrowing authority of the Corporation from three billion to five billion dollars. This agency at present has outstanding approximately $700,000,000 in loans. In addition, it has an inventory of approximately $1,500,000,000. This gives total assets of approximately $2,200,000,000. Total losses as of December 31, 1944, were approximately $838,000,000, all of which resulted from operations for wartime purposes and were fully justified as costs

of the war. Why not increase the borrowing capacity? The Corporation today has 1945 production commitments of over $2,000,000,000 to produce food to feed the armed forces and the civilians of this country. This commitment may be increased by another billion dollars after VE-day, which appears to be fast approaching.

If this war ends within the next few months we may be without lend-lease to sell to, we will be without a large part of the Army to sell to, we will be without a large part of the Navy to sell to; in other words, much of the market for farm commodities will be gone. It simply means that additional funds will be needed to fulfill our commitments to support farm prices for this year's crops. Farmers have already made their crop plans for this year, and in many instances have planted their crops. It will be too late in the middle of the crop season to change farm production plans.

If the Congress refuses to make this $2,000,000,000 of borrowing power available it will fail to fulfill its contract with the farmers of the country. The result can only be chaos and bankruptcy among American farmers. Does any Member here want to see the farmers back in the condition of 1932?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, after the remarks and the charges which have been made here this afternoon, it seems to me we might be wise to do what an old English professor of mine used to say back in school some years ago when he would challenge his class every several weeks with a statement like this: "And now it is time to see where we are at in this course." I was always in some doubt about the grammar of his sentence, but when he said "where we are at in this course," we all knew what he meant. It seems to me with reference to the Commodity Credit Corporation, it might be wise for this Congress to find out where it is at. I am a new member of the committee and do not have a thorough understanding of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I do know from what discussion we had in the committee and from the evidence before us, that it is important that the Commodity Credit Corporation have an adequate amount of funds with which to cushion the V-day adjustments, and it is important they have whatever is necessary for that purpose. However, I believe if the Commodity Credit Corporation attempts to repeal the law of supply and demand for a long period, it is taking on a heretofore unbeatable opponent. The Commodity Credit Corporation is not going to change the law of supply and demand. It has worked in that direction for some years, as my experience and an exchange of correspondence with Marvin Jones indicates. In our discussion in the committee, this question came in my mind, and I made the inquiry of Mr. Jones:

What plan has the Commodity Credit Corporation formulated to insure the Congress that its inventory of basic commodities, such as cotton and wool, will not continue to increase as long as additional funds are appropriated by Congress?

Certainly, that is a question on which this House should have some understanding. It should understand what plan the Commodity Credit Corporation has or what plan this Congress has to assure the people of this country that as long as Congress continues to appropriate additional money, the commodity inventories of the Commodity Credit Corporation are not going to increase. Certainly, we cannot put money in forever. If this is a stabilizing operation, it will have to stop somewhere. There will have to be a braking mechanism somewhere. Mr. Jones answered me by telling me that neither do they have a plan nor does Congress have a plan in effect. I will put his letter in the RECORD so that everyone may look at it and study it carefully, because we are spending a lot of money in this Corporation. We should know where we are coming out. Either Congress should know or the Commodity Credit Corporation should know. Certainly, we can keep on buying, but some day there will be a limit. Certainly, it is true we are in a period of high commodity prices where the inventory commitments of the Commodity Credit Corporation should be low and their cash should be high.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. PACE. I am quite sure Mr. Jones did not indiacte to the gentleman that there were not many of us at work on such plans, and earnestly at work on such plans.

Mr. BUFFETT. No, sir; he stated specifically there is work being done on that, but the results thus far have been in the other direction as far as inventories are concerned. I make no attempt to even suggest how the problem should be handled. But the problem is before the Congress. It is a real problem.

I do want to offer one other item which I think this Committee should know about. That is that the Commodity Credit Corporation is officially operating at least one practice directly contrary to the methods and procedures set up which are fundamental to the successful operation of the pending Bretton Woods scheme.

The Bretton Woods scheme sets forth as one objective, among others "to facilitate the expansion and balanced growth of internatonal trade."

This purpose obviously requires the elimination of the dumping of goods at prices lower than the domestic prices. However, under the authorization contained in section 21 (c) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, Commodity Credit Corporation has instituted a program for the exporting of cotton at competitive world prices. At the present time the established differential between domestic prices and export prices is 4 cents per pound, it having been determined that United States prices were about 4 cents per pound above export prices of competing growths of cotton, particularly Brazilian cotton. This program has been in effect for a relatively short period of time and commercial outlets of cotton are still very limited as a result of wartime conditions and particularly the shortage of shipping.

The complete letter from Marvin Jones, to which I have referred, is as follows:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION,
February 28, 1945.

Hon. HOWARD BUFFETT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BUFFETT: This is in reply to your letter of February 8, in which you refer to the recent hearings before the House Committee on Banking and Currency and ask for our comments on two questions.

1. What plan has Commodity Credit Corporation formulated to assure the Congress that its inventory of basic commodities, such as cotton and wool, would not continue to increase as long as additional funds are appropriated by Congress?

2. Is the job we are now doing complicated by unwise legislation or is the legislation under which we operate thoroughly satisfactory to the management of Commodity Credit Corporation?

These are two very appropriate questions and we are glad to submit certain data and comments which have a bearing on these questions.

Enclosed is a table showing the loan rates, the quantity of cotton put under loan each year, and the quantity of cotton which Commodity Credit Corporation owned or controlled as of specified dates since the beginning of our cotton loan operations in 1933. It may be noted that under the 12-cent-loan program carried out in 1934 substantial quantities of cotton were acquired by the corporation. Some liquidation of these stocks occurred in 1935 when the loan rate was reduced to the 10-cent level and in 1936 when no loans were made on cotton.

In 1937, in the absence of any effective acreage-control program and with better than average growing conditions, a record crop of 19,000,000 bales of cotton was produced. Out of this crop 5,581,000 bales were put under loan and most of this cotton was taken over by the Corporation in satisfaction of these loans, even though the loan rate at that time was down to 9 cents per pound. Substantial quantities of cotton were also put under loan in 1938 and 1940 but most of this cotton was subsequently redeemed as a result of the higher loan rates and higher market prices which have been in effect since 1941.

For 1944-crop cotton Congress has directed (section 37 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944) that loans be made at 95 percent of parity and has further directed (sec. 3 of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended) that all legal steps be taken to achieve parity prices. Pursuant to this directive the Corporation is making loans on 1944-crop cotton at 95 percent of parity and is purchasing such cotton at a schedule of prices approximating parity. Through February 3, 1945, the Corporation had acquired 1,341,702 bales of cotton under its purchase program. Section 3 of the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, directs the Corporation to make loans at 92½ percent of parity on crops of cotton, subsequent to the 1944 crop, harvested during the 2-year period after the first of January immediately following the date on which the President by proclamation or the Congress by joint resolution declares that hostilities in the present war are terminated.

The Commodity Credit Corporation item in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945, prohibits the Corporation from selling cotton below the parity price with the exception of sales for new or by-product uses and sales of cotton which has substantially deteriorated in quality. Section 381 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment

Act of 1938 provides that Government cotton shall not be sold for less than the amount paid out with respect to such cotton and that Commodity Credit Corporation shall not sell more than 300,000 bales per month or more than 1,500,000 bales per year. Section 21 (c) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell or cause to be sold cotton at competitive world prices without regard to restrictions with respect to the disposal of commodities imposed upon it by any other law.

At the present time only one program is in effect involving the sale of cotton at below market prices for new or byproduct uses. This program is designed to promote the use of cotton in the manufacture of insulation. Under the program Commodity Credit Corporation is making cotton of the 1937 crop available at about 12 cents per pound, which represents the approximate cost of this cotton to the Corporation. In addition, a payment of 9 cents per pound cotton content in the insulation is being made by the Office of Marketing Services out of funds made available under section 32 of Public, No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress. During the 1944 calendar year 23,500 bales of cotton were made available under this program.

During the past years new-use programs have been carried out with respect to cotton for bale covers, binder twine, fabric for roads, rag-content paper, mats for curing concrete, side walls in roofing material, ditch and canal linings, reinforcement in roads, streets, and airport runways, protecting tree seedlings, protecting fruits and vegetables, use in fumigating tobacco plants, bags for peanuts, and covering beehives. The quantity of cotton diverted to these new uses during the period from July 1, 1936, through June 30, 1944, totaled about 200,000 bales.

While these programs have been helpful in disposing of cotton and we feel that work on new and expanded uses for cotton should be actively promoted, we do not believe that programs of this type provide an effective answer to the questions which you have propounded. Numerous studies have shown that the major factor in determining the volume of consumption of cotton in this country is the level of consumer incomes. If consumer incomes are maintained at or near present levels, we may confidently expect cotton consumption in this country to continue at a level of eight to ten million bales. If consumer income should drop substantially below present levels, domestic consumption of cotton might easily drop to the six- or seven-million-bale level which existed prior to the war.

Under the authorization contained in section 21(c) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, Commodity Credit Corporation has instituted a program for the exporting of cotton at competitive world prices. At the present time the established differential between domestic prices and export prices is 4 cents per pound, it having been determined that United States prices were about 4 cents per pound above export prices of competing growths of cotton, particularly Brazilian cotton. This program has been in effect for a relatively short period of time and commercial outlets of cotton are still very limited as a result of wartime conditions and particularly the shortage of shipping. During the period from November 15, 1944, when the program was instituted, through February 3, 1945, the quantity of cotton registered for sale under the export program was 203,000 bales.

In addition to these commercial exports, some exports are being made under the lend-lease program, particularly to the United Kingdom and France. These exports are currently running at about the level of 1,000,000 bales per year. It appears, however, that lend-lease and commercial exports during the current year may not exceed one and a half million bales. During the period from 1935 to 1939 cotton exports from this country averaged 5,589,000 bales per year. It is, of course, assumed that commercial exports will increase as more shipping becomes available but it is not certain that cotton exports will equal or exceed prewar levels since large stocks of foreign produced cotton are available and there has been a large growth in the production of synthetic fibers abroad as well as in this country. It will, however, be our purpose to promote the export of cotton and cotton goods in line with the Congressional authorization which had been given.

The authorizations to sell, at less than parity prices, cotton which has substantially deteriorated in quality does not, of course, provide a means for materially increasing consumption of cotton or reducing Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

With loan rates fixed at the levels now prescribed and minimum sales prices fixed as stated above, Commodity Credit Corporation would not be in position to assure Congress against excessive accumulations of stocks of cotton. Under such conditions assurance could be provided only by adjusting production to the level of the effective demand at the prescribed prices. In the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 Congress has provided a means for restricting the marketing of cotton and thereby provided a measure of production adjustment. That act provides for the establishment of cotton acreage allotments and limits marketing without penalty to the quantity of cotton produced on such acreage allotments.

The effectiveness of these provisions in bringing about production adjustments, however, is weakened somewhat by the provisions that have been written into the act establishing minimum acreage allotments and by the ability of farmers to increase per-acre yields on their acreage allotments. The minimum cotton acreage allotments which could be established under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 would permit a substantial increase in cotton acreage over that planted in 1944. Per-acre yields of cotton during the 5-year period ended with 1944 average 261 pounds as compared with an average of 174 pounds in the 5-year period ended with 1932, an increase of 50 percent.

The entire cotton program is being reviewed at the present time by the House Committee on Agriculture, and doubtless that committee will give consideration to the necessity of allowing greater flexibility either with respect to prices or acreage if administrative agencies are to be held responsible for accumulation of supplies.

Stocks of domestic wool are accumulating at the present time as a result of the availability of foreign wool at prices substantially below the prices at which domestic wool is being supported. The United States normally consumes substantially more wool than it produces. During the 5-year period ended with 1939, 13 percent (grease basis) of the apparel wool consumed in this country was imported. There have never been appreciable exports of domestically produced wool. At the beginning of the war, in order to assure adequate supplies of wool in the United States in the event of a substantial reduction in imports, arrangements were made for (1) the importation and stockpiling by the Defense Supplies Corporation of approximately 342,000,000 pounds of wool, and (2) the storage in this country of approximately 577,000,000 pounds of wool owned by the United Kingdom. Some of this wool has been reexported and there now remain approximately 460,000,000 pounds of such United Kingdom wool in this country.

With regard to the British-owned wool, the British Government and the United States Government, through Defense Supplies Corporation, each assumes one-half the cost of transporting this wool to the United States and the cost of storing, warehousing, and handling it. The United States assumes half these charges in consideration of its option at any time, if necessary, to utilize half of this United Kingdom wool, which, however, is not a part of the stock pile of the United States Government.

During recent months most of the wool owned by the Defense Supplies Corporation has been sold to domestic manufacturers and the Defense Supplies Corporation stock of imported wool is now down to about 85,000,000 pounds. In addition to the sales of the Defense Supplies Corporation stocks, wool is being imported through regular trade channels at the rate of about 700,000,000 pounds per year. The result is that relatively small quantities of domestically produced wool are being consumed except for Army contracts and most of the domestic wool being so consumed is under specifications of the Army that a minimum percentage of domestic wools be used.

During the past 2 years Commodity Credit Corporation has purchased at the ceiling prices established for domestic wool approximately 600,000,000 pounds of wool. Sales during the same period have totaled about 300,0000,000 pounds, and therefore stocks on hand at the present time total about 300,000,000 pounds. The preference for foreign wool by domestic mills results primarily from the fact that imported wools are available at the ceiling prices established therefor which are approximately 20 cents per pound, clean basis, or 7 cents per pound, grease basis, lower than the ceiling prices for domestic wool. In spite of the fact that domestic prices have been supported at ceiling levels, domestic production of shorn wool have been supported at ceiling levels, domestic production of shorn wool has declined during the war period. Production in 1944 was about 355,000,000 pounds, grease basis, as compared with 392,000,000 pounds in 1942, a reduction of about 9 percent.

Either a limitation on imports or the elimination of the differential in prices between domestic and foreign wool would provide assurance against excessive accumulations of wool in the hands of Commodity Credit Corporation.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

RUMORS AGAINST COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. PATMAN. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] referred to certain rumors as a scandal equal to Teapot Dome. I am very sorry indeed it was even referred to as a scandal, because nothing has been disclosed here so far to indicate a scandal. What I mean is anything that would indicate that the head of this great Corporation has been responsible for any kind of mismanagement, carelessness, graft, or corruption. As long as the head of the concern is not even charged, I do not think it even approaches any charge of being as great as Teapot Dome or any other scandal.

HON. MARVIN JONES

I do not believe any Member of this House doubts the honesty and integrity of the Honorable Marvin Jones, who is now a United States district judge, and who has agreed, by reason of the war effort, without any pay or compensation whatever except his salary as judge, to serve in the fine capacity that he is now serving as War Food Administrator.

Judge Jones does not have to take on this thankless job, but he is the right one to take it on. No man in America is better qualified for the particular job than the Honorable Marvin Jones. He served in this body something like 22 or 24 years. For 12 years he was chairman of that great Committee on Agriculture, the committee that wrote so many of the laws that are proving so beneficial and helpful to the farmers of this Nation today. We have no finer, or greater, or better American citizen in our country than Marvin Jones. I do not believe anyone questions him in the least. If anything wrong has been done, Marvin Jones will discover it and it will be corrected and the wrongdoer will be discharged. We have that assurance. We know it is true. There will not be a scandal insofar as Marvin Jones is concerned. The best evidence we have that this Corporation will continue to function in the fine and efficient manner it has functioned in the past, is because we have a man like Judge Marvin Jones at the head of it.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Of course, the gentleman will want to call attention to the fact that associated with Judge Jones, as president of the Corporation, is the equally distinguished and dependable former Member of this House, Mr. Frank Hancock.

Mr. PATMAN. That is exactly right. Everyone trusts Frank Hancock, too.

Now, we had a similar situation about this spoilage and charges of waste and corruption in France recently. It was discovered recently that many of our own soldiers in France were guilty, not only of carelessness and corruption, but downright dishonesty. They were guilty of bribery. They were guilty of stealing. They were guilty of everything wrong in the handling of property. It would be just as reasonable to say that because of those charges—and they have been proven to be true—we should absolutely discontinue sending food supplies to France for our soldiers because we found evidence of graft and corruption. Even if some of these charges should have been proven to be true, it would be no reason on earth why we should stop this great program that is in the interest of the consumers of America to keep down inflation, and also in the interest of the farmers, with whom we have a positive contract to give them certain prices, which we cannot do unless we pass this act.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman believe that Judge Marvin Jones, or Hon. Frank Hancock, both former Members of this House, would immediately dismiss any employee proven to be faithless to his trust?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. COOLEY. And has not this debate already indicated that such actions have been taken and that personnel has been terminated already.

Mr. PATMAN. I have heard that discussed here. I know nothing about the charges.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], made the statement that some faithless employees with criminal records had been discharged. If that is true, it seems to me it clearly indicates that Marvin Jones and Frank Hancock have the situation well in hand, and that they will rid their organizations of all such people.

Mr. PATMAN. There is no doubt in my mind about it and I would be willing to pledge my reputation that it will be handled in a way that will be satisfactory to all concerned; and there will be no charges of dishonesty, or graft, or carelessness that can consistently and reasonably be pointed to insofar as Marvin Jones and Frank Hancock are concerned.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I trust the gentleman does not misinterpret anything I may have said this morning or anything that has been said by the distinguished gentleman from New York as being an indictment of either Judge Jones or Mr. Hancock. But I believe the gentleman will understand that while we have implicit confidence in these two men who head up the War Food Administration and the Commodity Credit Corporation, that these organizations are so vast in their operations and character that it cannot be expected that either one of those individuals can have complete knowledge of all transactions and everything that takes place.

Mr. PATMAN. My time is very limited—I am sorry.

Mr. KEEFE. Does not the gentleman believe that the Congress itself ought to take a greater interest in the affairs and the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. PATMAN. I think the Congress has. We have not extended the Corporation for longer than 2 years at a time. We have it constantly under our control. We can call the officials before our committee at any time and ask them any question we desire.

It is not possible for Congress to execute laws; it was never intended that a legislative body should execute laws. It is necessary that we delegate power to the right kind of officials; and no one should want a better official to whom to delegate power than the Honorable Marvin Jones. We cannot pass on these egg cases, the lard cases, the subsidy cases; it is impossible for us to go into all those details; that is a matter of the execution of the laws, the administration of the laws. We can only pass the laws, give power to people to carry them out, and then hold them responsible in the event they do not.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Much has been said here today that might indicate that there is something wrong. I believe all of us know Marvin Jones, and we know Frank Hancock; we have respect for them. This whole thing can be cleared up by Marvin Jones and Frank Hancock if they will send in a statement to the gentleman who now has the floor, or someone else, tomorrow telling the country the truth about this thing.

Mr. PATMAN. The truth about what? Who is making any charge? Who will say that Marvin Jones is guilty of anything? Who will say that Frank Hancock is guilty of anything? No one has made any charge.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not know where the gentleman has been.

Mr. PATMAN. We have heard a lot of hearsay. Shall we stop the war to run down hearsay?

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman does not want to yield, that is up to him; but I do want to say that if I were in their position, in view of the rumors the newspapers have been carrying and the statements that have been made on the floor of the House, I would make a statement to clear the situation.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman can rest assured that Marvin Jones and Frank Hancock will do what is right and honorable in the premises. If the gentleman had been here and heard what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] said a while ago, he would be convinced that any rumors, whether true or false, were receiving the attention of his committee, and certainly a report will be made at the right time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman believe it is the duty of the Congress to call attention to those things that are going on that do not seem to be right?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly. If the gentleman——

Mr. TABER. Then it becomes the duty of the Administrator to clear the air.

Mr. PATMAN. It certainly is our duty to point out mistakes and to demand that they be quickly corrected.

Mr. TABER. And to demand that we find out the truth.

Mr. PATMAN. We should be careful about making loose charges against such fine people when we do not have the positive proof to support them.

Mr. TABER. No one here has made loose charges. Certainly I have not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this whole support program is wrapped up in this particular bill. A vote against this bill or a vote to recommit it is a vote against the interest of the farmers of this country. You cannot escape that. A vote against this bill or a vote to recommit it is a vote against the price-control and stabilization program. We might just as well recognize that fact. A vote to recommit this bill or a vote against it is a vote for inflation and against proper control. We might just as well admit that.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not likewise a vote against the consumers of the country?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. This money is for consumer subsidies.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. The consumers will suffer.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not also a vote to break faith and the pledge made by this Congress to support war-food prices to the farmers?

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely. We must have food. Next to air food is the most important. Every one of our 12,000,000 fighting men need 4,500 calories of food every day, which is almost twice as much as the average civilian consumes. This means about 66,000,000 tons of food of the finest and best quality must be produced in order to furnish these soldiers food every day. They are all over the world and we must make it possible for that food to be produced. The farmers are working under the greatest handicaps that they have ever worked under. They have had a shortage of manpower, they have had a shortage of machinery, they have had all kinds of misfortunes overtake them; yet they have produced more food than they ever produced before. Why? Because they have the support of this wonderful program.

Mr. Chairman, if we attempt to stop this program we are stopping the production of needed food for our 12,000,000 servicemen. Not only do we not get the food for them, but our civilians at home must have food and it must be equally and fairly distributed among them. After our boys in the armed forces are furnished food and our civilians at home, let us hope there will be some food available for our allies, because, as I pointed out yesterday, every time we are able to save some food, pay for it, and send it to China and a Chinaman uses some of that food to go out and kill a Jap, there is one less Jap to kill an American soldier. When we furnish food and send it to Russia, and a Russian goes out and kills a German, there is one less German to kill an American soldier. So every day we produce more food and we furnish that food to our servicemen and to our civilians at home and send it to our allies abroad, we are making it possible for more of our fine, brave fighting men to return to America and safely occupy the vacant chairs that they left here from 1 to 3 years ago.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. When we consider the fact this is March and that planting time is on in many sections of our country and that farmers are starting farming operations, what effect does the gentleman think the recommitment of this bill would have on the farmers of the country if we send it back for further study?

Mr. PATMAN. It would have a disastrous effect and a vote like that could not be considered in any other way than a vote for inflation, a vote to violate and break a promise we have made to the farmers of this country, and a vote against the consumers.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Would we not be just as well justified in voting to withhold funds for the war effort that is being carried on as to withhold our effort to support agriculture?

Mr. PATMAN. Food is just as important as bullets. You might just as well vote against sending bullets to the front-line trenches as to vote against this bill. It is just as important.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the Commodity Credit Corporation has made a contribution to the war-food program. Its value to the food program could have been improved if we had had less sectional favoritism. I have said it before, and I wish to repeat it now, that I think the Banking and Currency Committee has presented legislation which has had more to do with giving us somewhere near the abundant supply of food needed during this wartime period than any piece of legislation by any other committee of the House. I refer at this time particularly to the support of the nonbasic commodities. We know that there were plenty of stock piles of the basic commodities.

The Commodity Credit Corporation set up 90 percent of parity floor for the nonbasic commodities that the Secretary of Agriculture asked to be increased. This act did more to increase food production than any other legislative act. The weather, the patriotic and natural desire to produce, and a return that would enable the farmer to produce, were, I realize, the most important factors. However, the 90 percent parity floor gave the producer the assurance he would not ruin his business by producing to a maximum.

The Secretary of Agriculture can, however, upon public notice, discontinue support of any of these nonbasic commodities. That power has since been delegated to the War Food Administrator. The basic commodities have the loan provisions to protect them.

Many mistakes have probably been made, and I imagine each and every one of us here would have made some mistakes if we had been in charge of the program. However, there are two points in connection with the Commodity Credit Corporation which I think should be analyzed. From the time that I have known him, I think I have had as high a personal regard for Marvin Jones as any Member of this House. But I do not care who he is, I do not think we should continue to give such great powers to any one man. If we do, I think we are giving away the powers that we are supposed to have ourselves.

Last year we passed the Disney amendment, whereby the Congress told the President of the United States, "Now, Mr. President, nobody has ever given you any authority to tell the people of this country whether they will receive a $25,000 a year maximum salary or whether they will not." But today we are really giving one man the power to control the incomes of millions of farmers, and we are giving one man pretty much control over the grocery bill of every citizen in the land. I believe the Congress should hesitate to place all of the power involved in the C. C. C. in running a three or four or five billion dollar corporation in the hands of one individual. Did you ever hear of such a corporation? Did you ever hear of a $5,000,000,000 corporation where one man who was president, vice president, and the board of directors, and was running the whole show? This situation should be corrected by legislative action as soon as the war is over.

The second point is: If the C. C. C. by the use of its own funds or as custodian of other funds spends public funds for export subsidies or dumping on foreign markets, we are going to be called to account. There will be repercussions.

The following is the antidumping legislation on our own statutes, and we should not allow the C. C. C. to use any funds for dumping on foreign markets:

DUMPING INVESTIGATION

Section 160. Investigations by Secretary of the Treasury; notice to Secretary by appraisers as to sales price of imported articles; withholding appraisement:

(a) Whenever the Secretary of the Treasury (hereinafter called the "Secretary"), after such investigation as he deems necessary, finds that an industry in the United States is being or is likely to be injured, or is prevented from being established, by reason of the importation into the United States of a class or kind of foreign merchandise, and that merchandise of such class or kind is being sold or is likely to be sold in the United States or elsewhere at less than its fair value, then he shall make such finding public to the extent he deems necessary, together with a description of the class or kind of merchandise to which it applies in such detail as may be necessary for the guidance of the appraising officers.

(b) Whenever, in the case of any imported merchandise of a class or kind as to which the Secretary has not so made public a finding, the appraiser or person acting as appraiser has reason to believe or suspect, from the invoice or other papers or from information presented to him, that the purchase price is less, or that the exporter's sales price is less or likely to be less, than the foreign market value (or, in the absence of such value, than the cost of production) he shall forthwith, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, notify the Secretary of such fact and withhold his appraisement report to the collector as to such merchandse until the further order of the Secretary, or until the Secretary has made public a finding as provided in subdivision (a) in regard to such merchandise. (May 27, 1921, ch. 14, sec. 201, 42 Stat. 11; June 17, 1930, ch. 497, title IV, sec. 651 (d), 46 Stat. 762.)

HISTORICAL NOTE

Sections 160 to 173 of this title consist of title II of act May 27, 1921, ch. 14, 42 Stat. 11, entitled "An act imposing temporary duties upon certain agricultural products to meet present emergencies, and to provide revenue; to regulate commerce with foreign countries; to prevent dumping of foreign merchandise on the markets of the United States; to regulate the value of foreign money; and for other purposes," and sections 406 and 407 of title IV of said act, entitled "General provisions."

This section and sections 161 to 171 are expressly excepted from repeal or amendment by the Tariff Act of 1930 (act June 17, 1930, c. 497, 46 Stat. 763 in effect June 18, 1930) which provides in section 651 (d) as follows: "Nothing in this act shall be construed to amend or repeal any of the following provisions of law: * * * (5) the Antidumping Act, 1921."

(Source: United States Code Annotated, title 19, Customs Duties, pp. 88–89.)

Third. If we provide additional funds to a Federal agency to conduct an increased business, will this not reduce private business by just that much?

If the Government is going to expand and do more business, we should not be telling little business what we are doing for them. We could more properly tell them what this administration is doing to them.

We should pass the bill. We should hold the capital down as much as possible. We should provide the funds to furnish the food for the war. We should protect the guaranties of 90-percent parity floor to producers. And we should continue the life of the C. C. C. for 1 year instead of 2 for many reasons.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, to me it is unthinkable that the House will consider for a moment recommitting this bill or equivocating at all in the continuation of this important agency's activity. I fear in the discussion we have had over details not related to the purpose of this bill we may lose sight of some tremendously significant things that have taken place in the work of this great agency. What are the significant things? First, we have had a food-production program geared to an established agency that had made a remarkable record before the war began, a record that the farmers of this country believe in.

I have a telegram from Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, that I think well expresses the views of the farmers:

We strongly favor immediate enactment of H. R. 2023 continuing Commodity Credit Corporation and providing increased funds. We also favor proposed changes in Taft amendment to provide more funds for dairy program. Vitally important to act now so farmers can make their plans. This agency is keystone of entire agricultural program and farmers everywhere are for it.

So this ought to be approached without any partisanship at all. It ought to be approached with the one thought of protecting our farmers.

The Congress is perfectly familiar with the reasons for the success of the Commodity Credit Corporation. As Judge Marvin Jones has emphasized time and time again and as every farmer knows to be a fact, it is not the speculative price that encourages the farmer to produce, it is not a high price, even; it is the assurance of a stable price, the assurance that he will get a price that is above his cost of production.

While there are many problems left for the farmer, the Congress will face them. We have, for example, the cotton problem that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] has been prominent in exploring. We have many another problem that prevents and delays balancing the farmer's interest against the nonfarm interests of this country, economically.

Let me direct the attention of the House, however, to the progress that has already been made by this agency. As the previous speaker said, food is fundamental. General Marshall himself would have something to say about this if he thought the program were endangered. One of the first things he said to the country as he unfolded the program of the War Department was that food is the first munition of war. It had been said by others before him, and if we lose sight of it we will be betraying our country's best interests in the present crisis.

I had an opportunity last summer to observe something of the growth of the prestige of this country in other parts of the world. For 30 days I was with other Members in England, and we heard a good many references to America's part in feeding not only our armies, but the civilian populations of our allies. I know the people of Britain are grateful for what we are doing in food production. I heard it not only from officials and in the scheduled speeches, but I heard it in the conversations with people who have had food to eat that they would not have had except for the Commodity Credit Corporation. I heard them speak with warm gratitude of the people of America, and they were speaking of our farmers. I think one of the last things I heard in Britain, and I have had it clearly in my mind for a long time and have passed it on to my farmers, is what a leading farmer in Britain said: "Tell your farmers that when they have been inconvenienced, and I know they have been, when they have sacrificed, and they have made great sacrifices, the people of Great Britain are aware of them and are grateful to them."

We must not let the world down in this situation, because our interests are tied up with the interests of the populations of the Old World who must depend to some extent upon the food we send them.

The remarkable thing about it is that it has not been at great cost to the people of America. This is a truly amazing record. Actually the average man has had 7 percent more food in the war period than he had in the 5-year period that preceded it. That is a tribute to the farmers of America, that they have turned in this monumental record of food production, and it is a tribute to the Congress that we provided these legislative devices that enabled them to go out and produce food in a way that has impressed the world.

I have tried to speak in this connection of the significance from the human standpoint and not just the American standpoint, if we want America's prestige in the world to be preserved. I think one of the most stirring things I ever saw in any legislative assembly was in the Arkansas Legislature, and it had to do with another State, the great State of South Dakota.

In the farm depression that preceded the general depression, my State one year was almost prostrate. There was a widespread drought and the threat of real hunger. The people of South Dakota were among those who came to our relief. They sent a trainload of food. Later on, we sent to South Dakota in a drought year a consignment of food for their people and feed for their animals. A representative of that State came to Arkansas to express officially the thanks of South Dakota to the people of my State for that help. So there were tears that day because the speaker's presence and words involved something basic in human life. It was a very real experience for the peoples of two American States. We have seen the same thing take place on a larger scale. America, out of its benevolence and out of its great productiveness, has gone to the relief of other people, and that is tremendously important from the standpoint of our relationships with the rest of the world and in the solution of many problems that press upon us.

In that connection, as I speak of America's bounty, I would like to be clearly understood. I do not think that what we have done has been accepted by the people of Great Britain without commensurate sacrifices on their part. One thing that interested me in England was to see land once used for parks and playground purposes now sown to vegetables. The people of Great Britain have also done a good job for themselves.

For example, before the war Britain produced only 30 percent of the food which her people consumed. There are 50,000,000 people on that compact little island. Thirty percent of the food they consumed was grown by themselves, but today, because of what we have done in sending certain supplies and the exceptional efforts that their own people have made, they are producing about 70 percent of all the food they consume. A share of the remaining portion which they import is provided by America, but the share which we provide represents a much smaller percentage of our total food production. Now, it is an interesting fact that we have made provision in this monumental way not only for the feeding of our Army in an acceptable way—and there has been praise everywhere for it—but that we have been able to do that and at the same time eat well ourselves on the whole. Of course, we have been deprived of some of our luxury items. Of course, we have not been able to get a T-bone steak every time we would like to have one, but, on the whole, the people of America have eaten well in this period. It is explained partly by these facts to which I have referred: The application of the farmer to a strenuous program and the determination on his part to cooperate and share in the sacrifices which are necessary for the winning of the war. Therefore, we should not let down at this stage of the game.

The remarkable increase in food production and in farm income has not been accompanied by an undue increase in farm prices because income is often largely determined by factors other than price. So, while prices have remained stable, or rather approximately stable, income has gone up, and the production has gone up very impressively. One of the most interesting charts presented to

us in the hearings on this measure in the Committee on Banking and Currency was presented by Judge Jones in pointing out that in World War No. 1 there was scarcely any increase in total food production in this country, and yet there was a terrific increase in prices. On the other hand, in this war, there is a tremendous increase in production, but a stable price, showing that the sort of planning that has gone on by those to whom we have committed this governmental function in the Commodity Credit Corporation, is sound and that it can bear good results. I plead with the House to promptly act upon this measure which we know means much for the welfare of the American farmer.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended taking the floor to say anything on this bill until the question of milk subsidies came before the committee this afternoon. The milk producers of my State have consistently been opposed to the payment of subsidies. They have always taken the position that all they wanted was a fair and decent price for what they produced, in the open market place, without being dependent upon a paternalistic Government for a contribution from the Federal Treasury. On that foundation of freedom for the citizen, America has grown great and strong.

Now, under war conditions we have a Price Control Administration in effect, and ceiling prices have been placed upon a great many commodities and essentials for human life. Among those is milk. The ceiling price that has been placed on milk by the Price Administration is not sufficient for the farmer or the milk producer to receive an adequate return on his work, his labor, his investment, without the payment of subsidies in addition thereto.

This afternoon I asked a rather pertinent question. Why are not the milk producers of the Nation, and the farmers as well, for everything they produce, permitted to have in the open market place, a fair return for what they produce? That question has not been answered. If the payment of subsidies on milk and food is essential in a limited amount, then why not pay subsidies for the whole gamut of articles produced, necessary to sustain life? That would mean socialism, complete and over-all. If it is such a wonderful thing to have subsidies on some things in certain percentages, why not go all the way and pay subsidies on everything, and forget a free, republican system of government in the United States? We all know that is the collectivist idea but that is what we are leading to. That is the reason we had a bill before us yesterday, or part of the reason, to increase the debt limit of the United States from $260,000,000,000 to $300,000,000,000.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the distinguished gentleman, a member of the committee.

Mr. BUFFETT. I would like to make this observation that if the price of milk per quart had been raised in proportion as the price of cotton has been raised since 1939—namely, from 9 cents a pound to the present price of 20 cents a pound—no farmer in the country would ask one nickel from the Government.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman is correct. The farmers do not want to become dependent upon Federal hand-outs, because that is what subsidies are. It makes them dependent upon a paternalistic Government, restricts their liberty, and regiments them to the whims of government.

Now, some discussion has arisen in regard to a telegram we received. I am sure other members of the Michigan delegation have received the same telegram, including my able friend from Adrian, Mich. [Mr. MICHENER]. I brought that telegram to the floor, and I propose to read it. I still insist that the milk producers of Michigan are protesting and are against the payment of milk subsidies in the sum of $568,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. I have voted against consumer subsidies in the past. I realize that the farmers of the country have no alternative. They must either accept these subsidies, under the price ceilings that have been fixed, or go out of business. We must have the production of food. The milk producers and farmers are helpless, and I shall not desert them. Reluctantly, of course, I am going to vote for this bill.

Here is the telegram, showing the position of the milk producers of Michigan. The telegram reads as follows:

DETROIT, MICH., *March 6, 1945.*

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Washington, D. C.:

The administration and Congress apparently have adopted the policy of partially paying dairy farmers for a portion of their returns in the form of subsidy instead of from prices in the market place, this in spite of all protests made by dairy farmers. The War Food Administration apparently plans to arbitrarily reduce the amount to be paid next year as compared to the amount received last year. Cost of production has not changed, and reductions in price, together with selective-service policies, will tend to reduce production. It appears that it will take $568,000,000 from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1946. Inasmuch as it is necessary for producers to accept subsidy payments as partial remuneration for production of milk, we especially urge your support of this appropriation.

MICHIGAN MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION,
H. F. SIMMONS, *Secretary-Manager.*

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I believe that when the bill comes up for consideration under the 5-minute rule Monday an effort will be made to straighten out the question of subsidy. It is pretty difficult at this time to understand, for instance, why the subsidy should have been 40 percent greater in 1944 than it was in 1945. The question of subsidy was settled long ago. The question now is one of production. You have to have the subsidy to get the production as long as the price is fixed, and the gentleman is willing to subscribe to that program.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; as long as we have a policy that fixes prices upon farm products under which they cannot produce such products and stay in business without accepting a subsidy, there is no other choice.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Some dairy products receive two subsidies in devious ways, but even with the two subsidies those same farmers do not get any more than a fair price for their milk; so it is a very complicated policy.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman comes from the greatest dairy-producing State in the Union, and I am sure he is in the same position I am in regard to these subsidy payments. He is one of the ablest and best-informed Members in this House on farm problems. His people do not want subsidies if they can have a fair price in the market place.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Surely the gentleman will admit that I have taken the floor frequently but the gentleman never has heard me say we would not produce because the price was not right. We have tried to iron out the differences and do the best we could under the policy. We have produced, and no one can say we have complained because we were not getting enough because we realize that even if milking cows might not be the most pleasant work in the world, it was still far more pleasant than being out in the battlefield and being shot at as some of our boys are. We are doing our very best to boost up dairy production and will do all we can to maintain it.

Mr. DONDERO. I am not saying the farmers will not produce more; they are working all the time to produce more. They are just as loyal as any other group in this country; but they object to becoming dependent upon a paternalistic government.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. They would rather have a fair price than subsidies.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Just one question with reference to the interpretation of the telegram. I interpreted the telegram from the Michigan Milk Producers Association as a protest against subsidy, but they told us to please vote for subsidies. Does the gentleman interpret it any differently than I do?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not believe it says "please."

Mr. MICHENER. No; they say, "Do it."

Mr. DONDERO. They simply say that they urge us to support the appropriation, that they need it because they are helpless. They are in a position where they cannot do anything else.

Mr. MICHENER. But the controversy today arose over the fact that the gentleman in mentioning the telegram in the first instance did not mention the latter part of the telegram but said he had a telegram protesting. I had the

same kind of telegram protesting and then asking for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I agree thoroughly with what has been stated with reference to the importance of this legislation and the importance that it be done now, that it be not played with with any thought of considering the recommittal of the bill or any disposition to postpone action on the part of the Congress on any pretense whatsoever.

I am placed in a position I never expected to occupy in all my life, that, in view of some statements that have been made on the floor of the House today indirectly impugning the honesty and integrity of Judge Jones and, since Frank Hancock is now president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, having some left-handed significance as to his newly attained position, I would have to defend either one of these gentlemen against an accusation that, without explanation, some might think could reach to the very reputation and character of Judge Jones and Frank Hancock, if not that, then to negligence on the part of one or both, that should be used or might be employed to sabotage the farmers of this country.

I know the reputation of Judge Marvin Jones for honesty, integrity, truth, and ability. He stands high. I know the reputation and the character of Frank Hancock, who was Congressman from my own district preceding the time my brother and I became Members of this body. I know that in every respect both his reputation and his character are beyond question.

Along about the 1st of January of this year for the first time the Food Distribution Service was transferred to the Commodity Credit Corporation. About that time Mr. Hancock was made President of the Commodity Credit Corporation. It is intimated that sometime, probably prior to either one of these occurrences, someone was unfaithful to the trust reposed in him, but there is no accusation against the head of any of these institutions and none against any employee that would begin to compare with or justify a comparison with Teapot Dome or the scandals that occurred back there.

Somebody has picked something out from some place, and that the handling of such charges in this manner becomes an offense in the view of the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee for agricultural purposes, because in his opinion, seemingly, as expressed here, it was a breach of faith on somebody's part to do that. But to undertake to use it as a pretext for the recommittal or postponement of this important bill, intended to produce food and things that are necessary for the Army and the Navy and the civilian population of this country, is not at all to be commended in the good opinion of any man.

Why was it brought in at this time? This is not a competent forum to carry on an investigation against somebody in some department that may have been guilty of bad faith or dishonesty. The chairman talked and spoke to you about a possible or probable investigation, but, being himself circumscribed and limited by observance of the honor of secrecy which his position imposed, was not able to tell you that that committee is making whatever investigation may be necessary.

I do not think a great deal of the attempt to use any of these circumstances, whatever they may be, as a means or method to destroy the producing farmer of this country. You are not striking at me. I am not a farmer. So far as the political significance of it is concerned, I am willing to accept it as a challenge in the next election. Representations have been made to the farmers of this country that they may depend on the action of this Congress. Contracts must be made at a definite time before the crops are planted, which we are begging them to produce in great volume. The time is approaching when the planting following this contract must be made. Yet, in the face of that, there is an apparent undertaking to make it all ineffective regardless of its effect upon the farmers and regardless of its influence upon the war, and regardless of anything. I do not believe that the rank and file, the great majority of the men who sit on either side of the aisle, will lend themselves to such an undertaking. I hope not. The Commodity Credit Corporation was incorporated as an instrumentality of the Government itself. All of us know that. In the sense and for the purposes which it was designed to serve, it is a corporation belonging to the people of the United States, conveniently used as an instrumentality to lift wheat out of the 30-cents-a-bushel bracket and corn at 25 cents and the other products that had fallen to such disastrous levels; and to give the farmers of this country an honest and square deal. They have gotten it. Now, this is used as a means of support to bring about production of food for war purposes. I do not want to be the man who has any part in postponing it or stopping it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM].

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, farmers have quite frequently said to me that subsidies are a new and novel thing; that they are the invention of the Roosevelt administration. Today I heard some Republican Members of Congress say that farm subsidies are socialistic; that they tend to paternalism and collectivism. I want to refer to a bit of history because history completely upsets some of these charges or statements.

Farm subsidies are not a new thing. In 1890, and previous thereto, we had a protective tariff on sugar. Therefore, in the famous McKinley tariff bill, sponsored by William McKinley, there was a provision written, not in wartime but in peacetime, that sugar planters should receive a direct bounty of 2 cents a pound. This was in lieu of a tariff rate which was dropped. That bounty was paid, and therefore the idea of bounties, as far as I can learn, originated with the Republican Party.

Now, they say that subsidies lead to regimentation and to making the citizen the slave of the State. I happened to be reading the debate on the McKinley tariff bill the other night and I just want to repeat what a Member of Congress from Texas said about the bounty on sugar, enacted by the McKinley tariff bill. What Mr. Abbott, a Texas Democrat, said sounds like just what was said today by the critics of subsidies on the other side of the aisle now. He said:

> Mr. ABBOTT. Before the producer of sugar can get the benefit of the 2 cents per pound bounty for which this bill provides he must make application to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for a license or permission to raise sugar, and he must accompany his application with a statement of the place where he proposes to make it, a description of the machinery he proposes to use, and an estimate of the amount he proposes to produce, and he must further accompany his application for a license with a bond and good security conditioned that he will faithfully obey all the rules and regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the manufacture and production of sugar.
>
> The provisions of this schedule necessarily imply that the Internal Revenue Department of the Government is practically to take charge of this great agricultural industry, appoint overseers, inspectors, and so forth, how many the Lord only knows, and to make the citizens the slaves of the Government, and compel giving of bond to do whatever the Commissioner prescribes, under penalty that the favor of the Government will be withdrawn if he is disobedient.
>
> Thus the freedom of the citizen is destroyed; no longer can he do with his own as he wills; his knowledge and skill derived from experience are no longer of value to him, but he must obey the dictates of someone who probably never saw a stalk of sugarcane grow.

So I submit that bounties have been used as a device by the Democratic and Republican Parties both. Therefore, our friends on the other side ought to concede that this is Republican policy as well as Democratic policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have no other requests for time. The Clerk may read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is amended by striking out "$3,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,000,000,000."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2023) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 20 minutes on Tuesday next after the legislative business of the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REREFERENCE OF BILLS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from consideration of the bill (H. R. 2410) to continue existing gold-reserve ratios required to be maintained against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation and Federal Reserve bank deposits by increasing the monetary value of gold, and the bill (H. R. 2343) to continue existing gold-reserve ratios required to be maintained against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation and Federal Reserve bank deposits by increasing the monetary value of gold, and that these bills may be referred to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, the referral to the Committee on Banking and Currency having been in error.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF MARCH 12

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the majority leader tell us the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be pleased to.

Monday is District Day. The Committee on the District of Columbia has two bills for consideration: H. R. 2506, to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended; and H. R. 2552, to amend paragraph (c) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, as amended by act approved February 27, 1931. That will be followed by continued consideration of the Commodity Credit bill under the 5-minute rule.

Tuesday: It is the intention to meet at 11 o'clock on Tuesday. I have conferred with the gentleman from Massachusetts. We will take up the lend-lease bill on Tuesday, and it is possible that the bill will be disposed of that day. If it is not finished that day, and it appears that it will take too much time on Wednesday, it will be displaced, and the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill will be taken up. State, Justice, and Commerce, I understand, will probably take Wednesday and Thursday. Thereafter, if the lend-lease bill has not previously been disposed of, it will be the continuing order of business.

House Resolution 62, authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to continue investigation of the progress of the defense housing program, will be called up for consideration sometime during next week. I cannot tell at what time that will be called up, but when there is a break in the legislative program—possibly on Monday before the consideration of the lend-lease bill. We hope to call it up before the latter part of the week, but it will be called up sometime during the week.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asked unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon and include therein two excerpts from statutes of the United States Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] may revise and extend his remarks and include some statistical tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE SOL BLOOM

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection on the part of other Members who have special orders, the gentleman may proceed for 5 minutes.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the seventy-fifth anniversary of the birth of a very distinguished and lovable Member of this House the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who has served 22 years-plus in this body, nearly one-third of his life. More than one-fourth of that time has been served as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs during one of the most crucial and difficult periods in the history of this country, and may I indulge the hope that when our history concludes, this may still be true. That is, that this period may remain one of our country's most crucial and difficult ones.

He has presided over the functioning of that important committee with dignity, with fairness, with courtesy, with great ability, and with success. No member of the committee, even he who has most frequently found himself in disagreement with Chairman BLOOM, can or would wish to say that he has not always been afforded an opportunity to present his views, to subpena the witnesses he wished, to question them as long as he desired, or that he has not been treated fairly and courteously in all respects. In fact, he is, when at the head of that committee table, the same jovial, lovable, big-hearted SOL BLOOM, who is known, respected, and loved throughout the world.

His life, though only comparatively long, has been very definitely useful, full, and successful. Bearing in mind that Mr. Heurich died day before yesterday at the age of 102, I indulge the hope that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] may celebrate many, many more anniversaries of his birth. It is also my wish that on each of those occasions he will still be a Member of this body to which he is so thoroughly devoted, as we all are, and toward the functioning of which throughout the years he has made so many great contributions.

I would indulge still another hope which I am afraid some of my colleagues on the left side of the aisle may not agree with, although I am very positive that everyone on both side thoroughly agrees with what I have thus far said. The hope of which I am somewhat doubtful of unanimous agreement is that in the dim, distant future, when the gentleman from New York passes on to his well-earned rest and reward, his passing may create a vacancy in the chairmanship of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House. We can scarcely expect our Republican friends to agree with the hope for such lengthy Democratic control.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered for today I may address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON NEXT TUESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I had intended asking unanimous consent to meet on Tuesday next at 11 o'clock. Has my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts any objection to my submitting that request at this time?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have no objection. We want to get the work finished before the Easter vacation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we are having hearings by our committee on the Bretton Woods agreement. That will not prevent our committee, I presume, from continuing on until 12 o'clock?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; and the gentleman can get permission to sit during general debate. General debate will be on Tuesday. I refer to the lend-lease bill.

Mr. PATMAN. I shall notify the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday next it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on the following day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman

from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, with Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, Ambassador Patrick Hurley, and Admirals Nimitz and Halsey in Washington, we may be certain that the main topic in their conversations is Japan, and the reason for their being here, at this time, is how best to defeat our enemy as quickly and as completely as possible. They know full well just what they are up against in the Pacific and Asia, but I am afraid we at home do not, even yet, realize what is in store for us out there; what sacrifices it is going to take and what the cost is going to be.

At this moment we have in excess of 1,000,000 German prisoners in Allied hands. Compare that figure with the total of less than 5,000 Japanese prisoners we have taken in over 3 years of war and you will begin to get some idea as to the difference between the war in the west and the war in the east. On Iwo Jima the Secretary of the Navy has reported in excess of 12,500 Japanese dead behind the American lines and the news reports state that considerably less than 100 Japanese have been captured. These comparisons, these figures, should awaken us to the difficulties and the dangers which lie ahead in our conflict with the Japanese Empire.

JAPAN AND RUSSIA

The war in the Pacific is just as important and more significant than the war in Europe. As Americans we must face this fact, understand our limitations and possibilities, and gage the present and future as best we can. We can no longer ignore the greatest of the world's five oceans nor can we fail to understand and evaluate the nations living along its rim.

In this war the factor of distance is of great importance. The Pacific has an area of approximately 68,000,000 square miles. Fronting on this mighty mass of water are the British Dominions of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand; 11 American republics, excluding the United States; China, the Philippines, Dutch East Indies, New Guinea, Hawaii, the Solomons, and tens of thousands of other islands whose existence we are just now beginning to realize. In the far north the United States and the Soviet Union are the closest of neighbors, being separated from each other by a distance of 65 miles across the Bering Strait and by only 1½ miles between Little Diomede Island, owned by the United States, and Big Diomede Island, owned by the U. S. S. R. In this same general area we find that Attu, our easternmost island in the Aleutian chain, is only 250 miles southeast of the Soviet's submarine base in the Komandorskie Islands and 696 miles from Japan's advanced naval base at Paramushiro Island.

It is easy to see that the Pacific not only has size to commend it but interest as well. Wealth, trade routes, and future well-being are tied up with this area, and before we are out of this war we are, as a matter of national policy and survival, going to know it and know it well.

Our main object in the Pacific is to defeat Japan. In the course of these remarks I would like to discuss some of the phases of that country's importance to us and at the same time throw some pertinent light on Russia, our greatest potential ally in that area.

Since 1853, Japan has made tremendous strides to achieve the position of a great power among the nations of the earth. Before that time she was virtually unknown due to her 200-year policy of seclusion and exclusion during which time only a limited trade was carried on with China, Korea, and Holland by the Shogunate which then ruled Japan. One Dutch ship a year was allowed into Nagasaki and the Dutch maintained what could be called a resident consular merchant at Deshima in that harbor. The Dutch were always kept under close supervision and their every movement was watched by guards of the Shogun. On rare occasions, however, they were allowed to travel to Yedo or, as it was later known, Tokyo, the capital, and there as well as at Deshima, they acquainted the Japanese with developments in western medicine, armament, botany, and other fields. At one time during the Napoleonic wars when Holland had been occupied by the French Emperor and its overseas' possessions taken over by the British, the only place in the world where the Dutch flag was allowed to fly was at Deshima.

With the opening of Japan in 1853 by Commodore Perry the country was thrown open to the commerce of the world. Incidentally, one of the main reasons for Perry's visit was to compel the Japanese to give humane treatment to American sailors shipwrecked in Japan and taken captive by the Japanese. Hence, their treatment of Americans today is nothing new but the continuation of a practice which has been temporarily dormant. Extraterritoriality or the dispensing of justice by foreigners to their nationals was allowed in Japan until 1894 when the Aoki-Kimberly Agreement between Japan and England was effected. Shortly after this time all other nations followed suit and gave up their special rights. During the period from 1853 onward, the Japanese made great strides and literally jumped the transition period between their medieval and modern eras. They thirsted for knowledge of all kinds, imported technicians and experts, and sent their sons abroad to the colleges of Europe and America. They bought warships from the British and hired Englishmen to train their seamen; they engaged French Army officers to train their soldiers and, after the defeat of France in the Franco-Prussian War, they replaced them with German officers. Since that time the Japanese Army has been Prussian in its training and the Navy has been inspired to a great degree by British methods. It must be stated, though, that as soon as the Japanese felt that they had mastered the practices of the West they dismissed their foreign instructors, substituted their own men and began to build their navy and armaments in their own shipyards and factories. They clung to what they had learned, kept up with new practices, and added Japanese innovations. Today, as we all know, Japan has a highly trained, well-equipped and finely staffed army and navy which ranks with the best in the world. The lessons of Tarawa, the Solomons, and Iwo Jima will not be soon forgotten by us.

In the matter of education the Japanese were strongly influenced by the United States. The father of the Empire's education system was David Murray, an American school teacher, who laid the foundation for a system of training which has made Japan one of the most, if not the most literate nations in the world today.

While all these changes were taking place in the army, the navy, and education a significant change was working in the matter of government. The Shogun — great barbarian-subduing general—was displaced in 1867 and the Emperor, for hundreds of years only a figurehead, restored to real power. The Meiji era, so-called after the reign name of Mutsuhito, was one of great advancement. Meiji, as he was commonly referred to, had the abilities of a remarkable person at his disposal in Count Hirobumi Ito who studied the constitutions of America and Europe, decided the Prussian Constitution of Bismarck's was the best, and came home and modeled one on that basis and put it into effect. Under this constitution all power was derived from the Emperor and graciously granted to the people. If anyone saw fit to disagree with this assumption, as did Professor Minobe in 1935, when he advanced the theory that the Emperor was an organ of government and not its source, he took his life in his hands. As a matter of fact, the Emperor is thought of as being of divine origin, being considered the one hundred and twenty-fourth direct descendent of the sun goddess Ameratsu. The nation at large is likewise considered to be descended from the gods and consequently superior to all other nations. Japan was held to be the country of the gods, and of all the earth it was nearest to heaven when the break between the two occurred.

One peculiarity of the government worth mentioning is the position of the war and navy departments. The head of each must be an officer on active duty. This gives the chiefs of staff of the army and navy a direct voice in the cabinet and makes the two cabinet officers mentioned directly responsible to them. This control, coupled with their access to the Emperor's ear in his capacity as commander in chief, gives power to the armed services as is exercised in no other country in the world.

Until the death of Prince Saionji in 1940 there was an extra-legal group made up of elder statesmen known as the Genro. This body was created during Meiji's time, and while only advisory, it had tremendous influence in dictating policies of state. The Genro has now been superseded by the highest-ranking officers in the Army and Navy.

The Japanese Empire proper numbers approximately 80,000,000 people, of whom some 20,000 are Ainus. These Ainus are a primitive people who were the inhabitants of the Japanese Islands

until driven northward by advancing Malays and Mongols. They are Caucasians, very hairy, with coppery brown skin and features that are on the whole distinctly European. Today they reside in Karafuto, Hokkaido, and the Kurile Islands. They occupy a reservation status somewhat similar to that used in our care of the Indians.

The area of Japan is 148,756 square miles, or just slightly larger than the State of Montana. Not more than 20 percent of Japan's land is arable and the country is poor in natural resources. In this respect it will be recalled that on April 1, 1944—almost a year ago—I made a statement on the floor of the House that an agreement just signed between Russia and Japan, whereby Japan gave up its coal and oil concessions on northern Sakhalin and received in return an extension of 5 years of her fishing rights in Russian waters was a good thing for Japan. At that time the press and radio generally hailed this agreement as a Russian victory. Mr. Speaker, because of the possibility that Japan will not be invaded but instead, blockaded, and because of the fact that she is dependent on outside sources—rice from the south and fish from the seas—to feed and sustain her people, I am inserting at this point in my talk the statement I made on April 1, 1944, regarding the Russo-Japanese agreement referred to above:

Mr. Speaker, the abrogation by Russia of the Japanese coal and oil concessions in northern Sakhalin has been publicized in the press as a major Russian victory and on the radio as indicating that Russia has gained everything and Japan nothing. I wonder.

In my view, this is not the case because the Japanese are now no longer dependent on Sakhalin for part of its oil and coal needs. There is no doubt but that Japan has been able to reopen the oil wells and reconstruct the refineries in the Dutch East Indies and that they are now producing to capacity and fulfilling all of our enemy's needs. Furthermore, the coal deposits in Manchuria alone have been and are more than sufficient for Japan's requirements in that respect.

It is well to keep in mind that in giving up her coal and oil concessions Japan is having her fishing rights extended from 1 to 5 years. As fish furnishes one of the two staple elements in her diet—the other is rice—the conclusion may be drawn that Japan is augmenting her food supplies at home and, in return, giving up concessions over coal products which at present are of little or no value to her. We must remember that prior to this war Japan could not supply more than 10 percent of her oil needs from the shale of Manchuria and the concessions in Sakhalin. The rest of her supply she had to get from outside sources, primarily from Dutch Indonesia and, to a lesser extent, from the United States. Now, with complete control of the Indies oil fields, she is independent of any outside source and what she has given up is indicative of her complete independence in the petroleum field.

This new agreement between Russia and Japan is more significant than meets the eye at the moment. In my opinion, it signifies a need for a staple food in the Japanese Empire being met, and as a concession she is giving up her rights in coal and oil which she no longer needs Japan is, as a result, making herself stronger to defeat, both at home and in her conquered territories. I fear this agreement goes far deeper than newspaper headlines and radio accounts indicate.

Mr. Speaker, because of the possibility that Japan will not be invaded, but instead blockaded, and because of the fact that she is dependent on outside sources, rice from the south, and fish from the seas, to defend and sustain her people, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a statement I made on April 1, 1944, regarding the Russo-Japanese agreement referred to above.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, what I have said will, I hope, furnish food for thought as it indicates some of the weak points in Japan's economy. The important facts to keep in mind are as follows: Japan's population numbers 80,000,000 people; her area is 143,756 square miles; and the amount of land available for cultivation amounts to only 20 percent of this total. The result is too many people depend on too small a cultivated area and therefore must, in order to live, import fish and rice or die. These are the factors which make consideration of a sea and air blockade of the Japanese islands proper a vital one in our future planning. The Japanese know this and, as a result, have been building up an industrial economy of no little importance in Manchukuo and North China, where the finish of this war, now in its fourteenth year, will take place.

The above-mentioned figures might explain, in part, Japan's policy of expansion, although we should remember that expansion is nothing new with our enemies. They tried, during the third century of the Christian era, to expand into Korea, Manchuria, and China under the Empress Jingo. In the eleventh century Abe Yoritoko led a flotilla up the Amur River. In the sixteenth century Hideyoshi invaded Korea with the thought of conquering China, but he failed to fully complete his early victories. Incidentally, a Korean admiral, Yih Sun-sin, was able to defeat Hideyoshi's navy in a number of engagements through a remarkable invention known as the tortoise boat. This was, in reality, the first iron-clad warship and it superseded John Erickson's Civil War invention by over 250 years.

Perhaps the most remarkable statement about Japan's expansion policy was the Tanaka Memorial, the existence of which Japan has consistently denied. However, events to date have certainly followed the supposed memorial and thereby lend a degree of authenticity to the idea. According to the memorial which was first published in English in 1931, but which was said to have been presented to the Emperor of Japan on July 25, 1927, by Premier Baron Giichi Tanaka, it was the duty of Japan to conquer Manchuria and China, and when that was accomplished the South Seas area would be overcome, and when that was completed Japan would conquer the world. Whether the memorial is a true statement or not, the fact is that the pattern has been closely followed out.

Japan is driven today by the might of the nations who confront her on all sides. She considers not only the present situation, but she looks as far ahead as the year 2000. The term "100-year war" has come from the lips of her leaders more than once. Japan entered this war in the firm belief that conditions could never be any more favorable, and she is determined to build a position which she thinks will make her invulnerable. Germany, her ally, means absolutely nothing to her. Her moves are tied up only with Japan itself today and in the future.

This, in brief, is the background of the people who would destroy us. They are ruthless, fanatical, and determined. They have never lost a war and they do not intend to lose this one. They have never had their cities invaded; they have not felt the weight of bombings of their industries and cities until recently; and they have never had a powerful foe set foot on their home soil. They have already conquered far more territories and people than they dreamed they could, and they are prepared to defend what they have to the last ditch. It is going to take everything we have to defeat them, and to do it we will, as a matter of necessity, have to consider the part, Russia, perhaps, will play.

Russia, our partner in the European War, is only a potential ally in the Pacific. Many people wonder why Russia is not fighting Japan, and of late there has been increased speculation throughout the country and in the press concerning this matter. Let us consider the situation.

Russia is today in the war with Japan even though her army and navy are not fighting our enemy. This statement is made on the basis that Russia has an army estimated at anywhere from 500,000 to 700,000 on the Manchukuoan-Korean frontier. Facing this far eastern Army is an estimated force of 600,000 comprising the so-called Kwantung Army of Japan—an army made up of young, splendidly trained, and well-equipped soldiers who have not, except in rare instances, been used elsewhere. The Japanese cannot afford to withdraw this force because of the deep-seated antagonism between the two countries and the possibilities of Russia's taking advantage of such a situation should it ever arise. There has been no lack of incidents between the two over the years; in fact, over 2,700 minor cases of friction have developed along the Amur during the years since 1931 as well as 2 major battles at Changkufeng on the Korean-Siberian frontier and Nomonham on the Outer-Inner Mongolian fronter. In both of these battles the Japanese were decisively defeated. They are, however, realistic people and will not go to war unless they feel that the odds are in their favor or that they are forced to.

The Japanese not only realize the threat of the far eastern Red Army but they also fear the Red Air Force and Navy stationed at Vladivostok and Nikolaevsk. They know that Russia has from 80 to 100 submarines in the Far East, and they are aware of the damage which they could cause in the Yellow and adjacent seas. They are aware of the underground airdromes at Vladivostok, and

they appreciate the terrible destruction which could be brought to Tokyo, Nagoya, Osaka, Kobe, Yokohama, and other industrial cities which lie in a 700-mile radius from Vladivostok. The Japanese know that striking at this industrial empire would be striking at the heart of Japan itself, so—they wait.

On the other hand, the Russians know how defenseless Vladivostok is. Despite the fact that it has been heavily fortified it lies too close to Japanese Army, Navy, and air concentrations to hold out for long. The Japanese have built a powerful naval and air base at Rashin in the extreme north of Korea, and there is no doubt in anyone's mind but that its sole object is to envelop and destroy Vladivostok when the "day" arrives. The chief naval base of the Soviets in the Pacific will very likely be Nikolaevsk, at the mouth of the Amur, far to the north and enough out of sustained bombing range to make holding it more feasible. Before the outbreak of the war in the Pacific, the Russians were building a connecting link between Nikolaevsk and the Trans-Siberian Railroad by means of a double-tracked extension beginning to the east of Lake Baikal and describing a great arc northward to Sovietskaya on the Pacific. There have also been rumors to the effect that a road has been built from Komsomolsk up along the Sea of Okhotsk, and over into the Kamchatka Peninsula and from there to the Bering Sea. No proof of this has ever been ascertained but the report appears occasionally.

Although the Soviets have never officially announced it, highways and numerous airfields have been laid out in eastern and northeastern Siberia. No nation has been so aware of the significance of the plane and its future as the U. S. S. R. and to prepare itself against all possibilities they have endeavored to build not only the necessary railroads and roads, but airfields as well.

Why has the U. S. S. R. gone to such lengths to maintain an army, air force, and a sizable navy in the Far East? The reasons boil down to two: First, to protect Siberia from its traditional enemy, the Japanese; and, second, behind this protective curtain, to develop the huge and undeveloped resources of the country.

Few people seem to realize that it is in mid-Siberia that the third 5-year plan has been functioning since 1938. In the region of Stalinsk great strategic plants have been developed at Krasnoiarsk and Novo Sibersk to carry out the opening up of the country. This is necessary because of the hugeness of the area and the importance of Russia in the East. Russian Asia is the greatest area under one power on that continent, and the stepping stones used by the Soviets to open its eastern lands are the industrial developments it undertakes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, at Irkutsk, such natural resources as coal, iron, and water power are being developed, and because of their location are relatively free from concentrated attack by land and, to a lesser degree, by air. In the region north of Manchuko, coal and iron have been discovered in great quantities and are now being exploited. If Japan ever cut into the Lake Baikal area she could not isolate the Far East industrially because of the rice of Komsomolsk, Khabarovsk, and Nikolaevsk. Khabarovsk is located at the junction of the Amur, Ussuri, and Sungaro Rivers on the Manchukuoan frontier and is not only an important city industrially but is also the headquarters of the Soviet's far eastern Army. The Chita region is rich in tin, molybdenum, tungsten, and wolframite. Komsomolsk has petroleum refineries and steel mills. Nikolaevsk has shipyards as well as refineries and plants for the canning of food. In the Maritime Province there are many minerals of great importance such as copper, manganese, iron, zinc, graphite, and gold. Vladivostok is extremely important for its smelters, shipyards, and textile mills.

The island of Sakhalin across from the Maritime Province is owned jointly with Japan. The Russian or northern part is rich in oil, coal, timber, and is quite important in the fishing trade. North of Sakhalin is the Kamcatka Peninsula as yet largely undeveloped but offering a potential site for great events in the present conflict because of its nearness to the Kuriles, the Aleutians, and Alaska.

Then there is the Arctic which has, for the first time in history, really been opened and, to a certain extent, developed. Prof. Otto Schmidt, the great Soviet Arctic explorer, has likened the development of the Arctic to the discovery of America. Now the Soviets have established cities there such as Igarka on the Yenesei River and are operating weather stations along its entire area. During certain months of the year the Arctic can be kept open through the use of ice breakers and the Soviets look forward to the day when they can keep their northern sea open the year around. There have been reports that American supplies have gone to the U. S. S. R. by this route but due to military policy this cannot be definitely ascertained.

In addition to industrial development, many settlers have been sent in to till the soil which in many areas is extremely rich and capable of producing a variety of crops. Many units of the Army operate farms and many civilians have been induced to settle in what would otherwise be wilderness areas. These farmers, in many instances, have been promised exemption from taxes. Another device to settle the Far East has been the founding of the autonomous area of Biro-Bidjan as a Jewish colony in the region west of Khabarovsk. To further rail and road construction convict labor has been used, and in this way the country was opened up and a stable population settled.

All these factors are significant in an understanding of Siberia. Our knowledge of this great, rich, undeveloped country is not all that it should be, but the times call for an understanding of its importance. The newness and the distances explain in part the difficulties which have faced the Soviets there and should give us some idea as to the problems which Russia must overcome. Siberia will, because of its location, play a very important part in settling the war in Asia. However, we cannot bank on that happening too soon because of the fight the Soviets are waging against Hitler's legions in Europe. There Stalin's forces are carrying on magnificently and successfully. Could they do as well if they had to maintain another front in the Far East? The people who are demanding that Russia give us Siberian bases or enter the Pacific war immediately would do well to ponder this question.

On the basis of past history a showdown must occur at some time between Japan and the U. S. S. R. Russia has not forgotten her defeat in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–5, the Japanese occupation of Siberia from 1918 to 1923, the almost forced sale of the Chinese Eastern Railway in 1935, the numerous incidents of the Amur, or the battles of Changkufeng and Nomonhan. On the other hand, Japan has not forgotten Russia's acquisition of Port Arthur in 1895, Russia's old desire for Korea, or her loss of face at Changkufeng and Nomonhan.

I do not know what, if any, agreements concerning Japan have been entered into between Russia and the United Nations, but I am certain, in my own mind, that the differences between Japan and the U. S. S. R. are too great to be overcome except by clash of arms. They are too close to one another, too distrustful of each other, and both feel that they have a score to settle. These two countries are going to war, and it is not a question of "if" but "when." Of that we may be absolutely certain.

The time, however, will depend on circumstances which we cannot foresee at the moment. It is our hope, naturally, that the time for such action is not too far distant because it is our desire to achieve victory in the Pacific at the earliest possible moment. To do this and to build a solid and enduring peace in that area is going to take the combined efforts of the major United Nations. This will be accomplished only through mutual understanding, and the quicker that is achieved the sooner the war in the Pacific and in Asia will be ended. United action and common efforts directed toward the defeat of our enemy, Japan, will not only shorten the war but it will save lives—American lives—and get our boys back to us that much sooner. That is what counts now.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. I wish to sincerely compliment the gentleman on his excellent speech and express to him my deep appreciation, which I am sure is concurred in by the many other Members who heard him, on the very enlightening information he has given us.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

MAJ. MURRAY DEEVERS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] referred to the fact that American troops are now east of the Rhine and spoke very proudly of the fact that a constituent of his was the first in that group to cross the famous river. Without disparaging at all the achievement of Lieutenant Timmerman, but for purposes of accuracy, may I point out that a later dispatch has this say, and I quote from the Washington News an item today sent by C. R. Cunningham, United Press war correspondent:

Victory is in the air on this side of the Rhine, where American troops hit the pay dirt of Germany.

It can't be told yet how the Americans crossed the Rhine, but it took only 15 minutes to get at least one company of Infantry to the eastern side yesterday afternoon.

Later on the dispatch states:

The crossing was a case of spotting an opportunity and grabbing it. Maj. Murray Deevers of Hagerville, Ark., ordered his men across and the company swept into inner Germany.

(An earlier dispatch from Cunningham had reported that a Second Lieutenant Burroughs and First Lt. Carl Timmerman, of West Point, Nebr., spotted the opportunity and flashed the word to battalion headquarters where Lt. Col. Leonard Engemann, of Minnesota, made the historic decision.)

It appears, therefore, that the first arrival was Major Deevers, of Hagersville, Ark., located in Johnson County, in the Fifth Congressional District, which it is my honor to represent.

May I add, Mr. Speaker, I am extremely anxious to share the glory with my friend the gentleman from Nebraska and with all others whose constituents have participated in this great enterprise. I am sure there will be glory enough for all and that the membership of the House has heard with great pride of the historic advance which has carried our Army beyond the Rhine. I know the Members are noting the tremendously significant facts that have been reported today.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TAYLOR (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of official business.

Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, under its previous order, until Monday, March 12, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Brand Names and Newsprint Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Monday, March 12, 1945, to resume public hearings on newsprint.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Tuesday, March 13, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold a hearing on Tuesday, March 13, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 173.

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold a hearing on Wednesday, March 14, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1624 and H. R. 1746.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, March 15, 1945, at 10 a. m., to continue hearings on parcel-post rates.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Tuesday, March 20, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in room 247, House Office Building, on H. R. 128, a bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will continue hearings on Wednesday, March 21, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 128, a bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection for pensionable purposes for service rendered between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

283. A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Smithsonian Institution for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

284. A letter from the Secretary, United States Employees' Compensation Commission, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2506. A bill to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 306). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2552. A bill to amend paragraph (c) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, as amended by act approved February 27, 1931; without amendment (Rept. No. 307). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KEARNEY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2305. A bill for the relief of Jose M. Arrias, also known as Joseph P. Arrias; with amendment (Rept. No. 293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1038. A bill for the relief of Daniel B. Johnson; with amendment (Rept. No. 294). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1134. A bill for the relief of J. L. Horton, James Horton, Fred Bird, John Dowdell, Martin Dowdell, Harrison Trent, Charles Clark, Obed Crutcher, Nannie Horton, Virgil Funk, Lubie Bailey, Della Stone, Cowley Heiss, Arthur Carr, Lonnie Wise, E. B. Meyers, Nellie Meyers, Leo Wise, Clyde A. Meyers, W. C. Masters, Gertie Stone, Caskmears Atcher, Josephine Clark, Alexander Higdon, Mrs. J. T. Eubanks, Mrs. Harrison Basham, Harry Yates, and G. S. Stone; with amendment (Rept. No. 295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1151. A bill for the relief of James Lemuel Muzzall and James M. Muzzall; with amendment (Rept. No. 296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1357. A bill for the relief of the estate of Otto Frederick Gnospelius, deceased; with amendment (Rept. No. 297). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1486. A bill for the relief of Sam D. Moak; with amendment (Rept. No. 298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1568. A bill for the relief of John C. Tuttle; with amendment (Rept. No. 299). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1711. A bill for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton; with amendment (Rept. No. 300). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. S. 167. An act for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.; without amendment (Rept. No. 301). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 807. A bill for the relief of John Burl Townsend; with amendments (Rept. No. 302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania: Committee on Claims. H. R. 912. A bill for the relief of William H. Shultz; without amendment (Rept. No. 303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COLE of Kansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1055. A bill for the relief

of the Realty Bond & Mortgage Co. and Robert W. Keith; with amendment (Rept. No. 304). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1059. A bill for the relief of Leonard D. Jackson and Elsie Fowkes Jackson; with amendments (Rept. No. 305). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2517) granting a pension to Charlie Jones, and the same was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COFFEE:

H. R. 2548. A bill increasing the specific exemption for purposes of the excess profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 2549. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the eastern section of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 2550. A bill to provide for, foster, and aid in coordinating research relating to neuropsychiatric disorders; to provide for more effective methods of prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of such disorders; to establish the National Neuropsychiatric Institute; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 2551. A bill to provide for continuing the pay of members of the armed forces for 12 months following the date of discharge from the service to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2552. A bill to amend paragraph (c) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, as amended by act approved February 27, 1931; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2553. A bill to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's tailor shop at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2554. A bill to permit Federal employees to serve as election officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2555. A bill to provide disability and death compensation or pension in the case of certain members of the naval enlisted reserve who received Civil Aeronautics Administration war training prior to December 15, 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2556. A bill to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's cobbler and barber shops at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs

H. R. 2557. A bill to provide for promotion of certain American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2558. A bill to allow an additional period of 6 months in which certain members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, or their beneficiaries, may make a claim for benefits under the act of July 18, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2559. A bill to provide that World War veterans serving in the land or naval forces during the present war shall be given the highest rank, grade, or rating held by them during the World War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2560. A bill to provide that any service rendered and any deductions made or taxes paid by any person under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, any other Federal retirement act, or the Social Security Act may be credited to such person for the purposes of any other such act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 2561. A bill to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments with respect to strategic metals and minerals and petroleum and petroleum products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2562. A bill to extend the privilege of retirement to the judges of the District Court for the District of Alaska, the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

H. R. 2563. A bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Goshute Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 2564. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 2565. A bill to prohibit the issuance of alcoholic beverage licenses in certain localities in the District of Columbia, to prohibit advertising the price of such beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (by request):

H. R. 2566. A bill to provide that veterans may obtain copies of their marriage records in the District of Columbia, without the payment of any fees, for use in presenting claims to the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 2567. A bill to provide that service on inactive duty shall be credited toward the 90-day period of service required of servicemen eligible for certain educational benefits provided by the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2568. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, so as to eliminate the requirement that not less than 15 percent of the principal of insured mortgages upon farm property be expended for improvements; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 176. Resolution authorizing that the report from the Attorney General of the United States dated February 28, 1945, on international air transport policy be printed, with illustrations, as a House document, and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof; to the Committee on Printing.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, a memorial was presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that adequate Federal appropriations be provided the Forest Products Laboratory of the United States Forest Service which would enable it to make full use of its present facilities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina:

H. R. 2569. A bill for the relief of Daphne Webb; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2570. A bill for the relief of Charles J. Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 2571. A bill for the relief of Jason Meth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 2572. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. J. Moore of Butler, Taylor County, Ga.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2573. A bill for the relief of Frank L. Howard; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2574. A bill for the relief of Kenton L. Mullenax; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2575. A bill for the relief of Earl J. Huber; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2576. A bill for the relief of William F Schmeltz; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2577. A bill for the relief of Ellen S. Huber; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2578. A bill for the relief of Rufus A. Hancock; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2579. A bill for the relief of John G. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

160. By Mr. ANGELL: Memorial of the Forty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon petitioning the Congress of the United States to appropriate an additional $50,000 to the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station for the establishment of a forest utilization services unit to bring the results of wood utilization research to the forest industries of the Pacific Northwest; to the Committee on Appropriations.

161. By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa: Petition for wartime prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

162. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of 1,250 citizens of the Twenty-third Congressional District of New York protesting against enactment of the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

163. By Mr. MOTT: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon petitioning the Congress of the United States to appropriate an additional $50,000 to the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station and to provide adequate Federal appropriations for the Forest Products Laboratory of the United States Forest Service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

164. By Mr. TIBBOTT: Resolution of the Armstrong County Historical Society, Kittanning, Pa., that Congress memorialize the President of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce, and all other public authorities desirable, that publication may be made of the various censuses of the United States from 1800 to 1860, inclusive, and that publication be made first of the 1850 census; to the Committee on Printing.

165. Also, resolution of the Indiana County Historical Society, Indiana, Pa., that Congress memorialize the President of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce, and all other public authorities desirable, that publication may be made of the various censuses of the United States from 1800 to 1860, inclusive, and that publication be made first of the 1850 census; to the Committee on Printing.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in a troubled time we turn to Thee with hearts that are heavy with anxiety and grief, with minds that are clouded with perplexity and doubt, with spirits that are dismayed and discouraged by the world's catastrophe. Even as we fight on and believe on with the thick mists about us, we seek in Thy presence, in whom is no shadow, the assurance that these clouds are lies and that the blue sky is the truth. May Thy completeness flow round our incompleteness, Thy strength be made manifest in our weakness, Thy forgiving mercy in our guilt, Thy reinforcement in our disappointed hopes and fruitless efforts. Send us forth against unnumbered foes with the whole armor of faith and righteousness, pledging our loyalty to Thy kingdom of love, never letting our confidence in it nor our devotion to it fail because of the fury of the wicked when they boast themselves in the day of their pride.

As Thy servants and the people's in this temple of democracy, save us from the perversion of power that has not Thee in awe. Upon the altar of our freedom may there ever be lifted the offering of an humble and a contrite heart. And in this day of destiny for us and for the world may we be worthy of our vocation as keepers of the sacred flame. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, March 8, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on March 9, 1945, the President had approved and signed the following act:

S. 340. An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2348. An act to provide for the coverage of certain drugs under the Federal narcotic laws; and

H. R. 2404. An act to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes.

ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF DR. SUN YAT-SEN—EXCERPT FROM HIS WILL

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, today, March 12, is the twentieth anniversary of the death of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, founder of the Chinese Republic and the leader of the revolution against the Manchu dynasty. The Chinese, among our strongest allies at the present time, the world over are celebrating this day, following a custom which is a good one from the standpoint of history and morale building and one which they should be commended for following because of the ideals of the man who is responsible for what they have wrought. Wherever the Chinese meet today they will read Dr. Sun Yat-sen's will. I therefore, Mr. President, ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from his will be printed in the RECORD at this point and made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My life has been consecrated to the Chinese people, and my devotion to the tasks I set myself has remained unchanged during this long period. Neither the might of the Manchu dynasty nor all the misfortunes of my life availed to turn me aside from the aims I placed before me. I strove for what I aspired to; and the more failures I experienced, the more I yearned for the struggle. That is why I was able to raise the mass of the Chinese people to revolutionary action and thereby overthrow the monarchy and found the republic.

AWARD OF PHILIPPINE MEDAL FOR VALOR TO GENERAL MACARTHUR

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, President Osmeña, of the Philippine Commonwealth, has just given to Gen. Douglas MacArthur the first award of the highest honor created by the Philippine Commonwealth. I ask that the citation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the citation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANILA, March 10.—President Sergio Osmeña, of the Philippine Commonwealth, decorated Gen. Douglas MacArthur today with the Commonwealth's highest award, its Medal for Valor, the Philippine equivalent of the United States Congressional Medal of Honor.

* * * * *

The Medal for Valor was authorized in 1931, but had never been awarded prior to its presentation to General MacArthur. With the cabinet looking on, President Osmeña said: "Through this decoration, the highest in the power of the Filipino people to give, the Commonwealth desires to make patent for all the world to see our gratitude, our esteem, and our admiration for our true friend and courageous liberator."

Col. Tomas Cahill, Secretary of National Defense, read the citation, which said, in part: "His direction of, planning, preparation, and execution of the Philippines operation has been of such accuracy and thoroughness that the initial blow struck at the enemy with characteristic daring and swiftness has been most successful and is an infallible sign of the final victory now in sight."

General MacArthur, in response, said: "This is a signal honor from the Philippine Government. It will bring me ever closer to the Philippine soldier whose valor and courage I have witnessed so often in battle."

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BAILEY

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer in its issue of March 10, 1945, commending the great speech delivered in the Senate by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] when the work-or-fight bill was under consideration.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAILEY EXHIBITS THE PRIMITIVE VIRTUES

Senator BAILEY, of North Carolina, has consistently tried to convince his colleagues that the Nation needs an effective work-or-fight bill. He has failed in that undertaking.

Congress is still piddling around with this legislation. Its politically minded Members are too sensitive to the opposition which pressure groups have stubbornly presented against the enactment of a suitable measure which would draft available workers for war industry or place them in uniforms.

The House weeks ago passed a reasonably good bill designed to this end. The Senate refused to accept it. After weeks of more or less vapid and meaningless torrents of oratory, the Upper Chamber has finally enacted a milk-and-water bill of its own. Now the two measures, that passed by the House and that passed by the Senate, have been referred to a conference committee from both branches to reconcile conflicts and differences that exist in their respective bills.

Senator BAILEY deserves well of his constituents in North Carolina and of his supporters all over the Nation for the fine fight which he has made in behalf of a work-or-fight measure which would have accomplished the purposes for which the President and the Nation's military leaders demanded this legislation.

The Baltimore Sun speaks with eulogy of the courageous and aggressive fight which the North Carolina Senator has made for this cause.

That newspaper contends that if anyone in the United States is looking for the phenomenon of the primitive virtues, such a one could find them in the statesmanship which has been exhibited by Senator BAILEY.

The Sun singles out this excerpt from the Senator's powerful speech in favor of a work-or-fight bill for which the administration has asked:

"Some have said that they would beat us for office. Well, what if they do? Are not Senators expendable? Think about the country. Think about the boys. Think about the generals who are responsible, who are begging us for men, who are begging us for arms and ammunition."

"What are the primitive virtues?" asks the Baltimore Sun and forthwith makes answer:

"Well, among them is courage, honesty, faithfulness to trust and duty, contempt for evasion, for deviousness, for fraud in any degree. These were on view in Senator BAILEY's speech on manpower."

STREAMLINING THE FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be privileged to address the Senate for 5 minutes in order to present certain statistics and facts regarding surplus pay-roll costs under the Federal Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin that he be allowed to address the Senate for 5 minutes? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wisconsin will proceed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has stated that the annual pay-roll cost of the estimated 300,000 Federal workers who are

holding surplus and artifical jobs is $700,000,000. This figure would pay the annual interest, computed at a rate of 2 percent, on $35,000,000,000 of our national debt. Some of the astronomic spenders in our Government might disparage this $700,000,000 figure as a comparatively small sum; yet I invited their attention to the fact that this interest would be paid to our 85,000,000 citizens who have invested their savings in Government War bonds, either directly by individual purchases, or indirectly through their profit-making or eleemosynary institutions.

On December 31, 1944, $230,500,000,000 of interest-bearing securities issued or guaranteed by the Government were outstanding. Of this figure, commercial and Federal Reserve banks held $96,000,000,000 worth; individuals held $52,000,000,000; insurance companies held $19,500,000,000; mutual savings banks, $8,500,000,000; State and local governments, $4,000,000,000; Federal agencies and trust funds, $21,750,000,000; and corporations, miscellaneous associations, and others, $28,000,000,000.

Thus, every cent which might be saved, rather than go down the bureaucratic drain, could help to pay off the interest owed to these individuals and groups or, indeed, to begin to retire the Federal debt. This latter action would serve as a "shot in the arm" to the Nation and would reassure it of our country's financial solvency.

Is it not then the high obligation of every executive in the Federal service to cut corners insofar as possible, to conserve manpower, conserve funds, and maintain the self-respect and pride in honest workmanship of employees?

Is this high obligation not doubly heavy upon the shoulders of those executives who hold sway over the larger Federal departments and agencies? I refer in particular to such gigantic enterprises as the War Department with its 1,185,000 civilian employees within the United States, the Navy Department with its 693,000, the Post Office with its 372,000 employees, the Treasury with 95,000, and the Department of Agriculture with its 72,000 employees.

And, lastly, is not every holder of public office duty-bound to render to the public maximum service conducted in streamlined operations with conscientious thrift and sincere courtesy?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I made to the press on Friday, March 9. In this statement I called, as I have on many previous occasions, for a businesslike reduction of the Federal bureaucracy.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

With our boys doing the impossible on every war front, it is an outrage that we should throw up our hands in helplessness while the bloated Federal bureaucracy continues to swell.

There are 3,372,000 civil service civilian employees here and abroad. Senator BYRD has estimated that at a minimum 300,000 of these are surplus. The existence of this sit-down army of seat-warmers and hangers-on makes a mockery of every sacrifice by private enterprise on the home front and by the military services on the war fronts. It is a shocking testimonial to the inadequacy of the present administration in handling the wartime affairs of Government and the peacetime affairs to come.

The screws are being constantly tightened on industry and agriculture to force out needed manpower. The Senate has just passed a bill imposing stiff penalties on employers who willfully violate War Manpower Commission regulations. In my own State, manufacturers have been notified to list all of their employees between the ages of 18 and 29, and have been instructed by the Army that they may only retain 15 percent of these men. In the words of one manufacturer, "If the Army takes this many men away from industry, I fail to see how the men on the front line will be able to be supplied." In agriculture, our people are abandoning their life-long holdings or are working man-killing hours because their farms have been stripped of hands.

The war plants are crying for help. The farms are crying for help. The military services are crying for help. But at the same time, Government, "the greatest hoarder of them all," in the words of Senator BYRD, is obstinately refusing to release any help from its padded rolls. Indeed, there is barely a single Federal agency which contemplates any sizable reduction even after VE-day, let alone VJ-day.

In Heaven's name, when will the executive branch of the Government recognize its sacred obligation to the people not only to conserve manpower but to conserve funds? Federal officials are the trustees of every single penny appropriated to them by Congress and made available through taxation of the hard-earned incomes of the American public. The House has just raised the national debt limit to $300,000,000,000. When we reach that limit, as we surely will, every man, woman, and child in this country will owe over $2,000, in addition to bearing the crushing burden of interest upon that principal.

The particular Federal agencies empowered to take the lead in the economy drive have apparently folded their hands—the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget (which were responsible for Federal manpower conservation), and the War Manpower Commission (which is responsible for all manpower conservation). They have set a terrible example for every bureaucrat to pass the buck on this issue. But if the afore-mentioned agencies will not spearhead the job, then it is up to every patriotic Cabinet officer, every patriotic agency head, and every patriotic bureau head to take and keep the initiative in economizing.

Any supervisor employed by the United States Government must answer to his conscience if he creates or maintains artificial jobs in order to bolster his prestige or salary. Any employee must stand accused in his own mind if he remains in a job which does not call for 8 hours of honest work in an 8-hour day. In these cases, the supervisors and employees are little better than slackers or war profiteers.

No business could long endure which encourages extravagance with stockholders' money and weakening of the moral fiber of its employees such as the United States Government does.

Therefore, I make this demand for the long overdue reduction in the Federal bureaucracy. I am not calling for an arbitrary slash, but rather for an introduction, with patriotic zeal, of business methods, business efficiency, business speed, and business conservation into every last Federal office. Only thus may the Federal Government be adequate to its responsibilities in these desperate days of the Republic.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR VANDENBERG BY THE OMAHA WORLD-HERALD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have in my hand a very short editorial which appeared in the Omaha Evening World-Herald on March 6, 1945, which makes very complimentary reference to the remarks recently made on the floor of the Senate by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and I should like to have it appear in the RECORD at this point.

I might say that the founder of this paper, the late Senator Gilbert M. Hitchcock, was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations during the First World War, and the present editor in chief, Mr. H. E. Newbranch, occupied that position during the First World War.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE AS THE BASIS

There is reason for deep satisfaction in Senator VANDENBERG'S decision to accept membership in the San Francisco Conference.

And this not only because had Mr. VANDENBERG declined the President's invitation, the effect of his refusal would have been instantly chilling. The disturbing reaction would have been felt first among the American people, who hold the Michigan Senator in high respect. And later the Conference itself, and the nations of the world, would have been beset by a sense of doubt and fears concerning the existence of a nonpartisan American unity in the desire for a world security league.

Fortunately Senator VANDENBERG has been given the President's cordial assurance that at San Francisco he will enjoy the right to free action. In other words, he will be a freeman, speaking and acting as all freemen should, according to the dictates of conscience and judgment. It is on such a basis that honest and sincere men can hope to arrive at valuable agreements.

An even greater reason for gratification is that Senator VANDENBERG, announcing his acceptance, places emphasis where emphasis is needed. He calls for justice as a guiding objective in establishing a practical system of collective security. No permanent peace is possible except with justice as its basis. And so:

"It will be my prayer that the San Francisco Conference may be successful in promoting dependable peace, with organized justice, in a free world of freemen."

In that prayer every American not only, but every man and woman everywhere in the world, may well join. It is for this the conscience of civilization is yearning: "Organized justice in a free world of freemen." So vastly more important this than land grabbing, than spheres of influence, than boundary disputes, than commercial rivalries—the ghosts and evils that through the centuries have plunged the world into recurring wars. Never, so long as the material ponderables are permitted to trample the spiritual imponderables under heel, can the bright vision of enduring peace be realized.

In this Senator VANDENBERG speaks the quenchless idealism of his country. And with it he voices America's practical common sense: "Civilization cannot survive World War No. 3."

And so here is formulated the problem to which the San Francisco Conference must address itself. Another world war must be averted. But it cannot for long be averted except on a basis of justice in a free world of freemen.

Not an easy task. Rather it is one of exceeding difficulty. Certainly it will not have been achieved if justice, if honor, if morality are forgotten or surrendered to make a peace that is no peace.

REPORT OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 10, 1945.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 28)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1945, amounting to $996,000 for the Federal Security Agency (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT RELATING TO OIL AND GAS LEASES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, in relation to oil and gas leases issued prior to August 21, 1935, that have been included in approved unit plans of development, etc., and stating that no leases which expired during the calendar year 1944 were extended beyond their initial terms under the provisions of law; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

LEGISLATION BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation enacted by the Legislative Assembly and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

LIQUIDATION OF FEDERAL RURAL REHABILITATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Administrator of the War Food Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, three statements constituting a report with respect to the progress of the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, the Executive Director of the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the Associate Director of the National Park Service, the Alien Property Custodian, Chairman of the War Production Board, Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, and the Secretary of the United States Employees Compensation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective department and offices for the quarter ending June 30, 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY A COMMITTEE WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a report for the month of February 1945 from the chairman of the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, being in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
March 1, 1945.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 319, I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the War Contracts Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the Department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, War Contracts Subcommittee.

WAR CONTRACTS SUBCOMMITTEE, SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Kurt Borchardt	6007 34th Pl. NW., Washington, D. C.	Smaller War Plants Corporation, Washington, D. C.	$5,600
Ann Cheatham	4000 South Capitol St. SE., Washington, D. C.	do	2,000
Bertram M. Gross	613 South Quincy St., Arlington, Va.	Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	8,000
Doris Phippen	40 Plattsburg Court NW, Washington, D. C.	do	2,300

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Concurrent Memorial 1

"House concurrent memorial memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States of America to commit the United States to accept the principles of the federation of the world and requesting the President of the United States to call an international convention to formulate a constitution for the federation of the world

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

"Whereas it is necessary at the present juncture of human affairs to enlarge the basis of organized society by establishing a government for the community of nations, in order to preserve civilization and enable mankind to live in peace and be free, the following principles and objectives are hereby enunciated in:

" 'THE DECLARATION OF THE FEDERATION OF THE WORLD

" 'Man, the source of all political authority, is a manifold political being. He is a citizen of several communities: the city, the State, the Nation, and the world. To each of these communities he owes inalienable obligations and from each he receives enduring benefits.

" 'Communities may exist for a time without being incorporated but, under the stress of adversity, they disintegrate unless legally organized. Slowly but purposefully through the centuries, civilization has united the world, integrating its diverse local interests and creating an international community that now embraces every region and every person on the globe. This community has no government, and communities without government perish. Either this community must succumb to anarchy or submit to the restraints of law and order.

" 'Governments can only be established through the deliberate efforts of men. At this hour two elemental forces are struggling to organize the international community: totalitarianism and democracy. The former, a recent version of repudiated militarism and tyranny, is predicated upon the principle of compulsion, rules through dictatorship, and enslaves men; the latter, a proved bulwark of the rights of man as a human being and as a citizen, derives its authority from the consent of the governed, embodies the will of freemen, and renders their collective judgments supreme in human affairs. The cornerstone of totalitarianism is the ethnographic state, whose restricted interests define the scope of its favors; the foundation of democracy is man, whose integrity is inviolable and whose welfare is its primary concern. The motivating power of the former is violence; of the latter, freedom. One feeds upon unscrupulous ambition; the other upon an enlightened sense of obligation.

" 'One or the other of these forces will now triumph and govern mankind. The present conflict is irrepressible and decisive. It is the challenge of the ages to the generation of today, and represents those spiritually cosmic forces which visit the world at critical periods in human history to shape the destinies of men. This world cannot remain half slave, half free; half totalitarian, half democratic. The laws of civilized society prevent intercourse between slaves and free men from being either congenial or profitable. If totalitarianism wins this conflict, the world will be ruled by tyrants, and individuals will be slaves. If democracy wins, the nations of

the earth will be united in a commonwealth of free peoples, and individuals, wherever found, will be the sovereign units of the new world order.

" 'Man has struggled from time immemorial to endow the individual with certain fundamental rights whose very existence is now imperiled. Among those rights is man's freedom to worship, speak, write, assemble, and vote without arbitrary interference. To safeguard these liberties as a heritage for the human race, governments were instituted among men, with constitutional guaranties against the despotic exercise of political authority, such as are provided by elected parliaments, trial by jury, habeas corpus, and due process of law. Man must now either consolidate his historic rights or lose them for generations to come.

" 'The ceaseless changes wrought in human society by science, industry, and economics, as well as by the spiritual, social, and intellectual forces which impregnate all cultures, make political and geographical isolation of nations hereafter impossible. The organic life of the human race is at last indissolubly unified and can never be severed, but it must be politically ordained and made subject to law. Only a government capable of discharging all the functions of sovereignty in the executive, legislative, and judicial spheres can accomplish such a task. Civilization now requires laws, in the place of treaties, as instruments to regulate commerce between peoples. The intricate conditions of modern life have rendered treaties ineffectual and obsolete, and made laws essential and inevitable. The age of treaties is dead; the age of laws is here.

" 'Governments, limited in their jurisdiction to local geographical areas, can no longer satisfy the needs or fulfill the obligations of the human race. Just as feudalism served its purpose in human history and was superseded by nationalism, so has nationalism reached its apogee in this generation and yielded its hegemony in the body politic to internationalism. The first duty of government is to protect life and property, and when governments cease to perform this function they capitulate on the fundamental principle of their raison d'etre. Nationalism, moreover, is no longer able to preserve the political independence or the territorial integrity of nations, as recent history so tragically confirms. Sovereignty is an ideological concept without geographical barriers. It is better for the world to be ruled by an international sovereignty of reason, social justice, and peace than by divers national sovereignties organically incapable of preventing their own dissolution by conquest. Mankind must pool its resources of defense if civilization is to endure.

" 'History has revealed but one principle by which free peoples, inhabiting extensive territories, can unite under one government without impairing their local autonomy. That principle is federation, whose virtue preserves the whole without destroying its parts and strengthens its parts without jeopardizing the whole. Federation vitalizes all nations by endowing them with security and freedom to develop their respective cultures without menace of foreign domination. It regards as sacrosanct man's personality, his rights as an individual, and as an individual and as a citizen and his role as a partner with all other men in the common enterprise of building civilization for the benefit of mankind. It suppresses the crime of war by reducing to the ultimate minimum the possibility of its occurrence. It renders unnecessary the further paralyzing expenditure of wealth for belligerent activity, and cancels through the ages the mortgages of war against the fortunes and services of men. It releases the full energies, intelligence, and assets of society for creative, ameliorative, and redemptive work on behalf of humanity. It recognizes man's morning vision of his destiny as an authentic potentiality. It apprehends the entire human race as one family, human beings everywhere as brothers, and all nations as component parts of an indivisible community.

" 'There is no alternative to the federation of all nations except endless war. No substitute for the federation of the world can organize the international community on the basis of freedom and permanent peace. Even if continental, regional, or ideological federations were attempted, the governments of these federations, in an effort to make impregnable their separate defenses, would be obliged to maintain stupendously competitive armies and navies, thereby condemning humanity indefinitely to exhaustive taxation, compulsory military service and ultimate carnage, which history reveals to be not only criminally futile but positively avoidable through judicious foresight in federating all nations. No nation should be excluded from membership in the federation of the world that is willing to suppress its military, naval, and air forces, retaining only a constabulary sufficient to police its territory and to maintain order within its jurisdiction, provided that the eligible voters of that nation are permitted the free expression of their opinions at the polls.

" 'It being our profound and irrevocable conviction:

" 'That man should be forever free and that his historic rights as an individual and as a citizen should be protected by all the safeguards sanctioned by political wisdom and experience.

" 'That governments are essential to the existence of communities and that the absence of government is anarchy.

" 'That there exists an international community, encompassing the entire world, which has no government and which is destined, as a consequence of the present war, either to be ruthlessly dominated and exploited by totalitarianism or to be federated by democracy upon the principle of freedom for all nations and individuals.

" 'That all human beings are citizens of this world community, which requires laws and not treaties for its government.

" 'That the present conflict is one whose issue involves the survival of free institutions throughout the world, and that it is morally incumbent upon all free peoples, before this war proceeds further, to write the definite treaty of peace in terms of the constitution of the Federation of the World in order that those who are called to give their lives and fortunes for the triumph of democracy may have positive knowledge of the incorruptible utility of their sacrifice and in order that this conflict may not be fought to found a new world order at the conclusion of hostilities, but to defend the existence of one already established by the Federation of the World': Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein)*:

"SECTION 1. That the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring) does hereby solemnly declare that all peoples of the earth should now be united in a commonwealth of nations to be known as the Federation of the World, and that to that end it hereby endorses the declaration of the Federation of the World as is specifically set forth in the preamble hereof and makes said declaration a part of this memorial in the same manner as if same were recited herein and requests the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in the United States Congress assembled to introduce and secure the passage of a resolution in the Congress of the United States committing the United States to the acceptance of the principle of the Federation of the World and requesting the President of the United States to call an international convention to formulate a constitution for the Federation of the World, which shall be submitted to each nation for its ratification, and that the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, respectfully requested and urged immediately to call such a convention.

"SEC. 2. That when the said international convention is called it be urged to select a territory for the seat of government for the Federation of the World, and that the nation in which the said territory is located be requested to withdraw its jurisdiction over this area and cede it to the Federation of the World for its capital, with all the prerogatives and attributes of sovereignty, in order that there might be built in this area a city symbolic of world unity adequate for the needs of the nations and worthy of the aspirations and destiny of mankind.

"SEC. 3. That a certified copy of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative of the United States Congress from the State of Utah."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of South Dakota, memorializing Congress not to increase the Federal gasoline tax and lubricating oil tax and also to discontinue such taxes as soon as possible; to the Committee on Finance.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. GURNEY on the 6th instant, p. 1754, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by Local Union No. 127, Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers of America, of Alameda County, Oakland, Calif., favoring reduction of the present age limit of 65 to 60 years for persons to be eligible to receive old-age pensions under the Social Security System; to the Committee on Finance.

The petition of Christian Danielsen, of New York City, N. Y., favoring the removal of the words "Without revealing the nature or source of its evidence" from the War and Navy Departments restrictive circular entitled "Discharge of Subversives from Private Plants or War Department Plants Privately Operated of Importance to Army Procurement," dated February 8, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Forty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, convened in regular session, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas timber stands in the Pacific Northwest, both public and private, are being cut at an accelerated rate, far beyond the natural growth of the timber; and

"Whereas in converting timber to lumber less than one-third of the tree is utilized as lumber. About a ton of wood per thousand board feet of lumber is left at the sawmill as sawdust, slabs, and edgings, while about 8 tons are left in the woods as tops, limbs, broken and cull logs, cull trees, and noncommercial species. Such wood is perfectly good chemical raw material; and

"Whereas diversified utilization of timber, taking the forest crop as it comes and using

those portions of it for those uses to which they are best suited will eliminate this extravagant waste of a dwindling natural resource; and

"Whereas the full utilization of timber products and waste material not only means the answer to future employment but the maintaining of many important communities as well: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring), That the Forty-third Regular Assembly of the Oregon Legislature petition the Congress of the United States to appropriate an additional $50,000 to the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station for the establishment of a Forest Utilization Services unit to bring the results of wood utilization research to the forest industries of the Pacific Northwest; to take the problems of industry needing solution to the Forest Products Laboratory of the United States Forest Service and to conduct other urgently needed work such as participating in local pilot plant demonstrations of promising new processes and products; and be it further

"Resolved, That adequate Federal appropriations be provided the Forest Products Laboratory of the United States Forest Service which would enable it to make full use of its present facilities; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to both branches of the Congress of the United States, the Department of Agriculture, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon."

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"Enrolled House Resolution 24

"Resolution expressing commendation and approval of Hon. PAUL STEWART for introducing H. R. 1831; commending the Oklahoma delegation in Congress for their support thereof

"Whereas Hon. PAUL STEWART, Member of Congress from the Third District of Oklahoma, has introduced H. R. 1831, which has for its purpose the granting of old-age assistance when an applicant is a citizen of the United States, is 65 years of age, and residence requirements conform to the provisions of titles 1 and 4; and

Whereas this is a great improvement over the present old-age assistance program and will have a tendency to eliminate so much case work and expense on account thereof, and reduce materially, if not eliminate, case workers; and

"Whereas this is the program that many of the old-age societies have urged and pleaded for; and

"Whereas Congressman STEWART has shown himself farsighted and ready and willing to cooperate with the old people for their betterment and happiness, and

"Whereas the entire Oklahoma delegation in Congress has endorsed Congressman STEWART'S bill: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Twentieth Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, That Hon. PAUL STEWART, Congressman from the Third District of Oklahoma, who served for 6 years as a member of the house of representatives in the Oklahoma Legislature and 16 years in the State Senate of Oklahoma, be highly commended for his splendid record in Congress and especially for his introduction of H. R. 1831; and be it further

"Resolved by the house of representatives, That the entire delegation in Congress from the State of Oklahoma be commended for their loyal support of H. R. 1831 and that this body go on record expressing their wholehearted approval and thanks, especially to Congressman STEWART and to the entire delegation in Congress from Oklahoma, and respectfully urge that the Congress of the United States approve at an early date said H. R. 1831; be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives forward, by air mail, certified copies of this resolution to each Member in Congress from the State of Oklahoma.

"Passed the house of representatives the 1st day of March 1945."

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

"Enrolled Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relating to public lands in, and funds and other relief due, the State of Wyoming from the United States of America

"Whereas lands now constituting the State of Wyoming were acquired largely under treaties with France and Mexico, that with Mexico having provided that the territory embraced under such acquisition 'Shall be formed into free, sovereign and independent States and incorporated into the Union of the United States of America as soon as possible, and the citizens thereof shall be accorded the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages and immunities as the citizens of the original States', and said Louisiana Purchase Treaty with France having contained almost identical requirements; and

"Whereas in the early days of the public domain none questioned but that it should and soon would pass to the several States within which it was situate, the then excuse for withholding such action having been that it was pledged to secure a national debt created by the Revolutionary War but after said debt was paid, such lands having been retained by the Federal Government and funds rapidly accumulated from disposal thereof, with a relatively minor exception, having been loaned to and among the then 26 States of the Union, most of which had never contributed toward such fund, and which fund with accumulated interest is now reported to be in excess of $2,000,000,000, distribution thereof being equitably due to said public land States; and

"Whereas although the act admitting Wyoming into the Union, approved by the Federal Congress on July 10, 1890, included the express provision that 'The State of Wyoming is hereby declared to be a State of the United States of America and is hereby declared admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever * * *' and although the United States never asserted ownership of the lands, minerals, or waters of the original States and by paragraph 17 of section 8 of article I of its Constitution, the Federal Congress was authorized to exercise authority over, in addition to the District of Columbia, only such places as the Nation might purchase, by and with the consent of the legislature of the State in which the same are located, for specified purposes not including forests, minerals, monuments, or waters; and

"Whereas instead of vesting in the State of Wyoming, full title to all public land within its borders, as legally and equitably due said State under the treaty and constitutional provisions aforesaid, the Federal Government has followed a program of executive withdrawals under which there have been eliminated from the tax rolls and control of this State, more than one-half the lands within its borders, which program has included recent administrative set-up of the so-called Jackson Hole Monument, covering several hundred thousand acres of Wyoming land, portions thereof being privately or State-owned, and the will of Congress in setting aside such autocratic executive action having been defeated by Presidential veto: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-eighth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (its house of representatives concurring), That the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, the Honorable EDWARD V. ROBERTSON, and the Honorable FRANK A. BARRETT, Senators and Representative respectively from Wyoming in the Congress, and the Honorable Lester C. Hunt, Governor of this State, be and they are hereby requested, first, to continue their efficient, past action in opposing establishment of said so-called monument; second, to have initiated and diligently prosecuted, appropriate legislation by the Congress, looking to early restoration to this State, of full title to all public lands inside its boundaries, and third, to initiate and prosecute in like manner, action looking to recovery by this State, of all moneys properly payable to it on account of lands and minerals previously and improperly withdrawn from it or from private ownership, including, but not by way of limitation, the proportionate amount due said State on account of the one specific fund previously mentioned; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies hereof be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Federal Congress, the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, the Honorable EDWARD V. ROBERTSON, and the Honorable FRANK A. BARRETT, Senators and Representative respectively, in said Congress from Wyoming, and to Honorable Lester C. Hunt, Governor of Wyoming.

"Approved 4:55 p. m. February 13, 1945.

"LESTER C. HUNT,
"Governor."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.)

Two joint memorials of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial memoralizing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and pass legislation to amend the Social Security Act

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows:

"Whereas the present social-security law does not provide for retirement before the age of 65: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America be, and is hereby memorialized to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the retiring age be 65 years for workers in covered employment, and to provide that employees who have worked for 30 years or who have been disabled and are unable to work be retired with full payment as provided by the United States Social Security Act; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to United States Senators, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and E. V. ROBERTSON, and Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT.

"Approved January 31, 1945.

"LESTER C. HUNT,
"Governor."

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation relating to employers' sinking funds and reserves and taxability thereof

"Whereas sound and patriotic efforts by employers to set aside sinking funds and to establish other reserves for employment of returning veterans, for the taking care of necessarily deferred maintenance, for plant and other industrial reconversions and for current or post-war business adjustments and as a precaution against otherwise required payment of interest in the future of money which must be borrowed if present surpluses are dissipated and present market conditions or income levels become depressed, are now impaired if not completely frustrated by United States Treasury Department regulations under which the Internal Revenue Bureau assumes arbitrary authority to decide whether or not such reserves and funds are so unduly accumulated as to require their being either distributed or taxed out of existence, thus defeating experience-based plans of employers to safeguard the future welfare of their employees and resulting in present unnecessary and unwarranted spending of funds which should be preserved to accomplish the future purposes indicated and to preserve a stable, tax-producing structure: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-eighth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (its house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to promptly enact suitable legislation as required to eliminate or appropriately modify the criticized regulations, to expressly permit and encourage accumulations by employers of sinking funds and other reserves for the objectives stated and to provide that while set aside as such, they shall not be so taxed as to defeat their intended purposes; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Hon. EDWARD V. ROBERTSON and Hon. FRANK A. BARRETT, Senators and Representative respectively in the United States Congress, from Wyoming.

"Approved February 20, 1945.

"LESTER C. HUNT,
"Governor."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two joint memorials of the Legislature of Wyoming identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.)

Two joint memorials of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial No. 1

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States that all presently proposed Federal irrigation projects and all such which are proposed in the future, for construction in the State of Wyoming, be continued in all stages under the direct supervision of the United States Bureau of Reclamation.

"Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation has had many years of, and the only, experience in initiation, construction, maintenance, development, and operation of all Federal irrigation projects in the West and in such matters has been and is required by laws of the Nation to comply with all affecting State laws: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the Twenty-eighth Wyoming Legislature (its house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to promptly and effectively enact such legislation as may be appropriate to vest in said Bureau beyond any possibility of judicial doubt or Executive evasion concerning congressional intent, continued and direct supervision of the initiation, construction, maintenance, development, and operation of all Federal irrigation projects wholly or partially within the State of Wyoming, now or in the future proposed; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this joint memorial be sent to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of the Federal Congress and to the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, the Honorable EDWARD V. ROBERTSON and the Honorable FRANK A. BARRETT, Senators and Representative, respectively, in said Congress from Wyoming.

"Approved February 13, 1945.

"LESTER C. HUNT,
"Governor."

"Enrolled Joint Memorial No. 2

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to consider and act upon legislation to remove or amend the excess land provisions of the reclamation act for lands receiving water supplies (in addition to their now existing water supplies) and relating to excess land provisions for new lands on future projects of the Bureau of Reclamation in the State of Wyoming.

"Whereas the agricultural economy of many existing irrigated areas in Wyoming is based upon the production of livestock, which requires large areas of irrigated pasture land and hay meadows; and

"Whereas the size of these existing farm units has been determined by each individual settler and has been dictated by the requirements of feed for livestock; and

"Whereas any reduction in the size of existing farm units would reduce the base acreage for allocation of public grazing land, which would work an undue hardship on the livestock producer; and

"Whereas the future economy of many new land projects will be based upon the production of livestock, and a farm unit of 160 acres has been found through past experience to be inadequate to maintain a sufficient number of livestock to support a single farm family: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, that the House of Representatives of the Twenty-eighth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring), That we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to consider and act upon legislation to provide for removal of the excess land provision of the reclamation law for lands in future projects of the Bureau of Reclamation in the State of Wyoming already having partial water supplies; and be it further

"Resolved, That the determination of economic size of new land farm units on future projects of the Bureau of Reclamation in the State of Wyoming be left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, but in no case to exceed 320 acres under a single ownership; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States and to the United States Senators Joseph C. O'Mahoney and E. V. Robertson, Congressman Frank A. Barrett, to the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and Harry W. Bashore, Commissioner of Reclamation.

"Approved February 19, 1945.

"LESTER C. HUNT,
"Governor."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.)

REPORTS OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 8th instant,

The following reports of the Committee on Appropriations were submitted on March 10, 1945:

By Mr. McKELLAR (for Mr. GLASS):

H. R. 1924. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 88).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

H. R. 2126. A bill making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 87).

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 686. A bill to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 89).

CONTINUATION OF STUDY OF AUTHORITY FOR ISSUANCE OF EXECUTIVE ORDERS AND DEPARTMENTAL REGULATIONS

Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 98) and submitted a report (No. 90) thereon, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority contained in Senate Resolution 252, Seventy-eighth Congress (relating to a study into the legal and constitutional authority for the issuance of Executive orders of the President and of departmental regulations), agreed to March 30, 1944, and extended by Senate Resolution 16, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to January 29, 1945, is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress; and that the limit of expenditures thereunder is hereby increased by $50,000.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on March 8, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 177. An act for the relief of Oscar Griggs;

S. 211. An act for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthews McCord, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 212. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11–12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941;

S. 214. An act to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943;

S. 215. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval

auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944;

S. 217. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States, and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine;

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Duke Power Co. a 180-foot perpetual easement across Camp Croft, in the State of South Carolina; and

S. 290. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Orange & Rockland Electric Co. a 150-foot perpetual easement across the West Point Military Reservation in the State of New York.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 719. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Peter N. Bragg, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 720. A bill to extend the benefits of the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act of May 24, 1928, to officers honorably discharged from the Army under Public, No. 259 Sixty-seventh Congress, June 30, 1922; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado also introduced Senate bill 721, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 722. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Alice Yarlott Othermedicine; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 723. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. CORDON (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 724. A bill to provide promotion of certain retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who served during the War with Spain and World War No. 1; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. J. Res. 45. Joint resolution extending the effective period of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution to provide for the use of the words "Observe Sunday" in the cancelation of United States mail; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

FURLOUGHS WITH PAY FOR VETERANS UPON SEPARATION FROM SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, in the press of yesterday Admiral William H. Standley, former Ambassador to Russia and at one time Chief of Naval Operations, is reported to be urging Congress to provide a month's leave with pay and a ticket home for every overseas veteran before his discharge from the service. In the article the admiral goes on to give his reasons for this innovation, which seem to me to be very sound. I therefore introduce a bill which I send to the desk and ask to have appropriately referred. It is designed to do what the admiral suggests that Congress do.

I also ask that the statement as printed in yesterday's newspaper be made a part of my remarks at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 721) to provide for granting terminal furloughs with full pay and allowances to enlisted men upon separation from service, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The statement presented by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado is as follows:

STANDLEY URGES LEAVE WITH PAY FOR VETERANS BEFORE DISCHARGE

Admiral William H. Standley, former Ambassador to Russia and onetime Chief of Naval Operations, is on record as urging Congress to provide a month's leave with pay and a ticket home for every overseas veteran before his discharge from service.

Offering the suggestion "as a first step" to help "our boys readjust themselves to changed conditions and viewpoints" on their return, Admiral Standley likened his own feeling of frustration at the time of his first leave from the Naval Academy to the problems returning veterans will face.

Writing in the Army and Navy Journal, he said:

"Throughout my plebe year at the academy I was looking forward to the grand time I would have when home again with friends. The reunion was all that I anticipated, * * * but in a few days something seemed out of adjustment. My friends were all busy, and in the main pursuing the same objectives they were before I left. * * *"

TELLS OF LONELY TIME

"In the daytime I was unoccupied and lonely and * * * had passed out of their orbit of activities and interests. * * *

"Many of our boys will be in exactly the same status as I was when I had my first leave from the academy. A month's leave at home while still in uniform will not only help them toward a realistic readjustment but will prevent them from squandering whatever bonus they may receive on discharge."

The retired naval officer, now serving with the Office of Strategic Services, recalled that during the last war "political pressure" for release of servicemen "became very heavy," and that this "upset the order of discharge and resulted in discontent all down the line, usually causing displaced boys to write home about it, and then would come more special-order discharges. Because of this many youngsters left the service with feelings of disgust and bitterness."

LEAVE WOULD AID ADJUSTMENT

"All this would have been avoided and can be avoided," Admiral Standley said, by a month's leave "immediately after their services can be spared—a month's leave to go home in uniform and with full pay to see their wives, their children, their mothers, and their sweethearts.

"Such a respite would give them a chance, without the necessity of trying to plunge right back into civilian life, to see what conditions are, what has to be done, what they can do, so when they do get their discharge they will be far better fitted in every way to resume their places as useful citizens."

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 2348. An act to provide for the coverage of certain drugs under the Federal narcotic laws; and

H. R. 2404. An act to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Appropriations Committee I desire to submit several notices in writing in accordance with rule XL of the standing rules of the Senate, that it is my intention to move the suspension of paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing that the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, be amended.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the Senate rule I believe that a motion to suspend a rule must lie over 1 day.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would make it impossible to take up the bill today.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think we could take it up. There is considerably more to do with it. We could finish with everything except the particular question which I have raised.

Mr. BARKLEY. We could not conclude consideration of the bill today.

Mr. McKELLAR. We could do so unless some Senator objected. Under the Senate rules consideration could be completed if no Senator objected.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct.

The notice in writing submitted by Mr. McKELLAR is as follows:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purpose, the following amendments, namely:

On page 19, line 13, before the period insert "*Provided*, That of the $35,000,000 appropriated in this paragraph, $5,000,000 shall be available for loans or advances without matching under the provisions of said title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, but the remaining $30,000,000 shall not be available for obligation or expenditure under said title V except to make loans or advances in cases in which sums at least equal to such loans or advances shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, their agencies or political subdivisions for the purposes set forth in said title V."

On page 22, line 9, before the period insert "*Provided further*, That the Commissioner of Public Buildings may, in his discretion, upon such terms and conditions as he may deem to be in the public interest, with the approval of the Federal Works Administrator, accept on behalf of the United States for installation in the United States Post Office Building at Kennebunkport, Maine, a mural, contributed by public-spirited citizens of the town of Kennebunkport, Maine, depicting, historically, the shipbuilding and seafaring activities of that community."

On page 30, line 7, before the period insert "*Provided*, That no part of the appropriation made in this paragraph for use in any cooperating country shall be available for obligation or expenditure unless said cooperating country executes a written agree-

ment that it will impose no restrictions on the use of the highway, nor levy directly or indirectly any tax or charge for such use, by traffic or vehicles from any other country that do not apply with equal force to the like use of the highway by traffic or vehicles of the cooperating country."

Page 55, line 10, after the word "field", strike out the following: "$9,648,000, together with the unexpended balance on June 30, 1945, in the 'Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1945', to remain available until June 30, 1946, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against the 'Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1945,' and insert in lieu thereof $59,701,000."

Page 55, line 24, after the word "hostilities", insert the following: "*Provided further*, That the Tennessee Valley Authority shall pay all its receipts into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, except the continuing fund of $1,000,000 provided in section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of the amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and myself give notice in writing that, in accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, we hereby move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to House bill 1984, the independent offices appropriation bill, an amendment, which I send to the desk, ask to have printed, and lie on the table until it shall be called up.

The notice in writing submitted by Mr. WHERRY for himself and Mr. MAYBANK is as follows:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is the intention of myself and Mr. MAYBANK to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. —. In order to enable persons who have served 90 days or more in the land or naval forces during the present war, and who have been honorably discharged from such service, to obtain materials required for the construction, alteration, or repair of dwelling houses to be occupied by them, any department or agency of the Government, in allocating or granting priorities with respect to any materials, shall give to such persons a preference over all other users of such materials (except to the extent such materials are needed by such other users to meet actual military needs), without requiring any showing of hardship or other necessity for the construction, alteration, or repair of such dwelling houses."

Mr. WHERRY (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK) also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them jointly to House bill 1984, the independent offices appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS AND PRACTICES IN THE PRODUCTION, ETC., OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I ask to have referred to the proper committee. It has to do with an investigation of the production, distribution, and transportation of livestock, and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 96) was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with a view to determining:

(1) The conditions prevailing in the production, processing, and marketing of agricultural commodities, including livestock, feed, poultry and eggs and the products thereof;

(2) The effects of regulations, orders, and directives issued by governmental agencies upon the production, processing, marketing, distribution, and supplies of such commodities;

(3) Adverse effects upon meat supplies of maladjustments in maximum prices established on different grades of meat and particularly because of an inadequate allowance on the better grades of meat to encourage the feeding of livestock; maladjustment in prices of feed grains for livestock result from maximum prices established for such commodities or products thereof;

(4) The practices of purchasers of livestock for slaughter and the effect of such practices upon producers, processors, distributors, and consumers;

(5) Any practices wherein processors of livestock are circumventing the purposes and objectives of price floors, price ceilings, and subsidies at the expense of the producers and the Public Treasury;

(6) Reasons for the failures to support prices to farmers as required by existing law;

(7) Procedures followed by the Office of Price Administration, the War Food Administration, and the Director of Economic Stabilization in the issuance of regulations, orders, and directives relating to maximum prices, rationing, production, processing, and marketing of agricultural commodities and products thereof and the extent to which conflicts of policies and recommendations have occurred;

(8) Improvements in conditions which could be effected through consolidation of all activities pertaining to food production, marketing, processing, distribution, rationing, and price control, under one agency.

Such committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, together with its recommendation for any necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION CONFERENCE—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM CONVENTION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of secrecy with regard to the convention which has been sent to the Senate, Executive A, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, relating to the International Civil Aviation Conference which was held at Chicago in December. The convention was signed in the English language by the respective plenipotentiaries of the Governments of the United States of America, the Philippine Commonwealth, and certain other countries.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the ban of secrecy is removed from the convention and it will be published in the RECORD.

The convention, with accompanying papers, is as follows:

[Executive A, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session]

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a convention on international civil aviation, concluded at the International Civil Aviation Conference, at Chicago, on December 7, 1944, and signed in the English language by the respective plenipotentiaries of the Governments of the United States of America, the Philippine Commonwealth, and certain other countries, as explained more fully in the report by the Acting Secretary of State, which report I transmit herewith for the information of the Senate.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 12, 1945.*

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State. 2. Convention on international civil aviation—certified copy.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 5, 1945.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to its transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a certified copy of a convention on international civil aviation, concluded at the International Civil Aviation Conference at Chicago on December 7, 1944, and signed as of that date, in the English language, by the respective plenipotentiaries of the Governments of the United States of America, the Philippine Commonwealth, Afghanistan, the Commonwealth of Australia, Bolivia, Canada, Chile, China, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Lebanon, Liberia, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Syria, Turkey, the United Kingdom of Great Britain, and Northern Ireland, and Uruguay. The respective plenipotentiaries of the Governments of Guatemala and Norway signed the convention on January 30, 1945. The Minister of Denmark in Washington and the Minister of Thailand in Washington were present at the International Civil Aviation

Conference in their respective personal capacities and affixed their signatures to the convention.

The provisions of the convention are designed to give effect to certain principles and arrangements in order that international civil aviation may be developed in a safe and orderly manner and that international air transport services may be established on the basis of equality of opportunity and operated soundly and economically. The signatory Governments have, by this convention, indicated their recognition of the fact that the future development of international civil aviation can help greatly to create and preserve friendship and understanding among the nations and peoples of the world and, furthermore, that it is desirable to avoid friction and to promote that cooperation between nations and peoples upon which the peace of the world depends.

Attention is invited to the final paragraph of the convention. Although it is stated in that paragraph that the convention is "done at Chicago the 7th day of December 1944, in the English language," it is provided therein also as follows: "A text drawn up in the English, French, and Spanish languages, each of which shall be of equal authenticity shall be opened for signature at Washington, D. C." Under ordinary circumstances it would be considered proper, in view of a provision such as this, to delay the transmission of the convention to the Senate until there had become available for that purpose a certified copy of the convention as signed in all the languages which are to have equal authenticity. However, the Department of State is informed that the French and Spanish versions have not been completed and it is anticipated that it may be a considerable time before it will be possible to have the convention signed at Washington in the three-language text.

Considering that the English version to be signed at Washington will be the same in all respects as the English text drawn up for signature at Chicago, a certified copy of which is enclosed herewith, and considering also that the French and Spanish versions, when completed, are to correspond exactly as a matter of substance with the English version, it has been decided that it would be advisable to have the convention brought to the attention of the Senate without delay. It is believed that this action, while not strictly in accordance with the customary procedure in relation to the transmission of treaties to the Senate, will serve to expedite consideration of the convention by the Senate.

The convention is divided into four parts, part I relating to air navigation, part II relating to the international civil aviation organization, part III relating to international air transport, and part IV containing the final provisions. The convention likewise is divided into 22 chapters, dealing, in order, with the following matters: General principles and application of the convention (I); flight over territory of contracting states (II); nationality of aircraft (III); measures to facilitate air navigation (IV); conditions to be fulfilled with respect to aircraft (V); international standards and recommended practices (VI); the organization (VII); the assembly (VIII); the council (IX); the air navigation commission (X); personnel (XI); finance (XII); other international arrangements (XIII); information and reports (XIV); airports and other air navigation facilities (XV); joint operating organizations and pooled services (XVI); other aeronautical agreements and arrangements (XVII); disputes and default (XVIII); war (XIX); annexes (XX); ratifications, adherences, amendments, and denunciations (XXI); and definitions (XXII).

The articles of the convention which contain the specific provisions are numbered article 1 to article 96, inclusive. For the purposes of the present report, it is believed to be unnecessary to undertake a detailed analysis of the provisions of the convention. A marginal note accompanying each of the articles indicates the subject matter thereof. Particular attention is given here to a few of the significant provisions.

The contracting states recognize that every state has complete exclusive sovereignty over the air space above its territory (art. 1).

The right of nonscheduled flight is extended to civil aircraft, subject to certain limitations (art. 5). It is provided, however, that no scheduled international air service may be operated over or into the territory of a contracting state except with the special permission or authorization of that state (art. 6).

The convention provides that each contracting state shall have the right to refuse to the aircraft of other contracting states the privilege of taking on in its territory passengers, mail, and cargo carried for remuneration or hire and destined for another point within its territory, and that arrangements shall not be made whereby any such privilege may be granted or obtained on an exclusive basis (art. 7).

Each contracting state reserves the right to establish prohibited areas for reasons of military necessity or public safety and, in certain circumstances and on a nondiscriminatory basis, to restrict or prohibit temporarily flying over the whole or any part of its territory (art. 9).

The convention contains provisions relating to the adoption of international standards and procedures with respect to aircraft, personnel, airways, and auxiliary services (art. 37).

Provisions relating to the establishment, objectives, and functions of the International Civil Aviation Organization, the assembly and council thereof, and the Air Navigation Commission, and to the personnel and finances of the Organization, comprise part II of the convention (arts. 43 to 66, inclusive).

As between the contracting states, this convention supersedes the Paris Convention of October 13, 1919, relating to the regulation of aerial navigation and the Habana Convention of February 20, 1928, on commercial aviation (art. 80). The United States of America is not a party to the Paris Convention of 1919, but is a party of the Habana Convention of 1928 together with certain other of the American republics. The Habana Convention of 1928 is printed in the United States Statutes at Large, volume 47, part 2, page 1901.

Aeronautical agreements in existence at the time the convention comes into force are to be registered with the council (art. 81).

The contracting states accept the convention as abrogating all obligations or understandings between them which are inconsistent with the terms of the convention, and undertake not to enter into such obligations and understandings (art. 82).

It is provided that contracting states may make arrangements not inconsistent with the provisions of the convention, and that any such arrangement shall be registered with the council (art. 83).

In case of war, or in the case of any contracting state which declares a state or national emergency and notifies the fact to the council, the provisions of the convention shall not affect the freedom of action of any contracting states affected, whether as belligerent or as neutral (art. 89).

The final provisions of the convention relate to ratification by signatory states, adherence by nonsignatory states, admission of certain other states to participation in the convention, the method for effecting amendments to the convention, and the right of any contracting state to give notice of denunciation 3 years or more after the convention comes into effect (arts. 91 to 95, inclusive). It is provided in paragraph (b) of article 91 that as soon as the convention has been ratified or adhered to by 26 states it shall come into force between them on the thirtieth day after deposit of the twenty-sixth instrument, and shall come into force for each state ratifying thereafter on the thirtieth day after the deposit of its instrument of ratification. Under paragraph (b) of article 92 the convention shall take effect with respect to an adhering state as from the thirtieth day from the receipt by the Government of the United States of America of the notification of adherence.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH C. GREW.

(Enclosure: Convention on International Civil Aviation—certified copy.)

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION

(Preamble)

Whereas the future development of international civil aviation can greatly help to create and preserve friendship and understanding among the nations and peoples of the world, yet its abuse can become a threat to the general security; and

Whereas it is desirable to avoid friction and to promote that cooperation between nations and peoples upon which the peace of the world depends;

Therefore the undersigned governments having agreed on certain principles and arrangements in order that international civil aviation may be developed in a safe and orderly manner and that international air transport services may be established on the basis of equality of opportunity and operated soundly and economically;

Have accordingly concluded this Convention to that end.

PART I. AIR NAVIGATION

Chapter I. General principles and application of the Convention

Article 1. Sovereignty

The contracting States recognize that every State has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace above its territory.

Article 2. Territory

For the purposes of this Convention the territory of a State shall be deemed to be the land areas and territorial waters adjacent thereto under the sovereignty, suzerainty, protection or mandate of such State.

Article 3. Civil and State Aircraft

(a) This Convention shall be applicable only to civil aircraft, and shall not be applicable to state aircraft.

(b) Aircraft used in military, customs and police services shall be deemed to be state aircraft.

(c) No state aircraft of a contracting State shall fly over the territory of another State or land thereon without authorization by special agreement or otherwise, and in accordance with the terms thereof.

(d) The contracting States undertake, when issuing regulations for their state aircraft, that they will have due regard for the safety of navigation of civil aircraft.

Article 4. Misuse of Civil Aviation

Each contracting State agrees not to use civil aviation for any purpose inconsistent with the aims of this Convention.

Chapter II. Flight over territory of contracting States

Article 5. Right of Non-Scheduled Flight

Each contracting State agrees that all aircraft of the other contracting States, being aircraft not engaged in scheduled international air services shall have the right, subject to the observance of the terms of this Convention, to make flights into or in transit non-stop across its territory and to make stops for non-traffic purposes without the necessity of obtaining prior permission, and subject to the right of the State flown over to require landing. Each contracting State nevertheless reserves the right, for reasons of safety of flight, to require aircraft desiring to

proceed over regions which are inaccessible or without adequate air navigation facilities to follow prescribed routes, or to obtain special permission for such flights.

Such aircraft, if engaged in the carriage of passengers, cargo, or mail for remuneration or hire on other than scheduled international air services, shall also, subject to the provisions of Article 7, have the privilege of taking on or discharging passengers, cargo, or mail, subject to the right of any State where such embarkation or discharge takes place to impose such regulations, conditions or limitations as it may consider desirable.

Article 6. Scheduled Air Services

No scheduled international air service may be operated over or into the territory of a contracting State, except with the special permission or other authorization of that State, and in accordance with the terms of such permission or authorization.

Article 7. Cabotage

Each contracting State shall have the right to refuse permission to the aircraft of other contracting States to take on in its territory passengers, mail and cargo carried for remuneration or hire and destined for another point within its territory. Each contracting State undertakes not to enter into any arrangements which specifically grant any such privilege on an exclusive basis to any other State or an airline of any other State, and not to obtain any such exclusive privilege from any other State.

Article 8. Pilotless Aircraft

No aircraft capable of being flown without a pilot shall be flown without a pilot over the territory of a contracting State without special authorization by that State and in accordance with the terms of such authorization. Each contracting State undertakes to insure that the flight of such aircraft without a pilot in regions open to civil aircraft shall be so controlled as to obviate danger to civil aircraft.

Article 9. Prohibited Areas

(a) Each contracting State may, for reasons of military necessity or public safety, restrict or prohibit uniformly the aircraft of other States from flying over certain areas of its territory, provided that no distinction in this respect is made between the aircraft of the State whose territory is involved, engaged in international scheduled airline services, and the aircraft of the other contracting States likewise engaged. Such prohibited areas shall be of reasonable extent and location so as not to interfere unnecessarily with air navigation. Descriptions of such prohibited areas in the territory of a contracting State, as well as any subsequent alterations therein, shall be communicated as soon as possible to the other contracting States and to the International Civil Aviation Organization.

(b) Each contracting State reserves also the right, in exceptional circumstances or during a period of emergency, or in the interest of public safety, and with immediate effect, temporarily to restrict or prohibit flying over the whole or any part of its territory, on condition that such restriction or prohibition shall be applicable without distinction of nationality to aircraft of all other States.

(c) Each contracting State, under such regulations as it may prescribe, may require any aircraft entering the areas contemplated in subparagraphs (a) or (b) above to effect a landing as soon as practicable thereafter at some designated airport within its territory.

Article 10. Landing at Customs Airport

Except in a case where, under the terms of this Convention or a special authorization, aircraft are permitted to cross the territory of a contracting State without landing, every aircraft which enters the territory of a contracting State shall, if the regulations of that State so require, land at an airport designated by that State for the purpose of customs and other examination. On departure from the territory of a contracting State, such aircraft shall depart from a similarly designated customs airport. Particulars of all designated customs airports shall be published by the State and transmitted to the International Civil Aviation Organization established under Part II of this Convention for communication to all other contracting States.

Article 11. Applicability of Air Regulations

Subject to the provisions of this Convention, the laws and regulations of a contracting State relating to the admission to or departure from its territory of aircraft engaged in international air navigation, or to the operation and navigation of such aircraft while within its territory, shall be applied to the aircraft of all contracting States without distinction as to nationality, and shall be complied with by such aircraft upon entering or departing from or while within the territory of that State.

Article 12. Rules of the Air

Each contracting State undertakes to adopt measures to insure that every aircraft flying over or maneuvering within its territory and that every aircraft carrying its nationality mark, wherever such aircraft may be, shall comply with the rules and regulations relating to the flight and maneuver of aircraft there in force. Each contracting State undertakes to keep its own regulations in these respects uniform, to the greatest possible extent, with those established from time to time under this Convention. Over the high seas, the rules in force shall be those established under this Convention. Each contracting State undertakes to insure the prosecution of all persons violating the regulations applicable.

Article 13. Entry and Clearance Regulations

The laws and regulations of a contracting State as to the admission to or departure from its territory of passengers, crew or cargo of aircraft, such as regulations relating to entry, clearance, immigration, passports, customs, and quarantine shall be complied with by or on behalf of such passengers, crew or cargo upon entrance into or departure from, or while within the territory of that State.

Article 14. Prevention of Spread of Disease

Each contracting State agrees to take effective measures to prevent the spread by means of air navigation of cholera, typhus (epidemic), smallpox, yellow fever, plague, and such other communicable diseases as the contracting States shall from time to time decide to designate, and to that end contracting States will keep in close consultation with the agencies concerned with international regulations relating to sanitary measures applicable to aircraft. Such consultation shall be without prejudice to the application of any existing international convention on this subject to which the contracting States may be parties.

Article 15. Airport and Similar Charges

Every airport in a contracting State which is open to public use by its national aircraft shall likewise, subject to the provisions of Article 68, be open under uniform conditions to the aircraft of all the other contracting States. The like uniform conditions shall apply to the use, by aircraft of every contracting State, of all air navigation facilities, including radio and meteorological services, which may be provided for public use for the safety and expedition of air navigation.

Any charges that may be imposed or permitted to be imposed by a contracting State for the use of such airports and air navigation facilities by the aircraft of any other contracting State shall not be higher,

(a) As to aircraft not engaged in scheduled international air services, than those that would be paid by its national aircraft of the same class engaged in similar operations, and

(b) As to aircraft engaged in scheduled international air services, than those that would be paid by its national aircraft engaged in similar international air services.

All such charges shall be published and communicated to the International Civil Aviation Organization: provided that, upon representation by an interested contracting State, the charges imposed for the use of airports and other facilities shall be subject to review by the Council, which shall report and make recommendations thereon for the consideration of the State or States concerned. No fees, dues or other charges shall be imposed by any contracting State in respect solely of the right of transit over or entry into or exit from its territory of any aircraft of a contracting State or persons or property thereon.

Article 16. Search of Aircraft

The appropriate authorities of each of the contracting States shall have the right, without unreasonable delay, to search aircraft of the other contracting States on landing or departure, and to inspect the certificates and other documents prescribed by this convention.

Chapter III. Nationality of aircraft

Article 17. Nationality of Aircraft

Aircraft have the nationality of the State in which they are registered.

Article 18. Dual Registration

An aircraft cannot be validly registered in more than one State, but its registration may be changed from one State to another.

Article 19. National Laws Governing Registration

The registration or transfer of registration of aircraft in any contracting State shall be made in accordance with its laws and regulations.

Article 20. Display of Marks

Every aircraft engaged in international air navigation shall bear its appropriate nationality and registration marks.

Article 21. Report of Registrations

Each contracting State undertakes to supply to any other contracting State or to the International Civil Aviation Organization, on demand, information concerning the registration and ownership of any particular aircraft registered in that State. In addition, each contracting State shall furnish reports to the International Civil Aviation Organization, under such regulations as the latter may prescribe, giving such pertinent data as can be made available concerning the ownership and control of aircraft registered in that State and habitually engaged in international air navigation. The data thus obtained by the International Civil Aviation Organization, shall be made available by it on request to the other contracting States.

Chapter IV. Measures to facilitate air Navigation

Article 22. Facilitation of Formalities

Each contracting State agrees to adopt all practicable measures, through the issuance of special regulations or otherwise, to facilitate and expedite navigation by aircraft between the territories of contracting States, and to prevent unnecessary delays to aircraft, crews, passengers, and cargo, especially in the administration of the laws relating to immigration, quarantine, customs and clearance.

Article 23. Customs and Immigration Procedures

Each contracting State undertakes, so far as it may find practicable, to establish customs and immigration procedures affecting international air navigation in accordance

with the practices which may be established or recommended from time to time, pursuant to this Convention. Nothing in this Convention shall be construed as preventing the establishment of customs-free airports.

Article 24. Customs Duty

(a) Aircraft on a flight to, from, or across the territory of another contracting State shall be admitted temporarily free of duty, subject to the customs regulations of the State. Fuel, lubricating oils, spare parts, regular equipment and aircraft stores on board an aircraft of a contracting State, on arrival in the territory of another contracting State and retained on board on leaving the territory of that State shall be exempt from customs duty, inspection fees, or similar national or local duties and charges. This exemption shall not apply to any quantities or articles unloaded, except in accordance with the customs regulations of the State, which may require that they shall be kept under customs supervision.

(b) Spare parts and equipment imported into the territory of a contracting State for incorporation in or use on an aircraft of another contracting State engaged in international air navigation shall be admitted free of customs duty, subject to compliance with the regulations of the State concerned, which may provide that the articles shall be kept under customs supervision and control.

Article 25. Aircraft in Distress

Each contracting State undertakes to provide such measures of assistance to aircraft in distress in its territory as it may find practicable, and to permit, subject to control by its own authorities, the owners of the aircraft or authorities of the State in which the aircraft is registered to provide such measures of assistance as may be necessitated by the circumstances. Each contracting State, when undertaking search for missing aircraft, will collaborate in coordinated measures which may be recommended from time to time pursuant to this Convention.

Article 26. Investigation of Accidents

In the event of an accident to an aircraft of a contracting State occurring in the territory of another contracting State, and involving death or serious injury, or indicating sericus technical defect in the aircraft or air navigation facilities, the State in which the accident occurs will institute an inquiry into the circumstances of the accident, in accordance, so far as its laws permit, with the procedure which may be recommended by the International Civil Aviation Organization. The State in which the aircraft is registered shall be given the opportunity to appoint observers to be present at the inquiry and the State holding the inquiry shall communicate the report and findings in the matter to that State.

Article 27. Exemption From Seizure on Patent Claims

(a) While engaged in international air navigation, any authorized entry of aircraft of a contracting State into the territory of another contracting State or authorized transit across the territory of such State with or without landings shall not entail any seizure or detention of the aircraft or any claim against the owner or operator thereof or any other interference therewith by or on behalf of such State or any person therein, on the ground that the construction, mechanism, parts, accessories or operation of the aircraft is an infringement of any patent, design, or model duly granted or registered in the State whose territory is entered by the aircraft, it being agreed that no deposit of security in connection with the foregoing exemption from seizure or detention of the aircraft shall in any case be required in the State entered by such aircraft.

(b) The provisions of paragraph (a) of this Article shall also be applicable to the storage of spare parts and spare equipment for the aircraft and the right to use and install the same in the repair of an aircraft of a contracting State in the territory of any other contracting State, provided that any patented part or equipment so stored shall not be sold or distributed internally in or exported commercially from the contracting State entered by the aircraft.

(c) The benefits of this Article shall apply only to such States, parties to this Convention, as either (1) are parties to the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property and to any amendments thereof; or (2) have enacted patent laws which recognize and give adequate protection to inventions made by the nationals of the other States parties to this Convention.

Article 28. Air Navigation Facilities and Standard Systems

Each contracting State undertakes, so far as it may find practicable, to:

(a) Provide, in its territory, airports, radio services, meteorological services and other air navigation facilities to facilitate international air navigation, in accordance with the standards and practices recommended or established from time to time, pursuant to this Convention;

(b) Adopt and put into operation the appropriate standard systems of communications procedure, codes, markings, signals, lighting and other operational practices and rules which may be recommended or established from time to time, pursuant to this Convention;

(c) Collaborate in international measures to secure the publication of aeronautical maps and charts in accordance with standards which may be recommended or established from time to time, pursuant to this Convention.

Chapter V. Conditions to be fulfilled with respect to aircraft

Article 29. Document Carried in Aircraft

Every aircraft of a contracting State, engaged in international navigation, shall carry the following documents in conformity with the conditions prescribed in this Convention:

(a) Its certificate of registration;

(b) Its certificate of airworthiness;

(c) The appropriate licenses for each member of the crew;

(d) Its journey log book;

(e) If it is equipped with radio apparatus, the aircraft radio station license;

(f) If it carries passengers, a list of their names and places of embarkation and destination;

(g) If it carries cargo, a manifest and detailed declarations of the cargo.

Article 30. Aircraft Radio Equipment

(a) Aircraft of each contracting State may, in or over the territory of other contracting States, carry radio transmitting apparatus only if a license to install and operate such apparatus has been issued by the appropriate authorities of the State in which the aircraft is registered. The use of radio transmitting apparatus in the territory of the contracting State whose territory is flown over shall be in accordance with the regulations prescribed by that State.

(b) Radio transmitting apparatus may be used only by members of the flight crew who are provided with a special license for the purpose, issued by the appropriate authorities of the State in which the aircraft is registered.

Article 31. Certificates of Airworthiness

Every aircraft engaged in international navigation shall be provided with a certificate of airworthiness issued or rendered valid by the State in which it is registered.

Article 32. Licenses of Personnel

(a) The pilot of every aircraft and the other members of the operating crew of every aircraft engaged in international navigation shall be provided with certificates of competency and licenses issued or rendered valid by the State in which the aircraft is registered.

(b) Each contracting State reserves the right to refuse to recognize, for the purpose of flight above its own territory, certificates of competency and licenses granted to any of its nationals by another contracting State.

Article 33. Recognition of Certificates and Licenses

Certificates of airworthiness and certificates of competency and licenses issued or rendered valid by the contracting State in which the aircraft is registered, shall be recognized as valid by the other contracting States, provided that the requirements under which such certificates or licenses were issued or rendered valid are equal to or above the minimum standards which may be established from time to time pursuant to this Convention.

Article 34. Journey Log Books

There shall be maintained in respect of every aircraft engaged in international navigation a journey log book in which shall be entered particulars of the aircraft, its crew and of each journey, in such form as may be prescribed from time to time pursuant to this Convention.

Article 35. Cargo Restrictions

(a) No munitions of war or implements of war may be carried in or above the territory of a State in aircraft engaged in international navigation, except by permission of such State. Each State shall determine by regulations what constitutes munitions of war or implements of war for the purposes of this Article, giving due consideration, for the purposes of uniformity, to such recommendations as the International Civil Aviation Organization may from time to time make.

(b) Each contracting State reserves the right, for reasons of public order and safety, to regulate or prohibit the carriage in or above its territory of articles other than those enumerated in paragraph (a): provided that no distinction is made in this respect between its national aircraft engaged in international navigation and the aircraft of the other States so engaged; and provided further that no restriction shall be imposed which may interfere with the carriage and use on aircraft of apparatus necessary for the operation or navigation of the aircraft or the safety of the personnel or passengers.

Article 36. Photographic Apparatus

Each contracting State may prohibit or regulate the use of photographic apparatus in aircraft over its territory.

Chapter VI. International standards and recommended practices

Article 37. Adoption of International Standards and Procedures

Each contracting State undertakes to collaborate in securing the highest practicable degree of uniformity in regulations, standards, procedures, and organization in relation to aircraft, personnel, airways and auxiliary services in all matters in which such uniformity will facilitate and improve air navigation.

To this end the International Civil Aviation Organization shall adopt and amend from time to time, as may be necessary, international standards and recommended practices and procedures dealing with:

(a) Communications systems and air navigation aids, including ground marking;

(b) Characteristics of airports and landing areas;

(c) Rules of the air and air traffic control practices;

(d) Licensing of operating and mechanical personnel;

(e) Airworthiness of aircraft;

(f) Registration and identification of aircraft;

(g) Collection and exchange of meteorological information;
(h) Log books;
(i) Aeronautical maps and charts;
(j) Customs and immigration procedures;
(k) Aircraft in distress and investigation of accidents;
and such other matters concerned with the safety, regularity, and efficiency of air navigation as may from time to time appear appropriate.

Article 38. Departures from International Standards and Procedures

Any State which finds it impracticable to comply in all respects with any such international standard or procedure, or to bring its own regulations or practices into full accord with any international standard or procedure after amendment of the latter, or which deems it necessary to adopt regulations or practices differing in any particular respect from those established by an international standard, shall give immediate notification to the International Civil Aviation Organization of the differences between its own practice and that established by the international standard. In the case of amendments to international standards, any State which does not make the appropriate amendments to its own regulations or practices shall give notice to the Council within sixty days of the adoption of the amendment to the international standard, or indicate the action which it proposes to take. In any such case, the Council shall make immediate notification to all other States of the difference which exists between one or more features of an international standard and the corresponding national practice of that State.

Article 39. Endorsement of Certificates and Licenses

(a) Any aircraft or part thereof with respect to which there exists an international standard of airworthiness or performance, and which failed in any respect to satisfy that standard at the time of its certification, shall have endorsed on or attached to its airworthiness certificate a complete enumeraion of the details in respect of which it so failed.

(b) Any person holding a license who does not satisfy in full the conditions laid down in the international standard relating to the class of license or certificate which he holds shall have endorsed on or attached to his license a complete enumeration of the particulars in which he does not satisfy such conditions.

Article 40. Validity of Endorsed Certificates and Licenses

No aircraft or personnel having certificates or licenses so endorsed shall participate in international navigation, except with the permission of the State or States whose territory is entered. The registration or use of any such aircraft, or of any certificated aircraft part, in any State other than that in which it was originally certificated shall be at the discretion of the State into which the aircraft or part is imported.

Article 41. Recognition of Existing Standards of Airworthiness

The provisions of this Chapter shall not apply to aircraft and aircraft equipment of types of which the prototype is submitted to the appropriate national authorities for certification prior to a date three years after the date of adoption of an international standard of airworthiness for such equipment.

Article 42. Recognition of Existing Standards of Competency of Personnel

The provisions of this Chapter shall not apply to personnel whose licenses are originally issued prior to a date one year after initial adoption of an international standard of qualification for such personnel; but they shall in any case apply to all personnel whose licenses remain valid five years after the date of adoption of such standard.

PART II. THE INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION ORGANIZATION

Chapter VII. The organization

Article 43. Name and Composition

An organization to be named the International Civil Aviation Organization is formed by the Convention. It is made up of an Assembly, a Council, and such other bodies as may be necessary.

Article 44. Objectives

The aims and objectives of the Organization are to develop the principles and techniques of international air navigation and to foster the planning and development of international air transport so as to:

(a) Insure the safe and orderly growth of international civil aviation throughout the world;

(b) Encourage the arts of aircraft design and operation for peaceful purposes;

(c) Encourage the development of airways, airports, and air navigation facilities for international civil aviation;

(d) Meet the needs of the peoples of the world for safe, regular, efficient and economical air transport;

(e) Prevent economic waste caused by unreasonable competition;

(f) Insure that the rights of contracting States are fully respected and that every contracting State has a fair opportunity to operate international airlines;

(g) Avoid discrimination between contracting States;

(h) Promote safety of flight in international air navigation;

(i) Promote generally the development of all aspects of international civil aeronautics.

Article 45. Permanent Seat

The permanent seat of the Organization shall be at such place as shall be determined at the final meeting of the Interim Assembly of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization set up by the Interim Agreement on International Civil Aviation signed at Chicago on December 7, 1944. The seat may be temporarily transferred elsewhere by decision of the Council.

Article 46. First Meeting of Assembly

The first meeting of the Assembly shall be summoned by the Interim Council of the above-mentioned Provisional Organization as soon as the Convention has come into force, to meet at a time and place to be decided by the Interim Council.

Article 47. Legal Capacity

The Organization shall enjoy in the territory of each contracting State such legal capacity as may be necessary for the performance of its functions. Full juridical personality shall be granted wherever compatible with the constitution and laws of the State concerned.

Chapter VIII. The assembly

Article 48. Meetings of Assembly and Voting

(a) The Assembly shall meet annually and shall be convened by the Council at a suitable time and place. Extraordinary meetings of the Assembly may be held at any time upon the call of the Council or at the request of any ten contracting States addressed to the Secretary General.

(b) All contracting States shall have an equal right to be represented at the meetings of the Assembly and each contracting State shall be entitled to one vote. Delegates representing contracting States may be assisted by technical advisers who may participate in the meetings but shall have no vote.

(c) A majority of the contracting States is required to constitute a quorum for the meetings of the Assembly. Unless otherwise provided in this Convention, decisions of the Assembly shall be taken by a majority of the votes cast.

Article 49. Powers and Duties of Assembly

The powers and duties of the Assembly shall be to:

(a) Elect at each meeting its President and other officers;

(b) Elect the contracting States to be represented on the Council, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter IX;

(c) Examine and take appropriate action on the reports of the Council and decide on any matter referred to it by the Council;

(d) Determine its own rules of procedure and establish such subsidiary commissions as it may consider to be necessary or desirable;

(e) Vote an annual budget and determine the financial arrangements of the organization, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter XII;

(f) Review expenditures and approve the accounts of the Organization;

(g) Refer, at its discretion, to the Council, to subsidiary commissions, or to any other body any matter within its sphere of action;

(h) Delegate to the Council the powers and authority necessary or desirable for the discharge of the duties of the Organization and revoke or modify the delegations of authority at any time;

(i) Carry out the appropriate provisions of Chapter XIII;

(j) Consider proposals for the modification or amendment of the provisions of this Convention and, if it approves of the proposals, recommend them to the contracting States in accordance with the provisions of Chapter XXI;

(k) Deal with any matter within the sphere of action of the Organization not specifically assigned to the Council.

Chapter IX. The Council

Article 50. Composition and Election of Council

(a) The Council shall be a permanent body responsible to the Assembly. It shall be composed of twenty-one contracting States elected by the Assembly. An election shall be held at the first meeting of the Assembly and thereafter every three years, and the members of the Council so elected shall hold office until the next following election.

(b) In electing the members of the Council, the Assembly shall give adequate representation to (1) the States of chief importance in air transports; (2) the States not otherwise included which make the largest contribution to the provision of facilities for international civil air navigation; and (3) the States not otherwise included whose designation will insure that all the major geographic areas of the world are represented on the Council. Any vacancy on the Council shall be filled by the Assembly as soon as possible; any contracting State so elected to the Council shall hold office for the unexpired portion of its predecessor's term of office.

(c) No representative of a contracting State on the Council shall be actively associated with the operation of an international air service or financially interested in such a service.

Article 51. President of Council

The Council shall elect its President for a term of three years. He may be reelected. He shall have no vote. The Council shall elect from among its members one or more Vice Presidents who shall retain their right to vote when serving as acting President. The President need not be selected from among the representatives of the members of the Council but, if a representative is elected, his seat shall be deemed vacant and it shall be filled by the State which he represented. The duties of the President shall be to:

(a) Convene meetings of the Council, the Air Transport Committee, and the Air Navigation Commission;

(b) Serve as representative of the Council; and

(c) Carry out on behalf of the Council the functions which the Council assigns to him.

Article 52. Voting in Council

Decisions by the Council shall require approval by a majority of its members. The Council may delegate authority with respect to any particular matter to a committee of its members. Decisions of any committee of the Council may be appealed to the Council by any interested contracting State.

Article 53. Participation Without a Vote

Any contracting State may participate, without a vote, in the consideration by the Council and by its committees and commissions of any question which especially affects its interests. No member of the Council shall vote in the consideration by the Council of a dispute to which it is a party.

Article 54. Mandatory Functions of Council

The Council shall:

(a) Submit annual reports to the Assembly;

(b) Carry out the directions of the Assembly and discharge the duties and obligations which are laid on it by this Convention;

(c) Determine its organization and rules of procedure;

(d) Appoint and define the duties of an Air Transport Committee, which shall be chosen from among the representatives of the members of the Council, and which shall be responsible to it;

(e) Establish an Air Navigation Commission, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter X;

(f) Administer the finances of the Organization in accordance with the provisions of Chapters XII and XV;

(g) Determine the emoluments of the President of the Council;

(h) Appoint a chief executive officer who shall be called the Secretary General, and make provision for the appointment of such other personnel as may be necessary, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter XI;

(i) Request, collect, examine and publish information relating to the advancement of air navigation and the operation of international air services, including information about the costs of operation and particulars of subsidies paid to airlines from public funds;

(j) Report to contracting States any infraction of this Convention, as well as any failure to carry out recommendations or determinations of the Council;

(k) Report to the Assembly any infraction of this Convention where a contracting State has failed to take appropriate action within a reasonable time after notice of the infraction;

(l) Adopt, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter VI of this Convention, international standards and recommended practices; for convenience, designate them as Annexes to this Convention; and notify all contracting States of the action taken;

(m) Consider recommendations of the Air Navigation Commission for amendment of Annexes and take action in accordance with the provisions of Chapter XX;

(n) Consider any matter relating to the Convention which any contracting State refers to it.

Article 55. Permissive Functions of Council

The Council may:

(a) Where appropriate and as experience may show to be desirable, create subordinate air transport commissions on a regional or other basis and define groups of states or airlines with or through which it may deal to facilitate the carrying out of the aims of this Convention;

(b) Delegate to the Air Navigation Commission duties additional to those set forth in the Convention and revoke or modify such delegations of authority at any time;

(c) Conduct research into all aspects of air transport and air navigation which are of international importance, communicate the results of its research to the contracting States, and facilitate the exchange of information between contracting States on air transport and air navigation matters;

(d) Study any matters affecting the organization and operation of international air transport, including the international ownership and operation of international air services on trunk routes, and submit to the Assembly plans in relation thereto;

(e) Investigate, at the request of any contracting State, any situation which may appear to present avoidable obstacles to the development of international air navigation; and, after such investigation, issue such reports as may appear to it desirable.

Chapter X. The Air Navigation Commission

Article 56. Nomination and Appointment of Commission

The Air Navigation Commission shall be composed of twelve members appointed by the Council from among persons nominated by contracting States. These persons shall have suitable qualifications and experience in the science and practice of aeronautics. The Council shall request all contracting States to submit nominations. The President of the Air Navigation Commission shall be appointed by the Council.

Article 57. Duties of Commission

The Air Navigation Commission shall:

(a) Consider, and recommend to the Council for adoption, modifications of the Annexes to this Convention;

(b) Establish technical subcommissions on which any contracting State may be represented, if it so desires;

(c) Advise the Council concerning the collection and communication to the contracting States of all information which it considers necessary and useful for the advancement of air navigation.

Chapter XI. Personnel

Article 58. Appointment of Personnel

Subject to any rules laid down by the Assembly and to the provisions of this Convention, the Council shall determine the method of appointment and of termination of appointment, the training, and the salaries, allowances, and conditions of service of the Secretary General and other personnel of the Organization, and may employ or make use of the services of nationals of any contracting State.

Article 59. International Character of Personnel

The President of the Council, the Secretary General, and other personnel shall not seek or receive instructions in regard to the discharge of their responsibilities from any authority external to the Organization. Each contracting State undertakes fully to respect the international character of the responsibilities of the personnel and not to seek to influence any of its nationals in the discharge of their responsibilities.

Article 60. Immunities and Privileges of Personnel

Each contracting State undertakes, so far as possible under its constitutional procedure, to accord to the President of the Council, the Secretary General, and the other personnel of the Organization, the immunities and privileges which are accorded to corresponding personnel of other public international organizations. If a general international agreement on the immunities and privileges of international civil servants is arrived at, the immunities and privileges accorded to the President, the Secretary General, and the other personnel of the Organization shall be the immunities and privileges accorded under that general international agreement.

Chapter XII. Finance

Article 61. Budget and Apportionment of Expenses

The Council shall submit to the Assembly an annual budget, annual statements of accounts and estimates of all receipts and expenditures. The Assembly shall vote the budget with whatever modification it sees fit to prescribe, and, with the exception of assessments under Chapter XV to States consenting thereto, shall apportion the expenses of the Organization among the contracting States on the basis which it shall from time to time determine.

Article 62. Suspension of Voting Power

The Assembly may suspend the voting power in the Assembly and in the Council of any contracting State that fails to discharge within a reasonable period its financial obligations to the Organization.

Article 63. Expenses of Delegations and Other Representatives

Each contracting State shall bear the expenses of its own delegation to the Assembly and the remuneration, travel, and other expenses of any person whom it appoints to serve on the Council, and of its nominees or representatives on any subsidiary committees or commissions of the Organization.

Chapter XIII. Other international arrangements

Article 64. Security Arrangements

The Organization may, with respect to air matters within its competence directly affecting world security, by vote of the Assembly enter into appropriate arrangements with any general organization set up by the nations of the world to preserve peace.

Article 65. Arrangements With Other International Bodies

The Council, on behalf of the Organization, may enter into agreements with other international bodies for the maintenance of common services and for common arrangements concerning personnel and, with the approval of the Assembly, may enter into such other arrangements as may facilitate the work of the Organization.

Article 66. Functions Relating to Other Agreements

(a) The Organization shall also carry on the functions placed upon it by the International Air Services Transit Agreement and by the International Air Transport Agreement drawn up at Chicago on December 7, 1944, in accordance with the terms and conditions therein set forth.

(b) Members of the Assembly and the Council who have not accepted the International Air Services Transit Agreement or the International Air Transport Agreement drawn up at Chicago on December 7, 1944, shall not have the right to vote on any questions referred to the Assembly or Council under the provisions of the relevant Agreement.

PART III. INTERNATIONAL AIR TRANSPORT

Chapter XIV. Information and reports

Article 67. File Reports With Council

Each contracting State undertakes that its international airlines shall, in accordance with requirements laid down by the Council, file with the Council traffic reports, cost statistics and financial statements showing among other things all receipts and the sources thereof.

Chapter XV. Airports and other air navigation facilities

Article 68. Designation of Routes and Airports

Each contracting State may, subject to the provisions of this Convention, designate the route to be followed within its territory by any international air service and the airports which any such service may use.

Article 69. Improvement of Air Navigation Facilities

If the Council is of the opinion that the airports or other air navigation facilities, including radio and meteorological services, of a contracting State are not reasonably adequate for the safe, regular, efficient, and economical operation of international air services, present or contemplated, the Council shall consult with the State directly concerned, and other States affected, with a view to finding means by which the situation may be remedied, and may make recommendations for that purpose. No contracting State shall be guilty of an infraction of this Convention if it fails to carry out these recommendations.

Article 70. Financing of Air Navigation Facilities

A contracting State, in the circumstances arising under the provisions of Article 69, may conclude an arrangement with the Council for giving effect to such recommendations. The State may elect to bear all of the costs involved in any such arrangement. If the State does not so elect, the Council may agree, at the request of the State, to provide for all or a portion of the costs.

Article 71. Provision and Maintenance of Facilities by Council

If a contracting State so requests, the Council may agree to provide, man, maintain, and administer any or all of the airports and other air navigation facilities, including radio and meteorological services, required in its territory for the safe, regular, efficient and economical operation of the international air services of the other contracting States, and may specify just and reasonable charges for the use of the facilities provided.

Article 72. Acquisition or Use of Land

Where land is needed for facilities financed in whole or in part by the Council at the request of a contracting State, that State shall either provide the land itself, retaining title if it wishes, or facilitate the use of the land by the Council on just and reasonable terms and in accordance with the laws of the State concerned.

Article 73. Expenditure and Assessment of Funds

Within the limit of the funds which may be made available to it by the Assembly under Chapter XII, the Council may make current expenditures for the purposes of this Chapter from the general funds of the Organization. The Council shall assess the capital funds required for the purposes of this Chapter in previously agreed proportions over a reasonable period of time to the contracting States consenting thereto whose airlines use the facilities. The Council may also assess to States that consent any working funds that are required.

Article 74. Technical Assistance and Utilization of Revenues

When the Council, at the request of a contracting State, advances funds or provides airports or other facilities in whole or in part, the arrangement may provide, with the consent of that State, for technical assistance in the supervision and operation of the airports and other facilities, and for the payment, from the revenues derived from the operation of the airports and other facilities, of the operating expenses of the airports and the other facilities, and of interest and amortization charges.

Article 75. Taking Over of Facilities from Council

A contracting State may at any time discharge any obligation into which it has entered under Article 70, and take over airports and other facilities which the Council has provided in its territory pursuant to the provisions of Articles 71 and 72, by paying to the Council an amount which in the opinion of the Council is reasonable in the circumstances. If the State considers that the amount fixed by the Council is unreasonable it may appeal to the Assembly against the decision of the Council and the Assembly may confirm or amend the decision of the Council.

Article 76. Return of Funds

Funds obtained by the Council through reimbursement under Article 75 and from receipts of interest and amortization payments under Article 74 shall, in the case of advances originally financed by States under Article 73, be returned to the States which were originally assessed in the proportion of their assessments, as determined by the Council.

Chapter XVI. Joint operating organizations and pooled services

Article 77. Joint Operating Organizations Permitted

Nothing in this Convention shall prevent two or more contracting States from constituting joint air transport operating organizations or international operating agencies and from pooling their air services on any routes or in any regions, but such organizations or agencies and such pooled services shall be subject to all the provisions of this Convention, including those relating to the registration of agreements with the Council. The Council shall determine in what manner the provisions of this Convention relating to nationality of aircraft shall apply to aircraft operated by international operating agencies.

Article 78. Function of Council

The Council may suggest to contracting States concerned that they form joint organizations to operate air services on any routes or in any regions.

Article 79. Participation in Operating Organizations

A State may participate in joint operating organizations or in pooling arrangements, either through its government or through an airline company or companies designated by its government. The companies may, at the sole discretion of the State concerned, be state-owned or partly state-owned or privately owned.

PART IV. FINAL PROVISIONS

Chapter XVII. Other aeronautical agreements and arrangements

Article 80. Paris and Habana Conventions

Each contracting State undertakes, immediately upon the coming into force of this Convention, to give notice of denunciation of the Convention relating to the Regulation of Aerial Navigation signed at Paris on October 13, 1919 or the Convention on Commercial Aviation signed at Habana on February 20, 1928, if it is a party to either. As between contracting States, this Convention supersedes the Conventions of Paris and Habana previously referred to.

Article 81. Registration of Existing Agreements

All aeronautical agreements which are in existence on the coming into force of this Convention, and which are between a contracting State and any other State or between an airline of a contracting State and any other State or the airline of any other State, shall be forthwith registered with the Council.

Article 82. Abrogation of Inconsistent Arrangements

The contracting States accept this Convention as abrogating all obligations and understandings between them which are inconsistent with its terms, and undertake not to enter into any such obligations and understandings. A contracting State which, before becoming a member of the Organization has undertaken any obligations toward a non-contracting State or a national of a contracting State or of a non-contracting State inconsistent with the terms of this Convention, shall take immediate steps to procure its release from the obligations. If an airline of any contracting State has entered into any such inconsistent obligations, the State of which it is a national shall use its best efforts to secure their termination forthwith and shall in any event cause them to be terminated as soon as such action can lawfully be taken after the coming into force of this Convention.

Article 83. Registration of New Arrangements

Subject to the provisions of the preceding Article, any contracting State may make arrangements not inconsistent with the provisions of this Convention. Any such arrangement shall be forthwith registered with the Council, which shall make it public as soon as possible.

Chapter XVIII. Disputes and default

Article 84. Settlement of Disputes

If any disagreement between two or more contracting States relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention and its Annexes cannot be settled by negotiation, it shall, on the application of any State concerned in the disagreement, be decided by the Council. No member of the Council shall vote in the consideration by the Council of any dispute to which it is a party. Any contracting State may, subject to Article 85, appeal from the decision of the Council to an ad hoc arbitral tribunal agreed upon with the other parties to the dispute or to the Permanent Court of International Justice. Any such appeal shall be notified to the Council within sixty days of receipt of notification of the decision of the Council.

Article 85. Arbitration Procedure

If any contracting State party to a dispute in which the decision of the Council is under appeal has not accepted the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and the contracting States parties to the dispute cannot agree on the choice of the arbitral tribunal, each of the contracting States parties to the dispute shall name a single arbitrator who shall name an umpire. If either contracting State party to the dispute fails to name an arbitrator within a period of three months from the date of the appeal, the arbitrator shall be named on behalf of that State by the President of the Council from a list of qualified and available persons maintained by the Council. If, within thirty days, the arbitrators cannot agree on an umpire, the President of the Council shall designate an umpire from the list previously referred to. The arbitrators and the umpire shall then jointly constitute an arbitral tribunal. Any arbitral tribunal established under this or the preceding Article shall settle its own procedure and give its decisions by majority vote, provided that the Council may determine procedural questions in the event of any delay which in the opinion of the Council is excessive.

Article 86. Appeals

Unless the Council decides otherwise, any decision by the Council on whether an international airline is operating in conformity with the provisions of this Convention shall remain in effect unless reversed on appeal. On any other matter, decisions of the Council shall, if appealed from, be suspended until the appeal is decided. The decisions of the Permanent Court of International Justice and of an arbitral tribunal shall be final and binding.

Article 87. Penalty for Non-conformity of Airline

Each contracting State undertakes not to allow the operation of an airline of a contracting State through the airspace above its

territory if the Council has decided that the airline concerned is not conforming to a final decision rendered in accordance with the previous Article.

Article 88. Penalty for Non-conformity by State

The Assembly shall suspend the voting power in the Assembly and in the Council of any contracting State that is found in default under the provisions of this Chapter.

Chapter XIX. War

Article 89. War and Emergency Conditions

In case of war, the provisions of this Convention shall not affect the freedom of action of any of the contracting States affected, whether as belligerents or as neutrals. The same principle shall apply in the case of any contracting State which declares a state of national emergency and notifies the fact to the Council.

Chapter XX. Annexes

Article 90. Adoption and Amendment of Annexes

(a) The adoption by the Council of the Annexes described in Article 54, subparagraph (1), shall require the vote of two-thirds of the Council at a meeting called for that purpose and shall then be submitted by the Council to each contracting State. Any such Annex or any amendment of an Annex shall become effective within three months after its submission to the contracting States or at the end of such longer period of time as the Council may prescribe, unless in the meantime a majority of the contracting States register their disapproval with the Council.

(b) The Council shall immediately notify all contracting States of the coming into force of any Annex or amendment thereto.

Chapter XXI. Ratifications, adherences, amendments, and denunciations

Article 91. Ratification of Convention

(a) This Convention shall be subject to ratification by the signatory States. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America, which shall give notice of the date of the deposit to each of the signatory and adhering States.

(b) As soon as this Convention has been ratified or adhered to by twenty-six States it shall come into force between them on the thirtieth day after deposit of the twenty-sixth instrument. It shall come into force for each State ratifying thereafter on the thirtieth day after the deposit of its instrument of ratification.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Government of the United States of America to notify the government of each of the signatory and adhering States of the date on which this Convention comes into force.

Article 92. Adherence to Convention

(a) This Convention shall be open for adherence by members of the United Nations and States associated with them, and States which remained neutral during the present world conflict.

(b) Adherence shall be effected by a notification addressed to the Government of the United States of America and shall take effect as from the thirtieth day from the receipt of the notification by the Government of the United States of America, which shall notify all the contracting States.

Article 93. Admission of Other States

States other than those provided for in Articles 91 and 92 (a) may, subject to approval by any general international organization set up by the nations of the world to preserve peace, be admitted to participation in this Convention by means of a four-fifths vote of the Assembly and on such conditions as the Assembly may prescribe: provided that in each case the assent of any State invaded or attacked during the present war by the State seeking admission shall be necessary.

Article 94. Amendment of Convention

(a) Any proposed amendment to this Convention must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the Assembly and shall then come into force in respect of States which have ratified such amendment when ratified by the numer of contracting States specified by the Assembly. The number so specified shall not be less than two-thirds of the total number of contracting States.

(b) If in its opinion the amendment is of such a nature as to justify this course, the Assembly in its resolution recommending adoption may provide that any State which has not ratified within a specified period after the amendment has come into force shall thereupon cease to be a member of the Organization and a party to the Convention.

Article 95. Denunciation of Convention

(a) Any contracting State may give notice of denuncation of this Convention three years after its coming into effect by notification addressed to the Government of the United States of America, which shall at once inform each of the contracting States.

(b) Denunciation shall take effect one year from the date of the receipt of the notification and shall operate only as regards the State effecting the denunciation.

Chapter XXII. Definitions

Article 96

For the purposes of this Convention the expression:

(a) "Air service" means any scheduled air service performed by aircraft for the public transport of passengers, mail or cargo.

(b) "International air service" means an air service which passes through the air space over the territory of more than one State.

(c) "Airline" means any air transport enterprise offering or operating an international air service.

(d) "Stop for non-traffic purposes" means a landing for any purpose other than taking on or discharging passengers, cargo or mail.

Signature of Convention

In witness whereof, the undersigned plenipotentiaries, having been duly authorized, sign this Convention on behalf of their respective governments on the dates appearing opposite their signatures.

Done at Chicago the seventh day of December 1944, in the English language. A text drawn up in the English, French, and Spanish languages, each of which shall be of equal authenticity, shall be open for signature at Washington, D. C. Both texts shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America, and certified copies shall be transmitted by that Government to the governments of all the States which may sign or adhere to this Convention.

For Afghanistan: A. Hosayn Aziz.
For the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia: Arthur S. Drakeford.
For Belgium:
For Bolivia: Tcnl. Al. Pacheco.
For Brazil:
For Canada: H. J. Symington.
For Chile: R. Sáenz, G. Bisquert, R. Magallanes B.
For China: Chang Kia Ngau.
For Colombia:
For Costa Rica:
For Cuba:
For Czechoslovakia:
For the Dominican Republic: C. A. McLaughlin.
For Ecuador: J. A. Correa, Francisco Gomez Jurado.
For Egypt: M. Hassan, M. Roushdy, M. A. Khalifa.
For El Salvador:
For Ethiopia:
For France: M. Hymans, C. Lebel, Bourges, P. Locussol.
For Greece: D. Noti Botzariz, A. J. Argyropoulos.
For Guatemala:
For Haiti: Edouard Roy.
For Honduras: E. P. Lefebvre.
For Iceland: Thor Thors.
For India: G. Bewoor.
For Iran: M. Shayesteh.
For Iraq: Ali Jawdat.
For Ireland: Robt. Brennan, John Leydon, John J. Hearne, T. J. O'Driscoll.
For Lebanon: C. Chamoun, F. El-Hoss.
For Liberia: Walter F. Walker.
For Luxembourg:
For Mexico: Pedro A. Chapa.
For the Netherlands: Copes, F. E. Aronstein.
For the Government of New Zealand: Daniel Giles Sullivan.
For Nicaragua: R. E. Frizell.
For Norway:
For Panama:

The Delegation of the Republic of Panama signs this Convention ad referendum, and subject to the following reservations:

1. Because of its strategic position and responsibility in the protection of the means of communication in its territory, which are of the utmost importance to world trade, and vital to the defense of the Western Hemisphere, the Republic of Panama reserves the right to take, with respect to all flights through the air space above its territory, all measures which in its judgment may be proper for its own security or the protection of said means of communication.

2. The Republic of Panama understands that the technical annexes to which reference is made in the Convention constitute recommendations only, and not binding obligations.

For Paraguay:
For Peru: A Revoredo, J. S. Koechlin, Luis Alvarado, F. Elguera, Guillermo Van Oordt.
For the Philippine Commonwealth: J. Hernandez, Urbano A. Zafra, J. H. Foley.
For Poland: Zbyslaw Ciolkosz, Dr. H. J. Gorecki, Stefan J. Konorski, Witold A. Urbanowicz, Ludwick H. Gottlieb.
For Portugal: Mário De Figueiredo, Alfredo Delesque dos Santos Cintra, Duarte de Gusmão, Vasco Vieira Garin.
For Spain: E. Terradas, Germán Baraibar.
For Sweden: R. Kumlin.
For Switzerland:
For Syria: Kahale.
For Turkey: S. Kocak, F. Sahinbas, Orhan H. Erol.
For the Union of South Africa:
For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: Swinton.
For the United States of America: Adolf A. Berle, Jr., Alfred L. Bulwinkle, Chas. A. Wolverton, F. La Guardia, Edward Warner, L. Welch Pogue, William A. M. Burden.
For Uruguay: Carl Carbajal, Col. Medardo R. Farias.
For Venezuela:
For Yugoslavia:
For Denmark: Henrik Kauffmann.
For Thailand: M. R. Seni Pramoj.

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the Convention on International Civil Aviation dated December 7, 1944, concluded at the International Civil Aviation Conference at Chicago, Illinois, in the English language, the signed original of which is deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America.

In testimony whereof, I, E. R. Stettinius, Jr., Secretary of State, have hereunto caused the seal of the Department of State to be affixed and my name subscribed by an Assistant Chief, Division of Central Services of the said Department, at the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, this twenty-second day of January, 1945.

E. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,
Secretary of State.
By M. L. KENESTRICK,
Assistant Chief, Division of Central Services.

ADDRESS BY HON. JOSE CASTILLO TORRE WELCOMING DELEGATES TO A MEETING OF THE PERMANENT COMMISSION OF THE CONGRESS OF MEXICO

[Mr. AUSTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a translation of an address delivered by Hon. Jose Castillo Torre welcoming the delegates to the recent Inter-American Conference held in Mexico City, on behalf of the Permanent Commission of the Mexican Congress, which honored them with a special session held in the Chamber of Deputies, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL AVIATION'S NEW CHARTER—ADDRESS BY L. WELCH POGUE

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "International Aviation's New Charter," delivered by L. Welch Pogue, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, before a meeting of the Council on World Affairs at Kansas City, Mo., February 10, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS—EDITORIAL BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Unanswered Questions," by David Lawrence, from the United States News of March 9, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO ANDREW FURUSETH

[Mr. BURTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum regarding Andrew Furuseth, late president of the International Seamen's Union, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL STAMP COMMEMORATING VALOR OF UNITED STATES MARINES ON IWO JIMA

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Flag Raising Stamp," published in the Washington Star of March 12, 1945, and an article from the Washington Star of March 11, 1945, by James Waldo Fawcett, both relating to the proposal of Senator O'MAHONEY that the photograph of the raising of the American flag on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima, be adapted for use as a design for a special postage stamp, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE MISSOURI RIVER VALLEY AUTHORITY—REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 555

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution (S. Res. 78) to change the reference of S. 555, establishing the Missouri River Authority, from the Committee on Commerce to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, coming over from a previous day.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on February 15, 1945, I introduced Senate bill 555, a bill to create a Missouri Valley Authority. I had requested that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but instead the bill was referred by the Chair to the Senate Committee on Commerce. Such reference was in error, and I gave notice in the discussion on February 15, 1945, that I intended to move to have the reference rectified. I am now moving to have the Committee on Commerce discharged from further consideration and asking that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. In introducing this bill, I did not request its reference to a committee in whose deliberations I could participate or whose procedures I might be able to expedite. I requested reference to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry because that committee is best equipped to give the proposed legislation the fullest consideration and because that committee has the chief claim to jurisdiction of such legislation if the established precedents of the Senate are to guide.

I do not mean to suggest that the Committee on Agriculture is the only committee having an interest in the subject matter covered in the bill. On the contrary, the very nature of the measure makes it cut across the uncertain lines of committee jurisdiction in the Senate, just as it cuts across the sharper boundaries of the old-line departments of the executive branch of the Government.

The purpose of this bill is to unify responsibility for the administration of the major Federal programs dealing with the development of the Missouri River Basin. It has to do with water control, reclamation, the development of the natural resources, and other purposes relating to a single river valley. It is intended to end piecemeal legislation for the region it serves and in inaugurate a unified approach to the general problems involved.

As a result of the successful experiences of the Tennessee Valley Administration, which was set up by the Congress in 1933, both the legislative and executive branches of the Government have come to agreement on the question of the proper method of comprehensive development of river basins and resources.

It is now recognized that the administration of such multi-purpose programs should be entrusted to a single regional agency having headquarters in the region, which shall be directly responsible to the President and the Congress, with full authority and responsibility for carrying out the program authorized.

Ever since the successful inauguration of the T. V. A. in 1933 measures proposing legislation of this character have been uniformly referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. If this were the first time such a measure had ever come before the Senate, and I had had the vision and the wisdom to invent this new device for river development, I should have felt impelled to request that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry rather than any other of the several committees of the Senate whose claims for jurisdiction could be plausibly presented.

Such undertakings as that contemplated relate principally to agriculture, to land utilization, to soil erosion, to irrigation, and to the development of sound agricultural methods. Millions of farmers who reside in the area are directly affected by the program. Therefore, the soundest reasons exist for the referring of this character of legislation to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Of course, in addition to agriculture, the bill deals with various matters concerning which other Senate committees might be inclined to claim jurisdiction.

For example, the bill sets up a corporation, with power to sue and be sued, to settle its own claims, and to acquire land by condemnation. Bills involving such matters are customarily referred to the Judiciary Committee. It is obvious, however, that these provisions in the bill are an inseparable part of the whole, and no one would dispute that reference to the Judiciary Committee would be an inept reference for a measure dealing with agricultural development, soil erosion, reclamation, and so forth.

I could point to other features of the bill which might give rise to the thought that other committees besides the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should be entitled to consider the legislation.

Of course, it would not be practical to have several committees working on the same legislative proposal. This matter has been discussed time and again by the Senate, and it has been uniformly recognized that in a program of this character, the committee having the major interest in the program is entitled to jurisdiction.

An important part of the bill relates to the development and administration of irrigation projects, but these projects also form only a special feature of a larger pattern of land and water conservation and use.

Again, one of the purposes of this bill is to promote navigation and the control of floods, subjects which, if separately considered, would lie within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce.

Nevertheless, if this legislation were being presented before the Senate for the first time, where these several committees were claiming jurisdiction based on its separate parts, it would still appear that, in view of the vast interest of agriculture in the proposed program, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry should be the committee selected for its study.

Clearly, no other committee would have a better claim for jurisdiction than the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Section after section of the bill relates specifically to the problems of soil conservation and cultivation, reclamation of arid, semiarid, and swamp lands, utilization, fertilization, and conservation of forests, and reforestation of lands, the restoration of the subsurface water table, the protection of the Nation's resources from droughts, winds, and dust storms.

The bill contains provisions establishing a policy for the segregation of agricultural lands in small units for the encouragement of small family-sized farms, and providing homes for thousands of new settlers in the areas involved.

At a glance anyone can see what a tremendous role this program will play in the post-war period, when we will be called upon to provide new homes and new businesses for millions of workers.

No committee of the Senate is more familiar with the general problems of the region, because the Missouri Valley is the greatest agricultural area of this Nation. Its soil is the greatest single natural resource with which the Missouri Valley Authority will deal. Agriculture is the foundation of manufactures, since the products of the soil are

the materials of all commerce and industry. Commerce increases the wealth and glory of a country, but its real strength and stamina are to be looked for in agriculture. The agricultural lands of the United States constitute our greatest natural wealth. Upon the well-being of agriculture, the future progress and prosperity of this area and the Nation will depend.

All of these arguments I might have presented if this bill constituted a new and novel piece of legislation. I think such arguments made to justify the reference of the bill to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry would have been convincing to the Chair if the program were being presented de novo. But that is not the situation here.

Mr. President, the introduction of my bill does not raise a new question for determination. More than a quarter of a century ago when the first Muscle Shoals bill came from the House to the Senate, the question of its reference was taken up in open Senate and by the acquiescence of the Senate, after full notice, the bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It first was requested that the bill go to the Military Affairs Committee, but the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee at that time requested that the bill be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. There was an open discussion of the matter on the floor and the bill was finally referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Every piece of legislation on this subject has come to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, including bills pertaining to the Columbia River Basin.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held hearings on the Muscle Shoals bill and finally reported bills on the subject to the Senate. For the past quarter of a century no law on this subject has been passed which did not come from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and there can be no sound reason to change that procedure at this late day.

No other committee has any shadow of claim to jurisdiction, for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is the only committee of the Senate which has ever considered and reported a bill creating, as my bill proposes to create, an independent regional agency having unified responsibility and making its decisions in the field. It is the only committee which has had any experience with the application of the principles of modern management to the problems of resource development. It is the committee which from the beginning has had jurisdiction over legislation covering T. V. A.

It has certainly been no secret from the public that my bill is an attempt to apply the principles and adapt the experience of T. V. A. to the problems of the Missouri River Valley. I have never pretended that the administrative device proposed in my bill was an innovation. It is patterned after T. V. A. Its basic principles are the same. To suggest that such a bill should not be considered by the committee which has handled all legislation relating to T. V. A., to ignore and waste its unique experience, seems to me a wholly indefensible departure from traditional Senate procedure, one which could be justified only by a record of signal incompetence on the part of the Committee on Agriculture. The record is quite the contrary. Through the years, the Committee on Agriculture has demonstrated its competence and wisdom. It has recommended amendments to the original T. V. A. Act a half dozen times. It has refused to recommend amendments proposed on other occasions. I believe it has acted wisely. The people of the Missouri Valley have a right to the benefit of the accumulated wisdom of that committee.

It must be conceded that no other legislative committee of the Senate has this specialized knowledge, garnered from its exclusive consideration of all T. V. A. legislation which has come before the Senate. Yet we are faced here with the extraordinary situation of another committee, which, so far as I can learn, has never given an hour's consideration to matters affecting T. V. A., challenging the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Committee when the creation of a second regional agency is proposed.

Mr. President, this is a curious time for such a challenge to be made. I find that at least seven times since T. V. A. was created, bills which indicated a desire to adapt a part or all of the T. V. A. idea to other river valleys have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and only once before the introduction of my bill was any kind of protest recorded. The committee was never discharged.

In 1935, in the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] and the then Senator from Idaho, Mr. Pope, introduced such bill relating to the Mississippi and Columbia Rivers, and they went to the Committee on Agriculture. In the second session of that Congress, in 1936, the last Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Norris, introduced a similar bill for the Mississippi Valley and it was promptly referred to the Committee on Agriculture. Again, in 1937, Senator Norris introduced another bill, this one creating a number of different authorities and extending the T. V. A. idea to various river valleys. It, too, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture as a matter of course, but in this latter case, the then chairman of the Committee on Commerce did challenge the reference. A motion to discharge were filed. The matter was debated. The manner in which bills are traditionally referred in the Senate was discussed with some humor. After the debate the claim of the Commerce Committee for jurisdiction was completely dropped.

Mr. President, I have before me the volume of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contains that debate. As I have said, the matter was fully discussed at the time, and after that complete discussion of the problem of jurisdiction, the motion to have that sort of legislation referred to the Commerce Committee was dropped and nothing further was done about it. The question was discussed on two separate occasions at that time. I shall not take the time of the Senate at this moment to read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what took place in reference to this matter, but if it becomes necessary during the course of the discussion of the subject I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. President, in 1941, in the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, the then Senator from South Dakota, Mr. Bulow, introduced a bill providing for a development of the Missouri Valley. It, too, went to the Committee on Agriculture, and likewise in the same session a bill introduced by the then Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Miller, for himself and his colleague, Senator Caraway, was similarly referred. In 1942, in the Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, a bill introduced by the then Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Lee, for himself, the Senator from Oklahoma Mr. Thomas, and Senator Caraway, followed to the Committee on Agriculture.

From the record it is fair to conclude that every since the establishment of T. V. A. this has been the procedure. Whenever a Senator intended the measure he introduced to provide a multipurpose development based on T. V. A.'s experience, as distinguished from other types of development, he requested its reference to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and the Chair agreed. The reference of my bill to the Committee on Commerce is an astonishing reversal of what appears to be that unbroken precedent. It is an unmerited affront to the splendid Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, for my bill fulfills every condition for reference to that committee. It adheres to the basic principles of T. V. A. Its consideration requires the experience and knowledge of that committee.

I do not know how a reference of the bill to the Committee on Commerce can be justified. I assume it must have been so referred, because one of the purposes of the bill is the promotion of navigation and the control of floods. But, as I have already stated, that is not the only purpose of the bill. If it were the single purpose of the bill to authorize the building of structures for navigation or the control of floods, of course, it would belong before the Commerce Committee. No one would dispute that reference. In that event, I should have wanted to have the judgment of that committee. But my bill does not deal with flood control alone, nor does it propose to deal with it at all in the way in which bills customarily referred to the Committee on Commerce deal with it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I do not care to disturb the continuity of the Senator's thought if he would prefer not to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. As a matter of fact, a great part of Senate bill 555 refers to reclamation and irrigation.

Mr. MURRAY. That is true.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does not the Senator believe that jurisdiction belongs in the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation?

Mr. MURRAY. No; I do not, for this reason: When a bill provides for multiple purposes, as this bill does, any one of several committees may be used in the first instance for considering the bill.

The bill cannot be sent to half a dozen committees. That question was discussed on the floor of the Senate. But such legislation having been sent to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which was the committee which had the major part of the program to study, it seemed to me that we should continue to send similar measures to that committee, which has had experience, and is qualified to act upon it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Of course, the Senator knows the bill in detail. The truth of the matter is that the greater part of the bill deals with matters concerning reclamation and irrigation.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not admit that.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is the whole tone of the bill, all the way through.

Mr. MURRAY. No; if the Senator will read the bill——

Mr. McCARRAN. I have read the bill with that in mind.

Mr. MURRAY. If the Senator will read the bill, he will find that section after section of the bill has no reference whatever to reclamation. But it would make no difference because, as I say, the Senate has had this question before it on a number of occasions, and the practice heretofore has always been to send bills of this character to the committee to which the Senator introducing the bill requests it to be sent. That has been the recognized practice in the Senate for the past 25 years, at least. Why, after all that experience, should we attempt to upset the precedents of the Senate and now take away from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which has had the study of such bills during all this time, and has gained experience, jurisdiction over such legislation, and send it to a committee which has not had 1 hour's experience with the major problems involved?

As I stated a moment ago, if legislation of this kind had been sent in the first instance to the Committee on Commerce I should have wanted my bill to go to the Committee on Commerce. If it had been sent to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation in the first instance, when the Muscle Shoals bill was introduced, and if for the following 25 years the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation had been considering such legislation, I should have requested reference to that committee, and I would have fought any move on the part of the Senate to take it away from that committee, and especially to take it away and turn it over to a committee which seems to have some preconceived notions about such legislation, and some philosophy which it wishes to put into effect with reference to the public power problem. That committee wishes to reverse Federal policies which have been in effect for a great many years, and take away from the people of the United States the great benefits which come from the development of power projects over the country. I object to that. I cannot understand why the Senate should want to agree to such a course as that when it is obvious that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is entirely qualified and competent in every way to handle this legislation.

As has been stated on the floor of the Senate many times, it is the practice, when a committee is handling legislation of a certain kind, to leave that committee in charge of future legislation of the same kind, and not deprive the Senate of the benefit of the knowledge and experience gained by the committee.

So I say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that he is mistaken in his view that this bill should go to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. It should not go there because the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry are just as well informed on irrigation and reclamation as are the members of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has studied the problems of irrigation and reclamation, and is just as well qualified to pass on those problems as is the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. If it were the single purpose of the bill to authorize the building of structures for navigation, I would, of course, concede that this bill should go to the Committee on Commerce.

My bill is not simply a bill to control the water in the river, although, of course, it contemplates the building of dams and reservoirs, levees and floodways. It provides for a much more comprehensive program. It envisages a continuing program designed to store the water on the land as well as behind great structures of earth and concrete. This bill recognizes, as T. V. A. has recognized, that flood control begins on the farm. Section 11 (a) (1) of the bill shows that the Board of M. V. A. will not limit its program of flood control to the building of physical structures. It is directed to include measures for "the control and retardation of water run-off and the restoration and improvement of the absorption and infiltration capacity of the soil" by "improved methods and conditions of soil conservation, utilization, fertilization, and cultivation, and the conservation of forests and afforestation and reforestation of lands."

Does the Committee on Commerce assert jurisdiction over a program which will affect the farming practices of tens of thousands of individual farmers? I think it will be admitted that such a program is the concern of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

What of the other agricultural features of Senate bill 555? Is the Committee on Commerce the most competent to consider broad programs for soil conservation and improved land use? No one would so contend. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is the proper committee to consider such questions; and it is the proper committee to consider questions of navigation and flood control as those problems are considered in my bill, as inseparable parts of a total program of conservation and utilization of the region's natural resources. No one can argue that those problems are new to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It can be argued that the Committee on Commerce has had no experience with and has never had jurisdiction over agricultural problems. But the converse is not true. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has had wide experience in handling problems relating to navigation and flood control. It cannot be claimed that reference of my bill to that committee is entrusting its provisions respecting water control to inexperienced hands. Legislation creating T. V. A. came from that committee in 1933; and never since has there been any question of its jurisdiction over bills affecting the most successful program of river control the world has ever seen.

It is exactly the kind of a program of river control the people of the West want to see carried out on the Missouri. The engineering problems will not be the same as those encountered by the T. V. A., of course. That is unimportant. No committee of the Senate should be required to pass on the technical problems of project design, construction, or operation. The Senate's concern is with major policy determinations. Its concern is with the characteristics which distinguish T. V. A. from every other instrumentality of the Federal Government.

Of course, other Government agencies build dams and reservoirs and levees. In the Missouri Valley today a dozen different bureaus are at work, dealing with problems which will be the concern of M. V. A. if the bill I introduced should be enacted. Competent and devoted public servants are employed by all those agencies. But, Mr. President, their work, carried on under the several bureaus, and directed from the Nation's Capital, has not been as beneficial to the people of my river valley or the Nation as the work of T. V. A. has been to the people of that area. I want the policies of T. V. A. to be repeated in the region where I live. I want its unrivalled record of accomplishments to be equalled in the Missouri Valley.

I have made some study of the question. I am convinced that the secret of the success of T. V. A. lies right in the statute which created it, the statute originally considered and reported, and at various later times considered and amended, on the recommendation of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That committee, as no other committee of the Senate, knows how essential to the repetition of the record is the repetition of observance of certain basic principles provided for in the organic act. It knows, as no other committee knows, the importance of the unified approach and how easily it might be destroyed by an infringement or limitation in the statute. It knows how essential for success is application of the principles of modern management in the development of our natural resources, as applied so magnificently in the T. V. A. It knows that T. V. A. would not be T. V. A. if it were not independent of other agencies of government, free to make its administrative decisions close to the people it serves.

Mr. President, my bill provides an instrument like T. V. A. in every fundamental. Its proper consideration requires the years of experience of the Committee of Agriculture and Forestry. I respectfully submit that the Chair was

in error in referring the bill to the Commerce Committee. That committee should now be discharged from its further consideration, and the bill should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing some of the debates of the Seventy-fifth Congress, first session, at which time this subject was under consideration in the Senate. I think the Members of this body should familiarize themselves with that debate in order intelligently to act on this motion. It seems to me it would be totally without justification to undertake to change the reference of such bills from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry at this late time, after such legislation has been referred during all that time to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, a committee which has done a splendid piece of work in that respect. I submit that the Senate should continue to have legislation of this kind handled by that committee, which has had so much experience with such measures.

I desire to call attention to the discussion which took place in the Senate on June 3, 1937. It will be found in volume 81, part V, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-fifth Congress, at page 5281 and the following pages.

At that time the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] said the following:

It seems to me that there ought to be some rule of the Senate by which bills shall be referred in a more consistent and uniform manner. I am not a member of either committee, and I am not concerned about which committee shall consider the subject; but it seems to me that bills of identical nature, introduced at the same session, and dealing with the same subject, should not be referred to two or three different committees. There ought to be a definite rule as to the reference of bills. Certainly two bills, relating to the same subject matter ought not to be considered one by the Committee on Commerce and the other by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The then Vice President, who at that time was in the chair, had this to say:

With the permission of the Senator, the Chair would like to say in defense of himself that in the matter of making references to committees, when bills are introduced which cover a number of subjects, and of which various committees have jurisdiction, it is the custom of the Chair to refer them to the committees requested by those introducing the measures. The bill which the Senator from Nebraska has introduced, and also the bill which the Chair understands the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and the Senator from Ohio, Mr. Bulkley, have introduced, deal with various subjects concerning which different Senate committees would have jurisdiction.

The Senator from Nebraska asked that the bill he has just introduced be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Chair does not know whether the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Ohio requested that their bill be referred to the Committee on Commerce, or whether they left the disposition of the bill to the Parliamentarian.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] also said at that time:

Mr. President, I will say that bills providing for flood-control legislation have heretofore come from the Committee on Commerce; and, whether or not we should request that a bill dealing with that subject be referred to that committee, the bill would go there. Of course, I do not raise any question with respect to which one of these committees would have jurisdiction of the subject. My point is that certainly two committees ought not to be considering the same subject at the same time.

Later he said:

With all due respect to everyone involved, it does seem that there ought to be some uniformity with respect to the reference of bills which deal with subjects which are already under consideration and before the Senate. I am not concerned about which one of these committees shall consider these flood-control bills, but both committees ought not to be considering the bills at the same time.

Then the late Senator from Arkansas, Mr. Robinson, the great majority leader at that time, said the following:

The rules of the Senate do not expressly define the jurisdiction of its committees. By precedent it has been the custom of the Senate to refer to the various standing committees measures which have relation to the titles of the committees. As stated by the Chair, frequently there is an overlapping, or rather duplication, of jurisdiction. Many bills might be referred to either one of two or more committees, and either one of those committees would have proper jurisdiction. It would be very difficult to revise the rules so as to determine or enable the Chair to determine just what committee should take jurisdiction of every bill that might be presented in this body.

Then the discussion continued, and the Senator from Kentucky at that time made the following further observation:

Mr. President, I did not rise to object to the reference of the whole subject to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I agree that the President's message contains a discussion of many subjects, and the bill introduced by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Norris] contains provisions touching many subjects which might give jurisdiction to one or more committees of the Senate. I doubt the wisdom of trying to have two committees consider the same measure. I think the bill should go to one committee or the other, because whenever we have division of authority between committees we have confusion and chaos. This particular bill does lend itself to reference to either one of the two committees, and perhaps to another one.

The Senator from Kentucky further said:

I am not raising any point about that; I do not care what committee considers it. As one of our chief justices in Kentucky once said about the 1st day of the month, when a large assortment of bills came in, it was not the size of the bills but the numerosity of them that troubled him. I think it is unfortunate we should have races between two committees and perhaps have both of them report the same bill.

Senator Robinson, the leader at that time, said:

Usually no contest arises between committees to obtain jurisdiction of bills. It seldom happens when a Senator prepares a bill or offers a bill, and, under the custom that prevails, makes a suggestion for its reference that the reference is not made in accordance with his suggestion.

Senator Norris also participated in the discussion of the subject. He stated:

An identical bill, introduced by the Senator from Tennessee, had already, in a prior Congress, been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That bill was reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as a part of a more comprehensive bill. It passed the Senate under the report from that Committee on Agriculture, and went into conference, where it was lost. So a year before the Senator introduced his bill and had it referred to the Committee on Commerce the Agricultural Committee had already passed on a similar measure and recommended that favorable action be taken, and the Senate had passed a bill in pursuance of that recommendation.

It merely illustrates, I think, what the Senator from Arkansas has said as to the jurisdiction of various committees. But I do not know of any rule that could be adopted, although it would be nice if one could be provided, that would make it impossible for any conflict to arise, for, in the very nature of things, there must be conflict. After all, however, the rule provides that if a reference is not satisfactory to the Senate it may take action and refer any bill to any committee it chooses.

Later Senator Robinson said:

Let me say as one who has had many years' experience in this body that I have not found very much difficulty arising out of the conflict of jurisdiction among the committees. While, as suggested by the Senator from Missouri, Mr. Clark, and other Senators, it would be preferable to have a clear definition of the jurisdiction of the committees. I know of no way by which that can be accomplished when a bill which is introduced embraces several subject matters. At last it becomes a matter of discretion with the Chair and a matter of judgment on the part of the Senate if an issue is raised as to the reference.

Mr. President, it seems to me that when we have followed a course of procedure for 25 years, and legislation of this character has been uniformly referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, there is no basis whatsoever for undertaking to take the bill out of the jurisdiction of that committee. I make that statement especially in view of the fact that it is apparent that the Commerce Committee has a philosophy with reference to public power which is not in accordance with the philosophy of most of us in this country. We believe that in the development of public power the benefits to be derived from it should be given to the people and not to the big power corporations of the United States. It seems to me that disagreement with that belief forms the sole basis for the effort to get this bill away from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Agriculture has demonstrated its sympathy with the national policy which has been in force. It has had experience with the subject, and I think the bill should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DREW PEARSON

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, it is not only generally known, but it is universally admitted, that Drew Pearson is the biggest and most notorious liar in America today. Not only is Pearson recognized as being the biggest liar, but he is also recognized as being the most perfect smear artist of the press and radio. He will go down in history as Drew Pearson

the sponge [laughter], because he gathers slime, mud, and slander from all parts of the earth and lets them ooze out through his radio broadcasts, and through his daily contributions to a few newspapers which have not yet found him out.

In his radio broadcasts he includes a feature of predictions of things to come. I wish to add one prediction, namely, that he will go down in history as Drew Pearson the sponge. He is so great a liar and so vicious that it becomes necessary for the President of the United States to denounce him as a chronic liar. The Secretary of State, that grand old man, Cordell Hull, found it necessary to denounce him as an infamous and pusillanimous liar. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], all outstanding Members of this body, have found it necessary from time to time to denounce him and call him what he really is—a liar.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator from Mississippi will recall that what I had to say about him was exceedingly and excessively mild.

Mr. BILBO. Yes; in comparison to what I proposed to do to this gentleman a little later on the Senator is correct.

Mr. President, it now becomes my duty, by request, to call the attention of the Senate and the country to a Drew Pearson article in the Washington Post of February 1, in which he denounced and slandered the Walter Reed General Hospital. Among other statements he makes this one:

> One result is that ward attendants are doing a thriving business selling liquor from $5 to $15 a quart. Visitors have often noted that the innocent-appearing pitchers alongside hospital cots contained liquid much stronger than Coca-Cola, while nurses have been known to go through a ward distributing ice cubes.
>
> Recently the men in ward 32, most of them in traction splints, which require absolute quiet, drank so much and became so noisy that an M. P. appeared to restore order and was beaten up by the patients. Several patients were set back several weeks in their recovery as a result of leaving their cots to jump on the M. P.
>
> At the Forest Glen Convalescent Home, under Walter Reed administration, the situation is perhaps worse. Most of the G. I.'s here are able to get out and visit Washington. Classes in mathematics, language, and other academic subjects are offered by volunteer teachers, but no attempt is made to give the men psychological tests to aid them in choosing a post-war trade or profession.

Drew Pearson continues with the story and I ask that the full and complete story be made a part of my remarks at this juncture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

VETERANS' HOSPITAL

Although the Army boasts of its Walter Reed General Hospital in Washington as the finest in the country, hundreds of servicemen come out severely critical, except of the actual surgery performed.

Head of Walter Reed is 64-year-old Maj. Gen. Shelly U. Marietta, General Pershing's close friend and personal physician. General Marietta is a renowned doctor, but not so strong as an administrator, with the result that the hospital morale is extremely low, especially among enlisted men.

One failing is that the Army's vaunted rehabilitation program has never been properly installed at Walter Reed. The only serious attempt at rehabilitating veterans is for men who are to remain in the service. Those scheduled to get discharges are practically ignored.

One result is that ward attendants are doing a thriving business selling liquor from 5 to 15 dollars a quart. Visitors have often noted that the innocent-appearing pitchers alongside hospital cots contain liquid much stronger than Coca-Cola, while nurses have been known to go through a ward distributing ice cubes.

Recently the men in ward 32, most of them in traction splints, which require absolute quiet, drank so much and became so noisy that an M. P. appeared to restore order and was beaten up by the patients. Several patients were set back several weeks in their recovery as a result of leaving their cots to jump on the M. P.

At the Forest Glen Convalescent Home, under Walter Reed administration, the situation is perhaps worse. Most of the G. I.'s here are able to get out and visit Washington. Classes in mathematics, language, and other academic subjects are offered by volunteer teachers, but no attempt is made to give the men psychological tests to aid them in choosing a post-war trade or profession.

The Army Morale Service is permitted to work at Forest Glen only at the invitation of the Medical Corps. Last summer a group of psychologists from the Morale Service prepared an analysis of the hospital's needs and recommended a reorganization. This group was ordered overseas before its report was completed—and the report never has been finished.

Mr. BILBO. In response to that slander and lie of Drew Pearson, I want to present to the Senate a statement signed by 85 patients at the Walter Reed General Hospital, 24 of whom are from ward 32, in which they in no uncertain terms denounce the gentleman in these words:

To Whom It May Concern:

As veterans of this war, who have given their utmost in blood and effort for the preservation of the sacred democracy founded by our forebears, we feel that Drew Pearson's caustic editorial entitled "Veterans Hospital" (Washington Post, February 1), should not go unchallenged.

We, naturally, believe in free speech and a free press, but we unqualifiedly take exception to journalistic lies, lies that not only invade the sanctity of a veteran's life, but lies that try to hurt the institutions (hospitals) that are more instrumental than any other single element in mending us in mind and body.

Mr. Pearson is evidently familiar with the fact that legislation against morals has never worked throughout the centuries. Then, how does he expect it to work in hospitals where the dispensation of mercy is the chief dosage? Does he wish to post a guard at the door of each ward to search mothers, fathers, wives, brothers, sisters and sweethearts before allowing them to visit some boy who has been seriously wounded? This is the Gestapo method, Mr. Pearson, the very thing we fought and are fighting against. Of course, as in any human society, there are exceptions to the rule, but we can assure you that any liquor that finds its way into the Walter Reed Hospital is not through maladministration.

What point are you trying to prove, Mr. Pearson, by your statement that General Marietta is a good friend of General Pershing's? Certainly, if "Black Jack" had judgment enough to win a war for us, his judgment is good enough for us veterans along other lines. Friendships, as a general rule, are based on respect and I assure you that anyone that is respected by "Black Jack" is respected by us.

Your allegation that nurses deliberately furnish patients ice cubes for whisky is a most flagrant violation of the truth. The fact is that, not only the nurses at Walter Reed, but the nurses in all veteran hospitals, furnish patients with a fresh pitcher of water along with ice cubes both morning and night. Patients who have been wounded severely have to be administered copious quantities of pain pills and sleeping pills day after day and night after night. Consequently, the drying effects of these drugs make them have a continual desire for ice water.

I shall not take the time to read the remainder of the statement which is a continuation of this lie and attack upon Walter Reed General Hospital and upon these soldiers. It is signed by 85 of the patients, nurses, and employees. I will ask that the entire statement may be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, merely stating the number of names and not the names themselves.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

WALTER REED GENERAL HOSPITAL,
ARMY MEDICAL CENTER,
Washington, D. C.

To Whom It May Concern:

As veterans of this war, who have given their utmost in blood and effort for the preservation of the sacred democracy founded by our forebears, we feel that Drew Pearson's caustic editorial entitled "Veterans Hospitals" (Washington Post, February 1) should not go unchallenged.

We, naturally, believe in free speech and a free press, but we unqualifiedly take exception to journalistic lies, lies that not only invade the sanctity of a veteran's life, but lies that try to hurt the institutions (hospitals) that are more instrumental than any other single element in mending us in mind and body.

Mr. Pearson is evidently familiar with the fact that legislation against morals has never worked throughout the centuries. Then, how does he expect it to work in hospitals where the dispensation of mercy is the chief dosage? Does he wish to post a guard at the door of each ward to search mothers, fathers, wives, brothers, sisters, and sweethearts before allowing them to visit some boy who has been seriously wounded? This is the gestapo method, Mr. Pearson, the very thing we fought and are fighting against. Of course, as in any human society, there are exceptions to the rule, but we can assure you that any liquor that finds its way into the Walter Reed Hospital is not through maladministration.

What point are you trying to prove, Mr. Pearson, by your statement that General

Marietta is a good friend of General Pershing's? Certainly, if "Black Jack" had judgment enough to win a war for us, his judgment is good enough for us veterans along other lines. Friendships, as a general rule, are based on respect and I assure you that anyone that is respected by "Black Jack" is respected by us.

Your allegation that nurses deliberately furnish patients ice cubes for whisky is a most flagrant violation of the truth. The fact is that, not only the nurses at Walter Reed, but the nurses in all veterans hospitals, furnish patients with a fresh pitcher of water along with ice cubes both morning and night. Patients who have been wounded severely have to be administered copious quantities of pain pills and sleeping pills day after day and night after night. Consequently, the drying effects of these drugs make them have a continual desire for ice water.

It is too bad that Mr. Pearson is not imbued with some of the sympathy and understanding of the Army nurse, the girl who mothers the wounded soldier up through the echelons—from his removal from the fury of battle until he is far on the road to spiritual, mental, and physical recovery. She not only furnishes him with ice cubes to alleviate a scorching palate but she tediously dresses his wounds, gives him bedpans, scrubs his body, shaves him, and even clips his toenails. (The last of these ministrations is certainly a stinky one. However, it may not be quite as stinky as yours, Mr. Pearson. I specifically refer to the clipping of deserving reputations.)

This, Mr. Pearson, is the Army nurse, a lady who deserves, at this time especially, every consideration instead of the cheap criticism you have sent her way. If your accusation went unchallenged by us veterans, civilians throughout the country could easily acquire the impression that Army nurses are nothing more or less than glorified barmaids and that hospital wards had deteriorated into swank cocktail lounges. Mothers and fathers who have sons in hospitals and at the front have enough to worry about without your adding incendiary thoughts to their burdens.

Your allegations that the boys in ward No. 32 left their beds due to inebriation, to beat up an M. P. are entirely unfounded.

You, most certainly, must have obtained your flimsy information from someone suffering from an "off limits" psychosis. Disgruntled people talk too much.

Your accusation that the morale of the enlisted patients at Walter Reed is low is a pure fallacy, as anyone who has visited here will attest. If, to prove the rule, there may be an occasional isolated case of self-pity or discouragement, it certainly is not due to maladministration, but to the fact that any man who has been subjected to months of suffering flat on his back cannot be expected to have the high spirits of one like yourself, who has good legs, hearty lungs, and the cocktail lounge at his beck and nod. We firmly believe that our morale is amazingly high, considering some of the people we had to fight for.

We veterans wish to go on record right now against the trend of some commentators to pounce upon unfounded lies about individuals or organizations in order to build a great journalistic reputation and a "fatted pocketbook" for themselves. And, we are in sufficient numbers to not only see that this malignant trend is stopped but to put an end to a lot of other evils that have slowly arisen during our absence. We assure you that "dollar grabbers" will be taken care of in a way befitting their august positions.

May we suggest, Mr. Pearson, that men who have not experienced the long toils of pain that battle wounds bring, keep their noses out of veteran affairs. Any one of us would gladly give up his bed space to you or any other commentator so that you, in turn, could become a guinea pig for unfounded journalistic jabs.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, so much for that lie.

On two or three occasions recently, while we have had under consideration the Aubrey Williams case, Mr. Pearson has stated in his broadcasts that there is a religious issue involved in the Williams case. Any newspaper man or radio broadcaster who wanted to know the truth could find out the truth because here is a copy of the hearings which is available to him and was at the time he made the statement. In justice to the committee, to the Senate, and to the Congress, I say to you, Mr. President, that not one member of the committee and no visiting Member of the Senate asked Mr. Williams one word on earth about his religious views or convictions. We are all aware of the Constitution. But, instead of telling the truth, Pearson is trying to make a false issue which is not involved in the Williams case.

In this morning's Washington Post I find a paid advertisement signed by a lot of folks about whom I could make a speech, but I merely wish to call attention to this advertisement and answer it before it gets cold; I want to answer it while it is hot. I read from it as follows:

Senator BILBO in a letter to a constituent dated February 16 regarding Aubrey Williams' nomination, says, "We do not want this Negro-lover on this job."

Who will stand with BILBO?

That is question No. 1.

Can political reactionaries decree that no Presidential appointee shall take office if he opposes racial discrimination?

This is question No. 2.

Question No. 3 is:

Shall a Presidential appointee be crucified by appeals to racial and religious bigotry because he puts the welfare of the small farmer above the self-interest of absentee landlords and private power companies?

Mr. President, I have been a candidate for office many times in my life and I have heard many candidates express themselves, but this is the sorriest and puniest piece of political demagoguery that I have heard in a lifetime.

The Senate will answer these questions, yes or no, when they vote on Aubrey Williams. Those who stand with BILBO must accept the Bilbo tag, and defend themselves, if they can, before their constituents and their conscience.

FRIENDS OF AUBREY WILLIAMS.

That is all predicated upon a certain letter which I wrote to one of my constitutents in Mississippi on February 16. Instead of giving the people the benefit of that letter and what I had to say about Mr. Williams, they merely take the concluding sentence of the letter and leave the impression that I am making a fight against Aubrey Williams because of his friendly attitude against racial discrimination. Let me read the letter; I want it to go in the RECORD:

Hon. RALPH H. HERRIN,
Collins, Miss.

FRIEND HERRIN: Your letter of February 14 has been received and I want to thank you for your very kind words of commendation on my support of Henry Wallace for Secretary of Commerce.

So it will be seen that Mr. Herrin congratulated me on my position on Mr. Wallace. If this were a question of discrimination, if that were being considered in the Williams case, I certainly would have voted against Mr. Wallace, because he is as strong that way as is Aubrey Williams. The only difference is that Aubrey Williams came from the South, and should know better. He is guilty of the rankest apostasy to everything for which the South stands, while Mr. Wallace was reared in Iowa, and does not know the difference. [Laughter.] The letter continues:

I also note what you have to say about my opposition to Aubrey Williams. I will not take time to write you in full about the reasons that prompt me to fight this appointment but I am sure when you know all the facts you will approve of my position.

You know he used to be Deputy Administrator of the W. P. A. and it was there that I learned that he was totally bad, irresponsible and would do almost anything in the category.

That has been my personal experience with him, and I was against him before the President ever appointed him.

It would be a sad day for the R. E. A. if he should become its director. I am hoping that we will be able to defeat him in the interest of the people that I serve.

This letter is to a Mississippi constituent.

I will send you a copy of the hearings when they are printed so you can read for yourself and find out that we do not want this Negro lover on this job.

By that I mean I take them on some jobs, certainly. I have to. [Laughter.]

Thanking you for writing me, I am,
Sincerely yours,

When I used the expression "Negro lover," that is a localism, that is a provincialism of the South. Whenever a man breaks over the color line in defiance of the custom that has existed in the South for 150 years, we white folks refer to him as a "Negro lover"—that is, when he breaks over the color line. In this letter I was talking to an old southern boy, and I had given him the reason why I was against Aubrey Williams, and this expression was merely a descriptive term I used in referring to Aubrey Williams.

Mr. President, if the attention of Senators is called to the advertisement in the Washington Post signed by "Friends of Aubrey Williams" and a partial list of the committee, and if they will study the list of committeemen, if their mental processes are working, I think they will have some inspiration, if they give thought to some of the folks who signed this petition for Aubrey Williams. If I had been for Williams before, I should certainly be against him after I saw the array of backers whose names are on the petition.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say at this time.

THE MISSOURI RIVER VALLEY AUTHORITY—REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 555

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of resisting the motion to

discharge the Committee on Commerce from the consideration of Senate bill 555, to which committee the bill was referred by the Vice President. We seem to have a good deal of time today, and not a great deal to do except to answer newspaper advertisements and columnists, and I believe I shall take a little time myself just by way of introduction.

Mr. Macaulay, celebrated as a historian, and also as an essayist on history and politics, speaking of the Roman Senate in the days of the Republic, remarked that the Senate was so exalted, it was constituted of such eminent men, that they sat quietly in their seats and with utter serenity received the news of the disaster at Cannae, when it appeared that Hannibal had broken down the last barrier; and it appears clearly that the historian attributed to Providence the fact that he did not proceed at once to march on Rome.

Mr. President, we may make a comparison as between the serenity of the Roman Senate in that ancient time, and the present American Senate, which pauses to respond to the radio comments and the newspaper writings of a man whose title to infamy is well established, or which must take time to respond to a political advertisement.

We travel very far, Mr. President. That seems to me to be about the distance between the earth and the remotest sun.

I have a suggestion for my brethren of the Senate in this matter, and it comes by way of a tradition or legend of the South. It was said that many years ago the possum was elected head of the animals in his neck of the woods, and after being elected by all the other animals, he was walking down the path one day, when the polecat insulted him, in the only manner in which a polecat can either insult, or defend, or operate. The animals were very indignant and very much amazed that they had elected as their leader another animal who would take an insult from the polecat. The polecat heard of it, and greatly enjoyed his distinction in having gotten away with the insult. So he repeated it the next day when he again met the possum. Finally he got the possum in a crowd on Saturday, the day when everyone in the South sees everybody else. The saying is, "I'll see you Saturday." That expression was used in "Green Pastures," and it is a perfect touch. The polecat insulted the possum again in public, and the animals decided that they would turn the possum out as president, that they would not have such a president. So they had a meeting and arraigned him, brought their charges, and Mr. Possum kept perfectly silent. He listened to what they said. They denounced him for being a coward. They said they halfway believed that he deserved the insult he had received, and they all got ready to vote him out of office. Then Mr. Possum said, "Well, brethren, before you take final action I should like to say a word. I am not resisting your motion to discharge me, but I should like to say a word in explanation." They said, "That is fair. What do you say?"

He replied, "Well, now, brethren, I could have "fout" him and I could have whipped him, but I knew doggone well my family would never let me come in the front door again." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, that is the story. I think there are people who bring us down if we notice them. I think we compromise ourselves and justify the lower animal by taking notice of anything he says. He flourishes upon notice of his attacks.

Now, coming back to the matter about which I rose to speak, the Senator from Montana rather astonished me by saying, toward the conclusion of his remarks, that he thought the purpose of having Senate bill 555 referred to the Committee on Commerce related to some power policy, and had the objective of stating one policy and framing another. That is a rather severe reflection upon the Vice President of the United States.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] says he sent the bill to the desk without indicating to which committee he wished it to be referred, and the Vice President referred it to the Committee on Commerce. The Committee on Commerce had nothing whatever to do with that. I did not even know when the bill was introduced, and I did not know it was referred until it reached the Comerce Committee. But the idea of a sinister or an ulterior motive here relates altogether to the Vice President of the United States, the President of the Senate. I do not think he needs defense in the circumstances, and I do not intend to try to offer one for him. I know that the Vice President is not permitted to take part in debate. I do not think I would reflect upon him under the circumstances. He is not even present. But I will say on behalf of the Vice President of the United States that he is superior to such an attack and superior to any necessity for defense.

Something was said a few weeks ago, and again today, about the Committee on Commerce, and the imputation was made that the Committee on Commerce is up to something having to do with power. The power policy of the United States was fixed by the Committee on Commerce and submitted to the Senate, and the Senate confirmed it, and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who is listening to me, wrote that policy, as I understand, in association with the Army engineers. I resisted that policy in part. I am not satisfied with it now. But that is not to be imputed to the committee.

I shall not discuss the policy; I do not care to involve it here; but I will say that such policy as we have in this country in respect to the sale of power, such policy as we have with respect to irrigation, to dams and the production of electrical energy, has proceeded from the Committee on Commerce of the United States Senate, and been approved by the House and the Senate and the President of the United States. So I think that is enough to say in the defense of the Committee on Commerce against the suggestion, and, so far as I am concerned, I do not intend to defend it.

Mr. President, there cannot be imputed to the committee, which consists of 20 members, any shortcomings which the chairman may have. I might defend the 19 and be very happy to submit myself to the condemnation of the junior Senator from Montana, and I would submit myself before any tribunal on earth without a qualm with him for the accuser.

Mr. President, to come down to the merits of the matter, here is the bill. The Senate can read it for itself. The title is:

A bill to establish a Missouri Valley Authority, to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods—

What committee, Mr. President, in the Senate has charge of legislation intended to relate to the control and the prevention of floods? Everyone knows it is the Commerce Committee. It has been so ever since there was any legislation on the subject. I read further:

the promotion of navigation.

What committee of the Senate has had jurisdiction of the promotion of navigation? There has been but one committee having that jurisdiction in 130 years. The Commerce Committee was constituted by the Senate in the year 1816, and it has had jurisdiction of navigation in America from that year until now.

I think the Vice President acted properly in referring the bill. If the title of the bill is to be relied upon, the two most prominent features and purposes of the bill are the promotion of navigation and the development of water control. Of course, that means dams and other means "in the interest of the control and prevention of floods."

The title also contains the words, "The strengthening of national defense." No one intends to refer the bill to the Military Affairs Committee or the Committee on Naval Affairs. After national defense we find "and for other purposes." The title speaks of "the development of recreational possibilities" and "the promotion of family-type farming" and "reclamation of the public lands." So the bill on its face, and by way of the title, which I suppose was written by its author, the junior Senator from Montana, declares it to be within the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee. Yet the Senator comes before the Senate and protests and make a special plea on the basis of the precedents with respect to the T. V. A.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. MURRAY. Does not the Senator recognize that the title of the bill has a much broader application than the Senator has indicated? The title says: "To provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region."

Mr. BAILEY. Oh, yes. I was just reading the title.

Mr. MURRAY. But if the Senator will read the bill itself he will find section after section and page after page which indicate that the main purpose of the bill is the development of the entire region of the Missouri Valley.

Mr. BAILEY. I have read the bill, but I am saying to the Senator, and I want him to hear me, that a Senator who introduces a bill in the Senate is supposed to state its purposes in its title.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. I have read the title. It may be read any way one wishes to, and one may crawl in any direction, but when it is all said and done, here is the declaration in the very title of the bill, "to establish a Missouri Valley Authority."

That is there. You may talk about it all you please; but when you get through it is there—

The Moving Finger • • • having writ—

You cannot change a word of it.

Does the Senator wish to say anything more?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I think the Senator places a very narrow construction on the title of the bill. The rule of construction of the bill it seems to me would require an examination of the purpose of the bill as indicated by the various paragraphs and sections in the bill. The title of the bill is broad enough to cover all the provisions contained in the bill, because it states that it is "to provide for unified control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region."

The great purpose and object——

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I did not yield to the Senator for a speech.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. BAILEY. Let me answer the Senator from Montana.

I have read the title of the bill, as written, I presume, by its author; and I stand upon it. Of course, I know it takes in more territory. It takes in the general welfare, the national defense, and I suppose the Kingdom of God as well. That is not the test. The test is what he wrote by way of interpreting his bill to start with. That is on the threshold of the argument.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Tennessee Valley Authority Act refer to control of floods and improvement of navigation also?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; I am coming to that.

Mr. AIKEN. Those bills have all been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BAILEY. I was just coming to that argument. I think that is the basis of the contention now advanced, and it brings forward a rather interesting matter of history.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is no precedent for the reference of bills. That is a broad statement, but I think I can support it. The Tennessee Valley Authority was a gradual development. Fortunately I was here to see a great deal of it, as were other Senators. At the end of the First World War the United States Government had a great dam on its hands at Muscle Shoals. That dam had been built for the national defense. It had been built under the direction of President Wilson. The purpose was to create an enormous amount of energy and obtain nitrates from the air. We had to ship our nitrates, which are essential in the manufacture of munitions, all the way from Chile, and the German raiders were on the high seas. We felt that as a matter of national defense we should create our nitrates here, since there were none in the earth to amount to anything, and we could not mine them. So we built the Wilson Dam.

The war ended, and nitrates could again come from Chile for agricultural purposes. We needed none for munitions, and we thought peace was here for a long, long time.

A great question arose as to what to do with Muscle Shoals. I remember when that was a matter of debate for 5 or 6 years. The press carried stories to the effect that Mr. Henry Ford was about to buy it and establish a great manufacturing plant in the South. Finally, after at least 15 years, we decided to go back to the original purpose and use the dam to obtain nitrates from the air and supply the farmers with cheap fertilizer. Very naturally a bill intended for that purpose was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. That is the whole sum and substance of it. But having gone that far, and that being the primary purpose, we felt that it was necessary to develop it.

I believe I will ask something of a personal nature. After I was elected to the Senate, and before I had qualified, the question was raised, by way of inquiry, I believe from newspapers or poll takers, as to what the new Senators thought should be done with Muscle Shoals. That put the matter rather earnestly in my mind, and I raised the question with someone as to why Mr. Henry Ford did not buy it and turn it into a great manufacturing plant for the South. I was told that Henry Ford would not buy it because it was said that he would have to spend more than $100,000,000 building dams up the stream in order to create the power necessary to make Muscle Shoals a success. I think that is true. Our Government took it over and, having found it to be not worth anything as a single dam, went up and down the Tennessee River and the Little Tennessee River and their tributaries and built great reservoirs. It is true that Henry Ford would not pay $15,000,000 for it because he said it would cost him $100,000,000 to make it worth $15,000,000. So we proceeded to develop the whole Tennessee Basin. It is a very astonishing development, a very popular development, and a very useful development.

My whole point is that it began as a scheme to supply the farmers with fertilizer, after having been abandoned as a scheme to create nitrates for munitions. So naturally and reasonably, the T. V. A. and the legislation which followed through the years, was handled by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, largely through the insistence of the late Senator George Norris, a very able man, and a man with whom the Senate liked to agree. He was old, and he was honest. None of us liked to disappoint him about anything. He insisted that, having begun with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as a fertilizer enterprise, it should remain there. So I consider the T. V. A. as no precedent at all. It is an isolated instance.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I will yield for a question. I do not wish to stand here and hear the Senator read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to call attention to the fact that the bill which we have before us today is like the bill to which Senator Norris was referring in the debate which took place on the floor of the Senate on June 3, 1937, when the question of the appropriate reference of that bill was under consideration.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand the Senator's position. That is an illustration in logic from Montana. Because this bill is like the bill which created the Tennessee Valley Authority, it must go the same way. I was just showing how the T. V. A. started. If this bill had started as a fertilizer proposal, the Senator would have some basis for his reasoning.

Mr. MURRAY. Let me interrupt the Senator for a moment. This bill does contemplate the development of fertilizer on a huge scale.

Mr. BAILEY. I want to keep the Senator's mind on the ball.

Mr. MURRAY. I have my mind on the ball.

Mr. BAILEY. It does not start as a fertilizer enterprise. All I was saying was that the T. V. A. started as a fertilizer enterprise. According to the Senator's logic—Montana logic—if we ever mention fertilizer in any bill from now on, I suppose it will go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or if we have a bill anything like the T. V. A. legislation it must go to that committee. That is not logic. It is not reason. It is not even rational.

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator entirely misconstrues my argument. I do not make any such contention at all. However, I do say that when the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has for 25 years been handling this sort of legislation, we should not deprive the Senate of the benefit of the experience which that committee has had. One of the main purposes of this bill is the resource development of the Missouri River and the surrounding region.

Mr. BAILEY. I realize that. I have already stated the purposes. If the Senator wishes to make an argument inside mine, I shall take my seat and let him try again. I should like to have him confine his observations to questions, and not argue in and out of what I am saying.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit another observation?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. I am not arguing in or out.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not believe the Senator is arguing either, to tell the truth.

Mr. MURRAY. I am presenting my case as clearly and plainly as it is possible to present it. The Senate has previously had this question under consideration, and it seems to me that if the

Senator wishes to be fair he will recognize that this legislation properly belongs to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. BAILEY. I was just showing why I did not. But I am not disposed to reply to a suggestion that I am not fair.

I believe I will say to the Senator that he is a Senator from Montana, but no one ever made him a judge over any other Senator. This imputation of unfairness in the Senate does not go.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Senator is unduly sensitive. I have merely been referring to the Senator's fairness in construing my language.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand.

Mr. MURRAY. I have no desire to reflect on or to impugn the motives of the Senator from North Carolina in any respect. I have had very friendly relations with him for a great many years.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator has very friendly ones with him now.

Mr. MURRAY. I do not think the Senator will say that I have ever been unreasonable in my attitude regarding any matters before the Senate. In the argument I have presented in support of my motion, I think I have been absolutely fair and reasonable in every respect. I have not said anything at which the Senator can take any offense.

Mr. BAILEY. I am not saying anything in reply, but I have just remarked that self-praise is no recommendation with me. The Senator has imputed that I might be unfair, but he swears that he is fair. If he wishes to be a judge of himself, he may be. But he may not be a judge of other Senators.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to make a closing remark. I think the discussion into which we are now entering is entirely irrelevant to the question before the Senate. The question before the Senate is whether my bill should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The pending question is not whether the Senator from North Carolina is fair or whether I am fair or whether anyone else is fair.

Mr. BAILEY. I am glad to have the Senator's apology. He is the one who raised the question, and I am glad he takes back his statement. I accept the Senator's apology.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I think the Senator has been very captious in calling attention to my mere reference. All I said was that if the Senator would be fair he would not give such a narrow construction to what I said. I will withdraw the word "fair" and will let the rest of my statement stand.

Mr. BAILEY. Anything to suit the Senator.

Mr. MURRAY. It is not a question of doing anything to suit the Senator. I do not think it is a question of suiting anyone. It is a question of presenting this matter in a fair and decent manner. That is all I am trying to do. I am not attempting to reflect on the Senator.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not think the Senator can reflect on me. I am not troubled about that, I am not at all disturbed about it. I do not think the Senator has tried to do so. But if he did try to do so, it would not disturb me at all, anymore than it disturbed the Vice President of the United States when the Senator reflected on him today.

Now let us go to another matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from North Carolina whether he cares to express an observation regarding the extent of authority the bill might give to a Missouri Valley Authority relative to the use of the waters of the Missouri River, over and above or in direct contradiction to the policy which Congress laid down in the last session, which policy provided that the States which lie wholly or in part west of the ninetieth meridian may use the waters for the purposes which the States themselves may determine. I realize my question is a long one. Let me state briefly what I should like to have the Senator express an observation upon. If legislation as proposed by the bill is enacted, would the authority granted under it be broad enough so that the Authority could or might establish a policy in direct contradiction to a policy the Congress has already laid down.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes; unquestionably. But I was not going into the merits of the proposed legislation. If I were to discuss the merits of what is proposed, I think I could make the Senator's hair stand on end.

But now I am dealing with the question of how the bill is founded and whether it should be referred to the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, the Military Affairs Committee, or the Committee on Naval Affairs. The bill is a defense bill, so it says on its face.

I have cleared up the matter of the origin of the T. V. A. legislation and how the T. V. A. bill happened to go to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and how it stayed there. The legislation began as an act to enable the Government to manufacture fertilizer for the farmers. The bill now under discussion does not begin in that way at all.

Let us consider for a moment the first declaration on page 19 of the bill:

> Particular consideration in such a plan and recommendations shall be given to projects and activities which shall serve the following purposes:
>
> (1) The control and prevention of floods which impair and disrupt navigation, the facilities of interstate commerce, the properties and functions of the United States, and agricultural and industrial properties and production.

There we have flood control and navigation. They are covered in the first purpose mentioned in that section of the bill.

On page 20, in paragraph (2), we find the following:

> The promotion of navigation by, among other means, the improvement of the channels of navigable rivers and their tributaries.

That is navigation, if I understand anything about it.

Next, we find—

> The prevention of siltation of such waters.

That subject is under the Army engineers at this moment, and likewise is under the Commerce Committee.

Next we have—

> The regulation of stream flow.

That is flood control.

Next—

> And the development and coordination of navigation facilities.

At that place in the bill the Senator is laying the foundations of his bill in navigation. There is no authority on earth for any other portion of his bill except the power to regulate navigation and flood control. The Senator must stop there; every Member of the Senate knows that. Electrical energy must be handled as an incidental to flood control. Agricultural development and irrigation are incidental to the dams, navigation, and flood control. The power of Congress over navigation is founded in the commerce clause of the Constitution. The Congress derives a great train of powers and activities from that clause.

For 128 years all such matters have been considered by the Commerce Committee. I have been chairman of the committee only 7 years, but I speak in the names of all the chairmen down the decades, back to 1816.

Paragraph 4, on page 20, reads as follows:

> (4) The safeguarding of navigable waters and their use by, among other means, the prevention and abatement of pollution of navigable streams and their tributaries.

Except insofar as that subject might refer to health, measures relating to it always have been referred to the Committee on Commerce; and even matters relative to health have been referred to the Committee on Commerce to this day.

Paragraph (b), under paragraph (4), reads as follows:

> (b) So far as may be consistent with or necessary or appropriate for the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation, the safeguarding of navigable waters, and the reclamation of the public lands.

Beginning on page 24, we find the following provision:

> The Corporation—

In other words, the Authority. The bill would create a corporation with all the powers of the United States. The corporation would have all the powers of buying and selling, all the powers of building, all the powers of giving, all the welfare powers which the United States has. Action would be taken in the name of the corporation. By such legislation a great structure would be erected—probably greater than that of any three States of the United States—and it would be given all the powers of the Federal Government. It would be able to buy anything or to do anything.

Under the provisions of the bill the corporation would be authorized and directed to construct, acquire, operate, and carry out such projects and activities on the Missouri River, its tributaries, and surrounding region as will serve to control and prevent floods, to reclaim the public lands, to promote navigation.

Yet the Senator from Montana says that the Commerce Committee has no jurisdiction. If it does not have jurisdiction of a bill of this character its jurisdiction over any form of proposed legislation can be questioned. The Commerce Committee was founded on the subject of navigation. For more than 100 years every river and harbor bill which has been introduced in Congress has been referred to the Committee on Commerce. That applies as well to all flood bills with the exception of those relating to the T. V. A., which I have explained.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The first bill which was passed for the improvement of the Tennessee River was the one relating to the dam at Muscle Shoals, now known as the Wilson Dam.

Mr. BAILEY. I have previously referred to that matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives. I was a member of that committee at the time and urged the committee to report the bill to the House. It was reported. However, it was handled by the Military Affairs Committee because the purpose of the bill was to manufacture nitrates for war purposes and, incidentally, for agriculture in peacetime.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the Senator.

Subparagraph (1) on page 25 of the bill reads as follows:

(1) To acquire, construct, operate, maintain, and improve dams, locks, reservoirs, levees, spillways, floodways, fishways, conduits, powerhouses, steam-generating plants, transmission lines, rural electric lines and substations, canals, roads, roadways, docks, wharves, terminals, and recreation facilities, and structures, equipment, and facilities incidental thereto.

The bill is far reaching. It could be referred to any one of three committees.

Subparagraph (2) on page 26 is as follows:

(2) To acquire, construct, operate, maintain, and improve such machinery, equipment, structures, and facilities, for the storage and transportation of water or for the generation and transmission of electric energy as the Corporation deems necessary or appropriate to supply existing and potential users or markets.

That language would provide the power to condemn and take over land anywhere. It would embrace exclusive use, possession, control, and operation of the Fort Peck Dam.

I wish to invite the attention of Senators to something else as showing how far the bill would go. Senators know that we must authorize before we appropriate. Authorizations must first come from some committee. The Committee on Commerce never appropriates money. All it does is to authorize. The pending bill carries language substantially as follows: "All appropriations necessary to carry out this act are hereby authorized." That would cover the whole United States. I suppose that it could also include Mexico and Canada.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I invite attention to the concluding section of the bill, which seems further to fortify the Senator's construction of it. Section 27, the concluding section of the bill, provides in part, as follows:

This act shall be liberally construed to carry out the purposes of Congress—

And so forth. The purposes, as explained near the beginning of the bill, are to strengthen the national defense, promote navigation, control destructive floods, promote interstate commerce, and aid in the general welfare of the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. That would include everything except taxation. If we read section 8, of article I, of the Constitution, we find that the bill contains all the power which is found in section 8, except the power to tax. On such a theory the bill could be referred to any committee of the Senate except the Committee on Finance.

Mr. President, the question of what is referred to my committee has never been a matter of any great concern to me. I entertain no jealousy with regard to the committee's jurisdiction. All the members of the committee have plenty to do. As the committee's chairman, I consider it to be my duty to defend the jurisdiction and functions of the committee. I believe that when an attempt is made to take from the Commerce Committee a bill which, on its face, has to do with flood control and navigation, I have a duty to perform. I have an idea that a Senator may be very useful whether he happens to be a member of a committee or not. I do not think that a Senator's usefulness or his career depends on his membership on a committee. I believe, however, that if the chairman of the committee should stand here at any time and assert its rights, I have the duty to do so now. I think the Committee on Commerce compares favorably with any other committee of the Senate, and that its members compare very favorably with any other Senators. No one of us ever got high enough to set himself up in judgment over the Vice President, or over any other Senator. That may be done in some other tribunal, but I do not think it can be done very successfully here.

Mr. President, I have a proposal to make, I think I could stand on the record and hold the bill in the Committee on Commerce. But I do not like to enter into jurisdictional conflicts. I have one now with the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce. It will come up some time this week. I believe he and I have agreed on next Thursday, have we not?

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. Jurisdictional conflicts are very disagreeable. They do not do the Senate any good. They handicap us, consume our time, and worry us. They are very disagreeable. Under the Constitution, perhaps such things are necessary. A person should take what is coming to him in the ordinary course of nature without quarrel or complaint. But I should like no Senator ever to think that the Committee on Commerce tries to take jurisdiction over matters which should be handled by any other committee. If I have something on my desk which I think should go to the Committee on Commerce, I will send it there. If I have something on my desk which I think should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations, I will send it to that committee. The Members of the Commerce Committee have plenty to do without encroaching on the duties of the Members of other committees.

In order to show my good will, and to eliminate friction, I submit the following resolution:

Whereas Senate bill 555 (to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the promotion of family-type farming, the development of the recreational possibilities and the promotion of the general welfare of the area, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes) having been referred to the Committee on Commerce and motion having been made to discharge said committee and refer the bill to the Committee on Agriculture: Therefore be it

Resolved, That said bill, to wit, S. 555, shall be considered forthwith by the Committee on Commerce with respect to navigation and flood control, and thereafter returned to the Senate for reference to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to be considered by said committee with respect to irrigation and reclamation, and thereafter shall be returned to the Senate for reference to the Committee on Agriculture for consideration with respect to the agricultural features thereof; be it further

Resolved, That said bill shall be reported on respectively by each of said committees within 60 days from the date of its reference to each of said committees and that the first 60-day period shall be calculated from the date of the passage of this resolution.

That takes in all committees. It saves all faces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution (S. Res. 97) submitted by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] will lie over, under the rule.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it the Senator's understanding that if the bill were referred to the three committees to which he has referred, it could not be acted upon by the Senate until it had been favorably reported by all three committees.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senate may always act on any bill, whether it has been reported favorably or unfavorably.

Mr. AIKEN. If one committee should report it unfavorably——

Mr. BAILEY. In my judgment, an unfavorable report does not prevent the Senate from considering a bill, and the rule of the Committee on Commerce has been to send bills to the floor, even those with adverse reports. It did it with respect to the Florida Canal I remember, and, as I recall, at the instance of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I will say that the Commerce Committee has one rule and it was a rule of the committee when I became chairman of it and it was spread on the calendar. I have stated it before in the Senate. I found it on the Calendar of

the Commerce Committee. The rule is to this effect, that when a bill is referred to the Committee on Commerce the chairman must refer it at once to the appropriate agencies in the executive department of the Government.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President——

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I should like to finish my statement with reference to the rule if the Senator will permit me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning hour having expired, and the consideration of the pending resolution not having been concluded, under the precedents it will be placed on the calendar under rule 8.

Mr. BAILEY. Then we cannot vote on the resolution today?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution goes to the calendar.

REPORT OF NOMINATION OF AUBREY W. WILLIAMS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma obtained the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to ask about another matter?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to ask the Senator from Oklahoma, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, at what time we may expect the Committee on Agriculture to report on the nomination of Aubrey Williams, which I understand the committee passed on about a week or two ago; I have forgotten the exact time.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, out of order and as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to report adversely the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received, as in executive session, and placed on the Executive Calendar.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2126.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2126) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] desires to have something to say about his recent trip to Mexico. I know every Senator will be glad to hear him, and I ask permission of the Senator from Oklahoma that I may suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, before I yield for that purpose let me say that I have an engagement at the Navy Department at 2:30 p. m., which, from my standpoint, necessitates my attendance. I think we can pass this bill in 10 or 15 minutes. There are only a very few amendments and, so far as I know, they are all assented to by everyone interested. If the Senator from Texas will defer his remarks for 10 or 15 minutes, if we do not conclude the bill in that time I shall be very glad to yield to him.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well, I shall not press for recognition now.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Texas the next bill is an appropriation bill, and when that bill comes up I shall certainly ask for a quorum and yield to him to make his address.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Quartermaster Corps—Cemeterial expenses," on page 2, line 3, after the word "one", to insert "used."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Signal Corps—Alaska communication system," on page 3, line 23, after the word "be", to strike out "affected" and insert "effected."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Corps of Engineers—Rivers and harbors," on page 6, line 15, after the word "hundred", to insert "used", and in line 19, after the word "law", to strike out "$41,358,000" and insert "$44,508,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Flood control," on page 7, line 19, after the word "forty", to insert "used", and in line 22, after the word "control", to strike out "$14,037,000" and insert "$24,172,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "The Panama Canal," on page 10, line 23, after the word "twelve", to insert "used."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 2, after the word "shall", to insert "be."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 2126) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of the report of the committee on the bill which has just been passed, and following the committee report I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD a statement of the new work contemplated by the bill, which is very meager.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the report (No. 87) and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2126) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made:

Amount of bill as passed House	$99,165,940
Amount of increase by Senate	13,285,000
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	112,450,940
Amount of regular and supplemental estimates for 1946	104,263,240
Amount of appropriations, 1945	102,475,840
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Exceeds the estimates for 1946	8,187,700
Exceeds the appropriations for 1945	9,975,100

The break-down of the direct appropriation of $112,450,940 in the bill recommended by the committee is as follows:

Quartermaster Corps: Cemeterial expenses		$1,658,700
Signal Corps: Alaska Communication System		227,840
Corps of Engineers:		
Rivers and harbors	$44,508,000	
Flood control, general	24,172,000	
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries	30,000,000	
Emergency fund for flood control on tributaries of Mississippi River	500,000	
Flood control, Sacramento River, Calif.	2,050,000	
Miscellaneous civil works	12,000	
		101,242,000
United States Soldiers' Home		1,213,600
The Panama Canal:		
Maintenance and operation	$4,137,000	
Sanitation, quarantine, etc.	1,784,200	
Civil government	1,377,000	
Construction of additional facilities	810,600	
		8,108,800
Total, direct appropriations in bill as recommended to the Senate		112,450,940

The changes in the amounts of the House bill recommended by the committee are as follows:

Increases and limitations

Corps of Engineers:
Rivers and harbors:
Preliminary examinations and surveys $1,500,000

The bill as passed by the House includes $2,000,000 for this purpose. At the Senate hearing, however, the Chief of Engineers testified that the $2,000,000 contained in the bill as passed by the House did not provide for carrying out any of the preliminary examinations and surveys called for in the recently enacted river and harbor bill, which bill contains provision for some 300 investigations.

He testified further that in order to carry on preliminary examinations and surveys for the items listed in the new river and harbor act, the Corps of Engineers could spend an additional $1,500,000. The list of projects included in the additional $1,500,000 appears on pages 20–27 of the Senate hearing.

New York and New Jersey channels 1,650,000

The bill as passed by the House carries $1,600,000 for work on the New York and New Jersey channels. It was brought out at the hearings that the Corps of Engineers requested of the Budget Bureau a total of $3,250,000 for this work during the fiscal year 1946. The Budget allowed $1,600,000, and the purpose of the committee's amendment is to provide the additional $1,650,000 requested by the Corps of Engineers.

The funds requested are for dredging and rock removal to afford wider channels for the larger oil tankers now in use.

It was stated at the hearing that the Navy has been very much interested in the advancement of this work, and that likewise the American Merchant Marine Institute, the Standard Vacuum Oil, and the Shell Oil Co. are interested in it. A letter from Secretary Forrestal to the Secretary of War relative to this project appears in the Senate hearing on pp. 42–43.

Total, rivers and harbors 3,150,000

Flood control, general:
Preliminary examinations and surveys 2,500,000

The bill as passed by the House includes $2,000,000 for this purpose. At the Senate hearing, the Chief of Engineers testified that the $2,000,000 included by the House does not provide any funds for the forty-odd examinations and surveys authorized in the Flood Control Act approved Dec. 22, 1944. He stated that to carry forward this survey program at a moderate rate, including work on the examinations and surveys authorized in the last flood control act, would require a total amount for the fiscal year 1946 of $4,500,000, or an increase of $2,500,000 over the House bill. The projects included in the additional $2,500,000, recommended by the committee, appear on pp. 19–20 of the Senate hearing.

Advance planning (preparation of detailed plans and specifications $7,635,000

The bill as passed by the House includes $2,000,000 under this appropriation for advance planning on flood-control projects. Of the $7,635,000 increase recommended by the committee, $5,000,000 is proposed in a supplemental Budget estimate contained in S. Doc. 11, which was received by the Senate on Mar. 1, 1945. The list of projects included in the $5,000,000 proposed in the estimate and approved by the committee appears on pp. 27–29 of the Senate hearing. The remaining $2,635,000 recommended by the committee is to provide for advance planning in connection with the following projects:

Missouri River Basin:	
Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak.	500,000
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.	250,000
Fort Randall Reservoir, S. Dak.	200,000
Missouri River local protection projects	450,000
Havre, Milk River, Mont.	28,000
Hazen, Knife River, N. Dak.	2,000
Harlem, Milk River, Mont.	4,000
Beulah, Knife River, N. Dak.	6,000
	1,440,000
Central Valley, Calif.:	
Table Mountain Reservoir, Calif.	200,000
Sacramento River, Calif., local protection	125,000
Folsom Reservoir, Calif.	125,000
Isabella Reservoir, Calif.	175,000
Kings River project, California	200,000
Terminus Reservoir, Calif.	175,000
Hogan Reservoir, Calif.	50,000
Tuolumne River Reservoir project, California	50,000
	1,100,000
Farm Creek Reservoirs, Ill.	95,000
	2,635,000
Total, flood control, general	10,135,000
Total, Corps of Engineers	13,285,000

Purchase of automobiles: Purchase of used passenger-carrying automobiles: Under the appropriation "Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries," as passed by the House, requirement is made that during the fiscal year 1946 only used motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles can be purchased. The committee has approved this requirement. However, there are 4 other appropriations in the bill out of which it is proposed in the 1946 estimates to purchase passenger-carrying automobiles. The committee has amended the appropriation language accompanying each of these appropriations so as to provide that only used passenger-carrying automobiles can be purchased during the fiscal year 1946.

Total increase $13,285,000
Amount of bill as reported to Senate 112,450,940

Funds for new work on river and harbor and flood-control projects included in the pending War Department civil appropriation bill, H. R. 2126

RIVERS AND HARBORS

	Proposed allotment fiscal year 1946
New York and New Jersey channels	$1,600,000
For application to dredging and rock removal to afford wider channels for the larger oil tankers now in use.	
Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, Florida	165,000
To provide 7 Taintor gates for the new spillway at the St. Lucie lock, and the construction of a single leaf auxiliary lock gate to replace temporary wooden flashboards.	
Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers	1,000,000
For continuation of dike and revetment construction to afford a more stable 9-foot navigation channel in this important link of the Great Lakes to Gulf Waterway.	
Ohio River open channel work	507,000
To provide for enlarging channels and removing shoal areas at various locations to provide safe passage for heavier tows navigating the river.	
Kanawha River, W. Va.	198,000
For payment of flowage rights resulting from the construction of large navigation dams.	
Illinois waterway, Illinois	500,000
For widening the channel at 2 locations, necessary due to larger tows now in use.	
Total	3,970,000

FLOOD CONTROL, GENERAL

Clear Creek drainage and levee district, Illinois	874,000
East St. Louis and vicinity, Illinois	1,000,000
Wood River drainage and levee district, Illinois	1,495,000
Harrison and Ivy Landing drainage and levee district No. 2, Illinois	1,140,000
Perry County drainage and levee districts Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Missouri	995,000

Raising and enlarging earth levees and reconstruction of appurtenant drainage facilities. Funds are needed to continue the program of raising the levee systems along the upper Mississippi River between St. Louis and Cape Girardeau, which will be resumed with funds appropriated in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1945, as soon as manpower conditions permit resumption of this essential work (certified by War Food Administration and Office of Defense Transportation). The completion of this work is urgently needed to provide protection from recurring floods for 153,000 acres of highly productive agricultural lands, main lines of Missouri-Pacific, St. Louis-Southwestern, Illinois Central, and St. Louis-San Francisco Railroads, and important industries engaged in war production, and to prevent further large expenditures for flood fighting and repair work on those levees such as were made in 1943 and 1944 when more than $3,300,000 was spent for those purposes. The repair work accomplished restored the levees to their original condition but did not remove the threat of further failures because of the need for raising and extensive strengthening the levees which was beyond the scope of the emergency authority and funds provided by Congress for the repair work.

York, Pa.---------- $450,000

Earth and rock fill dam and channel improvement. Funds are required for completion of the channel improvement, removal of an existing mill dam in the river channel, and to complete miscellaneous items to place the project in full operation. Since the project was suspended, silting has taken place and has become very critical. If completion of the project is not accomplished during the fiscal year 1946, the project in present incomplete status might create a flood hazard greater than that which existed prior to initiation of construction.

Brevoort levee, Indiana---------- 300,000

Levee Unit No. 8, Indiana---------- 230,000

Gill Township levee unit, Indiana---------- 60,000

Levees and pumping plants. Funds required during the fiscal year 1946 are for raising and strengthening the levees. This work has been found necessary as a result of the experience of the floods of 1943 and 1944. The levees have been found to be sufficiently pervious to show that the Government investment is in constant danger of being destroyed due to boils and sloughing. Construction of an additional blanket of impervious material will be necessary to remove this threat. Unless this work is done and the projects placed in complete operation, there is a constant threat of overtopping and breaching of the levees, thereby causing loss of Government investment and flooding of the protected area.

Muskingum River Reservoirs, Ohio---------- $500,000

14 reservoirs (13 earth-fill dams and 1 concrete gravity structure) for flood control and water conservation in eastern Ohio. Construction of the dams and railroad relocations and most of the highway relocations have been completed. Funds are required for continuation of reimbursement to the Muskingum Water Conservancy District for expenditures by that agency for acquiring lands, easements, and rights-of-way, and for the direct purchase by the Government of lands, easements, and rights-of-way.

Total---------- 7,044,000

MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mississippi River, flood control (includes $10,000,000 for maintenance)---------- 30,000,000

Continuation of work on the project for flood control in the alluvial valley of the Mississippi River. The comprehensive project involves the construction of levees, reservoirs, revetments, and other works for flood control, the maintenance of certain existing works that have been completed as part of the project, the necessary dredging to maintain and improve the navigation channel, and the surveying, mapping, and miscellaneous work essential to the prosecution of the various features of the project. Above the mouth of the Red River the main Mississippi River levees have not been completed to final grade and cross section. A large portion of the funds requested for fiscal year 1946 will be applied to work on these levees, a failure of which would inundate several million acres in the St. Francis, Tensas, and Yazoo Basins.

SACRAMENTO RIVER, CALIF.

Sacramento River, Calif., flood control (includes $153,000 for maintenance)---------- 2,050,000

Continuation of levee construction and bank protection work and maintenance dredging of flood channels including shore protection. Existing protection against floods is inadequate at places and until additional levee work is completed to the required grade and section, vital transportation facilities to be protected by the levees may be damaged or destroyed by floods, resulting in serious delays in transportation of material and military personnel and supplies for civilians. The annual program of bank protection, clearing of flood channels, and maintenance dredging, is required to sustain completed flood protection works and prevent their deterioration. Construction of the works proposed for fiscal year 1946 will be of direct benefit to two transcontinental railroads, one transcontinental highway, and the main highway and railroad routes from Portland, Oreg., to San Francisco and Sacramento, Calif.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Overton
Bailey	Gurney	Pepper
Ball	Hart	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hatch	Reed
Barkley	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hayden	Robertson
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Saltonstall
Briggs	Hoey	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bushfield	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Lucas	Taylor
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McFarland	Tunnell
Chandler	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McMahon	Vandenberg
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Cordon	Millikin	Walsh
Donnell	Moore	Wheeler
Downey	Morse	Wherry
Eastland	Murdock	White
Ellender	Murray	Wiley
Fulbright	Myers	Willis
George	O'Daniel	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on official business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

RESULTS OF INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE AT MEXICO CITY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, prior to the convening of the Inter-American Conference on problems of war and peace, in Mexico City, the Secretary of State invited the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and myself, together with Representatives LUTHER A. JOHNSON, of Texas, and Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, to attend the Conference as advisers to the Secretary of State, who was, of course, the American delegate. I assume that we were probably acting more in an executive capacity than as Members of the Senate and of the House, but I construe the invitation from the Secretary of State to have Senators and Representatives participate in these deliberations as an evidence of a better spirit between the executive department and the Congress with regard to many matters of international import which will from time to time come before the Senate for its action. So I feel a sense of gratification that the course will be as indicated.

As the Senate has already been advised through the press, the President has invited the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] to attend the coming conference which is to meet in San Francisco on April 25—and I understand he has accepted—together with the senior Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and two Members of the House of Representatives. So that when we consider the constitutional provision which declares that treaties are to be made by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, it seems to me these are instances wherein the full power and authority of the Senate is being recognized. In other words, the Senate is being consulted before the actual drafting and submission of the treaties, and, of course, will be called upon later to act upon, and to ratify or reject.

In pursuance of the invitation of the Secretary of State to which I referred in starting these remarks, the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Vermont journeyed to Mexico City. I regret that my duties here detained me so that I was 7 days or more late. The Senator from Vermont preceded me by 2 or 3 days, and I wish to say that he rendered very outstanding and distinguished service in the deliberations, upon which I shall touch more fully a little later.

In its activities the conference covered a great number of resolutions and propositions, all of which I shall not, of course, be able even to mention, to say nothing of discussing them. As to the economic resolutions, they will be properly filed with the Senate, and at a later date, when they have been thoroughly revised and verified, I shall offer them for printing as a Senate document for the information of all Senators. I shall not discuss the economic resolutions at this time, and I shall advert only briefly to some of the other matters which were considered.

Permit me to state, Mr. President, that all the 21 American republics, with the exception of Argentina alone, were represented in the Conference. As Senators know, the Argentine situation has been a source of much concern, not only to our own State Department, but under the administration of Mr. Hull, and to many of the countries of Latin America. Toward the end of the sessions a resolution was adopted by all those in attendance relating to Argentina.

On January 26, 1944, the Argentine Republic broke diplomatic relations with both Germany and Japan, but she made no declaration of war, neither did she sign the United Nations declaration. That declaration, however, was signed by all the other 19 Latin-American nations.

The situation produced by the attitude of Argentina has been quite irritating, not alone to our own interests but, as suggested a moment ago, to many of the Latin-American countries.

At this point I wish to pay a tribute to former Secretary of State Hull. I feel that the action of the conference with regard to Argentina is a complete vindication of the far-seeing vision, the patience, and the statesmanship of Cordell Hull while he was Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I shall not read the action taken with regard to Argentina in detail, but shall read its salient features. After the preamble the resolving clauses, reading from the provisional English translation, are as follows:

1. To deplore that the Argentine Nation has up to the present time not found it possible to take the steps which would permit her participation in the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, with the conclusions of which the principle of solidarity of the hemisphere against all types of aggression is consolidated and extended.

2. To recognize that the unity of the peoples of America is indivisible and that the Argentine nation is and always has been an integral part of the Union of the American Republics.

3. To express its desire—

This is the desire of the Conference—

That the Argentine Nation may put herself in a position to express her conformity with and adherence to the principles and declarations which are the results of the Conference of Mexico, and which enriched the juridicial and political heritage of the continent and enlarged the scope of American public law, to which on so many occasions Argentina herself has made notable contributions.

4. To reiterate the declaration, established at Habana, amplified and invigorated by the Act of Chapultepec, and demonstrated by the association of the American republics as members of the United Nations, and this Conference holds, that complete solidarity and a common policy among the American states when faced with threats or acts of aggression by any state against an American state, are essential for the security and peace of the continent.

5. To declare that the Conference hopes that the Argentine Nation will implement a policy of cooperative action with the other American nations, so as to identify herself with the common policy which these nations are following, and so as to orient her own policies so that she may achieve her incorporation into the United Nations as a signatory to the joint declaration entered into by them.

And the final paragraph:

To declare that the final act of this Conference shall be open to adherence by the Argentine Nation, always in accordance with the criteria of this resolution, and to authorize His Excellency, Dr. Ezquiel Padilla, president of the conference, to communicate the resolutions of this assembly to the Argentine Government through the channel of the Pan American Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the action taken with regard to Argentina as set out in a provisional English translation of the final act printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIX

The Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace having considered the text of the communication directed by the Argentine Government to the Pan American Union considering:

1. That the Conference was called for the purpose of taking measures to intensify the war effort of the United American Nations against Germany and Japan and to seek the strengthening of their political and economic sovereignty and their cooperation and security;

2. That the circumstances existing before the meeting have undergone no change that would have justified the Conference in taking steps to reestablish, as it earnestly desires to do, the unity of the 21 states in the policy of solidarity that has been strengthened during the deliberations of the Conference.

Resolves:

1. To deplore that the Argentine Nation has up to the present time not found it possible to take the steps which would permit her participation in the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, with the conclusions of which the principle of solidarity of the hemisphere against all types of aggression is consolidated and extended.

2. To recognize that the unity of the peoples of America is indivisible and that the Argentine Nation is and always has been an integral part of the union of the American republics.

3. To express its desire that the Argentine Nation may put herself in a position to express her conformity with and adherence to the principles and declarations which are the results of the Conference of Mexico, and which enrich the juridical and political heritage of the continent and enlarge the scope of American public law, to which on so many occasions Argentina herself has made notable contributions.

4. To reiterate the declaration, established at Habana, amplified and invigorated by the Act of Chapultepec, and demonstrated by the association of the American republics as members of the United Nations, and this conference holds, that complete solidarity and a common policy among the American states when faced with threats or acts of aggression by any state against an American state are essential for the security and peace of the continent.

5. To declare that the conference hopes that the Argentine Nation will implement a policy of cooperative action with the other American nations, so as to identify herself with the common policy which these nations are following, and so as to orient her own policy so that she may achieve her incorporation into the United Nations as a signatory to the joint declaration entered into by them.

6. To declare that the final act of this conference shall be open to adherence by the Argentine Nation, always in accordance with the criteria of this resolution, and to authorize His Excellency Dr. Ezequiel Padilla, president of the conference, to communicate the resolutions of this assembly to the Argentine Government through the channel of the Pan American Union.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the essence of the resolutions is to the effect that Argentina is at liberty to subscribe to the resolutions and declarations made at the conference in Mexico City, and that she is also at liberty and is really invited to place herself in position and to become a member of the United Nations, and that when she complies with these suggestions that she then will be restored—if that may be the word—to full partnership and brotherhood in the organization of the republics of the Western Hemisphere. Of course, there is speculation as to whether Argentina will see fit to meet these conditions or to accept these suggestions. That can only be relegated to the field of speculation and to the development of time.

Allow me to say also, Mr. President, that the attitude of the Latin-American nations toward the United States at Mexico City was of the most cordial character, and gave many evidences of an improved situation throughout the Western Hemisphere toward the United States. There was the warmest consideration for the delegates, and there seemed to be ever present a disposition and a desire that we should coordinate our efforts with regard to the war and with regard to the peace.

We found practical unanimity among all the nations of Latin America to support the conference which is to be called at San Francisco. There was, however, a distinct understanding that each nation represented at San Francisco would have the liberty and the right to present any resolutions or any proposed amendments, and that they would be considered at San Francisco. There was avoided any appearance of an American bloc, as it might be, in going to San Francisco. There was no suggestion that the 20 or 21 American republics shall in any wise be considered as a united bloc or a voting bloc or anything of that character in the San Francisco conference. Each nation goes there with complete liberty of action and the right to present problems as it may see fit. But over all these things there seems to be complete unity in the desire to see established at San Francisco, as a result of that conference, an international organization for the preservation of the peace and for the curbing of aggressors.

Mr. President, one other matter and then I shall surrender the floor. The most important aspect, in my mind, of the whole conference was what was known as the Act of Chapultepec. That was the resolution relating to the measures to be adopted for the preservation of the peace in the Western Hemisphere, whether that preservation of peace be against the aggressions of a country from foreign shores, or whether it should arise within the Western Hemisphere itself. In essence the resolutions adopted at Chapultepec, according to my mind, amounted to an adoption of our historic policy which we have had through the years, and which we have called the Monroe Doctrine. The Latin-American countries were enthusiastic in adopting a multilateral policy with regard to that ancient doctrine. Some of them, as Members of the Senate know, were not particularly fascinated with the name "Monroe Doctrine," but they were anxious that its principles should be embraced by all of them, and that hereafter it should be a multilateral doctrine which would have the support and attachment of all the republics of the Western Hemisphere, and not be supported alone by one or two or a group of states.

I have in my hand a copy of the so-called Act of Chapultepec. I shall not read the whereases because probably that would grow a little tedious. The whereases in the document relate to prior pronouncements of international conferences held at Habana, Lima, and other points in Central and South America. They furnish a background and basis for the declarations and policies adopted in the main body of the Act of Chapultepec. I ask that the entire document be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the Act of Chapultepec was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ACT OF CHAPULTEPEC—RECIPROCAL ASSISTANCE AND AMERICAN SOLIDARITY

Whereas the peoples of the Americas, animated by a profound love of justice, remain sincerely devoted to the principles of international law;

It is their desire that such principles, notwithstanding the present difficult circumstances, may prevail with greater force in future international relations;

The Inter-American Conferences have repeatedly proclaimed certain fundamental principles, but these must be reaffirmed and proclaimed at a time when the juridical bases of the community of nations are being reestablished;

The new situation in the world makes more imperative than ever the union and solidarity of the American peoples, for the defense of their rights and the maintenance of international peace;

The American states have been incorporating in their international law, since 1890, by means of conventions, resolutions, and declarations, the following principles:

(a) The proscription of territorial conquest and the nonrecognition of all acquisitions made by force (First International Conference of American States, 1890);

(b) The condemnation of intervention by a state in the internal or external affairs of another (Seventh International Conference of American States, 1933, and Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);

(c) The recognition that every war or threat of war affects directly or indirectly all civilized peoples and endangers the great principles of liberty and justice which constitute the American ideal and the standard of American international policy (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);

(d) The procedure of mutual consultation in order to find means of peaceful cooperation in the event of war or threat of war between American countries (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);

(e) The recognition that every act susceptible of disturbing the peace of America affects each and every one of the American nations and justifies the initiation of the procedure of consultation (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);

(f) That any difference or dispute between the American nations, whatever its nature or origin, shall be settled by the methods of conciliation, or full arbitration, or through international justice (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936);

(g) The recognition that respect for the personality, sovereignty, and independence of each American state constitutes the essence of international order supported by continental solidarity, which historically has been expressed and sustained by declarations and treaties in force (Eighth International Conference of American States, 1938);

(h) The affirmation that respect for and the faithful observance of treaties constitutes the indispensable rule for the development of peaceful relations between states, and that treaties can only be revised by agreement of the contracting parties (Declaration of American Principles, Eighth International Conference of American States, 1938);

(i) That in case the peace, security, or territorial integrity of any American republic is threatened by acts of any nature that may impair them, they proclaim their common concern and their determination to make effective their solidarity, coordinating their respective sovereign wills by means of the procedure of consultation, using the measures which in each case the circumstances may make advisable (Declaration of Lima, Eighth International Conference of American States, 1938);

(j) That any attempt on the part of a non-American state against the integrity or inviolability of the territory, the sovereignty or the political independence of an American state shall be considered as an act of aggression against all the American states (declaration XV of the second meeting of the ministers of foreign affairs, Habana, 1940).

The furtherance of these principles, which the American states have practiced in order to secure peace and solidarity between the nations of the continent constitutes an effective means of contributing to the general system of world security and of facilitating its establishment;

The security and solidarity of the continent are affected to the same extent by an act of aggression against any of the American states by a non-American state, as by an act of aggression of an American state against one or more American states.

PART I

The governments represented at the Inter-American Conference on War and Peace declare:

1. That all sovereign states are juridically equal amongst themselves.

2. That every state has the right to the respect of its individuality and independence, on the part of the other members of the international community.

3. That every attack of a state against the integrity or the inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state, shall, conformably to part III hereof, be considered as an act of aggression against the other states which sign this act. In any case invasion by armed forces of one state into the territory of another trespassing boundaries established by treaty and demarcated in accordance therewith shall constitute an act of aggression.

4. That in case acts of aggression occur or there may be reasons to believe that an aggression is being prepared by any other state against the integrity and inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state, the states signatory to this act will consult amongst themselves in order to agree upon the measures it may be advisable to take.

5. That during the war, and until the treaty recommended in part II hereof is concluded, the signatories of this act recognize that such threats and acts of aggression, as indicated in paragraphs 3 and 4 above, constitute an interference with the war effort of the United Nations, calling for such procedures, within the scope of their constitutional powers of a general nature and for war, as may be found necessary, including

recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; breaking of postal, telegraphic, telephonic, radiotelephonic relations; interruption of economic, commercial, and financial relations; use of armed force to prevent or repel aggression.

6. That the principles and procedure contained in this declaration shall become effective immediately, inasmuch as any act of aggression or threat of aggression during the present state of war interferes with the war effort of the United Nations to obtain victory. Henceforth, and to the end that the principles and procedures herein stipulated shall conform with the constitutional processes of each republic, the respective governments shall take the necessary steps to perfect this instrument in order that it shall be in force at all times.

PART II

The Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace recommends that, for the purpose of meeting threats or acts of aggression against any American republic following the establishment of peace, the governments of the American republics should consider the conclusion, in accordance with their constitutional processes, of a treaty establishing procedures whereby such threats or acts may be met by the use, by all or some of the signatories of said treaty of any one or more of the following measures: Recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; breaking of postal, telegraphic, telephonic, radiotelephonic relations; interruption of economic, commercial, and financial relations; use of armed force to prevent or repel aggression.

PART III

The above declaration and recommendation constitute a regional arrangement for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action in this hemisphere. The said arrangement, and the pertinent activities and procedures, shall be consistent with the purposes and principles of the general international organization, when established.

This agreement shall be known as the Act of Chapultepec.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in general the "whereases" are merely recitations of the anxiety to preserve peace and solidarity of the Western Hemisphere, and the interest of each of the countries in the security and peace of other countries of Latin America.

Perhaps I should read first the declaration of the Lima Conference, which is pertinent. This is paragraph (i) of the "whereases." This is the declaration at Lima in 1938:

(i) That in case the peace, security, or territorial integrity of any American republic is threatened by acts of any nature that may impair them, they proclaim their common concern and their determination to make effective their solidarity, coordinating their respective sovereign wills by means of the procedure of consultation, using the measures which in each case the circumstances may make advisable.

At the conference at Habana was laid the basis for the action taken at Mexico City. I quote paragraph (j):

That any attempt on the part of a non-American state against the integrity or inviolability of the territory, the sovereignty, or the political independence of an American state shall be considered as an act of aggression against all the American states.

That proclamation was issued at Habana, adopting among all the American states support of the doctrine to which we have been attached since 1823, and long before that in our hearts and minds.

As a summary of declarations previous to the Act of Chapultepec, the document continues as follows:

The furtherance of these principles, which the American states have practiced in order to secure peace and solidarity between the nations of the continent, constitutes an effective means of contributing to the general system of world security and of facilitating its establishment.

The security and solidarity of the continent are affected to the same extent by an act of aggression against any of the American states by a non-American state, as by an act of aggression of an American state against one or more American states.

This document, in its later passages, which I shall note, lays down the rule that an aggression by one American state against another shall be regarded as an act of aggression against all the states. That is one of the surest safeguards that can be initiated to preserve the peace.

The Act of Chapultepec, in its formal parts, is divided into several sections. Part I is called the declaration. Part II is called the recommendation. Part III gives the designations, names, and so forth. At the risk of wearying the Senate, I wish to read the declaration and the recommendation. They comprise less than two pages.

In part I the Conference declares—

1. That all sovereign states are juridically equal amongst themselves.

2. That every state has the right to the respect of its individuality and independence on the part of the other members of the international community.

3. That every attack of a state against the integrity or the inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state, shall, conformably to part III hereof, be considered as an act of aggression against the other states which sign this act. In any case invasion by armed forces of one state into the territory of another trespassing boundaries established by treaty and demarcated in accordance therewith shall constitute an act of aggression.

Part III, to which reference is there made, as will be pointed out a little later, is the part which provides that these measures must all be consistent with the purposes and principles of the international organization. We were seeking to avoid any conflict between the jurisdiction, powers, and activities of any American organization for peace, as against the international organization, so they are made subordinate to, and they must conform with, the general purposes and principles of, the international organization. I may say that the language "conformably to part III hereof," which brought about the removal of any clash between the organization of the 21 American republics and the world organization, were inserted at the urgent insistence of the United States delegation.

The American delegation also insisted on the last sentence of the third declaration wherein it is stated that "trespassing boundaries established by treaty and demarcated in accordance therewith shall constitute the act of aggression."

4. That in case acts of aggression occur or there may be reason to believe that an aggression is being prepared by another state against the integrity and inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state, the states signatory to this act will consult among themselves in order to agree upon measures it may be advisable to take.

To my mind, that is a very wise provision. In other words, if acts of aggression are occurring, or there is reason to believe that they are about to occur, instead of plunging recklessly into war the nations agree to consult among themselves as to the appropriateness of measures they may be able to take that will remove the aggression or remove the danger of its occurrence.

The next provision is very important. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] devoted his splendid attainments and labors toward having it drafted in a manner agreeable to the United States delegation.

5. That during the war, and until the treaty recommended in part II hereof is concluded—

We have not yet reached part II, but we shall reach it in a moment—

the signatories of this act recognize that such threats and acts of aggression, as indicated in paragraphs 3 and 4 above, constitute an interference with the war effort of the United Nations, calling for such procedures, within the scope of their constitutional powers of a general nature and for war, as may be found necessary, including recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions; breaking of diplomatic relations; breaking of consular relations; breaking of postal, telegraphic, telephonic, radio-telephonic relations; interruption of economic, commercial, and financial relations; use of armed forces to prevent or repel aggression.

6. That the principles and procedures contained in this declaration shall become effective immediately, inasmuch as any act of aggression or threat of aggression during the present state of war interferes with the war effort of the United Nations to obtain victory. Henceforth, and to the end that the principles and procedures herein stipulated shall conform with the constitutional processes of each republic, the respective governments shall take the necessary steps to perfect this instrument in order that it shall be in force at all times.

In other words, pending the conclusion of the war, acts of aggression by any other power in Central, South, or North America should be regarded as interfering with the war effort. Then, under the war powers, the United States Government would have the authority to act in conjunction with other Western Hemisphere republics in taking such measures as may be found necessary to prevent further interference with the war effort.

Mr. President, that concludes what is called the declaration. In other words, the declaration is an announcement of principles to which they agree, and in it they make certain suggestions as to how they shall meet the danger of aggression.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that

the Act of Chapultepec repeals the Monroe Doctrine?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I did not say that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Or did the Senator say that the Act of Chapultepec supersedes the Monroe Doctrine?

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not use either one of those terms. I said that it is an evidence that all the Latin-American countries are now embracing the Monroe Doctrine and are making it a policy of their own, as well as of ours.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then, it is an acceptance of the Monroe Doctrine, instead of a repeal of it; is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. There is no repeal of it. Of course, I tried to suggest as delicately as I could, awhile ago, that heretofore there have been certain elements in South America which did not feel very well about the idea of having the United States enforce the Monroe Doctrine, in the sense that it offended their pride, and so forth and so on; and some of them may not agree to the statement that the agreement embraces the Monroe Doctrine. But they mean to say that now it is a doctrine which is multilateral, rather than unilateral.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That part is all right; but I wish to ask whether I correctly understood the Senator to say that the new approach to the Monroe Doctrine or the new attitude toward it in the Western Hemisphere and the new approach to its acceptance have been made subordinate to whatever peace plans might develop.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would not say that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Is the Monroe Doctrine made subordinate to the international peace organization which is to come?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure that is not the case. That is not the purpose of these resolutions. A moment ago I referred to a portion of the act as showing that we were undertaking to avoid any conflict of jurisdiction between the peace measures covered by the Act of Chapultepec and the over-all world organization.

Paragraph No. 3 of the declaration reads as follows:

3. That every attack of a state against the integrity or the inviolability of the territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state, shall, conformably to part III hereof, be considered as an act of agression against the other states which sign this act.

Those are all the other states.

Let me say to the Senator that this declaration does not have the legal effect of a treaty because it has not been ratified by the Senate. It is a declaration of policies and principles upon which they agree.

Part II of the Act of Chapultepec is entitled "Recommendation." This is what the delegation recommends in order to accomplish these purposes and these declarations. It reads in part as follows:

PART II. RECOMMENDATION

Recommendation.

The Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace recommends:

That for the purpose of meeting threats or acts of agression against any American republics following the establishment of peace, the governments of the American republics should consider the conclusion, in accordance with their constitutional processes, of a treaty establishing procedures whereby such threats or acts may be met by the use, by all or some of the signatories of said treaty, of any one or more of the following measures:

Then it cites what I referred to a while ago, namely, the recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions, and so forth.

Part III is the one to which the Senator from Colorado no doubt has reference. It provides that upon the establishment of the world security organization, all procedures referred to therein "shall be consistent with the purposes and principles of the general international organization, when established."

We felt that it was absolutely necessary so to provide in order to keep faith with our plan and our purpose to establish an international organization at the conference in San Francisco.

The concluding words are simply the following:

This agreement shall be known as the Act of Chapultepec.

Furthermore, I wish to point out that part III also provides as follows:

This declaration and recommendation provide for a regional arrangement—

That language was inserted because, in view of the fact that the Dumbarton Oaks convention or temporary convention provides for regional organizations, we wished to provide that this Western Hemisphere organization, if appropriate, and if agreeable with the over-all organization, might for some purposes from time to time be utilized as a regional organization to settle regional disputes.

So part III provides that—

The above declaration and recommendation constitute a regional arrangement for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action in this Hemisphere. The said arrangement and the pertinent activities and procedures, shall be consistent with the purposes and principles of the general international organization, when established.

Mr. President, with the exception of the provision that the declaration and recommendation shall be known as the Act of Chapultepec, that concludes the formal parts of the so-called Act of Chapultepec.

For the duration of the war it will be unnecessary for any treaties or other matters to be negotiated; but as a long-time peace measure there is contained in the recommendation the statement that after the conclusion of the war we shall consider the matter of drafting treaties. That provision is not a pledge as to what the treaty or treaties may contain, but it is simply a statement that we shall consider the matter of drafting treaties.

Mr. President, I am sure that all of us are aware of the very great importance to the United States of having peace in this hemisphere. Our historic Monroe Doctrine was designed to prohibit aggression by any foreign power against any foot of soil in the Western Hemisphere. This document expresses the desires and the wishes of 19 other republics in this hemisphere to support that doctrine as against any non-American state. That was declared in the Declaration of Habana, in 1940. Now, however, not only are they willing to extend that doctrine and to have it apply as against a non-American state, but in the interest of peace they declare that they are willing to regard an act of agression by any other American state against its neighbor as an act of aggression against all of them. Mr. President, that may seem a rather broad course of action; but if what we want is peace, that is about the surest way we can guarantee it, namely, to let an aggressor know that if he violates the laws of logic and reason and justice he will have not only one enemy, but 15 or 20 enemies to see that he is not successful.

So, Mr. President, according to my view this document is a very important one, and it will be regarded in the literature of peace as a milestone along the roadway which we hope to be able to tread in order to reach world peace.

One of my chief concerns was to insure that nothing antagonistic to the world organization was contained in those resolutions. I realized that the success of the world organization was paramount, and transcended any other conception of an organization anywhere else. Unless we are able to establish a world organization with the sanctions not alone of the small powers, but of the great powers as well, and unless we are able to join hands with the great and the weaker nations of the earth in a common compact to take measures to preserve the peace of the world, those regional organizations will not have the authority or the power to accomplish the results for which we hope and expect.

According to my view, without any offense intended to any Latin-American country, the Act of Chapultepec adopts the Monroe Doctrine as a multilateral rather than a unilateral policy, both as to attacks by any non-American state, and unjust attacks by an American state. The Act of Chapultepec pledges the resistance of all American states against the aggressor. It establishes the rule of law and logic instead of the cruel and bloody statutes of the sword. It embodies the realization of all the powers of the Western Hemisphere that the historic pronouncement that no alien power may establish his system on the Western Hemisphere was a wise and prophetic policy which has preserved the liberty and independence of the nations of the western world. It represents a formal adoption by all the republics of this hemisphere of that salutary and far-seeing doctrine, and makes it the common property of all the western world.

As one of the representatives of the United States delegation, I wish to express my gratification at the results of the conference in its approval of the Act of Chapultepec. We of the United States participated in the conference and had a part in the consideration of an international arrangement for the preservation of peace and security in the entire western world.

Mr. President, allow me to say to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] that we in the United States have a par-

ticular responsibility in the Western Hemisphere. We have maintained an ancient doctrine, and together with its maintenance go certain responsibilities and duties. If we are to say that the Western Hemisphere is to be a sanctuary which shall not be invaded by any European or American aggressor, or armed conqueror, it becomes all important that we give leadership, direction and assistance to the people of the western republics in order that they may be able to work out their ambitions with respect to peace and development of their system, consistent with our sense of protection and assistance in the maintenance of that ancient doctrine. I do not think the United States can consistently do less than to give leadership and direction to the peoples of Latin America who are trying to attain the standards of peace.

Mr. President, it has long been the ambition of the Western Hemispheric republics to preserve their integrity, and to see that no alien system from Europe or elsewhere shall be established among them. By action of the Conference that was the objective of all American states. We are united in the objective that aggression shall never come from other shores to assail the sanctity of America without meeting the resistance of the united republics of the western world.

No ambitious power in this hemisphere can now contemplate the conquest of another republic in this hemisphere. The act recognizes the equality of states. It protects both the weak and the strong. We do not ignore in this document the organization of the over-all international organization on peace and security. We propose that the regional organization shall be integrated and coordinated with the world organization. We hope that the San Francisco Conference may construct a world organization based on the same noble principles. Within that framework looking toward peace and security of the entire world we are giving courage and hope to the advocates of security and peace the world over.

Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the activities and labors of our American representatives: Secretary of State Stettinius; his Assistant Secretaries, Rockefeller and Clayton; and the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. The Senator from Vermont was untiring in his industry. He brought a fine intelligent grasp of the problems which we were considering, and he gave unremittingly of his time and labor.

The Members of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, also rendered valuable service. Among the advisers were representatives of labor, agriculture, industry, and women's organizations. Each contributed valuable suggestions and aided materially in advancing the work of the Conference.

On the whole, Mr. President, we feel that the accomplishments, particularly those which culminated in the Act of Chapultepec, will be historic. We feel that they are evidence of an accomplishment in securing unity and harmony among 20 republics. Senators may think that they were simple and easy of accomplishment. While I had never attended this type of conference before my information had been that in former years there were conflicts, irritation, blocs, and groups. In the conference at Mexico City there could not have been a finer and more splendid attitude of mind and conception. The delegates seemed to be animated by the one desire to stand by the United States in the war effort, and to aid and promote the formation of an international organization for peace to take effect at the earliest possible moment.

I shall not deal with the economic resolutions which were agreed to. All of us know that in the years to come we cannot ignore all of Central and South America with relation to trade, commerce, industry, and the development of all their resources. During the war we have been purchasers of large amounts of war material from those territories. We pray that we shall never need war materials again; but if we do need them we shall hope to obtain those which are available from the republics of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. President, I believe that we made giant strides toward peace. I think we traveled a long way on the road toward San Francisco. I believe that the action taken at Mexico City will serve as a beacon in enabling the states represented at San Francisco to see the roadway toward peace. We believe it will rank in the future among the great state papers set down for future generations to observe. The Act of Chapultepec is an epochal document which will mean peace and security in the Western Hemisphere for years to come. It will be a great influence in guaranteeing that aggression and conquest shall be challenged, and that those who would shed the blood of innocent peoples shall be curbed forever.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the modesty of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate [Mr. CONNALLY] is equalled by his generosity. I appreciate what he has said with respect to the humble service which I performed in the meeting at Mexico City. I also join in commending our Latin-American neighbors for their remarkable spirit. Our South American neighbors joined the North American delegation fully in spirit to make everything drive toward that greatest objective in the hearts of all mothers and fathers of soldiers in this great war, namely, the establishment of security in which the conditions necessary for the attainment of peace through long years of living together according to reasonable rules of the game can be attained. From the beginning to the end of the conference I felt that I was having an education in courtesy, in sportsmanship, in fairness, and in justice.

It can well be imagined on the proposition of security and peace, coming from nations like Brazil, Uruguay, Colombia, Cuba, and Mexico there would be differences in detail. An example is before me. One of the propositions was this paragraph:

> The signatory states oblige themselves to defend by all means, including by arms, the territorial integrity and the political independence of all and each one of them once it has been decided by the absolute majority of all of the American states.

It can readily be seen how a keen difference would arise in the subcommittee dealing with this subject on that one item, which would have committed the armed forces of the United States to the direction of an absolute majority of all the American states. Notwithstanding that we were able to deal with each other in the subcommittee and later in the conference on a basis of understanding. Men's minds and hearts were receptive of the ideas of each other; and I may say in all sincerity and candor that the Latin-American representatives contributed greatly to the thought that entered into the ultimate Act of Chapultepec.

So, Mr. President, I am grateful for the opportunity to have learned from our Latin-American neighbors the remarkable fact that whatever documents we may write, whatever they may contain, they will be vitalized by a harmony of spirit, of consecration to a great and noble idea by which we are sure to achieve progress.

I shall not take the time, Mr. President, to go into these matters in detail, but there are some observations which I should like to put in the RECORD with respect to certain features of the Act of Chapultepec which the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has emphasized as probably the most important achievement of the conference.

Let me digress long enough to say that the respect and honor for the judgment of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate which was entertained by our Latin-American friends, as well as by his colleagues of the North American delegation, paved the way for the ultimate acceptance of the very important amendments which finally were made in the Act of Chapultepec, and gained for him a prestige which I know already has spread all over the Western Hemisphere. I know that from statements of representatives personally to me, as well as from announcements over the radio and by the press. It was a great privilege to me to serve in this duty with him and under his leadership.

I now refer to one item. The Act of Chapultepec marks a reversal of attitude in one regard. Even as late as 1936 there was a reiteration of a doctrine of international attitude on the part of the American republics, the substance of which was the condemnation of intervention by a state in the internal or external affairs of another. That had also been announced at the seventh annual conference of American states in 1933. It was a clear expression of the doctrine of nonintervention.

Again there had been the doctrine enunciated at Habana in 1940:

> That any attempt on the part of a non-American state against the integrity or in-

violability of the territory, the sovereignty or the political independence of an American state shall be considered as an act of aggression against all the American states.

The Act of Chapultepec reversed the doctrine of noninterference in the external affairs of another state, and it declared that whenever the sovereignty or the territorial integrity of one of those states is attacked by another state, whether from within the Western Hemisphere or from without, it becomes a concern of all other American states.

That is an extension of the Monroe Doctrine instead of a restriction or limitation of it, and its tendency of course is to serve as a warning to all other states to seek those channels of determination of controversies which are pacific and not warlike. The Act of Chapultepec recognizes the priority in use of the pacific method of settlement of controversies among the American nations.

It also takes that further step which has never been taken before, and which has always been feared by Latin-American republics, the step of requiring the use of armed force when necessary, when peaceful and pacific means of settling controversies have failed.

It may be asked, "Who says they have failed?" This arrangement, which is a regional arrangement, adopts the plan of consultation, to be entered into before the employment of that type of peace force which consists of the use of armed force. So that in a very simple form there is a regional arrangement set up for the pacific settlement of disputes within the Western Hemisphere.

Someone raised the question as to whether this was not an act which endangered the prospects of a world organization of general character for the same purpose, and I wish to answer that briefly.

To begin with, this conference approved of the principles and policies set forth in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as a basis of consideration at the San Francisco Conference. Of course, many of the countries had individual desires and projects, and they were not suppressed. They were given assurance that each individual country would have its free opportunity to present its own individual desires and recommendations at the San Francisco Conference. However, they unanimously approved of the purposes and principles set forth in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals as a basis for negotiation.

I say they approved; they did so in another resolution, but in this very resolution they envisage that in this form. Section 6 of the whereases of the act of Chapultepec provides:

The furtherance of these principles—

Meaning the principles aimed at peace and security which have come down through history—

The furtherance of these principles, which the American states have practiced in order to secure peace and solidarity between the nations of the continent, constitutes an effective means of contributing to the general system of world security and of facilitating its establishment.

They envisaged that. They were conscious, by having it repeatedly referred to, of the following language of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals. I read section c, "Regional arrangements."

Nothing in the charter should preclude the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action; provided such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the organization.

I skip some of the text to get in another thought which fits this discussion:

2. The Security Council should, where appropriate, utilize such arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority, but no enforcement action should be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council.

We articulated that right into the Act of Chapultepec by part III of the act, which adopts part of the language. Senators will see the striking similarity to it. It adapts it to the Western Hemisphere in the following way:

The above declaration and recommendation constitute a regional arrangement for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenarfce of national peace and security as are appropriate for regional action in this hemisphere, and such arrangements and the activities and procedures referred to therein shall be consistent with the purposes and principles of the general international organization when established.

Of course, all that deals with the future. That deals with the period after the war is over. The grave fears aroused on the border between Uruguay and Argentina, and certain rumors that were afloat, the fears of the necessity of help to maintain security and peace immediately caused every one of these declarations which came from Latin-American countries to envisage the obligation to come to the rescue in the event of aggression.

It can readily be seen how impossible it was for any country whose constitution required that a declaration of war should be made by its legislative body to enter into any such arrangement as that unless and until a treaty should be entered into which provided for such prompt mobilization of troops.

Therefore, once we got together on this point, on the use of some of the peace forces which do not consist of the use of armed forces, and certainly that type of force which consists of armed forces—when we got into the subject and pointed out to the representatives of the other countries that their own constitutions made it impossible for them to subscribe to such a declaration as that, they readily saw it, of course. They were reasonable men. What they wanted was, of course security now by lawful means. Thus it is that we find in this act of Chapultepec, part II, which is based on constitutional, general, and war powers which now exist, provision for the use of powers which are available during war, whenever and wherever an interference with the war effort of the United Nations occurs.

Mr. President, I shall not repeat the reading of it; Senators have it in memory. I shall conclude with a brief statement.

We have done three things. We have provided for security and peace during the war through the employment of constitutional, general, and war powers after consultation. This does not require any act of our Congress or of any other parliamentary body in the Western Hemisphere.

Second, we have provided for the negotiation of a treaty to take care of the same objective in peacetime.

We have, third, provided that this hemispheric arrangement shall be within the structure of the world organization.

Mr. President, if the world organization should fail of establishment, or if the world organization should operate in such a way that it did not afford the security and protection and peace we seek in the Western Hemisphere, this arrangement of the Western Hemisphere would be competent and able to take care of security and peace in the Western Hemisphere so long as the war lasts and in subsequent peacetime by special treaty.

Thus the structure of security and peace has been started on sound foundations. So what we have done is not temporary. What we have done is not in conflict with the plans for a general international organization for security, and what we have done is sure to develop conditions in which peace can be attained that will prevail in this hemisphere, whatever may betide.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Was Canada represented at this conference?

Mr. AUSTIN. No. Canada is not one of the American republics, and Canada's situation is somewhat different because of her membership in the Commonwealth of British Nations. There was great interest shown by Latin Americans and by ourselves in having Canada articulated in some way with this hemispheric arrangement. Everyone desires it. Often it came up and often discussion arose: "How can we invite this great neighbor of ours into this cooperative effort for peace?" We feel that we will attain that result some day. I will not say "we feel"—I should rather say "we felt"—because I doubt that I will ever be a member of such a conference again.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In any case, there was no objection to Canadian entry if it could be brought about?

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would think the entry of Canada would strengthen the organization.

Mr. AUSTIN. There was no objection. On the contrary, there was a great desire to have that effected. The difficulties involved are somewhat complex at the present moment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Reference was made a moment ago to the Monroe Doctrine. It would seem to me, from the Senator's description of the conference, that it has resulted in vastly strengthening the Monroe Doctrine in that it alined the interests of all the American nations behind the Monroe Doctrine. Is that not true?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. One of the astounding things we discovered there was that the Latin-Americans, who formerly regarded the Nation up north as a sort of a club over their heads, now were not only willing but eager to participate in the Monroe Doctrine. Some of them desired that Dumbarton Oaks plans should involve some direct and express reference to such an eventuality; that all the American nations should become responsible for the Monroe Doctrine and that the responsibility be recognized by the rest of the world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Texas have any particular difficulty there in connection with the question of the juridical equality of all these sovereign states; that is, the difficulty of reconciling our side with that of the small nations? There has been much criticism of Dumbarton Oaks because of that. I wonder whether that question was to any extent discussed at the conference.

Mr. AUSTIN. It was not discussed at all. No question was raised about it. In fact, one of the most beautiful characteristics of the whole conference was the faith, the spirit of confidence which permeated that meeting. Mind you, these proposals arose in Latin America. These proposals for security came to us principally in the form that they first came from Brazil, Colombia, and Uruguay. The most impressive suggestions that were made came from them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator means our delegation did not propose those things?

Mr. AUSTIN. Oh, no. What our delegation did, however, was, in my judgment, admirable. Secretary of State Stettinius, Assistant Secretary Rockefeller, and Assistant Secretary Clayton, assisted by Ambassador Berle, Ambassador Avra Warren, Ambassador Messersmith, and by others whose names do not arise to my memory at once.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Ambassador Messersmith was there, was he not?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. They conducted informal negotiations among the various representatives of state departments of all these countries, so that undoubtedly there was an exchange of views informally on this subject, which became reflected more or less definitely in these proposals. But, of course, there were differences between their view and our view of the matter which prompted the striking out of the direct obligations that would be enforced by a vote of the majority of the American states, and so on. The United States would not make such a proposal as that, of course.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. From what I understand, the two Senators representing the Senate made a great contribution toward bringing in these suggestions and reconciling differences.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I would give great credit to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee for what was done, but I think no one man can claim preponderant credit for it. It was our job to do all we could for it, as we had the light and guidance given to us. I am sure every representative performed that duty at the conference.

The representatives of labor and agriculture were particularly diligent and came forward and presented their views in meetings, and in the evening personally to the steering committees, and so on. We were in session much of the time. We had a great working team in Mexico City. To have a cross section of our interested life here in America at that conference was beneficial and something new. I wish to say that the consideration of these matters on the parliamentary level was a good thing. There were representatives of parliamentary bodies from all over the Western Hemisphere there, and their point of view had much to do with taking the "bugs" out of propositions which parliamentarians have to deal with in considering and passing laws. I feel that the theory of having intercourse among the parliamentary bodies of the world regularly and frequently was given a new impulse at the conference in Mexico City, because of the positive benefits that it provided in setting up, not the Act of Chapultepec alone, but 59 other resolutions. Two hundred and eighty-five resolutions were offered, and they all received some consideration, sufficient consideration to enable the conference to know what to sift out. They were sifted down to 60, and 60 of these very important resolutions were acted upon.

Consider the calendar of the Senate, and remember that these propositions were, some of them, as serious as any that come before the Senate. We disposed of 60 resolutions in about 2 weeks. That is because men could act with knowledge. They had the benefit of special study and experience and skill right there on hand all the time. For example, whenever we confronted a question which affected the dairy interests of the State of Vermont there was a man there who was able to tell us what was the matter with that proposition. In this case the president of the Grange, Mr. Goff, stayed there 2 days extra because of what he saw in a certain resolution he wanted attended to. He stayed until it was attended to.

Have I answered the Senator's question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I heard both of our distinguished colleagues say that the proceedings at Chapultepec were historic. As I sat here and listened to them relate the events of that occasion I got a great thrill. Why? Because here was the democratic process—the constitutional process—in action. I wonder if we are cognizant of the fact that their report to this body is historic. This is, indeed, a significant occasion. For a period of 6 years some of us have stood here and insisted that the word "advise" in the Constitution, when it speaks of treaties and foreign relations, and the function of the Senate, meant something.

I am indeed grateful that I am alive at this moment. I see a new day in prospect for America. No longer do the two members of this team—the Senate and the Executive—play separately. They are now playing together. This is the first time since I came to the Senate that a Senator of the United States has been sent by the executive department to treat with foreign nations; and we have the report today. The occasion is highly encouraging. It augurs well for the future. When we can send two such men as the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who know the Constitution, who know the meaning of having checks and balances in government, and who can sit down and reason a proposal through, we know that the plan of the fathers is in operation.

All of us realize that in all the conferences heretofore—Casablanca, Cairo, Teheran, Moscow, Yalta—not once was the Senate of the United States represented. Not once did we have an accounting by our "own" such as we have had here today. Not once have we been told the facts, or received the "stimulation" which we have received today.

Mr. President, only a few days ago I submitted a resolution expressing in substance the hope that what has occurred in this instance might happen in relation to such a conference as that which is to be held in San Francisco. We might resolve ourselves into a committee of the whole and be told definitely and clearly the facts, without having to rely upon hearsay. We would hear at first hand the report of our own Members, as well as that of representatives of the State Department.

Mr. President, I say again that this is a great occasion. This is a historic occasion of far greater importance than the conference which took place at Chapultepec. The South American countries have now come to see the wisdom of the Monroe Doctrine. Perhaps they did not see it before. The world has been shrunk. Airplanes go around the world in a matter of hours. Those nations sense the need of unified action, and they sense, further, the importance of extending the Monroe Doctrine, as explained by our distinguished associates.

This is the report of our associates, and they have builded well, as the Constitution contemplated.

Mr. President, I thank our two brother Senators for the fine work they have done. I am satisfied that they have set the pattern which will be followed in the future. I am grateful that the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are going to San Francisco; and I trust that in every other conference hereafter, whenever foreign relations are considered, this body will have its representatives present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the senior Senator from Texas a question. Do I correctly understand that the Senator intends, at some future time, to describe to the Senate the economic resolutions of the Mexico Conference?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to discuss them, but I have just handed the Senator a copy of the resolutions.

Mr. TAFT. I glanced through them.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think possibly the Senator was misled by my statement that I would try to have them all col-

lected up to date, and then request that they be printed as a Senate document.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator know whether or not any obligations were undertaken by the United States in the matter of loans, and so forth, after the war, which were not included in the resolutions?

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator mean privately or under cover?

Mr. TAFT. They necessarily would be between two nations. There would not be a general resolution covering such arrangements. I wondered if there were any specific obligations in view, through Lend-Lease, F. E. A., the Export-Import Bank, or otherwise, in connection with the conference.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall ask the Senator from Vermont to stand by. I made specific inquiry of our delegates dealing with those matters. I was not on the committee which handled the economic resolutions, although I did give considerable attention, as did the Senator from Vermont, to the particular resolutions called the economic charter. We studied that document. I inquired of our other delegates, and they assured me that no money commitments of any character were made during the conference.

Mr. TAFT. I did not intend to criticize if there were. I only wondered, if there were, how we could find out about them. If there are none, there is no further knowledge to be sought.

Mr. CONNALLY. For more accurate information I refer the Senator to Assistant Secretaries of State Clayton and Rockefeller. But I made specific inquiry as to that matter, and I was told that there were no commitments which required that we furnish any money whatever. I do not mean by that that there were not general statements in the resolutions that we would endeavor to do this, that, or the other thing which might eventually involve some expenditures. However, so far as direct commitments are concerned, I believe that the statement which I have made is accurate. I will ask the Senator from Vermont if he has any information to the contrary.

Mr. AUSTIN. The economic charter is in quite general terms. I take some risk in undertaking to state its purpose and objective simply, because it is quite a lengthy document. However, this is my impression of it:

It declares the policy of promotion of equal and reciprocal opportunity for both the nationals and goods of each country. That does not mean free trade, and does not mean equality in its absolute sense; but it does mean reduction of trade barriers in a scientific manner, adapted to the needs ascertained at the time and for the period necessary in order to create an expanding economic system in the Western Hemisphere. This was a hemisphere proposition; but it contemplated also the world, and the attitude of the Western Hemisphere toward the world in economic matters. In general, its objective was stated in broad terms, and not specifically. As I recall, there was no express promise to make a loan, to reduce a tariff, or to remove a subsidy; but the general principles which any man can see will have to be inaugurated in the world if we are to have economic peace, and by its means a political peace, are declared in the economic charter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. When will these documents be printed? When shall we see the economic charter?

Mr. AUSTIN. I have a copy of it here, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has not as yet been printed has it?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; it has not as yet been printed.

Mr. McKELLAR. But I assume it will be printed?

Mr. AUSTIN. I certainly assume that it will be printed, and that all the 60 resolutions of the meeting at Mexico City will be published. They ought to be published.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think most of them were published in the New York Times, or at least a summary was published in the New York Times, and is available there.

Mr. AUSTIN. It was.

Mr. TAFT. I was only interested to know whether there were outside agreements between individual nations. As I understand, the Senator knows of no such agreements.

Mr. AUSTIN. I know of none. There was another economic document which referred more specifically to the subject of tariffs. That was the one in which President Goss was so much interested. As it was finally adopted, it met with his approval; and I believe that anything that meets with President Goss' conservative approval would meet with Republican approval.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Last week I obtained consent to have printed in the RECORD what was purported to be an authorized interview with Mr. William L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, regarding two subjects. One of them was protection for infant industries in South America, a subject about which some concern was expressed, apparently. As I understand the situation, ample latitude was allowed for the South American and Central American republics to protect their infant industries.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is my recollection. I think it came under the heading of new industries.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. It included not only independent industries, but new industries erected within old industries, and reference is made to protection, namely, tariff protection and trade barriers.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. AUSTIN. I cannot remember the exact language; but it is against the raising of such barriers above a reasonable level.

Mr. BREWSTER. Very well.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Maine was referring, was he not, to the resolutions relative to new industries?

Mr. BREWSTER. In the report by Mr. Herbert B. Elliston, associate editor of the Washington Post, reference was made to infant industries.

Mr. CONNALLY. A clause relating to new industries, as I recall, is contained in the economic charter. It is not available here at the moment. There is a clause providing that new industries within a country shall have protection, but that when it is no longer necessary to have high rates of duty to keep them going and alive, the rates shall be reduced.

Mr. BREWSTER. That provision would be applicable to us, as well as to the other countries, I understand. In other words, I assume it is of universal applicability.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume it would be. I do not recall that any exceptions are stated. But the point was, for instance, that in some countries there are simply no industries of certain characters. If it was desired to establish such industries, they would be assured of sufficient protection to put them on their feet. But the provision was that once such industries were on their feet, the tariff should be reduced. However, I think a distinction was made between a new industry and an addition to an old industry. The latter would not acquire that particular right, I believe. My recollection is that in case of an addition to an old industry, that provision would not be applicable. It was for new industries, which are to be created and stimulated.

Mr. BREWSTER. There is another phrase in the same interview which indicates that, apparently, Mr. Clayton undertook to draw a distinction between good cartels and bad cartels. Is that also a matter which enters into the document in its economic sense?

Mr. CONNALLY. It probably enters into some of the documents; but I cannot recall them all. There is a great mass of them. I was not on the committee which dealt with them, so my information regarding some of them is very inadequate.

Mr. WHEELER. Is there a difference between good cartels and bad cartels?

Mr. BREWSTER. I obtained unanimous consent to have the interview printed in the RECORD, and I spoke to Mr. Clayton following his return. In the interview he indicated that there might be cartels which might be appropriate and which, he said, speaking for our Government, might meet with the approval of our Government. Other cartels he regarded as bad cartels.

Mr. WHEELER. I am interested in knowing whether there were any agreements whereby we would break down the tariffs on raw materials. Coming from the West, which produces the raw materials, I find that although a number of persons who are manufacturers in the East want to have high tariffs on their manufactured articles, they are perfectly willing to have no tariffs or low tariffs on raw materials which are produced by the

farmers, the miners, and the stock growers of the West. I certainly hope that there were no agreements which would break down or throw open the tariffs on the raw materials produced in the western section of our country, whereby raw materials would be shipped into the United States from the countries to the south with the result that our farmers, stockmen, and miners would be put out of business.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I now have before me the economic charter. At page 61, paragraph 4, appears the following, which I think bears on the subject of cartels:

Private agreements which restrict international trade:

4. To seek early agreed action by governments to prevent these practices by cartels or through other private business arrangements which obstruct international trade, stifle competition, and interfere with the maximum efficiency of production and fair competitive prices to consumers.

That is all there is to that paragraph.

The following paragraph, entitled "Elimination of Excesses of Economic Nationalism," provides as follows:

5. To cooperate for the general adoption of a policy of international economic collaboration to eliminate the excesses which may result from economic nationalism, including excessive restriction of imports and the dumping of surpluses of national production in world markets.

I do not believe the word "subsidy" will be found in this economic charter at all. I do not think any direct reference to it will be found.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield to me, let me say that the interview with Mr. Clayton appears at page A1054 of the Appendix of the RECORD under date of March 7. In that interview we find that the following was apparently Mr. Clayton's authorized distinction:

Distinction can be drawn between private cartel arrangements which have to do with the fixing of prices, the allocation of markets and the control of production for private profit, particularly when such agreements are made by such industries with a limited number of products, as the chemical industry and an international agreement under Government auspices which relates to commodities which have developed unmarketable supplies—

I presume that means surpluses—

and which concern raw materials in the production of which millions of producers are involved. We can defend the latter while we condemn the former.

Does that distinction come within the scope of what appears in the economic charter?

Mr. AUSTIN. It is not an interpretation which I would place upon it. I suppose it is possible to place such an interpretation upon it, but I do not see it in the language which is employed.

Mr. BREWSTER. When the Senator from Vermont has an opportunity to examine it, I think it would be very interesting to have his comment. The portion I read purports to be quoted from an interview with Mr. Clayton. The reminder of the article is an interpretation by Mr. Elliston, who, of course, is a very competent reporter.

Mr. AUSTIN. The charter further states directly, on the subject of private enterprise, the following:

(8) To promote the system of private enterprise in production which has characterized the economic development of the American republics, to take appropriate steps to secure the encouragement of private enterprise and to remove as far as possible obstacles which retard or discourage economic growth and development.

Everything is in rather broad, general terms. So this does not make a commitment with respect to the points about which the Senator from Maine has inquired, as I understand it or interpret it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator feel that the agreement reached at Mexico City will result in building up and maintaining more balanced economies in all the Americas? The reason why I ask that question is that we are all aware that in some sections there is a fear that emphasis will be placed upon agricultural production in South America, Central America, and Mexico, and that less emphasis will be placed on industrial production. If that is the case, of course it is conceivable that such a policy might have a harmful effect upon agriculture in the United States.

On the other hand, if the industrialization of those countries somewhere near keeps pace with their agricultural production, then not only would we probably have little, if anything, to fear for our own agriculture, but the increased purchasing power of those countries would create a better market for everything we produce here.

Does my colleague feel that the agreement reached will have a tendency to build and maintain a balanced economy? I realize that that cannot come about all at once; but will it have that tendency?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, my answer is "Yes." I am not as familiar with the economic principles and policies as I am with other features of the conference, although I worked with the steering committee on that subject as well as on other subjects.

I now turn over the page, and in section 10 point out how the policy is expressed with respect to labor. The language—and, as in all similar matters, action is looked forward to in the future—is as follows:

To take appropriate steps to assure to the workers of the American republics, under conditions of progressive economic development, the realization of the objectives set forth in the declaration at Philadelphia adopted by the International Labor Conference.

That is one segment of our economic responsibility. I well recall that there are others which have in view the encouragement of the industrialization of Latin-American countries. The use of their own balances—I do not recall this having been written into the document, but I do recall the discussion concerning it—in the United States will be for the purchase of machine tools, and becoming established on an industrial basis so that their economy will not be based solely on the production of raw materials and agricultural products.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that it is hoped by all of us that earning power of the countries to the south may nearly approximate that of our own, and that when that time comes we may be able to discard barriers which now exist between the nations. If the Conference at Mexico City has resulted in a step being taken toward the day for which we all hope, it will certainly result in a very lasting benefit. I hope that at some time we may learn a little more about the economic agreements which were reached at Mexico City, but I realize the Senator did not take part to any extent in the negotiations on that subject.

Mr. AUSTIN. I believe that within a few days a printed copy of the document will be available to all of us.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. A little while ago the Senator said that the word "subsidy" was not used during the entire deliberations.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator care to express an observation as to whether or not any policy of restriction was discussed which would have a tendency to prevent surpluses being produced or being dumped into world markets, especially with respect to agricultural production?

Mr. AUSTIN. Of course, there were deliberations along that line, but as a result of those deliberations there was omitted from the economic charter any reference to subsidies. I am now giving only my opinion.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I am asking for.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is my opinion that section 5 really covers in a broad way the point to which tht Senator refers. It reads as follows:

To cooperate for the general adoption of a policy of international economic collaboration to eliminate the excesses which may result from economic nationalism, including excessive restriction of imports and the dumping of surpluses of national production in world markets.

The Senator can see from that language that much is implied but there is no reference to subsidies.

Mr. WHERRY. Nor any methods which may be adopted with reference to them?

Mr. AUSTIN. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2506) to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2506) to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended, was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Executive Office of the President—Bureau of the Budget," on page 3, line 19, after the word "amended", to strike out "$2,227,257" and insert "$2,004,532."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 20, to strike out:

National defense activities: For all necessary expenses of the Bureau of the Budget in the performance of activities relating to the national defense, including all the objects for which the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of the Budget" is available, and including the temporary employment (not exceeding $12,500) of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and the employment of persons, including State, county, or municipal officers and employees, with or without compensation, $445,300: *Provided*, That upon the expiration of 60 days after the cessation of hostilities between the United States and the principal enemy powers or after the date of an armistice between the United States and the principal enemy powers, this appropriation shall cease to be available for obligations unless Congress shall otherwise provide by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 12, to insert:

No part of the appropriations herein made to the Bureau of the Budget shall be used for the maintenance or establishment of regional, field, or any other offices outside the District of Columbia.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, would that amendment take away from the Bureau of the Budget the funds necessary in order to carry out the purposes of the Federal Reports Act, which was passed by the Senate a short time ago?

The Bureau of the Budget has been putting that act into effect, and the funds which were appropriated for it were for the purpose of enabling the Bureau of the Budget to carry out the purposes of the act.

Mr. McKELLAR. This amendment refers to the national-defense activities. The item was stricken out entirely. The Bureau of the Budget now desires to have four regional offices. The committee felt that to be unnecessary because the estimates have heretofore been made at Washington, and the Bureau wished to establish two additional offices. The amendment deals merely with that subject.

Mr. MURRAY. Small business has been especially benefited by the Federal Reports Act, and the Bureau of the Budget, as the result of its work under that act, greatly relieved small business from the innumerable requirements which were in effect heretofore with regard to the submission of reports to Washington.

Mr. McKELLAR. The subject was not mentioned in the hearings. I think the pending bill has nothing to do with it.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I think the pending bill does have something to do with it. The Federal Reports Act is administered in the Bureau of the Budget by the Division of Statistical Standards, which will share in the reductions proposed to be made.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will look on page 3, in line 19, he will see that a general appropriation of $2,004,532 has been recommended. The Bureau will have plenty of money with which to administer the act so far as its responsibilities are concerned.

Mr. MURRAY. My information is to the effect that it will not have sufficient funds, and that the amendment will greatly hamper and interfere with the administration of the act by the Bureau of the Budget. The Division of Statistical Standards, which has been carrying forward the program of relieving small business from the necessity of filing innumerable reports, will be greatly hampered.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, the testimony which was given before the committee contains nothing in the world about that subject. What the Senator has said is a new idea which has been suggested since the testimony was taken, and since the bill was reported. Of course, every bureau of the Government which may be affected in the slightest way by a reduction always feels that it will be hampered, and that something will happen to somebody, usually employees of the bureau. But the committee went over the matter very carefully and heard all the testimony which was offered.

The representatives of the Bureau appeared before us. They did not mention that particular feature at all, but, after carefully considering the matter, the committee felt that these reductions could be made, and they were made, and I think were properly made. I hope the Senator feels the same about it.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I understand this matter was given some consideration in the House of Representatives, and there are certain Members of the House who feel that this curtailment would have the effect I am stating it would have. The Federal Reports Act, as administered by the Bureau of the Budget, has certainly served a very useful purpose, and if it is true that the cut which will be made will reduce their activities and interfere with their carrying out the purposes of the act, of course I object to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the amendment proposed is the judgment of the committee. Of course, if the Senate feels that the statement of the Senator from Montana is correct, the Senate can restore the item, but I hope it will not be restored. This Bureau started out 22 years ago, when it was established, with 35 employees. Today it has 575, and is constantly adding to them, and if we appropriated all the money they ask for, there is no telling how great the sum would be. I believe that the committee was correct and that the Senator is not.

Mr. MURRAY. I have no doubt that the Senator has given very great study to the matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee has.

Mr. MURRAY. While it is true that this Bureau has grown, the country has grown as well, and we have become one of the greatest industrial nations in the world.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. It seems to me that the Bureau of the Budget is a very important agency of the Government, and will have to grow some more if it is to take care of the problems which will be forced upon it in the years to come, especially in the immediate post-war period. Anyway, I feel that this curtailment is not justified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee on page 4, after line 20.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7 it is proposed to strike out lines 1 to 18, both inclusive, as follows:

AMERICAN COMMISSION FOR THE PROTECTION AND SALVAGE OF ARTISTIC AND HISTORIC MONUMENTS IN WAR AREAS

For all expenses necessary for the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas in performing its functions, as described in the letter of the Secretary of State, approved by the President, June 23, 1943, as amended, including the employment of persons, without regard to citizenship, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $15,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil-service and classification laws or section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; travel expenses, purchase of books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; not to exceed $90 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail as required by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364); and printing and binding; $40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Civil Service Commission," on page 8, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$236,270" and insert "$217,000"; and in line 17, before the words "of which", to strike out "$9,512,520" and insert "$8,673,882."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee to explain what reason the committee had for this sharp cut in the appropriations for the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. We provided for them exactly what the had for the current fiscal year. The Civil Service Commission is performing an excellent service for the Government, but it was the opinion of the committee that to increase the appropriation at this time was not necessary, and would not be of any material assistance. I certainly hope the Senate will uphold the committee in this respect.

The Commission has been very active. They have had a great many employees. The Commission has grown tremendously, and as the Senator knows, it does a very valuable work; but to increase the appropriation just about the time the war in one area at least is over, and give them more and more, is not justified. This country is going to have a very large debt, and it is time we were trying to do something for the benefit of the taxpayers.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am fully aware of the debt. The Senator is correct; it is large. There must have been some justification given to the House committee or it would not have allowed $9,512,520. What I am trying to ascertain from the Senator is what specific activities of the Commission the committee has in mind curtailing in reducing this item.

Mr. McKELLAR. They are getting exactly what they had last year. I do not think the Commission was ever more active in its history than it was during the past year. It had an infinite number of defense activities caused by the war. Instead of such activities increasing, it is very likely that by July the 1st they will probably decrease, not only in a small degree, but to a very considerable extent; and, after mature, careful consideration, and after hearing the testimony of those who were interested, the committee was of the opinion that the amount appropriated last year was sufficient, and that is why it is left as it was.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do not have the benefit of being a member of the Committee on Appropriations, but everyone knows that the House committee goes over these items very carefully and is as much concerned with the debt and with economy as is the Senate committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The amount of $9,512,520 was allowed and passed the House. I am not a member of the Senate committee, and I have not had the benefit of sitting in on the hearings. All I am asking the Senator from Tennessee to tell me is what particular phases of the activity of the Civil Service Commission which appeared justified to the House it is now proposed they shall not either carry on or undertake. According to my hurried calculation, if we take into consideration the cut in the printing item, the reducton amounts to about $838,638. That much of a cut cannot be made without either curtailing some of their existing activities or some they had in contemplation when this item was originally arrived at.

Mr. McKELLAR. These are the activities they had in contemplation:

Work improvement program, $106,678.

Promoting better personnel management, $76,400.

Preparing and issuing standards, field classification work, $229,810.

Budget and Finance Division, $30,489.

Office services division, $33,703.

Penalty mail, $26,400.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Do those items constitute those which have been eliminated?

Mr. McKELLAR. The House applied cuts to them, and then the Senate committee applied the same sort of cuts. We reduced the appropriation to the amount appropriated last year. The committee did not think it was necessary to appropriate more money for the Civil Service Commission this year than was appropriated last year, because last year they had the heaviest amount of work they ever had, and we thought it was exceedingly unlikely they would have a larger amount of work to do the coming year. That is what actuated the committee, and that is the situation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Let me ask the Senator whether included in this cut will be any reduction in the activities of the Commission so far as the placement of veterans is concerned.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I think not. They are placing veterans. The veterans are returning now by the scores of thousands, and perhaps, even at a greater rate. I believe the Commission can do their work with the appropriation allowed as well as they did it last year.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understood that among other things the Commission had set up a section, or whatever they may call it, which has special reference to the placement and replacement of veterans, because of course there are a very large number of veterans who have gone into the armed forces from the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. From the civil service.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And under the Selective Service Act the Government is under the same obligation to find reemployment, as is a private employer.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am anxious to know from the Senator whether this rather substantial cut——

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; not a cut. The appropriation is exactly the same as that of last year.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Well, it is a cut below what the Bureau of the Budget recommended and what the House allowed.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is about a 10-percent cut, roughly speaking.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And I am trying to ascertain whether the reduction recommended by the Senate committee will impair this activity which the Commission has undertaken so far as veterans are concerned.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I do not think so.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Was that activity taken into consideration by the Senate committee in arriving at the amount which was recommended?

Mr. McKELLAR. It certainly was. The Senate committee had before it the number of soldiers who were being discharged. Many questions arose concerning such soldiers. I assure the Senate and the Senator from Wisconsin that if I thought that what we did would impair any right of the soldiers or duty we owe them the cut would not have been made.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is very reassuring to me, because it seems to me that it is obviously an activity which is going to expand rather than contract as the war comes to an end.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true, but other activities will contract very greatly. The employment of individuals by the Government today is enormously greater than it ever has been before, and the Government will be obliged to reduce this employment when the war is over.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Oh, certainly, that is obviously true, especially so far as the war agencies are concerned. I realize that probably it may be even more than we hope for; but what I had in mind was that, as it becomes possible to discharge and demobilize the armed forces, the problem confronting the Civil Service Commission in seeing to it that the Government responsibility under section 8 of the Selective Service Act is properly administered and discharged, will increase in direct ratio to the number of persons previously employed in the Government service, or with respect to a later established veterans' preference, in seeing to it that they are given their rightful consideration. I am very anxious to make certain that if the Senate adopts the amendment proposed by the committee, it will not result in curtailing that particular activity of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee not only discussed that, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin; but on page 332 of the record of the hearings the Senator will find that Mr. Flemming was told concerning a 10-percent cut under the House provision:

> Try it (for) 1 year. If you did and then came back and said you could not do it, we would be more likely to want to uphold you.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Under the heading "Civil Service Commission," I notice in addition to this cut, "Salaries and expenses, $838,638" there is another cut "Salaries and expenses, national defense, $1,000,000." Will the Senator explain the reason for that?

Mr. McKELLAR. We did not believe there would be the necessity of putting so many employees in national-defense service next year as the present year.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it an expression of hope on the part of the committee that it will not be necessary?

Mr. McKELLAR. Naturally, no one can tell; but it seems to be a very extravagant view to take that we should appropriate money for the Commission for another year and 4 months of war.

Mr. AIKEN. It is the Senator's expectation, then, that if it develops that the money will be needed, the officials can return and ask for it later in the year?

Mr. McKELLAR. It can be done, and if it is done the money will be provided.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I did not attend all the meetings of the subcommittee, but I heard some of the discussion with reference to this item. I think I am wholly justified in saying that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate acted in no punitive spirit at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. WHITE. But the committee restored the appropriation to that of last year because, in the opinion of the committee, of failure to justify the increase asked for?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Maine is correct. No member of the committee had any other view but to appropriate every dollar that was actually necessary for this purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 8, in lines 16 and 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 9, line 24, after the word "binding", to strike out "$7,032,000" and insert "$6,032,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Communications Commission," on page 12, line 12, before the word "maintenance", to strike out "purchase (not to exceed five)"; and in line 21, after the word "amended", to strike out "$2,554,400" and insert "$2,550,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Power Commission—Salaries and Expenses," on page 15, line 13, after the word "services" and the semicolon, to strike out "purchase (not to exceed three)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 19, before the words "of which", to strike out "$2,150,000" and insert "$1,818,466."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that that amendment, and the one in the next line, go over until tomorrow in order that we may receive some information about them.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments will be passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the next amendment, which is in line 22, on page 15, also be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment in line 22 will be passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. I also ask that the amendment in line 5 on page 17 be passed over, so all amendments relating to the Federal Power Commission, except the one on page 15, line 13, may go over together. I think it would be better if that were done.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not asking that they all go over.

Mr. McKELLAR. They all come under the heading "Federal Power Commission," and should all go over together.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments referred to will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Works Agency—Office of the Administrator," on page 18, line 20, after the word "laws'" to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$293,302."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 25, after the word "planning" and the colon, to strike out "Toward accomplishing" and insert "For carrying out."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask the Chair not to be in such a hurry with this bill. Unanimous consent was granted that the bill might be reported during the adjournment of the Senate. I am now beginning to question whether it was a wise thing to grant such request.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Chair will not rush the bill through. I am sure the Senator from Wisconsin will have every opportunity to discuss its various provisions.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. This is a very important amendment, and I am trying to obtain some information about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin can rest assured that the Chair is not railroading the bill through. Every Senator will be given a chance to be heard on it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Chair. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee a question about this item. This is the item which, as I understand, provides for assistance to the States and local subdivisions, and for the activities of Federal Government looking to the planning of a post-war public works program. The Bureau of the Budget recommended $77,000,000 plus for this purpose, and the House, I regret to say, reduced the item to $5,000,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair may say to the Senator from Wisconsin that the amendment under consideration is the one beginning in line 25 at the bottom of page 18.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand, that amendment involves the question I am discussing.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. There may be simply a change of language, but in order to get in in time, before the Chair has the next item in the next line agreed to, I thought I would take advantage of my right and ask for some information. Will the Senator from Tennessee be kind enough to make a rather comprehensive statement about this matter? I think this is a very important item, and one that should have the consideration of the Senate. I wish to say at the outset that I am pleased that the Senate committee saw fit to restore at least a portion of the amount estimated for this item, thus recognizing the importance of the subject matter; but I have heard, also, that a legislative amendment was intended to be offered. If the Senator would be kind enough to give us a rather comprehensive statement about this item, I would appreciate it very much.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to do so. As we all know, the President recommended $77,000,000-plus for planning. There seemed to be some difference as to whether the planning money was to be returned after the bonds were issued by a particular city which is to issue bonds for public works. The plans must be made before the bonds are issued.

There was a difference as to whether, after the $77,000,000 was advanced, the cities, States, counties, and other subdivisions of government should return the money.

When the matter came before the House, the House allowed only $5,000,000, reducing the appropriation by $72,000,000. When it came to the Senate committee, to be very frank, I thought that probably the full amount should be restored, and that the question should go to conference. However, there was a very sharp difference of opinion among members of the committee. We heard every kind of argument about the matter, and finally some member of the committee suggested this method. The question arose very frequently as to whether the money should be paid back. I remember that we asked Mayor LaGuardia, Mayor Kelly, and other witnesses whether or not the money was to be paid back. Some of them thought it was to be paid back, and others thought that perhaps not all of it would be paid back to the Government. Thereupon a member of the committee made the suggestion that, inasmuch as in making such appropriations we had almost uniformly adopted the plan of a 50–50 appropriation in connection with roads and other things of like character, that plan might well be followed in this instance. Very quickly the suggestion was carried out; and instead of providing for the whole sum, the committee adopted the plan to appropriate $30,000,000, with none of it to be returned. We are not asking the cities to return it, but merely to match it. In other words, we have adopted the well-known policy of matching State, county, or city funds.

That amendment was adopted. I think probably it would prove as satisfactory as the other plan. The only difference is that the cities, counties, and States will have to put up half the money. Most of them are going to put up large sums, anyway. Judging from the statements of witnesses, it is expected that this will be only a part of the planning funds.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Just a moment. I am rather inclined to the view that perhaps I was mistaken in suggesting that the whole amount be appropriated. I am rather inclined to think that it would be more beneficial to the cities themselves to put half the money and let the Government put up the other half. The cities can return the half which the Government puts up.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator intend to offer an amendment to the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. It is perfectly clear to me what the bill would do. The bill would lend the money to the States or the cities, as the case might be; and if the city should proceed with the work, it would have to pay it back, because bonds would be issued to cover the whole project, and money would be included in the bond issue to pay it back. If for any reason a project were discontinued, the city would not have to pay back the money. That seemed to me to be a perfectly reasonable system. I do not quite see the reason for changing the system.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is the amendment which has been proposed and will be offered tomorrow.

On page 19, line 13, before the period, it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That of the $35,000,000 appropriated in this paragraph, $5,000,000 shall be available for loans for advances without matching—

That is the $5,000,000 which the House has allowed—

under the provisions of said title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, but the remaining $30,000,000 shall not be available for obligation or expenditure under said title V except to make loans or advances in cases in which sums at least equal to such loans or advances shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, their agencies or political subdivisions for the purposes set forth in said title V.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. What the committee is now proposing to do is to accomplish the identical thing which we were trying to avoid. Many municipalities and political divisions are not able to take out of ther treasuries money to make surveys and plans and prepare for post-war work, but must depend upon their own people for a bond issue later in order to carry out their programs. They will not be able to get any of this money on the matching basis. A few large, wealthy cities will perhaps be able to absorb it all. So the very purpose which the committee had in mind, and which Congress had in mind, would be defeated.

Mr. McKELLAR. The large cities could not absorb it all. It would be allocated under the terms of the law.

Mr. GEORGE. That may be true; but they will absorb all of it that can be paid out.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if he shares the apprehension which I have, that if the matching plan is adopted, and thus the plan which I thought had been agreed to and enacted into law is altered, we are likely to have a very distorted and spotty type of planning. Communities which are able to provide money for planning purposes will have their plans all ready; but communities which cannot do so, and must have a bond issue in order to get the money, will not be able to plan. The net result will be that certain municipalities and States which have a program and are ready to go forward will have an advantage, whereat communities in which improvement may be more needed may not be able to carry out the policy and program envisioned in the measure to which the Senator refers.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I believe that this is an important question. I ask the Senator from Tennessee if he is willing to have this amendment go over until tomorrow.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish the Senator from Tennessee would do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to do so.

Something has been said about large cities. I should like to read a paragraph from Mayor LaGuardia's testimony:

Mayor LAGUARDIA. Gentlemen, I want to be perfectly frank and be fair with the committee, and say, as General Fleming has stated, that is the law, but I want to add this, by stating that the mayors of those communities have said that a public-works program of the magnitude necessary to create employment and get industry going is not possible with merely advancing the money for these plans. It contemplates grants to localities, cities, and counties, from the Government if such a program is to be worked out within 3 to 5 years following the war.

To my mind, nothing is of greater importance in the matter of furnishing employment for our returning soldiers than to have plans made as early as possible. That was the important idea, just as it was the President's idea to advance $75,000,000, in round numbers, for this purpose. It seems to me that would be the better plan.

On the other hand, when it was stated by some witnesses that the expectation was to pay back the $75,000,000, and by others that the funds would be accepted without any intention of paying back the money, it seemed to me that the plan which was offered was not a bad plan. Probably some cities would prefer the 50–50 arrangement, rather than paying back the money. Others would not, and would take their chances on paying it back.

I believe that what we should do is to make plans. After the last war we did not make plans. I was a Member of the Senate at that time, and I know that planning was not done. It was very unfortunate that it was not done, because there was a great deal of unemployment that would not have occurred if there had been proper planning.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not familiar with the wording of title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act. I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if any part of the $35,000,000 would be available for use for the planning of semipublic or nonprofit institutions, such as schools or hospitals.

Mr. McKELLAR. The States could use it as they like.

Mr. AIKEN. It would have to be used through the States.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would have to be used through the States. They could use it as they liked, except for 10 percent of it, which would be an emergency fund.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think the act so provides. The act very distinctly provides that loans or advances shall be made to the States and their agencies and political subdivisions. It does not authorize any loans for charitable institutions.

Mr. McKELLAR. If a loan or advance were made to a State, I presume that an institution under the authority of the State could be improved. I am not sure. The Senator may be correct about the law. I have not examined it. However, I should say that ordinarily, if the State were to set apart money for a certain purpose, it would be used for that purpose.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Could the Senator's amendment be worded in such a way that it would be applicable to institutions which are public in fact, although perhaps not 100 percent public in name or title?

Mr. McKELLAR. Section 501 (a), under title V, reads as follows:

SEC. 501 (a). In order to encourage States and other non-Federal public agencies—

They must be public agencies—

to make advance provision for the construction of public works (not including housing), the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to make, from funds appropriated for that purpose, loans or advances to the States and their agencies and political subdivisions (hereinafter referred to as "public agencies") to aid in financing the cost of architectural, engineering, and economic investigation and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action preliminary to the construction of such public works: *Provided*, That the making of loans or advances hereunder shall not in any way commit the Congress to appropriate funds to undertake any projects so planned.

Several witnesses evidently thought that the making of such advances would commit the Congress. That is a matter which will have to be threshed out in the future, I presume.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The use by Congress of the words "loans or advances" carries with it the implication that they are not identical terms. If they were loans to be paid back, Congress need not have said anything except "loans," which would the implication that they were to be repaid. But when it used the word "advances" that did not necessarily mean that the amount was to be repaid. It might mean an advance on the part of the Federal Government to plan public improvements, and that the Government was encouraging employment to that extent by helping to plan such projects in

the future. So in view of those two words, there might have been justification for those who felt that the amounts were not to be repaid.

Mr. McKELLAR. That may be true; and, of course, it has given rise to a difference of opinion.

On the other hand, it is perfectly certain that this is an advance of money for the purpose of planning, and necessarily that in itself carries the idea of a loan.

Mr. TAFT. Not only that; but subparagraph (c) specifically provides as follows:

> Advances under this section to any public agency shall be repaid by such agency if and when the construction of the public works so planned is undertaken.

Mr. McKELLAR. Absolutely.

Mr. TAFT. The word "advance" cannot mean anything different from a loan.

Mr. GEORGE. This question was gone into fully a few months ago when we passed the act in question. We had a good deal of controversy with the House; and the House has cut the life out of the measure by the smallness of the appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true.

Mr. GEORGE. We used the language "loans or advances" because many municipalities and some States have no authority to borrow except in a constitutional way. Their constitutions provide for making direct loans. Therefore we classified this planning money as "loans or advances." But it must be repaid, whether it is in the form of a loan or an advance, if any construction is undertaken by the political subdivision or State making the improvement. It is perfectly obvious.

This question was debated to some extent on the floor of the Senate when we passed the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act. Our purpose was to encourage planning at the earliest possible date, and also to assist political divisions of States, counties, school districts, and perhaps levee districts, in making their investigations, having their engineering work done, and their plans blueprinted in preparation to commence work at the appropriate time. If the improvement is made, there is an obligation to return the money advanced.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE In most instances, of course, there would have to be a bond issue by the local political subdivision.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who has followed State governments very closely in the past few years, I should like to call attention to the fact that if the amendment proposed by the committee is to be adopted, there should be some over-all State agency to determine where the money should go. The amount to be allocated to each State is limited. When the Federal Government contributes under the Hayden-Cartwright Act to the States there is an over-all State agency which determines where the money shall go.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is there a planning commission in the Senator's State?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure it would go to the planning commission.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But the amendment refers to any State or local planning agency. The approval of the local planning agency would be sufficient. What would that mean? It would mean that under the terms of this amendment there would be a race; and if two cities should get the money, the State and the other cities would not get any. In cases where a limited amount goes to each State, it would seem, I say most respectfully, that some one State agency should determine where the amounts should go.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator very much. The amendment has to go over until tomorrow, under the request already granted. I would suggest to the Senator that he prepare such amendments as he thinks would result in the accomplishment of the real purpose of the act.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say most respectfully, again, that it would seem to me that the simplest way would be to determine the amount of money the Federal Government might wish to appropriate. We would leave the act as it is now, and would simply decide whether we wish to appropriate $5,000,000 or $75,000,000 or $30,000,000; we would not attempt to insert any proviso.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. In other words, the Senator would be opposed to the 50–50 plan, would he?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would be, unless it were limited to the one State agency. I do not see that the 50–50 plan is of any value, anyway, because if a community can put up 50 percent of the planning money it should put up 100 percent, if it is going ahead with the work.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator understand that the provisions of title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act would apply to construction appropriated for by a State, even though such construction might not be fully owned by the State when completed, although it was fully paid for by the State?

Mr. McKELLAR. It would be difficult to express an opinion on that matter, unless the Senator could tell me what kind of an institution wished to get the fund.

Mr. AIKEN. For instance, let us consider a nonprofit educational institution supported by a State, or at least supported in part by a State; in other words, any deficit is made up by the State.

Mr. McKELLAR. It would be difficult to say as to that. I would not know offhand. I should like to look into the matter.

Mr. AIKEN. But any construction would be paid for 100 percent by the States, I understand.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. In Ohio there are a number of universities which are partially supported by the State. I have no doubt that this planning provision could be used as to them. Funds can be appropriated for the institutions so I am sure money for planning can be appropriated for the institutions. I do not see any difference between them. However, the State would have to have the right to do that under its constitution and laws.

Mr. AIKEN. That is exactly what I had in mind. The Senator from Ohio is reassuring in that respect.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has been requested that further consideration of the amendments in the first paragraph on page 19 go over until tomorrow. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Buildings Administration", on page 20, line 23, after the word "advance", to strike out "$1,347,890" and insert "$1,335,710"; in line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$639,650" and insert "$638,540"; and on page 21, in line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$522,700" and insert "$513,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 3, after "(45 Stat. 533)," to strike out "$6,500,000" and insert "$6,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 22, after the word "carfare", to strike out "the purchase of four passenger automobiles;", and on page 23, line 2, after the word "conductors", to strike out "$26,495,000" and insert "$25,495,000: *Provided*, That all furniture now owned by the United States in other public buildings or in buildings rented by the United States shall be used, so far as practicable, whether or not it corresponds with the present regulation plan for furniture."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 15, after the word "conductors", to strike out "the purchase of three passenger automobiles"; and in line 22, after the word "Administration", to strike out "$12,160,000" and insert "$11,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Roads Administration", on page 26, line 16, before the word "passenger", to strike out "seventy-three" and insert "fifty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal-Aid Highway System", on page 27, line 19, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$30,000,000" and insert "$25,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Accounting Office", on page 32, line 18, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "purchase of one and", and in line 20, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$1,895,500" and insert "$1,894,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Interstate Commerce Commission—Salaries and Expenses," on page 33, line 23, after the word "services", to strike out "$2,910,445" and insert "$2,619,400", and in line 24, after the word

"exceed", to strike out "$2,620,000" and insert "$2,358,000."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, with reference to the reductions affecting the Interstate Commerce Commission, I ask that the amendment go over. This matter has just been called to my attention today. I asked for a memorandum from the Interstate Commerce Commission showing in what way the amendment would affect the Commission.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will be entirely satisfactory to have the amendment go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 2, after the words "expenses", to strike out "$431,465" and insert "$388,319."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I also ask that that amendment be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 14, after the word "services", to strike out "purchase (not to exceed 30)", and in line 18, after the word "act", to strike out "$2,532,619" and insert "$2,502,619."

Mr. McKELLAR. I also ask that that amendment be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Housing Agency—Office of the Administrator," on page 41, line 24, after the word "expenses", to strike out "In addition to the amounts available by or pursuant to law (which shall be transferred to this authorization) for" and insert "For"; in line 5, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$449,825" and insert "$400,000", and in line 19, after "$500);", to strike out "purchase of one passenger automobile (not to exceed $2,500) and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Home Loan Bank Administration," on page 44, line 18, before the words "to be", to strike out "$7,502,583" and insert "$7,490,127."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Housing Administration," on page 46, line 25, after the word "expenses" to strike out "In addition to the amounts available by or pursuant to law (which shall be transferred to this authorization) for the administrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law not", and insert "Not", and in line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$10,537,747" and insert "$10,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 21, after the word "exceed' to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Public Housing Authority," on page 49, line 5, after the word "expenses", to strike out "In addition to the amounts available by or pursuant to law for the administrative expenses of the Federal Public Housing Authority in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law, and not to exceed $96,200 of the funds of the Defense Homes Corporation available for its administrative expenses (all of which are hereby merged with this authorization), not" and insert "Not"; in line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,327,400" and insert "$2,072,241", and on page 50, line 4, after the word "agencies", to strike out the comma and "and expenditures by the Authority for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative expenses."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Securities and Exchange Commission," on page 51, line 9, after the word "gloves", to strike out "$4,134,500" and insert "$3,900,000."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the reduction which it is proposed to make? Would the amendment result in a reduction of the amount provided last year, or are we asked merely not to approve the total amount requested?

Mr. McKELLAR. We are proposing to do the same as we did last year. Last year the amount allowed was $4,059,000.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the reason for believing that less money will be required this year? With the amount of loose cash floating around the country, and with people looking for investments, is it not necessary that they be as adequately protected now as they have been for a long time?

Mr. McKELLAR. An effort was made in the full committee to bring the item up to what it was last year, and it was voted down. I hope the Senate will sustain the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. AIKEN. What does the Securities and Exchange Commission have to do with rubber gloves?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if the Senator from Tennessee will yield, I will answer the question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The gloves are used in photostatic work.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; the gloves are used in photostatic work. That is a perfectly proper use.

Mr. AIKEN. I did not know but that they were used in handling live wires.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there is one amendment with regard to the Federal Public Housing Authority which I was asked to have passed over until tomorrow. I do not object to it being passed over. I do not at the moment know what amendment it is, however.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Action on the amendment referred to by the acting chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, which is on pages 49 and 50, will be considered as having been reconsidered and, without objection, it will go over until tomorrow.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Smithsonian Institution," on page 52, line 12, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$1,065,160", and insert "$1,054,061."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 12, after the word "grounds", to strike out "$583,207" and insert "$549,727."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Tariff Commission," on page 54, line 5, after "(Public Law 364)", to strike out "$914,900" and insert "$823,410."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Tennessee Valley Authority," on page 55, line 14, after "Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1945", to insert a comma and "and in addition, $4,000,000 for the continued construction of South Holston and Watauga Dams and $3,000,000 toward the construction of a fertilizer-manufacturing plant at or near Mobile, Ala., said additional sums to be available and to remain available for no other purposes until expended: *Provided*, That said construction shall be proceeded with whenever the War Production Board or its successor shall have determined that manpower and materials are available for these purposes or in any event within 6 months following the cessation of hostilities."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the entire amendment concerning the Tennessee Valley Authority beginning on page 55, line 14, be passed over.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think there is any objection to this particular amendment, and I hope it will be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment last stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "United States Maritime Commission", on page 56, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$28,290,000" and insert "$28,287,450", and in line 23, after the word "services" to strike out "purchase (not to exceed three)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Veterans' Administration", on page 62, line 17, before the words "to be", to strike out "$1,000,000,000" and insert "$900,000,000."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Tennessee to state the reason for the proposed reduction.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I refer to the reduction of $100,000,000, which has to do with the National Service Life Insurance Act.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, for the current fiscal year, Congress appropriated $500,000,000 under this heading. The committee was advised that as of January 31, 1945, $275,000,000 of the $500,000,000 had been either obligated or expended, and that, based on the present rate of approval of claims, it is expected that the remaining $225,000,000 will be obligated by June 30 of this year.

For the fiscal year 1946, the estimate is in the amount of $1,000,000,000. The committee's recommendation that the estimate be reduced by $100,000,000 is not intended to deny the actual amount that experience may prove to be necessary during the ensuing fiscal year, but rather the committee's recommendation is based on the recognized uncertainties of estimating accurately months in advance the actual demands upon this fund, such as, the ultimate strength of the armed forces, the rate of replacement, the type of action in which these forces will be engaged, and the uncertainties as to the length of the war. In view of these uncertainties in making accurate estimates months in advance, the committee feels that the amount of the appropriation can be fixed at this time in the amount of $900,000,000. Should developments during the coming months prove that this figure is too low, the item can be reviewed further by Congress with a view to ascertaining the actual needs in the light of more recent facts and experience.

Furthermore, I may say to the Senate that before this recommendation was made the chairman of the committee took the matter up with General Hines, the head of the Veterans' Bureau, one of the best administrators in the Government service. He was asked if this sum could not be reduced, without stating the amount. He said he hoped it would not be reduced more than $200,000,000. Of course, he recognized the differences between estimates and what is actually used, as we all do. In view of what he told us, out of an abundance of caution, the committee reduced the appropriation by only half the amount mentioned by General Hines. As a matter of fact, remembering that the appropriation was $500,000,000 last year, and this year is $900,000,000, it seems to me that amount will be sufficient, but if not, the Senate can be assured that the necessary amount will be appropriated.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. There is one other thing in which the Senator from Wisconsin may be interested, and I think it was told to the chairman of the committee, also. When the Veterans' Bureau made its estimate of a billion dollars, it was at the time of the so-called December bulge, and they did not know what would happen after that time.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct. As stated by the witnesses, the estimates were made during the time of the "December bulge," and it was not certain what the future might bring forth. But since that time conditions have changed, and we hope that $900,000,000 will take care of the situation. The Senate can be assured, however, that if it does not, the necessary appropriations will be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 62, line 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 17, after the name "Veterans' Administration", to strike out "$2,707,119,250" and insert "$2,607,119,250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 65, after line 19, to insert:

SEC. 107. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling a position formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the armed forces of the United States and has been honorably discharged therefrom and has within 40 days thereafter made application for restoration to his former position and has not been restored thereto.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I was contacted today by Mr. Ketcham, the national legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, concerning the amendment which appears on page 65, and if it is agreeable to the Senator from Tennessee, I should like to have that amendment go over in order that I might show him some amendments suggested by Mr. Ketcham which he thinks should be considered in connection with the amendment of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. This was an amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and while he is not in the Chamber at the moment, I am sure it would be perfectly agreeable to him to let it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—General provisions," on page 66, after line 23, to strike out:

(c) Appropriations contained in this act, available for expenses of travel shall be available, when specifically authorized by the head of the activity or establishment concerned, for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the function or activity for which the appropriation concerned is made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 67, line 5, before the word "appropriations", to strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 8, after the word "office", to insert "by the head of the department or establishment concerned".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 5, after the word "therefor", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That any transaction carried out under the authority of this section shall be evidenced in writing and a copy filed with the General Accounting Office."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments with the exception of those which have been passed over.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Sundry naval aviators of the Marine Corps Reserve and several citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps, in accordance with the provisions of law.

Br. Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Walter H. McKinney, of Michigan, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general;

Christian T. Steger, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general;

Thomas McEnelly, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general;

James K. Penfield, of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general; and

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers, unclassified, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service: V. Harwood Blocker, of Texas; William H. Christensen, of South Dakota; Jack G. Dwyre, of California; and Marold Sims, of Tennessee.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William T. Sherwood, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, to fill an existing vacancy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 13, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 12, 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Richard Ford, of Oklahoma, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Robert F. Fernald, of Maine, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Forrest K. Geerken, of Minnesota, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Hon. Albert A. Ridge, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the western district of Missouri, vice Hon. Merrill E. Otis, deceased.

Robert Lewis Brown, of Montana, to be United States district judge for the district of Montana, vice Hon. James H. Baldwin, deceased.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

J. Albert Woll, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois. (Mr. Woll is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 10, 1944.)

Randolph Carpenter, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas, vice George H. West, resigned.

Bernard J. Flynn, of Maryland, to be United States attorney for the district of Maryland. (Mr. Flynn is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 4, 1944.)

Dennis E. Sullivan, of New Hampshire, to be United States attorney for the district of New Hampshire, vice Alexander Murchie, resigned.

George F. Troy, of Rhode Island, to be United States attorney for the district of Rhode Island. (Mr. Troy is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires March 10, 1945.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

W. Bruce Matthews, of Maryland, to be United States marshal for the District of Columbia, vice John Colpoys, deceased.

John J. Wein, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Ohio, vice George J. Keineth, deceased.

Ben Ivy King, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the western district of Tennessee, vice Charles W. Miles, resigned.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

James G. Rea, Notasulga, Ala., in place of A. M. Stevenson, retired.

CALIFORNIA

William N. Parkinson, Canoga Park, Calif., in place of F. L. Cary, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Margaret M. DeCoste, River Grove, Ill., in place of E. O. Trumbull, removed.

Helen Elaine Varias, Schiller Park, Ill., in place of H. J. Cheze, removed.

IOWA

Glen W. Heath, Rake, Iowa, in place of W. O. Thomas, deceased.

KANSAS

Marie F. Jehlik, Cuba, Kans., in place of E. C. Strnad, transferred.

Harvey E. Yauk, Durham, Kans., in place of E. R. Schwemmer, transferred.

MAINE

Hattie M. Higgins, Mapleton, Maine, in place of D. F. Smith, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

Eugene Matheson, Ipswich, Mass., in place of S. D. Conley, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Mabel E. McMichael, Lennon, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Martha E. Krzyszke, Waltz, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

MISSOURI

Collis P. Lindimore, Montrose, Mo., in place of M. D. Cole, removed.

NEW YORK

Aleine Miller, Perrysburg, N. Y., in place of J. H. Vaughn, transferred.

NORTH CAROLINA

Clarence H. Mason, Timberlake, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OHIO

Clayton L. Rupright, Beaverdam, Ohio. Office became Presidential Oct. 1, 1944.

Ruth W. Steuart, Brookfield, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

OKLAHOMA

Harry N. Patterson, Grandfield, Okla., in place of Audrey Teeter, deceased.

RHODE ISLAND

Alexander P. Bates, Oak Lawn, R. I. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

TEXAS

Hubert John Risinger, Bandera, Tex., in place of R. V. Roome, resigned.

Granville M. Knox, Bertram, Tex., in place of R. N. Gray, transferred.

VIRGINIA

J. Frank Walsh, West Point, Va., in place of R. T. Bland, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Charles L. Seavey, Winslow, Wash., in place of M. B. Start, retired.

WISCONSIN

Edgar H. Setzkorn, Arpin, Wis., in place of J. F. Loschky, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 12, 1945:

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

William T. Sherwood, to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Catherine R. Lanneau, Barney.
Sarah W. Turner, Pelham.
Margaret D. Cate, Sea Island.

MICHIGAN

Emma Keating, Allen.
Mary L. Myers, Berrien Center.
Lester Kittell, Riverside.

NEBRASKA

Harold C. Bruce, Verdigre.

NORTH CAROLINA

Byron U. Richardson, Pinehurst.

OHIO

George T. Meesig, Bellevue.
F. Stone Trautman, Belpre.
Sue A. Watts, Conesville.
Alverda Wells, Dellroy.
Inez S. Winget, Edison.
Josiah Eikenberry, Laura.
Pearl Burket, Rawson.

OKLAHOMA

Myrl J. Finch, Tupelo.

OREGON

Pearl A. Carsley, Malin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 12, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of heaven and earth, who ridest on the wings of the morning, keep alive in our breasts the deathless desire for human service. What a kingly privilege to be a distributor of that life which is a lyric balm for every wounded heart. O lift us nearer to the Father, where our hearts go out faithfully and lovingly to our fellow men.

Thou whose light is the way of blessing, make us to realize the plain, searching words of Jesus: "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." The upright thing we did yesterday and the unselfish act of last week will make the forces of good a little stronger. Herein is the sureness of an elevation of soul which comes to those who understand that no man liveth unto himself and no man dieth unto himself. For the sake of others, revitalize us with courage to attack every evil habit and check every wrong tendency. Impress us each day that we are sealing destiny which will meet us in the future years. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 9, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on Thursday, March 1, 1945, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

On March 1, 1945:

H. R. 626. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amend-

ments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1752. An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE SENT TO GENERAL EISENHOWER AND HIS REPLY

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the unanimous-consent request agreed to on Wednesday, March 7, 1945, he did on Friday, March 9, send the following message to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Allied Commander, Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Force:

At the request of the United States House of Representatives, unanimously expressed, I send to you, the officers and men of all services under your command, our congratulations and thanks for the magnificent victories recently achieved on the western front.

Through the War Department this message came back from General Eisenhower:

On behalf of myself and all troops under my command, please convey to the House of Representatives our appreciation and sincere thanks for your inspiring message which is being transmitted to the officers and men of all services.

LT. GEN. COURTNEY H. HODGES

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, from time to time Members rise here to call attention to the accomplishments of one or the other of our great military leaders. Certainly we are blessed and should give thanks for our matchless leadership in this war.

I am sure you will forgive me this morning for pointing with pride to the leadership of my own distinguished constituent, Lt. Gen. Courtney H. Hodges, in command of the First American Army.

Aside from its official designation, it was first to land at Normandy, first to enter Germany, first to crack the Siegfried line, and now the first to cross the Rhine.

General Hodges was born and reared at Perry, Houston County, Ga. His mother, brother, and other members of the family live there today.

It is springtime down in Georgia. The sun shines bright and the air is scented with the sweet fragrance of the flowers. In my mind's fancy I can see General Hodges' devoted mother, there in the sunshine and among the flowers, lifting her voice to a gracious God for a son who has distinguished himself so greatly and has been given the opportunity to contribute so much to the cause of freedom.

LEND-LEASE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who met today in executive session, I read for the information of the House an amendment that was approved unanimously by that committee with reference to the lend-lease bill. This amendment was agreed to by all the signers of the minority report. It is an amendment to section 3 (c):

Provided, however, That nothing in section 3 (c) shall be construed to authorize the President to enter into or carry out any contract or agreement with a foreign government for post-war relief, post-war rehabilitation, or post-war reconstruction; except that a contract or agreement entered into in accordance with this act in which the United States undertakes to furnish to a foreign government defense articles, services, or information for use in the prosecution of the present war and which provides for the disposition, on terms and conditions of sale prescribed by the President, of any such defense articles, services, or information after the President determines they are no longer necessary for use by such government in promoting the defense of the United States shall not be deemed to be for post-war relief, post-war rehabilitation, or post-war reconstruction.

SENATOR HENRY CABOT LODGE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The Speaker. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, shortly after his reelection by an overwhelming vote to the United States Senate Henry Cabot Lodge resigned his seat in that body that he might enter the armed forces of his country. He believed his country should have the benefit of his military experience in its most critical period. His many friends in Massachusetts and in the Congress of the United States and throughout the country were delighted to learn this last week that his outstanding services have won for him the French Legion of Honor and the Croix de Guerre with Palm. That he may return to us at the end of the war in good health, with even richer military honors, is the sincere wish of his legion of friends.

CENSUS BUREAU REPORT ON WOMEN

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OUTLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances in the Appendix of the RECORD and include in each an editorial on Bretton Woods.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter and a poem from a friend in Oregon on the subject The White Flowering Dogwood, a Memorial to Veterans.

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on construction of merchant shipping through February 1945, and to include a letter from Admiral Vickery and a summary by the committee.

MAJ. PAUL DOUGLAS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, we hear with a great deal of pleasure and satisfaction the well-deserved and appropriate tributes being paid to those of our outstanding men, former Members, and other Americans, who have served the Nation well. In that connection, I call attention to Paul Douglas, of Illinois, who was a member of the Chicago City Council and a professor in the University of Chicago. He resigned and joined the Army as a private and it is not surprising that he has already distinguished himself and been decorated several times nad advanced to the rank of major. He is the husband of our beloved Member, the gentlewoman from Illinois, Mrs. EMILY TAFT DOUGLAS, who was elected a Member at Large from our State. I cite this particular instance, Mr. Speaker, and make this brief observation in hearty appreciation of the patriotic and distinguished service to the Nation by the brave and courageous men of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on Thursday next for 15 minutes after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California askec and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a portion of a recent report by the Judicial Council of the State of California.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD at the proper place in the proceedings on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill a statement of agricultural prices during 1932 and 1933, and also a statement of production payments on dairy products by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE AT MEXICO CITY

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

BRETTON WOODS—WHY THE HURRY?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PLUMLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HENRY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Mr. Marvin Jones.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Norman Thomas appearing in Human Events.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on international peace control of the air.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles on the repeal of the Use Stamp Act.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FLOOD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DEATH THROUGH CARELESSNESS

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I dislike to sound the sour note this morning after hearing the fine tributes that have been paid to our men overseas, but at the same time I do not believe a thing I regard as almost criminal negligence should go unnoticed.

The son of my very close friend, a boy who was in training recently on a submarine on the Atlantic, was lost. This boy was on duty at his post when the order to submerge was given, and this young man was disregarded and left to perish as his submarine submerged. At least, that is the conclusion one must reach when the report merely states that when roll was called 3 hours later he did not respond. This to me is a very regrettable incident. It cannot be expected that his parents will look upon the loss of his life with anything but bitterness—as I do myself. This seems to be a careless disregard for life.

When boys are in combat parents naturally expect the worst might happen, but certainly in a peaceful training zone they have the right to expect that due diligence will be exercised in preserving the lives of their sons. I am asking the Committee on Naval Affairs to make a searching inquiry into this incident, not that it will bring this boy back, but in the hopes that such an investigation will safeguard the lives of other boys.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUNKER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short newspaper article.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include a resolution

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix.

Mr. CRAVENS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of Arkansas.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article by Lionel Calhoun Moise.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes today after the conclusion of the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem written by a grandfather of his grandson who was killed in action.

SGT. WILLIAM B. GOODSON

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay a tribute, which is justly due, to Sgt. William B. Goodson, of Rushville, Ind., and from the district I have the honor to represent, who was in command and manned the first tank to cross the Rhine and to roll into the now solidly held bridgehead on the east bank of that river. Sergeant Goodson is a typical Hoosier, and he is a typical American. He is a true American solider. With three other soldiers—Cpl. William E. Richard, of West Virginia, Pvt. Berthold Fried, of South Dakota, and Sgt. Robert A. Jones, of Kentucky—they crossed the Rhine and took up the fight on the east side and continued the drive into German territory. These men evidenced the fighting spirit of our armed forces on those far-away battle fronts, which is daily bringing this war to a victorious conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Goodson, and those with him, with Sergeant Drabik, of Ohio, who was the first foot soldier to cross the River Rhine in that daring rush to establish the First Army bridgehead, are heroes in this war. We salute them. All Americans salute them. We say to them "Well done, thou good and faithful soldiers." These soldiers have made a lasting contribution to our victory, and to the peace which must follow after this war.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION TO CONSIDER CRITICISMS OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in response to what has been said here and in the press relative to the treatment of our disabled men in veterans' hospitals, I wish to announce that I have called a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation on Thursday morning at 10 o'clock to go into this proposition.

I have made it a rule to ask Members of Congress—especially members of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation—to visit veterans' hospitals and go through them from top to bottom whenever they have a chance to do so; and I am going to continue that policy. If we have an Easter recess, I hope to have every veterans' hospital visited during that time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

ELECTIONS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged reso-

lution (H. Res. 177) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Judiciary, FRANK L. CHELF, of Kentucky.

Irrigation and Reclamation, GEORGE P. MILLER, of California.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—ANNUAL REPORT OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 10, 1945.*

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia Day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH.]

AMENDMENT TO ACT REGULATING HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2506) to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from West Virginia, or the mayor of the District of Columbia, which is a better title for him, how high they expect these buildings to be built in the section which the bill covers?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I may say that this is an extraordinary case which apparently calls for legislation. It was presented by our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] and has to do with the erection of a hospital as part of the Georgetown Medical School with facilities for 400 beds. That hospital is being erected with Federal Works Agency funds and approximately $600,000 of the Georgetown University funds for the site and certain equipment.

The height of the building referred to, or that the legislation would permit it to be built to, is 110 feet, which would be approximately 8 feet higher than the zoning laws will allow a building to be erected in that section. As a point of information it might be stated that the cupola of the medical school will be more than 20 feet higher than the highest point on this proposed building, which is to be built at Thirty-ninth Street, on the south side of Reservoir Road. I may say to the gentleman that that is a section of Northwest Washington that is wooded. On the north side of Reservoir Road is the estate of Mrs. Archibald. Ordinarily this sort of legislation would not be necessary because the Zoning Commission would have had sufficient time to notify interested parties, and they would either make objection or give approval. However, because of the emergency for hospital facilities in the District of Columbia and because of the fact that the Georgetown Medical School is carrying on such a worthy program, the District of Columbia Committee unanimously report this bill, H. R. 2506, as introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. RICH. How much higher will that building be than buildings in the surrounding territory?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It will be 8 feet above the height allowed in that section of northwest Washington. This building sets itself well into the Georgetown Dental School and the Medical School, and really beautifies that section as well as being a building of utility.

Mr. RICH. It will not in any way interfere with the surrounding buildings, make it different from the other buildings in that locality so that it might be distasteful to the residents of that section.

Mr. RANDOLPH. No. The gentleman is correct. As I said, it will be located well back from the street in a wooded section on the south side of the road, while the estate of Mrs. Archibald is on the north side. May I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I may advise the gentleman from Pennsylvania that it is also 165 feet back from the street. The total cost will be $2,420,000, of which the Federal Works Agency made available $1,820,000. The university contributed the difference, about $600,000 for the site and part of the equipment. As the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia stated, this hospital is to be erected adjacent to the university medical school on Reservoir Road.

Mr. RICH. Will the money that the Federal Works Agency grants to this institution be paid back to the Government?

Mr. MCCORMACK. No; that is part of the money appropriated under one of the provisions of the Lanham Act, a certain proportion of which has been allocated to the District of Columbia.

They have also made an allocation for a hospital for George Washington University. Georgetown University and George Washington University have both had an allocation, because there is a need for hospitals in the District. And it is connected with the war effort.

Mr. RICH. The only thing I might suggest there, where we are making these allocations, that there is an obligation for the institutions who receive the money to pay it back into the Federal Treasury. Just remember that the Federal Treasury needs all of the funds it can get, and we ought to be careful to put it out only as a gratuity where it is going to do the Nation as a whole some good.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I can assure the gentleman that the allocations of these funds have a national interest, and a very important local interest.

Mr. RICH. May I call to the attention of the majority leader that in all the things we do from this time on, just bear in mind that the Treasury is empty, and wherever we can get some money from our people to put back into the Treasury, certainly it ought to be a great incentive for the people back home, because it will lighten their tax burdens in the future. We must stop these gratuities from the Federal Government.

Mr. MCCORMACK. No one can take issue with that observation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I inquire of the distinguished chairman of the committee if this legislation is at all in conflict with the bill for further hospitalization introduced by Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland?

Mr. RANDOLPH. No; it is not. Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, has a proposal for additional hospital facilities. It has nothing to do with the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an act entitled "An act to regulate the height of buildings in the District of Columbia," approved June 1, 1910, as amended, be, and it is hereby, further amended by adding at the end of section 5 of said act the following proviso: "*And further provided*, That the building to be erected by the Georgetown University for a hospital as a part of the Georgetown University Medical School on parcels 28/31, 28/36, and 28/37 located on the south side of Reservoir Road NW., in the District of Columbia, approximately opposite Thirty-ninth Street, plans for which building are on file in the office of the Inspector of Buildings of the District of Columbia, be permitted to be erected to a height of not to exceed 110 feet above the finished grade of the land, as shown on said plans, at the middle of the front of the building."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 2552) to amend paragraph (c) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, as amended by the act approved February 27, 1931, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain what is accomplished by this legislation?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The inquiry of the distinguished minority leader on this legislation, I think, is most appropriate for the reason that it concerns each and every Member of the House of Representatives. You will realize that we have given to us, each Congress, a tag issued by the District of Columbia especially for the use of Members of Congress and certain other officials attached to the personnel on Capitol Hill. It has been found that there has been an abuse of the use of these tags during the years, and we are attempting to correct it by this legislation. In other words, when Congress expires at the end of 2 years, certain individuals have continued to carry that tag upon their automobile. In many instances it is reported by the Metropolitan Police that the tags apparently have been taken from a congressional car and placed upon the car of some individual who perhaps never was a Member of the Congress. We believe that the time has come when these tags should be valid only for the 2 years that a Congress is in session, and under this legislation we would make it unlawful for these tags to be used on automobiles in the District of Columbia for more than 30 days after the conclusion of the Congress.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, supposing a car formerly belonging to a Member of Congress gets into the hands of somebody else and he continues to keep that tag on his car. If this legislation passes, will there be a penalty?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; there is a penalty of $300 or imprisonment for 90 days. We do believe that a condition exists which should be stamped out. I think there are persons who are abusing this privilege, and that is the reaction of law-enforcement officials in the District of Columbia.

Mr. RICH. I quite agree with the mayor of the city.

Mr. PACE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I have never found any advantage or benefit from having these tags. Of what benefit are they to the Members of Congress?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think that would be a matter for debate, perhaps, although I can say that the reason the District of Columbia issued the tags in the first instance and has continued the practice is that if a Member leaves his office on Capitol Hill to go downtown to visit a department, his car may be parked overtime, perhaps, or even in a spot that might not be used by the ordinary vehicle. In other words, this was done as a convenience for the Members of Congress as they do business with the departments downtown. Whether or not this privilege has been abused is a question certainly open to interpretation by the gentleman and others.

Mr. PACE. Is the advantage the gentleman has described the only advantage of the tag?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I know of no advantage other than the one to which the gentleman has called my attention; that is that Congressmen who are here on official business are given certain privileges to which others are not entitled.

Mr. PACE. Does the gentleman think that is sufficient to justify the expense and the trouble of issuing the tags and passing special legislation?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am not sure. The legislation became law before I was a Member of Congress. I have not checked into the advisability of repealing the law. I am now simply trying to correct the abuse that has developed, by bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. MURPHY. If the gentleman will yield, there are scores of places throughout the city where special parking privileges are available to the holders of these tags, and it is an advantage to a Congressman who runs his personal errands in going to these departments.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I tried to state that I thought it was in the dispatch of official business that a Member might find the greatest value in the use of such a tag. Certainly it would be of no value in the Member's district.

Mr. PACE. It never has been to me.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the gentleman might have much to endorse his thought.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso of paragraph (c), section 6, of the District of Columbia Traffic Acts, as amended by the act approved February 27, 1931, be, and the same is hereby, further amended by adding thereto the following: *"Provided further,* That such congressional tags shall be valid only for the Congress in which such tags are so issued, and it shall be unlawful to display such congressional tags for a period longer than 30 days after the opening of the next Congress.

"At the expiration of the said 30-day period it shall be unlawful to display such tags and the Commissioners shall be authority and empowered to order removal of any such tags from any motor vehicle so displayed.

"Any person violating this section shall be fined not more than $300 or imprisoned not more than 90 days, or both."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, on page 2, line 3, a mistake has been made by the printer. The word "authority" should be "authorized." I ask unanimous consent that this correction be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Long Beach Pacific News.

MANPOWER DRAFT BILL

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has turned out an amended version of the manpower draft bill that will, in my opinion, do all we have to have done at this time and will not offend or fill with apprehension the laboring people of the Nation.

I hope the House will see its way clear to join with the Senate and pass the Senate version of the bill. That is my voice and will be my vote.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say to the majority leader that some of us, and very likely the majority leader himself, are tremendously interested in the Lemke resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) that was reported from the Committee on Rules some days ago. It has not been considered in the House. More than 7 days have elapsed since the granting of the rule by the Committee on Rules. I take it that any one of us on the Committee on Rules could call it up. However, I dislike very much to do that. I would much rather cooperate with the majority leader and the majority leadership in carrying on the program of the House.

I am wondering what assurance we might have as to the calling up of that resolution?

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman desire to have it called up?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I do. I think it is a matter of extreme consequence and importance.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the gentleman taking it up in the way he has. Several legislative days have transpired. I assure the gentleman if it is possible to get it up this week, it will be called up. If not, it will definitely be on the program for the early part of next week. I will do everything I can. If there is a break in the legislative program this week, it will be called up.

Mr. HALLECK. I am very hopeful that it can be called up this week. I understand we have quite a full program on matters that are of consequence. I would like to suggest, for myself, I think the matter covered by the Lemke resolution is of tremendous consequence to the country.

Mr. McCORMACK. I assure the gentleman if it is possible, it will be called up this week. But, in any event, it will definitely be called up in the early part of next week. May I state I am not referring to next week to create the impression that my statement is a coverall not to bring it up this week if it is possible to do so.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate the sincerity of the majority leader. I know

if it can be done, he will follow it up this week.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SABATH. May I inform the gentleman from Indiana that it is not necessary to have it called up on Calendar Wednesday and that it can be called up at any time.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Indiana is not objecting to the request that business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

Mr. HALLECK. That is not my purpose. I am not going to object to the passing over of Calendar Wednesday. I hope that the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts can be granted.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say to the majority leader, several of us intended to speak several times and somewhat at length. If we forego that privilege, will it help to get it up this week?

Mr. McCORMACK. No doubt, it would. Foregoing any such privilege by any Member will be of material assistance in bringing about the strong probability that it might come up this week.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can the gentleman increase the probabilities even?

Mr. McCORMACK. I said strong probability. I will do all I can to bring it up this week. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has very kindly given the gentleman from Massachusetts notice, and that is all the gentleman from Massachusetts needs from any Member of the House when they are exercising their rights.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, but to show how serious this matter is, I would like to call to the attention of the House that this very morning I had a long-distance call about the case of a boy who had taken an appeal. He was the only help the farmer had. The farmer has 65 head of cattle and is a large sugar-beet grower. They have taken the boy, and they have turned down his appeal. This thing has been drifting along and drifting along. Something ought to be done, especially now when the situation has become so serious at home that efforts have been made to cut down on exports to save our own people.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 85]

Anderson, Calif.	Fuller	Madden
Auchincloss	Gardner	Monroney
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gearhart	Morgan
Bates, Mass.	Gerlach	Mott
Bender	Goodwin	O'Toole
Bolton	Gorski	Pfeifer
Boren	Gross	Philbin
Brumbaugh	Hagen	Powell
Buckley	Hancock	Quinn, N. Y.
Case, N. J.	Hand	Rains
Celler	Hart	Robertson,
Chapman	Heidinger	N. Dak.
Clark	Herter	Robinson, Utah
Clason	Hobbs	Sheridan
Coffee	Holmes, Mass.	Sikes
Combs	Isac	Simpson, Pa.
Curley	Johnson,	Slaughter
Daughton, Va.	Lyndon B.	Starkey
Dawson	Kearney	Stewart
Dickstein	Kelley, Pa.	Taylor
Dingell	Kunkel	Torrens
Dirksen	LeCompte	Weiss
Drewry	Luce	West
Eaton	McGlinchey	Wood
Fellows	McKenzie	Woodrum, Va.

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 359 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Chester Bowles addressed to the Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles from the Baltimore Sun.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each a newspaper article.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each a letter.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2023) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2023, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state that when the Committee rose last Friday in the consideration of this bill the general debate had closed and the first section of the bill had been read.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read from the Clerk's desk a letter I have received from Judge Marvin Jones in regard to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the letter as follows:

MARCH 12, 1945.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
Chairman, Banking and Currency Committee, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your inquiry as to statements made on the floor of the House concerning operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, as soon as these matters were brought to my attention I immediately instituted a thorough investigation into all phases of our operations.

I want to assure you and through you the Members of Congress that we are going to the bottom of these charges, secure the facts, and, if any evidence is found of criminality or improper conduct on the part of any officials or employees, I shall promptly remove them and shall ask that proceedings be instituted to punish them if the facts justify such action.

Frank Hancock, the president of the Corporation, joins me in this assurance.

The War Food Administration purchases and handles an average of more than $5,000,000 worth of food per day, much of which is of a perishable or semiperishable nature. It deals with more than 1,200 warehouses. It arranges for the transportation of more than 700 cars of these supplies per day. Much of this in wartime must be done hurriedly.

Of course there has been spoilage. There always will be. This is inevitable in the handling of highly perishable foods.

In spite of severe floods on the Ohio River and the worst storm in years throughout the Northeast, our record shows that our losses to date from spoilage have been only a fraction of 1 percent of our total operations. It is less than has occurred in the normal channels of trade.

The great quantities of food that must be made available and the speed with which it must be handled make it impossible to avoid some mistakes as well as losses. In view of the manpower situation it is not always possible to secure the most efficient help or a sufficient number to do the work in the best possible manner in the vast network of activities that are essential to the production, gathering, processing, inspection, packaging, storing, loading, and transporting of this food.

It is significant that not a single battle has had to be postponed because of a lack of food. At the same time no one has gone hungry in this country.

The Commodity Credit Corporation operations have a vital part in the production and distribution of food for our armed forces, for civilians, and for our fighting allies. It is the means by which the commitments of the Congress to the farmers of America for support prices are carried out in order to secure the essential production. There is no other available way in which these obligations can be fulfilled.

We assure the Congress again that we will bend every effort to avoid losses and to prevent mishandling insofar as it is humanly possible to do so without undue delay in getting this food to shipside and making it available to our own and Allied soldiers at the battle front.

Sincerely yours,

MARVIN JONES.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I had Judge Jones' letter read because I thought it would be of vital interest to the Members of Congress. I hope we are not going to try this great governmental agency on rumors. Rumors were abhorrent to the people who founded our

Government. Before a man can be convicted of crime, it is provided in the Constitution that he must be indicted by a grand jury. He is presumed to be innocent. He must be proven guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. He must have counsel for his defense and he must be tried by a jury of his peers. Not only that, but with respect to the most infamous of all crimes—treason—Congress was afraid that men might be the victims of rumors. After the country had been infiltrated by British spies and foreign sympathizers, they wrote into the Constitution itself a definition of treason, that treason consists of waging war against the United States, adhering to its enemies, and giving them aid and comfort. A man could not be convicted of treason except by the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act. That is one of the fundamental laws of the United States. We certainly are not going to try this great organization on rumors. If there is any wrongdoing, if there has been any criminality, it will be punished. Let us try this issue on the facts as presented and try it in the light of the great services that the Commodity Credit Corporation has rendered to the people of America.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 1, lines 5 and 6, after the word "thereof" in line 5, strike out the sign and figure "$5,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the sign and figure "$4,000,000,000."

Mr. SPENCE. I cannot accept that amendment for the committee. The Commodity Credit Corporation agrees to it. I think it should be adopted. I am sure there will be no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 381 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 67) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) During the continuance of the present war and until the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date upon which the President by proclamation or the Congress by concurrent resolution declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not sell any farm commodity owned or controlled by it at less than the parity or comparable price therefor, except that the foregoing restriction shall not apply to (1) sales for new or byproduct uses; (2) sales of peanuts for the extraction of oil; (3) sales for export; (4) sales for seed or feed: *Provided*, That no wheat or corn shall be sold for feed at less than parity price for corn at the time such sale is made: *And provided further*, That in making regional adjustments in the sale price of corn or wheat for feed the minimum price need not be higher in any area than the United States average parity price for corn; (5) sales of commodities which have substantially deteriorated in quality or of nonbasic perishable commodities where there is danger of loss or waste through spoilage; or (6) sales for the purpose of establishing claims against persons who have committed fraud, misrepresentation, or other wrongful acts with respect to the commodity. The method that is now used for the purposes of Commodity Credit Corporation loans for determining the parity price or its equivalent for seven-eighths-inch Middling cotton at the average location used in fixing the base loan rate for cotton shall also be used for determining the parity price for seven-eighths-inch Middling cotton at such average location for the purposes of this section."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I misunderstood the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. I had no right to agree to that amendment. The amendment which I thought the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] submitted, and the only one that he ever submitted to me, was an amendment to increase dairy payments to $568,000,000, and to increase the noncrop program from $60,000,000 to $120,000,000. That was a clear misunderstanding on my part.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I can see very plainly where the gentleman might be perfectly correct in misunderstanding the amendment which I had offered. Frankly the gentleman rather surprised me when he said the amendment was acceptable.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask the committee, under the circumstances, to reconsider its action.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There will be no objection on my part.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the action by which the amendment was agreed to will be vacated.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserves the right to object.

Mr. SPENCE. It was a clear misunderstanding. It seems to me we should deal with the utmost candor and fairness with our colleagues.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RICH. I just want to ask you one question. In permitting this to go from $4,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 where will you get the one, two, three, four, or five billion dollars?

Mr. SPENCE. If you will reconsider, we can tell you that.

Mr. RICH. Then, Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SPENCE. The amendment will be debated. I am only asking that it be reconsidered. If the House wants to adopt it, it can do so.

Mr. RICH. Have you any idea where you can get this money?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment will again be reported.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I desire to ask that I will have an opportunity, if the unanimous-consent request is granted to withdraw the vote, to have an opportunity to make my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I object—until we can get some information on the subject.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has objected to the consent request of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to reconsider the action of the Committee by which the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Such a motion is not in order in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Inasmuch as business has been transacted since the original request was submitted by the gentleman from Kentucky, would it be in order for me to propound a consent request that the proceedings by which the amendment was adopted be vacated?

The CHAIRMAN. Such a request would be in order, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings by which the amendment was adopted reducing the amount from $5,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000 be vacated.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman from Kentucky if he had any idea where he could get one billion, two billion, three billion, four billion, or five billion for this purpose. I wish to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] if he can give me a reply.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The amendment which I will offer will strike out the $5,000,000,000 and substitute $4,000,000,000, which I believe is in keeping with the gentleman's idea and my own idea with respect to their needs.

A billion dollars will be obtained by the sale of debentures and bonds of the Commodity Credit Corporation. They, of course, become contingent liabilities of the Federal Government. I believe in view of the fact that this is almost altogether a total loss, that eventually the billion dollars will have to be raised by a debt transaction or in the form of an appropriation to restore the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was a member of the Committee on Appropriations at one time and is conversant with the procedure in that committee. I am sure he will exercise his very best judgment, which is always good, as to whether he will consent that the impairment of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation be restored by the Committee on Appropriations when the matter comes to it in a deficiency bill, probably next year.

Mr. RICH. Then we are going to ask the taxpayers of this country to make up this deficit.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Wolcott amendment; I should vote for it were it put to a vote. On the other hand, I recognize, and we all must recognize, that, under parliamentary proce-

dure, when we get back into the House a separate vote may be had upon this amendment. I should much rather see the amendment stand on the basis of the arguments the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] will be able to advance for it on the floor than to have it stand on the basis of the committee's refusal to reconsider the amendment. That was the reason I did not object to reconsideration. I am sure that is the reason the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] did not object.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is very apparent there was an honest mistake made, evident to everyone, and that the gentleman from Kentucky thought he was accepting another amendment which the gentleman from Michigan is going to offer.

Mr. TABER. That is true. Frankly, I believe we have a much better chance of keeping the amendment in the bill by further consideration than to have it held in and the opportunity for consideration refused.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Is it not true that the method the gentleman is advocating and which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] proposes is the only honest parliamentary way by which we can correct this mistake?

Mr. TABER. It is the only way in which there will be opportunity for fair consideration.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. As I understand the gentleman, under the present parliamentary situation he feels the merits of the amendment cannot be debated on the floor of the House and we will be forced to vote on the amendment in the House when the Committee rises?

Mr. TABER. Without any fair opportunity for its consideration.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I would be the last one here who would try to trick somebody into something that is not honest or honorable. I will not do that. But, as I understand it, the gentleman from Michigan offered an amendment to reduce this from $5,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000 and I thought he did that because of the fact he honestly believed in reducing it from five to four billion dollars. Am I wrong in that contention?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct in that, there is no question about that.

Mr. RICH. Then it seems to me when we make mistakes in the House, the one who makes the mistake is the one who has to suffer. I want to see this reduced if it is possible to reduce it and if we can get enough sound sentiment in the House to cut down the Government expenses and do something that will save this country from bankruptcy, then I will withdraw my objection and give you a chance to do something about this, but I want the Republicans to stand up here and fight and I want the Democrats who believe in sound government to get up and fight and try to save it because if we do not we will be overthrown, and it will not be very long until that happens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will realize that in offering the amendment, to begin with, I was most sincere, as I will explain if we have an opportunity to discuss it. It is very obvious an error has been made and I surely do not want to take advantage of any situation which has been developed because of that error in getting an amendment through which might otherwise be adopted after debate on its merits. We have taken our lickings on this floor, and we might take some more lickings, but they have always been fair and aboveboard, they have always been the result of discussions of amendments on their merits and, personally, I would feel much better about it if the amendment was defeated after debate on its merits than I would to have it adopted by default. I surely would not be in position in conference to argue very strongly for an amendment which had been adopted in the House by default or through error.

Mr. Chairman, I now renew my unanimous consent request that the proceedings by which the amount in this bill was reduced from $5,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000 be vacated.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 1, lines 5 and 6, after the word "thereof" in line 5, strike out "$5,000,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,000,000,000."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the Commodity Credit Corporation was organized back in 1933 to do a particular job. At that time farm prices were low. Farmers in very, very few instances were obtaining parity for their commodities, and it was found advisable, if we were going to have food enough to eat and farm income sufficient to create purchasing power by which we might put men back to work in our industries, to give the farmers some assurance of stability in prices.

Personally I believe that throughout the years the Commodity Credit Corporation has in the main justified its existence. The only controversy that there has ever been has been the controversy waged in the last 2 years with respect to the payment of consumers' subsidies by the Commodity Credit Corporation. We felt that nowhere in any law has there been any legal authority for them to pay subsidies to maintain maximum prices; that the purpose of Commodity Credit was to maintain floors under prices or, as we say, support prices. This Corporation has been continued periodically from year to year. There might have been occasions when it was continued for more than a year, but there have been other occasions when it was only continued for 6 months, and seldom, if ever, has it been continued for periods longer than 1 year.

Regardless of whether there have been periods or times when we continued Commodity Credit for more than 1 year, we are confronted with this situation: This House through its committees is looking into the future, planning ways and means of stabilizing our post-war economy. We have no assurance whatsoever that the bill which we are now asked to enact is the answer to economic stabilization in the field of agriculture.

It seems to me that the only logical thing to do is to review not only this agency but all other agencies at least once a year so that if in 1946 the economic conditions throughout the world have changed, if our position in world affairs is different than it is at the present time, we will then have an opportunity to write new standards by which we may operate throughout the world. It seems to me that we would be making a grave error in continuing the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation for more than 1 year; thus we will be assured that next year we will be able to give them as much money as they need, to give them as much authority as they need to do the job which we intended they should do.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might say in that connection that I expect to offer an amendment to the last section of the bill with that object in view. Because of that it is necessary only that they have a billion dollars. As a matter of fact, a billion dollars is perhaps $200,000,000 more than they will need during this period of 1 year.

I now yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I may say to the gentleman that he has answered the question I intended to ask him. I wanted him to say positively whether the amount which would be available, if his amendment is adopted, would be sufficient to take care of the obligations of the Corporation during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The Commodity Credit Corporation has asked for certain amounts which have been agreed to, which total in the aggregate, after giving them about $100,000,000 to play around on, we will say, about $900,000,000, so they will have at least $200,000,000 more this year than they need.

The other body has cut this amount to $1,500,000,000 already, and has continued the Corporation for 2 years. So if we want to take a look at this next year and continue it for a year, then $1,000,000,000 is ample money for them to operate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that

the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The bill as drawn with the $5,000,000,000 is based upon the idea that it is for a 2-year period.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman's amendment cuts the increase to $1,000,000,000, and a subsequent amendment will make it 1 year; that is, $1,000,000,000 for this year, and if next year we continue it for another year, then it may be increased $1,000,000,000 or whatever may be required.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. It was agreed in the other body that the $2,000,000,000 for the 2 years is $500,000,000 too much, so we know that by cutting this down to $1,000,000,000 we are giving them at least $200,000,000 more than they will need this year.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand, the gentleman proposes to offer another amendment here fixing the payments that are to go to the producers. I note from that amendment that those payments are only for the year 1946.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. So that if this $1,000,000,000 is cut off, will the remainder, $4,000,000,000, be sufficient to meet all commitments for the year 1946?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. As a matter of fact, we will have about $200,000,000 more than we need for that purpose. I may say that the amendment to which the gentleman refers I included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. It appears on page 1976 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 9, last Fdiray.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman understands that the Commodity Credit Corporation now has commitments to the farmers of America for $2,000,000,000 for the year 1945. These promises are commitments already made. How can they operate with an increase of less than $2,000,000,000?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The 1945 program is as follows: $568,000,000 for operation during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, with respect to the dairy program; $120,000,000 for operations during the fiscal year with respect to other noncrop programs; and $225,000,000 with respect to the 1945 crop-program operations.

The reason they need the additional $68,000,000 which has been referred to is that they expect to increase their production materially during this year.

The break-down of the figures I have just given is as follows:

The $120,000,000 is made up of the following items: Cheddar cheese, $16,000,000; fluid milk, $12,000,000; shortening payments, $1,000,000; peanut butter, $8,500,000; feed wheat, $50,000,000; and for expanded or other programs, $32,500,000.

The $225,000,000 is made up as follows: Fruits for processing, $26,500,000; vegetables for processing $36,200,000; dry edible beans, $4,800,000; soybeans, $48,000,000; peanuts, $7,000,000; sugar, $54,100,000; and for expanded or other programs, $48,400,000.

Therefore, we have given them in those programs alone a total of $80,000,000 for expansion purposes, in addition to what they have asked for. That is their program, and it is about $200,000,000 less than what we will give them if we give them a billion dollars and cut their program down to 1 year.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yeld?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. As I understand the figures outlined by the gentleman from Michigan, he expects to put in an amendment that is not in the bill. But he referred to noncrop subsidies.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I referred to crop subsidies. I will explain in detail the $568,000,000 when I get to it. But, as the gentleman knows, that is almost all for dairy products and the dairy program.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman realizes that the Commodity Credit Corporation is obligated to the farmers for $2,000,000,000 this year?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Not in addition to the figures I have referred to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate my colleague the gentleman from Michigan on the attitude he has taken. The only amendment that had been submitted to me to be proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] was agreed to by the Commodity Credit Corporation. I thought that was the amendment, and inadvertently I agreed to it. I have never thought that I had to be so vigilant in dealings with my colleagues to prevent them from taking advantage of inadvertence. And I do not want to take any advantage of any inadvertence on their part. I think there ought to be a high standard of relationship between the Members of Congress. I congratulate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] on the reconsideration of this amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I state that the amendment I have just offered was offered in the committee?

Mr. SPENCE. But it was not the amendment which we discussed, and it was not the amendment that I knew as the Wolcott amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is correct.

Mr. SPENCE. For that reason, I inadvertently agreed to it. I am glad it has been corrected in this manner. The Commodity Credit Corporation is a vast corporation. It has had a wonderful effect upon the prices of agricultural commodities. The other day I made a statement that at the time the Commodity Credit Corporation was organized, wheat was less than 30 cents, corn was 15 cents, cotton and tobacco were about 5 cents. This statement was challenged. I have received a statement from the Commodity Credit Corporation verifying the statement I made, which statement I have been authorized to put in the RECORD. The statement is as follows:

According to reports of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics:

1. The average price of wheat paid to farmers in the State of Kansas fell as low as 27 cents per bushel for the month of December 1932;

2. The average farm price of cotton in the State of Texas fell to as low as 4½ cents per pound in June 1932;

3. The average farm price of corn in the State of Iowa fell to as low as 12 cents per bushel in February 1933; and

4. The average price to farmers for type 23 (fire cured) tobacco for the 1932 crop in Kentucky was 4½ cents per pound.

The Commodity Credit Corporation has had a remarkable effect in obtaining for the farmer a higher price and stabilizing the prices of agricultural commodities. It has taken vast sums of money to do that. Some of these sums necessarily have been expended as subsidies and were a loss. Dairy products have received the greatest proportion of all commodities in subsidies. The Commodity Credit Corporation has written off $400,000,000. But I understand by next June they will have written off $1,200,000,000 in losses. They have now invested in commodities $2,100,000,000. They must be given some leeway in order to continue their operations.

They feel that if you reduce this amount by $1,000,000,000 it will seriously cramp them in the discharge of their onerous duties. The Commodity Credit Corporation is required to support prices for agricultural commodities before the planting season. They have done that. We want them to carry out their commitments. We have imposed upon them an additional burden. In the Senate there was a provision that $250,000,000 should be used for 6 months for the dairy program, and that $60,000,000 could be used for a noncrop program. That was limited to 6 months. We have made that program mandatory over the year, and we have increased the $250,000,000 to $568,000,000, and we have increased the $60,000,000 to $120,000,000. Judge Jones has said he will not use any more than is absolutely necessary to carry out the program. There is no reason that should persuade us to do anything that would weaken the Corporation or prevent it from carrying out the program and keeping our promise to the farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I am taking this time to ask some questions of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I was under the impression that he was going to explain to us about the commitments made by the Commodity Credit Corporation amounting to about $2,000,000,000; but unfortunately he did not have the time to do so. I would like to have

that made clear to the Committee, as to the nature of the commitments and the amount of them. I will be very glad to yield now to the chairman, or any other member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, to tell us as to those commitments.

Mr. SPENCE. I made no such statement. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] made that statement.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I made that statement.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. They have made commitments of around $2,000,000,000. That is contained in the report on page 28. Of that amount, what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is talking about amounts to over $800,000,000 which are direct subsidies, mostly for dairy products. The other is a revolving fund, cotton, wheat, and the regular commodities which we helped prior to the war. Since the war the others have been direct subsidies. The only subsidies we have here will be those contained in the amendment which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] expects to offer, which is practically the Taft amendment in the Senate bill. That is where he spells out in figures how much you can give as subsidies. The other amount will be just a revolving fund, and perhaps we will get most of it back. Now, suppose the war ends. If the war ends we may not have lend-lease to sell our products to. We will not have as large an Army or as large a Navy to sell products to. It means that we may have some losses, something like $900,000,000, just because the crops will be dumped on the market. There is no place to sell them; no market in which to sell them. But we have guaranteed to the farmers, "You will get a certain price." For that reason they will need this $2,000,000,000. The enitre list of those commodities is spelled out on page 28 of the hearings. There is nothing covered up about it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I did not think there was. I am simply asking for information. It is quite apparent that the Commodity Credit Corporation now has enough money to meet its commitments on subsidies and other payments, and that the additional amount that is asked for here, which is sought to be stricken out by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is to be placed in the revolving fund, rather than to be used in making commitments.

If I have not got it clear I certainly hope that the gentleman from Georgia will make it clear in his time; and if he needs time I think he should take it for this purpose.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Did the Commodity Credit Corporation have authority to make commitments up to $2,000,000,000 before the passage of this legislation under consideration?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This legislation, as I understand it, covers only commitments for the next fiscal year. If I am in error in that I should like to have somebody point it out to me.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOPE. I call the attention of the gentleman from Georgia to the question I am asking of the gentleman from Minnesota. As I understand, the Senate authorized an increase of a billion and a half to cover a 2-year period. As I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, it authorizes a billion dollars to cover a 1-year period; that is, the gentleman from Michigan later will offer an amendment to limit the extension to 1 year. I wish the gentleman from Georgia would advise us if the $1,000,000,000 will not be sufficient for 1 year if the billion and a half is considered sufficient for 2 years by the Senate?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. No. The evidence as to estimated obligations for loans, purchases, and expenditures, November 1, 1944, to December 31, 1945, show it will not. They make a list of all of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Another thing, if this war ends any time soon, under the estimate these obligations run for 12 months after VE-day and amount to $900,000,000. If military needs and lend-lease do not take these goods, we will have no market for a great many farm products, the price of which we are obligated to guarantee to the farmers.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I understand, though, from the Commodity Credit Corporation that they do have enough funds to meet their commitments up to June 30, 1945. The gentleman is referring to certain contingencies. If those contingencies should arise, that is something we could act on quickly in Congress.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. From what has been said, it seems apparent to me that we have not provided enough funds if the amount carried in the bill is spread over 2 years.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sure none of us here, at least most of us, would not want to hamstring the Commodity Credit Corporation; but I feel that the facts should be brought out here as to whether a reduction in this amount of $1,000,000,000 for a 1-year period would hamstring it.

Mr. HOPE. Is it the gentleman's idea that the additional money provided in this bill, added to the assets now on hand, will be sufficient to carry them through another year?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think it will.

Mr. HOPE. I should like to have the gentleman from Georgia clear that point up, for it seems very important to me.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The program of the Commodity Credit Corporation is based upon the money they have on hand, and they do not seek to go beyond those commitments in what they are to pay to the farmers. In fact, they are reducing payments in order to stay within the funds; and so I hope that somebody will attempt to make clear at least the actual amount of money that is necessary.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. If the Senate formula as written is adequate and the House only reduces the amount provided in the Senate by $500,000,000 and provides for just one-half of the time, certainly it would seem to be more than adequate—if the Senate formula be correct.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The amount here should, of course, be stepped up $568,000,000 above the Senate proposal as far as dairying is concerned. And another thing about the Senate proposal with reference to payments to farmers, the first program was for 6 months, up to December 31.

Mr. WOLCOTT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I must yield first to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say that the $568,000,000 to which the getleman has referred will provide $183,000,000 more for 1945 than was actually spent in 1944, and that contemplates the milk payment of an amount of $28,900,000. The reason for this $28,000,000 is that in 1944 many milk producers did not collect the payments to which they were entitled and for which they were eligible. This amounts to about $5,660,000. So $28,900,000 is made available in the money the gentleman from Georgia has reference to in the $568,000,000.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Here are the total estimated net obligations: November 1, 1944, to December 31, 1945, $2,178,778,000, and for 12 months after VE-day, $910,000,000. That is a total of $3,089,578,000. Less estimated funds available, cash on hand on October 31, 1941, $21,448,000, available borrowing power October 31, 1941, $811,365,000. That makes the amount they should have after all these deductions of $2,000,000,000, and they have estimated that, it is

their figure and they have made commitments to that extent.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from Michigan says that cutting off this billion dollars will not make any difference.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I do not know who is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not know who is right either. We ought to find out who is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, as one who represents a district that is distinctly a city district, I have always supported legislation of this sort. I supported the original act and all extensions of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Without regard to the intent of the original act back in the depression days, and the original intent has been preserved for the benefit of the farmers of America, may I say that during the war the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation have extended themselves into other necessary fields for the best interest of our country and our people. While this bill directly is one that is of vital importance to the 6,000,000 farmers of our country and those connected with the soil, numbering approximately thirty millions of our people, today it is of vital concern to the consumer. I therefore look at this as not essentially a farm measure but, rather, as a farmer-consumer measure, and I go beyond that. It plays an important part in the conduct of our Government so far as the war is concerned. In addition to being a bill that is necessary for the farmer, from the practical angle and taking into consideration the exigencies which exist today, it is also vitally important and necessary for the consumer and of vital concern to all Americans in connection with the conduct of the war, because, as I see it, this agency plays a very important part in the conduct of this war.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to hear the gentleman make those remarks as to the importance of this measure to the consumers because, after all, when it comes to dairy products and other subsidized foods, it is a consumer subsidy. The price is being held down to the consumer. If it were not for that fact the consumers would pay about 25 percent more for their dairy products and other foods than they are doing at the present time in this country.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not take issue with what the gentleman says. As a matter of fact, I completely agree with the gentleman's statement and would say that it is probably more than 25 percent.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then, as some would have it, this is not so much a measure to help 6,000,000 farmers as it is a measure to lower the prices for the consumer.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think I have expressed myself. And if it were a farmers measure I would support it. It is far more important than that. It is necessary to the consumers and it is a very important measure as a part of our war effort.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. What part does it play in the advantages to the American taxpayer?

Mr. McCORMACK. Addressing my self to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] that amendment is connected up with an amendment that he will later offer, as I understand, to reduce the 2-year period to 1 year. I hope that neither one of these amendments will be adopted, and I have reasons which prompt me to take this position and to vote against both amendments.

As I see it, no one can tell in advance how much money it is going to take to carry out the important activities of this agency even during the next year, let alone the next 2 years. In any event, it is a borrowing power. But beyond that I am for the 2-year extension because Congress has guaranteed support prices to the farmers of America during the war and for a 2-year period thereafter. Congress has made its promise. I voted for it last year as did most of the Members.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is a definite promise made to the farmers of America by the Congress of the United States. The support price is 90 percent of parity.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I say to the gentleman that that was only on basic commodities.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The 2-year guaranty on nonbasic commodities depends largely upon whether the policy of the War Food Administration, or whatever other agency is in charge, encourages the production of other crops. But this has no relationship whatsoever to the so-called Steagall amendment, in that we are only setting up a year's program anyway.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has very ably presented his part of the argument and I am undertaking to give to the House what I consider to be the arguments against the adoption of the gentleman's amendment. Congress has made a promise to support prices for the farmers of America during the war and for 2 years thereafter; a support price of at least 90 percent of parity. Having made that promise, it seems to me that the 2-year extension provided for in this bill should be adopted by the House today.

I agree with the gentleman from Michigan in his statement the other day that the main purpose of the C. C. C. in these days is to assure the maximum amount of production, and, in doing that, to obtain for the farmers an adequate price for the products of the farm, thereby guaranteeing maximum production.

We must also keep in mind that we cannot very well appropriate money directly to the farmers. We appropriate money directly to produce and manufacture the weapons of war. The manufacturers and producers of weapons of war get cash but the farmer does not. The situation is such that it is difficult to make direct appropriations, but we have done the next best thing. We have promised the integrity of our Government to the farmers of America for a 90 percent, at least, support price during the war and for 2 years thereafter, and because of that promise I think the 2-year extension recommended in this bill should be adopted by the House.

With all respect to the gentleman from Michigan, appreciating his argument and differing with him as I do but respecting his views, I hope the Committee will reject both of the gentleman's amendments and pass the bill as reported out with the one amendment that has apparently been agreed upon.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that everybody on both sides of this aisle is for the Commodity Credit Corporation and wants the Corporation to have sufficient funds to carry out its obligations, though I think there is some misunderstanding.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has an amendment which he expects to introduce and I expect to support it. It is practically the same as the Taft amendment in the Senate bill, that spells out just how much money is to go to dairy and other consumer commodities. This is a real gift. We do not expect to get any of this money back. That is what you call a consumer subsidy. You all remember that I helped lead the fight here against consumer subsidies. We lost out by a veto. Then we embarked on this program to get production to feed the armed forces and the civilians of this country. We have made obligations since that time and we cannot turn back. The Corporation needs this much money to carry out the obligations for loans, purchases, and expenditures.

As a matter of fact, the Corporation has made $23,000,000 on the basic commodities up to this time. On cotton alone it has made $93,000,000. On some commodities it lost, but on the total it has made $23,000,000. I do not mean we are going to lose this $2,000,000,000 by any means. A great part of this $2,000,000,000 is a revolving fund for making loans on and buying corn, cotton, wheat, and other commodities, and on these particular commodities we do not expect to lose any money.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. The table which is shown on page 28 and to which the gentleman referred in the course of his remarks seems to be based upon the situation that existed on October 31, 1944. I notice others in the hearings also seem to be based upon the situation existing at that time. I am wondering if there are any more up-to-date figures than those which are in the hearings.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. No. This is what the Corporation claims it will have to have.

There is some misunderstanding about direct subsidies and the revolving fund in the way of loans on the basic commodities, on which the Government has lost nothing. Therefore, the C. C. C. cannot carry out the commitments and needs of the farmers without this money. It does not mean a loss. We are helping the consumers on the $900,000,000 that we expect to lose, and the balance is necessary if we carry on and make the loans on the basic commodities on which we have lost nothing. We guarantee the prices of certain food crops. If the crops do not reach those prices, we will make it good, and on many of these crops the Corporation has not lost a dime.

If this war ends in the next few days we know that a great many farmers producing food crops will not have any market in which to sell their food. Therefore, there will be some losses on those particular crops. The Corporation estimates that it will have to spend after VE-day something over $900,000,000 within 12 months from that day, and it should know more about this than any one of us because it has given careful study to this phase of the operations.

Mr. HOPE. On October 31, 1944, which seems to be the date, by these figures, the Corporation had available, I notice, a buying power of $811,000,000; there was listed an appropriation pending of $256,000,000 and there was cash on hand of $21,448,000, or a total of $1,089,578,000. I assume that most of those funds are still on hand. Does not the gentleman think, if we limit the expense to 1 year and take that sum of more than $1,000,000,000 and add another billion dollars to it, it will be sufficient to enable the Corporation to carry on its operations for the 1-year period?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. It might be if it were not for the estimated net additional obligations for 12 months' period after VE-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman is right. The total estimated obligations from November 1, 1944, to December 1, 1945, are $2,000,000,000. The estimated net additional obligations for 12 months' period after VE-day is $910,000,000. That makes $2,910,000,000. It had in cash on October 31, 1944, $21,000,000; available borrowing capacity of $811,365,000; and appropriations pending, $256,000,000. The last 3 items added up and subtracted from the $3,000,000,000 leaves about $2,000,000,000, which they will need. That is what they say it will need. It does not mean the money will be wasted, because the Government has made money on these basic crops. As a matter of fact, it has over $600,000,000 of loans outstanding now, and the estimated value of the assets of the Corporation, in addition to these loans, is something over $1,500,000,000.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. What is the total loss during the coming year?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The total loss, as I understand it, is approximately $900,000,000. That is the subsidy for the dairies and other subsidies where the consumer, and not the producer, gets the benefit.

Mr. COOLEY. If the bill provides an amount of money sufficient for a 2-year period, and you cut that period to a 1-year period, why could you not reduce the amount in proportion?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. This bill does not provide money for a 2-year period. It provides money for the period ending December 31 this year. The bill extends the life of the Corporation for 2 years. But the money is provided only through the year 1945.

Mr. COOLEY. That is the information we have been trying to obtain.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. If the Members will turn to page 1976 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I think we can tie this up. On that page you will find certain figures which I am informed the Commodity Credit Corporation has agreed to go into this proposition as an amendment. That gives a total of $913,000,000. The $913,000,000 is made up of $568,000,000 for the dairy industry: whole milk payments, $416,000,000; butterfat payments, $152,000,000. That makes up the total of $568,000,000.

Then, we have the noncrop programs, which are Cheddar cheese, fluid milk, peanut butter, for food wheat, expended on other purposes—that means something you cannot detail at the present moment—$32,500,000, or a total of $120,000,000.

Then, you have programs which are on a crop basis, crop-year basis, or to be provided for under the amount of $225,000,000 total.

So, $568,000,000 for milk, $120,000,000 for noncrop program, and the programs which are on a crop year basis for $225,000,000, gives $913,000,000.

That, I might say to the gentleman from Kansas, brings these figures of October 31 down to date, you might say. I think that answers the question of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], about the later figures from October 31. So, on that basis, I shall be very glad to support the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. Chairman, there is another thought I want to express here. A lot has been said about an investigation. We have the letter today from the Administrator, Mr. Jones. Mr. Jones himself cannot personally make that investigation. I mean Marvin Jones, personally, cannot make it. I have been a friend of the Commodity Credit Corporation with all the other Members of Congress, and I have heard so much and I have seen so little—there has been so much said by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] and there is so much in the RECORD which we have not seen that insofar as I am personally concerned, for the benefit of the farmers of this country and for the benefit of Marvin Jones and Frank Hancock, let me say that I would not go any further than those two men to fill those two positions, but, to protect the farmers, to protect the Commodity Credit Corporation, to protect every Member of the House who supports Commodity Credit Corporation, to protect the public of this country, I personally am going to demand a thorough investigation by a committee of this House, of the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I think I know enough to know that when the committee gets into it, it will find plenty that needs cleaning up. You must keep in mind that Administrator Jones and Mr. Hancock are new men on these Commodity Credit jobs. You will probably find that the dirty work—and I allege there has been dirty work—took place before either one of them joined the Corporation. If the house is clean let it be shown to be clean. If it is dirty, let us clean it up.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No; I do not yield. I have kept my mouth closed up to this time. I do not propose to have something come out 6 months from now which will stigmatize me as a friend of Commodity Credit Corporation. Furthermore, passing this law at this time has nothing to do with that investigation. The Congress has authorized these parity and support price payments. The Commodity Credit Corporation is the machinery through which those payments are to be made. We mandate the Commodity Credit Corporation to make loans. I am going to vote for this bill. I am not going to vote to recommit the bill, because I am not going to mix the flour of the Commodity Credit Corporation with the red pepper of an investigation, if we can get one made.

There has been so much said here now that I do not know any way you can avoid an investigation. The Administrator sends a letter up here saying he is going to make one. The chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee says he is going to make one. That is a fine kettle of fish you have here. We should either make an investigation or nothing should have been said, and let the scandal come at some future time. So, if I cannot get the investigation taken care of in any other way, I will introduce a resolution, in order to clear my own skirts, and the rest of the Members can carry their own responsibility in whichever way they prefer to do it.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman believe that the resolution which has recently been passed by the House, authorizing the Committee on Agriculture to investigate all phases of marketing activities, might not be broad enough to include authority to conduct this investigation?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Personally, I do not think it is broad enough.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has expired.

A WAR MEASURE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if this were a bill to appropriate money for planes, tanks, guns, and ammunition, I do not think any question would be raised as to the amount to be appropriated, because we are all in accord with doing everything possible to successfully prosecute this war. Yet, we have a bill here providing for the use of money for the purpose of making those planes, tanks, and guns effective.

FOOD AS IMPORTANT AS BULLETS

Food is just as important as bullets, and when we vote against providing the necessary food to carry on this war we are in effect voting against the successful prosecution of the war. I do not care how many planes, tanks, and guns we have upon the battlefields of the world, unless we have food for our fighting men, those planes, tanks, and guns will be absolutely useless. So this is just as important as anything that can be done in this war.

MONEY TO PROVIDE FOOD

This bill provides for an increase from $3,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 in the amount of money that is available for the Commodity Credit Corporation. For what purpose? To provide needed food. We talk about deferring farmers—and we should, because they are engaged in work that is just as essential, just as necessary, as work in the war plants or upon the battlefields—and yet we quibble about whether or not it will be $4,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000 in a program where we are spending from $75,000,000,000 to $100,000,000,000 every year for war supplies which cannot be used unless we provide the necessary food, which this $1,000,000,000 difference will probably provide. Does not the gentleman think it is too small, considering the over-all cost of the war picture, to even quibble about or to run any risk about?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. I have been informed in the last few minutes by the Commodity Credit Corporation that they have $1,000,000,000 available; that their commitments for this year are $2,278,000,000, and that if the war comes to an end this year there will be another billion needed.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. So this money is absolutely needed, not for next year but for the year 1945.

We are spending at least $75,000,000,000 this year for war supplies. Think about that. Yet we are quibbling about the $1,000,000,000 which will probably be necessary in order to make that $75,000,000,000 effective in planes, tanks, and guns. We must not run that risk; it is too great a risk to run.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. The life of the Corporation by this bill is extended 2 years.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. And they are asking an increase of $2,000,000,000.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Suppose an amendment is adopted limiting the extension to 1 year; would not one-half of the amount be sufficient?

Mr. PATMAN. No; the need would still be $5,000,000,000, that is, if we want to carry out the solemn contract we have made with the producers of food in the United States. We cannot carry out that contract in any other way.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. It seems to me that $2,000,000,000 increase being furnished here for a 2-year extension, that should an amendment be adopted reducing the extension to 1 year, that $1,000,000,000 should be enough.

Mr. PATMAN. We are not discussing that now; we are discussing what will be necessary for 1945. We have outstanding obligations. We have voted to put Congress on record as favoring certain support prices and certain price increases to those who will produce the necessary food; and we cannot carry out those promises unless we vote for this bill as it is.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Instead of quibbling over this $1,000,000,000, as the gentleman says, how about increasing the price of farm commodities so the individuals who get the commodities pay the $1,000,000,000? Then we will not have to take it out of the Treasury.

Mr. PATMAN. That is a separate question, but I will tell the gentleman the reason why. If we do what the gentleman has sincerely suggested these wives, children, fathers and mothers of the fighting men will find their standard of living reduced.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. The wives and children, the fathers and mothers of these fighting men we have voted to send to war—and we have voted to give their dependents a certain amount each month—if we were to increase prices as the gentleman suggests it would reduce their living standard immediately. The amount of money they would receive would not purchase as much. We owe to them an obligation. If we were to do what the gentleman suggests we would place the greatest kind of burden upon the loved ones of our fighting men, upon the people who are drawing old-age assistance, upon people who are working for salaries and wages and who live upon fixed incomes. We would absolutely reduce it and do it quickly, immediately, reduce the purchasing power of those people, and we would be treating them wrong. It would cost them several times as much as $1,000,000,000.

Mr. RICH. Then, $1,000,000,000 in the gentleman's estimation not being worth quibbling over, it cannot be a very large sum to him. If it is not, and if you are trying to hold down the purchasing power of the people so that we do not have inflation, it seems to me that those who consume the goods should pay the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has his opinion, and I have mine; a billion is a large amount, but when we consider that the whole war program, a hundred times that large, is involved, the amount is comparatively small, I suggest that a vote for this amendment is a vote against the loved ones of those fighting men whom we have promised to defend by keeping the cost of living down so they could live on the amount we have provided. A vote for this amendment is a vote against those loved ones.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The difference between the attitude of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] and the gentleman now addressing the House is on this $910,000,000 which is estimated after V-day. V-day may come tomorrow or next day and it is estimated that it would be $910,000,000 for 1 year after V-day. If that came tomorrow, then we would have to come back and appropriate more money.

Mr. PATMAN. I am giving the Members the benefit of my opinion. You can have your own opinion any way you want. My opinion is if I were to vote for this amendment and quibble about a billion dollars, which is small compared to the over-all picture, making ineffective the billions of dollars of fine war equipment and supplies we have, I would be voting against the interest of the loved ones of these fighting men, I would be voting against the interest of the fighting men themselves, I would be voting against providing sufficient food here at home as well as enough food for our fighting men. Please remember that 12,000,000 fighting men consume as much food as 24,000,000 civilians because the average soldier must have 4,500 calories every day, twice as much as the average civilian consumes. So we must make it possible to have produced 65,000,000 pounds of the best food on earth every day for an equivalent of 24,000,000 men in the armed services. In addition to that, we have to make it possible for civilians at home to have the right kind of food in order to keep up our health standards in the Nation. In addition to that, if we can furnish some food to our allies and our allies use that food to help destroy our common ene-

mies, thereby permitting more of our men to safely return home we are doing a grand thing. Therefore this program is too big for us to quibble about whether or not it should be $4,000,000,000 or $5,000,000,000. There is more involved than that.

Furthermore, this is a bill to help prevent inflation. I am not criticizing anyone who has a different viewpoint from myself, but I personally would feel, if I were to vote for this amendment, that I was taking a step in the direction of releasing inflationary pressures and permitting inflation to possibly engulf our country. It would be a definite inflationary step. Now, that is my opinion about it.

Another reason is that after we have voted here solemnly, practically every Member of this House has told the farmers of this Nation to go back to his farm, even with the shortage of manpower and machinery, double up, work harder, and produce more food and that the Congress will guarantee them for 2 years after the declaration of peace a certain price for their products. So if I were to vote for the pending amendment I would feel that I would be going back on that promise.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I have listened very intently, as I always do, to the remarks of our very able colleague from Texas, but I take this opportunity to say that I cannot go along with his reasoning so far as his opposition to the pending amendment is concerned. It is all very well when anything is brought up here for consideration to come down here in the well of the House and talk about the boys at the fighting front, and because of my support of the pending amendment, I do not want any Member of the House or anyone else to think for one minute that I would do one single thing which would hamper the war effort in any way or that would sacrifice the life of one additional man in this war. However, there is a fundamental question involved here in which I am deeply interested.

I understand there is going to be another amendment offered to cut the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation from 2 years to 1 year. Unfortunately, that amendment has to be offered later and cannot be offered now. The particular amendment I wish to talk about at this time is the amendment to be offered cutting the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation from 2 years to 1 year. I am not speaking against the extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation at this particular time, but I do hope that the House will not vote for an extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation for 2 years.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was organized, as my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, said, to help the farm interests of this country, but it was not organized to do the work that it is doing at the present time, which is to perpetuate consumers' subsidies in this country.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. It is true that it was not organized for that purpose; neither was the R. F. C. organized for three purposes, to help the banks, the railroads, and the insurance companies, but finally they were extended for good purposes, and this is being used for the same reason.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I will cover the gentleman's objection to my statement in a minute. We got into the war before the Congress knew what was happening. The Commodity Credit Corporation was subsidizing the consumers of this country when the first subsidy started in the canned vegetable industry in connection with the resale program. We have had several fights in the last 2 years about consumers' subsidies in this House. I, for one, was against it, but since the Commodity Credit Corporation, in cooperation with the O. P. A., developed that as a policy during this war, I am perfectly willing to go along and continue that program as long as the war lasts and as long as this emergency lasts because I, for one, in line with what my colleague the gentleman from Texas just said, do not want to do a single thing to upset the economy of this country which would in any way hamper the war effort.

May I ask the Members on the Democratic side to pay particular attention to this? I have heard quite a good many of you in the cloak room talking about the extension of the powers and the authorities granted as war emergencies. Why is the Commodity Credit Corporation asking for a 2-year extension? Just as sure as we are in this Chamber today, the Commodity Credit Corporation, or through a separate agency of this Government, expects to continue the payment of food subsidies after the war is over. An article published in the Baltimore Sun, emanating from a department here in Washington, made the flat statement that it was going to be the policy of Government, and the Congress would soon be given a bill covering it, that people in low income groups would have food subsidies as a permanent part of our Government. Members of the House, you are getting into something very dangerous. You are getting into something that is going to upset our whole system of government if that is done.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. We have committed ourselves to the farmer to continue the support prices for 2 years after the war.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I agree with my chairman. But support prices, Mr. Chairman, and consumers' subsidies are entirely different things.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. All I wish to say is this. We are in an emergency; I do not think there is any question about that.

If we come back at the end of 1 year and we are in the same emergency, I am sure no Member of this Congress will be opposed to extending it again. But let us keep the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation under the scrutiny of the Congress so that we can watch the policies that have developed from time to time, so that after the emergency is over and we want to retrench, we will have a chance to do so.

I shall support this amendment, and if that amendment prevails and they need two billion for 2 years, certainly one billion additional would be enough for the 1 year.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support this amendment. I have supported consumers' subsidies. I have supported a good many other things. I am going to support it directly on the ground that it has been my observation that if you give people too much money in the Treasury to play with you get pretty lax methods. We talk about a promise to the farmers. You cannot tell me that this House will not at any time meet any legitimate payments that are required under its present laws. No one in this House can very successfully charge me with operating against the interests of plain people. If it becomes necessary as part of our economy by a food-stamp plan or otherwise to take care of the food requirements of the low-income group, I will be there.

But, primarily, I come just one speaker too late. I may fall into the habit myself, and anyone in this body can call me on it from now on, but I am beginning to retch a little at the stomach about hearing so much about our boys in the service. It has been my observation that men in this House who have lost sons are prepared to make their arguments upon sound grounds as to the merits of propositions and not go around here talking to us about the boys in the service every time they want to make an argument on anything.

I have come back from Europe and France and seen a few of those boys, and I have seen a good many of them who are injured. You are not going to fool them with a lot of tears about them. I think it is about time that somebody in this House at some time call some attention to the fact that some of those boys-in-the-fox-holes speeches are a little nauseating to most people of decent sensibilities.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have a feeling that the Commodity Credit Corporation and the O. P. A. have in an over-all way done a pretty good job of helping to keep down the rise in the cost of living. I think that as far as the cost of living can be cut down during this war period it is going to cut down our over-all debt at the end of the war. Those of us who are interested in the taxpayers will be doing something for the taxpaying public by helping to keep that cost of living down during this war. For that reason, I am going to vote against this amendment.

I have every confidence in the gentlemen who are running the Commodity Credit Corporation. One of them is a former Member of the House. I have confidence not only in their ability but in their integrity.

As I say, I think there has been a pretty good over-all job done in many ways. On the other hand, I feel that it is my duty to call the attention of the House to some things that have been developed in the hearings before the Committee on Insular Affairs during the last 2 weeks.

The vast powers that have been vested in the O. P. A. and the Commodity Credit Corporation, if wisely used, will, I think, as a war measure, do a great and beneficial service to this country. On the other hand, if they are unwisely used, they constitute a very powerful instrument of oppression and destruction. I feel that it is my duty to call to the attention of the House some facts that have been developed during the past 2 weeks in the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Our attention was called recently through cablegrams and letters to the fact that for 4 long weeks a strike has been going on in the biggest industry in the island of Puerto Rico.

We have read in the papers from time to time that we are to receive another cut in our sugar allowance for the next year. The biggest production of that island is sugar. They have what we call a sugar economy. From seven hundred to nine hundred thousand tons of sugar come out of there normally every year. Last year, the O. P. A. fixed a price on raw sugar below the cost of production and the Commodity Credit Corporation paid such a low subsidy that producers of sugar in Puerto Rico operated at a deficit last year. According to the best testimony we could get, eight companies alone lost about $1,500,000 last year. They have been pleading with the O. P. A. to raise sugar prices to the point where they would not go on losing money or to get subsidies from Commodity Credit Corporation to offset the losses. The workers on the island faced, as they are elsewhere, with the rising cost of living, have struck for a higher wage. The producers of sugar, the little colonos, the larger people, and even large corporations, have all been faced with the fact that you cannot pay more than you take in. It has been a deadlock. According to the best estimates we have, they have been losing about 15,000,000 pounds of sugar a week because of the strike. In other words, the householders of America have already lost 60,000,000 pounds of sugar.

They took care of the continental producers by having the Commodity Credit Corporation pay them a subsidy large enough to make up the difference between the cost of production and the price fixed by the O. P. A. On the continent, they have kept the producers quiet and kept them operating by paying a subsidy to take up the slack between the low price fixed for raw sugar and the amount they have to have to produce it. For instance, down here in Louisiana, they are paying a subsidy of more than twice the subsidy paid down in Puerto Rico.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. There is only one way that the householders of America are going to get sugar, and that is help the people who raise sugar to continue producing it. It cannot be produced so long as the price is forced down below the cost of production. I do not have to argue that point with any man in this Chamber. It is fundamental. It is a principle that we Americans have been raised upon.

There have been negotiations going on for 6 months, but the O. P. A. and the C. C. C. have stood pat and refused to give relief. They are now threatening to take over the sugar industry down there and to take over all the sugar farms and the sugar centrales, and operate them under Government control.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the philosophy behind an order of that kind of fixing the price below the price of production?

Mr. BELL. I certainly do not want to charge the gentlemen running the C. C. C. with the kind of philosophy which you know is held by some people connected with the insular government. But you know what philosophy prevails down there where one after another of the island's industries has been taken over by the island government. That is common knowledge here. I do not have to expand on that.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman believe the same philosophy is working in the States?

Mr. BELL. There may be some people here, but I think at least 98 percent of the people do not believe in that philosophy. I do not think that the people of this country will ever favor that sort of thinking.

Mr. RICH. I think the gentleman is right in saying that 98 percent of the people do not believe in that philosophy, but we are going right into it very rapidly. The people of this country are being fooled and they had better wake up pretty quick.

Mr. BELL. If this plan to take over that industry is carried out, it is going to mean a tremendous loss in sugar to the people of this country. In the first place, for every day that the cane is left standing in the fields there it is deteriorating. They should have been cutting cane for the last 30 days, but everything has been at a standstill. In fact, the longer that situation goes on, the worse it is going to get and, of course, it is going to mean that with a few more weeks like this, this year's cane crop will be lost and gone. It will mean, too, that the men who have spent their lifetimes down there developing the greatest business of the island will be frozen out, and the business will be taken over by those folks in the island who do not know how to run it as well as the people who developed it. The result will be that we either will not have sugar here or else the price will be forced up to the point where it will be altogether too high.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Who does the gentleman believe is responsible for that situation?

Mr. BELL. Well, I do not know all the ramifications back of it. I would say, however, that if the Commodity Credit Corporation would pay the same subsidy to sugar producers in Puerto Rico that it is paying on the continent, the strike could be settled immediately, and we would salvage something out of this cane crop standing in the fields down there.

Mr. COOLEY. Is there any reason why they should not pay the same subsidy?

Mr. BELL. I know of no reason why they should not, except I am convinced there are some people on the island who may be opposed to having it done.

Mr. COOLEY. I infer from what the gentleman said that there is some evil or sinister influence back of this thing.

Mr. BELL. I think there is.

Mr. COOLEY. That is on the island.

Mr. BELL. I doubt very much if the gentlemen running the O. P. A. and the Commodity Credit Corporation are fully cognizant as to the far-reaching influences down there in the island that may be back of this situation.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the amount of the subsidy per hundred pounds?

Mr. BELL. Forty cents per hundred pounds.

Mr. DONDERO. What is it in continental United States?

Mr. BELL. One dollar per hundred pounds.

Mr. DONDERO. How much is the total subsidy paid to both the insular possession sugar and the continental sugar?

Mr. BELL. Down there it is 40 cents per hundred and here it is $1 per hundred.

Mr. DONDERO. Have you the overall amount?

Mr. BELL. No; it depends on the amount of the production.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On page 28 of the hearings the Commodity Credit Corporation has requested $63,000,000 on sugar. I assume that is the support price which they propose to pay to all domestic producers, which includes Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the continental beet sugar growers.

Mr. BELL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to congratulate the chairman of the Insular Affairs Committee for calling this matter to the attention of the House, and also to point out that while this crop is standing in

the fields, remaining unharvested, not only is the sugar content being lost in the juices, but there are no new plantings going in for the year 1946, which means to say if we lose this crop we also lose next year's crop, or in round figures 1,800,000 tons of sugar.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I am very much interested in the statement the gentleman has made. I am sure most every citizen of this country is interested. Is the cost of production of sugar in the island as high as the cost of production of sugar in this country?

Mr. BELL. The cost of labor in the island, per ton, is higher than it is on the continent. There are many reasons for that.

However, before I close, I would like to say I am opposed to this amendment, because I think over-all, they are doing a good job, but I do think this body ought to know that hidden down there is a tremendous power of oppression and destruction that if unwisely used might bring disaster, not only down there in that little island, but here on the continent as well. Unless this thing is seen by the men who are operating O. P. A. and the Commodity Credit Corporation, there will be a time when some committee will come in here with an amendment to the law to protect the people of this country.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does that feeling originate with the Governor? Is he not spear-heading that sort of feeling in the island?

Mr. BELL. I cannot speak for the Governor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABATH to the amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Strike out "$4,000,000,000" and insert "$4,500,000,000."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I am going to devote a few moments to a matter which, to me, is not so sweet as the sugar the gentleman has talked about.

In the first place, I presume most of the Members know that the Senate has already acted in this matter and that their bill provides for $4,500,000,000. From the figures I have and from the evidence I have seen, I believe that $4,500,000,000 will suffice; but in case it does not, we can always increase it should conditions justify it.

Before going into these figures, and lest I forget, I wish to compliment Judge Marvin Jones upon the letter he sent down here. As I said in my remarks on the rule on this bill, I have always had the utmost confidence in Judge Jones and Mr. Frank Hancock, with both of whom I served here. At that time I did not recollect that Mr. Hancock is President of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I hope that they will clean house, and expect they will. They have already, as I am informed, dispensed with two men; and I am sure they will promptly do likewise with any and every person who shows himself to be unpatriotic, incapable, or who does not give honest service to that organization and to the country.

ARE SUBSIDIES NEEDED?

I have heard a great many arguments about subsidies. I do not know whether a majority of the Members realize that most of the money called for in the bill goes to the dairy industry. According to the figures given me, nearly $930,000,000 goes to the dairy industry. If that industry needed a subsidy, and if milk prices had been kept down as we were led to believe they would be, I would not object to voting this or any other amount. Unfortunately, however, milk prices have not been kept down. Before we started this program milk was selling for 90 and 95 cents a hundredweight; today it is selling at $2.75 a hundredweight, three times the former figure. No one can tell me this industry, in view of the high prices they are now getting for dairy products, should receive these additional millions provided in the bill.

I have been urged by Mr. Holman, representing the National Milk Producers' Association, and others, to favor an increase in the subsidy on butter or to increase the ceiling price 6 cents per pound, notwithstanding that today butter is selling for 50 cents per pound. The farmers already are receiving triple prices for milk and cream. But most outrageous is the high prices that consumers are paying for the various makeshift concoctions of cheese now appearing on the market, and which, in some instances, are selling for as high as 500 percent above the prices the consumer should pay.

Presenting the dairy industry with over $900,000,000 surely is not, in my opinion, by any means responsible for the increased production of milk, because, according to the report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the seasonal upswing in milk flow during February was somewhat more rapid than usual. On March 1 production per cow was about 8 percent above the 1934–43 average for the date and 2 percent higher than a year earlier. In the western group of States production per cow was 6 percent above the March 1 average for the 1934–43 period and slightly higher than last year. For the country as a whole milk production per cow averaged 13.99 pounds on March 1 this year, compared with 13.71 pounds for the same date of 1944 and a 1934–43 average of 12.96 pounds.

All the talk in the House concerning the sad plight of the dairy industries and the alleged necessity for authorizing these additional subsidies to stimulate milk production is the bunk.

I have expressed the belief that we should call a halt to appropriating these millions upon millions to the dairy and packer industries, or, if these subsidies are continued, that these industries be required to bring about an immediate and substantial reduction in the high cost of butter, cheese, milk, and other dairy byproducts, and meats and other foodstuffs that they process.

I think we are going altogether too far; but, as I say, had the price to the consumer been held in check I would not object to expending this money to provide sufficient food, not only for our servicemen, but for our underpaid American white-collar citizens as well, of whom we have nearly 20,000,000 earning less than $1,300 a year.

PRESSURE GROUPS VERSUS CHESTER BOWLES

Mr. Chairman, I have noticed in the press the last few days the activities of the pressure group, their agents and lobbyists, exerting every pressure and influence they can to obtain higher prices, notwithstanding the enormous profits they are making now, and notwithstanding the hundreds of millions of dollars which have been voted to them by Congress as subsidies intended to hold down the prices of the necessaries of life to the American people. These groups speak for the large interest holders in these various companies and corporations who have, as their financial reports will show, made tremendous profits.

May I suggest that Mr. Bowles obtain the financial reports of these avaricious corporations and industries whose representatives, with crocodile tears, urge higher ceilings in order to "aid" the Government in further prosecution of the war. Their sole interest is to make greater and more profits for themselves, and still more profits, and the public be damned. There may be one or two exceptions out of the many but I have not been able to detect them. The "poor" packers claim that unless they are permitted to do as they please they will be forced into bankruptcy, notwithstanding that most of them have made millions above what they made between 1935 and 1939, or even in the year 1940.

That applies also to the so-called dairy interests as well as to the vegetable and fruit growers. And to the "poor" tobacco millionaires who have doubled the prices of cigars and substituted weeds and sawdust for tobacco.

I must not overlook the poor sugar combination, and I quote from their report for 1945:

The consolidated net income of the company, as shown by the profit-and-loss statement, after Federal income taxes, and depreciation of $2,029,523.15, was $5,902,530.68. After provision for the dividend on the preferred stock, this net income is equal to $6.11 per share on the common stock.

Dividends of $7 per share were declared during the year on the preferred stock. On December 20, 1944, a year-end dividend of $3 per share was declared on the common stock, which was paid on February 2, 1945.

Cash at the year end was $17,574,728.70. Short-term United States Government securities were $13,336,826.47 and other United States Government securities were $933,584.87. Current assets were $56,795,854.29 and current liabilities were $14,309,855.91. Surplus was $12,805,934.98.

There was credited to earned surplus $233,505.89, representing reserves for taxes created in prior years, no longer required, and an additional sum of $538,765.36, representing loans to colonos, no longer required.

INFLATION

I suggest the reading of a very timely article by Mr. Richard L. Strout on the danger of inflation. The article follows:

CAPITAL SEES RISE IN PERIL OF INFLATION

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON, March 15.—Inflation and fear of inflation are the motivating factors in half a dozen major fields in Washington today.

They are behind simultaneous House and Senate hearings on price control; they are involved in the hold-the-line efforts in the labor field, including the new coal-strike threat; they arise anew in the efforts of Chester Bowles to roll back the price of textile goods and put a ceiling on motion-picture tickets.

They figure in the statistics compiled by the Federal Reserve System, and the recent recommendation by Chairman Marriner Eccles for a heavy increase in the capital-gains tax.

They are the outstanding, compelling home-front factors considered in every current Washington financial discussion.

INFLATION THREAT GROWS

The inflation threat is greater today than at any time since price controls were put into effect, according to authorities, and with every day of successful war the inflation will grow. That is the situation that worries Washington.

Here is the situation in brief: In the biggest boom in history, the public is accumulating savings that have no place to go. The reduction in things to buy is vividly illustrated in new austerity developments and almost every day—less meat, empty store shelves, midnight curfew, city dim-out, and manpower regulations. Meanwhile potential purchasing power is advancing by leaps and bounds, and controls are threatening to bend or break in certain directions.

Here is the latest compilation of figures, illustrating the situation:

1. Expenditures on war are pouring money into the financial stream. World War No. 1 to its end cost $32,000,000,000. World War No. 2 in the same period cost $153,000,000,000, and to December 1944 has cost $245,000,000,000. Living costs in the first war went up 84.4 percent and ultimately rose to 108 percent by June 1920. Controls in this war have so far held down the balloon to only 28.8 percent increase, but the upward pressure is increasing.

2. The public's income after taxes was only $56,000,000,000 in World War No. 1, but in 1943 alone it was $124,000,000,000. In 1944 it was $137,000,000,000.

3. In World War No. 1 only 25 percent of the national production went to war; the balance was left for civilians. Now in this closer-to-total war, 44 percent of goods are going to war; only 56 percent is staying at home.

4. Currency in circulation tells the alarming story of the amount of money available for purchase of dwindling amounts of goods. In 52 months (to armistice) in World War No. 1 the amount jumped to almost $5,000,000,000. But after 52 months of this war the figure was $20,000,000,000, and by now it is $25,000,000,000—24 percent increase over a year ago. Bank officials are vitally concerned on this single tell-tale statistic.

5. Checking accounts in banks shows the present staggering total of $60,000,000,000—7 percent higher than a year ago. This is so much hip-pocket dynamite so far as the possibility of sudden spending spurts go.

6. Summarizing some of the foregoing figures, the present excess of public income over goods and services available to buy with aforesaid income now totals $40,000,000,000. This is the difference between $137,500,000,000 in income after taxes and $97,500,000,000 of available civilian goods and services. This is the little red pointer on the inflation-pressure gage that is constantly pointing to a higher and higher explosive force inside.

7. Finally latest statistics indicate that public savings have increased by $100,000,000,000 from Pearl Harbor to the end of 1944. What is the public going to do with this money? Nobody knows. If a sudden fear of inflation should sweep the country, everybody would start bidding for the insufficient supply of civilian goods in order to turn rubber dollars into real goods.

That is what would happen now in many lines if there were not price controls, even though the public has confidence in the dollar. The savings so far are equal to three times the total cost of World War No. 1, and they are accumulating at the rate of $3,000,000,000 a month.

Mr. Chairman, under leave given me I insert an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of March 12 entitled "Homeside Readjustment." I feel this editorial should be read by the present-day faultfinders:

HOMESIDE READJUSTMENT

There is a growing uneasiness among those close to the readjustment problem of the returning veterans which calls for prompt recognition.

The source of this feeling is not to be found in the provisions of the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944—the G. I. bill of rights—with its broad program for rehabilitation through hospitalization, education, loans, and unemployment benefits. The Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, with their newly functioning separation and adjustment divisions are sounding a note of helpfulness.

No, the framework of readjustment as provided by law and regulation is ample, in fact more than ample in the opinion of many. As a Nation, the United States has marched far from the land-grant benefits given to the ragged Continentals mustered out after the Revolution. There is no evidence of hurdy-gurdies being handed out by a befuddled Government such as were given the blue-clad veterans of Bull Run and Gettysburg, and apple-selling such as the doughboys from Belleau Woods and the Argonne were reduced to after World War No. 1 is definitely not a post-war probability for today's G. I.'s.

Where, then, shall we look for the cause of this feeling—now no larger than a spot on the peacetime horizon? Right in our own mirrors. We, the families of our servicemen, are causing this vague but growing feeling of uneasiness among those studying the readjustment problem.

Farsighted, experienced observers call now for a "homeside readjustment." Too much, they say, has been emphasized about readjusting the fighting men. Incidents of naval veterans removing their combat ribbons to avoid ill-advised questioning, and of infantrymen from the Italian front taking off their honored shoulder patches to escape thoughtless inquiries are straws in the wind. Let the family circle make a more thoughtful effort to get into harmony with the G. I.'s.

It is the wartime duty of us all to search deeply into our motives as we eagerly step forth to help in the great opportunities of readjustment. Let there be no unwise probing into combat-packed hours. Let the Golden Rule guide our every step and temper our grateful enthusiasm.

Naturally enough we can find our readjustment guide in the Bible. Can we not turn as did Solomon when he was called on to face great problems and great opportunities and ask for "an understanding heart"? That might well be the start for "homeside readjustment."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. We have, I admit, perhaps due to the need for haste, allowed manufacturers large sums for the war material they furnish the Government. But when we realized that we had been too generous we passed the Renegotiation Act, which is bringing back into the Treasury most of these unusually high and unwarranted profits. If we can do that with the manufacturers, why can we not also hold dairy prices down?

What applies to the dairy industry applies to other industries whose prices we are boosting; and, Mr. Chairman, if we continue to permit the boosting and maintain these prices, I am afraid for the future, when we will not be able to appropriate these large sums of money, we will suffer a crash the same as we suffered when the $500,000,000 was expended in 1928 and 1929 to support wheat prices. That is what alarms me. I dislike very much to see the farmers and agriculture generally placed in that unfortunate position they found themselves in when the $500,000,000 was expended.

ABUNDANT CROPS AND SURPLUSES

Now, we have great surpluses in wheat, we have great surpluses in corn, we have surpluses in nearly everything, through the aid of God Almighty; and if we shall have as favorable weather as we have had the last 3 years we will, of course, with the aid of the farmers, continue to raise great crops—larger crops than ever before.

Farm implements have been frozen and the prices that farmers pay for the things they need have been frozen.

Why not freeze the prices on some of the agricultural commodities on which they receive these tremendous subsidies, and which they unload upon the people, like cheese and partially synthetic cream, which is only about 50 percent cream but still sells for double the price real cream used to sell for? I really think that something remedial should be done in the interest of the consumers, so that they may be protected in this important matter of food prices.

I have observed in the hearings of the Committee on Banking and Currency that the Commodity Credit Corporation has sustained a loss of $1,208,084,481 in subsidizing agricultural commodities to date; and we shall have to write that off. Of that sum dairy products received $603,186,335 and fluid milk received $23,617,062; wheat received about $273,317,759, and corn received about $39,813,207.

If, as I maintain, these millions and millions in subsidies for the dairy interests, meat packers, livestock producers, and feed interests have not benefited the consumers, how can it be logically said that these subsidies avoid and minimize the effects of inflation?

FARMERS PROSPEROUS

The Commodity Credit Corporation bill continues the guaranty that 90 percent of parity will be paid farmers for 2 years after the war. Since farm prices are now 114 percent of parity and only a few instances of temporary gluts have occurred, little thought is given at this time to this guaranty.

Farm debt is declining. This is particularly true of mortgage debt, which has decreased in a few years by one-half. During and after the last war such debts rose sharply.

Farm operators' reserves of about $12,000,000,000 in cash and other liquid resources are the largest in history. Included are about $2,400,000,000 invested in United States savings bonds.

Largely as a result of price increases, and also because of reduced debts, increased cash and bonds, and increased quantities of livestock and other assets, the equities of the owners in agriculture increased about $30,000,000,000 in the 4-year period ended January 1, 1944.

Concerning the importance of price controls to farm prosperity, the Office of Price Administration points out that during this war we have had a widespread and generally effective system of price controls. These price controls have held down the farmers' own costs for food and clothing, for fertilizer, machinery, and other supplies. During the last war, the farmers' costs rose almost as much and as fast as his prices.

The rise in prices of farm commodities, real estate, machinery, and equipment accounts for $19,700,000,000 of a $21,100,000,000 increase in the valuation of tangible farm assets in the 4-year period. The other $1,400,000,000 reflects an increase of physical working capital. Of the total increase of nearly $30,000,000,000 in proprietors' equity, $8,000,000,000 was in cash, bank deposits, War bonds, and other quick assets, and from $500,000,000 to $800,000,000 was in debt reduction.

Real estate is the most valuable single asset owned by farm proprietors, including as proprietors the absentee landlords as well as the owner-operators. Bureau of the Census figures show the value of farm land and buildings to have been $33,600,000,000 in 1940. By 1944 such property was valued at $45,600,000,000.

MUST GUARD AGAINST RUN-AWAY BOOM

And now let me remind you of the dangers of a run-away boom in farm lands. Surveys made by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics indicate that about two-thirds of all farms bought during the last few years have been bought by farmers for operation by themselves. Buying both by farmers and nonfarmers has been active. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics further says that forces that could lead to a run-away boom like that of the last war are numerous and strong, including exceptionally high annual returns and an expectation on the part of a good many that good times will last at least for a year or two after the war; low interest rates on mortgages; small down payments, and low annual payments on mortgages; assistance to servicemen under the G. I. bill may increase demand for farm land; farm-land holders already have larger equities in higher-priced real estate, and thereby have been encouraged, in some cases, to buy additional tracts; and farmers have more money on hand, in banks and in United State Savings bonds than at any other time in the history of our country.

FARM MACHINERY AIDED RECORD PRODUCTION

We hear a great deal about the scarcity of farm machinery, and this subject was mentioned by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] before the Committee on Rules the other day. While the availability of machinery on farms has probably decreased somewhat during the last 2 to 3 years, many of the major types of machinery have increased in number. For example, the number of tractors on farms on January 1, 1942, was 1,845,000 and climbed to 1,940,000 by January 1, 1944. The number of combines increased from 269,000 to 303,000 during the same period. The number of milking machines jumped from 256,000 to 339,000.

Farm machinery and equipment was valued at $3,135,000,000 on January 1, 1940, and at $4,198,000,000 on January 1, 1944.

Purchases of farm machinery during the last 4 years were as follows: 1940, $956,000,000; 1941, $1,281,000,000; 1942, $718,000,000; and 1943, $577,000,000. These statistics disprove the charges of a great shortage of farm machinery.

I have offered my amendment providing that the appropriation be reduced to $4,500,000,000 which is the amount provided in the Senate bill, and, as I have said, I feel that should be sufficient. However, I realize that the powerful dairy interests, aided and abetted by the equally powerful milk combinations, livestock, and packing interests, will exert their utmost influence to defeat my amendment looking to this reduction in the amount proposed.

Mr. Chairman, I have devoted a great deal of time to studying this subject, and I regret exceedingly that I feel it to be my duty to call the attention of Members to the fact, among other things, that it is too far-reaching. As I stated last Friday on this floor, I have voted for and supported all these measures for extensions of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and in fact for all other measures designed to help agriculture, when I have felt the help was really necessary and that it would obtain for farmers a sufficient price for their products to leave them some profit for their labors. But today, when they are receiving, as I have said, from 200 to 400 percent more than they received for their commodities in 1932 and from 100 to 200 percent more than they received only 4 years ago, I feel there is no justification for voting these millions and millions of the taxpayers' money for the dairy interests, and livestock and packer combinations who twice have been indicted for conspiracy and wrongdoing and who are so hungry to make even greater profits that they continue to urge these additional hundreds of millions of dollars to put in their own jeans.

Most of the gentlemen from Wisconsin, Michigan, Nebraska, Minnesota, the Dakotas, and especially the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] have stated and restated that the Congress has pledged this additional financial help to the farmers to induce them to produce more milk.

They pointed out how badly food is needed to feed the Army and the civilian population. I restated that the prices farmers are receiving now and which they are permitted by the Office of Price Administration to receive, are high enough to be a sufficient inducement to them to put in large crops and also get all the milk they can from their cows. The gentlemen to whom I have referred are trying to make us believe that there is a shortage of food, including milk and cheese, and especially they point out the shortage of meat and butter. As to the last two commodities, I concede there is a shortage, but we have tremendous surpluses of all other agricultural commodities. Surely, there was a shortage of corn last year because the farmers refused to sell their corn, believing they would be able to obtain still higher prices, due to the magnanimity of Judge Marvin Jones, the War Food Administrator, and Mr. Chester Bowles, Price Administrator.

At that time we did have a great surplus of wheat, but by shrewd and selfish manipulation it was not permitted to be used as a substitute for the withheld corn.

GRANTING UNDESERVED SUBSIDIES MUST STOP

I repeat, I want farmers to receive good prices for everything they produce, but I do not want them or the processors of their products to be receiving unjustifiably high prices and at the same time demanding millions and millions more from the Public Treasury in the form of additional subsidies for dairy and livestock products. In addition thereto, we are allowing farmers millions of dollars for feed; a reduction in transportation costs; supplying them with war-prisoner labor at very reasonable costs.

I hope these unjustifiable, unnecessary, unreasonable appropriations for undeserved subsidies will be stopped.

Every reasonable and well-informed man knows that milk was selling for 95 cents a hundredweight a few years ago, and now it is selling for $2.75 a hundredweight, as I have heretofore pointed out. I have told you that synthetic cream is selling for 34 to 36 cents a pint. The same applies to cheese, eggs, poultry, and everything else that the farmers are producing.

I have also called attention to the high prices of meats, vegetables, and fruits. The President intended to hold down the prices of food and that is the reason he insisted on the payment of subsidies, but the farm- and dairy-interest lobbyists, the same as the livestock and packing-house lobbyists, are all crying for, urging, and demanding from the O. P. A. higher ceilings and from the C. C. C. greater subsidies.

I am informed that some of the farmers are ashamed to accept these subsidies,

and many manufacturers and businessmen feel that prices have gone high enough.

The biggest dairy interests, and the processors, of course, are receiving the larger portion of these subsidies; and I realize that, in spite of anything I may say or do now, in view of the lobbying activities of the dairy interests, and of these other special interests, the grainmen, livestock interests, vegetable producers' organizations, and meat packers will have their way in connection with this pending bill.

As to the packers, inquiry into their alleged heavy losses has so far been only perfunctory; and I urge that a deliberate, detailed, and thorough inquiry be made at an early date.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the price of meat has risen about 18 percent over the average price during the base period of 1936–39. During that base period the annual average earnings of the Big Eight packers was $22,383,000 a year; and, note this, earnings of $153,193,000 for the year 1944 alone—approximately seven times higher than the prewar level, and their profits were three times higher, even after deducting taxes, than the peacetime average.

I wish I had conveniently at hand some statistics for this year, but apparently no conclusive figures are yet available to show the earnings of these packers since the beginning of 1945. However, with unprecedented numbers of livestock now available, with the exception of hogs, and the profits so great, no responsible and informed Government official will trustfully accept the assertions of some of those speaking for the packers and meat processors that they are confronted with ruin and will be forced out of business unless the present price controls and regulations of the O. P. A. are promptly modified or adjusted to their special advantage.

I again express the fear that if these unconscionable subsidies are continued we will have the same condition we had under Mr. Hoover when we spent more than $500,000,000 in 1929 to keep up the price of wheat.

ADVISORY GROUPS

As I have stated, I have complete confidence in Judge Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator; Mr. Frank Hancock, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, with both of whom I served here in the House; and Mr. Chester Bowles, able Price Administrator. All are able, honest, and sincere gentlemen, but they are surrounded by advisory committees and are being urged daily by the various special interests and combinations to hike the prices higher and higher and they find it extremely hard, almost impossible, to resist the pressure.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and others call attention to the losses that have been sustained due to spoilages. Naturally, when handling millions and millions of tons of perishable food some of it is going to spoil, as it does even in the best regulated and most efficient private companies and among experienced and cautious shippers.

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS MUST BE TRUSTWORTHY

As to the charges or implications now afloat concerning the Commodity Credit Corporation, I have called attention to the fact that I feel that some of the Commodity Credit Corporation employees and officials, and some of the members of the advisory committees thereof, have not the interests of the organization or country at heart. I am sure that some of them have played into the hands of speculators, but in this connection I also know from experience in the fight I made in 1929 and 1930 against the stock exchange and board of trade manipulations that there are always some selfish men giving wings to groundless rumors which do not come from official sources but which are given out for the purpose of affecting the markets.

I shall soon introduce a bill for the imposition of heavy penalties upon anybody who makes these false reports or circulates them, or upon anybody who may give out advanced confidential official information before it is authorized to be given to the public generally. I am not going to contend that some of these officials, in whom we have complete confidence, may not have been misled by some of these advisory committeemen; in fact, I believe they have been in many instances, but I know further that whenever their attention was called to it, they endeavored to correct their action. I was, therefore, much pleased to hear the letter from Judge Marvin Jones read here, in which letter he assured the Congress that he is investigating alleged wrongdoing by anybody connected with the Commodity Credit Corporation or the War Food Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I must confess that the figures we have heard today, in addition to the figures shown in the hearings, leave me very much confused. It is pretty difficult to get any idea from these figures as to how much is really needed. In my opinion, the principal difference between the figures submitted by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], and the figures in the record of the hearings which have been referred to by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], is that the figures of the gentleman from Michigan apparently do not take into account any amounts which may be necessary to support the price of the basic commodities and other commodities upon which price supports rather than subsidies are in effect.

Undoubtedly we are going to need some additional funds for that purpose, but when you come to look at the figures in the record on page 47, showing the amount of stocks on hand at this time, you will find that there are over $2,000,000,000 worth of farm commodities now owned or under loan by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Some of those loans are going to be liquidated, some of the stocks are going to be sold during the coming year. That money will go into the revolving fund and will be available for making new loans or acquiring new stocks. So I am constrained to believe that we do not need $2,000,000,000. It seems to me the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, however, should take care of the situation during the coming year, assuming that we extend the life of the corporation for 1 year only.

I call your attention to the further fact that $910,000,000 of the figures which are in the hearings and which have been referred to by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] are contingent figures based upon what may be necessary after VE-day. Of course, no one knows when this is coming after VE-day, and no one knows just what effect it may have upon commodity prices. I think perhaps if we do not take those figures into consideration we will still be safe and prudent, because if there are further amounts necessary as a result of changes after VE-day, the Congress will provide them if they are needed to make good our commitments.

Then as a final conclusion as to whether or not the amounts covered in the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan are sufficient, I want to read just an extract from the statement of Marvin Jones before the Banking and Currency Committee, which is shown in the hearings on page 71. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] asked the following question of Mr. Jones:

> Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask one question about this $2,000,000,000 figure which I believe the Senate has reduced to one and a half billion dollars. What about that, Mr. Jones?
>
> Mr. JONES. We preferred the $2,000,000,000 because we felt, from the psychology of the situation, it was better to have an assurance, with this commitment lasting for 2 years, that we would have the full amount; that is, it would be desirable from every standpoint. The Senate committee took action cutting it to $1,500,000,000. I think it is probable that that will be sufficient for the period intended. If it is not, we can come back and ask for additional authority. I should have preferred that it be $2,000,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. We have there the opinion of the head of the War Food Administration that they would have preferred $2,000,000,000 for the 2-year period, but that they thought they might get along with one and one-half billion. Based upon that statement it seems to me that we are safe in adopting the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan, especially knowing that we will be in session most of the time and can come back and increase this amount if it is necessary.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that if we want to aid and assist the farmers of this country permanently, we have got to do something different than we are trying to do here in this bill. May I quote from the remarks made by the President

of the United States in his acceptance speech of July 2, 1932? I quote:

> We should repeal immediately those provisions of law that compel the Federal Government to go into the market and purchase, to sell, to speculate in farm products in a futile attempt to reduce farm surpluses.

If the President made that statement in order to reduce farm surpluses, he certainly would make the same statement or, at least, he should, in order to try to help the farmer secure a fair price for his commodities and his labor.

I have a great agricultural district, the finest in the land. I want to help the farmers, but I do not want to aid them for only 1 year now or for 2 years after the war. I want to aid them permanently. I want the farms on a sound business basis. The farmer does not want a hand-out or a dole. He wants a fair price for his commodities.

When I think of some of the things we do in order to get the farmers in that position, certainly I cannot acquiesce in the things we are doing here to help them, because I think we are only leading them to the greatest fall this Nation has ever seen, especially when the time comes that we cannot pay the farmers subsidies. You are taxing the farmer and giving him a hand-out. If you Members of Congress think for a minute that the time is always going to be here when we will have $1,000,000,000, as was said awhile ago, to quibble over, or $2,000,000,000, to quibble over, you will find that some day we will not have any dollars to pay the farmers any subsidies. A billion dollars to me is more than a quibble.

I heard John Brandt, president of Land O' Lakes, give an address at the Mayflower Hotel a few weeks ago. He deals altogether with farmers. He said: "The quicker we have the farmers get behind the Government's paying the cost of production and giving them payment for the hours they spend in working on the farm, the better it will be for the farmers." I quite agree with him, because then we will give the farmer a price for his commodity that will not drop down after the war is over, and he will be able to continue to furnish the foodstuffs this country and other countries of the world would like to have, at a fair price to the farmer. We should do it without paying the farmers a subsidy or a dole.

How many farmers in this country want to be on the charity of the Government? I say none of them. I do not believe in it myself. I would not want it for myself. What are they doing to me on my farm? They give me lime, they give me fertilizer, they give me a subsidy for milk, and they give me a subsidy for the program of the agriculture adjustment program this administration has adopted. I receive their checks, and I pay them out to charity, because I believe I can do more good with that money that way than if I turned it back to this administration to let them squander it. I would just like to give you a list of the money I have gotten for my farm in the last 2 years, and most every farmer gets subsidies in lime, fertilizer, or checks from a Treasury that is drained dry. Farmers, wake up before it is too late; these checks cannot always come to you, but taxes can, and they will. So beware if you would save your farm.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman knows that while he was not here we did our best to stop these subsidies in the last session of Congress, but the President vetoed the bill.

Mr. RICH. Did the gentleman hear me read what the President said? Let me give the gentleman another quotation from the President.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He did not mean it.

Mr. RICH. He does not mean it; no. He has fooled more people in this country than any man who ever lived.

The President said in his address at Atlanta, Ga., on October 24, 1932:

> We are certainly paying enough for the Department of Agriculture to get something more useful than we are now getting. I have always proposed its reorganization. I am going to insist that we get more service for the farmers for less money.

Would not that make you laugh? What a joke he is making out of his promises. He has no respect for his word.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. May I point out that this measure is not in whole a measure to help the farmers, because $913,000,000 of it is a consumer subsidy that is paid to the consumers of this country. If the farmers are going to produce food, they must be reimbursed for what is given to the consumers.

Mr. RICH. If we wanted to help the farmer we would get him what it costs to produce the food plus a profit for his time, for the articles he produces, and we would stop having to subsidize the farmers for their work.

Farmers, just remember some day you will be sorry for this procedure of subsidies. Farmers, you will not always receive subsidies but you will always pay taxes. Let us farmers fight for honest prices for our labor and for our produce. That is what we need and want and that is what I am for, to help the farmer and to keep our country solvent.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Reserving the right to object, may I say to the gentleman that I have been on my feet now for 1 solid hour seeking every 5 minutes to get recognition. I have not been able to get recognition for reasons best known to the Chair, and I have no objection; but I want to ask some questions about this proposition. There are a lot of things I do not yet understand, and I think there are a lot of men on this floor who do not understand the situation yet. Why does not the gentleman let us go on for just a little while?

Mr. SPENCE. We have been going on for quite a while. I have no disposition to close debate, but if we continue at this rate we will not get through today.

Mr. KEEFE. I think we will get through much faster, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPENCE. I withdraw the request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that he gives prior recognition to members of the committee, and then alternates between the respective sides.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the statement of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] and also in the letter which came down from the Chairman of the War Food Administration.

The gentleman from New York, Representative TABER, asked about soap. I notice that at page 1972 of the RECORD, March 9, the distinguished and able gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] included in his attack upon the Commodity Credit Corporation a charge that 20,000,000 pounds of lard in storage tanks at Cincinnati, Ohio, had been allowed to spoil and, therefore, had to be turned over to soapmakers for manufacture into soap.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] does well to raise question concerning this transaction. The inquiry he suggests should be pressed, I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will pursue it diligently, even after he begins to learn the facts.

Now my understanding of this affair differs somewhat from that of the gentleman from New York. In the first place I do not believe the Commodity Credit Corporation was at fault. I believe that the investigation the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] requests will show that the Office of Distribution in the War Food Administration exercised a controlling influence in what was done.

Now let us see what that was. Of course, I only report on the basis of hearsay evidence. I do not make charges. I will reserve accusations until the matter is investigated. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] demands investigation. I support him in that demand.

On hearsay, then, I suggest that perhaps the facts of the matter were something like this. A year ago lard was being produced in great quantities. It was a banner year. The War Food Administration claimed it could not find storage space for all the lard. Lard was removed from the rationing list. And lard, edible lard, was released to soapmakers for manufacture into soap.

This was done because, as I said, the Food Administration claimed there was not enough storage space for all the lard, and I do not want to be understood to confirm that claim. On the contrary it is one of the matters I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will seek to have investigated, because we and the whole wide world stand at this

moment in great need of additional fats and oils, both edible and inedible, and there are many in liberated nations of Europe who are desperately hungry for food fats, and for soap fats, but they shall not receive them from us because we cannot supply them in adequate quantities. Why we cannot supply them, within 1 year of the greatest fat glut in our domestic history is one of the things that needs to be investigated, very thoroughly investigated, and I trust the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is going to follow through on that to the bitter end. He will find me standing right by his side.

So, as I said, lard was turned over to soapmakers and they used it and made soap with it. Two hundred million pounds of edible lard went into soap, I understand.

By the fall of last year the glut of lard had disappeared. Indeed there was no glut but an increasing scarcity. What every economist in the Department of Agriculture knew very well in the spring of 1944, finally became apparent to the War Food Administration in the fall of 1944. A sharp reduction in hog breeding late in 1943 had resulted in a smaller number of baby pigs being born in the spring of 1944 and a sharply reduced supply of hogs to market in the fall of 1944.

So by November the lard glut had been turned into a lard shortage, and the War Food Administration on November 13, 1944, issued an order saying "No more edible lard is to be made into soap."

Now the soap industry had seen this 2,000,000 pounds of edible lard sitting in soap makers' tanks at Ivorydale, Ohio, and belonging to the War Food Administration. It wanted that lard because it wanted more soap to sell. Soap sales are profitable, very profitable, especially when sold at very fancy prices with very fine perfume to the American consumer. How profitable they are you only have to turn on your radio to discover. You will find endless, and I might say tedious, hours of soap entertainment—if you call it that—pouring out of your loudspeaker. And I do not need to tell any of you that those hours cost money. They cost plenty of money, and they are not being paid for by soap makers unless there is a good profit coming back to them as a result of that expenditure.

Well, mind you, when you have a commodity that is highly profitable to make and sell, and you want more raw material to make it with, there is likely to be some way to get hold of that raw material. A good profit is a strong magnet; it attracts unto itself that which has an affinity with it.

And, as I heard told—and again this is only a hearsay which the gentleman from New York and I are going to get investigated if we can—the soap companies did get that 20,000,000 pounds of edible lard.

Here is how they went about it: It so happens that the Army needs a lot of soap. It wants more soap, I understand, than the soap companies have been willing to sell it. The trouble with the Army is that it wants cheap soap, yellow bar soap. It wants this for its own use and for civilian populations in Europe and elsewhere.

Now yellow bar soap is just plain, ordinary soap, good for washing and not good for much else. At any rate, it is not good for high-powered radio puffing at a high profit. The Army is a generous buyer, I am sure, pays a good price for everything, but obviously the Army is not paying the soap companies a price for yellow soap that is anything like so profitable as the dainty little smelled-up soaps and suds that are sold to housewives by means of the soap operas.

Knowing what comes first in the minds of so many manufacturers—and surely is not missing from the minds of soap manufacturers—I do not find it hard to understand why the Army had trouble getting enough cheap soap when there is such a fine market for expensive and highly profitable soap right here at home.

At any rate, as I understand and want the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to find out about, the soap companies promised the Army they would sell it more of the kind of soap it wants if it would get them that 20,000,000 pounds of edible lard owned by the War Food Administration and stored in tanks at Ivorydale.

Some time late last year—I am not sure when this was—the War Food Administration offered this lard to packers to be used as food. In December the lard was inspected by Government inspectors and found to be in need of reconditioning to make it suitable for food use. It was found that this could easily be done, and that 98 percent of the 20,000,000 pounds could be recovered as edible lard. So it was offered to the food trades on that basis, and the offer was accepted. It was just about to go back into our total supplies of food fats, where, as anyone can see now, it was badly needed.

That is when the soap companies stepped in. By offering to meet military soap requirements more adequately if the Army would do this little favor for them, they persuaded someone in the Army to go to the Office of Distribution and say that the Army wanted to buy that 20,000,000 pounds of edible lard.

The War Food officials complied. They canceled the arrangements to deliver it to the food trade and turned it over to the Army. Shortly thereafter, or to be exact, at 2 p. m., eastern war time, on January 18, 1945, the War Food Administration announced that "approximately 20,000,000 pounds of off-condition prime steam lard has been released to the Army." Further, the announcement said, the War Food Administration, acting as agent for the Army, was offering this lard to five soap manufacturers who had soap contracts with the Army, the amount each soap maker was to get being determined by Army allocation.

So that is how Mr. TABER'S lard got to be turned into soap, and if he wants to investigate how it happened I want to suggest to him that he start with the soap companies to see by what kind of pressure, through what extremities, they were able to persuade the Army and the War Food Administration to turn edible lard into soap. If it will help him with his inquiries, I can tell him what soap companies got that lard and how much went to each. Here they are:

	Pounds
Procter & Gamble Distributing Co., Cincinnati	8,600,000
Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co., Jersey City	6,045,000
Lever Bros., Cambridge, Mass	2,790,000
Armour & Co. Soap Works, Chicago	1,865,000
Manhattan Soap Co., New York	700,000

Now I want it to be very clearly understood I have made no charges against the soap companies, or the Army, or the War Food Administration. I have recited hearsay for the benefit of Mr. TABER'S investigation, and I wish him Godspeed.

And by the way, it may be true that when this lard was delivered to soap companies, it was, as the War Food Administration said on January 18, "off condition." I have heard that U. N. R. R. A. learned that this lard was about to be taken out of the food supply and diverted to soap, and wanted it very badly for food use and tried to get it, and learned that it had been inspected not long before and was found, as I said, 98 percent edible after reconditioning. But U. N. R. R. A. possibly was no match for soap companies in getting what it wants. At any rate, it did not get it. Shortly thereafter, as I understand, the lard was denaturalized so that there would be no question then that it could not be used for food. After being denaturalized, soap was all it was good for.

I say we should have an investigation but we should place the responsibility. By the way it may be true that when this lard was delivered to the soap companies it was, as the War Food Administrator said on January 18, off condition. U. N. R. R. A. wanted that food but U. N. R. R. A. did not have, well let us say, the pull that the soap companies of this country had. It is about time we investigated this thing to find out exactly where the fault lies.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. If the lard had spoiled, what earthly reason would U. N. R. R. A. want it for?

Mr. HOOK. The lard was not spoiled. By a renovation process they could make it 98 percent edible, and only 2 percent would have been lost.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly U. N. R. R. A. would not want any spoiled lard.

Mr. HOOK. But there was only 2 percent of it spoiled. They could have renovated 20,000,000 pounds and only lost 2 percent. Ninety-eight percent would have been edible.

Mr. BREHM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOOK. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Is it not true, that the points on lard were raised to the consumers at the same time this lard was in storage and being permitted to spoil?

Mr. HOOK. That is right. The gentleman is absolutely correct and I wish to thank him for his able contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Wisconsin may proceed for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to see if we cannot agree to close debate on this section and all amendments thereto.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes after the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has concluded.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to note that so many individuals are now pressing for an inquiry and demanding an investigation of the facts which were very sketchily disclosed on the floor of this House by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself recently. In order that they may be accommodated, may I say that I have prepared a resolution to cover this whole subject matter and it will be offered at a very appropriate time. Then all of the gentlemen who are so vociferously seeking to clear the air I hope will get behind that resolution and provide a very searching inquiry into the operations of all Government corporations as well as the Commodity Credit Corporation itself.

Mr. Chairman, I should like the attention of the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, if I may, because I confess to some confusion of thought, and I am satisfied that there are a lot of other Members on this floor who are confused in their thinking, and that the argument thus far has tended to increase the confusion rather than to to clarify it.

With reference to the particular amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] called attention to the fact that the hearings on page 28 disclosed the attitude of the Commodity Credit Corporation in asking for an increase of their borrowing authority from three to five billions. The gentleman from Michigan seeks to cut that borrowing authority to $4,000,000,000. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] seeks to cut it to $4,500,000,000. There is the choice that now rests with the Congress. As one Member who has been somewhat critical of the operations of the War Food Administration and the Commodity Credit Corporation may I say that I think the spirit and purpose behind the law is one that cannot be dispensed with and that I would not support a motion to recommit this bill.

I believe that the farm support program that has been announced in the way of a contract with agriculture in this country, must be carried out. The only question in my mind is how much borrowing authority does the Commodity Credit Corporation need in order to carry out its commitments?

If you will turn to page 28 of the hearings you will find that the Commodity Credit Corporation gave the committee these figures: Their estimated net obligations for loans, purchases and expenditures from November 1, 1944, to December 31, 1945, was $2,178,778,000. You will note that is for a period of 14 months. For the period from November 1, 1944, to December 31, 1945, they say they will need $2,178,778,000.

They further say that they have as against that obligation $811,365,000 in available borrowing capacity as of October 31, 1944, and in addition they say they have $21,448,000 in cash. They further say that they have an appropriation estimate pending before the Congress in which they are asking for $256,765,000 to make good an estimated impairment in their capital structure.

Now here is what concerns me: This is a bill to extend the Commodity Credit Corporation for 2 years—2 years, not from October 31, 1944, but for 2 years from June 30, 1945. Please note that. They say, "We need a portion of this $2,178,000,000 to carry us from June 30, 1945, to December 31, 1945." If I read the figures correctly, this proposed increase they are asking for will only carry them to December 31, 1945, which is 6 months of the 2-year period of extension. Am I right or wrong?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman is right.

Mr. KEEFE. Very well, I am right. Then what you are asking in effect is this: You are asking for $2,000,000,000 of additional borrowing authority which it is estimated will only carry this Corporation through to December 31, 1945, and you are asking that the Corporation be extended for a year and a half further. What do you expect to do in the other year and a half? Do you expect to come back here and get additional borrowing authority?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. We will have to, and I thought everybody understood that.

Mr. KEEFE. All right; just so we understand it. Then you will expect on the same basis that the increase in borrowing authority sometime between now and December 31, 1945, will have to be extended another two or three billion dollars; is that right?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. No, sir. If VE-day does not come before then, we will not, but if VE-day comes before that time we will have to ask for more money. This $910,000,000 is included in the $2,000,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; the $910,000,000, which is purely speculative as to what may happen in the event the war ends, is included in the $2,000,000,000.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. But if you require $2,178,000,000 to run your program for a period of 14 months, as contemplated by these figures, you will have to have, to conduct your regular program, in addition to this speculative program, at least half again as much as that in order to carry out your program for the year and 8 months.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman understands that these are commitments already made.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand. But the point I am making is this: I cannot see where you are going to have money enough to carry this program through further than to December 31 this year; is that right?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. They certainly cannot pay the gentleman's dairy people or the other commodity growers nearly as much money——

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman misunderstands me. Please listen to what I say.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman is asking me a question and I will either answer it or not answer. I know the gentleman is a friend to the farmers and I will do my best to give him a correct answer.

Mr. KEEFE. Are you going to have more than enough money to carry you under this borrowing authority beyond December 31?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. If we do not get the $2,000,000,000, we cannot carry out the commitments to the farmers, including the dairy people.

Mr. KEEFE. I am sorry the gentleman does not answer my question. I am not in opposition to the thing. I am seeking information. I hope the gentleman will take time to answer it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ].

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the afternoon the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] made a statement, in all sincerity, I am sure, but nevertheless an erroneous statement, which should not go unchallenged or uncorrected. The gentleman from Missouri said, in calling attention to the strikes in the insular island of Puerto Rico, that some people down there were opposed to increasing the subsidy paid by Commodity Credit there to a sum comparable to that in continental United States, because they wanted the Government to take over the sugar industries. The inference should not be that Governor Tugwell or other insular officials are opposed to either increasing the price or paying the higher subsidy.

As a matter of fact, in the last few days Governor Tugwell testified before the Committee on Insular Affairs in positive and strong terms in favor of increasing that subsidy and, in fact, said that it was an outrage that the insular sugar producers were not paid the same subsidy as in this country.

It must be said, however, in all fairness to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] that he was not present at some of those hearings. If these strikes down there continue and if a Federal administrator is appointed, it would not be fair for this House to be under the impression that the people in the island or Governor Tugwell were responsible. The full responsibility for the lack of higher payments of subsidies to the sugar industry

of Puerto Rico lies with the Commodity Credit Corporation here and not with any officials in the island government. All of the people from the island who attended the hearing that we had in the last few days testified in favor of it in the strongest terms possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to make a correction in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] and also our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], stated here on the floor that the administration, or that we as a Congress, have guaranteed a 90 percent parity floor for 2 years after the war is over. Of course, we have as far as the basic commodities are concerned, because they have loan provisions; and with that also goes basic legislation that controls that production. These nonbasic commodities do not have any guaranty of 90 percent of parity for 2 years after the war unless the Secretary of Agriculture so desires. I think that that should be made very clear not only here, but everywhere. I read many agricultural papers, and the information is going across the country that there is nothing to worry about; that the farms are going to get 90 percent of parity for 2 years after the war. If anybody is familiar with the production of food after the last war, he will find that most of our difficulties came in the production that took place after the war was over.

The facts should be given that these and loose statements about 90 percent of parity guaranty 2 years after the war.

Therefore, I do not think it is a good policy for the country to get the idea that they are guaranteeing that. I might say that this year they have limited the support of 90 percent of parity to some commodities, and limited it to the amount of the commodity that they want, which is surely in the line of reason, something that I think the War Food Administration should follow. It is a good policy to follow.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of urging the chairman or another member of the committee to answer the question propounded by the gentleman from Wisconsin a moment ago. I would like to know, How long will the money provided in this bill enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry on, on an efficient and effective operating basis?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Until the 31st day of December of this year.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Wisconsin was correct.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. They estimated in October or the 1st of November what it would take them to run them up to the 31st of December of this year, and their estimate was $2,000,000,000. They estimated that on VE-day, if it came any time soon, they would need $910,000,000 to operate the Corporation to carry out its obligations to the farmers for 1 year, and that is included in the $2,000,000,000. I think the main difference between what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] had in mind and this figure is the VE-day expectations.

Mr. COOLEY. Without getting into the discussion of VE-day, what I have in mind is this: Is the gentleman from Wisconsin correct in his summary of the situation, and is the gentleman from Georgia correct in his statement that the funds provided here will carry the activities until the end of this calendar year?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. If this is cut $1,000,000,000 by the Wolcott amendment, have we not destroyed the Commodity Credit Corporation for the remainder of the year? I hope somebody will clear that up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I trust this Congress and the country will understand that the legislation under consideration today, providing for millions and billions for food subsidies, is really a consumer food subsidy bill and not a farm subsidy bill. Our Government has put ceilings on farm products below cost of production. So the Government, through the Commodity Credit Corporation and other organizations, authorizes payments to make up what the farmer would otherwise lose, and to further stimulate the production of food. So the increase of $2,000,000,000 requested is for consumer protection. So long as the limit or ceiling price on farm commodities is fixed below the cost of production, under the policy established by the Government, there is nothing else to do but provide subsidies to take care of the difference of what the producer would have been entitled if he had received a parity price for his products.

Mr. Chairman, the particular thing to which I want to direct your attention at this time is that the Commodity Credit Corporation is not the only Government agency that is disbursing subsidies from the Federal Treasury. We have another agency, the Defense Supplies Corporation that distributes millions and billions of dollars in subsidies. A big share of subsidies paid out by the Defense Supplies Corporation is to make up for what is known as the roll-back on particular items of food. Most of it really is paid to the meat packers and other food processors.

We have heard a lot of discussion today about the need of subsidies on milk and milk products. As a matter of fact we are going to need more subsidies than are now being paid if we are expected to keep up our production of milk in this country. We have been talking also about subsidies on butter, flour, meat, and sugar.

In order to make up for the so-called "roll back" price on butter alone, the Defense Supplies Corporation $6,500,000 per month. Our Government has already expended approximately $120,000,000 on butter "roll back" subsidies. Let us look at flour. In order to hold flour in line, the processors are getting subsidies at the rate of seven and a half million dollars a month. We have already spent about $90,000,000 in flour subsidies. Sugar has been mentioned. The Defense Supplies allocated approximately $25,000,000 for sugar last year.

Now let us take a look at the meat situation. I mention that in particular because there is discussion about meat shortages, and about the ceiling price on live cattle as well as on the various grades of meat. You will recall that some time ago the O. P. A. "rolled" the prices of meat back. On beef it was 2 cents per pound. Do you know that the "roll back" on the price of meat has already cost the Federal Treasury $650,000,000. Right now we are turning over to the meat processors, to take care of the "roll back," the sum of $40,000,000 per month.

Mr. Chairman, incidentally here are some further figures that might be of interest. There is being spent from the Federal Treasury subsidies to the tune of $2,500,000 a month on meat shipped to countries abroad. I assume mostly under lend-lease. Subsidies on butter shipped abroad cost approximately $500,000 per month. Last year foreign shipments of flour cost our Government around $4,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know the extent of the commitments of the Defense Supplies Corporation in subsidies. Perhaps some member of this committee can supply this information.

Mr. STEFAN. I think these commitments of the Defense Supplies Corporation would run about $1,000,000,000. But that is in every category, including materials, and so forth. It is true it includes flour, meat, and butter. Those are some of the items.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank my distinguished colleague from Nebraska for this information. He is one of the diligent members of the great Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I feel the Congress and the people of this country ought to know we have at least two big corporations of Government dealing with, and paying, subsidies on certain foodstuffs and farm products. I believe a member of the committee in charge of this measure explained there had been a cost of $838,000,000 under the Commodity Credit Corporation to support and stabilize the price of farm products. To make the picture complete, you will need to take into consideration the sum of $860,000,000 to support the program of "rolling" them back. Do not forget it must all be paid in taxes. Why not have one agency, instead of two, deal with this problem. As it stands we have a sort of paradox. One agency disburses funds from the Federal Treasury to support and stabilize prices, the other distributes funds from the Treasury so it can "roll" the prices back.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there are only 2 questions involved here. One is whether or not we are going to authorize an agent to make a contract with producers and others

and then supply him with the funds with which to carry it out. I am struck with this situation in addition. The gentleman from Michigan has announced he proposes to offer an amendment to increase the dairy production subsidy payment from $526,000,000 to $568,000,000. Then, as appears on page 28 of the hearings, cheese will get $18,000,000; fluid milk, $14,000,000; and it would give dairy products $600,000,000 of the $1,000,000,000. Yet, the same gentleman who proposes to offer that amendment proposes to cut the money down from $2,000,000,000 to $1,000,000,000. It does not seem to me a proper position for 1 commodity to take $600,000,000 and limit the funds to $1,000,000,000. I believe there are, including the basic and war crops, between 25 and 30 crops which must be protected under this fund. It seems to me that it is improper for 1 commodity to take $600,000,000, and you will get that on page 23 of the hearings, and then leave only $400,000,000 for wheat, for corn, for cotton, and for all of the war crops. I would much rather see you vote to cut this authority down from 2 years to 1 year than to see you vote to cut this money from $5,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000. I say to you quite candidly, from my study of this matter, I think it would be a very serious mistake.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. OUTLAND].

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to use these 2 minutes at my disposal for one purpose only, and that is to call the attention of the House to remarks made a few moments ago in debate on this bill by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. I tried to get him to yield to me at that time. I am sorry he did not yield to me because I dislike very much going back to a point previously made. If I am not misquoting, the gentleman from Pennsylvania at that time said the person who had fooled more Americans than any other person was the President of the United States. I am astounded that any Member of Congress should make such a remark. Now, ladies and gentlemen of the House, we can debate honorably on the floor of this House; we can debate issues; but when we are engaged in war, it is no time to make remarks like that in committee or on the floor of this House about the President of the United States. They reek of partisanship, prejudice, and politics.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OUTLAND. I certainly will.

Mr. RICH. I do not apologize for that statement in any sense of the word. I mean every word of it.

Mr. OUTLAND. The gentleman should apologize, however.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ROE].

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, having been engaged extensively in the grain business for the last 40 years, I am keenly interested in this question. To corroborate what the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] just said a few moments ago, grain is now being redeemed freely daily by the hundreds of thousands of bushels. In our own bank we had Commodity Credit Corporation loans of nearly $300,000. They are nearly all paid off.

We have two different propositions in this proposal. We have the support proposition for the farmers for their basic crops. I am in favor of that. We have the consumer subsidy proposition. I am opposed to that. It is absolutely unsound economically. I am going to vote for this amendment and the following amendment for this reason, that I want subsidies to stop just as soon as the war stops; and I hope that will be soon.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] is recognized.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to what I have been talking about for a long time in this House, namely, the fact that in the State of Nebraska there have been over 100,000,000 bushels of corn on the ground, much of it in danger of spoilage. I repeat that statement in order to get the attention of the War Food Administration in an effort on the part of the farmers, businessmen, and various organizations in Nebraska to save that corn and put it to some use. I understand some effort has been made to get us some cribbage material and additional boxcars, but that is not solving the question. I understand that 75 percent of that 100,000,000 bushels of corn is still on the ground and must be moved. It contains considerable moisture. I think it is vitally important for the War Food Administration and agencies of the Government to take some recognition of the fact that in Nebraska the farmers raised the corn that the Government asked them to raise, and that it is on the ground, in danger of spoiling.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The same situation prevails in the State of Kansas and other States in the Southwest with respect to grain sorghums, and also corn. Unless we get some relief soon many millions of bushels of grain will be lost.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is absolutely right. That situation exists not only in Kansas and in South Dakota, but mainly in the State of Nebraska. I think something should have been done about it a long time ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, in 2 minutes I cannot begin to say how I feel the danger that would accompany the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], and at the same time advert to observations made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], to the effect that surely we have not reached the point where, in passing on this bill, we will try somebody that may have committed some wrong in the Office of War Food Administration or the Food Distribution Service. I think we might just as well authorize nothing as to authorize less than the $2,000,000,000. Already since we have been in this House considering the bill and amendments offered, we have been told that instead of the need being $2,000,000,000, it is $2,178,000,000, with the definite probability that if the war in Europe should come to an end that amount would be increased. The extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation has nothing to do with the amounts required in this authorization for borrowing. We will come to that when that time comes.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOLGER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. What effect will the Wolcott amendment have, if adopted, upon the effective operation of the Corporation?

Mr. FOLGER. I will not make any "ifs" about it. In my opinion it will make it impossible for the War Food Administration to operate or the Commodity Credit Corporation to meet the obligations which it has already under authority of Congress, made with the farmers of this country, and led them to believe they would receive.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this amount has been increased from $2,000,000,000 for 2 years up to over $2,000,000,000 for the balance of this year. It has gotten to the ridiculous stage, so let us get back to the figures. Who knows more about this program than Marvin Jones? But first let me say that the total losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the 4 years 1942, 1943, 1944, and 1945, the last year being an estimate, are only $1,208,098,481. They have under loan and owned, crops of the value of $2,031,392,046.03, much of which will come back to them in cash when it is disposed of. All right, they have had losses of $1,200,000,000 over 4 years. They have assets in warehouses and as security for loans amounting to $2,031,000,000.

If you will turn to page 71 of the hearings, you will see where Marvin Jones testified as follows:

> Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask one question about this $2,000,000,000 figure which I believe the Senate has reduced to one and a half billion dollars. What about that, Mr. Jones?
>
> Mr. JONES. We preferred the $2,000,000,000 because we felt, from the psychology of the situation, it was better to have an assurance, with this commitment lasting for 2 years, that we would have the full amount; that is, it would be desirable from every standpoint. The Senate committee took action cutting it to $1,500,000,000. I think it is probable that that will be sufficient for the period intended.

Marvin Jones thinks $1,500,000,000 is all right for 2 years. Surely $1,000,000,000 is enough for 1 year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized for 2 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, on page 3 of the hearings is the statement of Judge Jones who told the committee in commenting on the amount of money that was requested that $2,000,000,000 additional authorization is needed by the Commodity Credit Corporation. I quote his language:

> That is a considerable amount of money, but, as we see it, it is needed in

order to have assurance in advance that we will be able to comply with the policy laid down by the Congress, and it is a policy that I regard as a wise one.

It seems to me that many of these questions that disturb us because they are terribly complicated and hard to answer can often be resolved on the simple basis of faith in the man who administers the fund. It would be hard to find a man who holds the confidence of this Congress any more than Marvin Jones does. He has had legislative experience, he is a man of integrity, he is a wise man; and now he has had administrative experience. He states on the basis of that experience that the $2,000,000,000 is needed.

On page 4 of the hearings he tells us why this money is needed, and then he does what every wise man does, to regard a figure as relative; and he places it against the enormous amount of money that we are spending for other munitions of war; and in the light of war costs it is a small amount of money. If all of the $2,000,000,000 were lost to the Government it would be less than 2 weeks' cost of the war that is now in its fourth year; and I submit to the Congress that there is not any way for us to give assurance to the farmers of the country that the commitments heretofore made with them will be carried out except to continue this authorization for 2 years and to grant the full amount that Judge Jones says is necessary. The difference between dealing with industry and agriculture is that we can pay the manufacturer prescribed cash sums, we can make a contract with him, individually or at least with a few persons—but when we deal with six and one-half million individual farmers, the only way we can increase production is to lay out a plan, invite these six and one-half million farmers to make commitments and assure them that Congress will do its share by maintaining adequate prices. We must not weaken in those commitments which the Congress has previously made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired; all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment to the amendment be read again.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment will be read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABATH to the amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Strike out $4,000,000,000 and insert $4,500,000,000.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 109, noes 103.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. SPENCE and Mr. WOLCOTT to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 125, noes 154.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The last paragraph of section 2 (c) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, shall not apply to the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation designed to support prices or obtain production of agricultural commodities, or to absorb abnormal costs in connection with the transportation of agricultural commodities and foods.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, frankly, I feel very much relieved now that the Wolcott amendment is defeated. I am very much afraid the House did not fully appreciate the ultimate effect the amendment might have upon the operations of this very important agency.

I want to speak generally about the pending measure. Perhaps a motion will be offered to recommit the bill. Much has been said about rascality of some type or another in the Commodity Credit Corporation. I agree with what the gentleman from Kentucky said in opening this debate today. We are not now dealing with individual crooks or criminals. The issue clearly before Congress at the moment is the issue of the life or death of the one agency of the Government which has contributed more to the welfare of agriculture than perhaps all the other agencies of the Government combined.

Another important issue involved in this controversy is the faith and integrity of Congress itself. The question is whether or not we intend to redeem the pledges we have heretofore made to the farmers of this Nation. Certainly there can be no political considerations in deciding questions of this importance. I think the Republicans have exactly the same interest in this measure as Democrats. Certainly I could have no interest in the passage of this law that you and you and the whole House should not likewise have.

This agency serves not only those engaged in agriculture, as has been pointed out here and as is understood by all of us, it serves the Nation at large. Through the subsidy program it protects the consumers of the Nation. By protecting the consumers of the Nation in the manner in which they are protected, to that degree the forces of inflation are controlled.

Speaking of inflation, may I divert a moment from the bill to say that I am not in accord with the views of some of our farm leaders in America who are constantly warning the investing public against investing in farm lands in this Nation. They are telling the people that land values have reached inflationary proportions; that it is no longer safe to invest in farm lands; that such an investment will bring the investor to great grief. I cannot be alarmed about inflationary farm values. Cotton, one of the great agricultural commodities of this Nation, is now selling below the cost of production, and is now being supported in a price program by the Government to the tune in an aggregate sum of $100,000,000. I cannot get excited about the possibilities of land values going to inflationary levels when I realize that flax, another important crop, is selling below the cost of production; when I realize that the peanut crop of America, the entire production, is now being purchased by the Federal Government; and when I realize that other agricultural commodities are being heavily subsidized by the Government. Frankly, I do not believe that land values have reached an inflationary level. I believe that every acre of American farm land is well worth the price it will bring today on the open market. Yet these leaders of ours, some in and some out of Congress, are saying to the investing public, "Do not invest in farm land." Can you imagine the president of some public utility such as a power company or railroad company or even a banking institution, going on the radio, saying to the public, "Do not invest in the stock of this corporation; it has now reached inflationary levels." You and I know that such an officer would be faithless to his trust and would be dismissed. Yet, we from the agricultural sections, apparently countenance such propaganda as that which is being spread throughout the country warning the public not to invest in farm land. This measure, of course, is calculated to control the forces of inflation.

How can it be said that land values have gone to inflationary levels when we realize the fact that farm income has doubled in recent years and land values have not gone up in proportion nor even to where they were during the last World War.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. I agree with the gentleman that land values, in most cases at least, are not now at inflationary levels. But the gentleman will recall that following the last war when we did really have inflationary land values, most of the increase took place after the war ended, and that at the present time land values have gone up further during this war than they did during the last war.

Mr. COOLEY. At the same time I will remind my friend of the fact that income on the farms likewise has gone up. I will remind the gentleman further of the fact that we did not control the forces of inflation during the last war and immediately thereafter as we are attempting to do today. Neither did our national debt reach the level it has now reached. The things that alarm me are items such as this which I saw in the press yesterday, indicating that some suggestion has been made that a ceiling of some sort be placed on farm land values or that some profit tax be imposed upon the farmer when he sells his property. Pray tell me how can there be any fairness in such a proposition?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do I understand the gentleman correctly to have said that the Government is now purchasing the entire peanut crop?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And other crops?

Mr. COOLEY. The Government is purchasing the entire peanut crop and selling it at a profit of $13 a ton.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the Government can do that, how do you figure that farm values are going to fall, if the Government is going to purchase the farm crops?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman must have misunderstood me. I have not suggested that farm values were going to fall. They will not fall. They are going up.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They will not fall because the Government is going to purchase the crops after cutting the price; is that it?

Mr. COOLEY. No, sir. I do not think they are going to fall under our present economy nor immediately in the postwar period.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield briefly.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not true that Secretary Wickard has proposed legislation that would take 90 percent of the profit on any increased value on farm land, though other corporations get away with 25 percent?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know about that. No such a bill or suggestion as that has been brought to my attention. Certainly, it would not be seriously considered by the Congress. With reference to this subsidy program, I am interested primarily, of course, in the tobacco crop. I am interested in cotton. I am likewise interested in the peanut crop and in naval stores. On those four crops, gentlemen, the Government has made money under this program. On peanuts, in round numbers, $10,000,000; on cotton, in round numbers, $106,000,000; on tobacco, in round numbers, $8,000,000; and on naval stores approximately $4,000,000. That is where the profit has been made. Money has been lost on other crops but I am sure that much good has been accomplished.

Just one more word about inflation: If we are not able to maintain land values and commodity prices at or about present levels, and if we are not able to maintain our national income at or about the present level, we cannot pay the national debt, which is steadily mounting. We must, therefore, maintain a high national income and to do that we must have a continuity of employment, high land values, and commodity prices.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, it looks as though we will be going until about 7 o'clock. I am going to object to any extension of time under the 5-minute rule. We must clear this bill tonight if we can.

AN ATTEMPT TO SUPPRESS THE PRESS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Labor Digest, purporting to be published in behalf of labor at Indianapolis, Ind., finds the National Labor Relations Board on its trail.

It appears to be an independent labor publication, published monthly. It carries an editorial on the first page of its February 1945 issue, stating that it is in agreement with William Green, John L. Lewis, and the Tobin leadership of the teamsters' union on the proposition that the National Labor Relations Board is not all it pretends to be.

It calls attention to the fact that Lewis and many A. F. of L. leaders are now demanding repeal of the National Labor Relations Act, and then charges that an examiner for the N. L. R. B., Dorothy Craig, is touring the territory served by the Labor Digest, on Government salary and at Government expense, slandering the publication to its advertisers and subscribers because the N. L. R. B. does not agree with the editorial policy of the paper.

A letter from Miss Craig, dated January 19, 1945, on the stationery of the National Labor Relations Board, St. Louis, Mo., addressed to the H. A. Douglas Co., Bronson, Mich., reads as follows:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD,
St. Louis, Mo., January 19, 1945.

H. A. DOUGLAS CO.,
Bronson, Mich.

GENTLEMEN: I am investigating a matter involving an Indianapolis publication, edited by Norman A. Zolezzi, called the Labor Digest. Investigation discloses that employees of your company have in the past received this newspaper at their correct addresses. Would you please advise me whether or not the subscription was paid for by the company, and, if so, when were these payments made? Since the company may not have subscribed or placed ads in the newspaper in the past few years, I should appreciate it if you would check your files back to 1937. Please designate whether payments were for ads or subscriptions.

I should appreciate your prompt attention to this matter.

Yours very truly,
DOROTHY L. CRAIG, *Field Examiner.*

That letter was called to my attention and I addressed a letter to the National Labor Relations Board at Cincinnati and at Washington, enclosing a copy of a letter received from the editor of the paper, complaining of Miss Craig's activities, and asking as to the objective of Dorothy L. Craig in making inquiries of the advertisers of the Labor Digest as to ads inserted by them and as to their subscriptions to that paper.

On March 6, I received an answer from the Washington office of the N. L. R. B., stating, among other things, that:

The sole purpose of the inquiry made of the Douglas company was in connection with the investigation of a charge filed by the United Furniture Workers of America in our St. Louis regional office. That charge alleges that Norman A. Zolezzi and others specifically named have engaged in and are engaging in unfair labor practices within the meaning of section 8, subsections (1) and (2) of the National Labor Relations Act by dominating and interfering with the formation and administration of Tri-State Wood Workers, Local No. 1, a labor organization, and by carrying on a campaign of vilification of bona fide labor organizations, and favoring an employer-dominated labor organization through the medium of the Labor Digest.

From what congressional enactment does the N. L. R. B. get authority to supervise the editorial policy of the Labor Digest or its editor?

Where does it get authority to attempt to destroy the circulation of that paper?

Whatever other purpose Dorothy may have in mind, it is quite evident that one of the results of her inquiries—the inevitable result—is to lessen the circulation of the paper; to intimidate, if that be possible, its editor.

To get more of the facts, I today introduced a privileged resolution directed to the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board.

To me it would appear that Dorothy Craig, an examiner for the N. L. R. B., is attempting to aid a C. I. O. labor union in its organizing campaign; is endeavoring to muzzle the Labor Digest, to diminish the revenue it receives from advertisers; in short, to intimidate all who oppose the C. I. O. activities of the Tri-State Wood Workers, Local No. 1, of St. Louis, Mo.

On the theory advanced by the N. L. R. B. here in Washington, its examiners have the right to control the editorial policy of any paper which ventures to express an opinion which may be in conflict with that held by the Board's examiners or by the members of a union.

Apparently the Board claims the right to go around to the advertisers of a daily, weekly, or monthly publication and ask them whether they subscribe to the paper and their purpose in so subscribing, if they do.

Apparently it also claims the right to intimidate advertisers of any publication by threatening to show that those publications, if given to or circulated among employees, make the publisher a conspirator engaged in unfair labor practices within the meaning of the National Labor Relations law.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on the 1st day of April, the farmers of the New York milkshed will receive a body blow which will wellnigh put them out of business for the rest of the war program. I refer to a reduction in the subsidy being paid on milk, from 80 cents to 35 cents per hundred pounds on milk produced. When I say the New York milkshed I can refer in like manner to every part of the country. They are all getting about the same treatment. I cannot be reconciled to the statement I heard here today, and which has been constantly made on this subject, that the dairymen are being helped by this bill. If the policy of reducing milk subsidies by over 50 percent is carried out after April 1 every dairyman will be on the spot and will have to sweat to survive his increased production costs.

Only today I received a letter from Mr. Fred H. Sexaner, the president of the Dairymen's League Cooperation Association, a cooperative which takes care of the whole New York milkshed. He says that the farmers of that milkshed will lose $7,500,000 under the new program that is contemplated after April 1.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am very much interested in what the gentleman says but did I observe correctly or incorrectly when I thought I saw the gentleman going down the line voting to reduce the amount of money authorized for this corporation?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman saw correctly, but let me remind him I have had no assurance on the floor or any other place that the subsidy policy will be continued as it is going at the present time. I will vote an increase when I am assured there will not be a reduction of over 50 percent in milk subsidies if we vote to increase this bill to $5,000,000,000.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Does not the gentleman think the dairy farmers will be tremendously interested in his vote to reduce that amount?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The dairy farmers know where I stand and I will be on record in their favor. I will show the gentleman when I cast my vote for increased subsidies for the dairy farmers. However, I would like to have him answer me on the floor, or someone else if he cannot, what policy will be inaugurated after the 1st of April. Are they going to reduce the milk subsidy from 80 cents to 35 cents? That is what they said they intend to do. Or will they raise it to $1 per 100 pounds as I have advocated for so long? I would like to see a subsidy of $1 prevail after the 1st of April.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I do not think I can answer nor can anyone else answer what the reduction will be after April, but it is better to put enough money in the bill to pay these farmers than to vote on the other side and perhaps not have enough money to pay them.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. There has been no assurance that there will be any attempt to keep the subsidies the way they are being paid out at the present time. The policy which has been announced by the War Food Administration states exactly the opposite. I think, if I understood the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] correctly, he mentioned that there would be enough money to play with, even if the amendment which he offered was not adopted. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri, I am ready to vote for an increase if it will go to the farmer. There would be enough money anyway for the present subsidies on milk to be paid.

I wish this program would be kept in effect. I hope that somebody will be able to answer the question I have asked again and again, Why is it necessary to cut the milk subsidy from 80 cents to 35 cents per 100 pounds after the 1st of April? I would like to have that question cleared up, and I hope somebody will answer it before we get through. To this very minute, my question has not been answered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has expired.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

NO POST-WAR LEND-LEASE

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, last week five of us on the Foreign Affairs Committee filed a minority report on the lend-lease extension bill voted out of our committee. We urged that lend-lease should be confined to the war effort and not extended into the post-war period as a measure for relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, has announced today the text of an amendment to H. R. 2013, the lend-lease extension bill, which was unanimously adopted by our committee today and will be offered on the floor tomorrow as a committee amendment. I wish to announce that this amendment meets the objections of the minority, and, in fact, carries out the specific recommendations in the minority report, which said:

> For unity we should confine its extension to the field in which we are all united on lend-lease, as a mutual war-aid measure.

Over the week end I helped to draft the amendment the committee unanimously approved this morning. It carries out in appropriate legal language the suggestions in our minority report:

> To provide specifically that no agreements for post-war relief, rehabilitation, or reconstruction should be made. * * * That agreements should be made for the post-war purchase by foreign governments of war materials furnished or agreed to be furnished by our country for use in the prosecution of the present war.

Insofar as Congress can define a policy for administrative purposes the committee amendment limits lend-lease to the war period and prohibits lend-lease as a post-war policy.

I congratulate the majority of the committee upon their willingness to consider our suggestions, and I believe this amendment will be accepted overwhelmingly in the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Page 3, line 6, strike out all of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "SEC. 3. The last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, shall not apply to the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946: *Provided*, That the making of subsidy payments and the buying of commodities for resale at a loss, by the Commodity Credit Corporation, shall be limited as follows: Obligations for making such payments and absorbing such losses may be incurred and paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation (a) in such amounts as may be necessary (1) to complete operations with respect to 1944 and prior year crop programs and (2) to fulfill obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1945, with respect to 1945 and prior fiscal year noncrop programs; and (b) in amounts which do not involve subsidy payments or losses in excess of (1) $568,000,000 for operations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, with respect to the dairy production payment program, (2) $120,000,000 for operations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, with respect to other noncrop programs, including the feed-wheat program, and (3) $225,000,000 with respect to the 1945 crop program operations: *Provided*, That not to exceed 10 percent of each amount specified in clauses (b) (1), (2), and (3) shall be available interchangeably for the operations described in such clauses but in no case shall the total subsidy payments and losses absorbed under any one of such clauses be increased by more than 10 percent.
>
> "*Provided further*, That in carrying out the dairy production payment program, beginning April 1, 1945, the rate of payment per pound of butterfat delivered shall not be less than 25 percent of the national weighted average rate of payment per 100 pounds of whole milk delivered."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, that is the amendment I thought I was agreeing to some time ago. While I cannot speak for the committee, because it has not been formally presented to it, the amendment meets with the approval of the Commodity Credit Corporation and it meets with the approval of the membership of the committee so far as I have been able to consult with them and is acceptable.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment to the Wolcott amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE to the Wolcott amendment: Following the Wolcott amendment insert a new provison as follows: "*Provided further*, That any schedule for subsidy payments for milk and butterfat shall be upon a uniform basis and shall be in effect for a period of at least 12 months after announcement."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have tried to make it clear that the purpose of the Commodity Credit Corporation in handling these subsidy programs must be preserved and that it must have sufficient funds with which to operate. I could not maintain any other position than that.

This amendment goes to the very heart of the proposal in this subsidy program for the dairy farmers of this country. Let me show you what I have in mind. The Commodity Credit Corporation and the War Food Administration have announced their subsidy program for the current year ending December 31, 1945. At the present time they are paying subsidies in a range of scale from a low of 60 cents per 100 to a high of 90 cents per 100. Beginning on April 1 and carrying through to June of 1945, that scale will drop from a low of 25 cents a hundred to a high of 55 cents a hundred. In July it will be from 35 cents to 65 cents and from October to December it will go back to 60 cents low to a high of 90 cents.

That range of payment means simply this: Take, for instance, the State of Wisconsin; at the present time the farmers are receiving 60 cents a hundred for milk. That subsidy will drop on April 1 to 25 cents a hundred for milk. It will go up to 35 cents on July 1 and it will go back to 60 cents on October 1.

Down in Alabama the subsidy payments at the time the Wisconsin farm-

ers are receiving 60 cents is 90 cents, in Arizona, 70 cents, in certain counties in California it is 80 cents, in other counties it is 70 cents, in Connecticut it is 80 cents, in Delaware 70 cents, in Florida 90 cents, in certain other States 70 cents, in Massachusetts 80 cents, and so on down the line.

The point I am trying to make is this: The War Food Administration in determining the payment of these subsidies says that there are two factors entering into this variation in payment. They say, for example, that in Minnesota where they pay a subsidy of 60 cents and in Arkansas where they pay a subsidy of 70 cents there is a variation in labor costs as well as a variation in feed costs which accounts for this differential.

I have a table before me furnished by the Department of Agriculture which shows the labor costs in each one of those cases.

I defy anybody with a sense of fairness to examine those figures and show how there can be a reasonable justification for this differentiation in these subsidy payments. The amendment which I am offering simply means that these subsidy payments will be placed upon a basis of equality. There are only four States in the Union that would be affected, according to my computation, in any way by the proposal I have offered. It would put the producers of milk on a basis of equality. Can anyone say that if a subsidy of 60 cents is paid to the farmers of Wisconsin, that the milk which they produce is not as valuable in the war effort as that produced by the farmers in Florida, who receive 90 cents a hundred, where the wage scale in Wisconsin is more than double the wage scale in Florida?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Can the gentleman tell us something about the comparative value of dairy feed in the different sections? He has mentioned labor, but he failed to mention the feed as a factor.

Mr. KEEFE. As to feed being a factor, may I say that time will not permit me, and I do not want to be diverted to go into that, for I only have 5 minutes. But we have made a pretty fair examination and estimate of that situation, and I say that when you take the factor of labor and set it alongside of the feed factor, there is no possibility, in my judgment, of justifying these differentials that are to be found in the War Food Administration announcement.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. And also the factor of weather.

IN OPPOSITION TO AMENDMENT TO WOLCOTT AMENDMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is adopted to the Wolcott amendment, the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] says that he will be under no further obligation to support the Wolcott amendment. He will be opposed to it and I will too, as well as other Members on our side. It would ruin the amendment entirely. We expect to support the Wolcott amendment if this amendment is not tied on. This amendment cannot be discussed intelligently in 5 minutes. It is a far-reaching amendment. We have never had a hearing before our committee on it. We do not know how far it goes. The gentleman did not present his proposal to our committee in order that we might give it consideration.

I appreciate the fact that one should be on the alert to help the people in his own State and in his own district, and I congratulate the gentleman for trying to help his own dairy farmers. It so happens that Wisconsin will be helped, that is true, but I dare say there are other States that will receive a reduction in dairy production payments. If the Keefe amendment is adopted it will probably reduce the production of dairy products in the following States. This information was given to the chairman of our committee the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the War Food Administration. So while Wisconsin will get an increase, these States will have a reduction in price and probably a reduced production of dairy products.

Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, Arizona, Nevada, California, Oregon, and Washington. Those 31 States will have definite reductions at once. So I do not think this amendment should pass. It will be very harmful to the industry. There has never been a charge to my knowledge that Mr. Marvin Jones, of the Commodity Credit Corporation, has been unfair and arbitrary in fixing——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I am sorry; I cannot yield now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am going to make that charge right now.

Mr. PATMAN. Has been unfair and arbitrary in fixing these rates. The gentleman from South Dakota makes a charge, so he is one. Possibly there are many others; I do not know. But, anyway, if we do not get the prices that we want, sometimes we are prone to exaggerate just a little bit about the unfairness of the entire program. Certainly we do not want to adopt an amendment here on the floor which we do not know how far it goes. We appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from Wisconsin and know that he looks after the interest of his constituents. I congratulate and commend him for it, and I know he is sincere in placing this amendment before the House. But he has not given us an opportunity to consider it the same as he has considered it. So I suggest to him that he introduce a bill and let it come before our committee, and I suggest that the chairman will be glad to give him a hearing on it, and let us go into it, see how far it goes, and see how it will affect the entire production. This is no time to cut down production. This is the time to increase production. This amendment, if I have the information correctly, will have a tendency to and probably will reduce production of dairy products in this country and seriously affect the dairy farmers in 31 different States.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman have any objection to the proposal that would provide that the announcement of subsidy payments shall be for a period of 12 months?

Mr. PATMAN. I would love to hear the gentleman on that before the committee, where we could hear the other side, if there is another side. Sometimes things sound very good on this floor, and we do not have the other side; we do not have all the information. That is the object of the committee hearing. If the gentleman will present that to the committee—and I know he will present it in a very effective and intelligent way—then if there is another side to it, we can get the other side and bring it over here in the form of printed testimony, and every Member can take this testimony and read it and be in a position to vote intelligently on it.

Mr. KEEFE. I submitted both of these amendments to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SPENCE. Not until long after the hearings; not until the day before yesterday.

Mr. KEEFE. Was I incorrect in the assumption that the gentleman would have no objection to that part of the amendment which provided that the announcement of the dairy payments should be for a 12 months' period?

Mr. SPENCE. I expressed no opinion about the gentleman's amendment, except that I was opposed to the amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Do not ask us to bring up something here that we know so little about, and ask us to vote on it and make it a part of the law, when we have had no hearings on it. We have had no testimony except just the word of the gentleman. I am not disputing him, I am not saying he is not correct, but I want to know all about it before I vote on it. I hope the gentleman will not insist on it.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CHELF. The gentleman said 31 States would suffer. Is Kentucky listed in there any place?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I think Kentucky is, but I am not sure.

Mr. CHELF. The gentleman did not call it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on

the Wolcott amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I tried to appear before this committee and give the facts that the gentleman is now saying he does not have. I want the privilege of giving these facts to the House.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment to the Wolcott amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Wolcott amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has the following Members listed as those seeking recognition: Mr. VOORHIS of California, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Mr. GROSS, Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I understand the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] is that the time on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto, shall be limited?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; that debate close in 20 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment to offer to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] cannot offer a further amendment until the pending amendment, which was offered by him, is disposed of.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Chair note that I am on my feet as one of those seeking recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be so noted.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Do I understand the interpretation of the Chairman with regard to the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], is that it covers the Keefe amendment and all amendments thereto?

The CHAIRMAN. It covers the Wolcott amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet seeking recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be included in the list.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet seeking recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The name of the gentleman will be added to the list.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, is it to be hoped that the Wolcott amendment will be adopted? I trust that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] will also be accepted. About one-third of the milk supply which goes into commercial channels of this country comes from 3 or 4 Northwestern States. Those States have been discriminated against so far as the ceiling price to the farmers is concerned. On the average, the State of Wisconsin farmers received about 59 cents less per 100 pounds for their milk than the farmers of the other 47 States of the Union. Undoubtedly, the same ratio is true as to Iowa and Minnesota.

That is a differential which has been fixed by another administrative bureau, so that the 60 cents subsidy which the Wisconsin farmers have been supposed to be receiving for milk does not bring up the price of their milk to the average throughout the country.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has enumerated a number of States which would have a reduction in subsidy if this amendment were adopted. However, he fails to state that it is the higher prices which the farmers of those States receive for milk which bring up the average price for the whole country. Iowa, to get the same average price of other States, leaving Wisconsin out of the computation, would have to have at least 65 cents merely to equalize that differential in price.

The purpose of this subsidy program is supposed to increase production. I can say to you people that out in the Northwest, where the larger part of your milk comes from, there is going to be a steady decline in production. In the last 3 weeks, in my own district, which is one of the largest districts of the Northwest, there have been not less than 100 farm auction sales. Only this morning I received an urgent letter from a man by the name of John Carter, a Republican, a prominent businessman of Menominee, telling me there are going to be 7 farms vacant on one highway in the midst of that very rich farming section, all relatively close to each other.

He wanted to know if something could not be done about it. I am not so sure there is anything that can be done at this time about those particular farms, but even with the incentive payments, which by the way are consumer subsidies and not farm subsidies, of 60 cents per 100 pounds, the farmers are selling off their stock and leaving their farms, and many farms will be idle.

Another phase of this situation is that some of this same milk, for which the farmers of our State receive a less amount in subsidies after April 1, when it is going to be only 25 cents per 100 pounds, is shipped out by the large dairy companies into eastern States where they have a higher price and a higher subsidy, and is being sold on the consumer markets in the eastern States on the same price level with that milk which receives a higher subsidy and a higher price, produced in nearby sections.

It does seem to me if we are going to increase production, or if we are going to hold up production, something must be done so that the farmers out there in the Northwest shall receive equality of treatment as far as these payments are concerned.

There is another angle to this situation. There is a great shortage of butter in this country, and it is getting worse every day. That shortage of butter is largely due to the fact that under the so-called subsidy system a higher subsidy has been paid for milk which goes into cheese, whole milk sales, and whole milk powder than for butter. The effect of that 6 or 7 cents a pound more for butter fat for those commodities is being reflected in the lessened butter production.

Unless something is done, in another year there will be a very serious situation as far as dairy products are concerned. They are highly important. They are not only important to the health of the people of this country, but they are of vital importance to the health of our armed forces. Thirty-nine percent of the food cost for the armed forces is for dairy products.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to address my remarks to the Keefe amendment. It ought not be adopted and I will tell you why. The gentleman who just preceded me said the purpose of the subsidy was to increase production. That is only one of the purposes. Another purpose of the subsidy is to prevent inflation, but the principal purpose of the subsidy was to enable the dairymen to operate without a loss.

You will remember when the first stabilization act was passed there was a provision in there that the price-fixing authorities could not fix the maximum price of certain agricultural products below parity. At that time the price of feed products or dairy feed was away below parity. Under that act the price of feed rose to a considerable extent. While the price of feed was rising the maximum ceiling price on milk did not rise. It remained where it was. In various parts of the country feed can be raised much cheaper than in other parts. In Detroit, Mich., they can make automobiles a great deal cheaper than we can make them down South. Down South we can raise cotton cheaper than you can in Michigan. You know and I know that the price of dairy feed varies in various parts of the country. The Commodity Credit Corporation has made a study of the varying prices of feed products in various parts of the country. They have found that in some parts of the country dairymen have to buy their feed, whereas in others they are able to grow it. By reason of the fact that they have to buy it in some places, those who had to buy it would have been crushed to death if it had not been for the subsidy. By reason of the investigation of the Commodity Credit Corporation different subsidies are allowed in different States to make up the differential in the cost of producing that feed. If the Keefe amendment were adopted it would crush the farmers in those States where subsidies would be decreased. The gentleman addressed his remarks to the difference in the cost of labor. He did not have time to answer the question of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], who asked him to direct his attention to the difference in the feed cost. He said he did not have time to do that. If he had had time and if he

had called to your attention the diversity in the cost of producing feed in various parts of the country, his argument would have fallen of its own weight and he would have proven conclusively that his amendment should not have been adopted.

I hope it will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to more ridiculous arguments on this agricultural subsidy here today than I ever thought I would have to. The farmers of the country are laughing at the ignorance displayed in this House on this matter. Here comes a gentleman from the South pleading for us to help the poor peanut growers, and then telling us in the same breath that the Government has taken their entire production and they are making $13,000,000 out of it. It is ridiculous that such a statement should be reported to a body that is supposed to have the intelligence this body has. Why did not the Government let the growers make those millions?

The farmers in my district are not asking for this milk subsidy. I know of one man who has refused a $700 subsidy on his milk. This paternalistic Government is simply trying to throw the money around like the Lord causes the rain to water the earth, thinking they will get votes. Behind it all is the desire to get votes on the part of the administration and on the part of Congressmen who are voting for such programs. This will not help the farmer any more than putting a ceiling price on cattle helped him. I was on the fat-cattle market this morning, and well-finished cattle were bringing just a dollar and a half below the ceiling because nobody would recognize that they were thoroughly finished. The Government is penalizing the farmer on the one hand yet trying to help him on the other. Because of the ceiling on hogs there were not enough hogs to make a market. The black market is getting the livestock.

As far as the milk subsidies are concerned, in Wisconsin they make the cheapest milk in the country. There comes an up-State Representative from New York demanding 100-percent milk subsidy. Ridiculous. I know what I am talking about. What we need is for this administration to be honest with itself and with the people, for the Congressmen to be honest with themselves and the people they represent. Admit the facts and be guided accordingly. The many farm sales talked of is the regular spring procedure. If the farmers need so much help now where will the help come from in the post-war period? At the many farm sales now being held livestock and equipment is selling high and farmers are paying cash. That speaks for itself.

To boast about farmers paying their loans from Commodity Credit is foolish; you must remember they paid because they had the good fortune of a rising market, and the rising market was due to the war and not because of anything the administration did during the preceding 12 years. And still the Commodity Credit lost a lot of money. Had we not had a war only God knows how much money it would have cost the taxpayers. If the whole subsidy program were thrown out of the window the farmer would be better off, feel more independent, and the taxpayers would be relieved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I cannot fail to speak extemporaneously for the 2 minutes allotted to me in this important debate. I speak in behalf of the great dairy industry of the great Eighteenth Congressional District of my native State of California. Regardless of what the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who has just preceded me, had to say about milk producers not asking for or needing subsidies to survive, one of the first important groups in my district which called upon me after my election to this high post was a responsible group of leaders of the dairy industry from that portion of Los Angeles County which I represent in this House, and which group also included responsible leaders of this vital industry from other portions of this great county of Los Angeles as well. Gentlemen, they made it emphatic and clear that the dairying industry in this time of global war with its emergencies, demands, and necessary controls could not survive very long unless they continued to have subsidies on their production. I shall therefore vote against the proposed amendment, which would take away all, or practically all, of their subsidies. I shall vote for the bill which not only does that which is so vital to the dairy industry in my district, but likewise protects the Nation against an apparent result of slight inflation, at least, if the bill is defeated.

For your information, the Eighteenth Congressional District of California contains the great shipbuilding industries of Consolidated, Craig, and the great aircraft industries of Douglas and Consolidated Vultee, and the great naval base named Roosevelt, and the great naval drydocks—the largest in the world. The total war workers population of these industries and plants above enumerated, together with thousands upon thousands of war workers in lesser war plants and industries numerically, but not strategically, must be computed in figures around at least 200,000. Besides these already there, the great and rapidly rising population, as a result of the influx to southern California, the thousands upon thousands every month from most of the States you gentlemen represent, in order to aid in the war effort, indicates the strategic importance of the Eighteenth Congressional District, as to population, as to war production, as to housing problems, as to food necessities. In one corner of my district is the great dairy industry of which I speak. It produces the sinews of war in the content of milk and dairy products. It is equally important with ammunition. Wars must cease. We cannot aid the war effort by now upsetting the economy of the dairying industry.

The dairies of the great Eighteenth Congressional District of California, which I have the honor to represent, as well as dairies throughout my native State; the men and women of the armed forces as are located in California; and thousands and thousands of war workers in my district working hard in essential war industries will be affected if this bill fails to pass. It is presently an order providing for payment of adjusted dairy feed payments to milk producers and will expire March 31, 1945—so the War Food Administration interpreted that the Price Control Act of 1944 only permits payments of a subsidy if that program of production was provided for at the specified time the act was finally passed.

In southern California the dairy subsidies vary from 55 cents per hundred pounds for a short period to 90 cents per hundred pounds for a short period. In April 1944 War Food Administration gave notice that faith payments to dairies could be continued for only 11 months; but this assured producers the necessary financial aid to guarantee a steady flow of milk until the expiration of 11 months. This 11 months ends March 31, 1945—the 31st of this very month.

There is no question but that dairy-feed subsidies must absolutely be continued. Milk is basic food for civilians, the armed forces, at home and abroad, our allies, and to the nations we have already and will liberate. The great dairying industry of my congressional district is needing their checks from War Food Administration every month instead of every 3 months, as is the present practice—not every producer of milk—but many. I find the administration of this necessary security for a steady flow of milk is very cooperative, and Mr. Dodds told me this very morning that they would try to see that this further cooperation is extended. Congress must not break faith with this great section of agriculture.

We must defeat this amendment, which would almost immediately react with destruction to great dairying interests and to the supply of food and necessities in my district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, there is no Member who can stand here and justify a difference in subsidy on this milk who wants to be fair minded, who wants to be honest about it. When you talk about the fixed price of milk you must realize that that was pretty well established before we got into the war. But on this subsidy question there is no man who can give any logical reason why there should be any difference in subsidies. Of course out in the State of Washington they have a labor scale of $149 a month, in California, $145, and down South they pay as low as $38. If the representatives from Washington, Montana, and these other States with high labor costs want to humbly submit to a subsidy program that gives States with $38 to $50 per month labor costs a subsidy much greater

than their States are to receive that is their responsibility. One has to have many sips from the New Deal fountain of philosophy to like this kind of legislation. There is much difference in the cost of farm labor. Then there is the difference in the cost of feed. You will find all these figures in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A809. This table shows that cottonseed meal O. P. A. ceilings are $47.50 per ton in North Carolina; $46.50 per ton in Atlanta, Ga.; $53.90 per ton in Minneapolis, and $51.50 in Milwaukee. A year ago cottonseed meal was $10 a ton cheaper in North Carolina than in some of the Northern States.

Naturally the linseed meal produced in the North would be cheaper in the North than in the South because there is the cost of transportation entering into the picture. But when you take the cost of labor and feed, the cost of producing milk, there is no living man who can justify any difference in the subsidy payments that is based on what the W. F. A. has done in the past or on what it has shown it intends to do in the future.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman know that in some dairy sections there is a feed shortage, and they are definitely known as feed deficit areas; that in those areas, North Carolina, for instance, they pay as much as $55 a ton for hay? I dare say the gentleman is not paying any price like that in Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not want to get into any sectional argument in connection with this thing, but I do want to call attention to the fact that no living man can stand up here and justify the statement that a hundred pounds of milk in one State will win this war any more than a hundred pounds of milk in any other State. Anyone that wishes to take any other position is welcome to do so. I usually use the term "sectional favoritism," but cheap New Deal politics would be a more appropriate phrase to use in connection with a subsidy program that gives one small group a subsidy two and one-fifth times greater than the large group that produces the milk of the Nation.

The New Deal cannot change its ways even during wartime. In the parlance of the barnyard, these New Deal calves are hard to wean.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to say that it is regrettable that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], the chairman of this committee, moved to cut off the debate on this important question of equality of subsidy payments. This is all the more surprising when one notes that Kentucky is to receive 25 cents per hundred subsidy on April 1, though Kentucky received only $3.20 per hundredweight market price in 1944, less than the national average. When one compares this Kentucky price of $3.20 per hundredweight and the 25-cent subsidy, or a total price of $3.45 per hundredweight, with the market price of $4 to $4.80 in the States that are to have two and one-fifth times the Kentucky subsidy, it is still all the more surprising.

Of the increase in national milk production in 1944 over 1943, over one-third of this increase in production came from Wisconsin alone.

The War Food Administration provided the Wisconsin farmer $2.70 per hundredweight for their milk in 1944 when the national average price of milk was $3.24. Wisconsin farmers received forty-nine millions in so-called subsidies in 1944, but if they had had the additional 54 cents per hundredweight they were entitled to they would have received over 70,000,000 more for their milk. If the W. F. A. administration had provided the Wisconsin producers $3.24 per hundredweight for their milk, as they did the other States on an average, there would not need be any talk about subsidies as far as Wisconsin is concerned.

However, the New Deal is for the few at the expense of the many. It could not even pass an act based on equality for all. There would have to be "special privilege" for the few and this bill provides the "special privilege" for the few, so it is typical New Deal legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, during the remarks of the gentleman from Texas I made the charge that these subsidy prices are arbitrary. Let me give you the figures on that.

Let us take a comparison between the States of South Dakota and Texas. The farmers in South Dakota last year received an average price of $2.65 per hundredweight for milk, while in Texas they received $3.60 per hundredweight, $1 more per hundred. In North Carolina they received $4 per hundredweight, $1.35 more. That is 50 percent more than they received in South Dakota.

Now, what about labor costs? In South Dakota the composite labor cost as given in the tables placed in the RECORD of February 26 by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], was $94. In Texas it was only $74, and in North Carolina it was only $50.90.

What about feed costs? Here are the figures I have, which show that the price of cottonseed meal at the St. Paul-Minneapolis terminals in Minnesota was $53.90. On the other hand, in North Carolina it was only $47.50.

Now what about the subsidy payments? In spite of the fact that the O. P. A. price ceilings are such that milk producers averaged $4 in North Carolina per hundred pounds and $3.75 in Texas in 1944 against $2.60 in South Dakota with wages and protein feed costs higher in South Dakota, the administrators of the subsidy program, whoever they are, paid a 55-cent subsidy in North Carolina and a 35-cent subsidy in Texas against a 25-cent subsidy in South Dakota.

The program as announced for this year is even worse in that the subsidy goes up to 90 cents in some States and to 70 in some of the 55-cent States for certain periods while the comparable advance in South Dakota in those months is to 35 cents only.

In other words, there is rank discrimination in that, while feed and labor costs are higher in South Dakota, and while O. P. A. ceilings held prices lower, the milk subsidy was lower. And that continues in the new program. Therefore, I make the charge and I repeat it, that the subsidies allowed by the operators of this program have been arbitrary and discriminatory and do not reflect a proper consideration of the elements supposed to be considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I favor the Wolcott amendment because I believe that when adopted we will secure a greater production of dairy products and also a larger production of butter which is so necessary to maintain our civilian economy and meet our war commitments. This amendment will equalize the payments for dairy products and place butterfat on an equal basis with milk.

I also favor the Keefe amendment. I never could quite understand why sections of the country where they produce dairy products in large quantity should be penalized as against other sections. All the Keefe amendment does is to make the payment of subsidies uniform as long as the subsidy program is the policy of the present administration.

The dairy farmers of Minnesota and other States do not want subsidies, but they are forced to take them to maintain incomes, and as long as we have this policy we believe the payments should be uniform throughout the country. The historic dairy sections are in a much better situation to increase milk and butter than new producing areas, and I believe it only fair that all dairy farmers should receive the same payments. Therefore, I hope that both the Keefe amendment and the Wolcott amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the Wolcott amendment, but I am against that portion of the Keefe amendment that would make equal payments mandatory everywhere, because I understand the purpose of the subsidy is to enable dairymen to continue to produce milk. In some sections of the country where the costs are unusually high that would not be possible if the cut was made, which I believe the amendment would entail. I subscribe wholeheartedly to what my colleague [Mr. DOYLE] has just said so ably.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak on behalf of an amendment of my own which I cannot offer now but which I shall offer as soon as the Keefe amendment is disposed of. My amendment reads as follows:

Provided further, That subsidy payments to milk producers under the program dealt with in this section shall upon application by a recipient of such subsidy be made once each month.

All my amendment would do would be to provide that these payments shall be made once a month instead of once every quarter as they are now doing pretty generally. The Commodity Credit Corporation is not adverse to making payments once a month. They say, however, that it will entail some additional administrative expense, about $100,000 per year, in order to make monthly payments in the areas of the country where it is important since those dairymen conduct their business so largely on a cash basis, and have to buy almost all their feed and have very large cash expenses currently. I believe that if a dairyman can make a case and show where in his business he needs to receive monthly payments rather than less frequently, monthly payments should be authorized by the Congress and that is the purpose of my amendment. It is very much desired, I may say, by the dairymen of southern California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I cannot go into this matter as I would like to in this very limited period of time. It was my purpose to offer the amendment which I did offer and in the event that amendment was not acceptable to the House, I proposed to offer a further amendment which would simply provide that the schedule of subsidy payments for milk and butterfat shall be announced to be in effect for a period of 12 months. That is a perfectly sensible amendment as I believe every man on this floor who knows anything about the dairy program will concede. I hope that you just will not throw this out of the window as being another foolish amendment and say that it is dictated by sectional desires or because the gentleman from Wisconsin is trying to get something that he is not entitled to. I hope that when this amendment is offered you will accept it, and especially you people who know what the dairy business of this country is and why it is so necessary that the farmer know what his program is to be for a year. They have to plan their feed. They have to plan their production schedule, and as the matter stands now under the prevailing announcement they do not know what to plan for, because the announcement ends December 31, 1945. If you want dairy production you have got to assure the people that really produce the milk that they can afford to go out and pump high concentrate feed into their cows in the winter time so that they will bring the milk out in the spring and in the fall.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California to the amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: At the end of the Wolcott amendment add the following: *"Provided further.* That subsidy payments to milk producers under the program dealt with in this section shall upon application by a recipient of such subsidy be made one each month."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE to the amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: At the end of the Wolcott amendment insert a new proviso as follow: *"Provided,* That any schedule of subsidy payments for milk and butterfat shall be in effect for a period of at least 12 months after announcement."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. The first two sentences of section 1 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"As of the 30th of June in each year and as soon as possible thereafter, beginning with June 30, 1945, an appraisal of all of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of determining the net worth of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury. The value of assets shall be determined on the basis of the cost of such assets to the Commodity Credit Corporation, or insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower, and a report of any such appraisal shall be submitted to the President as soon as possible after it has been made."

SEC. 5. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1936 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1945" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1947".

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 4, line 8, strike out "June 30, 1947" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1948."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any particular reason why the debate on this amendment should be prolonged. We covered it very well, I think, when we were discussing the first amendment, which had to do with the amount which we were to make available to the Commodity Credit Corporation. But there is a fundamental reason, it seems to me, why we should restrict the life not only of this Corporation but of all the Government agencies which come up here periodically, and it is simply that we live today in a changing world. We do not know from one week to the next what the demands are going to be on Government. No citizen knows from one week to the next what his obligation to the Government is going to be. Surely we cannot look much beyond a year and determine with any degree of certainty what demands are going to be made on the Government in respect to this and many other programs. Because of these constant changes, it seems to me that we do our duty to our constituents only when we make it possible for us to review these agencies periodically, and "periodically" in this case means at least once a year.

Seldom, if ever, have we continued the Commodity Credit Corporation for more than a year. There is no reason why we should continue it for more than a year. Next year we might want to write entirely new standards in respect to its operation. We might want to enlarge the operation of this Corporation or we might want to limit its operation, to fit it into the post-war economy. There are many things we must consider next year. This is but one element, one factor, and but one piece of a major program. To name some of the other elements beside the Commodity Credit Corporation, there is the O. P. A., the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Lend-Lease, the Export-Import Bank, Bretton Woods, and many others. We owe it, not only to our constituents, but to ourselves, to review this agency and the other agencies at least once a year. I plead with you as representatives of a constituency, which I think demands of you at least that you consider what is going on in Government, to make it possible to review this agency next year. It is all the more advisable because of what has been brought up here in the last few weeks, whether we believe it or do not believe it. The fact that there are rumors indicates the necessity of keeping our hands on the Commodity Credit Corporation and all of the other agencies. We should not lose the opportunity to check this and the other agencies just as often as we possibly can. We are not doing our duty under the Constitution to our constituents unless we do. For that reason, I think we are doing all we are expected to do by continuing the life of this Corporation for 1 year. They have to come back here next year anyway. The subsidy provisions which we have just adopted make it essential that the Commodity Credit Corporation come back to us next year. Then, if we want to continue it beyond that time, we will have the opportunity just as we will have the opportunity to limit the scope or broaden the scope of its activities at that time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that this amendment would be offered after the amendment to reduce the amount to $4,000,000,000 was defeated. It seemed to be part of the same thing. Therefore, since that amendment was defeated, it occurs to me there should not be any question about the defeat of this amendment. The Commodity Credit Corporation has always been extended for 2 years every time until last year when we had the subsidy

fight and then we extended it for 1 year on account of that fight. But the people who opposed subsidies are now in favor of subsidies. That subsidy fight being no longer in existence, we should back its extension for 2 years.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly, I yield to the gentleman if he insists, although I hardly have any time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman from Texas misspoke himself when he says we have always continued the Commodity Credit Corporation for a 2-year period.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, that is my understanding, until we had the subsidy fight, and then it was extended 1 year.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It was extended then for 6 months when we had the subsidy fight, after that it was extended for a period of a year.

Mr. PATMAN. I know that was temporary, and then we extended it for 1 year. I am speaking from memory and could be mistaken about the 2-year period with the one exception of 6 months and the other of one year, but I do not think I am.

The Committee on Banking and Currency carefully considered this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman will not insist. My time is very limited.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I just wanted to ask the gentleman if he remembered any year in the last 8 or 10 years when we did not have Commodity Credit Corporation before us on this floor?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not going into that.

The Committee on Banking and Currency carefully considered this bill. It should be passed as it is. Judge Jones says it is necessary. The administration says it is necessary. It is a war measure. We need it not only to help keep down prices and to prevent inflation, but we need it for the purpose of getting needed food for our armed forces and the civilian population at home and for our allies abroad. It is just as much a war measure as a measure appropriating billions of dollars to make planes, tanks and ships and guns and munitions. It is purely a war measure and we should not be running any risk about it.

The Hon. Marvin Jones has made a wonderful record. Something was said about spoilage. Last year the War Food Administration bought $2,700,000,000 worth of food. Do you know how much spoilage there was? Only $7,000,000. That means that $1 out of $385 was lost in spoilage. That means about 25 cents on every $100 only was lost in spoilage. I do not think any organization, whether Government or whether private business, can make a better record than that. They are now buying $5,000,000 worth of food every day.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. When the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan was under consideration, reducing the amount from $5,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000, of course, we all understood that this particular amendment was involved in that also. The gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. WOLCOTT] has said "we are living in a changing world," and that is true. He also said, "we do not know what the demands will be on government," but in connection with this, there is one fact that cannot escape my mind and that is something that the Congress itself did. In the last Congress we promised support prices of 90 percent of parity or upward, on certain farm commodities for the period of the war and for 2 years thereafter. I do not think the changes that will take place in the post-war world for 2 years in relation to farmers will be so marked that the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan should be adopted. I hope the Congress will keep its promise to the farmers of this country by continuing this act for 2 years and that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

All time has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 101, noes 119.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 2023, and pursuant to House Resolution 167, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 358, nays 8, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

YEAS—358

Abernethy	Bennet, N. Y.	Camp
Adams	Bennett, Mo.	Campbell
Allen, Ill.	Biemiller	Canfield
Allen, La.	Bishop	Cannon, Fla.
Andersen, H. Carl	Blackney	Cannon, Mo.
	Bland	Carlson
Anderson, N. Mex.	Bloom	Carnahan
	Bonner	Case, S. Dak.
Andresen, August H.	Boykin	Celler
	Bradley, Mich.	Chelf
Andrews, Ala.	Bradley, Pa.	Chenoweth
Andrews, N. Y.	Brehm	Chiperfield
Angell	Brooks	Church
Arends	Brown, Ga.	Clements
Arnold	Brown, Ohio	Cochran
Bailey	Brumbaugh	Coffee
Baldwin, Md.	Bryson	Cole, Kans.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Buckley	Cole, Mo.
Barden	Buffett	Cole, N. Y.
Barrett, Pa.	Bulwinkle	Colmer
Barrett, Wyo.	Bunker	Cooley
Barry	Burch	Cooper
Bates, Ky.	Burgin	Corbett
Beall	Butler	Courtney
Beckworth	Byrne, N. Y.	Cox
Bell	Byrnes, Wis.	Cravens
Crawford	Holmes, Wash.	Price, Fla.
Crosser	Hook	Price, Ill.
Cunningham	Hope	Priest
Curtis	Horan	Quinn, N. Y.
D'Alesandro	Howell	Rabaut
Davis	Huber	Rabin
De Lacy	Hull	Rains
Delaney, James J.	Jackson	Ramey
	Jarman	Ramspeck
Delaney, John J.	Jenkins	Randolph
	Jennings	Rankin
Dickstein	Jensen	Rayfiel
Dingell	Johnson, Calif.	Reece, Tenn.
Dolliver	Johnson, Ill.	Reed, Ill.
Domengeaux	Johnson, Ind.	Reed, N. Y.
Dondero	Johnson, Luther A.	Rees, Kans.
Doughton, N. C.		Resa
Douglas, Calif.	Johnson, Okla.	Richards
Douglas, Ill.	Jonkman	Riley
Doyle	Judd	Rivers
Drewry	Kee	Rizley
Durham	Keefe	Robertson, Va.
Dworshak	Kefauver	Robsion, Ky.
Earthman	Kelley, Pa.	Rockwell
Eberharter	Kelly, Ill.	Rodgers, Pa.
Elliott	Keogh	Roe, N. Y.
Ellis	Kerr	Rogers, Fla.
Ellsworth	Kilburn	Rogers, Mass.
Elston	Kilday	Rogers, N. Y.
Engel, Mich.	King	Rooney
Engle, Calif.	Kinzer	Rowan
Ervin	Kirwan	Russell
Fallon	Knutson	Ryter
Feighan	Koppelmann	Sabath
Fellows	LaFollette	Sadowski
Fenton	Landis	Sasscer
Fernandez	Lane	Savage
Fisher	Lanham	Schwabe, Mo.
Flannagan	Larcade	Schwabe, Okla.
Flood	Latham	Scrivner
Folger	LeFevre	Shafer
Foland	Lesinski	Sharp
Fulton	Lewis	Sheppard
Gallagher	Link	Short
Gamble	Ludlow	Simpson, Ill.
Gathings	Lyle	Smith, Va.
Gavin	Lynch	Smith, Wis.
Gearhart	McConnell	Snyder
Geelan	McCormack	Somers, N. Y.
Gibson	McCowen	Sparkman
Gifford	McDonough	Spence
Gillespie	McGehee	Springer
Gillette	McGregor	Stefan
Gillie	McMillan, S. C.	Stevenson
Goodwin	Mahon	Stigler
Gordon	Manasco	Stockman
Gore	Mansfield, Mont.	Sullivan
Gorski		Sumner, Ill.
Gossett	Marcantonio	Sumners, Tex.
Graham	Martin, Iowa	Sundstrom
Granahan	Martin, Mass.	Taber
Granger	May	Talbot
Grant, Ala.	Merrow	Talle
Grant, Ind.	Michener	Tarver
Green	Miller, Calif.	Thom
Gregory	Miller, Nebr.	Thomas, N. J.
Griffiths	Mills	Thomas, Tex.
Gross	Monroney	Thomason
Gwinn, N. Y.	Morrison	Tibbott
Gwynne, Iowa	Mundt	Tolan
Hale	Murdock	Torrens
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murphy	Towe
	Murray, Tenn.	Trimble
Hall, Leonard W.	Murray, Wis.	Voorhis, Calif.
	Neely	Vorys, Ohio
Halleck	Norrell	Vursell
Hancock	Norton	Wadsworth
Hare	O'Brien, Ill.	Walter
Harless, Ariz.	O'Brien, Mich.	Wasielewski
Harness, Ind.	O'Hara	Weaver
Harris	O'Konski	Welchel
Hartley	O'Neal	Welch
Havenner	Outland	Whitten
Hays	Pace	Whittington
Healy	Patman	Wickersham
Hébert	Patrick	Wigglesworth
Hedrick	Patterson	Wilson
Heffernan	Peterson, Fla.	Winstead
Hendricks	Peterson, Ga.	Wolcott
Henry	Pfeifer	Wolfenden, Pa.
Heselton	Phillips	Wolverton, N. J.
Hess	Pickett	Woodhouse
Hill	Pittenger	Woodruff, Mich.
Hinshaw	Ploeser	Worley
Hoch	Plumley	Zimmerman
Hoeven	Poage	
Holifield	Powers	

NAYS—8

Buck	Jones	Smith, Ohio
Clevenger	Kean	Winter
Hoffman	Rich	

NOT VOTING—66

Anderson, Calif.	Bender	Case, N. J.
Auchincloss	Bolton	Chapman
Bates, Mass.	Boren	Clark

Clason	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Combs	Kearney	Robinson, Utah
Curley	Kunkel	Roe, Md.
Daughton, Va.	Lea	Sheridan
Dawson	LeCompte	Sikes
Dirksen	Lemke	Simpson, Pa.
Eaton	Luce	Slaughter
Elsaesser	McGlinchey	Smith, Maine
Fogarty	McKenzie	Starkey
Fuller	McMillen, Ill.	Stewart
Gardner	Madden	Taylor
Gerlach	Maloney	Traynor
Fagen	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson
Hand	Mason	Weiss
Hart	Morgan	West
Heidinger	Mott	White
Herter	O'Toole	Wood
Hobbs	Philbin	Woodrum, Va.
Holmes, Mass.	Powell	
Izac		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Clason.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Gerlach.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. Weiss with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Hand.

Mr. Vinson with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. Chapman with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mrs. Smith of Maine.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Auchincloss.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Holmes of Massachusetts.

Mr. Lea with Mr. Kearney.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Fuller.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Case of New Jersey.

Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. West with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Lemke.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.

Mr. McGlinchey with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Maloney with Mr. Herter.

Mr. McKenzie with Mr. Elsaesser.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 298) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, strike out all after the enacting clause, and substitute the provisions of the bill just passed, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the Act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is hereby amended by deleting the term "$3,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the term "$4,500,000,000".

SEC. 2. In the event the War Food Administrator determines that there is danger of loss or waste through spoilage in the stocks of any nonbasic perishable commodity owned or controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Corporation may sell or cause to be sold such stocks of such commodity below the parity or comparable price therefor and the Corporation shall, insofar as practicable, make such sales, or cause them to be made, in such manner as to prevent the depression of the farm price of the commodity.

SEC. 3. The provisions of subsection (c) of section 381 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 67) are suspended until the expiration of the 2-year period beginning with the 1st day of January immediately following the date on which the President, by proclamation, or the Congress, by concurrent resolution, declares that hostilities in the present war have terminated.

SEC. 4. The last paragraph of section 2 (c) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, shall not apply to the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946: *Provided*, That the making of subsidy payments and the buying of commodities for resale at a loss, by the Commodity Credit Corporation, for the purpose of maintaining maximum prices established pursuant to provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended and supplemented, shall be limited as follows: Obligations for making such payments and absorbing such losses may be incurred and paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation (a) in such amounts as may be necessary (1) to complete operations with respect to 1944 and prior year crop programs and (2) to fulfill obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1945, with respect to 1945 and prior fiscal year noncrop programs; and (b) in amounts which do not involve subsidy payments or losses in excess of (1) $250,000,000 for operations during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1945, with respect to the dairy production payment program, (2) $60,000,000 for operations during the 6-month period ending December 31, 1945, with respect to other noncrop programs, including the feed-wheat program, and (3) $225,000,000 with respect to the 1945 crop program operations. Should hostilities in the present war extend beyond December 31, 1945, such dairy production payment program and other noncrop program operations involving such subsidy payments and losses may be continued on a basis which, taking into account seasonal variations in rates and production, will not involve such subsidy payments and losses in excess of $250,000,000 for operations during the 6-month period ending June 30, 1946, with respect to the dairy production payment program, or $60,000,000 for operations during the 6-month period ending June 30, 1946, with respect to other noncrop programs, including the feed-wheat program: *Provided, however*, That if hostilities cease before June 30, 1946, no additional obligations provided for in this sentence may be incurred by the Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to such programs after the date on which hostilities cease.

SEC. 5. The first two sentences of section 1 of the Act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 107), as amended, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"As of the 30th of June in each year and as soon as possible thereafter, beginning with June 30, 1945, an appraisal of all of the assets and liabilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of determining the net worth of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury. The value of assets shall be determined on the basis of the cost of such assets to the Commodity Credit Corporation, or insofar as practicable, the average market price of such assets during the last month of the fiscal year covered by the appraisal, whichever is the lower, and a report of any such appraisal shall be submitted to the President as soon as possible after it has been made".

SEC. 6. The first sentence of section 7 of the Act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is hereby amended by striking out "June 30, 1945" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1947".

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of H. R. 2023, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings by which the bill (H. R. 2023) was passed were vacated and that bill laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL] be permitted to address the House for 1 hour on Tuesday, March 20, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GRANT] be permitted to extend his own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF ACT TO PROMOTE THE DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BATES of Kentucky, from the Committee on Rules submitted the following privilege resolution (H. Res. 178, Rept. No. 308), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2013), to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next after the legislative business of the day I may address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from the Committee:

MARCH 12, 1945.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith tender my resignation as a member of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee.

Genuinely yours,

FRANK L. CHELF,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and to include two letters and a news clipping from this morning's Washington Post.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a manuscript entitled "The American Scholar." It exceeds the limit. I have an estimate from the Public Printer and I am informed the cost will be $138.80. Notwithstanding that fact, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the legislative business has been completed and any other special orders I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GIBSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMITTEE

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker. On April 14, 1944, I brought to this House what I considered pertinent facts with regard to the organization and operation of what is known as the Fair Employment Practice Committee, which has until now existed and operated under an Executive order of the President.

In that report I showed to this body that this organization in the central office here in Washington and throughout the Nation maintained 106 paid employees, 61 of whom were Negroes, and 45 whites. I showed further that the existence of this committee cost the taxpayers of the Nation $317,160 per year; that the white employees drew $143,000 and the Negroes $173,000 per annum.

Realizing that the populace of this democracy has no means of obtaining the truth with regard to this committee, I feel it my duty to from time to time keep the people advised. I further feel that it is the duty of every Member of this House to have the facts actually existing with this committee when it has no standing other than a temporary organization set up by Executive order.

When the operation of this committee with its shameful, disgraceful, and undemocratic set-up is considered, when it is existing only as a temporary organization, it is impossible to conceive of the abuses that the people may expect from it when it once gets itself permanently established in this democracy.

To begin with, this committee or any such organization has no right of existence in a democracy where people are presumed to have some rights and privileges over themselves and their own business, but looking behind the curtain, let us see whether its status has been improved since my report of April 1944, or whether the misuse of power has been expanded and the privileges granted this organization more grossly abused.

I have recently obtained from the chairman's office a statement of the names, positions, salaries, and color of all employees connected with this committee throughout its entirety. It is at this time composed of 43 whites, 65 Negroes, and 2 Japs.

In other words, around 63 percent of its personnel is Negro, and nearly 2 percent Japanese. There being only 43 whites, I will give the names of them, as follows:

Malcolm Ross, Emanuel Blotch, Evelyn Cooper, Myra Bunting, Will Maslow, Hayes W. Beall, Inez Mercer, Celio Hoffman, Daniel R. Donovan, Olcott R. Abbott, Harold James, Witherspoon Dodge, George D. McKay, Sally Chubb, Don W. Ellinger, Evelyn Ronning, Harry L. Kingman, Edward Ruthledge, Bernard Ross, Virginia Seymour, Jewell Mazen, Bruce A. Hunt, Max Berking, Coral Coan, Simon Stickgold, Tillie Asepha, Sonia Schwartz, Mildred Greenbelt, Samuel Risk, Karyl Klinger, Alice Kahn, Edna Wasem, Joy Schultz, Penny Zeidman, Roy A. Hoglund, Eugene Ormsbee, Helen G. Schlien, Morris Levine, Carlos Castenada, Willetta Gutleben, Ignacio Lopez, Vera G. Vetter, Marie Lerma.

I want the people of the United States to bear in mind that this committee is vested with powers to destroy this democracy. I recited the powers granted this committee in my other report to the Congress, but I desire to quote said powers as follows:

First. All agencies of the Government of the United States shall include in all contracts a provision obligating the contractor not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin.

Second. All Federal agencies concerned with vocational and training programs for war production shall take all measures appropriate to assure that such programs are administered without discrimination.

Third. The committee shall formulate policies to achieve the purposes of this order and shall make recommendations to the various Federal departments and agencies. It shall also recommend to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission appropriate measures for bringing about the full utilization and training of manpower in and for war production without discrimination.

Fourth. The committee shall receive and investigate complaints of discrimination. It may conduct hearings, make findings of facts, and take appropriate steps to obtain elimination of such discrimination.

Fifth. The committee shall assume jurisdiction over all complaints and matters pending before the old committee.

Sixth. The committee shall have the power to promulgate such rules and regulations as may be appropriate or necessary to carry out the provisions of the order.

I feel in my heart such a spirit of indignation to any such condition being permitted to exist in this democracy until I am not in position to command words sufficient to express my contempt for this organization and the spirit that prompts its sponsorship.

There is quite a block of the membership of this House today sponsoring, and sponsoring with all their force, legislation to give this committee permanent status. They realize that if such legislation becomes law that this committee will have power to make them work in their offices a Negro, Japanese, or anyone else of their choice. Now let me get this straight in the beginning: this is not a Negro row—he is not to blame for this condition. He is being used as a tool, if you please, a means to an end, which end will bring to him nothing but suffering. If the Negroes in this country were let alone they would cause no one any trouble. It is the meddlers who are not interested in the Negro nor his well-being, but who are cheap enough to use him and his status as a means to destroy the liberties and freedom that have been the fruit of this democracy. If you Members of Congress are sincere in your efforts to establish this committee as a permanent branch of the Government, why don't you practice what you preach? I would like to say to the Negro people, if you want to test the sincerity of the membership who are sponsoring this legislation, call at the office of each one of them and see how many Negro secretaries they have. This one fact should convince you that they are not sincere and not willing to do voluntarily what they seek to force others to do by laws passed at their hands.

It is beyond me to understand why there is so much effort being put out to tear down and destroy all the fundamentals of the democracy our fighting forces are dying to preserve while they are absent on the many battle fields of the world today, and are precluded from even expressing themselves on these radical changes and this great progress of regimentation of man and property.

I want to say to the membership of this House, in no uncertain terms, that you will have to answer to those boys who,

while prisoners of Japan, were mutilated, burned, and abused, and forced to eat rats, cats, and stray dogs, while you have lived normal, full lives, for voting to put in charge of their homes, their families, and their businesses, Japanese, while they have had no right to express themselves. When you go to cast your ballot for this legislation, I want you to know that you will not be able to say in your next campaign that you did not know that you were voting to establish a dictatorial agency to control the destiny of the lives of the families of those who suffered at Bataan and Corregidor, who had in its employ at the time one Doris K. Sese, a Japanese, and one Otome Saito, a Japanese. You will not be able to say that you did not know that the office of the chairman of this committee was staffed by five whites and five Negroes; that the Field Operations was staffed by three whites and five negroes and one Japanese; that the office of Review and Analysis was staffed by two whites and six Negroes; that the Legal Division was staffed by one white by the name of Simon Stickgold, and two Negroes; that the Information Division was staffed by two Negroes only; that the Office of Budget and Administration was staffed by eleven Negroes only; and the office of Mail and Files was staffed by six Negroes only. I say you will not be able to tell them that you did not know this because I am now telling you, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will disclose these facts to you. I have been told that those who would not hear must feel, and those of you who cannot wait to set up this infernal machine of destruction until the boys do return and are given the privilege of at least expressing themselves, I hope will at least be able to feel.

I want to further remind you that the taxpayers are spending annually $351,380 base pay to maintain this stigma on the decency of America. I have no definite figures further than the base pay, but when the increased percentage employees draw and overtime is figured, I have every reason to know that the amount drawn from the tax funds of the Nation will run more than $400,000 per year.

I hold no prejudice, ill will, or malice against any individual on account of race, creed, or color. I measure people by their own conduct, but let me say to you that in my opinion if there is any such thing as a decent Japanese the percentage would be less than one-hundredth part of one percent. For the sake of argument, let us presume that there are some individual Japanese who could be considered loyal to this Government, and who could be considered trustworthy, then could it not be said that that individual who is privileged to live under our flag could safely trust native-born white Americans for a square deal. If you people think that the native-born Americans have deteriorated to such a low degree of responsibility, of decency, and of national honor that you have got to set up a board with no one but Negroes in charge of its administration and a bunch of Japanese to go out and control the business of this Nation, then you should be ashamed of your citizenship.

I wonder if you people really know just what your works are going to produce. I wonder if you have forgotten that, "by their works ye shall know them." I wonder if you think that the American people, the people who built this great commonwealth, are going to submit to a bunch of Negroes and Japs going about over the country telling them who they shall employ and how they shall run their businesses. I can tell you, you are fixing to produce a condition in this country that will cause your own children to look back on your record with scorn and disdain. Do you realize that you are sowing the seeds of revolution? Do you realize that you are meddling where you have no business; that you are nourishing national disorder and trouble that can only serve to destroy a land of freedom, liberty, and justice?

I hope that through the press and otherwise the inside story of this organization can go to the entire citizenry of this Nation, and irrespective of persons, I hope those who so far forget the spirit of those who perished at Corregidor and Bataan and those who lived through the horrors to return will not be forgotten by the voters who love America and American institutions.

I was criticized by some few individuals for bringing those facts to the people last April, and may again be criticized for exposing these facts. But let me say that I have them over the signature of the office of the Chairman if anyone wants to question the veracity of the statements of fact contained herein. I want to advise the House and this Nation that irrespective of any criticism I shall continue to keep the people advised on the work of this un-American set-up.

Let me say again that you may accuse me of striking at the Negro people, but I want to tell you that the Negroes through my district and in my home town are my friends and I do not believe that they would want such organization to exist in this country. I know that they would not want to be dictated to by a Jap, and if this committee ever obtains permanent status you have no assurance that it will not be dominated by Japs and every other un-American force that can be obtained. Let me tell you, and I speak with all the truth within my being, if an attempt was made here to set up a committee composed wholly of white native-born Americans to go out and meddle and dictate and interfere with the business of the Negro people of this Nation only, then I would stand on this floor and fight such a move as un-American and not worthy to be perpetuated under the American flag.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. CHAPMAN, for 2 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. PATRICK, for 3 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. HOBBS (at the request of Mr. SPARKMAN), for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. THOMASON), for the balance of this week, on account of serious illness in his family.

To Mr. IZAC, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MOTT, Mr. BATES of Massachusetts, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. FARRINGTON (at the request of Mr. VINSON), for 2 weeks, on account of official business to investigate the housing situation as it pertains to the Navy in the Hawaiian area.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 13, 1945, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Brand Names and Newsprint Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Tuesday, March 13, 1945, to resume public hearings on newsprint.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Tuesday, March 13, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold a hearing on Tuesday, March 13, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 173.

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold a hearing on Wednesday, March 14, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1624 and H. R. 1746.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, March 15, 1945, at 10 a. m., to continue hearings on parcel-post rates.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session at 10:30 a. m., on Thursday, March 15, 1945, in the committee room, 356 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Tuesday, March 20, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in room 247, House Office Building, on H. R. 128, a bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will continue hearings on Wednesday, March 21, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 128, a bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection for pensionable purposes for service rendered between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

285. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, reported by the Governor of the Virgin Islands to the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

286. A letter from the Administrator of War Food Administration, transmitting a report with respect to the progress of the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects; to the Committee on Agriculture.

287. A letter from the Administrative Officer of the White House, transmitting the estimated personnel requirements for the White House Office for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

288. A letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting an estimate of personnel requirements of the United States Tariff Commission for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

289. A letter from the Chairman of War Production Board, transmitting a copy of the personnel requirements of the War Production Board for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

290. A letter from the Executive Director of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, transmitting a copy of the estimates of the number of employees required for this Office during the period ending June 30, 1945, as submitted to the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

291. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting estimates of personnel requirements for the Post Office Department, for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

292. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $59,169,040 for the Federal Security Agency, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 111); to the Committee on Appropriation and ordered to be printed.

293. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1946, in the amount of $20,550, for the legislative branch, House of Representatives (H. Doc. No. 112); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

294. A letter from the Executive Secretary of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, transmitting a copy of the estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Scientific Research and Development during the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Commmittee on the Civil Service.

295. A letter from the Alien Property Custodian, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the period ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

296. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to section 16 of the organic act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936, a copy of various legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

297. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting estimates of requirements of personnel subject to Public Law 49 for the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard (departmental and field) for the fourth quarter, fiscal year 1945, together with a request that a new ceiling be established for the Navy Department in each classification for the fourth quarter, fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

298. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the bulget for the fiscal year 1946 for development of landing areas for national defense, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, Department of Commerce, in the form of a draft of a proposed provision extending the availability of the existing appropriation under that head to June 30, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 113); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

299. A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, transmitting the information for the purpose of making a determination of the number of employees necessary for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the Federal Works Agency for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

300. A letter from the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements of the National Labor Relations Board for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 178. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 2013, a bill to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 308). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Joint Resolution 115. Joint resolution relative to determination and payment of certain claims against the Government of Mexico; without amendment (Rept. No. 309). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2531) for the relief of Norman C. Albrethsen, and the same was referred to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 2580. A bill to give credit to veterans, for purposes of title II of the Social Security Act, for certain service in the armed forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2581. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the issuance of devices in recognition of the services of merchant sailors," approved May 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 81), and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUNKER:

H. R. 2582. A bill to provide for disregarding small amounts of compensation for casual labor in determining need for the old-age assistance provided for pursuant to title I of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2583. A bill to provide 30 days' leave to enlisted men before honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 2584. A bill to provide more efficient dental care for the personnel of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 2585. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Code; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 2586. A bill to authorize the leasing of Indian lands for business, and other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2587. A bill to dispense with the requirement of an oath in connection with applications for benefits under certain laws granting benefits to veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 2588. A bill to provide for the establishment of a bee-culture laboratory at Corvallis, Oreg.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 2589. A bill authorizing payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for the lands ceded by them in the agreement of February 25, 1896, ratified by the act of June 10, 1896, and reopening such lands to mineral entry; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 2590. A bill to provide for the bonding of Federal officials and employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WHITE:

H. R. 2591. A bill to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments and certain purchase and sale operations by corporations created pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 2592. A bill to establish the United States Naval Aviation Academy in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 2593. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2594. A bill to provide for compensation to blind persons for loss of earning power due to blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution designating period from Thanksgiving Day to Christmas of each year for Nation-wide Bible reading; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 179. Resolution requesting certain information from the National Labor Relations Board; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. Res. 180. Resolution to authorize the House Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate measures to open Palestine to free immigration and col-

onization by the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation relative to employers' sinking funds and reserves, and taxability thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that all presently proposed Federal irrigation projects and all such which are proposed in the future for construction in the State of Wyoming, be continued in all stages under the direct supervision of the United States Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to public lands in, and funds and other relief for, the State of Wyoming from the United States of America; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider and pass legislation to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to accept the principles of the federation of the world and requesting the President of the United States to call an industrial convention to formulate a constitution for the federation of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to have representatives of veterans of World War No. 1 and No. 2 at the Conference for World Peace at San Francisco; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for legislation providing that the military installations now located on the Indianola antiaircraft gunnery range be transferred to the county of Calhoun, State of Texas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 2595. A bill for the relief of Patrick A. Kelly; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 2596. A bill for the relief of M. F. Diller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 2597. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Arizona to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the estate of Earl W. Nepple, and for the relief of Marie Nepple; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2598. A bill for the relief of J. H. Atkins; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

166. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Edith M. Dennis and 23 other citizens of Lakewood, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

167. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Robert C. Hayes, Deadwood, S. Dak., urging that Congress refrain from passing legislation conscripting American labor or fixing hours, compensation, or places of employment; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

168. Also, petition of Robert C. Hayes, Deadwood, S. Dak., that legislation be enacted to reduce the civil employees of governmental agencies by one-third; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

169. Also, petition of Robert C. Hayes, Deadwood, S. Dak., urging that the Congress refrain from enacting any law involving the United States in any obligation to furnish men or means for foreign wars other than those for the safety of America and consistent with the national honor and rectitude; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

170. Also, petition of Robert C. Hayes, Deadwood, S. Dak., urging that Congress enact legislation to reduce compensation and salaries of all civil employees of the Federal Government by 35 percent; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

171. Also, petition of Robert C. Hayes, Deadwood, S. Dak., urging that the Constitution of the United States be amended limiting the term of the President of the United States to one term of 6 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

172. By Mr. MUNDT: Petition of the South Dakota State Legislature, commending the removal of limitations on the number of soldiers who may receive 30-day furloughs, leaving authority with theater commanders to determine which men deserve and need such relief, and urging that this practice be extended to all the armed services, if such action has not already been taken; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

173. Also, petition of the State Legislature of South Dakota asking that the Federal Government recognize and accept the obligation and responsibility to the Indians of South Dakota and to make payment to them for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children on the basis of 100 percent and without participation by the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

174. By Mr. MURDOCK: Memorial of the Senate of the Arizona Legislature, Senate Memorial No. 2, praying for the relief of certain property owners of Santa Cruz County; to the Committee on Claims.

175. Also, memorial of Arizona State Legislature, Senate Concurrent Memorial No. 3, requesting the Congress to pass Senate bill 114, to pay for land of the San Carlos strip ceded by the Apache Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

176. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, the Association of Provision Retailers of Mayaguez, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to asking from the Government of the United States the immediate determination of the political status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

177. Also, petition of Mrs. Harry Campbell and various citizens of Tennessee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their request for support of House bills 709 and 2082 and Senate bills 569 and 682; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

178. Also, petition of Dorsey W. McMahan, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to immediate deportation; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

179. Also, petition of Local 125, International Woodworkers of America, C. I. O., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Crimean Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

180. Also, petition of Local 401, International Woodworkers of America, C. I. O., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Crimean Conference; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

181. Also, petition of Americans of Estonian descent, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to their appeal to insure the territorial sovereignty of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania based on the free will of the people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, March 12, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou before whom the prayers of Thy children go up as incense, speak to our burdened and longing hearts as we lift our lives to Thy searching gaze. In these holy days of the Passion we would test our thoughts and deeds and words, not against the faulty background of our fellows but with our eyes upon the transparent glory of the Crystal Christ. In these hard, bestead, and dangerous days we would find peace in the midst of the storm and cleansing for the baseness of our own hearts. Sober us with a solemn sense of personal responsibility, with the realization that Thy call to every man is to contribute to the world's good his own life, strong, clean, honest, trustworthy, and serviceable. In the light of this truth we pray for ourselves, that we may not fail our own generation and Thee, that the paganism that afflicts the world may be redeemed into decency, justice, and mercy and into the brotherhood of that One who went to the cross that He might be the servant of all. We ask it in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, March 12, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 10, 1945, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 211. An act for the relief of Ensign Frederick Matthew McCord, United States Naval Reserve;

S. 212. An act to provide an additional sum for the payment of a claim under the act

entitled "An act to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel and certain Federal civil employees for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the hurricane and flood at Parris Island, S. C., on August 11–12, 1940," approved April 23, 1941; and

S. 215. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the naval auxiliary air facility, Astoria, Oreg., on April 2, 1944.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 298) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2552) to amend paragraph (c) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, as amended by act approved February 27, 1931, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the administrative officer of the White House, the Postmaster General, the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, the Comptroller General of the United States, the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, and the Executive Secretary of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective departments and offices for the quarter ending June 30, 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Two letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United State to take appropriate measures to open Palestine to free immigration and colonization by the Jewish people

"Whereas the Nazi persecution and wholesale slaughter of Jews in Europe have outraged the conscience of the civilized world and have vastly aggravated the tragedy of the Jewish problem there; and

"Whereas at the end of the present war large numbers of European Jews will find themselves in desperate need for a new home where they can rebuild their lives in dignity and security; and

"Whereas after World War No. 1, Great Britain had accepted at the instance of the Allied and Associated Powers the mandate for Palestine and had undertaken 'to facilitate the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine,' and undertaking subsequently approved by 52 nations, including the United States; and

"Whereas this policy was concurred in by a joint resolution unanimously adopted by both Houses of the Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922; and

"Whereas the Democratic and the Republican Party in their national conventions of 1944 adopted platforms in favor of the reestablishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; and

"Whereas the President of the United States, on October 15, 1944, expressed his approval of this aim which he stated to be 'in accord with the traditional American policy and in keeping with the spirit of the "four freedoms" ': Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, express our profound sympathy with the millions of innocent victims of the enemy's ruthless extermination policy, and that we demand just punishment of all those who perpetrated these horrible crimes against humanity; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the United States should take appropriate measures to the end that Palestine should be opened for free immigration and unrestricted colonization so that the Jewish people may rebuild their ancestral homeland as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth, and that the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, memorialized to take proper action for that purpose; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of the memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Senate, and the House of Representatives of the United States of America.

"Approved February 23, 1945.

"LESTER C. HUNT,
"*Governor.*"

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 19

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation repealing the $5 motor-vehicle stamp tax

"Whereas the Congress of the United States passed legislation imposing a yearly $5 motor vehicle stamp tax to raise additional revenues: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the members of the Michigan Legislature urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation repealing the $5 motor-vehicle stamp tax; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress."

"House Concurrent Resolution 14

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing for reimbursement of educational institutions for the cost of education for returning servicemen

"Whereas the provisions of the present G. I. bill of rights provides that the Federal Government shall pay the tuition fees of returning sericemen in the several institutions of learning; and

"Whereas the tuition fees do not represent the actual cost of education in such institutions; and

"Whereas the returning servicemen are entitled to the best of educational opportunities, which can only be furnished if the educational institutions in which they are enrolled are able to supply the needed facilities: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the members of the Michigan Legislature urgently request the Congress of the United States to enact amendments to the G. I. bill of rights, so that, instead of paying the tuition at the various institutions of learning, that the actual cost of education, as determined by each individual institution, be paid by the Federal Government, under such safeguards as the Congress shall deem necessary; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"To the Congress of the United States and to Hon. E. L. Bartlett, Delegate to Congress from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in seventeenth regular session assembled, respectfully represents, that—

"Whereas section 9 of the organic act approved August 24, 1912, creating a Legislative Assembly for the Territory of Alaska, and conferring certain powers thereon, contained, among other matters, a provision that 'no divorce shall be granted by the courts of the Territory unless the applicant therefor shall have resided in the Territory for 2 years next preceding the application'; and

"Whereas practically all courts of the several States of the United States have jurisdiction to grant divorces with much shorter residence requirements: Now therefore

"Your memorialist prays that the Congress of the United States amend the said organic act to provide that the courts of the Territory may grant divorces when it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the court that the applicant has resided in the Territory of Alaska for a period of 1 year last past immediately preceding the filing of his application.

"And your memorialist will ever pray."

By Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

A resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Resolutions memorializing the War Food Administration for immediate relief to farmers in the existing emergency pertaining to the hay situation

"Whereas the present critical conditions pertaining to the supply of feed for livestock are causing enormous loss to Massachusetts dairy farmers who are faced with the problem of purchasing hay at $50 per ton, which causes their costs for said feed to exceed their income from dairying operations; and

"Whereas hundreds of farmers have gone into debt by reason of said feed situation and find that their credit has been greatly impaired; and

"Whereas said farmers, by reason of said conditions and also due to their inability to better their financial status because of the governmental regulation of prices, are faced with impoverishment, and, unless immediate relief from their serious financial predica-

ment is provided, they will be forced to sell their cows for slaughter: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the War Food Administration to immediately take such action as may be necessary to put into effect the following proposals:

"1. The extension of the 90 cents per hundred milk subsidy, so-called, to July 1 in the current year;

"2. The immediate payment of the present subsidy for the months of January and February in the current year;

"3. Monthly payments of the subsidy until July in the current year;

"4. Continuance of efforts to provide adequate facilities for shipping and transporting feed for livestock;

"5. An investigation of the entire problem of such feed supply, particularly with a view to determining whether there is any so-called holding back of hay for the purpose of influencing the price thereof; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forthwith transmitted by the State secretary to the War Food Administrator and to the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth."

By Mr. McFARLAND:

A concurrent memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Memorial 3

"Senate concurrent memorial requesting the Congress to pass S. 114, to pay for lands of the San Carlos strip ceded by the Apache Indians

"To the Congress of the United States of America:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"There is pending in the Congress a bill (S. 114) to authorize payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for the lands ceded by them in the agreement of February 25, 1896, ratified by the act of June 10, 1896 (29 Stat. 358), reopening the lands to mineral entry, and making them a part of the public domain.

"The bill in question is designed to rectify errors made by governmental agencies in permitting citizens to homestead lands in the so-called San Carlos strip and in issuing patents to the State of Arizona and leases to other persons for lands therein, whereas under the agreement above referred to, the land should have been opened to mineral entry only.

"The proposed bill appears to provide the only equitable method of preserving the rights of all parties concerned, and all parties concerned favor passage of the measure. It is unjust that citizens who have expended much time and money in developing lands in the San Carlos strip should be ousted therefrom, when the fault lies not with the citizens but with governmental agencies. It is likewise unjust that the lands be used without compensating the San Carlos Apache Indians therefor, and it appears that, if other settlement be not soon made, the Indians and the Indian Service will demand complete restoration of the lands involved.

"It is fitting, also, to call attention to the fact that the longer action is postponed the more complicated the condition becomes. The situation should not be aggravated by continued delay.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona (the house of representatives concurring) prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States speedily enact S. 114, authorizing payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for lands ceded by them, and reopening those lands to mineral entry, in order to settle for all time the confusing and conflicting claims to the lands, and to do justice to all parties."

A memorial of the Senate of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Claims:

"Senate Memorial 2

"Senate memorial praying for the relief of certain property owners of Santa Cruz county

"To the President and the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"Through the establishment by the United States in 1898 of a 60-foot neutral strip of territory along the boundary between the United States and Mexico, the rights of persons owning property within said area were involved. Particularly were the rights of property owners within that portion of said neutral strip where the same passed through the territory now known as Santa Cruz County, Ariz., affected, inasmuch as the said strip at such location constituted a part of the city of Nogales, and later became what is now known as International Street in the said city of Nogales.

"In the course of a determination of the rights of parties owning property within the said area, the Court of Claims of the United States on April 15, 1912, found that the following named persons were entitled to compensation in the amounts set forth respectively, for the taking of their property within said neutral strip as it passed through Santa Cruz County: John T. Brickwood, $3,750; Edward Gaynor, $4,250; Theodore Gebler, $1,200; Lee W. Mix, $1,450; Arthur S. Peck, $2,350; Thomas S. Casanega, $500; Joseph D. Lusignan, $3,250; Joseph P. Berger, $1,800.

"Despite the fact that said court found said persons entitled to compensation in the amounts above set forth, they have never been compensated for the loss of their property in accordance with the findings of the court, or at all, a failure which appears to constitute a clear violation of the provision of the Constitution of the United States that private property may not be taken for public use without compensating the owner therefor.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, urgently requests:

"1. That the Congress of the United States enact the necessary legislation to pay the persons above named the amounts awarded to them by the United States Court of Claims as compensation for the land taken by the United States in the establishment of said neutral strip along the boundary between the United States and Mexico."

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"Whereas available State records indicate the current expenditure of approximately $124,000 of State funds per year for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children benefits for Indians in South Dakota, representing 50-percent participation by the State; and

"Whereas it is the considered opinion of the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota that the support and relief of the Indians in South Dakota is primarily the obligation and responsibility of the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring), That the Federal Government recognize and accept this obligation and responsibility to the Indians of South Dakota, and hereafter make payment to them for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children, on the basis of 100 percent and without participation by the State of South Dakota; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of South Dakota, and to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, at Washington, D. C."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 2

"Whereas victory in the present war is the paramount objective of every American, and home-area activity is properly concentrated on complete support of the attainment of that objective; and

"Whereas members of the South Dakota Legislature are much concerned over the fact that the nature of this war keeps more American soldiers farther from home, for longer periods of time, than troops of any land have been, in any war, and keeps them storming island after island in the Pacific, and ridge after ridge in Italy, France, and elsewhere, until they reach, and sometimes pass, the limits of human endurance; and

"Whereas the members of the legislature have sought to avoid any action that might be interpreted as critical of the conduct of the war, believing that military authorities are properly interested in home-area reactions to existing practices and regulations, as they affect home and battle-area morale: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the South Dakota Legislature (the house of representatives concurring), That we do commend the recently announced removal of limitations on the number of soldiers who may receive 30-day furloughs, leaving authority with theater commanders to determine which men deserve and need such relief, and we urge that this practice be extended to all the armed services, if such action has not already been taken; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of South Dakota, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Admiral of the Fleet, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps."

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

A concurrent memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress to commit the United States to accept the principles of the Federation of the World, and requesting the President to call an international convention to formulate a constitution for the Federation of the World; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See concurrent memorial printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on the 12th instant, pp. 1994–1995, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

FLOOD CONTROL AND VALLEY AUTHORITIES—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF ARKANSAS LEGISLATURE AND NEWSPAPER EDITORIAL

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, under the rule, and appropriately referred, a concurrent resolution adopted by the Arkansas Legislature pertaining to flood control and valley authorities. Following the resolution I ask to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred an editorial published in the Southwest American, March 5, 1945, commenting upon the resolution and upon the general policy of flood control, water development, and valley authorities.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Arkansas and the editorial were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution endorsing the flood-control program planned by the United States engineers and authorized by Congress for and within the several river basins of Arkansas; opposing the establishment of an Arkansas Valley Authority and requesting that the river basins of Arkansas be developed by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army.

Whereas Arkansas is a State of many rivers, some having their source within and flowing through the State, others having their source outside and beyond State boundaries but flowing through or alongside of the State, and floods upon these streams constitute a menace to the lives, lands, and properties of our citizens; and

Whereas in 1936, based upon reports made and filed by the United States engineers, Congress enacted into public law the omnibus Flood Control Act, authorizing the construction of certain public works for flood control and other purposes on the rivers of the Nation, and said law established a declaration of policy; and

Whereas said declaration of policy, among other things, states, in part, "that it is the sense of Congress that flood control on navigable waters and their tributaries is a proper activity of the Federal Government in cooperation with States, their political subdivisions and localities," and that "Federal investigations and improvements of rivers and other waterways for flood control and allied purposes shall be under the direction of the Secretary of War and supervision of the Chief of Engineers"; and

Whereas in conformance with the declared policy of Congress, the Chief of Engineers ordered and directed the United States engineer districts of Vicksburg, Memphis, Little Rock, and Tulsa to investigate, study, and report upon definite flood-control projects upon the Mississippi, Arkansas, White, Black, St. Francis, and Ouachita Rivers for the purpose of ascertaining what flood-control works such as dams, reservoirs, levees, sea walls, revetments, and channel clearances should be constructed in the watersheds of the afore-mentioned rivers for the benefit and protection of the people; and

Whereas based upon the findings and reports of the engineers, Congress (prior to the war) authorized to be appropriated $363,445,000 for flood-control work and structures in the basins of the Arkansas, White, St. Francis, and Ouachita Rivers. The engineers had completed, in whole or in part, approximately $109,470,000 of the authorized projects, when, owing to the war, further work on our rivers was suspended, and there remains approximately $253,975,000 of authorizations for flood-control structures for these basins; and

Whereas a thorough investigation of the water resources of the Arkansas River Basin in Arkansas and Oklahoma has been made and a report thereon set forth, a comprehensive plan of development has been prepared by a special board of engineers including the division engineer, southwestern division, which, if approved, and authorized, will involve the expenditure of additional Federal funds in the amount of $446,118,000 upon the Arkansas River and tributaries in Arkansas and Oklahoma; and

Whereas in order that interested parties may express their views and present additional statements and arguments concerning the advisability of the United States undertaking these vast improvements, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors will hold a hearing beginning at 9 a. m., May 7, 1945, in Little Rock, Ark., in the Exhibition Hall, Robinson Memorial Auditorium, Garland Street entrance, and all interested parties are invited to be present or represented at the hearing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Fifty-fifth General Assembly of Arkansas, That we favor the democratic method of development, construction, and operation of the river basins projects in the State of Arkansas by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and we are opposed to the creation of a valley authority; be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States make available to the United States Army engineers sufficient funds to construct and operate all the projects necessary and incident to a comprehensive plan of flood control including the attendant benefits of navigation, irrigation, and incidental power, whenever economically sound, and that such construction and operation be expedited in the aid of the post-war effort; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Congress of the United States, to the United States Senators and Congressmen of this and neighboring States having a direct interest in the river basins aforementioned.

[From the Fort Smith (Ark.) Southwest American of March 5, 1945]

OFF THE RECORD

(By C. F. Byrns)

The Arkansas Legislature has adopted a resolution declaring its full support of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, in its program for full development of the Arkansas River, and its opposition to the creation of an Arkansas Valley Authority.

A concurrent resolution expressing that position was passed, first in the senate and then in the house, late in the week. It will be used as part of the testimony in the hearing on May 7 at Little Rock before the board of review of the Corps of Engineers, to show the sentiment of the people of Arkansas on this program.

There was no controversy about it. There is no evidence that I know about of any substantial support in this State for creation of an authority to develop the Arkansas River. Our people who are familiar with the program and the prospects for immediate post-war work on the river-control system recognize that the Corps of Engineers is the agency which logically should carry to completion the plans the engineers have developed in recent years of intensive study.

In eastern Oklahoma, especially around Muskogee, there has recently been considerable agitation for creation of an Arkansas Valley Authority to take over the development of the river. Some of its supporters, doubtless, sincerely believe that power should be the chief objective of a river control program and rightly believe that an authority approach means first emphasis on power and secondary interest in flood control, navigation, and other uses of the waters of the Arkansas drainage system. Some of the supporters, perhaps, are not fully advised of all that is involved in a choice between the Corps of Engineers and the proposed authority to do the job.

As readers of this column know, I have much admiration for the work the Tennessee Valley Authority has done in its own area. But I do not believe that it is sound for us in the Arkansas Valley to advocate an authority for our river. There are many reasons, which seem to me quite sound.

I prefer the democratic approach of the Corps of Engineers to the centralized control of the authority. Work done by the Corps of Engineers is under control of Congress at every step and its actual construction is usually dependent upon local support. The people finally decide whether it is good policy. The engineers do it only when their nonpolitical professional judgment tells them it is economically feasible and productive of more benefit than it costs. The authority, in the Tennessee Valley and in any other place an authority may be created, has autocratic powers, which it can exercise autocratically or democratically as it sees fit. At all events, it is beyond control of the people most affected.

The Corps of Engineers already has planned and has had approved by Congress 20 flood-control reservoirs in the Arkansas Basin, of which 5 have been built (1 of them by the Grand River Dam Authority in Oklahoma), 4 are in various stages of construction, and 11 are approved but await congressional appropriations after the war. In addition the engineers have congressional approval for $12,150,000 worth of levees between Tulsa and Pine Bluff. These projects will substantially control floods on the Arkansas.

In addition the Corps of Engineers has planned a comprehensive program of navigation, irrigation, power, additional flood control, and silt control for the entire drainage area from Tulsa to the mouth. That program is up for approval now by the Board of Review of the Corps of Engineers. Its approval and its early construction are fundamental to our economic development in this valley.

If the people of the Arkansas valley now go chasing off after authority rainbows, it is certain the Corps of Engineers program would be delayed for an indefinite time. It is likewise certain that the Corps of Engineers will not be nearly so interested in early completion of our authorized flood works, if it becomes apparent that the whole project which they have planned is to be taken away from the engineers and handed to an authority.

I want to see the river controlled. I want to see the work done as quickly as possible. We need to get this comprehensive plan approved and built in the first 5 years after the war. I think it is short-sighted to turn aside from the program so nearly assured and follow a will-o'-the-wisp which might easily turn out to be disappointing illusion.

TREATY WITH MEXICO RELATING TO THE UTILIZATION OF CERTAIN WATERS—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF EX. REPT. NO. 2)

Mr. JOHNSON of California. As in executive session, Mr. President, I ask leave to submit the views of the minority of the Committee on Foreign Relations upon the treaty with Mexico relating to certain waters, which has been submitted to the committee, and which, as I understand, was taken to Mexico by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The minority views are signed by two members of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the minority views will be received and printed as requested by the Senator from California.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 725. A bill granting a pension to Dora H. Ellis; to the Committee on Pensions.

(Mr. CAPPER introduced Senate bill 726, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 727. A bill for the relief of the commissioned officers of the United States ship *St. Louis* during the Spanish-American War, May 18, 1898, to September 2, 1898; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(Mr. WILLIS introduced Senate bill 728, which was referred to the Committee on

Naval Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 729. A bill for the relief of William Andrews Evans; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 730. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States, under a quota for Koreans, persons of the Korean race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 731. A bill to provide for the appointment of female dentists in the Dental Corps of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. CAPPER introduced Senate Joint Resolution 47, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE FOR UNIFORM MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE LAWS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution providing for a proposed amendment to the Constitution, as follows:

The Congress shall have power to make laws, which shall be uniform throughout the United States, on marriage and divorce, the legitimation of children, and the care and custody of children affected by the annulment of marriage or by divorce.

I have been urging the adoption of such an amendment for some time. Personally, I would prefer to have the States adopt uniform laws on the subject of marriage and divorce, and on the property rights of those divorced, and particularly the unhappy children whose parents separate. But I realize that is a hopeless proposition.

There are many diverse views as to what constitutes the bases of our present civilization, which seems to be changing rapidly these days, and in some respects not altogether for the better. For myself, I happen to belong to a civilization which has considered two of these bases to be the home and the rights of the individual to own property. Both of these rights are threatened by the growing confusion caused by 49 different kinds of laws affecting marriage and divorce, particularly divorce. The latest figures from the Bureau of Vital Statistics show that nearly 1 marriage in 6 winds up in divorce and breaking up the family.

I do not know, of course, that a Federal act governing marriage and divorce would mitigate to any great extent the evils of divorce on a wholesale scale, although I believe it would to some extent; but I do feel strongly that such action would protect the children and their property rights, and end a great deal of confusion attendant upon the divorce evil.

A man and woman may be law-abiding citizens, and their children legitimate and entitled to all rights, including property rights, in the community in which they live; but if they move across the State line, the children may find themselves illegitimate and the parents guilty of bigamy or adultery. I say this is an intolerable situation, and one which we should at least attempt to cure.

I call attention to a statement from Dr. Carleton Simon, criminologist of the New York State Association of Chiefs of Police, the New England Association of Chiefs of Police, and the International Association of Chiefs of Police, at the forty-fourth annual convention of the New York association at White Plains, N. Y., last July 25, in which he says:

The increase of juvenile delinquency has commanded wide attention for which many causes have been ascribed. None of these stand out more conspicuously than disrupted home life.

Before reading further from Dr. Simon, let me interject that Congress cannot escape responsibility in this matter by laying it all on the war and war conditions. The disruption of home life and the attendant evils did not start with the war. War conditions have accentuated some of the effects, but they are not the cause. I continue to read from Dr. Simon:

The United States Bureau of Vital Statistics shows that 15 percent of marriages terminate in divorce. These figures do not include the vast number of unrecorded separations and abandonments.

Every State differs from another in its divorce laws, all of which tends to encourage mismated alliance as it makes separation an easy matter. What we need in the United States are uniform State divorce laws. These varied laws make a mockery of what should be a sacred institution.

Attention frequently has been directed to the fact that we are placing more power in Federal administration. In many instances this has been due to the inability or unwillingness of various States to cooperate with each other and obtain uniform laws. If the States do not evolve among themselves uniform divorce laws, then, because of the vast importance of this subject, it should be included in a Federal statute.

Mr. President, I wish at this time to introduce a bill which suggests a program that might be approved by the Congress after the constitutional amendment has been adopted by the States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill and joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Kansas will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 726) to provide for uniform regulation of marriage and divorce, introduced by Mr. CAPPER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 47) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to marriage and divorce laws, introduced by Mr. CAPPER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Simon's discussion, Post-war Crime Problems and Their Control, from which I have quoted, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST-WAR CRIME PROBLEMS AND THEIR CONTROL

(By Dr. Carleton Simon, criminologist of the New York State Association of Chiefs of Police, the New England Association of Chiefs of Police, and the International Association of Chiefs of Police)

Only history will be able to evaluate the vast destruction brought about by the present global war. It will record the immense loss of life and property, the separation of families, the wreckage of homes, the inhumanity of man to man, the upheaval of spiritual ideals, the racial and religious hatred, the chaos of economic, financial, and political unrest with its train of revolutionary episodes and riots, all spelling unnecessary waste, want, misery, and suffering. Above all of these stands out as a post-war heritage an increase of insanity and of crime.

Many of these reactions facing civilization will be interrelated. To properly meet these conditions suitable measures will have to be devised.

The police of this country are vitally interested, however, only in one problem, and that is crime. In spite of advanced police administration and improved technical improvement in criminal science, suitable legislative enactment will have to be initiated to meet conditions that will prevail.

Some of these methods to be advanced may be deemed by some as opposed to our present conception of civic regulations and restrictions of personal liberty but must become part of our social and legal practices if we wish to meet the needs of our modern civilization and to maintain the same.

The increase of juvenile delinquency has commanded wide attention for which many causes have been ascribed. None of these stand out more conspicuously than disrupted home life. The United States Bureau of Vital Statistics shows that 15 percent of marriages terminate in divorce. These figures do not include the vast number of unrecorded separations and abandonments. Every State differs from another in its divorce laws, all of which tends to encourage mismated alliances as it makes legal separation an easy matter. What we need in the United States are uniform State divorce laws. These varied laws make a mockery of what should be a sacred institution.

Attention has frequently been directed to the fact that we are placing more power in Federal administration. In many instances this has been due to the inability or unwillingness of various States to cooperate with each other and obtain uniform laws. We see this in matters of bankruptcy which were solved by placing it under Federal jurisdiction. If the States do not evolve among themselves uniform divorce State laws, then, because of the vast importance of this subject, it should be included in a Federal statute. There is also no reason why a woman divorced in one State cannot legally remarry in another State without a subsequent offspring in some States being considered illegitimate.

NEEDED CHANGES IN PAROLE METHODS

There has always been considerable controversy upon the theory and practice of parole. Initially, parole was conceived to get away from the retaliative or punishment method. It was believed that a consideration shown a prisoner in the reduction of his prison sentence and a return to his family would more readily tend toward his ultimate reformation. Its practice also would serve to remind prisoners that only by their good behavior in prison were they eligible for parole.

In the parole method, though a prisoner is permitted to be at large, he is required to report regularly to his parole officer, who also places restrictions upon his conduct to encourage him to live honestly. Any breach of

such regulations is construed as a violation, the penalty being revocation of his parole and return to prison until the expiration of his sentence. It has been the belief that this club held over the head of a prisoner would make for his reformation.

There is considerable merit in the principle involved in the parole method especially in making the prisoner feel that society, though protecting itself, is not seeking vengeance. If any regret or remorse exists in the mind of the convicted man, parole gives him an opportunity to retrace his steps and yet serves as a constant reminder of his civic responsibility.

The power of parole is vested in various parole boards, each State having its own system. The complexities of individual cases, political infiltration, and other causes have created havoc with the proper administration of these parole commissions until today there are very few States that have an efficient administration of this system.

On the other hand, the pendulum that swings between the concepts of punishment and rehabilitation has swung too far toward the rehabilitation idea, guided as it has been by misleading sentimentality and a disregard of factual conditions.

New York State has a splendid parole commission, yet we may not always have a board as intelligent, as conscientious, and as efficient. For that reason, and also as a milestone in the progress of criminal science, we advocate a method which, if universally adopted, would end at least 75 percent of the abuses that exist today. The turning loose of confirmed criminals would be brought to a complete halt.

The suggestion we have to offer in the interest of the public rather than of the criminal, the politician, or the sob-sister is that only one parole should be granted a man during his life. At present, parole commissions throughout the United States release annually thousands of men who should be kept behind the bars and who immediately utilize their freedom to launch new wars upon society. If we are to reduce the standing army of over four and a half million thieves, murderers, racketeers, gunmen, and gangsters in America, we must handle the situation without emotional hysteria. The principle of a single parole for felons should therefore be made a part of the law in every State.

THE ABOLISHMENT OF SUSPENDED SENTENCE

The criminal status of suspended sentence should be abolished. This is a pronouncement of guilt clothed in ambiguous manner. It releases an individual without the involvement of a penalty and yet finds him guilty. It inflicts the stigma of guilt without serving any other apparent purpose except perhaps preventing such person suing for false arrest. In a sense it is a contradiction and is radically wrong for it gives the offender a criminal record while actually extending leniency. Far better service could be rendered the community and the individual by the substitution of the term "suspended judgment" which is not to be construed as a conviction. In this manner, an individual may be automatically placed upon probation or observation. If found later to be a second offender he could be returned to court and a decision rendered as to his guilt or innocence of the first and also last offense.

The very fundamental purpose of probation is rehabilitation, and every avenue aims toward this desirable termination—spiritually, educationally, and by a clearer comprehension of everyone's civic responsibility. To keep a man's record clean would be a far better contribution toward reformation than finding him guilty and then releasing him in his own custody. Finally, it would not deprive such individual of civil service or other opportunities which a suspended sentence does. It is my personal opinion that political influence in many instances plays its part in pronouncement of suspended sentences.

PRESENT UNDESIRABLE METHODS OF OBTAINING NAMES FOR JURY DUTY

At this time we also wish to stress an undesirable feature in our present jury system. It is the general custom to secure for jury service the names on our voting lists. In consequence many individuals do not vote in order to escape jury and other civic responsibilities. Every police department should, at regular intervals, make a house-to-house canvass and obtain the names of residents and inmates. This would be an additional means to supply names for jury duty. Such survey might also disclose valuable information as uncovering men wanted and aliens illegally here.

UNIVERSAL FINGERPRINTING

The present war has brought home to everyone the value of personal identification. This subject has been stressed so often that we feel that reiteration of this may be considered futile. There has been, however, a distinctive advance in the direction of its popular acceptance. Every Federal employee is fingerprinted, including our entire military forces. It seems to us that the only objectors are those with potential criminal tendencies, and from those individuals the counterpart of those we meet in the induction of our military personnel—the conscientious objectors. If individuals do not desire to have their fingerprints in the civilian files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, there is no reason why they cannot have them deposited in the archives of their own homes. At least the latter method may render service, partial though it be, in the event of missing persons, sudden death, insanity, accident, and other manner where identity is unknown or otherwise unobtainable.

IDENTIFICATION OF THE NEWBORN

There is possibly nothing more valuable in human life than personal identification. The identification of the newborn has been met in various manners by maternity hospitals where, because of the great many infants there, various devices have been utilized. Chemical means, tapes, ribbons, ultraviolet rays, and other transient means, the purposes of which have been usually to avoid substitutions or other mix-ups or mistakes. These are but temporary expediencies. The identification of the newborn, however, should not be confined solely as a protection to mothers and innocent infants against errors, or even criminal purposes, but should be permanently recorded as legal proof of identification of the child and the mother. This is being done today in certain South American countries and at the Presbyterian Hospital, Chicago, where the mother is given a birth certificate with the footprints of the baby and her own fingerprints upon the document. We believe much good will be accomplished, much error avoided, and positive parental identification established were it formulated into legal requirement that every birth certificate bear upon its face the fingerprints of the mother and the footprints of the infant. This method would serve to clarify questions of parentage for purposes of inheritance and otherwise in instances of abandonment, kidnaping, accidents, and general identification purposes.

EVERY DEATH CERTIFICATE SHALL HAVE UPON IT THE FINGERPRINTS OF THE DECEASED

Untold thousands are buried yearly whose identities are unknown. Accidents that destroy features and make the victim unrecognizable, the unknown dead from insane institutions, missing persons, and those who lived under other names than their own; all of these might have been saved a nameless grave and their friends and relatives informed of their demise had their identity been known.

We advocate, in the interest of the individual and of the State, that every death certificate shall have upon its face a fingerprint or fingerprints of the deceased. From the police angle, this would serve to uncover the passing of wanted criminals. It would also prevent fraudulent insurance claims; it would serve as a proof of death; it would also prevent a false assumption of death of individuals who are still alive and who have used these means of burying their pasts by such substitution.

Finally, this would encourage universal fingerprinting.

THE MENTALLY MINUS

The revelations of the Army induction examinations have disclosed many hidden and obvious mental disorders. It would be a tremendous advantage to our civilization were every individual in our Nation put through a similar screening test to determine their mental capacity and also, what is most important, to serve as a vocational guide. Millions of our young men in the prime of life offer astounding proof that a large percentage of these are rejected for military duty because of mental and nervous ailments and incapacities.

Subnormal mentalities interfere with the exercise of those attributes that direct sanely and wisely the individual. In every community there are many who exhibit erratic, emotional trends. Some of them have various complexes of inferiority and others have a magnified egoism. All come under the general classification of unstable individuals; most of them suffering from a warped conception of their true relation to the rest of the population. To an extent, many of these types have not the freedom of moral action, even though morality is recognized by them as a proper and just conduct of behavior.

Although the mentally unstable, the defects, and the psychopathic inferiors may not be able to cope with competitive modern requirements, this does not imply that all of them will join or enter into criminal activities, yet in those instances where they cannot adjust themselves, or have not found their suitable vocation, the danger is ever present.

The figures obtainable from Army induction centers are substantiated by statistics obtained from schools, institutions, and other sources, all of which definitely prove that we have in this country many millions who are below mental average. When we find such a large section of our population to be slow in learning, to have no initiative, resourcefulness, or sustained alertness, it becomes immediately significant that these groups which might have succeeded in another era are now confronted with a swift-moving progressive age, which is practically a new civilization. It becomes obvious that these individuals cannot keep abreast of the times and must be failures.

Whereas undoubtedly these large numbers are the soil from which a great deal of crime springs, the lives of many criminals show that aside from any apparent mental departure from the normal, the greatest incentive for their activities has been their desire to obtain, without work, not only the necessities of life but luxuries as well. Our prisons hold many who rank high intellectually, who have been recruited from every vocation and profession. Most of them are crafty and hardened, hating society through their close contact with the law because it has not dealt as leniently with them as they desired. These men were originally, or have become subsequently, warped in their moral or ethical sense and, when carefully examined, display an intense egotism which further fortifies and enures them to their life of crime.

CRIME WAVES ALWAYS FOLLOW WARS

When millions of young men are removed from normal life into savage, primitive com-

bat, it follows as night does the day that they assimilate much that alters their future life. The stress of danger, the horrors of mutilation, frightful sights never to be erased from memory—these all tend to harden naturally sympathetic natures. War develops cruel, bestial instincts, just as peace develops the moral ones. In war men are taught that might is right and that force is the only factor that determines an issue. Men become indifferent to danger, they become familiar with the use of guns, and, what is most regrettable, a disregard for human life. Added to this we have victims of shell shock, with consequently frayed nerves, many of whom become permanent casualties. Not only does war become a stress on the nervous system of those who have been in the armed forces but it has also affected to a more or less extent those anxious relatives who remained at home. War has had a demoralizing nervous and mental shock upon the millions whose cities have been bombed and whose homes have been demolished. Throughout the world there are untold numbers who have undergone violent emotional experiences who do not know if their kin are alive or, if so, their whereabouts.

Nervous shock and mental depression seeks artificial stimulation. Those afflicted seek an escape from their thoughts. It is not pessimistic, with all the evidence in the scale, to assert that drunkenness and narcotic addiction is certain to increase.

We have, however, one compensation in the trials and tribulations of our heroic boys, and we are of the belief that when they return the vast majority will appreciate what this country has to offer them and realize that ultimate, lasting economic advancement can only be achieved by the correlation and community of interests which we see typified in our present social, economic, and political evolvement and generally higher standards of living. They will know that the ethics of life demand that the rights of the individual must be subservient to the good of the many.

PROPOSED MEMORIAL TO MARINE CORPS AND CAPTURE OF IWO JIMA

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, every American has been thrilled by the hardihood, the devotion to duty, the dauntless courage, and the will to win of the United States Marine Corps. I know, as we all know, that we can say little that will repay the marines for their sacrifices, and it is needless for me to endeavor to inspire them. Yet the assault on Iwo Jima, an island surrounded by the deep-blue waters of the Pacific near the coast of Japan, has furnished us an occasion for unlimited praise of the gallant members of the United States Marine Corps.

Iwo Jima, as we know, likely was the most heavily fortified island in the history of warfare. There were not just tens, or hundreds, of Jap pillboxes on Iwo Jima—there were thousands and thousands of them, according to news reports. And manning these defensive posts, with rugged land as a further help to them, were more than twenty thousand of the Mikado's crack troops.

Yet, for all practical purposes, Iwo Jima is our island today—less than 1 month after the first she'l of the naval bombardment that preceded the actual invasion was fired.

The story of Iwo Jima, in the future, will be memorialized on paper and on canvas, on films and in stone, by words and by tears. It is one of the grimmest stories of our history, for, we are told, the fight for Iwo Jima was the most sanguinary in the 170-year history of the Marine Corps.

In another sense, it is one of the proudest stories of our history, for, having obtained a toehold on the tiny island, the marines never turned back, despite the almost insurmountable opposition they knew lay ahead of them. The opposition was expected, I am sure, but not opposition of such intensity.

As in the case of all great historical events, the battle for Iwo Jima called forth a work of art. Other events, such as Washington crossing the Delaware, or the patriots battling at Lexington, or the signing of the Declaration of Independence, have waited for an artist to epitomize the spirit of the event at some more leisurely time, long after the event. We are fortunate that the work of art that came from Iwo Jima was made on the spot, that it was composed in the heat of battle, and that it was available within a matter of days after that memorable battle began. On February 22, American time, insofar as I can learn, an Associated Press photographer, Joe Rosenthal, after picking his way through dangerous minefields, took a picture of six marines planting Old Glory atop Mount Suribachi, newly captured from the Japs.

This picture, as every Senator will recall, contains all the elements of the beauty of bravery and the determination of the United States Marines. The half-furled flag, the forward movement of the men, the upstretched hands of the marine who had done his part—all these are details that have been observed by millions of Americans.

Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill providing for the erection here in Washington of a monument to the United States Marine Corps, and for the issuance of appropriate medals to the members of the Marine Corps who took part in the capture of Iwo Jima. In my humble judgment, this monument and these medals should be patterned after the stirring picture made by Joe Rosenthal. As I understand, under ordinary procedure, this medal will be sent to the next of kin of all those brave men who gave their lives to plant the Stars and Stripes on Iwo Jima, and to see that it stayed there. Secretary of the Navy Forrestal on March 5 said that, as of March 3, exactly 2,050 marines had been slain on Iwo Jima. He said that there were many wounded and missing, but he could not go beyond the communiqués. As of today, this terrible toll has been frightfully augmented, to what extent cannot now be announced.

The price we paid for this strategic island undoubtedly was high, but I cannot say that it was too high considering the importance of the island's location and its airfields. The Japs undoubtedly considered it was a pearl of great price, militarily speaking, for they paid in the lives of more than 20,000 troops. Very few Japs have survived on Iwo Jima.

Mr. President, in my judgment, no more fitting tribute to the memory of the brave men who gave their lives to capture this tiny—but strategic—island 10,000 miles from here could be made than that this Congress immediately authorize the construction of such a memorial and the issuance of such a medal as my bill provides for. These are little things, compared to the greatness of the sacrifice made by the marines, but they are not too little to be considered by this august body. I earnestly solicit the help of the majority leader, the minority leader, and all Members of this body in seeing to it that this bill is passed with the utmost haste.

As one who appreciates the sacrifices they have made, I want to make sure that the heroism, the sheer bravery, the valor of our marines on Iwo Jima are never forgotten. From Guadalcanal, to Tarawa, to Iwo Jima, the marines have carved out a bloody path that will lead us straight to Tokyo. Let us do everything we can to memorialize their all but unbelievable valor. The other gallant branches of our armed forces are memorialized elsewhere, and will continue to be, with my enthusiastic support. I address this subject matter to the marines particularly, for the unusually difficult, costly, and successful assault on Iwo Jima.

I ask unanimous consent at this time to introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for this monument and memorial.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 728) to provide for the erection of a monument to the United States Marine Corps, and the issuance of appropriate medals to the members thereof who took part in landing operations on Iwo Jima Island, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article from the Washington Post of this morning entitled "How Photographer Made Flag Picture," by Shirley Povich.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

HOW PHOTOGRAPHER MADE FLAG PICTURE

ADVANCE PACIFIC HEADQUARTERS, March 12.—You've seen it, as who hasn't—the thrill-picture of the war thus far; that camera shot with all the beauty of a sculpture piece showing seven United States marines silhouetted against the Pacific sky as they plant the American flag on Mount Suribachi's crest.

At headquarters here they're calling it the greatest flag picture since Washington crossing the Delaware. * * *

The photographer who got it is the most back-slapped man in this ocean area. His fame is at the stage where people point him out. All of a sudden he's a celebrity. * * *

He's Joe Rosenthal, Associated Press photographer from Washington, D. C., a graduate of McKinley Tech High School in 1929. * * *

Here's his story of the trek up the summit of Suribachi, already labeled Mount Plasma by the Fourth Marines on D-day plus four:

"We were landing when the bos'n pointed out a red spot moving halfway up the volcano and said, 'Gee, that must be the flag.' It loked like a picture to me, if I could make it, and I was the first man off the boat. That didn't take any courage: We were carrying explosives.

"I was unarmed, but I was lucky enough to pick up four marines who were, and we started up the hill. The 550-foot climb took us a half hour. We had to sidestep Jap mines and circle the pill boxes the marines were still cleaning out.

"The marines on top were still looking for the best place to plant the flag when I got there with my Speed Graphic. I'm too short to get the full picture, so they waited until I piled up rocks and sandbags from a Jap pill box and shot from the top of the pile. Then they stuck her in, in the face of a breeze. That's all there was."

Rosenthal might have added that's all there was except the job of getting back to a ship that would get his picture out. He descended the volcano alone and boarded an amphtrack on the beach where the Japs were still pouring mortars.

It took him 19 hours to get to a ship less than a half mile off shore. The amphtrack had wounded aboard, and it was wallowing in heavy surf that pitched it back on the shore innumerable times. There was also the item of the Jap mortar firing.

Rosenthal went in originally on D-day. He was chosen to represent the still photo pool, with his products available to all picture services. He shot 60 films. He figures the Suribachi picture as about his fortieth.

On D-day his plans were fouled up a bit. He didn't go in on H-hour. He didn't land until 3 hours after the first wave made it. That was a bit disappointing. He wanted to make Iwo Jima his third straight H-hour landing. At Pelelieu and Angaur he had gone in with the marines in the first waves. In fact, he made both those H-hour landings within 3 hours of each other.

A year before he was in on the Hollandia business, so Iwo was his fourth campaign.

He got a late start in this war. You see, the marines and Navy rejected him back in December 1941 on account of poor vision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very happy that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has called attention in his remarks just delivered to the very remarkable photograph made by Mr. Rosenthal with respect to the raising of the flag on Mount Suribachi. Too much praise cannot be given to the United States Marine Corps. Too much recognition cannot be given to the very remarkable picture which was taken. I believe, Mr. President, that that photograph will never be forgotten in the history of this country and of its military achievement.

I rise now only to supplement what the Senator from Indiana has said, and to call attention to the fact that yesterday I had the privilege of inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD—and it appears at page A1133—an editorial and an article regarding this photograph.

I desire particularly to call attention to the fact that I have written to the Postmaster General suggesting that this picture be made the simple design in a commemorative stamp to be issued by the Post Office Department to honor the valor and the sacrifice of the United States Marines. The Post Office Department already has the authority granted by law to issue commemorative stamps. I think a remarkable opportunity is now presented by this photograph to honor not only the Marine Corps but all our fighting forces and to render signal recognition to the artistic achievement of the photographer who made the picture.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I should like to add to what the Senator from Wyoming has just said that I have read with a great deal of satisfaction the proposal which he made that the photograph taken by Mr. Rosenthal be used as the design for a commemorative postage stamp. I am very happy to know that such a suggestion has been made, because we cannot give too wide circulation to this splendid photograph, which is not a posed photograph, but is a natural reproduction of the marines in action on Mount Suribachi. Therefore I lend my hearty support to what the Senator from Wyoming has suggested, and I ask the support of the Senator from Wyoming and of all Senators to my proposal for a memorial of even more lasting and permanent form than that which he proposes.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2552) to amend paragraph (c) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, as amended by act approved February 27, 1931, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

TRIBUTE TO HENRY A. WALLACE BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address broadcast by him over the Blue Network on January 26, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HERBERT BROWNELL, JR., AT LINCOLN, NEBR.

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Herbert Brownell, Jr., chairman of the Republican National Committee, at a dinner given by the Lancaster County Republican Committee at Lincoln, Nebr., on March 8, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

PEACE, REALISM, AND THE BALANCE OF POWER—ADDRESS BY JOHN DICKINSON

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Peace, Realism, and the Balance of Power," by Hon. John Dickinson, general counsel of the Pennsylvania Railroad, delivered at the midwinter meeting of the Maryland State Bar Association on January 20, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

DUMBARTON OAKS CONFERENCE COMMITMENTS—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Strange Alibi Seen on Oaks Commitments," published in the Washington Evening Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

RAISING OF THE AMERICAN FLAG OVER MOUNT SURIBACHI, IWO JIMA

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Paul Miller, assistant general manager of the Associated Press, enclosing a story by Joe Rosenthal of the photographing of the raising of the flag on Mount Suribachi, Iwo Jima, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSENT BY SUPREME COURT TO HEAR ARGUMENT IN HATCH ACT CASE—ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON STAR

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Supreme Court Agrees to Hear Argument in Hatch Act Case," published in the Washington Star of March 12, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the item for the Federal Power Commission, page 15, at the beginning of line 19, it is proposed to strike out "$2,150,000" and insert "$1,818,466."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the able acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], was kind enough to go into the matter of this appropriation for the Federal Power Commission, and, after conference, it is my understanding that, in view of the information which has been adduced, the Senator is willing, so far as he is concerned, to change the figure in the amendment in line 19 from $1,818,466 to $2,072,000.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is correct, and I think the change probably should be made, and I will ask unanimous consent that it be made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to thank and congratulate the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Wisconsin also for this change. I myself am not certain that the amount as increased is quite enough, but it is nearly enough, and I suppose we would not be justified in asking for the full amount.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I think it will be satisfactory to all concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. What effect will that have on the amendment in line 20?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Is it the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin that the appropriation in line 20 should be $1,340,000?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest $1,315,991, but I defer to the very able clerk of the committee if his arithmetic has produced different results from mine.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It is a very small difference anyway.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I offer an amendment, then, if it is satisfactory, to strike out in line 20 the figures "$1,062,457" and insert "$1,315,991." The item will be in conference in any event.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Oh, yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And it can be straightened out there.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I have no objection.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I wish to take this occasion before I resume my seat to thank the Senator from Tennessee for giving the time out of his very busy activities to go into this matter. I appreciate very much the attitude he has shown in connection with it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the amendment reported by the committee in line 20.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, what amendment is about to be submitted?

Mr. McKELLAR. An amendment has already been submitted and agreed to on page 15, under the item "Federal Power Commission," lines 19 and 20. The appropriation was increased by a small amount.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was on my feet as the Senator from Wisconsin had concluded his statement. I did not understand that the amendment had been adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming has a right to discuss the amendment, and the amendment will be considered as not having been agreed to if he is objecting.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understood the Senator from Wisconsin to ask for an increase in the appropriation in line 20, and that the request was agreed to by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to inquire what has been suggested with respect to the amendment in line 19.

Mr. McKELLAR. The amount there was changed from $1,818,466 to $2,072,000.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was increased above that which was reported by the committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator from Tennessee, with apologies, because I was not present at the meeting of the full committee——

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sorry the Senator was not present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was owing to the Military Affairs struggle with the manpower legislative proposal.

Mr. McKELLAR. I can understand.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Why was there a reduction below the amount allowed by the House?

Mr. McKELLAR. Because the amount for the regular activities of this Commission last year was $1,700,000 plus—I do not remember the exact figures—and they had $600,000,000 plus, for additional defense activities. The committee reduced the amount for national defense activities very considerably, and increased the regular appropriation by $400,000 or more. In making these changes the committee thought it had gone too far. What the committee provided was not very different from what the Commission received last year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What was the amount recommended by the Budget Bureau?

Mr. McKELLAR. It was $2,150,000, and they will get $2,072,000. I think it is entirely satisfactory to the Commission.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, let me say, just briefly, that I think the misunderstanding which arose was due to the fact that the Federal Power Commission, like other regular old-line agencies of the Government, was assigned certain national-defense activities, and the Bureau of the Budget insisted upon that being sent up as a separate item. Naturally, the impression might have been created that that had resulted in a total increase of personnel and activities, whereas in the case of the Federal Power Commission it simply transferred the personnel from its pre-war organization to the national-defense activities. The appropriation for those activities has been reduced, as stated by the Senator from Tennessee, to $110,000, and an increase then had to be made in the regular appropriation, in order to give the Commission anything like what it had been receiving even prior to the war. I think that is how the misunderstanding occurred. The figure which has now been agreed to is the rock-bottom figure which the Federal Power Commission feels it should have and at the same time discharge the responsibilities which have been placed upon it as the result of legislation passed by the Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, it is satisfactory to all now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments as amended have been agreed to. The clerk will state the next amendment passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, under the item "Federal Power Commission, salaries and expenses," on page 15, line 22, to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$20,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 17, line 5, under the appropriation "For all printing and binding for the Federal Power Commission," to strike out "$40,000" and to insert "$48,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 18, line 25, under the item "Public works advance planning," after the word "planning" and the colon, to strike out "Toward accomplishing" and to insert "For carrying out."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	Pepper
Bailey	Hart	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Reed
Bankhead	Hawkes	Revercomb
Barkley	Hayden	Robertson
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hoey	Shipstead
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Bushfield	Lucas	Taylor
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	McFarland	Tunnell
Capper	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McMahon	Vandenberg
Connally	Magnuson	Wagner
Cordon	Maybank	Walsh
Donnell	Millikin	Wheeler
Downey	Moore	Wherry
Eastland	Morse	White
Ellender	Murdock	Wiley
Fulbright	Murray	Willis
George	Myers	Wilson
Gerry	O'Daniel	
Green	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on the business of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE MENACE OF STRIKES IN WARTIME

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, evidences are mounting on every hand that sooner or later we must come to closer grips with the strike problem.

The manpower discussion which took place on the floor of this Chamber last week brought home to all of us the crucial nature of this problem. The stories in the newspapers about work stoppages all over the Nation reemphasize the urgency of this problem. For example, this very afternoon every major motion-picture studio is virtually paralyzed because of a jurisdictional dispute.

Moreover, a preview of the tremendous difficulties which management and labor will face in the reconversion and post-war era still further points up the menace of strikes. In the days to come employers and employees will have to iron out such thorny problems as release of workers, wage adjustments, hour adjustments, and so forth.

All this leads to the same inescapable conclusion: America can no longer tolerate the cloud of strikes over its national horizon. Somehow it must permanently dispel the darkness of ruinous industrial disputes and let the sun of labor-management harmony shine through.

This Nation simply cannot afford in peace, let alone in war, the staggering cost of strikes.

It cannot afford the loss in vital production which, in war, is so crucial to victory on the battle fronts and in peace so crucial to successful competition, either at home or with foreign concerns. It cannot afford the loss of breadwinners' wages, the shattering of business confidence for investments, the paralysis of whole communities, the discord, the hatred, and the ill-will which are the bitter grapes of strikes' wrath.

We cannot afford "strikes as usual" while our sons are suffering and dying on foreign battlefields. Nor can we afford strikes as usual when those sons return from foreign fields and seek uninterrupted employment in order to enjoy the

blessings of the land for which they fought.

In the sacred words of the United States Constitution, "We, the people, ordain and establish this Constitution" in order "to promote the general welfare." The interest of the public is paramount. The general welfare means the welfare of the whole community, the whole Nation. When we ordained and established the Constitution "to promote the general welfare," we did not write into it the provision that any group—management, labor, or any other group—had a right to injure that general welfare. Strikes in our economy can be compared to driving a car with the brakes set.

Why, then, do we kow-tow to special groups and not legislate for the general welfare? Why do we throw up our hands in helplessness as we watch industrial warfare in every corner of the Nation exploding in strikes of every stripe—jurisdictional strikes, sympathy strikes, "quickie" strikes, wildcat strikes, and every other sort of temper tantrum on the part of labor or management?

What is the answer to this problem?

I humbly submit this answer, believing it to be simple, direct, fair, and satisfactory. It is compulsory arbitration. Let us legislate necessary machinery which will be automatically and universally invoked in the event that a grievance on the part of labor or management arises and a strike looms.

For example, let us assume that a strike appears imminent because it is alleged that several employees have been unjustly discharged. In such a case, legislation might provide for a jury consisting of, say, three representatives of the employer, three representatives of employees, and a circuit judge or Federal judge. This jury would hear all the evidence and would weigh it impartially. The only question would be, Was the discharge justifiable? When a majority decision was reached it would be binding. Strikes would thus be outlawed and replaced with compulsory arbitration as a means of settlement of industrial disputes.

Recent developments in the Detroit area—and I do not pass upon the facts—clearly indicate that the general welfare has been put in jeopardy. To illustrate this, some 10,000 men went out on strike in a Chrysler plant because 11 employees had supposedly been unjustly discharged. No one can tell how many lives of our fighting sons that strike endangered. The workers were producing airplanes for the boys who are fighting our battles. If this matter had been referred to arbitration, as I have suggested, the issue of whether or not the particular employees had been released on adequate or inadequate grounds would have been met squarely and satisfactorily. There would have been no loss in time and production to labor, management, or the Nation.

Even now, as everyone knows, companies and unions throughout America are turning to arbitration to settle their disputes. There are thousands of such cases. However, there is always a small percentage, a fraction of 1 percent, who wish to run the show according to their own rules and not according to the rules of law or according to the mandate of the Constitution with respect to the general welfare.

When voluntary arbitration is not effective, what happens? Then we have strikes. When you and I have trouble we must arbitrate it or go to the courts.

The challenge to America in the postwar period requires that the strike issue be settled now. We should consider this question in this Congress. With the coal strike looming, what are we going to do about it?

I know that in submitting my suggestion I speak for union labor, though perhaps not for some of the boys at the top. I have letters in my office substantiating this statement. I speak for management, which is worrying about the future, and which senses what will happen if this explosive condition is not remedied. Furthermore, I speak for America, for the future welfare of all of us.

I know that only a small fraction of labor has been guilty of violating the no-strike pledge during the war. I know that such violations have occurred because of alleged injustices committed against labor. But two wrongs do not make a right.

When a strike injures third parties, as it always does, the third parties have the right to be heard, and yet we have not legislated for third parties. We have not permitted them to have a hearing in the Congress. I refer to the community, the State, and the Nation. The time has come to give the great majority of our people consideration in this matter. We should consider the general-welfare clause of the Constitution.

I speak as one who knows labor—who has been a laboring man. I have worked in the sawmills of the North for 15 cents an hour, which was considered big pay in those days. I have worked at painting houses, as clerk in stores, as insurance salesman, as farm hand. I do not wish to have it said that I am against labor. I am for labor.

But, Mr. President, there is something that is very dear to me, and that is my country.

We must have intestinal fortitude. As one Senator has expressed it, we must release our necks from the collar which has been placed there because of fear of one group or another. Unless we do so, assume a position of leadership, and enact the right kind of legislation, you and I will be responsible for what occurs when the war is over and the problems of peace approach.

Arbitration can do the job. It can settle grievances on the basis of what is decent and honorable and just. Arbitration results in better understanding. It removes sources of friction which make for future disturbances. It gets rid of the racketeering element in both labor and management—the element which wants to play the game only according to its own rules rather than the rules of society.

We must therefore seek to promote the general welfare of America. We must find the means whereby we may continue to realize the magnificent contributions of American labor and management—contributions which, in spite of industrial disputes, gave us the highest standard of living in the world and the greatest war production in the world.

DOMESTIC SUPPLIES OF MEAT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I note in today's press a criticism by ex-Governor Lehman, Director of U. N. R. R. A., of the policy of the Government in setting up an export committee to guard the Nation's food supply. This article says, in part:

> Pointing to U. N. R. R. A.'s obligations in Europe, China, the Philippines, and Ethiopia, Lehman said, "In view of these widespread and heavy responsibilities, we have a most vital interest in the work of the new committee. It is obvious that our operations will be profoundly affected by its deliberations and decisions."

In addition to U. N. R. R. A., Mr. President, a large amount of food is being shipped abroad under lend-lease. As a result a deplorable condition exists in the South today. Salt meat is the basic meat diet of millions of working people in the South. Practically the entire salt-meat supply has been consigned to Russia. For this reason none is available for the people of the United States. It is practically impossible to secure any kind of meat in the South today. We all desire that the Russian people and Army be well fed. However, it is not right to take necessary food from the American people. Certainly Russia cannot have less salt meat than we have, because we have none. We do not have any now; we have had none in months. Practically the entire supply of canned fish, sardines, and salmon is also being taken away from our people and is being shipped under lend-lease. As a result, the diet of the farm workers in the South is deficient. There will actually be suffering in the South if this condition is not immediately remedied.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The condition the Senator has mentioned certainly prevails in the South, and the Senator has ably described it. It also exists in other sections of the country, as I can personally vouch in the case of New England. We are very sadly lacking in meat and many other food products.

Mr. EASTLAND. The basis of the diet of farm labor in the South is dried salt pork. None is available, because the entire supply is earmarked for Russia. Consequently, today in the South there is actual suffering among farm labor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know that there is also a shortage of pork? Probably there will be a most acute shortage of pork this year. Of course, pork is an essential food which the people in my section of the country must have. There is a definite shortage of it. There is a decrease of 33⅓ percent in pork production this year, as compared to the production last year.

Let me say that it is my understanding that Mr. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, is attempting to correlate the

activities of the various agencies, and is investigating the amounts of food which are being sent across the water under lend-lease. I further understand that he is not going to permit the food supply for the people of our country to be jeopardized. I wish to commend him for it.

Mr. President, let me also say to the Senator that the shortage of pork this year will be the most acute we have had in the last 5 or 6 years.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I think that probably is true; because the production of farm products runs in cycles, and we have had 5 or 6 years of big crops and big production. On the basis of that rule, I think this year's production will be less than normal.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. As I have mentioned, the very thing the Senator has been discussing is also occurring in the State of Nebraska. Our people depend upon pork as an essential part of their diet, and it is exceedingly scarce now.

Mr. EASTLAND. And it has been for many months.

Mr. President, our farms have been stripped of labor. We are maintaining an Army and a Navy of 11,000,000 men. It is impossible to buy farm implements or labor-saving devices. Under such conditions how can our farmers be expected to feed the world? It takes food to produce food. How can people whose food supply is deficient and inadequate be expected to meet such responsibilities?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Of course, there is one food which could be used as a substitute, if the substitute had not been taken away. In Wisconsin our supplies of butter and cheese have been taken away. Of course, the Senator knows that Wisconsin cheese is a good substitute for any meat. I am sorry about the shortage of meat and I am also sorry about the shortage of cheese and butter.

Mr. EASTLAND. What the Senator has said is true, but the farm labor in the South is not able to buy Wisconsin cheese.

Mr. WILEY. It is not able to buy it because no supply of it is available. Is not that the case?

Mr. EASTLAND. Our farm labor would not have the money with which to buy it if it were available.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. It is true, is it not, that farm labor in the South really depends upon salt pork as an essential part of its diet?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. Salt pork, salmon, and sardines are the very basis of their diet. Not a bit of it is available, and none has been available for months.

Our people today are rationed at the subsistence level, but even that program is not fulfilled. Points are issued for meat; yet there is no meat to fill the domestic quota for the working man. We all believe in giving to Russia, China, and Europe, all the food that we can share. Yet how can we feed them when the diet of the farmers who are expected to produce the food is inadequate?

I note Governor Lehman's statement of our heavy responsibilities in Europe, China, the Philippines, and Ethiopia. We should, as far as possible, make food available. But when did Ethiopia come into this war? What has that country contributed to victory? Has not that country always supported itself? Why should Americans go without adequate food in order to supply Ethiopia? Ethiopia is a fertile country; food grows there in abundance; the woods abound in game. If citizens of that country are hungry, whose fault is it? Upon whose shoulders does the responsibility rest?

Mr. President, the need for an over-all Export Committee has been urgent since the Hot Springs Food Conference. Have commitments that we cannot fulfill been made? It is important that our gallant allies and friends be not misled by the ability of our country to produce. We are fighting a two-front war. We are contributing food and arms to our allies, the liberated areas, and a good part of the world. We are carrying our share of the war in Europe. We alone are effectively fighting the Japanese in the Pacific. The American people must be adequately fed.

I hope the new committee set up by Mr. Byrnes has the support of the Congress. I hope this committee will immediately make salt meat, other meat, and other essential items of diet available to the people of the South, and particularly to the working people of the South. If that is not done, I shall ask the Congress to correct the situation by appropriate legislation. Certainly working people who produce such huge amounts of necessary foods and fiber for the war effort and for our allies should receive an adequate diet.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr MAYBANK. I wish to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi for the very able presentation he has made. Let me say further that I understand the orders issued by Mr. Byrnes will be printed today in the Federal Register.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator refer to an order to make meats available to farm labor in the South?

Mr. MAYBANK. I have in mind the order creating the over-all board to limit the exportation of necessary agricultural products through lend-lease and the other agencies of the Government. That order will be printed today in the Federal Register.

The thought I had in mind in that connection was that the Senator discussed at some length what Governor Lehman had to say about the situation.

Mr. EASTLAND. I did.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to state that the board which has been appointed by Mr. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization, is composed of outstanding citizens, and I am certain they have just as much interest in the countries we are helping as anyone else has, and I am certain that under these orders and this able board much good will come.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree with the Senator. I think the establishment of the Export Committee was a sound and necessary step to prevent this country from incurring obligations which it cannot fulfill, and to safeguard the diet of the American people. That is necessary if we are to maintain the amazing production record of this country. Mr. Byrnes should be commended for this sound move.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. My understanding is that Mr. Byrnes, the Director of War Mobilization, has made a study of the supply of food which goes out under U. N. R. R. A. and the supply of food which is exported from this country by other Government agencies, and is coordinating them so that he knows what is leaving our country. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. I understand that to be the case, and I understand that he will be sure that adequate supplies are released to the American people.

Mr. WHERRY. That is my understanding. I also believe that Governor Lehman is objecting to that procedure.

Mr. EASTLAND. I judge so from his interview.

Mr. WHERRY. It is my understanding from the Senator's statement that if Mr. Byrnes' goal is achieved, so that sufficient food is left for the people of our country, as is proposed under the directive, that will be in accordance with the Senator's ideas.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I also understand that if that is not done, the Senator is prepared to introduce legislation to accomplish the same purpose.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, I should like to say that I hope all Members of the Senate will have an opportunity to read the orders which will be printed in today's issue of the Federal Register.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I merely wish to say that I commend the Director of War Mobilization for having taken this action. However, it is my apprehension that, good as it is to do it now, it comes late, when we consider the situation which has been produced so far as some of the essential food supplies are concerned.

I also wish to commend the Senator from Mississippi for his statement.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, it is true that the order comes late. But it is absolutely essential to safeguard our country's food supply.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the Executives Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the pending amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, in line 25, it is proposed to strike out "Toward accomplishing" and insert "For carrying out."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as stated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next passed-over amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 19, in line 2, after the numerals "1944", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$35,000,000, to be immediately available."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to amend the committee amendment in line 2 of page 19, by striking out "$35,000,000" and inserting "$50,000,000." In explanation of my amendment I may say that personally I should like to see allowed the full amount which the Bureau of the Budget recommended. However, I recognize that all legislation is the result of compromise. After conferring with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and others, I have arrived at the figure which I have suggested with, as I understand, an agreement that the proposed matching provision will not be offered.

In my view, $50,000,000 is the rock bottom amount which should be considered. I hope that the conferees on the part of the Senate will be successful in persuading the conferees on the part of the House to agree to $50,000,000 instead of a lesser amount.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to correct the statement of the Senator from Wisconsin in which he said that the amendment proposed by the committee will not be offered. I shall certainly offer it.

So far as the matter of planning is concerned, I thought that the amendment should be included. I think it would be a very great mistake if planning were not to take place as soon as possible so as to provide work for the soldiers as they return home. But the committee overruled me, and reported a half-and-half system. If the Senate feels so inclined, I see no reason why the amount should not be increased from $35,000,000 to $50,000,000. I shall not personally oppose it. However, I am here to carry out the instructions of the committee.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am sorry that I misunderstood the Senator from Tennessee. I now perfectly understand his position. I hope that when the proposed legislative amendment, which, as I view it, would change the entire basis of the section of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act here involved is offered, it will be rejected by the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I supported the matching amendment in the committee. On the basis of the evidence presented, it was submitted to the committee that the amendment was a reasonable solution of the problem confronting the committee; but, on the basis of further information which has come to me, plus information which has come to me as a result of the debate in the Senate, I for one agree to eliminate the matching amendment, and agree to the substitution of an increased sum as suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin. I think that perhaps the importance of planning at this time is such that the suggestion made by him would afford at least a partial solution of the problem.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I hope that the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin will be agreed to. I express the hope that in conference the committee will regard it as representing the minimum amount to be allowed, because really a larger sum ought to be appropriated. In some instances there may be abuses; but the communities, subdivisions, and districts, which should begin planning now, would be immensely helped by the proposed amendment, especially the matching provision.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am very appreciative of the Senator's offer of the amendment. I called to the attention of members of the committee the fact that there were certain States and political subdivisions which had no way of matching funds. The legislatures of some of the States will not be in session for perhaps 2 years.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the statements made by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] with reference to this item.

When we passed the reconversion bill, providing $75,000,000 to be used for planning—not for construction but for planning—we recognized that when this war is over employment must be provided for returning soldiers, and the construction of permanent projects in the United States must be undertaken for the benefit of the people of the country. Even if $75,000,000 were to be distributed among all States which applied for money to plan such projects, no particular community would receive very much. Therefore, I regret that the Committee on Appropriations did not include the entire $75,000,000. I realize that if we raise the amount from $5,000,000 to $50,000,000 it may be considerably reduced in conference. It seems to me that that would result in a mere pittance, assuming that all the cities, States, counties, and political subdivisions which may be eligible to make application take advantage of the act. I regret very much that the entire amount of $75,000,000 has not been included in the committee amendment. I am afraid that when the conference report comes back to the Senate the amount of $50,000,000 will have been very materially reduced. It seems to me that under those circumstances it might be wise for the Senate now to agree on the sum of $75,000,000. I wonder if we could not have the entire amount included. If I may do so, Mr. President——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I stated that I personally should like to see the full amount allowed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I realize that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The figure which I have suggested was arrived at only after conferring with members of the committee. If agreeable to the Senate, I should be very happy to accept the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe that many Senators feel that an appropriation of $75,000,000 should be provided by the bill. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will modify his amendment to that effect.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will test the sentiment of the Senate and modify my amendment in the first instance by changing "$50,000,000" to "$75,000,000."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was one of those in the committee who opposed appropriating money for these purposes without requiring that it be matched by the cities, States, or other political subdivisions of the Government. I realize that when we appropriate without imposing any practical limitation or restriction for a grant to be handed to cities, counties, States, and other local subdivisions of the Government, a great deal of strength is always manifested in favor of those appropriations. I have always marveled that much of the support of appropriations of money to States, counties, cities, and other local subdivisions of Government comes from those who complain most bitterly about increasing Government expenditures, and from those who oppose most vigorously any effort to increase taxes to finance Federal expenditures. I think the States and other subdivisions should be required to match every dollar of money appropriated by the Federal Government for local purposes. If some such requirement is not placed in this bill the appropriation, for all intents and purposes, will be absolutely wasted. It will not be worth anything to the public-works program which we must have later in the post-war period.

Let us remember that, there is a bill pending to increase the public debt of the United States to $300,000,000,000. The debt has assumed such astronomical proportions that it does not mean a great deal to people today. I think the average person in the country would not be much alarmed if we were preparing to increase the public debt to $900,000,000,000 instead of $300,000,000,000, because the debt has reached such a point that our sensibilities have been dulled to the appropriation of these tremendous sums and we no longer pay any attention to the aggregate of the indebtedness of this Nation which when the war is concluded will have to be put on generations yet unborn including as well the boys who are actually fighting this war.

Seventy-five million dollars is not a great deal of money as compared with $300,000,000,000, but the mere fact that the national debt is approaching that figure is in some degree due to the fact that the cities and counties and States and individuals throughout the Nation come to Congress asking for a few

million dollars here and a few million dollars there to be appropriated for purposes which in themselves are worthy but in the aggregate are running up a public debt which we may not be able to pay with a dollar that is worth as much as the dollar is today.

Mr. President, as I say, we have a debt that will reach at least $300,000,000,000 if not more. What is the condition of the cities, the counties, and the States today? There is not a single one of them that is not in better shape proportionately and per capita than is the Federal Treasury. Practically every one of the States has a State planning board and many State legislatures already have been appropriating for such boards and many of the cities of any size or consequence have already city planning boards for which some provision has been made. This $75,000,000 appropriation would be merely pyramided on top of the amounts which have heretofore been allocated for State planning boards.

As I have indicated, Mr. President, most of the cities have their reserves in their treasury with which to do this planning and many of the States have already allocated large sums of money to do post-war planning; yet we propose to dish out $75,000,000 on top of that to provide for post-war planning.

Mr. President, I will be as strongly in favor of a post-war public works program as any other Member of the Senate if it is necessary to develop such a program in order to prevent unemployment and to relieve suffering in this country; but it seems to me that we are not asking too much of the States and counties and cities that have reserve funds in their treasuries today if we request them to put up a few dollars to help plan for public works which are going to be appropriated for out of Federal funds from a depleted Treasury. They have a stake in the Federal Treasury just as we have; they have certainly a stake in post-war planning as we have, and they have more money per capita than we have. So why should not States and subdivisions put up a few dollars to go along with the Federal funds to prepare plans which will probably be financed 100 percent by appropriations from the Federal Treasury, which is already depleted to the extent of approximately $300,000,000,000. I say, Mr. President, that there is no reason why States, counties, cities, and other units of Government should not be compelled to put up something.

I do not desire my statement to be construed as any criticism of architects and engineers. Generally speaking, they are engaged in legitimate business, and I like to see them prosper; but when word goes forth that the Congress has provided $75,000,000 as a grant to prepare for planning, what is going to happen? They are naturally going to prepare their plans and sell them to the States and local subdivisions of government, and if the local subdivisions do not put up any money, they are certainly not going to be careful what kind of plans they buy or how much they pay for them. When you are spending other people's money or Federal money it is very easy money to spend, but, if you have some of your own money in the pot, you will be a little careful about the plans that are to be prepared and their practicability and adaptability to a real public works program such as we may need.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As the Senator knows, we have tried to cut down practically all these items.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; we have saved about five or ten million dollars in various small items in the bill, and here it is proposed to give away $75,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have saved about $73,000,000 in the bill.

The Senator no doubt recalls what took place in the committee. I supported the $75,000,000 appropriation. However, I was outvoted, and the plan offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] was adopted—a half-and-half plan to the extent of $30,000,000 to be appropriated by the Federal Government and $30,000,000 by the States.

Since that time and since the report of the committee we had General Fleming before the committee, and we discussed this particular matter with him. I believe the Senator from Georgia was there, though I am not sure. It was either today or yesterday that we discussed the matter with General Fleming, who will have charge of it, and who had recommended $75,000,000.

A question had arisen both in the committee and in the Senate yesterday as to whether this money was to be paid back. General Fleming said that, as he construed the George law, under which we are appropriating this money, that wherever a plan was used—and he thought all of them would be used—the money would have to be paid back by the States to the Government and that he would certainly take their receipts and require some kind of an acknowledgment and obligation upon the part of the State, city, or county using the funds. To my mind that makes a very great difference about this appropriation.

I think it would probably be cheaper to advance the $75,000,000 and have the States, counties, or cities or other units of State governments refund the money than to have a half-and-half plan. However, as I say, I was outvoted, the half-and-half plan was adopted, and is in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Tennessee has been consistent. He has been for the $75,000,000 appropriation every time the matter has been considered in the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say a word further if the Senator from Georgia will permit me. He says that the States, cities, and counties are in a better condition than the Federal Government, and I imagine that the Senator's statement, if it is not absolutely accurate at the present moment, will be very soon if we continue to spend money as we have done.

I am glad the Senator has made the speech on economy he has made today; I am glad that he has let the people of the country know whither we are drifting; but, on the other hand, the Senator knows that this country ought to do something about providing work for our returning soldiers. The Senator thinks that the States, cities, and counties are in better position to do it than we are. The difference is that, under the George bill, the Federal Government is going to undertake a centralized plan which will apply to the whole country, and if we leave it to the States, as we did in 1930 and 1931, the plans will not be ready and the work, in my judgment, will not be forthcoming. That is the only answer to the Senator's statement that the States, cities, and counties are in a better condition than the National Government. I really believe they are at this time. I think the Senator is correct about that. But if we want a plan which will apply to the whole country—and that is what we need—it seems to me to be obvious that we should appropriate $75,000,000 for the planning, and let it proceed, so that when the war is over these plans can speedily be put into effect.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator's statement is, for one whose views are generally consistent, a wee bit inconsistent. He says he wants to have the Federal planning for public works, and as a result he wants us to appropriate this $75,000,000 to be given to the cities, States, and counties for their planning, when we have no assurance——

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it is an advance.

Mr. RUSSELL. When we have no assurance whatever that the plans for which we pay will ever be used as part of any constructive program. Of course, we hope they will be, but we have no assurance that if these people are not sufficiently interested in the projects to put just a little money in plans, they will, when the public-works program shall be put into effect, adhere to and insist on the plans prepared now.

I am not at all afraid to predict that if we go ahead and give away the $75,000,000—and I will not admit it is a loan—at least half the plans prepared now will never be utilized when we have a Federal works program unless we compel the cities, States, and counties to put up some money.

I appreciate the commendation of me by the Senator from Tennessee for my effort to effect economy, but he insists that this is a loan. It is called a loan or advance in the act, and what kind of a loan is it? It is a loan that is extended to the States which is to be repaid from a subsequent appropriation in the nature of a grant to complete a public-works program. If that is the kind of a loan it is, it is just the same as if the Senator from Tennessee were to come with me and say, "Here, I am going to lend you $5 to pay on a suit of clothes, and when you pick out your suit I will give you the $50 to pay for the suit of clothes and deduct the $5 loan from the gift to buy the suit." That is the kind of a loan it is. It is an advance made to a State, and there is no legal obligation on the State to repay the loan. There may be some kind of moral

obligation that it shall be repaid, but the only way we will ever get the money back will be for us to appropriate billions of dollars for a public-works program and then deduct the loan from the appropriation we make. It is just taking money out of one pocket and putting it in the other. It is not a loan. It may be called a loan or an advance, but it is a grant, in the last analysis, which will never be repaid until the Congress makes a gigantic appropriation to carry out a public-works program.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I wish definitely to associate myself with the ideas expressed by the Senator from Georgia. I feel that my State, South Dakota, definitely wants to carry its share of the burden. In fact, I would go a little further than the Senator from Georgia has gone. My idea would be nearer the idea expressed in the appropriation of the $5,000,000 which the House has already approved. I feel definitely that we should make it a dollar-matching proposition.

I should like to suggest to the Senator, furthermore, that we are getting the cart in front of the horse, so to speak, because plans made today will be no good 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 years from now. Certainly we cannot do any building until the war is over, and there is no one of us on the floor of the Senate who expects the entire war to be over in any short length of time. I think we are just pushing things a little too far, and possibly looking at this planning through rose-colored glasses.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is not accurate in his statement that these loans will only be repaid by Federal grants. If that were so, I should certainly be against the whole proposal. As a matter of fact, the act expressly disowns any responsibility of the Federal Government to make any grant, and, as I have said, the proposal is merely that these localities shall have power to issue bonds of their own, and when they do that, if they have in view a great public work, a sewerage system, for example, and are going to issue $5,000,000 in bonds, they will make the figure large enough to pay the costs and pay back the loans. I do not think there is any Federal grant implied.

Mr. RUSSELL. If we cannot get these localities, as the Senator from Ohio calls them, to contribute at least something toward making plans, I am certainly not very hopeful of our being able to prevent the localities from prevailing on the Senator from Ohio, and other Senators who think as he does, to vote the funds to pay for the programs they have evolved.

Mr. President, I wish to read just a word from the act. I thought the Senator was on the committee.

Mr. TAFT. I was.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to read a subsection from the act. It is not necessary to read all of it about the advances being made, but here is subsection (c) of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act:

> Advances under this section to any public agency shall be repaid by such agency if and when the construction of the public works so planned is undertaken.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is entirely correct, but it is not assumed they are going to do that with a Federal grant. They can do it with their own bond issue. Many of the smaller towns and cities have no means of making plans. As a matter of fact, what is proposed is wholly unnecessary. In Ohio a city may issue notes to cover the expenses of planning public works, and then, when the public works are built, those notes are taken up in the permanent bond issue. That can be done. It was represented to the committee last year that many States could not do that, and they therefore wanted advances. The only difficulty is that many of them have no power to borrow if they have to pay the money back. There are limitations on their power to borrow. So we say, "All right; you will not have to make a promise to repay. We will advance this money, but you can include it in your bond issue if you make one."

I would expect that any considerable State or city which made a program of this kind would ultimately proceed with all the works contained in the program, and that the Federal Government would get back practically all the money, but we would remove a deterrent to making plans by telling them that they could make plans at our expense, and that if they would go ahead and use them, we would not make them pay the money back. That is the theory, as I understand.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator realizes that we are not dealing with a uniform situation. There are a number of States which are prohibited by their State constitutions from negotiating loans in the first place.

Mr. TAFT. Ohio is, but why should we want the money, anyway? We have $50,000,000 surplus in the treasury.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator is correct, the State of Ohio is prevented from making any legal commitment to repay advances.

Mr. TAFT. That is true. We will not make any, so we will not borrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are a number of cities which are prohibited from incurring debts, and therefore any obligation they might assume in accepting this money would be absolutely null and void, because there would be no legal obligation on them to repay.

I insist that if this money is to be expended advantageously in a public-works program, we would better have some genuine interest in it down at the grass roots, other than just the interest, perhaps, of some mayor, or the chairman of some planning board, or an architect who wants to draw a whole lot of plans. If a locality has to put money in plans, it will be very careful about the projects on which it embarks.

Certainly, when we will have obligations soon which will amount to over $300,000,000,000, I do not see why States like Ohio, which, as the Senator says, has $50,000,000 in reserve, and other States which I could name which have more in reserve, should not put up some money to formulate plans. If they do not, most of the plans will be drawn haphazardly, and will never be used.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have a great deal of sympathy with what the Senator says, and I should like to make some remarks in my own time on the public-works program, but I do not think the bill should be changed. If we think $35,000,000 is sufficient, I think we should appropriate $35,000,000 on the present basis, and if that will not give the towns sufficient money they can use some of their own.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had no purpose to say a word on this subject until it was decided to increase the appropriation to $75,000,000. The House, after careful hearings by the committee, appropriated $5,000,000. The distinguished acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations thought the amount should be raised to $75,000,000. I like to go along with him, but I could not do so in this instance because I thought it was sheer waste and extravagance to appropriate that sum of money and simply give it out without any more restrictions than are contained in this measure. I was sitting by quietly for the appropriation of even $50,000,000. But I do feel that somewhere, some time, somehow, Congress ought to give some consideration to the relative ability of the Federal Treasury to meet these obligations as compared with those of the local subdivisions of government. If we appropriate all this $75,000,000 outright, without the States matching the amount, in my judgment, the program which will be had will not be nearly as effective as if we required the matching of the funds. Certainly let us limit the appropriations to $35,000,000, and then, if there is any great need for more funds, they can be appropriated in the next deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE obtained the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may make a brief statement because I must leave the Chamber?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I have a strong feeling of sympathy with every reasonable effort toward economy that can be made. I realize the size of our national debt, and the magnitude of our national spending. It is somewhat alarming to most of us. I have never been one in this body to advocate a public program simply and solely for the purpose of spending.

Mr. President, I know that we face a really serious situation now, although we may not quite realize it as yet. If we are to keep up the level of employment in this country, not necessarily at 60,000,000 well-paid jobs, or at any other particular figure, but if we are to maintain employment at anything like its present level, or in any reasonable proportion to the present level of employ-

ment, we must constantly look ahead to the building up of the purchasing power of our own people, and, whether we like it or not, we also must have some regard for the purchasing power of the low-cost producing countries of the world. It is simply a matter of common sense, as I see it, and it is not a question of extravagant, unrealizable dreams.

Certainly in this respect the committee, when it framed the bill which is the basis of this appropriation, thought it was taking a wise step. We thought that every municipality, every local subdivision of a State, and political subdivisions of all the States for that matter, should be encouraged to make sensible plans, that is to say plans which they themselves desired for their public works, which could not be put into effect now because of the restrictions on material and manpower. We weighed all the things which my colleague has spoken about, such as the disposition of some salesmen to sell perhaps unusable plans to a municipality or political subdivision. But we knew that there was a shortage of manpower in that field as well as in others, and that individuals could not very well be procured to make useless plans now; indeed, most individuals who have any capacity in any field are pretty well engaged. So we felt that we should do something to encourage the States, the municipalities, the local subdivisions, to begin planning for work which could be performed when a release of materials could be obtained, and when manpower conditions justified the work.

It was contemplated in the first instance that this should be a straight loan to the political subdivisions which applied for it, and then we were reminded of what is a fact, that many cities, many counties, even States, do not have the capacity to borrow for this purpose. When reduced to a per capita basis perhaps most of them are in better condition than is the Federal Government, certainly they are in a much better condition than they were some years ago, and I am very happy over that fact, but they must make necessary construction after the war is over. Just as individuals have been, so political subdivisions have been denied the privilege of building many of their public-service projects. They have not been able to do the things which in many instances are necessary. They could not obtain an unlimited supply of manpower or material, and many of them are not disposed to proceed with public projects so long as they can do without. So there is an extensive deferred building program within the local communities, within the counties, within the cities, within the States—a building program which must be undertaken.

Mr. President, it may develop that the Federal Government will be called on to participate in carrying on the public works, which of course must be limited in some States, some counties, some cities, some local subdivisions; but, after a war of such length as the present war, there is a great need for public works which does not ordinarily exist. So it seems wise to us to offer as an incentive to all the political subdivisions which did not have the power to borrow the relatively small sum of money to be appropriated on the basis of population, so far as 90 percent of it goes, so that they might begin the work on their plans, make their blueprints, and be ready to begin operations.

If this were a question of encouraging States, counties, and municipalities merely to spend more money it would be a different question, unless we were faced with a threatened depression of large proportions. It is a question of putting in the hands of the political subdivisions, counties, States, and municipalities, the funds or the tools with which they can make their blueprints for necessary rebuilding, necessary expansion, necessary improvement of facilities which must be improved, and which I have no doubt the local communities, the counties, the States, will find it necessary to make. Whether the Federal Government should make any appropriation to assist them or not is wholly aside from the question, it seems to me.

We were not undertaking to bind any future Congress—we could not do so anyway—we were simply trying to make available to political subdivisions which would need to make improvements, and which had been denied the privilege of making the improvements, the means for making plans for such improvements, so they would be ready when the time came to use the money and proceed with the work.

Mr. President, I have stood for public economy as constantly as anyone, and have not been willing to go as far as many individuals in the country thought I ought to have gone in the matter of taxation during the war period, although the taxes are high. I had my own reasons for that. But I am strongly convinced that if we are to maintain any level of employment which will give us the opportunity to meet our post-war obligations, and finally to liquidate our public debt, we must have a wholesome regard for wise activity upon the part of the Government which will stimulate in the days to come activity on the part of both individuals and political subdivisions. Therefore I hope, whatever amount is finally placed in the bill—and I do not think $75,000,000 is too high, although I would have been willing to accept a somewhat smaller increase, so far as I am personally concerned—that the matching provision will not be included in the law; not that there is any objection to the matching provision itself, because under ordinary circumstances and conditions I would favor it as heartily as would anyone else. I hope the Senate will agree to a sizable and reasonable appropriation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate what both Senators from Georgia have said on this subject, and there is really much in what both of them have said. I am sorry that my suggestion about including the $75,000,000 resulted in the vocal activity of my dear friend the junior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, I am not unconcerned about the public debt. I realize that it is large, and will be larger before we are through, and I realize it must be paid. But it must be paid out of the pockets of the people who will be working or making profits when this war shall end. We certainly are not going to pay off the debt by widespread unemployment and by the stagnation of our people in the activities which we all hope will ensue in our domestic field when the war is over.

I agree with what the senior Senator from Georgia has said about the motive which actuated the committee in providing for the $75,000,000. That committee was not an extravagant, wild-eyed committee. It was presided over by the Senator from Georgia himself. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and other Senators, from both sides of the Chamber, who were not regarded as particularly visionary in matters of this kind—and that includes me also—framed this statute.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, does the Senator think he is particularly visionary?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I do not. Does the Senator think I am?

Mr. TAFT. I should like to be visionary.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are two ways to define a visionary. One definition is that a visionary is a man with vision. The other definition is to the effect that a visionary is a wild-eyed man who has nothing but vision which is not fortified or buttressed by judgment. I trust that whatever vision I may have is fortified by some qualities of sound judgment.

So we placed in the act the provision for $75,000,000 because we recognized the fact that, when this war is over and we are compelled to cope with the question of unemployment and public improvements, in the absence of such a provision there would inevitably come to Washington the most haphazard assortment of plans, programs, and projects of which the human mind can conceive. We placed this provision in the law in order to have some over-all direction. We provided that 90 percent of the money should be distributed according to the population of the State in proportion to the population of the entire country, and that the other 10 percent should be distributed according to the discretion of the Administrator of the Federal Works Administration. So it is not a haphazard distribution.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Kentucky knows that there is nothing new involved in the matching program, requiring sponsors of projects to match Federal funds.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know that.

Mr. RUSSELL. The only post-war bill providing for public works which we have passed up to this time is supposed

to give employment to 600,000 or 700,000 people on the roads. We enacted a huge road-building program, and we required sponsors of road projects to match Federal funds.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have done that ever since 1916. When we enacted the original Federal good-roads law, we provided for such matching. It was an encouragement to the States to embark on a comprehensive and effective road-building program. In that connection, the distinguished Senator [Mr. HOEY] who now occupies the chair comes from a State which was one of the pioneers in permanent road building in this country. Cooperation with the Federal Government by his State and other States gave encouragement to the States to match Federal funds. I do not believe that that is necessarily a precedent or guide by which we are compelled to be governed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me for the purpose of correcting the figures presented by my good friend from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, the Senator from Georgia stated that employment would be furnished 600,000 or 700,000 people. I have a statement from Mr. MacDonald, the Public Roads Administrator, in which he states that, directly and indirectly, the appropriation recently made for roads, including planning and other activities, would provide employment for 1,000,000 people for 3 years.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am delighted to hear that. I accepted the figures of my distinguished friend from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], whom I have always considered the greatest expert in the Senate on the building of roads. I thought I recalled—I might have been in error—that in the course of debate he estimated that employment would be furnished for 600,000 or 700,000 people.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The latest estimate is that the appropriation will take care of one million a year for 3 years, directly and indirectly.

Mr. RUSSELL. Am I in error in my recollection that the figure of 600,000 or 700,000 was used when the bill was under consideration on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. It might have been, when we were talking about a lesser amount of money. The amount was finally increased.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I believe that the inclusion of the entire amount recommended would be really in the interest of economy instead of extravagance. If we do not provide an adequate amount for the coordination and supervision of plans, so that they may be presented in an orderly fashion, we shall have all sorts of plans from local communities; and when they converge on Washington, we who have been here for a good many years know that the chances are that we may appropriate large sums of money for projects which will not be as orderly in their conception, engineering, and architectural design as would be the case if we were to appropriate an adequate amount of money.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. It might be of interest to recite a little history in that connection. The Senator will remember that in 1933 we appropriated $3,300,000,000 for public works. I believe there was no question in the minds of the great majority of Senators and Representatives that that money was to be expended on substantial public works which would add to the wealth of the Nation. That was what we all thought we were going to get.

What actually happened was that after the money was appropriated and the time came to determine what we were to do with it, there were no plans, but people had to be put to work. In cases in which there were plans of a substantial nature, the President allocated money to projects for 2, 3, or 4 years, so as to complete the job. In a corner of that organization was the W. P. A., headed by Mr. Hopkins. Mr. Hopkins put people to work. Soon the amount of money originally allocated to him was exhausted. Then the President was compelled to withdraw all allotments beyond 1 year. The money went into the W. P. A.; and before we were through the 10 years of depression, we had spent more money on the W. P. A. than we had spent on public works.

For the public-works program we have something to show, in the nature of substantial improvements which are of value to the Nation. For the W. P. A. we have nothing to show. Over a period of time the W. P. A., by means of projects which were conceived at the moment and executed at the moment, simply took care of people to keep them from starving. The projects themselves had no value. The same thing may happen again.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arizona. I believe that what he says about the W. P. A., or the F. E. R. A., as it was known at the beginning, is true. Finally, over a period of years, the program became more methodical, and plans were designed by which schoolhouses, highways, streets, and sewer systems, which are of permanent value, were built. But I do not wish to go into that matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make an observation at this point?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Arizona certainly cannot draw any analogy between the situation today and that which existed in 1933. In 1933, if any of the States had planning boards I was not aware of the fact. I had just come to the Senate then, after having served as Governor of my State.

Today all the States have planning boards. The larger cities have planning agencies. The Federal Government had planned to such an extent that the Senate decided there were too many plans, and over my protest the Senate killed the National Resources Planning Board, which cost only $3,000,000 or $4,000,000 a year to coordinate the plans. Now, having saved that money, we pursue our method of economy by voting an appropriation of $75,000,000 to the States, to permit them to make plans.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me say a word about the surpluses which are in the treasuries of the States. It is true that many of the States have surpluses which are larger than they have ever been before; but those surpluses exist because the States have not been able to construct or engage in any public works at all in the last 4 or 5 years. The States have not been able to build highways; they have not been able to build eleemosynary or penal institutions; they have not been able to build institutions for the care of the sick.

When the war is over it will not take long to dissipate the surpluses which now are in the treasuries of the various States, because they will have to spend the money for the things for which they would have spent them if we had not been in the war. So I think we should not take too much consolation from the fact that today the States have surpluses in their treasuries.

We all know that we will not permit large numbers of persons to be unemployed in this country. We all hope private industry will be able to employ everyone, but we know that if the matter is not handled in that way, we will not allow men, women, and children to go hungry. We may as well recognize that fact.

It seems to me that if we are going to assist in any way, this is one of the ways in which, I think, the Federal Government can cooperate with business. If plans are to be ready and coordinated and if they are to be made in an orderly way, a beginning should be made on them now, so that they will be ready. If they are ready, then if Congress does not see fit to appropriate the money necessary in order to carry on any of the projects, that will be the responsibility of the Congress when the time comes.

I believe the proposed appropriation is in the interest of economy. I believe it is in the interest of the orderly planning of public works in which we will engage in the future. I certainly think it is infinitely preferable to the haphazard, hop-skip-and-jump way in which if there is no orderly planning, supervision, and coordination by the Federal Government, communities will send their representatives to the Federal Government, urge projects of some kinds, and pile them up before the agencies in Washington in such numbers and in such sizes that Congress will almost be compelled to appropriate money to carry them out, notwithstanding that they have not been organized under this appropriation.

For that reason I hope the $75,000,000 appropriation will be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] as modified, to the committee amendment on page 19, in lines 2 and 3.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, my interest in this matter stems from the experience gained prior to and during the depression. I had something to do with the early consideration by the Senate of the question of Federal assistance for the relief of persons who were thrown out of work. I was one of the early advocates of what at that time seemed to be a large public-works program. The first bill I introduced called for an expenditure of $5,000,000,000; and I was looked upon, I think, by some of my colleagues, and I know by many of my fellow citizens, as being in the wild-eyed category. However, I still believe that had that program been initiated at the time when it was proposed, it was of sufficient magnitude that it might have prevented the depression from reaching such depths, and might have prevented it from producing such a cataclysmic crisis.

I have no interest in the unnecessary employment of architects, engineers, or any other persons; but I know, from the experience we had during the depression, that one of the reasons why some of the expenditures then made were of a wasteful character was that there had not been sufficient advance planning of a constructive type of wealth-producing projects. Therefore, I hope we will not repeat that mistake in contemplation of whatever may develop from an economic standpoint in the post-war period.

On the question of looking into the future, of course, people have different points of view and different estimates regarding what the situation may be. There are those who look for a terrific economic decline, a cataclysmic depression. On the other extreme are those who believe there will be no serious economic consequences in the period of reconversion, and that private industry will be able to absorb all those who will be looking for work.

As I understand, title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act sought to avoid any determination as to what part the Federal Government might play in the public works field in the period of reconversion. I think that is clear from the language of the title, as well as from a consideration of the debate which occurred at the time when the bill was passed. As I see it, all that title V seeks to do is to recognize that there may be created such a situation that it will be necessary for public works to be stimulated by government at all levels—local, county, State, and Federal—in order to prevent a catastrophic collapse from an economic standpoint and mass unemployment.

When the committee came to consider the question of how sound advance planning should be secured it found that there were certain communities and also certain States which, because of statutes of debt limitation or constitutional provisions, were not in a position to match funds the repayment of which they had to pledge in advance.

So, in order that such advance planning of public works might take place all over the country and might fit all situations, which vary in various municipalities and States, the committee provided this method, whereby States, municipalities, or counties which find themselves unable to match funds for planning would be able to carry on the planning, but provided that if the planned projects were ever put under construction, whatever money was advanced for their planning should be repaid to the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. President, it is easy enough to rise in this Chamber and describe a mad scramble of communities and States for this $75,000,000, and to predict that it will be wasted on wild plans of an unsound nature; but I think that if the Senate and the House of Representatives wish to make sure that in the future there shall be sound planning of a constructive type of public works, this is the only method whereby it can be obtained on a Nation-wide basis.

If what we all hope will happen should not actually happen, and there should be unemployment of a large number of persons, we shall need a program Nation-wide in character. It will not serve our purpose to have throughout the country areas in which planning has taken place, and other areas in which it has not taken place.

I grant as being true what the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has said. There has been increased activity on the part of the Government in setting up planning agencies at local, county, and State levels. Nevertheless, I am convinced that if we adopt the matching program we may prevent States and municipalities from participating in the planning envisioned under title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944.

Furthermore, it does not necessarily follow that the planning which may be done by States, counties, and municipalities under this title will be carried out in the future by assistance from the Federal Government. If the States and municipalities which Senators have pictured as having tremendous reserves or surpluses will plan sound public works which they will be ready to put into effect early in the period of reconstruction, when unemployment may manifest itself in their communities, and do so with their own funds, every dollar of the money invested by the Federal Government in sound planning will be repaid over and over again through relieving the Federal Government from having to inaugurate a much broader program should the planning not be completed and ready to go forward.

We have been guilty of discussing two amendments simultaneously. The only amendment pending is the one relating to an increase of the sum of $35,000,000 in line 2 on page 19 of the bill to $75,000,000. I do not think that such an amount would be excessive. I do not believe that any Senator need feel that we are making any decision with regard to what part the Federal Government might find it necessary to play in the post-war period so far as its participation in public works is concerned.

As I view the matter, the amendment is merely an effort to profit by the tragic experience through which the country passed during the last depression, and to prevent the country from again being confronted by a situation which would make it necessary to waste money on made work instead of spending it upon constructive projects which, when completed, would add to the total wealth of the community concerned.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I cannot find anywhere in the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act any express authorization for any particular amounts for the purpose to which the Senator has referred. I believe the Senator is mistaken. I am not sure, but I cannot find any authorization.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I may be mistaken. My impression was that the Bureau of the Budget had merely recommended the amount authorized by the act. However, the Senator from Ohio is more familiar with the details of the measure than I am.

Mr. TAFT. Section 622 of the act provides:

> There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act.

There is no limit or specific figure mentioned in the act.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad that the Senator has corrected me. I am sorry I made a misstatement. I was ill at the time the measure was under consideration, but I was laboring under the impression that there was provision for a specific amount for the purpose of planning. However, I am sure the Senator is correct, and I withdraw the statement which I made in that respect.

Mr. President, regardless of whether it was determined in the act or not, when we take into consideration the size of this country and the number of States, cities, and towns involved I do not believe that $75,000,000 is an excessive amount for the Federal Government to invest, so to speak, in formulating a sound constructive public-works program which will be ready and available to be put into effect by the States, counties, and municipalities if and when the time arrives when materials are available and men and women are seeking employment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I shall not take the time of my colleagues by adding in any way to the discussions which have taken place on both sides of the subject. However, I wish to make a point which I believe has not been given sufficient attention.

The matter of deciding what appropriation shall be made is not a question of the difference between $5,000,000 and $75,000,000. The sum of $75,000,000 was suggested in the other House, and it was discussed there. The sum of $70,000,000 was rejected in the Senate committee and $35,000,000 was agreed to. Considerable discussion took place in the Appropriations Committee along the lines of the debate which we have heard on the floor of the Senate. It was apparent that it would be impossible to restore the sum of $75,000,000 which had originally been proposed. In view of

that fact, as the acting chairman of the committee has already stated, a compromise was suggested. It was suggested that $35,000,000 be appropriated, and that it be matched on a 50–50 basis by the States and political subdivisions. That amendment was agreed to in the subcommittee, and later in the full committee. If there was a division of opinion in the House, in the subcommittee of the Senate committee, and in the full Senate committee, would it be worth while now to insist in the Senate on $75,000,000 instead of substantially half that sum, namely, $35,000,000? The subcommittee agreed upon the lesser sum because it was hopeful that it might be agreed to ultimately between the conferees on the part of the Senate and the conferees on the part of the House. From the standpoint of tactics and policy, is it wise to insist on $75,000,000? There is a real likelihood of getting $35,000,000, and there is very little likelihood of getting $75,000,000. Shall we risk the prospect of getting $35,000,000 by insisting on what was originally proposed but later rejected by the House of Representatives?

I remember as a boy reading Aesop's fable of the dog with a chunk of meat in its mouth crossing a bridge. The dog paused to look over the bridge into the still water underneath, saw the reflection of a piece of meat and, being greedy, dropped the meat in its mouth and dove after the piece of meat in the water, the result being that he lost both pieces of meat, the real and the reflected. It seems to me that is very applicable to the present situation; and I hope the considered report of the committee will be adopted without endeavoring to amend it here and trying for more than, in my opinion, we are ever going to get.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio permit me to make a comment on what the Senator from Rhode Island has just said?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. When Aesop conceived his fable the dog was not en route to a conference with the House. The Senator from Rhode Island talks about tactics. It is obvious that there will have to be an adjustment of this item in conference; and it seems to me that sound tactics should require that the Senate go on record for the amount which it thinks is justified, realizing full well that it will have to go to conference with the House after action has been taken by the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say a word about the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. There was much opposition to it. Many members of the committee wanted merely to appropriate $5,000,000 and let it go at that. So the Senator from Rhode Island offered this amendment, and, as a matter of fact, I think he did a great deal of good by offering it, because it was adopted and to that extent it was helpful. Otherwise, we might have gotten an agreement for $5,000,000, and no more, and then it would have been much more difficult to obtain an increase of the appropriation. So I think the Senator from Rhode Island was very helpful in the matter.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator from Ohio will yield, I desire to make the point of no quorum. If he does not care to yield for that purpose, I will defer making the point.

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. REED. I call attention to the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gurney	Pepper
Bailey	Hart	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Reed
Bankhead	Hawkes	Revercomb
Barkley	Hayden	Robertson
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hoey	Shipstead
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Bushfield	Lucas	Taylor
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	McFarland	Tunnell
Capper	McKellar	Tydings
Chavez	McMahon	Vandenberg
Connally	Magnuson	Wagner
Cordon	Maybank	Walsh
Donnell	Millikin	Wheeler
Downey	Moore	Wherry
Eastland	Morse	White
Ellender	Murdock	Wiley
Fulbright	Murray	Willis
George	Myers	Wilson
Gerry	O'Daniel	
Green	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, because I think $35,000,000 is ample, regardless of the method adopted for distributing it. I think the method fixed in the original War Mobilization Act is a proper method, and I do not think the Committee on Appropriations should propose to change it. It seems to me that is a policy which was determined by the Congress last year, and that it should be followed.

When we come to the question of the amount, $35,000,000 seems to me ample for any possible purposes of planning of which anyone can conceive, without encouraging waste. Thirty-five million dollars would give the State of Ohio approximately $1,750,000. If that amount is allotted to the State, it will not be divided proportionately among the various cities and units in the State. It will go to the State, and then it will be spent at the discretion of the Federal Works Administrator among those who apply for the money. There will be many cities and States which will not apply for the money. In many cases it will be found that the States are perfectly able to do their own planning, that they have already planned, perhaps, for public works they desire to construct. The result will be that the entire amount allotted to a State will then be available to the relatively few subdivisions which apply for the money.

If the city of Cincinnati should get about half of 1 percent, which would be $175,000, half the State probably would not apply for any of the money at all, and Cincinnati might get as much as $350,000. I do not know what the city of Cincinnati would do with $350,000 in planning for public works; I do not think the city would require any such sum.

My view is that $35,000,000 would be ample for the purposes of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, a plan does not mean a blueprint; that is, if a courthouse were planned in a county in Ohio, it would not mean they would draw a blueprint and be all ready to start on the construction of the courthouse.

Mr. TAFT. No. The plans actually cover working drawings, and no one is going ahead with working drawings until he is ready to erect the building projected. So far as the plans for the contractor are concerned, it is not necessary to proceed until the building project is to be undertaken.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. How much would it cost the State of Ohio to make plans for erecting a $1,000,000 building? What proportion of that should be set aside for planning? Can it be reduced to that sort of formula?

Mr. TAFT. I do not believe it can be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It should not cost very much if a blueprint is not involved.

Mr. TAFT. I would think 2 percent would be a fairly liberal provision for preliminary plans. The ordinary cost, as the Senator knows, for supervision, and completion, and everything else, is approximately 5 percent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Six percent.

Mr. TAFT. On new public works; so that I think that for anything in the nature of preliminary planning, 2 percent would be a very liberal allowance.

A large number of districts do not make any plans, and a large number of districts use their own money, or have used it, in making plans. It seems to me that $35,000,000 is more than ample for the purposes of the bill.

I wish to make a further statement. There is behind the bill the impression that in some way the Federal Government is undertaking a policy of assisting States and localities to build any public works they may desire to build, as a means of preventing unemployment. That was the policy adopted by Congress once under the P. W. A. However, since I have been a Member of the Senate we have never appropriated a cent on that theory, and personally I think it is an unsound theory. I think public works are a very minor factor in the creation of employment. We can have the largest public-works program desired, and yet we cannot put to work any very considerable number of men under such a program.

I do not say that such a program is not a factor and should not be used to some extent when there is a threat of a depression, but so far as curing a depression is concerned it cannot be cured by such means. The reason why the P. W. A. and the $3,000,000,000 works

program did not cure the depression situation previously is that enough men cannot be put to work on any worthwhile public projects actually to meet an unemployment crisis. It is necessary to adopt another method. Every city in this country is proposing to rebuild itself at Federal expense. We are willing to help them make plans. The cities ought to have some kind of program ready when the time comes when we must meet some unemployment crisis, but simply because we are helping them make plans should not justify the implication that the Federal Government is going to take over, and the act disowns such a policy when it comes to spelling out the language.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. During the taking of the testimony before the committee the chairman and other members of the committee impressed upon the witnesses that there had been no such plan, and that they must not consider that the Government would take over the plans and carry them out after they had been adopted.

Mr. TAFT. I thank the Senator. The act expressly provides:

> The making of loans or advances hereunder shall not in any way commit the Congress to appropriate funds to undertake any projects so planned.

So far as I am concerned, I do not think the time will ever come when the Federal Government will undertake, by Federal grants for local public works, to cure the unemployment situation.

I think governmental assistance with respect to local public works should be based on definite Federal programs, just as we are considering now the question of assistance to health programs, and whether we should aid the States in respect to hospitals as a part of the national health program; but I think the theory that we should provide Federal grants for any kind of public works which any local agency wishes to undertake is wholly unsound. I do not believe that anyone with whom I have spoken has conceived of a public-works program of more than perhaps three or four billion dollars a year of worth-while projects. Certainly no public programs of which I know will result in spending more than that. It will cost about $2,000 apiece to put men to work on the construction of public works, perhaps $2,500.

Conceivably 2,000,000 men might be put to work on public-works construction, but if there should be a crisis and ten or fifteen million men were unemployed, that would not afford a solution. It would be merely a drop in the bucket. We should be thinking about the means for securing full employment to meet such a crisis. Full employment cannot be obtained on public works. Methods must be adopted for stimulating the development of private industry where 55,000,000 out of 57,000,000, whatever the number may be, will have to find their work, particularly in the post-war period.

At this time, Mr. President, I do not think we need to go about the business of stimulating local public works. As a matter of fact the curious thing is that all those who came from the departments asking for an extension of power are telling us that the one great danger in the post-war period, particularly the 2 or 3 years after the end of the war, is inflation. Those who come asking for money tell us that the danger is unemployment. The two are absolutely inconsistent. If there is any danger of excessive activity after the war, then there is no danger of unemployment. I think conditions are such that there is a much greater danger of excessive spending than there is of too little spending.

Mr. Eccles, the head of the Federal Reserve Board, came before our committee. He is one of those who say the danger lies in inflation. He says that after the war we must continue price control and rent control, and must place control on speculation in order to prevent inflation, which would end in a depression perhaps 5 or 10 years from now. His figures are very convincing. He says we cannot avoid that danger until we get back to a balanced budget. He says that the thing which creates the danger of inflation is Federal spending which now causes a deficit of $50,000,000,000 a year. He points out that after the war there will be a tremendous spending power available in the United States; that we are not going to cut off Government expenditures. overnight. Studies have been made by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation which show that whereas we now have perhaps a $50,000,000,000 yearly deficit, we will have a $35,000,000,000 yearly deficit when we have only one war on our hands, probably a $20,000,000,000 deficit the year after that, and a $10,000,000,000 deficit a year after that, and that we will not get back to a balanced budget until 3 or 4 years after the end of the war with Japan. That will be so even under the most conservative administration. That means that until after the end of the German war we will have a Government deficit of $50,000,000,000 or $60,000,000,000 a year.

We do not simply cut off Government spending overnight and throw everyone whose work depends upon it out of work. We shall continue very considerable Government expenditures and Government deficits, creating money out of thin air. We will have a hard time to sell Government bonds to the banks then, but they will have to take them. The difficulty will arise from the fact that then there will not be the patriotic urge to buy more bonds. We have today a tremendous amount of currency outstanding; $17,000,000,000 more in individual hands than before the war. We have $32,000,000,000 of individual deposits in excess of what were the normal individual deposits before the war. We will have approximately $40,000,000,000 of E bonds outstanding which can be cashed overnight, for they are owned by the kind of people who want to spend their money and who would have spent it probably if the war had not cut off the supply of many things they want to buy. So we have $90,000,000,000 there of liquid spending power available after the war.

In addition to that, corporation reserves are approximately $20,000,000,000 more than they were before the war. Then, of course, we have the foreign buying power. We have the constant urge made upon us to lend money abroad. Yet Mr. Eccles testified the other day that the foreign nationals now have $25,000,000,000 in dollars and gold which they could spend the day after the war ended, in buying goods in this country. They already have that money. Those balances are building up today because, as Mr. Eccles pointed out, under lend-lease we export about $12,000,000,000—we give it all away practically—and the $3,000,000,000 worth of goods which we import we pay for in dollars. So that all the nations that are supplying anything to us are constantly building up their dollar balances. I think it is very doubtful whether they are going to need the loans which are referred to so freely and liberally, with the exception of a very limited number of countries which have no resources whatsoever today.

Mr. Eccles points out that probably what we will have to do after the war is to place limitations on exports. We will have to say to many foreign nations, "You cannot come here and buy stuff from this country, because we have not yet gotten our production up to a point where we can supply the things you need." So far as I can see, there is approximately $200,000,000,000 of what may be called excess accumulated purchasing power over and above the purchasing power which would be created by the very high standard of activity in the United States during the next 3 or 4 years. So I cannot see the present need of a public-works program. I do see that there is going to be a short period after the war when the war plants must reconvert. That situation may last from 6 to 12 months, although, as things look now, it is going to be a gradual process, and will not hit us all at once. I do not believe that situation, however, can be met by public works. I care not how greatly the program may be stepped up, we will not be able to undertake a major program of public works and get it started in that period because the materials will not be available for the purpose. It seems to me we must meet the situation in that temporary period by stimulating just as large a program of repairs and replacements as is possible. Repairs and replacements will add up to tremendous figures. They are the kind of things that will put to work temporarily men without any special training or special ability along particular lines. The park commissioner of New York told me that in New York City alone there is about $2,000,000 of temporary work. So far as that is concerned, the whole country is shabby. The railroads are shabby. Everyone's home is shabby. There is enough repair and replacement work to fill that gap with great success.

However, so far as big public works are concerned, if we now stimulate an extensive program of public works we shall have them on our backs at the time when private industry will be active, and when

all the force of foreign buying and reserve buying power will be brought to bear.

I believe very strongly that what we should do, if we can, is to hold down the boom in activity until perhaps the second, third, or fourth year after the war. Nothing will tend to a greater degree to bring about the danger of depression than excessive activity based on loans and on conditions which cannot be repeated and cannot be permanent. I believe that our difficulty will come 4 or 5 years or more after the war. I believe that the best way to prevent trouble at that time is to hold down excessive activity at this time.

So it seems to me that while we ought to encourage the various local agencies to have projects on their shelves, and while I believe that such projects would afford good insurance, and that we might as well start now, I do not see any great need for hurry in rushing out the whole $75,000,000. I believe very strongly that $35,000,000 is all that will be used, and all that is necessary. I cannot see any reason why we should not support the committee in an effort to bring about a reasonable approach to the problem. If $35,000,000 should prove to be insufficient, we could appropriate more later; but I think we shall find that $35,000,000 will never be used by the local communities and States.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the treatment given this appropriation bill by the Senate today, and until its disposition, may have a far-reaching influence upon current Government expenditures. The pending bill is a new style appropriation bill, so far as the past 12 years are concerned. For the first time, I believe, a general appropriation bill covering a large number of subjects shows a reduction instead of an increase in the expenditures as recommended by the Appropriations Committee. Even after allowing an increase of $30,000,000 over the amount allowed by the House for this purpose—and I shall return to that factor—the bill, as reported by the committee, shows a net decrease of $73,738,635.

Mr. President, to make that decrease, the committee had to start at the beginning and go all the way. There were times when I personally would have liked to see a different treatment for some of the Government agencies affected. I did not ask for it. We treated them all alike. We made reductions in the Budget estimates and in the amounts requested by the bureaus, according to our very best judgment as to what should be done.

The effect was just what any experienced public man might expect. When the news of this bill got out my telephone started to ring. It so happens that I have a very cordial acquaintance in most of the independent offices affected by the bill. None of the agencies thought that its appropriation should be reduced. My telephone has been ringing, and I have been approached as a member of the committee to see if particular agencies could not be excepted from the general reductions which the committee has recommended.

Mr. President, once we start to undo the work of the committee, there is hardly any place to stop. If this bill cannot go through the Senate in virtually its present form, particularly so far as the amount of money it carries is concerned, and if the Senate does not support the committee, there will be no reason why the Appropriations Committee should assume responsibility for bringing about economy.

The thing which was discussed in the Appropriations Committee more than anything else was the fact that we have a $300,000,000,000 debt. What are we going to do about it? How are we going to keep this country solvent? How are we going to avoid the bankruptcy which has cursed many nations of the world throughout our whole history? The only answer, of course, is to stop spending so much money. In this bill the Appropriations Committee has offered the best contribution it can make toward that end.

Coming to the particular part of the bill which is now under consideration, the House of Representatives allowed $5,000,000 for making plans. A great deal of discussion occurred in the committee about the making of plans. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], acting chairman of the committee, was inclined to the view that we might very well go along with the House. We put this item in a separate classification. The acting chairman of the committee was in the minority. The committee did not agree with him. Finally this plan was evolved. It was the brain child of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]; and in my opinion it has great merit.

One of the worst evils flowing from the character of administration which we have had during the past 12 years is the declining sense of responsibility on the part of the citizen, the town, the county, and the State for their own welfare. More than anything else, it is important that we restore to the citizenry of this country and to responsible public officials a sense of reliance upon themselves. They should stop regarding the Federal Government as a Santa Claus with an inexhaustible supply of Christmas presents.

When we come to make plans, if plans are to be worth anything, there must be local cooperation.

The weakest part of such an appropriation is the failure to require from local communities some participation, however small, by which they may show their good faith in enterprises which are to be jointly undertaken by the Federal Government and the local communities.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, that the Federal Government may well take the initiative in planning. However, I stop there. I do not think the Federal Government should have the sole responsibility or that it should bear the entire expense.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, let me say that yesterday or this morning—I have forgotten which—I questioned General Fleming, Director of the Federal Works Agency, regarding how the money would be paid back, whether he expected it to be paid back, and whether he would require that it be paid back, under the law. He said he had talked over the matter with his counsel, and that these were advances which had to be paid back, and he would insist that that be done in each and every case.

If that is done, under the law, by the Administrator, this money will not be a gift to the States, counties, and cities; but it will be a loan to them, and they will have to pay it back. Therefore, the program will be very much less expensive to the Federal Government.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that that will be the case only if the plans are actually put into effect. If plans are made but if no work is done in connection with them, the Federal Government will have paid for the plans, but there will be no sharing of responsibility by the local governments or States.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I think there will be very few plans which will not be put into effect.

Mr. REED. Let me say further that I think the bill should be amended so as to provide that whatever aid is given shall be extended through a State agency. The Federal Government should not undertake to deal directly with a municipality.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has an amendment which he proposes to offer. His amendment deals with the very subject. It would require that the matter be taken up by the State planning commission, if there is such a planning commission, or by the head of the planning commission, if there is such a head; or if not, the Governor should appoint an officer, under certain circumstances. Such an amendment would cover that defect.

I think the Senator is correct. I think the Senator from Massachusetts has done a very valuable work in suggesting that that be done.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, let me say that I was aware of the amendment which is to be offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. I have examined it, and I told him it met with my full approval. I was delighted to know that it also had the approval of the Senator from Tennessee. Mr. President, that begins to make sense. The funds provided for in the bill may be channeled through a State agency, just as all our Federal road funds have been channeled all during the years. In building highways and in giving Federal aid in that connection, we do not deal with counties, townships, or local units. We deal with States. In post-war planning we should deal with States. I understand from the Senator from Massachusetts that he intends to offer an amendment to that end, and that the amendment has the approval of the Senator from Tennessee, the acting chairman of the committee.

Mr. President, I have no desire to detain the Senate. I have said to the Senator from Tennessee that I stand on the original committee amendment. I am happy to have his assurance that he, too, will vote for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. To which original committee amendment does the Senator refer?

Mr. REED. I will read it to the Senator. He offered it.

Mr. McKELLAR. No, Mr. President; the Senator is mistaken about that. I have reported it from the committee, just as the committee instructed me to do; but in the committee I voted against it, and I imagine I shall vote against it here.

Mr. REED. Then, Mr. President, I certainly misunderstood the Senator from Tennessee, because just a few minutes ago I received the impression from him that he was prepared to go through with the original amendment reported by the committee to the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Either the Senator misunderstood me or I misunderstood him, one or the other.

Mr. REED. Then, Mr. President, that entitles me to revise my views upon some subsequent matters which may come up.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I wish to summarize the situation regarding the amendment, if I may do so. Even after making a $30,000,000 increase over the sum allowed by the House of Representatives for plans, the bill will carry with it a $73,000,000 decrease in such appropriations, as compared with the appropriations made last year. It is the beginning of what I hope may be a pattern which the Appropriations Committee may follow from this time on. If the committee, after the careful work it has done, brings to this floor a bill providing for economies, but if the Senate does not want the economies and does not sustain the committee, that will not help very much to encourage the Appropriations Committee to continue in the future the effort to reduce appropriations.

Personally, I stand for the original committee plan. I think it is the best one offered. If any change is made, it should only be the change suggested by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], namely, to discontinue the matching, which I think would be a mistake, and to leave the sum at $35,000,000, the amount carried in the bill as passed by the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to the committee amendment on page 19, in lines 2 and 3.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Capper	Hawkes
Bailey	Chavez	Hayden
Ball	Connally	Hickenlooper
Bankhead	Cordon	Hill
Barkley	Donnell	Hoey
Bilbo	Downey	Johnson, Colo.
Brewster	Eastland	La Follette
Bridges	Ellender	Lucas
Briggs	Fulbright	McCarran
Buck	George	McClellan
Burton	Gerry	McFarland
Bushfield	Green	McKellar
Butler	Gurney	McMahon
Byrd	Hart	Magnuson
Capehart	Hatch	Maybank
Millikin	Revercomb	Tunnell
Moore	Robertson	Vandenberg
Morse	Russell	Wagner
Murdock	Saltonstall	Walsh
Murray	Shipstead	Wheeler
Myers	Smith	Wherry
O'Daniel	Stewart	White
O'Mahoney	Taft	Wiley
Pepper	Taylor	Willis
Radcliffe	Thomas, Okla.	Wilson
Reed	Thomas, Utah	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I inquire if the vote about to be taken will not be upon agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], on page 19, line 2, in the committee amendment, to strike out "$35,000,000" and insert "$75,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the question before the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senate should reject the amendment proposd by the Senator from Wisconsin, then the committee amendment would be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. The next question would be upon the legislative proposal submitted by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] providing for a matching of funds by the State, county, city, and other political subdivisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would be the question before the Senate.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, before the Senate votes on the amendment I wish to make a brief statement. A few minutes ago I stated that I was opposed to increasing the amount to $75,000,000. I am opposed to it, first, because I believe it to be untimely. Even if the Senate believes that we should make ready immediately for the post-war period, I do not believe it would be wise to allow such a thought to go out. When we let a similar idea get out last fall it resulted in a detriment to the war effort. I believe the pending amendment would have the same result.

Another reason for my opposition to the amendment is that if the Congress still believes in a program which we have had for 10 or 15 years, namely, a program to provide public money for public employment, the pending amendment would be merely a reendorsement of the "spending yourself rich" program.

Inasmuch as we are being asked to appropriate funds in order to provide plans, I wish to advise the Senate that plans have already been made. In the hearings which were held by the committee last week statements were made by Army Engineers to the effect that they already have made plans under the river and harbor law which Congress enacted early in the year, and under the flood-control law which was enacted last September. Plans have been made, and contracts are about to be let. The total sums of money involved are quite considerable. On page 10 of the printed hearings on the river and harbor bill the statement is made that already plans have been formulated for $170,000,000 worth of work. On page 11 of the hearings it is stated that if money was appropriated for war plants—and it was appropriated—a total of $382,000,000 worth of work would be provided for.

As to flood control, General Reybold testified that as of December 1944, $273,000,000 worth of work was ready to be started. He stated that by June 30 of this year there will be a backlog of $580,000,000 worth of work. He also stated that by June 1946, plans and blueprints will be ready for the construction of a total of $1,000,000,000 worth of work. By adding the sums we arrive at a total of a billion and a half dollars worth of work, which is a considerable cushion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope that the Senator's initial remark that an appropriation of $75,000,000 for the purpose of formulating plans would again make us overoptimistic, will not prove to be true. I also hope that he does not mean by such a statement that we should sit around and wait until the war is over, and then be confronted with a serious economic situation before beginning to look forward and make plans.

Mr. GURNEY. I anticipated that such a statement might be made, and I endeavored to answer it by saying that we have a cushion in the river and harbor bill, as well as in the flood-control bill, of a billion and a half dollars worth of work which has already been planned.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is all Federal work. It does not involve anything to be done by local communities. The pending bill, and the act on which it is based, namely, the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, which was enacted last year, contemplate work the responsibility for which, in part, at least, is to be assumed by local communities. The pending amendment would be an effort to relieve the Federal Government of the entire burden which might otherwise fall upon it, of providing projects and employment for persons who may be out of work. It seems to me that the Federal Government is interested in having as many projects as possible locally sponsored and paid for, in part, by local communities, instead of allowing the full burden to be dumped upon the Federal Government because of an economic situation which we all hope will not exist, but which no one can now say will not exist.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I do not believe the public-works program will furnish as much employment as it did in the past. I believe that private industry and initiative will take care of the problem. If it does not take care of it, we cannot take care of it by appropriating large sums of money, even when matched by local divisions of the Government. Many Members of Congress have endeavored to obtain material with which to construct necessary buildings during the war. Without exception they have failed. They cannot obtain materials. No building construction can be performed. There is no question that this war will continue for several years; but, nevertheless, no materials will be allocated to any job, be it paid for by a

local government or be it paid for by the Federal Government.

Suppose we provide these amounts of money to the local subdivisions of Government. Changes occur in local governments every few years, and, as we are quite familiar with how city governments and State governments operate, we know that a succeeding government or commission wants its own plans. It does not want to pick up old plans which have been approved by a prior commission or State government; it wants new ones up to date along its own ideas. So when we appropriate now to make plans for construction that cannot be entered upon for 3, 4, or 5 years I believe it is throwing money away.

I, therefore, hope that the amendment increasing the amount to $75,000,000 will not be agreed to, and I sincerely trust that the matter will be delayed possibly until war conditions are better than I think they are at the moment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has adverted to the fact that large sums have already been provided for flood control and river and harbor works. I hope he will not overlook the fact that there has been a very substantial appropriation which will result in expenditures in excess of $3,000,000,000 in 3 years in the post-war period in the highway legislation which has been enacted. That has already been planned and the authority to obligate the Government of the United States for its part of the expenditure has already been established by statute.

Mr. GURNEY. And that three and a fraction billion dollars will be added to this one and a half billion dollars. I believe no citizen of this country can criticize the Congress for not having been at least thoughtful of the needs of the post-war period.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on the pending amendment to increase the amount to $75,000,000, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the chairman of the committee a question for my information? Do I understand correctly that if this amendment is voted down there will be an amendment then offered which will suggest the figure $35,000,000?

Mr. McKELLAR. If this amendment is voted down and the text is left as it was reported to the Senate, there will be offered an amendment which has been authorized by the committee—it is subject to a point of order, but it will be offered—in the following words:

Provided, That of the $35,000,000 appropriated in this paragraph, $5,000,000 shall be available for loans or advances without matching under the provisions of said title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 but the remaining $30,000,000 shall not be available for obligation or expenditure under said title V except to make loans or advances in cases in which sums at least equal to such loans or advances shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, their agencies or political subdivisions, for the purposes set forth in said title V.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I should like to point out to the Senator from Michigan, that if the pending amendment is voted down the next question will be on the committee amendment found on page 19, line 2, of the committee print, providing an appropriation of $35,000,000. The proposition to match is not necessarily tied with the appropriation because it will require only a majority vote to provide $35,000,000, whereas, if the point of order be made, it will require a two-thirds vote to suspend the rule in order to provide that any part of it shall be matched. So Senators who want the $35,000,000 appropriation will vote against the pending amendment, then for the committee amendment, and then against the legislative amendment which requires matching.

Mr. HATCH. I ask that the pending amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, it is proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin to amend the committee amendment by striking out "$35,000,000" and inserting "$75,000,000."

Mr. HATCH. Then the vote is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained in Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] are absent on official business.

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on business of the Senate.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—31

Barkley	Hill	Myers
Bilbo	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Burton	La Follette	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	McMahon	Wagner
Fulbright	Maybank	Walsh
George	Morse	Wheeler
Hatch	Murdock	
Hayden	Murray	

NAYS—42

Austin	Eastland	Reed
Bailey	Gerry	Revercomb
Ball	Green	Robertson
Bankhead	Gurney	Russell
Brewster	Hart	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hawkes	Smith
Briggs	Hickenlooper	Taft
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Bushfield	McCarran	Vandenberg
Butler	McClellan	Wherry
Byrd	Millikin	White
Capehart	Moore	Wiley
Capper	O'Daniel	Willis
Donnell	Radcliffe	Wilson

NOT VOTING—22

Aiken	Johnson, Calif.	Pepper
Andrews	Johnston, S. C.	Scrugham
Brooks	Kilgore	Shipstead
Chandler	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Chavez	Magnuson	Tobey
Ferguson	Mead	Tydings
Glass	Mitchell	
Guffey	Overton	

So Mr. LA FOLLETTE'S amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in the committee amendment, I move to strike out the figures "$35,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000." I am hopeful that perhaps this amount will appeal to a majority of the Senators, bearing in mind, of course, that the pending measure still will have to go to conference, and a figure between $5,000,000, as provided by the House, and $50,000,000, if this amendment were adopted, would be the limit within which the conferees could agree.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the amendment of the committee. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 19, line 4, before the words "per centum", to strike out "4" and insert "3."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask the Chair whether the amendment in line 4 on page 19 is the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The amendment in line 4 on page 19 is the pending question.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let it be voted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in line 4 on page 19.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 19, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$30,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before we proceed to consider another amendment, I will say that the committee has authorized and directed me to offer an amendment to carry out the provisions of the amendment appearing at the top of page 19, and I will have to ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment now, because we are proceeding under the plan of committee amendments being first considered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the Senator from Tennessee taking up the amendment at this time, but I cannot grant unanimous consent to waive the rule.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator makes a point of order——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I understand, this is the amendment providing for matching.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator has already given notice of a motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. It does not come up regularly at this time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. As I said, I have no objection to the Senator making his motion to suspend the rule now, but I cannot give unanimous consent that the amendment be considered in order. In other words, I wish to make certain that in the unanimous-consent request there is no waiving of paragraph 4 of rule XVI, and that if the Senate takes it up now—and I am perfectly willing to take it up now—we take it up under a motion to suspend, in conformity with the Senator's notice previously given, and not by unanimous consent, which would waive paragraph 4 of rule XVI.

Mr. McKELLAR. We cannot do that now. It will have to go over.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am perfectly willing to grant unanimous consent that the Senator take this matter up now and move to suspend the rule in accordance with his notice.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well. That is all I intended to do.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Tennessee has offered the amendment, as I understand, which he was authorized by the committee to offer, which provides for the matching of these funds.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. If a point of order is made against that amendment, and the point of order is sustained, it will then be in order, will it not, to make a motion to suspend the rule in order that the amendment may be considered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands the parliamentary situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly unanimous consent is not required to make a motion to suspend the rule after the point of order is sustained.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; we will take that course. Does the Chair sustain the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No point of order has been made against the amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Tennessee to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the amendment at this time. I am perfectly willing that it be considered at this time, if such a request is necessary in view of the previous unanimous-consent request, which was agreed to, that the committee amendments be first considered. I have no objection to the amendment being considered at this time; but when the amendment is offered I wish to make a point of order against it. The Senator can then fall back on the notice which he has given of a motion to suspend the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, the Senator from Tennessee has offered his amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, line 13, before the period, it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided*, That of the $35,000,000 appropriated in this paragraph, $5,000,000 shall be available for loans or advances without matching under the provisions of said title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944, but the remaining $30,000,000 shall not be available for obligation or expenditure under said title V except to make loans or advances in cases in which sums at least equal to such loans or advances shall have been appropriated, subscribed, or contributed by States, their agencies or political subdivisions for the purposes set forth in said title V."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment is general legislation and comes under the terms of paragraph 4 of rule XVI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is not necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. McKELLAR. In accordance with the written notice heretofore given, I move that paragraph 4 of rule XVI be suspended so that it may be in order for me to offer the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. [Putting the question.] The noes seem to have it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Austin	Gerry	O'Daniel
Bailey	Green	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hart	Reed
Barkley	Hatch	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hawkes	Robertson
Brewster	Hayden	Russell
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Briggs	Hill	Smith
Buck	Hoey	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Bushfield	La Follette	Taylor
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	McClellan	Tunnell
Capper	McFarland	Vandenberg
Chavez	McKellar	Wagner
Connally	McMahon	Walsh
Cordon	Maybank	Wheeler
Donnell	Millikin	Wherry
Downey	Moore	White
Eastland	Morse	Wiley
Ellender	Murdock	Willis
Fulbright	Murray	Wilson
George	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI, so that it may be in order for him to offer an amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have no particular interest in this amendment, but I should like to point out that it should appeal to every Member of the Senate. It should appeal to those who want $75,000,000 to spend for planning, because if the $35,000,000 is matched by the States and local subdivisions to the extent of $30,000,000, there will be $65,000,000 available for planning. Therefore, those who want the largest amount for planning should support it.

It should appeal to those who want to see economy in the expenditure of this fund, because when a local community or State government contributes anything to planning it will make sure that the planning relates to something in which it has a real interest, and something which is needed in the community.

While I have no pride of authorship in the amendment, and did not offer it in the committee, I think it would be a wise thing if the amendment were agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, all the evidence before our committee tended to show that approximately $75,000,000 would be required to carry out

this program. As Senators know, I took that position in the committee. I have taken that position on the floor of the Senate. If the rule is suspended and this amendment is agreed to, there will be available $65,000,000, of which $35,000,000 will be contributed by the Federal Government and $30,000,000 by the States and localities. I believe that $65,000,000 should be available for planning. I believe that we ought to plan now, before the war is over, so as to be in readiness to proceed immediately it is over with carefully planned projects.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I am a little confused about the $35,000,000 and the $30,000,000. I thought the matching was to be on a 50–50 basis.

Mr. McKELLAR. The matching will be on a 50–50 basis if the rule is suspended and the amendment is agreed to; but if the rule is not suspended and the amendment is not agreed to, there will be only $35,000,000 with which to proceed with this work.

On the other hand, if the rule is suspended and the amendment is agreed to, there will be available $65,000,000—$35,000,000 from the United States and $30,000,000 from the States, counties, and cities. I think by all means the amendment should be adopted. I can scarcely understand how the Senate could refuse to adopt it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. What confused the Senator from New Jersey and, I am sure, what confused nearly all the members of the committee was the fact that under the plan $5,000,000 would be made available without any matching. That money would be for the purpose of giving the administrator a fund with which to correlate all the plans. The other $30,000,000 would be subject to matching by the States.

Mr. McKELLAR. It will not be unless the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. McKELLAR. The amendment must be agreed to; otherwise the matching system will not be utilized.

Under the matching system, if the amendment is agreed to, the Federal Works Agency will have the money, less $10,000,000, which was originally requested. I think it should have it by all means.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is not necessary, is it, for the Senate to adopt the amendment in order to allow the State and local units to spend their own money, anyway?

Mr. McKELLAR. I know that; but the planning is general planning for the purpose of having substantial works—not fol-de-rol works, but substantial works—to be erected hereafter. It will do away with future W. P. A.'s, which many persons objected to at the time because there was no planning.

But if we provide for proper planning, $65,000,000 will be available for that purpose, so that when the boys come back from the war there will be work at hand.

Mr. REVERCOMB and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield first to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I address this question to the Senator: Who will have charge of the management of the expenditure of the fund locally, in cases in which matching is done?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the proposed amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is agreed to, as I hope it will be, it will be done by the planning commission of the State or by the proper officer of the State if there is no planning commission. I understand there may be two or three States which have no planning commissions.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. If the proposed amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts is not adopted, then the fund will be controlled, will it not, by the Federal Government?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no; it will be handled by the States in the same way. The proposed amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts would make it specific, and I think it should be made specific; but, under any circumstances, the State authority will have control of the fund.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that in justice it should be said that the amendment originated with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], not with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. McKELLAR. No, Mr. President; I am speaking of another amendment, one which the Senator from Massachusetts is going to offer. It will specifically provide that the funds shall be made payable to the State planning commissions.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

I wish to ask whether the committee in considering the matching principle had in mind the laws of some of the States, such as my State, which make it impossible for a number of our local governments to match the money of the Federal Government. In my section of the country we have the peculiar problem that, as a result of wartime conditions, thousands of persons have come to the State. Many of them will stay there; they would prefer to stay there on relief rather than go back to some of the States from which they came. In my judgment that situation definitely involves a Federal problem.

When the principle of matching the money is involved, I think a great injury results in the case of States where at present there exist legal limitations on a number of subdivisions of government which make it impossible for them to adopt the principle of matching Federal money.

For that reason, my colleagues on this side of the aisle and, I think, a number of the Senators on the other side of the aisle voted for an appropriation of $75,000,000, because we think a definite problem exists. Certainly if the principle of matching the money is to be applied, a great hardship will be worked on my State.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that I took exactly the same position, and I voted for the $75,000,000. But we were voted down. Now the plan as reported by the committee should be carried out.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to say that I feel obliged to vote against the motion to suspend the rule. I desire to state briefly my reasons for coming to that conclusion.

As has already been stated, few of the States have any statutory provision for allowing any matching of this kind. Some of the States have constitutional provisions which would have to be altered before they could match the funds. That would mean, Mr. President, that if the amendment were adopted, in some States it would be impossible to use the fund or any part of it, except the $5,000,000, for post-war planning.

For that reason, it seems to me that if we are to have an equitable use of the fund throughout the United States, the amendment suggested by the Senator from Tennessee should not be adopted.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have yielded to the Senator from Wyoming. When he concludes, I shall yield first to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the reason why planning is necessary is wholly a Federal one. It is because of the dislocations and maladjustments which have been occasioned by the war. The problem for which the planning will be a solution is a national problem.

Therefore, Mr. President, I feel that the authority to make such plans should be extended without the imposition of any obstacles or impediments, and, consequently, I shall vote against the motion to suspend the rule.

Mr. TAFT and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have already promised to yield to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am willing to have the Senator from Tennessee finish his remarks; and then I shall, in my own time, make the few remarks I have in mind making.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have yielded to the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay a vote, and I apologize for repeating any of my remarks on the amendment.

Personally, looking at the welfare of the various towns, counties, and subdivisions of the various States to which, under the law on which the amendment is based, advances could be made up to $75,000,000—and the Senate has now voted down that amendment, so that the fund would be only $35,000,000—I would prefer to accept the $35,000,000 untrammeled, rather than to have the $35,000,000 and the requirement that it be matched; because the result might be that only the communities which were able to match it would have any plans made and submitted to the Federal Government, whereas communities which could not match it would get nothing at all. The result would be that the richer communities would get all the money, but the poorer communities, which will need it most, would get none.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In connection with what the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said, let me state that at the hearings it was testified that in many places it would be impossible to match the funds, and that it would be necessary to include in the over-all bond issues for the total development, provision for the engineering and planning for the years to come. We have adopted a plan to lend to the local communities or subdivisions planning money, in advance, for plans which later are to be put into effect.

I wish to add to what the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] have said that the plan not only affects States, but it also affects subdivisions, and particularly the cities. The testimony was to that effect.

I am in favcr of the plan for the reason that if the money were divided among 130,000,000 people on the basis of the population of the States, some States would receive so little of the money that it would not be worth their while to engage in post-war planning for the purpose of taking care of the returning veterans.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator from South Carolina for his statement. Let me add that I think it will be found that the States, particularly those on the west coast, where there has been a great deal of dislocation as a result of the war effort, are perfectly willing to do everything they can do to meet the employment problem which will confront them after the war. But they think—and, I believe rightly so—that the least the Federal Government can do in this emergency is to provide in advance the funds with which plans can be made to take care of the people who have come to our States as a result of the war.

I think it is most regrettable that the Senate has not seen fit today to vote to make $75,000,000 available for use in order to meet the pressing problem which will confront us after the war; namely, the unemployment problem. Unless we meet it we can talk to our heart's content about the private enterprise system; it will not work in the face of unemployment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, at one of the hearings held by the committee a list was submitted in connection with the question whether or not the Government would receive back the planning money which it might lend. The list demonstrated that two-thirds of the projects shown therein were of the self-liquidating type, such as water projects, sewerage projects, and other projects of that kind.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] if it is not true that under the basic law the money was not required to be advanced to States alone, but could be advanced also to public agencies of the States, without having to go through the States.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Federal Works Agency can deal with any county, city, or public agency within the State without having to go through State channels.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. President, I should like to call the Senate's attention to the ridiculous position in which the Senate is now being asked to place itself. The loan or advance of funds must be repaid, but before a State could even take advantage of a loan it would have to dig down and get a part of the money with which to match the loan by the Government.

If we really mean what we are talking about, and if we are in earnest about putting people to work when the time comes, we must stimulate not only private enterprise as such, but every city, county, and political subdivision of the country. If we do not do that, we shall have an unemployment situation in this country which we shall not be able to explain. I may say to my honored and venerable friend the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. MCKELLAR] that it seems to me that the Appropriations Committees of the House and of the Senate were dissatisfied with the law which Congress enacted within the past few months.

Mr. BARKLEY. And enacted almost unanimously.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. The money would not be a gift to a State, county, municipality, or public agency; it would be merely a loan. The word "advance" was inserted in the language of the bill because many political subdivisions do not have authority of law to borrow.

It has been said that the loans would not be repaid. Mr. President, this is not a scheme to induce States, counties, districts, or public agencies to accept Federal money. It is a program under which political subdivisions and public agencies may themselves prepare to continue with the building of their own municipal and public projects which have been delayed because the war has made it impossible to obtain materials or manpower.

I am surprised that any Member of the Senate should fail to grasp what the pending proposal would do, and should now wish to inject into the discussion the perfectly ridiculous argument that before a State may obtain funds which it must pay back, it must match, to the extent of 50 percent, the amount of the loan which would be given it.

We really have cut the life out of the whole program by reducing the amount to $35,000,000. If the maximum is required, as the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has pointed out, we shall make it possible for only the more able communities, political subdivisions, counties, and States to take advantage of the opportunity, and they will not care one rap what we do with the money when it is paid back. If they must put up 50 percent of the money in advance in order to obtain a small sum of money which they must pay back, they may prefer to raise all the money and go ahead with their own planning. In States in which maladjustments have taken place, in which there have been great shifts of population, and in which vicinities have been virtually destroyed because of the war, what will happen to the poorer communities and subdivisions which will not be able to match to the extent of 50 percent for the blessed privilege of obtaining loans which they must repay? I understand what the 50-percent matching program is. It never was advanced except in those cases in which we made grants to States, municipalities, or public agencies, and we then said that if they obtained the grant they would have to advance so much money. What we are saying here is, "If you advance half of the money, you may have a loan from the Federal Government which you will have to repay."

Mr. President, I hope the motion to suspend the rule will be voted down.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Georgia. He has stated more forcefully than I could have done what was in my mind.

I have already said that communities, public agencies, and subdivisions have been put on the same footing. Such an agency might be a school district. If a school district needed a schoolhouse and applied for money with which to build a schoolhouse, it would be confronted with the requirement that in order to obtain a Government loan it would have to match. If it did not have money in its treasury with which to meet the requirements, no matter what the need might be, some other school district which happened to have sufficient funds in its treasury could make application and obtain a loan. The result would be that the greater need would be denied.

Mr. President, I join in the hope that the motion to suspend the rule will not be agreed to.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say to my friend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] that he does not need to look toward me as if I have done something very unusual. I voted against the committee in the action which it took. In the beginning I voted for $75,000,000. I have already spoken on the floor of the Senate for $75,000,000. I was just as much in favor of appropriating that much money as was the Senator from Georgia, or any other Member of the Senate. But the Senate decided the question by agreeing to an

appropriation of $35,000,000. The committee instructed me to offer this amendment, and I am carrying out the instructions of the committee. I think it is better to have $65,000,000 for the purposes which have been explained than it is to have $35,000,000 for the same purposes purely from Federal money. I think it would be much better, because almost any political subdivision would be able to pay something.

I have had quite a long experience with another matching system. I refer to the road funds. I was with that subject from the beginning. I once heard an argument similar to that which has been made today, namely, that the money under the road act would never be matched. One of the newspapers in this city, and I think I shall have something to say about it tomorrow—said that the idea was foolish, that the States never would match the road funds, and that the Federal Government should not expect any matching. I have never seen any funds submitted on a 50–50 basis which have not been matched. If any State or county or city had the opportunity to match funds and did not match them, I have never known of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the fact that the Senator voted for the $75,000,000, and I commend him for it, and I am sorry our combined efforts were unsuccessful in that regard. I appreciate the Senator's sympathetic attitude toward the matter; but would it not have been just as logical, if we had gotten the $75,000,000, to require that it be matched, as to require that the $35,000,000 be matched? Communities can put up all they want to, anyway.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. Many of them will match voluntarily, but it is the system we are asking for here, the cooperation, and without cooperation between the States, counties, and cities, and the Federal Government, it is not likely we will get very far anyway. I think it is a wonderful plan. I regret more than I can say that $75,000,000 was not agreed on, but not having gotten an agreement as to that, the next best thing is to get the States to put up $35,000,000.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not desire to take very much time but I do wish to remind the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia that there is no sounder fiscal policy possible, in dealing with Federal loans, or grants, or gifts, than to require some degree of cooperation, no matter how small it may be, from the local community or the State to which cooperation is given. I adopt that from Calvin Coolidge, who said that the Federal Congress should never make an appropriation for local purposes or local uses unless there were some participation, no matter how small, on the part of the community, which indicated a degree of interest in the community which justified the help of the Federal Government.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Kansas that I thoroughly agree with that principle, where the Federal Government is making a grant, but that is not this case at all. It is like asking a farmer to advance half the loan which he gets from a Federal agency if he wants to get any money on which to cultivate his crops. If he is able to put up half the money, he will make out in some other way, and let the Federal Government go. In this case the poorer communities and subdivisions will simply not make the plans.

Mr. REED. I do not think that follows at all.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the Senator will live to see that it will follow, and not only that, but he will be here speaking on a proposal to make an enormous Federal grant for public works, which no doubt would be prevented if we allowed the local communities, the States, and counties, to get ready for the expenditure of the money on their own plans and on their own bases.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts will shortly offer an amendment which will channel these funds through a State authority, and I am in entire sympathy with his proposal.

Let me remind the Senate, and the Senator from Georgia, that the most successful Federal participation has been under the Federal-aid highway system. The funds are paid through a State agency, and go down to the counties and the townships through a State agency only when there is local participation. We have appropriated, and will appropriate in the future, hundreds of millions and even billions of dollars. If I could feel assured that every local community which benefited had to participate with some of its own money, if it were only 1 percent, or 5 percent, or 10 percent, or any other amount which definitely indicated the interest of the community in the project, I would feel that our money was going to be much better spent, and that the expenditure would be much better supervised than in any other way. Everyone within the sound of my voice knows the temptation in the local communities to throw discretion to the winds, and to disregard all rules of careful expenditure, if the money comes from the Federal Government.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only a few moments. I am unalterably opposed to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Tennessee. Briefly, my reasons are these. They have been stated by other Members of the Senate.

My State of Illinois is peculiarly affected by an amendment of this character. In the first place, the amendment is devoid of any flexibility whatsoever. In other words, as has been heretofore said, the richest community in my State is placed in the same category with the poorest community in the State. As an example, if a city in Illinois wants to borrow $5,000 from the Federal Government, irrespective of its financial difficulties, or its limitations on borrowing power under the constitution of Illinois, it will be compelled to follow the same course pursued by another community, that has no financial troubles.

I have in mind at this moment a section of Illinois where in 1932, during the depression period, there was more unemployment per capita than in any other section of the United States. The people in that community not only made contributions from their own pockets in order to relieve the situation which existed then, in addition to what they received from the Federal Government, they also bonded their cities, their municipalities, their subdivisions of State to the limit under provision of the State constitution. And there they are now, still barely able to pay the interest on the obligations which were incurred at that desperate hour, and still pay current obligations.

Mr. President, there is not a chance in the world for a community of that kind to obtain any relief under an amendment of the character now proposed. The planning they will do will be on a haphazard order, and as the able senior Senator from Georgia a moment ago stated, unless the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States recognize what is at stake here now in connection with the question of intelligent planning, then there may be something in the post-war era which will be equal to what was seen in the days of the W. P. A., or even greater.

Mr. President, the proposal is not to give anything to a community from the standpoint of relief. It is good business, at this particular time, as I see it, to spend this money in the various communities in intelligent planning, and the best business proposition of all is to spend it in the poorer communities, where the people need it most. The richer communities will pay no attention to this kind of an amendment. They do not need to come to Washington and get $10,000 with which to do their planning. They now have the money. What would be the sense in borrowing $10,000 or $100,000 from the Government with which to do their planning when, as the senior Senator from Georgia so ably says, they have to withdraw in the first instance from their own treasuries an equal amount. If they are so financially situated they can borrow it from the banks, they do not need to come here. It is the communities which have been stricken down in the past by something through no fault of their own who need the money at this particular time, so far as aid from the Federal Government is concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Illinois spoke of certain communities in the southern part of his State. I might refer to and remind the Senate of the conditions now prevailing in the entire Ohio Valley, where floods have overrun not only small communities from which thousands upon thousands of people have been moved, and much property has been damaged, but large communities as well. I know of cities in the Ohio Valley which have been looking forward to the utilization of a part of this fund in order that they might make plans for the future. I know one city in the Ohio Valley which has been required, by reason of this unexpected flood, to spend $20,000 out of its treasury to buy sacks in order to have them filled with sand to keep

the water out of its streets. The city had to employ people to fill the sacks with sand. I know of a dozen cities in the Ohio Valley, in West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and in Kentucky which have been planning to use their portion, whatever it might be, of the $75,000,000, or whatever may be appropriated, but because of this sudden flood exigency and emergency they have exhausted their funds in order to protect their people against the waters of the Ohio River and its tributaries. Those cities could not share in this fund if they were required to match it, unless they could obtain money from some source of which I have no knowledge. That is simply an illustration of the condition which may exist throughout this country on account of flood conditions.

Mr. LUCAS. The illustration is a perfect one.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. REED. May I inquire of the Senator from Illinois whether he classes the great city of Chicago with the wealthier or the poorer communities of his State?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think that has anything to do with the question at all.

Mr. REED. The Senator was talking about the poorer communities.

Mr. LUCAS. Chicago had a great problem of unemployment in 1932 and 1933.

Mr. REED. I wish to say to the Senator from Illinois that Mayor Ed Kelley, of Chicago; Mayor LaGuardia, of New York; and Mayor Scully, of Pittsburgh, Pa., the mayors of three enormous and wealthy cities, members of the "Gimmie" Club, appeared before our committee asking for this appropriation. They were not representing poor communities. They were representing wealthy communities.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Kansas does not understand the needs of big municipalities, and I can understand perfectly why he does not understand. The truth of the matter is that when unemployment comes, the smaller communities can get along fairly well. But trouble, misery, chaos, social and economic difficulties become worse in the larger cities such as the city of Chicago. Back in 1932 and 1933 we knew what the conditions were in the larger cities all over this country. We know that there were food riots. We in the city of Chicago saw the school teachers marching through the streets because they could not be paid. There was no money in the treasury from which to pay them. Of course, we are proud of the city of Chicago. It is one of the real metropolitan cities of the world. But when the junior Senator from Kansas speaks disparagingly of the city of Chicago, it simply indicates that he does not know what he is talking about, as usual.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to ask the Senator from Illinois a question. I remember when Congress appropriated money to help pay the school teachers in Chicago, by way of a loan made to that city. The loan was paid back, as I recall. But suppose we required the city of Chicago to match every dollar we put up to make the loan to Chicago with which to pay the teachers, how many teachers would have been paid at that time?

Mr. LUCAS. That, Mr. President, is a perfect example showing how ridiculous the amendment is.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I shall vote against the suggested amendment. I simply rise to make the observation that I am surprised to hear Members of the Senate paint so dark a picture of what the situation will be after the war, because it has been my understanding that almost everyone believes that after the war we are going to have nothing but peace and prosperity throughout the United States. I am at a loss to understand why Senators have had such a change of view. As a matter of fact, I have repeatedly said that after the war we probably will have inflation for a short period of time, and after that undoubtedly we will have a very serious depression, but when I have made such a statement I have been ridiculed by many persons who contended that nothing but prosperity would exist throughout the world after the war.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, for several days I sat in the meetings of the subcommittee and listened to the testimony there given. I should like to make one thing plain before the vote is taken to suspend the rule, because it requires two-thirds of those voting to suspend the rule. The proposal now before the Senate is simply that of States and political subdivisions matching Federal money for planning; that is all. It is not matching construction loans. The proposal is simply to require a political subdivision to put up as much money as the Federal Government in order that it may make plans. That is all.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield to the Senator in a moment. I should like to finish my statement. If Senators will turn to page 176 of the hearings they will find that on the basis of an appropriation of $72,000,000 Nebraska would receive $636,000. That is what Nebraska would receive.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator know what planning costs? For $636,000 Nebraska could make the biggest, the most extensive plans Nebraska ever heard of. It is a tremendous sum for planning.

Mr. WHERRY. Wait a moment. I wish to reduce the amount down to my little town so I myself can understand it. I have difficulty understanding figures in millions or billions of dollars, but I can understand thousands of dollars. On the basis of a Federal appropriation of $72,000,000 Nebraska would receive $636,000, and if we then reduce the Federal appropriation to $35,000,000 it will result in Nebraska receiving about $300,000. On the basis of a population in Nebraska of one and one-half million, it would mean that every person in Nebraska would receive about 18 cents, and my town, which has a population of 2,000, would receive an amount equal to 2,000 times 18 cents, which would be about $360. Mr. President, does anyone mean to say that Pawnee City is so hard up that it cannot put up $360 to match $360 of Federal money, if the city wants to match it?

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. I may point out that the $300,000, if that is what Nebraska would receive, would not be distributed proportionately to Pawnee City and every other city. It would be available throughout the entire State.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that.

Mr. TAFT. Thus, any particular city which is interested in planning—incidentally there must be a planning commission, and many cities do not have such a commission—will receive a considerably larger sum than a proportionate amount based on any population theory.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator from Ohio wholeheartedly. Therefore, I think the Federal money ought to be matched by a political subdivision, and should be given to a planning commission. But the argument was made a moment ago by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] that a school district might wish to receive some of the Federal money, but might be in such a financial condition they could not even begin to put up the matching money. What does the Federal money amount to? It amounts to 18 cents per head in Nebraska, and that would be $360 to a town such as Pawnee City. That is the maximum amount that city could obtain. So when we hear talk about how hard up some communities are, and how impossible it would be for them to match the Federal money, when the amount involved is reduced to the figure which would be available for any given community, it will be found that the amount is insignificant.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is it the Senator's understanding that if $35,000,000 were made available throughout the United States by the passage of this measure that that sum would be divided per capita?

Mr. WHERRY. It would be divided on the basis of 90 percent of the population of the various States, and if it is given to the planning boards of the States they probably would allocate the money on whatever basis they saw fit. The argument has been presented here all afternoon that while the money might be made available to municipalities, political subdivisions of States, and even school districts, yet some of the political subdivisions could not match the Federal fund, and therefore no Federal money would be made available to them. My point is simply that the total amount of money per capita in Nebraska would be so insignificant that any town which wanted to come directly to Washington could get the money. There would be no handicap. The money would be expended only for planning. It would not be expended for building.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Might it not well be that a poverty-stricken municipality or subdivision of government might, because of its very poverty, as well as for other reasons, find itself in such a position that its needs would be far greater than its ability to meet its necessities?

Mr. WHERRY. That might be true.

Mr. CORDON. It might wish to request an opportunity to prepare for the time when construction can be commenced.

Mr. WHERRY. In reply to the Senator, let me say that if a community is so hard up that it cannot raise $360, I cannot see how in the world it can sell bonds to build anything.

Mr. CORDON. Does not the Senator recognize the possibility that within the terms and spirit of the law Pawnee City might be allocated $3,600 instead of $360?

Mr. WHERRY. I believe that the towns in my State will be able to match any amount of money which is allocated. I simply made the computation according to the method by which the allotments are expected to be made. I believe that the provision that the money shall be allocated to planning boards is the proper way to do it. However, I wished to make the point that if the locality wanted to borrow money for planning, it certainly would not have to put up very much to get it.

The impression seems to be that a large sum would be devoted to planning. When it is scattered over the country, it becomes very insignificant. If the amount for planning is increased, municipalities will be coming to Washington to obtain loans to build many projects; and instead of a program in the interest of economy, we shall find that we shall be required, under pressure, to expend billions of dollars to fulfill the plans which will be made under this provision. That will be the difficulty.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REED. I am sure the Senator is fully aware of the fact that the amount for planning has been reduced to $35,000,000. The population of the United States is approximately 138,000,000. When $35,000,000 is spread out over the United States, the average per capita will be 30 or 35 cents as a maximum.

Mr. WHERRY. That is true. The reason why I supported the amendment in the subcommittee was that I felt that the amount of $75,000,000 suggested for the planning program was satisfactory; but the only way to reach the problem is to have a matching system, so that if $30,000,000 is matched by another $30,000,000, there will be $60,000,000 available. Five million dollars more would provide $65,000,000, which is what is being asked for. The subcommittee heard all the evidence. I believe that the plan would be sound if matching were required. I believe that the States and communities can easily match the amounts allotted for planning, if they are given an opportunity to do so.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. What does the Senator propose to do with those subdivisions of government which do not have legal authority to match?

Mr. WHERRY. If there is a law in the Senator's State which provides that communities must keep within certain legal bounds, I believe that is a very good provision. It emphasizes the fact that the State has been very well managed. I believe that the political subdivisions should be required to comply with the law in that respect, just as they are required to do in my State.

Mr. MORSE. How does the Senator propose to solve the problem of legal obstacles which prevent matching?

Mr. WHERRY. I think the problem can be solved by the local communities and States themselves, without requiring the Federal Government to solve all local problems.

Mr. MORSE. When the States and communities seek the money which the Senator fears they may ask for, if the unemployment condition in the country is such that that is the only way the problem can be met, here is one vote to give them the money.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we have been talking about unemployment all afternoon. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] made a speech about money. We have nearly $27,000,000,000 worth of Federal bank notes in circulation. There are approximately $76,500,000,000 worth of time and demand deposits, which represent credit money. Other countries are ready to buy everything we have. They will be spending their money in this country.

Furthermore, we shall have the greatest consumer demand in this country that the world has ever known. In the United States we have not manufactured an automobile for 5 years. During the last year when automobiles were manufactured 5,000,000 of them were produced. All my friends desire to buy new automobiles. The people want to buy refrigerators, washing machines, and many other articles. For 6 months I tried to find a washing machine in Washington, and finally had to send to Nebraska for a second-hand machine with which my washing could be done in Washington, D. C. Hundreds of thousands of items will be manufactured; and during the next 4 years the pent-up money we have will provide the greatest employment we ever heard of.

Instead of being afraid of the post-war period, why do we not give private enterprise an opportunity to function? With all the money the people will have to spend, the problem will be that of manpower rather than unemployment. If we give private enterprise an opportunity, we can produce materials not only for the United States, but for the world, because the world is our territory at this time.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. Does the Senator believe that the language of the bill provides for real loans?

Mr. WHERRY. The amounts obtained would be loans.

Mr. TUNNELL. Does not the Senator think that the provision is rather crudely stated, if it is intended to provide real loans?

Mr. WHERRY. If the money is paid back, it is a loan. If bonds are issued to obtain money for construction, the money will be paid back to the Government.

Mr. TUNNELL. As the Senator knows, I was not a member of the subcommittee. If a community is too poor to match an allotment of $360, let us say, I wonder if such a grant would be a good loan for the Government. Would it be paid back?

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, the answer is that it would not be paid back. However, the testimony from those who want to see the money appropriated is that they believe that such loans will be lost anyway, but that the loss would not amount to as much as the loss from unemployment.

The argument is based almost entirely on the theory of unemployment. Everywhere we turn we encounter fear of unemployment. I believe that it is time for Senators to rise on the floor of the Senate and say that we are going to have employment in this country. We are beset by fear. With the money we have stored up, and with the materials and manpower we have, the 4 years following the war will be the greatest 4 years this country has ever known.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI, so that it may be in order for him to offer an amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are detained in a committee meeting.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is detained at a Government department on business pertaining to his State.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on business of the Senate.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent as a member of the Senate committee attending the funeral of the late Senator from North Dakota, Mr. Moses.

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—28

Bankhead	Hawkes	Russell
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	McKellar	Tunnell
Capper	Millikin	Wherry
Eastland	Moore	White
Gerry	Radcliffe	Wiley
Green	Reed	
Gurney	Revercomb	

NAYS—43

Austin	Hart	O'Daniel
Ball	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hayden	Pepper
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Briggs	Hoey	Saltonstall
Bushfield	La Follette	Smith
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Capehart	McFarland	Taylor
Connally	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Donnell	Maybank	Walsh
Downey	Morse	Wheeler
Ellender	Murdock	Willis
Fulbright	Murray	
George	Myers	

NOT VOTING—24

Aiken	Glass	Mitchell
Andrews	Guffey	Overton
Bailey	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Brewster	Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Kilgore	Tobey
Chandler	Langer	Tydings
Chavez	McCarran	Wagner
Ferguson	Mead	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative, the motion of the Senator from Tennessee is rejected.

CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AS AN AGENCY OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 298) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WAGNER, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, in line 13, before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: *"Provided*, That said sum shall not be available for making loans or advances under said title V with respect to projects in any State until the legislature of such State has designated an over-all State agency to allocate the sums made available to such State under said title V to individual projects conforming to a State, local, or regional plan: *Provided further*, That until the final adjournment of the first regular session of the legislature of such State which ends more than 60 days after the enactment of this act, the Governor may designate such over-all agency."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to consideration of the amendment out of order? The Chair understands that committee amendments are first in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to having the Senator offer the amendment, but I feel it my duty to say that I shall have to raise a point of order regarding the amendment, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator make that point of order at this time?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, Mr. President, I give notice of the amendment, and I also give notice that in due course I shall ask to have section 4 of rule XVI suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a notice must be given in writing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, Mr. President; the Senator will have to file a written notice, which will lie over 1 day, under the rule.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the next amendment of the committee which has been passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment which has been passed over will be stated.

The next committee amendment passed over was, on page 33, line 23, after the word "services", to strike out "$2,910,445" and insert "$2,619,400"; and in line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,620,000" and insert "$2,358,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment to the committee amendment: In line 23, on page 33, strike out "$2,619,400" and insert "$2,769,400"; and in line 24, strike out "$2,358,000" and insert "$2,488,000".

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the House of Representatives reduced the appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission by approximately $600,000. The Senate committee voted to reduce it 10 percent more. Probably that reduction was larger than should have been made.

Of course, I cannot speak for the committee regarding the Senator's amendment to the amendment. But so far as I am individually concerned, I do not think we would do anything more than justice by accepting the amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words about the amendment. I think the House of Representatives cut the appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission by approximately $300,000. When the bill came to the Senate committee, it voted to reduce the appropriation for the Commission 10 percent more, without ever giving the Interstate Commerce Commission a chance to be heard about the matter at all. I understand the committee wrote a letter to the Interstate Commerce Commission, asking whether the Commission wished to be heard, and I understand the Commission said it was willing to accept the reduction made by the House. That was taken by some member of the committee to mean that the Commission was willing to have a further cut of 10 percent made.

I am informed that the Interstate Commerce Commission—and this fact is known by everyone who is familiar with the Commission's work—because of the war situation and because some of its employees have been drafted, has been very much handicapped in its work. It is away behind in some branches of its work, namely, those relating to valuation, and so forth. The Commission has been severely criticized because some of the work has not been done. But the reason why it has not been able to do that work is that it has been short of funds, its appropriations have been reduced, and a great deal of additional work has been placed on its shoulders.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not true that a great deal of the inspection work required of certain branches of the Interstate Commerce Commission has been sadly neglected?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. REED. The House of Representatives did reduce the appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission, under the appropriation for the present fiscal year, by $208,555. As one member of the subcommittee supporting the subcommittee and the full committee in their action, I was not aware that the House had reduced the appropriation for the Commission to the extent that it had. The cut under the Budget estimate in the House of Representatives was $307,555.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REED. Without in any way changing the attitude which I have previously expressed on the floor of the Senate, and many times in the committee, I think the amendment proposed by the Senator from Montana might very well be accepted by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] to the committee amendment on page 33. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 33, line 23, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "$2,619,400" and insert "$2,769,400"; and in line 24, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "$2,358,000" and insert "$2,488,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment passed over.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 37, line 2, to strike out "$41,465" and insert "$388,319."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 37, line 14, after the word "services", to strike out "purchase (not to exceed thirty)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on the same page, line 18, after the word "act", to strike out "$2,532,619" and insert "$2,502,619."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say to Members of the Senate, and especially to members of the Committee on Appropriations, that the amendment on page 49, beginning in line 5, which was agreed to yesterday, should not be agreed to. Funds for the administration of the Defense Homes Corporation are furnished to it under the Lanham Act. I am wondering if members of the committee would be willing to have the amendment rejected.

Mr. GURNEY. To which amendment does the Senator refer?

Mr. McKELLAR. The amendment on page 49, beginning in line 5, to strike out certain language and insert one word. The proposed reduction of the sum of $2,327,400 in line 11 would not be affected. All I am referring to is the stricken portion of the language beginning in line 5.

Mr. RUSSELL. The total amount of the appropriation would not be changed in any way, would it?

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. GURNEY. I have no objection.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was agreed to; and I also ask that the amendment be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 49, line 5, after the word "expenses", it is proposed to strike out "in addition to the amounts available by or pursuant to law for the administrative expenses of the Federal Public Housing Authority in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law, and not to exceed $96,200 of the funds of the Defense Homes Corporation available for its administrative expenses (all of which are hereby merged with this authorization), not" and insert "Not."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 49, beginning in line 5.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was laboring under the impression that on page 47 of the bill, beginning in line 4, the amendment reducing the appropriation for the Federal Housing Administration was passed over yesterday. I am advised that I am mistaken. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the Senate agreed to the committee amendment be reconsidered in order that I may offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. McKELLAR. Let us first finish the amendment on page 49.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought the amendment had been agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee amendment in line 11 decreasing the amount has not been acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 49, line 11, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "$2,327,400" and insert "$2,072,241."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment in line 4 on page 47 was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, may we not have a statement with regard to the amendment so that we can determine whether or not it will be wise to interfere with the amendment as agreed to? A very large sum of money is involved.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, during the consideration of appropriation bills in every Congress, when Members of the Senate labor under some misapprehension, I do not recall any occasion when the Senate refused to reconsider the vote by which an amendment had been agreed to in order that a Senator could make a statement or offer an amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to deprive the Senator of the right to discuss the amendment, but the Senate agreed to it yesterday. What I see taking place here is a gradual increasing of appropriations.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a matter for the Senate to determine. It is for the Senate to determine whether an appropriation shall be increased.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senate agreed to the amendment yesterday.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senate agreed to it in the same way that it agrees to many things. Without objection, the amendment was agreed to. I thought it had been passed over, but I have since found that I was mistaken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 47, in line 4, was agreed to.

The motion is debatable.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. I believe the Senator from Maryland desires to discuss the matter, and I yield to him.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will restore the amount originally in the bill, which was $10,537,747. The amount eliminated was $537,747, and the appropriation recommended by the committee is about $4,000,000 less than the amount with which the agency was operating only a year or two ago. Everyone, I am entirely confident, believes that the F. H. A. has done a very efficient job. The F. H. A. has now only a skeleton organization all over the country. It is operating successfully, and very economically. I have heard no one question such a description.

In the next few days it will be necessary that the Senate consider a bill extending, for a short period, the time during which certain duties now performed by the F. H. A. may be continued by that agency. The F. H. A. today has not more than one-half the organization it had several years ago, and it is operating on a budget very much less than customary.

In addition to the regular duties it has to perform, I wish to call attention to the fact that certain special duties have been placed upon the F. H. A. It is now in the act of processing applications for the Veterans' Administration. Already it has a number of men engaged in that most laudable task. It is quite obvious that the job of processing these applications by the F. H. A. will increase, and not decrease, in size. It is, of course, desirable that so far as possible the processing of these applications for the veterans should be handled through existing agencies. The F. H. A. is admirably equipped to do this kind of work, and consequently it would seem to be a matter of economy, and would be also helpful to the veterans themselves, if at this time no effort were made to curtail unnecessarily this appropriation, and thereby hamper the F. H. A. in its efforts to service our veterans.

Of course, $553,747 is a considerable sum of money, but it is really only a small percentage of $10,000,000, only about 5 percent, and I think it must be apparent to everyone that the F. H. A., in order to continue with the duties which it must now perform, and also to take on the duties for the veterans, which are going to increase instead of decrease, should not at this time be limited in any necessary facilities.

Mr. President, let me emphasize that those who are familiar with the operations of the F. H. A. agree that it is operated on a very economical basis. I do not know of any department which

comes before any committee with which I am connected which has made a more favorable impression from the standpoint of economy than has the F. H. A.

Considering the fact that the amount involved is only about 5 percent of the appropriation, considering especially the fact that the new duties and responsibilities growing out of the service which the F. H. A. is rendering to the Veterans' Bureau will certainly increase in the future very greatly, I think it would be a mistake at this time to cut off this relatively small amount of appropriation. We can all be fully assured that the F. H. A. will continue to operate just as economically as is possible. I hope that the amount eliminated by the committee will be restored.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Federal Housing Administration voluntarily reduced its force from 5,200 employees, the number on the day of Pearl Harbor, to 2,700 employees now. The money which is appropriated does not really come out of the Treasury, because the Federal Housing Administration has made money for the Government. It has made a profit of $66,000,000 for the Government of the United States.

The Federal Housing Administration has taken on an additional burden of work because of the fact that we are undertaking to provide housing for the ex-service men who are returning, and that is an additional requirement of the Federal Housing Administration not heretofore imposed upon it. I think $553,747 is entirely too drastic a cut from the figures carried in the bill as it was passed by the House. If this were really a charge on the Treasury, I could understand and appreciate the argument for economy, but it really is not. The organization is self-sustaining.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think it can be said the organization is self-sustaining. No one knows whether it is self-sustaining or not. It set up a vast insurance fund, and there is not the slightest evidence that if we had a depression, such as we had 10 years ago, the whole fund would not be wiped out overnight. They have taken a half of 1 percent of all property insured and put it in a reserve, and increased the reserve, and done a fine job, but I do not think we can say we know whether it is going to be a profitable operation or an unprofitable operation until there is some major crisis.

Mr. BARKLEY. The same might be said of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which, on the basis of present figures, has made a profit of half a billion dollars. We do not know what will happen to any of that until it is finally liquidated. Taking the figures as of today of the Federal Housing Administration, it has only insured loans made by banks, and it has accumulated a profit of about $66,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. It has accumulated a reserve. That is not a profit. That is a reserve against possible loss, and no insurance company in the world would consider that a profit.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whatever the reserve may be, whenever this agency is liquidated, it will go into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Unless it has to make good on its insurance, which it may have to do.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it will all come out in the final accounting, whenever it is liquidated. At any rate, it seems to me this cut is entirely too drastic.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Could the Senator tell me whether the $10,537,747, which is the amount in the bill as it passed the House, is the same as that recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, or whether it is more or less?

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The current budget for the present year is $10,484,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, the appropriation for the current fiscal year is only about $50,000 or $75,000 less than the House provision.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That is the case exactly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Which sum has been cut by about $500,000.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Of course, the Senator from Ohio is entirely correct in stating that no one knows how the F. H. A. is going to pay out in the end. It takes time to know that result. But the fact is that so far the F. H. A. has worked both profitably and economically. What is going to happen in the future, should another depression unfortunately develop, as the Senator from Ohio has said, no one knows, but all we can say at present is that to date the record of the F. H. A. organization has been an exceptionally economical and efficient one. The loss record today is really a negligible one.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say just a few words about this question.

Last year was the most active of all the years of the Federal Housing Administration. We all know that to be so. Everyone knows that the present fiscal year has been the most active one in all its existence. Last year, the most active year in the history of the F. H. A., we appropriated $9,030,648. This year the House appropriated $10,537,747, or about one and a half million dollars more. Under those circumstances the committee thought that a slight cut such as was made by the Senate committee was not unreasonable. The committee made a cut of only $537,747, and I appeal to the Senate to stand by that cut. We are borrowing every dollar we expend. Of course the Government officials who come to us and ask for money cannot understand that there is any necessity for economy, in view of the fact that we are spending money as we are. Various officials came before the Senate committee and asked that we make the appropriations in the amounts they had requested. The amount proposed to be appropriated for F. H. A. this year is nearly $1,000,000 more than the amount appropriated last year, which was the year of greatest activity by the F. H. A. I do not see how any one could reasonably ask that the appropriation be increased.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I agree entirely with the Senator from Tennessee in his insistence upon economy. I nearly always agree with him. He is a safe guide. But I should like to make two suggestions in regard to this special appropriation. First, let me repeat, I think everyone will agree that the F. H. A. has been very economically operated. I have never heard any criticism, in or out of committee, concerning the cost of operations of the F. H. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Federal Housing Administration is very active and is trying to do a good job; but no matter how good a job is sought to be done, we ought to be reasonable in our appropriations. Last year was the year of greatest activity by the F. H. A., and now they come before us and ask for an increase of $1,507,000 over what was given them last year. We propose to give them an increase of $1,000,000, and the Senate committee has simply cut off $537,000 from the amount appropriated by the House.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. It is my belief that no matter what we appropriate, Mr. President, the F. H. A. will still continue to be operated very economically. I should be rather inclined to believe as the Senator from Tennessee does but for one reason. I do not think we should underestimate the importance of the needs of the Veterans' Bureau. Requests for loans are coming in ever more frequently. In the month of January, the F. H. A. had about 70 people working on the loans. The requests of the veterans' loans are, of course, going to be processed, and it is highly important that they may be processed as economically as possible. No one can do the work more economically, I believe, than the F. H. A. It has the machinery with which to do the work. It has the trained men available. It has an organization all over the country. No one for a moment thinks that the pace has as yet been set with regard to the number of these loans. Every month that pace is going to be accelerated and before the year is over we will find that probably quite a substantial number of employees will have been added to take care of this particular work of veterans' loans. If it were not for this extraordinary new burden, and certainly a most praiseworthy one, which has been placed on the F. H. A., I would agree with the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senate committee gave the F. H. A. an additional million dollars for that purpose in this bill. Why give the F. H. A. one and a half million dollars for the additional work which is to be done? The F. H. A. does not have a million dollars worth of additional work. The committee has gone into this matter very carefully. It heard the testimony of witnesses. It even heard Mr. Blandford,

He is a splendid man, and I have the highest respect, esteem, and admiration for him. That, however, does not mean that we should turn over the Treasury to this activity of government. We must be reasonable. We must be guided by the proof. The Senator from Maryland did not hear the proof. He did not hear all the facts which were adduced. I suppose the Senator did not know how much was appropriated last year. Did he? The Senator does not know that. He does not know how much the increase is. Since the Senator did not hear the evidence, I am sure he did not know—and I am not reflecting on him because he is not a member of the Appropriations Committee—that we had already provided a million dollars extra for the work which the Senator is speaking of. Surely, under these circumstances we ought not to provide a further increase. I appeal to the Senator from Maryland not to insist upon the amendment. I appealed to Mr. Blandford this morning, when he approached me, not to insist upon the increase. I am very fond of Mr. Blandford. I should like the best thing in the world to do what he asks for. But I appealed to him not to make this request for increase of more than a million dollars for this particular service.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The present budget of the F. H. A. is $10,484,635, which is within a few thousand dollars of the amount asked for. I assume that that budget has been worked out carefully and economically. We can all so assume, I think.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish I could praise the Bureau of the Budget as much as I praise Mr. Blandford. I am sorry I cannot.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. This is a problem which we must consider. If we reduce the amount to $10,000,000 then we shall have to reduce the budget. We shall have to reduce the present method of operating. As I have said, the F. H. A. has less than half the number of employees of a few years ago. I am disturbed about any possible interference with the Veterans' Bureau, and I am very much afraid that even if this relatively small cut is made there will be an impairment of the service rendered. That is the only reason I am pressing the matter at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator's fears will not be justified, and I hope the Senate will agree to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the pending committee amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. A parliamentary inquiry. What is the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 47, line 4, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "$10,537,747", and to insert "$10,000,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT TO INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 19, line 13, before the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That said sum shall not be available for making loans or advances under said title V with respect to projects in any State until the legislature of such State has designated an over-all State agency to allocate the sums made available to such State under said title V to individual projects conforming to a State, local, or regional plan: *Provided further*, That until the final adjournment of the first regular session of the legislature of such State which ends more than 60 days after the enactment of this act, the Governor may designate such over-all agency."

Mr. SALTONSTALL also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 1984, the independent offices appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is now after 5 o'clock, and the Senate has done a hard day's work. I believe we might suspend at this time. Therefore I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Reports of committees are in order. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to call the Executive Calendar.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nomination of Aubrey Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thought the first item on the calendar was a treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The clerk will state the first item on the calendar.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Executive A and H (78th Cong., 2d sess.).

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consideration of the treaty.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before action is taken on the motion, I wish to say that there is on the calendar a nomination which was adversely reported from committee yesterday, but which was acted upon in committee some 2 weeks ago, I believe. I am not certain with respect to the date. The nomination is that of Mr. Aubrey W. Williams. I should be very happy to vote on that nomination now without any debate. I think his appointment should either be confirmed or rejected. It seems to me unnecessary to continue this matter day after day, as it has been continued since the nomination came to the Senate, and I should like to ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote now on the nomination.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in connection with the nomination of Aubrey Williams, everyone knows that the Senate cannot vote now upon that nomination. Everyone knows that in justice to the Senate and to Mr. Williams and to the President who appointed him, and to everyone else concerned, the Senate is entitled to debate the nomination, and no doubt will debate it. How long it will take to dispose of it I do not know. Mr. Wallace's nomination was postponed for a month. So long as Mr. Williams' nomination is not confirmed, he is not the head of the R. E. A. and is not on the pay roll. I do not see any reason for haste in trying to obtain a vote this afternoon on Mr. Williams' nomination.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am merely asking for it. If the Senate objects, I cannot get it this afternoon. However, I hoped that the Senator would be willing, as the Democratic leader, to fix a time when we might debate it—say tomorrow. After the pending appropriation bill is disposed of, let us go into executive session and debate the nomination. I believe in debate. I am perfectly willing that it should be debated. Confidentially, I may have something to say about it myself, but whether I shall or not——

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure that if the Senator has anything to say, it will not be in confidence. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not intend it to be in confidence. I merely mention it in confidence to the Senator at this time.

Mr. President, I feel that this nomination should be voted upon, and I hope that our leader and my friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] will allow us to proceed to debate it and get through with it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, not only have I no desire to postpone consideration of Mr. Williams' nomination, but I am anxious to dispose of it as early as possible. It is entitled to be debated. I do not think any Senator will deny that statement. I do not know how long a time will be required for consideration of the nomination. The Senator from Texas has moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that such a motion is not necessary. The treaty is now before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. The treaty comes up automatically. I understand that the Senator from Texas, who is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and who has been an outstanding, honored, and useful delegate of the United States to a conference in Mexico, and ere long must journey to the Pacific coast to add further laurels to the distinction which he already enjoys as an international conferee on important matters, desires to have the treaty disposed of. I suppose the Senate is entitled to determine the relative importance of ratifying the treaty with Mexico and having Mr. Williams' nomination confirmed or rejected, as the Senate may see fit. I can very well understand the anxiety of the Senator from Texas, who is in charge of the treaty, to bring it forward for consideration. Of course, the question is for the Senate to decide; but the treaty comes up automatically. It, likewise, is subject to debate. I have frequently stated to Senators—and I now state publicly—that I hoped that the Senate would proceed to consider Mr. Williams' nomination immediately after concluding consideration of the appropriation bills. I did not stop to think that the treaty was already on the calendar, and I had not been advised by the Senator from Texas just when he desired to take it up.

It is obvious that we cannot dispose of the treaty today; nor can we dispose of the Williams nomination today. The treaty is also subject to debate; and I understand that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] has a heaving in his bosom to unload on the Senate; what he regards—and what I am sure we will all regard—as an erudite discourse on the subject of the treaty with Mexico. I have no desire to deprive him of that privilege. However, obviously we cannot dispose of either the treaty or the Williams nomination this afternoon.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator. I am quite sure that this matter can be amicably arranged. As we all know, frequently a treaty is taken up, and then temporarily laid aside for the purpose of considering other matters. Why cannot that be done in this case? Why cannot a time be fixed when we may begin consideration of the nomination of Mr. Williams?

There will be a great deal of debate on the treaty. I understand that certain Senators are opposed to the treaty, and intend to make speeches of great length. If the Senator from Texas would agree to lay aside the treaty temporarily, we could fix a day—say, tomorrow, or even Thursday—so that both sides could be heard on the question of the nomination of Aubrey Williams. As Senators know, the Senate is divided on the subject. The extent of the division does not seem to be known. Can we not fix a day certain for the consideration of the nomination—either Thursday or Friday?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will some Senator yield to me?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I have the floor, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas. I am not sure but that the Senator from Texas had the floor all through this debate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I entertained the illusion that I had the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty is the matter before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I admire the zeal of the Senator from Tennessee. However, the name of Mr. Aubrey Williams hit us only yesterday.

Mr. McKELLAR. No. It hit us some time ago. It hit us in February or January.

Mr. CONNALLY. It was reported on the 12th of March.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true. It was somewhat delayed.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know anything about the nomination except when it was reported to the Senate.

The treaty was reported to the Senate on the 26th of February. It affects the national interests of the entire United States. I believe that it is of somewhat greater importance than one individual, Mr. Aubrey Williams. I thought the Senate had other business before it besides Aubrey Williams.

During the progress of the consideration of the treaty, if Senators who are interested in the nomination of Aubrey Williams can obtain a unanimous-consent agreement for an immediate vote, or for a limitation of debate to a few hours, my personal inclination is to be agreeable to such a plan. I am not making any hard and fast commitments, because I am not the entire committee; but I shall certainly oppose postponing consideration of a treaty which is of great interest to the people of the United States and affects our relations with our sister Republic of Mexico, dealing, as it does, with a very vital element, water for irrigation and other purposes, in order to consider the fate of one little two-by-four job seeker. So I insist on proceeding with the consideration of the treaty.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. If I have the floor, I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I can understand the Senator's zeal for the treaty; but, as all Senators know, about the warmest question before the Senate right now is the nomination of Aubrey Williams. He is entitled to have a vote of the Senate on whether his nomination shall be confirmed or rejected. I should have no objection to proceeding with consideration of the treaty if we could have an agreement to take up and dispose of the Williams nomination within a reasonable time. If the Senator would agree to take it up tomorrow afternoon at 3 o'clock, and dispose of it, say, by Friday at 3 o'clock, I should have no objection.

Mr. CONNALLY. That would be 2 days.

Mr. McKELLAR. That would be 2 days. I believe that that is more time than has been devoted to the discussion of any nomination before the Senate. I doubt very much whether it would require that much time. We are told that it is the purpose of the advocates of Mr. Williams' nomination not to permit his nomination to come to a vote until after the recess.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no understanding that I have heard of by any of Mr. Williams' supporters that the nomination will be postponed until after the recess, if there is to be a recess. I do not know whether there will be one. There has been no understanding on the part of anyone. I am speaking now because I have talked to Senators on both sides of the aisle, although I think we probably are being discourteous to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in discussing the matter now, because the chairman of the committee is not present at this moment, and he should be present and should have an opportunity to hear the debate and to reply to it or take part in it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I think so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Neither the Senator from Tennessee nor I are members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is a member of the committee, but I do not understand that he is speaking for the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I am not.

Mr. BARKLEY. But there has been no understanding that I know of, by any member of the committee, to have consideration of Mr. Williams' nomination postponed until after the recess, if there is to be a recess.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then why cannot we agree to take up its consideration at a certain time in the future, after we have had a recess, if we are to have one, if there is no disposition to pass it over and to continue passing it over. I certainly take the word of the Senator from Kentucky on that point; I know he would not mislead us regarding anything, and I unhesitatingly and unqualifiedly take his word regarding that matter. But I say we should have an arrangement or an agreement under which Mr. Williams' nomination can be considered at an early date.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is not the treaty now regularly before the Senate, without a motion to proceed to its consideration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The present procedure should be the second reading of the treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. The treaty is now before the Senate; is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is. It is on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The parliamentary inquiry which has just been made relates to the point I wished to make, namely, that the matter before the Senate is, not the question of passing on the nomination of Mr. Williams—for that nomination is

not before the Senate—but the treaty. The treaty is before the Senate. When that is taken care of and when we come to consider items further down on the Executive Calendar, the nomination of Mr. Williams will be reached. But it has not as yet been reached. The treaty is the business before the Senate. It has been on the Executive Calendar since the 26th of February.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to ask the Senator from California how long, in his judgment, consideration of the treaty will take?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, first let me say that I appreciate the complimentary remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] about my own address; but I believe that what I shall say on the floor of the Senate will be a very small fraction of the entire debate concerning the treaty.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a hopeful statement. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not know how hopeful it is, but nevertheless it is correct.

There are seven Colorado River Basin States, and of course the State of Texas likewise is vitally concerned with the treaty, because of the Rio Grande. Almost every Senator from the Colorado River Basin States has told me he expects to address the Senate—and, I think, at some length—because the issues are not only of vital importance to his State but they present a very great complication. In addition to those Senators, there are at least 10 other Senators who have indicated to me that they intend to address the Senate—and, I hope, in opposition to the treaty. Probably there will be an equal number of Senators who will address the Senate in behalf of the treaty. So I imagine that before consideration of the treaty is completed 30 or 35 Senators will have addressed the Senate at considerable length.

There will be no disposition to filibuster. There will be no disposition on the part of anyone, so far as I know, and certainly not on my part, to speak at any great length; but certainly there is a desire to speak in the interest of the people of the United States on a subject of such vital importance and character.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. If matters simply take their natural course and if the treaty is taken up in executive session, can the Senator name the year in which we would reach the second matter on the Executive Calendar? [Laughter.]

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator does not expect a reply to that question.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I understand that the treaty is before the Senate and that no further action is required to make it in order for consideration.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Texas has been away on an important mission in behalf of our country and he has only recently returned. In a few short weeks he will be leaving to attend what will perhaps be a still greater conference, one involving issues of tremendous consequence to our country and to the world. I anticipate that he will have very many busy days of preparation before he leaves for San Francisco.

I do not blame the Senator from Texas at all for his desire to have the Senate proceed with consideration of the treaty. But what we have just heard from the Senator from California indicates that there will be long discussion and delay, in any event.

Mr. Williams is an individual, and all individuals have their rights, among which is the right to receive consideration. I think Mr. Williams is entitled to have consideration of his nomination begun at the earliest possible moment.

Having in mind the rightful desire of the Senator from Texas to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of the treaty, and having in mind the rightful desire of Senators to discuss the treaty, I wonder whether it would be possible to reach an agreement for the Senate to vote on the nomination of Mr. Williams within the next 2 or 3 days, and thus dispose of that matter, and then leave the Senator from Texas a clear and unobstructed track upon which his treaty might proceed to its ultimate destination.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to confirm and ratify, so far as I can do so, what has been so well said by the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]. However, I wish to ask the Senator from Texas whether he is in a position to take up the treaty now. Have the hearings been printed?

Mr. CONNALLY. Practically all of them are printed, and all of them will be printed by the time the debate starts, I am sure.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have understood that the hearings have not even been printed as yet.

Mr. CONNALLY. Most of them have been printed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly it will take a week or two to get all of them printed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Enough of them have already been printed to take the Senator from Tennessee a week to read those that have been printed.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Tennessee is not going to read that much.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know that; but the Senator raised a point about whether the hearings had been printed, as if he had some interest in them. I did not anticipate that he would ever look at them, of course; but it is a good argument. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. That is not the situation at all. But the Senate is not in a position to take up the treaty unless the records are here.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senate itself will be the best judge of whether it will be able to take it up and handle it.

I wish to say that I regret very much that I cannot accede to the request of the Senator from Tennessee, for whom I entertain very great affection. But he must realize that the Senator from Texas has some duties to perform as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. We had 4½ weeks of hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations. Every day the Senator from Texas was there in his seat, listening to the hearings.

After all the hearings, the committee has reported the treaty by a vote of 13 to 4. It is of the highest importance. It affects all the people of the United States. I cannot willingly desert the treaty and fail to present it because some one individual is seeking a job.

Mr. President, let me say that the treaty is already before the Senate. I shall not make any agreement to lay it aside. Perhaps during the progress of its consideration those who are more interested in Mr. Williams than in anything else will be able to obtain an agreement to have Mr. Williams' nomination called up and to have a day and hour fixed when a vote will be had on it. But I shall not agree now to any limitation on our right to have the treaty considered.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUTLER. The treaty is shown as the first item on the calendar. But the date of report is shown as February 26, and the treaty appears for the first time on the calendar today. The report which was made on the nomination of Mr. Aubrey Williams by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was dated March 12, yesterday. I wonder if any explanation can be made as to why the report of the treaty was not made available from February 26 until today?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty has appeared on every Executive Calendar since the date of its report.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is obvious that at this late hour we cannot proceed with consideration of the treaty, or with consideration of the nomination of Mr. Aubrey Williams. I wonder if the Senate will agree to postpone consideration of both the treaty and Mr. Williams' nomination, and proceed with consideration of the remaining items on the calendar?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that could be done. I should very much prefer to pass over the treaty and vote on the nominations. But why are we being asked to skip consideration of one nomination on the calendar and agree to all the others?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let us be reasonable about this matter. We all know that day after day from time immemorial, whenever there has been a controversy over some particular nomination on the calendar the Senate has gone ahead and considered the remaining nominations.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not objecting, but I merely wish to point out that the Senator is inconsistent in demanding that the Williams nomination be passed over, and that all the remaining nominations be taken up out of their turn.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not care whether they are taken up now or whether they are ever taken up; I have no interest in them; but it seems to me that in the interest of orderly business we should dispose of noncontroversial matters.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I make no objection if the nominations are purely routine and if debate will not ensue.

Mr. BARKLEY. Neither the Senator from Tennessee nor I is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I have not had an opportunity to confer with that committee or its chairman as to what the committee's program may be. I think that in the interest of comity of nations, or comity of Senators——

Mr. CONNALLY. I have stated that I have no objection.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not conferred with the chairman of the committee, but it has been my understanding that the nomination of Mr. Williams would not come up until the appropriation bill was out of the way.

In the meantime the Senator from Texas brought up the subject of the treaty, which is a perfectly legitimate thing to do. I am not trying to delay the vote on the nomination of Mr. Williams. I do not know of any advantage which he would obtain by the vote on his nomination being delayed. I do not quite understand the urgency with regard to Mr. Williams' nomination being taken up at any particular time, especially on the part of Senators who are not on the committee and had nothing to do with the question of whether his nomination should have been reported favorably or unfavorably. But if there is no objection to proceeding to consider the remaining nominations on the calendar, I should like to ask, notwithstanding the status of Mexico or Aubrey Williams, that we proceed to consider the remaining nominations on the calendar.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the question of how long the Williams nomination has been hanging fire in the Senate. The committee received his nomination on the 22d of January. We conducted hearings from February 2 to February 15. We then held a meeting of the committee to pass upon the nomination, and later reported it to the Senate. However, it was not reported for a week or two after the committee had acted. I agree with the leader on the other side of the Chamber that the Williams matter is growing so old that it has whiskers, and we should do something about it. I am sure the Senator from Texas will give us sufficient time during the consideration of the treaty to dispose of the Williams nomination.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the question of when a chairman of a committee shall make a report for his committee is not for the Senate to consider. It is within the discretion of the chairman. Frequently there are reasons why a report should not be made immediately. I am sure no other Senator would impugn the good faith of the Senator from Oklahoma. He is the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and it is his duty to determine when a report of his committee shall be made.

Mr. BILBO. I am very sorry if the Senator from Kentucky got the idea that I was trying to impugn the good faith of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Mississippi said that the Williams matter had been here so long that it had whiskers. I am sure that he will shave it when it finally gets into the senatorial barber shop. [Laughter.]

Mr. BILBO. I wish only to make a reply to the speech of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. I understand that under the rules when a Senator rises for a parliamentary inquiry, he may make the inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the rules of the Senate require that the Senator who has the floor must first yield for that purpose.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator. Would it be in order at any time during the consideration of the treaty to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Aubrey Williams?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that such a motion would be in order and if it were agreed to by a majority of the Senate the treaty would be displaced.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, a motion to proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Aubrey Williams could be made by any Senator at any time, and it would be in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the motion were agreed to it would displace the treaty as unfinished business. It would be just as though a bill were pending and a Senator moved to take up another bill. If the motion prevailed the bill taken up would displace the bill which had been under consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that such a motion would be in order at any time.

Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish merely to make a parliamentary inquiry with respect to the suggestion made by the Senator from Tennessee. My impression was that it would be necessary for a motion to be made temporarily or permanently to lay aside the pending business, which would be, for example, the treaty. A simple motion to proceed to consider the nomination of Aubrey Williams would not be in order. There would have to be a motion to set aside the pending business, which would be, as I have said, the consideration of the treaty.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield if I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that if such a motion as suggested by the Senator from Illinois were made and agreed to it would set aside consideration of the treaty until it was brought up again by motion.

Mr. McFARLAND rose.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to ask our leader what the plans of the Senate are in regard to the treaty. Is it planned to proceed until the matter is concluded, or take up legislative business in the meantime?

Mr. BARKLEY. Ordinarily, Mr. President, executive business is not supposed to interfere with the legislative program. As the Senator knows, we usually go into executive session at the end of the day when we are about ready to adjourn or recess, but in the case of a controversial matter, either a nomination or a treaty, we ordinarily try to take it up and debate it during the day at a time when urgent legislative business is not before the Senate. When we take up a treaty, we have to be in executive session during the time when it is under consideration, but if an urgent matter of legislation arose which needed immediate attention, and might be unnecessarily delayed by the consideration of the treaty, I would not say we could not go into legislative session and transact the legislative business without laying the treaty aside, because it is considered only in executive session anyway.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the Senator proposes that we proceed and finish the consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. I now ask that the other nominations on the Executive Calendar be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to state the other nominations on the Executive Calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Marine Corps nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

INTERNATIONAL SANITARY CONVENTIONS—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM CONVENTIONS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive B, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, an International Sanitary Convention, signed by the United States of America on January 5, 1945; and also that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive C, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, an International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, signed by the United States of America on January 5, 1945, modifying the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation of April 12, 1933.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the conventions and they will be published in the RECORD.

The conventions, with accompanying papers, are as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
March 13, 1945.

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of each of the following two conventions:

First. International Sanitary Convention, 1944, modifying the International Sanitary Covention of June 21, 1926;

Second. International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1944, modifying the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation of April 12, 1933.

These conventions were opened for signature at Washington on December 15, 1944, and were signed on behalf of the United States of America on January 5, 1945.

I transmit also for the information of the Senate the report of the Acting Secretary of State regarding the two conventions and a copy of an accompanying memorandum from the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

[Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Copy of memorandum from the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service; 3. Certified copy of International Sanitary Convention, 1944; 4. Certified copy of International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1944.]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 10, 1945.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House:

The undersigned, the Acting Secretary of State, has the honor to lay before the President, with a view to their transmission to the Senate to receive the advice and consent of that body to ratification, if his judgment approve thereof, a certified copy of each of the following two conventions:

1. International Sanitary Convention, 1944, modifying the International Sanitary Convention of June 21, 1926;

2. International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1944, modifying the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation of April 12, 1933.

The International Sanitary Convention, 1944, and the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1944, were opened for signature in the English and French languages at Washington on December 15, 1944. Both conventions were signed on behalf of the United States of America, France, Poland, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on January 5, 1945; on behalf of China on January 11, 1945; on behalf of the Union of South Africa on January 13, 1945; and on behalf of Canada, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, and Peru on January 15, 1945. The International Sanitary Convention, 1944, was signed on behalf of Czechoslovakia on January 15, 1945, subject to ratification; and the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1944, was signed on behalf of Bolivia on January 15, 1945, subject to ratification.

Reservations requiring ratification of each of the two conventions were made on behalf of the United States of America, Canada, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, and Peru.

The conventions were closed for signature on January 15, 1945, but remain open for accession by any government not a signatory.

The Pan-American Sanitary Convention signed at Habana on November 14, 1924; the International Sanitary Convention signed at Paris on June 21, 1926, which is amended by the International Sanitary Convention, 1944; and the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation signed at The Hague on April 12, 1933, which is amended by the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1944, are in force between the United States and a large number of other countries and have formed the basis of our quarantine controls insofar as international maritime and aerial travel are concerned.

Under the provisions of the conventions of 1926 and 1933 the receipt of information regarding epidemic diseases and quarantine regulations and the distribution of that information to the participating governments are entrusted to the International Office of Public Health in Paris, established pursuant to the arrangement signed at Rome on December 9, 1907, for those purposes. During the period of the occupation of Paris by the enemy from 1940 to 1944 the functions of that office were in effect suspended and the system of exchange of information regarding epidemic diseases and quarantine regulations was not in operation. The United States Public Health Service, as well as the health authorities of a number of other countries, is of the view that the International Office of Public Health is still unable effectively to carry out all the duties and functions assigned to it under the conventions of 1926 and 1933.

Significant progress in the field of disease control since the signature of the conventions of 1926 and 1933 has rendered many of the provisions of those conventions obsolete. Even before the present war the International Office of Public Health had recognized the need to revise the conventions of 1926 and 1933 and the permanent committee of that office had begun a preliminary study of the provisions of the conventions for that purpose.

During 1944 consideration was given to the matter of an extensive revision of the conventions of 1926 and 1933, but it was the feeling of certain governments, including this Government, that any action along those lines should be deferred pending a general international conference on public health. It was recognized, however, that it was essential to reestablish as soon as possible an international service on epidemic diseases in keeping with modern practice but within the framework of the existing sanitary conventions.

The primary purposes of the conventions of 1944 are: (1) to bring up to date, pending the calling of a general conference on public health, the technical provisions of the conventions of 1926 and 1933 in the light of recent developments in modern medical practice and travel facilities, and (2) to reestablish as promptly as possible a reliable service for the exchange of information regarding epidemic diseases and for uniformity in quarantine regulations. Both of these matters are extremely important because of the health conditions in liberated areas and the problem of the repatriation of persons displaced by reason of the war.

The conventions of 1944 were drafted under the auspices of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration with a view to fulfilling significant duties of that organization in relation to public health matters in the liberated and conquered territories, including epidemic control, and in connection with the enormous problem of the repatriation of persons displaced by reasons of war, the number of whom in Europe is estimated at twenty million.

Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon General, and other members of the United States Public Health Service represented this Government in the negotiations which led to the formulation of the conventions of 1944.

The Director General of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration transmitted drafts of the conventions to this Government with a request for its views and comments. After consultation with the United States Public Health Service, the Secretary of State informed the Director General of this Government's approval of the drafts with certain modifications. Those modifications and certain amendments suggested by other governments are embodied in the conventions as signed.

There is enclosed herewith for the information of the Senate a copy of a memorandum from the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service discussing the history of the two conventions, their technical provisions, and the urgent need for such conventions.

The conventions, having an emergency character, provide for the temporary performance by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, for a period not longer than 18 months after the conventions become effective, of duties and functions of the International Office of Public Health with respect to maritime and aerial travel. The principal reasons for transferring those functions, on a temporary basis, to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration are that the Administration is able with little or no additional personnel, and for a negligible extra expense, to take over those duties; that the duties under the conventions relate closely to work in the field of disease control which, in any event, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration would find it necessary to carry on in connection with its program of repatriation of displaced persons; and that, as stated in the preambles to the conventions, the International Office of Public Health is unable, for the time being, effectively to carry out all the duties and functions assigned to it under the conventions of 1926 and 1933.

Each of the conventions of 1944 provides specifically that the entrusting of those functions to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is without prejudice to the status of the International Office of Public Health. The conventions also provide that the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau shall continue to perform the same duties and functions as in the past in relation to the American republics. The Pan-American Sanitary Bureau has acted as the general coordinating sanitary agency in regard to the American republics, including in its functions the general collection and distribution of sanitary information, as specified in the Pan-American Sanitary Code and

as recognized by the International Office of Public Health.

The system of notification and communication of information to the International Office of Public Health, provided in the conventions of 1926 and 1933, remains in force; but governments which are parties to the conventions of 1944 will undertake also to transmit notifications and communicate information to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. Furthermore, each government will communicate, in addition to information respecting diseases specifically mentioned in the conventions of 1926 and 1933, information respecting other communicable diseases which, in the opinion of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, constitute a menace to other countries, and will keep the Administration regularly informed of the course of any epidemic. In turn, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration will promptly inform all governments of the outbreak of any disease which, in its opinion, constitutes a menace and of measures taken to prevent the spread of the disease across frontiers.

The International Sanitary Convention, 1944, contains a preamble, 27 articles, and an annex of forms consisting of a declaration of health and 5 certificates.

The International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1944, contains a preamble, 24 articles, and an annex of forms consisting of 2 declaratons of health and 5 certificates.

Reference may be made again to the detailed discussion of the provisions of the two conventions of 1944 in the enclosed memorandum from the Surgeon General.

Particular attention is invited to the following provisions of each of the conventions of 1944:

Article I of each convention provides that all references to the International Office of Public Health in the convention (1926 or 1933) which the convention of 1944 amends shall be read as references to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

Articles II to XX, inclusive, of the International Sanitary Convention, 1944, contain amendatory provisions relating specifically to parts and articles of the convention of 1926 with a view to making them conform with present emergency conditions.

Articles II to XVII, inclusive, of the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1944, contain amendatory provisions relating specifically to articles of the convention of 1933 with a view to making them conform with present emergency conditions.

The remaining articles in each of the conventions specify the manner in which the convention shall come into force, the effect of such convention upon the convention which it amends, the duration of the convention, and formal or procedural matters, including the procedure for application of the convention to colonies or to overseas and other territories.

Among the significant improvements effected by the conventions of 1944 is the amendment embodied in article XV of the International Sanitary Convention, 1944, which provides that "bills of health and consular visas shall be abolished as soon as the conditions of hostilities permit the establishment of effective epidemiological communications," and substitutes for the bill of health a Declaration of Health. This change has been made because many countries no longer require the bill of health and other countries were about to abolish it at the outbreak of hostilities. The use of bills of health has been rendered obsolete by the improved methods of notification of epidemic diseases and has lent itself to usages which were often in no way connected with the protection of health in the countries concerned. Adequate legislative authority to effect such a change in the quarantine system of this country exists by virtue of section 366, title III, of the Public Health Service Act of 1944 (Public Law 410, 78th Cong.). Aircraft, the speed of which is much greater than that of seagoing vessels, have never been required to carry bills of health, and the amendment will bring the maritime and aerial sanitary conventions of 1926 and 1933 into conformity with each other.

Articles XI–XIV, inclusive, of the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1944, alter the provisions of the convention of 1933 dealing with yellow fever so as to harmonize those provisions with the progress of knowledge of this disease and with the increasing speed of air travel. Restrictions are removed in the case of travelers in possession of valid certificates of inoculation against yellow fever. In order to provide for special and exceptional cases where the unobstructed passage of a non-inoculated person is absolutely and immediately essential on grounds of high policy, provision is made for the issuance of Certificates of Urgency to such persons which will permit their rapid passage. Two important changes in procedure have been made, namely:

(a) That "antiamaril" aerodromes in an endemic yellow fever area shall be no longer deemed to be separate "local areas"; and

(b) That the detention in quarantine of healthy passengers and crews not carrying valid inoculation certificates shall be carried out at the first aerodrome of arrival in an area at risk and not at the aerodrome of departure.

In accordance with article XXI of the International Sanitary Convention, 1944, and article XVIII of the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1944, each of which reads: "The present convention shall come into force as soon as it has been signed or acceded to on behalf of 10 or more governments," both of those conventions came into force on January 15, 1945, between the governments of the following countries, on behalf of which the conventions had been signed without any reservation with respect to ratification:

China, Ecuador, France, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Poland, the Union of South Africa, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

By article XXVI of the International Sanitary Convention, 1944, and article XXIII of the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1944, the duration of each of the conventions is limited to a period not exceeding 18 months from the date on which the convention enters into force. It will be noted that this 18-month limitation corresponds with the time limitation contained in section 9 of Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944, which provides that the authorization of appropriations for participation by the United States in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration shall expire on June 30, 1946.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH C. GREW,
Acting Secretary of State.

[Enclosures: 1. Certified copy of International Sanitary Convention, 1944; 2. Certified copy of International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1944; 3. Copy of memorandum from the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service.]

INTERNATIONAL SANITARY CONVENTION, 1944—INTERNATIONAL SANITARY CONVENTION FOR AERIAL NAVIGATION, 1944

Memorandum to the Secretary of State.
From the Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service.

PURPOSE OF CONVENTIONS

The purpose of these conventions is to reestablish as promptly as possible a reliable international epidemiological service and outline uniform quarantine measures that will afford a maximum of safety in the prevention of the spread of the epidemic diseases with a minimum restriction to commerce and the movements of people.

These conventions propose the most sweeping concerted action against epidemic diseases that has been attempted by the nations, and may be considered an important first step toward the future international organization for the prevention of disease and the promotion of health.

The principal international treaties relating to quarantine and the exchange of epidemiological information are (1) the Pan American Sanitary Convention signed at Habana November 14, 1924, which relates to both maritime and aerial travel, (2) the International Sanitary Convention signed at Paris on June 21, 1926[1] (hereinafter referred to as the 1926 convention), which relates to maritime travel, and (3) the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation signed at The Hague on April 12, 1933 (hereinafter referred to as the 1933 convention), which relates to aerial travel. The United States is a party to each of these conventions and they have formed the basis for our quarantine controls so far as international maritime and air travel are concerned.

The Pan-American Sanitary Convention is not affected by the conventions of 1944. However, provision is made in these conventions for cooperation with the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau, which functions under the Pan-American Sanitary Convention.

The International Office of Public Health at Paris, which was established by the arrangement for that purpose signed at Rome on December 9, 1907, is responsible under the 1926 and 1933 conventions for the receipt of epidemiological information and for its distribution to the principal public-health authorities of the participating governments, and for certain other administrative duties in relation thereto.

Owing to the occupation of Paris by the enemy from 1940 to 1944, the functions of the International Office of Public Health were in effect suspended and the system of exchange of epidemiological information was consequently not in operation during this period.

The principal effects of the conventions of 1944 are twofold:

1. Modernization of provisions: Since the signature of the 1926 and 1933 conventions, significant progress has been made in the field of disease control. Furthermore, since 1933, revolutionary progress has been made in the field of air travel. Consequently, many of the provisions of those conventions are obsolete. It is the purpose of the conventions to bring the technical provisions of the 1926 and 1933 conventions up to date in the light of interim progress. A detailed explanation of the scope and effect of the amendments made by the conventions of 1944 is given below under the heading "Principal technical provisions."

2. Provision for effective service for exchange of information regarding diseases and quarantine regulations: The conventions provide that, for a period not longer than 18 months after they become effective, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is to assume certain duties

---

[1] The 1926 convention was amended by the International Sanitary Convention signed at Paris on October 31, 1938, which has not been approved by the Senate and therefore is not in force as to the United States. However, the 1938 convention relates only to certain administrative arrangements with the Egyptian Government with reference to travel through the Suez Canal and therefore the 1944 convention with reference to maritime travel may be considered without reference to the 1938 convention.

and functions of the International Office of Public Health. The preamble to the conventions specifically states that the temporary entrusting of these functions to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration is without prejudice to the status of the International Office of Public Health.

In connection with the repatriation of displaced persons, and in the field of disease control, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration would be compelled to assume some phases of the work of reporting the epidemic diseases and quarantine controls which for the time being could not be effectively carried out by the International Office of Public Health.

The conventions also provide that the Pan American Sanitary Bureau shall continue to perform the same duties and functions as in the past in relation to the American Republics. These duties are specified in the Pan American Sanitary Code and are recognized by the International Office of Public Health.

HISTORY OF PRESENT CONVENTIONS

At the first session of the U. N. R. R. A. Council, held in Atlantic City in November 1943, a resolution was adopted relating to U. N. R. R. A.'s functions in connection with health and medical care which recommended in part that governments "cooperate fully with U. N. R. R. A. in establishing at the earliest possible date regional and other emergency agreements and arrangements for the notification within the limits of military security, of diseases likely to become epidemic, uniformity in quarantine regulations, and for other measures of prevention."

It will be recalled that the U. N. R. R. A. agreement and resolution of the Council place upon U. N. R. R. A. significant duties in relation to public health matters in the liberated and conquered territories, including epidemic control, and in connection with the enormous problem of the repatriation of persons displaced by reasons of war, the number of which in Europe alone is estimated at 20,000,000.

In accordance with this recommendation, the subcommittee for Europe of the standing technical committee on health of the U. N. R. R. A. council established an expert commission on quarantine early in 1944 with instructions to consider measures to give effect to these recommendations. The expert commission was composed of representatives of the United Kingdom, Canada, Poland, France, and the United States. This country was represented on that commission by Lt. Col. Leonard A. Scheele, United States Public Health Service, Chief, Preventive Medicine (civil affairs), Supreme Headquarters, Allied Expeditionary Force, and Dr. Hamilton Southworth, senior surgeon (retired), United States Public Health Service, who was then attaché at the American Embassy in London. Dr. J. A. Doull, senior surgeon (retired), United States Public Health Service, and professor of public health, Western Reserve University, was a member of the commission in his capacity as medical consultant for U. N. R. R. A.

Although originally the scope of the work of the expert commission might have been limited to recommendations for quarantine measures with reference to the European area, it was evident that the problem of such controls is world-wide in scope and that separate regulations cannot be placed in force for different parts of the world. Accordingly, the commission's work developed into a general study of the 1926 and 1933 sanitary conventions, and it concluded by recommending to the European subcommittee on health the adoption of draft conventions amending those conventions. (It should be noted at this point that, while the creation of the expert commission was primarily motivated by the necessity for reestablishing a reliable international epidemiolcgical service in connection with U. N. R. R. A.'s emergency duties, the substantive changes made by the present conventions are based solely upon modern medical practice and are changes which in the opinion of experts in the quarantine field should be made regardless of U. N. R. R. A.'s special interest in the subject. Even before the war the International Office of Public Health had recognized the need to revise these two conventions and its permanent committee had in fact begun a preliminary examination of them for that purpose, the general results of which were available to the expert commission.)

In April 1943 the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service initiated a discussion of current quarantine problems with the Surgeon General of the Army and the Surgeon General of the Navy. Following this discussion, an Interdepartmental Quarantine Commission was formed by joint action of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Federal Security Administrator. The members of this commission were directed to study the quarantine practices throughout the world and make recommendations for effective quarantine measures applicable to both maritime and air traffic. Many of the recommendations made in the final report of the Interdepartmental Quarantine Commission were incorporated in the drafts of the present conventions.

The draft conventions were approved in principle by the various committees of the U. N. R. R. A. council in London and were transmitted to the Standing Technical Committee on Health of the council in Washington for its consideration. (The United States member on this committee is Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, who in this capacity was also a member of the United States delegation to the second session of the U. N. R. R. A. council referred to below.) Prior to such consideration, members of the Expert Commission came to Washington and held discussions in May 1944, with representatives of the United States Public Health Service and the Pan American Sanitary Bureau who expressed agreement with the provisions of the convention after certain technical changes had been agreed upon.

The Health committee approved the draft conventions as so changed and requested the Director General of U. N. R. R. A. to submit them preliminarily to the member governments of U. N. R. R. A. for their comments in the hope that the conventions could be approved and opened for signature at the second session of the council of U. N. R. R. A. in Montreal in September 1944.

At the second session of the council in September, the conventions were examined in the light of the comments of the member governments. Two principal problems arose at this time:

1. It was the feeling of certain of the governments that wider revisions of the conventions might be desirable and that consequently any action along these lines should be deferred pending a general international conference on public health. This point had been recognized by the expert commission and the health committee of U. N. R. R. A. which had felt, however, that despite these considerations it was essential as soon as possible to reestablish an international epidemiological service in keeping with modern medical practice but within the framework in general of the 1926 and 1933 conventions. This view prevailed at the meeting of the Council of U. N. R. R. A. at Montreal and general agreement was reached on this point.

2. The second point related to the status of the International Office of Public Health in the light of the liberation of Paris during the interval since the consideration of the conventions by the health committee. An objection was made by the representative of one of the governments that in view of this development it was not necessary to proceed with the transfer of the functions to U. N. R. R. A. and that unnecessary duplication of functions would thereby be brought about. The same representative also expressed concern over the future status of the International Office of Public Health in the light of the proposed transfer of duties. It was the feeling of the United States delegation and representatives of a number of other countries that, despite the liberation of Paris, the International Office of Public Health was still, and would remain for some time, unable effectively to perform its functions because of difficulties of communication and travel and personnel problems. It was also felt that no duplication would arise by transferring the functions to U. N. R. R. A. since U. N. R. R. A. would in any event require this information for its work in Europe and the Far East and since the Pan-American Sanitary Bureau would in either case act with respect to the American republics.

With reference to both points, there was general agreement among the experts that it would be desirable during 1945 or the early part of 1946 to convene an international conference on public health matters for the purpose, among others, of giving further study to the problems of quarantine control and their administration by an international public health organization. Accordingly, each convention contains the following provision:

"The present convention shall remain in force as to each contracting party until either (1) such party shall become bound by a further convention amending or superseding the 1926 [2] convention, or (2) the expiration of 18 months from the date on which the present convention enters into force, whichever shall be the earlier."

In view of the questions raised at the session of the council at Montreal and the fact that further changes in the conventions were agreed upon at that session, it was agreed that the conventions should be resubmitted to the member governments and accordingly a resolution of the council (No. 52) was adopted approving the conventions in principle; requesting the director general to submit the drafts to the member governments; and authorizing him to undertake the functions set out therein for the period for which the emergency amending conventions are to remain in force.

The conventions were again discussed by the standing technical committee on health in Washington in December 1944, at which time objection by one of the governments to the transfer of functions of the international office of public health to U. N. R. R. A. was disposed of by the adoption of a resolution providing in substance for cooperation and exchange of information between U. N. R. R. A. and the international office of public health, in such a manner as to prevent confusion and to insure that the information received by the two organizations in question would be complete.

CHANGES ACCOMPLISHED IN THE 1944 MODIFICATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SANITARY CONVENTION FOR AERIAL NAVIGATION OF APRIL 12, 1933

Article III provides for the definition of typhus fever as relating only to epidemic, louse-borne typhus. Endemic or murine typhus fever is, from an epidemiological standpoint, a different disease. In the past indiscriminate reporting of typhus fever has caused quarantine authorities to place unnecessary restrictions on the movements of persons and ships.

There have been various interpretations of the endemic yellow-fever areas by the sanitary authorities of different countries. This confusion has particularly harassed the movements of persons by aircraft. A method

[2] 1933 in the case of convention on air travel.

is provided whereby all medical authorities may accept identical areas where yellow fever is considered endemic.

In the past different countries have established arbitrary periods for the duration of immunity following anti-yellow-fever inoculation. This section of the convention outlines definite and reasonable standards for the duration of immunity and describes the requirements for a valid anti-yellow-fever inoculation certificate.

When the 1933 convention was drafted it was generally accepted that the Aedes aegypti mosquito was the only vector of yellow fever. In the interim at least four additional species have been suspected or proved as vectors of the disease. The convention provides for the inclusion of any potential mosquito vector of yellow fever.

Article IV provides for the standardization of specified quarantine forms and vaccination certificates in order to promote uniformity in quarantine procedures. This particularly important in air travel where a plane load of passengers may land in several countries during a single day's flight.

This article also provides that the aircraft commander may be required to complete an aircraft declaration of health. A similar form has been required on entry into the United States since the beginning of international flights.

Article VII. This section clearly outlines the details required when reporting on the presence of epidemic diseases. When other countries are in possession of full information the sanitary authorities can more accurately evaluate the risks of spread of the infection and can take appropriate protective measures.

Article IX. This article takes recognition of typhus vaccine, which has been developed and widely accepted since the original convention was drafted.

Article XI. This part relates to standards with which yellow-fever vaccine shall conform and provides for freedom from quarantine restrictions against yellow fever for those persons properly immunized.

Article XII defines the perimeter of an aerodrome and takes recognition of the changed concept of the flight range of the principal vector of yellow fever. This article also provides that mosquito-proofed dwellings be maintained for flight crews, staff, and passengers.

Article XIV provides for a certificate of urgency for securing unimpeded passage to persons where high policy is involved.

Article XVII provides for disinsectization against insect vectors of diseases other than yellow fever.

CHANGES ACCOMPLISHED IN THE 1944 MODIFICATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SANITARY CONVENTION OF JUNE 21, 1926

Most of the modifications made in the convention for aerial navigation were also incorporated in the modification of the maritime convention.

The following are additional changes:

Article VII provides for the sanitary authority of a country to prohibit the embarkation on board a ship on international voyage of persons with any communicable disease, the subject of a formal notification under any international sanitary or quarantine convention in force.

Article VIII provides that the usual measures in force in the country shall apply to the handling of diseases on board a ship when the disease is not covered by the conventions.

This article also provides that a ship shall not be employed as a means of isolation of the sick, or of their contacts, if such use should unduly interfere with the movements of the vessel.

Article IX provides for circumstances under which surveillance is replaced by observation and prescribes for conduct of persons under either status.

Article X provides for an extension of the anchorage distance to 400 meters offshore. This additional distance is considered adequate to prevent an infected mosquito from boarding a vessel at ports where yellow fever may be present.

Article XI provides for the establishment of an Aedes aegypti control service at ports in endemic yellow-fever areas. Under present conditions no ports in the United States would be classed as an endemic yellow-fever area. In the event the disease should make its appearance in our ports, we would be compelled to institute Aedes aegypti control measures for our own protection.

Article XII provides that ships trading in areas where typhus fever is prevalent shall carry effective insecticides and typhus vaccines.

Article XV provides that bills of health and consular visas be abolished as soon as the conditions of hostilities permit the establishment of effective epidemiological communications, and that the master shall prepare and sign a declaration of health which shall be countersigned by the ship's surgeon if one is carried. The Sanitary Convention of 1926 anticipated abolishing bills of health, as evidenced by article 49, which reads in part as follows:

"(4) That special agreements in the spirit of article 57 of this convention be made with a view to doing away gradually with consular visas and bills of health."

Adequate legislative authority to effect such a change in the quarantine system of this country exists by virtue of section 366, title III of the Public Health Service Act of 1944 (Pub. Law 410, 78th Cong.). Aircraft have never been required to carry bills of health, and the proposed amendment will bring the two conventions into conformity with each other.

At the present time a similar form to the declaration of health is in use in the United States.

Article XVII provides that observation, if considered necessary, be enforced at land frontiers.

Article XVIII provides that railway carriages for mail or luggage and goods trains may be detained to apply the necessary sanitary measures.

Article XX provides that contracting parties may be entitled to make special arrangements for handling displaced persons.

There are appended to the conventions a form of international certificate for inoculation against yellow fever and standard forms of certificate for vaccination against cholera, typhus, and smallpox. The governments are urged to adopt these forms in view of the opinion of the experts that the placing of such certificates on a sound basis is long overdue.

In the 1944 modifications of both conventions a number of provisions have been deleted from the original agreements. The deleted sections have been made obsolete by scientific advances, or experience has demonstrated their impracticability.

Respectfully submitted.

THOMAS PARRAN,
Surgeon General.

FEBRUARY 28, 1945.

EXECUTIVE B—SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION—INTERNATIONAL SANITARY CONVENTION, 1944, MODIFYING THE INTERNATIONAL SANITARY CONVENTION OF JUNE 21, 1926

The Governments signatory hereto,

Considering that the International Office of Public Health created by the Agreement signed at Rome on December 9, 1907, is unable for the time being to carry out effectively all of the duties and functions assigned to it in the Annex to that Agreement; in the International Sanitary Convention, 1926; in the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1933; and in other Conventions or Agreements relating to the public health;

Having entrusted the task of solving this temporary problem by the preparation of emergency agreements and arrangements for the notification of epidemic diseases and for uniformity in quarantine regulations to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (hereinafter referred to as UNRRA), in accordance with Resolution No. 8 (2) adopted by the Council of UNRRA at its First Session, without prejudice however to the status of the International Office of Public Health which it is hoped will be able at the expiry of the present Convention to resume the above-mentioned duties and functions; and having received the recommendations of UNRRA in this connection;

Having agreed that, in regard to the American Republics, the Pan American Sanitary Bureau shall continue to act as the general coordinating sanitary agency, including the general collection and distribution of sanitary information to and from the said Republics, as specified in the Pan American Sanitary Code and recognized heretofore by the International Office of Public Health;

Desiring also to modify as between themselves the provisions of the International Sanitary Convention signed in Paris on June 21, 1926, as modified by the Sanitary Convention signed in Paris in 1938, insofar as the provisions of the Convention of 1938 may be in force between the respective Governments (hereinafter referred to as the 1926 Convention), in the light of the present-day conditions which call for special measures to prevent the spread by land and sea across frontiers of epidemic or other communicable diseases;

Have decided to conclude a Convention for these purposes, have agreed that, whereas the authentic text of the 1926 Convention is in the French language, the present Convention shall be in English and in French, both texts being equally authentic, and have accordingly appointed the undersigned plenipotentiaries who, having communicated their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed that the 1926 Convention shall be amended as follows:

ARTICLE I

All references in the 1926 Convention to the International Office of Public Health shall be read as references to UNRRA.

ARTICLE II

The second paragraph of Preliminary Provisions (2) shall be deleted and the following substituted:

"The word surveillance means that persons are not isolated, that they may move about freely, but that the sanitary authorities of the place or places to which they are proceeding are notified of their coming. They may be subjected in the places of arrival to a medical examination and such inquiries as are necessary with a view to ascertaining their state of health; and, in any territory where the competent Contracting Party thinks fit, surveillance may include requirement to report on arrival and afetrwards at such intervals during continuance of surveillance as may be specified, to the Health Officer of the city, town, district, or place to which they proceed."

ARTICLE III

The following definitions shall be added to the Preliminary Provisions:

"(5) The term typhus, typhus fever, or exanthematous typhus in the 1926 Convention and in the present Convention shall be deemed to relate only to epidemic louse-borne typhus.

"(6) The term Stegomyia, Stegomyia (Aëdes aegypti), or Stegomyia calopus (Aëdes aegypti) shall be deemed to include Aëdes aegypti and any potential mosquito vectors of yellow fever."

ARTICLE IV

To Article 1 the following shall be added:

"Every Contracting Party shall, in addition to the diseases specifically mentioned in this Article, to wit, plague, cholera, yellow fever, typhus, and smallpox, notify to

UNRRA outbreaks of such other communicable diseases as, in the opinion of that Party or in the opinion of UNRRA, constitute a menace to other countries by their spread or potential spread across frontiers, and shall keep UNRRA regularly informed of the course of the disease and the measures taken to prevent its spread. The provisions of the 1926 Convention as amended or supplemented by the present Convention shall, unless clearly inapplicable, apply to the above-mentioned other communicable diseases."

ARTICLE V

In Article 3 the word "Paris" in the second paragraph shall be deleted and the words "London or Washington" shall be substituted.

To Article 3 the following shall be added:

"In order to facilitate the prompt and scrupulous fulfilment of the foregoing provisions, the Contracting Parties shall ensure priority for all communications which may enable UNRRA rapidly to appraise the situation concerning the outbreak of a disease and to inform governments in order that they may take appropriate measures against the spread of the disease across their frontiers."

ARTICLE VI

After Article 5 the following shall be inserted:

"Article 5A. In addition to carrying out the system of notification and intelligence prescribed in Part I, Chapter I of the 1926 Convention, which remains in full force, the Parties to the present Convention shall transmit promptly to UNRRA the notifications and other information prescribed in Part I of the 1926 Convention.

"Article 5B (1). In addition to the formal notification required above, the Contracting Parties shall, so far as possible, send to the Health Organization of UNRRA at regular intervals notifications of communicable diseases notified in their countries.

"(2) The Contracting Parties shall make the necessary arrangements with UNRRA for giving prompt information to all the governments concerned of the outbreak in their respective countries of a disease which, in the opinion of UNRRA, constitutes a menace to other countries and of the measures which are being taken to prevent the spread of the disease across frontiers."

ARTICLE VII

To Article 13 the following shall be added:

"In a country where there exists a communicable disease, the subject of a formal notification under any international sanitary or quarantine convention for the time being in force, the sanitary authority in that country may prohibit the embarkation on board a ship on international voyage of persons suffering from the disease, and of persons in such relations to the sick as to render them liable to transmit the disease, unless the Medical Officer of the port of embarkation is satisfied that measures can be taken on board the ship to prevent the spread of the disease to the other persons on board. The Medical Officer of the port of embarkation, or other authorized officer of the sanitary authority, if he has reason to suspect any clothing, bedding, or other article of personal use which belongs to or is intended for use by persons embarking to be infected, may examine and require the disinfection of any such clothing, beding, or other article of personal use before it is taken on board.

"The measures enumerated in this Article shall be taken as far in advance of the sailing date of the ship as possible in order not unduly to delay the ship's departure.

"Nothing in this Article shall affect the power of the Master of the ship to refuse to embark the sick persons."

ARTICLE VIII

In Article 15 the following shall be inserted between the third and fourth paragraphs:

"If on the call or arrival of any ship at a port there is on board a case of infectious disease duly verified by the port medical officer, not being a case of plague, cholera, yellow fever, typhus, or smallpox, the usual measures in force in the country in which the port is situated shall be applied subject always to the provisions of Article 54 of the 1926 Convention.

In carrying out measures for control of the spread of communicable disease across frontiers, particularly in regard to the movement of displaced populations conveyed by international maritime transport, the Contracting Parties will not delay any ship at any point of her voyage longer than is necessary for the medical examination of crew and passengers, for the disembarkation (if such is considered necessary) of persons suffering from communicable disease, and of their bedding and personal effects, and for the disinfection of the accommodation they occupied. The ship shall not be employed as a means of isolation of the sick, or of their contacts, unless such isolation can be effected without delaying or unduly interfering with her movements.

ARTICLE IX

The footnote to Article 25 shall be deleted and the following substituted:

"In all cases where this Convention provides for surveillance, surveillance may not be replaced by observation except

"(a) in circumstances in which it would not be practicable to carry out surveillance with sufficient thoroughness; or

"(b) if the risk of the introduction of infection into the country is considered to be exceptionally serious; or

"(c) if the person who would be subject to surveillance cannot furnish adequate sanitary guarantees.

"Persons under observation or surveillance shall submit themselves to an examination which the competent sanitary authority may consider necessary."

ARTICLE X

In articles 35 (a), 36 (4), and 47, the words "200 meters" shall be deleted and the words "400 meters" shall be substituted.

ARTICLE XI

To article 40 the following shall be added:

"With a view to the elimination of Stegomyia (Aëdes aegypti) as an important step in the control of the spread of yellow fever, the Contracting Parties shall, in the light of their knowledge and experience of the control of the yellow fever vector, render and maintain free from Stegomyia (Aëdes aegypti) (a) ports and their surroundings in endemic areas, and (b) ports not situated in endemic areas but exposed to the risk of the introduction of the disease. They shall also use their best endeavors to secure that personnel employed in the handling of ships in ports in endemic areas and in ports specially exposed to risk shall be inoculated against yellow fever.

"The Contracting Parties agree that all persons inoculated in compliance with the provisions of the preceding paragraph of this Article shall be furnished with and carry an inoculation certificate signed by the officer carrying out the inoculation. This certificate shall conform to the International Form of Certificate of Inoculation against yellow fever annexed hereto.

"Persons in possession of a valid anti-yellow fever inoculation certificate shall not for the purpose of the control of yellow fever be subjected to quarantine restrictions.

"In place of a valid anti-yellow fever inoculation certificate, a certificate that the bearer has recovered from an attack of yellow fever and that his blood contains immune bodies against yellow fever, as proved by a test carried out by an institute regularly carrying out biological tests for yellow fever and approved for this purpose by the government of the country concerned, will be accepted."

ARTICLE XII

In Article 41 (4) and (5), before the word "disinsected" the words "disinfected and" shall be inserted.

To Article 41 the following shall be added:

"The Contracting Parties will use their best endeavors to secure that ships trading with areas infected with typhus shall carry a sufficient quantity of an effective insecticide for the personal protection of the crew and passengers, and will give favorable consideration to the inoculation against typhus of all persons on board exposed to risk."

ARTICLE XIII

Article 42 (3) shall be deleted and the following substituted:

"(3) Other persons reasonably suspected to have been exposed to infection on board, and who, in the opinion of the sanitary authority, are not sufficiently protected by recent vaccination, or by a previous attack of smallpox, may be subjected to vaccination or to observation or to surveillance, or to vaccination followed by observation or surveillance, the period of observation or surveillance being specified according to the circumstances, but in any event not exceeding 14 days, reckoned from the date of arrival of the ship."

In Article 42 the following shall be inserted as the penultimate paragraph:

"For the purpose of this Article "recent vaccination" shall be taken as meaning evidence of successful vaccination not more than 3 years or less than 14 days previously, or evidence of an immune reaction."

To Article 42 shall be added "Vaccination of such persons may be performed".

ARTICLE XIV

In Article 43 after the word "crew" in the first paragraph shall be added the words "and passengers".

ARTICLE XV

Article 49 shall be deleted and the following substituted:

"The Contracting Parties agree that bills of health and consular visas shall be abolished as soon as the conditions of hostilities permit the establishment of effective epidemiological communications. The Master of every foreign-going vessel approaching the first port in a territory shall ascertain the state of health of all persons on board and shall prepare and sign a Declaration of Health which shall be countersigned by the ship's surgeon, if one is carried, to be handed to the appropriate authority."

ARTICLE XVI

To Article 57 the following shall be added:

"The Contracting Parties will, so far as possible, adopt the International Form of Declaration of Health and the International Forms of Certificates of Inoculation or Vaccination against cholera, typhus, and smallpox, respectively, annexed hereto.[1]

"For the purposes of the present convention the period of incubation is reckoned as 6 days in the case of plague, 5 days in the case of cholera, 6 days in the case of yellow fever, 12 days in the case of typhus, and 14 days in the case of smallpox."

ARTICLE XVII

Article 58 shall be deleted and the following substituted:

"Observation may, if considered necessary, be enforced at land frontiers. Persons may be directed to the places which have been designated for frontier traffic, and sanitary stations, equipped in accordance with the terms of Article 22 of the 1926 Convention, shall be set up at such places. These places and the measures taken shall be notified immediately to the countries concerned and to UNRRA. Individuals who have been in con-

[1] With regard to yellow fever see Article XI.

tact with a person suffering from a disease referred to in Article 1 of the 1926 Convention, and their bedding and effects, may be subjected to the appropriate sanitary measures. In the case of persons suffering from a communicable disease not referred to in Article 1, the measures in force in the country of arrival shall be applied."

ARTICLE XVIII

Article 63 shall be deleted and the following substituted:

"Railway carriages for mails or luggage and goods trains may not be detained at the frontier longer than is necessary to apply the necessary sanitary measures for the prevention of the entry of communicable diseases into the country concerned."

ARTICLE XIX

To Article 65 the following shall be added:

"In framing regulations under this Article, the Contracting Parties will consult UNRRA and will inform UNRRA of the regulations and of the date of their entry into force."

ARTICLE XX

To Article 66 the following shall be added:

"In the application of Articles 58 to 66 inclusive of the 1926 Convention, as amended by the present Convention, to any persons coming within the category of 'displaced persons', the Contracting Parties shall be entitled to make such modifications as may be required by any special international arrangements under schemes to be organized by governments and by UNRRA for dealing with such persons."

And the Contracting Parties have further agreed as follows:

ARTICLE XXI

The present Convention shall come into force as soon as it has been signed or acceded to on behalf of ten or more governments.

ARTICLE XXII

The present Convention shall supplement and be read as one with the 1926 Convention, which as hereby amended remains in full force between the Contracting Parties, and whenever any provision of the 1926 Convention contains a reference to another provision, the reference shall be deemed to be a reference to that provision as modified by any amendments effected thereto by the present Convention.

ARTICLE XXIII

After January 15, 1945 the present Convention shall be open to accession by any government not a signatory. Accessions shall be notified in writing to the Government of the United States of America.

Accessions notified after the entry into force of the present Convention shall become effective with respect to each government upon the notification of its accession.

ARTICLE XXIV

Any Contracting Party may on signature or accession declare that the present Convention does not apply to all or any of its colonies, overseas territories, territories under its protection, suzerainty, or authority, or territories in respect of which it exercises a mandate. The present Convention may at any time thereafter be applied to any such territory by notification in writing to the Government of the United States of America, and the Convention shall apply to the territory concerned from the date of the receipt of the notification by the Government of the United States of America.

ARTICLE XXV

The Government of the United States of America shall give notice in writing to governments parties to the 1926 Convention and to governments parties to the present Convention, of all signatures and accessions to the present Convention and of all notifications regarding the territories to which the present Convention is to be applied.

ARTICLE XXVI

The present Convention shall remain in force as to each Contracting Party until either (1) such Party shall become bound by a further convention amending or superseding the 1926 Convention, or (2) the expiration of eighteen months from the date on which the present Convention enters into force, whichever shall be the earlier.

ARTICLE XXVII

The original of the present Convention shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America and shall be opened for signature at Washington on December 15, 1944, where it shall ermain open for signature until January 15, 1945. Certified copies hereof shall be furnished by the Government of the United States of America to each of the governments on behalf of which this Convention is signed or acceded to and to each of the governments parties to the 1926 Convention.

In witness whereof, the undersigned plenipotentiaries, having deposited their full powers, found to be in due and proper form, sign the present Convention in the English and French languages, both texts being equally authentic, on behalf of their respective governments, on the dates appearing opposite their signatures.

For the French Republic: André Mayer, January 5, 1945.

For Poland: Jan Ciechanowski, January 5, 1945.

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: At the time of signing the present Convention I declare that my signature does not cover any of the territories referred to in Article Twenty-Four of the International Sanitary Convention, 1944. Halifax, January 5, 1945.

For the United States of America: Subject to ratification. E. R. Stettinius, Jr., January 5, 1945.

For China: J. Heng Liu, January 11, 1945.

For the Union of South Africa: S. F. N. Gie, January 13, 1945.

For Egypt: With the following reservations: 1. That this signature does not affect in any way the relations of the Egyptian Government with the International Office of Public Health, Paris, or its obligations toward the Regional Office at Alexandria; 2. That this convention is subject to ratification by the Egyptian Parliament. M. Hassan, January 15, 1945.

For Czechoslovakia: Subject to ratification. V. S. Hurban, January 15, 1945.

For Canada: Subject to ratification. L. B. Pearson, January 15, 1945.

For Cuba: Esta Convención previa la aprobación del Senado de la República, será ratificada por el Ejecutivo.[2]. Gmo Beit, January 15, 1945.

For the Dominican Republic: Con la reserva de que la República Dominicana no podrá ratificar esta Convención sin adherirse, al mismo tiempo, a las Convenciones de Paris y de La Haya, y que por virtud de disposiciones constitucionales de la República, estos procesos estarán subordinados a la previa sanción del Congreso Nacional.[3] Emilio G. Godoy, January 15, 1945.

For Nicaragua: Guillermo Sevilla Sacasa, January 15, 1945.

For Peru: With the following reservations: 1. That this Convention is signed ad referendum; 2. That if the execution of the said Convention would not conform with the regulations contained in the Pan American Sanitary Code of Havana, Perú will give preference to the latter. P. G. Beltrán, January 15, 1945.

For Luxembourg: Hugues Le Gallais, January 15, 1945.

For Ecuador: S. E. Durán-Ballén, January 15, 1945.

For Greece: C. P. Diamantopoulos, January 15, 1945.

For Honduras: Julián R. Cáceres, January 15, 1945.

For Haiti: J. Thébaud, January 15, 1945.

EXECUTIVE C—SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION—INTERNATIONAL SANITARY CONVENTION FOR AERIAL NAVIGATION, 1944, MODIFYING THE INTERNATIONAL SANITARY CONVENTION FOR AERIAL NAVIGATION OF APRIL 12, 1933

The Governments signatory hereto,

Considering that the International Office of Public Health created by the Agreement signed at Rome on December 9, 1907, is unable for the time being to carry out effectively all of the duties and functions assigned to it in the Annex to that Agreement; in the International Sanitary Convention, 1926; in the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1933; and in other Conventions or Agreements relating to the public health;

Having entrusted the task of solving this temporary problem by the preparation of emergency agreements and arrangements for the notification of epidemic diseases and for uniformity in quarantine regulations to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (hereinafter referred to as UNRRA), in accordance with Resolution No. 8 (2) adopted by the Council of UNRRA at its First Session, without prejudice however to the status of the International Office of Public Health which it is hoped will be able at the expiry of the present Convention to resume the above-mentioned duties and functions; and having received the recommendations of UNRRA in this connection;

Having agreed that, in regard to the American Republics, the Pan American Sanitary Bureau shall continue to act as the general coordinating sanitary agency, including the general collection and distribution of sanitary information to and from the said Republics, as specified in the Pan American Sanitary Code and recognized heretofore by the International Office of Public Health;

Desiring also to modify as between themselves the provisions of the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation signed at The Hague on April 12, 1933 (hereinafter referred to as the 1933 Convention) in the light of the present-day conditions which call for special measures to prevent the spread by air across frontiers of epidemic or other communicable diseases;

Have decided to conclude a Convention for these purposes, have agreed that, whereas the authentic text of the 1933 Convention is in the French language, the present Convention shall be in English and in French, both texts being equally authentic, and have accordingly appointed the undersigned plenipotentiaries who, having communicated their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed that the 1933 Convention shall be amended as follows:

ARTICLE I

All references in the 1933 Convention to the International Office of Public Health shall be read as references to UNRRA.

ARTICLE II

The second paragraph of Article 1, subparagraph VI, shall be deleted and the following substituted:

"The word surveillance means that persons are not isolated, that they may move about freely, but that the sanitary authorities of

---

[2] [Translation: This Convention, after approval by the Senate of the Republic, shall be ratified by the Executive.]

[3] [Translation: With the reservation that the Dominican Republic will not be able to ratify this Convention without adhering, at the same time, to the Paris and Hague Conventions, and that by virtue of Constitutional principles of the Republic, these processes shall be subject to the prior approval of the National Congress.]

the place or places to which they are proceeding are notified of their coming. They may be subjected in the places of arrival to a medical examination and such inquiries as are necessary with a view to ascertaining their state of health; and, in any territory where the competent Contracting Party thinks fit, surveillance may include requirement to report on arrival and afterwards at such intervals during continuance of surveillance as may be specified, to the Health Officer of the city, town, district, or place to which they proceed."

ARTICLE III

To Article 1 the following definitions shall be added:

"VIII. The term typhus, typhus fever, or exanthematous typhus shall be deemed to relate only to epidemic louse-borne typhus.

"IX. An endemic yellow fever area is a region in which yellow fever exists in a form recognizable clinically, biologically, or pathologically.

"X. A valid anti-yellow fever inoculation certificate is one certifying that the bearer has been inoculated against yellow fever, with a vaccine and by a method approved by UNRRA if there have elapsed:

"(1) More than 10 days and less than 4 years from the date of the inoculation.

"(2) Less than 4 years from the date of a re-inoculation performed within 4 years of the previous inoculation.

"(3) More than 10 days and less than 4 years from the date of re-inoculation performed after an interval of more than 4 years.

"XI. The term Stegomyia (Aëdes aegypti) shall be deemed to incude Aëdes aegypti and any potential mosquito vectors of yellow fever."

ARTICLE IV

Article 9 shall be deleted and the following substituted:

"(1) All passengers traveling by aircraft on international flight shall on or just before arrival at the point of final disembarkation, or, if required, at any aerodrome where the journey is broken, complete a Personal Declaration of Origin and Health.

"(2) The Commander of an aircraft on international flight shall, on or just before the arrival of the aircraft at the first authorized aerodrome in the country of entry, complete an Aircraft Declaration of Health to be handed to the aerodrome authority on arrival, and may be required to produce certificates concerning sanitary measures which such Declarations states were undergone by the aircraft before departure or at stopping places in application of the 1933 Convention as hereby amended.

"(3) Aircraft shall not be required to carry Bills of Health.

"(4) The Contracting Parties will, so far as possible, adopt the International Forms of Aircraft Declaration of Health, Personal Declaration of Origin and Health, and Certificates of Inoculation or Vaccination against cholera, typhus, and smallpox, respectively, annexed, hereto."[1]

ARTICLE V

To Article 13 the following shall be added:

"Further, the embarkation of persons who do not present adequate sanitary guarantees may be prohibited, until the sanitary measures—delousing, disinfection of clothing, etc., or any other measures that are, in the opinion of the sanitary authority, necessary to prevent the carriage of the disease by aircraft, have been carried out."

ARTICLE VI

To Article 16 after "sanitary measures" at the end of the first paragraph the words "including cleansing" shall be added.

[1] With regard to yellow fever see Article XI (6).

ARTICLE VII

Article 20 shall be deleted and the following substituted:

"(1) Each Contracting Party shall immediately notify, by the most rapid means, the other Contracting Parties and UNRRA of:

"(a) The first recognized case of plague, cholera, or yellow fever discovered in its territory.

"(b) The first recognized case of plague, cholera, or yellow fever which occurs outside the limits of local areas already affected.

"(c) The existence of an epidemic of typhus or of smallpox.

"(2) Every notification prescribed above shall be accompanied, or very promptly followed, by detailed information as to:

"(a) The place where the disease has appeared.

"(b) The date of its appearance, its source, and its type (including reports of pathological examinations as soon as available.)

"(c) The number of recognized cases and the number of deaths.

"(d) The extent of the local area or areas affected.

"(e) In the case of plague, the existence of that disease, or of an unusual mortality, among rodents (including reports of bacteriological examinations as soon as available).

"(f) In the case of cholera, the number of germ carriers when any have been discovered.

"(g) In the case of yellow fever, the presence and relative prevalence (index) of Stegomyia (Aëdes aegypti).

"(h) The measures taken.

"(3) Each Contracting Party shall, in addition to the diseases specifically mentioned in Article 18 of the 1933 Convention, to wit, plague, cholera, yellow fever, typhus, and smallpox, notify outbreaks of such other communicable diseases as, in the opinion of UNRRA, constitute a menace to other countries by their spread or potential spread across frontiers and shall keep UNRRA regularly informed of the course of the disease.

"(4) In addition to the formal notification required by paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) above, the contracting parties shall, so far as possible, send to UNRRA at regular intervals notification of other communicable diseases notified in their countries.

"(5) The contracting parties shall make the necessary arrangements with UNRRA for giving prompt information to all the governments concerned of the outbreak in any country of a disease which, in the opinion of UNRRA, constitutes a menace to other countries and of the measures which are being taken to prevent the spread of the disease across frontiers by aircraft.

"(6) The notifications contemplated in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this Article are to be addressed to the diplomatic missions, or, failing them, to consular offices in the capital of the infected country and shall be held at the disposition of consular offices established in its territory.

"(7) These notifications shall also be addressed to UNRRA which shall communicate them immediately to all diplomatic missions, or, failing them, to the consulates in London or Washington as well as to the principal public health authorities of the participating countries. Those prescribed under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this article shall be transmitted by telegraph or radio.

"(8) The appropriate health authority of each Contracting Party shall transmit to the sanitary and authorized aerodromes of its country or within its jurisdiction all information contained in the epidemiological notifications and communications received from UNRRA (and the regional bureaus with which it has made agreements for this purpose) in execution of the provisions of the International Sanitary Convention of June 21, 1926 which may affect the exercise of sanitary control in those aerodromes.

"(9) In order to facilitate the prompt and scrupulous fulfilment of the foregoing provisions, the Contracting Parties shall ensure priority for all communications which may enable UNRRA rapidly to appraise the situation concerning the outbreak of a disease and to inform governments in order that they may take appropriate measures against the spread of the disease across their frontiers."

ARTICLE VIII

The second paragraph of Article 32 shall be deleted.

ARTICLE IX

In Article 34, paragraph (b), the following shall be inserted after sub-paragraph (3):

"(4) The Contracting Parties shall give favorable consideration to the inoculation against typhus of all persons on board exposed to risk."

Sub-paragraphs (4) and (5) of Article 34 shall be renumbered (5) and (6) respectively.

ARTICLE X

Article 35 (b) (3) shall be deleted and the following substituted:

"(3) Other persons reasonably suspected to have been exposed to infection and who, in the opinion of the sanitary authority, are not sufficiently protected by recent vaccination, or by a previous attack of smallpox, may be subjected to vaccination or to observation or to surveillance, or to vaccination followed by observation or surveillance, the period of observation or surveillance being specified according to the circumstances, but in any event not exceeding 14 days, reckoned from the date of arrival of the aircraft."

The final paragraph of Article 35 shall be deleted and the following substituted:

"For the purpose of this Article "recent vaccination" shall be taken as meaning evidence of successful vaccination not more than 3 years or less than 14 days previously; or evidence of an immune reaction."

ARTICLE XI

Article 36 shall be deleted and the following substituted:

"The Contracting Parties agree:

"(1) That persons suffering, or suspected to be suffering, from yellow fever shall not be allowed to embark on aircraft on international flight.

"(2) That they will take all possible measures to establish the existence or non-existence of yellow fever within their territories. For this purpose, in territories where endemicity of yellow fever is suspected, in cases where the person dies within 10 days from the onset of any undiagnosed febrile illness, it is important that a specimen of liver tissue be taken, if necessary by viscerotome, for histopathological examination. In endemic areas a sample of blood for a yellow fever immunity test should, in addition, wherever possible, be taken from all persons suffering from an undiagnosed fever, and if the cause of the fever remains doubtful and the patient recovers, a second sample should be collected at the end of the third week from the onset of illness.

"(3) For the purpose of quarantine control, UNRRA in consultation with the governments concerned and, as regards the Western Hemisphere, with the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, shall define the boundaries of endemic yellow fever areas.

"(4) That they shall use their best endeavors to secure that all persons who are likely to land in an endemic yellow fever area shall be inoculated against yellow fever 10 days before arrival in the area and that, so long as such persons remain in the area, they shall be re-inoculated every 4 years.

"(5) (a) That inoculation against yellow fever shall be required for all regular staff employees and crews using authorized aerodromes situated in endemic yellow fever areas.

"(b) That in areas in which yellow fever does not exist, but in which there may be conditions permitting of its development, inoculation of such personnel is recommended.

"(6) That all persons inoculated in compliance with the provisions of paragraphs (4) and (5) of this Article shall be furnished with and carry an Inoculation Certificate signed by the officer carrying out the inoculation. This certificate shall conform to the International Form of Certificate of Inoculation against yellow fever annexed hereto.

"(7) That persons in possession of a valid anti-yellow fever inoculation certificate shall not for the purpose of the control of yellow fever be subjected to quarantine restrictions.

"(8) That in place of a valid anti-yellow fever inoculation certificate, a certificate that the bearer has recovered from an attack of yellow fever and that his blood contains immune bodies against yellow fever, as proved by a test carried out by an institute regularly carrying out biological tests for yellow fever and approved for this purpose by the government of the country concerned, will be accepted.

"(9) That any person not in possession of a valid anti-yellow fever inoculation certificate shall be considered to have been exposed to the risk of contracting yellow fever during the period of his stay in an endemic yellow fever area.

"(10) That UNRRA shall lay down standards with which yellow fever vaccine shall conform.

"(11) That they will make arrangements to test at frequent intervals the activity of the yellow fever immunizing vaccine in use in order to ensure that its immunizing properties are satisfactory, and for this purpose agree that UNRRA in consultation with the governments concerned and, as regards the Western Hemisphere, with the Pan American Sanitary Bureau, shall designate from time to time institutes which are approved for the carrying out of such tests."

ARTICLE XII

Article 38 shall be deleted and the following substituted:

"Notwithstanding Article 4 of the 1933 Convention, every aerodrome which receives aircraft to which the 1933 Convention as amended applies (Article 1, I, second paragraph) and which is situated in a region, that is to say, a part of a territory, in which yellow fever exists in a form clinically, biologically, or pathologically recognizable shall be made a sanitary aerodrome as defined in the 1933 Convention, and in addition, shall be:

"(1) situated at an adequate distance from the nearest inhabited center; [2]

"(2) provided with arrangements for a water supply completely protected against mosquitoes, and kept as free as possible from mosquitoes by systematic measures for the suppression of breeding places and the destruction of the insects in all stages of development;

"(3) provided with mosquito-proofed dwellings for the crews of the aircraft and for the staff of the aerodrome;

"(4) provided with a mosquito-proofed dwelling in which passengers can be accommodated or hospitalized.

"With a view to the elimination of insect vectors of yellow fever, the Contracting Parties will render and maintain free from such vectors (a) aerodromes and their surroundings in endemic yellow fever areas, and (b) aerodromes not situated in endemic yellow fever areas but exposed to the risk of the introduction of the disease.

"As an immediate precaution against the carriage of vectors of yellow fever, disinsectization of aircraft shall be carried out at each aerodrome within an endemic yellow fever area, particularly on departure from the last aerodrome in an endemic yellow fever area.

"Health authorities in any territory within an endemic yellow fever area shall be at liberty to impose such quarantine restrictions against other territories within that area as may be authorized by the 1933 Convention as hereby amended. Detention of healthy passengers and crews not carrying valid Inoculation Certificates shall not be carried out at the aerodrome of departure. They shall be permitted to depart, the necessary quarantine measures being carried out at the first aerodrome of arrival in an area at risk."

ARTICLE XIII

Articles 39 to 46 inclusive shall be deleted.[3]

ARTICLE XIV

Article 47 shall be deleted, and the following substituted:

"(1) In territories in which yellow fever does not exist, but in which there may be conditions which permit of its development:

"(a) authorized aerodromes shall conform to the requirements set forth in Article 38 of the 1933 Convention as hereby amended;

"(b) upon arrival at the first aerodrome of call aircraft which have proceeded from endemic yellow fever areas shall be disinsected.

"(2) All persons traveling by air from an endemic yellow fever area to one in which yellow fever does not exist but in which there may be conditions which permit of its development, shall be dealt with in the following manner, at the first stopping place in the latter area:

"(a) if they are in possession of a valid anti-yellow fever inoculation certificate they shall be allowed to proceed without any quarantine restrictions with respect to yellow fever;

"(b) if they are not in possession of a valid anti-yellow fever inoculation certificate, they may be isolated in properly screened quarters until the certificate becomes valid or until 6 days have elapsed, whichever is the lesser.

"(3) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this Article, the Contracting Parties may (but only in the most exceptional cases) issue Certificates of Urgency to non-inoculated persons whose unobstructed passage is absolutely and immediately essential on grounds of high policy, certifying that a passage without hindrance to the bearer of the Certificate is urgently necessary.

"The precise form and method of issue of the Certificate and the nature of the certifying authority shall be a matter for arrangement and communication between governments concerned.

"The Contracting Parties undertake to grant unimpeded passage to bearers of such Certificates but the movements of such Certificate holders will, whenever possible, be restricted during stops on air routes to adequately screened quarters which will not be left except to re-enter the aircraft."

ARTICLE XV

The first line of Article 51 shall be altered to read "The following measures may be taken on arrival:".

ARTICLE XVI

Article 53 shall be deleted, and the following substituted:

"Persons who, on their arrival at an aerodrome, are considered, under the terms of part III of the 1933 convention as hereby amended, liable to surveillance [4] up to the expiration of the period of incubation of the disease, may nevertheless continue the voyage, on condition that the fact is notified to the authorities of subsequent landing places and of the place of arrival by some method sufficient to secure that they can be subjected to medical inspection in any subsequent aerodromes on the route.

"Persons who are liable to observation [4] under the terms of Article 26 of the 1933 contion shall not be authorized, until the expiration of the period of incubation, to continue their voyage except, in the case of diseases other than yellow fever, with the approval of the sanitary authorities of the next stopping place.

"Persons under observation or surveillance shall submit themselves to any examination which the competent sanitary authority may consider necessary."

ARTICLE XVII

The first paragraph of Article 54 shall be deleted and the following substituted:

"In applying sanitary measures to an aircraft coming from an infected local area, the sanitary authority of each aerodrome shall, to the greatest possible extent, take into account all measures which have already been applied to the aircraft, in another sanitary aerodrome abroad or in the same country, and which are duly noted in the Aircraft Declaration of Health referred to in Article IV of the present Convention."

To Article 54 the following paragraph shall be added:

"In view of the special risk of conveying insect vectors of malaria and other diseases by aircraft on international flight, all such aircraft leaving affected areas will be disinsected. Notwithstanding the terms of Article 54 of the 1933 Convention as hereby amended, further disinsectization of the aircraft on or before arirval may be required if there is reason to suspect the importation of insect vectors."

And the Contracting Parties have further agreed as follows:

ARTICLE XVIII

The present Convention shall come into force as soon as it has been signed or acceded to on behalf of ten or more governments.

ARTICLE XIX

The present Convention shall supplement and be read one with the 1933 Convention, which as hereby amended remains in full force between the Contracting Parties, and whenever any provision of the 1933 Convention contains a reference to another provision, the reference shall be deemed to be a reference to that provision as modified by any amendments effected thereto by the present Convention.

ARTICLE XX

After January 15, 1945, the present Convention shall be open to accession by any government not a signatory. Accessions shall be notified in writing to the Government of the United States of America.

---

[2] For the purpose of mosquito control the perimeter of the aerodrome should be defined as the line enclosing the area containing the aerodrome buildings and any land used or intended to be used for the parking of aircraft. A building-free zone of 400 meters should be maintained around the perimeter of all aerodromes on main air lines of communications within endemic yellow fever areas.

[3] In view of the deletion of Article 40, compliance with the requirements of Article 38 as amended shall no longer cause aerodromes situated in an endemic yellow fever area to be regarded as "antimarii aerodromes" and separate local areas. Passengers landing at such aerodromes shall submit to the measures laid down in Article 38 as required.

[4] In all cases where this convention provides for surveillance, surveillance may not be replaced by observation except

(a) in circumstances in which it would not be practicable to carry out surveillance with sufficient thoroughness; or

(b) if the risk of the introduction of infection into the country is considered to be exceptionally serious; or

(c) if the person who would be subject to surveillance cannot furnish adequate sanitary guarantees.

Accessions notified after the entry into force of the present Convention shall become effective with respect to each government upon the notification of its accession.

ARTICLE XXI

Any Contracting Party may on signature or accession declare that the present Convention does not apply to all or any of its colonies, overseas territories, territories under its protection, suzerainty, or authority, or territories in respect of which it exercises a mandate. The present Convention may at any time thereafter be applied to any such territory by notification in writing to the Government of the United States of America, and the Convention shall apply to the territory concerned from the date of the receipt of the notification by the Government of the United States of America.

ARTICLE XXII

The Government of the United States of America shall give notice in writing to governments parties to the 1933 Convention and to governments parties to the present Convention, of all signatures and accessions to the present Convention and of all notifications regarding the territories to which the present Convention is to be applied.

ARTICLE XXIII

The present Convention shall remain in force as to each Contracting Party until either (1) such Party shall become bound by a further Convention amending or superseding the 1933 Convention, or (2) the expiration of eighteen months from the date on which the present Convention enters into force, whichever shall be the earlier.

ARTICLE XXIV

The original of the present Convention shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America and shall be opened for signature at Washington on December 15, 1944, where it shall remain open for signature until January 15, 1945. Certified copies hereof shall be furnished by the Government of the United States of America to each of the governments on behalf of which this Convention is signed or acceded to and to each of the governments parties to the 1933 Convention.

In witness whereof, the undersigned plenipotentiaries, having deposited their full powers, found to be in due and proper form, sign the present Convention in the English and French languages, both texts being equally authentic, on behalf of their respective governments, on the dates appearing opposite their signatures.

For the French Republic: André Mayer, January 5, 1945.

For Poland: Jan Ciechanowski, January 5, 1945.

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland: At the time of signing the present Convention I declare that my signature does not cover any of the territories referred to in Article Twenty-One of the International Sanitary Convention for Aerial Navigation, 1944. Halifax, January 5, 1945.

For the United States of America: Subject to ratification, E. R. Stettinius, Jr., January 5, 1945.

For China: J. Heng Liu, January 11, 1945.

For the Union of South Africa: S. F. N. Gie, January 13, 1945.

For Egypt: With the following reservations: 1. That this signature does not affect in any way the relations of the Egyptian Government with the International Office of Public Health, Paris, or its obligations toward the Regional Office at Alexandria; 2 That this convention is subject to ratification by the Egyptian Parliament. M. Hassan, January 15, 1945.

For Canada: Subject to ratification. L. B. Pearson, January 15, 1945.

For Cuba: Esta Convención, previa la aprobación del Senado de la República, sera ratificada por el Ejecutive.[5]. Gmo Belt, January 15, 1945.

For the Dominican Republic: Con la reserva de que la República Dominicana no podrá ratificar esta Convención sin adherirse, al mismo tiempo, a las Convenciones de París y de La Haya, y que por virtud de disposiciones constitucionales de la República, estos procesos estarán subordinados a la previa sanción del Congreso Nacional. [6] Emilio G. Godoy, January 15, 1945.

For Bolivia: Sujeto a ratificación [7] V.

For Nicaragua: Guillermo Sevilla Sacasa, January 15, 1945.

For Feru: With the following reservations: 1. That this Convention is signed ad referendum; 2. That if the execution of the said Convention would not conform with the regulations contained in the Pan American Sanitary Code of Havana, Peru will give preference to the latter. P. G. Beltrán, January 15, 1945.

For Luxembourg: Hugues Le Gallais, January 15, 1945.

For Ecuador: S. E. Durán-Ballén, January 15, 1945.

For Greece: C. P. Diamantopoulos, January 15, 1945.

For Honduras: Julián R. Cáceres, January 15, 1945.

For Haiti: J. Thébaud, January 15, 1945.

[5] [Translation: This Convention, after approval by the Senate of the Republic, shall be ratified by the Executive.]

[6] [Translation: With the reservation that the Dominican Republic will not be able to ratify this Convention without adhering, at the same time, to the Paris and Hague Conventions, and that by virtue of Constitutional principles of the Republic, these processes shall be subject to the prior approval of the National Congress.]

[7] [Translation: Subject to ratification.] Andrade, January 15, 1945.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 14, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 13 (legislative day of March 12), 1945:

APPOINTMENTS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE GENERALS

Lt. Gen. Joseph Taggart McNarney (major general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley (major general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Carl Spaatz (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. George Churchill Kenney (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Mark Wayne Clark (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Walter Krueger (major general, U. S. Army, retired), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Brehon Burke Somervell (major general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Jacob Loucks Devers (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

Lt. Gen. Thomas Troy Handy (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO FIELD ARTILLERY

First Lt. John William Burtchaell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 11, 1944.

TO INFANTRY

First Lt. Franklin Rogers Sibert, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1939.

Second Lt. Edward Joseph Geaney, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 1, 1943.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE COLONELS WITH RANK FROM MARCH 1, 1945

Lt. Col. George Joseph Newgarden, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John Forest Goodman, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Ferdinand Francis Gallagher, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 13 (legislative day of March 12), 1945:

FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Walter H. McKinney — Thomas McEnelly
Christian T. Steger — James K. Penfield

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS, UNCLASSIFIED, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

V. Harwood Blocker — Jack G. Dwyre
William H. Christensen — Harold Sims

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Gordon E. Gray — Henry P. Huff
Lowell D. Grow — Dwayne E. Mears
Harold F. Brown — William R. Bennett
Floyd C. Kirkpatrick — James O. Hickman

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Frances A. Osterhout, Planada.
Ruth C. Parker, Rivera.
Dorothy M. Lyon, Springville.

IOWA

Bernard F. Welsh, Charles City.
Cleone E. Holscher, Ladora.
John Blake, Polk City.
William J. Maguire, Vail.

KENTUCKY

Maud Comer, Gamaliel.
Forest E. Jordan, Germantown.
Pansy Music, Seco.

MARYLAND

Raymond W. Noble, Federalsburg.

MICHIGAN

Coral D. Porter, Bath.
Royce Glen Hayward, Casnovia.
Clara M. Bevier, Flat Rock.
Thomas J. Kaufman, Hubbell.
Margaret A. Cook, Memphis.
Marcella A. Doyle, Menominee.
William J. Wheeler, Walled Lake.

MINNESOTA

H. Carroll Day, Albert Lea.
Anthony G. McDougall, Baudette.
Joseph F. Meighen, Preston.

MISSOURI

Curtis M. Van Hoozer, Blythedale.
Louis P. Hubert, Florissant.
Burl P. Mitchell, Seligman.

NEW JERSEY

Richard F. McMahon, Montclair.
Edward J. Jennings, Trenton.

PUERTO RICO

Maria C. Abraham, Aibonito.
Ramon Zaragoza, Penuelas.

RHODE ISLAND

Mildred B. Beaudreau, West Kingston.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Leona H. Becket, Nisland.

TEXAS

Fred C. Boga, Hufsmith.
Ida D. Martin, Wiergate.

WISCONSIN

Frank P. McManman, Wisconsin Dells.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 1945

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who are the Author of all godliness, who givest light to blindness and rest to the seeking heart, grant that we may be eager to do errands of mercy; patient to wait for Thy will; strong to resist evil and cleave to that which is good. Thou knowest that we are unworthy; linger with us in Thy helpfulness and bid faith lead us upward to a fresh consecration of our duties.

In our prayer we bear to Thee the homes of our country. Restore the broken firesides which have been wrecked and ruined by indifference, negligence, and infidelity. We pray that the gentle spirit of the Christ may restrain temper and make the home like the heaven of which it is the promise and the foretaste. O God, so make of them citadels of unity and happiness that children will ever love to tarry there. Grant that parents may not be conformed to worldliness, but have minds and hearts which aspire to every good and perfect thing. Help us all to be as grateful as we are dependent, remembering that a gracious spirit is the aroma of a happy and a contented home. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2126. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCES OF MINISTERS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, when we opened the session of the House this morning there were 14 Members here at the prayer service. I do not think that speaks well for the Congress.

I have a letter this morning from the ministers in Pennsylvania complaining about the Office of Defense Transportation prohibiting them from having their regular church group meetings where they have to use transportation. And preachers do not travel on trains unless it is necessary. I have an idea that when this country prohibits the ministers from having their regular conferences there is a sinister motive behind the whole thing. I do not believe it is the idea of transportation alone that is involved. I am afraid that something will happen so that we will close the churches of this country unless we take some action here in the Congress. They did it in Germany. They prohibited the gathering of church groups in Italy. They closed the churches in Russia; recently, however, they have permitted churches in Russia to reopen. I am afraid this administration will supervise our churches here in America. You say it cannot happen here. Oh, do not be too sure. The New Deal has a club over the radio, the newspapers, the business of America, the farmers of America; now look out for the churches. I say to America, wake up before it is too late. I am very much concerned myself and worried. American liberty soon will be gone; the New Deal is blaming it on the war. I do not believe it myself. I hope the O. D. T. will lift the ban on church travel at once.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief article from the American Political Science Quarterly

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and insert certain lists of employees on the pay roll of what is called the F. E. P. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

WAR-PLANT INVESTIGATIONS IN DETROIT

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VURSELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF LEND-LEASE

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 178, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2013) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, if adopted, makes in order the bill H. R. 2013, which does nothing except extend lend-lease for 1 year. Inasmuch as I have no request whatever for time, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be no opposition at this time on this side. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], who asks to speak out of order.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time merely to give notice I am about to file a resolution calling for the appointment of a special investigating committee to investigate the entire subject of the War Food Administration and distribution, the Commodity Credit Corporation, Defense Supplies Corporation, and related corporate agencies. I trust those who are interested in this matter will see to it that this resolution is given immediate consideration by the Committee on Rules in order that the matter may be cleared for good or bad, as the facts may demonstrate.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee was advised of a very unusual happening when the Committee on Foreign Affairs was reported as unanimous on their extension of this lend-lease legislation. There will be 4 hours of debate; then, if amendments are desired, the House may work its will. There will be few who will vote against this bill as agreed upon by the committee. The lend-lease policy is in force, and I, for one, shudder at what might happen if lend-lease were to be terminated in the midst of this critical war. Only the most compelling circumstances can justify further lend-lease expenditures. This vast spending must cease at the earliest possible date.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Appendix of the

RECORD and make a brief statement in regard to the insurance bill recently agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEND-LEASE

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] 1 minute.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this rule and bill I desire to say that, notwithstanding the fact that we have granted 4 hours for general debate, I hope that all the time will not be taken. It is a unanimous report. There is no contest or opposition. Repeating, I hope that when the bill is taken up not all of the time provided in the rule will be consumed, so that the bill can be taken up and considered under the 5-minute rule and passed today. With the other important legislation, it is to be hoped that we will be able to expedite the same and get it out of the way so that the Members, being under a terrific strain, may have an opportunity to take a few weeks' recess during the coming Easter holidays.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

DECLARATION OF CHAPULTEPEC

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and to include therein the text of the Inter-American Pact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Declaration of Chapultepec is a step of highest significance in the history of inter-American relations.

The immediate effect of this declaration is to provide, for the duration of the war, a mechanism whereby the American republics signatory thereto can take effective action against any aggression or threat of aggression against one of the American republics. The declaration provides that, in the event any aggression occurs, or even if good reasons exist for believing that such aggression is in preparation, the countries signing this declaration will consult with each other in order to decide what measures they consider it advisable to take. The declaration goes on to point out the various types of measures which might be considered, ranging all the way from the recall of diplomatic representatives to the use of economic sanctions and of armed force if that is necessary to repel an aggressor.

For the first time, therefore, the American republics are adopting enforcement measures to insure that their often-stated ideal of peaceful relations may not wantonly be violated. On the just grounds that any disruption of the peace among the nations of this hemisphere would constitute a blow to the war interests of the United Nations, to which all the signatory states belong, the Declaration of Chapultepec becomes effective immediately. For the future, the declaration recommends that the American republics enter into a treaty which will formally establish these procedures and continue to be effective after the war.

Behind this history-making declaration lies a long history of mutual collaboration among the equal, sovereign republics of this hemisphere for protection of their peace and independence. As long ago as 1890, at the First International Conference of American States, the republics of this continent agreed not to recognize acquisitions of territory brought about by force. This principle has been frequently reaffirmed in various conferences and meetings of the inter-American system. At the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace in 1936, the American republics inaugurated a system of consultation through which they might deal with problems of common concern, including breaches of the peace. This consultative procedure was further developed at Lima in 1938. When war broke out in Europe, the American republics, putting this procedure of consultation into effect, held meetings of their foreign ministers. At Habana in 1940 they declared that any aggression by a non-American country against an American republic would be considered an aggression against all of them.

Thus there has evolved through many years of constructive effort the principle of solidarity among the republics in protection of their independence. Now in the Declaration of Chapultepec this principle receives its logical and culminating expression in the recognition that any threat of aggression from whatever source against an American republic will be considered a threat against all of them.

In this document we find expression of the truth that the cause of peace is of equal concern to every nation, large and small. That truth is implicit in the background and evolution of the inter-American policies which made this declaration possible. That truth is specifically expressed in the provision stated within the declaration itself that the arrangements, activities, and procedures to be carried out under it shall be consistent with the purposes and principles of the general international organization when formed.

Adoption of this enlightened international agreement emphasizes the leadership which the American republics as a whole have given to the cause of world peace. The Declaration of Chapultepec is built upon the proposals of 3 of our good neighbors of South America, Brazil, Colombia, and Uruguay, and many representatives of the 20 republics assembled at Mexico have helped to shape its final form.

At the same time, we of the United States can justly take pride in the contribution which our statesmen have made to this great evolution of peaceful principles through the development and application of the good-neighbor policy.

The United States, as the most powerful of the American republics, has had a special rule and responsibility in the development of the inter-American system. Because of its strength, this country has in the past been feared by some of its smaller and less powerful neighbors. Through our consistent adherence to the good-neighbor policy, however, it has been possible for us to convince our friends to the south that the American people are devoted to the same principles of peace and of mutual respect among nations as they are. The enthusiastic formulation of the Declaration of Chapultepec, whereby the United States, as one of the republics signing that act, is given a necessarily large share of responsibility for the preservation of peace in this hemisphere, by the use of force, if necessary, demonstrates that we have been able to win the confidence of our neighbors.

The American people will welcome the Declaration of Chapultepec as a profound expression of good neighborly confidence and cooperation, and as a tangible indication of the determination of the peoples of the New World to play their part in building a lasting peace on just principles.

[From the Washington Post of March 4, 1945]

TEXT OF CHAPULTEPEC INTER-AMERICAN PACT—DOCUMENT ON STRONGER TIES FOR NATIONS OF WESTERN HEMISPHERE

MEXICO CITY, March 3.—The text of the Act of Chapultepec: Declaration on reciprocal assistance and American solidarity by the governments represented at the Inter-American Conference on War and Peace.

Whereas:

1. The peoples of the Americas, animated by a profound love of justice, remain sincerely devoted to the principles of international law;

2. It is their desire that such principles, notwithstanding the present difficult circumstances, may prevail with greater force in future international relations;

3. The inter-American conferences have repeatedly proclaimed certain fundamental principles, but these must be reaffirmed and proclaimed at a time when the judicial bases of the community of nations are being established;

4. The new situation in the world makes more imperative than ever the union and solidarity of the American peoples, for the defense of their rights and the maintenance of international peace;

5. The American states have been incorporating in their international law, since 1890, by means of conventions, resolutions, and declarations, the following principles;

(A) The proscription of territorial conquest and the nonrecognition of all acquisitions made by force. (First International Conference of American States, 1890.)

(B) The condemnation of intervention by a state in the internal or external affairs of another. (Seventh International Conference of American States, 1933, and Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936.)

(C) The recognition that every war or threat of war affects directly or indirectly all civilized peoples, and endangers the great principles of liberty and justice which constitute the American ideal and the standard of its international policy. (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936.)

(D) The procedure of mutual consultation in order to find means of peaceful cooperation in the event of war or threat of war between American countries. (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936.)

(E) The recognition that every act susceptible of disturbing the peace of America affects each and every one of them and justi-

fies the initiation of the procedure of consultation. (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936.)

(F) That any difference or dispute between the American nations, whether its nature or origin, shall be settled by the methods of conciliation, or unrestricted arbitration, or through the operation of international justice. (Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, 1936.)

(G) The recognition that respect for the personality, sovereignty, and independence of each American state constitutes the essence of international order sustained by continental solidarity, which historically has been expressed and sustained by declarations and treaties in force. (Ninth International Conference of American States, 1938.)

(H) The affirmation that respect for the faithful observance of treaties constitutes the indispensable rule for the development of peaceful relations between states and treaties can only be revised by agreement of the contracting parties. (Declaration of American Principles, Eighth International Conference of American States, 1938.)

(I) That in case the peace, security, or territorial integrity of any American republic is threatened by acts of any nature that may impair them, they proclaim their common concern and their determination to make effective their solidarity, coordinating their respective sovereign will by means of the procedure of consultation, using the measures which in each case the circumstances may make advisable. (Declaration of Lima, Eighth International Conference of American States, 1938.)

(J) That any attempt on the part of a non-American state against the integrity or inviolability of the territory, the sovereignty, or the political independence of an American state shall be considered as an act of aggression against all the American states. (Declaration XV of the second meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, Habana, 1940.)

6. The furtherance of these principles, which the American states have practiced in order to secure peace and solidarity between the nations of the continents, constitutes an effective means of contributing to the general system of world security and of facilitating its establishment;

7. The security and solidarity of the continent are affected to the same extent by an act of aggression against any of the American states by a non-American state, as by an American state against one or more American states.

PART I

Declaration:

First. That all sovereign states are juridically equal amongst themselves.

Second. That every state has the right to the respect of its individuality and independence on the part of the other members of the international community.

Third. That every attack of a state against the integrity or the inviolability of territory, or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state, shall, conformably to part III thereof, be considered as an act of aggression against the other states which sign this declaration.

In any case, invasion by armed forces of one state into the territory of another, trespassing boundaries established by treaty and marked in accordance therewith, shall constitute an act of aggression.

Fourth. That in case that acts of aggression occur or there may be reasons to believe that an aggression is being prepared by any American state, the states signatory to this declaration will consult amongst themselves in order to agree upon measures they think it may be advisable to take.

Fifth. That during the war and until treaty arrangements recommended in part II hereof the signatories of this declaration recognize such threats and acts of aggression as indicated in paragraphs third and fourth above constitute an interference with the war effort of the United Nations calling for such procedures, within the scope of their general constitutional and war powers, as may be found necessary, including:

Recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions.

Breaking of diplomatic relations.

Breaking of consular relations;

Breaking of postal, telegraphic, telephonic, radiotelephonic relations;

Interruption of economic, commercial, and financial relations;

Use of armed force to prevent or repel aggression.

Sixth. That the principles and procedure contained in this declaration shall become effective immediately, inasmuch as any act of aggression or threat of aggression during the present state of war interferes with the war effort of the United Nations to obtain victory. Henceforth, and with the view that the principles and procedure herein stipulated shall conform with the constitutional principles of each republic, the respective governments shall take the necessary steps to perfect this instrument in order that it shall be in force at all times.

PART II

Recommendation:

The Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace recommends:

That for the purpose of meeting threats of acts of aggression against any American republic following the establishment of peace, the governments of the American republics should consider the conclusion, in accordance with their constitutional processes, of a treaty establishing procedures whereby such threats or acts may be met by:

The use, by all or some of the signatories of said treaty thereto, of any one or more of the following measures:

Recall of chiefs of diplomatic missions;

Breaking of diplomatic relations;

Breaking of consular relations;

Breaking of postal, telegraphic, telephonic, radiotelephonic relations;

Interruption of economic, commercial, and financial relations; use of armed force to prevent or repel aggression.

PART III

This declaration and recommendation provide for a regional arrangement for dealing with matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action and procedures referred to therein shall be consistent with the purposes and principles of the general international organization when formed.

This declaration and recommendation shall be known by the name of Act of Chapultepec.

LEND-LEASE

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Chair expects to recognize the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] to ask unanimous consent to send a bill to conference.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 37]

Anderson, Calif.	Gardner	Morrison
Baldwin, Md.	Gavin	Mott
Bates, Mass.	Grant, Ala.	O'Toole
Bloom	Hagen	Patrick
Bolton	Hand	Philbin
Boren	Harless, Ariz.	Powell
Brumbaugh	Hart	Powers
Buckley	Hébert	Reed, Ill.
Cannon, Fla.	Heidinger	Robinson, Utah
Case, N. J.	Hobbs	Sadowski
Chapman	Izac	Sheridan
Clason	Johnson, Ill.	Sikes
Combs	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Simpson, Pa.
Courtney		Smith, Maine
Daughton, Va.	Kearney	Starkey
Dawson	Kunkel	Stewart
Dirksen	LeCompte	Taylor
Eaton	Lemke	Weiss
Ellis	Luce	White
Elsaesser	McGlinchey	Wood
Fellows	McKenzie	
Fuller	Morgan	

AFTER THE ROLL CALL

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 369 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MOBILIZATION OF CIVILIAN MANPOWER

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 1752, entitled "An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes," with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman reserve that until I make a statement?

Mr. HOOK. I will withhold it temporarily.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman reserve that until I can make a statement?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I will be very happy to do so.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the regular order of procedure in cases of this kind is to go to conference, with the idea in mind that conferees representing both Houses of Congress can reach some agreement on the legislation that may improve it. In this instance the House bill was stricken out by the Senate and an entirely different measure written as a single amendment to the House bill. That is the matter that is pending before the House today. If the House will allow conferees to be appointed at this time without further delay, we can go to work on the bill. If we do, and fail to agree, we will have to bring it back to the House for instructions, or if we do agree, we bring back a report which must be voted up or voted down, and on which a motion may be made, as I understand the procedure, to instruct the conferees. The House will have an opportunity at that time, after the conferees have made an honest endeavor to report proper legislation, to do whatever it wants to do with the conference report.

I hope the gentlemen will not merely delay it by making objection, but will let us go to conference to see what we can work out.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not want to delay consideration of

this legislation, but it seems to me that since the Senate, after weeks of debate has adopted, by an overwhelming vote, amendments to the House bill, which are substantially what was offered here as a substitute, and which lacked passage by only a few votes, that the gentleman should modify his request and ask that the House concur in the Senate amendments. That certainly would expedite consideration of the measure.

Mr. MAY. I could not afford to do that, because I am not for the Senate amendment. That would be a complete abandonment of the position of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does not the gentleman think that the House is entitled to express itself on the Senate amendments after all these weeks of consideration of this legislation?

Mr. MAY. The House has already voted on that very subject, as the gentleman said, and expressed itself against it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. But not on the Senate amendments.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman himself said a while ago it was practically the same thing.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Substantially the same.

Mr. MAY. There is not much difference in the two. There should not be any difference in the vote. Now I have no disposition whatsoever to prevent the House from expressing itself on this matter but I think the regular way to proceed should be followed by the House, with credit to itself.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am reluctant to disagree with my distinguished chairman; I have a great affection for him, but this is a matter of great importance. Current press reports of the Senate committee in Detroit investigating manpower and production indicate that there is an inexcusable waste of labor; that we are getting only 50 to 60 percent efficiency in production in some plants. Particularly in those plants operating under cost-plus contracts where it is reported that labor is not being utilized to the fullest extent. I believe therefore the House should have an opportunity to express itself on these amendments. This bill, as amended, is intended to do precisely the thing the gentleman wants to accomplish—namely, to utilize to the fullest, available manpower and increase production. Moreover, we would accomplish that objective without enslaving the American people.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan demands the regular order. The regular order is: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky to send this bill to conference?

Mr. HOOK. I object.

EXTENSION OF LEND-LEASE

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2013) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2013) to extend lend-lease, with Mr. CLARK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 2 hours and the gentleman from Massachusetts for 2 hours.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, the bill (H. R. 2013) under consideration consists of a single paragraph and merely authorizes the extension for 1 year of the Lend-Lease Act.

Unless this bill is adopted lend-lease will expire on June 30 of this year. The bill merely provides that the time fixed in present law, that is the authorization of lend-lease, be extended for 1 year, to June 30, 1946; and that the second part of lend-lease with reference to the winding up of proceedings under it shall be extended from June 30, 1948, to June 30, 1949.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs gave extensive hearings and consideration to this bill covering I believe a period of about 4 weeks.

Mr. Chairman, the greatest war measure, as a matter of policy, that the United States has adopted and has followed during this war has been its operation under lend-lease whereby it pools its defense with its allies and there is no question but that the effective administration of this Lend-Lease Act has brought victory as near as it is at this time. But for the passage of the original Lend-Lease Act the Axis Powers would have long since defeated the Allies. Not a single witness appeared before our committee in opposition to the extension of lend-lease; on the other hand, every one agreed that it is vitally necessary that it be extended at least for another year in order that complete victory might be won. There was agreement also that failure to extend lend-lease at this time would be hurtful not only to the practical operation of the war but also the psychological effect upon our soldiers, our allies, and our enemies.

When the committee first reported this bill there was a minority report filed objecting to a certain feature of the bill; however, the Committee on Foreign Affairs yesterday had a meeting at which an amendment to the bill as originally reported to the House was considered and agreed to, and will be offered as a committee amendment. This amendment has been very carefully worked out, and after consultation with the majority and minority members of the committee and with the executive branch of the Government was unanimously adopted by the entire committee. In view of that action of the committee, I am authorized to say that the Foreign Affairs Committee is now unanimous in support of the pending measure.

We have also prepared a statement with reference to the purpose and meaning of the proposed committee amendment which we think will be helpful. I shall not read the amendment which the committee will offer at the proper time since it was presented to the House on yesterday by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] who is necessarily absent this morning in attendance upon a conference, being the first meeting of the American delegation appointed to attend the conference at San Francisco. However, the RECORD of yesterday contains the amendment which will be offered, but I thought it might be helpful to read at this time a statement in explanation of the reasons for the amendment.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I note that copies of this statement the gentleman is about to read are available at both desks. I thought possibly some of the Members might wish to follow it while the gentleman is reading the statement.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I thank the gentleman for the suggestion. Copies are available. The statement is not my own personal statement but one prepared yesterday by the committee with great care.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman be willing to insert in the RECORD the full statement? I would be glad to have it in the RECORD.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. That is my purpose in reading it so that it will be in the RECORD and if I do not have time I shall ask unanimous consent that the complete statement be inserted in the RECORD.

STATEMENT ON PROPOSED COMMITTEE AMENDMENT TO SECTION 3 (C)

The Committee on Foreign Affairs is of the opinion that the Lend-Lease Act is a war supply measure and that section 3 (c) of the act was intended to provide a 3-year clean-up period within which contracts or agreements with foreign governments might be liquidated in an orderly and efficient manner. This view of the Lend-Lease Act has also been emphasized by the President in his quarterly reports to the Congress and by Mr. Crowley, the Foreign Economic Administrator, Secretary of War Stimson, and all the other witnesses who appeared before the committee in the hearings on H. R. 2013.

In order to reaffirm and to make this purpose of the Lend-Lease Act more explicit, the Foreign Affairs Committee is proposing an amendment to section 3 (c). The committee is unanimous in supporting H. R. 2013 with this amendment added.

The first provision of the proposed amendment expresses the clear intention of Congress that the 3-year period for carrying out contracts or agreements entered into with foreign governments under the Lend-Lease Act does not permit the making or carrying out of contracts for post-war relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction. This provision writes into the Lend-Lease Act the principle

which the committee believes is implicit in the act and which has been consistently followed by those responsible for the administration of the lend-lease program. The Committee on Foreign Affairs believes that the clear expression by the Congress that the Lend-Lease Act is not a post-war relief, rehabilitation, or reconstruction measure will help to avoid misunderstanding and facilitate the separate consideration by the Congress of appropriate measures to deal with these important and complex post-war problems. The amendment does not bear on the general problem of settlement under the Lend-Lease Act.

The second provision of the amendment relates to the authority which section 3 (c) confers upon the President to carry out until July 1, 1949, a contract or agreement with a foreign government entered into prior to July 1, 1946, or prior to a concurrent resolution by the two Houses, whichever is the earlier. Under this provision a contract or agreement entered into in accordance with this act in which the United States undertakes to furnish to a foreign government defense articles, services, or information for use in the prosecution of the present war and which provides for the disposition on terms and conditions of sale prescribed by the President of any such defense articles, services, or information after the President determines they are no longer necessary for use by such government in promoting the defense of the United States shall not be deemed to be for post-war relief, post-war rehabilitation, or post-war reconstruction.

The basic purpose of this second provision is to permit the orderly and efficient liquidation of war supply contracts with foreign governments as contemplated by section 3 (c), as originally enacted, through the purchase by foreign governments for cash or on credit of such supplies as may not be produced or delivered in time to be of use in the war. It would continue to permit the making and carrying out of war supply agreements such as that recently concluded with the French Government. This agreement with the French insures the flow of supplies required by them in the prosecution of the war without disruption due to uncertainty as to the termination of the war and arranges for the orderly and efficient liquidation in our national interest of our agreed supply programs and the purchase by the French of such supplies as may be produced too late to be of use in the war and which are not more urgently needed in this country.

The amendment proposed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs is in the language as set out yesterday.

Mr. Chairman, I think the unanimous action and the united front now presented by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who have considered this legislation from its inception, should commend itself to the House and that there should be no difficulty whatever in the passage of this bill. Since Lend-Lease was first created, we have adopted the policy of renewing it not for 2 years but for a single year. The Congress has thereby kept a check upon the administration of lend-lease, and the renewal each time has enabled us to have before the committee those who have been administering the act. There have been many false rumors made against the administration of the act which have been corrected by Mr. Leo T. Crowley, the able Administrator, and Mr. Oscar Cox, the brilliant general counsel, and others of the administrative staff. I think that now the American people realize the necessity for this legislation. I shall not consume the time of the committee further at this time.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the statement on the proposed committee amendment which the gentleman from Texas has just read is, in my judgment, a very accurate and fair analysis of what the agreed amendment is intended to accomplish, and a fair interpretation of that amendment.

PRE-WAR LEND-LEASE

Mr. Chairman, this is the third time lend-lease has come up for extension. Many of us remember that lend-lease came up the first time in 1941 before Pearl Harbor in peacetime. We forget that over a third of our membership was not here at that time. The vote on pre-Pearl Harbor lend-lease was injected into the congressional campaigns of 1942 and 1944. Of those who voted against lend-lease, 56 are no longer here. Of those who voted for lend-lease in 1941, 106 are no longer here. Percentagewise omitting those who are dead or who resigned or retired, 72 percent of those who voted for pre-war lend-lease and wanted to stay in Congress, are still here, and 81 percent of those who voted against pre-war lend-lease and wanted to stay in Congress are still here.

This House has overwhelmingly supported lend-lease strictly as a war measure, and the amendment unanimously adopted by our committee limits lend-lease to war supply and does not project it into the post-war picture, so that nothing is to be gained by redebating pre-war peacetime lend-lease.

These figures show, however, that lend-lease is not and never was very popular with the voters, even though it is now a necessary war measure. These figures also show that any foreign policy in order to have general support in this country must have the support of the kind of people, the kind of Congressmen, who were against going to war, who are now loyally supporting our war effort, and who are determined not to turn over vast, unlimited powers to the Executive in peacetime, before or after a war.

The great significance of the committee amendment which will be submitted today, which was originally proposed by the minority and is now unanimously supported, is that it shows complete agreement between the Executive and both parties in Congress that our post-war plans and policies will be submitted to the Congress and that the approval of a majority in both parties is sought for these policies. From now on unity is to be attained not merely by following the leader but by having the Executive, and the Congress, and both parties of Congress pulling together and adjusting their differences so as to present a united front to the world.

WARTIME LEND-LEASE

The question before us now is the continuation of lend-lease for another year as a part of our mutual war-aid policy. We have done this twice before since Pearl Harbor; it is imperative that we do it again. Lend-lease had not accomplished as much as some of its proponents claim and has not been as bad as some of its enemies charge. It has been only a small part, about 15 percent, of our war effort. It has been only a small part, around 20 percent, of the British war effort, and even less of the Russian war effort. The part it has played has been important but it has not been the "supply mechanism" for all of the forces of the Allies. It is not bleeding us white, either. It has become an integral part of our total Allied fighting machine, and must go on as long as the fighting goes on. But we will be wise to remember that 85 percent of our effort in money is not in lend-lease but in direct support of our own gallant millions fighting all over the world, and Britain, Russia, and China are for the most part supplying their own forces in the field. When it comes to mutual gratitude after the war, our allies will probably be more grateful for what we did for the common cause with our own forces than for what we helped them do with their forces.

As Americans, we can well afford to furnish tanks, planes, and guns for boys of other nations to use while risking their lives to kill Japs and Germans. Continuing wartime lend-lease will do this. Voting against it means we insist upon doing it all ourselves. Mutual war aid should be continued to final victory.

POST-WAR LEND-LEASE

Now, as to post-war lend-lease, the amendment barring the use of lend-lease as a post-war mechanism is not airtight, it is not even machine-tool tight. The reason is, there will be no airtight division between conditions of war and peace. The amendment prescribes, as clearly as Congress can lay down, directives for the administration as to what the dividing line shall be. But it permits agreements such as the French agreement. There can be honest differences of opinion, and also deliberate abuses, in deciding what and how much of what shall be agreed upon for war use which also has a post-war use. Our lend-lease arrangements with France, however, have been the most businesslike of all, in many respects.

We have kept war munitions separate from civilian materials, and up to yesterday we had received over $153,000,000 in cash from the French for the cost of civilian lend-lease supplies we furnished, with $31,000,000 more now being negotiated. We are winding up lend-lease in north Africa as of July 1, 1945. Under the new agreement, we are to receive 20 percent down payment on all materials we furnished which have a post-war use, and the balance in installments.

The $2,500,000,000 is more of a limitation on what the French agree to receive than a guaranty of what we will deliver; for while France agrees to accept all that we offer, or pay damages, we do not guarantee to make future deliveries.

We will need to make more transition agreements with other nations besides France. The agreed amendment to be offered will require these transition agreements to provide for payment for whatever is furnished after the war along

the lines of the French agreement. We will have to avoid the danger pointed out by Col. W. L. Culbertson, Chairman of our Special Economic Mission to North Africa. Unfortunately, he was heard by our committee in executive session, but I can quote from what he stated in a public address a few weeks ago before the French Chamber of Commerce in New York. I wish the Members would listen to this. He said:

I have found in the discussion of post-war problems, especially across the Atlantic, a tendency to overemphasize the "transition period" after the war. So long as this phrase covers merely a period of active change-over from war economy to peace economy, no exception can be taken to it. But in some plans for the future it seems to be treated as a sort of catch-all into which unsolved and seemingly insoluble problems are dumped in the hope that in some mysterious way they will solve themselves with the passage of time.

He then went on to point out the policy his mission was following, and I quote again. He said:

May I be pardoned if I revert again to the instructions of our mission. In my opinion these reveal a wise approach to this problem. They sought to deal with post-war military problems while they were still flexible and while the issues involved had at least some defenders on both sides. They gave support to the view that to retain wartime controls and Government participation in business after their wartime justification had gone, tends to weld such restrictive practices into a permanent commercial system. It was recognized that adjustments take time but no situation exists which will not yield to constructive treatment if the will exists among the nations to return to a healthy, wealth-creating economic system.

Now, following that line of thought, I want to quote from a statement Mr. Crowley, Administrator of Lend-Lease, gave before our committee. On page 157, he said this:

There is so much talk about lend-lease in the post-war period that I want to be very emphatic about our position in the matter.

I want to say to this committee that I think that sometime soon, through the appropriate committee—it may be the Appropriations Committee—we will have to give the picture as we see it of the amount of funds required and what should be done in the way of giving aid to these people immediately after the cessation of the war. In these liberated countries, if when the shooting stops we are going to pull out and say, "Now, we are all through," we may find ourselves in quite a lot of difficulty. I think there is going to have to be a short transitory period in some of these countries that the Allied Governments are going to have to take into consideration. I think that is specifically a responsibility of Congress. It is not a part of the Lend-Lease Act.

So this amendment today is offered in the spirit of these quotations I have just given.

Our post-war problems still lie before Congress. We are determined not to use lend-lease as a post-war mechanism. The question still remains, what machinery will we approve? We have already approved U. N. R. R. A. for post-war relief. In spite of the money and power we have given this organization, it has fallen down on the job. We shall soon be asked to approve the Bretton Woods proposal for post-war monetary stabilization and reconstruction financing. We, here in the House, will have responsibilities for the post-war security organization. Our action here today does not mean that we have solved the problems or discharged the post-war responsibilities of Congress. I hope that it means that we will meet these problems by setting up efficient machinery that preserves the form and traditions of our Republic and our kind of economy, with legislative and executive responsibilities clearly separated, with public and private business separated, but with the Executive and the Congress and both parties and businessmen working together to build an American foreign policy that protects the interests and the traditions of our country in meeting our international problems and responsibilities, and our great opportunities that lie ahead.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What effect will it have on page 1, by striking out "July 1, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1949"?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That is the so-called clean-up period. We had a tremendous battle on that in the committee. I was one of those who saw no reason for extending the act that long, and contended that the full powers of lend-lease were continued until 1949. Under the amendment which has been agreed upon that 3-year period which has been extended each time we have extended lend-lease for a year, becomes strictly a clean-up period. As to the extent of time needed we do not know. If we do not need all the time, the Congress can cut it off later. If we need more time the Congress can extend the time. If Congress finds that instead of being a clean-up period, there is some abuse of the restrictions we have placed in the amendment today, Congress may then take appropriate action.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. What sum of money in the aggregate has been appropriated up to and including the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 1945?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. We have already appropriated and made available through transfers $64,000,000,000. Of that about $35,000,000,000 has been encumbered. The gentleman will find a very full statement in the report and in the hearings.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The other $31,000,000,000 that has been appropriated has not been encumbered up to this time?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. It has been appropriated to the Army and the Navy with power to transfer to lend-lease, but it has not been definitely appropriated to lend-lease. The distinct lend-lease appropriations have just about been exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished gentleman who preceded me said, the history and purpose of lend-lease have been so frequently discussed on the floor of this House and on the floor of the other body, in the press, and by the people of our country that it is scarcely necessary to indulge in any extended discussion of it. As he said also, it was enacted as a peace measure to the extent that the United States was then at peace. I call attention, however, that while the United States was at peace and although we ardently hoped to remain at peace, all of Europe not only was at war but all of it except the British Isles and Greece had been conquered by Hitler. I am not sure therefore that it was, strictly speaking, a peace measure. I recall the reference I made at that time, something to this effect. You will recall that the act was entitled "An act to further the defense of the United States." I believe I made some reference to the effect that the best defense of this country which could then be undertaken was to contribute anything possible toward keeping the British Navy afloat.

Lend-lease has accomplished important results, as the gentleman from Ohio said. I am not sure that I am in complete agreement about public support of the policy; I believe the people are more strongly in favor of it than the gentleman indicated; but there is no use in arguing that.

Lend-lease has been expensive, yes; war is expensive, destructive, and useless—until you have to get into it; and yet, the billions expended in lend-lease have, I believe, probably contributed as much toward the victory which is in the offing and saved probably more American lives than any other similar expense this country has incurred. It is, of course, more essential now than ever before in order to contribute toward the final victory punch. It is therefore but natural that no witness appeared before the committee in opposition to lend-lease. Not only that, frequent references have been made to the amendment which the committee will submit today. My good friend the gentleman who preceded me quoted from Mr. Crowley to the effect that the amendment simply carries out the way he is administering the act already. He could have quoted, as the minority report did, the President of the United States and the Secretary of War to the same effect, as well as the Assistant Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, and every single other witness who appeared before the committee; in other words, while we are delighted at the unanimous agreement on this amendment, it is simply the position that the great majority of the committee, including many Members on both sides of the aisle, have taken all along.

While I do not care to indulge in extended discussion of the legislation, there is a new phase of it with which the people are not so familiar as they are with the other phases which I believe deserves attention; therefore, it is my purpose to address my remarks to the French agreement.

It should be borne in mind, in the first place, that we have already under lend-lease outfitted 8 French divisions and some 15,000 aviators, several hundred of whom were trained at Tuscaloosa, Ala., in the district it is my privilege to represent. Incidentally, I need not tell you of the magnificent fighting those French

poilu and officers have done. It is the purpose to equip at least 8 more French divisions to join their brothers and their American Allies in carrying the war on into Germany, on into Tokyo, and wherever necessary. We have with France an agreement that you might say has 3 parts or 3 subdivisions.

There is the master agreement which we have with all lend-lease countries; there is the reverse or reciprocal-aid agreement we have with the United Kingdom and several other countries; and then the so-called 3 (c) agreement, which is entirely new and has not been negotiated with any other country although, as the gentleman from Ohio said, it probably will be negotiated with several other countries to the great benefit of ours.

The whole purpose of this 3 (c) agreement is to, insofar as possible, throw the entire weight of France, its manpower, its industry, its agriculture, its people in general, behind the war effort.

I quote from a press release of Acting Secretary Grew relative to the signing of this agreement:

> The basic purpose of the whole program is to enable all the French resources and the whole French Nation, soldiers, workers, producers, and farmers, to be mobilized and used for the war against the common enemy.

I quote also from the agreement itself:

> The Government of the United States of America and the Provisional Government of France desire to insure the continuing provision of said articles, services, facilities, or information without interruption owing to any uncertainty as to the day when the military resistance of the common enemy may cease.

I say this is a new phase of lend-lease, brought about by new conditions. What are those new conditions? Never before have we been so near the end of the war. Never before? I am not sure but that we may have been nearer the end of the war back yonder when we passed the original Lend-Lease Act, when Great Britain was on the ropes and when Hitler had conquered all of Europe except Great Britain and heroic little old Greece. With that exception we have never before been nearer the end of the war. Never before has a great country which has been entirely occupied by the enemy been liberated and commenced to function under its own government. So these new conditions required a new agreement which was entirely possible under the 3 (c) section of the Lend-Lease Act. In that agreement supplies are divided into two groups, schedules 1 and 2.

Schedule 1 includes what might be called expendable items, such as raw materials; cotton to be manufactured into uniforms; tents for the American soldiers; synthetic rubber to be manufactured into tires for the use of American and French soldiers; petroleum supplies, freight charges, and so forth.

Schedule 2 includes heavy industry products such as locomotives, machinery, and industrial equipment. Human nature being what it is, and the war being as near its end in Europe as we all hope and reverently pray, it would have been but natural without this 3 (c) phase of the agreement for our officers in charge of lend-lease and the manufacture of these supplies and perhaps even our factories to have slowed up, as it were, or been somewhat reluctant to have continued to produce these goods on a 100-percent basis of efficiency and rushed them into France if they believed the war would be over in Europe before they reached there.

So these agreements were signed to meet that situation, as well as for another purpose, so that when the war is over the sale of all of this material which will remain in France will have already been agreed upon instead of having to salvage it then for whatever the French people or anyone else would pay for it.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is this not also true that as to schedule 2, machinery, and so forth, the French pay 20 percent down and the balance on credit, even though that particular item is used up in the war?

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman. He is exactly correct. As to the expendable goods under schedule 1, the French agree to pay for any of those goods delivered after the President determines that they are not necessary for the prosecution of the war. As to schedule 2, they pay 20 percent down, as the gentleman says, and the remainder of the entire value in deferred payments. They are all necessary for the war. Many of them will be used in the war, but regardless of whether used or not, as to those schedule 2 items—heavy-industry products—the French are going to pay us on a 100-percent basis. If their use occurs in the war it is a part of their contribution to it.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. Is it not also true that as far as schedule 1 of the lend-lease agreement that has been concluded with France is concerned, any of the materials contracted for which would be furnished under ordinary lend-lease for war purposes, should the war end, are then taken over by the French and paid for on the same cash and credit basis as provided for in schedule 2?

Mr. JARMAN. That is quite true.

Mr. HERTER. In addition to that, schedule 2 already has had to be revised in connection with shipping matters.

Mr. JARMAN. That is also true.

Mr. HERTER. But schedule 1 has not been revised. Schedule 1 contains an item of some $220,000,000 for the charter hire of ships which under the extension of lend-lease might carry on until the year 1949. That charter hire would then be paid for on a 20 percent down basis and a 30-year extension of credit for the balance. Can the gentleman tell me why charter hire, which is an immediate thing, should be charged on the basis of a 30-year credit?

Mr. JARMAN. My answer to that is that I consider it preferable for this country to be paid for on a 30-year credit basis than not to be paid at all.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is this not also the situation regarding schedule 1? Whatever material is expendable, such as food, charter hire, and things like that, that that may be needed right while the fighting is going on, if it is furnished during that period it goes on the regular lend-lease-give-away arrangement with no present payment requirement?

It is only such as is to be furnished after the war is over that is to be paid for at all, and that is to be paid for on this long-term basis; but we do not guarantee to supply any particular amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. With reference to this matter of charter hire, the gentleman who was interrogating the gentleman from Alabama doubtless has received a letter, signed by the Secretary of State, that I sent around this morning to all members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on the Merchant Marine, to the effect that the agreement with the French Government is not to apply to the transfer of title to ships. Since that time I have taken the matter up with Mr. Cox, of the Foreign Economic Administration, and practically the same effect applies as to charter hire. The only provision now under law for leasing ships is for the duration of the war with Germany and Japan, or the one that will last the longer, and 6 months thereafter.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman very much. May I call the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts to the next note I had, which is that we reserve the right in both of these agreements to withhold any supplies we care to. As the gentleman from Ohio said, we agree to furnish an amount up to that maximum, but the right is reserved to withhold at any time anything we wish. Also, the right of review at any time is reserved. Against that there is a French reservation to the following effect.

Let us take as an example a locomotive and an intricate piece of machinery useful only for war, under section 2, we will say. Let us say the war ends 3 months from now. Both of those articles are under construction; they are being manufactured. The locomotive the French can use in their civilian economy. They can say to us, "Go ahead and finish the locomotive and send it to us and we will pay for it, 20 percent down and the balance on deferred payments. As to the intricate piece of machinery, which we cannot use in our civilian economy, the need for it has passed, the war is over, and we have no use for it. Therefore, we will simply pay you your out-of-pocket loss, that is, what has already been expended in manufacturing it, and you can junk it and forget it."

As I view this French agreement, the gist of it is that we are arranging now to get 20 percent cash in some cases and the remainder over an extended period for articles many of which will never be

used or necessary in the war, although we cannot be sure of that, many of which will be used partially, and some of which may be used considerably. But instead of waiting until that day after it is all over, when we are going to have a big job all over the world, and when that 3-year period that has been talked about will be very, very necessary, I think; instead of waiting until that time and saying to the French "Now we have all this material here which belongs to us, inasmuch as we have not transferred title to you. It has been used. Some of it is good, some fair, some indifferent, and some worthless. What will you give us for it?"—and you can imagine about what the answer would be—instead, we are indulging in a business deal by arranging in advance to see that the whole effort of France, the maximum effort of that country continues active in this war, and also to be reimbursed substantially, we hope and believe, after it is all over, for this part of our contribution, reimbursed in cash as well as in the assistance of the French Armies and in their great contribution toward our victory. I regard the agreement as very beneficial to this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, if one were talking to a stabilized audience here today, I do not think it would be necessary for me to say much of anything at all. But during the debate, Members come and go and the faces change. Perhaps I should, therefore, say a few things on this legislation which may be of interest to those who did not hear some of the preceding speakers.

We are all aware of the fact that this is the third time we have been called upon to extend the lend-lease legislation. The first time it was extended without change. The second time it was extended with an amendment which was proposed by the minority, discussed at length by the committee, and at the eleventh hour accepted, so the committee unanimously supported the extension of lend-lease with the following amendment, which I shall now read, because I think it tends to show the evolution of an expression of opinion on the part of the Congress which it is important to have impressed upon the executive agencies.

The amendment which made unanimity among the committee members possible on the second extension of lend-lease a year ago reads as follows: It is an amendment to section 3 (b) of the act. It reads:

> *Provided, however,* That nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the President to assume or incur any obligations on the part of the United States with respect to post-war economic policy, post-war military policy, or post-war policy involving international relations, except in accordance with established constitutional procedure.

That amendment was accepted, and it is found on page 59 of the Eighteenth Report of the Lend-Lease Administration to the Members of Congress.

In this third extension of the Lend-Lease Act, the minority members have felt it is important to reenforce, reemphasize, and redeclare that provision because some questions developed during the course of the hearings as to whether through constitutional procedures a loophole had not been left through which the Executive might perchance, in the field of post-war activities, engage in commitments and agreements. For that reason, as you are well aware, five of us signed the minority report expressing our viewpoint, and this report appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Thursday, March 8, page A1088.

However, again, at the eleventh hour, we were called back in committee meeting and the committee reconsidered the situation, and an amendment has been added or proposed to be added at this time, which once more makes it possible for the committee to approach you with unanimity, urging the Congress to extend this Lend-Lease Act.

Some of the history of that amendment has already been given. It is the desire on the part of the members of our committee to put into legislative language an expression of opinion repeated many times by the executive witnesses who appeared before us. There is no difference between their statements of opinion and the desire of the five of us who signed the minority report, except that we believe it to be wise and prudent to put into legislative language that declaration of policy. This amendment does that.

To those of you who have expressed to me this morning the fear that this amendment does not go far enough, that it is weak and vapid, and still leaves loopholes, I can say only that it is as strong and as vigorous and as inclusive as we felt it was possible to draw and have it accepted. We believe it does the job. With this amendment added, there can be no post-war economic activities by Lend-Lease except through the most flagrant violation of the intent of Congress.

May I call your attention to some of the specific language of this amendment? In the first place, may I point out that the proposed amendment says, "provided nothing in section 3 (c) shall be construed to authorize the President to enter into or carry out any contract or agreement with a foreign power."

I want to emphasize the words "or carry out." Even in this 3-year clean-up period the President, with the adoption of this amendment, cannot carry out any procedures in violation of the stipulations and inhibitions set up in the amendment. May I point out further that in the amendment on lines 17 and 18 of the committee print it reads "except that a contract or agreement entered into in accordance with this act in which the United States undertakes to furnish to a foreign government defense articles, services, or information for use in the prosecution of the present war and which provides for the disposition, on terms and conditions of."

It specifically mentions the fact that in this continuing 3-year period the conditions must be the terms of sale, not terms and conditions of lend or of lease.

So we feel this is a strong amendment, a protective amendment, a precautionary amendment, an amendment which should make it possible for friends of lend-lease as an actual war aid, to join with the committee in supporting the amendment and the extension of lend-lease for an additional year as amended.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman who is not a lawyer gave me a brief interpretation yesterday of what this amendment means, which I wish he would share with the rest of the House.

Mr. MUNDT. I will be happy to do so, because I feel that laymen's interpretations are better than lawyers' interpretations in matters of this kind. This amendment means, in short, that in the post-war arrangements there will be no supplying of material on the part of the United States except for cash once the war has been terminated. It means that and that specifically.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Is there any reason why this amendment could not have been adopted 2 years ago when some of us were asking for it and so strenuously objected to lend-lease as then written, so that we might have gone along on the roll call which I did not at that time?

Mr. MUNDT. No good reason, I think. But, fortunately, it is still adopted before the emergency which you have anticipated has arisen.

Mr. BREHM. I congratulate the Foreign Affairs Committee on adopting the amendment. I shall now vote for it.

Mr. BUFFETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. Suppose under lend-lease they decide to give China, for instance, an oil refinery of fifty or a hundred million dollars. They do not have oil refineries. It would not be post-war rehabilitation. It would not be post-war construction. It would not be post-war relief, but it would be a lot of money and a great expense.

Mr. MUNDT. I think such a transaction would not be legal. I think the gentleman has too narrowly defined the word "rehabilitation." I think putting an oil well in China might well be considered rehabilitation since it would be done to restore or rebuild the economy of China. It could not legally be done under lend-lease as a post-war project under our amendment.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I think you should have the word "development" in there, in addition to these other words, because at the Bretton Woods Conference they had quite an argument. Some countries like China and the Latin Americas wanted money for development, and they put that additional word into these agreements, because they felt the word "reconstruction" did not cover the word "development." You will find

just as much demand for development projects as for reconstruction.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the word "rehabilitation" would cover the word "development" although I make no claim to being a second cousin to a lexicographer.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Nothing with the prefix "re" would cover it. Development means something new.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I wonder if the gentleman can give us the reason behind extendiing this act for such a long period of time, especially in view of the fact that we all hope that the war will be over in Europe this summer. What justification is there for not giving Congress an opportunity to look over what is going on in lend-lease without this long period of extension?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is thinking of that 1949 extension period?

Mr. O'HARA. The 1949 extension period; yes.

Mr. MUNDT. I think, with the amendment which has been proposed, and which will be adopted, that the 3-year period becomes of value to the United States because during that time it will be possible for us to evaluate the results—to allow the administrators to look over their books and establish debits and credits and determine what procedures and processes are going to be entered into for recovery and for disposition of surplus material. It also makes possible the carrying out of long-term contracts which may be in process of fabrication. Thus, it is limited to the pulling back to this country of the strings of lend-lease in a clean-up proposal, so there is nothing to fear in that 1949 date line.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Would the proposed amendment permit the sale of munitions to a nation which might become an aggressor nation against this country?

Mr. MUNDT. I think any nation can become an aggressor nation against this country. If history has taught me anything it has taught me that when we have new wars we sometimes change partners from the war we had last time; so I think any of these things might conceivably be used against us.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But this legislation applies only to this war.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not to any future war.

Mr. MUNDT. As to any future war they would have to save the munitions, keep them well oiled and in good condition if they were going to use them against us. We hope such weapons would be largely obsolete before any new war could break out. We all hope for an enduring peace.

Mr. DONDERO. For 3 years following termination of this war we still would be able to sell munitions to other countries.

Mr. MUNDT. No; no new sales.

Mr. DONDERO. I understood the gentleman to say that the provision for sale would include munitions of war.

Mr. MUNDT. No; no new sales but only a 3-year period during which to complete contracts entered into before the expiration of the act.

Mr. DONDERO. This applies only to contracts entered into during the life of the act.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct, and it provides for materials furnished or held after post-war to be paid for on a cash basis rather than on a lend-lease basis.

A CHALLENGE TO THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

I wish to continue without interruption now, for I have a few words to address to the Committee on Appropriations. I want to refer to two other items beside this amendment.

The first is the disposition of surplus property by lend-lease. It had been my intention originally to offer an amendment which would require lend-lease to utilize surplus property in making available to other people American supplies, but in an interchange of letters with the Lend-Lease Administration I have been advised that that is presently the practice and the policy, and that in fact it is interpreted to be the present law. So that at the present time if lend-lease procurement officials conform with the spirit and the letter of the laws of Congress they do consult surplus property agencies before entering into any contract for new supplies made available to other countries. So I believe such an amendment would be mere surplusage at this time.

I have one other section I wish to discuss briefly before I yield further; that is the use of section 6 (b) of the act which is known as the revolving fund. This, in my opinion, has not received the close scrutiny and attention of the Congress and the country which it merits. Page 25 of the hearings shows there are about $556,000,000—well over half a billion—in this revolving fund. I had an amendment to this bill in mind striking out that entire section of the bill, thinking perhaps that might be a proper approach to this problem. I have decided against that because it seems to me that today section 6 (b) has become a definite, established procedure in the lend-lease administrative bookkeeping processes, and it is one of the established methods by which sales are made through Lend-Lease and the receipts recorded. Certainly there has been no abuse of the money in the revolving fund thus far but it still is a half-billion dollar fund.

So it occurs to me that a more orderly approach and the proper approach for this Congress to make would be for the Committee on Appropriations, in determining the amount of money they are going to make available to Lend Lease in the next fiscal year, to make a close check of the half billion or more dollars available in the revolving fund and to use that as an offset against the amount of money requested for the continuance of Lend Lease. Thus we could achieve the purposes and the objectives without impairing the present bookkeeping procedure by which the revolving fund is built up.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. JARMAN. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that section 6 contains very definite limitations as to the funds. The Bureau of the Budget must approve the expenditure of the funds for the same purpose; and I believe the testimony is that invariably what the Director of the Bureau has done has been simply to certify it to the Appropriations Committee, and practically what he desires is being done. Is not that correct?

Mr. MUNDT. That is approximately correct, although the bill also provides for that money to be spent in that fiscal year or in the succeeding fiscal year.

Mr. JARMAN. I was just going to refer to that. There is another limitation, it is not an unlimited proposition. It could not be used for more than 24 months.

Mr. MUNDT. That is right.

Mr. JARMAN. It could not be used beyond 24 months and to all intents and purposes it amounts to an extension of about 18 months.

Mr. MUNDT. I call this matter to the attention of the Congress and point it out to the Appropriations Committee simply to illustrate that there is over a $500,000,000 deposit to the credit of America in this account which might well be used as an offset when the time comes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I want to refer to the report given by Mr. Daniels on December 31, 1944. According to the chart there indicated, we have given for lend-lease $35,300,000,000, and we have received in reverse lend-lease, according to this chart on page 29, approximately $4,000,000,000, leaving $32,000,000,000 yet to be received in some manner. What arrangement has been made by our Government with these foreign countries so that these obligations may either be paid or a disposition of the obligation made under lend-lease?

Mr. MUNDT. I may say no arrangements have been completely consummated to that up to the present time. The whole thing is in the status of flux. The processes of lend-lease are still going on and the processes of lend-lease in reverse are still coming in. We have this 3-year extension period during which we can make these adjustments at the proper time.

Mr. RICH. If we were interested in the United States of America, is this not the time to be dealing with those foreign countries in some sort of manner whereby our country might be protected in its interests, especially the people and the taxpayers of our country? Should we not be dealing with them now?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, sir. We should be dealing with them now and I hope we are, but obviously the dealings are not going to be spread out on the floor of the House of Representatives because they are in process of consummation.

We should be dealing with them now and I hope we are.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that this cash receipt feature of lend-lease and the revolving fund I have already mentioned, from now on should well be stepped up tremendously, because as we approach this French type of agreement and receive down payments on a cash basis, and as we approach the end of the war as we all hope in the European theater, there is a likelihood that the cash receipts in 6 (b) will be stepped up tremendously. Consequently it is important that the Appropriations Committee probe into the desirability of setting up precautionary legislation under the Ramseyer rule which will prevent any misuse or extravagance in those funds. I want to throw out that thought to be considered by the Appropriations Committee.

It is also true, in my opinion, that the Appropriations Committee should give careful attention to a tendency on the part of the Lend-Lease Administration to use increasing liberality in its definition of what comprises material or supplies to be provided under lend-lease. We started out with weapons of war, food, and things of that kind. The war has become pretty large and the interpretations had to be pretty liberal. We are now, however, including prefabricated houses built for the factory districts of London. I do not know how far we should go; however, this is a job, too, to which the Appropriations Committee should give its attention.

Up to now only the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House has apparently scrutinized carefully lend-lease and all the significant changes ever made in the law have been made in our committee. In the other body, lend-lease has skidded through with about as little attention as a routine supply bill. The Appropriations Committee has established no restrictions and I submit that we should invite the cooperation of the other committees and branches of the Congress in safeguarding as much as possible the lend-lease activities in the future.

It is important too, Mr. Chairman, that the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate—especially the Appropriations Committee of the House—scrutinize very carefully requests from the Lend-Lease Administration for the carrying out of agreements such as the one recently signed with the French. To the extent that Congress retains a tight check on the expenditures and appropriations of Lend-Lease, to that extent Congress retains control of its activities and its projects. To the extent that we fail to regulate the expenditures of Lend-Lease, to that extent we delegate our responsibility to members of the executive branch of government. It is on this point that I urge that the House Committee on Appropriations examine with increased and increasing care the purposes for which lend-lease funds are requested.

France is in many ways a special case. France is a fighting ally in this war whose countryside and cities have been overrun by war machines. France is presently serving as a base for our military operations. It was right that we should make an agreement with the French to supply under the terms of lend-lease some of the material which she needs and the French agreement appears to be a just and equitable manner in which to determine the basis upon which our assistance to France should be made available.

However, we should move slowly and with considerable care in extending this type of agreement and before authorizing the expenditure of vast sums for similar agreements in cases where the persuasive arguments are less compelling. Uncle Sam has about reached the bottom of his barrel. We must begin measuring our generosity and good intentions in terms of our capacity to pay and the requirements of our national solvency. Before another large appropriation is authorized for lend-lease our Appropriations Committee should secure a clear-cut and detailed break-down of how the money is to be spent and of what further agreements if any along the line of the French agreement are in prospect. As we redefine and restrict the powers of Lend-Lease today in extending it another year we should do so with the hope and confidence that our Appropriations Committee will redouble its efforts to restrict to absolute essentials the purposes for which additional lend-lease funds will be appropriated.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I shall leave to the senior members of the committee the discussion of the tangible results of lend-lease and the tangible phases of it. As a new Member of Congress, in my brief time I would like to discuss what I think are some of the intangible results of the program.

Mr. Chairman, I consider the lend-lease program one of the great accomplishments of the Congress; and certainly one of the most productive for good during the war period. I was impressed by the oneness of the testimony of the witnesses who testified before the Foreign Affairs Committee—and we had many witnesses to appear before the committee. The testimony was convincing; that the lend-lease program has been a success, that it had enabled our allies to put armies in the field in quick time, thereby indirectly saving the lives of many of our own men. It also kept the enemy off balance and enabled us, at a time when the tides of fortune were lowest, to resist with determination and skill.

But this great advantage of lend-lease is outweighed, to my mind, by another benefit growing out of it. Through lend-lease we have been permitted to sit down around the council table with our allies and through the perils of adversity we have formed friendships that will mean much to us as a nation in the difficult year ahead.

Cyrus once said:

All men have their frailties; and whoever looks for a friend without imperfections will never find what he seeks. We love ourselves notwithstanding our faults and we ought to love our friends in like manner.

And Colton at another time said:

The firmest friends have been found in mutual adversity; as iron is most firmly united by the fiercest flame.

Certainly out of the crucible of this war and our work together we have learned to understand each other's faults and each other's virtues and, I think, have unselfishly tried to forge a bond of friendship among the nations who are our allies. Our duty as Members of the Congress and as parents is to do all that we possibly can to look beyond our own personal inconveniences and heartaches, and to work and vote for those things that will make secure the generations that will follow us.

Youth is the future. Youth is interested in the program of the Congress; its effort to create good will. Youth is interested in lend-lease; and from the smoke and stench of battle youth thinks of better conditions in the world of the future and hopes that his children will not have to undergo the trials which he now endures.

I like a little poem which I read not long ago, written by Elsie Robinson, which tells what I want to say far more beautifully than I could ever do, entitled "Youth Speaks":

The sky is black;
The storm howls at the pane;
The trails my father
And his father knew,
The paths they followed,
The good fields they plowed
Are swamped beneath the uproar
Of the flood:
The sheltered garden
Which my mother grew
And where we children played
In peaceful days,
That, too, is blotted out
With all the rest:
There is no spot
On all this mad, sick star
Where one may rest
Or feel secure,
They're gone,
The world's at war.
Am I, too, lost
In that same
Hell of hate?
Am I, too, doomed
Because I'll never know
The carefree laughing years
My elders knew,
Are there to be
No April dusks for me,
Cobwebbed with stars?
No singing dawns
When all the air's
Apulse with ecstasy?
Must I plod on
Through the years bereft of dreams,
Robbed of all reason and delight,
As lost as some dead thing
The flood has spewed
From out its grave?
Am I, too, lost
Because my elders
Went insane with hate
And must the very air
Be poisoned for me
Evermore?
Am I, too lost?
Beneath the screams and sobs,
The senseless waiting,
And the racking pain,
My heart cries "No!"
I am not lost!
There is within me something
Which no storm can kill.

Something that lasts
Though all the old ways pass
And young dreams dim:
Something that neither hate
Nor greed nor fear can change—
Something,
A spark God planted
In my shapeless clay
When first He molded me
And called me son,
I am not lost!
Though all the rest shall change
This spark lives on triumphant
And, from the bloody rubble
At my feet
I'll build a cleaner,
Better, larger world
In days to come:
I am not lost
As long as God lives on!

Out of this backlog of good will we are building we can leave a heritage to the youth of the land.

I hope that the bill H. R. 2013 is passed by this House by a unanimous vote.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, all through the hearings on lend-lease I took the position that we should continue lend-lease as a mutual military-aid measure but that it should not be used as a post-war mechanism for post-war rehabilitation or for post-war reconstruction.

At first we who shared this view were unable to limit lend-lease to war use. Several of us filed a minority report, in which we insisted it should be confined to a mutual war-aid measure, and post-war rehabilitation and reconstruction policy should be separately and specifically authorized by Congress.

We have now succeeded in writing into this measure limitations which would prohibit the President from entering into or carrying out any contract or agreement with a foreign government for post-war relief, post-war rehabilitation, or post-war reconstruction, with a single exception. There may be a sale of defense articles to a foreign government when they are no longer necessary for use by such government in the defense of the United States. This seems to me to be along the proper lines and is a step in the right direction.

Under the circumstances, therefore, I do not believe additional amendments will be offered by members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and I intend to support and vote for this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, it may safely be said, I believe, that we are all in favor of extending the Lend-Lease Act for another year. It has been said by high officials that it would be unthinkable not to do so, and I agree that it would not be wise to even think of discontinuing the Lend-Lease Act.

On the other hand, high officials in the administration, from the President down, are equally agreed that lend-lease should end with the war. As President Roosevelt said in the seventeenth lend-lease report:

> Lend-lease and reverse lend-lease are a system of combined war supply. It should end with the war.

I believe that the overwhelming majority of the American people are agreed that it should continue to the end of the war but should with equal certainty end with the war.

The purpose of the committee amendment which you will find recited in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is to accomplish both of these objectives. Neverthless the attainment of these objectives will depend, under this legislation, entirely on the good faith of the administration. Under modern conditions, where war has become an all-out war, and almost every commodity, with the exception of a few luxuries, can be considered as necessities for carrying on the war, it is a simple matter to designate and classify articles primarily for civilian use, as defense articles. It seems to me that this is just what has been done in the French agreement of February 28, 1945, making a lend-lease agreement for post-war rehabilitation and reconstruction by the simple expedient of executing it before the war is ended and calling it war necessity.

The so-called French lend-lease contract consists of three distinct agreements: First, a master agreement identical with those entered into with the United Kingdom, China, the Soviet Union, and other countries; second, a reciprocal aid agreement similar to those entered into with the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand, and others; and, finally, third, an agreement under section 3 (c) of the Lend-Lease Act for the benefit of France only. No one can successfully deny that under the first and second agreements we would be able to give France all the military lend-lease she needs for the purpose of winning the war and until the day of victory. This has been true of the master agreements with all the other nations, and France would not be an exception.

Why then do we need the third agreement under 3 (c), unless it is for post-war use? The agreement with France under 3 (c) gives the answer in the following words:

> In the preliminary agreement of February 28, 1945, between the Government of the United States of America and the Provisional Government of France on the principles applying to mutual aid, each contracting Government undertakes to provide the other with such articles, services, facilities, and information useful in the prosecution of their common war undertaking as each may be in a position to supply.
>
> The Government of the United States of America and the Provisional Government of France desire to insure the continuing provision of such articles, services, facilities or information without interruption owing to any uncertainty as to the date when the military resistance of the common enemy may cease; and desire to insure further that such articles, services, facilities, or information as shall be agreed to be furnished by the United States for the purpose of providing war aid to the Provisional Government of France shall be disposed of and transferred, following a determination by the President that such aid is no longer necessary to the prosecution of the war, in an orderly manner which will best promote their mutual interests.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. JONKMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. VURSELL. My question is for the purpose of obtaining information. I was led to believe by what I saw in the press that this extra lend-lease agreement was based upon some sort of a contract; that it was a loan of something like $2,500,000,000 on which France was to pay us an interest rate and finally liquidate it over a period of years. Is that true or not?

Mr. JONKMAN. Yes; that is true. If the gentleman will bear with me, I will cover that a little later in my statement.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I have been concerned over the shortage of farm machinery in the Middle West section of the country, and I am disturbed by information which I have received relative to a considerable amount of farm machinery that has been shipped under lend-lease. We have difficulty out there in getting some very necessary farm machinery for our farmers. I wonder if the gentleman has anything to offer in the way of comfort to our farmers who cannot get the farm machinery which this bill would authorize to be furnished to foreign countries under lend-lease agreements; or under the system which now exists?

Mr. JONKMAN. I know of nothing in the lend-lease agreement which would change that process. Schedule I contains provision for $250,000,000 to France of short-lived machinery; whatever that is, I do not know. Schedule II contains another provision for $100,000,000, and the other for $150,000,000 for various kinds of machinery for production.

Mr. O'HARA. A great deal of the farm machinery of this country has deteriorated to such an extent that one might say their life has expired. Has anybody given any consideration to that?

Mr. JONKMAN. I do not know that it is covered by the lend-lease agreement.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Can the gentleman tell us when the post-war period commences under the proposed committee amendment? Is that when hostilities have ended or when the war is officially declared by the Congress to be ended?

Mr. JONKMAN. Of course, the gentleman well knows that is something which has been discussed a great deal. Nobody knows when the war is going to end. I mean, when the war will have ended or what will end the war.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. That is right. As I recollect, after the last war, it was 1921 before it was officially declared to be ended.

Mr. JONKMAN. And it could have ended 12 or 18 months earlier.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. That is right. What assurance do we have that this war, let us say particularly the war with Germany, shall be declared to be ended in 1948 when hostilities may cease in April, we hope, of 1945?

Mr. JONKMAN. I do not think we have any assurance whatsoever.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. May I ask one more question? Assuming that

the war against Japan is carried on for a matter of 2 years after the war with Germany ends, could not lend-lease be continued as to all these European countries during that interim period?

Mr. JONKMAN. There is not any question about that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What assurance do we have with the committee amendment that it will terminate all of this rehabilitation and reconstruction aid after the war?

Mr. JONKMAN. None whatsoever except the good faith of the administration.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then the amendment does not really make it mandatory to stop this post-war rehabilitation?

Mr. JONKMAN. Under a statement made by a man who I think has tremendous influence in the policy making of this Government, who is one of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, who said sometime ago "the notion that because the words of a statute are plain, that, therefore, the meaning is also plain, is just pernicious oversimplification."

Under that definition I do not think you can frame words that would protect the American people.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Can the gentleman tell me why it is there are so many people in high places who want to literally take the shirts off the backs of the American people and give it away?

Mr. JONKMAN. I presume because it is to their personal benefit.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Did the gentleman inquire to what extent, if any, American naval vessels have been turned over to our allies under the lend-lease act, if it is not a matter of secrecy?

Mr. JONKMAN. I do not think that matter was gone into.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Does the gentleman appreciate that under the amendment there is nothing to prevent them using lend-lease money to build a proposed T. V. A. on the Yangtze River in China?

Mr. JONKMAN. I would not say that I am fully aware of that, but I suspect it.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. They have recently put about 15 percent of the total expenditure of lend-lease into the money for France, and they attempt to justify it on the ground that that is the only way they could get France into the war, and perhaps they will pay afterward, although that does not seem to be very important. There are many countries like Turkey and others who have decided to come into the war, now that it is practically over, in order to get in at the peace table and get their adequate consideration. Does the gentleman think that we dare vote for this thing in view of the fact that amounts like that have been given to France, and if other countries come into the war at this late date and might be treated similarly, we might pay almost as much for lend-lease postwar consideration as we have paid during the war, for no obvious purpose that I can see.

Mr. JONKMAN. I will say that at least it should cause us to pause and reflect, and I think be filled with more or less apprehension.

Mr. VURSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. At the conclusion of the last war the gentleman will remember we had in bacon and sugar and edible commodities about $2,500,000,000 over in France. France was our ally then to a greater extent than she is now and the French Government immediately passed an export bill which provided that it could not be exported, and we had to finally let them keep it there at about 16⅔ cents on the dollar. I am wondering when all the defaults were made at that time by the French Government, if we could afford now to believe that we have a fair opportunity of ever getting any appreciable part of the $2,500,000,000 that is proposed to go to France under this lend-lease loan agreement.

Mr. JONKMAN. I would not bank on it sufficiently to spend any part of it.

In this particular 3 (c) agreement there are two schedules, one a list totaling one billion six hundred and seventy-five million, and the other totalling nine hundred million. The second schedule is ostensibly and admittedly more adapted to post-war use than the first, but both, to a layman at least, bear the earmarks of post-war-reconstruction-end use rather than war-end use, and, of course, immediately upon the ending of the war, be that tomorrow or any other day, will be for the former purpose. In fact, the Acting Secretary of State, Joseph C. Grew, Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., and Foreign Economic Administrator Leo T. Crowley in an official statement on February 28, published in the New York Times, March 1, said:

> The first two agreements with the French are based on the same principles as the lend-lease and reverse lend-lease agreements made by the United States with our other allies. The third agreement is the first to be concluded with any of the United Nations. A similar agreement is in negotiation with the Soviet Union.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Supplies and services under schedule 1 do not include finished armament, etc., for the use of French military forces. Up to the extent that they are not found to be necessary in the joint war effort by the President, any undelivered balances of schedule 1 items may, subject to the reservation of the President to withhold in the national interest, be acquired by the French. Such items are to be paid for by the French in 30 annual installments, beginning July 1, 1946, or on the 1st day of July following delivery with interest at 2⅜ percent per annum.

In other words, all that is necessary to vitiate the effect of the committee amendment is for administration officials to say that what are in fact postwar rehabilitation and reconstruction supplies are needed and necessary for the winning of the war, and then to execute the agreements while the war is on and carry them out under the 3-year period provided in 3 (c). All this without Congress being permitted to pass upon it, except by way of implementing the agreements by appropriations. There is the further consideration that only thirty-five billions of the seventy-odd billions already appropriated by Congress for lend-lease have been expended, leaving some thirty-five billions which would in all probability be available for this purpose.

In addition, it must be considered that there have been what I consider something more than mere rumors of agreements similar to the French agreement in the process of making with Russia, the United Kingdom, and perhaps will be with China, Holland, Belgium, and so forth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would it be possible to construe the language of this bill as authorizing the President to enter into commitments now to be fulfilled perhaps 10 or 15 years from now?

Mr. JONKMAN. That is what I just got through saying—that very thing. There is nothing to prevent their doing that, and I believe that is what they are doing in the case of the French now. If the French agreement is proceeded with, that is what they are going to do in the case of the Russian, the United Kingdom, and Chinese agreements.

Mr. KNUTSON. Certainly I do not believe either side of the aisle would be willing to confer powers of that kind that extend way into the next decade. To me that is indefensible.

Is there a minority report on this measure from the committee?

Mr. JONKMAN. There is a minority report.

Mr. Chairman, in the Committee on Foreign Affairs hearings I tried to ascertain something of the probability of other agreements with other nations similar to the French agreement through questions as follows:

> Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Crowley, is it your opinion that the proposed or talked-of six billion credit to Russia can be handled under lend-lease on the same general principles as the two billion, five hundred million to France?
>
> Mr. CROWLEY. Certainly we do not have any money available for that. I would assume that any amount of that size would have to be appropriated by Congress. That is a matter that is entirely outside lend-lease.
>
> Mr. JONKMAN. But assuming you had that appropriation?
>
> Mr. CROWLEY. If Congress gave us the money and told us we should use it for that purpose, I suppose we would do that. But the six billion credit is not connected with supplies for the war.
>
> Mr. JONKMAN. Don't you think that this thirty-five billion total appropriation which has been appropriated directly to the Army and Navy would be available for that purpose?
>
> Mr. CROWLEY. No.
>
> Mr. DAVIDSON. It would not be available for that purpose. The Russian interest in this six billion loan is with respect to post-war

supplies. There is no relationship to the carrying on of the war. I think we all agree that the only purpose of the Lend-Lease Act is to furnish supplies which will help in the defense of the United States.

Mr. CROWLEY. Even though next Monday morning one of our allies came along and paid us $10,000,000,000 on their debt—which is going quite a long ways—I would not assume that we would have a right to take that $10,000,000,000 and loan it to Russia for a period of 25 or 30 years without the consent of Congress under the Lend-Lease Act.

Mr. JONKMAN. I quite agree with you on that. But what is the difference between Russia and others? I think you have already answered that, but I want to be certain.

Mr. DAVIDSON. There are two categories of supplies in which they are interested. The $6,000,000,000 figure you mention relates to equipment which the Soviet Union wants for post-war purposes.

There is another category of a very much smaller amount which they need for carrying on the war. Those are the items which are included in the Russian 3 (c) proposal which we made last summer.

Mr. JONKMAN. Why do you distinguish between the $900,000,000 that is going to be advanced to France and the $6,000,000,000 to Russia?

Mr. DAVIDSON. The $6,000,000,000 bears no relation to the war.

Mr. JONKMAN. Do you claim that the $900,000,000 advanced to France does?

Mr. DAVIDSON. Yes.

Now, it would seem that in the above questioning I did not get very far or secure very much information, and yet I got further than the record shows. I do not wish to make a mountain out of a molehill, but in the transcript, one of these paragraphs read:

There is another category of a much smaller amount which they need for carrying on the war. I think that is in the range of around $500,000,000. Those are the items which are included in the Russian 3 (c) proposal which we made last summer.

In checking the galley proof I noticed that the statement, "I think that is in the range of around $500,000,000" was missing, and upon turning to the transcript I found that it had been crossed out and deleted; I do not know by whom, or why this was done, but it was the only part of the answers that was specific and satisfactory to me, because by identifying a $500,000,000 agreement, I assumed that I had eliminated the $6,000,000,000 post-war agreement. And it is precisely this paucity of information and apparent reluctance to give information that makes me wonder whether the French agreement is only the beginning of similar agreements for post-war rehabilitation and reconstruction with other nations. For as a matter of fact a far more frank and complete statement had already appeared in the New York Times of March 1, the day after the agreements were signed. There was not only the text of the official statement already referred to, but a newspaper article running alongside of it which is as follows:

A lend-lease agreement was signed with France at the State Department today, providing, for the first time, for the furnishing of civilian goods and equipment useful not only for the prosecution of the war but for reconstruction in the period following the cessation of hostilities. The maximum amount stipulated in the civilian-goods program was $2,575,000,000.

Announcement was made at the same time that a similar agreement on civilian goods is in the process of negotiations with the Soviet Union. According to some reports, Russia has been seeking a total in this category of about $6,000,000,000.

* * * * *

The civilian-goods program was worked out under section 3 (c) of the Lend-Lease Act, which permits the delivery of any lend-lease materials that are on order or are in process of construction or delivery, in fulfillment of contract terms over 3 years after the war, during which time arrangements will be made for settlement.

Resort was said to have been made to this section for the first time in view of the urgency of post-war reconstruction in Europe and the failure, to date, of Congress to enact measures covering repeal of the Johnson Act against foreign loans, approval of plans for an international bank worked out at the Bretton Woods Conference, and expansion of the lending powers abroad of the R. F. C.

* * * * *

All of them were specified to apply to military purposes, although the civilian goods and equipment will, of course, be highly useful in reconstruction after the war.

The amount of aid to be furnished under the standard master lend-lease agreement was not announced; although, manifestly, it will depend on military factors in development of the war.

I could quote at great length from this official text given out by Messrs. Grew, Morgenthau, and Crowley, as well as the news item which accompanied it as announcements from these officials in addition to the text of the statement. However, I think this is sufficient to give a far better picture of the status and intent of the French agreement, as well as the proposed Russian agreement for $6,000,000,000. When we consider that these may be followed by five billion to England and six billion to China and other nations that may desire post-war rehabilitation and reconstruction, it is sufficient to cause the American people to pause, reflect, and become apprehensive as to where this program will end; and all this without any opportunity for Congress to pass upon it as is to be done in the Dumbarton Oaks agreement, the Bretton Woods proposals for an international bank and stabilization fund, as well as the other post-war economic rehabilitation measures.

Last week Congress passed the bill increasing the debt limit to $300,000,000,000. At the beginning of the thirties the total wealth of the United States, representing an accumulation of 150 years, was estimated at $320,000,000,000 with a national debt of twenty billions, or a net worth of just about equal to what our national debt will be in a few months, and which is now estimated at two hundred and forty billions. In other words, we will have spent our entire accumulation of 150 years. There is a limit somewhere.

We, of course, can spare no expense in the winning of the war. The American people also will want to help the stricken nations to help themselves. But before measures are taken for such an ambitious program in rehabilitation and reconstruction, Congress should have an opportunity to pass upon them. This action of Congress should not be circumvented and bypassed through the making of agreements for post-war aid under the guise that they are win-the-war contracts.

I shall vote for the bill in the hope that the administration will carry out the intent of Congress as provided in the committee amendment.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries has been holding hearings on the so-called ship-sales bill. In the course of the hearings last Friday before the committee the attention of your committee was directed to a recent agreement between the United States and the Provisional Government of France, whereby the United States undertook to transfer certain articles and services to the Provisional Government of France, including articles defined as merchant marine, of an estimated cost of $140,000,000—harbor craft, fishing fleets, and inland-water craft. There was considerable confusion occasioned by reason of the reading of the agreement and the provisions with reference to it.

I have a letter dated March 12, 1945, from the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration, which I shall read if I may do so under the rules of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to read this letter.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. The letter reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 12, 1945.

The Honorable SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BLAND: We understand that at the hearings on the ship-disposal bill, H. R. 1425, held on March 9, 1945, a question was raised with respect to the possible transfer of vessels as part of a war supply program to the Provisional Government of France under the 3 (c) lend-lease agreement, signed February 28, 1945. It was alleged that this agreement provided for terms of payment for vessels which would be more favorable than those granted to citizen purchasers under the provisions of H. R. 1425.

In view of the fact that ship-disposal legislation is now under consideration by Congress, the Department of State and the Foreign Economic Administration have agreed with M. Monnet, Special Envoy of the Provisional Government of France, that there will be no transfer of title of ocean-going merchant vessels under the terms of the 3 (c) lend-lease agreement. If at some subsequent time it becomes necessary to consider transfer of vessels to France or to any other foreign government, the provisions of such legislation as may then exist bearing on the subject will be followed.

Sincerely yours,

E. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.,
Secretary of State.
LEO T. CROWLEY,
Administrator,
Foreign Economic Administration.

Mr. Chairman, some question arose as to the possible effect of charter agreements and, as I previously stated today, I understand from Mr. Oscar Cox, Deputy Administrator of the Foreign Economic Administration, that there are no

charter agreements made or to be made other than the merely lend-lease agreements which are authorized by law and which are to expire at the conclusion of the war with Germany or Japan, whichever may occur the later, and 6 months thereafter. So that as to these particular items, plus the amendment which will be offered here today as a committee amendment, I think the situation is taken care of with reference to disposal of ships. The terms appearing in the French agreement are different from those in the bill now appearing before the committee and, if adopted, would have led to confusion in its consideration, but it will be noted that the letter reads that "if at some subsequent time it becomes necessary to consider the transfer of vessels to France or to any other foreign government, the provisions of such legislation as may then exist bearing on the subject will be followed."

Communications from the State Department and a report made on March 3, as I recall, to the committee show that no definite commitments have been made.

The letter from Joseph C. Grew, Acting Secretary of State, is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 3, 1945.

The Honorable SCHUYLER OTIS BLAND,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BLAND: Reference is made to your letter of January 15, 1945, in which you request further information concerning arrangements or agreements with other countries involving commitments for the transfer of vessels after the war.

No arrangements or agreements committing the United States to post-war disposition of vessels to foreign governments or foreign individuals have been made by this Government or by its authorized representatives. However, agreements have been made with Norway, Brazil, and Chile which provide in general terms for aid in replacement or rehabilitation. The Department of State takes the position that these agreements should be honored in their spirit and that the absence of similar arrangements with our other allies who have likewise lost tonnage in the common war effort should not preclude reasonable consideration of their merchant-marine problems.

Information concerning the lend-lease agreement with Norway was furnished with the Department's letter of December 11, 1944. While that agreement does not constitute a commitment to replace lost Norwegian ships, it is in the nature of an assurance of the willingness of this Government to assist in the rehabilitation of Norway's merchant fleet.

On September 30, 1942, this Government entered into an agreement with the Government of Brazil relating to the chartering by Brazil of 13 vessels to the United States and the maintenance in service between the United States and Brazil of 23 additional Brazilian vessels. This agreement provided for charter hire of $1 per vessel per month. The principal consideration, however, was an obligation to replace lost vessels, in accordance with article 9 of the agreement, a copy of which is attached. The agreement of September 30, 1942, has been replaced by one of April 14, 1944, at which time the chartered vessels were returned to Brazil. In consideration of an agreement on the part of Brazil to maintain certain vessels in service between the United States and Brazil, and to assume responsibility for the carriage of a minimum quantity of cargo in that trade, certain features of the replacement article of the previous agreement were retained. A copy of article 5 of the April 14, 1944, agreement is enclosed.

On July 31, 1943, the United States entered into an agreement with the Government of Chile upon the occasion of the sale to this Government of three Chilean motor vessels and the chartering of substitute freighter tonnage to Chile. Article 3 of this agreement, a copy of which is attached, relates to the right of the Chilean Government to acquire vessels in the United States after the war.

Although a considerable number of ships have been turned over to Great Britain during the course of the war, the arrangements under which these vessels were chartered contain no commitments with reference to post-war disposition of the vessels concerned. In this connection it is pertinent to call to your attention the following statement made in the eleventh report to Congress on lend-lease operations, for the period ended July 31, 1943:

"* * * While our merchant fleet has been growing, that of Britain has been dwindling due to sinkings and to the fact that she has not built many replacements but has instead relied on us for production of merchant ships. The British, therefore, have a reserve of experienced seamen. To utilize the services of these men, we will charter to the United Kingdom about 15 new ships a month for the next 10 months. These ships are being chartered only for the duration of the war; title will remain with the United States Government, and the uses to which they may be put will be determined by the Combined Shipping Adjustment Board * * *."

With reference to your inquiry concerning the formation of a Shipping Division in the Department, I am enclosing a copy of Departmental Order 1301. Mr. J. E. Saugstad is Chief of the Shipping Division.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. GREW, *Acting Secretary.*

(Enclosure)

COPY OF ARTICLE 9 OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1942, AGREEMENT WITH BRAZIL

ART. 9. If during the life of this agreement any of the vessels enumerated in article 1 and article 3 be lost, the United States Government obligates itself—

(1) To replace such lost vessel after the war with a vessel of similar size, tonnage, and characteristics; or

(2) If unable to effect such replacement, to pay to the Brazilian Government the amount required by the Brazilian Government in order to purchase a replacement vessel of similar size, tonnage, and characteristics.

The sums required to be paid in accordance with this article and the number, tonnage, and characteristics of the replacement vessels shall be determined by a mixed commission to be established by the two Governments within 30 days after the end of the hostilities in which the United States and Brazil are at present engaged.

COPY OF ARTICLE 5 OF APRIL 14, 1944, AGREEMENT WITH BRAZIL

5. The United States Government will, after the war, replace any vessel totally lost as the result of a war casualty, as provided in the attached exhibit which is incorporated into and forms a part of this agreement, occurring during the period of its service under this agreement. Partial losses from war risks and total or partial marine risk losses are expressly excluded, and insurance against such losses will not be provided by the United States Government. The replacements to be made after the war shall, in each case, be by a vessel of approximately similar dimensions, tonnage, and characteristics, and of comparable value to the lost vessel. The values of both replacement vessel and lost vessel shall be established by the mixed commission hereinafter referred to on the basis of United States market values current at or about the time of replacement. If for any reason the United States Government is unable or unauthorized to effect such replacement, it will pay to the Brazilian Government an amount required by the Brazilian Government to replace such a replacement vessel. The sums required to be paid in accordance with this paragraph and the characteristics of the replacement vessel shall be determined by a mixed commission to be established by the two Governments within 60 days after the end of the hostilities in which the United States and Brazil are at present engaged.

COPY OF ARTICLE 3 OF JULY 31, 1943, AGREEMENT WITH CHILE

3. The Government of the United States agrees that for a period of 2 years following the termination of the present war, as proclaimed by the President of the United States, the Republic of Chile, or if designated by the Republic of Chile, the Compania Sud Americana de Vapores shall be given the privilege, to the extent permitted by the laws of the United States, of acquiring, at its own expense, in the United States vessels of an aggregate gross tonnage equal to the aggregate gross tonnage of the *Copiapo, Aconcagua,* and *Imperial,* and of such class as may be acquired in the United States by any other Government or steamship line. The Government of the United States may accord this privilege by authorizing any or all of the following: (a) Contracts with a shipyard or shipyards in the United States for the construction of vessels; (b) purchase in the United States of privately owned vessels; or (c) purchase in the United States of vessels owned by the United States. Nothing in this article shall be construed as a commitment by the Government of the United States to give financial assistance in connection with such acquisition.

EXTRACT FROM DEPARTMENTAL ORDER 1301

2. Shipping Division: The Shipping Division shall have responsibility for the formulation and coordination of policy and action of the Department of State in matters concerning international shipping (except those functions relating to shipping space requirements and allocations vested in the War Supply and Resources Division, Office of Wartime Economic Affairs). This includes such activities as:

(a) Analysis and study of all international aspects of shipping and, in cooperation with other economic and geographic divisions, formulation of policy concerning the economic, commercial, and political aspects of international shipping.

(b) Observation and review of developments in the maritime services and laws of other countries, in order to identify and advise on their implications to the foreign policy of the United States.

(c) Analysis and recommendation with regard to foreign policy aspects of subsidies and other governmental assistance to shipping and with regard to discriminatory laws or practices against American shipping.

(d) Development and recommendation on foreign policy aspects involved in relationships between private and governmental shipping, with particular reference to problems of the transitional period of adjustment from war to post-war conditions.

(e) In cooperation with the geographic and other interested offices of the Department, conduct of negotiations between foreign governments and the Maritime Commission and War Shipping Administration with regard to disposal of tonnage, transfer of nationality, redistributions of ships to essential trade routes, and other shipping matters.

(f) Formulation and carrying through of policy recommendations on matters that involve the effect of ocean freight rates, marine insurance rates, and war-risk insurance rates on foreign trade.

(g) Analysis of and recommendations regarding legislation and Executive orders affecting international shipping, and international conventions, treaties, and agreements governing shipping and shipbuilding industries.

(h) Analysis of and recommendations on policy of the Department regarding revision of navigation laws and their adjustment to current seagoing conditions.

(i) Interpretation of and liaison in all matters within the responsibility of the Division relative to international conventions concerning seamen.

(j) In cooperation with the Office of the Foreign Service and other interested divisions, and in collaboration with the Maritime Commission and other agencies, the drafting of instructions to Foreign Service establishments regarding reports on matters of economic and political significance in the maritime services and shipbuilding industries of other countries.

(k) Analysis of reports from the field for developments that are significant from a policy viewpoint, and furnishing of pertinent information to offices of the Department or other Government agencies on international shipping matters.

(l) Analysis of regulatory measures and standards that affect shipping and trade in order to determine their relationship to foreign policy.

Attention is called particularly to the following paragraph in Assistant Secretary Grew's letter of March 3, 1945:

No arrangements or agreements committing the United States to post-war disposition of vessels to foreign governments or foreign individuals have been made by this Government or by its authorized representatives. However, agreements have been made with Norway, Brazil, and Chile which provide in general terms for aid in replacement or rehabilitation. The Department of State takes the position that these agreements should be honored in their spirit and that the absence of similar arrangements with our other allies who have likewise lost tonnage in the common war effort should not preclude reasonable consideration of their merchant-marine problems.

Assistant Secretary Grew described (a) our agreement with Norway as an assurance of the willingness of this Government to assist in the rehabilitation of Norway's merchant fleet; (b) our agreement of September 30, 1942, with Brazil as an agreement of replacement, and our later agreement of April 12, 1944, as an agreement on the part of Brazil to maintain certain vessels in service between the United States and Brazil and to assume responsibility for the carriage of a minimum quantity of cargo in that trade, certain features of the replacement article of the previous agreement being retained; and (c) an agreement with Chile upon the occasion of the sale of three Chilean motor vessels to this Government and the chartering of substitute freighter tonnage to Chile, with an article in the agreement for the acquiring at its own expense in the United States of an aggregate gross tonnage equal to the three motor ships acquired, but with no commitment of the United States to give financial assistance in connection with such acquisition.

As to Great Britain, Acting Secretary Grew said:

Although a considerable number of ships have been turned over to Great Britain during the course of the war, the arrangements under which these vessels were chartered contain no commitments with reference to post-war disposition of the vessels concerned. In this connection it is pertinent to call to your attention the following statement made in the eleventh report to Congress on lend-lease operations, for the period ended July 31, 1943:

"While our merchant fleet has been growing, that of Britain has been dwindling due to sinkings and to the fact that she has not built many replacements but has instead relied on us for production of merchant ships. The British, therefore, have a reserve of experienced seamen. To utilize the services of these men, we will charter to the United Kingdom about 15 new ships a month for the next 10 months. These ships are being chartered only for the duration of the war; title will remain with the United States Government, and the uses to which they may be put will be determined by the Combined Shipping Adjustment Board.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I am not at all certain I can add anything to the discussion but perhaps I am justified in giving you my impression of the attitude of the representatives of the executive branch of the Government as they appeared time after time before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. If you do not mind my saying so, I have sat on a great many committees of Congress at one time or another and have taken part in a great many hearings, and I can say in all frankness that never in my experience have I seen witnesses from the executive branch of the Government more candid, more cooperative, than I have in connection with these hearings.

We started in really to learn about the lend-lease program and its operation from Mr. Stettinius, of whom it may be said that he was the first man who built the organization. He may not have been the first Administrator but he was the Administrator at the time when it was put actively to work after we had become participants in this war.

Mr. Stettinius is a man of broad experience, and he impressed every member of our committee with the idea that he knew what he was doing in the handling of these goods and funds. He was succeeded by Mr. Crowley, whose acquaintance I had not had the pleasure of making before he came before the committee. I think every member of the committee will join with me in the assertion that Mr. Crowley has responded to every single inquiry we have made of him, and we have made hundreds of them. He has stated over and over again his profound conviction that lend-lease is a war measure, and nothing but a war measure; that it never was contemplated as a post-war reconstruction or rehabilitation measure.

The same estimate, I think, can be made of Mr. Cox, attorney for the F. E. A., and for Mr. Acheson, of the State Department, who time and again have come before our committee and answered every conceivable question. They have traced rumors and stories down around the earth to find out the truth of various suggestions or criticisms in Congress, and in some instances they have corrected evils and done it promptly. In other words, whether we agree with the policy of lend-lease—and I do, and have from the very beginning, and make no concealment of the fact—I do not think we are justified in distrusting these men. I say that advisedly. They have given us their word in open session. Their words were taken down by the committee reporters that such and such is their conception of their duties, and they have been supported in those assertions by the Secretary of War, by the Secretary of the Navy, and by Admiral Land, of the Maritime Commission. I indulge in this observation because I think it is due to these men to be given some credit, indeed, full credit, for the strenuous efforts they are making for our country. I never asked them what party they belonged to, and I never will.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I think it should be made clear that the motivating purpose of the amendment supported by the minority was not an indictment or an expression of suspicion against any men or group of men. It was based on the well-recognized theory of government that men come and go, but that is a government of law and not a government of men.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman is correct. I supported this amendment in committee. I believe it is a clarifying amendment. I believe it will do much toward doing away with misunderstanding and misconception of what lend-lease is about. I am glad to see it inserted in the basic act. I think it is effective to accomplish the purposes which our committee unanimously want accomplished, and which I am sure the Congress and the people of the United States want accomplished; in other words, the confining of lend-lease active operations to that of a war agency and keeping it out of the field of reconstruction and rehabilitation in Europe or China or any other spot on the face of the globe.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is making a very fine statement and is a valuable member of the committee. Under the bill as reported out by the majority lend-lease would be extended to June 30, 1949.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Lend-lease will not be extended until June 30, 1949. The clean-up period in which we salvage what we can, in which we reach final agreements as to what the material is worth, and can we get any money for it or what we will do with it, is extended 1 year from 1948 to 1949, making a 3-year period to accomplish a mighty difficult job which will have to be pursued all over the face of the earth.

Mr. KNUTSON. When does this bill expire as it is worded now?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The active operation of lend-lease will expire on June 30, 1946.

Mr. KNUTSON. Assuming this bill is enacted, would it be possible for the administration to enter into commitments

between now and 1946 that would perhaps not be put into effect for 10 or 15 years?

Mr. WADSWORTH. No; it would not.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] said it would, and he is a very able lawyer.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The law specifically provides that commitments made under lend-lease shall be for the purpose of securing the defense of the United States in this war and nothing else.

Mr. KNUTSON. But the gentleman from Michigan said that it would.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am sorry to disagree with him if he did. I did not hear his remarks.

Perhaps we can visualize men being utterly faithless to their oath of office, utterly faithless to an act of Congress, and just deliberately, like pirates, going out and doing things that they are not authorized to do by law, but I do not think the people who are running this thing are that kind of people. That may be an unconventional thing for me to say, but that is my belief.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JARMAN. Does not the gentleman also feel, just as he feels that the people who are running this thing are not that kind of people, that no men placed in those positions in our Government will probably be that kind of people?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am the more reinforced in my opinion of this because the fact is that none of these measures under lend-lease are undertaken without the advice and recommendation of our high military command. Every line of any agreement made in Europe, for example, while this war is going on, is passed upon by General Eisenhower. Our committee learns that Eisenhower has organized on his general staff at his headquarters in Europe a special section composed of officers whose sole duty is to examine into the military advantages, the military values of the things which are proposed to be done. His recommendations and those of MacArthur and of Admiral Nimitz are all taken, and they are brought back to the Joint Chiefs of Staff here in Washington for them finally to determine what will be to the greatest military advantage.

This thing is a miiltary undertaking, not civilian. The Lend-Lease Administrator does not decide whether or not Australia shall contribute 90 percent of the food consumed by MacArthur's troops, which happens to be the fact. MacArthur, in cooperation with the Australian military command and the Government of Australia, recommends that that be done, it being within the power of the Australian people and their economy to produce that food. Of course, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I have no doubt, say "Good work; that is a military weapon, that food."

Lend-lease, with the help of W. F. A. and the Treasury Procurement, procures the goods and keeps track of it all, and sees that it is distributed where the military people want it distributed.

We went through the whole thing in north Africa. There was a lot of talk about our operations in north Africa. Looking back on them now, I do not believe a single Member of Congress would say that they were not extraordinarily successful. Lend-lease contributions were a very important part of it. Eisenhower commanded that expedition. He commanded not only all of the American elements in it but all the British: British land, British Navy, British air, and American land, American Navy, and American air. It was he primarily who first recommended what lend-lease would be necessary and useful in the military sense in north Africa. It was done.

The war has moved away from north Africa, almost 2 years ago. Lend-lease is now leaving north Africa. It is no longer a military necessity there. Lend-lease is now moving into France. Through one of our allies it is moving into Belgium. Great Britain is to rearm and reequip the Belgian Army. We tackle the French Army and the British tackle the Belgian Army. It is a partnership, but its objective collectively is military.

I have confidence in Eisenhower; I have confidence in Marshall; I have confidence in King and Nimitz and MacArthur and all the others in high command. I know that before any of these things of any importance whatsoever is embarked upon the military opinion stands No. 1.

I cannot conceive of this amendment or any other provision of this law being so interpreted by any administrator as to permit even by indirect methods lend-lease to be used for nonmilitary purposes in connection with post-war rehabilitation or reconstruction. It simply is not in the statute.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. May I furnish the gentleman a copy of the committee print of this bill and ask him to interpret or explain the exception beginning on line 13 of the committee amendment in the committee print? I do not understand that exception.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The exception was put in by the unanimous vote of our committee so that the prohibitory language of the first half of the section should be deemed to interfere with and make illegal an agreement such as the French agreement recently entered into.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Would not that permit them to carry on even after the 3-year limit?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not in the furnishing of any goods, but only in the collecting of money.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. The gentleman and I would not disagree upon the furnishing of supplies of a military nature. But the gentleman knows, does he not, that they have been furnishing under the guise of lend-lease a great many things which we are badly in need of, such as farm machinery, in this country? There is a grave question as to whether that is an aid to our military forces; is that not true?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The military thought it was a very wise thing for us to do. As to farm machinery, I am interested in that as much as anybody because I am in the farming business. The farm machinery that we have supplied under lend-lease has gone largely to Great Britain, Australia, and New Zealand. It totals approximately 3 percent of our annual production in the United States.

Mr. O'HARA. Of course, 3 percent of that production at a time when it is very difficult for our own people to get machinery is quite a serious percentage.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Of course, we are having difficulties. But when we sent those cream separators to Australia to enable them to increase their production of dairy products, we enabled the Australians to give us a lot more food for nothing. Had we not sent them any machinery and had we not helped them to increase their production and had we shipped the food that General MacArthur's men required from the United States in our own ships, the cost would have been 16 times as great.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, in the very title of this bill, which has been overlooked in the debate so far, can be found the most eloquent argument for its continuance as reported to the Committee of the Whole by the unanimous action of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That title reads "A bill to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States." This is a war measure. It is before the House on that basis. It must be so considered and on that basis alone. On this point the committee was in agreement. Lend-lease is to be considered solely as a weapon of war—lend-lease is a weapon of victory. It is the considered judgment of us all that articles and services are and may only be provided under the Lend-Lease Act when to do so is in the interest of our national defense.

That supreme interest at this moment is to win the war. At this moment, with the help of Almighty God, the military situation appears to be favorable to our cause in nearly all areas of the world, and yet we must avoid wishful thinking and rosy predictions as to the course of military events. We must continue to plan for war. There must be no slackening of our war effort in any quarter until all our enemies have been defeated utterly everywhere.

On February 8, before the Foreign Affairs Committee, the Honorable Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, concluded a statement with these words, which impressed me deeply. I quote:

As we look about us at the progress of the war in Europe and in the Far East we have every reason to feel pride in our allies and gratitude for their enormously effective part in winning the war. We have all shared our problems, our hopes, our substance, and the burden of the battle. We must continue to do so; and we must continue to maintain faith and confidence in nations of good will

both to defeat our enemies and to secure a just peace.

When the war has been won—and I say this now as a Democratic member of the committee, to show how in complete agreement both sides of the aisle are on this point—all witnesses who appeared before the committee without exception, the President, Mr. Crowley, Mr. Stettinius and everyone else—when the war has been won lend-lease should end and be liquidated as promptly and efficiently as possible, in accordance with the intention of Congress and the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act, and as emphasized by the definitive and clarifying amendment submitted as the result of the unanimous action of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I was very glad to hear the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], the former Senator from New York, and in my opinion, one of the best brains and one of the most distinguished statesmen of the entire Congress, refer to this matter, that whatever a person may think of the lend-lease program, or for that matter, any other phase of Government activity, he has one obligation which should be fulfilled before he engages in criticism. There are objective criticisms but there are obligations before it should be engaged in. He should assure himself of the correctness of the information on which he is basing his judgment.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield.

Mr. JONKMAN. I think it is true that under lend-lease and the standard master agreement there is only one objective and that is to win the war. When that has been done everything else is dropped, is that not true?

Mr. FLOOD. I think we are all in agreement on that.

Mr. JONKMAN. Is it not also true that the French agreement goes beyond that?

Mr. FLOOD. That is true, but may I explain it by saying this, it goes beyond but in this way: The French agreement, by its extension over a period of years, has to do solely and entirely with payment by the French, if and when we say they are to pay certain things and as the agreement provides.

Mr. JONKMAN. In the 3 (c) agreement is there any limitation on that time?

Mr. FLOOD. There is no limitation on the time within the 3-year clean-up period, but under the French agreement, when they talk about periods of 20 years or 27 years, that has nothing to do with the supplying by the United States of America of any article, but only with payment.

Mr. JONKMAN. One further question. If the articles provided for in the French agreement are not delivered at the time, 3 years after cessation of the war, is there anything to prevent further delivery?

Mr. FLOOD. Certainly. First there is the act itself.

Secondly, there is this amendment to which the committee agreed entirely, that the act itself expires in 1 year. At the end of 3 years the clean-up period expires, and under any agreement made now or before the extension date in June 1946 anything that has to do beyond the 3-year period is for the best interest of the United States only and nobody else and is concerned only with payments to the United States and has nothing to do with deliveries.

Mr. JONKMAN. But, is it not true that in that extension we have waived the principal consideration in lend-lease, that is the winning of the war, and gone beyond it?

Mr. FLOOD. No; and may I interject this, I am very glad the gentleman raised this issue: At any time during the life of any of these agreements—and even now may I say since this French agreement was written it has already been revised, been rewritten—on February 26, I believe the agreement was made, yet, even since February 26 we have reconsidered and revised and restricted certain provisions. At any time during the life of any one of these agreements under the master agreement we can revise and reconsider any phase of it.

Mr. JONKMAN. That is true; but is it a desirable thing to do, gentlemen, to go back on our contract?

Mr. FLOOD. Oh, now, Mr. Chairman, if one has in mind the meeting of minds that is necessary when any contract or agreement is entered into it cannot be construed in that way. Certainly it is presumed that we take this upon some expression of faith. There is more than the appearance of a contract; there must be a meeting of the minds on this kind of agreement. Certainly any revision will not be made arbitrarily by this Nation, I am sure, or by any administrator of this lend-lease agreement, or by the administration itself.

Mr. JONKMAN. Then, if in the normal course of events the gentleman assumes the contract will be carried out, is not he doing the very thing that violates the terms of the agreement?

Mr. FLOOD. I think the gentleman is begging his own question. The very thing the act does do is to prevent quibbling and quarreling among allies about items which in the over-all picture serve the purpose for which this Congress created the law itself. That, I believe, with all due deference to the gentleman from Michigan, who was a tower of strength in the committee, with all due deference to the gentleman, I think certainly he is not speaking against the spirit of the act; I think that is a matter of detail in carrying out the contract, it has no legal weight and does not violate the terms of the agreement—the agreement calls for such action.

May I say this: After the cessation of hostilities, especially in the European theater, much more important than the question the gentleman raises are the payments, under the agreement, the question raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]—the very payments themselves are consideration of the fact much more importantly—and I believe the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] had that in mind a moment ago—that is much more important than deciding whether or not we will continue to give them an engine or a crane; and I think payments of these moneys, the return of the gold for our contribution, must await the final determination of hostilities; then we will sit down and work out an itemized basis which I agree has not been as full as it should be but which must await the end of the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. JONKMAN. I was just going to say that the gentleman understands, of course, I was talking about if the spirit as well as the letter of this agreement is carried out then we have protection.

Mr. FLOOD. My only reply to the gentleman is this: That when Mr. Justice Holmes was Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Judicature of Massachusetts, his favorite reply to the question what he would do under certain circumstances was, "When the situation arises I shall endeavor to deal with it."

True in any time, and on any subject, this is more than ever an obligation in wartime and on the subject of lend-lease. For anyone who, even unintentionally, misrepresents the work of this great war agency is doing a serious disservice, not only to his country, but to the whole Allied cause.

The United States has supplied its allies with goods and services amounting to $35,382,000,000. Munitions, including planes, tanks, motor vehicles, and guns accounted for the greatest part of lend-lease transfers, 58 percent; industrial raw materials for 21 percent; foodstuffs and agricultural products, 16 percent; petroleum products, 5 percent. Ninety-eight percent of all lend-lease has flowed to the four major allies—Britain, Russia, China, and France. In reverse, they have supplied us with $4,000,000,000 worth of goods and services.

Yet despite all these concrete benefits of lend-lease, Secretary of War Stimson sees in it something of still greater significance. He told the Foreign Affairs Committee:

> I think that the most important contribution which has been made by lend-lease to the prosecution of this war has been the effect which it has had in knitting into one compact body with ourselves the power of the several nations which have become our allies.

It is, indeed, the indispensable, unifying force which has made our coalition effective. There could be no greater folly than the setting aside of a weapon which has served us so well.

If I may be permitted to mix a metaphor, as the great State of Pennsylvania is known as the keystone of the Union of States, so lend-lease is the foundation stone of the new union of nations.

In reply and answer to the questions and remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] on the use of farm machinery in lend-lease, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein statements from the Foreign Economic Administration entitled "Fiction and Fact," and a letter from Leo T. Crowley,

Administrator, to the gentleman from New York, Hon. SOL BLOOM, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D. C., December 30, 1944.
Hon. SOL BLOOM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BLOOM: Speaking on the floor of the House on Friday, December 1, Representative A. L. MILLER submitted a report on his trip to England, in the course of which he discussed phases of lend-lease operations. Several statements which were made should, I believe, be replied to, in order to keep the lend-lease record clear.

For example, Mr. MILLER said that he had visited a place about 60 miles north of London, where there were "at least a square mile of American-made farm machinery—new tractors, plows, harrows, and disks packed close together." This material, he indicated, had been sent from the United States under lend-lease, and he quoted a colonel who accompanied him as saying that "this type of lend-lease should have stopped long ago." He added that he presumed that equipment "was on order and someone felt it necessary to complete the order."

Actually, the place visited by Mr. MILLER was a depot where a type of American tractor with ancillary equipment was stored preparatory to shipment to France to build military roads or assignment on war projects in England such as the clearance of ground for air bases. Normally there are about 200 crawlers at this depot awaiting shipment, and at certain times before and after the invasion of France there had been as many as 500 or 600. They are continually moving either to the battle lines or to war tasks behind the lines, assigned them by the Combined Munitions Assignment Board acting for the Combined Chiefs of Staff. There may possibly be a dozen pieces of agricultural equipment among these, but the overwhelming bulk of the equipment which Mr. MILLER saw and which can so readily be mistaken as machinery for agricultural use was equipment required for military operations.

I would like to emphasize that shipment of equipment to England as lend-lease is recommended by the accredited representatives of the United States Government, including some of the highest-ranking American officers, stationed in England who are constantly in touch with the war situation and who recommend only when they are convinced this equipment will serve best in the winning of the war. The lend-lease equipment present at the depot at the time of Mr. MILLER's visit had been sent there pursuant to such recommendations.

Mr. MILLER, following his discussion of this equipment, which he mistakenly believed to be agricultural machinery, says that England has increased her domestic production of food from 35 to 75 percent of her need. He adds that this has been accomplished through lend-lease of farm machinery and that "it is very evident now, however, that this type of lend-lease should be stopped."

England produced abcut 40 percent of her domestic consumption before the war and now produces about 70 percent. The United States supplies about 10 percent of Britain's food needs, and we have sent her some equipment and fertilizer and seed which, of course, have helped make possible the increase in her domestic production. However, we have sent to all of our allies no more than 3 percent of the total farm machinery manufactured in the United States. Certainly, the crisis in food in England has not passed. The British are still living on an extremely strict diet. Of the total of lend-lease exports to the United Kingdom from the inception of the lend-lease program in March 1941 through October 1944, 26.8 percent consisted of foodstuffs and agricultural products. In the first year of lend-lease, food was the largest single item of lend-lease aid sent by this country to the United Kingdom. At one time the British had been reduced to a 7-day supply of food. That the situation remains critical, however, is indicated by the fact that in the first 10 months of the current year, 1944, 18.4 percent of our lend-lease exports to the United Kingdom was still foodstuffs and other agricultural products.

It would seem obvious, therefore, in view of the fact that our lend-lease exports to Britain are determined after the closest possible study of conditions within that country by our representatives on the scene, and after conference with Government agencies in this country, such as the War Production Board, which are responsible for the maintenance of our domestic economy, that lend-lease supplies are sent abroad to our allies in accordance with the intent of the Lend-Lease Act to strengthen the defense of the United States by strengthening the defense of our allies without crippling our domestic economy.

Discussing the recent report of the President to the Congress on the operation or reverse lend-lease, Mr. MILLER, after citing that phase of the report dealing with transportation of American troops to England in British ships, said that the President "did not state how much money the War Department or some agency was paying in addition for the transportation of these troops." He indicated a desire to ask someone representing the administration the following question: "What, if anything, is it costing this country when troops are transported to England on English ships? Is this a part of lend-lease; if not, why not?"

In the seventeenth report to Congress on lend-lease operations it is pointed out that approximately one-third of all the supplies and equipment currently required by our armed forces in the European theater of operations between June 1, 1942, and June 30, 1944, was supplied by the British as reverse lend-lease aid, without payment by us. The British supplied us with everything we needed that they were able to produce in sufficient quantities. This includes transportation on British ships, for which the United States does not pay anything. Our men have been and are being carried in British ships as a phase of reverse lend-lease.

In his remarks Mr. MILLER used a quotation which he attributed to a statement issued by Secretary of State Stettinius, Secretary Morgenthau, and myself, as a special committee of the Government on lend-lease and reverse lend-lease discussions with the British. The quotation was as follows:

"Lend-lease aid to the United Kingdom will be liberalized following the defeat of Germany to include materials for improving British living conditions."

This sentence did not appear in our statement, as an examination of a copy of the statement, which I am enclosing, and which was issued to the press on November 30, 1944, will disclose. In the statement we reaffirm the frequently repeated statement of lend-lease policy to the effect that—

"From the beginning of the lend-lease program in March 1941 lend-lease aid has been extended for one purpose, and for one purpose only, the defense of the United States and to enable our allies to bring the full weight of their men and resources to bear against our common enemies."

We add—

"That policy will be continued without change."

The only paragraphs in our statement which would seem to have any kinship with that of Mr. MILLER were the following:

"After the defeat of Germany the United Kingdom and the United States will both use all the fighting power that is required for the earliest possible defeat of Japan. It is likely, however, that both the United Kingdom and the United States will be able to reconvert part of their resources on an equitable basis to meet essential civilian needs in the period between the defeat of Germany and the defeat of Japan. As a result of such a partial and equitable reconversion there will be some improvement in the conditions of life of the British people. For 6 years, first standing alone against the enemy and later fighting alongside our own forces on battlefields, on seas, and in the sky all over the world, they have endured privation in diet, had their houses destroyed about them, and have been sent to distant parts of the country to work wherever the needs of war called them. After the defeat of Germany, it is necessary that their inadequate diet be improved, temporary emergency housing be provided, and such other measures adopted as may relieve in some degree their present extremely difficult circumstances.

"This committee believes that a program which will help in achieving this objective is a matter of necessity for the most effective prosecution of the war against Japan and that it expresses in some measure the common bond which has carried our countries through the hard days of the war to approaching victory."

However, these paragraphs only state once more that we intend to maintain lend-lease in its traditional role, as an arm of our allies' and our own defense in the fighting of this war.

I have gone to some length in setting the record straight on the lend-lease picture because I am anxious that we shall not appear to be breaking faith with the men who are giving more than material to this struggle. I believe in justice to them, and to their parents and friends, also, that we should not permit mistaken impressions which would indicate that we on the home front are not doing everything possible to protect their interests to be freely circulated.

Sincerely yours,
LEO T. CROWLEY, *Administrator.*

---

13. FICTION

A Congressman who recently returned from a trip to England stated that he had seen "at least a square mile of American-made farm machinery, new tractors, plows, harrows, and disks, packed close together," which he understood had been sent from the United States under lend-lease.

FACT

Actually what was seen in England was a depot where American tractors with auxiliary equipment were stored preparatory to shipment to France to build military roads or assignments on war projects in England such as the clearance of ground for air bases. At certain times before and after the invasion of France there were as many as 500 to 600 tractors, with necessary equipment, at this depot awaiting shipment. They are continually moving either to the battle lines or to war tasks behind the lines. All equipment such as this which has been shipped to England has been recommended by representatives of the United States Government, including high-ranking military officers, who are constantly in touch with the situation in England and only recommend equipment which in their opinion will serve best in the winning of the war.

19. FICTION

A rumor which has been particularly irritating to the farmers of this country, who have been unable to get the farm machinery which they need, concerns the alleged storage in Algiers of a large number of combines which have been sent there under lend-lease.

FACTS

In the last 2 years approximately 230 combines were shipped to French North Africa. These represent but a fraction of 1 percent of our total production. We are being paid for all combines delivered in north Africa. An investigation carried on in Algiers last July disclosed that agricultural machinery shipped there was on its way to producing

areas within 10 to 12 days after arrival at port. There is a strict rationing system in effect which insures that machines go where they are most needed. The combines which we have shipped have served as replacements for equipment which has worn out or which was destroyed as a result of the war. They have aided north Africa to maintain production of food, large quantities of which have been furnished to United States forces in the Mediterranean as reverse lend-lease, and since D-day to metropolitan France.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 2013, known as the lend-lease bill, was reported out by the committee just a few days ago. It was not a unanimous report at that time; however there was a feeling on the part of a few of us who filed minority views that an effort should be made to reconcile the differences that existed. The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] was given the responsibility of attempting to work out a satisfactory amendment with Mr. Crowley and his able counsel. An amendment was worked out over the week-end and yesterday it was approved by the whole committee and it will be offered at the proper time. Credit, if any, must go chiefly to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] for his successful efforts to reconcile committee differences so there could be unanimity of action on the part of the committee today.

The bill comes to us again as a war measure; it is "to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States." Yet reports were current that the program was going far afield and was about to become a vehicle for post-war relief and rehabilitation. I am sure that many Members of the House have read newspaper and magazine accounts of alleged abuses of the program, which, of course, are denied by lend-lease authorities. In that connection, however, James M. Landis, former minister to the Middle East, and certainly pro-New Deal, made some pertinent comments with reference to the lend-lease program in the Middle East. In an interview by Louis M. Lyons, in the Boston Sunday Globe of February 4, 1945, he said:

> Of all the things that engendered the anti-British feeling in the Near East, the sorest when I got there was their handling of lend-lease. The area was full of rumor, some of it true. It was the first thing I went after, to correct it, not only for itself but to make a sound basis for Anglo-American unity. I think there is nothing wrong now. The British distributed lend-lease materials out there to meet civilian needs without reference to us. But that was our own fault. Our arrangements were so loose that they were violating no law in selling goods that we had consigned to their military. If you give a man free rein and he feels entitled to use it for purposes of his own that he can always relate somehow to the war.

And continuing, Mr. Landis said:

> I had to be very outspoken with the British at first. I said they must pay us for the lend-lease materials they had sold to the native population and governments for political or any other reasons. They wondered about me for a few minutes but then discovered that I was working in the interest of true American accord. I said the proceeds belonged to us. They saw the point so they paid. They coughed up millions of dollars of the proceeds of sales of our lend-lease out there.

Continuing, he said:

> Not a single item of lend-lease today is transferred out of the hands of the British military without our consent. That's important.

And further said he:

> I found we were pretending to operate an Anglo-American agency out there but we were really underwriting British policy. I felt we should have our own policy and play our own part.

It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the lend-lease program is so vast in scope that abuses are bound to arise unless there is vigorous attention to the details of the program. It seems quite certain that we shall never know just what has happened with this entire program until the war is over and Congress can begin a detailed study of all that has transpired. A short time ago, another sour note with reference to the program was expressed by one Samuel D. Marble, writing in the Christian Century for February 21, 1945, in an article dealing with U. N. R. R. A. He had this to say about lend-lease:

> In this case, however, our affection for U. N. R. R. A. does not prevent us from having other enthusiasms and our divided loyalty goes far to explain the muddled state of affairs. Perhaps the decisive reason why the international relief machinery has produced so little is that it cannot meet the compensation we have chosen to give it in the form of the American lend-lease organizations. This agency is also in the business of giving away supplies which are increasingly for civilian consumption. Probably the United Nations relief administration will never in its lifetime distribute as much material as the Lend-Lease office has shipped away in 1 year. The reason why needy nations prefer to do business with Lend-Lease is that this agency is able to give supplies on a protocol basis. It does not ask for an accounting nor pry into their use after they are delivered. Since the principal source of all these commodities is the United States there is no reason why Russia for example should stand in line to tap her rations through the U. N. R. R. A. bunghole so long as the barrel is open at the top. There is no reason why she should prepare a detailed justification for her requests when she can have what she wants without going to all the trouble. The relief administration on the other hand is bound by a variety of regulations and conventions. There is one rule for U. N. R. R. A. and another for Lend-Lease. If in the use of international conduct it is possible to think of such a thing as a double standard, then U. N. R. R. A. must be feminine, for in her case the expectations are far more exacting.
>
> The Office of Foreign Economic Administration, of which Lend-Lease is a part, is at present transporting supplies to all the Allied Nations and to Italy as well. Because the detailed operations of this Office are highly secret, it is impossible to say what portion of the materials presently being shipped abroad is for civilian use. However, enough is known to make it clear that the United States, with a virtual monopoly of exportable surplus and means of transportation is in a position to render the relief agency virtually functionless by diverting supplies through other channels.

Mr. Chairman, if I sense the attitude of my constituents correctly, they, too, are asking pertinent questions regarding lend-lease operations. If any criticism is to be directed toward the program at all, it would seem to me to be that heretofore the entire lend-lease program has been surrounded with an air of secrecy. The time has now come, it seems to me, for a frank statement of this whole program, and although we are now entering into another phase of it from this point on, we must deal frankly and honestly with the people of this country.

It was my purpose, Mr. Chairman, to offer a simple resolution confining the program for the balance of the war to military lend-lease only. The resolution I propose would have been something like this:

> *Provided, however,* That henceforth all aid provided for herein shall be limited to the weapons of war, all having a military-end use.

I would have contended that lend-lease, being originally designed as part of our program for national defense that it should not now be used as a vehicle for a post-war relief or rehabilitation agency. I am now of the opinion that the committee amendment accomplishes the same objective I had in mind, namely, that it is a prohibition designed to prevent the President from using the program for post-war purposes. Yet it will provide weapons of war for our allies until the end of the war.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman will recall that when the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] returned from Europe a short time ago he reported to us that he had seen a square mile of American-made farm machinery that was packed in just as tight as they could possibly get them at a point about 60 miles north of London; that Britain had sold a thousand units of this farm machinery, consisting of tractors, plows, disks, and so forth, to the Egyptians, and it is the further information we get that Britain is acting as a sort of wholesaler of American-made farm machinery to all parts of the world. This is being done, I am told, under lend-lease. Is there any Member on the floor of the House who can justify transactions of that kind, more especially at this time when there is such a crying need for labor-saving machinery on our farms to take the place of boys who have been drafted into the military service?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I can only say to the gentleman, in answer to his question, that the authorities deny that such a situation exists. As a matter of fact, it was inquired into and the authorities tell us that the situation does not exist.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] was taken up to this place by an American Army colonel who protested the manner in which we were being hornswoggled.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is it not true that the entire Near East and middle

eastern program of lend-lease is shortly to be terminated, and as far as Africa is concerned it is to be terminated on July 1, 1945, which will mean that there will not be any more abuses in that territory?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is right. Of course, that applies to the Middle East. The gentleman was talking about a situation that existed in England.

Mr. KNUTSON. What assurance have we that these abuses and misuses will not be continued in Europe?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. All we have to rely on, it seems to me, is the integrity of these people who are administering the program.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. In answer to the gentleman regarding the assurances, I do not believe that the House could get any better assurance than that given by the officers administering lend-lease that such a condition does not exist. The record contains many statements by Administrator Crowley and other people that such a condition does not exist.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, all we have had within the last 12 years is assurance, assurance; spending, spending; taxing, taxing; electing, electing.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I just point out that Mr. Landis in his statement has now assured us, and so testified, that that entire situation in the Middle East has been corrected. It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the lend-lease program is so vast in scope that abuses are bound to arise. It seems quite certain that we shall never know just what has happened with the entire program until the war is over.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, early in 1941 an historic debate took place over an original and daring plan called lend-lease. National organizations took their stand for and against this measure. Because I was active in Illinois in one of those groups which from the start supported the new policy, I am glad to make my first statement in the House on this subject.

Perhaps because of my long-term interest in this matter, my mail has been heavy since hearings on the extension of lend-lease opened in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Civic leaders and dozens of citizens have been reminding me that lend-lease was created a weapon for victory 4 years ago. The war has now reached its crisis. The tempo is augmenting and we must use every ounce of our strength to finish the job. We dare not set aside our chosen weapon or fumble with it at this time.

In 1941 many distinguished national organizations endorsed lend-lease and ever since have assumed its continuance without hampering amendments throughout the war. Among the women's organizations solidly supporting extension are:

American Association of University Women.
American Federation of Teachers.
Association for Nursery Education.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.
Girls Friendly Society of the U. S. A.
National board, Y. W. C. A.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National League of Women Voters.
National Service Star Legion.
National Women's Trade Union League.

Those of us who supported lend-lease in 1941 did so because we believed that the surest way to keep war away from America was to help those nations which were resisting aggression. Already Hitler had conquered most of Europe and Britain stood alone with her best equipment lost at Dunkerque. If Britain went down and her Navy were taken over by the enemy, as looked all too likely, our own chance was poor to continue the American way of life, an island of freedom in a totalitarian world. At the risk of reprisals from the dictators, we decided therefore to become the arsenal of democracy and to aid those few nations which continued the fight.

In a sense we were purchasing time to prepare ourselves. At this period, however, there were still many who believed that we could do business with Hitler and keep the peace with Hirohito. New light since that time and the disclosure of the plans of the dictators have justified the wisdom of our decision in 1941. The dictators' schedule called for the destruction one by one of its victims. Happily, and with the help of our supplies, other great powers were still fighting the enemy when war came to America.

The policy of immediate credit and rapid transfer of supplies I have called original because it enabled the industrial nations to pool the necessary resources at once in order to bind into a unified strategy the striking power of numerous allies. In dollars we have spent on lend-lease only about 16 percent of what we have spent on our total war effort. But that 16 percent has forged the links of the grand alliance which is winning the war in all parts of the world. It has coordinated action. All planning today and for the future is based upon the principle of mutual aid, which this act developed.

The pooling of materials and labor has earned dividends many times on the original investment. Strategic items have uncorked bottlenecks of production. As an example, alloys have been sent to help produce steel in Russia, aluminum to help produce planes, and small amounts of American farm equipment have helped multiply the necessary harvests in Britain.

The all-important fact is that lend-lease is speeding victory. What that means to us is that American lives are being saved, thousands upon thousands of them. This is the supreme fact which concerns us today.

Our factories have been able to turn out more munitions, more planes and tanks than we could effectively use. Elsewhere there were men eager to fight the common foe but without weapons or money to purchase them. The creative statesmanship behind lend-lease placed those surplus weapons in the hands that needed them. Because of that sharing, our allies were able to use their manpower more fully and to increase the mobility and fire power of their troops. As an example, lend-lease has equipped a French Army of 8 divisions with 300 supporting units and an air force of 1,500 men. This Army has played an impressive part in the liberation of Europe. In the Mediterranean theater is another example; our troops form only about one-fifth of the total number, but British and American lend-lease have jointly equipped Polish, Brazilian, South African, Indian, and French troops which comprise the rest. In those sections where they fight, our men need not fight. A like story can be told of sea power where American-made ships have been equipped and manned by our allies. Every enemy that our allies put out of combat means fewer enemies for American boys to face.

Since this is a joint struggle, we cannot put more value on American planes than on the English boys shot down in them. Who can say that the tanks sent to the eastern front were of greater value than the Russian youths who manned them? Our allies have suffered heavier blood losses than we, but in helping them to help themselves, we have reduced the losses for all.

We loaned our neighbor a hose when his house was on fire. It was good for the neighbor but it was not entirely altruism on our part for we hoped that the fire would be put out on his property before it spread to ours. It did finally leap over to one end of our yard and then, of course, we all rolled up our sleeves and our young men grabbed another length of hose and went after the fire in earnest. I do not know what our neighbors would think if we paused now to consider taking back the hose which we had loaned. But I do know that our American fighting men would have cause for fury. Until the fire is stamped out, we must wholeheartedly go on extinguishing it and must not pause to consider at what o'clock we shall drag home the hose.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, 4 years ago, on the 11th of March 1941, the original Lend-Lease Act went into effect. During the weeks immediately preceding the adoption of this historic legislation I expressed my wholehearted support of the proposed program in New Hampshire through the press, over the radio, and on the public platform. The people of my State were for this legislation. They have given it their enthusiastic support from its inception. Since becoming a Member of this House in January 1943, I have had the opportunity on two occasions to vote for the extension of lend-lease. As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the present Congress, I voted to report favorably the bill

now under consideration. This resolution will continue lend-lease for another year, to June 30, 1946. I hope the Congress will vote for this extension overwhelmingly. Let us, by passing this bill, with unanimity send an announcement to our already collapsing enemies that we are determined to prosecute the war with ever-increasing determination and vigor until Germany and Japan surrender unconditionally.

When the Lend-Lease Act first became a law this country was not engaged in hostilities but Europe was overrun by the Nazi hordes and the defenders of freedom were hard pressed. The invasion of Russia was to occur in a period of approximately 3 months. Lend-lease gave encouragement to those who were so gallantly resisting Hitlerism. It afforded much needed aid to the countries striving to check Nazi aggression. The Congress realized that the defense of those who were fighting Germany was vital to the interests of the United States of America. The formulation and the adoption of the Lend-Lease Act is evidence of far-sighted American statesmanship, and will remain in our history as an imperishable monument to the Congress that adopted it. Under lend-lease we have given invaluable assistance to our allies. The efforts of the United Nations have been unified. It was a most important step in preparing American industry for the great task of producing war materials for this unparalleled conflict.

From the beginning of lend-lease in those dark days of 1941, the United Nations have successfully turned the tide of Hitlerism which so sinisterly threatened freedom. Since 1941 we have come a long way. Victory after victory has been scored. Today our troops stand in triumph on the east bank of the Rhine. The heart of every American is thrilled as the good news continues to pour in from the battle fronts of Europe and the Pacific. It may be only a matter of weeks before we witness the complete and final collapse of Hitler's regime of hate and murder. In all our victories lend-lease has played a most prominent and a most vital part. Lend-lease and reverse lend-lease have been highly effective weapons for the United Nations.

In the fighting of modern war thousands of items are essential. Lend-lease consists of goods transferred, such as munitions, petroleum products, industrial products, agricultural products, and services rendered. The Foreign Economic Administration has listed 10 categories under the types of items lend-lease has made available to our allies. They include ordnance and ammunition, aircraft and parts, tanks, and other motor vehicles and parts, watercraft and parts, machinery, metals, petroleum products, foodstuffs, agricultural products other than foodstuffs, and miscellaneous materials. I have referred to these items since they illustrate the complexity and the magnitude of modern industrial warfare. Practically every substance on earth is a defense item.

Ninety-eight percent of the lend-lease aid has been furnished to our major allies—the Soviet Union, the British Commonwealth, China, and France. Through December 31, 1944, lend-lease aid totaled $35,382,646,000. Since that time, according to a letter written by Leo T. Crowley, Foreign Economic Administrator, to the President in recognition of the fourth anniversary of lend-lease, the figures for January 1945 are about $1,175,000,000, bringing the total lend-lease aid through January 1945 to over $36,500,000,000. These figures symbolize the extent of the program. They speak eloquently for the effectiveness of this most telling war weapon.

For several weeks the Foreign Affairs Committee has held extensive hearings on this bill. The review of the lend-lease program by the committee has been extremely searching. We have meticulously scrutinized every phase of this giant undertaking. Not a single witness appeared before the committee in opposition to the extension of lend-lease. Detailed reports were made by all those connected with the carrying out of the program. To date 18 reports have been submitted to Congress on its operation. No act has received a more thorough congressional review. The rumors concerning lend-lease so frequently heard were investigated and found to be without basis. The results of the investigation under the title "Lend-Lease Fact and Fiction" are included in the record of the hearings.

With the adoption of the proposed committee amendment all fear that lend-lease will be employed in the post-war period will be dispelled. The committee amendment will write into the law the position taken by the Foreign Economic Administrator that lend-lease is a war measure and should not be used after the war is over. Lend-lease and reverse lend-lease in both the European and the Pacific theaters of warfare are devastating weapons against our enemies. Lend-lease has made possible the pooling of the material resources of the United Nations. It has greatly augmented our cooperative effort. It gave courage to and sustained our allies in the darkest period of this conflict. It was a vital step in preparing this Nation for total war. Lend-lease has, without doubt, been a major factor in shortening this struggle. Thousands of lives have been and will be saved by lend-lease. We are at the dawn of victory. Our efforts must not be slackened. We cannot conceive of discontinuing lend-lease. To do this would be a serious blow to our allies and to our own war effort. We must continue lend-lease until every enemy is completely overcome. After hostilities cease let us hope that the same spirit of cooperation which has characterized our lend-lease activities will permeate the thinking of the statesmen in the post-war period. Such a spirit of cooperation will be most effective in the construction of a decent international society of permanent peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is appropriate at this time, under the discussions having to do with the extension of the Lend-Lease Act, that we say a few words about China and the situation in that country and in that part of the world.

Lend-lease aid to China started in mid-1941. Up to July 1, 1944, the following amounts of supplies had been shipped from the United States for Chinese account: In long tons, 303,262.22; in dollar value, $371,645,836. Approximately 232,000 of these tons were shipped to India. The balance was shipped to Rangoon or sunk en route.

About half this amount still remains in inventory in India, while the rest has either been flown into China, issued to Chinese troops in India, or put to use by American or British troops in India.

The greatest single effort to aid China has been applied to building up the Air Transport Command operation which rose from a few tons a month to a total now of approximately 44,000 tons a month. Approximately 210,000 tons of supplies have been flown into Kunming, China, from India between April 1942 and July 1, 1944.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to interrupt my friend, who knows so well his subject and who is speaking about China and the aid this country has given the Chinese people. I do it because he has just mentioned Kunming. Visiting the Capitol this afternoon, greeting our Vice President and Speaker and many Members—and I trust he will shake hands with the gentleman from Montana also—is Dr. S. Y. Chen, a 29-year-old Chinese doctor who gave vital medical care to Capt. Ted Lawson and his four companions when they crashed in China after the 1942 raid on Tokyo, and has just arrived in the United States. Dr. Shen-yen Chen will study surgery for 2 years at American Government expense. This chance to realize an ambition which he has long had is given to him as a gesture of appreciation of his sacrifice and risk in tending the injured American flyers behind the Japanese lines and guiding them to safety in Free China.

Dr. Chen's story is well known to Americans who have read or seen the screen version of Captain Lawson's book, Thirty Seconds Over Tokyo. The young Chinese doctor was working in his father's hospital in an inland city in Japanese-occupied territory when the Tokyo raiders were brought in by their guerilla rescuers. At great personal risk and refusing all compensation, Dr. Chen and his father treated the wounded flyers.

As soon as the men were well enough to move, young Dr. Chen traveled with them on the long journey to Kunming to make sure of their safety. There he

parted with the flyers in June 1942. Since that time Dr. Chen has been in the Medical Detachment of the Chinese Air Force in Chungking. The invitation for him to study in America was extended by the Department of State in connection with its program of cultural relations with China.

I feel that when we speak of the Chinese we should give real words of credit not only to that great nation but to those individuals like Dr. Chen, slight of stature but staunch of soul.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I thank the gentleman and wish to say there are millions of other Dr. Chens in China who have rendered great service helping to get flying personnel who have been forced down behind the Japanese lines back to their own headquarters. To Dr. Chen and to his people we owe a great debt for their assistance to us and for their 7½-year battle against Japan.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I am delighted to.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The gentleman now addressing us is well qualified to testify with reference to the Chinese people because of the fact that he spent many years of residence in China before this war, and only within recent months made a trip of investigation to China. I am glad to corroborate what was said by the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I thank the gentleman.

More than half of the tonnage shipped into China represents supplies for the Fourteenth Air Force and equipment for Chinese troops used by Stilwell in his attempt to recapture the Burma Road. Only a very small amount of supplies is delivered to the Chinese to do with as they see fit, the largest part of which consists of materials for the Chinese arsenals. Even when the supplies reach Kunming they have 800 or more miles to go to reach fighting fronts and the transportation forward from Kunming to Chungking and every other part of China totaled only approximately 3,000 tons per month in May 1944 and is only about 7,000 tons per month now.

The principal direct assistance supplied by the United States to her Chinese ally is that furnished by the Fourteenth Air Force. Since July 4, 1942, when the Fourteenth Air Force took over from the American volunteer group, it has sunk more than a million tons of Japanese shipping and has provided constant interference with Japanese internal communications in China. The Fourteenth Air Force was the most important factor in delaying for months the late Japanese invasion into Kwangsi and Kweichow and still controls the air over China. Under Gen. Claire Chennault it has performed magnificently during the course of this war and its assistance to China has been invaluable. Insofar as the present situation is concerned, there are many pressing problems in China today calling for action both by China and the United States.

Chiang Kai-shek and Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer, commander in chief in China, should be given the maximum possible tonnage of supplies flown into China, because they will make them count more than any other operation being conducted on the Asiatic mainland.

The Ledo-Burma Road operation should be realistically appraised. It is obvious that it will take some time to get this road in full operating condition, to get pipe lines operating beside it, and that its total tonnage will be relatively limited, though extremely useful.

The Stilwell program for training Chinese soldiers should continue, but it should be borne in mind that no policy of extreme paternalism by the United States Army will be long tolerated by the rising nationalism of China. The training must be both of officers and men. Except for short periods of time, the leadership in operations must come from the Chinese themselves, tactfully implemented where possible by American advisers.

A port on the China coast should be opened at the earliest possible date. A realistic program should be developed for utilizing this port when it is opened. Food and cotton cloth in some quantities will be necessary. Finished ordnance and other equipment for Chinese troops should be supplied in this way to the extent that they can be used practically. Principal emphasis should be on supplies to improve China's near extinct internal transportation, such as trucks, watercraft, gasoline, spare parts. Fifteen thousand especially designed trucks are now being built for China pursuant to plans worked out and more will be needed. Large quantities of medical and public-health supplies will be needed also.

Speaking of internal transportation within China I should like to remark that the least understood fact about aid to China is the difficulty of absorbing the aid within China once the obstacle of the Hump is overcome. For instance, in December 1943 it was ascertained that whereas we were at the time flying in about 10,000 tons of cargo a month into Kunming the ground transportation facilities within China did not exceed about 2,500 tons a month out of Kunming. Today a similar serious situation prevails. My latest information is that over-the-Hump tonnage is running over 40,000 tons a month, but that ground transport has not yet reached 7,000 tons a month.

I do not know whether, if the Chinese had had their choice, they would have preferred to have the supplies themselves rather than have had General Chennault consume them in the form of aviation gasoline and bombers of the Twentieth Bomber Command use them in B–29 raids over Japan, but whatever the tactical decision might have been, there really was no choice.

However, I do think that any fair appraisal of the situation would conclude that so far as tonnage is concerned, we have put in all the tons across the Hump that anybody could ever expect us to do. Indeed, I feel that in attempting the Ledo Road project we tried to put in too much aid to China in one sense of the word. In pinning our faith on this very difficult military operation and road-building project we failed to evaluate the cost of this project in terms of other things that could have been done. I think there has been enough discussion of this idea above to show you what I am driving at. It is a common saying among people in China that we swapped Myitkyina for southeast China, and certainly there is much to be said for the argument of those who take that view.

The current attacks on lend-lease aid to China are generally based on an analysis of the tonnage actually delivered to the Chinese for their own use. Some people have wished to cross off as aid to China supplies to General Chennault or to the B–29 project. They even wished to put in a separate category supplies which have been given to troops within China—the Yoke force—which have been operating more or less under General Stilwell's, and lately General Wedemeyer's, direction in connection with the Burma campaign. I think that the foundation of this point of view is very debatable. In the broad sense, the real aid to China has and will continue to be the activities of our Pacific Fleet. Once one recognizes the fact that the Burma Road will contribute but will not be the real supply route to China, and probably never could have been, one will then appreciate that in a true military sense it has always been necessary to wait until our fleet could drive through to the sea coast. The immensity of the operations of our fleet, the amounts of money, and the number of lives at stake in trying to liberate China—although we are also trying to beat our enemy Japan—would perhaps beggar the lend-lease to any other nation.

I should like at this time to bring to the attention of the House the fine spirit of cooperation which exists between the F. E. A. in China and the Army in that theater. Furthermore, the cooperation between these two groups and the Chinese Government is on a sound and mutually agreeable basis.

The chief of the China Section of the F. E. A., Mr. Whiting Willauer, and the acting head of the agency in Chungking, Mr. William Stanton, have done a remarkably fine job in trying to attend to the needs of the Army and the Chinese Government. I was informed while visiting the headquarters of the F. E. A. in Chungking that of all the material sent into China, 60 percent goes to the Fourteenth Air Force and the Twentieth Bomber Command with no lend-lease connection whatsoever; 30 percent goes to the Y force, the Z force, and the S. O. S.; 10 percent goes to lend-lease, is administered by Mr. Stanton, and is described as the C or civilian type of material. Of this 10 percent 70 percent is distributed through F. E. A. and 30 percent through the Army. These figures are for the first 9 months of 1944, and while I cannot say accurately what the situation has been down to date, it is my impression that the figures down to the present time would be just about the same. It is well to note that most of the material being sent into China is not lend-lease at all, but is primarily Army supplies.

It is my hope that lend-lease assistance to China will be stepped up as time goes on so that together America and China will be able to combine their joint efforts in contributing toward the defeat of Japan on an ever-increasing scale. This is necessary and important because for us the long war will be in Asia. It is there that this world-wide struggle will end and because of that we want China to assume her full share of the load in defeating our common enemy.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the remarks of the very charming young Member from Illinois as she recited the virtues of this legislation and all that it has accomplished. However, I notice that the Member from Illinois failed to tell us that this law, which was finally enacted on March 11, 1941, was but one of many of President Roosevelt's devices for keeping the country out of war. Lend-lease has already cost the American taxpayers $35,000,000,000 more than the total cost of World War No. 1. Think of it. And as I understand, there is very little bookkeeping in connection with its operation, and that those who sit in high and powerful places have assured our collaborationists, if I may use that word, time and again that they will not be called upon to repay any part thereof. There is no question but that lend-lease has done much good in prosecuting the war but it will not be needed when hostilities cease unless the Congress intends to tax the American people for the post-war cost of rehabilitating of the war-devastated areas.

I freely concede that it has contributed toward the shortening of the war and to putting new heart into allies who were pretty much discouraged when we got into the war, although you would not think so by the way some of them are acting now. But it has done much good. On the other hand, it has also been badly abused.

We recall that when the gentleman from Nebraska, Dr. MILLER, returned from England not long ago, he told us of a vast field of power farm machinery in storage in a place about 60 miles north of London, all American made. Britain was acting as a sort of superretail salesman on the lot. Only a few days before Dr. MILLER visited this place in company with an American Army colonel who wanted to show Dr. MILLER how badly it was being abused, the British Government had sold 10, or was it a thousand units consisting of three pieces, a tractor, plow, and disc, to the Egyptians.

It is my information that farm machinery under lend-lease is going to all parts of the world by way of London, all of which, of course, will redound to the benefit of our allies when the war is over, but I suppose what credit we will get out of it we can put in one eye.

Then there is the case of the British brigadier who registered at the Waldorf. I am told they took him up to the suite of rooms and, as he looked around in awe and admired the sumptuous furnishings, he said, "My, ain't lend-lease wonderful?"

Then, of course, I am disposed to feel a little more kindly toward lend-lease when I think how it has contributed to the mellowness and the happiness of the innumerable cocktail parties that are being held in some of our best hotels. Far be it from me to condemn anything that contrbutes to the happiness of the world, particularly at this time when we are at war and everybody has plenty of troubles of his own.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman is criticizing the lend-lease program.

Mr. KNUTSON. No; I do not want the gentleman to use the word "criticize" because I am not criticizing. I am merely making some observations.

Mr. RICHARDS. Did the gentleman hear the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] refer to an amendment a while ago that cures all the aches and pains of lend-lease? Does the gentleman think that will remedy the situation any?

Mr. KNUTSON. If this House will adopt an amendment that will safeguard the interests of the American taxpayers, who have to pay the bill in the final analysis—well, frankly, I do not believe there are enough economy-minded Members in the House to adopt such an amendment, unfortunately.

Mr. RICHARDS. Does the gentleman believe that this amendment agreed upon remedies the situation, like the majority in the House?

Mr. KNUTSON. Some lawyers say "yes" and some say "no." Not being a lawyer, I cannot add anything to the confusion.

They tell me you can go up to Canada and get all the beef you want, without points, without any restrictions. The reason is that Britain is not buying much beef up in Canada. She likes American beef with that lease-lend flavor. Of course, American beef is corn fed. That also perhaps has something to do with it, because we who come from the Corn Belt think there is no beef in all the world like corn-fed beef.

I hope we will not go into this extension blindly. To me it is inconceivable that the Congress would vote to extend lend-lease if it contains a provision that will permit the administration to enter into commitments that may not be fulfilled for the next 10 or 15 years.

Some say "Yes" and some say "No." Again, not being a lawyer, and my good friend from New York not being a lawyer, neither one of us can add anything to the confusion.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Why, certainly.

Mr. BLOOM. Did I understand the gentleman to say something about Canada and lend-lease? I do not know whether I understood the gentleman correctly, but may I state that Canada is not a participant in lend-lease at all.

Mr. KNUTSON. I understand that. I merely said the British prefer to buy their beef in this country because they like the lend-lease flavor, fortified by corn, of course.

Mr. BLOOM. I see.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. I note in a release of lend-lease of March 11, 1945, it is indicated that Canada accepted the principles of lend-lease on November 30, 1942.

Mr. BLOOM. Canada is not a participant in lend-lease at all.

Mr. STEFAN. Canada merely accepted the principles of it; is that it?

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman say they accept the principles?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. No.

Mr. KNUTSON. I would be surprised if any of our allies should refuse to accept anything.

Mr. STEFAN. They accepted the principle of lend-lease on November 30, 1942.

Mr. BLOOM. Does the gentleman say they accepted the principle of it?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. We have not a lend-lease agreement between the United States and Canada. The gentleman does not mean to say we are sending lend-lease goods to Canada?

Mr. STEFAN. The notice I have indicates that Canada, on November 30, 1942, accepted the principles of lend-lease.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. Could the gentleman tell the House, and I think this is quite important, under what arrangements, if we know anything about the arrangements, do we send gasoline to Great Britain and sell it to them for 15 cents a gallon and then purchase it from Great Britain for use in our airplanes and jeeps and so forth over there for 40 cents a gallon.

Mr. KNUTSON. I presume that is true; yes, I have had a number of letters to that effect. I will say that the returning Members of Congress who visited the European theater of war this winter have commented on that. The gentleman himself was over there so he knows whether it is true or not.

Of course, when it goes over there for 15 cents a gallon, it is lend-lease. When we buy it for 40 cents, it is lend-lease in reverse.

Mr. WADSWORTH. But we do not buy it. There is not a word of truth in that.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am just taking the gentlemen's word for it. There certainly must be some truth in it because there is so much smoke.

Mr. SHAFER. It certainly was told to us over there.

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes; by American officers.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to myself.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, indeed.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentlewoman very much. I simply wish to say, in commenting on the remark of

the gentleman from Minnesota about the sale and purchase of gasoline that we neither sell to nor buy gasoline from the United Kingdom.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have been asked to touch upon lend-lease insofar as it relates to lend-lease in the countries of the Western Hemisphere. During my attendance at the Inter-American Conference on War and Peace recently in Mexico City, I did not hear the subject of lend-lease discussed. I am also informed by other official delegates to the conference that there was no discussion upon that subject, which I think is extremely interesting.

I am very happy to report to the Congress that the delegates at the Inter-American Conference were extremely cooperative, helpful, and courteous in trying to work out measures that would solidify and unite the countries of the Western Hemisphere. I have never seen any group of delegates more helpful than were they. They would have gone farther in some of the military measures than possibly the United States delegates felt the Congress would approve at this time. But the Act of Chapultepec is a step in that direction and should be beneficial in the defense of the Western Hemisphere. Every country of the Western Hemisphere except Argentina was represented at the Conference. We passed a resolution that we hope will bring her into the family of Latin-American republics after she meets certain provisions therein and that she will be therefore eligible and asked to the Conference at San Francisco.

Lend-lease aid which we have extended to the republics of Latin America has been limited to weapons of war and other supplies having a military end-use. This aid has been rendered in the interest of our hemispheric defense and to help the other American republics protect the vital sea lanes to Africa and Europe.

The total amount of such aid to the end of 1944, including the value of goods transferred and services rendered, amounted to $290,500,000. This represented less than 1 percent of our total lend-lease aid to all countries. Brazil received approximately two-thirds of the aid extended to all of Latin America. We have furnished lend-lease aid to the following republics: Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, El Salvador, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

Brazilian soldiers and flyers, equipped in part by lend-lease, are fighting beside American troops in the Italian theater. The ships and planes which we have furnished to Brazil have enabled her to take over a large part of the antisubmarine patrol in the South Atlantic as Mexico and other Central American republics have done in the Caribbean, thus releasing United States naval and air forces for use in other areas. Brazil has made available to us the airport of Natal, which has been a vital factor in the air passage of American planes, including lend-lease planes, en route to Africa, Europe, and Russia. I saw Brazilian soldiers with the Fifth Army in Italy last October and they were of great assistance to General Clark, who was in command of the Sixth Army at that time.

A very short time ago a Mexican air force which was trained in Texas left for the Pacific and is now taking its place in the air forces of the other United Nations in the war against the Axis.

I would like to report to the Congress the intense interest that the delegates from Latin America showed in helping us to win the war and in keeping up their supply of war materials which are so vital to us. Our own delegates, advisers, and technicians worked early and late. Some worked all night in the closing days. Every one of the United States delegates felt grateful for what had been accomplished at Mexico City.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute. Our able Secretary of State, Mr. Stettinius; the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Nelson Rockefeller; the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. William Clayton were splendid leaders of our delegation. My colleagues of the Senate and House worked tirelessly for success at the conference.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I am sure the House is very grateful for the very fine report the gentlewoman has brought back from her recent visit to Latin America. I wonder if the gentlewoman was present in the Committee when this bill was considered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was present at two or three meetings. Unfortunately, I was in Mexico City at the Conference—in a number of them—but I was present at the last meeting of the Committee when the amendment, which is a part of the bill, was agreed to.

Mr. STEFAN. I was wondering whether the Committee, in discussing lend-lease, took into consideration that several lend-lease agreements were made with provisional governments in exile, which for the most part are no longer the recognized governments representing those nations.

For instance, Mihailovitch of Yugoslavia, the Greek situation, the Polish situation; were they discussed in the committee?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I was not at the hearing; I was at Mexico City when that was discussed. I think there are Members here, however, who did hear that discussion.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentlewoman give me time to ask that question?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; I yield myself 1 additional minute and yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. STEFAN. I ask the gentleman from New York if he can answer my question.

Mr. BLOOM. Is the gentleman talking about Mexico City?

Mr. STEFAN. No; about another subject. I wondered whether the committee in discussing the extension of lend-lease for another year discussed the matter of provisional governments and committees which are no longer in existence but with whom we made lend-lease agreements. What becomes of the money they owe us? What arrangements were made about transferring the obligations to governments and committees that are recognized now?

Mr. BLOOM. Would the gentleman kindly give one example?

Mr. STEFAN. I can give many examples, but one is Mihailovitch in Yugoslavia; another is the Polish situation.

Mr. BLOOM. We had no lend-lease equipment there that was not fully protected by proper agreements.

Mr. STEFAN. Oh, yes; we had lend-lease with Yugoslavia. The agreement was made on July 21, 1942.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

As soon as there is no further use for lend-lease in any of these countries it stops; that is all.

Mr. STEFAN. Do the hearings contain anything on this particular subject?

Mr. BLOOM. No; not in that way.

Mr. STEFAN. Many of these provisional governments and committees with whom we made lend-lease agreements are no longer in existence. Those agreements have stopped, but was any money transferred under lend-lease to those particular governments or committees?

Mr. BLOOM. If any money has come back it has gone into the revolving fund of lend-lease.

Mr. STEFAN. Does the gentleman believe we will get much back?

Mr. BLOOM. Either that or reverse lend-lease, or we get the property. The gentleman must remember that lend-lease never transferred the title of any of the property to any country, never does.

Mr. STEFAN. In other words, it has stopped, and if any money has been paid out we lose that money, that is all.

Mr. BLOOM. That is what the 3-year clean-up period is for, so we will have some opportunity of getting something out of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Chairman, to speak for lend-lease today is in a sense, I believe, unnecessary. I think we are all agreed that lend-lease must be continued. The vote on the original lend-lease bill constituted a commitment on the part of Congress, a commitment to the spirit, the intent, and the purpose of the act, an expression of faith and hope in the democratic future of this world. It was not a commitment for just a year but for the duration of the war. The continuous repassage of the bill is very much like the renewing of vows which the partners to a successful marriage make to one another on each anniversary of their union.

So it is really not lend-lease of which I wish to speak; I wish to speak of one of the byproducts which we receive from

lend-lease, which is not tabulated on any of the charts which we find in the committee hearings. It is found in the words of the testimony of some of those men who had to do with lend-lease, who appeared before us in the committee, men upon whose shoulders much of the prosecution of the war has rested. I would like to quote here the words of the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War:

What I wish to make clear is that all of these gigantic movements, covering so many vast theaters of combat in opposite portions of the globe have been successfully carried on by the smoothly coordinated efforts of a group of Allied Nations. These nations have faced powerful enemies who almost everywhere had the tremendous advantage of shorter and interior lines. Nothing but superb cooperation could have secured success against such odds. To that cooperation, the lend-lease machinery has been an indispensable assistance. Without its material aid, and the still more potent assistance of the good will which it has fostered, no such result could have been anticipated or effected.

Mr. Chairman, I say that without this good will which Secretary Stimson, Admiral Land, and others who appeared before the committee testified to, we could not have won this war. We will not win the peace without it either. I say that we have through the instrumentality of lend-lease a revolving fund from which we can spend, and I say, too, at this crucial hour that we must dip sparingly into that revolving fund. Words which can be the greatest spendthrift of good will must be used with greater wisdom and greater reserve than ever before. Unless we do, the peaceful world for which we all work today and for which millions are dying may never become a reality.

I remember the scarred faces and the maimed bodies I have seen as I walked through the hospitals. As the President said in this great Chamber, we do not talk into a vacuum. Words ring around the world. Words can destroy the peace we are trying to build for tomorrow. Words today recklessly spoken can fill hospitals 20 years from now.

Let us husband the good will that has come to us through the lend-lease program, knowing what a treasure we have with which to start the building of our new home for the future, in which all the men on the face of the earth must live.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the bill before the Committee today is one which every Member of the House should give more than passing attention. Before voting upon it, every one of us should ponder our fantastic national debt and also the fact that, before the wars in which we are engaged are over, it will be one to stagger the imagination.

Mr. Chairman, I volunteered and served through the Spanish War as a corporal of Company G, Thirty-third Michigan Volunteer Infantry, this being the Owosso Company in that regiment of the National Guard. We were a part of the expeditionary forces and were in action at the Battle of Santiago.

I volunteered and served for 2 years in the First World War as an infantry officer, serving 11½ months in that capacity with our expeditionary forces in France; returning to this country with the rank of major. When I volunteered I left at home a wife, a daughter of 11, and a son of 9. That son of nine is now a major in the United States Army, serving somewhere in the Philippines. I have not been informed as to the exact area of his activity. At the time of Pearl Harbor he had been very happily married for 10 years. Within a few days after that tragic event he volunteered for service and was accepted. He has an excellent record in the Army, and I am very proud of him. Early in life I taught him that every person who accepts the privileges of citizenship takes upon himself also the responsibilities of citizenship. With men those responsibilities include an obligation to defend the country, in the way they can best serve during great national emergencies. That is and should be inescapable to those physically capable of service.

MAKING THE WORLD SAFE FOR DEMOCRACY

I volunteered for service in the First World War, believing I was helping to "make the world safe for democracy," and that out of it all would grow a better understanding and relationship between nations. I had always believed that nations could get together, compromise their differences, and live at peace with each other if only the rulers and ruling classes of those nations would approach the agreement in a spirit of unselfishness and a determination to understand the problems of others.

After my return from France for demobilization in August 1919, I immediately returned to Europe on business and remained there for 6 months. During this time my business brought me in contact with the public officials of eight different countries. Very much to my surprise I found the ruling officials and classes had learned exactly nothing as a result of their participation in the war. The same suspicion of each other; the same sordid selfishness controlling their every action, and a total lack of knowledge gained from their experience was evident wherever I went. I will cite one case as typical. I made two trips to Poland from Paris in the winter of 1919–20. This was when Paderewski was Premier. My business was with the Government and brought me in contact with the Minister of Finance, a man by the name of Bielinski, a Galician Pole. You perhaps will recall that, after Poland was partitioned, by Russia, Germany and Austria in 1795, neither Russia nor Germany permitted a Pole to have anything whatsoever to do with government. Austria, wisely I think, utilized the services of outstanding Poles in governmental as well as other activities. Galicia was made a part of the Austrian loot at the time of partitioning.

At the outbreak of World War No. 1 in 1914, Minister of Finance Bielinski was a high official of the Austrian Government, and as such was one of the three men who signed the declaration of war against Serbia, such action precipitating the world's First World War. One would think that a man, whose hand had signed the document that had plunged nearly the whole world into war, thereby signing the death warrant of 10,000,000 of the world's finest young men and more than 40,000,000 civilians who died as a result of the war—and who had lived to see the government and nation of which he was a part completely dismembered, and destroyed economically, would have perceived something of the futility of war. Not so in the case of Mr. Bielinski, however.

When I was in Poland it was in the dead of winter and bitterly cold. Conditions were desperate. Bread lines everywhere. Poland had been the battleground over which the Russians and Germans had fought back and forth, each retreating army removing from the land all that could in any way be helpful to the pursuing army. The result was that every living thing was removed from the farms of the country. On my two trips there I rode for hours through some of the finest farming lands I have ever seen. I saw not one sign of life on any farm. There was no food for man or beast. The farmers had flocked into the cities, because it was there only that food was available in sufficient quantities to sustain life. Warsaw, a city of 700,000 prior to the war, had doubled in population because of these conditions. To show how completely denuded of animals Poland had become, it is only necessary to recall that in the bitter cold of winter such coal as was to be had was delivered by men hauling and pushing wagons through the streets. Apparently this was the only medium of fuel delivery in that great city. I saw women tramping through the snow with nothing on their feet but little slippers; no stockings and no overgarments that could protect them. Men were similarly ill clad. Conditions were as desperate as they could possibly be.

Notwithstanding this, however, controlling Polish officials, not satisfied with the boundary lines as laid down by the Versailles Peace Conference, had raised and poorly equipped an army of a million men. This army was pushing into Bolshevik territory seeking to reestablish the boundary lines that existed at the time of the partitioning previously mentioned. The fact that they had neither sufficient supplies nor arms to wage war successfully was apparently given little consideration.

I cannot believe that the Polish people who had suffered the ravages of war, as had few other peoples in all history, could possibly have approved this further war adventure. They, however, were powerless to prevent it.

In a conference with Mr. Bielinski one day I suggested that Poland probably was creating a great deal of unnecessary trouble for herself. Said he, "What do you mean by that?" "Your armies are pushing into Bolshevik territory," I responded, "and when spring comes and the Russians can move their armies and matériel against you they will drive you into the sea." The old gentleman with the utmost complacency and assurance declared, "Oh, that is not possible." This gentleman was highly intelligent, yet seemingly even his intelligence had enabled him to learn nothing as a result of one of the most disastrous wars that any nation had ever experienced. It is

interesting to note in this connection that the following spring the Russians did drive the Poles out of Russia and invade Poland. They nearly captured Warsaw and would have overrun the country had it not been for the aid extended by France. As I said before, the attitude of Bielinski typified that of others in like positions with whom I came in contact in the countries I visited.

DREAMS OF WORLD PEACE

It had been with great hopes for future world peace that I watched the proceedings at Versailles, but when the final draft of the treaty was published I finally realized that within the structure of the treaty itself was written what amounted to a prohibition of future peace.

The following quotation from the book, The Peace Negotiations, a personal narrative by Robert Lansing, Secretary of State under Woodrow Wilson during the Versailles Peace Conference, seems timely:

> The League of Nations, created by the treaty, is relied upon to preserve the artificial structure which has been erected by compromise of the conflicting interests of the great powers and to prevent the germination of the seeds of war which are sown in so many articles and which under normal conditions would soon bear fruit. The league might as well attempt to prevent the growth of plant life in a tropical jungle. Wars will come sooner or later.
>
> It must be admitted in honesty that the league is an instrument of the mighty to check the normal growth of national power and national aspirations among those who have been rendered impotent by defeat. Examine the treaty and you will find peoples delivered against their wills into the hands of those whom they hate, while their economic resources are torn from them and given to others. Resentment and bitterness, if not desperation, are bound to be the consequences of such provisions. It may be years before these oppressed peoples are able to throw off the yoke, but as sure as day follows night the time will come when they will make the effort.
>
> This war was fought by the United States to destroy forever the conditions which produced it. Those conditions have not been destroyed. They have been supplanted by other conditions equally productive of hatred, jealousy, and suspicion. In place of the Triple Alliance and the Entente has arisen the quintuple alliance which is to rule the world. The victors in this war intend to impose their combined will upon the vanquished and to subordinate all interests to their own.

Mr. Chairman, the prophets of old could not have looked into the future more clearly than did Mr. Lansing, who was at the elbow of President Wilson all during the conference.

It was a most significant fact that we were the only nation of the many represented at Versailles that asked for nothing, except that the nations of the world live at peace with one another. Every other nation represented there reached out with greedy hands and clutched everything they could possibly secure. There was not a single exception to this. If anything further were needed to convince me that the ruling classes of the world were not yet ready for permanent peace, it was my experience in Europe and my contacts with the ruling classes thereof.

FRANCE WAS BLED WHITE

I had been in France on business shortly after we entered the war in April 1917. I returned to this country in time to enter the second officers' training camp. While in Paris, Georges Despret, French delegate minister of commerce, said to me: "Mr. WOODRUFF, when the United States came into this war we were defeated. We were bled white. It is only the fact that your armies are coming that gives us the courage to hang on until you get here." Other French citizens told me the same thing. What they said was confirmed by what I saw when I was on the train between Bordeaux and Paris. Everywhere old men, women, and little children were working in the fields. One occasionally would see among them a man in uniform, evidently a soldier either on furlough or recovering from wounds. Every able-bodied man was in the army. France had fought a gallant fight. Her casualties could be counted by the millions. Her resources were expended. She was defeated, and she knew it. There can be no question that our getting into the war saved France. With her out of it, Britain could not possibly have won. The war would speedily have ended disastrously for both nations.

OUR CONTRIBUTION TO ALLIED SUCCESS IN WORLD WAR I

When once we entered the war we did so wholeheartedly. We loaned our allies billions "on the cuff." We moved our armies and supplies to the western front and to other battle areas. It was not long before we had 2,000,000 fighting men in France. We built and equipped railroads. We built harbors and docks. We established a complete telephone and telegraph system that covered every area throughout France in which our troops were located; in fact, we provided every facility we needed for the efficient functioning of our Army of 2,000,000, all of which facilities we left in France. These things had cost us more than two billion dollars. France offered us $400,000,000 for the whole lot. It was only a promise. She never paid us a dollar on the account and presumably is still using the equipment and facilities. We also moved our Navy to European waters, thus helping to close the seas to the German Navy.

Our losses were: 39,362 killed in action; 14,009 died of wounds; 75,460 died of disease; 1,297 died of accidents and other causes; 192,369 were wounded in action; 786,738 have since died, many of them from disabilities incurred in their service. It has cost us $13,721,000,000 for these disabled veterans and their dependents since the war. It will cost us $1,300,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1945. This includes relief to veterans of the present war and their beneficiaries. These costs will skyrocket before the present war ends.

WE ASKED FOR NOTHING

We knew our costs down the years growing out of the war would be staggering. Yet we asked for nothing at Versailles—not one dollar of indemnity, not one foot of territory. Naturally we expected the loans, which Congress cut more than in half when the final settlement was agreed upon, would be paid. We reduced the interest rate to the point where it was almost nonexistent. Our debtor nations agreed this was a fair settlement. Notwithstanding this, however, it was not long before the French named us "Uncle Shylock" and the British led all other debtor nations, except Finland, in their repudiation of the debts.

At no time did our former allies so conduct themselves as to cause us to believe honesty or gratitude had any place in their thinking. Are we justified in believing our experience in this war will be greatly different, except in increased degree, than it was during and following the other one, unless we proceed with care and confine our activities and efforts to cooperating with our allies, and not permit ourselves to continue to be persuaded to carry far more than our proper share of the burdens past, present, and future?

THE PRESENT SITUATION AS COMPARED TO THAT OF WORLD WAR I

The present situation differs from the other in that from the very first the beneficiaries of lend-lease, so-called, were not asked either to pay for or to return the supplies, matériel, and money we have placed in their hands. We will not be repaid for any part of our contributions of money or goods.

In a report which came to our desks a few days ago, I learn we have disposed of thirty-six of the seventy-four billions of the one-time available lend-lease funds—thirty-six thousand millions of dollars. A lot of money you will agree. I think also that, if no further appropriations are made, there is an ample balance to more than take care of any justified expenditures.

Such supplies as have been delivered by us to the beneficiaries, with the exception of Canada, who has not accepted lend-lease, New Zealand and Australia—both of whom have about offset our contributions to them—constitute token payments only. Already we are being urged to recognize the "blessings" which would follow a continuation of lend-lease after the war.

MORE POST-WAR BILLIONS TO EUROPEAN NATIONS

We are now informed that it is the purpose of high authority to leave in Europe everything we have over there, including all supplies and equipment for our own armies—supplies, railroad, and other equipment of value in peacetime, war supplies and equipment, including all ordnance and ammunition. Whether this includes all our warplanes is not clear. From usually reliable sources we hear that we already are committed to the further gift of five billions in lend-lease to Russia and six billions to Great Britain after the armistice. We also hear of six billions to China. Recently it was officially announced by the State Department that we have signed up with France to extend lend-lease in the amount of $2,575,000,000 to be used also after the war. While the billions are being passed around, how many are to go to Belgium, Holland, Greece, Italy,

and all the other nations which have suffered from this war? It was only a few days ago that General De Gaulle affronted our President by refusing to see him. Can the $2,575,000,000 be considered a peace offering? What in heaven's name are we coming to?

"GIVE US THE TOOLS AND WE WILL DO THE JOB"

You will remember that Mr. Churchill told us, "Just give us the tools and we will do the job." He well knew that if we embarked on that program it would be but another short step to furnishing the armies also. The fact that we now have 3,000,000 fighting men in Europe and that they are doing the major share of the fighting on the western front in that area seems to prove the point.

BOONDOGGLING IN CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA

Our expenditures in the Central and South American republics on boondoggling and other projects are fantastic. A program of six billions over a period of 3 years is now under way. This was disclosed by Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, after a tour of investigation there. This was vigorously denied in the Senate by the New Deal Senators, but after an audit by James A. Councilor & Co., Washington certified public accountants, no further denials have been heard. What other commitments, not yet disclosed, we may have around the world only the Supreme Being knows.

Under U. N. R. R. A. we will be expected to carry the load in restoring the war-devastated countries—to rebuild electric lighting and waterworks systems, transportation, and other facilities; restore the old and supply new manufacturing plants, feed and clothe the people until such time as they can supply themselves.

NO THOUGHT GIVEN TO AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

Apparently no one in the administration gives serious thought to the American taxpayer who must pay for all this. In 1932, when he was a candidate for the office he still holds, Mr. Roosevelt said: "Taxes are paid in the sweat of the man who labors." No man ever spoke more accurately. Taxes are paid across the counter. If we spend beyond the national income, whatever we spend, wherever we spend it, whatever we spend it for, a debt is created which the American taxpayer must sometime pay. No other nation will do it for us. Our past experience should teach us that at least.

Little thought apparently is given to the ability of other nations to rehabilitate themselves. Little thought is given to the fact that our national debt is greater than that of all our allies combined, and that it is increasing much more rapidly. Congress is now asked to extend the debt limit to $300,000,000,000. It will be again increased. Certainly it will be much larger than the amount now asked for before we will have finished with our adventure into world power politics. It is high time that every one of us should open our eyes to what is going on in this world and what it will mean to all of us if a halt is not called to the fantastic policies that mean national bankruptcy.

FALSE PROPAGANDA

When I volunteered in World War No. 1, I was 41 years old—past the draft age. I was shocked beyond words by the stories of the horrible atrocities perpetrated on the Belgians by the Germans, appearing almost daily on the front pages of our newspapers and on our billboards. Many of these stories stemmed directly from the British white papers. As they were official, it was natural that our people should believe them. During the 6 months I was in Europe, following my demobilization, I made several trips into Belgium, and while there made it my business to investigate the reports we had received such as "cutting off the hands of little boys that they might not later become members of the armed forces," "the crucifixion of Canadian soldiers," "the processing of the bodies of our dead from which fats could be secured with which to manufacture more powder to kill more young Americans," "the ravishing of Belgian women by German officers in the occupied areas," to mention only a few. Everywhere I went I talked with business people and others. I talked with hundreds about these stories. Not in one single instance did I find verification for any one of them. No one had ever heard of them. In the last-named instance the answer invariably was the same: "We never heard of anything like that, but we do know many Belgian women married German officers."

Those stories of atrocities with which we daily were regaled were made up of whole cloth. There was not a shred of evidence anywhere in substantiation of them. They were sent to us for the sole purpose of arousing our people to the point where we would enter the war against the Central Powers. That the efforts were successful is history. I was among the deluded.

A book, Falsehood in Wartime, by Arthur Ponsonby, a very prominent member of the British Parliament, was published by George Allen & Unwin, Ltd., in London in 1922. It was republished in 1923 by E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., New York. It is an amazing collection of carefully documented lies circulated in Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and America. It completely exposes the falsity of the propaganda which so aroused our people and demonstrates the theory that "self-preservation is the first law of nature," and that it applies to nations as well as to individuals. Neither stop at anything to preserve life.

If anyone questions the prominence, the integrity or the high-standing in British official life of Mr. Ponsonby, I refer him to the Encyclopedia Britannica. In the concluding paragraph in his book, he states:

"Is further proof needed that international war is a monster born of hypocrisy, fed on falsehood, fattened on humbug, kept alive by superstition, directed to the death and torture of millions, succeeding in no high purpose, degrading to humanity, endangering civilization and bringing forth in its travail a hideous brood of strife, conflict and war, more war? Yet statesmen still hesitate to draw the sword of their wits to destroy it."

THE ATLANTIC CHARTER AND THE FOUR FREEDOMS

Mr. Churchill's Position

I think every intelligent and unselfish human being was stirred to his depths when the Atlantic Charter with its four freedoms was announced to the world. We were informed that the compact was signed, sealed, and delivered, and that it was the purpose of the Allied Powers to bring these freedoms to the peoples of the world. It was not long, however, before disillusionment took place. Mr. Churchill, in a speech to the lord mayor of London, in November 1942, stated:

> Let me, however, make this clear, in case there should be any mistake about it in any quarter. We mean to hold our own. I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire.

At Yalta when the question of nation's colonies came up it was suggested that this matter be held in abeyance until the United Nations Conference at San Francisco. Prime Minister Churchill dissented, stating that he preferred not to have the question of colonies decided upon at the United Nations Conference. "I," said Churchill, "will not have the fumbling fingers of 52 nations meddling in the heritage of Britain." It must be clear that if the British will tolerate no "meddling" with her colonies, certainly colonies of other nations will be treated likewise.

That Britain is determined to hold on to her colonies was rather graphically substantiated on the Island of Tarawa, after the island had been taken from the Japs by our marines, when the British commissioner, on November 24, went ashore and hoisted the British flag. There had not been one British fighting man on the island while the fighting for the beachhead was going on. Our losses were 988 killed and 2,163 wounded, but there was the commissioner on the job to protect the British sovereignty of the island as soon as it was safe to go ashore. Good taste and some degree of decency would have delayed that ceremony for a time at least.

On February 17, 1942, not long after we had entered the present war, in a speech in Parliament, Mr. Churchill said:

> When I survey and compute the power of the United States and its vast resources, and feel that now they are in it with us, in with the British Commonwealth of Nations altogether, however long it lasts, till death or victory, I cannot believe there is any other fact in the whole world which can compare with that. That is what I have dreamed of, aimed at, and worked for, and now it has come to pass.

Such candor is rarely found in world-famous statesmen. That Mr. Churchill was deeply impressed is also shown by his statement that he considered this to be his greatest accomplishment in all the years of his service for the Empire.

The Churchill speech to the Lord Mayor of London was delivered on November 10, 1942. This was about the

time when it seemed probable the Japs were to invade India. There was a growing and insistent demand on the part of the people of that country for some degree of freedom—for at least a step toward self-government. The country seemed really aroused and anythng might have happened. The speech served two purposes. First, it notified the rebellious Indians that Great Britain would not yield an inch at any time, especially while the war was on; that any attempt at rebellion would be put down with an iron hand.

Second, it constituted due notice to the people of the United States and of the world that, regardless of the declared agreement as to the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms," such activity will not be permitted to even remotely touch the people of the British possessions. In response to suggestions from outside the Empire touching its administration, Mr. Churchill also stated that "no interference from any source whatever will be tolerated in handling the affairs of the Empire."

STALIN'S POSITION ON THE FOUR FREEDOMS

On February 23, 1942, Stalin listed Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and a part of Poland as "Soviet land." Not only has no responsible official so far contradicted the claims of many Russian authorities that the Soviet Union means to take and keep those small unfortunate areas, but also Finland and Rumania, lands which have become victims of Russian aggression. From the more recent Soviet activities the expansion program appears far more ambitious than was indicated by Mr. Stalin in his original statement. It must be clear even to the most obtuse that Mr. Stalin will not permit the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" to interfere with his plans for expanding the Russian Empire. It seems, Mr. Chairman, that in the last analysis the United States constitutes the only powerful nation which appears to be still supporting the Atlantic Charter and its four freedoms. We will find that, if we have not already done so, we will later bend to the will of Stalin and Churchill on this most important question, after which future negotiations will be conducted on a frank and open basis of world power politics, the end of which will be—future wars.

CLEMENCEAU, LLOYD GEORGE, AND WILSON IN 1918—STALIN, CHURCHILL, AND ROOSEVELT NOW

All this is reminiscent of the closing days of World War No. 1. Woodrow Wilson was then President of the United States. He was a far-seeing, highly intelligent, and idealistic gentleman. In seeking peace he kept one thought ever before him—that of reaching a peace based upon terms that would permit all nations to live at peace with each other; that would give to each nation a place in the economic sun that would enable its people to live on a basis of freedom and a reasonable prosperity. Great Britain and France agreed to Mr. Wilson's 14 points—"in principle." At the Peace Conference at Versailles neither would agree to anything that even remotely approached Mr. Wilson's demands. Instead, our President was finally compelled to agree to the treaty which eventually was promulgated. He returned home bitterly disappointed, his health ruined, and he finally died knowing his efforts for future peace had failed completely, and that future wars were inevitable.

It seems very clear that Mr. Roosevelt now finds himself in the same position that Mr. Wilson earlier found himself. At the coming peace conference he will find himself faced with two individuals just as inexorable, just as determined to promote the power of their respective countries as were Clemenceau and Lloyd George a quarter of a century ago. He will have brought home to him anew the fact that "when the devil is sick, the devil a saint would be, but when he gets well, a devil again is he," and that this applies to nations as well as individuals.

Certainly Churchill has let it be known that not for one moment will he agree to anything which will prevent the British Empire doing exactly what he believes it should do to perpetuate its present organization and power. If he expects to gain further colonies or possessions he has not as yet let it be known. Stalin's position differs from Churchill's only in the fact that he openly proposes not only to maintain Russia's present holdings, power, and influence, but also to extend the same to a point not yet disclosed.

We are living in a very practical world. The human animal is a selfish one. Wars stem directly from the selfishness in human hearts. Judging from the fact recorded history tells us that from 1500 B. C. to 1860 A. D. more than 8,000 treaties of peace, meant to remain in force forever, were concluded, and that the average time they remained in force was 2 years, the ephemeral character of treaties and the futility of wars as a medium of settling disputes between nations is obvious.

There have been nearly 300 wars in the three centuries of the modern state system. The settlement of the more important ones, in most instances, because of the selfishness written into peace agreements, have been followed by other wars of greater magnitude and more horrible death-dealing methods.

Certainly if we continue our wars and improvement of weapons and methods of destroying human life the human race will revert to the depths of the Dark Ages. Civilization simply cannot survive unless we radically change our ways.

All this leads me to the question, What are we going to do about it? I would have kept us out of the present war if I had found it possible to do so. It seemed clear we were continuing a policy of perpetuating the British Empire, which we began in 1917. It seemed a disastrous course to follow. I am for the perpetuation of the United States of America. I am against this country becoming entangled in a web of international power politics, and would have kept us out of them. However, we are in "up to our necks." Now that we are in, the only way out for us is to fight our way out, and I am for this program to the end. I will do everything in my power to help win the war in the shortest possible time. Every other method of establishing and preserving peace in the world having failed, I shall go along with the program of disarming the belligerent nations and keeping them disarmed until they are ready to live in comity with their neighbors.

It follows, therefore, of course, that I must oppose with all the strength that God may give me any scheme which can work out only to draw us and the world into more wars in the future. It does not matter if the war plan is labeled a "peace plan." Mr. Roosevelt's policies have all been termed "peace policies." Power politics is power politics under any label, and the only plans that have thus far come from this administration involve a disguised variety of the same power politics which have always led to war. The only difference is that in the future, unless we watch our step, we will be leading instead of following the procession into war.

I shall continue to do everything I can to help preserve this as the greatest land of opportunity for the common man this world has ever known. If it is to be preserved, it will be through a return to constitutional government, under which any man, no matter how lowly born, can aspire to the highest office in the land or a measure of prosperity which is possible only in this America of ours.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to bring this matter into this debate at this time. However, after the very masterful defense by the distinguished gentleman from New York of the action of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on all matters pertaining to the military, I wonder how the gentleman can justify the action of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the Canol project. Certainly no one wants to detract from their brilliant war record and the magnificent victories they are daily recording, but it should be their duty to stay with the business of war. I trust there will not be any Canol projects under the lend-lease legislation that will prove so great a failure as Canol.

The War Department has finally written off the Canol project—that fantastic excursion which would not have been undertaken by any man of experience and judgment in such matters.

It is to be abandoned, the Department says in a lengthy press release, "by June 30." A committee of the other branch of the Congress asked why the project should not be closed down now, as it costs about $1,000,000 per month to operate. I can find no answer to that, except that an appropriation was made last year of about $16,500,000 for maintenance and operation of the project, it has not been used up yet, and it would be a violation of the traditions of this project to try to economize by quitting now and saving two or three million dollars.

I have spoken on this subject before to the Members of this House and to the public. That was a long time ago. On October 12 and October 19 of 1943 I

covered this story fully. It is no great pleasure to me to see my early fears of complete failure confirmed. I had talked to men who were wise in the development, the transportation and the refining of petroleum before saying anything about it. Economically, the Canol project was an absurdity of such high degree that anyone outside of Government who would propose such a thing would be thought to be a fit subject for a mental examination. Militarily, it falls equally flat. It has not yielded as much gasoline and other products as was required on the project itself. All the steam was used to blow the whistle.

The War Department, of course, has not admitted to having made an error. With a tenacity, a stubbornness which would be admirable on the battlefield but is wholly inexcusable here, the Department blandly seeks in its press release to create the impression that Canol was, after all, a great triumph. The most infantile of the several justifications set forth by the alert Public Relations Bureau of the War Department is that expressed in the following paragraph:

> The Canol project has demonstrated that oil may be conveyed over long distances and refined in year-around operations in the Arctic despite difficulties of terrain and climate. The knowledge and experience obtained from the operation of Canol will be of great value if indicated large reservoirs of oil in Alaska or northwestern Canada materialize. Such oil can be made an available continental resource.

Well, perhaps that is the most tangible of the gains the Department can think of. I wonder how much time and effort on the part of the military was necessary to figure out that one? Certainly the physical properties have little value. The War Department has spent about $135,000,000 of the taxpayers' money in demonstrating that oil can be moved around and refined in a cold climate, and if there is any oil found up there in the future, it will be useful information to have available. If that is all that was accomplished, the knowledge could have been acquired for a few thousand dollars instead of the many millions that were spent.

We do not know just what the cost was. It has been placed officially by a congressional committee at more than $134,000,000. The War Department, by a different system of bookkeeping, scales down this figure, chiefly by charging to another account the construction of products distribution lines. As a matter of fact, the cost cannot be calculated by any method. Several thousand soldiers were used on the construction. Materials by the thousands of tons—critical and strategic materials which the oil industry of the United States was begging for—went into this fantastic adventure in the Canadian wilderness. Who can reduce to dollars the good that would have been achieved by their use in the oil fields of this country? Trucks and tractors, airplanes, river boats and barges, and all the supplies and equipment needed to maintain thousands of soldiers and more thousands of civilians who worked on the job for 2 years would have advanced the war effort immeasurably if used in a sensible way. What could those workers have achieved in war production here at home? Incidentally, there are a couple of thousand persons still on the pay roll and will be until June.

Now, says the War Department, they are beginning to prepare to put a valuation on the project and will offer it for sale under the agreement with Canada. Who will buy it? No oil company would be interested in more than a fragment of it. It is to be appraised with regard to its commercial value. There is no market for a couple of thousand barrels of production up in the Canadian wilderness, and, mark me, it will fall into disuse and be abandoned. The scrap would not bring the cost to take it out. The Dominion of Canada seems to have a preference, and they show sound judgment, for letting private industry develop oil fields and build refineries and it is unlikely that the Canadian Government will want a property which requires a million dollars of public money to operate.

Canol contributed nothing to winning the war. It detracted from the total war effort. It was an extravagant waste of manpower and materials in a period of war when the country was crying for both. The War Department consulted oil men before it started the job in 1942 and all such advisers urged as strongly as they could that the project not be started; they suggested alternative means of supplying oil that would cost far less and would yield greater and more immediate results, but little or no attention was paid to them.

If we will take careful stock and remember this project well through the years to come, perhaps there is something of value in it. It should serve as a lasting warning to leave industrial affairs to the men who know about such things. The War Department knows how to wage war. Let it be confined to its proper role from here on. It has no business in trying to develop oil fields or run refineries. In this case, its judgment on advisers was bad. It disregarded the opinions of those whose experience entitled them to express opinions, including those who discovered the oil field which was to supply the refinery, and adopted the views of men who knew no more about what they were getting into than they would about the whaling industry.

Other departments have been trying to get into the oil business. The Navy has a project under way at this time in an area of Alaska that is even more inaccessible than is the Canol. No further encouragement or money should be given to this. The Interior Department has been turned down twice in the past year in its ambition to go wildcatting in Alaska. If there is oil to be obtained in that Territory private industry will find it and develop it under a policy of leasing which is liberal enough to compensate for the risks involved. Certainly, the taxpayers of this country should not be compelled to pay for any more of these wild gambles by any agency of government. Whenever one of the proposals is made our watchword should be, "Remember the Canol."

The inquiries heretofore made into this project should not be ended. There remains to be filed the ultimate responsibility for ordering the thing started. It made no sense at any time. The emergency situation in early 1942, when the Japanese were attacking the Aleutians, could not be met by instituting a wildcat oil exploration and a construction job that many foresaw, and advised the War Department, would require a long time. The Japs were driven from the Aleutians long before 1 gallon of gasoline came from the Canol refinery, but the project went merrily on when millions of dollars could have been saved for the American taxpayers.

This entire project should be given an immediate investigation by the Lea Petroleum Committee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce or by Military Affairs. Certainly it must be agreed the American people are entitled to a full explanation on this $138,000,000 project which is now being unceremoniously junked with an official War Department release. I say "unceremoniously," because if I remember correctly, they held a ceremony when it was completed, announcing to the world that the great Canol was in operation.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to call attention to an explanation which is full and complete, relative to some of the charges that have been made in the debate today with reference to farm machinery, in a statement contained in a letter from Mr. Leo T. Crowley, Foreign Economic Administrator, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which will be found on page A307 in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this session of Congress. It shows that this statement, like many others that have been made about lend-lease, is grossly exaggerated and not in accordance with the facts. As was stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]—in his statement he said 3 percent, but I think the record will show not less than 2 percent of farm machinery has gone under lend-lease to our allies, and it has only gone when and where the military said it was necessary for the production of food for our soldiers, and many of the American farm tractors have been used in the clearing of ground for air bases in England and also the building of military roads in France, and elsewhere.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further request for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (c) of section 3 of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1945" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1946"; by striking out "July 1, 1948" and

inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1949"; and by striking out "July 1, 1945" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1946"; and subsection (b) of section 6 of such act is amended by striking out "June 30, 1948" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLOOM: At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. 2. That subsection (c) of section 3 of such act is further amended by striking out the period after the word 'earlier,' inserting a semicolon, and the following new language: '*Provided however*, That nothing in section 3 (c) shall be construed to authorize the President to enter into or carry out any contract or agreement with a foreign government for post-war relief, post-war rehabilitation, or post-war reconstruction; except that a contract or agreement entered into in accordance with this act in which the United States undertakes to furnish to a foreign government defense articles, services, or information for use in the prosecution of the present war and which provides for the disposition, on terms and conditions of sale prescribed by the President, of any such defense articles, services, or information after the President determines they are no longer necessary for use by such government in promoting the defense of the United States shall not be deemed to be for post-war relief, post-war rehabilitation, or post-war reconstruction.'"

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I simply wish to state that during my absence from the floor this afternoon my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON] read the amendment and also the statement on the amendment. This amendment was agreed to unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, especially by the Members who signed the minority report. There was a unanimous vote of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on this amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to confine my remarks primarily to an amendment I expect to offer as soon as the pending amendment is disposed of; but I bring it to your attention now in order that you may have a little time to think it over.

The amendment I propose to offer would join the Congress of the United States to the President in approving the termination of contracts of lend-lease with foreign governments. It seems to me the lend-lease act was very weak in respect of the termination of contracts made under it. It is a poor way for America to aid the war. There is no reason why the termination of these contracts should not be with the approval of the Congress. That is our responsibility, the responsibility of Congress. The amendment I propose to offer is one that was offered a year ago by the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. Schiffler, who was a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It seems strange to me that the committee at that time would not adopt that amendment. I claim no pride of authorship; it is Mr. Schiffler's and one which I believe the Congress is duty bound to consider fully when we terminate these contracts.

I cannot understand why the Congress of the United States has permitted the Chief Executive to handle all the affairs of lend-lease. Seems to me Congress abdicated. It is true that he has appointed an administrator, but when it comes to the termination of these contracts more than one or two men should enter into the discussion of how they should be settled. Our taxpayers want to know about the settlement. A manufacturing concern which sent its manufactured products to another concern with no arrangement whatever as to how they were to be settled for would be accused of very loose credit practices. It would be only a short time in my judgment until that concern went into bankruptcy. I liken this lend-lease program to such a dealing. We are elected as trustees representing the stockholders of this country, we have been sent here for the purpose of looking after the interests of America, of the American Treasury, of the American taxpayer.

If we had a man at the head of our Government who loved America as much as Mr. Churchill loves Great Britain or as Mr. Stalin loves Russia I would not fear so much the outcome of what happens at the termination of lend-lease for America to get her just dues in a final settlement, but I do not favor altogether the idea that we should permit the power to be lodged in any one man in this country regardless of who he may be. America might be sold short.

I wish to read you a statement made by the President of the United States in his address in St. Louis, Mo., on October 31, 1932:

> My job will be to prevent a recurrence of this incident and to prevent the hard-earned dollars of American investors from being frittered away in foreign fields encouraged by the sanction of the Federal Government of the United States and with the profits flowing only to certain international financiers whose greed is greater than their patriotism.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I have not time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard several remarks this afternoon about farm machinery in Great Britain. The gentleman from Texas just made a statement about its not being farm machinery.

I was born on a farm and I think I know what farm machinery is—harrows, discs, plows, and all that sort of thing—and may I say to the gentleman from Texas who just spoke to you that I saw about 640 acres of new farm machinery over there in England. I also saw trucks unloading more farm machinery at the time I was there. I also read Mr. Crowley's statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that this machinery was road-building machinery to be used over in France. I am not objecting to farm machinery being sent to Great Britain because I think it was necessary. It has helped Great Britain come from the point of producing around 30 or 40 percent of her food production to up around 70 percent, but unfortunately the people who are handling lend-lease and the military go on the theory that you can never get too much. Of course that is not so. You can get too much farm machinery, you can get too much of one thing and not enough of something else. The thing that happened so far as our farm machinery is concerned is that we sent entirely too much farm machinery to Great Britain. We were overenthusiastic in our belief that we could do something for Great Britain. I am not objecting to sending some of it to them, but they do not need as much as we sent them. The farmers of this country have been doing without machinery.

If you will take the time to read the record of the hearings, page 168, you will note that I placed in the record at that point the official report of Great Britain that I received when I was over there in October, showing what they were doing in reverse lend-lease. You will also notice some very interesting items that they gave us, for instance, 1,280 bottles of whisky. You will find that they gave us pianos over there, some bolts and screws, and so forth. You will also find the number of hours they spent in moving lend-lease equipment from one place to another for us, their lend-lease equipment. They go into a great deal of detail, and I am not criticizing the British for doing that. I think it is fine; I believe we ought to have good bookkeeping methods, but I have been unable to find where the Americans have been as meticulous in their bookkeeping methods as the British have been. It is rather interesting to me when I read in so much detail the amount of things they have given us in lend-lease.

I brought this article back and had it put in the record at the time, because they are doing a good job of keeping track of what they do for us. But I think the time has come when we must have some accounting on lend-lease, a statement as to how long, to what extent, and how many billions of dollars the lend-lease policy is going to be continued once a normal peace has returned to Europe. You know the original purpose of lend-lease, as rather loosely stated, was that the United States would provide the money and the matériel of war and our European friends were to do the fighting and dying and our participation in the war could be avoided. I read some of the statements by Members when the Lend-Lease Act was adopted in this House. I was not a Member at that time. Members on the right side of the aisle who were Members at that time should read some of the speeches they made in 1941 when the House adopted the Lend-Lease Act; they should go back, and then see what has really happened.

Lend-lease was necessary, but it was not a measure to keep us out of the war. Unfortunately, we have now some 11,000,000 men in this war. The Prime Minister of England said at one time, "Give us the tools and we will do the job." But what is the picture? We have not only given them the tools but we are furnishing 75 or 80 percent of the men on the fighting fronts of Europe; we are having all the casualties of the war, and how many men are we furnishing in the Pacific theater? Most of them. Eng-

land has furnished a few down in India to police that territory. In other words, lend-lease did not keep us out of war. We have furnished the tools, we have furnished up to now some 11,000,000 men, and the casualties are running up close to a million.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESSER. May I say to the gentleman that, with the exception of the India area, we are furnishing 100 percent of the men in the Pacific.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman is against the Australians.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The majority leader can get all the time he wants on the subject. I have been here all afternoon seeking time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, we have already spent around $40,000,000,000 and there will be from twenty-five to thirty billion dollars more that has not been spent. Just how far are we going to go in the rehabilitation and construction of Europe under lend-lease? The pending amendment presently before the House helps clarify the situation.

When I went before the committee handling this bill I rather strongly urged that some terminal facilities be provided for lend-lease. I think it is necessary and I am certain that the folks out in my country want the American Congress to stand up and protest most vigorously the wanton waste of our American resources without some promise of a fair return. I feel certain that we can dissipate our resources in this country to a point where we will no longer be a strong and virile nation. To what extent actually can Uncle Sam, having done his full part in the winning of the war, convert himself next into a perpetual Santa Claus for all the world? Truly it is a problem deserving the careful consideration of Congress. The war has cost the United States more than $250,000,000,000. The national debt limit has recently been increased to $300,000,000,000. Such figures are beyond understanding. They would represent hopeless bankruptcy if demand payment were required now. It is argued by some mystics, however, that since "we owe it to ourselves" the debt does not count. The taxpayers are, many, if not most of them, bondholders, and the bondholders are all of them taxpayers. The debt could be wiped out if the Government were so minded, by transferrals from the right pocket to the left pocket.

I hope that this Congress will give careful thought to how far we should go with lend-lease. I think that we should keep very careful books on lend-lease.

When I came back from England I made some statements about lend-lease and how it was being treated. Of course, some folks in Congress and in England did not like it, and they called me by telephone and wanted me to retract some of my statements. I supported it the last time. With the large amount of money now available for lend-lease it is possible it can be used in such a way as to waste the resources of America and destroy our future.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Do I understand the gentleman to say that when he came back from England he made several statements that the British called him up about?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; the British press in New York.

Mr. BLOOM. And the gentleman did not resent it?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; I resented it.

Mr. BLOOM. That is an unusual thing. I am surprised that the gentleman would make a statement like that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. May I tell you one conversation I had with a newspaperman in New York? He said, "Congressman, we were in this war 2 years before you were. What do you think you owe us for that?"

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman said that a British representative asked him to retract or withdraw his statement; is that right?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; they wanted me to withdraw the statement.

Mr. BLOOM. A British representative?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. A representative of a British paper.

Mr. BLOOM. That is different.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. He represented the thinking of the English.

Mr. BLOOM. I would not want it to go out and have the world think that the British Government or any representative called the gentleman up.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It was a British newspaperman from one of the big papers who represents the thinking and opinion of that country.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman made the statement that in this lend-lease program there has been wanton waste. I am wondering if the gentleman could give the House a bill of particulars and point out where this wanton waste occurred?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not think that would be very hard if the gentleman would just look around some of these ports where this equipment is piling up. How about the Canol project up in Canada or the Alaskan Highway? Would not the gentleman say that was wanton waste?

Mr. COOLEY. No; I do not agree with the gentleman at all.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. May I say to the gentleman he forgets that at the time the Alaskan Highway was built no one knew what the Japs were going to do in Alaska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am not yielding for a speech.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Not for a speech, but in order to inform the gentleman as to both the oil project and the other.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Let me answer the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. The gentleman heard the statement of Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General, that $50,000,000,000 had been wasted in war contracts, cost-plus contracts. He comes from your State and served in this House. Is he wrong?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; I recall that statement.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Would the gentleman call that waste?

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman is conscious of any wanton waste of Federal funds, it is his duty to bring it to the attention of the Congress or some agency of the executive branch of the Government to the end that those wanton criminals may be brought to justice.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Did not Lindsay Warren point out that there was $50,000,000,000 of waste?

Mr. COOLEY. He did not use the word "wanton," which implies something evil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is too bad at this late hour in the debate that this question should arise, but I cannot permit any statements to be made such as were made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] a few minutes ago. I hope he was wrong or did not intend them so but whether he did or not I must challenge his remark.

It is my purpose now, Mr. Chairman, to express my heartfelt resentment against the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], that the President of the United States does not have in the depth of his heart the welfare of America as does the leader of any other nation of the Allies or of any other country in the world. I say now, and I think I speak for everybody in the House on both sides of the aisle, perhaps with the exception of the gentleman himself, that nobody can question the patriotism of Franklin D. Roosevelt, the President of the United States of America.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman for any purpose.

Mr. RICH. I was referring to the President of the United States as a spendthrift, that he did not know the value of a dollar and was not protecting the dollars of the American taxpayers. He never has and he never can and he never will.

Mr. FLOOD. That is probably the best autobiographical statement I have ever heard in the House. But the record of the President stands as an example of great leadership, patriotism, sacrifice and devotion to his country.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are considering a serious and important bill here today and I feel it is worthy of a body like this to stick to the merits of the bill. I very much resent the remaks made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Just because the President is not with all the rich people all the time does not mean that he is not loyal to the United States. I think the American people have said four times that he is the most loyal American there is in this country. I certainly know that the millions that voted for President Roosevelt this time to carry on the war negotiations, and so on, voted for him because they have supreme confidence in the man's sincerity and loyalty to the people of America.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might call attention to history. George Washington underwent the same kind of attacks in his day. Lincoln, during the Civil War, underwent the same type of attack, not from the South but from the North, and from members of his own party in Congress. This shows that any strong President of our country, when the country is faced with a crisis, must undergo those types of attack. But history shows that the attackers are the ones who are lacking in that stability which is necessary to give the leadership to bring our country to success when a crisis confronts us.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAVAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. May I say to the gentleman that I have no animosity toward the President of the United States in any sense of the word. It is only the things that he does and his record that I am attacking. The things he promised in 1932 and 1933 and from then on he has repudiated; he has not carried them out. Those are the things I object to. I do not want to object to the President as a man, but I object to the things that he does.

Mr. SAVAGE. I think it is fair to consider a man on his works and on what he does, and I am sure that is what the millions of people considered when they voted for President Roosevelt.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I call attention to the fact that the candidate of the Republican Party last fall took the position that no measure passed during the past 12 years would be repealed, and he did not take issue with the leadership of the President of the United States during this war.

Mr. SAVAGE. I noticed that in the campaign and was very happy that the American people were practically unanimous in their support of his leadership in bringing the war to a successful conclusion and the establishing of a permanent peace.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, this measure should be passed without modification or amendment other than that proposed by the committee.

On the 11th day of March 1941, the Congress of the United States, warned by the shadows of coming events, forged for the defense of this Nation the most effective weapon ever devised by the minds of man. This was not in any way a secret weapon, the character of which was to be shrouded in mystery and closely guarded lest it be divulged to our actual or potential enemies, nor was it a newly invented instrumentality of war designed for the destruction of armies on land and navies at sea. Nor was this weapon something in the nature of high-powered explosives, nor deadly guns, nor swifter planes, nor greater ships, nor other devices of death for the effective prosecution of war. Yet, though classed with none of the instrumentalities with which wars are actually waged, the weapon forged by Congress when it wrote into law the Lend-Lease Act has exceeded all the others in its deadly effectiveness and has been, and is today, the greatest contributing factor to our certain victory.

On that March day 4 years ago when the Congress first passed the act to promote the defense of the United States, to which there was almost immediately given the shorter, though less accurately descriptive title of "lend-lease," our country was not at war. Coming events, however, were certainly casting their shadows—very dark and forbidding shadows—evidencing an ominous threat to our security.

This threat was not from one country nor one continent alone. In Europe the great war machine of a Nazi regime, that had been in the building for 20 years with a singleness of sinister purpose unparalleled in history, had already rolled across the greater part of the continent and was moving onward with resistless force. So closely associated with the Nazi organization as to be an actual part of the machine and a contributor to its might, was Mussolini's new Roman Empire, sweeping on with the tide of conquest and aggression. At this same time the winds blowing toward us from across the Pacific were bringing not only whisperings of plot and counterplot in the land of Nippon, but were also bringing rumors of evil things in the minds of the sons of the Son of Heaven.

It was then, and because the organized and equipped forces of evil were sweeping steadily onward, overwhelming free lands and free peoples, bringing devastation, slavery, and death to the weak and helpless, regarding no right except that of might, drenching the earth with the blood of the helpless, seeking to destroy all freedom, justice, and liberty, endeavoring to erase from the world the last trace of democratic government and to substitute instead the dictatorship of a superman born of a self-styled super race, that the Congress of the United States forged and put into immediate effect the weapon known as lend-lease.

By this act our national legislative body promised every endangered and freedom-loving nation throughout the world our aid and assistance in any effort undertaken to halt the onward march of the Axis powers. We recognized the fact that the maintenance of the sovereignty and the security of every other free nation in the world was necessary to the defense and maintenance of the security of the United States. We recognized the aims and the purposes of the Axis powers. The rapidly moving events throughout the eastern world as well as upon the continent of Europe indicated to us the grave danger of procrastination and delay. With no hesitancy our Government girded itself for a war that men of vision recognized to be inevitable.

Immediately following the passage of the Lend-Lease Act, this Nation moved in the accomplishment of its great purpose. What followed is not only a matter of history, but it is a record of accomplishment at which the world will wonder for untold generations to come. With a great, free people aroused to the danger and to the necessity of action, there was presented to the world a picture of democracy in action. The construction of our plants for the production of materials of war, the mobilization of our mighty army of workmen, the conversion of our factories into plants for the manufacture of munitions, the instant response of capital and labor to the demands of the crisis, the rapid and unprecedented change in the way of life of a peace-loving nation into an army of defense and the transformation of this land of ours from a land of peace into a great arsenal to supply the entire world with the weapons necessary to save that world from devastation and ruin, has all been recorded in the most remarkable chapter in our history.

That these preparations, inaugurated by the passage of the Lend-Lease Act in March 1941, were indeed the part of wisdom was conclusively shown on December 7 of that same year when the treachery of the Japanese Nation not only drove this country of ours into conflict but plunged the peoples of the Far East, and indeed the entire world, into a total war.

It cannot be denied that if we were in any way prepared for the mighty conflict in which we were suddenly plunged on that December day in 1941, we owe that preparation to our lend-lease policy. The necessary changes we had been forced to make in our national economy by reason of our pledges under the Lend-Lease Act had already placed us in position to meet the new demands made upon our production capacity. It was only necessary for us to enlarge upon the plans we had already made and to double and redouble our efforts at production already commenced. As we look back over the fateful year of 1941, we tremble at the thought of what might have happened had we not initiated our efforts at the production of war materials immediately after the passage of

the Lend-Lease Act. We tremble at the thought of what might have occurred had we suddenly been plunged into war in the unprepared condition in which we found ourselves at the beginning of that year. Fortunate it was indeed that when the blow finally fell in December, many of our plants and factories all over the land had long been engaged in turning out munitions and materials necessary for the prosecution of the war. These materials were already moving, and for some time had been moving, in a steady stream across the seas to aid the nations who became our allies in the gallant and seemingly hopeless struggle in which they were engaged. Finding it suddenly necessary to equip our own armies with the instrumentalities of war, we were indeed fortunate to have the factories and plants already in production. Our indebtedness to our lend-lease policy for this fortunate state of preparation must indeed be recognized.

It is not necessary, I believe, for us on this occasion to attempt any detailed statement of the accomplishments of lend-lease during the past 4 years, but that it has been an effective instrumentality in the winning of a victory for the United Nations cannot be disputed. Those splendid men who have been in charge of the administration of lend-lease during this time have constantly and fully reported their every act to this Congress. These reports, with their extensive information, are available to every Member of the Congress and their examination will enable any inquiring person to find where every item of material has gone and where every dollar has been expended. These reports will, I believe, clearly indicate that the lend-lease supplies furnished to our Russian ally enabled that stricken country to recover from its disaster, to turn upon the Nazi foe and to drive him back over the Russian lands he had devastated and despoiled and to follow him to his lair across his own border. That lend-lease has been of equal if not greater aid to Great Britain is also a matter beyond question or dispute.

Its operations in the Middle East and the Mediterranean area has been proven to have been effective by attained results. It was lend-lease that made it possible, after our landing in Normandy, for the underground army of the French to come out of their holes and coverts bearing arms and ready to join in the fight. The story of lend-lease accomplishments in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia is not yet complete, but we do know that it will be an epic when published to the world.

It would serve no useful purpose to further detail the accomplishments of this policy of mutual aid inaugurated by the passage of this act and pursued under successive extensions. Reciprocal or reverse lend-lease has been a feature of the act in operation that has been of tremendous importance to the war effort of the Allies in all theaters of action. Evidence before our Foreign Affairs Committee has failed to disclose a single case where supplies available to any of our allies and needed by our forces have failed of delivery to us on request under reciprocal lend-lease.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that further discussion of the resolution for the extension of lend-lease for another year is entirely unnecessary. The extension of this act and a continuation of the program is, I am fully convinced, necessary to an early and a complete victory. Lend-lease has already carried us far toward our goal—a goal that I believe will be reached with this, the third extension of the act. Your committee is for this measure, your fighting forces are for it, the American people approve it. Let us pass the measure today and speed the ending of the terrible conflict in which we are now engaged.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment which is at the Clerks desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUFFETT: On page 1, line 8, of the committee amendment, after the words "reconstruction", insert "or other purposes."

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, that is on page 2, line 13, of the complete bill. I understand from the Parliamentarian that the proper designation is page 1, line 8. Mr. Chairman, may I read for the information of the Committee the language of this particular part of the bill as it would read:

Provided, however, That nothing in section 3 (c) shall be construed to authorize the President to enter into or carry out any contract or agreement with a foreign government for post-war relief, post-war rehabilitation, post-war reconstruction, or other purposes, except—

And then the bill would go on from there.

I rise to offer an amendment to this bill with considerable hesitation because I do not pose as an expert on foreign affairs. But I think there is one thing the House should have learned in the last few years, and that is it should spell out its purposes in legislation. A few moments ago I asked a member of the committee whether this would bar the President from arranging for an oil refinery in China. He said, "Oh, yes, it would, because that would be post-war rehabilitation."

Webster's Dictionary defines "rehabilitate" as meaning "to restore something to its previous condition." Therefore, an oil refinery would not come under this act. There are many other types of expenditure that would not be banned under this amendment as it is now written. I think this Committee should write this bill in clear terms and spell out the intention of Congress. Post-war relief, post-war rehabilitation, and post-war construction are subject to various interpretations. They do not cover the field of possible activity. It is only by adding a clause that will cover the field that the amendment will stop lend-lease with the end of the war. I hope that this Committee will adopt this amendment and strengthen the bill so that Congress will be limiting lend-lease to the war period. Unless we do so, this so-called Republican amendment is not much more than a pious hope.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The insertion by the gentleman of the words "or other purposes" would prohibit any further contracts or agreements under lend-lease whatsoever. That is, if it is for post-war relief or post-war rehabilitation or post-war reconstruction, or for any other purpose it would bar war contracts. I know the gentleman does not intend his amendment to have that effect. May I say I had considerable to do with the drafting of this amendment. I spent hours in consultation with the able counsel for Mr. Crowley in the F. E. A., Mr. Davidson. We thought over and argued over each and every word of the amendment The words used, "post-war relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction" are words used in various statutes and documents and clearly define the class of contracts which the Congress does not want to have lend-lease enter into. The statement from our committee, the speeches here today, show what is intended by our committee.

On the other hand, it is not the purpose of this amendment to bar specifically military contracts and agreements which are the very purpose of lend-lease. So that not only does the proposed amendment completely stop the operation of lend-lease agreements of any kind for any purpose, but I know of no way to doctor up this amendment to express any more accurately or precisely than the words already used the purpose which the Congress has in mind and which the minority had in mind when they filed their minority report.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I want to endorse what the gentleman from Ohio has said with reference to the fact that the amendment, if adopted, would nullify the bill entirely. Furthermore, to say what the gentleman has said is correct, that the language of this amendment has been considered word by word, syllable by syllable, and sentence by sentence, and it underwent the searching scrutiny of the entire committee and the experts of whom the gentleman speaks. I think it meets the will of the unanimous consent of the Foreign Affairs Committee and I do not believe it could be improved upon.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I may be overanxious, but the minority having originally suggested this, and the majority having adopted it, I am most anxious that it be adopted in the form which was given such careful scrutiny by both sides of our committee. I hope we will vote on the original amendment very promptly.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. We have held hearings for a month on this legislation and this amendment. The gentleman from Ohio and other gentlemen have spent hours in consultation and conference, trying to get some kind of an amendment that would be satisfactory to all concerned. It would be very unfortunate if an amendment such as that offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT]

should destroy the entire lend-lease legislation, practically. This amendment which is now before us is an amendment that has been considered by all the Members, and I hope the amendment to the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] intends to say "other post-war purposes," which broadens the language already used in the amendment. It seems to me the committee ought to permit him by unanimous consent to modify his amendment and that they should then accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to answer the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Major BULWINKLE, about the Jap threat to Alaska, the Aleutians, and Kiska. I may say there might have been some plausible reason for the Canol project at that particular time, but after that threat was removed and there was no further need for this project further expenditure and the development of a pipe line or a refinery up in the Canadian wilderness, we should have cut it out, written off our losses, called it a day, and brought back the thousands of troops and civilians, brought back the material and equipment, and saved the American taxpayers many millions of dollars.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I decline to yield at this time.

Several months ago I personally went to the War Department and as I had been advised that the Chiefs of Staff were the ones who approved the project and initiated the construction of a refinery, pipe line, highways, waterways, roads, airfields, and the development of the oil fields suggested the entire project be dropped. I said to the Acting Chief of Staff, "Now that the threat is removed and there is approximately $20,000,000,000 unexpended, why not call it a day, bring back the thousands of troops and civilians who were up there at that time because of the fact we have a manpower shortage and we have a material shortage, and we will feel that good judgment in the matter is being used." I said to him that we felt it was the duty of the Chiefs of Staff to fight the war and let the oil production to those who knew the business.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Not at this point.

I told him that if a group of oil men were to come in with a plan for fighting the war and lay it on the desk of the Chief of Staff they would be told to stay in the oil business and let the military men fight the war. So I felt that we in the oil business should be considered as knowing something about the oil business, and therefore they were intruding on territory that belonged to the petroleum life of the Nation—that therefore they should have gotten out and saved the American taxpayers lots of money. But no. They are still going on; they are spending approximately a million dollars a month, even though the project is to be discontinued, and they have several hundred technical men of the petroleum industry who could be used back home—also much greatly needed oil equipment could be returned. The only reason I am bringing this to the attention of the House is that projects like this will not be carried on under any lend-lease program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment changing it from "or other purposes" to read "other post-war purposes."

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I merely want to say, in order not to take more time than necessary, that about the same arguments I made before might apply to an amendment which would be applicable to all post-war purposes. This new form would bar military agreements during the post-war period. While I do not object to changing the amendment I still think it open to substantially the same criticisms in its new form.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I agree with what the gentleman from Ohio says. I do not think we should have that language in the amendment. It would have practically the same effect as the amendment before modification.

Does the gentleman from Ohio think this in any way hampers the execution of this lend-lease bill? As I understood the gentleman from Ohio he said it would have practically the same effect.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. It obviously would not have the wartime effect but it might have an effect upon the operation of lend-lease which is not intended; and while I do not object to the change, and while I believe that if the gentleman wants it that way, we might as well modify it the way he wants to, yet without repeating what I have said, it is subject to the same objections against attempting to modify an amendment that received a great deal of attention in the committee and has been presented as an agreed-upon amendment.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman does not need to say that he does not object to the modification suggested to the gentleman's amendment; we object to the amendment as originally offered and to the modification.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand, the gentleman from Ohio has no objection to the consent request; and I hope it is approved. The gentleman, however, is opposed to the original amendment.

Mr. BLOOM. The whole thing.

Mr. McCORMACK. So I hope the gentleman will be permitted to modify his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment to read "or other post-war purposes."

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Insert a new section, as follows:

"Subsection (b) to section 3 is amended by striking out the period after the word 'Procedure' and insert the following: '*Provided however*, That no final settlement shall be made by the President until the terms and conditions of such settlement have been submitted to the Congress of the United States and shall have been approved by the Congress: *Provided, however*, That all duties and obligations heretofore lawfully created and arising out of or in connection with all existing contracts or agreements shall in no manner whatsoever be impaired or vitiated by this act.'"

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this is the same amendment that was offered by Mr. Schiffler, a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee at that time a year ago. I believe it is a wise thing to have this amendment as part of the pending bill.

It seems to me that the Congress and the President jointly should approve the consummation of these contracts with foreign countries and not leave it up to the President entirely.

I also call the attention of my colleague from Pennsylvania who was very much shocked awhile ago at the statements I made that represents some people in Pennsylvania who are followers of Mr. Roosevelt, and do everything he wants done, whereas I represent in Pennsylvania those people who are opposed to the Roosevelt philosophy. I will give the gentleman the reasons why I am opposed to him.

Let me read from a letter written to Samuel B. Hill on July 5, 1935, in connection with the Guffey coal bill, and this is what the President said at that time:

Manifestly, no one is in a position to give assurance that the proposed act will withstand constitutional tests, for the simple fact that you can get not 10 but 1,000 legal opinions on the subject. But the situation is so urgent and the benefits of the legislation so evident that all doubts should be resolved in favor of the bill, leaving to the courts, in an orderly fashion, the ultimate question of constitutionality. A decision by the Supreme Court relative to this measure would be helpful as indicating with increasing clarity, the constitutional limits within which this Government must operate. The proposed bill has been carefully drafted by employers and employees working cooperatively. An opportunity should be given to the industry to attempt to work out some of its major problems. I hope your committee will not permit doubts as to constitutionality, however reasonable, to block the suggested legislation.

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States has access to the best legal talent in this country of ours and he can determine the legality of any bill which he wants to have passed. He should do that before he suggests that the Congress pass a bill and then leave it up to the courts to determine the constitutionality.

As I said awhile ago it is on account of the things he has said and the things that he has done that I oppose him. I do not oppose the man himself, but the things he has done. The promises he has made and the ones he has repudiated.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to vote for the present bill unless the amendment I have offered is agreed to whereby we permit the Congress to approve the contracts which we are now about to consummate in the extension of the Lend-Lease Act. We should now make some arrangements with these nations in order that the interests of the United States will be properly looked after.

I hope the amendment I have offered will be adopted. When the boys come home they will want to know the how, when, and why of lease-lend and the power you gave the President.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, this matter was presented to the House a year ago when we had the extension of this act up at that time. The amendment applies to the agreements, so-called, which will be made and must be made in what might be termed the clean-up period. When that time comes there will be littered over a wide portion on the face of the earth an infinite variety of utensils and matériel, to all of which we will have title. Remember we retain title to all airplanes we sent to Russia or to any other of our allies, to every machine tool or tank, to every truck, to every article of equipment. The list is legion. When the shooting stops it will be lined up at the roadsides, and in the rivers and creeks; some of it utterly worthless, worn out, good for nothing but junk. Others will be partially worn out. A few will still be good for use in the military service. These things are not expendable like food and gun powder.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Not at this moment.

Mr. WHITE. What about ships?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Ships are not in this category. Ships are only chartered. The ship agreement is not covered in this bill at all. It is separate and distinct and has nothing to do with lend-lease.

Mr. Chairman, can you visualize the Congress of the United States trying to pass judgment on every single agreement for the picking up of all this junk and disposing of it? How could we ever find time? There are literally hundreds of thousands of articles. Would we send special committees traveling to India and Persia and China, to say nothing of Europe and north Africa and the Middle East? To check up as to whether or not the agreement proposed to be entered into for the disposition of this property should arise, it would be a job far beyond the ability of the Congress. We simply do not have the time or the facilities for doing such a thing. I do not visualize the President of the United States doing it either. It will have to be done in the best way possible by those representatives of ours who have administered the lend-lease program in the several countries. For example, in Moscow, Russia, we have a very important mission there headed by military people who know down to the last details just what we turned over to Russia, where it is, and when the war is over they will know what kind of condition it is in and whether it can be sold for anything at all or whether some of it might better be shipped back to the United States. The same thing is true in Great Britain. The same thing is true in Australia and in India, and it will be true in China.

It strikes me from the practical standpoint that the men who have been on the ground all the time must be trusted to make these agreements for the salvaging, if there is any salvaging of all this property. To put such a burden on the Congress is to put a burden on them which is impossible to bear. The 3-year clean-up period, Mr. Chairman, would not be enough under such circumstances.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken little or no time of the House on this matter, and I hesitate to do so now. But I was intrigued by the words of the last speaker, who said such lend-lease participation would place such a tremendous burden on the Congress. The people of this country think that the Congress has already cast too much of its burden on the Chief Executive. They want Congress to regain its power rather than to delegate more to the executive branch.

I am not thoroughly in accord with the amendment, but I think the purpose of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], as I understand, does not direct the Congress to go into all of the meticulous work of accounting with reference to all of the different pieces of salvage, but just in the event that there might be a billion dollars worth of food and oil and gasoline, and so forth, in France at the end of this war, that possibly we should not give that away through the Executive or some of the people he has over there representing him—or should I say us? There was something like $2,000,000,000 worth left at the end of the last war. There will be billions in American supplies—our property. Congress, in the last analysis, should be allowed to join with the President in its distribution. I think the purpose of the amendment is to throw some safeguard around the final settling up of this matter. It is a matter of approval.

I remember a year or so ago, when we were debating this, there was a very strong vote that, in the last analysis, approval of the disposition of what belonged to the United States that was overseas the Congress was to be taken into account, but we were defeated in that.

I think the division of opinion in this Congress on this bill and some other bills is that there are some of us who are a little more economy minded. The question is, Shall we give and give of our manpower as we have, spend and spend as we have, and give of the natural resources of this country toward winning the war or in the defense of this country, as has been stated in the debate here today? Shall we continue such a policy to the point that we will have sold out the opportunity of the men who are fortunate enough to come back after this war is over, and have we properly represented our constituents?

It has been said in the debate that this country does business in a big way. I think we have probably been overbenevolent ever since we went into this war. I think that when we were called upon the other day to raise the national debt limit of this country to $300,000,000,000, that is proof that we have done a very large part, maybe done more than our part, maybe done more than we should have done to win this war. We all want to win it as quickly as possible, but we should like to win it in such a way as to preserve the most we can for this country and for the opportunity of the fighting men when they come back and for the people of this country who are living here now and buying bonds and paying for the prosecution of the war.

Have we, the Congress of the United States, become so benevolent that we have lost sight of the interests of the people we represent? The question that comes to my mind day after day as I sit on the floor of this House is, Are we properly safeguarding the interests of our people, the people who have hired and elected us to come here to represent them?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CLARK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2013) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 178, reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 354, nays 28, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 38]

YEAS—354

Abernethy	Doyle	Kee
Adams	Drewry	Keefe
Allen, Ill.	Durham	Kefauver
Allen, La.	Earthman	Kelley, Pa.
Andersen, H. Carl	Eberharter	Kelly, Ill.
	Elliott	Keogh
Anderson, N. Mex.	Ellsworth	Kerr
	Elsaesser	Kilburn
Andresen, August H.	Elston	Kilday
	Engel, Mich.	King
Andrews, Ala.	Engle, Calif.	Kinzer
Andrews, N. Y.	Ervin	Kirwan
Angell	Fallon	Kopplemann
Arends	Feighan	Kunkel
Arnold	Fellows	LaFollette
Auchincloss	Fenton	Landis
Bailey	Fernandez	Lane
Baldwin, Md.	Fisher	Larcade
Baldwin, N. Y.	Flannagan	Latham
Barden	Flood	Lea
Barrett, Pa.	Fogarty	LeFevre
Bates, Ky.	Folger	Lemke
Beall	Forand	Lesinski
Beckworth	Fulton	Lewis
Bell	Gamble	Link
Bender	Gathings	Ludlow
Bennet, N. Y.	Gavin	Lynch
Bennett, Mo.	Gearhart	McConnell
Biemiller	Geelan	McCormack
Bishop	Gerlach	McCowen
Blackney	Gibson	McDonough
Bland	Gifford	McGehee
Bloom	Gillespie	McGlinchey
Bolton	Gillette	McGregor
Bonner	Gillie	McMillan, S. C.
Boykin	Goodwin	McMillen, Ill.
Bradley, Pa.	Gordon	Mahon
Brehm	Gore	Maloney
Brooks	Gorski	Manasco
Brown, Ga.	Graham	Mansfield, Mont.
Brown, Ohio	Granahan	
Brumbaugh	Granger	Mansfield, Tex.
Bryson	Grant, Ala.	Marcantonio
Buck	Grant, Ind.	Martin, Iowa
Buckley	Green	Martin, Mass.
Bulwinkle	Gregory	Mason
Bunker	Griffiths	Merrow
Burch	Gross	Michener
Burgin	Gwinn, N. Y.	Miller, Calif.
Butler	Gwynne, Iowa	Mills
Byrne, N. Y.	Hale	Monroney
Camp	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Morrison
Campbell		Mundt
Canfield	Hall, Leonard W.	Murdock
Cannon, Fla.		Murphy
Cannon, Mo.	Halleck	Murray, Tenn.
Carlson	Hancock	Murray, Wis.
Carnahan	Hare	Neely
Case, N. J.	Harless, Ariz.	Norrell
Case, S. Dak.	Harness, Ind.	Norton
Celler	Harris	O'Brien, Ill.
Chapman	Hart	O'Brien, Mich.
Chelf	Hartley	O'Neal
Chenoweth	Havenner	Outland
Chiperfield	Hays	Pace
Church	Healy	Patman
Clark	Hébert	Patterson
Clements	Hedrick	Peterson, Fla.
Cochran	Heffernan	Peterson, Ga.
Coffee	Hendricks	Phillips
Cole, Kans.	Henry	Pickett
Cole, Mo.	Herter	Pittenger
Cole, N. Y.	Heselton	Ploeser
Colmer	Hess	Plumley
Cooley	Hill	Poage
Cooper	Hinshaw	Powers
Corbett	Hoch	Price, Fla.
Courtney	Hoeven	Price, Ill.
Cox	Holifield	Priest
Cravens	Holmes, Mass.	Quinn, N. Y.
Crosser	Holmes, Wash.	Rabaut
Cunningham	Hook	Rabin
Curtis	Hope	Rains
D'Alesandro	Horan	Ramey
Daughton, Va.	Howell	Ramspeck
Davis	Huber	Randolph
De Lacy	Hull	Rankin
Delaney, James J.	Jackson	Rayfiel
	Jarman	Reece, Tenn.
Delaney, John J.	Jenkins	Reed, Ill.
	Jensen	Rees, Kans.
Dickstein	Johnson, Calif.	Resa
Dingell	Johnson, Ind.	Richards
Dolliver	Johnson, Luther A.	Riley
Domengeaux		Rivers
Dondero	Johnson, Okla.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Doughton, N. C.	Jonkman	
Douglas, Calif.	Judd	Robertson, Va.
Douglas, Ill.	Kean	Rockwell
Rodgers, Pa.	Spence	Voorhis, Calif.
Roe, Md.	Springer	Vorys, Ohio
Roe, N. Y.	Stefan	Wadsworth
Rogers, Fla.	Stevenson	Walter
Rogers, Mass.	Stigler	Wasielewski
Rogers, N. Y.	Stockman	Weaver
Rooney	Sullivan	Welchel
Rowan	Sumners, Tex.	Welch
Russell	Sundstrom	Whitten
Ryter	Taber	Whittington
Sabath	Talbot	Wickersham
Sadowski	Talle	Wigglesworth
Sasscer	Tarver	Wilson
Savage	Thom	Winstead
Schwabe, Mo.	Thomas, N. J.	Wolcott
Sharp	Thomas, Tex.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Sheridan	Thomason	Wolverton, N. J.
Simpson, Ill.	Tibbott	Woodhouse
Smith, Va.	Tolan	Woodrum, Va.
Smith, Wis.	Torrens	Worley
Snyder	Towe	Zimmerman
Somers, N. Y.	Trimble	
Sparkman	Vinson	

NAYS—28

Barrett, Wyo.	Knutson	Shafer
Bradley, Mich.	Miller, Nebr.	Short
Buffett	O'Hara	Smith, Ohio
Clevenger	O'Konski	Sumner, Ill.
Crawford	Reed, N. Y.	Vursell
Dworshak	Rich	White
Ellis	Rizley	Winter
Hoffman	Robsion, Ky.	Woodruff, Mich.
Johnson, Ill.	Schwabe, Okla.	
Jones	Scrivner	

NOT VOTING—50

Anderson, Calif.	Heidinger	Patrick
Barry	Hobbs	Pfeifer
Bates, Mass.	Izac	Philbin
Boren	Jennings	Powell
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Robinson, Utah
Clason		Sheppard
Combs	Kearney	Sikes
Curley	Lanham	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson	LeCompte	Slaughter
Dirksen	Luce	Smith, Maine
Eaton	Lyle	Starkey
Fuller	McKenzie	Stewart
Gallagher	Madden	Taylor
Gardner	May	Traynor
Gossett	Morgan	Weiss
Hagen	Mott	West
Hand	O'Toole	Wood

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Sheppard with Mrs. Smith of Maine.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Madden with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Lanham with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. May with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. McKenzie with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Weiss with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Heidinger.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 175 and House Resolution 178 both made in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 2013, which has just been passed. I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution 175 be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the institution by the House 3 years ago of the custom of observing Polish Constitution Day calls for a similar observance on Wednesday, May 3, of this year. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that 1 hour be set aside on that day for that purpose, to be controlled by me or to be allotted to Members on both sides of the aisle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 45), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed (1) to conduct thorough studies and investigation of the extent and character of aid now given by the Federal, State, and local governments and private agencies to the physically handicapped, (2) to study and investigate the diffusion within the United States of such aid to the physically handicapped, (3) employment opportunities for the physically handicapped, and all other questions in relation thereto which would aid the Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The said committee or any subcommittee is authorized to obtain and use for statistical purposes only confidential information (1) from the record of the Selective Service System, (2) records from the War Manpower Commission, and (3) from the records of the Bureau of the Census subject to the restrictions of Forty-sixth Statutes at Large, page 25, section 11 (U. S. C. 13: 211).

For the purposes of this resolution, the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) during the present Congress the results of their studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS OF PROGRESS OF THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 154, Rept. No. 332)

which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations of the progress of the war effort insofar as it relates to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee, with a view to determining whether such effort is being carried forward efficiently, expeditiously, and economically.

The Committee on Naval Affairs shall report to the House during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, and to take testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman. The chairman or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SEC. 2. The heads of the various executive departments and agencies are hereby requested to detail to such committee such number of legal and expert assistants and investigators as such committee may from time to time deem necessary, or, in case such detail is not authorized by law, to grant leave of absence without pay to personnel who may request such leave to serve with such committee, without prejudice to any rights or privileges to which such personnel would be entitled if such leave had not been granted.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 290, SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 155, Rept. No. 331), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is authorized, as a committee, by subcommittee, or otherwise, to continue during the present Congress the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 290 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 15, House Resolution 188, and House Resolution 383 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and by House Resolution 58 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and for such purposes such committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon such committee by House Resolution 290 of the Seventy-sixth Congress. Any unexpended balance of the appropriation authorized for the use of such committee under House Resolution 385 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and under House Resolution 58 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, is hereby continued for such purposes.

AUTHORIZATION OF CIVILIAN MANPOWER

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 183, Rept. No. 330), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill H. R. 1752, to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table to the end that all Senate amendments be, and the same are, disagreed to and a conference is requested with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

STUDY BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS UNDER AUTHORITY OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 281, SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 96, Rept. No. 329), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Public Lands is authorized to continue the study of the problems in connection with the public lands of the United States begun under authority of House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon it by said House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and such authority shall continue through the Seventy-ninth Congress.

TO SAFEGUARD ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. CLARK, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 182, Rept. No. 328), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 43) to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and special orders heretofore entered I be permitted to address the House tomorrow for 20 minutes regarding the Mexican Treaty.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon to include certain excerpts and a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY AND FEDERAL LOAN AGENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1946

Mr. RABAUT from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 2603, Rept. No. 333) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Judiciary, and the Federal Loan Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. STEFAN reserved all points of order on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein a letter received by him from Mr. Edward A. O'Neil, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD by including an editorial which appeared in the Passenger Transport.

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Washington Post of March 7, 1945.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four instances; first, to include a resolution; second, to include an editorial from the Chelsea Record; third, to include another editorial from the same paper; and, fourth, to include a letter.

Mr. EARTHMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Fort Lauderdale Daily News.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the subject of housing and include therein two telegrams and to extend his remarks on the Bretton Woods Conference and include therein a pamphlet setting forth the attitude of large sections of organized labor on that subject.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday of this week, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes on the question of a durable peace.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert an address delivered by Assistant Secretary Hensel.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Arthur G. Sherman.

Mr. LEWIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include excerpts from a speech by Strickland Gillilan.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a colloquy with Bob Evans, Columbia Broadcasting System news commentator.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his

remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Tulsa Tribune of March 8, 1945, and also to include a letter from T. H. Hammett, dated March 8, 1945.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and to include certain excerpts.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with reference to the lend-lease bill.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a letter from the United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

LEND-LEASE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the others who have special orders, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I did not vote for the legislation which passed the House just now, the lend-lease bill. I am opposed to the principles embodied in this form of lend-lease legislation. However, I am in favor of making available to our allies all manufacturing facilities in this country and unlimited credit. I am opposed to and voted against the lend-lease bill because of the give-away principle involved. In this war we are carrying the heavy end and financing this war up to the hilt. I do not feel we should make donations of manufactured products to the people who are engaged in war without them being obligated to repay us for those supplies.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY, REPRESENTATIVE-ELECT FROM THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk:

MARCH 12, 1945.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. J. VAUGHAN GARY, as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-ninth Congress from the Third Congressional District of the State of Virginia, to fill a vacancy in that district, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

MALADMINISTRATION BY O. P. A. BLAMED FOR MEAT SHORTAGE IN NEW ORLEANS AND BATON ROUGE, WHICH IS IN DESPERATE SHAPE

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the meat situation in Baton Rouge, the capital of Louisiana, and New Orleans, is in a most critical condition. For more than 2 weeks the situation has been growing worse, until now it is intolerable.

The entire blame for this is placed on the O. P. A., and apparently from the blundering and confusion the situation is growing worse hourly.

The two meat-packing plants in New Orleans have closed and the slaughterhouse in Baton Rouge is operating on such a limited basis that little relief is in sight for the thousands of war workers at the capital city. Both New Orleans and Baton Rouge are vital war-plant areas, and thousands of people have found the meat markets closed and no meat for days.

According to the local press in both cities, the entire blame is placed on the chaotic regulations of the O. P. A.

Harold Hall, of the O. P. A. in Dallas, Tex., came to New Orleans several days ago to make a study of the situation, but the butchers and the people feel that now is the time for more action with less study. Frantic appeals have been made to Chester Bowles, O. P. A. Administrator, here in Washington during the past week, with no results.

There is meat in the pens with hundreds of head of live cattle in New Orleans and Baton Rouge, but none has reached the majority of the butcher shops and meat markets.

Fred Dykhuizen of the Louisiana Meat Packers and Processors' Association blamed O. P. A. for giving control of the meat industry to the big 10 national meat packers by so fixing the regulations that the small local meat packers were put out of business. The big ten packers cannot and will not take care of the needs of Louisiana.

Mr. Dykhuizen said further:

This was unquestionably a squeeze play by the big meat packers to eliminate the small slaughterers throughout the country. I saw this situation developing more than 2 weeks ago, and called attention to the O. P. A.

Mayor Robert S. Maestri, of New Orleans, is so concerned about the critical meat situation in New Orleans that he stated to the press that he would be glad to go to Washington to do anything possible to relieve the situation.

Officials of the city of Baton Rouge are deeply concerned and have been conferring with O. P. A. officials and the various groups of meat producers and market owners.

If Chester Bowles would get busy and untangle the chaotic mess that his departments have placed the O. P. A. in, while trying to aid certain interests, instead of removing Congressmen from meetings which vitally affect their constituents, I believe that the people of Baton Rouge and New Orleans would have an adequate meat supply.

The cattle are there on the hoof, but apparently the O. P. A. is the bottleneck that keeps the cattle from getting into the markets.

Mr. Bowles, this unnecessary meat shortage is in your lap. It is time for you to act and act promptly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to the resolution passed last week setting aside April 14, which is Saturday, for the celebration of Pan-American Day.

April 14 was designated as Pan-American Day in 1930, by proclamations of the presidents of the American republics, the day having been selected because it was the date of the birth of the Pan-American Union. Since that time the day has been celebrated in various ways in the American countries. In some countries it is celebrated in the schools, in some in the parliaments, and in others in other ways. Last year the Chamber of Deputies of Chile indulged in a very gala celebration to which the president of that chamber invited two Members of each American House of Representatives or Chambers of Deputies. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] and I had the pleasure and honor of representing this body at that time. As was stated here several weeks ago, on the following day a committee was formed consisting of the chairmen of the delegations from each country for the purpose of creating and continuing the spirit of Pan-American unity. You will recall that the idea was unanimously approved by this body several weeks ago. The setting aside of this day is the first functioning of the United States member of that committee.

You will doubtless recall that the resolution stipulates that no other business except that germane to such an occasion shall occur at that time. The only business to be considered will be a fitting resolution and remarks of Members who may desire to discuss Pan-American Day, Pan Americanism, Pan-American unity, and so forth.

I wish at this time to extend a cordial invitation to every Member of the House to be present to speak on that subject if he or she desires or to extend his or her remarks in the RECORD on that occasion.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I wish to state to the gentleman that at Mexico City, Commission 3, which was in charge of the Act of Chapultepec and other measures, including the reorganization of Pan American groups, took notice of the gentleman's resolution favoring an interparliamentary union of the parliaments of Latin-American republics. The statement I made regarding the passage of the Jarman resolution by the United States House of Representatives was incorporated as part of the proceedings of the Act of Chapultepec. The Members attending that conference were very much pleased with this action of the United States House of

Representatives. The gentleman from Alabama deserves credit for getting it through this body unanimously. Many delegates sent messages to Congressman JARMAN and to Congressman CHIPERFIELD.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts very much, and I know I can speak for the gentleman from Illinois as well as personally in expressing appreciation of these messages from our Latin-American friends and neighbors. I am sure she realizes how gratified I was to be able to send her that message that she might pass it on to these friends at the important occasion on which she played such a large part.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York gladly.

Mr. COLE of New York. If the gentleman has not already done so, I suggest that he advise the House the relationship there is contemplated between this Pan American Interparliamentary Union and the old, established Interparliamentary Union that has been in existence, as the gentlemen knows, for many years and was suspended by reason of the war.

Mr. JARMAN. The Interparliamentary Union to which the gentleman refers as having been suspended by reason of the war was, I think, an international one rather than a Pan American one. Is that not so?

Mr. COLE of New York. That is correct.

Mr. JARMAN. The Pan American Union consisting of the pan-American republics functions generally through the diplomatic personnel of the countries. In other words, it is an executive proposition. I stand corrected if I am wrong.

Mr. COLE of New York. I think the gentleman is incorrect. It is not an executive interparliamentary union. The gentleman will recall that perhaps 6 years ago the Congress designated delegates to attend the Conference, I think in 1939.

Mr. JARMAN. Of the Pan American Union?

Mr. COLE of New York. I am speaking of the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. JARMAN. That is, the international one?

Mr. COLE of New York. That is the world-wide one.

Mr. JARMAN. Yes; the world-wide one.

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course, this Pan American Union is international also.

Mr. JARMAN. Strictly speaking, yes; but it is not what I think of as an international union, when we are discussing the world-wide Interparliamentary Union and the comparatively restricted Pan American one.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is not world wide.

Mr. JARMAN. No.

Mr. COLE of New York. It is limited to the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. JARMAN. That is true.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. In clarification, the Pan American Union, as the gentleman was saying, is the executive end of it. The Pan American Interparliamentary Union would be our part of it, would it not?

Mr. JARMAN. Yes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Supplementary to and side by side with.

Mr. JARMAN. Yes. I call attention to the fact that the other body is not participating in this. It is entirely a House of Representatives or chamber of deputies proposition.

Mr. COLE of New York. What is the reason for that? That arouses another bit of curiosity.

Mr. JARMAN. The only reason of which I can think is that the President of the Chamber of Deputies of Chile invited the corresponding bodies of the different countries to send representatives to a celebration by his body. He naturally held it in his own chamber and it was participated in only by the delegates sent by such bodies.

Mr. COLE of New York. The terminology "Interparliamentary Union" is not to be construed as including the parliaments of the various countries, but simply one house of the parliament?

Mr. JARMAN. The House of Representatives or the Chamber of Deputies.

Mr. COLE of New York. There is to be no connection or no relationship between the Pan American Interparliamentary Union and the International Interparliamentary Union?

Mr. JARMAN. No; not between these two. Of course, there necessarily has to be a connection between any two Pan American Unions, and there naturally must be a slight connection between this one I am talking about and the Pan American Union established in 1930. There is no connection between what I refer to as the International Parliamentary Union and this one.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is what I wanted to know about, the International Parliamentary Union.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has a special order for today and I ask that he be recognized at this time.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MAIL TO OVERSEAS SERVICEMEN

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution concerning Christmas or gift packages to men overseas, which is a matter that relates to millions of packages and also to millions of men in the armed services overseas. This is a serious matter, because there are hundreds of thousands of packages in the various theaters of war that it has not been possible to deliver for one reason or another, but in no case because of the failure of the service personnel, and I refer to the Army and Navy services, who are doing everything possible under the circumstances. This is because of insurmountable practical difficulties. The addressees have been transferred thousands of miles, casualties have occurred, the addresses on the packages have been obliterated, there are packages that will not stand reshipment, or there are no repackaging facilities in forward areas, and oftentimes the contents have broken out of the packages and have become unidentified.

I have here a letter from the Navy showing that to the Pacific area, for example, for the month of January alone, more than half of the people of the United States wrote letters—73,000,000 of them.

I am advised by the Navy that there were in excess of 10,000,000 packages sent in the Christmas mail to the Pacific area alone. I have myself seen 1 group of 5,000 bags of mail—and I do not mean packages, but bags of mail on a South Pacific island lying out in the rain, which it was not possible even to put under cover. I have seen 26,000 bags of mail in a warehouse which could not possibly be delivered. When that occurs, it means that all new mail must be further delayed because of this mail that has clogged up. The longest held mail must be taken out of the barrel first. It is like feeding the children apples. The mother that feeds the children just apples from the barrel as they become bad, soon finds that during the whole winter the children are fed nothing but rotten apples. I am saying to you: Let us sweep this barrel clean by distributing free and at once packages that cannot be delivered to the servicemen in the area. Let us find some way to do it differently in this war than we did in the last. If you will recall, in the last war the services turned such undeliverable packages over to certain charitable organizations and the packages were then auctioned off to the various soldiers in the area. This time let us give them, not sell them, to the boys. Let us give these packages to the buddies of the ones who have been killed or have been wounded and moved out. I would hate to see an auction held in this war, when that package was consigned to some boy, with a note reading, for example, "Bill, from his loving mother, with tender care." I want to see Bill's buddies get these packages and I want to see them get them free, as Bill would have shared the package with them had he been there.

The problem is expressed in this recent Navy Department letter to me which says:

> In a report from the Postal Coordinator, Seventh Fleet, it has been stated that post-office quarters are extremely congested in some spots, and that thousands of parcel-post sacks have been stored on concrete slabs with no protection from sun and rain except for tarpaulins. The statement was also made that hundreds of parcels were ruined by weather, the addresses being totally obliterated by dampness and that many other parcels were damaged by mildew and intense sunlight.

Possibly 70 to 80 percent of these packages contain simply food and candy. This food was sent in October and November of last year in Christmas packages. That means that the food is now 5 months old, and if we wait any longer the food is going to spoil. You cannot ship it back to the senders who cannot be found in many cases and do not want the food back anyhow. In some cases you cannot ship it to the addressee because you do not know his address, and there is not the quantity of shipping available for such a long useless haul.

My plan is simply this: Let us turn these packages over to the Red Cross in the area and have the Red Cross, assisted by the chaplains and the welfare personnel of the services, open these undelivered packages. The Red Cross is then representing the boys and will be present at the time of the opening of the packages. When the packages are opened the Red Cross then determines whether first, they have real value or sentimental value; if so, return them to the sender; second, if they do not have a real or sentimental value, are they food or perishables which can be used; if so, then distribute them to the boys in the area whose morale needs it most. Lastly, if they cannot be used in the area, and the contents are of no real or sentimental value, instruct the services to destroy the packages. Let us get rid of them, and let us have the Army and the Navy clean up these warehouses and not use the extra ships to bring those packages back to America. You just would not want Aunt Mary's fruit cake winding up at home 6 months after the boy she sent it to has become a casualty and is gone. I know that if the boy received it over there he would want to share it with his buddies. Lastly, let us have the boy who receives the package write to the particular person that sends it and say, "Many thanks for your generosity. I used it and was certainly glad to get it."

I am recommending this plan as a serviceman who actually himself saw part of his ship's Christmas packages go in the sea when they were being transferred from a destroyer. There were other packages aboard our carrier for 3 or 4 months for people who had been transferred long ago, that we looked at longingly through the cracks. We saw fruit cakes going to waste simply because the boy was transferred and no one could touch them without authority. This plan has to be flexible because it has to be suitable to local conditions and managed by the local area, ship, or facility commanders or by instructions from the Postmaster General.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I am delighted to have a resolution of this kind brought to the House. Many times the packages of the boys who have been casualties are returned to the families. These packages have been returned to the home 6 months after the death of the boy, by which time the food has all gone to pieces. In one instance a family after the packages were returned had the agony of knowing that not one single letter or package they had sent to this lad 18 years old, who had had only 17 weeks of training, had reached him from the time he left. If arrangements could be made whereby these agonized families would avoid these experiences, that in itself would be a very real contribution to the general morale.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentlewoman for her statement.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. I want to add my praise of the statement the gentleman has made to the House this afternoon. This matter has come to my attention, too. Based on what I have heard and on the gentleman's personal experience as he has related it, I am very happy to endorse the resolution the gentleman has introduced.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentlewoman from California.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Under the gentleman's plan, how long does the commanding officer have to wait before determining that the package cannot be delivered?

Mr. FULTON. Whether it is of a perishable nature or cannot be delivered within a reasonable time is to be determined under the circumstances right in the particular area according to the local conditions. It all depends on the local conditions.

May I ask the gentleman from New York if he endorses the plan?

Mr. BENNET of New York. I do endorse the plan.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I think the idea is an excellent one, if not for its sentimental value, for the value of the added space that will be made available for other purposes and that is now occupied by these many packages. I trust that those who sent the packages will have an opportunity to have something to say about their disposal, and that if the packages have no sentimental value, they will be placed to a good and proper use before they are destroyed.

Mr. FULTON. It will be a saving of storage space to the Army and the Navy now. It would also be a saving by getting immediate delivery because I understand that hundreds of thousands of undelivered Christmas packages were captured by the Germans in warehouses in the area they occupied in their recent offensive into France.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I think probably it is unnecessary for me to assert that there is probably no Member of the House who is not concerned with this problem of delivery of mail. We are all receiving letters complaining about it, but we also recognize that it is a tremendous responsibility to fight a war and at the same time get to those boys the best things from home to keep up their morale. I wonder if the gentleman's proposal has been submitted by him to any of the services who have this responsibility and, if so, what their comment is.

Mr. FULTON. I have submitted the resolution to the services. I have checked with them as to the need for some action and as to what action they have taken. It is not my intention to get a commitment from the services on the resolution until it has been introduced, which I understand is their practice. However, they say there is need for some constructive action to clear these warehouses and to save this shipping back. My plan is to give the theater and facility commanders and the commanders of the ships the opportunity to do the best under the circumstances under the guidance of the Red Cross, and more or less lay down a plan for them that they can amend or fit to local needs. The commanders now have no definite authority to act. I may say that this is along the general lines the Navy is thinking.

Mr. COLE of New York. Granted that something should be done to correct this system and that some adjustments need to be made, is it the gentleman's view that legislation is necessary to do it? Do not the services have authority to make whatever adjustments seem to be proper to correct the situation?

Mr. FULTON. That is a good point, because all personnel and all personal property in theaters of operation are under the absolute control of the theater commander, so that once these packages have been delivered to the post-office authorities of the fleet or of the Army in either New York or San Francisco they come under the foreign area commander rather than under the Post Office Department. But the commanders do not have definite authority to act, and hesitate to do so. It is therefore necessary for Congress to clarify and lay down a definite policy that can be followed by both services and by the post-office authorities.

Mr. COLE of New York. I do not want to strike a discordant note on this matter. I want to compliment the gentleman on his zeal in looking after his buddies.

Mr. FULTON. It does not need legislation at this time. It needs a clear statement of policy, which this resolution provides.

Mr. COLE of New York. I am not certain from having heard the gentleman's rather brief explanation of his problem, whether it would simplify and expedite the delivery of mail or whether it would make it more cumbersome if we bring in another agency and ask them to supervise the opening, distribution, and delivery of it, and whether it might not delay the distribution of mail rather than expedite it.

Mr. FULTON. My point on it is this. I want some independent arbitrator there at the time of the opening of the packages in order to protect the boy who is not there.

Mr. COLE of New York. That brings up another question. Does not the gentleman feel that the chaplain of the service, the religious corps of the services, is a sufficient representative of the boys' interest?

Mr. FULTON. That will depend on the local area. We have it in the resolution that both the chaplain and the welfare officer are to be consulted, but I know the families would appreciate an independent charitable organization such as the Red Cross representing their interests as well.

Mr. COLE of New York. I hope the gentleman is successful in expediting the delivery of mail whether it is by his plan or some other plan.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. I was interested in the point raised by the gentleman from New York because a great quantity of this mail is insured. It contains things of value. There has to be some agency, whether it be the Army, the Navy, or the Red Cross, to make an accurate and independent audit of what is in those packages, in order to protect the postal authorities on their insured packages.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution as I, too, feel that an independent outside agency such as the Red Cross also gives protection to the services on the opening of the packages.

Mr. CORBETT. I want to compliment the gentleman very much on his proposal. May I add my remarks to those of the other Members that I believe the gentleman ought to do everything he can to expedite the handling and distribution of these packages.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania has offered a very valuable suggestion and one that will clarify a problem which is already a rather serious one to the Army and Navy post office. However, I would like to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as I understand, the resolution which he has proposed, is merely a statement of policy?

Mr. FULTON. That is correct.

Mr. ADAMS. The gentleman has no intention of suggesting any basic law here. I think the gentleman's resolution is entitled to a great deal of consideration. I wish to compliment him on the suggestion which he has made.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. GWINN of New York. By way of confirmation of what the gentleman has stated, I have just received a letter from a mother saying:

> Our son is serving somewhere in the Southwest. Every letter we get from him says, "If we only could get some mail." They had absolutely no mail or packages for Christmas. I am wondering if any of the packages mentioned in the enclosed article—

This was a newspaper article—

> are not the ones such as my son is anxiously looking for, many containing articles he is in need of, which are simply neglected and left lying around rather than have the effort put forth to have them delivered.

I strongly favor the gentleman's resolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 more minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. LATHAM. During the last 3 years I have been in most of the Atlantic, South Atlantic, and Southwest Pacific bases of this country as a naval officer. I know that the handling of the mail is an enormous problem. I think the services do very, very well in the handling of that problem, considering what they have to work against. But I have seen in the Southwest Pacific bases enormous quantities of mail that have been stored a long time. It is true that not all of that mail would come under the provision of the resolution which the gentleman is seeking to pass, and not all of it is in that category, but it is a fact there is a great problem that must be met immediately. I think the gentleman's suggestion is a very worthy one.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

COMMITTEE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the Committee for Constitutional Government has been a very busy propaganda organization for a long time. It has been seeking to bring about the adoption of a proposed twenty-second amendment limiting the taxing power of the Federal Government to a maximum rate of 25 percent. Such a proposal is a very interesting one in these days of high corporate and personal taxes to finance the war. We are requiring for our financial well-being high levies in every bracket but we could not begin to meet the financial needs of this Government during this war without additional heavy sales-tax levies and increases in every type of excise taxes were it not for the graduated income tax on private incomes and the corporation levies which in many cases are more than three times as high as the maximum proposed by the Committee for Constitutional Government.

The effect of the proposed twenty-second amendment ought to be extremely clear. We would relieve large corporations and rich individuals of a great share of their taxes and compel the Government to find new sources of income which inevitably would have to be found in the application of a general sales tax. Those people and those States which have advocated the adoption of the twenty-second amendment must face that fact and must be willing to explain why corporations and individuals with tremendous wealth should be freed from their heavy tax burdens and why the great masses of low-income wage earners, already burdened with new income taxes and payroll deductions for social security and for the purchase of War bonds, should assume that load. I, for one, do not think it a very sensible suggestion. I do not think it is going to be adopted by the American Nation. I have a right to that opinion and a right to hold it without being smeared by the Committee for Constitutional Government.

I say that because the Committee for Constitutional Government has been releasing some publicity about those who have had the courage to oppose them in this matter. I have not heretofore had anything to say about it so what is contained in this propaganda does not refer to me but to certain other indiivduals over the country and particularly to at least one Member of this Congress. Here is what the latest statement says:

> An organized, Nation-wide smear campaign has been set afoot by left-wing agitators and opportunist demagogues to defeat the proposed twenty-second amendment, limiting the taxing power of the Federal Government. Its method is that of revolutionary communism—misrepresentations and abuse. Its leadership is in P. A. C., in Communist-dominated labor unions, and their pink fringe of misguided liberals.

Later on in the statement the committee refers to the "pink press" and to "diatribes by a mouthpiece who distorts and smears from behind a libel-proof barricade of congressional privilege." This is not very nice language to use concerning a Member of this body, but it is not the first time that the Committee for Constitutional Government has used money raised over the country supposedly for the purpose of supporting the Constitution to smear Members of Congress and the particular Congressmen to whom it refers in the quotation I have just given you.

Furthermore, it has been as busy as it could be defaming the new Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable Henry Wallace. Over a long period of years it has sought to create the impression that Mr. Wallace possesses a political philosophy alien to American ideals. In this same press release it pays its respects to Mr. Wallace again and says:

> The Wallace-C. I. O.-P. A. C. program is a mere tracing of blueprints from the compulsory state. It is compulsory extension of credit by government, drawing its funds by excessive taxation from one class of citizens and one class of business, to subsidize government—favored competition—until all can be socialized under a totalitarian regime.

Now, the interesting thing is that this organization which dishes out political propaganda in its every release, claims to be entirely nonpolitical and has had the the affrontry to attempt to obtain rulings which would permit funds given

to it to be deducted in income-tax returns as a proper business expense. While the Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures for the House of Representatives in 1944 was doing its work, we came across many evidences of this intention and desire and we found that corporations, particularly large corporations in Texas, were being solicited for funds on the basis of a legal opinion that it was proper to give money to the Committee for Constitutional Government for the purchase of books and that thereby those provisions of the Corrupt Practices Act which prevent contributions from corporations for political purposes, might be either evaded or avoided.

The matter interested me to the extent that on February 12, 1945, I addressed a letter to Joseph D. Nunan, Jr., Commissioner of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I want to give it to you in full at this point because it expresses completely the reasons why I have felt that contributions to this organization ought to have been made public and that no contributor should be permitted to escape the odium that should properly be attached to him because of his contribution to the Committee for Constitutional Government and its vicious, malicious political slander of top characters in public life such as the President of the United States and the members of his Cabinet. This is what I said to Mr. Nunan:

FEBRUARY 12, 1945.

JOSEPH D. NUNAN, Jr.,
Commissioner, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Internal Revenue Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NUNAN: As chairman of the House Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures in the year 1944, I became very much interested in the situation within the Committee for Constitutional Government. I enclose a copy of our hearings with this committee for your information.

I have been wondering, since the investigation ended, what would be the policy of your Department toward deductions by businessmen representing money advanced by them to the Committee for Constitutional Government. I believe that such sums should not be deductible and I base that on the theory that the Committee for Constitutional Government is a political organization, and if so, money given to it by individuals should not be deductible as a business expense. It is possible that money given to it by corporations represents a violation of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

As you know, we tried to find by examination the names of the contributors to this organization, but upon instruction of the board of trustees, Dr. Edward A. Rumely, the executive secretary, declined to furnish us with that information. The only place it will show up is in the deductions which businessmen take in their income-tax reports and the deductions which corporations claim because of their contributions to the educational work of this committee.

The files gathered by the House Committee on Campaign Expenditures included many pamphlets which seemed to the members of the committee to be frankly political. I doubt if I should add to the length of this letter by giving you many samples. We had sworn testimony that the Committee for Constitutional Government was active against the third term, even though, as it naively says, it did not come out against any particular candidate.

On page 457 of our hearings the following quotation can be found from one of the publications of the committee:

"These facts showing 'the progressive degeneration of American democracy' (O'MAHONEY) pose a question to the conscience of every honest Democrat in the land. And will Republican leaders, purged of the Old Guard which disunited the party in the 1920's, be patriots and effect an American coalition against the New Deal Nazis in 1944?"

It strikes me that referring to the Democratic Party as New Deal Nazis is political campaigning. In another pamphlet known as Destructive Taxation, the committee refers to what it calls the New Deal state-socialist revolutionists. In a pamphlet entitled "Is Life Insurance Next," we find these words:

"And so the savings of the people pass to the control of the most wasteful and profligate Government this world has ever known."

I don't know how anyone would contend that this characterization of the Government was nonpolitical. The same pamphlet carries these words:

"The door is now open for the new dealers to regulate and control every life-insurance policy in America. The socialization of insurance now has a green light."

Later on we find this quotation:

"The Europeanization of America has gone on for the past 10 years. The greatest asset our peoples possess, insurance, now falls under the control of the Government, which has failed to pay its bills a single year for 14 years."

I think the above quotation is a serious example of the lengths to which this committee has gone in its efforts to hurt the administration and in this particular instance; to defeat the war effort, because it leaves the inference that War bonds will not be safe when issued by a Government which it says has failed to pay its bills a single year for 14 years.

So much for the political aspects of some of the committee work. I now come to the question of its financing.

In the State of Texas, in the short span of a few months, the Committee for Constitutional Government raised more than $100,000. It got this by a high-pressure financial campaign directed by one T. R. Ewart, who was also the money raiser on a percentage basis for the American Democratic National Committee, likewise a political organization devoted to the destruction of the regular Democratic Party. Mr. Ewart was paid on the basis of $10,000 a year, although I never found where any salary deductions were made by the Committee for Constitutional Government. He drew additional money from sales of a publication. He got travel money. The committee took over the rental of his offices and employed help for him. All this work coincided pretty carefully with the Texas primary and was centered in the districts of Texas Congressmen who supported the administration.

Apparently there was quite a discussion as to how corporations could legally contribute to this work and Mr. Samuel B. Pettengill wrote a letter to the treasurer of the committee, Mr. Sumner Gerard, dated May 20, 1944, which appears in our hearings on pages 510 and 511. One paragraph reads as follows:

"Do the laws of the State forbid such expenditure? This would depend in each State upon its own legislation, but I have read the pertinent provisions of the Texas statutes and am satisfied that it is wholly proper for a Texas corporation to make such expenditures within the pattern described below."

That pattern is for the corporation to buy copies of the Norton book on the Constitution or the Bill of Rights wall piece. I submit that that is an attempt to establish a legal dodge to get around the provisions of the Corrupt Practices Act preventing corporations from making contributions for political purposes and that Mr. Pettengill so regarded it when he wrote his letter. As evidence on that point, I call your attention to the testimony of Dr. Rumely before our committee shown in the printed testimony at pages 508 and 509. We tried to find out how much the Bill of Rights cost and for what it was sold. I can say to you that it is supposed to be sold at 75 cents a single copy, and 40 cents in quantities. I tried my best at several different hearings to find out what the printing cost was but had no success. Finally by chance, I came across a photostatic copy of a letter sent by Dr. Rumely to Mr. Gerard referring to a special commitment for $14,120. Because of the nature of this, Dr. Rumely wanted to find some individual who could pay the bill for the committee and who could be reimbursed after the election. Mr. Gerard replied with a penciled notation reading: "Owing to present situation we must move cautiously. I suggest I see you first (confidentially) to talk it over. S. G." I became interested as to what that represented, so I insisted that the committee furnish me with information as to this bill. It developed that it was a bill for 200,000 Bill of Rights folders at $44.25 per thousand, or less than four and a half cents apiece. I can give you the photostatic bill if you need it, but it is Order No. 5060 from the Magill-Weinsheimer Co., 1320–1334 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., dated September 27, 1944.

Dr. Rumely knew when he was under oath when we were trying to find out what these folders cost, that he had ordered them and what the price was to be, but he did not reveal that information to us because it would have shown that a folder which cost four and a half cents was to be sold to a corporation for 75 cents under the pattern so carefully described by Mr. Pettengill as a legal method by which a corporation could contribute to the political purposes of the Committee for Constitutional Government. The Committee could take the profit from this sale and use it to scatter pamphlets broadcast over the country referring to the President of the United States and Members of his Cabinet as "New Deal Nazis."

I am advised that one corporation, namely the Gannett Newspapers, has purchased thousands of these. Dr. Rumely, in a letter to me dated December 20, 1944, states that Mr. F. E. Gannett, of Rochester, N. Y., the founder of the Committee for Constitutional Government, has "just purchased $5,000 worth of this printing of the Bill of Rights." I think that you may be interested in finding out at what price he purchased these copies. If he purchased them at more than a reasonable profit above the 4½-cent cost, then he was indirectly making a donation to the political purposes of the Committee for Constitutional Government, and it is a serious question as to whether or not his contribution should be deductible as a business expense.

If space and time permitted I could go through other publications of the committee. The Norton book mentioned by Mr. Pettengill sells at $2 and costs 86 cents. I learned that 4,500 copies of the book went to one purchaser in Texas. My question would naturally be whether the profit on that huge order did not become part of the fund which sent into Texarkana, Tex., thousands of copies of a pamphlet entitled "Roosevelt Is History's Most Lavish Spender." With this following comment, it intended to influence the primary in which Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN was a candidate for reelection:

"In 1940 Texarkana had a population of 28,859. Its share of the Federal debt on July 1 next will be $43,605,949. Its share of the interest charge will be $920,602 annually. Your city will tell a similar story. I mention Texarkana because it is the home of Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, who is one of those who thinks nothing of debt. He proposes to go right on going into debt when the war is

over. The thought of putting any limit on debt and taxes is very obnoxious to him."

The one book sale financed a quarter of a million of these pamphlets intended to harm the President and Congressman PATMAN. Many of them went into Mr. PATMAN'S district for the sole purpose of destroying him politically. I think you have a right to know whether book purchases were charged off as a business expense. You may have some obligation to tell the Department of Justice about the situation if it develops that corporation funds were used for political purposes because the profit on the book sale was more than $5,000 if the usual prices applied.

I trust that this letter gives you sufficient information on which to proceed. I want to express a personal hope that every agent for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, every collector and every employee of it will be on the lookout for deductions based on money advanced to the Committee for Constitutional Government and which went to pay for its books, its malicious pamphlets or what it terms its "educational work."

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON.

To supplement what I had said to him on February 12, I sent Mr. Nunan another letter on February 22, 1945. In it I called attention to the latest publication of the Committee for Constitutional Government. That publication says:

We feel we should protect our supporters from attacks and smears by the Communists, P. A. C., and fanatical new dealers like Chairman CLINTON P. ANDERSON, who, running for reelection with C. I. O.-P. A. C. support, assailed us from Sidney Hillman's headquarters. He has put out many false statements about us.

Therefore, I wrote Mr. Nunan and this is what I said to him at that time:

DEAR MR. NUNAN: I am handing you for return to me a sample of the latest publication for the Committee for Constitutional Government. You will notice how neatly Mr. Gerard links me with the Communists and claims I issued a statement from Sidney Hillman's headquarters. You will notice in this letter that this committee suggests that a folder entitled "Will Americans Surrender to the Legions of the Left?" is to be used as a tool to help them arouse the country, to speak to Congress against allowing Wallace and the left-wingers to take over the R. F. C. This is certainly political activity. You will notice also that they admit conducting a campaign to show the dangers inherent in unlimited deficit spending which is the only way we can finance the war. You will note the committee claims that they successfully mobilized the country against court-packing in 1937.

You will also notice their new plans which are to have an average of 1,000 people at work in every congressional district. This is no schoolhouse campaign. They are going to do active political work in every congressional district supporting those who favor their policies and trying to destroy those of us who do not respond to their leadership.

Notice in the pamphlet that they label the efforts of many sincere people to allow Henry Wallace to have the administration of R. F. C. as the showdown fight between "collectivism and Americanism."

You will notice on the yellow sheet that the Bill of Rights as a wall piece sells for 60 cents for a sample copy down to 40 cents in quantities of 5,000 or more. My previous letter to you pointed out that the printing cost of this Bill of Rights is less than 4½ cents, so that when a corporation fills out this "contribution pledge" it is in effect giving money for this political propaganda designed to link me with the Communists, to link Henry Wallace with Lenin, Trotsky, Mussolini, and Hitler and to say that Wallace will advocate a program which will provide for Government ownership of railroads, truck lines, airlines, coal, petroleum, iron, etc.

I am very happy to report to this House that Mr. Nunan, under date of February 26, 1945, replied to me advising that contributions to the Committee for Constitutional Government could not be deducted under sections 23 (o) or 23 (q) of the Internal Revenue Code, the sections which relate to gifts, to educational, philanthropic or charitable organizations and that there was no provision in the law or regulations under which contributions to this organization would be deductible by taxpayers as an ordinary or necessary business expense. I think it important to give you Mr. Nunan's letter in full:

FEBRUARY 26, 1945.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Reference is made to your letters dated February 12 and February 22, 1945, enclosing a copy of "Hearings before the Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures," together with sample of the latest publication of the "Committee for Constitutional Government, Incorporated". You request advice with respect to the policy of the Department toward deductions by businessmen of contributions or money advanced to the above-named organization.

The Bureau has ruled that since the organization in question failed to qualify for exemption under section 101 (6) of the Internal Revenue Code, contributions thereto would not be deductible under sections 23 (o) or 23 (q) of the Internal Revenue Code.

There is no provisions in the law or regulations under which contributions to this organization would be deductible by taxpayers as an ordinary and necessary business expense under section 23 (a) of the Code and if it is found upon the filing of returns and examination thereof that payments of this nature were not made for legitimate services rendered, they will be disallowed.

As requested, the publication enclosed with your letter is returned herewith.

In any further communication relative to this matter, reference should be made to IT:P:CA-DEM.

Very truly yours,

JOSEPH D. NUNAN, Jr.,
Commissioner.

To me, this is an extremely important situation. A great deal of the vile and malicious things which are being said about Congress as an institution and about individual Members of Congress come from such organizations as the Committee for Constitutional Government and the Constitutional Educational League. If businessmen were to be permitted to deduct sums given to these organizations then there would be no end to the amount of propaganda that would be turned loose in this country. I think we should make it our business, by the passage of appropriate legislation, to see that all these supposedly educational groups are brought within the purview of regular congressional examination, both as to their receipts and their expenditures, that we keep a consistent check on them through one of the committees of the House and not make it necessary for special committees to try to develop all the background information on them in the short space of a few weeks during a political campaign. We should ride herd regularly on those organizations which thrive on slander and abuse and which, by the very nature of their operations, detract from the war effort. We cannot do it sporadically. We must be in position to examine them regularly so that the connected story of all their activities will spell out their real purposes and their methods of operation.

With that in mind, I call to your attention and the attention of the Congress that portion of the report submitted by the Special Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures for the House of Representatives, 1944. As we went through our work, we saw steadily the influence of these so-called "educational" groups. We saw how Congress had used language designed to exclude organizations of a purely social, charitable, religious, patriotic or educational character as distinguished from those groups that were frankly political. Then we used this language:

These distinctions between political campaigning and other activities were workable enough so long as the activities in question remained more or less separable in fact. The difficulty is that this condition seems no longer to obtain. There are still, to be sure, political committees in the traditional and statutory sense of the term; there are still quite nonpolitical, social, charitable, religious, patriotic, civic, and educational organizations; and there are still newspapers, magazines, and radio programs which are quite what they purport to be. But it is also true that major power and pressure groups show a growing tendency to participate in political campaigns indirectly through these traditionally nonpolitical forms rather than directly through political parties, party committees, and outright contributions to candidates.

But if the statutes are thus understandably limited, it does not follow that public disclosure from these presently exempt organizations is not important and desirable. On the contrary, disclosure of the sources of their funds, of their affiliations, and of their concrete objectives as distinguished from their abstract professions of faith, is even more important than disclosure by party committees of the conventional type. For the public knows pretty well where each political party stands, and what each represents. They present no great problem of mislabeling and misbranding. The true colors of some of the educational organizations herein investigated, on the other hand, are by no means as apparent. Some receive anonymous contributions, in one instance, two $1,000 bills in an unmarked envelope. Some solicit contributions by agents compensated on a commission basis, using what they call a mail-order technique. Several seek by this means to have contributions to their propaganda activity treated as deductible for tax purposes. Enforced disclosure by purveyors of political propaganda thus becomes as necessary for the protection of the public as it has in the past been recognized to be in the case of food and drugs, and in the case of securities (p. 7 of H. Rept. 2093, 78th Cong.).

Our committee felt that checking such organizations should be a continuous job and added a suggestion to that effect in these words:

The practices under investigation illustrate the ease with which "opinion molders" can adjust themselves and the form of their organizations to narrow and rigid statutory

prohibitions. But narrow definition and rigidity of interpretation are essential attributes of an effective criminal statute, not only as a matter of legal tradition but as a matter of practicable enforceability in the United States. The objective of remedial legislation should therefore be to set up a scheme of regulation resting on a general standard, relying on some congressional agency to watch continuously evolving practices and patterns of organization in the field of political activity, and to keep up-to-date regulations calculated to insure continuity of compliance with the general standard, despite the protean character of the forms of political activity. The task might be entrusted to a standing committee or other adjunct or agency of the Congress. Criminal penalties should be prescribed as a secondary sanction to enforce compliance with the disclosure requirements of the regulations.

The statutory authority of the agency empowered to require disclosure should be broad enough to cover organizations representing themselves as "opinion-molding, educational, or similar types of organization," including "civic, fraternal, social, patriotic, recreational, religious, and welfare," as well as "political" organizations. This would admittedly be a broad standard, and obviously there would be no real concern with the majority of organizations falling within each of the categories mentioned. But the investigation does show that organizations engaging in political activity for both reputable and subversive ends will more often than not be found masquerading under one of these nonpolitical heads. The only way to reach them is to subject all in these categories to a disclosure requirement, and at the same time to set up an administrative mechanism for exempting from further registration or disclosure the great majority of reputable nonpolitical organizations in these categories which are what they purport to be, and which most of them could speedily be ascertained to be.

I am, therefore, glad that the Bureau of Internal Revenue will not permit business organizations to charge off deductions for their contributions to the Committee for Constitutional Government. Indeed, I hope that wherever an agent of the Bureau of Internal Revenue comes across a purchase of books from the Committee for Constitutional Government he will turn that information into the Washington office in the shape of a special report with the hope that in some way that information can reach the hands of the Department of Justice and that appropriate action may be speedily taken against those corporations which have used this committee in an effort to dodge the requirements of the Corrupt Practices Act. Only by so doing will we eventually dry up these wells of misinformation that spread so much poison in our national life.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include therein certain statements, excerpts, and editorials.)

VICIOUS PLOT TO MAKE SNEAK ATTACK ON CONSTITUTION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor of the House on a number of occasions in the past year to warn the Members of this body and the citizens of our Nation of the vicious plot that was being perpetrated by a group of selfish individuals masquerading under the name of such a patriotic-sounding phrase as the "Committee for Constitutional Government," as just discussed by the gentleman from New Mexico, Congressman ANDERSON. You are well aware of the activities of this group as no State has escaped the tenacles of its insidious propaganda machine which has sent out millions upon millions of pieces of literature advocating that the sixteenth amendment to our Constitution be repealed and in its place a "twenty-second amendment" be added which would limit the power of the Federal Government to tax incomes, inheritances, and gifts to a maximum of 25 percent.

May I again call to your attention the principals who are behind this movement, and something of the true nature of the proposal?

FASCIST LEADERS BEHIND MOVEMENT

The man we find at the head of the Fascist lead Committee for Constitutional Government's activities and a man who would certainly benefit from the passage of such a tax-reducing amendment (for the rich only) is Frank Gannett, the pious millionaire publisher from New York State. What a benefit he would reap for his share of the work.

NO. 1 FASCIST IN AMERICA

Next comes a former Member of our own legislative body, Samuel B. Pettengill, able orator who uses the cloak of the Constitution as a shield for his real schemes, whom I consider America's No. 1 Fascist; next comes Edward A. Rumely, convicted German agent in World War No. 1, whom many think is the real brain behind the activities of this group who would lead us into the ways of fascism; last comes the once reputable author and publisher, S. S. McClure, who, after studying fascism for years in Italy, permitted the group to use his name and reputation as one of the "front" men for the organization.

MAKING DESPERATE EFFORT TO GET MORE STATES

The flag-waving Committee for Constitutional Government, in which I sincerely hope is its dying struggle, is reaching out in all directions in a desperate bid to gain the endorsement of a few more additional State legislatures so that it can grasp upon these endorsements as evidence that the Nation is still behind them.

SLIPPED THROUGH STATE LEGISLATURES

This has been one of their great selling points—under the cover of almost complete lack of publicity they managed to have the legislatures of 14 States pass resolutions memoralizing Congress to call a constitutional convention and submit the proposed "twenty-second amendment" to the States. They have continually harped on the number of States that have endorsed the plan—thereby hoping that additional States would follow blindly in what seemed to be national endorsement. They continue to frantically appeal to State legislatures on the basis that 18 States have already passed endorsing resolutions—what they are not publicizing is the fact that instead of gaining additional resolutions at present, the States are reversing their stand and several have taken their names off the Committee for Constitutional Government's list of States which have favored the amendment. The Committee for Constitutional Government would probably much rather continue to leave the false impression that 18 States are still favoring the "twenty-second amendment." I, for one, have never been able to find a record of 18 to begin with, and I can assure you that 18 certainly is not the correct figure at the present time. My records show 14 at the present time, since Wisconsin recently joined Arkansas in passing a resolution rescinding its former endorsing action. I would welcome any corrections, however, as the status of either endorsing or rescinding resolutions is constantly changing as more and more people are becoming aware of the true nature of the proposal and the caliber of the men behind it. Whatever changes are made in my information, I feel confident will show additonal setbacks for the advocating group.

RESULTS OF PROPOSAL

I have been asked on numerous occasions just what would be the result of such a proposal. I will tell you:

The principle of ability to pay in Federal taxation will be discarded;

Small business will be wrecked because big business will be able to keep so much of the huge profits that they make that little business will be unable to compete and will be quickly and easily crushed and destroyed;

The Government will probably be unable to collect sufficient money under the restriction to provide for more than the payment of interest on the national debt when the war is over. It is estimated that our national debt will be around $300,000,000,000 when the war is over. If the interest rate is kept down to 2½ percent, the carrying charges will be $7,500,000,000 per annum. Therefore, it is very doubtful that the Government can raise more than enough to carry this enormous carrying charge on the national debt with this 25-percent restriction;

Dependents of those who gave their lives for their country in this and other wars will no longer be able to receive assistance from the Federal Government;

There will be nothing left for the Federal Government to provide for those who can no longer carry on, due to injuries and wounds received in battle while protecting our country in this and other wars;

The aid for old-age assistance will have to be discontinued and much of the social-security program generally will be wrecked;

There can be no soil-conservation payments to farmers;

There can be no help by the Federal Government for constructing highways nor for the improvement of our rivers and harbors;

CHURCHES AND CHARITIES WOULD SUFFER

The Government would have to cut out present exemptions in order to make up the loss in revenue resulting from the decreased taxes on those high incomes which can best afford to pay. This, in turn, would mean that such exemptions as are at present allowed for contributions to churches and to charitable institutions would no longer be allowed. I

need not go into any detail on what this would mean to our country. The churches, many of our great hospitals, and many of our great charitable institutions which are impartially dedicated to the public welfare rely for the most part upon substantial donations which are liberally made because these donations are now exempt from Federal taxation under our present tax laws.

WOULD BE NATIONAL SUICIDE

Let us not be lulled by the carefully written propaganda which would lead us to believe that there is a possibility of any lowering of taxes for the majority through the proposed twenty-second amendment. There are methods of lowering taxes but to shackle the hands of Government by a constitutional amendment of this nature would be national suicide.

What would we do with our present necessary wartime budget under the restrictive tax proposed? Oh, yes; the Committee for Constitutional Government has a ready answer for that one! They have taken care of that argument, they think, by inserting a clause in their later versions of the amendment which would grant the Congress power by a three-fourths vote of each House to increase beyond the 25 percent limit taxes while, and I quote, "while the United States is actively engaged in such war."

When did our national emergency and our wartime expenditures begin—with Pearl Harbor? No, they did not, fortunately for us. They began some time before Pearl Harbor and before the actual declaration of war. Will our national debt be canceled as soon as the United States ceases to be actively engaged in this present war? It would be very nice for the high-income groups to have their taxes cut back to the 25-percent maximum as soon as the war is over and leave the bulk of the national debt to be paid by the lower-income groups, wouldn't it? Try to make the public swallow that one, Mr. Gannett, and Mr. McClure, and Mr. Pettingill, and Mr. Rumely. The proof is in the earlier version of the proposed amendment as advocated by the syndicate headed by the above four gentlemen. No provision was made for war emergencies in that early version and it passed some of the State legislatures in that form. If the war had not come along and focused attention on that particular feature, they would undoubtedly still be pushing the original version which would have seriously crippled us in the handling of any national emergency.

DECEITFUL PROGRAM

The whole program of advocacy has been one of deceit and inconsistencies. I have some of the propaganda on my desk which leaves the reader with the inference that the United States Treasury Department has gone on record as claiming that the 25-percent-tax level is the one at which the maximum revenue would be realized. This is certainly not what I would gather from reading the memorandum prepared by the Division of Tax Research of the Treasury Department May 31 1944, and the abridged February 1, 1945, memorandum on the effects of the proposed twenty-second amendment on our tax revenues and our national economy. These Treasury studies warn that there would be insufficient revenue to have any prospect of a budget surplus even in a prosperous year, much less any possible reduction of our national debt. The studies warn that present deductions would have to be eliminated and that other revenue sources be explored, with the only major unrestricted field that of commodity taxes—that is, sales taxes and excises.

ONE SPONSOR SAYS STATE RESOLUTION NOT BINDING ON CONGRESS

Permit me to call another example of inconsistency and deceit to your attention. I have a piece of propaganda issued February 28, 1945, by the Committee for Constitutional Government sent to all members of the Maryland Legislature which was directed at the Committee's attempt to secure the endorsement of the State of Maryland. I quote:

> Adoption of the resolution as presented does not commit Maryland or its Legislature to anything except a mere appeal to Congress to offer the proposed amendment to the States for ratification. But by blocking this resolution, the people of Maryland might be prevented from ever voicing their approval or disapproval of the tax curb that would certainly help discourage needless tax spending.

ANOTHER SAYS CONGRESS MUST ACT UPON PETITION OF 32 STATES

At the same time, additional propaganda issued by the American Taxpayers Association under date of February 15 states:

> We are happy to advise that substantial progress has been made toward this objective and that further early progress is in view. Eighteen States already have petitioned Congress to submit such an amendment. Congress has no choice but to submit it when 32 States petition. There is a good prospect that the remaining States necessary will petition this year.

On one hand, one tentacle of the propaganda machine is assuring the legislators that all of this means nothing. On the other hand, another tentacle assures the taxpaying group which would benefit most that "here is the club we hold—Congress has no choice."

ALMOST SLIPPED THROUGH BEFORE PEOPLE KNEW IT

Yes, the Committee for Constitutional Government and other proponents are making a last desperate bid for success—unfortunately for them, the cloak of righteousness and patriotism has been stripped from the diabolical plot and it is now exposed naked to the American public for inspection and study for what it is—and not what it was so cleverly camouflaged to represent. The newspapers, commentators, educators, legislators, and public figures all over our Nation are at present pointing out just how near we have come to having had slipped into our Constitution an amendment which could have, and might have, wrecked the democracy for which we have fought so many generations.

The Pennsylvania Legislature passed an endorsing resolution in 1943. A legislator of that State the other day said that the passage "did not represent the convictions or desires of the electorate." The resolution was passed during the final hours of the 1943 session without attracting very much attention. Millions of Pennsylvanians did not know the resolution was passed and that they are recorded at Washington as favoring a 25-percent income-tax ceiling.

Marriner S. Eccles, Federal Reserve Chairman, has this to say about the amendment:

> I can't imagine any action that would be more inflationary. I can't imagine the American people supporting any such proposal. It would mean we would have to impose very high excise and sales taxes. If adopted, it should carry the corollary that appropriations be similarly restricted. It is as thoroughly unsound as any proposal I can imagine being passed.

As of January 1, 1945, 17 States had passed endorsing resolutions: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

So far, from January 1, 1945, two States have passed rescinding resolutions: Arkansas, Wisconsin.

Of the 15 still on the list as having passed endorsing resolutions the following have before them rescinding resolutions:

Illinois: Passed house today, March 13, 1945.
Indiana: In committee.
Iowa: Passed house.
Massachusetts.
Michigan: In committee.
New Jersey: In committee.
Pennsylvania: In committee.

We have gone on the assumption that Governor Martin's veto constituted an annulment of the Pennsylvania legislature's endorsing action and that there were only 14 endorsing actions.

Since there is now a rescinding resolution before Pennsylvania's Legislature, the Governor's veto was evidently presumed not enough to kill the resolution.

Rhode Island: In committee.
Wyoming: Failed to pass either house.

Not a single State has been called to our attention as having passed an endorsing resolution during the present session of the legislatures.

The following States have had endorsing resolutions submitted during 1945, according to information we have:

Georgia: No information on action to date.

Connecticut: Information is that resolution has been withdrawn. More than one in hopper, however, and one may still be up for consideration. Have inquiry on this out now.

Kansas: No information on any action to date.

Maryland: Public hearing on proposal held in State capitol March 6, 1945. After the opponents concluded, no one offered to appear for the proponents.

This is the only time to my knowledge that public hearings have been conducted on this proposal. The policy of the proponents is to have no hearings and no publicity of any kind.

Montana: Killed at recommendation of author and committee.

Nebraska: No information on any action to date.

New Mexico: Were not brought out of committee at first session.

New York: Failed to pass on record vote.

Ohio: No record of action to date.

Oregon: No record of action to date.

South Dakota: Failed to pass—house vote 22 for and 51 against.

Tennessee: Failed to pass.

Texas: In committee of the house.

West Virginia: Failed to pass—house vote 16 for to 69 against.

BALTIMORE (MD.) EVENING SUN DENOUNCES PROPOSAL

The following editorial appeared in the Baltimore Evening Sun, March 7, 1945:

SOUND ADVICE

The general assembly is well advised by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, to take no part in the move launched in several other States to place a 25-percent limit on income and inheritance taxes in the Federal Constitution. Mr. PATMAN appeared before a joint Senate-House hearing yesterday to urge the rejection of a resolution that would make Maryland a petitioner of Congress for a tax-limiting constitutional amendment.

This is of a piece with constitutional limitations on property taxes adopted by several States, usually with embarrassment to local governments. The effect of tax restrictions is to impair Government's ability to deal with financial emergencies and to depreciate Government credit. American cities whose taxing powers were thus shackled found themselves in financial difficulties during the late depression when money was needed quickly for relief. They could offer only limited guarantees to repay borrowed money. In some instances police, firemen, and school teachers went long without pay.

These were purely local embarrassments, with no appreciable effect on the Nation as a whole. They should serve as a warning, however, of what can be expected on a magnified scale if the taxing powers of Congress are hamstrung with a war debt approaching $350,000,000,000 and a country facing the economic uncertainties of a post-war transition period. The central Government must look to national income to service and amortize the national debt, to finance post-war recovery programs. If it can't make a direct levy on income adequate to meet these needs, can't make loans amply secured by the taxing power, there is no choice but default or indirect taxes that may fall with a less even justice than direct income taxes, even those applied in high brackets.

Those who are proposing the tax limitation seem also to have overlooked another effect of current high levies. They have served to siphon off millions of "dangerous dollars" that, left on the loose, would have had inflation running hog-wild long before this.

Nobody likes to pay taxes. But there are worse evils to contemplate than a stiff tax bill.

WASHINGTON (D. C.) POST OPPOSES PROPOSAL

The Washington Post, Washington, D. C., had an editorial, February 26, 1945, concerning this unreasonable proposal, in which it was stated:

LIMITING TAXES

Seventeen States have passed resolutions asking Congress to call a convention for the purpose of amending the Constitution so as to limit Federal taxes on income to 25 percent. A tie vote on the proposal was recorded a few days ago in the New York Senate, and a similar resolution is now before the Maryland Assembly. Amending the Constitution by the round-about method of calling a constitutional convention at the request of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States would be a time-consuming procedure; so we are disposed to discount heavily the changes of any decisive action in the immediate future.

Nevertheless, we share the alarm of the National League of Women Voters at the growing strength of this movement to tie the hands of the Federal tax authorities. For it points to the existence of widespread misunderstanding of the nature and purpose of our Federal system of taxation, likely to encourage bungling attempts at tax reform. The burden of heavy taxation cannot be lightened by simply setting upper limits to the Federal income-tax rate. The tax program is conditioned by the demands made upon the Government and by legislative spending policies. Unless public expenditures are cut, mandatory reductions in specified tax levies would simply force the Treasury to turn to alternative sources of revenue to make up for losses, or else lead to deficit financing on an expanded scale, with all that implies. As Trends, the organ of the National League of Women Voters, points out, the proposed 25-percent limitation on high-bracket incomes would probably make it necessary to levy sales taxes and various other regressive taxes that are especially burdensome to low-income groups.

The Federal Government has assumed heavy post-war commitments that will entail large outlays, while unforeseen conditions may necessitate additional drains on the public purse. Under the circumstances it would be incredibly foolish to deprive our lawmakers of freedom to adjust tax programs to rapidly changing and unpredictable needs. Finally, as we stated last July in discussing the proposed amendment, rigid restrictions of the kind contemplated would not only hamper the Government in carrying out the mandates of Congress, but would also weaken its credit standing by depriving it of reserve taxing powers. The proposed 25-percent limit could be suspended in event of war by a three-fourths vote of the Senate and House. Even so, it would impose a dangerous handicap upon the Government in wartime and leave it incapable of meeting peacetime crises.

PHILADELPHIA RECORD CALLS ON PENNSYLVANIA LEGISLATURE TO REPEAL RESOLUTION APPROVING PROPOSAL

March 9, 1945, the following editorial appeared in the Philadelphia Record:

STILL TIME TO ACT

The Pennsylvania Legislature has muffed one chance to rescind Pennsylvania's action in approving the proposed millionaires' amendment to the United States Constitution.

The amendment, which would put a 25-percent limit on Federal income, gift, and inheritance taxes, was indorsed by the legislature with little publicity in 1943.

This week, Representative James E. Lovett, Democrat, of Westmoreland, demanded action on his resolution reversing that approval. But by a vote of 92 to 76 the house refused to discharge its rules committee from consideration of the Lovett resolution.

This means that the house will have no chance to vote on the repealer, and that the resolution will stay pickled—unless the Republican majority demands action.

Governor Martin saw the danger in the bill, backed by Publisher Frank Gannett's Committee for Constitutional Government, and he disapproved at the time it was adopted. Unfortunately, his disapproval had no legal effect.

The Republican majority in the legislature should follow the lead of Governor Martin and start the ball rolling to reverse Pennsylvania's approval of a dangerous bill.

SOAK THE RICH

The following news item appeared in the Philadelphia Record, February 27, 1945:

DEMOCRATS FIGHT "SOAK POOR" ACT

HARRISBURG, February 26.—Democratic members of the legislature will make a major issue at this session of repeal of the 1943 resolution putting Pennsylvania on record in favor of a constitutional amendment for a 25-percent ceiling on Federal income, gift, inheritance, and profits taxes. House minority leader, H. G. Andrews, made that announcement today.

"It is the Democratic position that the general assembly when, at its 1943 session, it passed a resolution 'memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances,' did not represent the convictions or desires of the electorate," said Andrews.

PASSED IN FINAL HOURS

The resolution was passed during the final hours of the 1943 session without attracting very much attention. Millions of Pennsylvanians do not know the resolution was passed and that they are recorded at Washington as favoring a 25-percent income-tax ceiling.

An effort will be made to reverse, rescind, or repeal the action. To this end Representative James E. Lovett, of Westmoreland County, has introduced a resolution which has been referred to the House Rules Committee.

Andrews' statement declared:

"The position taken by the minority party as represented in the general assembly is that; if income tax schedules, as they apply to incomes in the higher brackets—incomes in excess of $25,000 a year—are reduced, it would be necessary either to increase other taxes or impose new taxes."

WOULD MEAN SALES TAX

"The advocates of the proposed amendment want to shift the tax base instead of taxing large incomes more than 25 percent. Supporters of the proposed amendment would enact some sort of Federal sales tax. It is the position of the minority party that such a course would be unfair and economically unwise. The proposed amendment would in effect, the minority party contends, soak the poor. At any rate, the Democratic Party will insist that the concurrent resolution which passed the general assembly in 1943 be rescinded, and, as pointed out, this proposal presents a major issue."

CHAIRMAN FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD DENOUNCES PROPOSAL

The following news item appeared in the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., March 6, 1945:

ECCLES THINKS TAX LIMIT OF 25 PERCENT MOST INFLATIONARY

WASHINGTON.—Marriner S. Eccles, Federal Reserve Chairman, said a constitutional limitation on Federal taxation would bring about inflation.

"I can't imagine any action that would be more inflationary," he told the House Banking Committee.

Mr. Eccles' statement was in reply to a question by Representative PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, who said 17 State legislatures have called for a constitutional amendment putting a ceiling of 25 percent on all Federal income, estate, and inheritance levies.

"If 32 States so act," Mr. PATMAN said, "then Congress will be required to act. The proposition is being pressed by a very powerful lobby and is being done quietly. The States are being told that if Federal taxes are limited then the States can impose higher taxes."

Mr. Eccles replied: "I can't imagine the American people supporting any such proposal. It would mean we would have to impose very high excise and sales taxes."

Mr. PATMAN commented that such a limitation would mean the Government "would have a hard time collecting money to service the national debt, and there would be no money for veterans and dependents."

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR DENOUNCES FASCIST PROPOSAL OF GANNETT-PETTINGILL-RUMELY-M'CLURE GROUP

The following article appeared in the Boston (Mass.) Christian Science Monitor, March 6, 1945:

TWENTY-SECOND AMENDMENT ON THE WAY? AN INTIMATE MESSAGE FROM WASHINGTON

(By Richard L. Strout)

Congressmen are just discovering with surprise that a movement to amend the Constitution is aready almost half way to completion. Their surprise turns to amazement when they learn that the proposed method of securing the amendment is one that has never been used before since the founding fathers drew up the document. And their amazement turns to downright incredulity when they study the terms of the proposed amendment—the so-called twenty-second amendment—for which 14 State legislatures have so far gone on record, in both houses, as favoring the summoning of the first constitutional convention in 165 years.

The proposed amendment would limit the right of Congress, now and for all time (save in war) to impose higher than 25-percent Federal taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts. It's as simple as that. Since taxation is the basis for most congressional power, this would go a long way to impose or restore States' rights—a reason, perhaps, for the progress the proposed amendment has made.

In testimony on another matter yesterday before the House Banking Committee, Marriner Eccles, head of the Federal Reserve System, was asked his opinion of the proposal.

"I can't imagine any piece of legislation that would be more inflationary than to adopt such a restriction on taxes," he declared. "If adopted, it should carry the corollary that appropriations be similarly restricted. It is as thoroughly unsound as any proposal I can imagine being passed."

These are strong words, but if anybody in the committee objected to them—Republican or Democrat—they did not say so at the hearing. When told that 14 State legislatures have already passed a constitutional petition for this proposal they—like most other readers—reacted in a mood of astonishment.

There have been 21 amendments added to the Constitution in a century and a half. The customary method is for Congress to pass the proposals by the required two-thirds vote and submit it to the States—which, in turn, make it a law when three-fourths of the State legislatures approve it.

But there is another way of amending the Constitution. On "the application of legislatures of two-thirds of the several States" the same machinery may be set in motion, irrespective of Congress.

The effect of this is to summon what the Constitution calls "a convention for proposing amendments." And it is this which individual action of 14 State legislatures, quietly accumulating since 1939, has so far done. When (and if) 18 more States, being the total to the required number of 32, the convention will be called. The Constitution sets no time limit. So far as anybody can legally see, year by year, decade by decade, generation by generation, the new State legislatures might add their petition and the proposal would be valid when the total is achieved. When (and if) the convention completes the formulation of its amendment (or amendments) the latter will be submitted back to the State legislatures, and become part of the Constitution if approved by a total of three-fourths.

Under questions by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN (Democrat), of Texas, Mr. Eccles said he couldn't believe the American public "would seriously support any such proposal" because a limitation to 25 percent of Federal income, inheritance, and gift taxes would inevitably mean substitution of sales taxes which, according to Eccles, would mean unemployment.

And yet the Legislatures of the following States have passed the proposal (in two of them, Arkansas and Wisconsin later rescinded, and in Pennsylvania vetoed): Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

The amendment is backed by the Committee for Constitutional Government, of which Frank Gannett, Rochester, N. Y., publisher, is a leading figure.

In a well-financed campaign, the committee is publicizing the amendment. First response of most people—certainly of most Congressmen—is surprise to learn that the amendment has got so far.

Opposition, like that of Eccles, is just becoming vocal. The Gannett organization charges that its opponents are using the weapons of "revolutionary communism" to thwart the amendment, and in a recent release declared that a plot is on foot to "liquidate capital savings and hamstring private enterprise" by heavy Federal taxes.

DAILY STAR-JOURNAL IN MINNESOTA AGAINST PROPOSAL

A recent issue of the daily Star-Journal of the State of Minnesota, the following letter and editorial comment appeared:

LIMITING INCOME TAXES

To the EDITOR: This neighborhood is pretty strong for the Star-Journal, but we think we notice an approving silence on your part for the Committee on Constitutional Government, which is proposing a twenty-second amendment limiting income taxes to 25 percent. We suggest an editorial on the committee and its dangerous proposal to ease off income taxes in the higher brackets.

Is there any connection between this constitutional committee and the Minnesota Resources Commission, to whose proposals you have given so much space?

FRED R. BROWN.

ROCHERT, MINN.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Although the legislatures of 17 States have passed resolutions asking Congress to call a constitutional convention on an amendment limiting Federal income taxes to 25 percent, there seems little likelihood of success. The Star-Journal does not think that a flat maximum on income taxes is going to accomplish the purpose the committee seems to have in mind—reducing expenditures. Congressmen would be driven to other forms of revenue and the hidden taxes they may propose probably would be no improvement. Tying the hands of the Government in tax matters, when the Nation faces necessarily large outlays in the post-war period, could lead to a number of difficulties. The Constitutional Committee and the Minnesota Resources Commission are entirely separate bodies.

MEXICAN TREATY INVADES THE RIGHTS OF LABOR

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, there has been in the Senate for several weeks past, consideration of a treaty between Mexico and the United States on the water rights of the Colorado and Rio Grande Rivers. Today I want to speak on the question of how this treaty affects the rights of American labor.

The hard-won rights of American labor are summarily set aside by the proposed Mexican Treaty. With regard to the boundary sections of the Rio Grande and Colorado River, the treaty contains this startling provision:

> The whole of the personnel employed either directly or indirectly on the construction, operation, and maintenance of the works may pass freely from one country to the other for the purpose of going to and from the place of location of the works, without immigration restrictions, passports, or labor requirements.

Thus the treaty provides that cheap foreign labor may be employed on the construction, and perpetually in the operation and maintenance of vast river works in the United States without regard to immigration restrictions, American labor laws and American wage scales. Because it is cheap labor, it is inevitable that contractors will use it to cut their costs and that these contractors who do use it will make the low bids and get the jobs. So, in the post-war period an American treaty will foreclose American workmen from getting work on these great projects.

The treaty has been denounced and its ratification is opposed by the American Federation of Labor, speaking through a resolution unanimously adopted at its 1944 national convention in New Orleans. An authorized representative of the A. F. of L. appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and testified against the proposed treaty.

The treaty is opposed by resolutions adopted by the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, and by the National Railway Labor Executives Association, speaking for 19 railway labor brotherhoods. Representatives of most of these organizations appeared personally before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and strongly urged that the treaty be not ratified. They have been ignored by the majority of the committee and by the State Department.

Let us look for just a moment at the resolution against the Mexican Treaty that was adopted unanimously by the American Federation of Labor at its national convention last December in New Orleans. This is what a great association of workers representing more than 9,000,000 members has to say about the Mexican Water Treaty.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks the resolution adopted by the American Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AT ITS SIXTY-FOURTH ANNUAL CONVENTION IN NEW ORLEANS, NOVEMBER 29, 1944

Whereas there is pending before the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate a treaty between the United

States and the Republic of Mexico, relating to the waters of the Rio Grande, the Colorado River, and the Tijuana River; and

Whereas said treaty authorizes an international boundary and water commission, and the American section thereof, without adequate congressional controls, to plan and construct vast works on the main stream and on all tributaries of said rivers, and to control all labor on such construction work, and expressly permits the free passage of labor into the United States for use upon such works without any immigration restrictions, passports, or labor requirements, and further expressly permits the free passage into the United States of materials, implements, equipment, and repair parts fabricated by foreign labor for the construction, operation, and maintenance of such work; and

Whereas under the method of performing such work authorized and permitted by the said treaty, low-cost Mexican labor may be used upon any job done in the United States along the international border, to the exclusion of American labor; and

Whereas the pending treaty guarantees a minimum of 1,500,000 acre-feet of water per year to Mexico from the Colorado River, which guaranteed minimum exceeds by 750,000 acre-feet per year the quantity of water which Mexico could use from the unregulated river, and such additional water is available for use solely by reason of the expenditure of American money and the use of American labor on American soil in the construction of the Boulder project, and such guarantee of water to Mexico would deprive the Southwestern part of the United States of water required for its growth and expansion, both industrially and agriculturally, and would curtail the opportunities of American labor in such development; and

Whereas the application of such water to agricultural use in Mexico, where cheap labor is available, would enable Mexican farmers to undersell American farmers using American labor, and would tend to reduce American standards of living; and

Whereas the United States has entered into solemn contracts for the use of all of the waters of the Colorado River stored by the Boulder project, in consideration of which public and private organizations within the United States have agreed to repay to the United States the entire cost of such Boulder project, and have expended hundreds of millions of dollars in the construction of works to utilize such water, and such contracts cannot be fully performed by the United States in the event of ratification of the pending treaty, and breach of such contracts on the part of the United States would be contrary to American principles and sound business practice and would deprive American agencies of water supplies upon which they have relied, and which have been made available to their expense: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this sixty-fourth annual convention of the American Federation of Labor vigorously protests the ratification of this said treaty.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I want to call special attention to one clause of that resolution:

Whereas the application of such water to agricultural use in Mexico, where cheap labor is available, would enable Mexican farmers to undersell American farmers, using American labor, and would tend to reduce American standards of living.

That is what the authorized representatives of 9,000,000 American workers from every State in the Union think about the water treaty. But the State Department wants the treaty. It remains to be seen whether the United States Senate will want the treaty.

If the standards of American labor are to be upheld, I firmly believe no such treaty as is being proposed ought to be rammed down the throats of the American workingman—and the American citizens as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to further emphasize the fact that California is not appearing in this instance as being unfriendly to Mexico. On the contrary our attitude is that a treaty is necessary but the one that is before the Senate is definitely unfair, and we believe it should be reconsidered and amended.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. LANHAM, of Texas (at the request of Mr. THOMASON), for today, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 14, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Tuesday, March 13, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold a hearing on Wednesday, March 14, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., on H. R. 1624 and H. R. 1746.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold open hearings on Thursday, March 15, 1945, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1425.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, March 15, 1945, at 10 a. m., to continue hearings on parcel-post rates.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session at 10:30 a. m., on Thursday, March 15, 1945, in the committee room, 356 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Tuesday, March 20, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in room 247, House Office Building, on H. R. 128, a bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will continue hearings on Wednesday, March 21, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 128, a bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection for pensionable purposes for service rendered between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

301. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting an estimate of the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the General Accounting Office during the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

302. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the Navy Department and naval services for the fiscal year 1946, containing estimates of appropriations in the sum of $25,232,165,674, together with proposed provisions affecting such estimates (H. Doc. No. 116); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 2504. A bill to discontinue certain reports now required by law; without amendment (Rept. No. 311). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 312. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 313. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 45. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor to conduct and investigate the extent and character of aid now given by the Federal, State, and local governments and private agencies to the physically handicapped, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 327). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 182. Resolution, for the consideration of H. R. 43, a bill to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 328). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CLARK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 96. Resolution authorizing continuance of study by the Committee on Public Lands of certain public-land problems and the use of public lands in rehabilitation of veterans, as authorized under House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-eighth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 329). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 183. Resolution for the consideration of a conference report on H. R. 1752, a bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 330). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 155. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to continue the investigation with

respect to petroleum begun under House Resolution 290, Seventy-sixth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 331). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 154. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs to study the progress of the war effort; without amendment (Rept. No. 332). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RABAUT: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2603. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and the Federal Loan Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 333). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2485. A bill for the relief of Moses Tennenbaum; without amendment (Rept. No. 310). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 780. A bill for the relief of Vonnie Jones, a minor; with amendment (Rept. No. 314). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1322. A bill for the relief of the Marine Engine Works & Shipbuilding Corporation, of Tarpon Springs, Fla.; with amendment (Rept. No. 315). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1488 A bill for the relief of Austin Bruce Bowan; with amendment (Rept. No. 316). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1539. A bill for the relief of Dr. David R. Barglow; without amendment (Rept. No. 317). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1716. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sue B. Bowen, as administratrix of the estate of Clyde Bowen, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 318). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1756. A bill for the relief of the estate of the late Demetrio Caqias; with amendment (Rept. No. 319). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCRIVNER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1983. A bill for the relief of Benjamin D. Lewis; with amendment (Rept. No. 320). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2007. A bill for the relief of Hattie Bowers; with amendment (Rept. No. 321). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2008. A bill for the relief of the village of Cold Spring, Minn.; with amendment (Rept. No. 322). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHENOWETH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2164. A bill for the relief of Wallace Robertson, Henry Bowker, and Edward Parisian, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 323). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2224. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval training center, Farragut, Idaho, on July 10, 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 324). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2336. A bill for the relief of Osborne E. McKay; with amendment (Rept. No. 325). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMEY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2427. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cox; with amendment (Rept. No. 326). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2599. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 2600. A bill to amend section 9 of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the construction, extension, or completion of interstate petroleum pipe lines related to national defense, and to promote interstate commerce," approved July 30, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ERVIN:

H. R. 2601. A bill to amend part VIII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) (title 11, Public Law No. 346, 78th Cong.) to provide for training in short intensive courses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa:

H. R. 2602. A bill to facilitate the administration of government and improve the quality of justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 2604. A bill to limit the term of office of certain civilian officers in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 2605. A bill to confer the degree of bachelor of nursing upon commissioned officers of the Navy Nurse Corps and the Army Nurse Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 2606. A bill to provide for the accommodation of 500 additional bed patients at the Veterans' Administration facility at Saratoga Springs, N. Y.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution designating period from Thanksgiving Day to Christmas of each year for Nation-wide Bible reading; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the election of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneatn navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PACE:

H. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution authorizing the special committee of the Committee on Agriculture, designated by the chairman to study post-war plans for agriculture, particularly as relate to cotton, to have printed for its use additional copies of the Learings held before said committee during the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution declaring it to be un-American to participate in activities to create racial or religious disunity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. Res. 181. Resolution to investigate the War Food Administration, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and other Government corporations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. Res. 184. Resolution relating to undelivered Christmas or gift packages mailed to members of the armed forces overseas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass Senate bill 114, to pay for lands of the San Carlos strip ceded by the Apache Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for the relief of certain property owners of Santa Cruz County; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend section 9 of the organic act approved August 24, 1912, to change residence requirement in Alaska for divorces from the present 2 years to 1 year; to the Committee on the Territories.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. DE LACY introduced a bill (H. R. 2607) for the relief of Dave Hougardy, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

182. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the Twenty-eighth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States to consider and act upon legislation to remove or amend the excess-land provisions of the Reclamation Act for lands receiving water supplies (in addition to their now existing water supplies) and relating to excess-land provisions for new lands on future projects of the Bureau of Reclamation in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

183. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Twenty-eighth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and pass legislation to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

184. Also, memorial of the Twenty-eighth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the United States that all presently proposed Federal irrigation projects and all such which are proposed in the future, for construction in the State of Wyoming, be

continued in all stages under the direct supervision of the United States Bureau of Reclamation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

185. Also, memorial of the Twenty-eighth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation relating to employers' sinking funds and reserves and taxability thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

186. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Twenty-eighth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, relating to public lands in, and funds and other relief due, the State of Wyoming from the United States of America; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

187. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Twenty-eighth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate measures to open Palestine to free immigration and colonization by the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

188. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Nellie E. Carter and 50 other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

189. Also, memorial of the South Carolina State Senate, urging Congress to provide the necessary funds for the research program of the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, to establish (1) a regional forest utilization unit in the southern Appalachians; and (2) an active forest research program at the Santee Experiment Station, Berkeley County, S. C.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

190. Also, memorial of South Carolina State Legislature, memorializing Congress to pass the McCarran-Sumners bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

191. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Board of Supervisors, Navarro Hill Conservation District, Corsicana, Tex., favoring House bill 538; to the Committee on Agriculture.

192. By Mr. LANE: Petition of the County Commissioners of Essex County, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at a meeting held at Salem, March 6, 1945, protesting the seizure by the Federal Government in said county of certain land for the Parker River National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Agriculture.

193. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging relief for producers of dairy products in the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, March 12, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

His Excellency Edwin V. O'Hara, bishop of Kansas City, Mo., offered the following prayer:

We will place ourselves consciously and reverently in the presence of God, in whose hands are all the counsels of men.

Direct, we beseech Thee, O Lord, all our actions by Thy holy inspiration, and carry them on by Thy gracious assistance, that all our deliberations and labors may begin from Thee and by Thee be happily ended. Through Christ our Lord, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, March 13, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on March 13, 1945, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 214. An act to provide reimbursement for personal property lost, damaged, or destroyed as the result of an explosion at the naval mine depot, Yorktown, Va., on November 16, 1943;

S. 217. An act to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States, and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine;

S. 222. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Duke Power Co. a 180-foot perpetual easement across Camp Croft, in the State of South Carolina; and

S. 290. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Orange and Rockland Electric Co. a 150-foot perpetual easement across the West Point Military Reservation in the State of New York.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2013) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ALBERT A. RIDGE TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, the 21st day of March 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Albert A. Ridge, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the western district of Missouri, vice Merrill E. Otis, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee in charge consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ROBERT LEWIS BROWN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF MONTANA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, the 21st day of March 1945, at 10:30 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, upon the nomination of Robert Lewis Brown, of Montana, to be United States district judge for the district of Montana, vice James H. Baldwin, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee in charge consists of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], chairman, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Austin	Hart	Overton
Bailey	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Robertson
Brewster	Hoey	Russell
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Burton	La Follette	Stewart
Bushfield	Langer	Taft
Butler	Lucas	Taylor
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McFarland	Tobey
Chandler	McKellar	Tunnell
Chavez	McMahon	Tydings
Connally	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Cordon	Maybank	Wagner
Donnell	Mead	Walsh
Downey	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Mitchell	Wherry
Ellender	Moore	White
Ferguson	Morse	Wiley
Fulbright	Murdock	Willis
George	Murray	Wilson
Gerry	Myers	
Green	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate on account of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is absent on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate letters from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, the Director of the Division of Administrative Management of the National War Labor Board, and the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective department and offices for the quarter ending June 30, 1945, which, with the

accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial to His Excellency, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, urging the Congress of the United States to make an appropriation, and Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of United States Veterans' Affairs, for the immediate construction of additional United States veterans' hospital facilities in Boise, Idaho

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that—

"Whereas the war veteran population in the State of Idaho has greatly increased since September 16, 1940, as a result of the present war emergency and world conflict and will be increased by approximately 400 percent; and

"Whereas the United States Veterans' Administration maintains in the city of Boise, State of Idaho, a United States veterans' hospital of a 350-bed capacity, which bed capacity has not been increased since 1936; that according to information available no steps as yet have been taken to have said veterans' hospital at Boise, Idaho, enlarged to care for the Idaho war veterans who are daily being discharged from the military service and returning to Idaho, their home State; and

"Whereas at the termination of hostilities every veteran now in active military service will be entitled to United States veterans' hospital care; and

"Whereas the National Congress, under Public Law No. 346 authorized the appropriation of $500,000,000 for the construction of additional Government hospital facilities; and

"Whereas Idaho veterans should be able to receive hospital care in their own State instead of having to leave their homes and families to obtain hospital care outside of the State of Idaho: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (and the House of Representatives concurring)*, That we, your memorialists, urge upon the Congress of the United States of America and respectfully request that appropriate action be taken for the immediate construction of an addition to the present United States veterans' hospital situated at Boise, Idaho, to the extent of not less than 350 beds; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and is hereby directed to furnish and forward to the President of the United States, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of United States Veterans' Affairs, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Idaho, copies of this memorial."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"Whereas upon the economic welfare of the several States, depends the stability of the Nation as a whole; and

"Whereas the safeguarding of each State's individual welfare is of vital concern to all; and

"Whereas the setting aside or withdrawal of any part or parcel of the areas within the State's borders to establish special privileged areas excluding all other use, or the establishment by proclamation, of parks, monuments, reserves, or wilderness areas is a grave injury to the economic soundness of a State whose industries depend upon the common and multiple usage of such federally owned lands; and

"Whereas removal of these lands vitally affects sportsmen in restricting the limited area in which they have to hunt, in that reserves and parks are usually restricted concerning hunting, and the harvest of timber is diminished as an asset in the State of Idaho, by the restriction of logging in these nonuse areas, and the farmers who contribute greatly to Idaho's social and economic welfare lose valuable territory by the setting aside of these monuments, parks, and nonuse areas, which are valuable to them in the construction of reservoirs, flumes, and other necessary construction to get water to the arid lands; and

"Whereas 69 percent of the State of Idaho is federally owned; and

"Whereas the members of the Legislature of the State of Idaho believe that Congress recognizes the rights, interests and estate which each sovereign State holds in the conservation, constructive use of Federal lands within its borders: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Idaho (jointly)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact such legislation as is necessary to safeguard the areas within the State's borders from being named as prohibited, nonuse areas, without first gaining the approval of the State legislature of the State concerned; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the State of Idaho be hereby authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to the Senators and Representatives of Idaho in the two Houses of Congress."

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Resolution requesting the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to extend the wild game season for a period of 90 days

"Whereas due to the large increase of wild water fowl as reported by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and

"Whereas this increase would seem to justify the taking of a reasonable number of wild waterfowl for food and sport; and

"Whereas the number of persons who are in a position to shoot wild water fowl has been very much reduced: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of Maryland*, That the United States Fish and Wildlife Service be and it is hereby requested to extend the open season for killing wild waterfowl for a period of 90 days; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be and he is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the Interior, the chairmen of the United States Senate and House committees on wildlife and Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives from Maryland.

"Read and adopted February 20, 1945."

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Villa Palmeras, Santurce, P. R., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 227, providing for the independence of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 194. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Glenn T. Boylston; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91); and

H. R. 687. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; without amendment (Rept. No. 92).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 249. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Hooper; without amendment (Rept. No. 93).

By Mr. McMAHON, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 1308. A bill for the relief of Sam Swan and Ally Swan; with an amendment (Rept. No. 94).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 316. A bill for the relief of June I. Gradijan; without amendment (Rept. No. 95); and

H. R. 949. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Ring; without amendment (Rept. No. 96).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 257. A bill for the relief of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 97).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 591. A bill for the relief of Chesley Brazil; with an amendment (Rept. No. 98); and

H. R. 1485. A bill for the relief of Henry B. Tucker; without amendment (Rept. No. 99).

By Mr. RADCLIFFE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 681. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 100).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 732. A bill for the relief of Ensign Elmer H. Beckman, United States Naval Reserve; and

S. 733. A bill to reimburse certain naval personnel and former naval personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in the bachelor officers' quarters known as Macqueripe Annex, located at the United States Naval Operating Base, Trinidad, British West Indies, on June 11, 1944; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 734. A bill granting a pension to Helen M. Hammond; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 735. A bill to authorize relief of the chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 736. A bill to provide that periods of vocational training undertaken by disabled veterans in preparing for employment by the United States shall be credited for retirement purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

(Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK) introduced Senate bill 737, which was

referred to the Committee on Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado introduced Senate bill 738, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 739. A bill to amend the law relating to embezzlement by officers of a carrier firm, association, or corporation engaged in commerce; and

S. 740. A bill to amend the Judicial Code with respect to the admission of attorneys at law to practice before the courts, departments, and offices of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 741. A bill to extend certain benefits provided under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to persons who served in the merchant marine; and

S. 742. A bill to amend section 104 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to provide for determination of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration with respect to persons discharged from the armed forces, prior to the granting of such discharge; to the Committee on Finance.

SAVANNAH VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and myself, to introduce a bill establishing a Savannah River Authority. I ask that the bill be given the same committee assignment that the Senate eventually will give to the bill to create the Missouri Valley Authority.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 737) to establish a Savannah Valley Authority, to provide for unified water control and resource development in the basin of the Savannah River in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation, and the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 657

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in connection with the bill which has just been introduced by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] on behalf of himself and me, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Committee on Printing be directed to print a sufficient number of copies of House Document No. 657, not to exceed the limit allowed. I make the request because there are no further copies of the document available.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to amend the so-called G. I. bill, and ask for its appropriate reference. Whenever legislation is enacted affecting a great many persons we always find that sooner or later it needs amendment. Defects are brought to light. The bill I am introducing is for the purpose of correcting some of the defects which have come to light in the administration and the operations of the G. I. bill. I do not pretend, Mr. President, that the measure I am introducing cures satisfactorily the defects of the G. I. bill, if they be defects, but at least it opens up the issues. The committee which will have charge of this proposed legislation will hold hearings, at which the Veterans' Bureau, the veterans' organizations, the veterans themselves, and all other persons interested in the operations of the G. I. law will be given an opportunity to state their positions. From such hearings and consideration we hope that the G. I. law may be greatly improved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Colorado will be received and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 738) to amend title III, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2013) to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS—MACGILBERY H. WILLIAMS

On motion by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, it was

Ordered, That leave be granted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers accompanying the bill (S. 3664, 76th Cong., 3d sess.) for the relief of Macgilbery H. Williams, no adverse report having been made thereon.

PROPOSED REPORT SHOWING AMOUNT AND LOCATION OF REAL PROPERTY OWNED BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have in my hand Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 8, which was adopted by the Texas Legislature. The resolution sets forth reasons for desiring certain information with reference to the amount of land owned in the several States by the Federal Government. I have made inquiry with reference to how such information might be obtained. It seems apparent that the best way to obtain it is by submitting a resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that Senate Concurrent Resolution 8 of the Texas Legislature be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, and that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, as follows:

Concurrent Resolution 8

Whereas in the State of Texas there is owned and claimed by the Federal Government and its related agencies and/or corporations in existence through grant by the Federal Government, extended holdings in real property and other interests thereunder; and

Whereas the State of Texas does not have a complete knowledge of the ownership and holdings of property within the State of Texas by the Federal Government and its related agencies and/or corporations in existence through grant by the Federal Government, and that the extent, location, and degree of said ownership is unknown to the State of Texas; and

Whereas the laws of the State of Texas covering ownership of real estate and interests thereunder by the Federal Government and its related agencies and/or corporations in existence through grant by the Federal Government are inadequate to protect private property interests and the rights of the State of Texas; and

Whereas the Federal Government and its related agencies and/or corporations in existence through grant by the Federal Government as a property owner and holder of real estate and other interests thereunder in competition with private ownership of real estate is not a recognized scope of said agencies' capacity; and

Whereas extended holdings of real estate and other interests thereunder by the Federal Government and its related agencies and/or corporations in existence through grant by the Federal Government, within the State of Texas beyond the scope of governmental necessity, creates an unfavorable tax and economic condition within the State of Texas and results in the said agencies usurping the rights of private ownership and private enterprise and takes from the State of Texas and other governmental agencies and subdivisions of the State of Texas considerable revenue that would ordinarily be derived from said property if owned by private enterprise; and

Whereas the magnitude of this problem is of great and far-reaching importance to the State of Texas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Representatives in Congress from the State of Texas and the United States Senators from Texas be respectfully requested to have compiled for the Texas Legislature a list of all interests and ownership in real property and rights therein in the State of Texas held or claimed by the Federal Government and its related agencies, as well as by corporations in existence through grant by the Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to each such Texas Representative in Congress and United States Senators from Texas with the request that the Texas delegation meet at the earliest time possible and take proper steps to obtain and compile this information for the Texas Legislature; and be it further

Resolved, That in order for this information to be made available while the legislature is still in session, we respectfully request that such information be compiled and furnished by March 1, 1945.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I now ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution for proper reference.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 99), was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, as follows:

Resolved, That the Attorney General is hereby requested to submit at the first practicable date a report showing the amount and location of all real property owned by the United States, in each of the several States, including price and values of each tract of land and also the price of improvements thereon.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR MOSES, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 100), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the financial clerk of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the

Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. John Moses, late a Senator from the State of North Dakota, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

PRINTING OF REPORT ENTITLED "POST-WAR TRAFFIC LEVELS"

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the report, Post-war Traffic Levels, prepared by the Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics of the Interstate Commerce Commission, brings together in a summary the very best opinion on post-war traffic levels and the estimates of the national income as it will bear on the revenues of common carriers. The purpose of the report is to present certain estimates of possible levels of traffic in the early post-war period for the chief transportation agencies, along with data which may be useful in the evaluation of these and other possible estimates.

Three possible national-income levels are presented for each of the post-war years, 1947, 1948 and 1949. The estimates represent the best-informed opinion there is on the subject and the material has been assembled and very carefully checked.

In order to make this analysis of the possible or probable traffic levels for the different types of carriers in the post-war period and the effect those levels will have on the earnings of common carriers, it was necessary to construct estimates of national income based on various assumptions. Because of this fact the report has a twofold interest—it is of interest to those concerned with transportation because of the traffic estimates it contains; secondly, it is of interest to nontransportation people who are interested in the national income in the post-war period. This no doubt explains in part the demand for this publication which I understand is one of the heaviest the Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics has ever experienced.

In order to have this report printed, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution for reference to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and the resolution may be submitted.

The resolution (S. Res. 101), submitted by Mr. WHEELER, was referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved, That the report of the Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics of the Interstate Commerce Commission, entitled "Post-War Traffic Levels," be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1934) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the item "Federal Public Housing Authority" it is proposed to strike out, on page 50, line 4, after the word "agencies", the comma and the words "and expenditures by the Authority for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative expenses."

ABANDONMENT OF THE CANOL PROJECT

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, the War Department has recently announced that operation of that part of the Canol project embracing production of petroleum, the oil pipe line from Norman Wells to Whitehorse and the refinery at Whitehorse, will be discontinued by June 30, and that representatives of the United States and Canada will soon appraise the present value of the properties which Canada has an option to purchase. If Canada does not exercise the option, the property will be sold, according to the War Department, to any other bidder at not less than the appraised value.

Mr. President, the Canol project, exclusive of operation and maintenance, has cost the American taxpayer approximately $134,000,000. The location and impracticability of the project are such that it has little, if any, present commercial value, certainly not more than a junk value less dismantling and transportation charges. I emphasize the cost of this project because it is clear that it will practically be a total loss. Operation charges recently reported by the Army of over $4,180,000 for the last 6 months of 1944 have been far in excess of the total value of all production at the Whitehorse refinery since it commenced operation.

The War Department attempts to justify its bullheaded and arbitrary attitude in going ahead with this project over the advice of many oil companies and petroleum experts, and in the face of the recommendations of the Mead committee, by pointing out that the project has demonstrated oil can be conveyed by pipe line over long distances and refined in year-around operations in the Arctic climate. This knowledge, the Army says, will be of great value "if indicated large reservoirs of oil in Alaska or northwestern Canada materialize." In other words, we have learned how to fry fish if we catch any. The Army has spent $134,000,000, plus operation and maintenance expenses totaling an additional $5,000,000 to $10,000,000, to discover that with the expenditure of enough money some oil can be transported by pipe line and refined under Arctic conditions. The oil companies of this country probably have a hundred laboratories in which these experiments could have been made at insignificant costs. The attempted justification of this inexcusable waste of money is so silly and childlike that it becomes a pathetic example of a drowning man grasping for straws.

The Army's press release states that, based on the experience in December 1944 and January and February 1945, the average cost of production, exclusive of depreciation or interest on investment, was $11.15 a barrel delivered at Whitehorse.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The figure the Senator has just given does not take into account the overhead on the capital investment or the loss incident to the abandonment, does it?

Mr. MOORE. Not at all; and, further, I am very sure the Army has no conception of what the cost will be, and very little concern.

The Army fails to point out that this means an average cost of $11.15 a barrel not only for the gasoline produced but includes fuel oil and other cheap byproducts as well.

The purpose of the project was to produce high-octane aviation gasoline. To be honest about it, the Army must compute the cost in terms of high-octane gasoline produced. For the last half of 1944 less than 8,000 barrels of aviation gasoline and only about 185,000 barrels of ordinary motor fuel were refined. If the cost of this total production of gasoline is to be considered on the figures admitted by the Army, it will be found to be approximately $23 a barrel, excluding the value of the crude oil consumed, or any allowance for amortization. If the crude consumed in the operation is charged to the refinery at $1.50 a barrel, and allowing a 20-year amortization, it will boost the cost of gasoline produced for this period to more than $42 a barrel.

It is difficult to understand why the Army refuses to meet the Canol issue honestly and frankly. If there is nothing in this deal to hide or cover up, why does the Army continue its effort to justify what everyone recognizes to be a mistake?

The Army says that the properties are to be offered to Canada under an option to buy at the present appraised value. In view of the incompetence displayed by the Army in connection with this project I seriously doubt the wisdom of permitting the Army to negotiate for the disposal of the property. When the Army ceases operation it becomes a part of our surplus war property and should be handled by the Surplus Property Board, which Congress has set up for such a purpose. I insist that the matter should be turned over to that agency for disposal. I have previously urged and I again take this opportunity to suggest that the Mead committee continue its investigation of the huge expenditures that have gone into the Canol project. The individuals responsible for this wanton waste of public moneys should be determined and held responsible for their acts. The exact nature and character of the deal the Army seems to have made with Canada should be carefully looked into. The construction contracts and the contractors on this project should be closely examined. The profits and fees growing out of these contracts and how these were dispersed should be scrutinized. The beneficiaries of this huge slush fund should be made known.

The plain facts are that Under Secretary of War Patterson and General Somervell have never had any experience in their business careers which would in any degree fit them to pass

upon the practicability of such a project. These men could have had, and did have, the expert advice of the entire petroleum industry and other qualified experts which they refused to accept, and instead chose to accept the advice and counsel of a man whose known business career was such that his counsel was not entitled to serious consideration.

What I have to say about this project is no disparagement of the conduct of this war by the War Department—it is not a condemnation of the leadership of our armies in the sphere of military activity; but it is a glaring example of the reasons why the Army or any other department of government, should not engage in business enterprises. Had the War Department and General Somervell accepted the advice of the petroleum industry, Judge Patterson would not have told the Mead committee that the Canol project would prove a model for other such projects throughout the world, nor would General Somervell have told the committee that Canol would open up the largest reserve of oil discovered on the North American Continent in the past 15 years.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will my colleague from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. MOORE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. First of all I want to commend the Senator for his interest in this subject, and I want to say to him that the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program has recently held a number of executive sessions with military officials, the latest one only last week, and out of them has come a rather satisfactory development, which includes the closing of the Canol project earlier than was first promised to our committee. There was a promised closing of the project on June 30, but at a subsequent meeting we were informed that the closing could be brought forward and would take place about the 1st of April.

We are now advised that the operations at the wells will be closed immediately; that operation of the pipe lines carrying the crude oil to the refinery will be stopped at once; that the operation of the refinery will be stopped as soon as the stock pile of available crude there is refined; and that some 281 needed workers will be transferred to the petroleum fields in this country. We were assured that that would be carried out expeditiously, and our committee will follow the matter along the line the Senator from Oklahoma has suggested in his remarks this morning.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the Senator from New York. I should like to inquire if his committee will be able to disclose to the Senate in its report the character of the option Canada has for the purchase of these facilities?

Mr. MEAD. Yes; that will be contained in detail in our report to the Senate.

Mr. MOORE. And will the report also disclose the settlement with the oil companies whose property the Army has been exploring?

Mr. MEAD. That also will be contained in the final report.

Mr. MOORE. I think that will be very helpful, and I thank the Senator.

Mr. MEAD. The figures are now being compiled.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under what authority was the option given to Canada for the purchase of this project?

Mr. MOORE. That is what I would like to know, and I understand the committee will disclose it.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which our committee is releasing today. It is in further explanation of what I have already said in connection with the subject discussed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, does the Senator have any objection to the statement being read?

Mr. MEAD. I am willing to read it. It is a statement which our committee is releasing today, and it will serve as an answer to the question propounded by the Senator from Oklahoma. The statement is as follows:

Our committee has been advised by the War Department of the specific dates upon which various sections of the Canol project will be closed.

In the War Department's release of March 9, it was stated that the project would be closed by June 30. On the same day this committee announced that it believed the project should be closed as soon as possible because of the need for experienced refinery workers in the United States.

The War Department has now advised the committee that the purchase of oil has already been discontinued at the Norman Wells field which supplies the project. Operation of stage 2 of the refinery which produces 100-octane gasoline also has already been discontinued. Operation of the first pumping station on the crude oil pump line already has been discontinued. It is expected that production of motor gasoline and Diesel oil will continue at the refinery until about April 1 for the purpose of consuming inventories of crude oil now in storage at Whitehorse, and to provide a supply of products at Whitehorse until alternate arrangements have been put into effect. About April 1, the entire refinery will have been placed on a caretaker basis.

This will greatly facilitate the return of experienced workers to the United States. The committee understands that thorough plans are being made for the employment of these workers at refineries within the United States where they will be most useful. The Petroleum Administration for War has already, at the request of this committee, ascertained the refineries at which such employees could be utilized. It has already determined that at just two of these refineries the employment of a few hundred of the personnel now at the Canol project would result in an increased production of 100-octane gasoline of 2,000 barrels per day. This compares with the production of 216 barrels per day at Canol refinery in February 1945. Employees of the Petroleum Administration for War already are en route to Whitehorse for the purpose of facilitating the transfer of personnel.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MOORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. LANGER. I returned only this morning from attending the funeral of the late Senator Moses. The question which I wish to propound may have been answered yesterday. If it was answered then, I beg the Senator's pardon for asking it again; but who is going to own the Canol project if it is closed? Is the Government going to sell it, or what is going to become of it?

Mr. MEAD. There is a plan which our committee is looking into whereby it may be turned over to the Dominion of Canada or to the Imperial Oil Corporation under an agreement which was reached at the time the project was put into operation; but certain arrangements have to be made because the project was closed up earlier than was originally anticipated. I understand that our State Department and the Canadian authorities have been in negotiation on that matter, and, therefore, I cannot at this time explain just what the details of the transfer of the property will be.

Mr. LANGER. How much has the Government of the United States invested there?

Mr. MEAD. Oh, a tremendous sum of money. I would refer that question to my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to trespass on the time of the Senate for long, but, in view of the fact that the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] today submitted a report to the Senate on behalf of his committee concerning the so-called Canol project, I wish to say a word about it. The project is one, Mr. President, with which I am somewhat familiar, as I am with most projects in Alaska and the western portions of Canada. Apparently the tenor of the report made by the Mead investigating committee is to the effect that the United States Army has again admitted a mistake in building in that area.

Early in 1942 the United States Army decided it would build a highway to Alaska. That project, to date, has cost the people of this country $139,000,000. The location and the route were selected apparently by the United States Army without any consultation whatsoever with a commission which was authorized by the Congress of the United States and appointed by the President, which had made a study of the matter for many years, and was about to submit to the Congress of the United States a proposal to build a feasible commercial highway to Alaska. The Army then stated that for reasons of national defense, and in order to connect up certain airports, which could have been built in other places for the amounts which were spent to rehabilitate them, it had selected a route for that highway. The highway runs from the Alberta region to Whitehorse, through the southern Yukon, crosses the White River and into Fairbanks. One hundred and thirty-nine million dollars was the cost, without some bridges which must be built.

Mr. President, I happened to be Chairman of the Alaskan International Highway Commission. I was at sea at the time the selection of the route was made by the Army. No member of the Commission was consulted, nor were any of our engineers consulted. That highway, as has recently been indicated by the Army, will probably also be abandoned.

The Canadian Government itself has told the people of the United States that it does not think it can maintain the southern end of that highway and make it a feasible commercial route.

We now propose to give to Canada an opportunity to buy at its appraised value the Canol project. It was so stated by the Army as set forth in a press dispatch some weeks ago. I do not know whether the Army means for what it is worth now or what it cost the American people. The cost was tremendous. Of course, the Canadian Government cannot buy that project. It can only produce oil at $11.13 a barrel as compared to seven dollars and some cents delivered by barge from Seattle and by pipe line into Whitehorse, which is the southern terminus also of the Canol project.

Mr. President, I hope the Mead committee will go into this subject further, as I know it will. If a buyer can be found, very well, but if one cannot be found, I trust that the committee will set themselves to the immediate task of having the project dismantled and salvaging what machinery is there so that the people of this country may obtain something out of the second mistake the Army has made in that area.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I remember very well the controversy which raged over that highway. An investigation was made by a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which I happened to be a member. Former Senator Clark, of Missouri, was also a member of the subcommittee, but I do not remember the other Senator who was on the subcommittee. We learned that the Army had not consulted with the International Commission, which had studied the matter for years. Some arrangement had been made with the Canadian Government. The first I at least heard of the road was when the investigation was instituted by the subcommittee, and we learned that the Army had three regiments in that area all winter, and they were taken over the mountains to build this highway. The work was done against the most vigorous protest on the part of people who were acquainted with the terrain and the territory, but, because of the emergency of war and the insistence upon the part of the Army and the State Department, the road was built. We had very dubious ideas about its success, because we learned that those who had undertaken the project had not traveled over the territory and knew nothing about it. Men who had spent years in that region said the work could not be done. But there are some individuals in Washington who, when they get an idea, put it through regardless of cost, although they later come to the conclusion that it should not have been done, no matter how much money was spent on it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Minnesota that I think I personally know nearly every engineer in Alaska and the people of the north country who know that territory, and, so far as I can ascertain, they were not consulted. Be that as it may, however, I suppose we could argue from now until doomsday whether or not the Army at the time they made the decision thought it was the right thing to do. But admittedly now the Alaskan highway situation has to be corrected by providing a feasible and logical connection so as to make it a usable land route to Alaska. If the Canol project cannot be sold, then, in my opinion, it should be dismantled now, and the American people salvage from it what they can.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial published in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer regarding another threat to the Pacific Northwest in relation to the railroad situation in the Western States and Canada.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEATTLE'S GATEWAY TO ALASKA THREATENED

Premier John Hart, of British Columbia, will go to Ottawa some time this month to offer the provincially owned Pacific Great Eastern Railway jointly to the Canadian Pacific and Canadian National. The premier hopes they will acquire the Pacific Great Eastern and extend it from its present northern terminus, Quesnel, British Columbia, into the great and rich Peace River country. Preliminary discussions have been inconclusive but favorably.

The Pacific Great Eastern, running from the Vancouver area to the Prince George area, is only 347 miles long and its business in central British Columbia at the moment is purely local. This railroad, however, is of tremendous potential importance to Seattle and the Pacific Northwest in the event a railroad is built north of Prince George to Alaska. And the Alaska railroad is inevitable, not only for the commercial development of interior Alaska but for the military protection of the United States and Canada as well.

Only over the independent tracks of the Pacific Great Eastern could American railroads connect with an Alaska railroad on terms competitive with Canadian transcontinentals. If and when the Alaska railroad is built—and it is being vigorously urged in Washington, D. C., as a post-war project—the Canadian railroads own Pacific Great Eastern and traffic to and from Alaska will surely be detoured away from Seattle and through the Canadian Middle West. This, of course would be done by discriminatory rate structure, the cheaper "through rate" applying to shipments from the American Middle West and East to Alaska only if routed by way of Canada.

Fortunately, our two Senators, WARREN G. MAGNUSON and HUGH B. MITCHELL, see this danger and have pledged themselves to avert it if possible. MAGNUSON has already talked with Premier Hart and urged him to keep future American interests in mind when negotiating with the Canadian lines. MAGNUSON thinks also that the State Department may wangle from the Canadian Government a promise that American roads will have through-rate access to Prince George over the Pacific Great Eastern, regardless of its ownership, if and when an American-financed railroad is built to Alaska from central British Columbia.

Seattle already has been bypassed by the Alaska military highway and there are ominous indications that powerful interests both in Canada and the American Middle West intend to establish it as the permanent way to the Territory. Unless an aroused public interest here makes itself felt in Washington, D. C., the same thing will happen again in post-war railroad development. The present is the time to act.

If the Pacific Great Eastern changes hands, or if it is acquired by the Canadian transcontinentals without an express understanding that American railroads shall have through-rate rights over it to Alaska, territorial east-west traffic will flow through Winnipeg and Portal, N. Dak., instead of through Seattle.

We must not wait until they actually lay the first rail to Alaska; today we must insure the connection.

DOMESTIC SUPPLIES OF MEAT AND FOODSTUFFS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on the floor of the United States Senate yesterday the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] made an observation and a rather comprehensive statement relative to the export committee which has been set up by the administration to guard our Nation's food supply. I wish to say that I for one am very much in favor of the creation of this committee, and I am especially happy that the Director of War Mobilization, Mr. Justice Byrnes, is the man who is responsible for it. I feel that the committee will be of great help not only in connection with the production of agricultural supplies, especially meat, but in preserving our food supply for the people in this country who really need it, particularly those engaged in the war effort.

Among other things—and I quote from the RECORD—the Senator from Mississippi said:

> We all desire that the Russian people and Army be well fed. However, it is not right to take necessary food from the American people. Certainly Russia cannot have less salt meat than we have, because we have none.

I have quoted from the statement made by the Senator from Mississippi relative to the situation respecting salt pork in his State.

On the floor of the Senate we also heard from the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] relative to the shortage of pork in his State, and I am quite sure that if we could hear the testimony of Senators from all the States it would be almost unanimous to the effect that there has been and is now a shortage of meat throughout the country, and that it is affecting to some degree the production not only of war materials but certainly is having an impact upon our domestic economy.

Twenty Senators have submitted Senate Resolution 96 asking that a group of five Senators be appointed by the Vice President to make an investigation into the production, the processing, the distribution, the transportation, and the retailing of all meat, grain, and livestock, and anything which has anything to do with those products. That resolution has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. A resolution has also been submitted by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which has been referred to his committee, which provides for an investigation into the imports and exports of all farm commodities. I hope that both those resolutions will be considered by that committee immediately, and that a

Senate committee will be created which will aid the committee recently named by the Director of War Mobilization which is guarding the food supply of the United States at this time. I feel that it is necessary. Senators from Midwestern States who have been watching over this question for the past year have not only called the situation to the attention of the Administration, but also to the attention of the people generally. I believe that it is in keeping with the wishes at least of Senators from Midwestern States that such a committee be established by the Senate of the United States as an added check, together with the board set up in the Administration, to guard the food supplies of this country.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REED. While the Senator from Nebraska is on that subject, I think he might be interested in a bit of information which I am able to give him. In the statement of Mr. Byrnes establishing this committee, reference was made to the serious condition of domestic transportation. I am able to tell the Senator from Nebraska that this factor was an important consideration in establishing the committee. If I may trespass upon the time of the Senator, I shall be glad to state the reasons.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to have the contribution of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. At this time, in the matter of freight-car supply, the grain-producing section and the livestock-producing section of the country are in the most desperate situation which they have faced for 25 years.

In the first place, there is a great demand for boxcars for the movement of munitions. Secondly, the important railroads in the northeastern section of the country were paralyzed, so far as operations were concerned, for about 2 months, from December 15 until recently, when weather conditions improved to some extent.

Twenty-five hundred grain elevators in the Corn and Wheat Belts have been closed and are unable to do business because of a shortage of freight cars. In addition, there is a movement to take in the next 4 months the equivalent of 100,000 boxcars for the movement of grain out of the United States for use in the occupied countries. The agencies sponsoring that program gave no indication of concern whatever for the domestic situation and the transportation requirements of our own people, including our own grain producers and livestock producers.

When that factor was laid before Mr. Byrnes, he set up the committee to which the Senator from Nebraska has referred. I wish to express my unqualified approval of the action of Mr. Justice Byrnes in establishing the committee so as to centralize to some degree responsibility for and control over, first, the amount of such commodities available for export; and secondly, the means of transportation necessary to export them, and how those two fit in with the requirements of our own people.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the junior Senator from Kansas for a very timely contribution relative to the situation in which we find ourselves. Let me ask the Senator from Kansas if it is not true that hundreds of freight-car loads of corn and other food products have been shipped to the export centers to be sent across the water, while dairymen in the eastern section of the country, particularly in New England, are unable to obtain commercial feed which they need to continue to feed their dairy herds and other livestock?

Mr. REED. The Senator from Nebraska is correct in regard to the shortage of feed in the dairy sections of the East and Northeast. Of course, a serious situation which I did not mention, but with which the Senator from Nebraska and Senators from other grain producing States are familiar, is that last year we had the largest corn crop the country has ever produced. Following that, we had a wet winter, with rain and snow all the time. The result was that corn did not dry by freezing on the stalk, as it usually does; and today there are between 100,000,000 and 200,000,000 bushels of what is known as wet corn. I think there is as much of it in the Senator's State of Nebraska as in any other State.

Mr. WHERRY. There are 100,000,000 bushels of it in Nebraska.

Mr. REED. Unless that corn can be moved to the terminal elevators where artificial drying facilities are available, it will spoil. In southwestern Kansas, the Panhandle of Oklahoma, and the Panhandle of Texas, probably 10,000,000 bushels of sorghum grains are rotting because there is no transport to move them to the interior elevators. In turn, the interior elevators are filled with wheat, and there is no room to handle the sorghum grains until the wheat can be moved out. We have the most serious interior transport situation that I have seen in 25 years; and during all those years I have been very familiar with that factor. The governmental agencies, without responsibility, and without knowledge and understanding of the program, are undertaking further to draw upon our already inadequate transport supply in the interior of the country.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator again for his contribution.

Mr. President, let me say a word further in relation to the shortage of meat. We have talked about it on the floor of the Senate. We have told the Senate what would happen. Not long ago, under the leadership of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], we had several meetings with the Price Stabilizer in an effort to obtain a broader feeding ratio, so that more cattle might be sent into the feed lots. We obtained a small increase, but not sufficient to create an incentive of such character that cattle feeders would take advantage of the wet corn feeding situation and put cattle back in the feed lots.

With regard to the shortage of meat, I have before me a report from Chicago, which is one of the largest meat-packing centers in this country, if not in the world. This report is dated yesterday:

CHICAGO, March 13.—The worst meat shortage since the start of the war has hit butchers' counters from one end of the United States to the other.

A United Press survey tonight revealed that in nearly every section of the country the better grades of meat—beef, pork, veal, and lamb—have disappeared. Producers, wholesalers, and retailers agreed gloomily that months may elapse before these meats again will be on the counter.

That is public information, but it only restates what we have stated on the floor of the Senate time and again, namely, that daily our production is decreasing, primarily because of restraints, and also because we have not the feeding ratio which we should have for the production of pork and beef. The production of pork in this country is off nearly one-third at the present time. Those figures are from the Department of Agriculture. The prediction is that within the coming months we shall experience one of the most acute shortages this country has ever experienced in the production of pork.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Nebraska stated that there has been a decrease of one-third in the production of pork. Yesterday, in company with the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], I visited the O. P. A. and discussed with the meat division officials the situation in the packing houses. The packing houses are divided into two classes, those which are Federally inspected and those which are not. We learned that the movement of pork through federally inspected packing houses has decreased more than 40 percent, as compared with last year. Let me ask the Senator from Iowa whether that is in accordance with his recollection.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank both the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] for their helpful contributions.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to two more facts which I think should receive consideration. As the Senator from Kansas has already stated, we have one of the largest corn crops that has ever been produced in this country. In my State it is a record corn crop. As the Senator from Kansas said, we have more than 100,000,000 bushels of wet corn in our States. There are only a few ways of disposing of such corn. One is to send it to the markets, where it can be dried in the elevators. The other is to feed it to livestock. Those are the only two outlets. But with the boxcar shortage and the restrictions on elevators, the corn can only be fed to cattle, for the eventual production of meat; and we need beef. So we find that the situation is that we have the largest corn crop on record and have nearly 83,000,000 cattle in the corn States. That is a near record. But because of the artificial restrictions and the managed economy, we cannot get the largest number of cattle and the largest corn crop we have ever produced together, in order to produce beef. We can produce

beef if the O. P. A. will give us a chance. We can raise and fatten the cattle if they will take off the restrictions. But here we are, with hundreds of thousands or even millions of bushels of corn which will spoil if it is not fed to the cattle or if it is not dried in the elevators, and yet we are unable either to get it to the cattle or to send it to the elevators. Why is it that we cannot get the corn to the cattle and, in turn, produce the beef, and finally make the beef available to the armed forces and to the civilian population?

I want to give the Senate some authentic information. I am sorry it is impossible for me to divulge its source, but I can assure the Senate that it is absolutely authentic. In my State there are some ordnance plants. There is one at Mead; we have the huge Cornhusker plant at Grand Island and we have the large naval ordnance plant at Hastings. I obtained the information I shall now state over the telephone just a few minutes ago, as a result of the discussion which occurred in the Senate yesterday relative to available supplies of meat.

Here it is:

To show you how bad this is, Mead—

That is a war plant—

and Hastings—

That, I understand, is the largest naval ordnance plant in the United States, covering more than 60,000 acres—

and this plant—

The plant at Grand Island, the Cornhusker ordnance plant—

are holding a meeting at Grand Island this afternoon trying to determine what we are going to do to get meat of any kind, enough to see us through.

We are in very bad shape—

At Grand Island—

but I understand that Mead is in worse shape than we are, and I understand that at Hastings they are just going to have to quit feeding their civilians unless they can get help.

At the present time all that we have been able to get is beef, and we have been getting that from little local packers or slaughterhouses. Now, of course, they have put these little places on a basis that they cannot furnish as much any more. The beef is forced over to the major packers.

Those of us in the Senate who took an interest in the O. P. A. order said it would drive the slaughterhouses and the small packing plants out of business. We predicted that would happen. Now it has happened, due to the O. P. A. quotas, which, when imposed on the smaller plants, have made it impossible for them to slaughter all types of beef.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator remembers, I am sure, that at the time when the O. P. A. order and the meat-packing situation were under consideration, we said that 19 small packing plants had been put out of business by the officials or agency in Washington which had loaned them money. As a matter of fact, the plant I have in mind, located at Grand Forks, N. Dak., had borrowed $150,000 from the R. F. C. It never used $50,000 of that amount. It had paid $19,000 on the principal, had paid all the interest, and had paid all its taxes, including social-security taxes. Yet Mr. Jones demanded every dollar of that money. When he demanded that it be paid back at once, the plant was unable to do so, and it had to close. The Armour Packing Co. paid $260,000 cash for the plant on which Mr. Jones would not let the $81,000 balance of the loan stand.

Every one of those 19 independent plants has been forced out of business. The Government officials should go out there and see the situation at first hand, as I saw it last week in North Dakota, where it is not unusual to see 10,000 or 20,000 bushels of corn piled up on many farms and rotting and spoiling. It is impossible to obtain lumber with which to build corn cribs, and it is impossible to obtain boxcars with which to ship the corn to the elevators. When we made telegraph and telephone inquiries about the possibility of obtaining either boxcars or lumber, as Representative HAROLD HAGEN, of Minnesota, and I did, the answer was that the cars had been snowed in at Buffalo. So we could not obtain either lumber with which to build corn cribs or boxcars with which to haul the corn to the elevators or to help elevators ship the corn to the terminal markets. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska that the situation is one which should not be tolerated by the people of our country.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. I understand he has just returned from North Dakota and has first-hand information about the seriousness of the situation.

Mr. LANGER. I reached Washington this morning. The corn is spoiling in every section of the Red River Valley.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not also true that because of the so-called herd quotas, the smaller plants, which have practically no facilities for keeping cattle of all grades, are required to slaughter the cattle they have, and thus they are put out of business?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; let me also say that some of the smaller plants which cannot possibly comply with the O. P. A. rules are being put out of business.

Mr. WHERRY. And is it not also true that when the major or larger packing plants buy the smaller plants, they are entitled to allocate that beef, and they sell it to their own customers, instead of taking care of the retailers who formerly bought the beef from the smaller packers?

Mr. LANGER. Of course, it is true.

VISIT OF THE QUIZ KIDS TO THE SENATE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I have asked the Senator to yield to me for a very important reason. Mr. President, there is in the gallery at this moment a very distinguished group of young people of our country. I doubt if we could find a more brilliant, charming, and unique group of youngsters anywhere in the world. We have a lot of "quiz" folks on the floor of the Senate, but today the Quiz Kids are in the gallery as guests of the Senate. Will the Quiz Kids please stand so that my colleagues and those in the gallery may see them?

(Thereupon the Quiz Kids rose from their seats in the gallery, and were applauded by the Senate.)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was my pleasure to have occasion to refer to the Quiz Kids approximately a year ago, and when I finally met them I found them as charming as they are brilliant and well-informed. I listen to them nearly every Sunday night when I am able to do so, and I always enjoy, with great humiliation, the knowledge they display in answering questions.

They are to be in Washington on Sunday night, I believe, in their regular Sunday night performance, and they are to be pitted against four Senators, so I understand, in a contest between the celebrated Quiz Kids and the four Senators. All I have to say is, may God have mercy on the souls of the Senators who will take part. [Laughter.]

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may I say "Amen." [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the Senator from New Mexico is to be one of the victims. [Laughter.]

I join in the greetings which we extend to these fine young Americans, and I congratulate them upon their achievement. I suppose I may be guilty of some disloyalty if I say that I wish them success next Sunday night. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I too, wish to join in the very complimentary remarks of the senior Senator from Illinois and the distinguished majority leader, the senior Senator from Kentucky. Since the Quiz Kids are in the gallery, I might ask them the $64 question: Why is it that if we have 83,000,000 cattle in the United States and if we also have more corn than we have ever had before, we cannot get plenty of beef for everybody? I should like to have them answer the question, if they will. It seems that the Senate cannot get the job done. [Laughter.]

DOMESTIC SUPPLIES OF MEAT AND FOODSTUFFS

Mr. REED. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REED. Before we leave the matter which has been under discussion, I wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota that there is no overestimating the difficulty caused to railroad transportation by the recent storms in the Northeast. Today there is probably the most serious dislocation in the supply of boxcars we have ever had. Sixty thousand empty boxcars, in addition to the normal flow of loaded cars westward, will be required in order to relieve our situation. For the past 3 days empty cars have been traveling west through Chicago and St. Louis at the rate of approximately 1,200 empty cars a day, in addition to the regular loaded movement.

In taking into consideration the limited facilities at their disposal, and the tremendous demand being made

upon their equipment, I believe that the railroads are doing all they can do. I believe there is hope for an improvement in the present situation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Day before yesterday I talked with the vice president of the Great Northern Railroad. I begged him for cars to be sent from St. Paul to North Dakota. I told him that we would accept the cars at any place; on small sidings, or at any other points along the road, just so long as we could save the produce which is now being spoiled. I was told by him that there was absolutely no prospect of anything being done for us for at least 10 days.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Great Northern Railroad happens to be in the most unfortunate situation with regard to available boxcars of any railroad in the country. I believe that within 10 days, however, the Great Northern situation will be immeasurably relieved.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am about to conclude my remarks. I should like to have the members of the Mead committee listen to what I have to say.

In the statement which I made in connection with the subject of cattle, I possibly used an incorrect figure. I may have used the figure of 84,000,000. It should have been 83,000,000.

The information which I was quoting continues as follows:

At the present time all that we have been able to get is beef, and we have been getting that from little local packers or slaughterhouses. Now, of course, they have put those little places on a basis where they cannot furnish as much any more. Beef is forced over to the major packers. Insofar as the major packers are concerned, we can hardly get anything from them. The civilian merchandise which they get naturally—I say naturally—goes to their old-time customers and we just get a little hand-out.

The corn-husker plant at the present time has approximately 700 people living in the area.

They are producing shells for our soldiers overseas.

In other words, if we do not do anything else, we have to feed that 700.

That is in a town of 25,000.

Now, of course, the Army has insisted that we feed one hot meal a day to everyone working on the line. Unless we get the relief very soon, we are going to have to discontinue that.

He means meat in the meal.

In regard to those living in the dormitories, we have had to cut out a goodly portion of our breakfast. We have no ham. We have no bacon. We have no sausage. We were within 1 day of being out of lard and we would have had to stop baking entirely.

We finally got a large shipment of lard from the Army through the quartermasters. Otherwise, we would have been entirely out.

We have been in touch with quartermasters at Chicago, Kansas City, and also with Ordnance at St. Louis in regard to the pork proposition, and they just tell us they cannot do anything for us, that they cannot give us any rights to purchase. We have talked with about every agency that we can think of and we are not getting anywhere.

People out here in Nebraska would be willing to forego anything if they felt that it was going to our armed forces, but I think they are getting sick and tired of feeling that it is going to other nations, and we can't even get enough to serve meals.

As was clearly brought out on yesterday by the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi, a part of our food supply which should be going to our farmers to help produce food is used by war workers to help produce the equipment which we must have in order to win the war.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. The Senator from Nebraska stated that he wished the Mead committee would look into this subject. I may say that for nearly a year the committee has been making studies of the subject, and we are now bringing those studies to a point where we are ready to approach the stage of public hearings. I will see that the discussion which has taken place this morning on the subject is brought to the attention of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from New York for his statement. I hope that something will be done which will result in rectifying the situation which I am assured will become acute unless it is remedied in some manner.

Mr. MEAD. I made a rather hasty check-up of the situation at Buffalo, and ascertained that approximately 17 vessels at Buffalo are loaded with cargoes of grain which must be unloaded before the vessels can be reconditioned for use during the coming summer. The elevators there, as well as other elevators in the West and the Midwest, are loaded to capacity. Unless something is done to improve the situation there will be a slow-down in the transportation of necessary foodstuffs, and the problem will be greatly aggravated. I hope that something will be done of a constructive nature.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to call to the Senator's attention the situation in connection with the shortage of pork throughout the United States. The shortage was anticipated a year ago. The farmers had so much trouble in marketing their hogs and obtaining adequate prices for them that they felt they could not maintain the same rate of production this year that they maintained last year.

Mr. WHERRY. I may say that the Senator from Minnesota is one of the Members of the Senate who has helped us do all that could be done, and I wish to thank him for his contribution.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Whatever I did was done under the promptings of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does not the Senator think that the agricultural situation and the food situation at the present time are due directly to the failure of those who planned for the war effort to give full credit to agriculture as a necessary part of the war effort?

Mr. WHERRY. I do not think there is any doubt about it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does not the Senator think there has been a failure in the past 2 or 3 years to credit agriculture in the production of food as an equal partner in winning the war?

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the junior Senator from Iowa wholeheartedly, and I want to thank him for the contribution.

Let me say further, Mr. President, that this resolution endeavors to correlate all the activities within the Department of Agriculture, the War Food Administration and the O. P. A., so that they may have some sort of organized program in the production, distribution, and sale of food products.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does not the Senator think we will never solve the food problem and the production, which is back of the food situation, until we do put it on that basis?

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator desires to refer to the food situation, I yield to him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well, sir.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I rise merely to state to those who have been discussing the food situation and who like to criticize what has been done, that as I have seen the agricultural situation develop, there has never been a time when the Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration have not completely recognized the importance of agriculture and the great significance of the effort which it has made to produce food for the war.

I should like to add that there have been great difficulties. I have never hesitated to criticize the O. P. A. for some of its mistaken administrative procedures, and I have made suggestions to the War Food Administration, but I do not believe, Mr. President, that it would be possible anywhere to find a man more competent than Judge Marvin Jones, the head of the War Food Administration, to protect the interests of agriculture. He was formerly chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and, in his capacity as chairman of that committee, he demonstrated not only his sympathy for agriculture but also a great ability to fight for the interests of agriculture.

Sometimes, Mr. President, I think we are inclined to minimize the difficulties which are involved in the tremendous organization that is necessary to carry on the war. We created the O. P. A., an utterly new agency, and of course it made a great many mistakes. It did things which never should have been done and it omitted to do things which should have been done. There can be no question about that; but I have observed over and over again that every mistake makes a headline while constructive achievements are usually buried in the want ads.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is the Senator through? I thought he was going to ask me a question. If not, and he wishes to make an observation, it is all right, and I shall yield to him further.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have trespassed upon the Senator's time merely to make these observations. Of course, I could take the floor. I feel, however, that we ought to give consideration to the tremendous task that is borne by the men who have to do the job. The organizations have been created without regard to political affiliations. There are men in the War Food Administration and in the Department of Agriculture who are civil-service employees of the Government of the United States. They work diligently and efficiently and despite the mistakes which may be made, in view of the difficulties which are involved, I think we should not fail to give them some credit. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Now, Mr. President, I wish to conclude with a few remarks in answer to the very distinguished Senator from Wyoming, who I will say, has been as cooperative with the midwestern Senators in our problems with regard to livestock and feed as any other Senator on this floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his interest in the subject. Of course, I do not blame him for coming to the defense of these agencies. I understood him to say that he did not know of an instance of any difficulty occurring. Let me refer to one or two. Does not the Senator remember the egg situation? A ceiling price was fixed on eggs, and there were produced so many more eggs than the Agriculture Department had anticipated that they did not know what in the world to do with them, and the price was allowed to go down to 11 cents a dozen in Nebraska, when the minimum price was 28 cents a dozen. Eggs were shipped from New England to Iowa and from Iowa back to New England, to be given away to different institutions because the producers did not know what to do with the eggs.

Here is another example: Recently the senior Senator from Wyoming and 17 or 21 Senators called on Judge Vinson to talk with him about a ceiling price on cattle. It will be remembered that the O. P. A. organization was for a ceiling, while the War Food Administration was against a ceiling. They did not have a unified program. They were told that if a ceiling of 18 cents a pound was fixed cattle would go back to the feed lots.

Through the efforts of the distinguished Senator, Judge Vinson did increase the ceiling price 50 cents a hundred pounds. I have the greatest of faith in Mr. Reed, of the War Food Administration, who apparently handles such matters. I think he is one of the most capable men I have ever met.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to hear the Senator say that.

Mr. WHERRY. I said in the presence of the Administrator that if they would follow Harry Reed's judgment we would probably get some place. Mr. Reed said unless they broadened the feeding ratio and put the ceiling up it would not make much difference what the ceiling was, so far as getting cattle back to the feed lots was concerned.

I want to say to the distinguished Senator that that afternoon they wanted facts and figures. In the past 3 days the senior Senator from Kansas has received a letter. One firm sent seven carloads of cattle to the Kansas City market. They were AA cattle, white-faced steers, weighing 1,088 pounds, the best kind of cattle that a man could put his money in. They cost $13 a hundred and when they sold they did not average $16. The very difficulty pointed out by Mr. Reed was experienced by the cattle feeders throughout the country, because of the ceiling price paid for AA cattle.

That is another illustration of what follows when two departments or agencies fail to work together. If we had a correlated department, probably the War Food Administration and the production end of the administration would act together and have a unified program.

I should like to say further to the distinguished Senator that I rose to compliment the Administration for setting up this food committee to throw protection around the exportation of our foods. I thought it was a fine thing, that it was a recognition by the Administration of the things for which we have been fighting in Congress, and that it should increase not only our protection, but also help prevent the exportation of all our foods to foreign countries.

Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. SHIPSTEAD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAYLOR in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the senior Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy to hear what the Senator has just said. Let me add that I have reason to believe that there will be some announcements in the very near future which will improve the situation another little bit. I have been working with the O. P. A. and with the War Food Administration, particularly on the problem of stocker and feeder cattle, so that they may be marketed in the customary manner.

Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that this morning in the Committee on Appropriations a witness appeared from the Commodity Credit Corporation who testified with respect to eggs. His testimony, as I recall—and the Senator from Tennessee will correct me if I am wrong—was to the effect that some $63,000,000 were expended by the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of supporting the price of eggs. The price would have fallen in all parts of the country, as well as in Nebraska, to 10, 11, or 15 cents. As a result of the manner in which the egg situation was handled, the Government will not lose more than five or six million dollars, as compared with a loss to the farmers of the country, if Congress had not asked for the support price and insisted upon it, which would have been counted in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

There is more than one aspect of this question, and I am happy that the Senator from Nebraska found time this morning to compliment the agencies for at least part of their work.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I take no exception to the commodity loans which have been made. I think the policy dates away back many years, and I am for that policy, I think it is fine, it helps to stabilize prices, but I merely drew the attention of the Senate to some of the experiences we have had with the production of eggs, milk, and feeder cattle, more than cattle from the ranges, because we have to buy these cattle and feed them, and when we have to buy them on too narrow a margin because of O. P. A. price ceilings, we just do not come out.

I did not get an opportunity to complete my remarks about steers, but I say to the senior Senator from Wyoming that on the cattle they fed the feeders did not make any money, but lost money, and if the O. P. A. continues the ceiling as it is today, it will be found that there will be less cattle going back into the feed lots than there are at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as one of the representatives from a cattle-raising State, it has always been my effort to sustain the feeder price.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I merely wish to call attention to the fact that since I have observed the Senator from Wyoming perform here in the Senate, I have noticed he has always taken good care of the stockers and feeders raised in Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from Wyoming, and other Senators who were present at a conference held in the Senate Office Building last year, will recall that the War Food Administration advised the O. P. A. strongly against the action it took in establishing a ceiling upon live beef animals.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REED. The War Food Administration, in the hearing of the Senator from Nebraska and myself, as well as a dozen or 15 others, then advised the O. P. A. that there was a severe shortage of pork, amounting at that time, as estimated, to about 28 percent, which has been increased to about 32 or 33 percent, and that the only way the deficiency in meat could be overcome was by feeding beef animals in the feed lots to heavier weights. The War Food Administration told the O. P. A. that if it followed the policy it intended to follow, and is following, instead of feeding beef animals out to heavier weights, there would be a tendency to empty the feed lots, and the Senator from Nebraska knows that that is happening now.

I happen to keep a daily record in my office of the movement of beef cattle through the 12 principal markets, and today, and through this period, the beef

cattle are being marketed through the feed lots at lighter weights instead of heavier weights, at lighter weights because the feeders, being faced with probable losses, are liquidating their cattle at any time they can escape with the smallest loss.

I wanted to rehearse the history of this matter, because here was the War Food Administration definitely warning the O. P. A. against the very thing that is taking place at this time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall yield the floor in a moment, but I wish to say that there has just been brought to my attention by the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], who also has taken a great interest in all these meetings, and was especially active in the egg-production program last April and March, a fact relative to the different grading of eggs. If I am correct, there are 13 grades of eggs. In this morning's mail I received a mimeographed announcement 7 pages long, which sets out 36 different kinds of eggs. How in the world can a man producing eggs know what the price will be in the market place if there are 36 different kinds of eggs?

I ask unanimous consent to have this announcement printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES STANDARDS FOR QUALITY FOR INDIVIDUAL SHELL EGGS—ORDER OF PROMULGATION OF STANDARDS

By virtue of the authority vested in the Secretary of Agriculture by the provision in the act of Congress entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes," approved July 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 664) reading in part as follows: "For acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States useful information relative to the standardization, classification, grading, preparation for market, handling, and marketing of farm and food products, including the demonstration and promotion of the use of uniform standards of classification of American farm and food products throughout the world," the following standards are promulgated as "Official United States Standards for Quality of Individual Shell Eggs," to be employed for the grading and certification of shell eggs by official graders of the United States Department of Agriculture, and to be in force and effect on January 2, 1943, and thereafter as long as Congress shall provide the necessary authority therefor, unless amended or superseded by standards hereafter prescribed and promulgated. These standards shall supersede all standards for quality of individual shell eggs previously promulgated under such authority.

SPECIFICATIONS FOR OFFICIAL UNITED STATES STANDARDS FOR QUALITY OF INDIVIDUAL SHELL EGGS

(1) United States standards for quality of individual eggs with clean unbroken shells.

United States standards for quality of individual eggs with clean unbroken shells shall be as follows:

U. S. grade AA: The shell must be clean, unbroken, and normal. The air cell must not exceed one-eighth inch in depth and may be regular or slightly wavy. The yolk outline may be slightly defined. The yolk must be free from defects or blemishes visible before the candle. The white must be clear and firm.

U. S. grade A: The shell must be clean unbroken, and normal. The air cell must not exceed two-eighths inch in depth and may be regular or slightly wavy. The yolk outline may be fairly well defined. The yolk must be practically free from defects or blemishes visible before the candle. The white must be clear and reasonably firm.

U. S. grade B: The shell must be clean and unbroken, but may be slightly abnormal. The air cell must not exceed three-eighths inch in depth and may show total movement not in excess of three-eighths inch. If the air cell is small (not over two-eighths inch in depth), it may be free. The yolk outline may be well defined. The yolk may show definite but not serious defects visible before the candle. The white must be clear but may be slightly weak.

U. S. grade C: The shell must be clean and unbroken but may be abnormal. The air cell may be over three-eighths inch in depth and may be bubbly or free. The yolk may be plainly visible and appear dark. The yolk may show clearly visible germ development, but no blood due to such development. It may show other defects that do not render the egg inedible. The white may be weak and watery. Small meat spots or blood clots may be present.

(2) United States standards for quality of individual eggs with dirty unbroken shells.

United States standards for quality of individual eggs with soiled, stained, or dirty shells shall be as follows:

U. S. light dirty: Individual egg that has not more than one-eighth of the shell surface slightly stained, slightly soiled, or slightly dirty, but without loose adhering dirt and of the interior quality of U. S. grade B or better shall be classed as U. S. light dirty.

U. S. dirty: Individual egg with more than one-eighth of the shell surface stained, soiled, or dirty, or with less than one-eighth of the shell surface stained, soiled, or dirty to such an extent that it is more than slightly stained, slightly soiled, or slightly dirty, or any egg with slightly stained, slightly soiled, or slightly dirty shell and of the interior quality of U. S. grade C shall be classed as U. S. dirty.

(3) United States standards for quality of individual eggs with checked or cracked shells.

United States standards for quality of individual eggs with checked or cracked shells shall be as follows:

U. S. check: Individual egg with either clean or dirty shell that has an open crack or break in the shell but with the shell membrane unbroken and with no leakage of the shell contents shall be classed as U. S. check.

U. S. leaker: Individual egg with either clean or dirty shell that has an open crack or break in the shell and shell membrane and with the contents exuding or free to exude through the shell shall be classed as U. S. leaker.

EXPLANATION OF TERMS

The official United States standards for quality of individual shell eggs are applicable to eggs that are the product of the domestic chicken hen and are in the shell.

Terms descriptive of shell

1. Clean: A clean shell is one that is free from foreign matter and from stains or discolorations that are readily visible. Eggs with only very small specks or stains may be considered clean, if such eggs are not present in sufficient number in a package to detract appreciably from its appearance. Eggs that show traces of processing oil on the shell are considered clean when classified as processed or shell treated, unless the shell is otherwise soiled.

2. Light dirty: A light dirty shell is one that shows slightly stained or slighty soiled areas that are readily visible but without adhering dirt that could be readily detached and that do not affect more than one-eighth of the shell surface.

3. Dirty: A dirty shell is one that has stained, soiled, or dirty spots of considerable size that may affect more than one-eighth of the shell surface or that has less than one-eighth of the shell surface stained, soiled, or dirty to such an extent that it is more than slightly stained, slightly soiled, or slightly dirty.

4. Unbroken: An unbroken shell is one that is free from actual checks or breaks.

5. Checked or cracked: A checked or cracked shell is one that has an actual break in the shell but where the shell membrane is unbroken and there is no exuding of contents from the egg.

6. Leaker: A leaker is an egg in which the shell and shell membrane are broken to the extent that the egg contents are exuding or are free to exude through the shell.

7. Normal: A normal shell is one that approximates the usual shape and that is of good, even texture and strength and free from distinct ridges, rough areas, thin spots, or other conditions not common to good shells. Slight ridges and rough areas that do not affect materially the shape, texture, and strength of the shell are permitted.

8. Slightly abnormal: A slightly abnormal shell is one that may be somewhat unusual in shape or that may be somewhat faulty in texture or strength. It may also show distinct but not pronounced ridges, thin spots, or rough areas.

9. Abnormal: An abnormal shell is one that may be decidedly misshapen or that may be decidedly faulty in texture or strength or that may show pronounced ridges, rough spots, or other defects.

10. Depth of air cell: The depth of the air cell, when in its natural position, is the distance from the large end of the egg to the plane passing through the egg at the point where the lower air-cell membrane touches the shell.

11. Regular: A regular air cell is one that retains a fixed position in the egg and that shows a practically even, smooth outline without any movement when the egg is twirled.

12. Slightly wavy: A slightly wavy air cell is one that retains a practically fixed position in the egg, but shows a slight movement, not to exceed one-eighth inch at any one point where its lower shell membrane touches the shell.

13. Movement not in excess of three-eighths inch: An air cell that shows a total movement not in excess of three-eighths inch from the line where its lower shell membrane touches the shell.

14. Bubbly air cell: A bubbly air cell is one that has several rather small bubbles within or beneath it, that give it a bubbly appearance.

15. Free air cell: A free air cell is one that moves freely about in the egg. Such an air cell will seek the uppermost point in the egg, no matter in what position the egg may be held.

Terms descriptive of the yolk

16. Outline slightly defined: A yolk, the outline of which, when viewed before the candle, is indistinctly indicated and tends to blend into the surrounding white.

17. Outline fairly well defined: A yolk, the outline of which, when viewed before the candle, is discernible but that has not become definite and distinct.

18. Outline well defined: A yolk, the outline of which, when viewed before the candle, is quite definite and distinct.

19. Plainly visible: A plainly visible yolk is one that has a definitely discernible outline before the candle and that may appear dark.

20. Free from defects or blemishes visible before the candle: A yolk that, when viewed before the candle, shows no spots or areas on its surface indicating the presence of germ development or other defects or blemishes.

21. Practically free from defects and blemishes visible before the candle: A yolk that, when viewed before the candle, may show

very slight blemishes within the yolk shadow.

22. Definite but not serious defects visible before the candle: A yolk that may show definite spots or areas on its surface, when viewed before the candle, indicative of defects but with no definite indication of germ development or other pronounced or serious defects or blemishes.

23. Other serious defects: A yolk that shows well developed spots or areas of a character that constitute serious defects or blemishes but do not render the egg inedible.

24. Clearly visible germ development: A development of the germ spot on the yolk of a fertile egg that has progressed to a point where it is plainly visible before the candle, as a rather definite, deeper colored circular area, or as a distant spot on the yolk, with no blood in evidence.

25. Blood due to germ development: Blood caused by development of the germ in a fertile egg to the point where it is visible before the candle. Such eggs are classified as inedible.

26. Blood clots (blood not due to germ development): Spots or clots of blood usually on the surface of the yolk but sometimes floating in the white. If they are small (not over one-eighth inch in diameter), the eggs may be classed as United States grade C. If larger and/or showing a diffusion of blood in the white surrounding them, the eggs should be classified as inedible.

Terms descriptive of the white

27. Clear: A clear white is one that is free from discoloration or from any foreign bodies floating in it. Prominent chalazae should not be confused with foreign bodies, such as meat spots or blood clots.

28. Firm: A firm white is one that is sufficiently thick or viscous to permit but limited movement of the yolk from the center of the egg when it is twirled. A firm white should have a consistency not lower than the white shown in No. 2 of the Van Wagenen Chart of Broken-out Eggs.

29. Reasonably firm: A reasonably firm white is one that has a reasonably good viscous condition but not as strong a condition as a firm white. A reasonably firm white permits the yolk to move somewhat more freely from its normal position in the center of the egg and thus to approach the shell more closely when the egg is twirled. A reasonably firm white may, therefore, cause the outline of the yolk to be fairly well defined. A reasonably firm white should have a consistency not lower than the white shown in No. 3 of the Van Wagenen chart of broken-out eggs.

30. Slightly weak: A slightly weak white is one that has lost its firm or even its reasonably firm condition, has become less viscous and is not as clearly differentiated from the thin white when the egg is broken out. It should have a consistency not lower than the white shown in No. 4 of the Van Wagenen chart of broken-out eggs.

31. Weak and watery: A weak and watery white is one that is thin and generally lacking in viscosity and that, therefore, permits the yolk to move freely from its normal position in the center of the egg and to approach the shell closely when the egg is twirled. It may have a consistency lower than the white shown in No. 4 of the Van Wagenen chart of broken-out eggs.

32. Small blood clots or small meat spots: Spots or clots of blood usually on the surface of the yolk but sometimes floating in the white. These blood clots may have lost their characteristic red color and appear as small spots of foreign material commonly referred to as meat spots. Such blood clots or meat spots are incorporated in the egg during its formation as, or after, the yolk leaves the ovary. Such blood spots are not due to germ development.

33. Bloody White: An egg, the white of which has blood diffused more or less generally through it. Such a condition may be present in new-laid eggs. Eggs with bloody whites are classed as inedible.

General terms

34. No grade: Eggs of possible edible quality that fail to meet the requirements of an Official or Tentative United States Grade or that have been contaminated by smoke, chemicals, or other foreign material that has seriously affected the character, appearance, or flavor of the eggs are classed as "No Grade."

35. Loss: Eggs that are inedible, smashed, contaminated, or containing bloody whites, large blood spots or large or unsightly meat spots, or other extraneous or foreign material are classed as "Loss."

36. Inedible eggs: Under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, eggs that are filthy, putrid, or decomposed, or otherwise unfit for food in whole or in part are adulterated. Eggs of the following descriptions are classed as inedible: Black rots, white rots, mixed rots (addled eggs), sour eggs, eggs with green whites, eggs with stuck yolks, moldy eggs, musty eggs, eggs showing bloody rings, eggs containing embryo chicks (at or beyond the blood ring state) and any other eggs that are filthy, decomposed, or putrid.

Done at Washington, D. C., this 2d day of January 1943. Witness my hand and the seal of the Department of Agriculture.

PAUL H. APPLEBY,
Under Secretary of Agriculture.

Summary of United States standards for quality of individual shell eggs

[Figures in parentheses refer to paragraph number of explanation of terms on pp. 2 to 6]

Quality factor	Specifications for each quality factor							
	U. S. grade AA	U. S. grade A	U. S. grade B	U. S. grade C	U. S. light dirty	U. S. dirty	U. S. check	U. S. leaker
Shell	Clean (1), unbroken (4), normal (7).	Clean (1), unbroken (4), normal (7).	Clean (1), unbroken (4), may be slightly abnormal (8)	Clean (1), unbroken (4), may be abnormal (9).	Unbroken (4), may have light dirty condition (2).	Unbroken (4), may have dirty condition (3).	Clean (1), or dirty condition (2 and 3), cracked but not leaking (5).	Clean (1), or dirty condition (2 and 3), may be cracked and leaking (6).
Air cell	⅛ inch or less in depth (10), regular (11) or slightly wavy (12).	3/16 inch or less in depth (10), regular (11) or slightly wavy (12).	3/16 inch or less in depth (10), may show total movement not over 3/16 inch (13), if small (not over 3/16 inch) may be free (15).	May be over 3/16 inch in depth (10), may be bubbly or free (14).	Same as U. S. grade B.	Same as U. S. grade C.	Same as U. S. grade C.	Same as U. S. grade C.
Yolk	Outline slightly defined (16), free from defects or blemishes (20).	Outline fairly well defined (17), practically free from defects or blemishes (21).	Outline well defined (18), may show definite but not serious defects (22).	May be plainly visible (19), may appear dark (19), may show clearly visible germ development (24) but no blood due to such development, may show defects that do not render it inedible (23).	do	do	do	Do.
White	Clear (27), firm (28).	Clear (27) Reasonably firm (29).	Clear (27), may be slightly weak (30).	Clear (27), may be weak and watery (31), small meat spots or small blood clots may be present (32).				

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, that gives an opportunity for 38 different prices.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. That is the difficulty with all these regulations. A man goes out to buy a drove of cattle today, and in the drove there are, let us say, 60 head of steers, 30 head of heifers, three or four cows, and two or three bulls. He has to buy 50 percent fat cattle and 50 percent utility cattle, and the man who goes out to buy them does not know how to grade them. If he does not grade them correctly and is found guilty, he is subject to a fine of $10,000 and a year in the penitentiary.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. As I understood the Senator, he stated he thought our planned economy was responsible for some of the agricultural difficulties we are now having. Did I understand the Senator correctly to state that he approved the egg-production program?

Mr. WHERRY. It may be feasible for the Agriculture Department to set up production programs, but if they do, those programs should be in coordination with the War Food Administration, and also correlated with the activities of the Office of Price Administration. But in the egg program one did not know what the other had done, and as a result a surplus of egg production and poultry resulted. The price for them was not maintained; so the farmers lost on the investment they made when they started to produce poultry, and also eggs.

Mr. McMAHON. At least the egg-production program was the result of a

planned situation brought about by the Agriculture Department?

Mr. WHERRY. The price was up a year ago, but now it is down. The same is true as to hogs. A minimum of $12.75 in Chicago was guaranteed. The raisers produced 133,000,000 hogs in 1943. This year that is off, it is about 88,000,000. I have not figured it out exactly.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator approve the egg-production program as it was developed by the Department?

Mr. WHERRY. I think the answer to all this inflation, and all this dire need about which everyone is hearing at the meat counter, is to have abundant production. If we develop abundant production, it will do more to correct inflation, it will do more to lower prices, than all the legislation we write on the statute books.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator feel that he has answered my question?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I think the answer is to obtain production.

I yield the floor, Mr. President.

ADJUSTMENT OF CHEESE PRICES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for years the State of Wisconsin has been producing more than half the Nation's cheese in its many small factories which are independently owned and operated.

Recent alarming developments, however, impel me to ask:

Is there an attempt or plan on foot to destroy that independent ownership and transfer control of the State's cheese production to a few large dairy companies? And is this being accomplished under the guise of winning the war through discriminatory provisions in O. P. A. orders?

In answer to these questions, let us examine the record and let the facts speak for themselves.

In 1941, at the beginning of this war, Wisconsin had more than 2,000 cheese factories. In 1943 it had about 1,800. Today, it has less than 1,700. Of the present 1,700, about 200 have been leased or sold to 2 or the major dairy companies during the past year. Some have been closed or sold because of the induction of the owner or of necessary and irreplaceable help.

Early in this war, Government procurement agencies recognized the nutritional value of cheese. They therefore placed it high on the honor roll of foods and ordered a percentage of all Cheddar cheese set aside for the Government. That percentage has varied from 25 percent in the months of low production to as high as 70 percent in the months of high production, averaging about 45 to 50 percent of the annual Cheddar production of the Nation.

In order to secure increased production of cheese, a subsidy of 3¾ cents per pound was granted. Later, a feed subsidy, which varied in amount in different States or sections, was established in order to increase milk production. The Nation's cheese industry responded with an increase in production from less than 700,000,000 pounds to more than 1,000,000,000 pounds of cheese in 1943 and 1944. These figures include all types and varieties.

With this background let us explore the specific well-justified grounds for the complaints of the Nation's cheese makers.

1. COMPLAINT RELATING TO COLBY CHEESE

O. P. A. Maximum Price Regulation 280 froze cheese prices at a ceiling based on the seller's highest sale price during the base period, September 28 to October 2, 1942, both dates inclusive.

Early in December 1942 a subsidy of 3¾ cents per pound was granted Cheddar cheese. On Christmas Eve 1942, MPR 289 was issued, establishing dollar-and-cent ceilings on Cheddar cheese.

Believing that the new Cheddar dollar-and-cent price was a little too high, O. P. A. granted a 3-cent per pound increase to all foreign-type cheese about a month later. The cheese defined in this amendment included Colby cheese, a type commonly made in large quantities in Cheddar factories.

It was soon discovered that this increase would permit a factory that switched to Cheddar for the 3¾-cent subsidy could now pay its farmers more by going back to Colby cheese for the 3-cent increase over its base period price.

This prompted another amendment that excluded Colby cheese from the earlier 3-cent increase. The natural result was that Colby cheese was priced off the market. You cannot make a process Colby cheese with the characteristics recognized by the consumer.

This type of cheese was originated at Colby, Wis., enjoyed a large trade and was for years made in many of our factories. O. P. A. has priced it off the market. So I ask, Is it an accidental war casualty, or is it the victim of a carefully designed plan, promoted through the assistance of O. P. A. orders?

I say that because our many domestic consumers could still have had Colby cheese if O. P. A. gave it, as it gave other types, a price permitting its profitable manufacture. O. P. A. could easily have accomplished this without defeating necessary objectives.

For example, a Cheddar cheese factory must set aside for the Government 45 percent of the amount manufactured in March. The balance, 55 percent, we will call free cheese. The factory should be permitted to make all or part of the 55 percent into Colby, and to include the Colby with the Cheddar in determining the number of pounds to be set aside. The factory could do that today but for the prohibitive ceiling price.

Thus, complaint No. 1 is that Colby cheese has been priced off the market by O. P. A. Why?

2. COMPLAINT RELATING TO SMALL STYLES

At the time MPR 289 was issued, Wisconsin was producing about 33 percent of its American or Cheddar-type cheese in small styles. Because the price differential was not sufficient to meet the increased cost of manufacture, as compared to large styles, the production of small styles dropped from 33 to about 7 percent in a few months. And there it has remained.

The small styles—Daisies, horns, squares, and loaves of 5 pounds or less, are for the retail-consumer trade as natural cheese. The large styles, twins, flats, and Cheddar (style) are intended principally for processing.

With premium prices for low moisture on large styles only, the natural and human trend followed the price attraction. Thus large styles moved from 67 percent to about 93 percent of Wisconsin's production, within a few months after the ceilings were established. The moisture premium is allowed when selling on the so-called moisture basis according to the table in MPR 289. But here is the joker—if the cheese is sold on the moisture basis, it must be sold to the Government or to a processor. So we know who got what Uncle Sam did not take. Yes; it was produced on a price basis but earmarked when made. If priced right, some small styles could still be made and the factory required to meet the set-aside order.

Thus, complaint No. 2 is that small style Cheddar cheese for retail-consumer trade as natural cheese is priced off the market by O. P. A. Why?

3. COMPLAINT RELATING TO AGED OR CURED CHEDDAR CHEESE

The first step in cheese making is daily converting the milk into curd and then placing the curd into a hoop or mold. This raises the question as to when curd becomes cheese.

An early O. P. A. order refers to aged or cured Cheddar cheese—admitting it is, or at least recognizing it as, a commodity other than young or current made cheese.

M. P. R. 289 places a ceiling on Cheddar cheese with no allowance for aging or curing. Moreover, aging and curing carry such fixed-cost items as storage charges, shrink, insurance, spoilage, and so forth. Therefore, no one is going to incur those costs knowing that he can only sell or resell at a price based on the freshly made cheese, and cannot recover the cost of curing or aging.

This has taken the old familiar and much desired "Cheddar with a flavor" off the market. Try and buy a nice 6-months-old dated natural Cheddar at your local grocer.

Thus, complaint No. 3 is that aged or cured natural Cheddar cheese has been priced off the market by O. P. A. Why?

4. COMPLAINT RELATING TO LIMITATION ORDER

War Food Order No. 92 restricts production of all cheese other than Cheddar, Cottage, Pot, and Bakers' to the quantity produced in the corresponding quarter of 1942.

Under this order, the only persons permitted to produce the restricted types of cheese are those who produced such cheese in 1942.

Manufacturers of foreign-type cheese are, under this order, permitted to shift from one variety to another to take advantage of the price for the variety which is currently highest.

But, the Cheddar factory without any quota in 1942 must continue making Cheddar regardless of the price or must quit entirely.

The "limitation order" is not correctly titled, because as to a factory making other than Cheddar cheese, it is "permission" to make any one of the many foreign types of cheese, while as to the Cheddar factory it is a "prohibi-

tion" against making anything except Cheddar.

If the Cheddar factory operator is denied the right to shift for a price advantage, he should not be compelled to produce under price penalty. Moreover, he should be hardly expected to do so when his is the only type of cheese subsidized and required to be set aside for Government purchase.

Thus, complaint No. 4 is that any industry expected to meet Government production goals and receiving a subsidy for encouragement should not be subjected to discrimination from which there is no escape because of a limitation order.

5. COMPLAINT RELATING TO CONFISCATORY PRICE CEILINGS

The hundreds of small cheese factories in Wisconsin and many other States are not equipped with the facilities and manpower to permit the laboratory control found in the laboratories of the large national cheese companies. Yet the present O. P. A. price order—Revised MPR 289—compels a price cut of about 50 percent if the cheese violates the fat or moisture standard set in the order.

That is not all. If the cheesemaker sells the cheese in good faith, not knowing the fat and moisture until he receives data of a laboratory test from the buyer and later learns that there was a violation, he is now liable to a 300 percent penalty for the overceiling sales.

I shall not describe a small cheese factory in detail—a husband and wife and perhaps a helper working 12 hours or more a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year—all of them good cheesemakers, but not laboratory technicians. The small owner must try to secure maximum yield, but with a few violations, he is out of business.

That decidedly is wrong. Why? Because the price could be bracketed to reflect the nutritional and sound value of the cheese and yet catch a cheater if there is one. If cheese of 40 percent moisture is worth 26½ cents per pound, I do not believe that cheese with 40.1 percent is worth only 14 cents per pound. Who asked for that type of penalty? Who can justify it?

Thus, complaint No. 5 is that where there is an admitted lack of laboratory control, a tolerance with a price differential should be provided before placing a price penalty of 50 percent on the violation of standard, and a penalty of 300 percent for the resulting overceiling sale.

SUMMARY OF THESE NATION-WIDE COMPLAINTS

The above complaints affect cheese factories in every State in the Union. All of them are developing their cheese industry for two reasons:

First. To give the consumer what he wants and more of it; and

Second. To provide a present and post-war market for the farmers' milk.

Reflect back on these five complaints and ask yourself: Is there a carefully planned program to purge the Nation of the locally owned farmers' milk market? Is it intended to force the small private or cooperative cheese factory out of business under the guise of the necessities of war?

Please remember that everything I have said so far applies to the cheese industry as a whole throughout the Nation.

6. COMPLAINT RELATING TO "PLYMOUTH PLUS"

May I present one additional well-founded complaint in the name of my own State of Wisconsin?

The so-called Plymouth-plus basis of fixing dollar-and-cent ceiling prices for cheese is in direct opposition to historic cheese prices and regional differentials. It unfairly penalizes surplus-producing areas, ignores cheese values, and substitutes a price mechanism that cannot be justified.

The price of Cheddar cheese is 23¼ cents per pound plus a transportation factor, which is 115 percent of the carlot freight rate from Plymouth, Wis., to the point of sale outside of Wisconsin. In other words, Wisconsin cheese is 23¼ cents and all other States are "plus." In actual application it is thus a "Wisconsin minus."

Let us compare the prices at which cheese was sold to the Government before application of the "Plymouth plus" formula and after.

The Department of Agriculture, through the Agricultural Marketing Administration, purchased cheese for lend-lease in May 1942—before "Plymouth plus" applied. The Dairy Products Marketing Association—D. P. M. A.—purchased in August 1943 after the "Plymouth plus" was in effect.

I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point a table which depicts the gross inequities in the actual prices paid at the named points for large style Cheddar cheese. These prices have been reported by the two agencies I have just mentioned.

The purchases in May 1942 were based on a 20¼-cent Wisconsin market. Those in August 1943 were based on a 23¼-cent ceiling under MPR 289 plus transportation allowance by the "Plymouth plus" provision.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table of prices paid f. o. b.

State and point of sale	By A. M. A., May 1942, 20¼-cent market	By D. P. M. A., August 1943, 23¼-cent ceiling	Over Wisconsin	Price
GOING WEST				
Wisconsin: All points	20.25	23.25	------	23.25
Minnesota: Pine Island	20.25	23.25	0.54	23.79
South Dakota: Milbank	20.25	23.25	.87	24.12
Montana: Missoula	----------	23.25	2.19	25.44
Idaho: Pocatello	----------	23.25	2.19	25.44
Oregon:				
Portland	20.25	23.25	2.19	25.44
Tillamook	----------	23.25	2.34	25.59
Washington: Seattle	20.25	23.25	2.19	25.44
California:				
Two Rock	20.25	----------	----------	----------
Oakland	----------	23.25	2.19	25.44
GOING SOUTH				
Wisconsin: All points	20.25	23.25	------	23.25
Iowa:				
Cedar Rapids	----------	23.25	.53	23.78
Des Moines	----------	23.25	.65	23.90
Illinois:				
Petersburg	20.25	23.25	0.47	23.72
Valley City	20.25	23.25	.52	23.77
Missouri:				
Springfield	20.25	23.25	.65	23.90
Aurora	20.25	23.25	.90	24.15
Koskonong	20.25	23.25	1.12	24.37
Kansas: Wichita	20.25	23.25	1.00	24.25
Arkansas: Bentonville	20.25	23.25	1.04	24.29
Texas:				
Round Rock	20.25	23.25	1.46	24.71
Alice	20.25	23.25	1.70	24.95
GOING EAST				
Wisconsin: All points	20.25	23.25	------	23.25
Michigan:				
Escanaba	20.25	23.25	.43	23.68
Detroit	----------	23.25	.55	23.80
Indiana: Warsaw	20.50	23.25	.50	23.75
Ohio:				
Belle Center	20.50	23.25	.60	23.85
Bremen	20.50	23.25	.66	23.91
New York: Lowville	21.25	23.25	.80	24.05
GOING SOUTHEAST				
Tennessee: Nashville	20.25	23.25	.91	24.16
Mississippi: Columbus	----------	23.25	1.16	24.41
Georgia: Atlanta	----------	23.25	1.25	24.50

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we are entitled to know two things. First, who was the inventor of the "Plymouth plus"? Second, can this price formula be justified by the O. P. A. official who has the power and authority to amend the order creating it?

Wisconsin has been justly claiming, as proved by the above table, that the "Plymouth plus" formula imposes an unfair, unjustified, and discriminatory price break of about one-half cent per pound of cheese at the State line. For over 2 years the Badger State has asked for an adjustment by a price increase of one-half cent for Wisconsin Cheddar. Recently, we were promised such an adjustment. But nothing definite has resulted.

Well, you may ask, Who may oppose? Both O. P. A. and W. F. A. have a national cheese advisory committee. Both of those committees recommended adjustment of the "Plymouth plus" over a year ago. I know of no member of those committees opposing adjustment of this discriminatory provision, yet nothing has been done to correct it. Nothing has been done to see to it that the Wisconsin farmers are not manhandled and racketeered out of $3,000,000 under this plan.

If either or both of those committees have any authority in guiding the decisions of O. P. A. or W. F. A., then what prevents adjustment of the "Plymouth plus"?

If those committees are only for window dressing, why not save their members the expense of attending the many Washington meetings?

I say this because after a lapse of months those committees were summoned to appear in Washington on January 4 and 5, 1945. But without their knowledge or advice, new cheese orders were published on January 5 and

6, 1945. In the statement of considerations supporting those orders, it was alleged that the amendments were recommended by the industry.

The two committees which I have mentioned never passed upon them, and I am so informed by L. E. Kopitzke, a member who represents the cheesemakers of the Nation. If these committees have no voice they should be discharged. But if they are discharged, we must first be told just who is assisting O. P. A. in drafting these technical cheese orders which are so consistently taking the independently owned factory out of the picture.

I have not mentioned set-aside Cheddar cheese. Senators may know that under the order, as an authorized assembler, one must meet set-aside requirements out of his total receipts in all his assembly plants in the Nation. How is that order working out when coupled with the "Plymouth plus"?

Let us take a particular Green Bay assembler. The company has an assembly plant in Wisconsin and one in Oregon. In 1944, it did not deliver 1 pound of Wisconsin cheese to lend-lease. But, as it had a right to do, it offered its total set-aside requirements out of Oregon. D. P. M. A., which bought for the Government, had to take the cheese at the f. o. b. Oregon price and then ship the cheese to New York for export, paying the freight clear across the Nation. Mind you, this cheese cost the Government—that is, the tax-paying public—at least 5 cents per pound more than it should have cost. Why?

That company could ship its Wisconsin cheese to Oregon after Uncle Sam bought the high-priced Oregon cheese and the company bought the lowest-priced cheese in Wisconsin.

Let us follow through with that example in the case of large operators in Wisconsin and other States.

D. P. M. A. purchase records of Cheddar cheese for the Government show that in 1944, May through December, Wisconsin, making 50 percent of the Nation's Cheddar, furnished only 20 percent to D. P. M. A. for lend-lease. Yet, all the other States, which produce 50 percent, furnished 80 percent. This was in spite of the fact that the manufacture of small styles is increasing in States outside Wisconsin.

The industry of Wisconsin is only asking O. P. A. to make more equitable the price break at the State line. To avoid interference with the dairy price structure, it has been recommended that this be accomplished by either, first, increasing the price one-half cent per pound in Wisconsin; or, second, by increasing the subsidy one-half cent per pound on Wisconsin cheese. During the 2 years that this repeated request has been refused, we have learned of no opposition from other branches of the dairy industry, or from other States. The situation calls for prompt action by the Administrator of O. P. A. or a full and complete justification of his refusal.

All theories which have been advanced in support of the "Plymouth plus" provision have fallen through. Some have been defeated by the very order they were intended to support. For example, Wisconsin cheese can and does move west. Western cheese can and does move east—all the way from Oregon to New York. Wholesalers' margins are not a factor, since 93 percent of the Cheddar does not and cannot move toward the retailer for consumption as natural cheese.

Lastly, I may say that I intend to request a congressional investigation if the Office of Price Administration does not promptly correct these unnecessary provisions and immediately remove from the backs of the Wisconsin milk producers the unjustified $3,000,000 a year penalty of the "Plymouth plus" order.

The continued disruption of the cheese industry of Wisconsin threatens the stability of the dairy industry of the entire Nation. That threat must be eliminated and justice must triumph.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 50, line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 51, line 9, after the word "gloves", to strike out "$4,134,500" and insert "$3,900,000."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] asked that this amendment be passed over. We had an understanding that it would be satisfactory to me personally to divide the difference. In accordance with that understanding with those two Senators, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment to strike out "$3,900,000" and insert "$4,017,250."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 52, line 12, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$1,065,160" and insert "$1,054,061."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 53, line 12, after the word "grounds", to strike out "$583,207" and insert "$549,727."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment passed over was, on page 65, after line 19, to insert:

SEC. 107. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling a position formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the armed forces of the United States and has been honorably discharged therefrom and has within 40 days thereafter made application for restoration to his former position and has not been restored thereto.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this is an amendment in which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are interested. The Senator from Rhode Island submitted the amendment in the committee. Certain amendments to the committee amendment have been suggested which are not objectionable to the committee. The Senator from Wisconsin will describe them.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, this matter was called to my attention first by Mr. Omar Ketchum, the legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Subsequently it was called to my attention by the representative of the Federal employees' organization of the American Federation of Labor. It is likewise my understanding that the American Legion was concerned about the amendment, although I have not had an opportunity to contact its representatives directly.

As Senators will observe from reading the committee amendment, the point is that in its present form it would cover not only permanent positions in the Federal Government but also temporary positions. The amendment is found on page 65. Senators will also recall that in section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act, as amended, paragraph (b) reads as follows:

In the case of any such person who, in order to perform such training and service, has left or leaves a position, other than a temporary position, in the employ of any employer—

And so forth. The concern of the groups and persons I have previously mentioned is to have the amendment apply only to temporary employees.

It has been suggested that the same result can be obtained by inserting, after the word "a", in line 22, the word "permanent."

Mr. McKELLAR. So that it will read "a permanent position."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer such an amendment to the committee amendment. On page 65, in line 22, after the article "a", insert "permanent", so that the language will read:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling a permanent position—

And so forth.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask for a vote on that amendment to the committee amendment. There is no objection to it on my part.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. How would the Senator from Wisconsin interpret the effect of the amendment he has offered as differentiated from the present language of the committee amendment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The amendment in the bill was reported by the committee. It is not my amendment. As it is now drawn, I understand it would cover not only permanent positions in the Federal Government, but also temporary positions. The amendment I have offered to the committee amendment would limit it to permanent employees.

Mr. BRIDGES. The displacement would occur only in the case of a permanent employee; is that correct?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The amendment would abolish a position which is not filled by a returning serviceman who previously held it. As the amendment is now drawn, its effect would fall upon the permanent positions in the service, as well as the temporary ones.

Mr. BRIDGES. I understand.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. So the amendment I have offered to the committee amendment would confine it to the permanent positions in the Government service, and would make it in conformity with paragraph (b) of section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act, as amended, so that it would not affect temporary employees.

As I have said, the purpose is to bring the language into conformity with the Selective Training and Service Act, and to continue on the part of the Federal Government the same policy that is imposed upon private employers, and not to have the provision apply to those who are in the temporary service of the Government.

Mr. BRIDGES. In other words, the Senator means, does he not, the temporary service of the Government in the war effort?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; I refer to temporary service in the war effort.

I may say in passing that several other suggestions were made regarding additional amendments, but I think they clearly fall under the prohibition of paragraph 4 of rule XVI, and should not be considered, because they go much beyond a pure limitation, which is within the rule.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator explain how it will be determined whether a position is permanent or temporary?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. My understanding is that there is a very distinct differentiation, and that the temporary employees are classified as being temporary.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is it not the employee who is temporary, not the position? Should not the language be "filling a position formerly held by a permanent employee"?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The language I would insert would be taken from the Selective Training and Service Act. I drew up an amendment to the committee amendment, providing for the insertion of the words "other than a temporary position." But the chairman of the committee suggested insertion of the word "permanent." On first reading, I thought that would accomplish the same result; and since the Senator favored the adoption of such an amendment to the committee amendment, I decided that it would be wise to comply with his suggestion.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. In order that I may make sure that I understand the matter clearly, let me state that I believe this amendment is offered in an attempt to make the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act more enforceable. I understand that if a man who is honorably discharged from the service applies within 40 days thereafter for restoration to his former position, he can get it back, if it was not a temporary one. The pending amendment to the committee amendment is for the purpose of making sure that if such a veteran does apply for his former position, no one who filled that position after he left it could be paid any salary. Therefore, I understand that the amendment would make available to him a way which might not otherwise be open to him. Is that correct?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes. Furthermore, let me say that it is not the purpose to have positions in the temporary service abolished. Of course, most of those who have been brought into Government service to assist in the war effort have been employed in the temporary service. This provision would not apply to them. My amendment is proposed because it is felt that otherwise the committee amendment would work grave injustices, because the intent was to protect the permanent positions, not the temporary ones.

Let me read a paragraph from Mr. Ketchum's letter:

> Unless this provision is confined to those former civil-service employees who held a permanent status in the classified civil service, a strict interpretation of the old language as written by the Appropriations Committee would be unfair and work to the disadvantage of thousands of World War No. 1 veterans and civil-service career employees who have been transferred into positions previously held by temporary workers, and there will be no alternative for the agency involved other than to discharge veterans and career employees who may be serving in positions formerly held by temporary employees and who are serving in those positions because of directives from their supervisors.

Mr. BURTON. That is to say, the original Selective Training and Service Act had no reference whatever to temporary positions, and therefore the language now under consideration should have no reference whatever to temporary positions.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is my position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin to the committee amendment beginning in line 20, on page 65.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator point out the exact place at which the words he has proposed would be inserted in the committee amendment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In the committee amendment on page 65, in line 22, my amendment would insert the word "permanent" before the word "position."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I inquire if the amendment has been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has been agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Then I desire to offer to the committee amendment a further amendment which I understand has been suggested by the Veterans' Administration in order to bring the bill into conformity with other statutes. In line 24, after the word "within," I move to strike out "40 days thereafter," and insert "90 days after his discharge or within not more than 1 year after relief from hospitalization continuing after said discharge."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to the committee amendment on page 65, in line 24.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Are there any further committee amendments which were passed over?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are none.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to ask the Senator from Tennessee what disposition was made of the appropriation item for the Securities and Exchange Commission. I wished to be heard on the amendment. I was called from the Chamber, and upon my return I was advised that action had been taken on the amendment during my absence.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator refer to the item on page 51 of the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The action taken by the Senate was, at the request of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], to divide in half the difference between the House text and the committee recommendation.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish merely to have a statement appear in the RECORD with respect to that matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I feel that the conference committee will be the forum in which the question will be settled.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I shall be very glad to consider any suggestion which the Senator from Wyoming or any other Senator may wish to present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My feeling is that the full amount should be restored. However, I shall not seek to have the amendment reconsidered.

Mr. President, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a letter addressed to the Senator from Tennessee by the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission. The letter did not appear in the printed copy of the hearings.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to have the Senator insert in the RECORD the letter to which he has referred.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Before sending the letter forward I may say that the

Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission points out that an increase over the 1945 appropriation of $74,700, which was allowed by the other House, was intended for the purpose of enabling the S. E. C. to carry on the following operations:

First, investigations under section 12 (h) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act. Section 12 (h) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act is the section which prohibits registered holding companies, or any subsidiary thereof, from using the mails, or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce, or otherwise, directly or indirectly—

(1) to make any contribution whatsoever in connection with the candidacy, nomination, election, or appointment of any person for or to any office or position in the Government of the United States, a State, or any political subdivision of a State, or any agency, authority, or instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing; or

(2) to make any contribution to or in support of any political party or any committee or agency thereof.

It is my understanding that several complaints have been made to the Securities and Exchange Commission to the effect that contributions of that character have been made.

The purpose of the appropriation which was requested by the Securities and Exchange Commission, and allowed by the House of Representatives, was to enable the S. E. C. to carry on its investigation.

Another purpose of the appropriation was to conduct a surveillance of securities markets, and related work. It was pointed out by no less an authority than Marriner Eccles, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, that there had been a great increase of speculation in the stock markets in a manner which he, at least, considered to be detrimental to the public interest, because it encouraged inflation. I understand that Mr. Eccles has made recommendations to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee with respect to that problem. It seems to me to be of the utmost importance that in making such investigations of the securities markets and related work, the facilities of the Securities and Exchange Commission should not be curtailed by a reduction of the appropriation which, in this instance, amounted to only $21,940.

Another purpose of the requested increase in appropriation which was allowed by the House of Representatives was the inspection of books and records of brokers and dealers, and an investigation of securities violations.

There was also a recommended appropriation of $12,780 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Mead-Ramspeck automatic promotion law.

The circumstances, Mr. President, are such that I hope consideration will be given in the conference committee to the restoration of the full amount allowed by the other House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there is no doubt in the world that the Securities and Exchange Commission has been doing fine work; under Mr. Purcell it has been doing splendid work, but we have been trying to hold down appropriations to what they are for the present fiscal year. I think that this year we have spent more money on our governmental activities than we have ever spent before. To increase the appropriations for the coming year would seem to me to be unwise. Wherever we could curtail them we have curtailed them. There is very little difference between the appropriation which was made for the present fiscal year, and the one proposed for the coming fiscal year. I believe the difference is only $42,000. In view of all of the so-called war work which has been done by this and other agencies of the Government, it seems to me that the slight reduction of $42,000 would not curtail a great activity of this nature. I am quite sure that if Mr. Purcell were present he would endorse this slight reduction in the appropriation as passed by the House. I shall be glad to consider what the Senator from Wyoming has said, but at the present time it seems to me that nothing further can be done.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe that the Senator from Tennessee is entitled to a great deal of credit for his efforts to promote efficiency and economy in the Government. However, day before yesterday, when the appropriation item for the S. E. C. was before the Senate I asked to have the amendment passed over because I realized there were present the makings of a considerable speculative boom ahead. Speculations and transactions in stocks are increasing very rapidly. I have talked with one of the members of the Securities and Exchange Commission. He feels that the work of the Commission will be even more difficult in the years ahead than it has ever been in the past. Many persons throughout the country will have a great deal of money, and will be looking for places to invest it. Others will suggest that the money be invested in ways in which it should not be invested.

If the Securities and Exchange Commission shows that it requires a small additional appropriation in order properly to do its work, I hope that when the matter comes before the conference committee an adequate appropriation will be agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have referred from Chairman Purcell, of the S. E. C., be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Philadelphia, Pa., February 26, 1945.

The Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MCKELLAR: I understand that the Independent Offices appropriation bill for 1946 is now under consideration by the Senate Appropriations Committee. In our recent conversation some of the items included in the 1946 Budget estimate of the Securities and Exchange Commission were discussed, particularly the increases we requested and the reasons therefor. I appreciate your suggestion that this date be submitted to you in writing and I am glad for the opportunity to do so. I have prepared a short statement, which follows, indicating the progress of our 1946 estimates, and the amounts approved at various stages.

STATEMENT WITH RESPECT TO THE 1946 BUDGET ESTIMATES—SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The estimates, prepared on the basis that the war would continue in 1946 on both the European and Pacific fronts, were submitted and/or approved as follows:

Amount of estimates as submitted to the Bureau of the Budget	$4,427,700
Reduction made in estimates by Bureau of the Budget	−191,700
Amount of estimate as submitted to Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives	4,236,000
Reductions by Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives	−101,500
Amount included in Independent Offices appropriation bill for 1946	4,134,500
Net increase over 1945 appropriation allowed	74,700
Amount of 1945 appropriation, less money for overtime pay (which amounts to $591,904)	4,059,800

As you know, the bill includes $4,134,500 under our appropriation for salaries and expenses, and that our estimate was reduced by $101,500 by the House Appropriations Committee. The committee's report on the bill does not specify the particular item involved in the reduction, but it would appear that $1,500,000 of the total reduction related to the cost of penalty mail and that the remainder, or $100,000, was a general reduction in all items.

Our testimony on the bill as given before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and recorded in the printed hearings beginning on page 630, includes a detailed explanation of the increases we requested. I would particularly like to call your attention to the table appearing at the bottom of page 630 of the hearings, which table states the specific purposes for which additional funds were sought. That table was prepared on the basis of a net increase of $176,200. However, when this amount was reduced to $74,000 it became necessary to revise the allocations. The revised allocations are:

Revised allocations on basis of an increase of $74,700

Project title	Number of positions	Man-years	Cost	Purpose
Corporation finance	5	4.8	$22,080	Investigations under sec. 12 (h) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act.
Trading and exchange	8	7.5	21,940	Surveillance of securities markets and related work.
Regional offices	5	4.5	17,900	Inspection of books and records of brokers and dealers and investigation of securities violations.
Additional cost in 1946 of automatic promotions made in 1945.	----------	----------	12,780	Mead-Ramspeck automatic promotion law (Public Law 200).
Total	18	----------	74,700	

I believe that the printed hearings referred to above adequately outlines our work, therefcre, it does not seem necessary to repeat what is written there. I am sure that you appreciate the necessity of providing at least a small staff to conduct investigations of reported or alleged violations of section 12 (h) of the Public Utility Holding Company Act; that because of the steadily increasing activities in the trading of securities we should have adequate personnel for the surveillance of security markets; and that we should provide for more frequent inspections of the books and records of brokers and dealers transacting business in the over-the-counter markets. These are the three activities for which additional funds are requested in 1946.

Because of conditions now existing with respect to manpower and to the war needs, the Commission does not intend to request the Senate Appropriations Committee to restore any of the funds heretofore eliminated from our 1946 budget estimates, but we do want to stress the fact that, in our opinion, the amounts presently included in the independent offices appropriation bill represents the minimum amount of money we will need in 1946 to administer the several laws assigned to us.

I hope that I have satisfactorily summarized the chief points in our recent discussion. If there is any other information on this subject which you may wish to have, I shall be glad to furnish it. Thank you for your courtesy in personally considering our budgetary problems.

Sincerely,

GANSON PURCELL,
Chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee have further amendments to propose in behalf of the committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe not.

Mr. SALTONSTALL rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me proceed and make the statement I desire to make, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Very well.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have been deeply concerned, as Senators who have been here several years know, about an amendment which was adopted 2 years ago concerning the T. V. A. I want to read the T. V. A. law, as amended. It will take me just a moment, and I think it will be worth while for Senators to listen to it. Section 26 of the original T. V. A. Act, as amended, reads as follows:

SEC. 26. Commencing July 1, 1936, the proceeds for each fiscal year derived by the Board from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the Corporation, and from any other activities of the Corporation, including the disposition of any real or personal property, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States—

That is still the law; it expressed the intention of Congress when it passed the law—

at the end of each calendar year, save and except such part of such proceeds as in the opinion of the Board shall be necessary for the Corporation in the operation of dams and reservoirs, in conducting its business in generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy and in manufacturing, selling, and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients.

Mr. Lilienthal, the Director of the T. V. A., construed that language as authorizing him not to pay into the Treasury the proceeds from the power business, but to hold them and use them as he sees fit without reference to the Congress. That he is mistaken about that is shown by the next sentence:

A continuing fund of $1,000,000 is also excepted from the requirements of this section and may be withheld by the Board to defray emergency expenses and to insure continuous operation.

If it was the purpose of Congress to turn over to the T. V. A. all these funds, all these receipts, to be used as the Director desired to use them, why establish another fund?

There is a proviso which reads as follows:

Provided, That nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the use by the Board, after June 30, 1936, of proceeds accruing prior to July 1, 1936, for the payment of obligations lawfully incurred prior to such latter date.

That applies only to 1 year; it does not apply at all to subsequent years, but Mr. Lilienthal has construed the act to mean that he does not have to pay into the Treasury of the United States the proceeds or receipts of the T. V. A.

Mr. President, to show that he carries out his view of that law, I wish to tell the Senate what happened just a day or two after we heard Mr. Lilienthal before the committee. I read from the Knoxville Journal and Tribune of the 8th of March 1945. I ask Senators to listen to this, because it shows distinctly where we are going:

T. V. A. BUYS EAST TENNESSEE LIGHT & POWER CO.—BIG DEAL CLOSED IN NEW YORK—GROSS PRICE TO APPROXIMATE $9,600,000

Tennessee Valley Authority has agreed to take over the East Tennessee Light & Power Co. in upper east Tennessee.

Terms of the agreement were revealed today by a high official of the power company who refused use of his name. He put the gross purchase price at approximately $9,600,000.

East Tennessee Light & Power operates in Sullivan, Greene, Washington, Unicoi, Johnson, and Carter Counties in east Tennessee; in Scott County, Va.; and Avery County, N. C.

I ask, Mr. President, that the remainder of the article be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). Without objection, the matter will be printed in the RECORD.

The remainder of the article is as follows:

T. V. A. bought the equity position of Cities Service Power & Light Co., including preferred and common stock of East Tennessee Light & Power, for $3,680,000.

The Authority agreed to buy East Tennessee Light & Power bonds owned by the John Hancock Mutual Insurance Co. valued at $4,800,000. The official said payment of a premium might be necessary to obtain these bonds.

T. V. A. also is obligated to retire 9,365 shares of East Tennessee Light & Power preferred stock now in the hands of the public. Par value of this stock is $100.

The sale became effective December 31, 1944, and a memorandum agreement was signed in New York March 3, 1945. Closing date of the sale is expected to be July 31.

Representing T. V. A. in the negotiations were E. J. Griffin, acting general counsel; Walton Seymour of T. V. A.'s power department, and E. H. Muir, T. V. A. evaluation engineer.

Offsetting the gross purchase price will be cash on hand and interim earnings, making the net sale price approximately $9,000,000, the East Tennessee Light & Power official said.

He said T. V. A. would become in effect a liquidating agent and would negotiate with the various municipalities served for their purchase of the distribution systems formerly owned by East Tennessee Light & Power.

Negotiations between T. V. A. and the utility company have been in since the Securities Exchange Commission had ordered Cities Service to divest itself of the East Tennessee properties, and had extended the time for this to August 17, 1945.

Mr. McKELLAR. Now, Mr. President, let us look at that and see what it means. Several years ago the Commonwealth & Southern Power Co. and the Tennessee Power Co., I believe, and perhaps one or two other smaller companies operating just below where the East Tennessee Power Co. operates, in the neighborhood of Chattanooga and Knoxville and further down, were purchased by T. V. A. Of both power companies the late Wendell Willkie was the president, and he controlled them. The T. V. A. came to Congress and obtained the authority and power to deal with this matter, and did deal with it. Congress passed a law, and the T. V. A. bought the companies from Mr. Willkie. We have never heard a word about it since. But this time our agent takes another view and considers that it is a matter with which Congress has nothing to do. Who knows—if there is a Senator on the floor who does know, I shall be glad to have him give the information—who knows whether $9,600,000 is a fair price, a high price, a low price, or what sort of a price it is for those power companies? Prices of things now are higher than they have ever been before. When the dams which have been authorized are completed I think undoubtedly this power-company property should be purchased, but I do not think it ought to be purchased under a flimsy, doubtful law, or an amendment to it. I think the T. V. A. should come before the Congress and request authority to make the purchase.

Mr. Lilienthal had something to say about the matter, and I shall tell the Senate what he stated. It was when he referred, just before the close of his testimony, to some who were thinking about buying this power company. Mr. Lilienthal came before our committee and had a very pleasant examination and got along beautifully. He testified 3 days, and his testimony covered 118 pages of printed matter, but he did not say anything about the T. V. A. buying the East Tennessee Light & Power Co., except in a wholly different way, and I shall read in a moment what he said.

The United States Government has $767,000,000 invested in the Tennessee Valley project. Do we want to exclude ourselves from any overseeing position about the matter? Do we want to give it up entirely, and merely turn it over to Mr. Lilienthal? He has the idea that it should be turned over to him, that he knows more about the power company business than anyone else, and that he should be allowed to run it just as he

pleases. He uses the word "independent." He wants it operated independently of the Government or anybody else. He is urging that the Missouri Valley Authority, when it is provided for, shall be operated independently of anybody, and that the money we put in shall be turned over to the graces of whomsoever is put in charge of it.

Mr. President, I think that would be unwise legislation. I do not think the policy under which Lilienthal is undertaking to conduct the Tennessee Valley Authority is according to law. I do not think he has a right under the law to do as he is doing and I am of the opinion that if anyone should attempt to enjoin him, and the courts should pass upon the matter, the courts would hold that he had no legal right to conduct this great industry independently of the Congress. Yet that is precisely what he is doing. The Senate of the United States has several times—I know of three times—undertaken to make Mr. Lilienthal do just what every other power company in the country is required to do. Do Senators realize that the Government has a much larger power business in the West than it has in the T. V. A.? Boulder Dam, Bonneville Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, and other dams in the West, under the direction of Mr. Bashore, do the largest power business in the world.

Mr. Bashore and his associates appeared before the committee, and he was asked if the plants under his control were hamstrung, or interfered with, or circumscribed in their liberty of action by having to come to the Congress to obtain appropriations, and having to pay their receipts into the Treasury. Mr. Bashore says that it was helpful to him to come before the Congress and get appropriations, and to pay the receipts into the Treasury of the United States. There may be some minor concerns somewhere, I am not sure, which do not do so, but so far as I can remember, not only do the other Government power plants pay their receipts into the Treasury and get their appropriations from the Treasury, but the great Post Office Department does the same. The Post Office Department is making money. It made $37,000,000 last year. Suppose, as soon as it became self-supporting, Mr. Walker had come before the Congress and said, "Just turn the Post Office Department over to us; we will run it hereafter." I do not think he would have gotten many votes. I think that if Mr. Bashore should come and ask that his company be turned over to him to run as he pleased, and not turn any of the receipts into the Treasury, neither the Senate nor the House would agree to it. The Tennessee Valley Authority is the only case of its kind. Mr. Lilienthal said that it would hamstring him. That is his constant statement, in addition to one other to which I must refer.

Another statement of the newspapers, especially those in Chattanooga, is that I, individually, wanted to take over the patronage of the T. V. A. I repeated that to Mr. Lilienthal and asked him if it were true, and he said that I had never done so, that I had never made a recommendation about any employee of his since the T. V. A. had been started.

I say to the Senate that I have no such desire. The truth is that patronage is a great detriment to a Senator, instead of being a help to him. Besides, I agree that this concern should not be in politics at all, but I ask Senators who are now present if it has not been in politics recently. Have not Senators been receiving telegrams, practically all of them inspired by this concern, or its agents or representatives? Why should we treat the T. V. A. differently from the other power developments? That is what I ask. Who is more interested in this matter than I am?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. We all know the very deep interest the Senator has taken in the T. V. A. As long as I have been in the Senate, and a member of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator has manifested his interest on every occasion. But I heard a radio commentator this morning—I have forgotten his name——

Mr. McKELLAR. Drew Pearson, probably.

Mr. OVERTON. No; it was not Drew Pearson. He was referring to what was going to occur on the floor of the Senate, and he said the Senator from Tennessee would bring this question up, and he referred to the Senator as the arch enemy of the T. V. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have seen that statement published several times.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not think there could be a grosser misrepresentation, because I think the Senator from Tennessee has been the best friend the T. V. A. has had.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator most cordially.

Mr. OVERTON. In my opinion, the Senator has been the one who, more than any other Senator or Representative, has built up the T. V. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator has made a statement which leads me to make a further statement along the same line. In 1916 I offered an amendment in the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, being a Member of the House at the time, which amendment provided for the building of a dam on the Tennessee River. It was buffeted and battered around. I was a member of the Committee on Military Affairs. At that time there were many Members of the House who did not think the Government should go into the building of dams. They honestly felt that way about the matter. I encountered strong opposition. The power companies helped that idea along very greatly. But I finally got a provision in a bill, which went to the Senate, and when it got to the Senate there were certain Members of the Senate who helped it along very materially in this body. The late Senator from South Carolina, Senator Smith, wrote a new amendment, and while it was not adopted in conference in its entirety, it was adopted substantially. The bill passed, and President Wilson not only signed it, but selected Muscle Shoals as the place at which the dam should be built.

That dam was built. It was finished by the end of the war. After the Government had put approximately $90,000,000, as I recall, into that dam, it was leased to the Alabama Power Co. in 1921 for a small rental. The Alabama Power Co. was a very large company. From that time until Franklin D. Roosevelt became President many bills and other measures were introduced in both Houses for the purpose of further utilizing the dam sites on the Tennessee River. During his campaign President Roosevelt announced that he was in favor of building the dams, and in January of the year he took office he came to Washington before he was inaugurated and invited a party to go with him to Muscle Shoals to see the dam. He invited as members of this party former Senator Dill, of Oregon, the late Senator Norris, of Nebraska, myself, and perhaps several other Senators, but we three Senators went with the party. The Representative from that district was also present. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] says he went with the party. I do not recall that, but since he says he did he will verify what I have to say about it.

On the way back the President said he had had a bill prepared, and the bill which he had had prepared was what is substantially now the law. I remember he said he wanted to change the name of the organization. He wanted it to be called the Tennessee Valley Authority instead of the Tennessee Valley Commission, and everyone agreed with him about that. He then said he was going to turn the bill over to his old friend, George Norris, and he hit Senator Norris on the back as he said it. The bill which was introduced was not the one Senator Norris had prepared, but the bill which the President had had prepared. At the same time he turned over an identical bill to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who was in the House at that time, to be introduced in the House. The bill passed the House and came to the Senate. It was amended a good deal in the Senate, and the final result, according to the RECORD, is that the Hill bill was passed and the Norris bill indefinitely postponed, so far as the nominal part of the situation is concerned. That, Mr. President, is what happened.

Mr. President, the passage of a law authorizing a project does not amount to a row of beans under circumstances such as came up in that case. Where did the fight arise? Over that bill? Not at all. It went through without a battle. But the power companies did not want the dams built. Not only did the power companies not want the dams built, but the Tennessee Valley Authority, after it was created, did not want them built. What happened was that the first two dams, the Wheeler Dam and what is now called the Norris Dam, were built without objection, out of E. R. A. funds. Then Dr. A. E. Morgan and Mr. Lilienthal, forming a majority of the Authority, objected to the building of any more dams on the ground that the Authority was not in competition with the power companies, but all they intended to do was to use the three dams they had as a yardstick to teach the power companies how much they should charge for their

power. Think of it, Mr. President. That was their attitude.

The bill which came from the House that year did not provide for the building of any more dams, but when it reached the Senate and was considered by the Appropriations Committee, I offered an amendment providing for the Pickwick Dam, and it was finally adopted, as I remember, by a 1-vote majority. From that day until the present time I have had the fight of my life over every dam that has been constructed under the Tennessee Valley Authority. Mr. President, I shall place in the RECORD a history of this transaction, to show what sort of fight was made in the Senate.

Mind you, Mr. President, the House in considering the bill did not agree to the building of the dam. We succeeded in getting agreement to it only in conference. Provision for every single dam, with one exception, was made in the Senate. The House did provide for one dam, but with that exception, provision with respect to every single dam was made by amendments which I offered in the Senate. Yet I have seen the willfully false statement contained in a Chattanooga newspaper that Senator MCKELLAR was opposed to the dams. I wish to say, Mr. President, that I was for the building of the dams on the Tennessee River at an investment of $767,000,000, every dollar of which was agreed to by the Senate Appropriations Committee. I take this occasion to thank my friends who were in the Senate at that time, some of whom are still in the Senate, who helped me. I see one of them beside me, the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who, since he has been in the Senate, knows what a fight I have had with respect to every one of these dams. As I recall, I succeeded in getting most of the dams provided for in committee by a one-vote majority. In the statement I am going to place in the RECORD Senators will find how Senators voted in the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to take the honor of being the Senator who provided that one-vote majority on several occasions.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I will say to the Senator that he was always one of the friends who helped.

Mr. President, the greatest work I have ever done as a legislator is in connection with the building of the Tennessee Valley dams. Some people seem to think that dams can be built simply by wishing for them or simply by introducing bills. Dams cannot be built in that way. It takes money to build dams. All I did was to secure the money with which to build the dams. Every dollar of the money was secured against great opposition. The poor, ignorant gentleman to whom the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] referred awhile ago as having stated that I was opposed to the Tennessee Valley Authority, made his statement because he was ignorant. I do not wish to say anything bad about him, only that he was simply ignorant. He did not know any better. He had seen newspaper advertisements which our friend Mr. Lilienthal is putting out.

Mr. President, I ask my Senatorial friends to read the material I shall put in the RECORD and they will see with what great difficulties I have had to contend.

Under the circumstances, Mr. President, Senators can imagine how I feel, after having persuaded the Congress of the United States to invest $767,000,000 in improving the Tennessee River. Incidentally, we are investing a little more in two more dams on that river. Senators can understand why I should feel that we ought to be scrupulous about accounting for profits, and about having that agency, no matter who is in charge of it, come before the Congress, as every other Government agency is required to do.

I believe that one newspaper stated a day or two ago that if an amendment such as I have in mind were adopted, this agency would have to come to Congress, hat in hand, for appropriations. Mr. President, the President of the United States comes to the Congress for appropriations. So do Cabinet officers. They do not come with their hats in their hands. Every year the Postmaster General comes to the Congress and obtains scores of millions of dollars to operate his Department. He does not come with his hat in his hand. It is remarkable that this one agency should be held up as an example of an agency which must come to Congress hat in hand. With the single exception of this organization, every Government agency, from the President on down, must come to Congress for appropriations.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield

Mr. DOWNEY. I am very much interested in what the Senator is saying. I regret interrupting the flow of his argument.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am quite anxious to understand more clearly the issues involved in this particular question. I understood the Senator to say a moment ago—and I may have misunderstood him because I did not hear clearly—that he was reading from the statute creating the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. DOWNEY. He was reading certain language which he thought would compel the Authority to turn its receipts into the Treasury; and he stated that Mr. Lilienthal had taken a different position.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. I wonder if the Senator will be kind enough to reread that language and then tell me whether he is seeking to introduce into the pending bill some further language which would clarify the meaning.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I shall first read the language of the statute, and then I shall tell the Senator what I propose to do.

Section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act reads as follows:

SEC. 26. Commencing July 1, 1936—

This language was subsequently amended, but that was the date of the act.

Commencing July 1, 1936, the proceeds for each fiscal year derived by the Board from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the Corporation—

That refers to fertilizer—

and from any other activities of the Corporation including the disposition of any real or personal property, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year, save and except—

This is the language which is relied upon to justify not turning the receipts into the Treasury—

save and except such part of such proceeds as in the opinion of the Board shall be necessary for the Corporation in the operation of dams and reservoirs, in conducting its business in generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy, and in manufacturing, selling, and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients.

Mr. Lilienthal claims that that language gives him the right to disregard the Congress. He contends that he need not come to Congress for anything, and need not turn in the receipts. The dams are nearly all completed, and there has been a good sale for power. The business is now profitable. When it became profitable he wanted to get away from Congress. According to his own statements, he wishes to operate the agency to suit himself. I asked him whether he believed that he was more capable of managing and controlling this agency than is the Congress, and I never did get an answer from him.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. To what extent, if any, has the Authority paid any of its proceeds into the Treasury?

Mr. MCKELLAR. In recent years it has paid in nothing. Before that it turned in all its receipts. It has been only during the past 2 or 3 years that it has had much money. Before that time it turned in its receipts and obtained appropriations from Congress, just as appropriations are obtained for Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and other dams.

Mr. President, I should like to read a few excerpts from the record of the hearings. I ask Senators to read the statement which will be placed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

I read from page 104:

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Let me put the matter on its own bottom.

The operation of a large electric system of this character is a business undertaking. It is owned lock, stock, and barrel by the Government of the United States. Every dime of T. V. A.'s investment belongs to the Government and the people of the United States. The whole beneficial use is in the people, and the control of policy and the control of that beneficial use is in the Congress of the United States.

Senator MCKELLAR. I am glad you concede that.

EXERCISING OF FUNCTION OF MANAGEMENT

Mr. LILIENTHAL. No question about that at all. I will spend no more time on that. We have no difference there at all. The question comes down to one of what function can and should be performed by the Congress as one of the responsible agents to the people in respect of these properties and what func-

tions can be performed by other agents of the people in the executive branch.

If we are to adopt that view, then all the money-making activities of the Government should be turned over to various individuals to operate just as they please. For example, if Mr. Lilienthal wanted to buy a $9,600,000 competing corporation, we should let him buy it, and Congress should have nothing to do with it. Congress should have no concern with it, under that theory. That would be a matter for him to determine. However, a short time before, when he wanted to buy other companies, he came to Congress and obtained permission of Congress. But he did not have the money at that time. As soon as the money began to roll in, he wanted to get rid of Congress, and avoid the trouble of coming before Congress to obtain appropriations.

I continue to read:

Senator McKELLAR. One minute, just right there. Do you mean to tell this committee that you are more capable of determining what is beneficial and what is useful to the country than Congress?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. I am referring to section 26 of the act.

He did not answer the question at all.

Senator McKELLAR. I am asking you for your individual opinion. Do you think that you are more capable of handling this matter than the Congress of the United States?

Mr. LILIENTHAL. I think to answer that question in that form would not be——

Senator McKELLAR (interposing). Suppose you answer it "Yes" or "No" and explain what you mean.

Mr. LILIENTHAL. Let me explain what I mean.

He did not answer the question.

Mr. President, what are we going to do? Are we going to turn these plants over to the individual managers and let them buy what they please with Government funds which come into their hands, or are we going to retain the same sort of supervision we retain over the Post Office Department, for example, and every other Government agency?

My distinguished friend from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] was formerly connected with the Department of Justice. When that Department receives money from penalties, and various other sources, it must all go into the Treasury. If we were to follow the plan of permitting each agency to control its own affairs, where would such a policy lead us? We would have 40 or 50 governments.

Let me turn to another question, although I am consuming more time than I had intended to take. A large amount of nitrate is manufactured at the T. V. A. plant, and it is used for war purposes in time of war and for fertilizer purposes in time of peace. Without consulting the Congress, so far as I know, Mr. Lilienthal has assumed the duty of giving largesses or munificences, as I believe they are sometimes called, or charities, as they are called at other times. What else could they be called, Mr. President? Subsidies is the usual word for them. We have a Department of Agriculture which looks after subsidies for farmers all over our country. Mr. Lilienthal has assumed the right to manufacture nitrates and fertilizers. I forget the exact amount which is produced by the T. V. A. each year, but the aggregate is several million dollars' worth. Mr. Lilienthal does not sell it; he gives it away. He gives it to the farmers. He is giving additional subsidies to the farmers. Heaven knows, if there is any class of persons who need subsidies, it is usually the farmers. They have the hardest time to get along of any class of our people. I can speak of that because I know at first hand what their situation is; I do not speak about it from hearsay. I know the difficulties they have to meet. My sympathy is with them; but if we are to give them subsidies, we should treat all of them alike.

Let me point out what Mr. Lilienthal does. He makes contracts with certain of the farmers to let them experiment with his fertilizers. He gives them a contract for a 5-year term of experimentation, and after the 5 years have elapsed he renews it. That is a fairly extensive experiment. Everyone knows that fertilizers of this sort will increase the productivity of the land. No experimentation is needed in order to know that. There is no one in my section of the country who does not know it.

Let me indicate what was done last year by Mr. Lilienthal in distributing fertilizers. I hold in my hand a summary statement covering the period commencing when this program began several years ago—in 1935, to be exact. Mr. Lilienthal began in Alabama with 47 counties and 5,206 farms. He selected those farms. Most of the farms were in Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia. But he did not stop there. He gave out his subsidies to farmers in States all over the country. I wonder whether many Senators knew about that. In Arkansas there are 25 farmers to whom Mr. Lilienthal gives such fertilizers. I do not know how he obtained the names of the farmers. Possibly he obtained them in some way through farm operators or farm organizations. He gives such fertilizers to 25 farmers in Arkansas, for a period of from 5 to 10 years; but he disregards all the other farmers in that State.

In Idaho there are 8 counties which receive those fertilizers. I wonder how Mr. Lilienthal selected them. Illinois has 16 such counties; Indiana has 53; Iowa has 31; Kansas has 12; Louisiana has 13; Maryland has 4; Michigan has 36; Minnesota has 20; Missouri has 20; New Hampshire has 10; New Mexico has 16; New York has 53; Ohio has 13; Oregon has 8; South Carolina has 21; Texas has 37; Vermont has 11; Washington has 20; West Virginia has 13; and Wisconsin has 61. To those selected counties several million dollars' worth of fertilizer was given absolutely free, for so-called experimental purposes, for periods ranging from 5 to 10 years.

Mr. President, if it is proper to grant such subsidies by giving fertilizer to farmers, if the Government is going to commence such a practice, all farmers should be treated alike. Mr. Lilienthal does not do that; he selects merely a few farmers—a baker's dozen, so to speak, of the farmers of our country. If we are to confer on Mr. Lilienthal the authority and duty to give to farmers subsidies in the form of fertilizer, should not such subsidies be given to all farmers alike? Should there not be some method of doing it? Shall we simply turn over this business to Mr. Lilienthal, and let him run it to suit himself, according to any method he may choose to use?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Will the Senator tell me how many farms in my State of California have received such subsidies?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will tell the Senator, if that information is given on the list I have before me. However, now that I examine it further, I find that no California farms are included.

Mr. DOWNEY. Did none of our farmers receive any of the fertilizer?

Mr. McKELLAR. No farmers in the Senator's State received any of it.

Mr. DOWNEY. Perhaps that is a compliment to our land; I do not know.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know, but I presume it is. Approximately 30 or 40 States are represented in the list. The others are not.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, let me inquire whether Montana farms are included.

Mr. McKELLAR. No Montana farms received any of the fertilizer. The Senator should get in touch with Mr. Lilienthal. I am quite sure that the Senator from Montana, with his winning ways, could easily have some Montana farms taken care of in that way.

I find that 124 Vermont farms have received such fertilizers. Think of it—the experimental use of fertilizers for from 5 to 10 years. It does not take that long to find out what fertilizer will do to land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list to which I have referred may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary of Tennessee Valley Authority test-demonstration activities through June 30, 1944

States	Number of counties	Total number of farms to date	Number of active farms, June 30, 1944	Tons of phosphate to June 30, 1944	Tons of nitrate to June 30, 1944	Year program initiated
VALLEY STATES						
Alabama	47	5,206	2,765	22,693	2,471	1935
Georgia	52	3,416	2,666	22,234	1,749	1935
Kentucky	49	1,798	695	10,653	710	1935
Mississippi	34	2,094	767	13,418	1,032	1935
North Carolina	64	6,358	5,577	26,823	1,629	1935
Tennessee	64	14,512	11,570	69,141	2,934	1935
Virginia	66	6,880	3,183	43,872	1,611	1935
NONVALLEY STATES						
Arkansas	25	487	130	2,396	220	1937
Idaho	8	17	16	211	21	1942
Illinois	16	330	283	1,402		1937
Indiana	53	79	67	643	80	1940
Iowa	31	424	248	2,391	3	1937
Kansas	12	77	35	394	3	1939
Louisiana	13	284	137	1,059	280	1937
Maryland	4	112	112	502	80	1942
Michigan	36	751	619	2,326	23	1940
Minnesota	20	228	165	1,458		1940
Missouri	20	325	241	3,444	167	1936
New Hampshire	10	90		60		1937
New Mexico	16	48	18	418	7	1941
New York	53	779	678	2,824	144	1939
Ohio	13	312	263	2,029	188	1937

Summary of Tennessee Valley Authority test-demonstration activities through June 30, 1944—Continued

States	Number of counties	Total number of farms to date	Number of active farms, June 30, 1944	Tons of phosphate to June 30, 1944	Tons of nitrate to June 30, 1944	Year program initiated
NONVALLEY STATES—con.						
Oregon	8	38	35	573	62	1941
South Carolina	21	351	124	1,390	260	1936
Texas	37	935	520	3,539	333	1936
Vermont	11	131	124	1,549	126	1941
Washington	20	52	49	533	38	1942
West Virginia	13	250	219	1,282	------	1936
Wisconsin	61	[1] 1,066	386	2,009	210	1938
Total	877	47,430	31,542	240,366	15,361	-----

[1] 21,585 are unit test-demonstration farms covering 4,101,081 acres, 25,845 are area test-demonstration farms covering 2,747,717 acres.

NOTE.—This summary is cumulative and reports all farms which have participated in the test-demonstration program since its beginning in 1935.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have presented this matter because it is my position that subsidies in the form of fertilizer which are given to farmers should be equally distributed. Let every farmer have a chance to receive them; let there be no favorites.

I wonder whether many Senators have already received telegrams about this matter from farmers in their States who have such 5-year or 10-year contracts. I do not know whether Senators have received such telegrams, but it would not surprise me if they had. I am sure that farmers who have such contracts will not want to give them up.

When I was a boy I had to mix the fertilizers I used, after buying the various ingredients; but today the great Tennessee Valley Authority, without any warrant of law, so I believe, is giving away millions of dollars' worth of fertilizers to certain farmers who are on the list or who were put on the list at the proper time.

I suggest to the Senator from Montana and the Senator from California that they endeavor to have the names of some of the farmers in their States placed on the list. My own view is that whenever we can help the farmers we must do so. I should be perfectly willing to have the fertilizers distributed fairly and justly to all the farmers of the country.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I do not wish to divert the Senator from the main theme of his argument, but I should like to ask a question, because I have been very much interested in what he has been saying. Does the Senator know what provision is made in the pending Missouri Valley Authority bill relative to payment of the funds earned by the proposed Authority into the general fund of the United States Treasury, or whether it is proposed that the Authority be allowed to keep the money in its own fund?

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand that it is to be independent. Does the Senator from Montana know anything about that?

Mr. WHEELER. It is to be independent.

Mr. McKELLAR. I so understood. That means that whoever acquires control of it will be in the same category as Mr. Lilienthal; he will have no supervision, to amount to anything, exercised over him by the Congress of the United States. He will not be required to come to Congress in order to obtain appropriations, and will not be required to turn over any proceeds to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I believe that the Senator has already stated that, so far as he knows, no other agency of the Federal Government is exempted from the necessity of accounting to the Congress for its proceeds, or making payments into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know of no other.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I was not present when the Senate took the matter up, and I am not fully informed. I am interested in knowing how Mr. Lilienthal deals with the farmers.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand it is through the county agents.

Mr. WHEELER. He furnishes them fertilizer.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. He requires that the farmers pay the freight.

Mr. WHEELER. He furnishes them fertilizer for a certain period of time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; for 5 years. I have urged that the length of time should be reduced so that more persons could obtain the benefits of experimentation; but he has not replied to my communication, and I do not believe he intends to reply to it.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I dislike showing my ignorance. I know that the T. V. A. is a very great enterprise.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it is a wonderful enterprise.

Mr. DOWNEY. But it is a long way from the people of California.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Has the T. V. A. already acquired steam plants?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it has acquired several steam plants. A steam plant was built at Muscle Shoals. One or two other steam plants were built at other places. One or two were acquired by purchase several years ago when Congress authorized their purchase. They were acquired from the power companies with which Mr. Willkie was associated.

Mr. DOWNEY. Were those steam plants acquired in pursuance of direct authorization by the Congress?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; they were acquired pursuant to an act of Congress 2 or 3 years ago, when Mr. Willkie sold the Commonwealth & Southern, the Tennessee Power Co., and other companies to the T. V. A.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I have been told that the T. V. A. is now acquiring control of another power company.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. Did the Tennessee Valley Authority apply to Congress for permission to acquire the power company?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it did not. I can find only one reference which Mr. Lilienthal made to the subject in 118 pages of printed testimony. He stated that some other persons had asked him to represent them in the matter of acquiring the company, but no notice of it was given with the exception, perhaps, of a notice published in the New York Times. As a matter of fact, Mr. Lilienthal did not ask that Congress authorize him to make the purchase. Whether it is a good purchase or a bad one, I do not know. I do not know what the price was. I do not know what the property was. When I asked the Senate to make appropriations, and when I was working my fingers nearly off in order to obtain the appropriations, I stated time and again that they were to be used for a public benefit, namely, to build up the great Tennessee Valley. I never dreamed that the money would be turned over to a single individual to be used as he saw fit.

The only reference he made during the course of the hearings to the East Tennessee purchase was the following:

> All of the major communities in the region served by the East Tennessee Light and Power Co. have authorized the T. V. A.—

I do not know what he means by "all of the major communities"—

> to act as their agent in negotiating with the company for the purchase of this property.

To act as agent of those communities.

> The negotiations have been going on with some degree of success. As yet no agreement has been reached, but progress has been made.

With reference to the article to which I have already referred, under tremendous headlines it was stated that the T. V. A. had bought that property for $9,600,000.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator's argument, but I have made inquiry with reference to the purchase. If it will not disturb the Senator I will put into the RECORD what information I have on the subject.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so, because I personally am not informed.

Mr. HILL. The properties referred to by the Senator belong to the East Tennessee Light & Power Co. I am advised that that company is a subsidiary of the Cities Service Light & Power Co., and that under the Holding Company Act the Cities Service Power & Light Co. must divest itself of its interests in those properties. Those properties are the distribution systems, and transmission lines leading to the following cities: Bristol, Va., and Bristol, Tenn.—cities very close to each other—Elizabethton, Erwin, Greenville, and Johnson City. All those

cities, with the exception of Bristol, Va., are in the State of Tennessee. As I have said, it is my information that those properties must be sold under the Holding Company Act. The T. V. A. is buying those properties, most of which would not be held or owned by the Tennessee Valley Authority, but which would be owned and held by the cities which I have enumerated. All the local city distribution systems would be owned by the cities themselves. What the Tennessee Valley Authority is attempting to do is to make a purchase for itself of a small number of those properties, such as the transmission lines, but, so far as the distribution systems within the towns enumerated is concerned, the Tennessee Valley Authority is really an agent for purchase of the properties for those towns.

As all of us in the Tennessee Valley know, the Tennessee Valley Authority does not own or operate the municipal distribution systems. The municipal distribution systems are operated by the cities themselves. All the Tennessee Valley Authority does is to generate the power and then transmit it to the municipal systems, and then the distribution of the power within the cities is controlled by the municipal distribution systems—owned by the cities.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am much obliged to the Senator from Alabama for giving that information, which is the first of its kind I have had. I do not know that it adds a great deal to the point I am making or detracts from the point I am making, which is that Mr. Lilienthal was before our committee supposedly for the purpose of making a complete statement about the transaction in question. It took him 3 days. He barely mentioned it, and yet within a day or a day or two afterward it was published that he had bought this concern for $9,600,000, and it has never been denied.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. As I understand, then, he is acting as a broker for the various cities?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know what he is doing.

Mr. WHEELER. According to that statement, he would be acting as a broker for the various cities. He is going to buy it and, I assume, pay $9,000,000 out of the funds of the T. V. A. and is going to sell a part of it back to the cities. Does he have such authority under the law?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think so. I do not think there is any authority for him to do that; it was never intended that he should do anything of the sort. I wonder what the next step will be.

Mr. President, I offered an amendment which the Committee on Appropriations sustained by a vote, if I remember aright, of 13 to 3 or 14 to 3. There were 17 present, and that was the vote. There may have been some proxies; I do not remember about that. I did not have any proxies, and did not ask any Senator how he would vote on this question if it was brought up. It would take a vote of two-thirds of the Senate to adopt this amendment. I have been here a long time, and I have seen certain signs which indicate to me that there is no use of presenting it to this body at this time, because more than one-third of the Senators will vote against it. I know perfectly well that I have a right to introduce a bill and have it referred to the proper committee. I think probably it should go to the committee of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], which is as fair a committee as could be found, and I am inclined to think that I had better introduce a bill and have it so referred. Then anyone who wants to testify concerning it can come forward and be heard. Such a bill could be passed by a majority vote. For that reason I shall not offer the amendment. I have already told Senators on the other side who are very much interested and also Senators on this side that I shall not offer the amendment this afternoon, because it would take a two-thirds majority to adopt it, and I want the question acted on in the usual way and passed on by a majority vote.

Furthermore, I have some letters and some telegrams which indicate to me that certain men in Tennessee would like to be heard on a bill. Under those circumstances, I think the matter should go to a legislative committee, and within the next day or two I shall prepare a bill and have it referred to the proper committee, which may then hold hearings with a view to requiring not only the Tennessee Valley Authority but every other authority or activity of the Government that collects money belonging to the United States to pay the money into the Treasury and to come before the Congress to obtain appropriations. That is what should be done. In my judgment we are neglecting our duty when we turn over great properties such as this, costing three-quarters of a billion dollars and say "Go ahead and manage it to suit yourself; you need not pay your proceeds into the Federal Treasury; you do not have to come before the Congress for your appropriations; just do the best you can, and let it go." I do not think it was ever intended by our Government that any such procedure should be followed in connection with the control and management of governmental agencies. So, I repeat, I am going to introduce a bill on which every Senator will have an opportunity to vote, and I hope that when it comes to a vote the Senate will sustain me in the position I have taken about this matter, because I assure the Senate that I have but one desire.

I have been very proud of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I have spent the best days of my life as other Senators here know working my fingers off to obtain from the United States Government $767,000,000 with which to build this great project. I am proud of it. I want to see it a perfect success. I have never attempted to interfere with its organization or activities. I never recommended anyone of the three Commissioners who were first appointed, I did not know who they were. It did not make any difference to me who they were. I have never suggested the name of anybody else who has been appointed. Such matters are immaterial to me.

Someone may say that I am interested in the votes that might be obtained. I told Mr. Lilienthal the other day when he appeared before the committee that I never had had any trouble in getting votes from the Tennessee Valley Authority people. I think I have carried counties where the T. V. A. operates. Why should I be bothered about votes of those connected with the Authority? Yet that notion is in the mind of some who want to assail me; that is all there is to it. They have undertaken from the very beginning to deprive me of whatever credit would naturally come to a man who worked to obtain the appropriations with which to build the T. V. A. dams. It seems to me there has been a studied effort to that end, especially on the part of Mr. Lilienthal, who has disregarded everything for the purpose of bringing that kind of propaganda before the people of the country.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I believe that everyone who knows the story of the Tennessee Valley Authority realizes that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is entitled to the major credit for what has been accomplished. I wanted to get a little information from him.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be glad to supply it if I have it.

Mr. WILEY. Recently while having the privilege of sitting at the hearing of the so-called Mexican Treaty it was developed very clearly that before Boulder Dam could be built the citizens of California in no uncertain terms had to give assurance to the Federal Government before it provided the half a billion dollars that they would take care of repayments. The Senator has said that approximately $1,000,000,000 of our money, the money of all the people of the United States, has gone into the T. V. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. Seven hundred and sixty-seven million dollars up to date.

Mr. WILEY. I wonder if any arrangement has been made as to repayment to the Treasury. What is the arrangement in relation thereto?

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no arrangement about it at all in the act, but, of course, if the T. V. A. makes money—and there is no reason why it should not make money, for power is in demand and the number of organizations using power in Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, Mississippi, Arkansas, Virginia, and North Carolina is increasing by leaps and bounds—and if it is required to pay its receipts into the Treasury of the United States, in my judgment, the time will come when it will pay out entirely. Not only that, but it has reduced the cost of power and light to the people in an immeasurable degree. I have not the figures before me, but I shall try to put them in the RECORD, showing, in a general way, how much the rates have been reduced in the entire locality. As I have said before, time and again, the T. V. A. is the best project I have ever had anything to do with since I have been in the Congress of the United States, a period now of 35 years, and for any man to publish in a newspaper the statement that I am op-

posed to the T. V. A. is ridiculous. There is no man on earth who has done more for it; there is no man who thinks more highly of it; there is no man who has taken such a drubbing time and again in his efforts to have it built. I am sure that everyone who has been a Member of the Senate during my term of service will agree that what the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and the distinguished Senator from Nevada and the other Senators have said about my activities in this matter is true. Most of the fights I have won have been either by a tie vote or 12 to 11 or 13 to 11, or something of the kind.

Mr. WILEY. If I have gotten the import of the Senator's recent statement, I believe it was to the effect that he agrees that when the Government, which is composed of 135,000,000 people, goes to the assistance of a certain segment, as was done on the Tennessee, such assistance should be considered in terms of a loan, because all the people provided the funds for that particular community.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly what happened.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator also said something about rates. As I understand, most of the power is distributed to local distributing stations, and I should like to know whether or not, in determining what the rates should be, there is included the initial cost of some $800,000,000, and if so, why is there not a yearly return to the Government for money invested?

Mr. McKELLAR. One reason is that there is nothing in the act which provides for it. That is the principal reason; but there are other reasons. It has been a long-time process to build all these dams. It has just been lately that the T. V. A. has been bringing in returns, and as soon as it began to bring in returns which were sufficient to pay its running expenses, it wanted to cut loose from Congress entirely. It is to that that I object. I think the returns over and above expenses should be paid into the Treasury of the United States, because the United States owns this property.

Mr. WILEY. Is it the Senator's understanding that at the present time, after deducting operating expenses, there would be shown a profit on T. V. A. which could be paid back to the Government as interest on the money advanced?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator can figure it out for himself. The net profits now amount to $10,000,000 or more a year, according to the clerk of the committee, who is a very careful expert.

Mr. WILEY. What is being done with that money?

Mr. McKELLAR. None of it as yet has gone into the Treasury.

Mr. WILEY. Is it being accumulated by the managers of T. V. A. for any purpose except to refund to the Government?

Mr. McKELLAR. None of it has gone into the Treasury as yet, and the purpose of the bill I shall introduce will be to require its return to the Treasury. I am not asking the Senator's help privately, but I ask him as a public matter to help me in seeing to it that the bill I expect to introduce, which will put these profits into the Treasury of the United States, shall be passed.

Mr. WILEY. If the Senator will yield for a moment further——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. The questions which I have asked the Senator have been occasioned by a good deal of concern over the future. We are talking about the Missouri Valley, we are talking about going into tremendous investment by the Government, running into literally billions of dollars, and we are talking about a national indebtedness of $350,000,000,000. We have advanced the present limit to three hundred billion. Having all that in mind, it would be a wholesome thing for the people of this country to know that in some of the investments which have been made there has been thought of a revenue return to the Treasury, instead of a constant outgo. I have nothing against the T. V. A.. I have not been to the scene of its activities, I know nothing about it of my own experience, but if the Senator could bring about what I have been discussing, to wit, that out of the Government's investment revenue should be returned to the Federal Treasury on the billion dollars invested, it would add to the solvency of this Nation, and it would also result in getting rid of some of the doubt in relation to the enormous national indebtedness which is all too widely entertained at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad the Senator is thinking about the national indebtedness, because it is a matter of great concern to every thoughtful person. We must not only be economical, as I have been trying to be since I have been a Member of the Senate, but we must also look after proposals which bring net revenue to the Government.

Mr. President, under the circumstances, I shall not at this time offer the amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin, I am sure he would be interested in having me read section 26 of the act with reference to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. WILEY. I shall be very happy to listen to it.

Mr. BARKLEY. It provides as follows:

SEC. 26. Commencing July 1, 1936, the proceeds for each fiscal year derived by the Board from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the Corporation, and from any other activities of the Corporation including the disposition of any real or personal property, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year, save and except such part of such proceeds as in the opinion of the Board shall be necessary for the Corporation in the operation of dams and reservoirs, in conducting its business in generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy and in manufacturing, selling, and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients.

In other words, out of its total proceeds, after deducting an amount sufficient to enable it to carry on its business from day to day and month to month during the year, the surplus is supposed to be turned into the Treasury of the United States. I am not able to say whether any surplus has up to now been turned into the Treasury, because the T. V. A. has been operating in a constructive era, it has not yet finished its operations in the construction of dams. But the law provides that when it really is through with that, and even beginning, as I have read, on July 1, it shall turn into the Treasury any surplus funds over and above its operating expenses.

Mr. WILEY. It has been my understanding, from what the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] said, that nothing has been turned in, so that there probably is available approximately $10,000,000. What I think particularly we have a right to express in this period, when we are thinking about tremendous spendings in the future, and Government enterprises many of which will compete with private enterprise, is that on the money invested in T. V. A. amounting approximately to $800,000,000, no interest has been paid. If it had been a private business it would have paid a good interest charge on $800,000,000. That necessarily means that the rates in the T. V. A. territory—and the people living outside that area have made possible their reduction—are considerably less than the rates at which a private industry could sell power. I think it is only right for us to ask this question: In selling electric current in that area is the element of interest on capital invested taken into consideration? In view of the fact that we as public servants are trustees of this property, it seems to me that is a pertinent question to which we should have an answer. If the Senator from Kentucky can give it to me I shall appreciate having it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not able offhand to give the Senator all the elements of cost which enter into the fixing of rates. I think most of them, if not all of them, are taken into consideration. Of course, this was a great public enterprise. We have not always charged to the Government and against operating expense the interest which would ordinarily be paid. In this particular valley, and probably in other valleys, private enterprise was not equipped to go into the field. The Tennessee Valley would never have been developed by private enterprise, because we tried it for a long time, and private enterprise simply was not able to do it. So I do not think we need to worry about the yardstick so far as the elements which go into the cost of producing power are concerned.

Of course, there is another element which enters into the situation—the public benefit to a very large body of people who would have been denied these facilities if the Government had not developed them.

Mr. WILEY. I appreciate that explanation. I think another element to be considered in the whole equation is the percentage which is allotted to flood control.

Mr. BARKLEY. And navigation.

Mr. WILEY. The evidence which has been produced here is to the effect that the enterprise is beginning to show a profit, and I think that is a very wholesome fact to have established.

Mr. BARKLEY. Unless Congress itself amends the fundamental law, the profits will go into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. WILEY. Unless the directors order otherwise.

Mr. BARKLEY. They cannot arbitrarily reserve any fantastic or arbitrary sums. It is supposed to be a going concern and operated like other utilities, and the directors are supposed to, and I think they do, exercise ordinary business judgment in determining how much they should hold back for operating expenses. But I think the record of the T. V. A. and the report of the committee of the Senate which investigated the T. V. A. a few years ago, abundantly show that the T. V. A. have pursued their policy and their program with business acumen and with due regard to the rights of everyone concerned.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] has advised the Senate that he will not press his motion to suspend the rule so as to make in order the amendment which he had proposed to the bill respecting the T. V. A. In view of the fact that the Senator from Tennessee will not make his motion and therefore will not attempt to have his amendment adopted by the Senate, I shall not delay the Senate by making an argument on his proposed amendment. I am glad the Senator from Tennessee is not going to make the motion, and I certainly commend him on the position he has taken in that respect.

In reply to the inquiry of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] concerning the return of money on the investment in the Tennessee Valley, let me say that the Government of the United States for many years has been appropriating money for the development of rivers and harbors, and, with the exception of the great Boulder Dam project, which was largely, as I understand, an irrigation project to provide water for southern California, no provision has been made for the return of any of the many millions and hundreds of millions of dollars the Government has expended on waterways and on harbors, and there has been no expectation of its return.

Consider the great Ohio River. According to my recollection, approximately $200,000,000 have been expended on the development of the Ohio River, to provide in that river a 9-foot channel. Not one dollar of that $200,000,000 has been returned to the Federal Treasury. No interest on that amount of money has been paid into the Treasury, and not one dollar of either principal or interest will be paid into the Federal Treasury. I could cite any number of illustrations of that kind.

When we set up the T. V. A., we made provision for the first time in the history of our country for construction which would bring money back into the Treasury, and I do not hesitate to say to the Senate of the United States that the day will come when the T. V. A. will pay back into the Treasury of the United States every dollar that has been expended in the Tennessee Valley and in the development of the Tennessee River.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to have that assurance, because, as I said before, when it appears to the people of this country that an enterprise on which the Government has embarked yields a return to the Treasury, it will in some degree reestablish more or less the element of faith we need. But I wish to say there is a distinction between the T. V. A. and the Ohio and other streams where the question of flood control is involved. In the T. V. A. the Government of the United States went directly into business in competition with its nationals, and when that occurs it seems to me there is a direct obligation on the Government to meet the same charges, and take into consideration the same elements, that an individual does when he goes into business. I think perhaps that is being done, at least I hope so.

Mr. HILL. That is being done. But the Senator speaks about the difference between the development of the Ohio and the development of the Tennessee, as being that of going into business and not going into business. The basis on which the Government entered upon public works on the Tennessee River was certainly the same as the basis on which it undertook the development of the Ohio, and that was navigation, and, incidentally, flood control and the generation of power. The big difference, though, was that in the case of the Ohio River no dams were built, and so no power was generated. On the Tennessee River, however, the Government built high dams from which power is obtained and from the power revenue is derived because the power can be sold. So far as going into business in competition with our nationals is concerned, I imagine that our railroads and their stockholders feel that when the Government develops a waterway, such as the Ohio or some other river, it is perhaps providing some competition for the railroads and for those who own the railroads. There can be no question that our waterways have affected our railroads; and no doubt in some instances the development of waterways by the Federal Government has affected the railroads adversely. It is not a question of the Government going into competition with its nationals. On the Tennessee River we built high dams, and as an incident to promoting navigation flood control and development of hydroelectric power were obtained.

As I have said, with the single exception of the Boulder Dam installation, in the Tennessee Valley we have the only Government development which will pay back into the Federal Treasury every dollar the Federal Government has put into it.

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee stated that he did not think that under existing law the Tennessee Valley Authority had the right to use for operating expenses money which it received from the sale of power or fertilizer. He felt that Mr. Lilienthal's construction of the statute was in error. For the sake of the record, Mr. President, let me say that I believe that Mr. Lilienthal's construction of the statute is absolutely correct. I think that everything the Tennessee Valley Authority has done with reference to the expenditure of its receipts to meet operating or maintenance expenses is entirely within the authority granted by the act.

I happened to be a Member of the House of Representatives when the Tennessee Valley Authority Act was passed in 1933, and also when many amendments to that act were made in 1935. I was a member of the House Committee on Military Affairs, which had jurisdiction of the T. V. A. legislation. I not only served as a member of that committee, but I was also a member of the conference committee in connection with the passage of the 1933 act and the 1935 amendments. There is no question that it was the intent and the express purpose of the Congress to give to the Tennessee Valley Authority the power to use its receipts for operating purposes. I submit that a careful reading of section 26 of the act will show that this power is clearly vested in the Tennessee Valley Authority.

In this connection, although section 26 of the act has already been placed in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate to read it. I ask that section 26 of the act as it now stands, as well as section 26 of the original act of 1933, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From act approved May 18, 1933]

SEC. 26. The net proceeds derived by the Board from the sale of power and any of the products manufactured by the Corporation, after deducting the cost of operation, maintenance, depreciation, amortization, and an amount deemed by the Board as necessary to withhold as operating capital, or devoted by the Board to new construction, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year.

[From act as amended November 21, 1941]

SEC. 26. Commencing July 1, 1936, the proceeds for each fiscal year derived by the Board from the sale of power or any other products manufactured by the Corporation, and from any other activities of the Corporation including the disposition of any real or personal property, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States at the end of each calendar year, save and except such part of such proceeds as in the opinion of the Board shall be necessary for the Corporation in the operation of dams and reservoirs, in conducting its business in generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy and in manufacturing, selling, and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients. A continuing fund of $1,000,000 is also excepted from the requirements of this section and may be withheld by the Board to defray emergency expenses and to insure continuous operation: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the use by the Board, after June 30, 1936, of proceeds accruing prior to July 1, 1936, for the payment of obligations lawfully incurred prior to such latter date. (48 Stat. 71, as amended by 49 Stat. 1079.)

Mr. HILL. Both section 26 in its original form, in the act of 1933, and section 26 in the act as it now stands, clearly

provide that the Tennessee Valley Authority shall have the power to use for operating expenses receipts from the sale of power and fertilizer.

In that connection let me say that the reason why the principle of the amendment the Senator from Tennessee proposes to offer was not accepted by Congress in 1935 was stated in the report of the conference committee of which I was a member. At that time the matter was made clear in the conference committee's report on the amendment. I read from the report:

It is manifest that long-term contracts could not be made if the power of the Tennessee Valley Authority to carry out those contracts is dependent upon appropriations by Congress. (H. Rept. 1846, 74th Cong., 1st sess.)

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee asked why, if the Bonneville Power Administration does not have the authority to use its receipts, the Tennessee Valley Authority should have such power. I shall not delay the Senate at this time by explaining the very important and fundamental differences between the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Bonneville Power Administration. Instead of taking the time of the Senate to explain those differences, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which shows those differences.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The present Bonneville power system is not comparable to the T. V. A. system because—

1. The Bonneville Power Administration produces no power. It simply markets the power produced by the Army and the Reclamation Bureau at the Bonneville and Grand Coulee hydroelectric plants. The T. V. A., however, operates 22 large dams, of which 20 have large hydroelectric generating stations, with a total generating capacity now installed of 1,629,460 kilowatts, and by long-term contract it supervises the operation of 5 hydroelectric plants owned by the Aluminum Co. of America. In addition, T. V. A. also operates 5 large steam-electric generating plants and a number of smaller generating stations, with a total capacity installed of 395,882 kilowatts.

2. As a practical matter, therefore, at the present time, expenses of operation of the Bonneville Power Administration can be estimated with reasonable accuracy more than a year in advance. Its operating budget for 1946 totals just over $4,200,000, presumably including all reasonable allowances for the operating contingencies that are likely to arise in this hydropower marketing program.

The T. V. A. has likewise submitted an estimate of the cost of its power operations in 1946. They are expected to be just over $9,300,000 and the cost of its multipurpose reservoir operations are anticipated to amount to slightly more than $2,350,000. But these estimates are based on average-year conditions, so far as stream flow is concerned. If 1946 is a dry year, these estimates may be exceeded by as much as $8,000,000. One million five hundred and fifty thousand tons of coal, above the amount estimated, will have to be burned to produce the 2,570,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy which will be delivered from steam-electric generating plants under dry-year conditions. The Bonneville Power Administration faces no such possibility of variation in expenses.

3. In the Pacific Northwest, however, as elsewhere, steam-electric facilities are used to firm up hydro generation. The difference is that in the area of the Bonneville Power Administration it is the private utilities and large municipal systems that own and operate the steam-electric plants which serve to firm up hydro power in dry years and meet unexpected load developments. These systems have the use of their revenues to meet these unpredictable situations. In the Tennessee Valley the situation is reversed. There it is the T. V. A. which owns and operates the steam-electric generating facilities as well as the hydro plants.

4. At the present time only a small proportion of the consumers in the Pacific Northwest are solely dependent on the Bonneville Power Administration as a source of power. During the 12 months ending November 1944, less than 3 percent of the output of Bonneville Power Administration was committed in firm sales to 39 local distribution agencies, and some of these own additional generating facilities, themselves. According to the annual report of the Secretary of the Interior industrial sales amounted to 894,600 kilowatts; next comes sales to privately owned utility companies of 73,667 kilowatts; then sales to public or peoples' utility districts of 48,200 kilowatts; sales to military establishments of 23,250 kilowatts; to cooperatives of 9,170 kilowatts; and last, sales to municipalities amounting to 5,725 kilowatts.

The situation in the Tennessee Valley is the exact opposite of this. The T. V. A. is the sole source of supply for a great area. About 30 percent of the output (10 times as big a proportion as the case of Bonneville) goes to 130 local distribution agencies serving more than 570,000 consumers who are entirely dependent on the T. V. A. as a source of power.

5. For the reasons listed above, as a practical matter there is little in common between the problem of power-system management presently faced by the Bonneville Power Administration and those of T. V. A. The principle, however, is the same. In the future if the Bonneville Power Administration becomes a power system in the same sense that T. V. A. is such a system, it will require the use of its receipts for the expenses of its operation. That principle has been recognized in bills which have been introduced to set up a permanent organization under which power from the great publicly owned dams of the Pacific Northwest would be marketed. The Bone bill (S. 2430) in the Seventy-seventh Congress was one. The Mitchell bill, now pending, is another.

Section 12 of the Bone bill would have created in the Treasury an account to be known as the Columbia Power Administration fund. Money in the fund derived from power revenues would have been permanently appropriated to the Administration for a number of specified purposes, including the operation, maintenance, and replacement of electric facilities, establishment of emergency and other reserves, payments in lieu of State and local taxes, payments of interest and principal on outstanding revenue bonds, and payments to the Treasury as reimbursement for the expenses chargeable to the Administration for operation, maintenance, and replacement of electric facilities at the Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects plus additional payments to return to the United States the outstanding amount of the Administrations' indebtedness to the Treasury. Section 22 of the Mitchell bill provides that, like T. V. A., expenses of operation and maintenance should be paid from receipts.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Tennessee also referred to the fact that the Post Office Department must come to Congress and have appropriated all the money which it spends. He asked why the Tennessee Valley Authority should not have to do the same. I shall not delay the Senate with an exposition of the differences between the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the operations of the Post Office Department. Anyone who carefully analyzes them will see many great and fundamental differences between the two operations.

To begin with, the Tennessee Valley Authority must generate its own power. It must manufacture the products and commodities which it sells. That is not true of the Post Office Department. The people write the letters and send the parcels, and provide the products and commodities for the Post Office Department. The Tennessee Valley Authority must provide the means of transmission or transportation for the products which it distributes, whereas the Post Office Department, as we know, uses the railroads, air lines, and truck lines to distribute the mail. We know that the great corporations which operate the railroads, truck lines, and air lines do exactly what we gave the Tennessee Valley Authority power to do; namely, use receipts for operating purposes. Even in the case of the Post Office Department, if a rural carrier has a blowout and has to buy a new tire, he does not have to come to Congress to get the money with which to buy a new tire. Means are provided to purchase a new tire so that he may continue to carry his route and deliver the mail.

With reference to the telegrams which have been received, I can speak only in part for the State of Alabama. I am sure my colleague [Mr. BANKHEAD] will concur in the statement that the people of Alabama who live in the Tennessee Valley and are served by the Tennessee Valley Authority are conscious of all that the Tennessee Valley Authority has done for them, and all that it means to their welfare, their happiness, and their future growth and progress. They are, therefore, alert to everything which might affect the Tennessee Valley Authority. They are ready and eager at all times to take any steps which may be necessary to prevent anything happening which would in any way impair or affect the efficiency of the Tennessee Valley Authority or its capacity to carry through its program.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to his colleague?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have not received a single letter or telegram from Alabama in opposition to the T. V. A. or in support of the McKellar amendment.

Mr. HILL. In that connection, Mr. President, let me say that all the telegrams which I have received have been in opposition to the McKellar amendment. Those telegrams were signed by leading and outstanding citizens of the State of Alabama residing in the Tennessee Valley.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I join in that statement.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, as I have stated, I did not desire to make an argument on this question, in view of the fact that the motion to suspend the rule will not be made. I am glad the Senator from Tennessee has decided not to make the motion. I heartily commend him for his decision.

There is one other matter to which I think I should call attention, and that is fertilizer, and the fact that the Tennessee Valley Authority donates or gives away fertilizer.

Senators who were Members of this body before the Tennessee Valley Authority Act was passed will recall that the Wilson Dam and the nitrate plants were constructed during the last great war for the production of nitrogen to be used in the manufacture of munitions of war in time of war, and for nitrates and fertilizer for the farmers in time of peace. In the original act the dam and the plants were dedicated to that purpose. After the war was over, for many years we debated the question of the disposition of the dam and the plants, how the plants should be operated, and whether or not the Government should proceed to go into the business of producing nitrates, manufacturing fertilizer, and selling such fertilizer in the open market. As we can well imagine, there were many who were opposed to the Government going into the business of the manufacture and sale of fertilizer in the open market.

So when the Tennessee Valley Authority Act was written Congress denied the Government the right to sell fertilizer; but for the sake of American agriculture, for the sake of the conservation and preservation of the soil, the act provided that the Tennessee Valley Authority should carry on experiments relative to the production of fertilizers. The act authorized the Tennessee Valley Authority—and now I read from subsection (b) of section 5 of the T. V. A. Act—

(b) To arrange with farmers and farm organizations for large-scale practical use of the new forms of fertilizers under conditions permitting an accurate measure of the economic return they produce. (48 Stat. 61.)

(c) To cooperate with National, State, district, or county experimental stations or demonstration farms, with farmers, landowners, and associations of farmers or landowners, for the use of new forms of fertilizer or fertilizer practices during the initial or experimental period of their introduction, and for promoting the prevention of soil erosion by the use of fertilizers and otherwise. (48 Stat. 61, as amended by 49 Stat. 1076.)

Subsection (e) authorizes the following:

(e) Under the authority of this act the board may make donations or sales of the product of the plant or plants operated by it to be fairly and equitably distributed through the agency of county demonstration agents, agricultural colleges, or otherwise as the board may direct, for experimentation, education, and introduction of the use of such products in cooperation with practical farmers so as to obtain information as to the value, effect, and best methods of their use.

There is no question in my mind that the Tennessee Valley Authority is authorized to engage in such operations.

Mr. President, it is under that specific authority provided in the law and under the direct obligation imposed by the law on the Tennessee Valley Authority that the Authority today is making donations of fertilizers through county demonstration agents, agricultural colleges, and agricultural extension services. I shall not detain the Senate at this time to review those experiments or to discuss what the matter of having the farmers and agricultural agents join hands has meant to American agriculture.

On the 22d day of last February I addressed the Senate on the subject of phosphate and the land. In the remarks I made at that time I endeavored to tell something of the story of the great benefit which has come to the farmers of America, to American agriculture generally, and to all the people of America because of the preservation and conservation of our soil through the experiments with fertilizer conducted by the T. V. A.

The question has been asked whether there are any other agencies of government which have authority to expend their receipts or use their receipts for operating purposes without coming to Congress to obtain an appropriation of such receipts. I call attention to the fact that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries, the Panama Railroad Company, the Inland Waterways Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and the United States Maritime Commission enjoy the same right, namely, to use their receipts for the purpose of carrying on their operations in their daily work under the duties imposed upon them by the Congress.

Mr. President, I shall not further detain the Senate. I felt that for the sake of the record I should make these comments and observations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement prepared by the Department of Agriculture relative to the post-war use of fertilizer and lime, and a statement prepared by the Tennessee Valley Authority relative to mineral fertilizers and the security of the Nation.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST-WAR USE OF FERTILIZER AND LIME

Greatly expanded use of fertilizer and lime after the war will be essential to human nutritions, soil conservation, and balanced farming, and therefore should be encouraged as a matter of national policy, a special committee has reported to the Secretary of Agriculture, Claude R. Wickard. The committee, composed of Department of Agriculture and War Food Administration officers, recommended increased phosphate production capacity, conversion of Government synthetic nitrogen plants for the production of fertilizers, and large importations of potash to meet increased demands.

The committee also pointed out that, under favorable conditions, greater use of fertilizer and lime will be profitable to farmers. Recent studies indicate that if post-war conditions are favorable farmers can profitably use twice as much fertilizer and three times as much lime as in 1944. Compared with pre-war consumption, the increases would be much greater.

The report emphasizes that the proper and adequate use of fertilizer and liming materials is essential to the development of farming systems that maintain soils and result in a balanced farm output. Under such improved farming systems, however, cash crops would receive a smaller proportion of the commercial plant food than at present, soil-conserving and soil-building crops would receive a greater percentage.

In addition to helping develop a permanent agriculture, the committee pointed out, adequate and proper use of fertilizer and liming materials improves the nutritional value of the food supply.

National policy, in the committee's view, should aim both to increase the use and insure a continuous adequate supply of fertilizers and lime.

Recommendations for carrying out these objectives include:

1. Develop a broad educational program in cooperation with various public and private agencies to (a) encourage use of high-analysis fertilizers, (b) continue through State action a reasonable limitation and uniformity of fertilizer grades, (c) encourage coordinated use of lime and fertilizer, (d) test and demonstrate the place of lime and fertilizer in desirable farming systems under various conditions.

2. Substantially increase Federal-aid programs for promoting the use of fertilizers and liming materials for conserving soil resources, with distribution of materials primarily through commercial channels.

3. Expand research on (a) use of these materials to achieve balanced production and soil conservation and (b) new products and processes for fertilizer production at low cost.

4. Explore possibilities of reducing shipping rates and otherwise keeping costs low.

5. Encourage development of additional sources of liming materials as near areas of need as possible, encourage other means of keeping distribution costs low.

6. As recommended previously by another committee, convert Government synthetic ammonia plants with a rated capacity of 300,000 tons (N) for the production of nitrogen fertilizers and ammonia derivatives as soon as war conditions permit. These plants should be sold or leased to private industry, including farmer cooperatives, under arrangements safeguarding the public interest. Otherwise, the plants should be operated as a public enterprise. All other Government nitrogen plants should be maintained in standby condition. Imports of nitrogen fertilizers should continue to be admitted free of duty. Duties should be removed from anhydrous ammonia when it is imported for use in fertilizer.

7. Encourage the construction of new phosphate plants needed to supply areas not economically or adequately supplied by existing plants or in which substantial increase in the use of phosphates is desirable. Government-owned sulfuric-acid plants should be sold or leased to private industry for post-war fertilizer production. Private industry, including farm cooperatives, should be encouraged (with Government support if necessary) to expand production of phosphates to meet all fertilizer demands.

8. Explore public land for new domestic sources of water-soluble potash. Known resources of potash in the United States are adequate for less than 50 years if used at rates most desirable for soil maintenance. The limited supplies available should be considered as a strategic reserve. The major portion of the potash used in this country should be obtained from foreign sources.

In accepting the committee's report, Secretary Wickard said: "Among farmers and the general public there is a growing realization that more fertilizers and liming materials should be used to conserve and improve soil

and promote balanced, ample, and profitable farm production.

"There also is a growing realization that present production and distribution capacity for these materials is not sufficient to meet requirements, and that the Nation's supplies of some fertilizers, particularly potash, may be extremely limited."

He recommended study of the committee's report to all persons interested in the adequate and proper post-war use of fertilizers.

Members of the committee are: W. A. Minor, Office of the Secretary, United States Department of Agriculture; H. R. Tolley, Bureau of Agricultural Economics; F. W. Parker, Agricultural Research Administration; W. C. Finn, Agricultural Adjustment Agency; J. L. Boatman, Extension Service; A. W. Palmer, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations; A. E. Burns, Office of Materials and Facilities; David Meeker, Office of Surplus Property and Reconversion; S. E. Johnson, Bureau of Agricultural Economics; G. F. Drown, Soil Conservation Service; and K. D. Jacob, Agricultural Research Administration.

Mineral Fertilizers and the Nation's Security

(An interim report issued by the board of directors of the T. V. A., summarizing its findings and recommendations based upon 10 years of experimentation)

The Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 placed upon the T. V. A. a responsibility to produce, improve, and cheapen fertilizers and to demonstrate, increase, and test their use in relation to the fertility of the Nation's soils. To this end the T. V. A. was authorized to build and operate fertilizer-manufacturing plants, using new methods and processes from its research laboratories, and to cooperate with farmers, associations of farmers, and National and State agencies for the use of the products of these plants. In short, the Congress instructed the T. V. A. to form a working partnership with the Nation's farmers and their organizations for the purpose of helping them to find better and more profitable ways to restore and maintain soil fertility by use of minerals and chemical plant food or fertilizers under practical farming conditions.

The T. V. A. has now completed a review and analysis of the results of the first 10 years of this broad assignment in the field of national fertilizer and soil-fertility policy. In this period several hundred thousand tons of improved and new fertilizer products have been produced in T. V. A. plants. New manufacturing processes have been developed and old ones improved. Year after year thousands of tests and demonstrations have been conducted on tens of thousands of privately owned farms in more than half of the 48 States. New arrangements in public agency and citizen relationships have been developed and tested. The board of directors considers it appropriate, therefore, to make this interim report of findings and recommendations for the information and consideration of the several agencies and organizations with which it cooperates and shares its responsibilities.

We recognize, first of all, the elementary truths of science: That human life and society are dependent directly or indirectly on plant life both as a source of food and as a source of raw materials supply for a large proportion of industry; that an abundant plant life requires a fertile soil; and that preservation of the soil itself is dependent upon the protective cover of plants.

We also recognize the important truth that what happens to the soil and how it is used depend largely upon the individual farmer—upon what he wants to do and what he is able to do with the land.

The truths of science can be related to the understanding and will of millions of free and independent American farmers and the enterprise of businessmen to produce a new era of national effort to restore and improve the fertility of our soils. To that end we offer these findings and recommendations:

Findings and Recommendations

1. Greatly increased use of mineral fertilizers, particularly phosphates, is essential to the future security of the American people; the Nation's soils need two to three times more phosphate than the Nation now produces

The elements necessary to plant growth are found either as minerals in the soil or as chemical elements in the water and in the air. The minerals secured from the soil, particularly potash and phosphorus, are the most strategic. They are not universally present in the soil in sufficient quantities to sustain desirable plant growth.

The elements necessary for plant growth obtained from water and the air enter the soil largely by the continual addition of vegetable matter. In this manner the power of the soil to produce vegetable matter is restored and preserved. But these elements from the air and the water cannot be captured to emerge in growth unless the strategic minerals are available in the soil.

Phosphate is one of the most important of these vital minerals holding the key to nature's cycle of plant growth. There is abundant evidence of the need of larger supplies of phosphate for agriculture. The most authoritative statement on this subject is contained in the report of October 1943 of the special committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities on the preservation of phosphate resources and their national use. This report places the requirements for phosphate at two to three times current production.

The evidence of serious deficiencies of potash fertilizers is equally startling.

Ample scientific data and practical everyday experience show that the depletion of the Nation's basic resources, the soil, limits the choice which the farmer may exercise as to the kind and amounts of products he grows and results in decreases in the quality and quantity of food production, increased erosion and floods, and poorer nutrition for all people.

Our national agricultural practice must correct the natural deficiency of the soil and in addition restore the strategic minerals lost through cropping and erosion. The usual quantities of phosphate made available through a continuation of historic and current fertilizer manufacturing and distribution practices are not enough. More phosphate must be made available and more must reach the soil. The future of the American economy and the future of American life is not secure unless this is done, and in time.

2. To supply the major part of the Nation's requirements there is urgent need for private industry to increase greatly its capacity to produce phosphatic fertilizer

Provision of an adequate supply of mineral fertilizers is a task which the privately owned fertilizer industry could well undertake by greatly expanding its present capacity and by adopting improved processes for improved products.

The fertilizer industry has increased productive capacity to help meet war food requirements It has not taken full advantage of its opportunity to utilize the advances that have been made in the technology of producing concentrated materials, distributing them directly to the farm, and encouraging their use in unadulterated form.

The results of research and experimentation by the T. V. A. and other agencies have been generally available and the fertilizer industry has been free to utilize these results. The T. V. A.'s program has encouraged increases in commercial fertilizer sales. But industry continues to produce far short of what the Nation's soils require.

Farmers will buy more nearly what the land needs when the industry produces more phosphatic materials in more concentrated form and distributes these materials by more efficient and less expensive methods than those which now prevail. The mineral requirements of the soil present a challenge to industrial and business enterprise.

3. Farmer ownership and operation of a portion of the Nation's fertilizer manufacturing capacity is needed to assure an adequate national supply

Farmers have a predominant stake in the improvement of the soil because the soil is their private capital and because the public interest views them as stewards of the Nation's most basic resource. Farmers and farming comprise the greatest private business in America. In carrying on their business farmers have turned in increasing numbers to a business device deeply rooted in the American rural tradition, the institution of the farmer-cooperative organization. By this voluntary and democratic device the individual farmer-businessman joins his right of capital ownership to those of his neighbors to acquire more cheaply and in greater abundance the materials upon which his production depends.

Mineral fertilizer is one of these essential materials.

One practicable way by which farmers can assure themselves access to an adequate supply of fertilizers of the right kind is to buy, through their cooperative organizations, a portion of the mineral deposits and to build or acquire manufacturing plants to process mineral ores into fertilizers. In this way farmers can answer for themselves the important questions of how much mineral fertilizers they can use, which kinds are cheapest and most efficient, and what methods of application should be employed in an economic soil-building farm program. In this way farmers can express by example and experience the kinds and quantities of fertilizers they need from industry and the prices at which it should be supplied.

4. Government ownership and operation of a portion of the Nation's fertilizer capacity for the conduct of a practical plant-scale research and development program is likewise essential

The principal phosphate reserves of the Nation are located at considerable distances from large portions of the consuming areas. This fact emphasizes the importance of the production and use of highly concentrated materials which cost less to ship, distribute, and use. Prior to the research developments conducted by T. V. A. no appreciable progress had been made toward improvement of phosphatic fertilizers since the initial development of the industry.

T. V. A. has developed a number of devices and methods of producing concentrated phosphates. The materials produced by these processes have been shown by rigid scientific tests to be equivalent per unit of phosphorus to the low concentrated phosphates in common use. Large-scale electric furnace plants have been designed, built, and operated by T. V. A. to manufacture triple superphosphate (47 percent P_2O_5). A large-scale calcium metaphosphate (63 percent P_2O_5) plant has been developed and operated experimentally. A large-scale plant is now under construction for the manufacture of fused phosphate (28 percent P_2O_5). A process to produce potassium metaphosphate (35 percent K_2O and 55 percent P_2O_5) has been developed into the semiworks plant stage. The blast furnace process, now successfully developed by T. V. A. on a pilot-plant scale, is ready for commercial-size development. This process offers promise as an economic method for producing concentrated phosphates at locations where, unlike the Tennessee Valley and the Pacific

Northwest, large quantities of low-cost electricity are not now available.

The Nation needs the discoveries and improvements produced in this type of research and experimental production on a commercial scale. Only in this way can the public be assured of access to research and improved technology for fertilizer production. The Nation needs the improved products manufactured in its Government experimental plants from publicly owned deposits. Only in this way can farmers be assured of access to at least a limited quantity of materials produced through the most advanced methods and against which they can judge the effectiveness of the more conventional products they manufacture or buy.

5. The phosphate deposits of Florida and the Western States should be drawn upon for a larger part of the national requirement

The most important phosphate deposits of this country are found in Florida, the Rocky Mountain States, and in Tennessee. A national program to increase the production and supply of phosphatic fertilizers to meet the needs of the Nation's soils should draw upon each of these deposits as a primary source of supply for the agricultural areas each is best equipped to serve.

The Tennessee phosphate deposits are very small in comparison with those of Florida and the West. They are, however, strategically located as a source of supply to a large fertilizer consuming area in the humid region. Furthermore, the Tennessee Valley deposits have supplied almost all of the phosphorus required for military purposes during the current war.

We firmly believe it is inconsistent with the national interest to continue to exploit the Tennessee reserves to meet further increased demands in agricultural areas which might favorably be served from the larger deposits in Florida and the West. The additional capacity required should, therefore, utilize these larger deposits.

6. A Nation-wide cooperative test-demonstration farm program is needed to show the way to widespread use of mineral fertilizers and their relationship to other plant foods and soil fertility in systems of improved farm and soil management

The ability of farmers to use concentrated mineral fertilizers to improve their land, to integrate and to stabilize their farm business and thereby raise the general economic level of their community, will be determined in the last analysis by the farmers themselves. Individual farmers and groups of farmers must test fertilizer materials on individual farms and communities of farms, giving full recognition to economic and social factors pertinent to the individual farm and to the local community. Since conditions vary widely from region to region, from community to community, and from farm to farm, full effectiveness of the test-demonstration farm technique can be achieved only by reliance upon systematic field surveys, conducted by local institutions and agencies, to provide a basis for programs tailored to fit the needs of local areas and of farms having specific physical and economic characteristics.

Concentrated phosphatic fertilizer materials have been made available directly from the T. V. A. Muscle Shoals plant to farmers. These demonstrator farmers, individually and in groups, have utilized these materials, together with purchased materials, including other forms and ingredients, with the guidance of the State extension services and the county agents. Test demonstrations are being conducted on over 31,000 farms in 28 States, the more intensive program being conducted within the Tennessee Valley. These demonstrator farmers have proved to themselves and to many of their neighbors that they can use concentrated phosphates efficiently, obtain permanent improvement of their soil resources, and at the same time achieve substantial increases in the acre yields and quality of farm products.

The proven effectiveness of the test-demonstration method and the broad educational program which it makes possible indicates the desirability of extending it throughout the Nation at somewhat the same intensity as now carried on within the Tennessee Valley. This cannot be done unless and until adequate supplies of mineral fertilizers are available. We believe that at the appropriate time Congress may wish to consider making this national test-demonstration program a regular part of the cooperative relationship between the farmers, the various agricultural colleges, and the United States Department of Agriculture, with Federal responsibility in the program transferred from the T. V. A. to the Department outside of the Tennessee Valley area. Within the Tennessee Valley area the T. V. A. would continue to carry on cooperatively an intensified program of fertilizer tests and demonstrations and agricultural development as a part of its integrated regional program. Under this plan the T. V. A. would also continue to develop new products through research for testing on a Nation-wide basis. The Tennessee Valley region could thus become a pilot-plant area for the Nation-wide test-demonstration and expanded-production program.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 298) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. CRAWFORD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ANDREWS of New York, and Mr. SHORT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. BURTON conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Several nominations for promotion in the Foreign Service.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 15, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received March 14 (legislative day of March 12), 1945:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Charles R. Denny, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1944 (vice T. A. M. Craven).

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

COLORADO

Richard C. Caddell, Grand Lake Colo., in place of H. G. Hawkins, resigned.

IDAHO

Charles L. Burdett, McCall, Idaho, in place of Martha Hentley, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Adam P. Eaton, Allerton, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Daulton L. Rohde, Jr., Oakdale, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

INDIANA

Bynum L. Shepard, Elizabethtown, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

KANSAS

Lorraine C. Mills, Bunkerhill, Kans., in place of H. F. Mills, deceased.

KENTUCKY

William H. Vitatoe, Albany, Ky., in place of W. E. Ferguson, removed.

Violette G. Thomas, Owingsville, Ky., in place of Earl Rogers, resigned.

Katheryn E. Short, Van Lear, Ky., in place of V. L. Daniel, resigned.

MAINE

Sarah A. Gillis, Pembroke, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Frank Lee Whitney, Surry, Maine. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MICHIGAN

George J. Cobb, Saranac, Mich., in place of G. P. Adgate, transferred.

NEW YORK

Richard T. Stanton, Millbrook, N. Y., in place of R. P. Stanton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lydia L. Keil, Stuyvesant Falls, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OHIO

Everett D. Crumrine, La Fayette, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Pearl C. Brown Middlefield, Ohio, in place of G. E. Sperry, resigned.

Virginia Bagent, North Industry, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

OKLAHOMA

Clifford C. McKown, Maud, Okla., in place of G. A. Phillips, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

May N. Schultz, West Pittsburgh, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

WISCONSIN

George W. Rickeman, Helenville, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Gene F. Guay, Peshtigo, Wis., in place of D. G. Guay, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple; the precepts of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandments of the Lord are pure, enlightening the eyes; the fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever; the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold.

Heavenly Father, as we know Thy word, may we bear fruit and do Thy will, thus enlarging our sphere day by day. Herein is no waste of energy, no contagion of weariness or annoying temper, for life is enriched by the spirit of Thy truth. Whatever we aspire to, dear Lord, we pray to be serious, diligent, and humble, carrying burdens for the oppressed and winning victories for liberty and peace. O bless richly those quiet, uncomplaining souls who are waiting and praying for the return of their sons and daughters in the fierce battle lines. As across their hearts the tidal waves of sorrow sweep, O may they know—

"They live. In all the past
They live; nor to the last
Of seeing them again, I will not despair.
In dreams I see them now,
And on their angel brows
I see written: 'We shall meet again.'"

In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 293) entitled "An act to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WAGNER, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Federal Works Agency.
5. Office of Defense Transportation.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. Department of War.
6. National Archives.
7. Office of Price Administration.
8. Selective Service System.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

MOBILIZATION OF CIVILIAN MANPOWER

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 183 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table to the end that all Senate amendments be, and the same are, disagreed to and a conference is requested with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 39]

Anderson, Calif.	Chapman	Fellows
Baldwin, Md.	Clason	Fenton
Bates, Mass.	Combs	Fernandez
Bell	Dawson	Fuller
Boren	Dirksen	Gordon
Cannon, Fla.	Doyle	Hagen
Hébert	Eaton	Hancock
Hedrick	King	Sheridan
Heidinger	Luce	Sikes
Hobbs	McKenzie	Slaughter
Hope	Madden	Smith, Maine
Izac	Morrison	Starkey
Jennings	Mott	Stewart
Johnson, Luther A.	O'Toole	Taylor
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Patrick	Thom
Jones	Pfeifer	Weiss
Kearney	Philbin	West
	Robinson, Utah	White
	Rowan	Wood

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 339 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. McCORMACK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MOBILIZATION OF CIVILIAN MANPOWER

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 minutes, and later on I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. Speaker, the resolution now before us is brought about by the fact that on yesterday when unanimous consent was requested by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to send this manpower bill to conference, objection was made; consequently I felt it my duty to call an immediate meeting of the Rules Committee in the afternoon, at which meeting the Rules Committee agreed to report the rule now being considered, which will carry out the request made by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs on yesterday to send the bill to conference.

That is the usual procedure under the circumstances. I have received since yesterday more than 50 telephone calls to explain this situation and why I acted so hastily in calling a meeting of the Rules Committee to grant this rule.

I have always assured the House that I believe in expediting business and believe in orderly procedure. I felt then and I feel now that it was my duty to do and act as I have. The rule is before you, and the House will have its will. That is the intent, of course, of the Committee on Rules, on all matters that are submitted to the House.

I feel, and I am in honor bound to explain to the membership, that when the time will have been used up, 30 minutes on a side, that I shall move the previous question on the resolution and shall be constrained to yield for the offering of an amendment, whereupon, of course, if the previous question is defeated, many of you who are so anxious to have a vote on the Senate amendments, or to do anything that you may feel should be done in lieu of sending the bill to conference, will have your opportunity.

I, of course, am for the rule. I am in honor bound to vote for it. I feel that the Committee on Military Affairs has worked hard in preparing the bill. Some of the Members and those interested in the legislation claim that due to the hearings and deliberations of the House Committee on Military Affairs the Senate was the beneficiary of the House committee's work and had the opportunity of improving the House bill, making it less stringent and at the same time meeting the need for this legislation.

Of course I am against slackers and evaders and while we are at war I believe it is the duty and responsibility of all of us to serve the country in the best way we are able. However, I fear that the House bill goes unnecessarily a little too far and may cause discontent and needlessly incur the risk of criticism against such legislation. We know that not only labor but industrial and manufacturers' organizations, such as commerce associations, are on record against such stringent action.

There is a shortage of labor in the production plants to adequately supply our fighting forces, and certainly we must do everything in our power to keep them supplied. Many members of the Senate committee, as well as many of us here, feel that there is a great deal of labor being hoarded, and I believe that is undoubtedly true.

Mr. Speaker, the situation has improved and the conditions are not exactly the same as when the legislation was originally recommended and passed in the House. It is up to the membership to decide on the action it will take. All of you are conversant and well informed on the existing conditions and I know you will use your best judgment in casting your vote. As I have stated, I shall vote in favor of the previous question, believing that if the bill does go to conference the conferees may agree on a bill that will be more to the satisfaction of the Senate, the House, and the country than either the present House or Senate bill. Furthermore, if the conferees should fail to carry out the wishes and best judgment of the majority the House will have an opportunity to vote down the conferees' report, and may have the further opportunity to vote for the original Senate amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, all that this rule does is to send the May bill, with the Senate amendments, to conference; in other words, the rule provides that the unanimous consent request propounded by the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, to send this bill to conference, shall prevail—the only difference being that it will be done by vote, rather than unanimous consent. That is all there is to this resolution. Debate will continue for 1 hour, with 30 minutes on a side.

Then the chairman of the Committee on Rules will undoubtedly move the previous question. If the previous question is voted down, then the resolution, not the May bill, is opened up for amendment. Any germane amendment to the resolution will be in order. If the previous question is voted down and an amendment to the rule is offered, the person offering the amendment will be recognized for 1 hour. In other words, he will be in exactly the same position at that time as the chairman of the Committee on Rules is whenever a resolution or a rule of this type is presented by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If a Member is recognized and then yields to another Member, will not the Member to whom he yields be entitled to 1 hour also?

Mr. MICHENER. No. I think the later precedents are that the Member offering the amendment is recognized for an hour and that he may then yield time from his hour to others. We had a question here one day while Speaker Bankhead was in the chair when a number of Members were recognized. Then the point was raised that each one had an hour. Later the Speaker clarified this matter, so that now each Member so recognized must use his time before another is recognized.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then it would be necessary to move the previous question again after the Member who had been recognized by the Speaker had finished?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I think so.

Mr. EBERHARTER. So we would have that question up twice?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; you would have the previous question up twice, as I interpret the precedents.

I do not think the passage of the rule is controversial, but there are those who want to amend the rule. It is the form of the rule that is contested.

Mr. Speaker, when the May work-or-fight bill was before the House some weeks ago, its proponents stressed its immediate necessity. As we all know, that bill went to the Senate, where it has had a stormy career, extending over a period of weeks. The Senate amendments to which the May proponents in the House object have drawn the teeth of the bill so far as the employees are concerned, but rigid control is provided over the employer, and these controls are implemented by severe penalties to be imposed upon the employer, and largely in the discretion of Chairman McNutt's War Manpower Commission.

I voted to send the May bill on to the Senate and stated at the time that the final bill would be written in conference. I am convinced if any bill at all is enacted it will be accomplished through that process. Therefore, I naturally am loath to do anything that would prevent the conferees giving the usual study and consideration. However, if by voting down the previous question it is intended to give the conferees further information as to the present attitude of the House concerning the legislation, then I can see some merit in that suggestion. Voting down the previous question on a conference report is a very unusual procedure. It is not uncommon to attempt to vote down the previous question on a rule making a House bill in order. Be that as it may, the roll will finally be called, each Member will exercise his franchise, democratic processes will have operated, and the desire of the majority will control. Who can object to that?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the explanation by the gentleman from Michigan as to the parliamentary situation. I cannot quite go along with him on the proposition that this rule is not controversial because I think it is controversial. I hope at the proper time to offer an amendment to the rule.

The gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, has spoken of the regular procedures of the House. I have never been able definitely to determine what are the regular procedures except that I know that on some occasions extraordinary circumstances require that actions be taken within the rules of the House that are a little different from those ordinarily taken.

As has been pointed out, if the previous question is voted down, then it is in order to offer an amendment to the rule. I have such an amendment to the rule, which I will offer if the Speaker recognizes me for that purpose. As far as I am concerned, I do not feel myself duty bound to support this rule as it is written.

The amendment I will offer is in these words:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "table", strike out the balance of the resolution and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and the House shall immediately proceed to the consideration of said Senate amendments in the House."

If I should offer that amendment, then 1 hour's time is granted to me for debate. I can yield for purposes of debate for the period of the 1 hour and will so yield if we get that far along in the process. At the conclusion of that hour, it would be in order, if this amendment is offered, for me to move the previous question on the amendment to the resolution, and the resolution to final passage. If that should prevail, and the resolution as amended is then adopted, an amendment to the Senate amendment would be in order. It is my understanding and hope that if we should reach that stage of the matter, the amendment that was offered when we had this matter under consideration first—the Barrett-Harness substitute—would be offered as an amendment to the Senate amendment.

Now, what is this all about, apart from the procedural situation? The Committee on Military Affairs reported to the House the so-called May bill. That bill proceeded on the theory of compulsion applied to the individual worker. It provided for the freezing of millions of workers in essential industries. It provided for the ordering of men from one job to another, and provided for severe penalties on the workers. During the consideration of that measure, the Barrett-Harness substitute was offered. That substitute proceeded on a different theory. It proceeded on the theory of an extension of voluntary control. It provided for surveys of local situations. It provided for the determination of the hoarding of labor. It provided certain statutory controls to be vested in the War Manpower Commission. It had certain provisions having to do with War Manpower ceilings. That substitute was thoroughly debated. When it came on for a vote, the vote was 177 for that proposition, and 187 against it. In other words, on that occasion, and before the bill went to the other body, the House of Representatives almost adopted the Barrett-Harness substitute, which proceeded on this different theory with these different provisions.

Then, what happened? The May bill was adopted by the House. It went to the other body, where it was considered; and, as I understand the situation, there never was at any time really serious consideration given by anything like a majority in the other body to the compulsory theory of the May bill. On the contrary, they proceeded to adopt by a vote of 63 to 16 a measure which proceeds largely on the theory of the Barrett-Harness substitute. It goes further than the Barrett-Harness substitute in several ways, but principally because it provided vigorous penalties to be applied on employers under certain circumstances. I think possibly it is fair to say that some of the 16 who were recorded against the 63 in the other body on that measure were voting against it, not because they preferred the May bill with its compulsory control of the individual worker, but rather because they did not like the penalties and other provisions in respect to employers.

What I am getting at is this: Why send to the other body for conference action, as will be done if the procedure I have spoken of here is not adopted, two bills so diametrically opposed in their approaches to this whole problem?

I do not believe it will avail anything to again go over the arguments pro and con on the May bill. We are all patriotic. We all want to give the fullest possible support to the armed forces. We want maximum production. We just honestly differ on how to get maximum production.

The May bill provides for compulsory control of the individual worker. The Senate bill has a diametrically opposite approach. My view is that that can result in nothing but a stalemate on this proposition.

Without regard to what anyone says or thinks of my personal position I happen to be one of those who want to see legislation on this very important matter. Hence I am advocating the procedure I am talking about now.

In other words, the Barrett-Harness substitute is very much in line with the theory and action taken in the other body. If we adopt the amendment to the rule, then we can proceed to a consideration of the Barrett-Harness substitute, assuming the Speaker would recognize the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS] or the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] to offer it as a substitute for the Senate bill. If it is so offered and the close vote of 187 to 177 should be followed by the majority in favor of the substitute, the measure as so amended would then be messaged to the Senate. It would be up to the Senate to concur in the action of the House amending the Senate bill, or to send the measure to conference. So that the whole thing, including the May bill, would be in conference with this different situation, that the conferees would then have the last expression of the House of Representatives in respect to the theory and general outline of legislation that they think should be adopted.

In the final analysis, the procedure I advocate will result in the House again having an opportunity to express its opinion on the theory of the Barrett-Harness substitute, which is much in line with the theory of the Senate amendment. If it is adopted then it will be up to the Senate to concur or to take the whole matter to conference. If it goes to conference, the conferees will know of the attitude of the House.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is it not a fact that if the previous question is voted down, then it will be in order to consider every Senate amendment to the House bill.

Mr. HALLECK. If the previous question is voted down, and the amendment to the rule which I propose to offer if recognized is adopted, then the House would proceed to a consideration of the Senate bill for amendment. The Senate bill struck out all after the enacting clause. An amendment would be in order to the Senate bill in the House, and I take it that the amendment I have referred to would be properly offered. It was held germane to the May bill. It certainly would be held germane to the Senate amendment, which is more nearly in line with the underlying theory and effect of the Barrett-Harness amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Then the amendment which would be offered would also be subject to amendment?

Mr. HALLECK. No. The gentleman who would offer the amendment would be recognized for 1 hour. He could yield for purposes of debate to other Members who might want to speak, but at the conclusion of the hour if he moved the previous question on his amendment and the Senate amendment to final passage, then the vote would come on the amendment to the Senate amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You would cut off all other amendments to the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Indiana 2 additional minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to ask whether or not, as a matter of fact, the bill finally enacted by the Senate was not more like the substitute which I offered in the House than any other measure which the House had to consider?

Mr. HALLECK. Well, I do not think so. The gentleman may feel that it is. I do not believe that it is. I have read the Senate bill and I was present when the gentleman's amendment was debated. I listened to the arguments, pro and con. I would not undertake to say I am an expert about that, but I am convinced that if the action is taken which I have here outlined this matter will ultimately come on in conference for action that I believe will result in legislation.

Some Members may think that with the attitude in the other body such as it is, the bill passed by the House will be accepted and adopted. I do not believe so; I think if it hinges on that proposition there will be no legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. When the gentleman offers his amendment to the rule, will it be amendable?

Mr. HALLECK. No; it is not amendable. I will yield for purposes of debate and then the vote will come on the amendment.

I now yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that if the previous question is voted down a motion to agree to the Senate amendments will be a preferential motion and take precedence over the gentleman's motion?

Mr. HALLECK. I do not think so.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I believe the gentleman stated the parliamentary situation correctly: If the previous question is voted down and the gentleman from Indiana is recognized, he will have 1 hour and will be in exactly the same position in reference to this resolution as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] was when the rule was called up today; he will be in control. He can move the previous question at any time or use his hour in debate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the statement made by my friend from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] clearly shows the soundness of the custom and practice that has existed in the House from time immemorial of sending a bill to conference where there is a disagreement between the two branches, for the purpose of having the conferees on the part of both branches iron out the differences that exist between the two.

Many Members think the Senate bill can come before the House for a vote. The gentleman from Indiana has clearly stated that that is not the intention. The bill they intend to bring before the House is the Barrett bill, the voluntary bill. On the one hand we voted to compel young men to fight and die for our country, yet on the other on the home front we want to leave it voluntary, resting with the individual, as to whether or not he wants to cooperate by going into defense plants to produce weapons of war, to produce the weapons needed by the young men who are doing our fighting.

I hope the House will follow custom; I hope the House will send the bill to conference. That is what we do on all measures.

The gentleman from Indiana says this is an unusual legislative resort. We are all agreed that it is. I am sorry to see my friend from Indiana, one of the recognized leaders of the minority party in the House today, taking this position, because the wheel of fortune changes and he would be establishing a precedent that might come back to plague him at

some future day, for with a turn of the political wheel of fortune the Democratic Party might become the minority. Then they could say that on such and such a date one of the recognized leaders of the then minority party, the Republican, in the House resorted to this very legislative procedure, when the then Republican leaders urged that a bill go to conference.

We are asking nothing but what has been done for 152 years. It will be an open and a free conference. I hope the previous question will be ordered, the resolution adopted, and the bill sent to conference.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of this distinguished body for 15 years. I have watched the RECORD pretty carefully, and I have never before witnessed a proceeding like this. I never dreamed it would happen in the middle of the worst war in all recorded history. I am sure that when the record is available, our fighting men on Iwo Jima and along the Rhine River will have a poor opinion of their Congress. I have never heard so many alibis in my life. I have never known such a resort to technicalities or parliamentary juggling. Why not stand up like men and face the issue? This is not a question of the merits or demerits of either the House or the Senate bill. That has nothing in the world to do with the question now before us. The question is whether or not this body will follow its custom and its precedents, as the majority leader said, of probably 100 years and let the bill go to free conference. If that conference can agree and bring a report back here, you have a right to vote it up or down, as you please, and if you do not like it, you can instruct the conferees what you want done. You have lost none of your rights. The House will have voiced its will and the majority will prevail.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] says it is a question, on the one hand, of whether the many thousands of men in the country who are not now doing any kind of war work shall be required to render useful service or shall we leave it to them to volunteer or do as they wish. That is not the way we handled the boys in the Army and Navy. Uncle Sam has touched 12,000,000 American boys on the shoulder and told them to get into the uniform and go to every fighting front in the world. Then the Commander in Chief of our Army 3 months ago and again last week, after the other body passed its bill, said that the House bill is more important now than ever. The drive in Germany, the drive on Iwo Jima and many other hot spots is now on. We must have 900,000 more men in the Army and Navy and 700,000 more men in industry by the 1st of July. That is the solemn word of General Marshall and Admiral King. There are only 570,000 men available through selective service, which leaves 1,030,000 men that have to be procured from some source.

Do you mean to tell me that by some parliamentary hocus-pocus, legerdemain, or alibi we can break the precedents of 100 years and not permit this body to follow the usual, orderly course and let this bill go to conference so that we can make an honest effort to bring back something that will meet this tragic situation?

I beg of you not to vote down the previous question, so that our friends on the majority side would be forced to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, a member of the minority, in order that he may have an hour's time to fight a bill that General Marshall, Admiral King, Under Secretary of War Patterson, Under Secretary of the Navy Bard, Mr. Krug, of the War Production Board, Marvin Jones, of the War Food Administration, and every other man in high authority has said is essential to our military success. There is not one of us who does not know there are many men throughout the country who ought to be doing something for the war effort. We drafted the boys to fight, yet some now propose to leave all the others on the home front to volunteer for war work, which many have not done. When they fail and refuse legislation is the only recourse. And I am not referring just to pool-hall players and night-clubbers. This is an all-out war and every man must do his part.

Our parliamentary proceedings and buck-passing today will not read well to the boys in the trenches and fox holes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Is it not true that the last communication from the Commander in Chief was to the majority leader in the other body and it stated, "Get the best bill you can"?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; and that is our duty. That is the very thing I am trying to do. Let this bill go to conference, let your representatives, your conferees, and the Senate conferees make an honest effort to bring back here a bill that will get the job done.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can assure the gentleman that the Commander in Chief prefers the House bill to the Senate bill. I know, I was present.

Mr. THOMASON. I also know that for I was present at the White House conference. I feel very keenly about this proposition. It is a grave problem and demands immediate solution. I sat with the Committee on Military Affairs for more than a month and I heard all our military leaders testify. I challenge you to name any man in high authority in the war effort who will not say that the House bill is necessary. This, my friends, is "must" legislation. The record will show I am a friend of labor. I am also friendly to industry. That is not the question here today. We are thinking of the welfare of our country. We are thinking of our fighting boys. The casualties now reach almost a million. Over 500,000 of them lie sick or wounded in hospitals all over the world. There must be replacements. How are you going to meet the situation? It cannot be done by messing around with a lot of dilatory tactics in a studied effort to defeat any kind of legislation. At least, give the conferees an opportunity to try to work out something. If you defeat this rule I predict you will set a precedent that will haunt you for years.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement containing facts and data regarding the manpower issue.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it is necessary to go into great length today in arguing this proposition. I think everyone here knows how they are going to vote, provided they understand the legislative situation, and I believe that has been made quite clear now.

So far as the Senate bill is concerned, every important provision in the so-called Kilgore bill has been tried again and again, and in each and every instance it has been found futile and ineffective. It adds no new sanction to those already tried and found useless because it places pressure only on employers who have no control over the individual workers. The ceilings on employment merely give authority to discharge workers; not to place them where they are needed.

Notwithstanding the sanctions against employers, in nearly 200 labor shortage areas comprising nearly every large industrial area in the United States, war production has tended to decrease rather than increase. The Senate committee Kilgore bill will not change this. Also, this bill has no provisions for any effective control of absenteeism, labor turnover, or quitting war jobs for nonessential occupations. Arbitrarily discharged workers do not readily heed persuasion or exhortation. And the employment ceilings that are proposed are more arbitrary and even cruel than anything thus far suggested.

The gentleman from Indiana, in referring to the situation today, pointed out that the provisions of the so-called Harness-Barrett proposals were almost in line with the Senate provisions in theory. That is correct. Both provisions are merely another case of "let linger and wait." While the vote on the so-called Harness-Barrett amendment in the House was close, it was not a full vote of the membership. We all know what is in the May bill.

It has been asked during the Senate consideration of this measure, "Why do we need this legislation; the war with Germany is almost over?" I make no predictions as to when that day will come, but if and when it does come, that is the day when we need the provisions of the May bill more than on any other day, because that is the day when the employees are going to leave plant after

plant unless there is a provision to freeze them.

May I say this in conclusion? If there is any one day of the many days we have had in this House when we are going to support the boys on Iwo Jima, in the Pacific, and in the Rhineland, and the wounded men coming home, as well as their families, this is the day to do it. There are going to be some votes in favor of the rule on the Republican side.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Then why not make that the issue and admit that this legislation is simply wanted to further regiment our people when the emergency is over, and that it is not now needed in order to win the war as has been argued all the way through this debate by members of the Military Affairs Committee?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. We need it more than ever when the war is over.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As far as I am concerned. I know what the gentleman's position is with respect to the May bill. Having regard for the desirability of increased production in which we all believe he supported the May bill. Some Members did not. But we have all heard those arguments.

The issue here is what shall the present action of the House be?

As far as that is concerned, I have not been here very long, but in my time I once sought to bring about the voting down of the previous question on a rule and succeeded in getting it done, and the rule was amended.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, when the manpower bill was under consideration in the House I offered a substitute for it. I think I am correct in saying that that substitute formed the basis of the Senate committee's consideration of this measure and the bill the Senate finally passed. While I like my own substitute somewhat better than I do the bill finally passed by the Senate, I honestly believe that if we want quick and effective action, if we want to improve upon the machinery already in effect and already having the support of management and labor throughout the Nation, adoption now of the Senate bill is the quickest way to get it. I am afraid that if this bill goes to conference a long-drawn-out conference will ensue. I wish the House could today agree with the Senate and get a bill enacted into law which does have additional sanctions over what we have now, and which I believe will be effective. My position is very simple. The Senate bill is almost the same measure that I advocated in the House. I want to secure an opportunity to offer a motion to concur with the Senate. If such a motion were to pass the House action on manpower legislation would have been completed and we could get on with the job of war production more quickly and effectively than can be done through the process of a long conference attempting to reconcile two such different measures. Furthermore, of course, I still believe the approach to the problem of the Senate bill is better and will yield quicker results than the House bill.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the orderly thing to do is to let this bill go to conference in order that we may get the benefit of the discussion that inevitably will result from a meeting of the two committees of the two Houses. The proposal here today is to accept a substitute bill that has passed the Senate without ever having the benefit of any committee discussion and to do that, too, without the Members of this House knowing what is in that bill.

The statement has been made here this morning that the bill as passed by the Senate is substantially the Harness-Barrett substitute. I say to you, and I challenge anyone to deny this, that it is not substantially the same. It is different in many respects and it is different in substantial respects. There are very few Members on the floor of this House who know what is in that Senate bill. Certainly this House would profit and the other House would profit from an opportunity for the two committees of the two Houses to sit down and discuss this thing together and try to work out something.

To me it seems reasonable that a person who is opposed to the House bill ought at least to be willing to let this rule come out in order that the two committees may meet and discuss the matter. There never were any hearings on the Barrett-Harness substitute in the House Committee on Military Affairs. When the bill was under consideration on the floor of the House there was a great discussion of it without the Members having a real opportunity to sit down and analyze the various provisions of that bill. We have not had that opportunity yet. The committee of conference would be able to analyze both measures to see what is in them and to try to work out an agreement.

There is one provision in the Senate bill that, it seems to me, certainly should receive very careful consideration, and that is the imposition of penalties upon the employer. No penalties are imposed upon the employee. It is purely voluntary on one side, with a penalty imposed on the other. I do not know how it strikes you, but it seems to me that if you are going to use compulsion that compulsion should in all fairness be applied to both sides.

Certainly, following the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] when the war in Europe is over and we again get the jitters of peacetime reconversion, we may normally expect employees by the thousands and hundreds of thousands to get out of war plants and go looking for peacetime jobs again. Under the bill as it passed the Senate there is absolutely no control over those employees, nor is there any control over them at any time.

I say the thing we ought to do is follow the orderly procedure of sending this bill to conference.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that the sensible thing to do with this proposition is adopt the Senate amendments and have the matter finished. While we wrangle over this legislation we do nothing to contribute to the peace of mind of either labor or industry. If this bill is sent to conference it means more delay, more debates and more newspaper reports of confusion and turmoil, in the Federal Government.

Frequently we have heard advanced the argument that the administration fears a slackening of production when the war in Europe is at an end. This is advanced as one of the moving purposes, if not the all-important purpose behind the desire to have this bill enacted as it passed the House. Let me cite an example of how well the administrative officers of the Government are contributing to keeping men and women on the job. The Providence Journal last week carried a report of an interview with Admiral Vickery in which Admiral Vickery is quoted as having declared that the Walsh-Kaiser shipyard in Providence will be all done in July.

We all know the production of ships or other war material cannot go on indefinitely. There has to be an end, and in all honesty the sooner that end comes the better. However, it does not produce good feeling among the people working in war industries to tell them they are practically out of a job. Admiral Vickery points to the fact that there are now 100,000 less working in shipyards than there were a year ago, and the number is still going down.

Why, then, is there the great demand for this legislation, at this late date? If it was ever necessary it was necessary 4 years ago, not now. On the one hand we have the cry that we have to draft men for war plants, and on the other hand we have men being thrown out of work. An administrative officer of the Government, one thoroughly conversant with all the details of the program he is administering, tells people they had better be on the lookout for a good job if they have any sense, and at the same time we have national legislators clamoring for a work-or-else bill. How can we hope to obtain cooperation from labor or industry as long as we contribute to such confusion?

When it comes to planning for postwar employment there is terrific hesitancy—Members argue it is wrong to spend money for such planning—yet we know as a positive fact that men and women face unemployment in the not far distant future unless we do something about it. Instead of that we stand here preaching that they must be drafted for war work. We tell them by indirection that the job they have done thus far is far from satisfactory, that they have failed in their promise

to produce and they must, therefore, be forced into war work.

By the time this law gets on the books, in whatever form it finally emerges, the armed forces will be preparing to shift their weight to the Pacific, and all our energies will be concentrated on finishing that dirty business. If you have confidence in our fighting men—if you believe in them—how can you think this legislation will accomplish anything?

It will be just one more element of confusion in the already too confused manpower picture. You will be throwing another log on the fire of anger that burns in everyone's mind when he thinks of the almost hopeless conglomeration of legislation, directives, rules and procedures that make up the Government's labor policy.

If this ever was a good idea, it is much too late now to have any effect and I am for getting it over with today. I shall vote against the rule and I trust you will do the same.

The House considered it, held hearings on it, listened to all sorts of testimony, debated and argued it. The Senate went through the same rigmarole. Now it is proposed to send it to conference for more argument and debate and discussion.

It is my belief the sooner we are through with this business the better off we will be.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending all the sessions on the work bill a year ago in the Committee on Military Affairs, and again this year. There are many things lacking in the Senate bill, and there are some things lacking in the House bill. I, for one, hope that this bill goes to conference, because that is the proper place to give the study which I think is necessary on this piece of legislation, and to bring about some adjustment on these two bills. I do not want to be put in the position of voting for one bill as against the other, when I think we need part of each of them. It is up to the conference committee to approach the House and Senate bills in a spirit of reconciling them and bringing out of them a better balanced piece of legislation. I have given a lot of thought to this matter. I have not had a chance yet to thoroughly examine the Senate measure, but it strikes me that it is exceptionally weak in that it excuses from all work a man who is well-to-do and does not have to work. It excuses him from doing anything at the very time we may need him most; and I refer to the time when Germany collapses, when there will be a general exodus from the essential war production plants. We had better have some degree of control at that time if we are going to do an efficient job of licking the Japs.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we have heard the arguments for the May bill over and over again. We have been asked to believe that labor conscription is the only real solution of our increasingly serious manpower shortages. We have been told that merely because we drafted 12,000,000 men for military service, we now should conscript the civilian labor forces which must support and sustain these fighting men.

I certainly would insist upon labor conscription just as vigorously as any proponent of the May bill if I believed that were the only way, or even the best way, to guarantee the high production rates which will hasten victory and save lives. I completely agree that if we have the power to draft men to fight and die for their country, we can draft others to work for it. But I am impatient with the purely academic argument that we ought to draft labor merely because we draft fighting men. This is no mere question of academic justice. This is a question of keeping the stuff rolling in increasing volume to the fighting fronts.

If a labor draft is not the best answer to that question, if it is unnecessary or unwise, we would actually be failing our fighting men by authorizing labor conscription. We would actually be writing a bill to give Government dictatorial power to enslave American labor at the very time our armed forces are fighting to rid the world of dictatorship.

Proponents of labor conscription have failed to show that there is any actual over-all manpower shortage in America. True, we all know there are critical shortages in certain industries and industrial areas. But about all we have definitely learned in these debates to date is that faulty leadership, planning, and contract distribution have led to deplorable labor wastage and actual idleness in many areas and industries at the very same time that we are suffering serious shortages in others. How this absolute power over American labor is to cure these basic faults and weaknesses, no one attempts to explain.

I sat in the committee and listened to the testimony of management and labor, which have done a miraculous job in producing implements of war. When those men tell us that labor conscription will do more harm than good, I think their advice on the question is better than the opinion of the people who champion this legislation.

We are told we should authorize labor conscription, not because we need it now, but because it will be necessary when Germany is defeated, because war workers will leave their jobs and seek peacetime jobs. Where, please tell me, can these optimists find peacetime jobs as long as the War Production Board can deprive any industry from going into civilian production until the war is over? There is no point nor merit in that argument. Now, what we propose here is not to violate the rules of the House but to proceed under those rules. I feel that the House of Representatives has not only the right but the duty to act upon the question in this manner if it can serve the national interest in so doing.

As my colleague the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] mentioned earlier, the previous vote on the Barrett-Harness amendment indicated a clear division of opinion on this question. This body indicated its real doubt then that the bludgeon of labor conscription is any real solution to the problem we are now facing. Subsequently the Senate, after prolonged debate, has followed the conclusions of the very strong House minority and has completely rejected the labor-conscription philosophy of the original May bill. The bill which the Senate has sent to us here, in fact, fully embraces the fundamentals of the amendment which it was my privilege to offer this body 6 weeks ago. Why should we not at this point, therefore, recognize that the overwhelming majority of the Senate expresses the original views of this body?

There is precedent for this procedure, and I feel that it is entirely proper here. I urge that we amend the rule, which, if amended, makes in order the amendment which has been suggested to the Senate amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The suggestion has been made of the desirability of getting this measure to conference. I would like to point out again, as I attempted to make plain when I first spoke, that if the procedure which we here advocate today is adopted, this matter can go to conference this afternoon, assuming action to be taken in the other body. In other words, it is not a delaying action. It is simply a matter of permitting the House to register its voice today in the light of developments, in the light of the bill adopted in the other body, and all of the circumstances surrounding the situation.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Of course, it will expedite consideration. It will give the conferees some idea about how we feel on this legislation. If it was almost evenly divided 6 weeks ago, certainly there must be some difference of opinion now after the Senate debated this bill for 2 or 3 weeks and by an overwhelming vote passed a bill that follows the same underlying principles as our bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. It is obvious that the House does not want the Senate bill any more than the Senate wants the House bill. Personally I want none of either one of them. My position is identical with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]; I see no necessity for this legislation, and from the hundreds of letters I have received the American people do not want it. If we do vote down the previous question on the rule, perhaps we could adopt the Barrett amendment upon which both the House and Senate could agree, but certainly we are not going to agree on either the Senate bill or the House bill that has already been passed.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Of course, I think the Members of the House know exactly how I feel on the legislation. As I said in the beginning, I have not changed my opinion. I am sure we need no legislation on the subject, but I am willing to compromise on the voluntary

approach to this situation, as provided in the Barrett bill.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. RAMSPECK. If what the gentleman from Indiana says is true, the object is to send this bill to conference, then what he is really trying to do is to get a conference between the Barrett-Harness substitute and the Senate bill, instead of between the May bill and the Senate bill.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Why should we not do it? Both Houses have expressed themselves on that approach to it.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. Has the gentleman read the newspaper stories about the Senate investigating committee finding that labor in Detroit is not employed; that they have a surplus of labor?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Oh, yes.

Mr. VURSELL. The Barrett-Harness bill seeks to stop that hoarding of labor and is the only bill that does.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is right. I want to call attention to this thing, that I think is vitally important to the May bill: That bill proposes, as the proponents of the bill have argued and urged, to reach out and get some of these pool-room slackers and put them into war work. While they are getting those fellows they are putting the shackles on several million patriotic workers who have done a marvelous job in industry.

When we talk about this pitiful fringe of slackers, who at the most are only a negligible factor in this problem, let me reemphasize the fact that no finger is being pointed at that vast majority of thoroughly patriotic and loyal men whose personal misfortunes have caused them to be classified as IV–F, but who have found other ways than military service to contribute to our total war effort. I am sure that even the most ardent advocates of labor conscription intend no reflection upon this particular classification, even though they would throw millions of patriotic American workmen into slave labor battalions merely to get their hands on a comparatively few traitors and slackers.

The principal point to remember in this connection is that these supporters of the May bill actually propose in this current issue to reward the slackers and shirkers. Although millions of workers have previously paid their own ways to war jobs, the May bill would pay the slacker, who stayed home until compelled to go to a war job by this legislation, his transportation to and from home. How will that go with our patriotic war workers? But that is not all, by any means. The May bill is going to give these shirkers who are finally forced into a war job by compulsion all the rights which a combat man received under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act. How will our combat men feel about that?

Just exactly as we would expect them to feel. Millions of decent Americans on war jobs long before this problem came up here are also going to feel exactly as you and I would feel if we were to see our slacker and shirker neighbors getting fancy bonuses for their slackerism. When a combat veteran asks you why this slacker on the home front rates the same recognition and reward he receives, I hope you will be able to report that you opposed this May bill, or that you have figured a way to explain this rank discrimination which will mollify that boy in uniform.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned about what I see going on here this morning on the floor of this House. I think it is very well, therefore, to take just a few moments' inventory to find out where we are and what our objective is.

To begin with, the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the Army, the gentleman whom a good many people over on this side of the aisle always follow on domestic issues, requested a national service act. As a result the House Military Affairs Committee brought out a limited national service act, and a very limited one at that. It passed the House and went to the Senate; and, choosing my words, that body further weakened the effort that had been put forth here in the House. That body labored for many weeks and brought forth a little eyewash, not a bill, to meet the objective. And even this morning what do we have here? There are evidences of a coalition against sending the bill to conference. We hear about some unholy alliances around here sometimes, but this morning it would appear that we have an unholy alliance among certain leaders over here on the minority side and certain gentlemen over here on the majority side, who ordinarily follow the Commander in Chief on domestic issues, who would defeat even the time-honored custom of sending this bill to conference.

I do not know what your thought may be; I have but one thought about fighting this war, and that is that the laboring man is just as essential a part of winning this war as the man who wears the uniform and fires a gun. By the same token the responsibility of the one to his country is just as great as the responsibility of the other.

I see in the gallery of the House this morning hundreds of men in the uniform of their country. How did they get in that uniform? Because this House of Representatives and the other body drafted them into the armed services. Was that enslavement? I ask the gentleman from Indiana. All we are asking here is to send this bill to conference. God knows it is going to be weak enough when it comes out; we are not going to get what the Commander in Chief asks for; we are not going to get an adequate bill to meet this manpower situation. We are not going to give the boys on the firing line the support we should. I want the Members who are scheming and planning to defeat sending this bill to conference to just stop and remember what is going on on Iwo Jima this morning. I want them to get a vision of our men dying out there because they have to use a blowtorch to kill the last Jap on that island.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that this House does not fully realize the gravity of the situation with which we are confronted today. Does this Congress, which placed these boys who are dying upon the battle fronts of the world in the uniform of their country, seriously talk about enslaving some civilian workers because it is proposed that they stay on the job of furnishing the munitions of war? Does this House want to send a message to these boys today to the effect that it is all right for them to fight and die in the slime and mud of Europe and Asia but that it is all wrong to talk about compelling the people on the home front, surrounded with the luxuries of civilization, to stay on the job? This war is going to be over over there and these boys are coming back. And they are going to come back and put the Nation's house in order when they find out what has been happening to them in their absence.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. CHELF. I just want to say that I am one of the veterans of this war who has put his uniform away in moth balls. I think that the gentleman is absolutely right. There is going to be a day of reckoning in this country when these 12,000,000 boys come marching back, and may I say this in addition: I do not know the reason why so many are objecting to this bill, yet I believe in my heart I know. I think that labor has something to do with it. Labor is all right, and I am not against the common man making a decent, livable wage earned by the sweat of his brow, yet I do think that the fear of labor has caused the Senate to pass this powder-puff bill. This House ought to vote for this bill because the President and our leaders of the armed forces have requested it. But be that as it may, if there are those who are voting against this bill because of political expediency, then may the Lord have mercy upon their political souls when those 12,000,000 brave lads come back to us. As I have stated previously, I repeat, if we can draft a man to fight, bleed, and die, we can draft him to work.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman for a very brilliant climax to my speech.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, let me open my remarks by saying that I am gravely concerned about the situation here today. It is a simple question, so simple, in my judgment, that we should not have wasted even the hour that we have been debating the matter. The only question involved is, Will the House of Representatives, after having enacted a bill, send it to conference in the customary way of dealing with legislation in order that we

may have a fair, free, and open conference by your representatives?

You ought to give us, as your managers, an opportunity to go and discuss it with the representatives of the Senate.

I want to respond for a minute to the remarks of my friend from Indiana who had the courage, if it is courage, to stand up here on the floor of the House and say that if this thing is as serious as it is urged to be, he would vote to enslave the American people in order to win this war. I would not do any such thing because it is not necessary, but I will vote to bring men who refuse to work back into the fold and see that they aid the men who are fighting for freedom on the battle fronts of the world.

When I was a school child, before I got out of the grades, I remember reading what the rule was at Plymouth in 1607 when they adopted the slogan, they adopted the law, if you please, that "the man who would not work should not eat." That was the rule of our first English ancestors; Pilgrims, if you please.

We have a Senate bill brought back to us here that is as different from the House bill as day is from night, and the gentlemen over here would offer the Barrett bill that if adopted would do what? Let me tell you what it would do. It would send the bill back to the Senate, and the Senate would then ask for a conference. We would then have to go to conference, which would involve another delay.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. In order to get the gentleman's reaction, may I say that Senator THOMAS of Utah was asked a question:

> We have great masses of people who are not employed at all, who are not now working. What is being done with respect to such people?
>
> Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The bill frankly does not touch the people who do not work except in the agricultural sections of the bill it reaches out to those in agriculture.

Mr. MAY. Yes, and I would like to say to the gentleman from Mississippi, I would like to say to the men here who want to protect organized labor along with myself, that I voted for them ever since I have been in this House, except when the question of war or peace was involved. When they bend the other way I vote against them. But this bill does not do a thing in the world except authorize the Chairman of the Manpower Commission to regiment and browbeat the men that work. Some call it a work bill. I do not know what to call it. The bill that I want will reach the men that will not work and that are not at work, and it will protect those who are already at work. We have heard argument after argument, and it has been argued in committee and out of committee, on the floor and in the Senate, that we have done the greatest job in all history. Everybody knows that we have, and everybody knows that without organized labor we never could have done it. Everybody knows that the workers in the plants have done their duty. It is not those men that we are after. We are after the men that are loafing in the poolrooms and on the highways. Yet they put a penalty provision in this bill applicable only to the employers. They do not even give Mr. McNutt the power to deal with the workers that are in the plants, except by fixing ceilings, and that means if a plant has a thousand men, and the Manpower Commission thinks he only needs 500, he can fire 500 of them and put them out of a job to ramble over the country.

That is all it means, and that is everything there is to it. I believe you gentlemen of this great body will let this measure proceed in the usual way to conference.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, on his earnest and splendid effort on behalf of this bill, and I regret the passing remarks made by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], with respect to some unholy alliances.

If the gentleman had made the speech when we were considering the Commodity Credit Corporation bill perhaps there might have been some justification for those remarks, but certainly there is no justification now for such intimation unless it was intended as merely facetious.

May I also say to my good friend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHELF] that there is no need for any fear on the part of any Member of this House regarding those of whom he speaks of having mercy upon their souls. This membership has been patriotic, honest, and has been inclined to do its duty to the best of its ability and judgment, and I feel there is no justification for any veiled threats as to what will happen when the boys come back. I have heard that remark several times in the past.

I feel that when our brave men return they, the same as the vast majority of our citizens at home, will acclaim and approve our service in their behalf and as being in the interests of our Nation. The members have the right to follow the dictates of their consciences and their hearts. Certainly a Member always has a right to his own views and opinions and to exercise his God-given judgment and vote the way he in his own heart believes to be true.

Personally, I welcome just criticism but I resent the unfair and unjust criticism to which the Congress has been subjected by certain writers and persons who, unfortunately, love to criticize and find fault and fail to give credit for real accomplishments. And especially do I feel that Members themselves should not be guilty of casting aspersions upon the actions of Congress, particularly when it is bigoted and expressed by those who love and live on unfair criticism and mud slinging.

We have heard expressions of unholy alliances here before from time to time but notwithstanding that fact I think the Members of this House are honest and sincere and desire to do the right thing.

I feel at times that we should be a little more careful and deliberate in our actions so that we may not be guilty of the same mistake made when we passed the Smith-Connally Act, which I opposed. In that connection I insert an editorial appearing in today's New York Times, as follows:

> This fantastic situation is all in strict accordance with the Smith-Connally Act, the so-called antistrike law which was adopted in June 1943 by the majority votes of both parties in both branches of Congress. Under this law the Government itself must take an official poll of the workers involved. The Government itself thus sanctions a strike vote and is in effect made a party to a wartime strike that could have the most disastrous consequences.
>
> This is the result of one of the stupidest pieces of legislation ever passed by Congress. Its sponsors have been too stubborn.

I hope that our action on this legislation will not be subject to such criticism.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. May I say as far as I am concerned that on this occasion as on all other occasions I am searching my own conscience and judgment as to what should be done. As far as I am concerned, I am not getting into any alliance except on that basis.

Mr. SABATH. I hope that applies to every Member.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 211, nays 177, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 40]

YEAS—211

Abernethy	Cox	Harless, Ariz.
Adams	Cravens	Harris
Allen, La.	Curley	Hart
Anderson, N. Mex.	D'Alesandro	Hays
Andrews, Ala.	Daughton, Va.	Hébert
Andrews, N. Y.	Davis	Hedrick
Angell	De Lacy	Heffernan
Baldwin, Md.	Delaney, James J.	Hendricks
Barden	Delaney, John J.	Herter
Barrett, Pa.	Dickstein	Heselton
Barry	Dingell	Hoch
Bates, Ky.	Domengeaux	Hoeven
Beckworth	Doughton, N. C.	Holmes, Mass.
Bell	Douglas, Ill.	Holmes, Wash.
Bennet, N. Y.	Drewry	Hope
Bland	Durham	Huber
Bloom	Earthman	Jarman
Bonner	Eberharter	Johnson, Calif.
Boykin	Elliott	Johnson, Okla.
Bradley, Pa.	Engle, Calif.	Judd
Brooks	Ervin	Kean
Brown, Ga.	Fallon	Kee
Bryson	Fernandez	Kefauver
Buckley	Fisher	Keogh
Bulwinkle	Flannagan	Kerr
Burch	Folger	Kilburn
Burgin	Forand	Kilday
Byrne, N. Y.	Gamble	King
Camp	Gathings	Kopplemann
Cannon, Fla.	Gibson	Lanham
Carlson	Gore	Latham
Carnahan	Gorski	Lea
Case, N. J.	Gossett	Lesinski
Case, S. Dak.	Granger	Link
Celler	Grant, Ala.	Lyle
Chelf	Gregory	Lynch
Clark	Gwynne, Iowa	McCormack
Clements	Hale	McGehee
Cochran	Hall, Leonard W.	Mahon
Cole, N. Y.	Hancock	Maloney
Colmer	Hand	Manasco
Cooley	Hare	Mansfield, Mont.
Cooper		Mansfield, Tex.
Courtney		Marcantonio

Martin, Iowa	Randolph	Sullivan
May	Rankin	Sumners, Tex.
Mills	Rayfiel	Sundstrom
Monroney	Resa	Taber
Morrison	Richards	Tarver
Mundt	Riley	Thomas, N. J.
Murdock	Rivers	Thomason
Murphy	Robertson, Va.	Tolan
Murray, Tenn.	Roe, Md.	Torrens
Norrell	Roe, N. Y.	Towe
Norton	Rogers, Fla.	Trimble
O'Brien, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.	Vinson
O'Neal	Rooney	Wadsworth
Pace	Rowan	Walter
Patman	Russell	Wasielewski
Peterson, Fla.	Ryter	Weaver
Peterson, Ga.	Sabath	White
Pickett	Sasscer	Whitten
Plumley	Scrivner	Whittington
Poage	Sheppard	Wickersham
Price, Fla.	Smith, Va.	Wigglesworth
Priest	Snyder	Winstead
Quinn, N. Y.	Somers, N. Y.	Winter
Rabaut	Sparkman	Woodhouse
Rabin	Spence	Woodrum, Va.
Rains	Stigler	Worley
Ramspeck	Stockman	Zimmerman

NAYS—177

Andersen, H. Carl	Gillespie	Miller, Nebr.
	Gillette	Morgan
Andresen, August H.	Gillie	Murray, Wis.
	Goodwin	Neely
Arends	Graham	O'Brien, Mich.
Arno'd	Granahan	O'Hara
Auchincloss	Grant, Ind.	O'Konski
Bailey	Green	Outland
Barrett, Wyo.	Griffiths	Patterson
Beall	Gross	Philbin
Bender	Gwinn, N. Y.	Phillips
Bennett, Mo.	Hall,	Pittenger
Biemiller	Edwin Arthur	Ploeser
Bishop	Halleck	Powell
Blackney	Harness, Ind.	Powers
Bolton	Hartley	Price, Ill.
Bradley, Mich.	Havenner	Ramey
Brehm	Healy	Reece, Tenn.
Brown, Ohio	Henry	Reed, Ill.
Brumbaugh	Hess	Reed, N. Y.
Buck	Hill	Rees, Kans.
Buffett	Hinshaw	Rich
Bunker	Hoffman	Rizley
Butler	Holifield	Robertson, N. Dak.
Byrnes, Wis.	Hook	
Campbell	Horan	Robsion, Ky.
Canfield	Howell	Rockwell
Cannon, Mo.	Hull	Rodgers, Pa.
Chenoweth	Jackson	Rogers, N. Y.
Chiperfield	Jenkins	Sadowski
Church	Jennings	Savage
Clevenger	Jensen	Schwabe, Mo.
Coffee	Johnson, Ill.	Schwabe, Okla.
Cole, Kans.	Johnson, Ind.	Shafer
Cole, Mo.	Jones	Sharp
Corbett	Jonkman	Short
Crawford	Keefe	Simpson, Ill.
Crosser	Kelley, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.
Cunningham	Kelly, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Curtis	Kinzer	Smith, Wis.
Dolliver	Kirwan	Springer
Dondero	Knutson	Stefan
Douglas, Calif.	Kunkel	Stevenson
Doyle	LaFollette	Sumner, Ill.
Dworshak	Landis	Talbot
Ellis	Lane	Talle
Ellsworth	Larcade	Thomas, Tex.
Elsaesser	LeFevre	Tibbott
Elston	Lemke	Traynor
Engel, Mich.	Lewis	Voorhis, Calif.
Feighan	Ludlow	Vorys, Ohio
Fellows	McConnell	Vursell
Fenton	McCowen	Weichel
Flood	McDonough	Welch
Fogarty	McGlinchey	Wilson
Gallagher	McGregor	Wolcott
Gavin	McMillen, Ill.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gearhart	Martin, Mass.	Wolverton, N. J.
Geelan	Mason	Woodruff, Mich.
Gerlach	Michener	
Gifford	Miller, Calif.	

NOT VOTING—44

Allen, Ill.	Fulton	LeCompte
Anderson, Calif.	Gardner	Luce
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gordon	McKenzie
Bates, Mass.	Hagen	McMillan, S. C.
Boren	Heidinger	Madden
Chapman	Hobbs	Merrow
Clason	Izac	Mott
Combs	Johnson,	O'Toole
Dawson	Luther A.	Patrick
Dirksen	Johnson,	Pfeifer
Eaton	Lyndon B.	Robinson, Utah
Fuller	Kearney	Sheridan
Sikes	Stewart	West
Slaughter	Taylor	Wood
Smith, Maine	Thom	
Starkey	Weiss	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Luce for, with Mrs. Smith of Maine against.

General pairs:

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Luther A. Johnson with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Madden with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Anderson of California
Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Combs with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Weiss with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Heidinger.

Mr. LESINSKI changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Messrs. MAY, THOMASON, BROOKS, ANDREWS of New York, and SHORT.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 298) to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, increase its borrowing power, revise the basis of the annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Messrs. SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, PATMAN, WOLCOTT, and CRAWFORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I expect to make on the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill and include a copy of a bill which I have today introduced relating to veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include an editorial in each.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] on March 12, 1945.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by prominent Americans, together with their signatures, supporting the stand of the War Department on the subject of loyalty tests.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he recently delivered before the chamber of commerce at Gardner, Mass.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expected to make later today in the Committee of the Whole, and include certain portions of tables and other extraneous matter.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a broadcast overseas made for him.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution by the poultry section of the Farm Bureau Federation of Los Angeles County.

GOVERNOR DEWEY KEEPS POLITICAL PLEDGES

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to draw this body's attention to an outstanding political figure in the United States, who, strangely enough, in these days, keeps his political pledges. Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, pledged in the following words:

> We shall establish a fair-employment practices commission as a permanent function, and authorized by law.

Unlike many political figures, Governor Dewey meant his promises, and only recently in New York signed an antibias law which through his efforts was overwhelmingly passed, creating a commission in New York State similar to the F. E. P. C.

We must remember, we Republicans, that that was not Governor Dewey's individual pledge alone which he so nobly fulfilled, but we in our platform pledged to create a permanent F. E. P. C. I, as an ardent Republican, shall do my utmost to see that the Republican Party carries out its promise.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND THE FEDERAL LOAN AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2603) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and the Federal Loan Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill continue during the remainder of the day and not to exceed 2 hours tomorrow, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] and myself.

Mr. STEFAN. That is perfectly satisfactory, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2603, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we bring before the Committee today the appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Federal judiciary and the Federal loan agency known as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

While the total amount in this bill is approximately $259,000,000, it does not seem large in comparison with other appropriations that are passed by this Committee. Nevertheless it is a huge sum, involving many items of appropriation and calling for extensive hearings, which hearings were started on January 16. I would be remiss in my position today as chairman of the subcommittee were I to fail to pay proper tribute to the devotion of my colleagues for their attention and interest during the committee hearings. Their records and long membership in the House for the most part are well known to the Committee. This subcommittee is composed of Messrs. KERR, HARE, O'BRIEN of Illinois, STEFAN, JONES, and the new member, DEAN M. GILLESPIE. All members took a very decided interest in the bill and I could very properly refer to the committee as a well coordinated team. I know that the committee individually and collectively would endorse my full appraisal for the work of our executive secretary, Russ Orescan. It can be said of him that he measured neither time nor effort in his devotion to his task.

In order to give the Committee an accurate picture of the appropriations for these departments I would like to refer you to page 2 of the committee report wherein it will be noted that the amount of the war overtime appropriation for the current fiscal year is not included in the fiscal year 1946 estimates and has been deducted for comparative purposes; that the amount recommended when compared with the current year's appropriation reflects an increase of something over $23,000,000. The deductions effected by the committee total approximately $13,500,000 under the Budget estimates.

The committee was not unmindful of the present debt of the Nation resulting from the huge expenditures necessary for the war program and its sentiments in this regard are set forth in the report. The committee recognizes that this is not a partisan matter but is the concern of every Member of the House. However, it should be borne in mind that this appropriation is made to four of the old line agencies of the Government all of which have had their individual part to play in the war effort both directly and indirectly.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The amount of the increase that is being recommended for the Department of State is something over $24,000,000. Of this increase about $1,000,000 is for the departmental service in Washington and $21,500,000 for the maintenance of the Foreign Service organization abroad, which at the present time consists of 250 missions and consular offices. Provision was made in the First Supplementary Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1945 for the opening of 32 additional consular offices and the increase recommended for this Service is, in the main, to continue on a full-year basis the program already authorized for a part of the year

The cost of maintaining the State Department on a full-year basis according to the estimates as presented is less than it costs to wage war, as it is waged today, for approximately 8 hours. I should like to quote Mr. Grew:

> The Department of State, under the direction of the President and in close cooperation with the Congress, is responsible for the achievement of our foreign policy objectives. On several recent occasions the Secretary has outlined our major foreign policy objectives. They are:
>
> First. The fullest possible support in the conduct of our foreign relations for our armed forces so that the war may be won at the earliest possible moment;
>
> Second. Effective steps to prevent Germany and Japan, after victory by the United Nations, from again acquiring the power to wage aggressive war;
>
> Third. Establishment at the earliest possible moment of a United Nations organization capable of building and maintaining the peace for generations to come. Resolutions passed by both Houses of Congress support this policy. An overwhelming majority of the American people favor it.
>
> Our fourth objective is to promote a great expansion of our foreign trade and of productiveness of trade throughout the world so that we can maintain full employment in our own country and, together with the United Nations, enter an era of constantly expanding production and consumption and of rising standards of living.
>
> Fifth. Encouragement of all those conditions of international life favorable to the development by men and women everywhere of the institutions of a free and democratic way of life in accordance with their own customs and desires.
>
> The achievement of these objectives is a tremendous responsibility. Only the strongest possible Department of State can deal successfully with the many difficult problems that are involved.

I would like to repeat that for the membership of the House: The cost to maintain the State Department on the basis proposed for 1946 is a cost less than it costs today to wage war for 8 hours.

The State Department carries on when the Army and the Navy lay down their weapons. The walks they take with the diplomats of the other nations, their dealings in all the ramifications of national life, are the things that either hold for peace or make for war. So let us remember the State Department deserves a great consideration at the hands of the Congress.

The economic and commercial relationships of nations has definitely become a real function of the State Department and it was principally on the basis of these additional responsibilities that increases are being recommended.

The committee is also in accord with the philosophy of the Department, as reflected in the increased personnel requested for the Office of Public Affairs, better to inform the people of this Nation as to its foreign policies and thereby better fortify itself with the backing of public opinion which is so vital to effective international dealings. It has often been stated that this is the peoples' war and it should follow, no less, that we should have a peoples' peace. The present and proposed activities of the Foreign Service may be divided into four main classifications, namely, political, economic and commercial, consular and administrative, and public and cultural relations. It has become obvious during the past decade that mere political reporting on the part of our foreign representatives is not sufficient in this industrial and economic age. This reporting must cover all of the interrelated happenings and forces within a country, including of course, the commercial and economic. Furthermore, this country will no doubt embark upon an era of greatly expanded foreign trade. Accordingly, if this Government is to be of any assistance to the manufacturers and exporters of this Nation, it must be

in a position to supply all the information dealing with the economic life of the world, not only as between this country and the importing and exporting country, but also as between the trade activities between third countries.

The committee called to the attention of the Department the huge expenditures for telegrams and it suggests that the Department advise the various division heads in Washington as well as the field offices throughout the world of the amount of money that is being expended for this service yearly with a view toward reduction.

The House might be surprised to learn that in the total amount of something over $51,000,000 being recommended for the Foreign Service the amount of $16,000,000, an increase of $14,500,000 over 1945, is to provide financial assistance for the American nationals in the various internment camps in enemy occupied territory. At the time of the hearings it was testified that 26,000 individuals were so detained. During the fiscal year of 1945 there was available for this purpose the sum of $11,000,000 which amount included balances from the preceding year. The actual payments to these American nationals are being handled for us by the Swiss Government who in the years past purchased Chinese dollars on open markets at considerably less than official rates. The principal reason for the increase this year is due to the fact that the Japanese compelled the Swiss to purchase these dollars through the Yokohama specie bank at official rates which increased tremendously the cost of this service. These payments to internees are made in the way of loans, most of which the Department hopes to collect as the nationals are released and as they become economically self-sufficient. The amount of $242,000 has already been refunded by the original recipients.

The amount of a little over $9,000,000 is being recommended for international obligations.

The purpose of this appropriation is, in the main, to cover the share of the United States for certain international commissions, congresses, bureaus, or other international associations of which it is a member; to provide funds to defray the costs of sending representatives of the United States to international conferences abroad or for the expenses of conducting international conferences in this country, and to carry out the program of cooperation with the American republics in accordance with the agreements and resolutions adopted at Buenos Aires, Argentina, in 1936, and Lima, Peru, in 1938.

The largest single item under this category is the cooperation with the American republics program for which the amount of $330,000 is included in the bill. The basic principles involved in this program are designed toward a better understanding between the peoples of this Nation and the peoples to the south of us, as well as development of stronger inter-American security and the extension of our post-war opportunities. The program is conducted by some 12 departments and agencies of the Government. The ones principally interested are the Department of Agriculture, which has devoted itself to the development of agricultural products including rubber; the Department of Commerce, which is aiming to the development of the aviation industry in those countries for the general security of the Western Hemisphere and for the creation of markets for our products in this field; the Federal Security Agency, which is endeavoring through the Office of Education and Public Health Service to improve general conditions in those countries in these fields; and the Department of State, which is striving toward the attainment of a better understanding by the peoples to the south of us of our culture and arts, and conversely toward our better understanding of their culture and arts, with the long-view objective of cementing hemispheric solidarity.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Concerning the Department of Justice, the committee has recommended the amount of approximately $93,000,000 for this Department, a considerable deduction from the current year's appropriation but an increase of a little over $1,000,000 in the Budget estimates. This increase is due to the deviation by the committee from its usual practice of not recommending amounts in excess of Budget estimates. However, testimony disclosed that in connection with the Federal Bureau of Investigation that if the amount allowed for this Bureau by the Bureau of the Budget was allowed to stand the Federal Bureau of Investigation would have been forced to close 5 field offices and to dispense with the services of approximately 600 employees. The committee was not disposed at this time to jeopardize in the slightest degree the security program of this Nation. Activities included in this Department of the Government are the Claims Division, the Lands Division, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Federal Prison System, under the able direction of James Bennett.

On the general subject of prisons I intend to extend my remarks, and I hope the Members of the House will give some attention to these remarks because, for the most part, the county jails of this Nation are a cancer upon the American Government. Read what happened to John Emberg, a 16-year-old boy, in the King County jail in Seattle, Wash., under the subheading "County jails."

FEDERAL PRISONS

Mr. Chairman, because our natural inclination these days is to concern ourselves almost exclusively with problems and programs directly related to winning the war and to establishing a sound peace, the attention of some of us may need to be called to a Government program which now lies on the fringe of the war effort, but which will assume signal importance when the war is won. I refer to the program of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, to which I have called your attention in the past and whose appropriation for the next fiscal year is now under consideration. I should like to elaborate a little further on the work of this Bureau for the information of the House.

There are three reasons why the Federal prison program is of special interest today: First, the substantial number of violators of the Selective Service Act and of other wartime laws, and of prisoners from the Army, presently confined in Federal prisons; second, the war production in Federal prisons and other contributions of Federal prisoners to the war effort; and, third, and perhaps most important, the Bureau of Prisons' position of leadership in the correctional field and the relation of this position to the increase in crime generally expected after the war.

VIOLATORS OF WARTIME LAWS

At the end of the last fiscal year, 6,837, or more than a third of the sentenced prisoners in Federal penal institutions, were violators of the Selective Service Act or other wartime laws, or were former members of the armed forces convicted by court martial of serious crimes and committed to the Bureau for long-term imprisonment. There were 1,417 of these military prisoners in Federal civil prisons last June 30; since then their number has increased to approximately 2,000.

Selective Service Act violators in Federal prisons numbered 4,679 on June 30, 1944, of whom more than half were members of the Jehovah's Witness sect. These individuals, though claiming no objection to war service for others, believe that they should be classified as ministers—IV-D—and thus exempted both from military service and from the alternative types of service provided for bona fide conscientious objectors. More troublesome, however, are violators of the act who do claim strong conscientious objection to war service. These prisoners either had been unable to convince their draft boards of their sincerity or, if classified as conscientious objectors, had refused to accept assignment to civilian public-service camps. Then there are the violators of the act who are neither Jehovah's Witnesses nor conscientious objectors—the draft dodgers and technical violators. While almost none of the Jehovah's Witnesses and very few of the conscientious objectors have criminal records, nearly half this latter group have had previous commitments under sentence.

Other special wartime offenders confined in Federal penal institutions, of whom there were 741 last June 30, were committed for such offenses as wearing military uniform illegally, prostitution in military areas, rationing and price-control violations, espionage, sabotage, sedition, and treason.

WAR SERVICE OF FORMER PRISONERS

More than keeping pace with the transfer of military prisoners to Federal civil institutions is the movement of former Federal civil prisoners into the armed forces. No estimate is possible as to the number of former prisoners inducted since 1942 when Army regulations were modified to permit the service of certain individuals with felony records. However, on January 1, 1945, out of a total of 4,725 individuals who had been released on parole from Federal institutions and whose full-term sentence expiration dates had not been reached, 819

or nearly 1 out of 5 were in the Army. There have been many reports of creditable, and in some cases of outstanding military service by former Federal prisoners. Take for instance the case of Harry B——, a youthful offender and a product of a broken home, who was sent to prison because he stole wallets and watches from passengers on trains running between my home city of Detroit and Chicago. Harry was sent to the Federal Reformatory, Chillicothe, Ohio, where he was selected for training in the airplane mechanics school. He made an excellent record in the school and was released on parole after he had completed slightly more than half his 3-year sentence. Two months after release his parole supervision was suspended to permit his induction. He is now crew chief of an Army transport plane, and has been awarded the Purple Heart with one Oakleaf Cluster; also the Silver Star, and a Presidential citation for ground action in evacuating wounded men from a combat zone. Corporal B——, when on leave in this country in December, visited the airplane mechanics school at Chillicothe. He says he owes his success in the Army entirely to the training he received there.

WAR PRODUCTION

Not only have former Federal prisoners made good in the Army, but prisoners now in Federal institutions are also contributing notably to the war effort. They purchased War bonds to the amount of more than a half million dollars up to June 30, 1944; they have contributed thousands of pints of blood to the Red Cross, served voluntarily as human guinea pigs in medical experiments, and toiled like free workers in the production of war goods. Last fiscal year the sales of Federal Prison Industries totaled more than $17,000,000. All products manufactured go to Government agencies, and 95 percent are for war purposes. Products include cargo and landing nets, bomb fins, berths and lockers for merchant ships, loading pallets for Army warehouses, canvas specialty goods, shoes, gloves, mattresses, brooms, and brushes.

POST-WAR PRISON POPULATION

While the sentences of most of the violators of the Selective Service Act and of other wartime laws will terminate soon after the war is ended, it seems probable that their places will be more than filled by the social casualties of the period of post-war readjustment. The prison population in this country decreased substantially both during the Civil War and during the First World War, and, as perhaps should have been expected, there was a 23-percent decrease in the population of State prisons and a 16-percent decrease in the population of Federal prisons from the end of 1940 to the end of 1943. Both the Civil War and the First World War were followed by increases in prison population, and there seems reason to believe that the economic friction and social disorganization which will accompany demobilization and the shift from a war to a peace economy will again fill our prisons and create a pressing need for new ones.

CORRECTIONAL PHILOSOPHY OF FEDERAL PRISONS

I find that the outstanding characteristic of Federal prisons is that, insofar as possible considering legal limitations, they are operated in accordance with a broad correctional and treatment philosophy. What does this mean? Simply that in the Federal system while all necessary consideration is given to the important matter of custody, the primary emphasis is upon what imprisonment should do to, or for, each inmate. Individualization is the keynote of what is known as the classification process. Inmates are assigned to institutions on the basis of their characteristics—the younger offender is separated from the older, those deemed most improvable from those whose future seems less hopeful, the first offender from the recidivist. Within each institution the process continues. When a sentenced prisoner arrives at a Federal institution he is held for about 30 days in quarantine while members of the institutional staff review his personal and vocational background, consider the character of his past behavior both outside and inside institutions, determine his mental level and attitudes, his education, and his physical condition. Then the institution classification committee decides where in the institution he shall live and specifies various programs for him—of work, of training and education, and perhaps of medical, psychiatric, or social work treatment.

THE CLASSIFICATION PROCESS

Thus classification connotes a broader process than merely placing similar prisoners together, and fitting round pegs into round holes. It embodies all those services, resources, and techniques which may be applied or made available to inmates to aid in their reformation. Of particular service in the classification program are the 1 or more staff members of each Federal institution called parole officers. The title, which now carries too limited a connotation, comes from an earlier and almost exclusive occupation with parole planning. Today their responsibilities, which all focus on the inmate as an individual, start with the collection and recording of social information concerning the newly received prisoner. Within the limits of their full schedules—for there are all too few of them—parole officers are more and more assuming the role of inmate counselors, and through the avenue of counseling, that of liaison officers between the inmate and his outside world. Their function is of utmost importance in classification and individual treatment in Federal institutions. There should be at least 1 of them for every 200 prisoners.

But beyond classification there must be institutional facilities and resources. Classification on the basis of inmates' physical and mental health requires adequate medical and psychiatric personnel. Prisoners who need trade-training assignments cannot receive this form of treatment unless there are adequate shops and qualified instructors. For those who need real work at real pay and the satisfaction of being able to contribute to the support of needy dependents, there must be paying prison industries. For illiterate or undereducated prisoners there must be school facilities and teaching personnel. And so on. Such resources and facilities are provided in Federal penal and correctional institutions. Top-notch medical, dental, psychiatric, and psychological service is furnished by the United States Public Health Service. Vocational and trade training run the gamut from airplane mechanics to rug weaving; academic education, from reading and writing to college-level courses. And there is the program of Federal Prison Industries which has already been discussed.

PROPOSED FEDERAL CORRECTIONS ACT

Earlier I stated that Federal prisons are operated in accordance with a correctional philosophy "insofar as possible, considering legal limitations." Here is what I meant by "legal limitations." During an inmate's stay in a Federal institution the warden and staff decide everything concerning the application to the prisoner of the institution's facilities and services—everything, that is, except the all-important question of how long these facilities and services need to be applied; that is, how long the inmate shall remain in the institution.

I do not claim, nor do I believe, that the staffs of penal institutions should have the full responsibility, or anything like it, for the determination of release dates of inmates. However, I think the correctional function of Federal prisons is somewhat belied by a situation under which those who plan, administer, and apply correctional treatment have nothing to say concerning how much time is needed in specific cases to accomplish rehabilitation. Most prison officials can recall scores of prisoners who have adjusted well and made good use of the rehabilitative resources of an institution for perhaps 2 or 3 or 4 years, and have then appeared to be fitted to return to the community; but because their sentences run for 6 or 10 or 15 years or more, they retrogress, become "prisonized," and finally go out broken, dispirited, and embittered.

There is no simple solution to the problem presented by such situations, and certainly none which would be generally accepted today. However, the proposed Federal Corrections Act, introduced by my colleague the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], H. R. 2445, if enacted, would represent a step forward in the fitting of sentences to the needs of individual offenders. It would also, I feel sure, tend to reduce the wide district-to-district disparities in average sentences. For example, during the fiscal year 1944 the average sentence imposed upon liquor-law violators was 2 months in Nevada, 4 months in southern Alabama, 9 months in southern New York, 14 months in eastern New York, and 25 months in northern Alabama. The Federal Corrections Act proposal, as will be remembered, would delay imposition of sentence in felony convictions for not more than 6 months after commitment to the institution. During the interval the proposed Federal Board of Corrections would study the case, interview the offender, and recommend a

sentence, which the judge might, but need not, impose.

I hope H. R. 2445 will soon be favorably reported and enacted. It would be if the Members of Congress took the interest in the program of the Federal Bureau of Prisons and its problems which their importance warrants. Unfortunately, however, genuine interest in penal institutions seems almost exclusively confined to those who run them and those who are incarcerated in them. Local jails are a notorious horrible example of neglect and indifference.

COUNTY JAILS

Let me give you an example of what is happening in these jails. On December 24, 1944, the eve of the great festival commemorating the birth of our Saviour, young John Emberg, a sensitive boy of 16, was brought to the King County jail in Seattle, Wash. He was booked only for delinquency. He was placed in the so-called juvenile section of the jail, which later investigation showed to be a hellhole of brutality and perversion. He was then promptly forgotten. He was not even given a preliminary hearing. Before anyone got around to his case his lifeless body was found—the victim of a brutal and sadistic murder by other inmates of the jail. During the month he was forgotten and held without a hearing he was persecuted, literally tortured and subjected to the most atrocious indignities, and finally beaten to death by other stronger boys because he refused to participate in their bestial activities. He was frequently tried by the "kangaroo court," which was permitted to operate in the jail, because he would not engage in their orgies. He was tied to the bars with his feet high, the weight of his body resting on the back of his neck on the floor, and cigarettes and matches were burned between his toes. After 3 weeks of such unbelievable torture, death came to John Emberg's rescue. And, mark you, all of this occurred within a few yards of the office of the jailers.

During the court's investigation concerning this case a jailer testified that he knew that smaller boys were beaten and tortured by older boys and that a kangaroo court ruled the juvenile quarters but he did nothing about it; and the sheriff who was elected by the people and in whom they placed their confidence and trust to fulfill his responsibilities and obligations and to protect the individuals committed to his care, knew that the kangaroo courts and their unspeakable abuses flourished in the King County jail.

The Federal Bureau of Prisons inspector pleaded with the jail officials, when he inspected the jail in 1943, to abolish the kangaroo courts and warned them of their dangers. But these warnings fell upon deaf ears, and with the knowledge and approval of the jail officials the kangaroo courts continued to rule the juvenile section in the King County jail. These courts are vicious organizations operated under the guise of self-government with the result that the most brutal prisoners can take advantage of the weak and helpless. It is a common practice for the members of these courts to extract money from newcomers. When a prisoner has no funds and when he refuses to pay the fines demanded he is assigned degrading tasks.

This episode I have related is not the first of its kind. It is like a second performance with a new cast and a new setting of a play staged in the Denver County Jail, Colorado, in 1938. The same scenes and the same acting took place when young George Coover paid the penalty with his life at the hands of the unscrupulous actors of the kangaroo court. In these theaters of crime made possible through the negligence of jail officials young boys—our citizens of tomorrow—are being trained. I am constrained to ask—if such training continues without intervention what effect may we expect it to have in the shaping of things to come, and what will be our responsibility for the consequences?

The system which permits conditions to exist such as I have described affects a much larger group of prisoners than the juvenile population. Its evils reach every person taken into custody—a serious or a casual violator—and worse still, it affects the innocent as well as the guilty.

The local county jail, unquestionably the most important prison unit, is a blot on American civilization. The Bureau of Prisons records disclose that more than 75 percent of 3,156 jails inspected by inspectors of the Bureau in connection with their use for Federal prisoners have been disapproved, because of their lack of the bare essentials for decent housing and treatment of prisoners, and because of conditions indescribably revolting and conducive to the spread of crime. The use of about 10 percent more is limited to emergency cases.

There are many deficiencies in these jails which account for the action of the Bureau. The insecurity of jails due to poor buildings and more often to lack of supervision by jail officials is one. Special privileges to a favored few, especially to the more influential and sometimes notorious; the mishandling of prisoners' funds—one prisoner was inveigled into paying $600 each to two lawyers who did not perform the services promised, and $250 to the jailer who recommended the lawyers; and lack of medical attention, inadequate food, especially where the fee system exists, are others.

Newspaper accounts of jail tragedies such as the Emberg and the Coover cases, and the occasional articles concerning jail conditions which appear in magazines—recently Women's Home Companion and Reader's Digest—aroused the indignation of those who read them, who frequently say we should rise up in our wrath over such conditions, and why does not the Government do something about these conditions. But all too soon through the indifference of the public the jail is forgotten until another tragedy occurs.

The Government has no control over county jails, and has no authority to establish jail standards. A few States have established authority in a central State agency for the control and supervision of local jails and all offenders against the law. In these States notable improvements have been made.

Without some central direction and guidance in each State toward jail betterments and more orderly treatment of jail prisoners we cannot look too hopefully for a high morale in our future communities.

I beseech every Representative from each State to take a personal interest in this problem and to commend to his Governor the consideration of measures to bring these jails under some sort of supervision.

It is my hope that these ideas will be crystallized into action promptly through the interest of every Member of this Congress. I believe that it is our inescapable responsibility to give leadership in preventing a continuation of the bad jail conditions I have described. We must take appropriate action, lest by our silence we condone these deplorable conditions. I intend soon to introduce a bill giving some authority to the Federal courts to take cognizance of these conditions. I would appreciate your suggestions and support.

Regarding the F. B. I. this subject will be dealt with at length by my distinguished colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] when he addresses the Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

For the Department of Commerce the committee is recommending an appropriation of something in excess of $79,000,000 as compared with the current year's appropriation of $81,000,000. In this Department are located the following major activities: Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, the Civil Aeronautics Board, Patent Office, Weather Bureau, National Bureau of Standards, Census Bureau, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

It may be stated in general that the bulk of the work of this Department is the rendering of technical and fact-finding information to other agencies of the Government and to the general public. The Department has, through many of its bureaus, been rather heavily involved in the war effort, and without any substantial increase in appropriations for the Department as a whole. This was made possible by the fact that many of the regular activities of the bureaus could not be carried on to the fullest extent during the war period. However, upon the cessation of hostilities, the Department will no doubt revert to its former position of advising and guiding, from a technical and fact-finding standpoint, the business enterprises of the Nation as well as supplying the regular agencies of the Government with information necessary for the conduct of their special activities.

The largest item of appropriation in the Commerce Department is for the C. A. A. for which the committee is recommending the amount of a little over $41,000,000. The subject of aviation is one of increasing importance not only during this war period but in the postwar era as well. The purpose of this program as expressed in the enabling

legislation is the development and promotion of aviation in this country. This is being accomplished principally through the establishment and the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities for the commercial enterprises as well as private individuals. This organization is responsible for the enforcement of air safety regulations as prescribed by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The principal item of increase is in connection with the establishment of very high frequency radio equipment on the Federal air ways system. My colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska, will go into the workings of this agency in detail. The Coast and Geodetic Survey is active internationally in the war program. Practically its entire facilities are now devoted to the war effort. This agency, as the committee well knows, is under the able direction of Admiral Colbert.

In the National Bureau of Standards, we have our old friend, Dr. Lyman Briggs.

This Bureau is in a similar category and has been signally successful in supplying necessities greatly needed by the armed forces both in the way of developing substitutes for critical materials and in the way of actually constructing implements of warfare.

THE WEATHER BUREAU

This committee puts to flight the statement of Mark Twain that "Everybody talks about the weather but nobody does anything about it." This Department is spending $12,000,000 annually studying the weather and Commander Reichelderfer and his staff are busy throughout the world with technical equipment rendering invaluable and vital assistance to our flyers and to the military programs. This service has not neglected its devotion to the activities wherein it was born—namely, agriculture.

THE PATENT OFFICE

The Patent Office has done its proper share in its individual field in the war program. Its Director, Mr. Coe, is also a member of the Inventors' Council.

THE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

For the most part, the committee was almost unanimous on the many items for this agency. There was, however, a difference of opinion in respect to the appropriation for some items in the Census Bureau. Especially did I differ with the committee in its elimination of the entire increase requested for its activities, referring especially to the item for the new annual sample census of operation and the expanded labor force statistics and reports. These studies were represented to the committee as being definitely tied up with our reconversion period and the many ills that will be attendant thereto. Both of these activities are in my opinion closely related to the economic situation of this country and we should, through this Bureau, place the Government in a position to render the utmost service to our post-war economy and in the shortest period of time possible.

JUDICIARY

There is contained in this bill for the first time in a number of years the appropriation items for the Federal judiciary. The amount of a little over $14,000,000 is being recommended. This amount will cover the financial requirements of the United States Supreme Court, the other Federal courts, and the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. During the course of the hearing the committee was surprised to learn of the many inadequacies and handicaps under which our judicial system has been operating during the past years. The Federal judiciary is now attempting to find itself, and I for one would not like to be a party to any action that would be in any way inimical to the rendition of proper justice in this country to both rich and poor.

I want to call the attention of the membership to the fact that a number of eminent and honored jurists appeared before the committee including the Honorable D. Lawrence Groner, Chief Justice of the United States Court of Appeals of the District of Columbia; the Honorable J. Biggs, of the United States Circuit Court, Third Circuit; the Honorable Albert B. Morris, United States circuit judge, third circuit; the Honorable J. J. Parker; and the Honorable John C. Knox. All of these gentlemen considered the items of appropriation for the Federal judiciary of such importance as to take their valuable time to come to Washington to appear in behalf of the requests that were being made.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am wondering if the gentleman feels that the provisions modifying the existing law by way of limitation will enable the judges to have the clerks and the stenographic assistants that they need for the transaction of their business.

Mr. RABAUT. May I say to my colleague that we are making every effort possible to try and effect that very thing.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would assume it is an improvement over the situation as presently obtains if the proposed modifications recommended by the committee are adopted.

Mr. RABAUT. We hope so.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Did the committee follow the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget in cutting down the appropriations for the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in appearing before the Budget made two requests. One was based on a war on one front and the other was based on a war being fought on two fronts. For the war on two fronts he asked for somewhere in the vicinity of $39,000,000; for the one-front war he asked $35,000,000. That subject will be treated at greater length when Judge KERR takes the floor. But the Bureau of the Budget cut it $2,729,000. The committee called the Bureau of the Budget before it, and after hearing them we decided that the funds for the F. B. I. should not be curtailed. We have arranged in this bill to restore the funds originally requested for the one-front war, which is satisfactory to the agency at this time. Accordingly, the total allowed is $35,729,000.

Mr. BENDER. That is, Mr. Hoover's request was complied with?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. I commend the gentleman on taking that action, because I think the Bureau is doing one of the finest services that is being performed by any Government agency.

Mr. RABAUT. I would say that the full committee felt the same way about it when we presented the item to them.

The complete testimony on all of the items will be found in the hearings, and I strongly urge each Member to read the hearings on the Federal judiciary in order to better familiarize himself with the needs of this great branch of our Government.

Mr. Chairman, the Government of this country is divided into three great subdivisions. For my part, I think for too long a period of time the legislative branch has neglected itself as a great branch of the governmental system, and that likewise it has neglected the Federal judiciary. I think that in a way they might be referred to as the stepchildren of the United States Government. In this bill we propose to do for the judges what we have done for Members of Congress on a somewhat lesser scale, that is, give them the right to hire a private secretary and a law clerk for their own offices. This would be for more efficient justice, and at savings to the Government, inasmuch as it would speed up the processes of justice.

Take for instance the probation system, the size of which has not kept pace with the needs for this service, principally because of the lack of adequate funds. The rising tide of juvenile delinquency in this country demands concrete action rather than any mere discussion of the subject, which has been taking place of late. We have too much talk going on and too little action.

The testimony before the committee by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the F. B. I., and James Bennett, Director of the Federal Prisons System, indicates that the arrests of 17- and 18-year-old offenders are at an all-time high. The delinquency of girls under 18 has taken a new jump of 137 percent greater than before. It is the probation service that must be strengthened if we are to render the proper justice on the basis of fact and understanding rather than on the basis of expediency in the handling of individual cases.

It was pointed out that of the 6,700 probationers in the Army only 42 had been dishonorably discharged and 6 have been awarded decorations for praiseworthy actions in the service. Probation is the greatest means of saving lives and restoring them to usefulness and at the same time of saving money for the Government that we know of.

Under the miscellaneous salaries are included the secretaries and law clerks to judges. It is inconceivable how the Federal Judicial System has been able to render the service it has with the limited assistance provided for the judges as a result of inadequate appropriations. It cannot be denied that the administration of justice is increasingly complex.

The lack of qualified law clerks and secretaries to Federal judges has no doubt reduced the effectiveness of the judges' services on the bench.

The augmentation of appropriations for the services is strongly urged. Proper assistance will not only enable the judge to render more accurate decisions and reduce the number of appeals to higher courts but will also considerably speed up the work of the courts by enabling each judge to dispose of cases to which he could not give the full amount of time if obliged to look up the numerous laws and references involved.

An item included in this bill for the first time is the salaries of court reporters. Considerable testimony was had on this item and there appeared before the committee, our colleagues, the Honorable SAM HOBBS and CLARENCE HANCOCK, members of the Judiciary Committee, in addition to representatives of the National Shorthand Reporters Association and other reporter groups. The Federal judges that appeared before the committee in behalf of this item were unanimous in their endorsement of the reporter system.

The purpose of the enabling legislation, as explained to the committee, was to provide each court with an official record of proceedings and to eliminate certain abuses in connection with the sale of transcripts by contract reporters to litigants. It was testified that the courts in every State with the exception of two have systems for the employment of official court reporters. The amount approved for this item will enable the judiciary to at least inaugurate this service on a partial basis. The Honorable Judge John J. Parker, Sr., United States circuit judge, stated:

> I want to say to you that I think that this is the most important matter affecting the administration of justice in the Federal courts now before the Congress.

THE FEDERAL LOAN AGENCY

This item was formally carried under the Commerce Department portion of the bill. It is now carried under the separate title in consequence of the recent enactment of legislation recreating the Federal Loan Agency. As the committee knows, the amounts for the administrative expenses of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries are not appropriations out of the United States Treasury but are rather authorizations of amounts of corporation funds that may be used for administrative purposes. The committee recommends an authorization of $33,000,000 for the administration of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries, a reduction of $2,600,000 under the budget estimates.

This is an important bill. It deals with the four old-time agencies of the Government.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, as ranking minority member of the committee which brings this bill before you today, I want to express my deep appreciation to the members of the entire committee who have labored so long together in order to bring to you the best possible bill we could under the circumstances of war and from the justifications presented to us by the representatives of the various agencies who appeared before the committee justifying the requests.

I especially want to commend the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT, for his courtesy and fair consideration of all members of the committee. It has been a great pleasure and inspiration to work with him and the other distinguished members of the committee, who include the Honorable JOHN H. KERR, of North Carolina; the Honorable BUTLER B. HARE, of South Carolina; the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, of Illinois; the Honorable ROBERT F. JONES, of Ohio; and the Honorable DEAN M. GILLESPIE, of Colorado; and to the very efficient clerk of this committee, Mr. Corhal D. Orescan. To Mr. Orescan I want to pay a special compliment because of his most efficient and thorough work.

While the bill we bring before you does not contain as large an amount as some of the appropriation bills that have been brought to you heretofore, it does include activities which, in my opinion, are of great importance to the people of the United States and to the people of the entire world. While the committee endeavored strenuously to hold down the number of pages of hearings in order to save unnecessary material and labor, they do contain over 1,200 pages of fairly complete information regarding the activities of the four Departments with which these appropriations deal, namely, the Department of State, Department of Justice, Department of Commerce, and the Federal judiciary. The estimates for the entire bill amounted to $272,729,800. The committee allowed $259,109,700, or a decrease as compared with the Budget estimates of $13,620,100. In only one of the Departments represented in the bill is an increase shown, namely, the Department of Justice, and the increase deals entirely with the activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The reason for that increase will be fully explained by myself and other members of the committee as we proceed in this debate. I am sure that the committee will agree that the increase is fully justified.

The decrease of $13,620,100 made by your committee should not be construed as meaning that this amount represents a saving because in a number of cases represented in this figure of decrease are items which will later appear in future appropriations and were taken out of this bill because there was no authority of law for them.

I shall not take up the time of the Committee now to detail all of the items in the four categories as represented in this bill, because I wish to confine myself to one Department, namely, the Department of State.

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill, if passed, will make $71,848,400 available to the Department of State for the fiscal year 1946.

The Department of State, like all other departments and establishments of the Government, has experienced unusual and, perhaps, unknown and unsuspected growth, both in functions and in personnel, during the past decade; and the end is not yet.

In 1933, the budget request for the Department of State was for $16,694,071.89, with 858 employees in the Secretary's office; and for the fiscal year 1946, the request was for $77,988,900 with 4,141 employees in the office of the Secretary. The Department now has a total of over 10,000 employees and asks for a total of 11,597.

In 1933, the sum of $2,039,740 was requested for personnel in the Secretary's office; and the request for the same item for the fiscal year 1946 had grown to $11,362,200.

In 1933, the Department requested $3,440,000 for 775 Foreign Service officers; and the request for the fiscal year 1946 was for $4,900,000 for 1,010 such officers.

In 1933, the request was for $2,716,439 for the salaries of 2,030 Foreign Service clerks; and the 1946 request was for $4,287,000 for 2,344 such clerks.

In 1933, there was no request for an item now found in the Budget, namely, "International obligations," for which $9,921,400 was requested for the fiscal year 1946.

In 1933, the request was for $100,000 for allowances for living quarters abroad; and for the fiscal year 1946, there is requested for that item $2,200,000.

The hearings on this bill show that the Department of State has undertaken, and is proceeding with, a sweeping reorganization, a reorganization which, in many respects is unusual and revolutionary in character. The reorganization has already brought into the Department top officials and heads who are neither trained nor experienced in statecraft, diplomacy, or international affairs; and, along with those new acquisitions have come many officials and employees of lesser rank who, likewise, have not been trained in handling the affairs of this Government abroad. What is, perhaps, more significant is that the reorganization has brought forth, and large appropriations have been requested for, many world-wide plans which, in some instances, are extensions of plans of former years, and, in other instances, plans that reflect what many people regard as strange and unusual functions in the field of diplomacy and international relations. Some of the plans are largely sociological in nature and call for their operation and execution in all parts of the world.

Your committee has, by agreements and compromises, recommended reductions in various amounts requested for the fiscal year 1946; and the committee's action has recommended the elimination of a few of the proposed items of expenditures.

My own feeling, Mr. Chairman, is that the Congress and the people should be informed as to some of the activities and plans of the Department of State; and it may well be that the Congress itself

will desire to make further reductions in the Department's request for funds.

CHANGES IN PERSONNEL

Our new Secretary of State and his latest assistants require no extended discussion, due to their long tenures in public offices not connected with the foreign affairs of this country, in the accepted and usual sense in which the phrase "foreign affairs" is used. Suffice it to say that those gentlemen are not, and they do not claim to be, trained and experienced in the orthodox handling of international affairs and diplomatic relations of this country with the rest of the world. Yet, Mr. Chairman, their present positions leave them at the head of this great Department with its many new plans for the future, which I shall discuss briefly in the course of these remarks.

COOPERATION WITH AMERICAN REPUBLICS

For some years, we have been appropriating funds for the practice and furtherance of cultural relations with the countries of South America. This activity, worth while or not, has grown from modest proportions at the beginning to an ever-widening scope, correspondingly increased costs. While, under existing law, these cultural relations are supposed and required to be fostered and furthered cooperatively, it becomes more and more apparent each year that the United States is doing most of the cooperating and paying, while the other countries remain on the end where lie the benefits—benefits which, in some instances, result to persons and individuals not intended to be served individually, either by this country or their own.

At any rate, our cultural-relations activities with the Latin-American countries have been carried to the point of extending to those countries the benefits of our knowledge of agriculture, mining, and many, many other business pursuits, along with education, music, the sciences, the arts, and other lines of human endeavor.

And, looking at the 1946 Budget, pages 597–598, it is found that it takes better than two pages of very fine print to list and describe the functions and the classifications and descriptions of the Department's personnel engaged in cooperation with the American republics. Those enlightening pages of the Budget show that those activities for the year 1946 will occupy 515 man-years and cost an estimated total of $4,430,000, including the unusual item of $1,439,046 for travel. Judging by the personnel classifications mentioned, we are indulging in very many things in the Latin-American countries of questionable value, aims, objects, and benefits, and they suggest, very clearly, that some of our activities have far outrun anything Congress ever meant and intended to be done. As examples we find that we have employees of the following kinds, among many others, included in the 515 man-years:

One principal social scientist, $5,600.
One pathologist, $5,800.
One agronomist, $4,350.
One chief anthropologist, $5,600.
One senior agricultural economist, $4,600.
Four senior social-science analysts, $18,700.
One senior educationist, $4,600.
Two specialists on Latin-American education, $9,200.
One specialist in the English language, $4,600.
One senior consultant in social services for children, $4,800.
One senior consultant, maternal and child-health services, $4,800.
One senior consultant in nutrition services, $4,600.
Three senior consultants in child welfare, $13,800.
One agronomist, $3,800.
One specialist, child-welfare services, $650.
One labor economist, $3,800.
One labor economist—trilingual—$4,000.
One visual education specialist, $3,800.
One press officer, $3,800.
Four principal agriculturists, $22,600.
One principal botanist, $5,600.
One principal soils technologist, $5,800.
One director—agricultural project—$5,600.
One principal geologist, $5,600.
One protocol officer, $5,600.
Four senior agronomists, $18,400.
Two senior agricultural economists, $9,400.
Two senior animal husbandmen, $9,400.
One senior biometrician, $4,600.
One senior biochemist, $6,900.
One aquatic biologist, $4,000.

And there are many others of like questionable character and value.

Pages 598 to 599 of the 1946 Budget also reflect many questionable projects operating under the function "Cooperation with the American Republics," including: Development of rubber production; fellowships in rural electrification; public administration, statistics; magnetic and seismological observations; tours of the United States by Latin-American journalists and exchange of fellows and professors; fellowship in the fishery science; cooperative investigations in anthropology; grants to visiting professors and hemisphere leaders; grants for cultural centers and materials; the Miami reception center, and the like.

It may be, Mr. Chairman, that Congress meant and intended that all those things should be undertaken, and that we should spend money from the Treasury for the employment of persons of the classifications shown; but I feel it my duty to bring these matters to the attention of Congress and, through Congress, to the attention of the people so that, if, with me, there is sufficient question concerning the propriety of the things mentioned, appropriate action can be taken.

OTHER CULTURAL RELATIONS PROGRAMS

The 1946 Budget and the justifications submitted in support of the appropriations requested, reflect that the Department of State has already launched a broad cultural relations program for China and the Far East, with funds made available from the President's Emergency War Fund. The Department now asks $1,390,000 for the enlargement and perpetuation of that program. And Assistant Secretary of State MacLeish stated frankly to your committee that it is proposed to extend that program of cultural relations to the entire world. Your committee has refused to include appropriations for the China-Far East cultural relations program.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that Congress should be consulted before money from any source is expended on such programs as the one mentioned; and it is clear that such assistance as our taxpayers can give to China ought to be directed toward winning the war before cultural relations and new ideologies are extended.

In passing, it is proper to observe that officials of the State Department frankly admitted that there was no statutory authority for a cultural-relations program with any country or countries other than those of Latin America. It, therefore, behooves Congress to go on record as to whether any more such programs shall be launched unless and until Congress, after their consideration, shall have approved and appropriated for them.

LECTURERS SELLING THE DUMBARTON OAKS CONFERENCE

Assistant Secretary of State MacLeish frankly admitted that a large number of high-salaried officials and employees of the Department of State have been and are being sent over the country lecturing on, and trying to sell the public, the principles of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. Those officials and employees are diverted from their regular and official duties for the lecturing purpose, and their traveling expenses are being paid from funds appropriated by Congress for the attendance at meetings, gatherings, and conferences pertaining to the Department's usual business and affairs.

No one can read Mr. MacLeish's testimony without reaching the conclusion that the American people are being high-pressured and propagandized into accepting the principles of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference; and the conclusion is inescapable that the administration, by those methods, is attempting to gain support of the public and, through that support, to put pressure upon, and to obtain favorable action by, the Senate on any peace plan that will embody substantially the principles of that conference.

To my mind, Mr. Chairman, it is a principle new to a republican form of government that the taxpayers are surreptitiously required to support and maintain a propaganda organization to sell the American people the policies of the administration, either on national or international affairs. We all know that we have, for many years, had a gigantic and questionable propaganda machine which has molded public opinion on the domestic front; and it is now, without semblance of authority, directed to the same end in respect of foreign affairs and international policies.

For my part, I have not consciously or intentionally voted for any appropriation of funds for any such purpose, and will not do so. And when the Department

of State assigns its regular officials and employees to the unofficial and unauthorized task of selling the American people a bill of goods, then the Department is deliberately and willfully causing the misapplication of appropriated public funds to uses and purposes not authorized by law. All such expenditures should be disallowed by the Comptroller General in the accounts of appropriate disbursing officers.

I am sure the Members of the House will find much interest in reading the nine and one-half pages of fine print—pages 280–289—required to list the places where lectures have been delivered on the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, and the statements of education, training, background, experience, and salaries of the officials and employees who delivered those lectures. In reading that important data, it will be well to note that many of those officials and employees appear to have been employed and selected as of recent dates, indicating that they may have been recruited for the specific purpose of lecturing on the Department's foreign policies and the Dumbarton Oaks Conference plan.

In concluding these remarks on the Department's force of lecturers, I suggest that the testimony of Mr. MacLeish is susceptible of but one meaning, namely that the lecture scheme for selling the administration's peace plans was adopted in the light of the fact that it might serve to accomplish those plans, whereas Woodrow Wilson's plans failed for want of efficient propaganda. In this connection, the following from the hearings is most significant:

Mr. STEFAN. Is it the view and feeling of the State Department that the State Department's policies may be made successful by publicizing and advertising them to the American public whereas Wilson's plans for lasting peace failed for want of publicity and education?

Mr. MACLEISH. I would like to consider the two parts of that. I am not sure that I would agree with the reference to Wilson's policy. As to the first part, I think we feel that the people of the United States have been invited to consider in great detail the Dumbarton Oaks proposal. This is the first time that a group of nations have submitted a proposal to the people of the world for consideration, and my view is that the people of this country, who are faced with that great decision, have a right to know everything that it is possible to know about the proposal and the background of it and the problems it proposes to deal with.

I, myself, think that the one policy Wilson defended and advocated most was the policy that a thing of this sort be taken to the people.

Mr. STEFAN. In other words, it is hoped that such a plan of publicity may create such public sympathy that the people will influence the Senate in the acceptance of the Department's policy?

Mr. MACLEISH. That is not the fact. The feeling is that if the facts are known and are put to the people, the facts will speak for themselves.

The hearings further disclose that, in addition to the lecture program, the Department of State was and is participating in extensive radio and motion-picture programs for publicizing the Dumbarton Oaks Conference and the Department's policies and views.

One other danger signal is inherent in the hearings on this bill, from the standpoints of future diplomatic practices and policies, the propaganda policies and practices of the future, and the over-all functions of the Department of State, namely: Assistant Secretary of State MacLeish admitted quite frankly that it would be the Department's purpose, as part of its reorganization and future cultural relations activities, to absorb at least a part of the functions and personnel of the Office of War Information which, as everyone has thought, was a temporary war agency. It seems, however, that the Department of State means and intends to take over part of the O. W. I.'s large personnel and tie them and their activities into the Department's world-wide cultural relations programs and other activities. Here, again, Mr. Chairman, is another matter on which Congress should be consulted; but the testimony of Mr. MacLeish and others make it apparent that, unless the interests of the public and the powers of Congress are vigilantly and properly watched and safeguarded, we may awake some fine day to find that we already have a world-wide ministry for the sale of our one-world thoughts and ideologies to all the earth's peoples.

With such evidence before us it is less hard to believe the recent report that a world-wide gestapo has been seriously proposed for this Government. So many unusual things have already been saddled on the people without authority of law, that bypassing Congress and disregarding the wishes and the will of the people have become commonplace, indeed. What shall we do about such things? Shall we stand idly by and permit our institutions to be changed, or even destroyed, because we are too timid to speak? To be forewarned is to be forearmed; and, as to these things concerning which we have extracted information in advance, something should be done, and done now.

Whither are we headed in these matters? Are we, under the guise of cultural relations and the advancement of new ideologies, to spend the taxpayers' money in all corners and quarters of the globe? Are such programs at all likely to produce any true good will for this country among the peoples of the earth? Are such programs properly a part of the diplomatic functions of this great country? Shall it henceforth be our policy foolishly to attempt to buy as so much meat or lard, the good will of other nations? Lastly, Mr. Chairman, are not such policies likely to grow into a new world order of our own, one which our public servants, in response to the human element inherent in all men, will attempt to force upon the peoples of other countries? Those are not mere possibilities—they are real dangers, and dangers which we should avoid as we would a plague.

An educational commission has been established in London with which this country cooperates; and who, then, can say that we may not be laying the ground work for forcing our own thoughts as to education on the peoples of other nations?

Are these cultural relations, educational, and other matters things that were discussed at Yalta? Were they discussed at Teheran, Casablanca, and elsewhere? Will they be discussed at San Francisco? And have they been discussed from the State Department's angles and viewpoints in the lectures which have been given throughout the country by the Department's staff of salesmen?

RESPONSIBILITIES OF STATE DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. Chairman, there has been some inquiry as to the duties and responsibilities of the principal officers in the Department of State. For the information of the Committee I submit a brief explanation:

UNDER SECRETARY JOSEPH C. GREW

The Under Secretary is the principal assistant of the Secretary and serves as Acting Secretary in the Secretary's absence. He assists the Secretary in directing all of the Department's activities. He is vice chairman of the Secretary's staff committee.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY DEAN ACHESON

He is responsible, under the direction of the Secretary of State, for liaison with the Congress on all matters affecting the work of the Department, except those of an administrative or budgetary character which are the responsibility of the Assistant Secretary in charge of Administration, Julius C. Holmes. In performing this function, Mr. Acheson directs, first, the drafting of proposed legislation (including treaties and conventions) in collaboration with the appropriate officials of the Department and of other Federal agencies; second, the presentation of proposed legislation to the subcommittees and committees of the Congress, including the appearances of qualified witnesses; third, the review of proposed legislation upon which the Department is requested to express a viewpoint; fourth, the consultation of departmental officers and Foreign Service officers with the Members of Congress; fifth, the handling of congressional correspondence pertaining to proposed legislation. He has general responsibility for coordinating the work of the Department in connection with the conduct of international conferences. He serves as a member of the Secretary's staff committee.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY JAMES C. DUNN

He is responsible, under the direction of the Secretary of State, for the formulation of over-all United States foreign policy with the countries of Europe, the Far East, the Near East, and Africa. With respect to these countries, he guides the conduct of our relationships with them, taking the initiative in matters which are primarily political in character and coordinating the activities of other officials of the Department and other Federal agencies who have primary responsibility in specialized fields such as economic policy or information policy. He is responsible for keeping these officials informed concerning emerging problems in the over-all foreign policy field. He directs the substantive work of Foreign Service establishments in

those countries included within the areas of his jurisdiction in the same manner as he directs the work of the offices under his supervision in the Department.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER

His responsibility, under the direction of the Secretary of State, is identical with that of Assistant Secretary James C. Dunn, except that the countries involved are the other American republics.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY WILLIAM L. CLAYTON

Under the direction of the Secretary of State, he is responsible for the formulation and coordination of policy and action in the participation by the United States in international economic affairs. He directs the Department's liaison with other agencies of the Government which participate in international economic affairs with a view toward coordinating their activities within the framework of United States foreign economic policy and relating such policy to the over-all United States foreign policy. He is concerned with both wartime and peacetime activities. The activities include principally the following: First, the protection and promotion of American commercial and agricultural interests in all foreign countries; second, the formulation, negotiation, and administration of commercial treaties, reciprocal trade agreements, and commodity agreements; third, international financial and monetary agreements and arrangements; fourth, international industrialization and development projects and programs; fifth, foreign funds and property controls; sixth, production and distribution in international commerce of major commodities such as petroleum, wheat, rubber, tin, coffee, sugar, and cotton; seventh, international fisheries; eighth, cartels and related arrangements; ninth, international labor, social, and health affairs; tenth, international aviation, shipping, transportation, and telecommunication matters; eleventh, procurement and development abroad of materials needed in the prosecution of the war; twelfth, wartime trade controls; thirteenth, lend-lease; fourteenth, disposition of surplus war property; fifteenth, administration of the proclaimed list of certain blocked nationals; sixteenth, economic blockade of enemy and enemy-occupied territories, and so forth. He serves as a member of the Secretary's staff committee.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY ARCHIBALD MAC LEISH

Under the direction of the Secretary, he is responsible for the formulation and coordination of policy and action regarding the informational and cultural relations aspects of United States foreign policy. He directs the Department's liaison with other agencies of the Government which are concerned with international information and cultural relations with a view toward coordinating their activities within the framework of the United States international informational and cultural relation policy and relating such policy to the over-all United States foreign policy. The work which he directs falls into three broad categories, namely, first interpretation and analysis of United States foreign policy within the United States, second, overseas dissemination of information concerning the United States and its foreign policies, and third, planning, coordinating, and putting into effect programs of the Department of State, and programs undertaken through other agencies of the Government, which are designed to encourage mutual understanding between the peoples of the United States and other nations through the exchange of persons, such as students and technicians, exchange of information, such as books and other publications, and the conduct of scientific and technical projects on a mutual basis. This includes direction of the program for cultural cooperation with the other American republics, and the program for cultural cooperation with China and neighboring countries and the countries of the Near East and Africa. He is also concerned with the United States participation in the Conference of the Allied Ministers of Education in London. He serves as a member of the Secretary's staff committee.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY JULIUS C. HOLMES

Under the direction of the Secretary he is responsible for the administration and management of the departmental and Foreign Service. He is responsible for liaison with the Congress in all matters pertaining to administration, in particular for liaison with the Appropriations Committees of the Congress with regard to estimates of appropriations for the Department, the Foreign Service, and all other activities affiliated with the Department. His duties include supervision over the following: First, recruiting, placing, training, and promoting personnel of the Department and the Foreign Service; second, planning for more efficient management of the Department and the Foreign Service; third, preparation of budget justifications and presentation before the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees of the Congress; fourth, fiscal control and management of appropriated funds; fifth, purchasing, space control, mail and messenger service, duplicating, and other housekeeping services; sixth, control and handling of telegraphic communications and other forms of communication, including coordination and review of all correspondence; seventh, administration of the Department's record system; eighth, control of travel; ninth, administration of the consular activities of the Foregin Service such as service to seamen, invoicing, handling of estates, whereabouts and welfare of Amercan nationals abroad, and so forth; tenth, administration of the cryptographic system; eleventh, coordination of the administrative management of international conferences; twelfth, handling of protocol matters; thirteenth, administration of laws and regulations relating to the control of American citizens and nationals leaving and entering territory under the jurisdiction of the United States—passport laws; fourteenth, administration of laws and regulations pertaining to alien visa control; fifteenth, the relief and rehabilitation of American nationals interned in enemy and enemy-occupied territory; sixteenth, evacuation and repatriation of American nationals; seventeenth, liaison with the protecting powers and the International Red Cross in connection with the handling of civilian internees and prisoners of war; eighteenth, intelligence and censorship matters. He serves as a member of the Secretary's staff committee.

THE LEGAL ADVISER, GREEN HACKWORTH

Under the direction of the Secretary, the legal adviser is responsible for handling the legal or quasi-legal aspects of problems which arise in the conduct of our international relations. He initiates action in many cases, and in others advises officials of the Department and he collaborates in this work with the officials of other governmental agencies. Legal questions are involved in all phases of the Department's work, therefore, it would not be possible to list all of the activities in which he engages; however, they include the following: First, interpretation of treaties, conventions, and agreements and participation in the drafting of such instruments; second, war crimes; third, shipping matters; fourth, protection of American interests in foreign countries, generally; fifth, claims resulting from war operations; sixth, international boundary questions; seventh, international fisheries and international waters, eighth, immunities of diplomatic and consular officials; ninth, matters relating to nationality, immigration, extradition, and so forth. He is a member of the Secretary's staff committee.

SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE SECRETARY, LEO PASVOLSKY

Under the direction of the Secretary, he is responsible for the formulation and coordination of policy and action in connection with international organization and security affairs, with special emphasis on the maintenance of peace and security through organized international action. This includes, first, United States participation in the establishment of an international organization for peace and security; second, relations of the United States with the proposed organization; third, activities of the proposed organization affecting the dependent areas of the world; fourth, relations with existing international organizations such as the Pan American Union; fifth, development of background studies, trend analyses, and appraisal of conditions and developments in foreign countries which bear upon United States foreign policy. In conducting this work the Office of Special Political Affairs, which is under Mr. Pasvolsky's jurisdiction, works in close collaboration with other offices and divisions, particularly the geographic divisions under Assistant Secretaries Dunn and Rockefeller, and with other governmental agencies, particularly the War and Navy Departments. He is a member of the Secretary's staff committee.

THE SECRETARY'S STAFF COMMITTEE

A description of the duties and responsibilities of the principal officers of the Department would not be complete unless some mention were made of the organization and responsibility vested in the Secretary's staff committee. The members of this committee are the Secretary, who is the chairman, the Under

Secretary, who is the vice chairman, the Assistant Secretaries, the legal adviser, and the special assistant to the Secretary for International Organization and Security Affairs. The primary responsibility of this committee is to assist the Secretary in the determination of current and long-range foreign policy. It is available for consultation instantly with the Secretary on all matters pertaining to the full range of activities and interests of the Department. The committee meets at least triweekly and frequently on a daily basis. In this committee major foreign policy matters are considered on a joint basis by the principal officers of the Department. The result is that when a final determination is made as to the course of action to be taken, every phase of the problem has been considered in the light of the responsibilities and interests vested in each of the principal officers.

Mr. BENDER. Will the chairman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. I think it is only fitting and proper that since the gentleman is paying tribute to the other members of the committee that there be some recognition of the gentleman's services as well. The gentleman from Nebraska for many years has rendered fine service on this committee. I think it is a great testimonial to the subcommittee to have so little controversy existing in connection with this appropriation. There seems to be universal satisfaction with its work, and has been for a long time. I am sure the gentleman from Nebraska has had a great part in doing this splendid job.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] very much. The gentleman has always been helpful to us. Let me say to the gentleman that there are some wide differences of opinion among members of the committee, but notwithstanding that, we strive to the best of our ability to bring before you a bill after very careful consideration.

In passing I want to say I am sure those of you who are interested in the Federal Bureau of Investigation will be satisfied with the amount allowed to that great organization. However, the concern of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] regarding this appropriation need not be of concern to him any longer, because I am sure those 600 employees will not be separated from the service, nor will the 400 highly paid special agents be separated from the service. The service will be continued in status quo.

Mr. BENDER. I know the gentleman has always supported this program and I know he would not permit such a thing to happen. I am pleased to have the gentleman's comment on that question.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman mentioned a moment ago that the State Department gave some indication that they would like to take over a part of the functions of the O. W. I. Perhaps the gentleman heard the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission state the other evening here in Washington that perhaps the Federal Communications Commission also would be taking over some of the functions of the O. W. I. Does the gentleman have an idea that that function might be the handling of propaganda broadcasts to the peoples of the world, or the censorship of world news, or what?

Mr. STEFAN. I understood Mr. MacLeish to say that when the war is over some of the employees of O. W. I. may be taken over by the Cultural Relations Department over which Mr. MacLeish has charge, for the purpose of developing the cultural-relations program which may be extended to Europe when the new legislation is passed by Congress.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is referring to "kultur"?

Mr. STEFAN. Cultural relations.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Are those cultural relations to be confined to foreign countries, or is he going to give us in this country a little of his cultural relations ideas?

Mr. STEFAN. It is the cultural relations program that is going on in Central and South America and Mexico.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I was interested in the gentleman's statement with respect to the use of funds to create the Division of Cultural Relations. It is not anything that is done without the authorization of Congress, is it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

What I referred to was the matter of extending cultural relations to China and the Near East, which is now going on through the President's fund. We did not allow that because we did not want to do it in this bill. If they continue it, they will do it through the funds they receive from the emergency fund of the President.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I was also interested in the gentleman's statement with respect to the propaganda program that is going on at the present time, as the gentleman suggested, by which the administration is spreading its views with regard to the Dumbarton Oaks and other proposals that are being considered by the people of this country. Of course we want the people to know about those questions.

Mr. STEFAN. So do I. The people should be informed on true facts. My objection is that in these bills we appropriate certain funds for officials of the departments to attend conferences, but here is a long list of highly paid employees who are taking valuable time away from their regular duties to make these trips. I think an appropriation should be requested specifically for that purpose if they are going to continue it. I am trying to guard the appropriations in order to inform the Congress as to what is being done with the taxpayers' money.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's position, but it is a fact, after all, that these representatives of the administration are going out and expressing the views of the administration on the question.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes. People do not want views, they want facts. You will find more information in the hearings which are available to you now.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If we want the people to know about these questions, then all sides should be presented.

Mr. STEFAN. There is no reason why the people should not get all sides of problems which will affect the future of government for years to come.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I say to the gentleman that in Mexico City there were a good many experts from the United States there. They worked tremendously hard. I know several of them who worked all night until 5 o'clock in the morning in order to get the information out and to make translations from Spanish into English of the acts and resolutions we passed.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; I do not doubt that some of them work hard, but I doubt that some of these functions are being accepted by those foreign people. Some of those activities do not make common sense to the people there nor to us here. We did not intend to have a lot of those things done, in my opinion.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think that may be true in some cases, but I would like to say how extremely hard the representatives of the Department of State worked, and, as you all know, they were so very successful in solidifying the republics of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentlewoman has made a very important contribution.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, countless speeches have been made and numerous resolutions passed by millions of Americans all over the country in protest against the notorious Chamberlain White Paper of 1939, which restricted and later closed the immigration of Hebrews from Europe to Palestine. An overwhelming majority of Members of this House and Members of the Senate have expressed themselves without any reservation as opposing this arbitrarily enforced rule by the mandatory for Palestine. Indeed, experts in international law maintain that Britain, as the mandatory power, has acted illegally, since the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations, an authority which supersedes the mandatory government, has rejected the white paper policy because it found that policy to be in contradiction with the terms of the mandate.

The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation maintains that in view of these circumstances, and particularly in view of the terrible plight in which the surviving Hebrews of Europe find themselves after 5 years of German pillage and murder, these people have both the moral and legal right to go to Palestine,

even if the British colonial administration there does not think so. They are determined, therefore, to organize the immediate transfer to Palestine of all the Hebrews in Europe who are anxious to go there.

Prior to the beginning of the war, members of the Hebrew committee were instrumental in organizing the transfer to Palestine of some 40,000 Hebrew men, women, and children from Europe. The British Colonial Administration of Palestine fought this effort, tried to disrupt it and termed it illegal, but these 40,000 illegal immigrants are alive in Palestine today where they are making a most valuable contribution to the prosecution of the war. Several thousand of them have volunteered into the Hebrew Palestinian units of the British Army; thousands of others are engaged in essential war production and farming to supply the needs of the United Nations' forces in the Mediterranean theater of war. If Britian's colonial officials had had their way, these Hebrews, too, would have been dead today—as are other millions of Hebrews in Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD the text of a statement of policy by the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation on the entry of Hebrews into Palestine:

ON HEBREW IMMIGRATION TO PALESTINE
A STATEMENT OF POLICY

In view of the vital and desperate needs of our Nation at this time, the Hebrew Committee of National Liberation publicly declares that it maintains it to be both morally and legally right and proper for every Hebrew in Europe, who has survived the holocaust of German murder, to proceed to Palestine and live there if he so desires.

The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation maintains that the regulations which the British Government has enforced and which bar the immigration of Hebrews to Palestine are illegal since they have been rejected by the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations.

It must always be remembered that Palestine is not and never has been a British territory. It is an international territory, mandated to Great Britain for the purpose of transforming it into a free and independent country and restoring it as the national territory of the Hebrews.

We are not proclaiming a rebellion against the mandatory government of Palestine. We wish to stress most emphatically, as we have done in the past, the need for complete cooperation with the administration of Palestine in all its regulations and decisions, even those which we bitterly oppose, but in this one respect—the right of the Hebrew to live in Palestine rather than die or be oppressed and humiliated in Europe—we do mean to take practical measures in accordance with the spirit of the mandate rather than the present British regulations based on the white paper policy which has been repudiated by the Mandates Commission of the League of Nations.

We do so because too many lives have been lost already due to the present policy. We do so because of our regard for the "opinion of mankind." Fifty-two nations have publicly and solemnly proclaimed that Palestine is the national home of the Hebrews. Whatever a home means it certainly means that one can seek refuge there from death. We do so because the British policy has been condemned repeatedly by an overwhelming majority of the leaders of the American people, as indeed it has been condemned by many of Britain's own leaders.

The Hebrew Committee of National Liberation solemnly proclaims that it will do everything within its power to assist every Hebrew in Europe who desires to go to Palestine, and will endeavor to land him there in complete disregard of the inhuman and illegal regulations which the Colonial Office enforces in Palestine.

During the years 1937 to 1940, members of the Hebrew committee were instrumental in originating and organizing free immigration to Palestine which resulted in the entry of some 40,000 Hebrews, most of whom would have been dead today had we bowed unconditionally to the rules of the Colonial Office. It is typical of the whole situation that several thousand of these "illegal immigrants" are fighting with the Hebrew Palestinian units of the British Army in Italy and many of them lost their lives in their gallant participation in the battles of Egypt and north Africa.

On behalf of all those Hebrews, survivors of the holocaust in Europe, who are determined to leave the scenes of horror and destruction, we appeal to the governments and peoples of the United Nations and the nations associated with them, to give their full assistance to such individuals so that they may reach their destination safely and without additional sufferings.

The Hebrew in Europe today is no longer a beggar, hopelessly knocking at the gates of every nation of the world. The Hebrew in Europe today is a voyager on his way home, and as such should be given all possible aid and comfort.

We have good reason to believe that over 500 000 Hebrews are clamoring for an opportunity to go to Palestine immediately, and we shall do our best to get them there in the nearest possible future.

We are making these decisions public because in the past British colonial officials found it possible to machine-gun transports carrying Hebrews and to force them back to sea. The understanding and support of the governments and people of the United Nations is our only hope that Britain's colonial administrators will refrain from such criminal brutality in the future. We wish to avoid the tragic necessity of post mortem protests which has too long been our lot. While we are in need of help we well realize that our chance for survival lies only in our own determination. We pray for God's grace and for the assistance of His followers the world over.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, my distinguished colleague on this committee the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], has again endeared himself to members of this committee on which he serves, by making complimentary statements with respect to his colleagues on that committee. I desire to thank him for what he said about me and to assure him that each member of our subcommittee appreciates the kind words he has spoken in respect for us and our secretary, and that each member of our committee has a very deep affection and greatest respect for him. I think this House shares that respect and that love, because he is not only an able man, but he has impressed us with his sincerity, with his candor, and his honesty, in his wise approach to all matters involving the interest of our country.

I have taken this occasion to speak to you today in reference to the activities and the achievements of the F. B. I., which is doing what we all must concede is a magnificent work in the interest of the welfare of this Nation and of the world.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation is a bulwark of American democracy. Guided by its watchwords of "Fidelity," "Bravery," and "Integrity," it has made a record which is one of the most laudable in our Nation.

The F. B. I.'s wartime accomplishments cause every patriotic American to tingle with pride, but we learned to depend on this organization long before Hitler became a major menace.

It is not difficult for us to remember the terrible days of uncertainty in the early thirties. Bank robbers had established themselves as a definite part of the American scene. Cashiers and tellers looked with suspicion on every stranger who approached, for robberies were occurring at a rate of almost two every business day.

This terrible situation, this rampant threat to American business, reached its crest in 1932. During that year alone there were over 600 bank robberies, and the robbers divided more than four and one-half millions among themselves. After another bad year in 1933, Congress acted. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, an organization which already had proved its mettle under the leadership of its Director, John Edgar Hoover, was given jurisdiction over these crimes.

Then the bank-robbery barometer began to decline. In 1935, there were 229 robberies, and the all-time low came in 1943 with 22. Bank robbery, once considered a choice way for a criminal to get easy money, now is an extremely dangerous profession.

All of us know the story with respect to kidnapings. Of 275 kidnapings, the F. B. I. has solved all but 2, and the G-men are still working on them.

These accomplishments were not accidents. The gangsters and other vicious criminals against whom the F. B. I. declared war were not easy foes. Their orders were enforced with blackjacks and with guns, and they had quick ways of rubbing out colleagues who turned on their mobs.

It took a two-fisted organization to handle these deadly hoodlums. But the F. B. I. did the job with cool efficiency. Its men moved unobtrusively about their task of cleaning up. They pitted brains and persistent work against criminal cunning. Dozens of tough mobsters said they never would be captured alive, but most of them were.

As this threat from the criminal element was being brought under control, the F. B. I. recognized a new menace. The Japanese and Germans began to show a more-than-ordinary interest in our activities, particularly of a military nature. The F. B. I. acted, in accordance with its tradition, quickly and efficiently. Its men and methods proved just as effective against agents for foreign nations as they had been against criminals.

Between 1936 and 1938, several spies who were working for the Germans and the Japanese were caught and convicted. The F. B. I. knew others were active, but

they were protected by the cloak of diplomatic immunity.

Meanwhile, the Hitler menace was growing in Europe. In the United States, offshoots of this Old World fanaticism threatened the security of our own Nation. The first real opportunity for the F. B. I. to go into this mushrooming mass of antidemocratic activity came, strangely enough, in the form of a request to conduct an investigation into the background of threats on the life of Adolf Hitler. At that time, of course, Hitler's armed conquests had not begun and we were at peace with Germany.

As war clouds gathered over Europe, and broke into an awful storm of uneven conflict, the Nation's leaders naturally turned to the Federal Bureau of Investigation as the logical agency to coordinate all internal security matters. Here was an organization of trained men which was accustomed to tackling hard jobs and doing them well. Here was a group whose integrity was unimpeachable and whose efficiency was a standard for all others in Government work.

The F. B. I. already possessed volumes of significant information on the enemy underground. It had built up, in its war on the criminal, a simple but extremely effective organization which could go into action in every part of the Nation on a moment's notice.

In a directive to the heads of all Government departments in the summer of 1939 and in a general directive dated September 6, 1939, the President delegated specifically to the F. B. I. the gravest responsibilities ever placed on a civilian organization.

The directive set forth the nature of the assignment and gave an excellent insight into the reasons for designating the F. B. I. to handle the job. I quote from it:

> The Attorney General has been requested by me to instruct the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice to take charge of investigative work in matters relating to espionage, sabotage, and violations of the neutrality regulations.
>
> This task must be conducted in a comprehensive and effective manner on a national basis, and all information must be carefully sifted out and correlated in order to avoid confusion and irresponsibility.
>
> To this end I request all police officers, sheriffs, and all other law-enforcement officers in the United States promptly to turn over to the nearest representative of the Federal Bureau of Investigation any information obtained by them relating to espionage, counterespionage, sabotage, subversive activities, and violations of the neutrality laws.

The tempo of the G-men's quiet war against this Nation's secret enemies increased. Open conflict was beyond the conception of many citizens, but the F. B. I. proceeded to prepare for the worst. Special agents, after thorough training for the job, checked 2,300 strategic war factories throughout the land for weak spots which might make it easy for the spy and saboteur to do their dirty work. Worker and employer alike joined in the consistently wholehearted response to recommendations for physical improvements to make our industrial fortress secure.

In early 1940 the F. B. I. had an opportunity to apprehend 3 known spies. Instead, the G-men infiltrated the ring and controlled its information outlets while other spies made their true colors known. By watching patiently and working tirelessly, these protectors of our Nation were able to catch 33 spies in this ring and 9 in another—42 in all—within a few months prior to Pearl Harbor. If these enemy agents had not been controlled and caught, they could have been responsible for untold damage, and many of them no doubt would be working against us today.

While the working spies were being watched, the F. B. I. was collecting an amazing amount of information on potential foreign agents and saboteurs. This work had to be done despite the opposition of some few well-meaning Americans who were hoodwinked into supporting the Axis sympathizer and the subverter. But the work was done, and proof that it had been done well came during those frightening days immediately after Pearl Harbor. For the F. B. I. ably assisted by local peace officers, apprehended dangerous alien enemies at a rate exceeding 100 an hour for a time after the Jap bombs fell. The G-men knew the dangerous enemy aliens and where to go to get them. Approximately three-fifths of the 16,000 alien enemies who have been apprehended have been interned or paroled. The F. B. I. has found arsenals of weapons, ammunition, and explosives, along with warehouses of cameras, short-wave radios, and other equipment in approximately 26,000 searches of alien enemy premises.

The enemy's reserves in this country were taken, and the effects are particularly noticeable in the field of sabotage. Not one case of enemy-directed sabotage has occurred in the United States since the war emergency began, and most of the 2,000 technical cases of actual sabotage have been traced to spite work. The F. B. I., as an efficient, Nation-wide organization, was ready for its job of controlling sabotage, and its record of accomplishment is truly remarkable.

As the F. B. I.'s responsibilities multiplied many times, it recruited and trained new special agents. The organization's educational program was enlarged to take care of new types of investigations. No special agent went to work until he was qualified to do a job consistent with the high standards already set, for I know from personal contact with the F. B. I. through the Appropriations Committee that Director Hoover has insisted that there be no letdown in efficiency and qualifications despite the emergency requirements.

Today, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is at a peak of efficiency. It has developed in direct response to the needs and desires of our citizenry, and the people of this Nation consider it a model and a standard. It gets results, and Americans like that kind of an organization.

Overconfidence is a current danger. If it grips us in its stranglehold, a dangerous relaxing of vigilance and effort will follow. Victory will be ours—that is certain—but we can keep the price down by maximum effort and constant vigilance during this crucial period.

The F. B. I., as guardian of the home front, is aware of the dangers of counting our victories before they are won. Director Hoover's previous words of warning were underscored recently with the capture of two German spies newly arrived by Nazi submarine. We know that others have been trained for similar missions and we must make certain that they receive an equally appropriate reception.

New pages are being added daily to the F. B. I.'s record of security work, but meanwhile it has continued to deal successfully with the criminal element. During the last fiscal year, there were 13,616 convictions in Federal cases within the F. B. I.'s jurisdiction and these carried sentences of 23,615 years. These ranged from impersonation act to kidnaping violations. Here is more of the record for the year: $21,490,000 in fines, savings, and recoveries; 14,695 fugitives located, and 6,632 automobiles recovered. Since the F. B. I. received the job of enforcing the selective-service law it has handled approximately 460,000 investigations.

One of the most striking tributes to the F. B. I. is its collection of 95,132,000 fingerprint cards, which has grown from a start of 800,000 cards in 1924. This collection of identification data has inestimable value to law enforcement throughout the world, and is a result of cooperation which has been fostered and consistently promoted by this Bureau. The F. B. I.'s efficiency is evident in its identification work, for no more than a few hours are required for answers in criminal cases.

There are many other important features to the F. B. I.'s work. Its crime-detection laboratory is a nightmare for criminals. During 1944, 154,511 examinations were conducted, including 2,478 for other Government agencies and local officers. The F. B. I. technicians develop information from fingernail parings, dust specimens, automobile paint chips, bloodstains, and other insignificant bits of evidence.

Work of training local officers in latest methods of crime detection began, through the F. B. I. National Academy, in 1935. When classes now in session graduate in the spring of this year, this institution will have more than 1,000 alumni representing more than 100,000 local law-enforcement officers. I have come in contact, in my home State of North Carolina, with some of the graduates of this F. B. I. school, and I know they have accomplished wonders in giving us more efficient and more economical protection.

The F. B. I. is on the job. I know that it plans to stay alert, not only against our foreign enemies, but against the subverters and the criminals at home. It will continue to do outstanding work, if given the assistance and wholehearted support of the people it protects.

When the history of this country is written, there will be inscribed on its pages the life story of many remarkable men and women embracing every human attainment. This Nation has made an outstanding contribution to the world's progress politically, industrially, and spiritually. No nation and no race can

ever be judged by any one individual or group of individuals; it is the combined intellect, virtue, genius, and industry of that race or that nation which measure its importance and fix its destiny.

It has been well said by Carlyle, "Blessed is he who has found his work; let him ask no other blessedness." In my opinion, one of the most useful men who ever served this Nation is Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

He has created within a few years an organization which has been more effective in the prevention and eradication of crime than any other ever perfected on this earth. Mr. Hoover's work and success are marvelous in our eyes, his measure of efficiency in the duty committed to him is matchless, and this Nation will be his debtor and every home will extol his service a thousand years after his spirit has winged its way to its eternal home.

It has been said that half of the world seems to have found uncongenial occupation. Not so with Mr. Hoover; he found his place. The world does not demand that you be a lawyer, minister, doctor, farmer, or scientist, but it does demand that you master whatever you undertake. That is what J. Edgar Hoover has done, and in doing so he has perfected an organization which has no equal in human history.

In the great race of life common sense has the right-of-way. Wealth, a diploma, a pedigree, talent, or genius cut a small figure without tact and common sense. The incapables and the impracticables, though loaded with diplomas and degrees, are left behind. Not what do you know, or who you are, but what are you, what can you do, is the interrogation of the century. Those of us who know something about the F. B. I. are well aware that the rare genius both before and behind this division in our Government has proved what he and his associates can do, and their accomplishments are a high tribute to this generation and to this Nation.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Bureau of Investigation requested an original appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $39,671,810 on the basis that the war would continue on both the European and Pacific fronts.

At the request of the Bureau of the Budget, the Federal Bureau of Investigation submitted an appropriation estimate for the fiscal year 1946, with Germany out of the war, in an amount totaling $35,829,008. The Bureau of the Budget, in considering the request of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, approved an estimate for the fiscal year 1946, based on Germany being out of the war, of an amount of $33,100,000, or a reduction from the request submitted by Mr. Hoover, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of $2,729,008. The committee restored this amount for the following reasons:

The contemplated cut in the appropriation estimate of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the amount of $2,729,008 would make it necessary for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to reduce its field investigative staff by 400 agents under the number it feels it needs to handle the work which will be referred to it during the fiscal year 1946. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, in its estimate, requested sufficient funds to employ on a full-year basis 3,900 field special agents. Under the reduced appropriation estimate approved by the Bureau of the Budget, only 3,500 special agents could be employed, or a reduction of 400 special agents would be necessary. These men are on the rolls now, which means that there would have been an actual reduction of personnel and not a theoretical reduction if the Budget estimates were approved as submitted. It would also have been necessary for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to reduce its field clerical staff by 200 clerical employees. The request of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in its estimates for the fiscal year 1946, based on a 1-front war, was for 2,000 clerical employees and under the proposed reduced Budget estimates, only 1,800 were allowed.

In summarization, it would have been necessary for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to reduce its field staff from its original estimate of 5,900 employees to 5,300 employees, or a total reduction of personnel of 600 employees.

In addition to the necessary reduction in personnel under the Budget estimates, it would have been necessary in order to stay within the estimate allowed for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to close at least five of its divisional offices located throughout the country. This would have made it more difficult to handle work being referred to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The committee's action will result in keeping these offices open.

The condition of the field work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation reflects a delinquency of approximately 33 percent in the handling of investigative matters. This is caused by the fact that sufficient special-agent personnel is not available in the field service to handle on a current basis all of the work being referred to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for attention. Approximately 23,000 investigative matters are in such a delinquent status, it not having been possible for the field investigative staff to give any investigative attention to these 23,000 matters for a period of at least 45 days. Each field special agent carries an average case load of 11.36 cases. Experience has shown that an agent can give the best investigative attention and secure the maximum investigative results when he is assigned no more than 10 investigative matters.

From the current statistics furnished, it had been definitely determined that there is an increase in cases being referred to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for attention. Many of these investigative matters being referred at the present time are in the most complicated investigative categories, necessitating multiple assignment of agents and investigations spreading into many communities in the continental United States. It is not expected that there will be any decrease in the work referred to the Federal Bureau of Investigation during the next fiscal year; and if the field investigative staff had been reduced from the absolutely necessary minimum staff as estimated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the condition of the field work would not and could not improve.

The accomplishments of the F. B. I. in the pre-war days are well known to the American public. It promptly stamped out the menace of kidnaping which threatened so many American homes. Following the passage of legislation by Congress giving the F. B. I. investigative jurisdiction over bank robberies, such crimes were reduced from 600 in 1932 to 22 in 1943. Extortion and other similar types of crimes were promptly solved by F. B. I. agents.

With the coming of war, the F. B. I. was designated by the President to coordinate all internal security matters. Working in close cooperation with Military and Naval Intelligence, the F. B. I. has performed its work in a manner which has met the approbation of all right-thinking citizens. Espionage has been kept under control, and scores of enemy spies have been sent to prison. Not one single act of enemy-inspired sabotage has occurred during the present war. As early as 1939, F. B. I. agents were making surveys of hundreds of strategic war factories with a view to making sabotage more difficult. Within a matter of minutes after the Pearl Harbor disaster, special agents of the F. B. I. were arresting dangerous enemy aliens who might have committed sabotage at that time. The work of the F. B. I. in the war effort has been such that it has been characterized by the President of the United States as closely akin to the responsibilities and work of the armed services.

Many new phases of work have been added to the F. B. I. as a result of the war. The F. B. I. has had the job of enforcing the selective-service law and has handled over 450,000 investigations in this field. In addition, it has handled thousands of investigations pertaining to escapes of prisoners of war, impersonation, war frauds, thefts of Government property, hijackings of scarce commodities, and similar crimes.

The fingerprints files of the F. B. I. now contain approximately 100,000,000 sets of fingerprint records. During the war period receipts of fingerprints have included persons in the armed services, civil-service employees, workers in plants manufacturing war materials, and alien enemies, as well as the fingerprints of persons arrested by law-enforcement agencies. This great collection of identification material will be of increasing value in the post-war period to law-enforcing agencies.

Other important factors of the F. B. I.'s work of value to all law-enforcement agencies throughout the Nation include its crime-detection laboratory, where any evidence found at the scene of crime can be analyzed, and also the F. B. I. National Academy, where selected officers from local communities are afforded specialized training in order that they may, in turn, impart this knowledge to their fellow officers in their home communities.

Many thinking citizens feel that it is possible that we may experience a seri-

ous post-war crime situation. This belief is based upon several premises, one of which is the startling increase in juvenile arrests which has occurred during the war period. It seemed false economy to reduce the appropriation of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and to eliminate from its service trained and experienced employees. Members of Congress have been very much impressed over the years with the fact that Director Hoover of the F. B. I. has practiced every possible economy in the operation of the F. B. I. On a number of occasions he has returned large sums of money to the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year which it was possible for him to save as a result of economical operation. I believe it would have been shortsighted if Members of Congress permitted a cut in the appropriation of this Bureau, which commands the respect of all decent Americans.

It is for these reasons and some other important ones which we are not permitted to discuss because of their security nature that your committee restored the funds which were denied to the Federal Bureau of Investigation by the Budget Bureau. I hope the House will approve the action of the committee and allow the total amount which is being requested in this bill for the operation of the F. B. I. during the next fiscal year.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to two of the most important documents affecting the western part of the United States which are likely to come before Congress in some time. I particularly invite the attention of the members of the Appropriations Committee and of the Members of Congress from the seven States of the Colorado River Basin.

One of these documents is a volume of 326 pages, still in tentative form and not yet submitted to Congress, called the Colorado River—A Natural Menace Becomes a National Resource. It contains Secretary Ickes' inventory of projects in the Colorado River Basin. His synopsis on page 6 says that the report includes 76 potential irrigation projects of the upper basin and 20 for the lower. The total estimated cost—page 9—is stated as $2,439,000,000, to benefit 2,413,820 acres—page 6—or a cost of about $1,000 per acre. Of this amount, $480,000,000 would be spent in Colorado, or about $3,000 per capita of the present population. One million seven hundred eighty-six thousand acre-feet would be exported or taken out of the basin by transmountain diversions, of which a substantial part are in Colorado—page 6.

This report shows that there is not enough water for the projects proposed, even if no water at all were delivered to Mexico. At page 125 the report says:

> The average annual flow at Lee Ferry in the 1931–40 period, had no upstream diversions been made, would have been 12,234,000 acre-feet. After deducting from this the 7,500,000 acre-feet allocated to the lower basin, only 4,734,000 acre-feet would have remained for the upper basin. Full upper basin depletion of 6,908,000 acre-feet could have been made, therefore, only if at the beginning of the decade the upper basin had hold-over storage sufficient to permit releases of 2,174,000 acre-feet annually throughout the 10-year period.

That is to say, over 21,000,000 acre-feet would have had to be in storage at the beginning of that decade.

The picture painted for the lower basin is just as serious. He says:

> Present, future, and potential depletion of the flow of the Colorado River as listed in the foregoing table total 9,922,600 acre-feet exclusive of the Gila River and any allocation to Mexico by international agreement. It is therefore evident that the projects discussed will need to be modified to conform with the available water supply.

That is to say the projects listed for the lower basin exceed by 2,500,000 acre-feet per year the inflow at Lee Ferry, putting to one side all reservoir and evaporation losses below Lee Ferry and what minor quantities of water flow into the river between that point and the Gila River.

In short, in a decade in which the upper basin lacks 3,000,000 acre-feet per year of what it is entitled to under the Colorado River compact in order to make good on the guaranty it gave in the compact to deliver water to the lower basin, the lower-basin projects would be short another 2,500,000 acre-feet.

In other words, there are projects waiting to be built wholly within the United States whose demands exceed by more than 5,000,000 acre-feet per year, or 50,000,000 acre-feet in 10 years, the whole available flow of the river during a period like 1931–40.

Now I come to the second document, the Treaty with Mexico signed February 4, 1944, now pending before the Senate.

I have pointed out that even without any allocation of water whatever to Mexico, the upper basin, if it lives up to the Colorado River compact, will be busted in a period like 1931–40 unless we appropriate money for tremendous storage reservoirs much bigger than Boulder Dam. The basic use of Boulder Dam storage during this period would not allow more than 8,500,000 acre-feet to be discharged, according to the figures the Reclamation Bureau gave our Appropriations Committee when it sought the funds to construct Davis Dam. Our actual contracts outstanding in the United States for the use of this water add up to 8,462,000 acre-feet.

I trust that the members of the Appropriations Committee and the members of the Colorado River Basin States have been able to keep these figures in mind. They are the water budget of the Colorado River. Water makes one budget that has to be balanced. You cannot print it and you cannot borrow it. You can save it in reservoirs, but the evaporation eats it up like interest on a mortgage, and you cannot build enough reservoirs to guarantee the whole project a water supply.

The second of these documents, the Mexican Colorado River Treaty, adds to the strain on the already exhausted water budget of the Colorado River by guaranteeing, from any and all sources and whatever its origin, 1,500,000 acre-feet per year to Mexico. For technical reasons which I will not go into, it is more likely that this guaranty amounts to 2,000,000 acre-feet, because we are only credited and Mexico is only charged with water delivered at the exact times which she orders it.

This guaranty is made a first mortgage on the river. It comes ahead of all American uses, no matter how old. Projects 50 years old will have to yield their right to water stored in works built at their own expense, such as Boulder Dam, the Roosevelt, Stewart Mountain, Horse Mesa, and Mormon Flat Dams in Arizona, and the great dams yet to be built in the upper basin. There are ambiguities in the treaty which will necessitate arbitration or a second treaty. We have an arbitration treaty—1929—which requires us to arbitrate differences in interpretation of a treaty like this one.

Without this treaty, it is true that Mexicans can stand on the bank of the Colorado River and watch some 7,000,000 acre-feet of water per year flow by them to the sea, until the users in the United States who have paid for the storage works are ready to use the water they have conserved. About 2,000,000 acre-feet per year of this would flow through Mexico during the irrigation season, and the rest during the winter, conforming to Boulder Dam power releases. The State Department knows next to nothing about the Colorado River. It stationed one engineer there for part of one summer, to prepare hurriedly for this treaty, as compared with the four decades of careful engineering work of the Reclamation Bureau, represented in the Colorado River report which I have just shown you. Nevertheless, the State Department, alarmed, I might say, almost to the point of hysteria, by the fact that 7,000,000 acre-feet of water would in fact be flowing to the sea through the Boulder Dam turbines for many years, and supposing that there is no way for the United States to regulate that flow, either at Boulder or Davis Dam, and supposing further that Mexico has some feasible physical means of getting the water out of the river, and supposing further that if she did do so, that Mexico could compel arbitration of her continued right to use Boulder Dam storage, has assured the Colorado Basin States that unless this treaty is ratified, they face a much greater danger in the future.

They overlook the fact that unless the United States deliberately regulates the discharges at Boulder and Davis so as to give this flow to Mexico in the irrigation season instead of at times when it would normally come down in response to power operations at Boulder Dam, the quantity reaching Mexico is very limited. They suppress further the fact that Mexico has never been able to successfully divert water in any large quantity on her own land, and is dependent now on diversion works located wholly in the United States. This treaty perpetuates the permission to use those diversion works, turning it into a firm right by adding an agreement to help Mexico build a large diversion dam

wholly or partly on American soil, to enable her to get not only the 1,500,000 acre-feet guaranteed to her, but as much more water as Mexico can use.

With the insistence of the State Department, apparently a number of generally level-headed citizens in the upper basin, and a few in Arizona, have jumped to the conclusion that they must force a ratification of this treaty right now, at all costs, notwithstanding the fact that the Mexican Senate does not meet to ratify it until next September.

I invite the members of the Appropriations Committee to read both of these documents: the Interior Department's plan for the development of the upper basin and particularly Colorado, and the State Department's plan to give the water needed by those projects to Mexico and to choose between them. Obviously, the upper basin cannot have both.

I cannot speak for my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, but I think it is plain common sense to say that they will not appropriate $2,500,000,000, or any substantial part of that sum, to build works in a basin which has an inadequate water supply. According to the Reclamation Bureau report, it is already inadequate to build these American projects, and if 1,500,000 acre-feet is guaranteed to Mexico, to be made good out of the storage works we are asked to build for the American projects, and having a priority ahead of these projects, then I say the whole plan is fantastic. Certainly the taxpayers of our Nation and the citizens of the affected States must be protected. This situation is a threat to development of the Colorado Basin.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, we might just as well pull the screen away from the off-the-record testimony given before our subcommittee and admit that all Government agencies are growing like Topsy. There are no terminal facilities for work attempted to be done between the regular, old-line agencies, and when you add to that the special war agencies, you have confusion in government personified.

The Department of Justice is the only agency that requested less funds than they had last year. In that request, the Budget Bureau made a mistake and the committee had to rectify it by approving funds over the Budget estimate in the sum of $2,179,000. The Bureau of the Budget apparently figured the war in Europe would be over by June 1 of this year, and recommended estimates for the F. B. I. for a one-front war beginning July 1, 1945.

The Departments of State, Commerce, Justice, and the judiciary have made demands for enormous increases in personnel, and are apparently unaware that there is a war on, or that the President claims at this time that there is a critical shortage of manpower requiring a slave-labor draft. To give you some idea of the growth of the State Department in the foreign personnel field, I quote Mr. Pen Davis at page 47 of the hearings:

> The Division handles field personnel which, before the war, was roughly 3,000, is now 6,000 and for the post-war period we anticipate eventually around 9,000.

That testimony alone may give you an idea of the utter and flagrant lack of appreciation on the part of these Government officials for the need to cut appropriations after these enormous war expenditures stop, not to mention the reckless abandon with which manpower will be recruited for civilian jobs in the Government service in this year of final push for victory. No one in the Government service seems to realize that the taxpayers of the Nation producing the war materials are being forced to do a production job, especially on the farms, without the able-bodied young men of draft age. One could stand this bureaucratic self-interest in growth for bureaucracy's preservation were the special war agencies ready to request, and no doubt get, tremendous funds—billions of dollars of the taxpayers' funds—on top of billions voted for the regular agencies. These billions of appropriations hire thousands of personnel to do work which, in many cases, is sheer boondoggling and a complete waste of the taxpayers' money.

On page 103 of the State Department hearings you will find the testimony of Mr. Monett Davis, as follows:

> Mr. DAVIS. Mr. JONES has, in effect, asked me two questions as follows: "What is the relationship of the Foreign Service to F. E. A. personnel abroad?" And "Is there a duplication of functions?"
>
> In determining the relationship of the Foreign Service to representatives of the F. E. A. and other war agencies abroad, the Department has maintained the principle of a single Foreign Service as established by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1939. In so doing it has been guided particularly by the President's statement of May 20, 1942, clarifying its relations with the Board of Economic Warfare, which provided that the Board would recognize that all functions which are being or can be performed through the regular or auxiliary Foreign Services of the Department should be so performed and that the persons which the Board contemplates being sent to the field, other than through the services mentioned, are those needed for the specialized technical and operational functions connected with production and procurement.
>
> Arrangements have been worked out with the F. E. A. to prevent overlapping of functions. The Foreign Service has continued to do the work regularly performed by diplomatic and consular officers, while F. E. A. personnel carry on activities, such as lend-lease operations, procurement transactions, and so forth, under the general supervision of our chiefs of mission.
>
> Officials going abroad temporarily for special purposes are sent by their respective agencies with the approval of the Department of State. If such officials are to remain for protracted periods and are to do work within the province of the Foreign Service, however, the Department takes the position that they should be appointed in the Foreign Service and assigned as an integral part of the missions or consular offices in the countries where they render their specialized services.

Mr. Davis' testimony would lead to the belief that there is a clear demarcation of duties; but at page 117 of the same hearings, Mr. Charles P. Taft, describing the State Department's personnel in Belgium, a newly-liberated country, said this:

> I might have said Mr. Miller is the joint representative of the State Department and the F. E. A. The same thing is true of Mr. Labouisse, economic counselor in Paris, and Mr. Wehle, in the Netherlands, is to be the same, I think.

What show and hypocrisy to say that there is a division of functions between the F. E. A. and the State Department? By their own statements they convict themselves of misrepresentation as to their relations with the special war agencies.

In passing, I want to give another illustration: At page 205 and the following of the hearings you will find the cultural relations program with China discussed. That program was hidden under a basket and financed from the emergency war fund. Congress would never have been asked to approve it, had not the Russell amendment been adopted in the Senate requiring special request to Congress for the continuance of such programs. Bear in mind, this program has been financed for 3 years; and it is now conceded by the Department that there is no basic law authorizing it.

Specifically, on pages 208 and 209, you will notice that they are sending industrial engineers, accountants, news editors, feature writers, radio news specialists, hydraulic engineers, microfilm, publications, scientific and educational equipment to China. Lo and behold, in Saturday night's paper—Washington Evening Star—a comprehensive program for the industrialization of China was announced as having just been completed by the F. E. A. In the first place, the main objective of taxpayers' funds should be to help win the war. It is presumed that if the F. E. A. made such a survey for China, providing for a $20,000,000,000 industrialization program, it has completed, on a broad and comprehensive scale, a long-range program which the State Department says it is doing, in its field, to the exclusion of everybody else.

There have been hundreds of thousands of dollars spent by the State Department on this China program without ever giving Congress a chance to learn that there was such a program; and, of course, those large sums were diverted from legitimate war purposes the Congress intended when it voted the President's emergency war funds. Virtually a month has passed since the State Department requested $1,390,000 for cultural relations in China and the Far East, and the legislative committee for the State Department legislation still has not brought before Congress a bill to authorize this cultural-relations program, or the expenditure of funds for it. And, Mr. Chairman, rest assured that if this appropriation is granted, no such specific authorization will be pressed.

The Budget and Accounting Act in the plainest of terms requires the President to submit Budget estimates to Congress at the beginning of each term; and while he may submit supplemental and deficiency estimates to cover matters em-

braced in legislation passed after submission of the regular Budget, and to meet the public need, the Budget and Accounting Act explicitly requires that the President accompany all such supplemental and deficiency estimates with explanations as to why they were not included in the annual Budget.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I do not know whether the gentleman is going to return during the course of his very interesting remarks to the connection or lack of connection between the State Department and the F. E. A. I wonder if, in the hearings or in the gentleman's remarks, there is a statement of how many each of them hire and the size of the budgets and pay-roll schedules so that we can get an idea of whether there are or are not duplications.

Mr. JONES. At the present time, may I say to the gentleman I attempted to develop that. But in the hearings on the State Department the gentleman will remember that all of the first-class men of the State Department, in the policy field from the Secretary down to the Assistant Secretaries, were either at the Yalta Conference or the Mexico City Conference. Those who did come were so busy, except Mr. MacLeish, who came very late at the very end of the hearings, we did not get an opportunity to develop the point. I will discuss that later on in my prepared statement, and I would ask the indulgence of the gentleman until I finish the statement.

Notwithstanding those provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget recently reported that, according to a "practice which has grown up in the past few years," all of the annual estimate was not being submitted at the beginning of this session, and served notice that the estimates for numerous agencies—that is, the war agencies—would be sent to Congress later.

To my way of thinking, this is a willful failure to comply with the law. The people will not know until the calendar year 1945 is half gone what the total estimates are for all Government functions. In addition, this committee does not know, and apparently the State Department does not know, where the functions of the war agencies start and where their own stop.

As fairly as I can make an appraisal, the State Department has developed an inferiority complex. A man, who has seemed perfectly confident to spend $25,000,000 a year for the last several fiscal years as administrator of a separate war agency, is given two bosses to spend $4,000,000 for the alleged coordinated counterpart of his war agency program in the State Department. I now call your attention to the hearings at page 264 where the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] is examining new Assistant Secretary Rockefeller:

Mr. STEFAN. Has the cultural-relations program been coordinated with some other program?

Secretary ROCKEFELLER. It has been coordinated. I will try to give you, briefly, the setup. The Department of State has two political divisions, one for inter-American affairs, and the other for European, far eastern, near eastern, and African affairs. We then have a division for economic policy, which is under Assistant Secretary Clayton, and he is responsible for economic policy. We have another division under Mr. MacLeish, which is responsible for information and cultural relations in the Department.

Mr. STEFAN. Then who will have this cultural program?

Secretary ROCKEFELLER. Mr. MacLeish.

It seems that Mr. Rockefeller was perfectly content as a Government agent of the United States, to make any kind of recording in Spanish, Portuguese, or English of this country, but as Assistant Secretary of State he seems to fear to make any broadcast, and I asked him, therefore, to touch upon the things he felt incapable of handling as Assistant Secretary of State to mold the good will of the United States with the South American republics. The record is as follows, at pages 268 and 269 of the hearing:

Mr. JONES. The public, the President, and everybody had confidence in you as the head of the C. I. A. A. and the head of South American affairs. The cultural-relations program in the past has been of a temporary nature. I wish you would specify for the record what things cannot be taken into the Department of State.

Secretary ROCKEFELLER. Well, when you say what things cannot be taken in, physically speaking, I suppose the Department of State could enlarge itself to take in any activity, so far as that is concerned. It is a question, really, whether it is desirable to take them in from the point of view of the most efficient operation. I make this point because, when you get right down to it, this is the basic problem involved: Can a policy-determining organization, the time and the energies of the personnel of which are devoted to a study of these policy questions, can they most effectively deal with these policy questions if, at the same time, they are loaded with tremendously heavy administrative and operating responsibility? That is where you really get right down to the heart of it.

Mr. JONES. Well, where would the operating responsibility come in? Would that be secret?

Secretary ROCKEFELLER. I am not talking off the record.

Mr. JONES. I mean could you specify the things?

Secretary ROCKEFELLER. Well, take the information program; take the C. I. A. A. information program, the radio activities. They are broadcasting 53 hours a day in Spanish, Portuguese, and English from this country. They have a point-to-point program with these other countries. You know all this.

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Secretary ROCKEFELLER. They have whole programs of recordings which are made and shipped to other countries and made available to local stations. They have programs in a majority of the countries which are sponsored locally, programs produced on the long waves. The amount of material which is produced for those, scripts and so forth, is extraordinary in volume.

Now, just in that one area alone, if the Department were responsible—if that was operated in the Department, then it becomes a question, because everything that is said on one of these programs becomes a State Department program, an official State Department statement.

Mr. JONES. I think, whether it is C. I. A. A. or State Department, it ought to be one that is sound and official, and one that you can stand by.

Some people might conclude from this statement that the State Department does not know exactly what it wants to do to win friends and influence people in South America, but my conclusion is that Mr. Rockefeller has just developed an inferiority complex. I intended going into this thoroughly with Mr. Rockefeller, but Under Secretary Rockefeller was too busy to spend much time at the committee as the following record will show at page 268:

Mr. JONES. Would it be possible for Mr. Rockefeller to come back this afternoon?

Mr. RABAUT. No; he is going away tomorrow afternoon, and I know he must be busy.

Secretary ROCKEFELLER. I will be delighted to come back when I return from Mexico.

Mr. JONES. But the hearings will be over then.

Mr. RABAUT. He will be back before we get through.

You will note it was promised that he would be back before the subcommittee finished hearings, but the subcommittee never got to see Mr. Rockefeller again before the hearings were completed.

I am sorry we could not develop any more detailed information on this subject, because I am interested in this apparent milk-toast complex.

I pursued the matter further with Mr. Frank and, lo and behold, Mr. Frank, Chief of the Division of Foreign Service Administration, has developed a lack of confidence in the Foreign Service of the State Department. I wish the committee would look at the testimony of Mr. Frank on this subject, which appears on pages 133 and 137 of the hearings:

Mr. JONES. At this time could not the Department of State do all the work in this field with reference to South America, using their Auxiliary Foreign Service?

Mr. FRANK. I doubt that stage has been reached, but I am not in a position to give a definitive answer.

Mr. DAVIS. There would have been no possibility of maintaining a centralized Foreign Service without the auxiliary. The demands were such that the Service could not have done its job if it had not been that we had the auxiliary and were able to hire officers and clerks to carry the load.

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. JONES. Will you recruit your personnel in the Foreign Service and the auxiliary service from the several special war agencies which are tapering off?

Mr. FRANK. I can very well imagine we will. Anyone who would be interested and has the qualifications and background necessary to the efficient conduct of the work to be done, we would be glad to get. We would recruit them, of course, Mr. JONES, with the agreement of the agency. It would not be pirating.

Now the Secretary, in his statement regarding the responsibilities of the Department, said with reference to the future:

"As the war progresses and the transition to the peace begins, some of the functions of the emergency war agencies in the international relations field will cease. Those that remain can be assimilated in the State Department or other permanent agencies of the Government, depending upon the nature of the functions involved. This is a matter which will require an analysis of each particular case in the light of events. Our present estimates do not contemplate funds for the performance of any of the functions which may be ultimately transferred."

Mr. JONES. I am interested in having an over-all representative of the United States in foreign countries, and I would like to see that eliminated immediately and the Department of State take over the functions at once rather than tapering off.

Mr. FRANK. I think that would be a most difficult thing to do, sir. While we appreciate your confidence, we are not in a position, obviously, to do very much about it at the moment. There should first be a tapering off and the bringing to an orderly conclusion of those activities not having long-range implications. State will eventually presumably take over and continue those activities which are of long, rather than short, range.

I would not be so concerned about this testimony, but I believe that it is indicative of a general inferiority complex of our State Department in dealing with other nations. It seems the State Department has completely lost its ability in the diplomatic field. I do not know of one concession by any other country to the United States that has been obtained by anybody in the State Department. In listening to these entire hearings, I have not heard of one quid pro quo agreement with any foreign country. I asked several witnesses questions tending to elicit even a little of value for Uncle Sam and the taxpayers of the Nation in exchange for the billions of dollars spent in the liberation of oppressed countries. At page 90 of the hearings, we were discussing French hotels and other buildings requisitioned by the Army and used by State Department officials in France. I asked, in effect, "Are you getting these hotels under reverse lend-lease?" and Mr. Frank replied, "No, sir." A $50,000,000 State Department in this present fiscal year ought to make an arrangement that Uncle Sam gets these buildings on reverse lend-lease at the time a lend-lease agreement is executed to furnish and equip the French Navy, its shore installations, and its personnel with uniforms. Instead, Mr. Frank said, "I understand that is a matter of current negotiations." In addition to this apparent apathy of the State Department to the propriety of protecting Uncle Sam's interests, these hearings show that representatives of the State Department in France who are receiving $6 a day for subsistence have been and are living in that self-same hotel at a cost to them of only $1.10 a day.

The Department of State justifies the participation of the United States in a conference of Allied ministers of education in London on the following facts: That laboratory equipment in educational institutions has been destroyed by the Nazis, and that we must join the conference in order to sell technical and scientific equipment to those countries. Who are the competitors to sell those materials? The nations receiving lend-lease—England in particular—and Russia. A fair share of this proposed market for that equipment certainly should have been reserved to the United States in a quid pro quo agreement.

Dr. Kefauver, consultant, Division of Cultural Cooperation, had this to say in regard to the necessity for the United States spending $172,000 to sell laboratory equipment to European countries:

There is being developed in London lists of laboratory equipment by a commission of the conference—it happens that the secretary of the commission is British personnel * * *. They go back to their country with knowledge of the British-made equipment. If they are uninformed relative to the nature of the American equipment * * * they turn naturally to the sources they know about.

I asked:

Don't you think that would have been a good deal to make? To insist that we have the post-war equipment to sell to these institutions?

He misunderstood that question, and I repeated it:

I mean in view of the fact that we are giving them lend-lease and probably will never be paid for it, as a consideration for that the folks in the State Department, of which you are a part, might be guaranteeing those considerations?

The reply to that question was completely out of this world; it was entirely unrelated to anything I had asked. I conclude the witness never heard of quid pro quo, or of diplomacy.

I point one further example of the entire lack of capacity in the State Department which even interferes with our war effort in our diplomatic relations with other countries. At page 75 of the Justice Department hearings, we had been discussing earlier in the testimony a critical war material which one of our allies holds the exclusive right to sell. The United States needs that war material. The Antitrust Division of the Justice Department requested funds to prosecute the Americans involved in this cartel arrangement. Now it seems strange to me that the Antitrust Division would prosecute American nationals on a subject involving international trade when the United States is making tremendous expenditures for lend-lease to save those countries. The following colloquy occurred concerning this matter:

PROCUREMENT OF CRITICAL WAR MATERIALS AT REASONABLE COST

Mr. JONES. Earlier in your testimony you mentioned some cases involving getting our war materials cheaply or not getting them. I hope that you will put this on the record. I wonder if you have referred these matters to the Foreign Economic Administration and the Lend-Lease Administration.

Mr. BERGE. Yes.

Mr. JONES. Has any report been made back to you?

(Discussion off the record.)

Mr. Chairman, that off-the-record testimony did not lend any credit to the State Department and its diplomats.

If an American or an American concern held up a vital war material needed by one of our allies he would not only be branded a Nazi or a Fascist, but he would be vigorously prosecuted by the Department of Justice. If he tried to charge an excessive price the renegotiation statute would catch him, or he would be in violation of the Price Control Act. There is no escape for the American, but the State Department yells, "Bravo," and promises more lend-lease to the foreign countries.

Further to drive the point home that the State Department has lost all semblance of diplomacy and interest in guaranteeing for us a post-war foreign trade, either in exchange for lend-lease aid and other expenses incurred in their behalf, or otherwise, I refer to the hearings, page 252, where I said:

I note on page 291 of the justification there is a paragraph in which you state "the expanded activities of foreign governments in the cultural field in the other American republics are competing with and challenging the prestige of this Government."

The competing countries referred to were not named in the record of the State hearings.

Now it is interesting to note while the World War No. 2 clouds were gathering in Europe the administration insisted that the Congress reenact an expression in the Monroe Doctrine. The expression for the aged and tried Doctrine was unanimous. Lo and behold! the State Department has lost all faith in its potency and instead of relying upon the principles enunciated by President Monroe ask for an increase in cultural relations funds to save the prestige of Uncle Sam.

At page 299 of the State Department hearings, I questioned Mr. Archibald MacLeish, Assistant Secretary of State for Public and Cultural Relations, in an effort to learn whether the "uplift and sociological" branch of the State Department had any conception whatever of diplomatic and trade functions and here is what I heard:

CONCESSIONS FOR AIRPORTS BUILT IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. JONES. I have heard considerable concern expressed, and I expressed it in 1942, in regard to concessions for airports that the Army and Navy had built in foreign countries, that lend-lease had built. I notice that two Senators who came back home point out that we will not have any rights at all to land on them for commercial purposes. I wonder if that has any relation to the cultural-relations program?

Mr. MACLEISH. I do not think it would have in those terms. I should think it would be a political problem.

Mr. JONES. I am quite concerned about the commitments we have made on lend-lease. We are giving favorable consideration to the problems of other countries, and the United States has lost by giving special concessions to the people we are buying from. It seems to me that is why there is a failure to make friends with those with whom we are dealing. Where is the failure in connection with those programs?

Mr. MACLEISH. My answer would be that those programs only go part of the way; that you really do not get the basic, underneath understanding through such relationships. We want people abroad to know what we are thinking and writing and working at. We want them to know about our scientific knowledge and about our culture.

Mr. JONES. I am putting the shoe on the other foot. In the Revolutionary War we got help from France through General Lafayette and the American people have always been friends of the French people because of that relationship. In this war we have given them $31,000,000,000 in lend-lease and loans of many more billions, with no strings tied to the purchases. Why has not this sort of thing made friends for the American people?

Mr. MACLEISH. A large part of the close relation between our people and the French is due not only to what you referred to, but to the fact that all during those early years people came here, French travelers, and wrote books about us, and our people went to France. Franklin went to Paris not so much as our Minister as our cultural attaché. Our relation to the French was based on the fact, and enriched by the fact, of the cultural relations we have had with them. But I agree with you.

Mr. JONES. That brings up the fact that Benjamin Franklin was our dispenser of good

will to the French. It also brings up the question whether the personnel of the F. E. A. are the type of men that Franklin had epitomized. It was a job for the Ambassadors.

I am concerned about the increasing appropriations for the State Department because I do not see anything that is settled. I cannot understand why the State Department cannot get concessions favorable to the United States when we have been spending these enormous sums of money. Other countries go out and propagandize and publicize and we go out and spend American dollars, but instead of making for peace and good will it is building up competition with the increased credits. It is a growing thing and we will have spent —— —— dollars in cultural relations because we have not been good diplomats. I wish somebody would give me an answer to that.

After the present war it is proposed by Admiral Land that we give 50 percent of our ships away. I wonder if that policy was established by the State Department.

Mr. MACLEISH. I cannot reply to that.

Mr. JONES. That is not a part of the cultural relations program.

Mr. MACLEISH. I think that is the kind of relations you referred to before. That is way beyond my field.

In 1941 this cultural relations program with the American republics cost $370,500; in 1946, $4,430,000 was requested, and $4,330,000 was approved by your committee. This is the program that the State Department will expand to cover the entire world. It has no practical business sense; and the expenditures of money show that the Department has no faith in the mutual respect of nations, through traditional diplomatic give-and-take. Can America afford to build airports all over the world without the right to land on them? Can America underwrite two-thirds of the cost of stabilizing the currencies of the world? Without reserving to herself the right to sell a portion of our products in the world market?

I emphasize this point because this program of the State Department is the only one outlined to us in concrete terms. In the diplomatic field, no witness knew whether it was or is to be our policy to give 50 percent of our surplus ships to other countries after the war. Nobody in the State Department knew what this country's rights are as to airfields built by us in foreign countries. Nobody seemed to know anything from the State Department except that they want to carry the ideologies of the New Deal to all parts of the world. The thought seems to be that this country can only prove her unselfishness by completely impoverishing herself for the benefit of all other nations.

Can it be that we fear hearing once again the cry of "Shylock" if we ask for as much as $1 in return for our assistance?

I gain the impression that the only persons who can talk for their own countries are Stalin and Churchill without running the risk of being called a Fascist or a Nazi. Certainly that is the philosophy of the New Deal's propaganda in international affairs.

I have already mentioned the efforts of our subcommittee to learn of our rights on foreign airfields built with lend-lease and Army and Navy funds. Nobody in the State Department could enlighten us. After the hearings were concluded and the bill was in process of being marked up, the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. Biddle, advised the country, the great English nationalist, Mr. Churchill, and the great Russian nationalist, Mr. Stalin, that we have almost no rights in the airfields. Of course, I expected that; but I did not expect the information from the Attorney General.

There are no terminal facilities between departments, but the committee stuck to the traditional functions of the Attorney General's Office when we examined its representatives.

So I will now call your attention to the hearings which give some little information about the internal administration of justice within the United States and our possessions.

The Attorney General's efforts in international law, first on the destroyer-exchange decision and then with the lend-lease airport decision, indicate he is incapable of making any legal determination with reference to them, and I am constrained to discuss only internal affairs in the administration of justice.

I have always thought the Attorney General was kissing around with the Communists, and I am now satisfied that the record has not falsified my impression.

It will be recalled that there were rumors that Mrs. Earl Browder, the wife of our No. 1 Communist, had been or was to be ordered from this country by the immigration authorities. She was a former librarian in Russia, under the Communist regime, in the Lenin School at Moscow, where students are trained in subversive tactics for use in other countries. In any event, that deportation was never carried out, and she is in this country. So I asked the Attorney General about her case. The colloquy follows from pages 23 and 24 of the hearings:

REENTRY OF MRS. EARL BROWDER

Mr. JONES. What part, if any, did the Department of Justice play in the reentry of Mrs. Browder?

Mr. BIDDLE. The matter was considered by the Board of Immigration Appeals. The Board of Appeals is in the Department, so in that sense it came to the Department.

Mr. MCGRANERY. It had the approval of the regular board set up by——

Mr. BIDDLE. As I remember it, she went out of the United States to correct a technical defect in her status—a preexamination, I believe it is called, and when she perfected that she came back and was passed by the usual procedure, which is by the committee consisting of the F. B. I. and Immigration Service of the Department, the Army, and the Navy. The case came to the Board of Appeals first, I think, before she went out.

Mr. JONES. Did the Department of Justice approve her reentry under those circumstances?

Mr. BIDDLE. I stated to you the manner in which it was approved. It came before the Board of Appeals, and they approved her going out to establish or to correct a technical defect in her status.

Mr. JONES. And that makes her eligible to remain in the country, does it?

Mr. BIDDLE. Yes.

Mr. JONES. Permanently?

Mr. BIDDLE. Yes.

Mr. JONES. She is a citizen now, is she?

Mr. BIDDLE. I do not think so. She is married to a citizen, but she herself is a Russian, I think.

Now let us see how the regular deportation cases are handled. I examined Mr. Finucane, of the Board of Immigration Appeals, and you will find in the following colloquy how the regular deportation cases are handled, from page 55 of the hearings:

VOLUNTARY DEPARTURES

Mr. JONES. In a case of a deportation order that is submitted by the immigration officials, and the party involved protests, does that protest come to your Board?

Mr. FINUCANE. Yes. The procedure is this: The alien is given a hearing; the presiding inspector makes his findings. If the alien does not agree, he will file exception and he can come before us and present oral argument, or have his attorney do so. We hear oral arguments every day at 2 o'clock.

Mr. JONES. Suppose an inspector orders a person deported, and he comes before your committee and you also order him deported. Can that person go to Canada or Mexico and then come back in and clear up any past differences?

Mr. FINUCANE. If there is an order of deportation, no matter whether he goes voluntarily or is physically deported, he has to remain out of the country for at least 1 year. He can come back thereafter only if, prior to his application for admission, he receives permission to reapply, which permission may be granted by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. But an order of deportation is a bar to the man's return.

Now you will see how Mr. Biddle opened the arms of Uncle Sam to Mrs. Browder, through the services of Mr. Finucane, his chairman of the Board of Immigration Appeals. At page 56 of the hearings will be found the following:

THE CASE OF MRS. BROWDER

Mr. JONES. Take the case of Mrs. Browder. How did she get back in?

Mr. FINUCANE. There was not an order of deportation against her when she left the United States. She was given what we term a "voluntary departure," which is permitted by section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917.

Mr. JONES. Of what country is she a national?

Mr. FINUCANE. She was born in Russia and claimed to be stateless. She claimed to have no nationality status.

Mr. JONES. Did you advise her to go to Canada?

Mr. FINUCANE. We did not advise her to go to Canada. She applied for permission to depart voluntarily, so that she could then apply for an immigration visa and come back in the regular manner.

During Mr. Biddle's questioning, Mr. Biddle tried to have the F. B. I., the Army, and the Navy share responsibility for her reentry from Canada; but I want to call your attention to the fact that the Department of Justice and the Department of Justice alone gave Mrs. Browder the legal right of reentry, as the following testimony on page 56 of the hearings further show:

Mr. JONES. Who is responsible for allowing Mrs. Browder the privilege of taking a voluntary departure?

Mr. FINUCANE. That case came before our Board and we authorized a voluntary departure and preexamination.

Mr. JONES. Your Board alone?

Mr. FINUCANE. Our Board alone authorized it.

Now it seems the Department of Justice took Mrs. Browder's word for it that she is not a Communist. Remember, she came before Mr. Finucane's Board in

the Department of Justice, and that gentleman claimed inability to find any evidence whatever that she was a Communist, as shown by the following from page 57 of the hearings:

Mr. JONES. Did they submit factual evidence to you?

Mr. FINUCANE. We had a transcript of the record. That is the basis upon which we act.

Mr. JONES. And you found nothing in her record at all.

Mr. FINUCANE. Not a thing in her record.

Mr. JONES. Not even a suggestion?

Mr. FINUCANE. There was no evidence of any character whatsoever suggesting that Mrs. Browder was a Communist.

Mr. JONES. She had never attended a Communist meeting, or anything?

Mr. FINUCANE. She denied that she had attended a Communist meeting.

Who in the United States of America can believe that the wife of our No. 1 Communist never attended a Communist meeting at Madison Square Garden or elsewhere, either on the arm of her distinguished husband or otherwise? She is not the wife of a rank-and-file Communist who, in our country of private enterprise, has been duped by Communist propaganda emanating from Russia and earns his living by the sweat of his brow in some war factory. She is the wife of a man who earns his bread and butter by spreading and indoctrinating unsuspecting Americans with the class hatreds of a foreign ideology. The bread he puts on his table, the rent he pays for their little communistic love nest are paid for with assessments laid upon his misguided American dupes. Even the clothes on Mrs. Browder's back, until Stalin drove the American Communists underground, no doubt were paid for by her husband's earnings from a foreign government. Can it be assumed that the wife of this No. 1 Communist could live in peace and tranquillity with him, accept the fruits of his evil labor, bear his children, and share the joys of his Presidential release from prison without going to Madison Square Garden arm in arm with him to share the joy with the American Communists for the return of the native?

Mrs. Browder is the wife of the convict who was released by the President, with Mr. Biddle's approbation, in the interest of national unity, they said at the time; but now Mr. Biddle gives a different reason. At page 24 of the hearings, Mr. Biddle said:

Mr. BIDDLE. His sentence was commuted. Earl Browder got a sentence of 4 years for using a false name in an application for a passport, if I remember accurately. I think there was no doubt that the sentence was far too long and was imposed on account of his being Communist and not for the crime that he had committed.

The President had a great many letters requesting the commutation of his sentence, including some from such leading Republican citizens as George Wharton Pepper, a former president of the American Bar Association. I discussed the matter with the President myself, that the sentence should be brought in line with the usual sentences which were given for such offenses.

I think there were practically none that had run over 2 years, so he served for practically 2 years, as I remember.

Can anyone doubt that the Browders have had favors at the hands of Mr. Biddle, which no other persons could get, whatever their ideologies, national or international? Put the Browder cases beside the soldier who refused to drill because he did not believe in killing people, and who was, at first, given capital punishment and then had his sentence reduced to life imprisonment.

I asked Mr. Ugo Carusi, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, how many cases there were like Mrs. Browder's case during the last 2 fiscal years and the first 6 months of this year, and, at page 143 of the record, he inserted the following table:

Preexamination cases

	Applications received	Completed
Fiscal year 1943	4,054	4,011
Fiscal year 1944	4,863	4,538
Fiscal year 1945 (6 months)	1,909	1,608

The statistics of the Immigration and Naturalization Service on immigration problems are entirely inadequate. The naturalization of aliens has increased by leaps and bounds within the past few years. It is my opinion that this has been encouraged, if not fostered, by the Justice Department. The concentration of large alien blocs in large cities presents not only an economic problem, as the relief records show, but a security problem for the American way of life. I asked the Immigration and Naturalization Service for statistics on naturalization, by cities, and Mr. Savoretti said: "It would be a terrific job, it would exceed $2,000,000," and "the total naturalized since 1907 is over 5,000,000, since 1941 there were 1,308,570 up to January 30, 1944." Mr. Savoretti said that, for the last 3 fiscal years, "it would cost close to $1,000,000." Mr. J. Edgar Hoover makes a statistical report in any form desired covering Federal crimes and those reported by State and local officials throughout the United States at a cost of $41,496.24.

It is apparent that the Immigration and Naturalization Service was not interested in furnishing statistics unless they believed such data would support their request for large appropriations. It is to wonder, too, whether the requested data might not disclose information which the Department prefers not to have known.

I have been interested for some time in the widespread operations of the Government in the field of private enterprise. I think it is time for Congress to become interested in that subject too, because of the Government's activities in the field of banking, insurance, home-building, construction and operation of powerplants and the sale of electric energy, and other endeavors. It will be noted that Mr. Berge first said that the Antitrust Division had made no reports to Congress on the question of "Government monopoly." Reluctantly he admits at the end of his testimony on this subject that this might, after all, be a good subject for the Antitrust Division to investigate. The colloquy appears at page 76 of the Justice hearings:

GOVERNMENT IN BUSINESS

Mr. JONES. The spirit of the antitrust law is to preserve private enterprise in America, is it not?

Mr. BERGE. Yes.

Mr. JONES. You have mentioned these reports that you have to make under the War Reconversion Act and under the Surplus Property Act. Have you ever made any reports to Congress, or have you been requested to make any, on the question of the Government monopolizing an activity, or of a situation where there is danger of the Government monopolizing an activity as against private enterprise?

Mr. BERGE. Where the Government is monopolizing an activity?

Mr. JONES. Yes; the Government, in its own activity, is monopolizing certain business.

Mr. BERGE. No.

Mr. JONES. I refer specifically to the small bank situation. There was the situation when Government loans were first started through the Agriculture Department and through other agencies. Now I have a flood of mail coming over my desk from small banks, small-town banks, that do not have any connection with big banks at all. They have money to loan, but the Government has taken away all of their prospective borrowers. Have you ever given any consideration to that problem?

Mr. BERGE. Of course, that relates to another field.

Mr. JONES. Well, it is monopoly, is it not?

Mr. BERGE. I would not quite say that. It seems to me, whether we like it or not, that there was a period when Government financing became more or less a necessity.

Mr. JONES. I grant that.

Mr. BERGE. And certain Government instrumentalities for loaning money did in certain fields supersede private banking. There is a problem there, an economic problem, that, frankly, I do not think falls in our field. I have not any expert opinion on it. I think it is a question of policy.

Mr. RABAUT. Does it come within your Division?

Mr. BERGE. I do not see how it does, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JONES. If the Government were guilty of monopolistic practices in loaning money, that would not come in your Division?

Mr. BERGE. I do not think it is a matter of monopoly. I think it is a matter of public policy. If the Congress and the policymakers of this country thought Government financing was necessary in certain fields, certainly the Government has the power to go into it.

Mr. JONES. But you are going to make reports to the Congress on legislation, or under legislation that has been passed; section 205 of the Reconversion Act and section 20 of the Surplus Property Act specifically calling for that. I was just wondering if you would take cognizance of Government competition with private enterprise, in making those reports.

Mr. BERGE. It may well be that in any report we make on banking we would discuss as an economic proposition the effect of Government financing on small bank operations. That may come up. But that would be discussed as an economic problem and not as a problem of antitrust law violations, because the Government has the power to take over the whole banking system of the country and operate it if it wants to. That is a matter of policy.

Mr. JONES. You would not make an analysis of the question whether there was any danger of that?

Mr. BERGE. Yes; I think we might well do that.

At page 83 of the Justice hearings it is made to appear from the testimony of Mr. Berge that, through inattention to duty by the Department of Justice, by a decision of the Supreme Court or other-

wise, the Department has been ousted of jurisdiction in the matter of violations of the antitrust and monopoly statutes in the field of radio broadcasting. Mr. Berge's testimony on that subject is as follows:

RADIO BROADCASTING INDUSTRY

Mr. JONES. In connection with the radio broadcasting industry, the F. C. C. investigating committee records are interesting in this connection. You say you had this case pending in the Hoover administration against the radio networks.

Mr. BERGE. We have no case against the radio companies under the antitrust laws at this time. The Hoover administration maintained a case against the R. C. A. and they got a consent decree, which has been in effect since. I speak now without having freshly reviewed the situation, but I do not think the consent decree in the R. C. A. case covered at all the practices that were involved in the F. C. C. cases against the radio networks. You have a different problem with radio, because you cannot have absolutely free competition in radio. There are only so many places on the dial and somebody has to decide who shall get them. There has to be some regulation of the number of stations and program distribution, and that sort of thing. That is not true with the vast domain of American business.

Mr. JONES. As a result of the Supreme Court decision approving F. C. C. regulations, does that not give the F. C. C. the antitrust power over radio stations, instead of you folks?

Mr. BERGE. To some extent the F. C. C., of course, has powers with respect to monopoly and restraint of trade questions; no doubt about it. But I would not want to say, and I do not mean to concede by that that the radio is entirely outside the scope of the Antitrust. I do not think it is. But whenever you give particular powers and authority to an administrative tribunal, to that extent it may create an exception to Antitrust.

Mr. JONES. My point is this: We have had a lot of monopoly discussion in the F. C. C. hearings, and the F. C. C. itself has mentioned it in press releases. The F. C. C. deals with transfers of licenses. You folks have no cases pending. So I assume from that that you have been ousted from jurisdiction over this field by that Supreme Court decision.

Mr. BERGE. I would not want to say we have been entirely, but the particular problems involved in those cases are within the F. C. C.'s jurisdiction, I assume.

Mr. JONES. You have no file on that and you are doing no investigating on it at all?

Mr. BERGE. We do not have enough men, of course, to spread around into every situation. I do not mean to say that there may not be some antitrust violations by radio stations or radio chains or radio corporations. I do not know. The fact is, whether it is a good fact or a bad fact, we are not investigating that field at the moment. Maybe we should be, but we are not in it and we do not have enough men at the moment to go into it.

Mr. JONES. At the present time your answer is no investigation; is that right?

Mr. BERGE. Yes.

The Comptroller General of the United States recently told a committee of Congress that this Government stands to lose $50,000,000,000 through waste, mismanagement, fraud, and so forth, in the war effort. If you want to know why Government officials do not take seriously positive terms of law which would save that enormous fund, or why Government contractors can get away with robbing and pillaging Uncle Sam, read the following testimony of Mr. Tom Clark, head of the Criminal Division, Department of Justice, and Mr. Francis M. Shea, head of the Claims Division of that Department, at pages 92–94 and 224–230, respectively, as follows:

TAMPA AND WATERMAN SHIPBUILDING CASES

Mr. JONES. Did the Attorney General rule that there was no basis for the fact reported by the Comptroller General as to the transaction between the Maritime Commission and the Navy Department in the Tampa Shipbuilding Co.?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. JONES. How long ago was that ruling made?

Mr. CLARK. About a year and a half ago, or 2 years. We investigated that very thoroughly. I had two lawyers down there and 10 or 15 F. B. I. men, as well as the Comptroller General's report.

Mr. JONES. The Comptroller General's report criticized the legality of it.

Mr. CLARK. I was passing only on the criminal prosecution. You have to have a good case to convict a man before a jury criminally. We turned those cases over to Mr. Shea. I do not know whether he filed a suit or not. I imagine that there was a civil suit for damages.

Mr. JONES. Was there a criminal case in the Waterman Steamship Corporation?

Mr. CLARK. There was not. We investigated that. That was over the transfer of bottoms, as I remember. That is when I first came to Washington from California. It must have been about 1942.

Mr. JONES. I have heard the report of the committee, and I thought that there was some irregular stuff in that. How about that?

Mr. CLARK. We would have to show that there was a violation of some Federal statute; second, that there was some intent involved, something that would violate the statute.

Mr. JONES. As I remember, there were irregularities.

Mr. CLARK. I do not remember the details. I have thousands of these cases. I will be glad to look it up. As I remember, there were some bottoms that were traded, and the Maritime Commission originally sold them and bought them back, and we looked into it, talked to Admiral Land and everybody over there. The F. B. I. also looked into it. We could not find anything to base a criminal prosecution on.

Mr. JONES. There was a considerable loss to the United States Government and a scathing rebuke by the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Comptroller General. I just wondered why they would not be guilty of criminal violation on that basis in view of the fact of the specific wording of the Maritime Commission law.

Mr. CLARK. You cannot prosecute a person for bad judgment. We turned it over to the Claims Division for any civil action. You see, if somebody makes a mistake of judgment—I am not saying this was a mistake of judgment—but if that is true in that case we could not prosecute them criminally unless they had some criminal intent.

Mr. JONES. You would not presume under the Federal statutes that the natural result of their action would presume intent?

Mr. CLARK. No, sir. If that were true, I am afraid that we would all get prosecuted. I know that I make mistakes, but I believe that I have no intent to do wrong. I might make a mistake over some case. I probably have.

Mr. JONES. Both of these cases, the Waterman Co. and the Tampa Shipbuilding Co. were referred by you to the Claims Division for action?

Mr. CLARK. Whatever action there might be under the facts as we investigated them, sir.

Mr. JONES. Did you make any investigation of the Truman committee report concerning the concrete barge program?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. Mr. McAvoy, I think, was the name.

Mr. JONES. Were there any criminal violations there?

Mr. CLARK. Not on the barge program; no sir. We have a case now against the same parties in Newark, N. J., that involves war housing. I believe that the name is McAvoy.

We heard a lot about concrete barges, something along the same line that happened after the last war, and we got busy on them. I sent Mr. Broome and some lawyers down to Savannah, and they got the F. B. I. and they tried to prove, as I remember—I handle a good many cases so I hope you will pardon me if I am wrong—that Mr. McAvoy transferred some old dilapidated machinery in Newark that he had already owned and that he had leased and rented it to the Government for an exorbitant amount. One item was a truck that he had allegedly bought some years back for $75, and he was renting it to the Government for several hundred. We could find nothing on which to substantiate the claim or complaint.

Mr. JONES. All these war-fraud cases do not involve cases where the United States Treasury has been fleeced. They have to do with inferior equipment, and so forth?

Mr. CLARK. Oh, no. We are working on cases where there is criminal intent to violate a statute of the United States.

Mr. RABAUT. You have to prove intent?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. Take the statistics, and what you say is true. We do not prosecute, I would say, 10 percent of the cases we investigate. The reason is we cannot find anything on which we think prosecution could be successfully conducted and by which we think we can prove guilt.

Mr. STEFAN. There was no proof in the McAvoy case?

Mr. CLARK. That is right. We have had returned 1,067 indictments in war frauds alone. I will wager that we have investigated 10,000 war frauds since we started.

Mr. STEFAN. In that McAvoy case, I understand he bought a truck for $75 and leased it to the Government.

Mr. CLARK. That was just one little part.

Mr. STEFAN. That is just an illustration.

Mr. CLARK. That is an illustration of what we find. We get these letters, you know, many of them anonymous, but we take them up. They say that so-and-so did so, and I will have the F. B. I. look them up, and if it is within the Treasury's bailiwick, they will look them up. If there is any criminal responsibility, we will prosecute them.

Mr. JONES. On these shipbuilding cases I do not understand them. The Maritime Commission says that a certain formula shall be followed in the payment for ships, requisitioned ships, and if it goes over that amount, how do they escape criminal violation of the law in that kind of case?

Mr. CLARK. We would have to show that they did it in order to defeat the Government and that somebody made some profit out of it, or somebody got the money.

Mr. JONES. They made a profit out of it. I went into that very thoroughly, and it showed the amount they made. They have a special income-tax-evasion provision. They made enormous profits, and there is a law that everybody should know. I do not know how they could escape criminal prosecution in a transaction of that kind. I would like to have an explanation of it.

Mr. CLARK. I will look it up in detail. I am not sure offhand.

Mr. RABAUT. Bring the details to Mr. JONES.

(NOTE.—This information will be supplied to Mr. JONES.)

Mr. KERR. How are your investigations carried on?

Mr. CLARK. The F. B. I. carries on a great many of our investigations. We do not do any investigating in the Criminal Division. We use the F. B. I. exclusively. We have to have witnesses that will stand up pretty strong in court. I would say that we handle 90 percent of the F. B. I. investigations in this division.

Mr. KERR. The evidence is evidence of the F. B. I.?

Mr. CLARK. Yes. In this spy case we have all sorts of tests that have been made of clothing to determine whether or not it has been in a submarine, tests of handwriting, hundreds of tests. It takes a lot of time.

Mr. RABAUT. Is there anything further that you want to tell us?

Mr. CLARK. Just that I am glad to see you again.

THE TAMPA AND WATERMAN CASES

Mr. JONES. Do you recall these claims that are referred to you by the Comptroller General on war-fraud claims?

Mr. SHEA. The Comptroller General refers to us all varieties of claims—pay cases, shortages in Government accounts, defaulted contracts, and everything that you can think of.

Mr. JONES. For instance, I asked about the Waterman Steamship Lines and the Tampa Shipbuilding Co. case. I read the record of the hearings in the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and it seems to me on its face—and I made an argument on the floor of the House and spent a lot of time in research—that the Government purchased these ships, or the Maritime Commission purchased the ships, in violation of a positive formula, and if they had followed the formula of the merchant-marine law, the taxpayers would not have to stand such a terrific loss.

Do I understand that you washed those cases out so that there would be no recovery against the Tampa Shipbuilding Co. and the Waterman Steamship Co.?

Mr. SHEA. If you are talking about the particular cases that I have reference to——

Mr. JONES. I am talking about the purchase of requisitioned ships. I believe that there was over $2,000,000 worth against the Waterman Co., if I remember correctly.

Mr. SHEA. I would like to speak about those cases if you will permit me to correct the record in case my recollection is not accurate.

Mr. JONES. You may wait and put it in the record.

Mr. SHEA. Let me tell you about it. My recollection of the Waterman case is this: The Maritime Commission sold ships to the Waterman Co. and under the terms of the contract of sale the Commission was entitled to purchase them back at a specific price, or a formula price.

Mr. JONES. Was it the old War Shipping Board that sold the ships?

Mr. SHEA. I thought that it was the Maritime Commission. In any event, there was a contract which permitted the United States to requisition them back at a price which could be calculated by a formula. The complaint which was made by the Comptroller General was that instead of requisitioning back those ships, the War Shipping Administration purchased five other ships and paid at a higher rate for those five other ships than they would have had to pay for the ships which they were entitled to requisition under that contract arrangement. What the Comptroller General suggested was they should have requisitioned the ships which they could have had at a lower price rather than purchase the others at the higher price. As a matter of fact, subsequently those five other ships were bought by the War Shipping Administration at the price they were entitled to under the earlier contract. My recollection of the reason why War Shipping Administration did not requisition those five vessels but purchased a different five vessels was that at the time they had not gotten into a requisitioning program.

Mr. JONES. I would like to know at what date the Attorney General's Office came to the conclusion that the emergency existed for the purpose of requisitioning ships under this present emergency.

Mr. SHEA. I am sure we never gave any opinion.

Mr. JONES. That would be determinative of your issue.

Mr. SHEA. I do not believe that they questioned the fact that they had the power to requisition as of that time, but as a matter of policy they had not entered into a requisitioning program.

Mr. JONES. But the price they would pay for the ships was determined as of a certain date, and it is important to know what date the requisitioning took place.

Mr. SHEA. I wonder if you are not getting into another problem. The Comptroller General and the War Shipping Administration had a different view in respect of the provision in the Requisitioning Act against including in the price of requisitioned vessels enhancements resulting from the causes necessitating the taking or use. Is that the problem that you are talking about?

Mr. JONES. That is involved in this question; that is right.

Mr. SHEA. And Judges Parker and Learned Hand and Hutchison were called in to give them aid, and they gave them an opinion which, to the best of my knowledge, the War Shipping Administration is trying to follow.

Mr. JONES. I read that opinion and thought it was of doubtful value, and I would like to know if you have come to any conclusion that there was any legal conclusion for the appointment of Judge Learned Hand and the other judges that you mentioned.

Mr. SHEA. I think there is no doubt about the fact that the President can ask any distinguished citizen to advise him.

Mr. JONES. What was that?

Mr. SHEA. They did not advise him as a court.

Mr. JONES. Is your Claims Division bound by the decision that these three judges reached in your decision not to prosecute?

Mr. SHEA. We litigate only.

Mr. JONES. I understand, but you have to make a decision if you are going to litigate.

Mr. SHEA. If a matter is referred to us and there is a substantial basis for litigation, we litigate it.

Mr. JONES. Have you litigated these cases?

Mr. SHEA. Involving the question of——

Mr. JONES. We are talking about the Tampa case and the Waterman case.

Mr. SHEA. No. As I have said in the Tampa and Waterman matters to which I have referred, we did not see how we could make out a case.

Mr. JONES. I differ with you. I have read those records, and I believe the taxpayers have been fleeced. I am particularly interested because of the form of statute that was repealed, and there is nobody standing between the taxpayer and the man who has stolen from the Government, or gotten an excessive price from the Government except in this Division right here.

Mr. SHEA. I think that I have given you the facts accurately. I would be grateful to you if you would give me a theory for a cause of action.

Mr. JONES. In the opinion of the Comptroller General and of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, there was an excessive price paid for both those classes of ships that you have described to me—the five they originally took, but not in accordance with their original agreement to repurchase the ships, and the other five they later purchased, which were sold by the War Shipping Board to this company.

Mr. SHEA. My understanding is that the five they were entitled to requisition under that original agreement were purchased at prices set in the original agreement. Do you have any different information?

Mr. JONES. I have different information. They were not purchased at the formula laid down by the maritime law, and there was some changing of dates by Admiral Land as to the date the emergency started from which the formula would apply as to the market price of the ships. I would like to have you state what date your office came to the conclusion that the emergency arose for the determination of the price of the ships. That would have to be answered in order for you to tell whether there was a lawful taking at a proper price.

Mr. SHEA. The Attorney General was not asked for an opinion on that.

Mr. JONES. If we are not going to recover any money in connection with these war frauds, we might as well eliminate the bureau.

Mr. SHEA. I want to say to you, sir, if you have any information in respect of Waterman or any information with respect to Tampa which has not come into our possession, I would like very much to have it; secondly, I would like to have any theory on which a lawsuit could be started in either of those cases. If there is a basis for a lawsuit, I would like very much to bring it. After a very thorough investigation and analysis, I was unable to arrive at any basis on which I thought we even had a chance of winning a lawsuit in either of those cases. However, there is still time.

Mr. JONES. I made an exhaustive speech on the floor—and I am not tooting my horn here—but I went very thoroughly into the Bland committee on ship subsidies and the formulation of the formula under the maritime and merchant marine law, and I am thoroughly convinced that the taxpayers have been fleeced in this case. My speeches are in the record on a couple of occasions, and the Senate has also discussed it—Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, made a very thorough study of it, and there have been debates in the Senate on that subject.

Were it not for the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reaching an adverse opinion on that, and the scathing rebuke of the Maritime Commission regarding the purchases, I would not think so much of my opinion standing alone; but everything I have said has been confirmed by the committee. It seems to me for you to say there is no cause for action is rather strange.

Mr. SHEA. There is a report of the committee that there was something wrong in the Maritime Commission or the War Shipping Administration's behavior?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. SHEA. I did not know that to be the case. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee asked the Attorney General if he had any objection to their publishing in a report on the Waterman matter correspondence with the Comptroller General. The Attorney General supplied copies of the full correspondence, and suggested publication of the whole thing. The committee limited itself to publishing the final letter of the Comptroller General. The Comptroller General's conclusion and that of the committee on the specific matter which I have been discussing was that, in view of the facts developed, no further action appeared called for on the part of the Attorney General. I shall be glad to lay this matter before you in as full detail as you may wish. You can go over it. If you have any facts not known to us, or if you can suggest a sound cause of action which has not occurred to us, we shall be glad to go forward with the lawsuit.

I should like here to make this further statement. As I suggested at an earlier point in the record, Mr. JONES appears to have been directing his inquiry not only to the Waterman case which I was discussing, but to a further question. He was also, if I correctly understand him, addressing himself to the question of whether a point of difference which arose between the Comptroller General and the Administrator of War Shipping Administration should not be submitted to litigation. This point of difference regards the appropriate application of a condition stated in section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended. Section 902 authorizes requisition or purchase during the national emergency, of vessels owned by citizens:

"When any such property or the use thereof is so requisitioned, the owner thereof shall be paid just compensation for the property taken or for the use of such property, but in no case shall the value of the property taken or used be deemed enhanced by the causes necessitating the taking or use."

It is not a controversy peculiar to any transactions with the Waterman Steamship Co. It has to do primarily with valuation for purposes of determining just compensation for all vessels requisitioned by the Maritime Commission or War Shipping Administration. By analogy or inference from the specific provisions in question, the Comptroller General has raised for consideration the question of whether the enhancement limitation is not also applicable to valuations for purposes of insuring chartered vessels and also for purposes of voluntary purchases. It is only in this latter connection that the matter has to date been brought to the attention of the Department in regard to transactions with Waterman Steamship Co.

Quite obviously these cases involving the Waterman Steamship Co. present the most difficult situations in which to test out by litigation the Comptroller General's views. This is so because the enhancement clause clearly relates to requisitions. It may be related to insurance coverage and voluntary purchases only by hurdling additional problems of at least substantial difficulty. Normally, therefore, one would select for the first test a requisitioning case to present the main issue squarely, unencumbered by the additional hazards.

The issue in question is one of complexity and genuine difficulty. The Department of Justice has had the matter under consideration for some time and is continuing to give it study. It will in all probability be presented to the courts in pending litigation involving ship requisitions.

To explore adequately the differences between the Comptroller General and the Administrator of War Shipping Administration would take many pages. It may perhaps be roughly summarized by two quotations. The first is from the Comptroller General's decision of November 28, 1942, reading as follows:

"Hence, it would appear reasonable to conclude that the enhancement clause in said section 902 (a) prohibits the payment of compensation for such vessels to the extent that it may be based upon values in excess of the values existing on September 8, 1939, provided such excess be determined as due to economic conditions directly caused by the national emergency."

The second quotation is an excerpt from rule 4 of the report of the advisory board which has been adopted by War Shipping Administration in determining values. This advisory board was composed of three judges of the courts of appeals, who, I think, enjoy among the bar as high reputations for learning, judgment, and integrity as any members of the judiciary. The excerpt in question reads as follows:

"Rule 4: From the value at the time of taking, there should be deducted any enhancement due, to the Government's need of vessels which has necessitated the taking, to the previous taking of vessels of similar type, or to a prospective taking, reasonably probable, whether such need, taking, or prospect occurred before or after the declaration of the National Emergency of May 27, 1941. Enhancement due to a general rise in prices or earnings, whenever occurring, should not be deducted. In the application of this rule neither the proclamation of limited emergency of September 8, 1939, nor the facts existing at that time are in themselves of significance."

The Attorney General has never expressed an opinion on the question at issue. He was never asked for such an opinion. His traditional policy of reluctance to render an opinion on a matter respecting which he is likely to be called upon in the immediate future to appear as an advocate for one side would in this instance have made him reluctant to render an opinion. I, therefore, hesitate to express any view at this time. It does appear to me, however, that any careful trial lawyer before plunging into litigation on this issue will remember as a caveat this sentence in the submission of the three capable jurists who advised the Administrator of War Shipping Administraton:

"We did not undertake to consider how far the rules we are submitting would in practice reach different results from the rules recommended by the Comptroller General. It is conceivable that in application the difference might turn out to be far less than has at times been assumed, and that the dispute would appear to be more in the reasoning by which the problems were solved than in the answers reached."

As a trial lawyer I should feel warned by this unanimous judgment of three jurists of no mean capacity that only on the most careful factual presentation should any test of these conflicting views be attempted. Should we in the course of our investigation find a substantial factual basis for urging that application of the formulae adopted by War Shipping Administration has in good probability resulted in enhancement of value beyond that permitted by the statute, we shall test the issue in the courts. But I should add this. My responsibility is not confined purely to the exercise of the shrewd guesses of a trial lawyer. The Administrator of War Shipping Administration has had put upon him the gravest responsibilities. No one denies that his primary job of supplying the essential shipping for victory has been well done. No suggestion of corruption in the activities of War Shipping Administration has ever to my knowledge been charged. Certainly no such suggestion has been brought to my attention in the considerable matters relating to that agency which I have had in charge. Some latitude certainly must be allowed the Administrator for the exercise of judgment. In my view reasonable deference is due him in respect of matters where he has the initial and primary responsibility for judgment. I believe the Comptroller General recognizes this. I have high regard also for the integrity and competence of the Comptroller General. After making allowance for the appropriate deference due the man carrying the primary responsibility, conflict of view between these two officers may appropriately be the subject for litigation to resolve the issue.

I do think it should be stated in conclusion that any fair reading of the patient, conscientious effort on both sides to resolve this dispute between the Comptroller General and the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration must lead any temperate inquirer to these conclusions stated by Judges Hand, Parker, and Hutchinson in the letter submitting their report to Admiral Land:

"We have been greatly impressed not only with the care and consideration which the record discloses that both you and the Comptroller General have given to the matters involved, but with the moderation and judgment exercised by all concerned in endeavoring to work out a solution consistent with the interest of the United States and the justice of the case. In closing, we take this opportunity to record our great appreciation of the fact that this has been so."

Mr. JONES. It is quite apparent from your answer that the taxpayers are fleeced out of nearly $2,000,000 on this case; that the Department of Justice apparently intends to do nothing about it, and it is made doubtful whether the Comptroller General who has control over public expenditures, has taken or will take any steps for the protection of the funds of the taxpayers. It indicates a great laxity on the part of the Department of Justice and other responsible officials of the various departments, charged with the duty of protecting public funds.

The hearings on which this bill is based clearly reflect that, when the notorious Browne and Bioff were convicted, the Federal judge presiding and imposing the sentences was procured by the Department of Justice to hold open the term of court so that, if Browne and Bioff thereafter talked and furnished evidence for the trial and conviction of others, their punishment could be, and it was, lessened. At page 25 of the hearings, I asked:

Mr. JONES. What is the procedure? They came up before him?

Mr. MCGRANERY. The procedure was this: As you know, after the term of court expires, it passes beyond the control of the presiding judge. Judge Knox, the presiding judge in this case, kept the term open until these two fellows began to talk. They first began to talk because Browne's wife's life was threatened, and they came to the court and said they would talk, and pretty soon it became evident that the Government was getting some very good information in Chicago with the result that the gang back there made certain threats. Bioff and Browne decided they would then come out in the open and said that they would not only tell about the gang but they would testify in open court, which they did, and it is quite apparent from the action taken that Judge Knox had all of this in mind.

Mr. BIDDLE. The action that he took was to keep the term open.

Mr. JONES. Who are the folks that were convicted as a result of their turning state's evidence?

Mr. McGranery's testimony would lead one to believe that the court held the term open on its own motion, and that Browne and Bioff, the extortionists, volunteered damaging evidence which assisted in the conviction of their prior associates. Judge Knox came before our committee to get an appropriation for probation officers, and I learned, lo and behold, that the Department of Justice was responsible for leaving the jail door ajar for lessened sentences for those two convicted men. At page 23 of the judiciary hearings, this fact is established, as follows:

Mr. JONES. Judge, would you tell us about Bioff and Browne. I understand that you held the term open on those cases.

Judge KNOX. I did at the request of the United States Government. When these men were convicted before me I sentenced them to jail. They were two of the worst crooks that ever came before me. At that time it was in contemplation that other people would be indicted, people who could not be convicted unless Browne and Bioff decided to tell what they knew. They were known as the Chicago gang, or the Chicago mob. It was utterly impossible, I was assured by the prosecutor, to bring those people to justice, unless Browne and Bioff talked. So they went out to the penitentiary, and they were there for a period of, I think, 3 years and 3 months, or thereabouts. Meanwhile, they decided to talk, so the Assistant Attorney General put them under guard and finally they took their statements.

Mr. JONES. The point is that the district attorney's office asked you to hold the case open?

Judge KNOX. At the time. I very frequently do that, not only in that case, but in many cases I hold the term of court open so that if anything eventuates that makes it desirable to take action that could not be taken otherwise, it can be done. I did it for that purpose.

Mr. JONES. And in that case they asked for it?

Judge KNOX. I don't recall whether they asked for it, but my recollection is—that was 4 years ago—that they told me at that time that they hoped to break this whole crowd but that Browne's and Bioff's testimony would be necessary to do it.

Mr. JONES. So that they must have asked you.

Judge KNOX. The probabilities are they did.

It is interesting to note that the Department of Justice did not bring to the court's attention, when Browne and Bioff came up for a shortening or change of their sentences, after 2 years, 3 months, and 1 day in the penitentiary on sentences of 8 years for Browne and 10 for Bioff with a $20,000 fine, that Browne and Bioff had stolen $2,000,000 from their union, and had not repaid it. I asked Judge Knox about this:

Mr. JONES. I have a recollection that after they were released it was alleged that they had gotten away with some $2,000,000 of union money. Was that brought to your attention or to the attention of the Department of Justice?

Judge KNOX. It was not brought to my attention when they were brought up before me and when they asked me to place them on probation.

This handling of the Browne-Bioff cases sets a new standard of criminal procedure, and it is significant to me that the Department of Justice did not inform the judge about the $2,000,000 they unlawfully took from the union they headed, nor have they since probation been prosecuted for this alleged misappropriation of union funds. It reminds me of the statement made by Mr. Biddle that the New Deal is tied up with the labor movement, and apparently the tie-up is with crooked labor union leaders, rather than with the honest laboring man.

The Department's justification in support of requested funds for the Office of the Assistant Solicitor General recites a duty of that office to advise the President concerning the form and legality of all Executive orders. The record on that subject (pp. 281–290) clearly shows that, if such a duty is so vested, it is not being performed with any appreciable degree of fidelity, efficiency, or effectiveness. It is common knowledge, as one or more congressional committees have reported, that the majority of Executive orders issued so far exceed the Presidential power that they have come to be, and are, regarded as instruments of one-man rule and epitomize a government of men rather than of law. Further appropriations should be refused the Department of Justice for these purposes, in view of the inefficient advice concerning Executive orders and the unconstitutional actions which so frequently follow their approval.

Outside of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, there are represented in this bill increases for the departments over the 1945 bill, as follows:

State	$24,807,812
Justice	3,953,618
Commerce	6,804,476
Judiciary	1,690,702
Total	37,356,808

These figures do not include overtime for either 1945 or 1946.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly for giving responsibility to the old line agencies. The State Department, I believe the record shows, is in a fog and further has developed an inferiority complex that is not worthy of an increase in personnel or funds in the fiscal year of 1946 as compared with the funds given in 1945 excluding overtime pay. I am terribly distressed that such a record has been made at these hearings by the Attorney General and his underlings with the exception of the F. B. I. The condonation of Communists, and the failure to prosecute those who have robbed the Government of billions of dollars in war contracts, and the kid-glove policy toward the labor racketeers, to my mind, make them certainly unworthy of an increase in funds and personnel, if the record does not prove that the Attorney General is undeserving of his salary as a result of his conduct of the high office of the Attorney General of the United States.

I have talked about just two agencies because their records were outstanding in fundamentals that are necessary for the welfare of our Nation at home and abroad. Observations regarding the commerce and judiciary agencies will be made when we reach those portions of the bill under the 5-minute rule. The record of all the agencies shows that there is no regard in the public service for doing the jobs assigned, with less men and money to set an example for the rest of the country. If I had my way, we would recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations and approve the same amount for the agencies involved as they had in 1945 without overtime, with the exception of the F. B. I., which I would leave as the committee has reported it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman has made some very serious charges against the Department of Justice. As I understand it, there is now pending before the Committee on Rules a resolution contemplating the investigation of that Department as a result of charges made by Mr. Littell, a Democrat, a former office-holder in that Department who recently resigned. Does not the gentleman think the charges he has made this afternoon might well be incorporated in a thorough-going investigation of the entire picture in the Department of Justice?

Mr. JONES. I really and sincerely feel they should be. I have no grievance personally against Mr. Biddle. He has never done anything against me personally. But from the standpoint of our country, it seems to me the conduct of Mr. Biddle as shown by this record demands an explanation, which this Congress should be interested in delving into. I think there ought to be further explanations. The Committee on Appropriations, in hearings on the request of the Department of Justice for funds for the fiscal year 1946, with propriety could not go into it more thoroughly.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Chairman, the Nation-wide observance of Brotherhood Week, for the purpose of promoting tolerance, charity, and love among men, ended on the 26th day of last month. Unfortunately, that religiously sponsored observance was so marred in this House that if such illustrious former Members as Henry Clay, Abraham Lincoln, Bourke Cockran, William Bryan, and George Norris had miraculously returned to this Chamber on Washington's Birthday, they might well have cried out:

Ancient of days! * * * where,
Where are thy men of might, thy grand in soul?
Gone—glimmering through the dream of things that were:
* * * * *
A schoolboy's tale, the wonder of an hour!

Your attention is respectfully invited to the reason why this might have come to pass.

On the 22d of February the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], in the course of an address to the House, severely disparaged Mr. Justice Frankfurter to my twofold regret. First, because, in my opinion, the disparagement of this eminent educator, jurist, and statesman was without a scintilla of justification; and, second, because the charges insinuated against him will tend to encourage bigotry, racial hatred, and disunity in this time of surpassing peril when domestic tranquillity, singleness of purpose, and harmonious action are indispensable to the early winning of the war, the preservation of American liberty, and the perpetuation of our democratic mode of life.

Please let me endeavor to avert or at least neutralize the unfortunate consequences of some of the gentleman's observations, innuendoes, and speculations. He, by quotations from a 3-year-old Detroit paper, informed the House that Judge Frankfurter was born in a foreign land and that he is a member of a persecuted race. The latter part of this revelation appears to be neither more nor less than a euphemistical charge that this great and good man is a Jew. Upon this foundation of foreign birth and Jewish race, laid during Christian Brotherhood Week with such propriety as it is your privilege to perceive and not my pleasure to portray, the gentleman proceeded to revel in idle rumor, defamatory insinuation, and fantastic speculation concerning one of the outstanding men of the Nation. The gentleman charged that Judge Frankfurter "is proposing himself, or some of his friends are proposing, that he take the position of chief justice on an international court," which would, among other things, determine whether the armed forces of the United Nations shall be used for security purposes after the war. Then was made this highly informative and convincing assertion of wicked desire: "They want Frankfurter sitting on that court, or Frankfurter wants Frankfurter on that court—somebody does." The pronoun "they" is without an antecedent either immediate or remote. But it seems rea-

sonably deducible from the entire address that if the word "they," as thus used, means anything, it means those who believe in international cooperation; it means the foreign-born, the Jews, the Communists, the C. I. O.'s, the P. A. C.'s, Secretary of War Stimson, and all the innumerable throng of others whom the gentleman from Michigan does not love.

The gentleman further asserted:

A few days ago the War Department announced that it was going to accept Communists as officers in the armed services.

After this assertion, the following amazing speculation was, with funereal solemnity, proclaimed:

In view of the * * * statement that Frankfurter and Stimson have long been intimate friends and that Frankfurter has influence in the War Department, some of us are beginning to wonder whether the acceptance of the Communists as officers who can send our sons to death on foreign soil is due to Frankfurter's influence?

Thus the gentleman added to his previously laid foundation the insinuation that Dr. Frankfurter is a Communist, and that he is seeking to have his fellow travelers made officers in the United States Army. But the gentleman's longing for aspersion was still unsatisfied. Therefore, he continued:

Let me read you something of what a Mr. Roosevelt said about him:

"* * * When the I. W. W. was making trouble during the last war, President Wilson sent Frankfurter to investigate. He denounced the citizens who had taken care of the disturbance with the result that former President Theodore Roosevelt wrote him a public letter which said, in part:

"'You are taking an attitude which seems to me to be fundamentally that of Trotsky and other Bolshevik leaders in Russia. You are engaged in excusing men precisely like the Bolsheviks, who are also murderers and encouragers of murderers, who are traitors to their allies, to democracy, and to civilization, as well as the United States.'"

Thus by quotation and insinuation we have still another defamation of the great Jewish judge. It is to the effect that he has excused murderers and traitors, and that he has been tainted with bolshevism—the policy of the terroristic branch of the social democratic party that gained ascendancy in Russia in 1917. If we accept as gospel Huxley's aphorism that "in the criticism of life the assertion that outstrips evidence is not only a blunder but a crime," we must shudder to think of the verdict that would be rendered against the gentleman from Michigan if he should ever be brought to trial before a jury of his peers for having violated both the letter and the spirit of this maxim.

Dr. Frankfurter's friends, with much pleasure, remember that he was long since acquitted of insinuations of communism, anti-Americanism, bolshevistic taint, and other crimes and misdemeanors identical in substance with those which the gentleman from Michigan recently made. In January 1939 in an important official proceeding at the other end of the Capitol, Judge Frankfurter's complete exoneration was effected not by sound and fury which frequently signify nothing; not by insinuating "words that go astray," but by the duly attested action of the United States Senate. Of this action please let me refresh your memory.

It was my privilege to be the chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which conducted hearings on Dr. Frankfurter's nomination to membership on the Supreme Court of the United States. The other members of the subcommittee were: Democrats: Senators King, Connally, McCarran, and Hughes; the Republican members were: Minority Leader McNary and Senators Borah, Norris, and Austin.

Among the witnesses who appeared in opposition to the confirmation were George E. Sullivan, who made the point that Dr. Frankfurter was foreign born; Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling, who was recently on trial for sedition, and who charged Dr. Frankfurter with communism; and Allen A. Zoll, who accused the Judge of being a Jew. Witness Sullivan resurrected Colonel Roosevelt's letter to Dr. Frankfurter from which the gentleman from Michigan quoted. The letter in its entirety appears at pages 13 and 14 of the printed record of the hearings. It is followed by Judge Frankfurter's reply, of which the gentleman from Michigan failed to inform you.

The record, among many other things, discloses the following:

Senator BORAH. Are we to understand that you oppose him—

Dr. Frankfurter—

because he is a Jew?

Mr. ZOLL. Partly, sir.

Senator BORAH. So far as I am concerned, I do not propose to listen to an argument against a man because of his religion. * * * You are raising the same question that is drenching Europe in blood. * * * In this country we do not deny any man privileges because of his religion or race. * * * So far as I am concerned, I want it understood that I am strongly opposed to anyone raising the race question.

But notwithstanding all the charges, rumors, and slanders with which the Jew baiters, fomentors of racial hatred, assassins of tolerance, and gravediggers of constitutional guaranties encumbered the record, after due consideration, the subcommittee favorably reported Judge Frankfurter's nomination to the full committee without a dissenting vote. And what did the committee do? Without a dissenting vote, it instructed me to report the nomination to the Senate. And what did the Senate do? That great legislative body unanimously confirmed the nomination.

Except the charge that somebody wants Judge Frankfurter on the postwar world court, everything that the gentleman from Michigan insinuates against him was known to the Senate when it stamped its approval upon his becoming a member of the most important Court on earth. It is very respectfully contended that Judge Frankfurter needs no additional testimonial of his Americanism, patriotism, stainless character, or faultless deportment in either public or private life. But, if it were needed, the Judge could doubtless find it in his clear conscience and in the realization that he is faithfully serving the United States, contributing his all to the promotion of human welfare, and that he is held in the highest esteem by millions of his fellow men.

Against the gentleman's fears of Judge Frankfurter's conduct as a member of a post-war international court, let me record my sincere hope that this country may have the benefit of the Judge's service on this tribunal, especially if it be empowered to try the infamous Hitler and Hirohito and their cutthroat minions for having maliciously set the world on fire and having diabolically murdered millions and millions of women and children and men. In my opinion, no one else would more certainly insist upon a fair trial for these fiends; no one else would more surely and appropriately protect the peace-loving of the earth against another war by hanging the duly convicted guilty ones as high as Ahasuerus hanged Haman.

If the address of the gentleman from Michigan had been confined to expressions of his dislike or disapproval of Judge Frankfurter without any additional implications, it would not have moved me to discuss it. But it is my fear that some of the gentleman's utterances will tend to fan the flames of racial hatred and religious persecution, which have, in recent years, devastated the greater part of the world.

According to the great Edmund Burke: "It is impossible to look on anything as trifling or contemptible that may become dangerous." In my opinion, the slightest encouragement to racial or religious hatred is dangerous. The slightest encouragement to Jew baiting by any public official should be most vigorously condemned. Let us not forget that the war that is now spreading wholesale death and destruction from the fairest cities of Europe to the bleeding heart of China and from the Tropic of Capricorn to the Tropic of Cancer was begun and its frightful technique was developed by persecuting, torturing, and exterminating Jews.

Let us remember that in a few months' time Hitler, with his storm troops, imprisoned more than 80,000 of this unoffending race in Germany because they were not Aryans, and, on the same preposterous pretext, ruthlessly robbed and persecuted 90,000 more of these defenseless victims of his lust for blood and plunder until they fled from the fatherland in tatters and torture and tears and became heartbroken, helpless, hopeless wanderers on the face of the earth.

Let us not, by thought or word or deed, emulate in the slightest degree the injustice, the insanity, and the barbarism of Hitler and his hordes who have—

Poured the sweet milk of concord into hell,
Uproared the universal peace, confounded
All unity on earth.

Instead of hindering ourselves with domestic hatred and handicapping our war efforts with racial disunity and religious discord, let us dedicate ourselves to a rebirth of devotion to the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, which reaches the height of its sublimity in the assertion that all men are created equal. Let us intensify our fidelity to the Constitution, which expressly prohibits the

making of any law against the free exercise of religion and, by clear implication, forbids discrimination against anyone because of race or creed or place of birth.

During the First World War, President Wilson said in an address to the Daughters of the American Revolution:

> Some of the best stuff of America has come out of foreign lands, and some of the best stuff in America is in the men who are naturalized citizens of the United States. * * * The vast majority of them came here because they believed in America; and their belief in America has made them better citizens than some people who were born in America. They can say that they have bought this privilege with a great price.

Multitudes of Jews, including Judge Frankfurter, who have come to the United States from other lands deserve their full share of the general compliment which the great Woodrow Wilson thus paid the patriotic and the praiseworthy of foreign birth.

Let us once and for all forsake the degrading, dangerous habit of slandering the Jews who, to all believers in the Holy Bible, are the chosen people of Almighty God, but who have nevertheless been agonized by persecution above every other race that has ever left its footprints on the sands of time.

For the Ten Commandments—the oldest laws which we profess to revere, or strive to obey—we are indebted to the Jews.

The Sermon on the Mount—the loftiest of all combinations of words of tongue or pen—was given without money or price to a wicked world by Jesus of Nazareth, a sinless Jew.

From the dawn of sacred history to the present hour the Jews have borne more than their share of the world's burdens; they have paid more than their share of the world's debts; they have done more than their part to elevate humanity from the depths of savagery to the heights of civilization; they have surpassed every other people in pointing and paving the way from earth to heaven where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary be at rest. Henceforth all things whatsoever we would that the Jews should do to us, let us do even so to them, for this is the law and the prophets.

As an incentive both to constitutional and Christian conduct toward all of foreign birth—whether Gentiles or Jews—who have come to America to find a better life for themselves and to help make this a better land for us all, let me conclude with a story that was told in this Chamber a quarter of a century ago by the eloquent, able, and beloved Congressman Scott Ferris, of Oklahoma:

> At a meeting of school children in New York to celebrate the Fourth of July, one boy, a descendant of native Americans, spoke as follows:
>
> "I am an American. My father belongs to the Sons of the Revolution; my mother belongs to the Colonial Dames; one of my ancestors threw tea overboard in Boston Harbor; another stood his ground with Warren; another hungered with Washington at Valley Forge. My forefathers were Americans in the making. They cleared her forests, they commanded her ships. They spoke in her council halls, they died on her battlefields. Dawns reddened and paled; stanch hearts of mine beat faster as each new star was added to the Nation's flag. Keen eyes of mine foresaw this Nation's greater glory, the sweep of her seas, the plenty of her plains, the manhives in her billion-wired cities. Every drop of blood in me holds a heritage of patriotism. I am proud of my past. I am proud that I am an American."
>
> Then a foreign-born boy arose and said:
>
> "I am an American. My father was an atom of dust; my mother was a straw in the wind to his serene majesty; one of my ancestors died in the mines of Siberia; another was crippled for life by 20 blows of the knout; another was killed defending his home during a massacre of the peasants. The history of my ancestors is a trail of blood to the palace gate of the great white czar. But then a dream came—the dream of America. In the light of liberty's torch, the atom of dust, which was my father, became a man, and the straw in the wind, which was my mother, became a woman for the first time.
>
> "'See,' said my father pointing to an American flag that fluttered near, 'that glorious banner of stars and stripes is yours. It is the emblem of the promised land. It is, my son, the sublime hope of the humanity of all the world. Live for it. If need be, fight for it. If necessary, die for it.'
>
> "Under the open sky of my new country I swore to obey my father's admonition, and every drop of blood in my veins will keep that vow. I am proud of my future. I am proud that I, too, am an American."

Let us, by our official conduct, prove ourselves worthy of fellowship with this patriotic boy of foreign birth. Let us fully share his loyalty to the flag, his deep appreciation of our country's opportunities, his firm determination to defend its blessings, and thus qualify ourselves devoutly and joyfully to declare: "Thank God, we, too, are Americans."

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, no reply whatever would be made to the gentleman who just preceded me were it not for the fact that he tries, as so many others have tried during the last 10 years, without success, to place me in a false position. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] mentioned the words "Jew baiter."

That term does not apply to me. I challenge any Member of this House on either side—and I notice three Members of the House who are of the Jewish race sitting here before me who have been Members of this House ever since I have been here—and, I repeat, I challenge any Member of this House to point to one word of mine, written or spoken, which ever condemned or criticized any man or woman of the Jewish race because he or she was a Jew.

I note the challenge is not accepted. No one disputes my statement.

Now, I am growing a little bit tired of this idea that because a man is a Jew he is exempt from criticism. A man should be criticized or praised for what he does, for what he is—never because of his color, lack of color, creed, national descent, or ancestry. Nor should any man who is justly subject to criticism be exempt because of his nationality, color, lack of color, religious belief, national descent, or ancestry.

All too often men subject to criticism, those subject to condemnation, because of their words or conduct, hide behind a manufactured screen of prejudice, relying upon their nationality, their religion, their color or lack of it, to claim exemption from an exposure of their records.

Nothing that I have said applies to the instant case, but is mentioned to call attention to the all too prevalent practice of yelling bias, prejudice, or persecution, or all three when none exists.

Were I a member of the Jewish race, I would be proud of that fact. I would not be running around complaining, or having some of my friends complaining, that I was being criticized because I was a member of the Jewish race.

If memory serves me correctly, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] complained somewhat bitterly that, on the 22d of February—and the pertinent part of the speech to which he made reference will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 1369-1370—I criticized Justice Frankfurter because he was a Jew.

That charge is without foundation, as the gentleman will learn, as the Members of the House may learn, if they will read the speech made by me.

My criticism was directed to the point that a Justice of the United States Supreme Court was taking an active part in the political affairs of another nation; was, according to the press, attempting to guide the destinies of the New Deal faction of the Democratic Party.

If memory serves correctly—and the test as to whether the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] knew what he was talking about can be made quickly by a reference to the printed record—I at no time criticized Justice Frankfurter because he was a Jew.

The gentleman from West Virginia alleges that, by insinuation, I attempted to belittle the Justice because he was a Jew. Even that I did not do.

My recollection is that I did not at any time mention the word "Jew," either in my own remarks or in the remarks which I quoted.

It may be that the gentleman from West Virginia is doing more to create race consciousness by the remarks he made today than I could possibly have done in the remarks made on the 22d.

The gentleman should at least, being such a stickler for justice and for accuracy, have examined the RECORD and, had he done so, he would have learned, and well might he have told the House, that his charge, made by innuendo, that I was a Jew-baiter was without any foundation in fact.

Again, the gentleman either directly or by inference, by innuendo, charged that I attempted to discredit Justice Frankfurter because he was born across the seas. Once more I challenge his accuracy. I am confident that an examination of the RECORD will show that the only reference to the fact that Justice Frankfurter was born abroad was in the quotation of the article which appeared in the Detroit Free Press on June 1, 1942, and in which it was stated, referring to the Justice, "He was born in Austria."

It is no crime to have been born across the seas. I know no one who is so foolish,

so bigoted, as to criticize any individual because of the place of his birth, the nationality of his parents.

I do not even know where my ancestors came from. I do know that a great-grandfather was born in Pennsylvania. When as a lad of 16 or 17, suffering from that disease so common to young men, designated by some as "the swell head," father, to deflate me, to take the false pride, the youthful assurance, out of me, used to tell me that my ancestors were Hessians, hired by King George to fight the Colonists.

To me, father's statement, whether it had foundation or not, was humiliating, for, reading the books written by Coffin, one entitled "Old Times in the Colonies," and the other "Building the Nation," my sympathies, my admiration, my loyalty, were all with the Colonists and their descendants, and I had no real affection for the Redcoats or any of those who opposed our forefathers in the Revolutionary War.

In the talk of February 22, and I repeat for emphasis, no attack was made upon the Justice of the Supreme Court because he was a Jew. Let me again assert if I belonged to that race I would be boasting of the achievements of the Jews.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not now.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman issued a challenge. I would like to meet that challenge.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You can put it in the RECORD any time. Well, what challenge do you mean? If you wish to deny the accuracy of my statement that I ever said or wrote a word criticizing a Jew because he was a Jew, do so.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does not the gentleman feel that when he singles out a person's race, when he singles out his birthplace, that he is doing so for the purpose of demeaning him and for no other reason, and in that respect the gentleman has been Jew-baiting?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; you are entirely wrong. No such thing. I never heard of a Swede complaining because he was called a Swede—a half dozen other nationalities could be mentioned and none so far as I know ever complained or felt hurt because he was referred to as being of a certain race. I have been called a round-headed Dutchman a good many times. That is supposed to be something—well, I just do not know how to describe it; not an individual who stands at the top, in education or culture, judged by some standards, but an individual who is stubborn, perhaps narrow-minded, but beyond question thrifty and saving and religious. I never resented it when a fellow said to me I was a round-headed Dutchman. I never knew an Irishman to get angry when you called him an Irishman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, just a minute. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; but you will have to get me more time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, on the floor of the Congress, the only thought I have in mind is this, that we are all Americans.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are right.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman may refer to me as an American of Irish blood, if he wants to, but the gentleman should be careful about referring to Americans as of any racial group, because over and above all we are all Americans. I have never heard the gentleman called a Dutchman on the floor, because I would insist that the gentleman is an American of Dutch origin, if that is his racial origin.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, that is a long enough lecture.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not lecturing the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, yes; you are feeling sorry for me as earlier in the day you felt sorry for the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. I am familiar with your method and you cannot distract me.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are all Americans.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly, we are all Americans. Then instead of this American and that American, an Irish-American, or a Jewish-American, why do we not forget the Jewish and the Irish and all the rest of it and let it go at that? No; that is not the way it is done. In my own district I have racial groups. There are Polish folks and there are Czechs. There are people of German descent, there are people from the Netherlands, there are Italians, there are Jews, there are Negroes. I have never had any trouble with any of them because of race, creed, color, or national origin, and I do not propose that anyone shall drag me into a position where I can be truthfully charged with being antagonistic to any group because of race, creed, color, or nationality.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has raised that question himself. He is the one who raised that, and he says it should not be raised.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is nonsense. I did nothing of the kind. The gentleman is the one who raised that issue. Look through my speech of February 22. You will not find a word where I made any derogatory reference to anyone because he belonged to the Jewish race.

Let me go back. I say if I were a Jew, I would be proud of it. Do they not hold most of the good jobs in the Government? Do they not control the big monied businesses? Do they not control many of the big financial institutions? Do they not control the picture business? Do they not control much of the press? Are they not at the top in the professions?

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I do not yield.

That they do is no reflection upon them as members of the Jewish race or otherwise. They do not control these things, they do not have control in business, in industry, in publications, in radio, they are not at the top in the professions, in the arts, in the sciences, because they are Jews. They have control because they have and use the ability to succeed to a remarkable degree. You know that just as well as I do. What is the use to try to make out that here in America they are persecuted? I know the purpose of all this. An effort is being made to get some excuse so that some time, in some campaign, somewhere, you can fight me with the statement that I am anti-Jewish.

That charge is completely false, and none knows that it is false better than the Members of this House and the people of my district.

There are two possible inferences which might be drawn from the speech of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and I do not charge, either directly or indirectly, for I have no personal acquaintance with him, that he had either in mind.

This much may honestly be said. One inference that a stranger might draw from the talk would be that the gentleman was making a bid for the political support of a racial group.

Another inference which the casual reader might get, if he was familiar with previous issues of the RECORD, would be that it was an effort to do me political harm because I was an opponent of the New Deal and a Republican.

Not one thing that I said on the 22d of February is as critical, as scathing, of the conduct of Mr. Justice Frankfurter as the statements contained in the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MCGEHEE], a Democrat, a member of the majority party, a colleague and a co-party worker of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

The gentleman from Mississippi—and his remarks will be found on page A693 of the Appendix of the RECORD—and when I made my talk I had no knowledge of the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi—used the same statement made by Theodore Roosevelt in referring to Justice Frankfurter and of which the gentleman from West Virginia today so bitterly complained that I used on the 22nd.

The gentleman from Mississippi went further and he called for the impeachment of Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Among other things, he said:

> I want to say to you, in my opinion, which is also the opinion of thousands of good patriotic American citizens, that this man Frankfurter, together with a few others, are the Rasputins of this administration. I am suggesting to the Dies committee that they go immediately into and delve into the actions of Frankfurter, with a view of bringing impeachment proceedings against him and relegating him back to private life and, if possible, send him back to the land from which he came and let him teach his un-American doctrines there rather than to try to contaminate a patriotic American citizenship.

He also made the same charge that I did—that the Justice, and I quote, "cherishes the ambition to be chief justice of an international court of justice to be set up under the Dumbarton Oaks program."

Why did not the gentleman from West Virginia, as he waxed indignant and wrathful because of what had been said by me about Justice Frankfurter, turn his vitriol upon his fellow party member?

It can hardly be possible that he withheld his indignation—real or simulated, whichever it was—because the gentleman from Mississippi was a Democrat; poured

it all forth on me because I was a Republican. I rather think, if I be permitted to express an opinion, that he was not familiar with the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi.

You can make all the charges you want. There are many Jews in my district and I never had trouble with any one of them. For years I was an attorney in the southwestern part of Michigan for the old Jewish Agricultural and Industrial Aid Society with headquarters in New York; and Mr. Simmon, of Chicago, who was head of the Chicago and western branch, never made any such charge as that; nor did any of the Jewish people I aided ever attempt to say I did not well and faithfully look after their interests.

I know the purpose in this attempted smear campaign. There has been an attempt—there was in the last campaign and in the one before it—to brand me as anti-Jewish. Jews contributed to the campaign fund used in the effort to defeat me in 1944. They had that right. They did not contribute to the campaign fund to defeat me because they were Jews; they contributed because they were New Dealers. And I knew it. And there were some Jews supporting me in the Fourth Congressional District in that campaign because I was anti-New Deal as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] well knows. So you cannot truthfully charge me with being anti-Jewish. You are not going to make that charge stick, never, not as long as I have breath to prove its falsity.

Now, another thing, in this talk which I made on the 22d, some reference was made to the Justice. Why? Not because he was a Jew, but because it was charged more than 2 years before, and so far as I knew then and so far as I have heard today from the speech of the gentleman from West Virginia, and he had 30 minutes to show its inaccuracy—it has never been denied—the statement was published in a Detroit paper to the effect that a lot of people seemed to think it queer that a Justice of the United States Supreme Court should be dipping his fingers in the diplomatic affairs of the British Empire.

My understanding of the conduct of a judicial officer is that he should keep his fingers out of politics. Especially is that true when a man goes on the United States Supreme Court Bench. And to think of a member of the Supreme Court bench dipping down into politics and trying to have a part in the destinies of a political party. I just cannot picture it in my mind.

If Justice Frankfurter wants to take the position—and we hear and see in the press almost every day where he has something to do with the policies of the administration—if he wishes to do that, that is a matter for his conscience.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman also stated the fact that I complained because Communists were to be commissioned as Army officers. I did, I did; and I shall continue to complain when Communists are given commissions in the armed forces. This Congress has more than once ousted Communists from position in the Government. I know the Communist doctrine, I know that their party theory is that there is no God and that religion is a fraud.

I have a son in the service. I have neighbors and friends who have boys and girls in the service and if I can do anything under God's heaven to prevent a Communist having authority over them—a man who does not believe in the Deity—I am going to do it; and you can mark that down anywhere you want to, and you can make any charges on the floor that you want to in the effort to deter me, but that position will be maintained.

You will find when you get down to it that the people of America are Christians or recognize the existence of a Supreme Being. They believe in the existence of an Almighty, and they do not propose to submit to the placing over their sons and daughters, with the power of life or death, of any Communist or anyone who denies the existence of God.

I see nothing wrong in my opposition to the participation of a Justice of the Supreme Court in political intrigue on either the home or foreign front. I am making no apologies for my opposition, for my condemnation of a man who, sitting on the heretofore most respected Court in the land, joins with the Communists, becomes their political coworker, drags his judicial robe through the political arena, attempts to guide the destinies of a political party, and so lowers the dignity of that Court—aids in destroying the respect the people have always had for it.

A Supreme Court Justice should be just as much apart from politics as should a minister, a rabbi, or a priest. I make no apology for my criticism of Frankfurter because he has so far forgotten his judicial position nor for my insistence that the armed forces deny commission to all who subscribe to the doctrine of the overthrow of this Government by force and violence. When they say they have repented and they have reformed, we should give them ample opportunity to show that the reformation has been real.

The only possible purpose in referring to a man as being foreign-born and his connection with our domestic or foreign affairs is the thought that, when a man is dissatisfied with the country from which he comes or when the parents who bring him here are dissatisfied with the government of the home country or the conditions surrounding them, that man who aspires to a position of public power and influence in this country should at least live here in America long enough to become acclimated and oriented before he attempts to move to the top or assumes in a loud voice and with an aggressive manner to tell the old-timers what is wrong with the country in which they have lived so long, of which he actually knows so little.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

MEXICAN TREATY

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time today to express myself regarding the proposed Mexican treaty, realizing that the House will not have an opportunity to vote on this treaty and owing to the fact that the treaty supporters have stated California is the only State affected when as a matter of fact the Mexican treaty would take billions of dollars out of the pockets of the farmers of the United States. So far as the cotton-raising areas of the United States are concerned, the Mexican treaty should be recognized as a cotton treaty rather than a water treaty. The treaty takes away from farmers and city dwellers in southwestern United States and guarantees in perpetuity to large landowners in Mexico a minimum of 1,500,00 acre-feet of Colorado River water each year. That is more water than all of the people of Greater New York and Philadelphia use for domestic and industrial purposes during a year. The treaty does not stop there. It also authorizes the building of dams and other works of the Colorado River in Mexico.

The Colorado River water guaranteed and made available to Mexican landowners by the treaty is a free gift to these landowners. The delta area in Lower California in Mexico that will be irrigated by the water is now being used almost exclusively for production of cotton. The treaty water will increase the cotton acreage from 500,000 to 800,000 acres. There are now about 200,000 acres in that Mexican area in cotton production.

The free United States water which the treaty hands over to Mexico to use in the production of cotton will not be primarily for the benefit of small Mexican farmers. It will mostly benefit a few wealthy landowners who control the larger part of the Mexican delta land. One of these barons is a citizen or a former citizen of the United States. The representatives of the State Department, in strongly advocating the Mexican treaty, have been insisting that it was being advanced in the interest of good will between the United States and Mexico. It appears to be the kind of good-will offering, insofar as the Colorado River water is concerned, that will richly benefit certain interests operating within Mexico; and is the kind of good-will offering that will cost the United States cotton growers millions of dollars annually.

Members of Congress from every part of the Union have a direct interest in this proposed Mexican cotton treaty. That is true because it will create and subsidize with American water an immense new competitive cotton-producing area next door to the United States. For a good many years Congress was called upon to appropriate millions of dollars annually to help out the cotton growers of our country. That was because these growers were facing cutthroat competition from cotton-growing areas in other

parts of the world. In fact during each of the 5 years prior to 1943, with its extraordinary war conditions in effect, our Treasury paid out more than $200,000,000 to assist our cotton growers.

Now the State Department proposes to bring that cutthroat competition a little closer home. It wants to build up greater and ever greater cotton competition right across the line from our own cotton growers in the United States. That will result, most certainly, in Congress being required to appropriate even greater sums of money each year to aid our own cotton growers.

It is not the business of Congress to dictate to Mexico or to any foreign country what crops they should, or should not, produce. But it is the business of Congress not to go out of its way to hand over to a foreign country a priceless natural resource of our people, namely, water, to be used by landowners in that foreign country to produce more and more crops that are directly competitive to crops produced in the United States.

I looked in vain over the record of the hearings on this treaty to find where the spokesman of Secretary Ickes' Interior Department had recommended that this treaty provide that no landowner benefitting from the water given to Mexico could irrigate more than 160 acres of land. The works on the Colorado River that control its waters and make it possible for Mexico to receive any benefits are all built with American money and on the understanding that the benefits were to be exclusively American.

Secretary Ickes and his henchmen have been very zealous in trying to see that any American in the United States receiving water from a Government project could only irrigate not more than 160 acres of land. When the amendment I introduced last year to the river and harbor bill was lost by the failure of that bill to pass the Senate, it was very largely the result of the efforts of Secretary Ickes and a few Senators who also failed to raise their voice and demand that the same conditions they are trying to apply on the American side be made a like rule on the Mexican side of the boundary.

My amendment would have removed the acreage restrictions of the reclamation law from applying to the Central Valley project in California, where due to the character of the water and the physical conditions it is impossible to enforce them.

Now in effect Mr. Ickes says to give to the landowners in Mexico an uncontrolled use of water, operated through American works, built by money of American taxpayers for the use of American citizens, while on the other hand take away from the American citizens their present rights, penalize them in some way when they do not comply with unworkable dictates and give away without control a natural resource that in 50 years will be vital to this country. This is consistent with the usual actions of the Interior Secretary.

A few days ago it was reported in the press that our State Department was advocating the removel of all tariff barriers between the countries of the Americas. At the present time, America's cotton growers are given some measure of protection in our domestic cotton market by reason of certain tariff measures. Under the State Department's plan even this protection would be removed. American cotton growers, already faced with cutthroat cotton competition in the world market, would be faced, under this no-tariff plan, with the same fate on the domestic market. And at the same time, the State Department is seeking to force through the Senate a treaty with Mexico that will give away, free and without restriction, for all time, American water to produce hundreds of thousands of bales of additional cotton in Mexico, right across the boundary line from our own struggling American cotton growers.

It can be readily seen how this treaty will benefit Mexican landowners and cotton operators in Mexico.

How can it be demonstrated that the treaty will benefit American citizens in the United States? The fact is, the treaty if ratified by the Senate will do a great injustice to millions of American citizens, and it will take away from a large part of this country for all time to come a large quantity of water vitally needed in the arid Southwest.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been talking about one crop, namely cotton. But this is not cotton alone. Sugar can be produced, corn, wheat, barley, oats, specialty crops, and dairy products. In other words we are making it possible to open up a large acreage for future farming operations with free water from the United States to compete with what our people are producing at the same time; and when the war is out of the way we in the United States will have no market for the crops our farmers are producing because of the many crops that will be grown with this free water.

We have heard much about providing farms for the returning veterans. We cannot under this program guarantee the returning veteran a market for his products. The veteran will have to pay for his water whereas under this treaty we furnish free water in competition against the veteran.

I am not opposed to a treaty that will give Mexico a square deal on what water she is rightfully entitled to. But I believe that our American people are entitled to water at least as free from cost and restrictions on the use of water as any treaty gives to Mexico. If favors or privileges are to be granted, they should be to our own people first.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Can the gentleman give us some information as to how the administration of this treaty will be handled once it is adopted? Is it under a boundary commission, is it under any other function or department of Government, or how will it be handled?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Once a treaty with Mexico is entered into, we have no further control. They will have full authority to act from now on for all time. The water rights that are now owned by our own Government, paid for by our own Government, will be turned over and given free to the Mexican Government.

Mr. McDONOUGH. There is no benefit to the United States in approving this treaty?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Not that I can see, except just as a good-neighbor policy. If we are not careful, if we continue to give and give and give, we are going to waken in a few short years to find that we have given so much that the American people will become alarmed at the tremendous debt we will still have on our hands.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I understand a boundary commission is set up in the treaty, made up of two men—one a Mexican and the other an American—and that this boundary commission has the privilege of administering the functions on both sides of the border, without veto power by Congress or any other authority, subject only to their own decision, and they have the spending of millions of dollars, the hiring of many men, and the delivering of millions of acre-feet to Mexico out of two rivers originating in the United States—the Rio Grande and the Colorado Rivers.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE].

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I shall take a very short time to call to the attention of the committee something which is not primarily the responsibility of the Committee on Appropriations but is, I believe, a matter in which the whole House will be interested. What I have to say has to do with the amount of work that is being done in the Federal courts throughout the country.

I have here a reprint of an article which appeared some time ago in the University of Kansas City Law Review. It was written by the late Judge Merrill E. Otis. He sets out various tables showing the number of cases of various types filed in all the Federal courts between the years 1929 and 1938. He divides them into three classes.

The first is the criminal cases. In 1929 there were 86,000 such cases filed. The number rose until 1932, which was the high, with 92,000 cases. Then the number filed each year dropped until 1938, when there were 34,000 cases. The figures for 1944 indicate a slight increase, up to 39,000 criminal cases filed. This increase, of course, is due to the enforcement of certain laws having to do with the war.

The next is a table showing the civil cases in which the United States is a party. Beginning in 1929 the number was 24,000 cases filed, rising to a high in 1932 of 34,000, dropping in 1938 to 11,000, and then in 1944 rising to 20,000.

The number of purely civil cases filed in 1929 was 20,000, rising to a high in 1933 of 26,000, dropping in 1938 to 22,000, and dropping further in 1944 to 17,000.

In other words, the figures show the number of cases in the Federal Court have been steadily declining. Yet, all

during that period, we have been increasing the number of judges. For example, in 1928, we created one new circuit judgeship. In 1929, we created 9 new district judgeships and so on, until 1938, which was the time when the cases filed in Federal Courts reached an all-time low. We authorized that year 5 new circuit judgeships and 15 new district judgeships.

However, I am not objecting to that so much as I am objecting to the fact that the courts of the country, particularly the Federal courts, have virtually ceased to function. Some of you will remember in 1940 we had before us the Walter-Logan bill, which passed the House by a very substantial majority. The purpose of the bill, you will remember, was to provide regulations for the bureaus and tribunals which are now running this country. At that time, the Committee on the Judiciary had prepared a chart listing these various bureaus and tribunals in the executive departments which exercised legislative and judicial functions. I have it here. It is a sizable chart. It includes only the tribunals and bureaus which were functioning when the war started. If I could have a chart including those set up since the war, I doubt if I could even lift it.

I want to point out some of these tribunals. I doubt if very many people in the country have heard of some of them. First, there are the tribunals in the Department of Agriculture. For example, here is a Board of Tea Appeals. Have you ever heard of that? That is a board which has been set up which exercises judicial functions having to do with the sale of tea in this country. You have here a lot of other tribunals. Here is a committee in re nut grading. Here is a committee in re tea grading. Here is a committee in re dry beans grading, sirups, and so on.

There are literally hundreds of these tribunals which are exercising judicial functions in this country. When you get to the National Labor Relations Board and the Wage-Hour Division, you find there what amounts to courts operating on the rights of the people but with almost no regard to any constitutional limitation.

If I had time, I would like to call attention to more instances. I can only mention a few instances where these bureaus have absolutely defied the Congress. Consider the matter of subsidies. There is nothing in the law to justify the payment of certain subsidies, and yet they paid them. There was nothing in the law to justify the attitude taken by Mr. Byrnes or Mr. Hershey in regard to the farmer draft.

Here we have the wage-hour law which allows the Administrator to fix a certain minimum wage. The Administrator of the Wage-Hour Division, some time ago, made a rule that no one could engage in home work. There is no provision in the law for that. In fact, that very proposition was before this House, that bill was here, and it was turned down. Yet, he established that as a rule. He said there could be no home work and put thousands of people out of that type of work. That case went to the Supreme Court and it was affirmed. It held he had a right to make that ruling. But I would like to call your attention to the dissenting opinion of Mr. Justice Roberts, in which he comments on the majority opinion. This is what he said:

> The philosophy of the Court's opinion can be nothing less than that the Administrator may, if he finds it necessary, rewrite the statute.

That is, in substance, Mr. Chairman, what these boards and bureaus are doing. If we intend to keep up the substance of representative government, some action must be taken to point out to them that the laws are going to be made by this Congress, and not by those bureaus. If something is not done quickly to reaffirm and reestablish constitutional government, then I, for one, am in favor of being honest with the people in telling them that we no longer are a representative government; that we have socialism here. Let us have that and be done with it.

Along the line of the bill which we did pass, the Logan-Walter bill, I yesterday introduced H. R. 2602. I introduced a similar bill in the last session. A number of similar bills are pending before the Judiciary Committee of the House. The purpose of the bill is to regulate these bureaus and tribunals. For instance, we enact a law. It goes to some bureau to be enforced. Immediately they write voluminous regulations, but in writing those regulations they have no regard whatever for the intent the Congress may have had in writing the law. What can you do? You can do nothing. The citizen can do nothing. Then if the citizen violates one of those regulations, of which there are literally hundreds of thousands, all having the force and effect of law, he is not ordinarily tried in a court. He is tried before one of these tribunals. The same tribunal prosecutes him, writes the law that he violates, and administers the punishment. If anything can be any more totalitarian than that, I would like to know what it is.

I fail to see, Mr. Chairman, why we spend billions and why we allow our boys to be shot in fighting that sort of thing, and yet day by day approve that in this country and literally do nothing in protest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM].

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, the administration of the affairs of veterans of this and other wars in which we have been engaged will shortly become one of the three most important functions of the executive branch of our Government. This is true because of the need for competent, efficient and sympathetic administration, because of the stupendous sums which will necessarily be expended, and because of the vast number of people employed.

The Budget request for the 1945–46 fiscal year for the Veterans' Administration is $2,707,000,000. This is more than has been requested for any of the Departments in the executive branch of the Government, except for the Navy, War, and Treasury Departments. Seven of the ten heads of departments who have Cabinet rank will spend during the coming fiscal year only a small fraction of the sum necessary to handle the affairs of veterans, in fact about one twenty-sixth of that sum. I venture to say that at the conclusion of hostilities, the Veterans' Administration will, from the standpoint of expenditures, equal or even exceed either the Navy or War Departments.

It has been my thought that a division of government so enormous, and so vitally important to every one of us should no longer be set up as a mere agency of government, but rather as a full-fledged department within the executive branch, the head of which should have cabinet rank. I have today introduced a bill to accomplish this, H. R. 2611.

I believe this change would be helpful in the rehabilitation, education, hospitalization, reemployment and security of our returning fighting men. If this bill were to pass and this governmental structure were to be adopted, it would create a formal and automatic arrangement for close liaison and conference between the responsible head of the Veterans' Administration department who would then be a Cabinet member, and the President of the United States. It would bring together under one head the various agencies and commissions now handling veterans' affairs, which have often been working at cross purposes.

We have as a Cabinet officer the head of the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, the Department of Labor and the Department of State, all of whose functions are certainly no more vital than the well-being of our sons, brothers, and neighbors, who have become casualties of war.

The bill which I have introduced also provides for establishment of an advisory council which would assist and advise the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs. This council would be comprised of nine members, appointed by the President, three from among the Presidents of the five largest veterans' associations, three to represent the general public, two would be members of the medical profession, and one a leader in the field of education.

The other day the head of the Veterans' Administration, after some criticism had been leveled at his agency by a member of this body, ordered an investigation of the medical services given to hospitalized veterans. I personally know nothing about the merits of the charges, but this would perhaps indicate that a reorganization at this time might not be amiss.

It is my hope that this measure will receive the favorable consideration of this body.

Mr. Chairman, in accordance with permission obtained earlier today in the House, I extend a copy of this bill:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That (a) there is hereby established at the seat of government an executive department to be known as the Department of Veterans' Affairs, which shall be administered by a Secretary of Veterans'

Affairs, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive the same compensation as other heads of executive departments.

(b) There shall be in the Department of Veterans' Affairs an Under Secretary of Veterans' Affairs and three Assistant Secretaries, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall perform such duties as may be required by law or prescribed by the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs. The Under Secretary shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum, and the Assistant Secretaries shall each receive compensation at the rate of $10,000 per annum. There shall also be in the Department such other officers and employees as shall be transferred to the Department of Veterans' Affairs under this act, and such other officers and employees as may from time to time be provided by Congress.

SEC. 2. (a) The Department of Veterans' Affairs shall be, and is hereby, vested with the authority, duties, and powers heretofore vested in the Veterans' Administration.

(b) The functions, powers, and duties vested in and imposed upon the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs are hereby transferred to and vested in and imposed upon the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, and any power which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has heretofore been authorized to exercise may be exercised by the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs.

(c) All orders, rules, and regulations, or other issues made or granted in respect to any functions consolidated or coordinated under the provisions of this act and in effect at the date of its enactment shall continue in effect to the same extent as now authorized until modified, superseded, or repealed by the Secretary.

(d) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, and he shall have authority to do all things necessary and proper to hospitalize, rehabilitate, and provide vocational and educational training, insurance, compensation, and pension benefits for honorably discharged veterans of all wars, and to administer all matters directly affecting their interests and welfare.

(e) The Secretary of Veterans' Affairs shall have authority to do all things necessary and proper to secure replacement of discharged personnel of the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, or Marine Corps, including the Women's Reserve components thereof, in their former positions and in securing employment in new positions to the end that every discharged person shall be reestablished in civil life as soon as possible after discharge; for the accomplishment of this purpose the Secretary shall have the power and the duty to cooperate with and employ the facilities of other governmental and State employment agencies.

SEC. 3. The President shall appoint an Advisory Council on Veterans' Affairs, composed of nine members, which shall meet from time to time at the call of the chairman of the council or the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs. The council shall elect its own chairman and secretary and shall advise the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs on all matters pertaining to the welfare of veterans and administration of the Department. Three of said members shall be chosen from among the presidents of the five largest veterans' membership organizations in the United States; three shall be persons representing the general public, who have no connection with veterans' affairs; two shall be members of the medical profession; and one shall be a person experienced in the field of education. The members of said Advisory Council shall serve without salary but shall receive a reasonable per diem compensation while meeting as a council, the amount to be determined by the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, and shall be reimbursed for necessary travel expenses incurred while traveling to and from meetings.

SEC. 4. It is further provided that the administration of any law creating benefits for veterans, the administration of which has heretofore been vested in some department or agency other than the Veterans' Administration, is hereby transferred to the Department of Veterans' Affairs.

SEC. 5. Appropriations for the Veterans' Administration shall be available for the administration of this act; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional amount or amounts as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act.

SEC. 6. The Secretary of Veterans' Affairs shall make annually at the close of each fiscal year a report in writing to Congress giving an account of all moneys received and disbursed by him and the Department, describing the work done by the Department, and making such recommendations as he shall deem necessary for the effective performance of the duties and purposes of the Department.

SEC. 7. This act shall take effect 30 days after the date of its enactment.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time now stands?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] has consumed 1 hour and 50 minutes; the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has consumed 1 hour and 38 minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2603, making appropriations for the Departments of States, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and the Federal Loan Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

MEXICAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 115, relative to determination and payment of certain claims against the Government of Mexico.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the resolution?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; very briefly, it extends the life of the Mexican Claims Commission 2 years. This Commission expires on April 5, which is the reason requiring prompt passage of this resolution.

I may say that this resolution comes with a unanimous report from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I took it up with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] this morning. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] knows about it, and there is no objection to it.

Mr. STEFAN. I notice that the appropriation bill under consideration today dealing with the State Department contained no appropriation for the Mexican Claims Commission.

Mr. BLOOM. That is correct. There is no appropriation needed. The operations of this Commission are paid out of the funds they receive from Mexico. They are collecting some $40,000,000 due United States claimants.

Mr. STEFAN. I think it is a pretty important bill.

Mr. BLOOM. I assure the gentleman this resolution calls for no appropriation.

Mr. STEFAN. This resolution extends the life of the Mexican Claims Commission for 2 years.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes; for 2 years. The life of the present Commission expires on April 5.

Again I emphasize the fact that this resolution calls for no appropriation. All the expenses of the Commission are paid out of moneys collected from Mexico. They gave us $40,000,000 to pay claims against Mexico.

Mr. STEFAN. We have had appropriations for the Mexican Claims Commission.

Mr. BLOOM. Not for this year.

Mr. STEFAN. Not this year but in past years. I feel that this is too important a bill to be called up at this hour of the day under unanimous consent. A bill extending the life of a very important Commission should be called up in the regular way.

Mr. BLOOM. As I say, this Commission has been operating for 2 years and we have not made 1 cent of appropriation for it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Committee on Foreign Affairs voted unanimously for this resolution. The Mexican Government is paying the expenses for this work. No money whatsoever has come out of the United States Treasury this past year for this Commission; and the the claimants are receiving very much more than they expected to.

Later they may receive from the Mexican Government in some instance 100 percent of their claims.

DETERMINATION AND PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF MEXICO

Mr. BLOOM, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to who was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) relative to determination and payment of certain claims against the Government of Mexico having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend unanimously that the joint resolution do pass.

In compliance with clause 2a of rule XIII, existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in heavy brackets, new matter is printed in italics, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman:

"SETTLEMENT OF MEXICAN CLAIMS ACT OF 1942

"Approved December 18, 1942 (56 Stat. 1058, 22 U. S. C., Supp. II, 661c)

* * * * * *

"SEC. 2. * * *

"(c) The Commission is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its functions under this Act.

"(d) The authority of the Commission under this Act, and the terms of office of its members, shall terminate at the expiration of [two] *four* years after the date on which a majority of its members first appointed take office, but the President may

by Executive order fix an earlier termination date. Upon the termination of the authority of the Commission, all books, records, documents, and other papers in the possession of the Commission shall be deposited with the Department of State.

"SEC. 4. (a) The Commission shall also have authority, within its discretion, as hereinafter provided, to examine and render final decisions (1) in those cases in which the two Commissioners designated by the United States and Mexico, respectively, pursuant to the General Claims Protocol between the United States and Mexico signed April 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 1844), failed to reach agreements and the Commissioner so designated by the United States made appraisals, and (2) in those cases in which appraisals were made by the Commissioner designated by the United States pursuant to the Agrarian Claims Agreement of 1938.

"(b) In connection with such cases, the Commission shall, as soon as practicable, notify each claimant, or his attorney, by registered mail to his last-known address, of the appraisals so made. Within a period of thirty days after the mailing of such notice, the claimant shall notify the Commission in writing whether the appraisal so made is accepted as final and binding, or whether a petition for review will be filed as provided in subsection (c). If the claimant fails to so notify the Commission in writing within such period, or if the Commission is notified within such period of the final acceptance of such appraisal, it shall, at the expiration of such period, enter an award on the basis of such appraisal. [and certify such award to the Secretary of the Treasury.]: *Provided, That if the Commission's efforts to notify the respective claimants, or their attorneys have failed to disclose their whereabouts, the Commission may, at the expiration of a period of thirty days from the date of the enactment of the Settlement of Mexican Claims Act Amendments of 1945, enter an award on the basis of such appraisal.*

"(c) In any case in which the Commission is so notified in writing that a petition for review will be filed, the Commission shall prescribe a reasonable period, which may be extended in the discretion of the Commission, within which such petition, together with written legal contentions in support thereof, shall be filed. If no petition for review is filed within the period of any extension thereof prescribed by the Commission, it shall enter an award on the basis of the appraisal in such case. [and certify such award to the Secretary of the Treasury.]

"SEC. 5. * * *

"(c) In connection with any claim decided by the Commission pursuant to this Act in which an award is made, the Commission may, upon the written request of the claimant or any attorney heretofore or hereafter employed by such claimant, determine and apportion the just and reasonable attorneys' fees for services rendered with respect to such claim, but the total amount of the fees so determined in any case shall not exceed 10 per centum of the amount of the award, unless in special circumstances the Commission shall find that a larger fee is just and reasonable. Any fees so determined shall be entered as a part of such award, and payment thereof shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury. Any person who accepts any compensation for services rendered with respect to such claim, which, when added to any amount previously received on account of such services, will exceed the amount of fees so determined by the Commission, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000.

"(d) *In any case in which the Commission shall enter an award, it shall, as soon as practicable, certify such award to the Secretary of the Treasury.*

"[d] (e) The Commissions shall, upon the completion of its work, [certify] *transmit* in duplicate to the Secretary of State and to the Secretary of the Treasury the following:

"(1) A list of all claims disallowed;

"(2) A list of all claims allowed, in whole or in part (together with the amount of each claim and the amount awarded thereon) [which have not been previously certified under section 4 (b) or 4 (c)]; and

"(3) A copy of the decision rendered in each case.

"SEC. 8. * * *

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cover into the fund—

"(1) the sum of $3,000,000, representing the total amount of payments heretofore made by the Government of Mexico under the Agrarian Claims Agreement of 1938;

"(2) the sum of $3,000,000 which was paid by the Government of Mexico upon exchange of ratifications of the Convention signed November 19, 1941;

"(3) such other sums as are paid by the Government of Mexico pursuant to the provisions of the said Convention; and

"(4) the sum of $533,658.95, which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and which represents the total amount of awards and appraisals, plus interest, made with respect to the claims on behalf of Mexican nationals against the Government of the United States which were filed with the General Claims Commission.

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, out of the sums covered into the fund pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, and after making the deduction provided for in section 10 (b), to make payments on account of awards and appraisals certified pursuant to sections 4 (b), 4 (c), and 6 (b) of this Act *prior to the date of the amendment of the Settlement of Mexican Claims Act Amendments of 1945,* of an amount not to exceed 30 per centum of the award or appraisal in each case, exclusive of interest; *and, on and after July 1, 1945, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, out of the sums covered into the fund pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, and after making the deduction provided for in section 10 (b), to make an additional payment on account of awards and appraisals certified pursuant to sections 4 (b), 4 (c), and 6 (b) of this Act prior to the date of the enactment of the Settlement of Mexican Claims Act Amendments of 1945, of an amount not to exceed 10 per centum of the award or appraisals in each case, exclusive of interest.*

"(d) *On or after July 1, 1945,* the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, to the extent that it may be possible to do so out of the sums covered into the fund pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, and after making the deduction provided for in section 10 (b)—

"(1) to make similar payments of not to exceed [30] *40* per centum on account of the principal amount of the award certified pursuant to section 5 (d) of this Act."

I. GENERAL STATEMENT

This joint resolution supplements a convention between the United States and Mexico, signed on November 19, 1941 (56 Stat. 1347), and the act of 1942. The convention provides for the adjustment of certain outstanding claims of each country against the government of the other country which arose between 1868 and 1940.

Under this agreement, the United States is relieved of all liability toward Mexico with respect to certain claims of Mexican nationals against this Government, and Mexico agrees to pay a total of $40,000,000 in full settlement of the American claims comprehended by article I. The convention credits against this amount a sum of $3,000,000 which had been paid prior to the signing of the convention. It provides also for the payment of $3,000,000 on the date of the exchange of ratifications. The balance is to be paid in annual instalments of not less than $2,500,000, beginning 1 year after the signing of the convention. A sum of $13,500,000 has already been paid by Mexico.

After the convention became effective, it was necessary, in order to carry out its purpose, to enact legislation providing for the distribution of the funds paid and payable by Mexico among those American nationals whose claims may be proved meritorious. The act of 1942 was enacted for that purpose. It establishes the American Mexican Claims Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, which is composed of three members, to examine and render final decisions in certain types of unadjudicated claims and to hear appeals in other types of cases.

II. PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

The primary purpose of the proposed joint resolution is fourfold:

1. To raise the limit of the initial amount payable to awardees after certification of the awards to the Secretary of the Treasury.

2. To dispose of certain cases in which the whereabouts of claimants or their attorneys is unknown.

3. To provide for the completion of the Commission's work.

4. To extend the above-mentioned initial payment to all categories of awards certified to the Secretary of the Treasury by the Commission.

III. EXPLANATION OF THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

The following detailed explanation of the proposed amendments deals with the above-mentioned purposes seriatim. It also covers certain amendments of minor importance. Changes in the existing law and the reasons therefor are pointed out under the respective headings.

A. Increase of the limit of the initial payment to awardees

Section 8 (c) of the act of 1942 creates in the Treasury of the United States a special fund known as the Mexican claims fund, out of which all payments to awardees are made. Pursuant to section 10 (b) of the act there is deducted from each such payment an amount equal to 5 percent thereof as reimbursement for the expenses incurred by the United States. Under section 8 (b) of the act there are covered into this fund all sums paid or payable by Mexico as well as an amount of $533,658.25 from unappropriated moneys in the Treasury which represented the total amount of awards and appraisals, plus interest, made with respect to claims of Mexican nationals against this Government which were filed with the General Claims Commission.

According to section 8 (c) of the act, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, out of the Mexican claims fund, and after making the deduction provided for in section 10 (b), to pay an amount not to exceed 30 percent of the award or appraisal, exclusive of interest, in the cases comprehended by section 8 (c).

Section 3 of the proposed joint resolution amends section 8 (c) by raising the limit of this initial payment to an amount not to exceed 40 percent of the award or appraisal, exclusive of interest.

The amount already covered into the Mexican claims fund is sufficient to justify a higher percentage of payment than the maximum of 30 percent authorized in the act. It is, of course, desirable that claimants be paid additional sums as soon as they are available.

Up to date there have been certified to the Treasury awards amounting to $28,507,672.51. This amount consists of (1) a sum of $2,800,627.18, comprising all the awards certified by the Secretary of State pursuant to section 6 (b) of the act of 1942, and (2) a sum of $25,707,045.33, certified by the Commission pursuant to sections 4 (b) and 4 (c) of the act. The maximum additional amount certifiable by the Commission under sections

4 (b) and 4 (c) prior to the completion of its work is about $83,000.

According to section 5 (d) of the act, awards by the Commission not certifiable to the Treasury pursuant to sections 4 (b) and 4 (c) cannot be certified for payment until the Commission's work is completed. It follows that, under the act, the maximum amount that can be certified to the Treasury prior to that time is about $28,590,672.51.

Forty percent of the total just mentioned amounts to $11,436,269. The amount already covered into the Mexican claims fund from payments by Mexico plus the above-mentioned appropriations of $533,658.95 is $14,033,658.95. It follows that, if 40 percent is paid on all awards which, under existing law, can be certified to the Treasury prior to the completion of the Commission's work, there would be left in the said fund a balance of about $2,597,389.95.

As stated hereinafter, it is proposed that the authority of the Commission be extended to April 5, 1947, by which date Mexico will have been under obligation to pay an additional sum of not less than $5,000,000; that is, two annual installments, on the 19th of November of 1945 and 1946, respectively. This sum, plus the above-mentioned balance of $2,597,389.95, would amount to $7,597,389.95. The sum just mentioned is 40 percent of $18,993,474.87. On the basis of awards of prior commissions and those so far made by this Commission, it is estimated that the awards on claims decided and to be decided by this Commission will not exceed $14,029,126.

Under the proposed joint resolution all awards by the Commission would be certifiable to the Treasury prior to the completion of its work and would be payable as soon as possible after certification. The Commission would have to render awards totaling $19,000,000 in round figures, in addition to those already certified, before the amount covered and to be covered in the Mexican claims fund through November 1946, would be exhausted by the payment of 40 percent of the awards. Even if the Commission's awards, as certified under the proposed amendment, amount to more than $19,000,000, it should be borne in mind that under sections 8 (c) and 8 (d) of the act the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay less than the maximum of 80 percent, and that under the proposed amendment he would have discretion to pay less than the maximum of 40 percent. However, if distribution of an additional 10 percent on awards now certified were authorized and paid under proposed section 8 (c), the obligation to distribute 40 percent on awards in claims decided by this Commission would follow under proposed section 8 (d).

With regard to balances to be available from time to time for payments on awards in claims which it will decide and certify, this Commission would, under authority of proposed section 5 (d), enter and certify such awards only at times when sufficient balances are available in the fund to make the 40-percent payments proposed by section 8 (d) (1).

After the initial payment of 40 percent of the amount of the awards, there would be no distribution of any additional sum until the work of the Commission is completed. According to section 8 (d) (2), payments with respect to the balance of the amounts due on the awards are to be made pro rata from the funds available for distribution at the time such payments are made. The amount ultimately to be paid to awardees in final settlement cannot be definitey determined until all claims comprehended by the convention of November 19, 1941, are adjudicated by the Commission. However, as stated, there would appear to be sufficient funds to justify raising the limit of the initial payment.

Since the balance of the awards after the initial payment would not be payable until the completion of the Commission's work, it is desirable to make available to claimants in the meantime and as soon as practicable as much money as may be available.

B. Disposition of cases in which the whereabouts of the claimants or their attorneys is unknown

Section 4 (b) of the act of 1942 requires the Commission to notify each claimant, or his attorney, by registered mail to his last-known address of the respective appraisals heretofore made by the Commissioner designated by the United States pursuant to the General Claims Protocol between the United States and Mexico signed April 24, 1934 (48 Stat. 1844), and by the Commissioner designated by the United States pursuant to the agreement between the two countries effected by exchange of notes signed on November 9 and 12, 1938, respectively, also known as the Agrarian Claims Agreement of 1938 (53 Stat. 2442). These Commissioners were Hon. Oscar W. Underwood, Jr., and Hon. Lawrence M. Lawson, respectively. The Commission has been given authority to review these appraisals in cases in which petitions for review are filed. The Commission has endeavored to communicate with the respective claimants or their attorneys. However, in a few cases, repeated efforts on its part have failed to disclose their whereabouts. While it may be argued that the Commission has authority under existing law to render final awards in those few cases in which the whereabouts is unknown, it would be preferable, in order to avoid any contentions regarding the jurisdiction of the Commission in this respect, to have a provision definitely authorizing it to render such decisions.

Section 4 of the proposed joint resolution amends section 4 (b) of the act of 1942 by providing that, if the Commission's efforts to notify the respective claimants or their attorneys, have failed to disclose their whereabouts, the Commission may, at the expiration of a period of 30 days from the approval of the joint resolution, enter an award on the basis of the appraisal heretofore made by either of the above-mentioned Commissioners and certify such award to the Secretary of the Treasury.

C. Completion of the work of the Commission

Section 2 (d) of the act provides that the functions of the Commission shall terminate at the expiration of 2 years after the date on which a majority of its members first appointed took office, April 5, 1943, the President being given authority to fix an earlier termination date by Executive order. Section 5 of the proposed joint resolution extends the authority of the Commission from 2 to 4 years, so that its functions would cease on April 5, 1947, unless previously terminated by Executive order.

The reason for the proposed amendment is that the additional time is necessary for the disposal of the business before the Commission.

The bill which subsequently became the act, as originally introduced, provided for the establishment of two commissions to determine the merits of claims while the act places this function solely on the Commission. Furthermore, the said bill, as originally introduced, made final and binding the previous determinations by Commissioners Underwood and Lawson, respectively, concerning the review claims mentioned above, while section 4 of the act authorizes the Commission, within its discretion, to examine and render final decisions in those cases in which the said Commissioners have rendered appraisals. The consideration of this class of claims by the Commission requires much more time and effort than the other categories of claims within its jurisdiction. In passing upon a petition for review of an appraisal, the Commission must examine the claim with a view to rendering a decision as to whether the petition should be granted, and, subsequently, should the petition be allowed, must consider the claim for the purpose of rendering final decision on the merits of the case. In the circumstances set forth, the work of the Commission as provided in the act is more than double the work contemplated by the bill which subsequently became the act, as originally introduced.

The magnitude of the work imposed on the Commission by authorizing it to review the appraisals of Commissioners Underwood and Lawson may be judged by the fact that, in order to comply with the provisions of section 4 (b) of the act, which requires notification of each claimant or his attorney of the previous appraisals with a view to affording him an opportunity to petition for review, the Commission was obliged to send over 5,000 letters to attorneys and claimants notifying them of their right to file petitions for review.

As a result of the inclusion of review claims within the jurisdiction of the Commission, it is also obliged to consider applications for extension of time within which to file petitions for review as well as petitions for leave to file additional evidence pursuant to section 4 (d) of the act. In the latter case, it must examine the proffered additional evidence and render a decision as to its admissibility under applicable provisions of law. All these matters require considerable correspondence between the Commission and the parties concerned.

Besides the work involved as a result of the inclusion of review claims within its jurisdiction, the Commission undertook to advise claimants as to the preparation of new claims filed pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of section 3 (a) of the act. The act did not require the Commission to assume this additional work. However, since all the other categories of claimants had an opportunity to receive the benefit of advice regarding the preparation of their claims, it was believed fair and equitable to afford new claimants a similar opportunity. This undertaking, not required either by the original bill or by the act, added considerably to the amount of the work of the Commission. It involves much correspondence between the Commission and the claimants.

The Commission has examined 504 claims pursuant to sections 4 (b) and (c) of the act and as a result of such examination it has certified to the Secretary of the Treasury awards amounting to $24,422,429.29. In addition, the Commission has, up to date, rendered, in pending cases, 162 decisions as follows: Petitions for review granted, 51; petitions for review denied, 45; special claims, 22; new claims, 7; and claims on review, 37. Claims in which petitions for review are granted are considered de novo by the Commission. Also, pursuant to section 4 (c) of the act, pecuniary awards amounting to $1,284,616.24 were certified to the Secretary of the Treasury in 28 of the cases in which petitions for review have been denied and there are ready for certification 17 additional such claims in which there are no pecuniary awards. Thus the total amount of awards certified by the Commission to the Secretary of the Treasury to date is $25,707,045.33.

Under section 5 (d) of the act any award which may be made in claims wherein petitions have been granted may not be certified for payment prior to the completion of the Commission's work. The proposed resolution would grant authorization of certification of such awards as soon as practicable after their rendition. This proposal is discussed in detail hereinafter.

The following classes of claims are yet pending for decision before the Commission: 123 new claims, under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of section 3 (a) of the act; 36 special claims, under section 3 (a) (5) of the act; 14 cases wherein petitions for review have been granted under section 4 (d) of the act; 245 claims (including Texas cattle claims) pending for review, under section 4 of the act.

D. Extension to all categories of claims of benefit of initial payment on certification of award

Under section 8 (c) of the act of 1942, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized, after making the deductions provided for in section 10 (b) of the act, to make payments on account of awards and appraisals certified pursuant to sections 4 (b), 4 (c), and 6 (b) only. The categories of claims comprehended by the sections just mentioned are (1) claims in which the appraisals heretofore made are accepted by the claimants; (2) claims in which the claimants fail to notify the Commission whether the awards are accepted or whether petitions for review will be filed; (3) cases in which petitions for review are not filed within the time fixed by the Commission; (4) cases in which petitions for review are denied; (5) cases in which decisions have been rendered by the General Claims Commission, United States and Mexico, except in the cases in which the decision was not rendered by that Commission in conformity with its rules of procedure; and (6) cases in which appraisals have been agreed upon by the Commissioners designated by the Governments of the United States and Mexico, respectively, pursuant to the aforesaid General Claims Protocol between the United States and Mexico signed April 24, 1934.

Pursuant to sections 4 (b) and 4 (c), the Commission must certify awards in the first four categories of cases just enumerated while, under section 6 (b), the Secretary of State must certify to the Secretary of the Treasury lists of the awards and appraisals made in the last two classes of claims mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Section (d) of the act provides that the Commission shall certify awards to the Secretary of the Treasury in other classes of claims than the ones comprehended by section 8 (c) when the Commission's work is completed. Pursuant to section 8 (d) of the act, the initial payment of not more than 30 percent, which it is now proposed to raise to 40 percent, cannot be made in those other categories of claims, i. e., in cases not envisaged by section 8 (c), until the Commission's work is completed.

The proposed amendments are intended to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, to the extent that it may be possible to do so out of the sums covered into the Mexican claims fund, and after making the deduction provided for in section 10 (b), to make the initial payment in cases other than those mentioned in section 8 (c), exclusive of interest, after the certification of the awards and appraisals by the Commission. For this purpose section 1 of the proposed joint resolution amends section 5 of the act by adding a new subsection numbered (d) which provides that in any case in which the Commission shall enter an award, it shall, as soon as practicable, certify such award to the Secretary of the Treasury. Section 6 of the proposed joint resolution amends section 8 (d) (1) by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to make payments of not to exceed 40 percent on account of the principal amount of the awards certified pursuant to the new subsection (d). The result of these two amendments is (1) to authorize the Commission to certify any award to the Secretary of the Treasury as soon as practicable after it is made, and (2) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to make the payments of not to exceed 40 percent after completing similar payments with respect to the cases envisaged by section 8 (c) of the act.

To summarize the order of payments under section 8 (c) of the act as amended: The Secretary of the Treasury may pay to claimants whose awards have been certified an amount not to exceed 40 percent of the award, exclusive of interest. Under section 8 (d) (2), which is not to be amended, after completing the payments just mentioned, he may make pro rata payments with respect to the balance due on the awards, exclusive of interest. And finally, under section 8 (d) (3), which also remains unchanged, after payment of the principal amounts of all awards and appraisals he may make pro rata payments on account of accrued interest on such awards and appraisals as bear interest.

As stated above, there are already in the Treasury sufficient funds to pay an amount not to exceed 40 percent of the principal amount of the awards or appraisals that may be certified under existing law. The payments which are to be made by Mexico, and the authority given to the Secretary of the Treasury to pay an amount less than 40 percent, justify a provision extending payment of the initial amount to all classes of cases certified by the Commission. The proposed amendment will enable claimants whose cases cannot be certified by the Commission under existing law to receive an amount not to exceed 40 percent without being obliged to wait until the Commission's work is completed. It is believed that such an equalization with respect to the treatment of the various categories of claims is desirable and fair.

E. Short title of joint resolution

Section 8 provides that the joint resolution may be cited as the "Settlement of Mexican Claims Act Amendments of 1945."

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The joint resolution has received the approval of both of the Departments concerned, the Department of State and the Treasury Department. Their reports are hereafter set forth. The Bureau of the Budget has advised both Departments that it has no objection to the submission of such reports to this committee.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 10, 1945.

Hon. SOL BLOOM,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your informal request for a report on House Joint Resolution 115, Settlement of Mexican Claims Act Amendments of 1945.

It is noted that this resolution incorporates the suggestions made in my letter of March 6, 1945, to you on the subject of House Joint Resolution 108. The proposed legislation with the suggested revisions was informally cleared by this Department with the Bureau of the Budget.

The Treasury Department has no objections to the enactment of House Joint Resolution 115.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 6, 1945.

Hon. SOL BLOOM,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Futher reference is made to your letter of February 20, 1945, on the subject of House Joint Resolution 108, Settlement of Mexican Claims Act Amendments of 1945.

Before the introduction of this joint resolution, representatives of this Department had several conferences with members of the American Mexican Claims Commission in regard to legislation of this nature. With the exceptions hereinafter noted, the Treasury Department has no objection to the enactment of House Joint Resolution 108.

It is probable that some awards considered and entered by the American Mexican Claims Commission under the provision of section 4 (b) and 4 (c) may be certified for payment after the enactment of the joint resolution. If such awards are certified for payment under section 4 (b) and 4 (c), it would appear that the Secretary of the Treasury is directed immediately to make a 30-percent payment upon them. The language beginning at line 25 on page 2 and continuing on line 1 of page 3 of the joint resolution seems to prevent a payment after July 1, 1945, of an additional amount not in excess of 10 percent upon these awards. However, conversations with the American Mexican Claims Commission and the staff of the Legislative Counsel's office of the House of Representatives lead me to believe that such result is not intended. In an effort to avoid the possibility of ambiguity, it is suggested that the proposed joint resolution be revised in the following particulars:

(a) By inserting in line 16 on page 2 following the word "Act": "Prior to the date of the enactment of the Settlement of Mexican Claims Act Amendments of 1945";

(b) By eliminating the following language found in the eighteenth line on page 3: "and certify such award to the Secretary of the Treasury";

(c) By eliminating the following language to be found beginning on line 24 and continuing on line 25 on page 3: "and certify such award to the Secretary of the Treasury";

(d) By eliminating the following language to be found in the act beginning on the eighth line and continuing on the ninth line of section 4 (c): "and certify such award to the Secretary of the Treasury."

If the joint resolution is revised in accordance with the above suggestions, it is believed that all certifications made by the American Mexican Claims Commission after the enactment of the joint resolution will be made under the provisions of the new section 5 (d). By virtue of the proposed amendment of section 8 (d) of the act, which may be found on page 4 of the joint resolution, all awards certified pursuant to the new section 5 (d), including those considered and entered by the Commission under sections 4 (b) and 4 (c) after enactment of the legislation, would receive an initial payment not to exceed 40 percent after July 1, 1945.

Since receipt of your letter of February 20, 1945, we have conferred with Commissioner Gold, of the American Mexican Claims Commission, with regard to the above-suggested revisions and he has advised us that the Commission is in accord with the suggestions.

As hereinbefore stated, this Department has no objections to the enactment of House Joint Resolution 108 other than those set forth in this letter.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Very truly yours,

D. W. BELL,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 8, 1945.

The Honorable SOL BLOOM,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BLOOM: Further reference is made to House Joint Resolution 115, a joint resolution relative to determination and payment of certain claims against the Government of Mexico.

The proposed legislation contemplates certain amendments to the Settlement of Mexican Claims Act of 1942, approved December 18, 1942 (56 Stat. 1058), which amendments are discussed and explained in a memorandum prepared by the American Mexican Claims Commission, a copy of which is understood to have been furnished to the committee.

As you know, section 2 (d) of the above-mentioned act provides, in effect, that the

Commission shall complete its functions within a period of 2 years after the date on which a majority of its members took office. The Commissioners took office on April 5, 1943, and consequently the 2-year period specified in the act expires April 5, 1945. Since it seems to be clear that, as a matter of fact, the work of the Commission has not progressed to such an extent as to enable it to complete its functions before the expiration of the prescribed 2-year period, it would seem desirable that the period be extended.

While the Department perceives no objection to the proposed amendments relating to the matter of making payments on awards or appraisals certified to the Secretary of the Treasury, it is suggested that that aspect of the matter is primarily of interest to the Treasury Department.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. GREW,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. BLOOM. It all comes to the citizens of this country.

Mr. STEFAN. I am not making any point about the appropriation, but I am objecting to an important bill coming up by unanimous consent which extends a very important commission. I think it should come up in the regular way.

Mr. BLOOM. We have got to get this out of the way in order to have it passed by the Senate, if we are going to adjourn over Easter. May I say to the gentleman that the Mexican Government is paying us two and a half million dollars a year and this money is being distributed to American claimants.

Mr. STEFAN. I am in favor of that, but I think the bill is too important to come up here with a half dozen Members on the floor of the House. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this go over until tomorrow.

Mr. BLOOM. There is no objection to it. Not a witness appeared before the committee against it, and I wish the gentleman would not object.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Nebraska is familiar with the Mexican Claims Commission.

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; I am familiar with the Mexican Claims Commission, and I am in sympathy with the work they are doing. There is no money in this bill to continue it, but I am wondering about the practice of bringing up a very important piece of legislation in the last minutes of the session. I think the Members of the House should have some knowledge of the bill. I suggest it go over until tomorrow.

Mr. RABAUT. I may say to the gentleman that the gentleman from New York has been on the floor two or three times today.

Mr. BLOOM. I have been here since 12 o'clock.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the principle of passing important legislation such as this is in this way is bad.

Mr. BLOOM. There is nothing to it.

Mr. STEFAN. There is something to it. A bill continuing an important Commission like that is important and I do not believe in the principle of passing it by unanimous consent at this late hour.

Mr. BLOOM. The importance is to the claimants, and these are American claimants.

Mr. STEFAN. What difference will it make if we wait and pass it tomorrow? It does not expire until April 5. I ask that it go over until tmorrow.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say to the gentleman from Nebraska that the Chair would have recognized the gentleman from New York earlier in the day but members of the Committee on Appropriations asked that nothing intervene between the vote on the rule to send the May bill to conference and the consideration of their bill. That is the reason why it is coming up at this time of the day instead of earlier.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that it go over until tomorrow and then we can agree.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York withdraw his request?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an address delivered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances, to include in one an article which appeared in the Leatherneck, a Marine magazine, in reference to a young boy in his district who was killed in action; in the second, to include an editorial that appeared in the Evening Star, and in the third to include a communication.

Mr. EARTHMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a clipping from a newspaper.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain statements.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Kent Cooper of the New York Times.

Mr. GIBSON (at the request of Mr. RABAUT) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert as part of my remarks on the Mexican claims bill the committee report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON (at the request of Mr. THOMASON), for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. GORDON, for 10 days, on account of illness in family.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EARTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 15, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m., Thursday, March 15, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold open hearings on Thursday, March 15, 1945, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1425.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Thursday, March 15, 1945, at 10 a. m., to continue hearings on parcel-post rates.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session at 10:30 a. m., on Thursday, March 15, 1945, in the committee room, 356 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Friday, March 16, 1945, at 10 a. m., at which time hearings will be had on H. R. 1121 and H. R. 2543, bills to require weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Tuesday, March 20, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in room 247, House Office Building, on H. R. 128, a bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will continue hearings on Wednesday, March 21, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in the committee room, 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 128, a bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection for pensionable purposes for service rendered between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

303. A letter from the assistant secretary-treasurer of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas, transmitting a copy of the report on the amended quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending March 31, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

304. A letter from the Director of the Division of Administrative Management of the National War Labor Board, transmitting a quarterly estimate of the personnel requirements of the National War Labor Board for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

305. A letter from the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting quarterly estimates of personnel requirements for the various ceiling units of the Department of Commerce for the period April–June 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

306. A letter from the Administrator, National Gallery of Art, Smithsonian Institution, transmitting a copy of the report on the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

307. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reimburse certain naval personnel and former naval personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in the bachelor officers' quarters known as Macqueripe Annex, located at the United States naval operating base, Trinidad, British West Indies, on June 11, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

308. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the detention, care, and treatment of persons of unsound mind in certain Federal reservations in Virginia and Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

309. A letter from the Acting Deputy Director of the Office of Civilian Defense, transmitting copies of quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1945, covering regular operations of the Office of Defense and its protective property program; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

310. A letter from the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, transmitting a copy of the Budget Bureau form on the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements during the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

311. A letter from the Director of the Office of Censorship, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Censorship for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

312. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for The National Archives for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

313. A letter from the Director, Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

314. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting a copy of his letter, with attachments, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the United States Maritime Commission for the period ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

315. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Federal Power Commission covering the period ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

316. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Ensign Elmer H. Beckmann, United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on Claims.

317. A letter from the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, transmitting a copy of his letter to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, submitting the civilian personnel ceiling limitation request for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1945 for the activities of the War Shipping Administration; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

318. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to approve the cancelation of the sum of $23,090.62 expended for drainage works to serve non-Indian-owned land under the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

319. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380); to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

320. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380); to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

321. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a bill to further insure the military security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information secured through official sources which the War and Navy Departments recommend be enacted into law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1617. A bill for the relief of Hugh M. Gregory; with amendment (Rept. No. 334). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2608. A bill to establish a Model Aircraft Division in the Civil Aeronautics Administration to encourage American youth in the science of aeronautics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2609. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of Eastern Hemisphere Indians of India and descendants of Eastern Hemisphere Indians of India, under the quota for India, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H. R. 2610. A bill to authorize correspondence schools to participate in the program for the education of veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 2611. A bill to establish a Department of Veterans' Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2612. A bill to promote domestic invention and industry; to amend the patent laws so as to prevent and eliminate the abuse of the patent system by international cartels, and otherwise to make illegal international cartel practices impairing domestic industry and foreign trade; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 2613. A bill to authorize the War Food Administrator or the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust boundary disputes by settling claims to certain so-called Sebastian Martin grant lands, in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 2614. A bill to require substitute rural letter carriers to serve their routes on national holidays at the expense of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2615. A bill to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the outlying degaussing branch of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., on December 4, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 2616. A bill to establish a Food Administration in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 2617. A bill to provide for the distribution of motor-vehicle tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. J. Res. 126. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the method of confirmation of Presidential appointments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. Res. 185. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation to continue an investigation of plans for the improvement of western rivers, as well as the Columbia River, as authorized by House Resolution 262 of the Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona:

H. R. 2618. A bill for the relief of settlers on the International Strip at Nogales, Ariz.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 2619. A bill expediting the naturalization of Dr. Alexander Sebo; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2620. A bill for the relief of Leslie O. Allen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 2621. A bill for the relief of Haselden & Huggins Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2622. A bill for the relief of George N. Cox, Jr.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2623. A bill for the relief of William Andrew Evans; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

194. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution of the Association of Ex-Members of Squadron A on universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

195. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Bertha Holmes and 48 other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

196. Also, petition of Lillian Smith and 46 other citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

197. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Congress of Retailers of Puerto Rico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the establishment in that island of a democratic system of government based upon the will of the Puerto Rican people itself; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

198. Also, petition of the Pan-European Conference, New York City, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the establishment of a European union and the plans for a world security organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, March 12, 1945)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, bowing for a hallowed moment at this shrine of Thy grace, we acknowledge before Thee that our lives are restless pools; we are disturbed by the social turmoil of our times, burdened by many anxieties, tempted to cynicism by human cruelty and perversity, often disheartened by human folly which seems to profit so little by bitter reaping. We would lay our problems and tasks before Thee, not to escape them but praying for Thy empowering so that with strength and courage we may carry them with a new gallantry.

May our attitudes and hopes widen every area of good will within the reach of our influence. In a divided and violent world may we be among those whom the generations to come shall call blessed, because our records shall write our names among today's peacemakers. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, March 14, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	O'Daniel
Austin	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hart	Overton
Ball	Hatch	Pepper
Bankhead	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hayden	Reed
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Brewster	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Burton	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Bushfield	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Taylor
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McClellan	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	McMahon	Vandenberg
Cordon	Magnuson	Wagner
Donnell	Maybank	Walsh
Downey	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Mitchell	Wherry
Ellender	Moore	White
Ferguson	Morse	Wiley
Fulbright	Murdock	Willis
George	Murray	Wilson
Gerry	Myers	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are absent on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Resolution 33

"Resolution requesting that the United States take appropriate measures to the end that Palestine should be opened for free immigration and unrestricted colonization so that the Jewish people may rebuild their ancestral homeland as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth

"Whereas the Nazi persecution and wholesale slaughter of Jews in Europe have outraged the conscience of the civilized world and have vastly aggravated the tragedy of the Jewish problem there; and

"Whereas at the end of the present war large numbers of European Jews will find themselves in desperate need for a new home where they can rebuild their lives in dignity and security; and

"Whereas, after World War No. 1, Great Britain had accepted at the instance of the Allied and Associated Powers the mandate for Palestine and had undertaken 'to facilitate the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine,' an undertaking subsequently approved by 52 nations, including the United States; and

"Whereas this policy was concurred in by a joint resolution unanimously adopted by both Houses of the Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922; and

"Whereas the Democratic and the Republican Party in their national conventions of 1944, adopted platforms in favor of the reestablishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; and

"Whereas the President of the United States on October 15, 1944, expressed his approval of this aim which he stated to be 'in accord with the traditional American policy and in keeping with the spirit of the "four freedoms" ': Be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Ohio, That we of the State of Ohio express our profound sympathy with the millions of innocent victims of the enemy's ruthless extermination policy, and that we demand just punishment of all those who perpetrated these horrible crimes against humanity; and be it further

"Resolved, That the United States should take appropriate measures to the end that Palestine should be opened for free immigration and unrestricted colonization so that the Jewish people may rebuild their ancestral homeland as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution should be forwarded to the President, the Secretary of State, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America."

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution urging Congress to provide the necessary funds for the research program of the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture

"Whereas approximately 55 percent of the total land area of South Carolina is forest land; and

"Whereas the total volume of standing saw timber in the State, including softwoods 9 inches and larger and hardwoods 13 inches and larger, is in excess of 30,000,000,000 board-feet; and

"Whereas the average gross rate of growth of this timber is 1,700,000,000 board-feet per year; and

"Whereas the value of the forest products manufactured in the State is second only to textiles and is approximately 14 percent of the total value of all industrial production; and

"Whereas the demands for forest products for the war effort have been greater than at any previous time in our history, and the potentialities for the use and development of

forest products, including lumber, pulp and paper, plywood, furniture, plastics, ethyl alcohol, and numerous others, following the present war are practically unlimited; and

"Whereas scientific and systematic research have not kept abreast of the demands for information on many of the problems encountered in the care and management of our forest resources, and that considerably expanded research efforts are necessary to determine proper cutting practices with respect to timber harvest, better methods of protecting forests from fire, the development of new methods and procedures for utilizing forest products, especially the inferior species of hardwoods, and other related forest practices: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to support the program of forest research now being carried on by the United States Forest Service, through the Appalachian Experiment Station, and recommends expansions of the present program to include (1) establishment of a regional forest utilization unit as provided under the item 'Forest products' in the agricultural appropriation bill now under consideration by Congress to the extent of not less than $50,000; and (2) expansion of the present experimental forest program to include an active research program in timber growing and related problems of fire protection and forest grazing in the Santee Experimental Forest, Berkeley County, S. C., and such other experimental areas as may be established in South Carolina; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forthwith transmitted to the South Carolina delegation in Congress and to all members of the Appropriations Committees of the United States Congress."

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to designate the limits beyond which the Congress and administrative agencies of the United States shall not go in exercise of the power given to Congress to regulate interstate commerce

"Whereas the United States Constitution gives to the Congress of the United States power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce; and

"Whereas this power is one delegated to the Congress by the Senate, and not one inherent in the Congress; and

"Whereas increasingly liberal interpretations have been put on the commerce clause by the Congress and the courts, to the extent that it is said now to extend to anything affecting interstate commerce; and

"Whereas such liberal interpretations have led to encroachment by administrative boards of the United States upon the rights of the States; and

"Whereas such encroachment makes it extremely difficult for all who are engaged in trade in any form to know whether or not they are engaged in trade that affects interstate commerce; and

"Whereas the state of uncertainty thus created has resulted in chaotic conditions in intrastate trade and commerce: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the State of Michigan, through its legislature, respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to so redefine its powers under the interstate commerce clause, as to prevent further encroachment upon the rights of the States and to ameliorate the chaotic conditions under which intrastate commerce is now conducted; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States and to each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States from Michigan."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 8

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation protecting farm labor as critical in the war effort

"Whereas farm labor has not been placed on the critical list in the war effort; and

"Whereas local draft boards apparently do not have sufficient power to classify physically fit producing farmers between the ages of 18 and 26 as critical in the war effort, and to defer the drafting of men critically essential to the production of the food supply of the Nation and armed forces, but are obliged to meet their draft quotas; and

"Whereas with rationing and shortage of food supplies, it is vitally important that farm production be kept at the maximum, and it is short-sighted to imperil production of crops and livestock: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is urged by the Michigan Legislature to enact legislation protecting farm labor as critical in the war effort, which action should be taken immediately to forestall a possible emergency, due to the recent ruling of selective service; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, and to the Michigan Members in the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, favoring the enactment of legislation for the creation of harbors of refuge on the Great Lakes as an integral part of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on the 6th instant, p. 1750, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, favoring the taking of appropriate measures to the end that Palestine be opened for free immigration and unrestricted colonization so that the Jewish people may rebuild their ancestral homeland as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on the 6th instant, p. 1751, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, favoring the enactment of legislation repealing the $5 motor vehicle stamp tax; to the Committee on Finance.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on the 13th instant, p. 2074, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, favoring the enactment of legislation providing for reimbursement of educational institutions for the cost of education for returning servicemen; to the Committee on Finance.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on the 13th instant, p. 2074, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Hamtramck, Mich., protesting against approval of the Crimean Conference in the fifth partition of Poland and the proposed annexation of small European countries to the Soviet Government; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Hamtramck, Mich., requesting that no boy of the age of 18 years, or thereabout, be sent overseas for combat duty without first receiving complete military or naval training for a period of at least 1 year; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 69. A bill for the relief of settlers on the International Strip at Nogales, Ariz.; without amendment (Rept. No. 102).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 174. A bill for the relief of the estate of Beatrice Withers, deceased, and Mary M. Withers; with amendments (Rept. No. 103).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 1527. A bill to exempt the members of the Advisory Board appointed under the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 from certain provisions of the Criminal Code and Revised Statutes; with amendments (Rept. No. 104).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. Res. 92. Resolution to investigate certain matters relating to food production and consumption; without amendment (Rept. No. 105), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 461. A bill authorizing the acquisition for park purposes of certain lands adjacent to Rock Creek Park in the District of Columbia; without amendment.

TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY TO EXPEND MONEY FROM CONTINGENT FUND UNDER CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to report an original Senate resolution for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 102), as follows:

Resolved, That all resolutions heretofore agreed to authorizing expenditures from the contingent fund of the Senate for the employment of clerical assistants or the conduct of inquiries and investigations until July 1, 1945, hereby are amended by terminating such authority at the close of business on June 30, 1945.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the purpose of the resolution is to bring the date of termination of employment in line with what is the customary practice.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution? I should like to know what it provides.

Mr. LUCAS. The resolution would simply move the date back 1 day, Mr. President, so as to enable the disbursing officer to keep his books in proper order, without adding one day.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does that mean that if a committee is now working on a subject which has been assigned to it to do by the Senate, and is unable to termi-

nate its investigation by the 30th day of June, nevertheless by this resolution the work is ipso facto terminated, and the staff must be dismissed, and the services of the staff lost?

Mr. LUCAS. This is merely an amendment to the original resolution which was agreed to. It sets back the date 1 day only, insofar as the termination of clerk hire is concerned. It is a matter of bookkeeping.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I understand the resolution which the Senator is seeking to amend, it provided for the termination of the same committees on July 1.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; and now, under this resolution, they are to be terminated on June 30.

Mr. BARKLEY. This simply makes the date June 30, so that for bookkeeping purposes the committees are ended at the end of the fiscal year instead of at the beginning of the next fiscal year.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, without attempting to take the floor, if the Senator will yield to me again?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am afraid the Senate and the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate have failed to grasp the situation. They have in mind, I presume, special committees. I am thinking now of the general subject, aside from the subject matter of this particular resolution. A subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary is not a special committee; yet a resolution of this kind would terminate the activity of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary because it would cut off whatever money is allocated to that committee for its work.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think I can explain the situation to the Senator from Nevada. On examination, the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate found that going back year after year the same amount of money was appropriated by the Senate from its contingent fund to employ clerks for subcommittees and special committees. If such clerks are necessary from year to year we agreed that the way to take care of the matter is to carry the item in the legislative appropriation bill, and not take the money from the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. But the Senator is speaking of special committees and not of standing committees.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; I am talking about standing committees, because the Senate adopts many resolutions which authorize standing committees to employ clerks. That is what we were trying to cure. If a standing committee of the Senate or a subcommittee of a standing committee of the Senate has employed a clerk last year and the year before and the year before that, it would appear to be a permanent need, and if it is a permanent need it should be provided for in the legislative appropriations. Those are the only instances in which the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate has said, "We will carry this on to the 30th of June, and allow the appropriate committee of the Senate then to include provision for such employees in the regular annual appropriation bill, and be done with it."

Mr. McCARRAN. Let us suppose that a standing committee—and I shall use the Committee on the Judiciary as an illustration, because I am chairman of that committee—let us suppose that a standing committee says to its subcommittee, "Go forward with this investigation and make your report before the end of the Seventy-ninth Congress." Then the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate by the action now proposed would say to us, "No; you cannot do that. You can continue only to the 30th of June."

Mr. HAYDEN. Because last year and the year before, and the year before that, the Committee on the Judiciary, if such were the case, had an extra clerk doing certain work, so that it really became an annual matter.

Mr. McCARRAN. But there was no such situation in our committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. If not, then the Committee on the Judiciary would not be affected by the resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this resolution affects primarily clerks who have been attached to standing committees and whose compensation or pay has been taken out of the contingent fund of the Senate. We discussed this matter some time ago on the floor of the Senate. Many clerks attached to standing committees have been paid for the last 4 or 5 years out of the contingent fund of the Senate. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate thought it was the best practice, and in keeping with the best interests of the Senate, to have the chairmen of the various committees appear before the Appropriations Committee, and if there was necessity for such clerks, request that they be placed on the permanent pay roll, and not come to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate each time and ask for funds to be paid from the contingent fund for the compensation of such clerks. That is all there is to the resolution.

Mr. McCARRAN. May I draw the Senator's attention to the fact that there may be a necessity for such a clerk during the pendency of work which was assigned to the committee by a Senate resolution. The chairman would not wish to go before the Appropriations Committee and ask that the clerk be paid in a general appropriation, when the work will end at a specific time.

Mr. LUCAS. Clerks attached to special committees are not involved in this matter at all. The resolution deals only with clerks of the standing committees whose chairmen have been coming to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate for funds with which to pay them.

Mr. McCARRAN. I know nothing about that.

Mr. LUCAS. That is all there is to the resolution. It is not as serious as the Senator from Nevada thinks it is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution. The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

FUNERAL EXPENSES OF THE LATE SENATOR MOSES, OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 100, and I ask for the immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 100), submitted by Mr. LANGER on March 14, 1945, was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the financial clerk of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate the actual and necessary expenses incurred by the committee appointed by the Vice President in arranging for and attending the funeral of Hon. John Moses, late a Senator from the State of North Dakota, upon vouchers to be approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PRESIDENTIAL, VICE PRESIDENTIAL, AND SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES, 1944 (REPT. NO. 101)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit at this time the report of the Special Committee to Investigate Presidential, Vice Presidential, and Senatorial Campaign Expenditures in 1944. The report is unanimous, apart from a few instances specifically noted. The report contains a summary of information relative to all the hearings and investigations conducted by the committee. The report also includes important factual material relating to the contributions to and expenditures by political committees which took an active part in the 1944 campaign. These facts are particularly important in analyzing the practical operation of the limitations imposed by the Hatch Act on campaign contributions and on receipts and expenditures of political committees. It has been found that these prohibitions have been ineffective in reducing the amounts of money spent in a Federal election.

Following the procedure established by former campaign expenditures committees of the Senate, careful attention was devoted to securing an over-all picture of the total amounts expended by all political committees seeking to influence the election of candidates for President, Vice President, and United States Senators. I believe the Senate will be interested in knowing that the total receipts of such committees, including the State committees of both parties, were approximately $25,000,000, while the total expenditures

of such committees amounted to approximately $23,000,000.

I know that my colleagues will be particularly interested in the amounts received and expended by all candidates for the United States Senate and by committees acting in their behalf in the primary and general elections of 1944. It was found that in connection with these campaigns an approximate total of $1,500,000 was received, and the approximate amount of $1,700,000 was expended.

Following committee investigation and study, certain recommendations for changes in the existing law have been advanced. Briefly, they are these:

First. The redefinition of the term "political committee" to cover all organizations which seek to influence directly or indirectly the nomination or election of candidates for the office of President or Vice President of the United States, United States Senator or Representative or Delegate or Resident Commissioner in Congress, or members of the electoral college of the United States.

Second. The establishment of a central depository for the filing of statements of contributions and expenditures as required by the Corrupt Practices Act, and providing for the compilation and prompt publication of the same, and the development of uniform methods of reporting.

Third. The encouragement of local publicity of contributions to and expenditures by every political committee operating within a single State by requiring the prompt filing with the clerk of the United States district court of the district in which that committee's headquarters is located of a duplicate copy of the statement of contributions and expenditures required to be filed with the joint committee in Washington.

Fourth. The extension of the act to include primary campaigns and nominating conventions.

Fifth. The elimination of present ceiling limitations placed upon (a) candidates for Senate and House, (b) political committees, and (c) individual contributions.

A bill incorporating these recommendations is being prepared and, I trust, will be introduced in the very near future.

There were also an additional minority recommendation as to a change in the law and two other committee recommendations as to other matters.

I wish to point out, Mr. President, that the basic theory underlying the recommendations of the committee is founded upon the conviction that the amount of campaign contributions is not the most important matter, but that the sources of these contributions and the manner in which they are expended are more important. Consequently, it is felt that greater emphasis should be placed upon publicity—full and timely publicity. When the public knows where campaign funds are coming from, and for what purposes they are spent, then the public is in a position to resist effectively any attempt to purchase a Federal office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report submitted by the Senator from Rhode Island will be received and printed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island permit me to make an inquiry regarding the report?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is this a final report?

Mr. GREEN. It is a final report. The activities of the committee were limited to the end of the last calendar year, and the time was extended merely to enable the committee to make a report.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will recall that on the first day of this session, when new Senators were being sworn in and the Senator-elect from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] presented himself to take the oath, I made a reservation that he take the oath without prejudice, in view of the fact that the committee had made no report, and there were some newspaper statements with reference to campaign methods in the State of Indiana. Of course, that was a formal reservation, such as we frequently make in the Senate, so that neither the Senate nor the Senator would be prejudiced by the fact that he was sworn in.

By reason of that reservation having been made, I do not want any suspicion or any cloud to be hanging over the title of the Senator from Indiana, and I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether in his report there is anything which would now make it improper to lift the reservation, so far as any action the Senate might contemplate with reference to it, based upon the report, is concerned.

Mr. GREEN. In the report which I have just filed, which covers some 250 pages, there is a summary of each investigation, including the one in Indiana. The investigation in that State was conducted by a special subcommittee, whose findings were approved by the main committee. It is expressly stated in the report that there is nothing to connect Senator CAPEHART directly with the frauds which were found by the investigation. He may have benefited by them, but there is nothing which would connect him with them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the report reveal anything which would cast any cloud or any doubt upon the Senator's election, or his title to the seat?

Mr. GREEN. No; we find that there is nothing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the chairman of the committee, I wish merely to say that, so far as I am concerned, the reservation which I made at the time the Senator from Indiana presented himself is lifted. Of course, that would not of itself prevent the Senate or any other Senator taking any action desired, but, so far as my reservation, made at the time the Senator from Indiana presented himself and took the oath, is concerned, and, so far as anything I contemplated based upon that is concerned, the reservation is lifted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Rhode Island to say at the beginning of his report that the committee found the Hatch Act to be totally ineffective, so far as dealing with the collection of funds for political campaigns is concerned?

Mr. GREEN. I did not say totally ineffective, but it is only partially effective.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senate committee has found it to be only partially effective. Is the Senator's committee making any recommendation with respect to the Hatch Act?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. The truth of the matter is that no one pays much attention to the Hatch Act. It has been repealed more or less by common consent. Is that not true?

Mr. GREEN. Attention is paid to it largely by finding means of getting around it.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the same thing.

HISTORY OF TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, yesterday I made the statement that I had had prepared a history of the Tennessee Valley Authority as it appears in the records of Congress, and that I would have it printed as a part of my remarks. Instead of that I ask unanimous consent that the history, prepared largely by the clerks of the Committee on Appropriations, be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 743. A bill to amend the World War Adjusted Compensation Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 744. A bill to prohibit the selling or serving of alcoholic beverages on certain aircraft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 745. A bill to amend section 602 (g) of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 746. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the payment of dependents' allowances in certain cases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 747. A bill imposing additional duties upon the postmaster at Lincoln's New Salem, Ill.; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 748. A bill for the relief of Nita Rodlun; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 749. A bill to amend the act of December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1080), relating to estates of certain deceased Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 750. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vashti Geer Coape-Arnold; and

S. 751. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. J. F. Brokaw, Mr. and Mrs. Earl Gunther, and James G. Cooney; to the Committee on Claims.

DOCUMENTATION UNDER THE LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE CANADIAN-BUILT DREDGE "AJAX," ETC.—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 552) to provide that the

Canadian-built dredge *Ajax* and certain other dredging equipment owned by a United States corporation be documented under the laws of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY MORGENTHAU AT MINNEAPOLIS

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Secretary Morgenthau before the Foreign Policy Association and the Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association, Minneapolis, March 12, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BIG BANKERS AND BRETTON WOODS—ADDRESS BY REV. E. A. CONWAY, S. J.

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Big Bankers and Bretton Woods," delivered by Rev. E. A. Conway, S. J., of the social action department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, which appears in the Appendix.]

BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENT—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Samuel Grafton, published in the Philadelphia Record of February 27, 1945, and an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of February 14, 1945, both relating to the Bretton Woods agreement, which appear in the Appendix.]

SENATORIAL COOPERATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senatorial Cooperation," published in the Washington Post of March 6, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NO COMPLAINT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, every United States Senator is daily receiving many communications from constituents of his home State and frequently we hear letters or telegrams read upon the floor of the United States Senate by various Senators. I received a letter recently which I wish to read to the Senate and which I submit is a model in form and brevity:

CHICAGO, *February 9, 1945.*

Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Everyone where I am working are sending letters to their Senator. At present I have no complaint.

One of your loyal supporters.

GEORGE A. HARRIMAN.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, in the debate last week over the so-called work-or-fight bill, many of us were seriously concerned with the compulsory features of one of the versions which was presented to the Senate. I for one feel very strongly that compulsion is not necessary in this situation because my experience has been that American workingmen and working women will do their utmost through voluntary measures.

I have been aware for some time of a significant experiment in the voluntary method which was made in the country's leading brass-production center, the Naugatuck Valley in Connecticut. This was called the pass-the-ammunition plan.

I should like to point out that the average worker returning the pledge under the pass-the-ammunition plan was willing to work 4 hours a day over his previous schedule, that he was agreeable to taking any kind of work the management wished to assign him, and that he was willing to accept the going rate for that job, even though it might be less than the rate for his regular job.

I believe that this kind of patriotism is to be highly commended. To my mind, it proves that the American worker desires to put his shoulder to the wheel to get the job done, to finish this war against fascism. It proves further that a voluntary plan, properly applied, can obtain quick and adequate results. It gets the ammunition going to our armed forces when they need it. It does not sacrifice any of the American freedoms which members of our armed forces believe they are fighting to preserve.

There has been very little publicity given to this voluntary plan of securing additional manpower with the working people involved without resort to any compulsion. For that reason I welcome the issuance last Friday of a release by the War Production Board telling of this plan. I ask unanimous consent to place the release in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Because of increased 1945 Army ammunition schedules, required deliveries of brass alloy strip, rod, and tube for the last half of 1945 have been further boosted, the War Production Board's Brass Mill Labor Advisory Committee was notified by W. P. B. officials at a meeting held this week, W. P. B. reported today.

January production of brass strip, brass rod, brass tube, and copper products was 478,000,000 pounds, the highest since November 1943. The increase in January production over that of December 1944 resulted in large part from cooperation between management and labor on production, W. P. B. officials said.

Brass-strip production increased 58,000,000 pounds in January, an increase of 23 percent over December 1944, according to data presented to the labor meeting. Brass-tube and brass-rod production in January was the highest in the history of the industry. January brass-rod production increased 12,000,000 pounds, brass tube 5,600,000 pounds, and copper products 3,500,000 pounds.

Lt. Charles L. Homer, Chief, Brass Mill Branch, W. P. B. Copper Division, gave the committee a detailed report on the steps taken to carry out previous recommendations of the committee. He said that, as a result of the committee's proposals, it has been possible for the Copper Division, by working with management and labor, to improve plant working conditions in some instances, to improve labor relations, to establish a third shift, to get necessary transportation in one case, and to get fuller utilization of manpower and facilities. Added to the tribute of the Copper Division was the recent statement of the Brass Mill Industry Advisory Committee that the Brass Mill Labor Advisory Committee has made an outstanding contribution to the increase of production to meet the high military requirements for 1945.

W. P. B. officials said that one of labor's important contributions to the solution of the manpower problems in the brass mills has been the pass-the-ammunition plan, which has been approved by the Labor Advisory Committee.

Under the plan, the union and the management in several plants in the Connecticut Valley made a careful survey of the workers in the plants to determine how many hours each worker was willing to work beyond his regular schedule, and the type of work he was willing to perform. The first company to adopt this overtime plan reported an addition of 38,922 working hours, or the equivalent of about 800 people working 48 hours a week. The men volunteered an average of 4 hours a day overtime. It was found in practice that problems of transportation, plant operations, the supply of raw materials, the relative urgency of the jobs the men offered to do and the actual ability of the men to carry so large a load of work made it impossible to utilize all the overtime offered. However, it was generally agreed that the plan is valuable. Steering committees, composed of management and labor have been set up in some plants to examine the pass-the-ammunition survey for the plant, to make the necessary adjustments, and to apply it to the extent practicable in the particular plant.

Despite the great increase in production achieved thus far, a huge job still faces the brass mills, W. P. B. officials told the Advisory Committee. Domestic production of alloy strip, which reached 306,000,000 pounds in January, must be gradually increased to 384,000,000 pounds a month by September 1945. The highest monthly production ever achieved in the past was 361,000,000 pounds. Brass-rod production must be stepped up to 130,000,000 pounds a month. The forecast on castings, based on the industry's peak operation, is 76,000,000 pounds short of Army requirements. The Copper Division of W. P. B. pointed out that actual deliveries of brass strip, rod, and tube, and of copper products for the entire year of 1944 were only 1.1 percent short of the Division's delivery estimates.

The Labor Advisory Committee gave special attention to the problem of increasing the production of castings—a major difficulty at the present time. Facilities are being provided to take care of the required increase, if manpower can be found for the job, W. P. B. officials said.

Lieutenant Homer presided at the meeting. Other Government representatives present were Michael Schwarz, Director, Copper Division; Leroy Sherman, labor assistant, Copper Division; and David Lasser, Director of Office of Labor Advisory Committees.

The members of the Brass Mill Labor Advisory Committee present at the meeting were Louis Hines, American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.; W. G. Flinn, International Association of Machinists (A. F. L.), Washington, D. C.; William Dameron, International Association of Machinists (A. F. L.), Washington; Paul Bennett and Raymond J. Brennan, Federal Labor Union (A. F. L.), Pittsburgh; John Farrell, United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers (C. I. O.), Detroit; Virgil Akeson, International Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers (C. I. O.), Washington; John Mankowski, John Porcu, and Robert Walkinshaw of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, Waterbury, Conn.; Charles McIntyre, Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, Cleveland; James De Bella, Interstate Copper and Brass Workers Union (Ind.), Washington, D. C.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, apropos of what the Senator from Connecticut has just said, I wish to make a brief statement to the Senate.

Every week I receive a newspaper published at Madison, Wis. The name of this newspaper is the Progressive. The president of the Progressive Publishing Co. is ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., our esteemed and beloved colleague from Wisconsin. The newspaper was founded in 1909 as La Follette's Magazine, by Robert M. La Follette, Sr., the great and

distinguished father of our colleague, who as a United States Senator so faithfully represented the American people.

Under the masthead of this newspaper, which I read every week with great pleasure and profit, appears the following:

Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free.

The lead editorial in the Progressive of last week was entitled "Miracles Aren't Enough."

I read the editorial:

Hidden deep within the Nation's newspapers last week, far from the front-page cries for labor conscription, was the best answer we have seen to the administration's demand for work-or-fight legislation.

William L. Batt, vice chairman of the War Production Board, recited figures of American production to a New York audience which the conservative Associated Press called staggering.

America, Batt said, is now producing war materials equal to that of all our allies and enemies combined.

Britain and Russia have conscripted labor. Germany and Japan have slave labor. Freemen in America are outproducing them all.

It's obvious that the advocates of regimentation aren't even satisfied with miracles.

Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the views of that newspaper, which undertakes to publish the truth, which was hidden away in many of the newspapers of the country. It is the lead editorial in the very fine Progressive, published by our beloved and distinguished colleague from Wisconsin.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. House bill 1984, the independent offices appropriation bill, is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, after having conferred with the acting chairman of the committee [Mr. McKELLAR] who is in charge of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the committee amendment on page 65, after line 19, was agreed to, be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what is the amendment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is the amendment having to do with abolishing a position which is not filled by a returning veteran.

Mr. TAFT. I have no objection.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it will first be necessary to ask unanimous consent to reconsider the committee amendment so that the Senator may offer an amendment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have already made such a request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, what is the request?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The request is to reconsider the vote by which the Senate agreed to the committee amendment in the independent offices appropriation bill, on page 65, after line 19. The amendment has to do with the abolition of a position not filled by a returning veteran after he has made application therefor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none; and the vote by which the committee amendment on page 65, after line 19, was agreed to, is reconsidered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, on page 65, line 26, after the word "position", to insert "and has been certified by the Civil Service Commission as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position."

I can state very briefly the purpose of the amendment. The purpose is to make certain that the veteran who returns and applies for his position has not suffered injuries or mental disturbance as a result of his war experience which would disqualify him for the position. If the amendment is agreed to, it will conform to section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act, thereby giving the personnel arm of the Federal Government the same right and power as that possessed by a private employer to pass upon the present qualifications of a former employee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to the committee amendment on page 65, after line 19.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it seems to me that the amendment should be agreed to. If any adjustment needs to be made, it can be taken care of in conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 30, in line 7, before the period it is proposed to insert *"Provided*, That no part of the appropriation made in this paragraph for use in any cooperating country shall be available for obligation or expenditure unless said cooperating country executes a written agreement that it will impose no restrictions on the use of the highway, nor levy directly or indirectly any tax or charge for such use, by traffic or vehicles from any other country that do not apply with equal force to the like use of the highway by traffic or vehicles of the cooperating country."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the amendment has the approval of Mr. MacDonald and the Public Roads Administration and the unanimous approval of the committee. As Senators know, we are building a road to the Panama Canal, but we have no agreements about its use after it is built. It is the general opinion that the adoption of the amendment will take care of that situation. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I now offer the next amendment which the committee has authorized me to present, and I ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, in line 9, before the period it is proposed to insert *"Provided further*, That the Commissioner of Public Buildings may, in his discretion, upon such terms and conditions as he may deem to be in the public interest, with the approval of the Federal Works Administrator, accept on behalf of the United States for installation in the United States Post Office Building at Kennebunkport, Maine, a mural, contributed by public-spirited citizens of the town of Kennebunkport, Maine, depicting, historically, the shipbuilding and seafaring activities of that community."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to. As we all know, Kennebunkport was one of the original shipbuilding sites in this country. The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] offered the amendment in the committee, and he is ready to speak in connection with it. I think the amendment provides for a very worthy and proper memorial which should be accepted.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I act on the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee, although I would have been perfectly willing to have the amendment disposed of on his statement.

The truth about the matter is that the amendment has no general public importance or consequence at all, but it is of consequence and interest to the people of the community mentioned. Some few years ago a new post-office building was erected in Kennebunkport, and the W. P. A. artists, or some other artists procured by the Government, painted a mural which has since been in that post office. The mural is a picture which, to speak frankly, depicts a group of fat women, scantily clad, disporting themselves on a beach. It has been an offense to the citizens of Kennebunkport ever since it was placed in the post office; in fact, it has been so much of an offense that the people of the community raised a sum in excess of $1,000 to have painted a mural which depicts historically, the seafaring and shipbuilding activities of the community.

All those citizens request is that they be allowed to give that new mural to the Federal Government, so that it may displace the offensive one. That is all that is involved in the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, so far as the committee was concerned, it was delighted to recommend the acceptance from the people of Kennebunkport of the mural referred to. I hope the Senate

will follow the recommendation of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe that completes action on the amendments, so far as the committee is concerned. However, I understand that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has an amendment to offer and something to say at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move the suspension of paragraph 4 of rule XVI in order that the amendment offered by me 2 days ago, and now lying on the table, may be considered at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts has given the proper notice in writing, and his motion is in order. It requires a two-thirds majority.

As many as favor adoption of the motion——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, is it in order to speak on the motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then let me say that I make this motion in order to be able to offer the amendment at this time, inasmuch as it seems to be a very proper amendment to go into the pending appropriation bill, particularly in view of the fact that at a later date appropriations providing for aid to States may come before the Senate.

I discussed this amendment with the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], and he said he had no objection to it. I also discussed it with the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who made the same statement.

On the floor of the Senate 2 days ago, if I heard him correctly, the Senator from Tennessee not only did not object, but stated that he believed there was very considerable merit to the amendment, and in the statement he made at that time I understood he supported it.

The purpose of the amendment is to permit a State board to choose which of several plans offered and approved by localities in the State shall be approved by an over-all State board selected by the legislature, prior to its being submitted to the Federal Works Agency in Washington.

Under the present law funds for such plans are offered in limited amounts to each of the 48 States. In those States there no doubt will be competing municipalities or regional authorities, or the State itself may present plans. The Senate has already agreed to a committee amendment providing for an appropriation of $35,000,000 for the item of planning. The plans to be prepared will involve approximately $875,000,000 worth of buildings. So a substantial number of buildings will ultimately be erected if all the money now provided in the bill is used for plans.

In the different localities there may be competition to submit various plans, and in a particular State more plans may be offered than can be paid for with the money allotted to that State. So the question will arise, What agency will choose between the various plans? I assume that the plans will be proper ones, because they will have been approved by the municipalities concerned.

Are we going to have the Federal Works Agency, in Washington, choose between the various plans and the various localities? Or are we going to have a State agency which is familiar with the affairs of the State, and which is more familiar with the needs of the various communities within the State, choose between the plans for those communities, when it happens that the cost of the plans submitted for the State exceeds the amount of money available to it, or even when the cost does not exceed the funds provided?

In years gone by the Congress has appropriated money under the so-called Hayden-Cartwright bill for the building of public roads. As one who has been close to State government, I believe that law has been excellently administered. Under it one agency in a State has the right to make the final decision, and that agency is the only one which can deal with the Federal Government.

Under the provisions of the pending bill various municipalities and various regional authorities would be permitted to submit their plans to the Federal Works Agency in Washington. So the matter really comes down to a question which goes to the foundations of home rule and the foundations of States' rights. Who knows better what is for the best interests of the various municipalities which may be competing in a State—a State agency approved by the legislature or, in the absence of the legislature, by the governor, or a Federal Works Agency located in Washington?

The whole principle of the pending appropriation bill is to reduce Federal expenditures, if it is possible to do so. Every one of us wishes to reduce the practice on the part of public and private agencies in the various States of coming to Washington with respect to questions which concern the States alone.

The idea back of the planning proposal of the bill is not like that of the W. P. A., which was based on need, and, furthermore, in this instance only a limited appropriation is involved.

What we must decide, in respect to this matter, which primarily concerns a locality or a State, is, Which is in the best interests of that State? Is a State agency, or the Federal Works Agency in Washington the best agency for reaching a decision on the relative merits of municipal, regional, and State plans?

Mr. President, I submit that this issue goes to the very foundations of the principle of home rule and the principle of States' rights. We all believe in the principle of State government. As one who has been close to it for several years, I sincerely hope that the rule will be suspended, so that the amendment may be considered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I regret very much finding myself in the position of having to oppose the amendment offered by the able Senator from Massachusetts, for whose personality, ability, and sincerity I have profound admiration.

The adoption of the amendment would nullify the whole purpose of section 501 (a) of the law which was enacted last year, providing for a national program for war mobilization and reconversion. That law was very carefully considered in every detail, and in every section of it, by the committee over which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] so ably presided. It is now the substantive law governing the appropriation of $35,000,000 which the Senate agreed to yesterday to provide advances to States and subdivisions of States in order that they may plan and carry out post-war activities of various kinds. It will take only a moment to read the section to which I have referred. I believe we should keep it in mind when we vote on the amendment. Section 501 (a) is as follows:

> In order to encourage States and other non-Federal public agencies to make advance provision for the construction of public works (not including housing) the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to make, from funds appropriated for that purpose—
>
> The Senate decided yesterday to appropriate $35,000,000 for that purpose—
>
> loans or advances to the States and their agencies and political subdivisions (hereinafter referred to as "public agencies") to aid in financing the cost of architectural, engineering, economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action preliminary to the construction of such public works: *Provided*, That the making of loans or advances hereunder shall not in any way commit the Congress to appropriate funds to undertake any projects so planned.

In other words, by the appropriation of $35,000,000—or $75,000,000, if the Senate had voted the full amount authorized under the law—the Congress would not thereby commit itself to making any contribution to the construction of the project after the plan had been adopted and submitted to the Federal Works Administrator. The question was discussed in detail in the committee, and on the floor in both Houses. If the law is to be changed fundamentally, so as to alter the whole conception of the relationship between this fund and local authorities all over the United States, surely it should not be done by an amendment to an appropriation bill. If it is to be done at all, it should be done after careful consideration has been given by the committee which reported the legislation in the first instance, the committee which is familiar with the matter, and whose purpose it was to make it unnecessary for a county, city, school district, or any other subdivision of a State, to go to the Governor or to a State authority in order to reach the Federal Works Administrator and participate in the fund.

Mr. President, much has been said about getting back to democracy. It seems to me that we are getting back to democracy when we allow every community which has a government to come to Washington directly and not be required to go to its State capital or to the Governor of the State.

The amendment offered by the able Senator from Massachusetts provides:

That said sum shall not be available for making loans or advances under title V with respect to projects in any State until the legislature of such State has designated an over-all State agency to allocate the sums made available to such State under said title V to individual projects conforming to a State, local, or regional plan.

In other words, the city of Hartford, Conn.; the cities of Pittsburgh or Greensburg, Pa; the city of Louisville, Ky.; or Winston-Salem, or the county of Buncombe—and there is such a county in North Carolina——

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, we have such a county in North Carolina, but we no longer have a Senator from Buncombe. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure of that. We not only have no Senator from Buncombe, but no Senator who is buncombe. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, none of those cities, large or small, could make application for participation in the fund unless and until the legislature of the State appointed an over-all commission of some kind to which the city would have to go in order to reach the Federal Works Administrator in Washington. Suppose the legislature did not appoint such a commission. All the counties, towns, and communities in such State would be barred from participation in the fund.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator from Kentucky believe there would be any logrolling in any State legislature for the appointment of such commission, or any bargaining back and forth for the disposition of the money to be obtained?

Mr. BARKLEY. If there should be no logrolling, then that process has been as completely abolished as has the Senator from Buncombe, N. C. [Laughter.]

The amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts further provides:

That until the final adjournment of the first regular session of the legislature of such State which ends more than 60 days after the enactment of this act, the governor may designate such over-all agency.

My State legislature will not meet until next January. Not even the governor could appoint an over-all commission. I do not see how Congress has authority to confer such jurisdiction upon the governors of the various States. The governor's authority is designated by the laws and the constitution of the State. Under this amendment I doubt very seriously whether a governor would have any authority to appoint a commission if the legislature should fail to act. It is not my understanding that Congress can authorize the governor of any State to appoint officers of any kind, or impose a charge upon a State treasury. There is no over-all planning commission in my State, and there is none in many other States.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that it would be unfair to deny to the communities and to the States the privilege of participating in the fund. Under the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts a State could not participate unless it had an over-all planning commission or unless the governor, without authority of the legislature, could appoint one. It seems to me the amendment would be unfair not only to the State which has no such over-all commission and may never have one, but it would also be unfair to the cities, counties, and communities which have governments of their own and contribute taxes to the fund which we are about to distribute. It would be unfair to require them to wait until the governor or the legislature created an over-all body under this amendment in order to participate in the fund.

I can appreciate very well how the Senator from Massachusetts feels about the matter. Having been a great governor of a great State, he feels that all this money should be siphoned through the State capitol. I believe that his theory may be sound, but in practice his suggestion would not only not work, but it would be extremely unfair to the States and communities which could not qualify under his amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hesitate to become involved in a discussion with the distinguished majority leader; but I point out that the amendment uses the word "designated" and not "created." Therefore the governor of a State, or the State legislature, may designate any existing agency. I may also state, with a smile, to the distinguished Senator that two of the States he enumerated have Democratic cities and Republican governors. My State today has a Democratic governor, but I am perfectly willing to entrust to him the question of the principle of States' rights in connection with siphoning the money through the State rather than through a Federal public works administrator in Washington.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not considered the matter from the standpoint of how many Republican governors there are, or how many Democratic cities there may be in the United States. Whether there are too many Republican governors, I shall not undertake to say, but I am sure they are all able men, regardless of their politics. I have not thought about that aspect of the matter. I have taken no census to determine how many Democratic cities are in States that have Republican governors, or vice versa, and I do not think we ought to consider the question from that standpoint. I believe the question of States' rights is not involved in requiring every city within a State to go to the governor or a commission designated by him before the city can participate in these funds.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. There has been a real abuse, I think, particularly with reference to the Federal works agencies—whether the W. P. A. or others—in going around the country and dealing directly with certain districts, regardless of whether they conformed to the State plan or did not. I know of schoolhouses that have been built by W. P. A. against the State educational code and in opposition to the State educational system. It puts tremendous power in the hands of public officials in a Federal agency to go around a State and pick out this favorite community and that favorite community and gradually use up all the funds which have been allotted to the State and pay no attention to the rest of the State.

I think, in theory, the Senator from Massachusetts is entirely correct. The only thing that bothers me is the question of having the legislatures pass on it because the legislatures may not be in session, and no action, therefore, may be taken for some time. There is no question in my mind that money allotted to the States under this plan should be controlled somehow through a State organization dealing with the entire State.

Mr. BARKLEY. I might remind the Senator from Ohio and other Senators that the theory of the Federal Government distributing funds through the States was first established in the Hoover administration when there was set up the R. F. C. and a fund was created which was to be loaned to the States for relief purposes. The theory was that the Federal Government would loan it to the States and that the States would ultimately pay it back, and that the States would decide where the money should be expended. We had to abandon that plan before the Roosevelt administration came into power because it was a pure fiction in the beginning.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts is not suggesting that the money be channeled through the States; that is not the suggestion here. The suggestion is that in making the allotments there be an over-all State control to determine how the money allotted to the States may be fairly distributed between different sections of a State, and that it not be left to the arbitrary discretion of a Federal official in Washington, who does not have the interest of the State at heart, and frequently plays favorites in making the allocations.

I may say to the Senator what the Senator from Massachusetts proposes has been done. I referred to W. P. A. In a great majority of State-aid plans, all the social security and health programs, except the housing program, distribution of Federal funds to a State has been primarily controlled and directed by a State body. I do not think that that is the principle upon which most of our legislation is based today. The only possible excuse for this expenditure, it seems to me, is an immediate emergency of some kind, but I still think that it should be done by allotting the money directly to a State official, the governor or some other official.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's viewpoint, but I am afraid he has not read the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. In order that we may understand what it is, I shall read it again:

Provided, That said sum shall not be available for making loans or advances under said title V—

That is to States, counties, or other political subdivisions—

with respect to projects in any State until the legislature of such State has designated an over-all State agency to allocate the sums made available to such State under said title V.

If that does not mean the governor or an over-all commission set up by the governor is to allocate the funds, I do not know what language means.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. While I am on the committee and cannot make a motion, I question very much whether we should have appropriated $35,000,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senate settled that question yesterday.

Mr. TYDINGS. I might say to the Senator first of all if the plans are made, behind them is the implication that the Federal Government is going to appropriate the money to carry on the local improvements.

Mr. BARKLEY. No. The law I read a moment ago, if the Senator will recall, specifically says that the Congress is not in any way committed to appropriate money to carry out projects after the plan is made.

Mr. TYDINGS. I understand the law so provides, but the fact that we are giving them money to make plans will not stop us from providing money for them after they make the plans.

I rose, however, to make the observation that, with a national debt of approximately $300,000,000,000 mark, with taxes as high as they are, and with a budget which has been unbalanced since 1929, I am wondering where the money is coming from eventually to pay off this $35,000,000. Where is it coming from?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, that would have been a legitimate argument against including this provision in the act which was passed last year, when it was authorized. There was, however, no objection made to it at the time. It went through both Houses practically by unanimous consent, and there was a unanimous report because it was felt by the committee of which the Senator from Georgia was the very able chairman that the Federal Government could very well encourage the States and their local subdivisions in preparing plans by making this advance which of course is intended to be repaid, though it might turn out later, as in the case of loans made under F. E. R. A. and R. F. C., they might never be repaid. That is the theory upon which we preserve the relationship between the Federal Government and the States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely wish to say that when the witnesses came before the Committee on Appropriations that question was brought up, and they were very distinctly told that there would be no agreement express or implied that any appropriations would be provided.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to say that anything that gets by the Senator from Tennessee in the Appropriations Committee, of which he is acting chairman and of which I have the honor to serve as a member, has to have strong support in order to be passed, for I can say for him, and I believe all members of the committee will agree, that he has saved the taxpayers of this country millions and billions of dollars during the time he has served there, and he deserves the thanks of the country. It is only because of the testimony that I did not protest the $35,000,000 appropriation. But I do think, if I may say this final word, that sooner or later somebody has got to ask where is all the money for the post-war period coming from.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am satisfied that that time will come sooner or later; whether sooner or later, I do not know; but I am sure it will come. We will all have to face it, but not now.

Before us is a proposal which, in my judgment, is unfair and discriminatory toward communities in States which have not through their legislatures set up over-all planning boards, and whose governors have no authority under the State law to create or designate such over-all planning boards or agencies. I think many of the most deserving communities in the United States will be denied any relief or help under this provision, if it should be adopted.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the senior Senator from Kentucky yield to his colleague?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. How much money is contemplated to be spent in the several States—$35,000,000 over all?

Mr. BARKLEY. Thirty-five million dollars over all.

Mr. CHANDLER. How is it to be apportioned among the States?

Mr. BARKLEY. A law enacted last year provided that 90 percent of it was to be allocated according to population, that is, as the population of the local community is related to the population of the whole country. The other 10 percent may be allocated at the discretion of the Director of the Federal Works Agency. No more than 90 percent can go to any State, except, of course, within the 10 percent which may be allocated according to his discretion. But when the State gets its 90 percent, if there are plans sufficient to absorb its share of the 90 percent, then, under the amendment, it would be up to the governor, or someone designated by him, to determine what communities should get the money after it had been allocated to the State.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish to associate myself with the views expressed by my colleague, because the Kentucky Legislature will not reconvene until January 1946. I do not believe we could pass a law empowering the governor to name an official to receive money in Kentucky. I think it might work a very great hardship on communities which may be deserving, and which may wish to represent their own situation, which may be urgent, and which may be clearly entitled to participate in these funds, and otherwise would not be permitted to do so. The question of States' rights, and the argument coming from where it does, interests me very greatly.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am about through, but in reply to my colleague, I may say—and it may apply to other States—our legislature will not meet until next January, and it will not adjourn, we will say, until the middle of March.

Mr. CHANDLER. About the 17th of March.

Mr. BARKLEY. It will be in session about 60 days, which will take it through to the 15th or 20th of March. Then, under this amendment, 60 days more would have to elapse, which would bring it to the middle of May before the Governor could appoint any over-all authority. By that time all the States which had been able to act immediately would have come in, and we probably would be left at the little end of the horn, and some other States would be in the same position.

I hope the motion to suspend the rules will not be agreed to, and that the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I think I should call attention to the last proviso, which permits the Governor to designate the agency until the legislature shall make its own designation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I doubt very much, in the first place, the authority of Congress to authorize the Governor to designate an agency to receive Federal funds.

Mr. GURNEY. It is so stated in the amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I quite disagree with the Senator from Kentucky. I think he is borrowing entirely too much trouble. What we are starting out to do is to make plans for post-war work. Certainly we need the cooperation of the States and the local communities in carrying out those plans. Is there any one so able to judge the needs of the various subdivisions in a State as the State government itself, the legislature which the people elect? Here we have a proposition to bring the State into the picture.

It seems to me that the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts definitely strengthens the program and makes for more careful administration and for economy. As every Member of this body knows, the closer the supervision over such expenditures is to the local communities, the greater the chance for economy, for the local folks are much more careful.

Mr. President, this is only a matter of making plans. The Senator from Kentucky asks whether Congress can authorize a governor to designate a body. All we are proposing to do is to recognize a State body to cooperate in the spending of money for plans which we provide. As the Senator from South Dakota very happily suggested, if the legislature has adjourned, or if it does not meet, the governor may designate a body with which the National Government can work.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that in all or virtually all the legislation proposed along social lines in

this body, the State government is recognized. There are now pending, either in committee or on the Senate Calendar, bills providing for aid to educational systems. Those bills provide that we must work through State bodies and accept State standards. There are bills providing for help in the health service, and for aid in the construction of hospitals. Those bills also provide that we must conform to State standards and work through State bodies.

I agree with what the Senator from Ohio has said; there has been some abuse, some favoritism has been shown by Federal agencies undertaking to go down into the minutiae of local expenditures in the various States. Certainly, there is no one so competent to aid the Federal Government in making sound plans as a State agency. The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts seems to me to be perfectly sound—not only sound, but desirable, and a very good aid to the whole program.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is with some reluctance that I find myself in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts, for whom I entertain a very high regard. However, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to an important fact—something which new Senators perhaps know little about: A committee was appointed by the United States Senate last year, known as the George Committee on Post-War Planning and Policy. Members from both sides of the aisle were appointed on the committee, and I think it is agreed by all, after long hearings, that a constructive job was done with respect to the question of post-war policy and planning.

After the hearings were completed, the Congress passed Public Law No. 458, which was an amendment to the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes. This is the legislation which was originally sponsored by the George committee, and finally came to the Senate and was passed, as I recall, unanimously, after careful discussion.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate, and especially of the junior Senator from Massachusetts, to a certain section of the act known as title V, under the caption "Public works." This is the section which states how the funds shall be allocated, as has been described heretofore by the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the majority leader. It also contains a provision which is more or less in keeping with what the Senator from Massachusetts is attempting to do by his amendment:

> *Provided further,* That no loans or advances shall be made with respect to any individual project unless it conforms to an over-all State, local, or regional plan approved by competent State, local, or regional authority.

That practically does exactly what the Senator from Massachusetts is attempting to do through his amendment, but I am constrained to say that in my opinion it does it better.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to the fact that the purpose of my amendment is to enable an over-all State agency to choose between local and regional and even State plans, when they involve more money than is available under this appropriation for the particular State. For instance, if in Illinois Chicago, Springfield, and several other cities, or if Cook County, or other counties, offer plans which are properly approved by the respective regions or localities, but involve more money than the total appropriation for Illinois, then who is to choose—a State agency, approved by the legislature of the State, or the governor, who are elected officials, or an appointed official in Washington under the Federal Works Agency?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I, of course, appreciate the force of the argument made by the able Senator from Massachusetts, but the point I am trying to make is that a committee studied this problem, not for days or weeks, but for months, before it finally made the report upon which the present law, from which I have read, is based. We went all over the problem at that time, and the Senate then had an opportunity to do what the Senator from Massachusetts seeks to do now, but did nothing about it.

Mr. President, one who proposes such an amendment as that of the Senator from Massachusetts, meets with the difficulty of attempting to legislate upon an appropriation bill. Of course, in the House of Representatives that could not be done, because it would be subject to a point of order. This is on the theory that legislation has no place on an appropriation bill. An amendment submitted from the floor without careful and close consideration presents ramifications of all kinds, as I see it. In view of the fact that a special Senate committee studied this matter for weeks and months, and finally adopted the section I just read, I believe the Senate would do well to leave the matter alone at this moment. We should not attempt to add an amendment which actually repeals, or at least seriously modifies, the very section I read, which the Senate adopted at the last session.

Now Mr. President, listen to another provision, subsection (c) of title V, as follows:

> Advances under this section to any public agency shall be repaid by such agency if and when the construction of the public works so planned is undertaken. Any sum so repaid shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Under the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts I do not believe the Federal Government would have any power whatsoever to enter into a contract with any local subdivision outside the State itself. In other words, I think that under the Senator's amendment, in view of what this section provides, the Federal agency's hands would be tied and everything would have to come through the over-all agency appointed by the respective governors or the legislatures of the different States. Therefore it would repeal, or seriously cripple, or at least it would add confusion and chaos to the proper administration of this act as it has been passed by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to these provisions most seriously, because of the fact that under the able leadership of one of the most distinguished Senators who ever sat in this body, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] we went through this matter from the beginning to the end. I do not believe the Senate of the United States should attempt at this time to enact legislation of the character now proposed which deals with a vital principle, and especially without any study whatsoever. It is the old story of legislating on an appropriation bill, and I say candidly and seriously that it is always a dangerous thing to do. That is especially true when we have basic legislation of this kind which has been so long and seriously considered.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the amendment will be defeated for the reasons so ably explained by the Senator from Kentucky and other Senators. The Senator from Illinois wants the community of Bloomington, Springfield, or any other city or municipality in Illinois, to be able to deal directly with the Federal Government if the community has its plans ready. So far as I am concerned, I do not want those cities to go through an over-all agency as designated by the amendment. I do not know what this agency would do with respect to those cities. I do not know how far advanced the smaller cities may be with respect to their plans. They may be far out in advance. They may be able to deal directly with the Government before the over-all agency could deal with them in the manner provided by the Senator's amendment.

I repeat, Mr. President, that adoption of the amendment would probably result in repealing, or at least modifying basic law which was passed by the Congress. I think it would add confusion and chaos to an orderly situation, which can be worked out under the law we passed last year.

Mr. CHANDLER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	O'Daniel
Austin	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hart	Overton
Ball	Hatch	Pepper
Bankhead	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hayden	Reed
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Brewster	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Burton	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Bushfield	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Taylor
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McClellan	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	McMahon	Vandenberg
Cordon	Magnuson	Wagner
Donnell	Maybank	Walsh
Downey	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Mitchell	Wherry
Ellender	Moore	White
Ferguson	Morse	Wiley
Fulbright	Murdock	Willis
George	Murray	Wilson
Gerry	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is the question before the Senate the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to suspend the rule so that he may offer an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI in order that he may offer an amendment. [Putting the question.] The motion not having received a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present, it is rejected.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I desire to offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. So do I.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator was fortunate to catch the eye of the Presiding Officer.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Wyoming will remain in the Senate Chamber, he will have an opportunity to offer his amendment in a few minutes.

I should like to make a brief statement with respect to the amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and myself, which amendment now lies on the desk. At the conclusion of my remarks I expect to offer the amendment. If a point of order is made against it, the Senator from South Carolina and I have decided that we will not press for a vote to suspend the rule.

This amendment is a new section which we ask to have added at the end of the bill. It grew out of the testimony in the hearings of Mr. Ferguson, Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, who testified that in the applications made by veterans it was necessary for a veteran to comply with a directive issued by the War Production Board, denominated as H-3, and more familiarly known as the hardship rule.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I judge from the remarks of the Senator that he intends to occupy some little time.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The amendment which I have to offer will, I am sure, be accepted by the acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and will involve no debate. Will the Senator yield to me so that I may offer the amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for that purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 17, line 20, after the numerals "$1,897,833", it is proposed to insert "of which not less than $171,673 shall be available for the enforcement of the Wool Products Labeling Act."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this is precisely the language which has been carried in the Independent Offices Appropriations Act for several years.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator's amendment provide for the same amount which was appropriated last year?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It provides for a smaller amount than that appropriated last year. It does not add any appropriation to the bill, but merely earmarks a part of the appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, returning to the statement made by Mr. Ferguson before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations relative to applications which are being made by veterans, let me say that the information which Mr. Ferguson gave before the subcommittee prompted the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and me to prepare the amendment. I refer particularly to page 412 of the printed hearings. I read from the committee hearings two questions and answers between the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and Mr. Ferguson, as follows:

> Senator MAYBANK. Mr. Ferguson, I was going to ask what is your experience with the veterans' loans for housing? You said you processed them under the G. I. bill.
>
> Mr. FERGUSON. Well, there have been comparatively few so far, but we are not having any trouble with them.
>
> Senator MAYBANK. You say comparatively few?
>
> Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

So we dropped the matter. We felt that the veterans were obtaining the materials they needed without any difficulty—possibly in other ways, of course; but inasmuch as very few applications had been made, it did not make any difference at the time. But, on further examination, as appears at the bottom of page 414 of the committee hearings, if Senators care to examine them, we found that many applications were being made. I read the following question propounded by me to Mr. Ferguson:

> Senator WHERRY. That would be a very small percentage?

I asked that question in reference to the G. I. applications for materials. I had understood from the replies Mr. Ferguson made to questions previously asked by the Senator from South Carolina, who is now on the floor, having returned from his committee, that only a few applications were made by veterans under the G. I. bill provisions.

Mr. Ferguson's reply to my question was:

> Then they permit veterans coming back to build houses.

Then I said:

> That is what Senator MAYBANK wanted to know, and I want to know if that is part of your anticipated work.

The Senate will understand that the Federal Housing Administration is requesting these appropriations in order to be able to continue this process.

Mr. Ferguson made the following reply:

> I understand the applications are running 1,500 a week.

He referred to applications made by veterans who are endeavoring to obtain materials with which to build homes, after they have complied with the provisions of the law, namely, the G. I. bill of rights.

The Senator from South Carolina then stated:

> I asked you, and you said there were very few, Mr. Ferguson.

Mr. Ferguson replied:

> You said under the G. I. bill.

I read further from the testimony:

> Senator MAYBANK. Well, war veterans.
>
> Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, I didn't understand your question. There are being received now applications for priorities under this so-called hardship classification.
>
> Senator MAYBANK. Is that the way the veterans get their money?
>
> Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Now, skipping a little of the testimony, we come to the important question and answer, as follows:

> Senator WHERRY. As I understand it, the only way that a veteran can get materials today is under the hardship clause?
>
> Mr. FERGUSON. That is right.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I brought up this matter for the reason that I do not think the returning war veterans, who have offered their lives for us, should be called upon to get priorities in order to be able to obtain materials with which to build homes or repair their homes, after returning from the battlefields.

What the Senator from Nebraska has said in reference to the testimony in the committee hearings is, of course, not all there is to the matter; because I think the Senator will agree with me that it is the thought of the committee and of the Government housing agencies that, as time goes on, there will be more and more such applications. I think the veterans should not be confronted with this hardship clause.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his statement. Of course, he is the joint sponsor of the amendment, and he is the one who, in reality, discovered the difficulty that veterans, who come under the hardship rule, are having in obtaining such materials.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me also say that after the committee heard the testimony and discussed the matter, it authorized us to offer the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. And let me further point out that on page 6 of the committee report the following language appears:

During the course of the hearings it was developed that returning veterans are making applications for priorities for materials to construct houses in increasing numbers, but that such applications fall within the so-called hardship classification. It is the feeling of the committee that every effort possible should be made to facilitate construction loans to returning veterans and that priorities for materials should be granted promptly to such veterans.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, the priorities will be granted only when the materials are available.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, there will be no interference with any Army or Navy priorities, because that point is distinctly set out.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I was about to state that one of the provisions of the amendment is that the veterans will be able to obtain the materials only when they are available, and that furnishing them to such veterans will be subject entirely to all military needs. So no materials will be taken from any war work or any activity needed to help the military effort. That is a rather broad statement, but it is correct.

The amendment simply provides that when a veteran returns, if he wishes to build a home he will not have to go to an agency and say that his house has burned down or that no suitable place is available for him; but he will be able to get the material, in order of application, subject to the supplying of all the military needs of the country.

I cannot see why there should be any objection to the adoption of this very brief amendment, which provides that the returning veterans—whose applications for such materials are now coming in at the rate of 1,500 a week, and they will increase—shall be able to obtain the materials, without having to apply under the hardship rule.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. When my friend the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska commenced his discussion of this matter, I was unavoidably detained. Since then I have returned to the Chamber. I wonder whether the Senator will ask unanimous consent for adoption of the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I previously stated that at the end of my remarks we would ask unanimous consent for the consideration and approval of the amendment; and that if a point of order were made against it, we would not pursue the method of moving for suspension of the rule, and subsequently request a vote on the amendment.

I believe that is the Senator's position; is it not?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent for consideration of the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. And, Mr. President, if unanimous consent is given for consideration of the amendment, I ask unanimous consent for its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the amendment is considered and agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly about the Tennessee Valley Authority. All of us have heard considerable about it before.

When the bill was reported from the Appropriations Committee, I began to receive some telegrams from the T. V. A. territory. I wish to read one of them, and then I shall read my answer. Following that, I will comment on them briefly.

I received the following telegram from Decatur, Ala.:

DECATUR, ALA., *March 11, 1945.*

HON. CLYDE M. REED,
Washington, D. C.

Senator MCKELLAR has again offered legislation detrimental to the people of the Tennessee Valley in the form of amendments which would kill the freedom of T. V. A. in serving the people of this Nation. We live and work with T. V. A. every day. We know its value and great results achieved under present regulations and strongly recommend that it be left alone. Congress was right in its enactment of the basic legislation that governs T. V. A. and it should not now be changed. We do not want this great agency of the Government, this helping hand to millions of people, handcuffed with stifling amendments. We want T. V. A. to continue to be absolutely free from politics and patronage, as the Congress had directed. We, as representatives of the people in every county of Alabama served by T. V. A. urge you to oppose by both voice and vote these endangering amendments.

H. R. Summer, mayor, Decatur, Ala.; John A. Caddell, president, Decatur Chamber of Commerce; R. H. Richardson, mayor, Athens, Ala.; Isaac Johnson, probate judge, Moulton, Ala.; John Benson, State senator, Scottsboro, Ala.; A. W. McAllister, mayor, Hunstville, Ala.; E. H. Couch, mayor, Guntersville, Ala.; J. A. Keller, president, State Normal, Florence, Ala.; J. A. Johnson, probate judge, Fort Payne, Ala.; A. A. Griffith, circuit judge, Cullman, Ala.; Edgar Underwood, probate judge, Russellville, Ala.; T. C. Almon, judge of probate, Morgan County, Ala.; J. Lee Andrews, Colbert County, Sheffield, Ala.; Julian Harris, circuit judge, Decature, Ala.; Jap Bryant, mayor, Bessemer, Ala.; Lem Cob, State senator, Center, Ala.; E. F. Martin, mayor, Florence, Ala.

I wrote the following letter to all the persons who signed that telegram:

MARCH 12, 1945.

I have your recent communication, objecting to the amendment adopted by the Senate Committee on Appropriations requiring that revenues from the T. V. A. be turned into the Federal Treasury the same as Federal revenues from all other sources, and then be expended through authorization of Congress.

The Army, the Navy, the Post Office Department, and every other agency of government operates under this policy.

Mr. Harry W. Bashore, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, testified before the Senate committee that the Boulder Dam, the Grand Coulee Dam, the Bonneville Dam, and all other power-producing agencies in the Western States operate successfully under this accepted principle of sound government. Mr. Bashore stated that they could, and did, get along with a revolving fund of $500,000 to meet emergencies or sudden changes in conditions.

There is nothing in the T. V. A. situation that calls for any such showing of opposition to perfectly sound policy of government which is in force and effect with every other agency as in this case. One would think from the sudden outburst of the population and newspapers of that section that some harm was intended to the T. V. A. There is nothing of that kind in the mind of anyone. Certainly not in mine. I think that Mr. Lilienthal will tell you I am not unfriendly to the T. V. A.

Out of the Federal Treasury some $767,000,000 has been expended in the Tennessee Valley. That any section of the United States should expect such enormous contributions from the Federal Treasury without any direct authority by the Federal Congress over the continuing policies affecting the expenditure of this vast amount is difficult to understand.

Sooner or later, the T. V. A. will be brought under the same policy that controls appropriations for and expenditures by every other agency of the Federal Government. People directly interested in the T. V. A. are certainly not benefiting the T. V. A. from the long view standpoint by objecting to a sound fiscal policy.

There has never been the slightest suggestion of any political consideration in the effort to bring the T. V. A. under the sound policy applying to every other governmental agency. I am one of the members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations that supported this effort. I shall continue to support it as long as I am a Member of the Senate. I have not been unfriendly to the T. V. A., but I am getting fed up on the constant effort of T. V. A. and its overzealous supporters to set itself apart from every other Government agency in the matter of sound fiscal policy.

With my best wishes, I am,
Cordially yours,

CLYDE M. REED.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that so many newspapers, columnists, speakers, and magazine writers have assumed that a personal fight exists between the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and some person connected with the T. V. A. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I assert that in his dealing with the T. V. A. problems and T. V. A. appropriations I have never heard the Senator from Tennessee utter a single word with regard to politics, patronage, or political considerations of any kind. As I recall the vote in the committee, it was 14 to 3 in favor of reporting the amendment which the Senator from Tennessee discussed yesterday, when I understood him to state that he did not intend to press the amendment. I believe that he is wise. Undoubtedly it would be legislation on an appropriation bill. I am of the opinion, as are most Senators, that the way to legislate is only through a legislative committee, and that only when an emergency exists should we undertake to write legislation into an appropriation bill.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] expressed the same view in discussing the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. That was one of the rare times when the Senator from Illinois has been right, and I agree with the position he took.

Mr. President, without the knowledge of the Senator from Tennessee, I have

taken occasion today to state what I have stated in order to set the record straight. For several years I have served in the Appropriations Committee with the Senator from Tennessee. I have never found a more earnest, hard-working, and industrious Member of the Senate than the Senator from Tennessee. At no time has there ever been the slightest mention by him of any political, partisan, or patronage consideration in connection with a legislative appropriation in the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I believe that the Senator from Tennessee is entitled to have me, or any other member of his committee, make the statement which I have made in order to set the record straight and keep it straight.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas with all my heart.

This morning I read in a newspaper a statement to the effect that I was the personal enemy of someone. I am quite sure that the Senator from Kansas and other Senators have known me long enough to know that I am a personal enemy of no one. I have been working for the T. V. A. since 1916. I have worked for it as earnestly, as carefully, and as sensibly as I knew how. A great institution has been built in that territory. It belongs to the Government. It belongs to the people of this country. What I have objected to is one man taking over control of the T. V. A. and undertaking to operate it without any regard to the Congress. All other Government agencies, including the President, Cabinet officers, and various other officers of the Government, come to Congress for their appropriations. The organizations operating the great dams in the West, which together form the greatest power-producing organization in the world, not only come to Congress for their appropriations and pay their receipts into the Treasury of the United States, but they state that by doing so they are not hamstrung or bothered in the slightest. They state that it is the best course for them to follow.

All we are attempting to do today is to apply the same law to the T. V. A. that we have applied to every other organization of the Government. It appears that Mr. Lilienthal has construed the law under which he operates to mean that he is exempted from paying receipts of the great T. V. A. into the Treasury of the United States, and that he is independent of the Congress. I do not care whether the head of the T. V. A. is Mr. Lilienthal, my distinguished friend the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], or my friend the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON]. I should be opposed to any of them taking such an attitude as Mr. Lilienthal has taken. I believe that any man who assumed such an attitude would be wrong.

I do not believe the law should be construed in the way Mr. Lilienthal claims it should be construed. I think he has misconstrued it. But in order to make certain, as I stated yesterday, I shall introduce a bill providing that all agencies of the Government whose operations result in a profit shall pay their receipts into the Treasury of the United States, and come to the Congress in order to obtain their necessary appropriations, just as any other activity or organization of the Government must do.

I am proud of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I am as proud of it as I am of any other activity of the Government, because I had such a great part in establishing it. No one believes in it more strongly than I do, and no one believes in its efficacy more than I believe in it. I do not want it to be ruined by any officer who thinks the law is otherwise than as written, and that because he is the head of the organization he has a right to do with its moneys and its receipts just as he pleases. All such receipts ought to be paid into the Treasury, and I shall certainly do everything I can to have the Senate pass a bill to that effect, not directed to Mr. Lilienthal alone but to all officers of the Government who receive money. There is but one place where such receipts should go, and that is into the Treasury of the United States, and for their appropriations they should come before the Congress and get them. So I thank the Senator with all my heart, and I hope we may now vote on the bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire to add one or two observations. I have always been intensely interested in the Tennessee Valley Authority. I was not here to vote for it or against it in the initial proceeding. If I had been here I would have voted for it, with provision for a moderate amount of money, but I doubt very much whether I would have voted for the T. V. A. to begin a program which would call for $767,000,000 from the Public Treasury.

I have sufficient interest in the T. V. A. to have made a trip last fall, in September and October, at my own expense, if you please, to take a close, intimate, first-hand look at T. V. A. I was Mr. Lilienthal's guest for a part of the time, and I found him a very pleasant, companionable gentleman. I think the T. V. A. is doing a number of very admirable things. I also think that T. V. A. is perhaps the most overadvertised of all Government agencies which I know anything about. Mr. Lilienthal is responsible for a part of it and his warm friends for the rest of it. I think they are doing the T. V. A. in the long run an injustice and disservice.

I met people up and down the Tennessee Valley. The people of Chattanooga were good enough to have a noonday luncheon at which I could discuss what I had seen. I did so as frankly and freely as I am discussing the matter here. I referred to the vast amount of money which had been spent and the results which were flowing from the expenditure.

I desire to leave with the Senate the thought that when we come to consider the long-range value of the T. V. A., nothing definite can be determined until the war is over and we can ascertain how much of that enormous power development can be turned into permanent private-business use. I said as much to the people of Chattanooga, and no one dissented. In other words, we have on the Tennessee River an enormous power development, and two-thirds or three-fourths—I should think 75 percent of all the power developed now goes to wartime industries. The acid test for T. V. A. is going to come after the war when it is determined how much of that vast power production can be utilized, and will be utilized, by private industry. If a great part of it can be so utilized, well and good.

Of course, the T. V. A. has brought prosperity to the Tennessee Valley. Heavens and earth, why should it not? Whenever there is an expenditure of $767,000,000 on any sort of enterprise, sound or unsound, in a limited territory such as the Tennessee Valley, of course, there will be good times.

I also observed the farm program which is being carried out, and it is an admirable thing. My State has had such a program for 25 years. We did not have to have a T. V. A. come along to start Kansas on a program of soil conservation, crop rotation, and proper handling of the soil, neither did most of the other States. T. V. A. is given great credit for a number of such activities which the people praising T. V. A. do not understand, and it is given credit for some things which are not at all new, but which follow an established pattern. So far as their soil program is concerned, it is admirable when utilized in an area where the soil has been dreadfully abused and agriculture has been sadly backward.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it may be said that, without doubt, there will be a steadily increasing demand for electric energy after the war, just as there was after the First World War. As I recall, we were using approximately 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually at the end of the last war. Consumption has steadily increased, with the exception, I think, of the year 1931, when there was a slight decrease, so that last year, 1944, we were using about 240,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

I understand that 80 of the utility companies of the country have been making a survey of the prospects for the future and that their estimate is that there will be an increase in the demand of about 10 percent a year until 1960. So, with the shortage which is developing and the new industries, such as the aluminum and magnesium industry, the chemical industry and synthetic industries of various kinds, which require the use of electricity, it seems to me to be likely that we will have use for all the power that is developed wherever it may be developed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont certainly does not expect, does he, that the tremendous present demand for power is going to be continuous without interruption after the war?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I think it is going to increase after the war.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator mean without interruption?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. We heard the same argument at the time of the last war, and the demand increased then, and the utility companies themselves are trying to prepare for the demand they now foresee.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate, but let me say that the T. V. A. and the power produced by T. V. A. have been of great advantage during the war; there can be no question about that. I have forgotten the number of kilowatts T. V. A. can produce, but that agency has been of tremendous advantage to the war effort and the war purposes; any candid man who takes a look at it and understands it must make that acknowledgment; but I repeat, with due regard to the Senator from Vermont, that I think the acid test of the T. V. A. is going to come after the war when it is determined how much of the enormous power which is being developed will be utilized by private industry.

I now yield the floor to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not care for the floor. I merely wish to say that I think the demand for electric energy will not only be maintained after the war, but will be increased. There are still 4,300,000 farms in the country without electricity, and the farms which already have electricity are becoming more electrified, so to speak, all the time. The consumption has almost doubled on the average farm since the war began. So while none of us can predict absolutely what will happen in the future, I am exceedingly confident that the demand will continue to increase.

Mr. McKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I am through, but if the Senator from South Carolina wishes to ask a question I yield to him.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, I wish to ask permission to have printed in the RECORD a statement showing the number of farms throughout the United States—State by State—as they were electrified in 1938, 1940, 1942, and 1944. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that there was a great upturn in the electrification of farms from 1938 to 1942, but since that time it has been stopped because of the lack of material, copper wire, and like things, and lack of manpower to continue the electrification. In some States of the Union only 7 percent of the farms are electrified, in my own State only 35 percent. So, I thoroughly and absolutely agree with the Senator that not only will farms continue to be electrified, but that there will be a huge demand, in addition to what is now used, as soon as we can get priorities to carry on rural electrification and like activities in the post-war period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of number and percentage of United States farms receiving central station electric service, 1938–44

	Farms receiving electric service [1]							
	1938		1940		1942		1944	
	Number electrified	Percent electrified	Number electrified	Percent electrified	Number electrified	Percent electrified	Number electrified	Percent electrified
United States	1,300,500	19.1	1,853,249	30.4	2,337,160	38.3	2,572,960	42.2
Alabama	22,600	8.1	33,907	14.6	51,020	22.0	60,500	26.1
Arizona	8,300	41.2	5,607	30.4	7,900	42.8	8,100	43.9
Arkansas	4,500	1.8	21,303	9.8	31,810	14.7	37,900	17.5
California	107,000	64.6	107,904	81.3	111,070	83.7	118,600	89.4
Colorado	8,700	14.6	14,823	28.8	22,230	43.2	24,200	47.0
Connecticut	20,500	62.5	16,995	80.3	18,080	85.4	18,800	88.9
Delaware	2,000	26.1	3,545	39.4	4,710	52.4	5,100	56.7
Florida	7,300	9.3	15,476	24.9	16,800	27.0	20,500	32.9
Georgia	21,300	8.3	42,409	19.6	64,740	30.0	72,100	33.4
Idaho	22,200	48.7	25,439	58.3	31,930	73.1	33,200	76.0
Illinois	52,000	22.4	80,027	37.5	106,510	49.9	115,500	54.1
Indiana	54,600	26.9	91,127	49.4	116,730	63.2	129,500	70.2
Iowa	36,600	16.7	73,308	34.4	105,280	49.4	116,200	54.5
Kansas	15,500	9.5	27,960	17.9	38,070	24.4	41,200	26.4
Kentucky	14,000	4.8	38,607	15.3	50,530	20.0	61,500	24.3
Louisiana	8,600	5.0	16,058	10.7	22,560	15.0	26,200	17.5
Maine	18,300	42.9	20,221	51.9	22,530	57.8	23,500	60.3
Maryland	13,900	31.2	17,170	40.7	23,630	56.0	25,600	60.7
Massachusetts	22,600	62.4	26,220	82.2	25,990	81.5	27,300	85.6
Michigan	94,000	48.4	131,126	69.9	146,200	77.9	153,700	81.9
Minnesota	23,000	11.6	50,075	25.4	72,840	36.9	84,500	42.8
Mississippi	7,600	2.4	26,078	9.0	40,330	13.8	47,800	16.4
Missouri	20,000	7.5	39,204	15.3	57,070	22.3	64,700	25.3
Montana	5,300	12.6	7,947	19.0	10,110	24.2	10,800	25.8
Nebraska	12,000	9.6	22,832	18.9	29,630	24.5	34,400	28.4
Nevada	1,400	38.8	1,555	43.5	1,490	41.7	1,760	49.3
New Hampshire	9,800	54.7	10,845	65.5	13,210	79.8	13,700	82.8
New Jersey	21,100	71.5	21,298	82.4	21,800	84.4	23,400	90.6
New Mexico	2,100	5.1	4,479	13.1	6,790	19.9	6,900	20.2
New York	89,000	50.6	102,283	66.7	113,010	73.7	118,200	77.1
North Carolina	45,000	14.3	67,627	24.3	90,100	32.4	98,500	35.4
North Dakota	2,000	2.7	3,218	4.4	4,470	6.0	5,800	7.8
Ohio	111,500	42.9	137,680	58.9	164,330	70.3	180,900	77.4
Oklahoma	7,000	3.4	20,149	11.2	29,730	16.5	33,800	18.8
Oregon	30,400	43.7	36,369	58.8	46,010	74.4	47,700	77.1
Pennsylvania	90,900	47.7	94,081	55.7	105,880	62.6	112,800	66.7
Rhode Island	4,000	95.7	2,457	81.5	2,770	91.9	2,900	96.2
South Carolina	16,000	9.5	27,568	20.0	49,350	35.9	52,300	38.0
South Dakota	2,600	3.6	3,981	5.5	6,800	9.4	7,800	10.8
Tennessee	29,000	10.2	38,884	15.7	57,400	23.2	61,700	24.9
Texas	29,400	6.0	79,127	18.9	110,860	26.5	130,200	31.1
Utah	18,500	61.7	17,411	68.5	18,960	74.6	19,700	77.5
Vermont	9,500	34.2	12,213	51.8	14,050	59.6	15,400	65.3
Virginia	30,000	15.3	42,144	24.1	50,130	28.7	58,000	33.2
Washington	48,500	54.7	58,283	71.4	62,140	76.1	66,700	81.7
West Virginia	11,000	10.2	25,199	25.4	31,600	31.8	33,100	33.3
Wisconsin	68,000	34.4	87,556	46.9	103,100	55.2	115,000	61.6
Wyoming	11,700	11.1	3,474	23.1	4,880	32.5	5,300	35.3

[1] 1940 data from Apr. 1 enumeration by U. S. Census; data for other years are estimates based on Rural Electrification Administration surveys as of June 30.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Tennessee will permit me to add one thing more, the price of electric power will have a good deal to do with the start of the expansion. It can be held so high that there will be a surplus, or it can be put so low that there will be a shortage.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee permit me to add one thing before we leave this subject?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Vermont referred to the farms served by electricity. That is a subject to which I have given attention for 25 years, starting with the time when I was chairman of the Kansas Public Utilities Commission. Of the 2,500,000 farms in this country served with electricity, 1,400,000 are getting it from private utility corporations, and about 1,000,000 or a little more than 1,000,000 are getting it from R. E. A.

From the great wails that go up about the R. E. A., and how it is being butchered and sacrificed, one would think farmers could not exist without the R. E. A. I was for the R. E. A. before there was any such thing. There is entirely too much mush being spilled around over the landscape about some of these things, including the R. E. A. and the T. V. A., and I think it is a lesson we can take to heart that 60 percent of the farms of the United States receiving electricity get it from private power corporations, and only about 40 percent from the R. E. A.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I now ask for a vote on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 1984) was passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Chair appointed Mr. GLASS, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. BROOKS conferees on the part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	O'Daniel
Austin	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hart	Overton
Ball	Hatch	Pepper
Bankhead	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hayden	Reed
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Brewster	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Burton	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Bushfield	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Taylor
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McClellan	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	McMahon	Vandenberg
Cordon	Magnuson	Wagner
Donnell	Maybank	Walsh
Downey	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Mitchell	Wherry
Ellender	Moore	White
Ferguson	Morse	Wiley
Fulbright	Murdock	Willis
George	Murray	Wilson
Gerry	Myers	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2126) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SNYDER, Mr. KERR, Mr. MAHON, Mr. NORRELL, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. POWERS, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2126) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. REED conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it has been some time since we called the calendar, and I think we can dispose of it within an hour or so. There are some bills on it in which the Senate is interested. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar for consideration of bills to which there is no objection.

Mr. WHITE. I have no purpose to object. I wonder if the Senator is in position to indicate what will be taken up at the conclusion of the call of the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is my idea that before we get into a prolonged debate over the Mexican treaty or over the nomination of Mr. Aubrey Williams that we should clean up the calendar, following which I shall move that the Senate go into executive session so we may consider the matters on the Executive Calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to call the calendar.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 97, on which agreement has been reached. I think it will take little time to consider it.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a resolution which has gone over under the rule. It is not in order to bring it up now. When it is brought up, I think it will be entirely agreeable to dispose of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first measure on the calendar.

JOHN H. GRADWELL

The bill (S. 491) for the relief of John H. Gradwell, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John H. Gradwell, of Meriden, Conn., the sum of $351.30, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for damage to his automobile resulting from a collision with an Army vehicle in Hamden, Conn., on January 4, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 105) to amend Public Law 603 (77th Cong., 2d sess., ch. 404), which is entitled "An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," was announced as next in order.

Mr. BILBO. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. WHITE. Will some Senator make an explanation of what is involved in this bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi has asked that the bill be passed over.

Mr. BILBO. I asked that the bill be passed over because the author of the bill is not present to explain it. I should like to know what is in it.

CHARLES A. STRAKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 519) for the relief of Charles A. Straka, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the words "accounts of", to insert "the late", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the accounts of the late Charles A. Straka, former postmaster at Milledgeville, Ill., with the sum of $1,149.35, representing the total of the amounts claimed by him in his quarterly reports as compensation for the period May 1, 1940, to December 5, 1940, but disallowed by the General Accounting Office.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Charles A. Straka."

AMENDMENT TO THE LOCOMOTIVE INSPECTION ACT

The bill (S. 46) to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended, to provide for the appointment of five additional inspectors, and to provide for adjustments in salaries, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third and fourth sentences of section 3 of the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," approved February 17, 1911, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 45, secs. 24 and 25), are amended to read as follows: "The director of locomotive inspection shall receive a salary of $8,000 per year and the assistant directors of locomotive inspection shall each receive a salary of $7,000 per year; and each of the three shall be paid his traveling expenses incurred in the performance of his duties. The office of the director of locomotive inspection shall be in Washington, D. C., and the Interstate Commerce Commission shall provide such legal, technical, stenographic, and clerical help as the business of the offices of the director of locomotive inspection and his said assistants and the district inspectors may require."

SEC. 2. The fifth and sixth sentences of section 4 of such act, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 45, sec. 26), are amended to read as follows: "Each inspector shall receive a salary of $4,600 per year and his traveling expenses while engaged in the performance of his duty. He shall receive in addition thereto an annual allowance for office rent, stationery, and incidental expenses, to be fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, but not to exceed in the case of any district inspector $1,000 per year."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of the second paragraph of section 4 of such act, as

amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 45, sec. 27), is amended to read as follows:

"Within the appropriations therefor and subject to the provisions of this act, the Interstate Commerce Commission may appoint, from time to time, not more than 20 inspectors in addition to the number authorized in the first paragraph of this section, as the needs of the service may require."

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on the first day of the calendar month following the calendar month in which it is enacted.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 47) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, who reported the bill, desires that it go over, and in his name I request that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

HENRY M. RUIZ

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 71) for the relief of Henry M. Ruiz, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the word "otherwise", to strike out "appropriated, to Henry M. Ruiz, of Phoenix, Ariz., the sum of $1,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for injuries sustained by his minor daughter, Estrella Ruiz, when a United Statets Army airplane crashed into his home in Phoenix, Ariz., on April 22, 1944" and insert "appropriated, to the legal guardian of Estella Ruiz, a minor, of Phoenix, Ariz., the sum of $1,350, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the personal injuries sustained by the said Estella Ruiz, and medical expenses incurred for her treatment, as the result of an accident involving an Army airplane which occurred in Phoenix, Ariz., on April 22, 1944:", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Estella Ruiz, a minor, of Phoenix, Ariz., the sum of $1,350, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the personal injuries sustained by the said Estella Ruiz, and medical expenses incurred for her treatment, as the result of an accident involving an Army airplane which occurred in Phoenix, Ariz., on April 22, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Estella Ruiz."

MARIA MANRIQUEZ RUIZ

The bill (S. 70) for the relief of Maria Manriquez Ruiz, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Maria Manriquez Ruiz, of Phoeniz, Ariz., the sum of $3,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for injuries sustained by her when a United States Army airplane crashed into her home in Phoenix, Ariz., on April 22, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MARY G. MARGGRAF

The bill (S. 93) for the relief of Mary G. Marggraf was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary G. Marggraf, of Chicago, Ill., the sum of $1,900, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her when she was struck by a United States mail truck at Cicero Avenue and Gladys Avenue, Chicago, Ill., on December 17, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

DANE D. MORGAN

The bill (S. 319) for the relief of Dane D. Morgan was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that there is a similar House bill of a similar title on the calendar, Calendar No. 83, House bill 1149. Without objection, the House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill, and, without objection, the House bill will be passed and the Senate bill indefinitely postponed.

NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE & TELEGRAPH CO.

The bill (S. 318) for the relief of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co. was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that a House bill of a similar title is on the calendar, Calendar No. 82, House bill 987.

Without objection, the House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill, and, without objection, the House bill will be passed and the Senate bill will be indefinitely postponed.

MRS. MAE E. SUTTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 411) for the relief of Mrs. Mae E. Sutton, which has been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$11,570.89" and insert $$7,570.89", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Mae E. Sutton, San Francisco, Calif., the sum of $7,570.89, in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Mae E. Sutton against the United States for injuries sustained when the automobile which she was driving was struck by an Army truck near Ord Village, Calif., on November 15, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES M. HILER

The bill (S. 321) for the relief of James M. Hiler was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the account of James M. Hiler, an employee of the Federal Public Housing Authority employed as housing manager of the Marine View Terrace housing project (project numbered CAL-4745), Eureka, Humboldt County, Calif., in the sum of $162.70, together with interest thereon, public funds for which he is accountable and which were stolen, without his fault, from a vault in the project office in the community building in said project sometime between the close of business at 5:15 o'clock post meridian on July 22, 1944, and 9 o'clock antemeridian on July 23, 1944: *Provided*, That the said James M. Hiler is hereby relieved of pecuniary responsibility for the loss of said public funds.

LAWRENCE MOTOR CO., INC.

The bill (S. 288) for the relief of the Lawrence Motor Co., Inc., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of the Lawrence Motor Co., Inc., Richmond, Va., for the payment of rental for passenger cars furnished to the Office of Price Administration, Richmond, Va., during the period June 1, 1943, to January 4, 1944, inclusive, for use in transporting officials of said agency throughout the State of Virginia in connection with the performance of their duties, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim the sum of not to exceed $5,391.30. There is hereby appropriated the sum of $5,391.30, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of said claim.

GRANT OF EASEMENT TO DALLAS COUNTY, TEX.

The bill (S. 530) authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration, Dallas, Tex., to Dallas County, Tex., for highway purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to grant an easement to the county of Dallas, State of Texas, for highway purposes in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration facility, Dallas, Tex., described as follows:

Beginning at the southeast corner of the Veterans' Administration, Dallas, Tex.; said corner is the intersection of the north line of Ledbetter Drive with the southwest line of the J. K. Sloan survey, abstract No. 1310, which is also the northeast line of the F. Sadler survey, abstract No. 1378; thence by metes and bounds, north thirty degrees west along the easterly boundary line of the Veterans' Administration reservation two thousand and twenty-three and eight-tenths feet; thence north thirty-eight degrees and fifty minutes west continuing along said easterly boundary line three hundred and two and three-tenths feet; thence north fifty-seven degrees and three minutes west five hundred and thirty-five and six-tenths feet to a point in the easterly boundary line of the Veterans' Administration reservation; thence north eighty-three degrees and three minutes west along said easterly boundary line thirty-one and nine-tenths feet; thence north fifty-eight degrees and thirty-three minutes west continuing along said easterly boundary line four hundred and eighty and nine-tenths feet; thence south thirty-two degrees and fifty-seven minutes west thirty-three and four-tenths feet; thence south fifty-seven degrees and three minutes east eight hundred and thirty-three and seven-tenths feet; thence on a curve to the right, with a radius of one thousand two hundred and forty-three and fifty-seven one-hundredths feet, five hundred and eighty-seven and two-tenths feet along the curve, the chord of which bears south forty-three degrees thirty-one minutes and thirty seconds east five hundred and eighty-one and sixty-seven one-hundredths feet; thence south thirty degrees east one thousands nine hundred and eighteen and two-tenths feet to a point in the north line of Ledbetter Drive; thence north sixty degrees east sixty feet to the point of beginning; containing four and forty-one one-hundredths acres, more or less.

The easement herein authorized to be granted shall be limited to the period of time the aforesaid lands are required and actually used for highway purposes, and when no longer so required and used, all interests herein authorized to be conveyed in said lands shall cease and determine.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to state to the Senate that the Chair does not under any circumstances want to have any of these bills passed in a hurry. The Chair knows Senators wish to have the call of the calendar completed as quickly as possible, but if any Senators objects to any bill which has already been passed, reconsideration will be in order.

The clerk will state the next bill on the calendar.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO CITY OF LOS ANGELES

The bill (S. 531) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for fire-station purposes, the title to certain land located at Veterans' Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transfer by quitclaim deed to the city of Los Angeles, State of California, the property hereinafter described and located at the Veterans' Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif., subject to conditions that the property shall be used for fire-station purposes and that 24 hours' fire protection be furnished to all accessible parts of the Veterans' Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif., without charge:

That portion of lot 2, block 23, subdivision of Ranch San Jose De Buenos Ayres, as per map recorded in book 26, pages 19 to 25, inclusive, Miscellaneous Records of Los Angeles County, bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a point in the northeasterly line of Veteran Avenue, formerly Lookout Avenue, as described in deed recorded in book 5162, page 231, of deeds, records of said county, distant thereon 18 feet northwesterly from the northerly line of that certain 20-foot strip of land conveyed to the county of Los Angeles for drainage purposes, described in parcel 1 of deed recorded in book 7376, page 225, Official Records of said county, said point of beginning being distant along said northeasterly line of Veteran Avenue northwesterly 733.85 feet from the northwesterly line of Wilshire Boulevard, 100 feet wide, thence northwesterly along said northeasterly line 100 feet; thence northeasterly at right angles to said northeasterly line 150 feet; thence southeasterly parallel with said northeasterly line of Veteran Avenue 100 feet; thence southwesterly in a direct line 150 feet to the point of beginning; containing .344 acre, more or less.

The deed authorized by this act shall contain the express reservation that should the city of Los Angeles, Calif., either fail to use the property for fire-station purposes or furnish 24 hours' fire protection to all accessible parts of the Veterans' Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif., then all right, title, and interest in such property shall revert to and revest in and become the property of the United States, except in the event that such failure to so furnish fire protection is temporary and is due to conditions beyond the control of the city of Los Angeles. The deed shall further provide that in the event that all right, title, and interest in such property so revert to and revest in the United States, the city of Los Angeles may remove the buildings and structures then existing on such property upon condition that said city of Los Angeles restore the land as nearly as possible to its former condition without expense to the United States.

F. L. GAUSE AND THE LEGAL GUARDIAN OF ROSALIND AND HELEN GAUSE, MINORS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1360) for the relief of F. L. Gause, and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$7,120.65."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I do not desire to interpose any objection or offer any amendment to the bill, but I should like to call the attention of the Claims Committee to the fact that House bill 1360 does not carry the terminology which has been adopted by the Claims Committee to the effect that the payment authorized is a payment in full for all claims against the United States. That wording is not contained in the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon wish to offer an amendment?

Mr. CORDON. I do not desire to offer any amendment. If the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is present I should like to call his attention to the matter. I do not believe the Senator is present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana is not present at the moment.

Mr. CORDON. I had simply intended to call the matter to the Senator's attention, because he reported the bill. If the Senator is not present, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be amended as follows: On page 2, line 3, after the comma following the word "minor", to insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in the absence of the chairman of the Claims Committee who reported the bill, probably it should go over. I ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. ELLENDER subsequently said: Mr. President, I understand that Calendar No. 62, House bill 1360, was passed over during my absence. I ask unanimous consent to recur to that bill.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1360) for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, am I to understand that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] wishes to offer an amendment? The bill is for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors. The bill seeks to pay to the estate of Gause the sum of $7,120.65, to one minor child $12,500, and to another minor child $1,500.

All these persons were badly mangled in an accident which took place in Texas. I understand that the Senator from Oregon desires to offer an amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I rose only to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the bill, which originated in the House, does not carry the usual terminology of claims bills, to the effect that the payments made are in full settlement of all the claims of the several claimants against the United States. Having in mind the thought that perhaps the Senator's attention had not been called to the matter, I felt he might desire to take care of that particular omission in the bill. I have no desire to offer an amendment, so long as the Senator's attention has been called to the matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the amounts fixed in the bill are presumed to be in full settlement of all claims against the Government. I believe that the bill

as it is drafted is in line with other similar bills.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MAJ. MALCOLM K. BEYER

The bill (S. 467) for the relief of Maj. Malcolm K. Beyer, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Maj. Malcolm K. Beyer, the sum of $1,076, in full settlement of all claims against the Government by him for the loss of clothing and personal effects destroyed by fire at the officers' quarters at Civilian Conservation Corps Camp Breeze Hill, Wawayanda, N. Y., on April 3, 1937.

RUBEN M. HERREN

The bill (H. R. 242) for the relief of Ruben M. Herren, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BALDWIN BROS. PAVING CO.

The bill (S. 514) for the relief of the Baldwin Bros. Paving Co., was considered ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of the Baldwin Bros. Paving Co., Cleveland, Ohio, on account of increased costs incurred in the performance of the said company's contract No. ER–T23ps–67338, dated March 17, 1942, with the Procurement Division, Treasury Department, by reason of unavoidable delays on the part of the Work Projects Administration in preparing the runways at the Erie Airport, Erie, Pa., for the application of the asphalt covered by the contract and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim the amount of not to exceed $12,000. There is hereby appropriated the sum of $12,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the said claim: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

DR. LUTHER J. HEAD

The bill (H. R. 256) for the relief of Dr. Luther J. Head, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT C. MEALS AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 946) for the relief of the estates of Robert C. Meals and Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, Donald Meals (a minor), and Betty Wrightstone (a minor) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PIERCE WILLIAM VAN DOREN AND ELMER J. COATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 407) for the relief of Pierce William Van Doren and Elmer J. Coates, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "$6,200" and insert "$3,500"; and in the same line to strike out "$5,-$272.80" and insert "$3,500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Pierce William Van Doren the sum of $3,500, and to Elmer J. Coates the sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for compensation for loss of time, pain and suffering, and permanent injuries sustained by them as the result of an accident which occurred when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a United States Army vehicle in San Fernando, Calif., on March 24, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAVE HOUGARDY

The bill (S. 544) for the relief of Dave Hougardy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dave Hougardy, Renton, Wash., the sum of $2,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages arising out of the death by drowning of Teddy Hougardy, 8-year-old son of the said Dave Hougardy, on August 5, 1938, when he fell from an unprotected foot log built by employees of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture on the Dalles Campground of the Snoqualmie National Forest, Wash.

MR. AND MRS. WALTER M. JOHNSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 426) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter M. Johnson, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with, an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,500, to Mr. and Mrs. Walter M. Johnson, of Redwood Falls, Minn., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their minor daughter, Myrna Arline Johnson, who was struck by an Army vehicle at the Redwood Falls fairgrounds on August 16, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a disdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1793) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the board of trustees of the Saunders Memorial Hospital was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over in order that opportunity may be afforded to study another bill which is before the Committee on Claims.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

WALLACE ROBERTSON AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 515) for the relief of Wallace Robertson, Henry Bowker, and Edward Parisian, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, for the months of August and September 1942, in the sum of $95, representing payments made by him to Wallace Robertson in full settlement for overtime services rendered prior to July 13, 1942.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of funds applicable for road-construction activities on Indian reservations, the sum of $188 to Henry Bowker and the sum of $53.33 to Edward Parisian, in full settlement of claims for compensation covering overtime services rendered during July, August, and September, 1942.

SEC. 3. No charge shall be made against the certifying officer, nor shall any claim be made against Wallace Robertson, for the amount of any payments for which credit is allowed under section 1 of this act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN MARINE CORPS PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST OR DAMAGED

The bill (S. 569) to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the training building at the Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, N. C., on June 3, 1944, was considered, ordered

to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $1,451.65, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the training building at the Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, N. C., on June 3, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ADVANCEMENT OF CAPT. EDWARD MACAULEY, U. S. N., RETIRED, TO RANK OF REAR ADMIRAL

The bill (S. 646) to provide for the advancement of Capt. Edward Macauley, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of rear admiral, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to advance Capt. Edward Macauley, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of rear admiral on the retired list of the Navy.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT OR ADVANCEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVAL PERSONNEL

The bill (S. 58) to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," approved July 24, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," approved July 24, 1941 (Public Law 188, 77th Cong.), as amended (55 Stat. 603; 34 U. S. C., Supp. III, 350 and the following), is hereby amended by inserting before the period at the end of section 11 (a) of said act a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That officers on the retired list of the Naval Reserve with pay pursuant to provisions of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and for other purposes,' approved July 1, 1918, may, while on active duty, be temporarily appointed to ranks or grades in a different branch or corps of the Naval Reserve under the authority of this act without loss of or prejudice to any rights, benefits, privileges, and gratuities enjoyed by them by virtue of their former status."

PRESENTATION OF MEDALS TO MEMBERS OF ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION, 1939–41

The bill (S. 397) to provide for the presentation of medals to members of the United States Antarctic Expedition of 1939–41, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to cause to be made at the United States Mint such number of gold, silver, and bronze medals of appropriate design as he may deem appropriate and necessary, to be presented to members of the United States Antarctic Expedition of 1939–41, in recognition of their valuable services to the Nation in the field of polar exploration and science.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

REIMBURSEMENT OF CERTAIN NAVAL PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOST OR DAMAGED

The bill (S. 525) to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval training center, Farragut, Idaho, on July 10, 1944, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $6,763.55, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy, to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval training center, Farragut, Idaho, on July 10, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ESTABLISHMENT OF RANK OF GENERAL IN THE MARINE CORPS

The bill (H. R. 197) to establish the grade of general in the Marine Corps, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTABLISHMENT OF RANK OF ADMIRAL IN THE COAST GUARD

The bill (H. R. 1646) to establish the grade of admiral in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

The bill (S. 647) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the State of Rhode Island, for highway purposes only, a strip of land within the naval advance base depot at North Kingstown, R. I., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to convey (subject to sec. 2 of this act) to the State of Rhode Island, for highway purposes only, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a strip or parcel of land, the metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department, consisting of two and five hundred eighty-three one-thousandths acres, more or less, situated within the boundaries of the United States Naval Advance Base Depot, North Kingstown, Washington County, R. I.

SEC. 2. If any part of the land conveyed pursuant to this act is used for other than highway purposes, or ceases to be used for highway purposes, such part shall revert to the United States.

SHORE DUTY BY NAVAL OFFICERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 645) to repeal section 2 of the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 481), as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, after the word "hereby", to strike out "repealed" and insert "suspended until 6 months after the termination of the present wars as determined by the proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress, whichever is earlier", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 481), as amended, is hereby suspended until 6 months after the termination of the present wars as determined by the proclamation of the President or concurrent resolution of the Congress, whichever is earlier.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read "A bill to suspend until 6 months after the termination of the present wars section 2 of the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 481), as amended."

PAYMENT BY WAR SHIPPING ADMINISTRATION OF EMPLOYERS' PAY-ROLL TAX FOR OLD-AGE BENEFITS

The bill (H. R. 1429) to permit the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and the United States Maritime Commission, during the national emergency, to pay the tax imposed under section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code without regard to the $3,000 limitation in section 1426 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 502) to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments with respect to strategic metals and minerals and petroleum and petroleum products was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Let the bill go over.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska reconsider his objection and permit an explanation of the bill?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator give notice that he will seek consideration of the bill immediately after the call of the calendar. I think probably it is too important a measure to be considered under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MURDOCK. That may be done. It is a very important bill, and, in my opinion, should receive consideration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am making the request in behalf of the minority leader, who has requested a member of the minority to have the bill discussed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The RECORD will so show. The bill will be passed over.

REGULATION OF HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 686) to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is on the calendar House bill 2506, Calendar 90, which should be substituted for the Senate bill. I ask unanimous consent that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill, and that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2506) to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 686, Calendar No. 88, will be indefinitely postponed.

MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF BILL

The resolution (S. Res. 78) to change the reference of S. 555, establishing the Missouri Valley Authority, from the Committee on Commerce to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Let the resolution go over.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] have entered into an agreement with regard to the procedure in connection with Senate bill 555. I think we can dispose of the resolution.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, when this subject was under consideration a few days ago, the Senator from North Carolina was unable to complete his remarks because of the expiration of the morning hour. It was my intention at that time to accept the proposal which he had presented.

The proposal provided that the bill should be sent first, for a period of 60 days, to the Committee on Commerce, for the purpose of studying it with relation to navigation and flood control; that following that it should go to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation for another period of 60 days; and then to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I have no objection to that procedure. During the last session, when I originally introduced the bill, at the suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] I then consented that the bill, in addition to being referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, should go to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. I would consent to a similar disposition of Senate bill 555. I have no objection to the bill being referred to the Committee on Commerce, which has jurisdiction over navigation and flood control, for a period of 60 days, for the purpose of studying it. Therefore, I wish to say that I am entirely satisfied with the proposal made by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move the consideration and adoption of the substitute resolution which I have previously offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The resolution (S. Res. 97) submitted by Mr. BAILEY on March 12, 1945, and which went over, under the rule, was read, as follows:

Whereas Senate bill 555 to establish a Missouri Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Missouri River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the promotion of family-type farming, the development of the recreational possibilities and the promotion of the general welfare of the area, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes, having been referred to the Committee on Commerce and motion having been made to discharge said committee and refer the bill to the Committee on Agriculture: Therefore be it

Resolved, That said bill, to wit, S. 555, shall be considered forthwith by the Committee on Commerce with respect to navigation and flood control, and thereafter returned to the Senate for reference to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, to be considered by said committee with respect to irrigation and reclamation, and thereafter shall be returned to the Senate for reference to the Committee on Agriculture for consideration with respect to the agricultural features thereof; be it further

Resolved, That said bill shall be reported on respectively by each of said committees within 60 days from the date of its reference to each of said committees and that the first 60-day period shall be calculated from the date of the passage of this resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of Senate Resolution 97?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, yesterday the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and I introduced a bill (S. 737) providing for the creation of a Savannah Valley Authority. At the time when the bill was introduced, I requested that it be given the same direction in respect to its reference as might be given in the case of the Missouri Valley Authority bill. There is really no occasion to have the bill affecting the Savannah Valley go to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, because no question of irrigation is involved. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered by the Committee on Commerce for a period not exceeding 60 days, and that it then be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because there is really no irrigation problem involved in connection with the creation of the proposed authority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Parliamentarian has called the attention of the Chair to Senate Resolution 97, which has been read and which covers the situation relative to the Missouri Valley Authority bill, as set forth in the discussion held between the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If there is no objection, Senate Resolution 97 will be considered in place of Senate Resolution 78.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina moved that the resolution which he has previously offered be adopted, in lieu of the original resolution offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Let me make the following observation: I shall not raise objection to the arrangement made between the Senators in regard to these particular bills; but I think it is a questionable practice to have bills go to two, three, or four committees for consideration ad seriatim, before the Senate can have them for consideration in the Senate itself—all of which emphasizes what I have complained about for a number of years, namely, the indefiniteness of the Senate rules with respect to the jurisdiction of committees. When a bill is introduced it should go to one committee. There should be a definite rule regarding where it should go, dependent upon the substance of the bill and, at least, the major portion of the matters with which it deals. I may feel somewhat strongly about this subject because of my long service in the House of Representatives, where there are definite rules relative to the committees to which measures shall be referred.

I simply wish to observe that the adoption of the proposed procedure in regard to the Missouri Valley Authority bill and the bill offered by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from South Carolina should not be taken as a precedent or as an indication of a trend toward a practice in the Senate of having bills referred to two or three committees before they can be considered by the Senate itself.

I am not going to raise that question about these particular bills; but I think it would cause infinite chaos in the handling of legislation by the Senate if we were to adopt the practice that in the case of a bill which deals with several subjects, all the committees which have jurisdiction of the separate subjects covered by the bill shall have a whack at it before action can be taken by the Senate.

I hope the action just taken will not be regarded as a precedent which will bind the Senate in the future in regard to the handling of bills.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to say to the Senator from Kentucky that when the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and I introduced the Savannah Valley Authority bill, the reason why we requested that it go to the committees as thus determined by the Senate was that at that time the motion relative to the Missouri Valley Authority bill was pending before the Senate. We were perfectly willing to have our bill referred to whatever committee the Senate decided was the proper one.

Having made the motion that our bill be treated in the same way that the Missouri Valley Authority bill is treated,

I thank the Senator for not objecting, and I thoroughly agree with him about the disposition of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. President, I wish to add the observation that a joint committee of the two Houses is now working on the problem of streamlining the procedure in both Houses of Congress. I hope the joint committee will offer a suggestion by which it will be possible to adopt some sort of rule which will give direction to the Chair and the parliamentary adviser in determining to what committees bills dealing with more than one subject shall go.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair sincerely hopes that such a suggestion will be made, and that the matter will be decided. The Chair has been accused several times of being arbitrary in connection with the determination of the committees to which bills should be referred. The Chair wishes to have all bills referred to the committees to which they should properly be referred, and the Chair hopes that a rule in accordance with the suggestion just made by the Senator from Kentucky will be adopted.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I understand that the agreement relative to the handling of the Missouri Valley Authority bill provides that the Committee on Commerce shall have the bill for 60 days, after which the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation shall have it for another 60 days, following which the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry shall receive the bill and shall be required to report it within 60 days. Is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. That is my understanding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate Resolution 97 will be substituted for Senate Resolution 78, and will be considered; and, without objection, Senate Resolution 97 is agreed to.

Without objection, Senate Resolution 78 is indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That concludes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, 10 bills which were reported yesterday were, for some reason, not included in the calendar. It is my understanding that the calendar was sent to the Printing Office and was printed before the bills were put on it. They are eligible for consideration, although they are not on the calendar.

Therefore I ask that they be considered ad seriatim; and if any explanation is required, it will be forthcoming, or the bill will go over.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, were any reports on the bills filed?

Mr. BARKLEY. Evidently reports were filed, but they do not seem to accompany the bills which are on our desks.

As I have said, 9 or 10 bills which were reported yesterday were inadvertently not included in the calendar when it was printed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that reports on the bills just referred to are not available at this time, I suggest that any Senator who is interested might ask the distinguished majority leader or the Senator who reported the bill for an explanation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to state the bills referred to.

MRS. GLENN T. BOYLSTON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 194) for the relief of Mrs. Glenn T. Boylston, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, in line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000", and insert "$5,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Glenn T. Boylston, of North Charleston, S. C., the sum of $5,000 in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation on account of the death of her husband, Glenn T. Boylston, who died as a result of injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a United States Army truck at Charleston, S. C., on July 2, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

RELIEF OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE WHO HAVE SUFFERED LOSSES OF PERSONAL PROPERTY

The bill (H. R. 687) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES R. HOOPER

The bill (H. R. 249) for the relief of Charles R. Hooper was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAM SWAN AND AILY SWAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1308) for the relief of Sam Swan and Aily Swan, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, in line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$1,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MILDRED RING

The bill (H. R. 949) for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Ring was announced as next in order.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation made of what is included in sections 15 to 20 of the act referred to in the bill, the provisions of which are to be waived by the bill. Do those sections include certain provisions relative to the limitation of actions; or just what do the sections contain?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin reported the bill. Will he explain it?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

JUNE I. GRADIJAN

The bill (S. 316) for the relief of June I. Gradijan, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding provisions contained in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1943, Public Law Numbered 674, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session (56 Stat. 664), prohibiting the payment of compensation therefrom to officers or employees who are not citizens of the United States, the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of disbursing officers' accounts, and relieve certifying officers of liability for such payment for services rendered by June I. Gradijan, while employed in the Department of Agriculture during the fiscal year 1943, as are otherwise correct and legal.

SEC. 2. June I. Gradijan shall not be required to refund the compensation received for such services; and any amounts which have been collected or paid as a refund of such compensation shall be repaid to the person making the payment.

ESTATE OF DR. DAVID O. CLEMENTS

The bill (H. R. 257) for the relief of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY B. TUCKER

The bill (H. R. 1485) for the relief of Henry B. Tucker was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry with regard to Calendar No. 93, House bill 1485, which the Senate just passed. The bill refers to limitations of time in sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended. I inquire of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] if the bill provides purely for waiving the limitations of time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The bill would only extend the limitation of time in favor of Henry B. Tucker and afford him an opportunity to have his claim considered by the Employees' Compensation Commission.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator.

CHESLEY BRAZIL

The bill (S. 591) for the relief of Chesley Brazil was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding provisions contained in the several appropriations acts for the fiscal years 1940, 1941,

1942, and 1943 prohibiting the payment of compensation to officers or employees who are not citizens of the United States, the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the settlement of disbursing officers' accounts, and relieve certifying officers of liability for payments for services rendered by, and for annual and sick leave granted to, Chesley Brazil, of Eugene, Oreg., as an employee of the Bonneville Power Administration, where such payments are otherwise correct and legal.

SEC. 2. If credit is allowed in disbursing officers' accounts in accordance with section 1 of this act, said Chesley Brazil shall not be required to refund the amount thereof.

SEC. 3. Notwithstanding any provisions contained in the civil-service laws, rules, or regulations relating to the admission to examination or appointment of aliens, said Chesley Brazil's appointment as an employee of the Bonneville Power Administration is hereby ratified and confirmed and his appointment and period of service shall be treated for all purposes as if he had been at all times a citizen of the United States.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 681) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment, on page 1, in line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 2. Section 608 (g) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out "upon eligibility."

And insert:

SEC. 2. Section 608 (g) of such act, as amended, is amended by adding before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "and to insure under this title any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by him of any property acquired under this title without regard to any limit as to time or aggregate amount contained in this title."

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc. That section 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by (1) striking out "$1,700,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,800,000,000"; and (2) striking out of the third proviso "1945" in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1946".

SEC. 2. Section 608 (g) of such act, as amended, is amended by adding before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "and to insure under this title any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by him of any property acquired under this title without regard to any limit as to time or aggregate amount contained in this title."

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, this bill relates to the National Housing Act. I ask the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency to make an explanation of the bill.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, the bill would not create any new authority, nor add any new kind of responsibilities to those existing in the F. H. A. It would merely provide for a continuation of the functioning of the National Housing Act under title VI thereof. All Senators know that that is the title under which certain kinds of privately owned housing may be constructed by private industry with private funds. Such operations relieve the Government from building at its own expense. Such construction is restricted to housing in war areas as designated by the President in order to facilitate war production when the encouragement to private builders to do such building without Federal insurance does not ordinarily exist.

From time to time it has been necessary to increase the aggregate amount of insurance under title VI in connection with construction of such new houses. This bill is for the purpose of authorizing additional insurance. At the present time the authorization of $1,700,000,000 is almost exhausted, and it is necessary to suspend further insurance operations. But more houses are needed in war-production areas and that fact was responsible for this bill being drafted.

This bill has two other purposes, neither of which would create any new duties or responsibilities. One of those purposes is to extend the life of title VI by 1 year, which extension of course, is obviously necessary.

The last amendment would provide for a more fluid and a more simple and direct manner by which the F. H. A. could dispose of properties which it had taken over under title VI of the National Housing Act. At times some of the properties must be taken over by the F. H. A. when the mortgage is in default. When that happens the Government naturally desires to dispose of such properties. Since in those cases the Government cannot often sell such property without furnishing some form of insurance of the loan, the bill would make it more convenient for the F. H. A. to dispose of the properties by the issuance of insurance under title VI even though title VI had ceased to be operative as to insurance on new properties.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, is an appropriation to be authorized?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No appropriation would be authorized. When properties are taken over it is sometimes necessary or desirable, as I stated, for the Government to issue insurance in order to assist in the disposition of the properties acquired by mortgage default. The amendment to the bill would make it clearly obvious that the property can be disposed of under title VI instead of under some other authority. It is designed to facilitate the Government's disposing of houses coming as salvage, and not in any sense through assuming obligations on new properties.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Would the requested increase of $100,000,000 represent to a very major extent the moneys necessary to finance the war housing which has already been programed?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No; the sum of $1,700,000,000, which was previously authorized, has been utilized and the requested additional sum of $100,000,000 is necessary in order to provide for insurance of new units which are now urgently needed by our war-production program.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, the bill would merely add another $100,000,000 to the $1,700,000,000 of insurability on the part of the Government for those housing projects which are already in existence, some units of which it may be necessary to take over by the Government.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator from Kentucky is entirely correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. But it does not involve any appropriation.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No. It would merely provide, as we have done several times in the past, additional authorization for insurance whenever the existing authorization becomes exhausted.

Mr. McKELLAR. In other words, as I understand the Senator from Maryland, the limit of insurability of property which may be insured will be increased by $100,000,000; but no appropriation will be required.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. The Senator is correct. As we all know, if houses are not constructed by private industry it may be necessary for the Government to pay for the construction of them out of its own funds, because such new houses are needed in certain areas for war workers.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has said that the bill would require no appropriation; yet appropriations are required in order to make up for losses incurred as a result of Government operation of Federal housing.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. No appropriation is required under this bill, because provision has been made for the payment of insurance premiums, and so far such premiums have been adequate. Of course, we do not now know what will happen in the future. After the war is over, so many of the houses may be acquired that a loss may result beyond the amount of insurance premiums collected. But so far no funds have been required for any such purpose to supplement receipts of premiums.

Mr. AIKEN. Was not the appropriation which the Senate passed for the purpose of making up losses on Federal housing?

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I think not; but I did not have charge of that legislation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maryland will yield, I think it should be said that the Federal Housing Administration feels that this will be the last extension of title VI. It does not believe it to be a sound peacetime measure. It has only a little more housing to be insured and a few plants to be extended. The Administration feels that if the time is now extended to July 1, 1946, it will be the last extension necessary, and the last increase which will be requested. So I think this is the last we shall see of title VI. It is strictly a war emergency matter on which the Government really expects to lose money. It is not to be compared with title II, which is the regular F. H. A. mortgage plan.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, as the Senator from Ohio says, we think this is the last extension that will probably be necessary and that title II will be adequate for other needs. Just now the construction of about 8,000 new units is needed for our war workers. These would be located in California, Illinois, Indiana, Oklahoma, Texas, Arizona, Col-

orado, Nebraska, Washington, and some of the other States. Where it was necessary that housing should be built in connection with war industries and where it is possible to build them under this insurance plan the Government of course encourages such procedure rather than to build them at its own expense.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. An amendment is now pending. Does the Senator desire to offer an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Subsection (b) of section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by striking out "$100,000," where it appears in such subsection, and inserting in lieu thereof "$300,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I dislike this method of legislation, but this particular amendment has been pending in the form of a bill before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency since last August without any action. It involves a matter of very great importance especially to small business in the United States particularly during the reconversion period. The amendment has the support of the Securities and Exchange Commission; it was drawn in cooperation with Chairman Purcell of that Commission; it has no opposition, so far as I know, from any quarter. It is simply inexplicably stymied in committee.

I shall state what the amendment proposes to do. At the present time new issues of securities down to $100,000 have to pass through the entire routine of the S. E. C. In many aspects it is an expensive routine; for small issues it is a very burdensome routine in respect to the engineering and accounting reports which are required. As a result it is asserted by spokesmen for small business in this country—and their case seems to be well sustained—that it is frequently impossible under existing circumstances to float small issues of stocks or bonds.

It is perfectly obvious that it is important to release small business to every possible opportunity it can enjoy in the difficult economic days ahead. The purpose of this bill, I repeat, is to increase the exemption limit from $100,000 to $300,000 as respects S. E. C. To that extent it enlarges the opportunity of small business to finance itself, free of the burden of S. E. C. rules and regulations in respect to the considerations I have indicated.

I repeat that the proposal has the approval of the Securities and Exchange Commission. I repeat that the figure itself was fixed in conference with Chairman Purcell, of the S. E. C., and I know of no reason in the world why the amendment should not be adopted. In the form of a bill it has lingered 8 months in the pigeonholes of the Committee on Banking and Currency and I think it is about time that it had its day in court. Wherefore, I submit the amendment.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, while the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan is not strictly germane to the bill the Senate is now considering, I have no objection whatever to the amendment being accepted.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I may say that I have no objection to the amendment. The committee would have reported the bill from which the amendment is taken at a time when we were not too busy.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that connection I think it ought to be said in fairness to the committee that the bill embodying the amendment has not been before the committee since last August. August was in the last Congress, and the bill was introduced and was before the committee during the remaining days of that session, but this is a new Congress and the bill referred to by the Senator from Michigan is a new measure which has only been before the committee since a certain day in January.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct, but it has been before the same committee all the time and it has had the same lack of success in both sessions up to date.

Mr. VANDENBERG subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the afternoon on my motion the Senate adopted the S. E. C. amendment to Senate bill 681. I neglected to state at that time that the amendment is based fundamentally on the report of the Senate Special Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning. I ask that at the point where the discussion originally occurred paragraph No. 12 of the report of the committee, dealing with equity investment, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(12) Equity investment: Revised taxation is not the only means of stimulating equity investment. It is strongly contended, from many sources, that the Securities and Exchange Act makes equity financing of small businesses practically impossible. That act should be examined with a view to retaining its salutary provisions and eliminating those that make the floating of new small security issues so troublesome and expensive that they are practically prohibited. The study might well be extended to all other practices that are restrictive upon the financing of new equity issues.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUBSIDY PAYMENTS TO STRATEGIC METALS, MINERALS, PETROLEUM, AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that, I understand, completes the calendar. There is a bill which went to the foot of the calendar which I think should be considered now.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. I had in mind the bill in which the Senator from Utah and other Senators are interested.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 502) to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments with respect to strategic materials and minerals and petroleum and petroleum products.

Mr. MURDOCK. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill, the title of which has just been stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Utah.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 502) which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended by the Stabilization Extension Act of 1944, shall not apply, with respect to operations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, to corporations created or operations authorized to be performed pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended: *Provided*, That with respect to such corporations and such operations the making of subsidy payments and buying for resale at a loss for the purpose of maintaining maximum prices established pursuant to provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended and supplemented, shall be limited as follows:

(a) Payments or purchases may be made after June 30, 1945, in such amounts as may be necessary to fulfill obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1945, with respect to 1945 and prior fiscal-year activities.

(b) Payments and purchases may be made with respect to operations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, which involve subsidies and anticipated losses as follows:

(1) With respect to materials or commodities, other than rubber and rubber products, produced outside the United States, in an amount not to exceed $80,000,000;

(2) With respect to rubber and rubber products produced outside the United States, in an amount not to exceed $60,000,000;

(3) With respect to materials or commodities produced within the United States, as follows:

(A) Meat in an amount not to exceed $560,000,000;

(B) Butter in an amount not to exceed $100,000,000;

(C) Flour in an amount not to exceed $190,000,000;

(D) Petroleum and petroleum products in an amount not to exceed $290,000,000;

(E) Copper, lead, and zinc, in the form of premium payments, in an amount not to exceed $88,000,000; and

(F) Other materials or commodities in an amount not to exceed $100,000,000;

Provided, That in the event the entire amount of any of the above allocations is not required for its purpose, the unused portion of such allocation, but not to exceed 10 percent of such allocation, may be used for making such payments on and purchases of any other item or items enumerated in this act, as may be determined by the Director of Economic Stabilization: *Provided further*, That the premium price plan for copper, lead, and zinc shall be extended until June 30, 1946, on

the same terms as heretofore, except that all classes of premiums shall be noncancelable unless necessary in order to make individual adjustments of income to specifications.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, this bill is of the utmost importance to the war program, and also to the control of inflation. The purpose of the bill is to permit the continuance for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, of certain subsidy payments which are now paid by corporations created under section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended. The legislation is necessary by reason of a provision, section 2 (e), which was added to the Emergency Price Control Act by the Stabilization Extension Act of last year.

The amendment referred to is an amendment which was placed in the bill by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and reads as follows:

After June 30, 1945, neither the Price Administrator nor the Reconstruction Finance Corporation nor any other Government corporation shall make any subsidy payments, or buy any commodities for the purpose of selling them at a loss and thereby subsidizing directly or indirectly the sale of commodities, unless the money required for such subsidies, or sale at a loss, has been appropriated by Congress for such purpose; and appropriations for such purpose are hereby authorized to be made.

I do not believe any Senator has any quarrel whatever with the soundness of the principle of that amendment, but it was found very inconvenient, to say the least, if not impossible, to carry on the programs which are referred to in the amendment by coming to Congress for specific appropriations. The same amendment applied to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and about 2 weeks ago the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate reported a bill to the Senate which relieved the Commodity Credit Corporation from the provisions of the Taft amendment but did limit in terms of dollars what this agency could spend in the way of subsidies.

Then the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], for himself and for a number of other western Senators, including myself, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Montana, [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], introduced Senate bill 502, to relieve from the application of the Taft amendment strategic and critical minerals and metals, and also petroleum and petroleum products.

After the introduction of the bill and its reference to the Committee on Banking and Currency, a subcommittee was appointed to consider it. The subcommittee consisted of myself as chairman, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS].

We began hearings on the bill, and the R. F. C. subsidiaries, which were affected, and also the Foreign Economic Administration, appeared before the subcommittee through their representatives, and after thorough consideration the subcommittee decided that we should not only include in the bill strategic and critical minerals and metals and petroleum and petroleum products, but also the other subsidy programs which have been in effect for the last 2 or 3 years.

The amendment which is now before the Senate follows almost the identical pattern that was adopted with reference to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The total amount authorized in the bill is $1,468,000,000. On each item or group of commodities there is a dollar limitation, just as was provided in the Commodity Credit Corporation Act.

It should be said, Mr. President, that of the $1,468,000,000 provided for, at least $500,000,000 is taken up by Government purchases, so that the net amount for which the bill provides is about $900,000,000. This amount, coupled with the $845,000,000 that is provided in the Commodity Credit Corporation Act, brings the entire subsidy program within the $2,000,000,000 estimate which has been recommended and estimated by the agencies involved to the Committee on Banking and Currency as sufficient to do the job.

I do not know that there is anything further to be said on the matter, unless some Senator has a question to ask. It seems to me that it is imperative that the bill be passed at once, and that the programs as outlined in the bill be carried on.

I might also say that, with reference to the metals program, which is a program affecting copper, lead, and zinc, it was just impossible to get the proper and necessary production of those metals without a continuance of the subsidy program.

There is one other amendment to be offered, which is a committee amendment, and has to do with 500,000 tons of bauxite ore in Arkansas, which is already blocked out, ready for mining, and if it is not mined, in all probability it will be lost permanently to the owners and to the country. This amendment, which was offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] in the Committee on Banking and Currency, provides that the Metals Reserve Corporation may continue to buy this bauxite ore at the price they were paying prior to the discontinuance of the purchase program, on the recommendation of the Bureau of Mines, but that the total amount to be purchased shall not exceed 500,000 tons. It would seem very unwise to let this tonnage of bauxite be permanently lost as it is a very important source of aluminum.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. What disposition is made or what becomes of the profits on the sales which these Government corporations make to the Army and Navy Departments and to the Maritime Commission? As a specific example, there is provided a $60,000,000 appropriation for rubber and rubber products purchased outside the United States. According to testimony which was given before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last year, on all the sales which the Rubber Reserve Company makes to other Government agencies, there is a mark-up of 17½ cents a pound in the price. Apparently that would represent a substantial profit. What becomes of that profit? Does it go into a revolving fund, or is it added to the appropriation made by the Congress, or what does become of it?

We also had testimony to the effect that the price of alcohol was marked up. I believe the Defense Supplies Corporation controls the alcohol output of the country, and when it sold to the Army and Navy there was a mark-up in the price which would represent a profit. I do not know whether the same is true of sales by the Metals Reserve Company, but it would appear that there might be profits made involving hundreds of millions of dollars, and I am wondering what is done with the money.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not know that I can correctly answer the Senator as to just what was done with it, but I would assume, of course, that the corporation making the profit would certainly be accountable for the profits coming to it. I do not know of any provision which carries profits into the general fund or into any other fund, so I assume that the profits, whatever they are, accumulate within the corporation which makes them, and certainly are to be accounted for in some method sooner or later. I cannot specifically give the Senator the correct answer.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder if that is taken into consideration when corporations like the Reconstruction Finance Corporation come before the committee for their appropriations. The Senator probably recalls that a year and a half ago the chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation came before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MURDOCK. Not for an appropriation, but for an authorization to increase its borrowing power.

Mr. AIKEN. It had to save $5,000,000,000 before night, or the next day, at the latest.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Otherwise the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would fold up. As the Senator recalls, the committee refused to give the appropriation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation did not fold up, and the Chairman never came back.

Mr. MURDOCK. I realize that what the Senator says is true, that Mr. Jones did come before the Committee on Banking and Currency and ask for an expansion, to the extent indicated, of the borrowing powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The expansion was not granted, and Mr. Jones, for some reason, did not see fit to come back; why, I do not know. I have not the answer.

Mr. AIKEN. He evidently got the money in some other way.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think it is a certainty that sooner or later the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and all its subsidiaries must account to the Congress for the profits they have made or the losses they have sustained.

Mr. AIKEN. The legislation that was enacted last month requiring an audit of all these corporations should furnish the information which the committee needs.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems to me that before we proceed with too many more appropriations we should have that information, and find out how much profit these Government corporations are making from other agencies of Government, and take that matter into consideration in making the annual appropriations.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I do not think any Senator is more interested in the subject the Senator from Vermont is talking about than the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] who offered the amendment which it now becomes necessary to suspend temporarily in order to carry on these subsidy programs. I do not believe he would have joined in reporting this bill to the Senate had he not been thoroughly convinced that it was imperative that the bill be enacted into law. I am hopeful legislation will be enacted which will give the Congress the full picture with reference to the R. F. C. and all its subsidiaries, but I do not believe the pending bill should be held up until that is done. I think it is imperative in the war program that the bill be passed. I am quite sure the able Senator from Ohio will join me in that statement. By this bill we are putting a dollar limitation on each item which is involved in the subsidy program or in the program of purchase for sale at a loss for the purpose of maintaining the ceiling prices.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe the Senator is correct in saying that this measure should be passed at this time. Of course theoretically it provides for purchase and resale at a loss. What I was inquiring about was the things which are purchased and resold at a profit, and what became of the profit.

Mr. MURDOCK. Of course, the pending bill has nothing to do with that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I invite the distinguished Senator's attention to the language of the bill on page 4, commencing with the word "provided", in line 6, as follows:

Provided further, That the premium price plan for copper, lead, and zinc shall be extended until June 30, 1946, on the same terms as heretofore, except that all classes of premiums shall be noncancelable unless necessary in order to make individual adjustments of income to specific mines.

May I ask also for the special attention of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I notice in the report on page 4 the following language relating to that provision:

The provision for making adjustments of individual premiums while prohibiting cancelation across the board is to preserve the present method of adjusting quotas upward and downward to return the producer a reasonable profit plus amortization and other allowances, and at the same time to prevent excessive windfalls due to development of richer ore bodies. In making such adjustments in specific cases, it may be necessary to cancel an individual C, B, or special additional copper premium, or later, if costs rise or grade of ore drops, to restore such premiums in whole or in part, but it is not intended that initial A quotas shall be raised. The committee did not wish to prevent necessary flexibility but did want to prohibit using cancelation as a mechanism for forcing mines to shut down. Neither is it intended to interfere with the right to add new classes of premiums if the agencies feel that this will benefit or increase the production of copper, lead, and zinc.

Mr. President, may I inquire of the chairman of the committee whether this report which I have read is the official committee interpretation of the language of the bill?

Mr. WAGNER. I think it is.

Mr. MILLIKIN. And is that the understanding of the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK]?

Mr. MURDOCK. It is my definite understanding that the part of the report read by the able Senator from Colorado particularly referring to the metals program is the committee's official construction of the bill as it relates to metals. However, the committee was very desirous of making it impossible for the War Production Board or any other agency on its own volition to cancel the program, and for that reason we have made the program effective until June 30, 1946, so that the mining industry of the country will be assured that the program will be carried out until that date.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I notice in the report that copper is mentioned specifically. The language in the report is not intended to be confined to copper, but extends to all the other metals?

Mr. MURDOCK. The bill extends the same principle to the other metals and the report specifically referred to copper as an example.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I ask the Senator further whether the views expressed in the report and the language of the bill have been discussed with the appropriate agencies of the Government so that they understand what we intend to do by this bill?

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator from Colorado is correct in that assumption.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the subsidy program. This bill in substance authorizes the continuation of the present subsidy program from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1946. The subsidy program started some time ago. I see the distinguished former Senator from Michigan, Mr. Brown, in the Chamber. He had a good deal to do with the early days of subsidy. In the beginning these mineral subsidies were started by the R. F. C. without any authority from Congress. Then the subsidies were extended to pay for the extra cost of the transportation of gasoline to the east coast, the extra cost resulting from the transportation by rail instead of the transportation by tanker. Those subsidies were gradually extended.

Then the Commodity Credit Corporation and the R. F. C., at the request of the O. P. A., established various consumers' subsidies and producers' subsidies for the purpose of holding down the prices of commodities. I think those subsidies were undertaken for the most part without any legal authorization whatever, and in some cases I thought in violation of the law. At first they were smaller. When we first had them called to our attention they might have been running one-half billion dollars a year. Today, the two measures relating to the Commodity Credit Corporation and the R. F. C. authorize subsidies in a total sum of $2,400,000,000 a year, and that is a direct loss to the Treasury of the United States.

Last year we enacted a law providing that this could no longer be done after the 1st of July of this year without appropriation by Congress. It seems to me the President should have included in his Budget the necessary appropriation of $2,400,000,000. In any intelligent consideration of the current Budget, in any intelligent consideration of the total appropriation made by the Congress, we should include this $2,400,000,000, because it is just as much a loss, it is just as much out-of-pocket expense, it is just as much an addition to the national debt as any appropriation made by Congress.

The President did not include these appropriations in his Budget, which was required really by the laws we passed last year. Instead of that, a bill was introduced to repeal that law. In effect the committee compromised with the Commodity Credit Corporation and the R. F. C. by saying, "All right, we will not require you to go to the Appropriations Committee. We will consider it, but we will only authorize an express amount for each subsidy, so that after this bill is passed you cannot substantially change the subsidy program."

For a long time, Mr. President, I have been trying to pin down subsidies. I think a year or a year and a half ago I tried to have passed a provision that subsidies shall stop where they are. Instead, Congress prohibited subsidies entirely. The bills were then vetoed by the President and sent back to the Congress. They were not passed over his veto. The net result was that the corporations had unlimited authority, so far as they could find or borrow money, to continue to pay subsidies in unlimited amounts. Finally, when we have got around to the business of pinning it down, subsidies have reached $2,400,000,000. I think it might be pointed out that of that sum, $1,700,000,000 is for the purpose of holding down the prices of foodstuffs; and of that sum, probably more than $200,000,000 is for the purpose of holding down the prices of foodstuffs bought by the Government. So it does not represent a total

loss. Because of that fact, the probable actual cost is less than $1,500,000,000 today.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator mean that that is the cost for 1 year?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. I am speaking of an annual program. I think the whole subsidy program is a very dubious one. We could save the Government approximately $560,000,000 by allowing the price of meat to go up 3 or 4 cents a pound. We could save the Government $190,000,000 by permitting the price of bread to go up a cent a pound. We could save $400,000,000 or so by letting the price of milk go up 2 cents a pound. At a time when people have more money than they have ever had before in their lives, I believe it might be well to let them pay that amount.

On the other hand, the metal subsidies have saved the Government a great deal of money. By paying subsidies of $88,000,000 for copper, lead, and zinc, we are probably saving the Government $400,000,000 or $500,000,000 a year. We subsidize only the high-cost producers, which enables us to hold down the price for everyone else.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I notice that the appropriation for the butter subsidy is $100,000,000. Is not that approximately what was paid last year?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. The butter subsidy is not increased. The actual present subsidy on butter, which is 10 cents a pound, represents about $90,000,000; and we allowed a little leeway in the total.

Mr. AIKEN. The new subsidy on butter does not go into effect until the 1st of April, does it?

Mr. TAFT. This is the roll-back subsidy, the R. F. C. subsidy of 10 cents. There is also a subsidy of 5 cents a pound on butter, which is paid directly to the producer. Provision for that subsidy is in the Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the answer to the question I was about to ask. I was about to ask where the other money came from.

Mr. TAFT. The other money is from that source.

Mr. President, I do not approve the subsidy program. On the other hand, I do not believe we should interfere with that program today. I think we are approaching the end of the war. I think we should certainly consider, for example, the question of the $290,000,000 subsidy on oil. I believe that probably $127,000,000 of it is for the transportation of gasoline to the east coast. We are reaching the point where we may be able to go back to tankers for that purpose. As soon as that can be done, we ought to be able to get away from that subsidy as far as possible. Plans should be made to reduce subsidies gradually.

Incidentally, the dairy cooperative association suggested before our committee yesterday a plan for gradually stepping the subsidies down and increasing the prices at intervals of 6 months until the subsidies disappear. Certainly it would be most unfortunate if we should enter the period of peace still undertaking to subsidize the price of food.

Mr. President, I see no alternative to the passage of this bill and the authorization of this amount. We have not held the R. F. C. down very closely. There is a little margin; and yet it cannot take a program which is now $2,300,000,000 and step it up to $3,000,000,000. It cannot substantially change the nature of the program or expand it in any material degree without coming back to Congress. I believe that if we had adopted that policy 2 years ago, it would have haved the Government a great deal of money. I doubt if the increase in prices which would have resulted would have seriously interfered in any way with the war effort.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand the purpose of this bill, we are accomplishing two things: First, the Congress is authorizing, for the first time, the payment of all the subsidies under a subsidy program.

Mr. TAFT. If this bill were not passed, all subsidies would come to an end on the 1st of July.

Mr. WHERRY. Are not some subsidies being paid now without the authorization of Congress?

Mr. TAFT. That is a legal question. I have never thought that the Commodity Credit Corporation had authority to pay milk subsidies. I have always doubted the authority of the R. F. C. to pay roll-back subsidies. However, those are legal questions which are disputed. There has never been express authority from Congress to pay subsidies. Government corporations have used for subsidies money which has been given to them for general purposes, and perhaps because of the breadth of the powers given those corporations, they may have had the legal authority to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask another question, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. TAFT. I yield. I might point out that they did so in violation of the express opinion of Congress, because twice we passed bills prohibiting subsidies. Those bills were vetoed by the President of the United States.

Mr. WHERRY. My understanding is that the total subsidy program will be continued for 1 year; that is, until June 1946.

Mr. TAFT. And then all subsidies will stop, except to the extent Congress may again authorize them to continue. In other words, the subsidy program must be submitted to Congress every year, just as appropriations for the Army and Navy are submitted to Congress every year. That is the condition. In effect, this is a combination appropriation and authorization bill dealing with this particular subject.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask one further question. As I understand, the total amount of the subsidies which we expect to pay in the next year is $2,400,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. Two billion three hundred and twenty-eight million dollars. That is probably a somewhat liberal estimate. I think there is probably 10 percent extra which will not have to be spent. I should say that the program is closer to $2,100,000,000 than the total of this authorization.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the purpose of these subsidies is to help to produce metals and products for the war effort.

Mr. TAFT. No; it is not really for that purpose. It is primarily to hold down the prices of such products to the consumer and to the Government.

Mr. WHERRY. But indirectly the Government benefits by some subsidies.

Mr. TAFT. The Government benefits greatly by the metal subsidies. It benefits to the extent of approximately $280,000,000 in the case of the food subsidies, and there is probably another $100,000,000 of benefit from other subsidies. So, with respect to the total of $2,300,000,000, I should say that we must somewhat discount the ultimate expense to the Government. Perhaps one and a half billion dollars represents our actual out-of-pocket loss, as compared with no subsidy program at all.

I have always been in favor of those subsidies by which the Government made a profit—subsidies whereby, by subsidizing one thing, there is a price effect on a series of commodities, thereby saving the consumer or the Government much more than the amount of the subsidy paid. But I have never believed in subsidies "across the board"—subsidies which cost the Government every cent of benefit to the consumer. It seems to me that in such cases the consumer rather than the Government should bear the cost.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the question in which I am interested. Let us consider the food subsidies. Two or three days ago on the floor of the Senate the distinguished Senator from Ohio gave us a statement relative to all the money we have in the United States. He referred to $26,000,000,000 or $27,000,000,000 in Federal bank notes and seventy-six and a half billion dollars in time and demand deposits. If I correctly remember, the distinguished Senator said that, in all, we had approximately $200,000,000,000, including reserves in other countries with which there will be an opportunity to do business.

Was any testimony taken before the Senator's committee justifying even the payment of food subsidies at this time when all this money is on hand?

Mr. TAFT. No testimony was taken; but I think it is fair to say that the argument of the Office of Price Administration on the subject is that they have now succeeded in stabilizing the cost of food, that the cost of living has not gone up more than 1½ percent in approximately 18 months, and that if today they add to the consumers' bills by increasing prices, a spiral of increases which would produce inflation might be started. I have never agreed with that argument, but many persons do agree with it.

My belief is that we should say to the Office of Price Administration: "All right; we grant the authority to pay the

subsidy; but if you face this problem further, if you permit costs to rise further"—because while this 1½ percent increase has occurred in prices of food, wages have risen in the past 2 years and other costs have increased—"if you are going to let the costs of food increase, you will be compelled to let other costs go up, because you will have no reserves upon which to draw." That is approximately the position I take on the bill.

Mr. President, I ask that a description of the principal subsidies covered by this bill be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEAT

The meat subsidy started June 7, 1943, to make it possible for the Office of Price Administration to roll back the prices of dressed meat. Payments are made to slaughterers who slaughtered more than 2,500 pounds a month, on live weight of the animals. The original rates were $1.10 per hundredweight on cattle and calves; 95 cents on sheep and lambs; $1.30 on hogs and pigs. No changes in the rates have been made to affect payments on hogs, sheep, or calves.

The subsidy was changed on cattle by a directive of the Office of Economic Stabilization October 26, 1943, which set up the so-called cattle stabilization plan. Under this plan, payments were made on cattle according to the grade. AA, $1 per hundredweight; A, $1.45 per hundredweight; B, 90 cents per hundredweight; C, cutter and canner and bologna bulls, 50 cents per hundredweight.

The cattle stabilization program involved also price compliance with a so-called floor and ceiling on livestock which consisted of prices by zones certified to Defense Supplies Corporation by the O. P. A. and the W. F. A. Every slaughterer who slaughtered more than 25,000 pounds of cattle per month was required to report his cost of cattle The amount that this cost of cattle exceeded his maximum permissible payment or was below his minimum permissible payment, was deducted from the amount of his claim.

Under the directive of January 19, 1945, of the Office of Economic Stabilization, the rates on cattle were changed to $2 on AA, $1.95 on A. On the lower grades the rates remained the same. The price-compliance provisions as to livestock stayed the same in essentials, although the livestock prices on AA and A were increased. Since the directive, the minimum slaughter which requires an applicant to report his cost of cattle was raised from 25,000 pounds to 50,000 pounds, including both cattle and calves. Under the directive of the O. E. S. of January 30, 1945, subsidy payments on cattle, calves, and hogs are limited to a certain percentage of the amount of slaughter for which applicant filed a claim for subsidy in the corresponding month in 1944 if the slaughter is not performed in a federally inspected establishment. The W. F. A. provides the percentages, which may change from time to time. At the present time, they are 100 percent on cattle and calves and 50 percent on hogs.

There is also an extra-compensation program in connection with the cattle-stabilization program. This provides for payments of 80 cents per hundredweight on cattle to nonprocessing unaffiliated slaughterers who sold in 1942 and who currently sell 98 percent or more of the beef produced from their cattle slaughter in the form of carcasses, wholesale cuts, boneless beef, and ground beef.

On recent reduced volume of meat production, subsidy payments are averaging about $37,000,000 a month; during previous months the average was nearer $40,000,000 or $480,000,000 a year. The hog crop in 1945–46 will undoubtedly be very large as a consequence of the current very high hog prices. If the crop is up to expectations, $60,000,000 extra will be needed for the increased hog payments.

The subsidy rates on cattle have recently been increased, with an expected increase in cattle payments of about $59,000,000 a year. If the present rates remain unchanged and present estimates of slaughter volume are correct, the cost of the meat subsidy would be about $600,000,000 in the fiscal year 1945–46.

BUTTER

Subsidy payments are made to operators of plants manufacturing dairy products on the amount of the butter produced each month to compensate them for a reduction in butter prices under Office of Price Administration regulations. Payments are made at the rate of 5 cents per pound both on ordinary butter and process butter.

This program was effective June 1, 1943, and has continued in effect without change from the beginning of the program.

The payments on butter during the first 18 months averaged $6,500,000 a month. If butter productfon is at the same volume during the fiscal year 1945–46, the cost of the subsidy would be $78,000,000. Butter production has been very low in 1944 and 1945, and is expected to continue low through 1945. It may well, however, recover in the first half of 1946 even if the war still continues, if War Food Administration's current attempts to encourage production are successful. Normal production during the first half of 1946 would increase the cost of the subsidy by $6,000,000 for the year.

The original estimate of the Office of Price Administration of the cost of the butter subsidy for a fiscal year was $100,000,000, on the basis of normal production. For the calendar year 1945, butter production is now expected to be no more than one and one-half billion pounds, indicating a subsidy of $75,000,000; this, of course, is minimum expectation and is the amount that is actually allocated in advance for consumption.

The minimum we could safely estimate for the fiscal year 1945–46 this far in advance on the assumption neither part of the war will end before December 1945, would be $90,000,000 for butter; $100,000,000 would undoubtedly be sufficient for all contingencies, including early end of the war.

FLOUR

The flour subsidy started December 1, 1943. The payments made to mills on the wheat ground into flour compensate them for the difference between market prices for wheat and the wheat cost on which the Office of Price Administration flour ceilings are based. The rates of payment vary monthly with the wheat market. While payments are on production, the applicable month's rate is determined for large mills by the date the flour was sold. Small mills are entitled to payment at the rates in effect during the month of grind to enable them to avoid bookkeeping problems.

Because of the use of flour sales to determine which month's rate is applicable, deductions were made at the beginning of the program on sales made before December 1, 1943. Sales of flour are the almost exact equivalent of the wheat which has been purchased by the mill. Consequently, no payments were made on wheat purchased before the program began. On termination of the program, we will pay on wheat purchased during the subsidy period by payments on flour sold in an amount not greater than the deduction at the beginning of the program provided the wheat was ground within 120 days after termination.

The production of flour is estimated to continue at about present high levels and the wheat crop is expected to be large enough to take care of full demand. For a flour production of 265,000,000 hundredweights—a little below the calendar year 1944—about 622,000,000 bushels of wheat would be used. The subsidy rate varies with the wheat market, and if wheat stays at full ceilings with parity unchanged, would average about 30 cents a bushel. The maximum cost of the subsidy for the fiscal year 1945–46 would be $190,000,000 on these assumptions. If the price of wheat is not at full ceilings, but at present levels, the cost would be about 162,000,000.

In the calendar year 1944 payments averaged about $8,600,000 a month. During that year wheat ceilings were 4 cents lower than at present and the bumper wheat crop forced wheat prices well below ceilings with the subsidy rates correspondingly lower. Rates varied from 0 to 18 cents on soft wheat and from 11 to 25½ cents on hard wheat.

The minimum cost we could properly estimate to safeguard the industry would be $162,000,000 for flour for the fiscal year 1945–46, if there is no change in parity. One hundred and ninety million dollars should be sufficient to keep wheat at ceiling prices if there is no change in parity.

PETROLEUM

It is estimated that $290,000,000 will be required for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, as follows:

1. Petroleum Compensatory Adjustments Regulation No. 1: Under this program oil companies are compensated for the extra costs involved in transporting petroleum and petroleum products from Petroleum Administration for War District No. 2 and Petroleum Administration for War District No. 3 into Petroleum Administration for War District No. 1 by tank car, pipe line or other substitute methods of transportation as compared with normal transportation by tanker. The purpose of the program is to maintain a steady and adequate flow of petroleum and petroleum products into the Atlantic coast area and to maintain existing price structures.

The program was initiated on August 1, 1942, and was recommended by the Petroleum Administration for War, the Office of Price Administration, the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Office of Defense Transportation. It is difficult to estimate the amount of payments which may be made by the Corporation in connection with the programs during any period, inasmuch as, in many instances, payments by the Corporation under the program are netted against revenues received by claimants as a result of specific increases in ceiling prices of certain petroleum products which were authorized by the Office of Price Administration for the purpose of providing compensation for the higher transportation costs involved in shipping petroleum and petroleum products over land to points in Petroleum Administration for War District No. 1 as compared with shipments by ocean-going tankers. In this connection it is estimated that the net loss under the program during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, will be in the amount of approximately $150,000,000.

2. Petroleum Compensatory Adjustments Regulations No. 5: Under this program refiners are compensated for extra transportation costs involved in shipping crude oil by tank cars or barges from points in Petroleum Administration for War District No. 3 and certain Wyoming points in Petroleum Administration for War District No. 4 to destinations in Petroleum Administration for War District No. 2. Under the program, shipments by pipe lines are considered to be the normal means of transportation between the points involved and the extra transportation costs payable by Defense Supplies Corporaton are the costs of shipments by tank car or barge in excess of the cost of normal pipe line shipments. The purpose of the program is to provide Petrolcum Administration for War District No. 2 refiners with an adequate

supply of crude oil to maintain maximum production for war and essential civilian uses.

The program was initiated on December 1, 1943, and was sponsored by the Office of Price Administration, the Petroleum Administration for War and the Office of Defense Transportation.

It is estimated that Defense Supplies Corporation will make payments under the program during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, in the amount of approximately $20,000,000.

3. Stripper-Well Compensatory Adjustment Program: The program is designed to maintain and possibly increase the national production of crude oil. The Office of Price Administration, by increasing the maximum prices of crude produced from fields averaging less than nine barrels daily, per well, makes it economically practical for producers to continue the recovery of crude, to undertake clean-outs and repairs and delay abandonment of old wells. By making premium payments to the first purchasers of crude, the maximum prices for which have been increased, and to the producers of such crude, which is not sold but which is otherwise utilized by the producers, Defense Supplies Corporation maintains the national market price of crude.

The program was initiated in August 1944, and was sponsored by the Office of Economic Stabilization, the Office of Price Administration and the Petroleum Administration for War.

It is estimated that the payments by Defense Supplies Corporation under the program during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, will be approximately $75,000,000.

4. Movement of crude from West Texas to California: Under this program Defense Supplies Corporation pays to purchasers certain excess charges involved in the movement of crude petroleum from West Texas to California over and above the laid-down cost in California of comparable crude petroleum.

The program was initiated in December 1944, and at that time it was contemplated that Defense Supplies Corporation would enter into five or six contracts thereunder under which it was estimated that a maximum of 20,000 barrels of crude petroleum per day would be purchased and shipped. In this connection, however, the Petroleum Administration for War is currently considering recommending to the Corporation that the daily purchases and shipments be increased to 50,000 barrels per day. At this rate, it is estimated that Defense Supplies Corporation will disburse approximately $45,000,000 under the program during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I share the view of the Senator from Ohio in favoring the elimination of subsidies at the earliest possible moment. However, I notice that the bill has for its title "A bill to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments with respect to strategic metals and minerals and petroleum and petroleum products." In the body of the bill I observe that subsidies are provided for meat and butter. It occurs to me that meat and butter are not petroleum products, and that the title should be amended.

Mr. TAFT. The committee has reported an amendment to the title.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President on, behalf of the committee, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. I may say that the amendment has been passed on by the committee, and I offer it on behalf of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, at the end of line 11, it is proposed to insert "and that the Metals Reserve Company shall purchase during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, at its 1944 price schedule, bauxite produced from such of the underground mines as supplied bauxite to the Metals Reserve Company during 1944 and in such quantities as the Bureau of Mines determines as being subject to permanent loss if not removed prior to June 30, 1946, but not to exceed, however, 500,000 long tons."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the committee amendment it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

No Government officer or agent shall have discretion or authority to deny or withhold payment of sums relating to the production or sale of agricultural or other commodities (including livestock and meat) to any currently eligible person, firm, or corporation through executive set-off for any disputed claim, or as a penalty not specified by statute, or otherwise.

Mr. MURRAY. The purpose of the amendment is to prevent the Government from withholding, on the basis of some supposed violation of a regulation or some set-off for some other supposed claim, the payment of a subsidy to which a person or firm is entitled. Many businesses cannot continue in operation if they do not receive the subsidies which are due them. In many cases if the Government holds up the payment of the subsidy, the business must cease operations and retire from the field.

Adoption of the amendment would not mean that the Government would surrender any of its claims. It would be entitled to bring suit against a business concern against whom a claim was made by a particular Government department or agency; and in the meantime the person or firm would be permitted to continue in business.

I think the amendment is a most proper one for the purpose of protecting businesses from arbitrary action on the part of Government officials who seem to think they are entitled to administer the subsidies as a matter of discretion.

As a matter of fact, they have no authority whatever to exercise such discretion. If the subsidy is due, it should be paid. If officials of the Government desire to inflict a penalty on a business, they have a right to proceed in some other manner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana to the committee amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY, I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator have in mind cases which demonstrate the need for adoption of the amendment?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. The need has been demonstrated on several occasions in connection with firms engaged in the meat-packing business. In several cases Government officials have undertaken to suspend the payment of subsidies in connection with price roll-backs because of an alleged violation of a regulation or because the Government claims a set-off against the concern which is entitled to payment of the subsidy.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is the payment of the subsidy stopped before the concern is found to have violated the law, or is it stopped merely when the firm is charged with violating the law?

Mr. MURRAY. Payment of the subsidy has been stopped when the firm was charged with violation of the law.

Mr. TYDINGS. In other words, the man is presumed to be guilty, in the first instance; is that the case?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Is it the purpose to discontinue payment of the subsidy after the man has been charged with a violation?

Mr. MURRAY. Oh, no.

Mr. TYDINGS. The purpose is to discontinue payment of the subsidy only after the man has been found guilty of the violation; is that correct?

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand that in the case of a dispute over whether a firm owes the Government money, the Senator's amendment, if adopted, would compel the Government to pay the subsidy; and thereafter the Government could recover as best it could such sums as might be due it.

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. Of course, when the Government has established a claim, it should be entitled to recover; but until such time as the validity of the claim or penalty the Government is attempting to enforce is established, it does not seem to me the business should be closed by the arbitrary withholding of a subsidy to which that concern is entitled.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not understand that the Senator from Montana contends that the Government has been canceling the subsidies. Did not the Senator say that the Government officials have simply been withholding payment of the subsidy until the disputed sum can be paid?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes; but that is the equivalent of putting the concern out of business, because it cannot continue to operate without the payment of the subsidy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let me say to the Senator from Montana that in the past 6 months my attention has been called to the fact that three meat-packing companies have been charged in crim-

inal court with violation of O. P. A. regulations, and in the meantime the subsidies have been withheld. Whether they will be found guilty, I do not know; but they have to wait until the Federal judge sets the case for trial and until the case is heard and decided. The practical effect has been to close all of them and put them out of business. Without regard to the question whether they actually have violated the regulations they are thus put out of business. As the Senator from Maryland has said, the O. P. A. puts them out of business by withholding payment of the subsidies before the court determines whether they are guilty or innocent.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be read again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be restated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the committee amendment it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

No Government officer or agent shall have discretion or authority to deny or withhold payment of sums relating to the production or sale of agricultural or other commodities (including livestock and meat) to any currently eligible person, firm, or corporation through Executive set-off for any disputed claim, or as a penalty not specified by statute, or otherwise.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, of course, if the claimant of the subsidy is not entitled to it or is not eligible to receive it, it will not be paid. But if the claimant is eligible or entitled to receive it, a Government agent should not have the right in his discretion to suspend payment of the subsidy because he thinks some violation has occurred or because he thinks there is a claim which would offset it. Such a claim should be established first.

Mr. MURDOCK. Who is to determine the eligibility of the applicant?

Mr. MURRAY. The Government could bring suit against the applicant and have it determined in court. If the applicant should deny that he had violated any regulation, or deny that the Government had any offset against him, he should have his day in court, and the Government should establish the claim against him without first putting him out of business.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator will examine his amendment he will see that it includes the words "to any currently eligible person, firm, or corporation."

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Under the Senator's amendment, who will determine the eligibility of the applicant?

Mr. MURRAY. The Government will determine it, but it may not deny that he is eligible merely because it contends that he has violated some regulation. If he is eligible, it will be a simple matter to determine.

Mr. MURDOCK. Suppose a black-market operation were involved in the denial of a subsidy. Some of the witnesses before the committee pointed out that there had been applicants for subsidies who were engaged at the time in black-market operations, and that the agencies dispensing the subsidies took the position that black-market operators were not eligible to receive subsidies. If I correctly understand the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana, if it becomes law, the Government could not deny the right of a subsidy to a black-market operator until it had first taken him into court and he had been adjudged as having violated the law or rules and regulations promulgated under the law.

Mr. MURRAY. The language would apply only in cases in which the applicant was admittedly eligible. If he were operating in a black market, the Government would have the right to bring suit against him, prove his black-market operations, and enjoin him from receiving a subsidy.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator take the position that before any penalty by way of denial of subsidies could be imposed against the black-market operator by the administrative agency, the operator would first have to be taken into court, tried, and found guilty?

Mr. MURRAY. It seems to me that that would be the proper procedure. A suit could be brought, and through an injunction proceeding the court could stop payment. But the Government could not exercise the arbitrary power of determining that the applicant for a subsidy had violated some regulation, and deny the payment of the subsidy which would otherwise be granted under the law.

Mr. MURDOCK. The person to whom the subsidy had been denied would have the right to go into court and sue for the subsidy, but if we turn the situation around and provide that subsidies shall be paid immediately to any and all applicants, regardless of the type of operation in which they happen to be engaged, we will destroy one of the most efficient means of curtailing black markets now existing throughout the country.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the distinguished Senator from Montana give us one or two examples of what he has in mind?

Mr. MURRAY. I cannot do so offhand at the moment; but my committee has received letters from several concerns. If I had access to my files I could call attention to some of them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I can give the Senator an example. Packing company A let us say, has been found by the O. P. A. to be violating O. P. A. regulations. Charges are brought against it and it is taken into court. Under ordinary circumstances the company would be eligible to receive a subsidy, but criminal charges have been made against it and it is brought into court. It is ineligible to receive subsidies until its case has been determined. If it is found guilty the O. P. A. will have a right to put the company out of business. I am sure the Senator from Montana is not trying to defend O. P. A. violators or black-market operators, but merely would allow such persons to have their day in court. Merely because an administrative agency says that a person is guilty is no reason for making him ineligible to receive subsidies.

Mr. TYDINGS. My understanding is that if a person violates the O. P. A. rules the Government can proceed practically instantly against him by way of injunction proceedings and put an end to his unlawful operations. Thereafter, the case is at issue as to whether the injunction shall lie. However, the Senator is not dealing with such a case. He is dealing with a situation wherein the Government is not willing to go into court and file an injunction but pursues other means without first proving that it has a case which justifies the defendant being penalized.

I think the Senator would be wise if he were to modify his amendment by adding to it the words "except in cases which are in litigation", or similar phraseology. In other words, if the Government feels that the case is strong enough to warrant application for an injunction, it should not be compelled to pay a subsidy pending a decision on the application for injunction. If, on the other hand, the case is not strong enough to warrant an injunction being granted, the citizen, firm, or partnership should be allowed to obtain a subsidy until sufficient facts have been developed to make out a prima facie case to be submitted to the proper tribunal.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for his suggestion, and I will modify my amendment by adding the words "except in cases pending in court."

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator now state the form of his amendment?

Mr. MURRAY. I have modified my amendment by including at the end of it the words "except in cases pending in court."

Mr. MURDOCK. I ask that the amendment as modified be stated so that we will understand what it is.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new paragraph:

No Government officer or agent shall have discretion or authority to deny or withhold payment of sums relating to the production or sale of agricultural or other commodities (including livestock and meat) to any currently eligible person, firm, or corporation through Executive set-off for any disputed claim, or as a penalty not specified by statute, or otherwise, except in cases pending in court.

Mr. MURDOCK. I merely wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the amendment was not presented either to the subcommittee or to the Banking and Currency Committee.

It is disagreeable for me to have to take a position in opposition to the distinguished Senator from Montana, but it seems to me that it would be wholly unwise at this time to insert this type of amendment in the bill we are considering, without any evidence on it whatever. It is easy to say that an amendment of this kind does no harm, that it is a very simple little thing, but it is these simple little amendments which do no harm, that really do the harm.

With reference to the meat subsidy, for instance, the provisions of the meat subsidy are that if a packer, over a month's time, on the average, buys at

prices in excess of the ceiling or below the floor, whatever the difference is, that part of his subsidy is denied him. Suppose that question is presented to the agency which pays the subsidy. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Montana, it could not deny the man the subsidy because he had violated the rules and regulations, but the Government would be required to file suit against him.

Let us apply the amendment to a fly-by-night operator who gets into the business of packing, brings himself within the regulations of the O. P. A., and claims that he is eligible for the subsidy, and goes on for a few months and receives it. Then, when they ascertain that he has violated the regulations, they cut him off because of that. If they can do that, in my opinion it would be very effective, and it is very effective in stamping out the black-market operators. But if a man is engaged in black-market operations and the Government of the United States has to go into court before a subsidy can be denied the man, it would take weeks, or perhaps months, before they could get him into court, and during the interim he would be receiving the subsidy, and probably go out of business before the court could take action.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator is mistaken in his last statement, because the addition to the amendment of the Senator from Montana provides that once a case is in court, before it is determined, the Government can withhold the subsidy, but the Senator said prior to that—taking the case of a man who violates either the ceiling or the floor price—the O. P. A. and the head of the agency paying the subsidy would have no right to deny him the subsidy. What proof is there that he has violated the O. P. A. regulations, in the Senator's supposed case?

Mr. MURDOCK. The proof is that each month the applicant sends in a report to O. P. A. or the other agency paying the subsidy. The Senator must remember that we are not only dealing with meat, we are dealing with the entire subsidy program and all producers of commodities coming under it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. We are dealing with flour and meat and everything else. If we are to impose on the administrative agency the obligation to continue to pay subsidies until they go into court on every infraction or every violation, I say to the Senator that the whole program will come down of its own weight.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Not just now. On the other hand, if there are those who are eligible for the subsidy, who are engaged in legitimate operations, and the subsidy has been wrongfully denied to them by the administrative agency, what an easy matter it is for such persons to go into court.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think it is easy at all.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not yield to the Senator just now. But there will be very few of those cases, whereas, on the other hand, if this thing is turned around and approached from the other angle, it is my opinion that we will do more to break down the program than anything we could do.

As I have said, I do not like to disagree with the Senator from Montana, but it seems to me we are dealing with too important a question here to adopt such an amendment hurriedly.

I suggest to the Senator that he introduce the amendment in the form of a bill, and let it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, if that is the proper committee, and then, after at least some study of the question, we could determine whether it should be enacted or not.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know the Senator does not desire to advocate that a man should be penalized or punished before he is found to be guilty.

Mr. MURDOCK. Oh, no; I would be the last person to advocate that.

Mr. TYDINGS. But does not what the Senator advocates head up to just that conclusion?

Mr. MURDOCK. I think not.

Mr. TYDINGS. Namely, that without any trial at all of the issues involved, some governmental bureaucrat or official could say, "I do not think that fellow has been conforming with the regulations; therefore I am not going to give him his subsidy." The man says, "But what is the charge against me? What have I done?" The reply is, "Well, there have been a lot of things that do not look right, and you are not going to get your money." The man may be completely innocent; all his competitors in the meantime are getting subsidies, and he has his property taken away from him without due process of law.

I think the sounder course, the one which does not conflict, I am sure, with what the Senator desires to accomplish, is that whenever the Government feels it has sufficient evidence to deny a man a subsidy, then the course of the Government should be to apply for an injunction against the man, and while the merits of that injunction are pending, the man obviously should not receive a subsidy until he clears himself, but up until the time the Government is ready to put its suspicions to the test of trial, no man should be at the mercy of a Washington official.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is all fine logic, but we are not confronted, in the enforcement of price control, with a lot of theories, we are confronted with a practical situation, and every witness who appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency said, "We are so restricted on personnel, and it is so difficult today to get efficient personnel, that it is almost impossible to carry the burdens which are now imposed on the agency."

I agree with the Senator that in ordinary times, of course, what he advocates is the proper course; but I say that when we are in a war, and when personnel is so limited as it is today, instead of throwing the cloak of protection around the black-market operator, we should do just the opposite. I am sure, Mr. President, that the agencies which are paying these subsidies, knowing the efficacy of the subsidy, are carrying out the war program, and in holding down inflation are just as anxious as they can be to pay the subsidies to those who are legitimately entitled to them as any Senator here. All they are asking of us is not to burden them with a multiplicity of lawsuits which may break down the program.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be voted down, that the Senator will submit his amendment as a separate bill, have it referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and handled in the regular method, instead of bringing it in at this time, without an opportunity for consideration, and asking us to pass it as a part of the pending bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator yield the floor?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Utah to two provisions of the Constitution which evidently during the war seemed to be unnecessarily set aside if any of it can be set aside:

In all criminal prosecutions—

And this is a criminal prosecution—

the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and a public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

That is one provision.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator yielded the floor. I have the floor.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thought the Senator had concluded. The Senator said he had concluded, and I addressed the Chair and obtained recognition. But I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. MURDOCK. I understood that I had the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah yielded the floor and the Senator from Maryland was recognized.

Mr. MURDOCK. I did not so understand.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad to defer, if the Senator wishes.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not think the Senator is deferring; I am deferring, and I am always glad to defer.

It seems to me the argument made was farfetched. There is no criminal prosecution involved in the denying of a subsidy.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I was going to ask the Senator from Maryland how the withholding of a subsidy could be a criminal prosecution.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the Senator from New Mexico has placed his finger right on the crux of the matter. I think the Senator from Maryland himself does not gain a great deal of comfort from the provision of the Constitution which he read.

I do not think there is any more I can add to the discussion, Mr. President. It seems to me the Senate should not adopt the amendment, and I ask that it be rejected.

Mr. President, I ask that following my remarks there be included in the RECORD a statement which has been prepared with reference to certain metals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

PREMIUM PRICE PLAN FOR COPPER, LEAD, AND ZINC

(A) HISTORY

On January 12, 1942, the Federal Loan Administrator announced that at the request of O. P. M. and O. P. A. Metals Reserve Company would stimulate the production of domestic copper, lead, and zinc through paying a higher price for these metals for production in excess of 1941 output, terms of the plan to be announced later. As made effective February 1, 1942, for a period of not to exceed 30 months from that date, the premium price plan for copper, lead, and zinc—the name by which the program is known—provided for the payment by M. R. C. of a premium on all domestic production of those metals in excess of monthly quotas established by W. P. B. and O. P. A. and approved by M. R. C. which would reflect the difference between the respective ceiling prices for the materials involved and the equivalent of 17 cents per pound Connecticut Valley for copper, 9 cents per pound New York for lead and 11 cents per pound East St. Louis for zinc, subject to prior termination in event of the end of the national emergency prior to July 31, 1944, upon terms specified in M. R. C.'s public announcement of March 7, 1942. On the basis of existing ceiling prices, which have not changed during the life of the plan, the basic or A premium are 5 cents per pound on copper, and 2¾ cents per pound on lead and zinc, respectively.

On January 9, 1943, pursuant to joint W. P. B.-O. P. A. recommendation, the effective period of the plan was extended for an additional year or until July 31, 1945, to aid in insuring the maintenance of maximum necessary production of premium metals for use in the war effort. All other terms remained unchanged.

In February 1943 the plan was broadened to cope with changing economic conditions in the lead and zinc industry so as to afford an additional premium for lead (called a "B" premium) and additional premiums for zinc (B and C premiums), upon joint recommendation of W. P. B. and O. P. A. Under such arrangement the maximum premium payable on lead was 5½ cents per pound and the maximum premium payable on zinc was 8¼ cents per pound. Such additional premiums (over the basic A premiums) were payable on quotas which were made available only in those special cases where the basic A premiums would not provide adequate revenue to obtain the maximum necessary production.

In April 1943 O. P. A. and W. P. B. advised that to insure maximum necessary production of copper it would be necessary, due principally to increased labor costs, to arrange in a number of special cases for the payment of premiums for copper higher than those then available. Arrangements for payment thereof were promptly approved, the additional premium (over the basic A premium of 5 cents per pound) to be specified in each case granted a special copper quota.

All additional premiums were made subject to cancelation upon prior notice.

The following chart lists the various quotas and premiums available under the plan:

	Zinc, East St. Louis	Lead, New York	Copper, Connecticut Valley
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*
A quotas, deduct ceiling price from	11	9¼	17
B quotas, deduct ceiling price plus A premium from	13¾	12	.....
C quotas, deduct ceiling price plus A and B premiums from	16½	.....	.....
Special copper quotas, to be specified for each mine.			

At existing ceiling prices of 8¼ cents per pound East St. Louis for zinc, 6½ cents per pound New York for lead, and 12 cents per pound Connecticut Valley for copper, premium rates are as follows:

	Zinc	Lead	Copper
	Cents	*Cents*	*Cents*
On production in excess of A quotas	2¾	2¾	5
On production in excess of B quotas	2¾	2¾	.....
On production in excess of C quotas	2¾	.....	.....
On production in excess of special copper quotas	As specified		

(B) EXPLANATION

The fundamental purpose of the plan was to stimulate domestic production of the premium metals. Production from marginal properties was encouraged and operators were compensated by the premiums for the extra costs involved in bringing out the additional metal output. To compensate for increased costs, wage increases, and the necessity for mining lower grades of ore, additional premiums were provided so as to insure the maintenance of the requisite production. From the viewpoint of price control, the plan has avoided the necessity for general price increases for the commodities with a consequent over-all savings to the Government, which, being the purchaser in one form or another of a large part of the production of the metals under war conditions, would have had to absorb such price increases.

A brief statement of the mechanics of the plan follows:

All quotas are assigned by the quota committee, composed of W. P. B. and O. P. A. representatives, based on an analysis of sworn data submitted by the producer. Such quotas are subject to approval by reviewing officers of W. P. B., O. P. A., and M. R. C., and upon approval make the producer eligible for the premiums specified therein upon his compliance with M. R. C. requirements. Monthly payments are effected through the processing plants receiving the materials (which purchase the products for their own account), such plants acting as agents for M. R. C., on the basis of sworn affidavits by the producers. To facilitate receipt of funds by producers a procedure exists whereunder preliminary payments are made by the agents following delivery of the material. Final payments are effected after check of full data by the M. R. C. Washington office, except in the tri-State district (Missouri, Kansas, and Oklahoma) where, due to special conditions affecting that area only, payments are made through the Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City. A financial statement is attached giving a break-down of premium payments made through the month of February 1945, and showing the amount of metals produced during the period February 1, 1942, through February 28, 1945, on which the premiums were paid.

The Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, authorizes this subsidy program, and the determinations required by section 2 (e) thereof have been duly made by the Federal Loan Administrator (Secretary of Commerce) and approved by the President.

(C) ESTIMATE FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1946

In the event that the Congress passes the requisite enabling legislation, it is proposed to extend the premium price plan, with certain modifications, through June 30, 1946. Full details as to the exact terms of the extension have not as yet been crystalized by W. P. B., O. P. A., and M. R. C., but agreement thereon is anticipated shortly. Estimated costs of this extension are:

Copper premiums	$33,000,000
Lead premiums	15,000,000
Zinc premiums	40,000,000
Total premiums	88,000,000

The proposed extension is predicated upon the continuing heavy requirements for the metals, copper, and lead being in a particularly tight position, and the need for maintenance of an adequate quantity of production in the face of high costs of operation and shortage of manpower.

Metals Reserve Company—Monthly premiums paid on excess production of copper, lead, and zinc

Month paid	Copper		Lead		Zinc		Total payments
	Pounds	Amount	Pounds	Amount	Pounds	Amount	
1942 totals	101,239,028.20	5,061,951.38	122,193,860.08	3,267,344.22	59,792,826.78	8,839,038.74	17,169,234.34
1943 totals	476,117,262.79	25,209,046.59	284,586,292.05	9,426,642.68	766,433,660.80	29,367,540.08	64,003,229.35
1944 totals	477,983,949.48	27,089,551.72	411,321,217.88	13,586,994.35	949,702,940.70	40,923,090.00	81,599,636.07
1945							
January	27,391,855.00	1,682,520.66	33,718,413.00	1,116,170.44	71,533,261.89	2,836,699.21	5,635,390.31
February	39,411,094.00	2,349,143.90	42,786,546.30	1,402,923.66	62,673,168.85	2,590,718.87	6,342,786.43
1945 totals	66,802,949.00	4,031,664.56	76,504,959.30	2,519,094.10	134,206,430.74	5,427,418.08	11,978,176.74
Grand totals through Feb. 28, 1945	1,122,143,189.47	61,392,214.25	894,606,329.31	28,800,075.35	2,210,135,859.02	84,557,986.90	174,750,276.50

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I did not say that the withholding of the subsidy was a criminal offense. What I said was—and I am sorry the Senator from Utah is not going to listen to me, apparently——

Mr. MURDOCK. I will listen, Mr. President.

Mr. TYDINGS. What I said was that a man who is charged with violation of the O. P. A. regulations, if proven guilty, has committed a criminal offense. Under the Constitution he is entitled to a trial, and as a matter of law, without a trial he cannot be condemned by someone here in Washington for having violated the O. P. A. regulations. I hope I have made my position plain. This has nothing to do with withholding subsidies. The only reason why a subsidy could be withheld, to use the Senator's own illustration, would be that the dealer has been violating the regulations and the laws of the country, in which event he has committed a criminal offense. If he engages in black-market activities, and is found guilty, he ought to be punished. He ought to be afforded every right that every other citizen has. But the case ought to be submitted to and tried in a court of law, and not passed upon ex parte by someone in Washington who has the power of life and death over an industry.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana attempts to give the individual all the things he should have as a matter of right under our laws and Constitution up to the time the Government takes legal action. From that time on a prima facie case is at least made out.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I do not quite follow the Senator's logic in his argument, because if we are going to stand on the Constitution there is more than one constitutional provision, and the mere filing of a charge has never, under Anglo-Saxon law, been any evidence of guilt at all.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree.

Mr. HATCH. On the contrary, the presumption of innocence is just as strong as the right of trial by jury.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator is willing to deny the presumption of innocence on one hand, but wants a trial by a court on the other hand——

Mr. TYDINGS. No; not at all.

Mr. HATCH. I want to know what the Senator's position is.

Mr. TYDINGS. My position is that, as a matter of right, the Government has no right to withhold the subsidy until a man is proven guilty. But a subsidy is not a matter of right under our Constitution. It is a privilege given to a citizen by his Government.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. And the withholding of the subsidy is not an action or a prosecution for a criminal offense.

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not say it was. I have never contended that it was, and I stated just a moment ago that the man who was charged with violating the O. P. A. regulations by dealing in the black market was charged with a criminal offense, but that a bureaucrat in Washington could not say he was a criminal until it had been ascertained in a court of law that he was such.

Does the Senator from New Mexico take issue with me on that summation of fact?

Mr. HATCH. I still do not follow the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. Well, let us suppose that——

Mr. HATCH. Let me finish first.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well.

Mr. HATCH. The bureaucrat the Senator is talking about could arbitrarily withhold the subsidy.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. If he is that type of man, he could simply arbitrarily file a bill of complaint in a court.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is now talking about something else. I am trying to check him up first on his misinterpretation of a statement which he thinks I made; I wish to do that first before we proceed further. I said if "Gyp the Blood" or "Louie the Blond," or whatever his name may be, is receiving a subsidy, and has been dealing in the black market, before he can be convicted of dealing in the black market his case must be put to the test in the courts.

Mr. HATCH. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator agree or disagree with me on that?

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will answer my question, I will allow him to ask me one, and my answer will be more direct than obviously his answer to me is going to be.

Mr. HATCH. No; I will answer the Senator directly without any hesitation and without any equivocation. Before "Gyp the Blood," or whoever he may be, can be convicted of violating a criminal statute all the constitutional privileges and safeguards should surround him.

Mr. TYDINGS. There we are agreed.

Mr. HATCH. Is there anything under the present law which would cause "Gyp the Blood" to be convicted of a criminal offense without benefit of a trial by jury?

Mr. TYDINGS. The very amendment which is at issue here imposes a penalty upon him without conviction, namely while everyone else in America could receive a subsidy, John Brown, a farmer in Colorado, or Michigan, or Maryland, who is thought to have violated the O. P. A. regulations, cannot receive it, even though he has never been tried.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

Mr. TYDINGS. Wait a moment. If that is not a sentence, to be deprived of the privileges which everyone else in America enjoys, simply on the suspicion of some head man in a bureau in Washington, then I do not know what it is.

Mr. CHANDLER. If we deny the subsidy, does not that take away the presumption of innocence from him?

Mr. TYDINGS. It takes away the presumption of innocence from him. Not only does it take away the presumption of innocence from him, but he is penalized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Then, should not the amendment go further and provide that no subsidy shall be denied until a man has been charged, tried, and found guilty by a jury of his peers?

Mr. TYDINGS. I think that is sound law, and I should not object to it. However, a subsidy is not a matter of right per se. It is an encouragement given by a government in time of war to stimulate the production of some particular article or commodity. If there has been abuse of the subsidy, I can see that the Government might rightfully want to use it as a set-off until such time as the Government's suspicions are proved to be founded or unfounded, as a matter of business. If I owed the Senator from New Mexico $100, and I had a business deal with him by which I thought he owed me $100, I would refuse to give him my $100 until he proved that he was going to pay me the $100 that was owing me.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely want to say that I am not a member of the committee. I have not studied this question or the amendment. I simply became interested in the remarks which were being made about the Constitution.

Mr. TYDINGS. I knew that without the Senator telling me.

Mr. HATCH. That is quite true. But it proves, Mr. President, what the able Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] has been arguing, that a question of this kind ought to be submitted to the proper committee, considered, and a report made to the Senate by those committee members who are familiar with the subject, who have studied it, and have received testimony of witnesses on it, rather than by an amendment of this kind offered from the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is something to be said for that, but I think this is so A B C in its simplicity that we can decide it here on the floor.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland, after the great speech he made a week or ten days ago on the subject of manpower, tell the agencies involved where they can obtain the additional manpower to deal with the difficulties they would have imposed upon them by the adoption of this amendment? And then also will he agree, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, when the agencies come in and ask for the additional funds necessary to carry out efficiently the burdens which the Senator is willing now to impose on them, to vote for additional funds?

Mr. TYDINGS. That question, Mr. President, is so involved my answer is "Yes" and "No."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Black market practices are not isolated cases where someone simply sells something above the ceiling price or buys something below the ceiling price; they are day-by-day practices which are indulged in by men who

deliberately seek to violate the law and break down the barriers which we are seeking to preserve.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. When a man is charged in an indictment with an offense, specific instances must be cited in the indictment. The indictment must set forth the time, place, and all that. Would the Senator advocate the principle that anyone engaged in black market practices from day to day, and against whom an indictment is brought in the Federal court for violating the rules and regulations in some particular case, should nevertheless be permitted to draw his subsidy? He might not be tried for 3 or 4 months, or 6 months. Notwithstanding the indictment, and notwithstanding the fact that he could not be convicted or acquitted for 5 or 6 months, does the Senator believe that he still ought to be permitted to draw his subsidy?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator did not hear me. I offered an amendment to take care of that situation, by suggesting to the Senator from Montana that if the matter were in court, the subsidy could be withheld; but in all cases which were not in court, subsidies should not be withheld. Unless the Government felt that it had a strong enough case to submit to a trial in court, in my judgment no one should have the right to tell a citizen, because of mere suspicion, that he could not get the subsidy.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator knows that—

Mr. TYDINGS. I have answered the Senator by saying that in the particular case he mentions, I agree with him. What is the next question?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not only in matters involving O. P. A. regulations, but in all matters of violations of law, there are probably ten violations for every indictment brought to trial in court.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should say 100.

Mr. BARKLEY. Perhaps there are as many as 100. So in dealing with a matter such as this, when a man deliberately breaks down the barriers which we have undertaken to erect, it presents to my mind a serious question as to whether the power of the Government to deal with the violation should depend upon whether the man is actually indicted and taken into court.

Mr. TYDINGS. An injunction could be obtained against him.

Mr. BARKLEY. We talk a great deal about bureaucrats. It is a popular indoor sport to talk about bureaucrats; but these things are not handled in Washington. They are handled by whatever force the Government has in the field. All the investigations are made in the field by such force as the Government has, and it is inadequate.

Mr. TYDINGS. When someone writes to a Senator, it then becomes a Washington matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. People do not write to Senators until they get into trouble. It is not the enforcement officer who writes to a Senator. It is the man against whom the enforcement officer is proceeding. My observation is that there is very little we can do in Washington, and perhaps very little we ought to do, in order to help a man avoid observance of these regulations.

Mr. TYDINGS. My position is not opposed to the premise laid down by the Senator from Kentucky. My position is that if the Government has commenced a proceeding in a court of law against a citizen, partnership, or corporation, from that time on the Government is within its rights in withholding the privilege of a subsidy. But up until the time the Government is willing to put its findings to the test of a verdict in court, it seems to me it is not within the power of anyone in the Government to show discrimination among citizens on mere suspicion.

Perhaps the power would not be abused, even without the amendment of the Senator from Montana. However, in my contact with the Government during the war I have encountered two or three cases in which the guilt or innocence of the accused was a matter of speculation. During a certain period the subsidies were withheld. I did not follow those cases through to find out whether the persons accused were ultimately found guilty or innocent; but, assuming that they were ultimately found innocent, it would have been wrong to have withheld the subsidies prior to the time when the Government commenced legal action.

I do not care particularly about the amendment, except that the wisdom and fairness of it, as modified, appealed to me. I rose because I did not think the Senator from Utah had made out any kind of a case against the merit of the argument. If we must send a simple amendment like this to a committee, it does not speak very highly for the present membership of the Senate, particularly those who are present, because it is too simple a matter to spend more than a year deciding.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency is now holding hearings every day on the extension of the O. P. A. law. I do not know whether the committee will limit itself to a mere extension of the law, or whether the original law may be amended. However, the committee is now meeting daily and holding extensive hearings on the extension of the law for a year and a half. It would not involve much delay to go before that committee and present the matter.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that this is a limitation on an appropriation, and the very place to put it is in this bill, where it belongs. This has nothing to do with the fundamental concept of the O. P. A. law, as I understand it.

Mr. BARKLEY. This is not altogether an appropriation bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is an authorization bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I wish to make an observation with reference to the statement which the distinguished Senator from Maryland made about my argument. If he was hopeful that I would attempt to answer the constitutional argument, all I can say is that in my opinion it is so inapplicable to anything with which this amendment has to do that I do not think it is worthy of an argument.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, without expressing any opinion on the amendment, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland if he believes that any bureaucrat who might reach an arbitrary and capricious determination would hesitate to write out a complaint and file it in court. If he should do so, as I understand the Senator's amendment to the amendment, the subsidies could be immediately stopped. So I do not believe that very much protection would be thrown around a citizen who might be innocent, by imposing a mechanical duty upon the O. P. A. bureaucrat, as the Senator chooses to call him.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think it would be a great restraining influence. I believe that many officials might withhold the subsidy if they did not have to put the charges in writing and bring the matter into court; whereas if they had to go through the formal procedure of filing a complaint in court, it would act as a tremendous deterrent.

I am glad the Senator from Connecticut raised the point, because it proves more clearly than anything I said that what we want is a deterrent against abuses, rather than the exercise of any particular function of the O. P. A. regulating authorities. The amendment would act as a deterrent.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I must disagree with the Senator, because my experience with the enforcement division of the O. P. A. leads me to believe that some of the officials who might reach the determination that a violation had been committed would not hesitate to swear to a complaint and file it in court.

Mr. TYDINGS. I still believe that it would act as a deterrent.

Mr. McMAHON. Not to any great extent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Maryland. I would go even further. I agree also with the Senator from Utah, that we must have some enforcement of the law. I appreciate that 999 persons out of 1,000 who have been actually charged in court are probably black-market operators, and have violated the O. P. A. regulations. I know of a case in which a man was found innocent, but in the meantime his business was wiped out. I do not know what can be done about that. Perhaps I should introduce a private claim bill. There is not much we can do.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should advise the Senator against that course, because at least 25 years would be required to get it through both Houses of Congress. By that time his constituent would be not only broke, but dead.

Mr. MAGNUSON. At least we can go far enough on this subject to say to the O. P. A. that we condemn the abuse of such power. The shortage of manpower is what creates the abuse. The cases cannot be examined as well as they should be examined. A man representing the O. P. A. in the field may say to his fellow bureaucrat who is paying the subsidy, "I think you had better go easy with company A. They have violated the

O. P. A. rules. We are checking upon them. We are making an investigation." It seems to me that we should say something which would deter those officials from holding their own star-chamber proceedings. If there is an actual violation and they have a case, they can go into court. In most cases the violator will probably be taken to court.

This sort of thing is happening all over the country, particularly out in the field. Sometimes personalities are involved. The officers of company B, who do not like company A, may know someone in the O. P. A. They may say, "We think our competitor is violating the O. P. A. regulations." An investigation may be started, and in the meantime company B will find its subsidies withheld, and then it will be out of business.

Of course, what the Senator from Maryland has said is correct. No one is saying that one who violates the law should not be prosecuted, but in many cases the effect of accusing him of crime is to force him out of business.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Probably in many cases no crime at all is involved. All that would happen would be that payment of the subsidy would be suspended until a thorough investigation was made and until there was a determination as to whether a violation of the rule or regulation had occurred. The violation might not involve a crime.

I think the important point to consider is that in the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency we had testimony not only by men whom some Senators like to call bureaucrats——

Mr. MAGNUSON. We might call them administrators.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. But I call attention to the fact that after Chester Bowles and other men of his caliber—men who, in my opinion, are serving our country today at a sacrifice—come before the committee and say there is not enough manpower in the country to do the present job, and after the committee also hears from volunteer workers who present the picture of hundreds of persons in Washington and thousands of persons throughout the United States who are volunteering their help in order to hold the line on price control, when Senators thereafter rise in the Senate Chamber and glibly state that the matter is a very simple one and that we are denying some constitutional right to a man because we allow a subsidy to be withheld, in my opinion they are greatly adding to the burdens of the O. P. A. Increased burdens on the O. P. A. involving additional manpower and additional appropriations simply should not be imposed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, Mr. President, I entirely agree with the Senator from Utah. No one is questioning the integrity of Mr. Bowles or of 99.44 percent of the members of his organization. I am merely endeavoring to protect a man, whether it be "Gyp the Blood" or someone else, from having the O. P. A. be the judge, the jury, and the prosecutor in the case.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The word "bureaucrat" is a mark of opprobrium only in the minds of the guilty. "Bureaucrat" is a perfectly inoffensive word which is to be found in Webster's Dictionary. Some may consider it as being synonymous with "democrat," and in the best society even the appellation "democrat" is occasionally regarded as a slur. Mr. President, a bureaucrat is simply one who works from a bureau.

Of course, we have gone rather far afield in this discussion. I can sympathize with the sponsors of the amendment, in view of the fact that the opposition to it is so far devoid of any logical argument that its opponents have fallen back on the procedure of name-calling, for lack of any other resource. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I assume we are all trying to do the same thing. But some of us wish to have the O. P. A. proceed somewhat carefully before it suspends the payment of subsidies prior to a determination of whether a man has violated the law. After all, we have to maintain some semblance of observance of the rights guaranteed by the Constitution, without regard to who the individuals concerned may be.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. If one of the distinguished administrators of a Government agency—

Mr. TYDINGS. That is right; we should call them administrators.

Mr. CHANDLER. If one who heads a bureau were to tell a committee that there is not sufficient manpower in the country to take care of his duties, and if I were a member of the committee, of course I would not believe him.

On the other hand, situations which actually have occurred have been pointed out today, and that is why I am in favor of adoption of the amendment. A presumption of innocence goes with a man until he has been proved guilty of having violated the law. In many instances—not merely a few—subsidies have been arbitrarily withheld, because of suspicion of violation of regulations, from persons who otherwise would have been entitled to receive them.

I agree with the Senator from Maryland that a man is not paid a subsidy because it is a privilege granted to him by his Government under certain conditions. The authority to withhold its payment is not lodged in the head of any Government bureau.

Mr. TYDINGS. The law does not provide, in effect, "Pay this as you see fit."

Mr. CHANDLER. No. He does not have any right arbitrarily to determine whether it shall be paid. As the Senator from Maryland has said, if he withholds it on his own whim or caprice, and if later the man is found not guilty, it is too late to resume payment of the subsidy because in the meantime the man has been completely broken; he has lost his money or his business.

As I see it, the amendment is a rather simple one. It would simply ask an administrator to be cautious and to take time. No harm can be done by taking time because I understand that the courts are kept open in order to try to take time in considering charges before persons are convicted. The courthouses have many empty witness rooms——

Mr. TYDINGS. And plenty of empty seats.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes; they have numerous empty witness rooms and empty chairs due to the present disposition of manpower, not the shortage; there is no shortage of manpower.

I think we should at least adopt this simple amendment. I do not think any harm can result from its adoption.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in presenting the amendment I had no idea that such a controversy would be precipitated. It seems to me that the amendment is a simple one. It has received more consideration today in the Senate than it would have received if it had been presented to a committee.

I think the purpose is plain and clear. The amendment is simply for the purpose of preventing arbitrary action by an administrator or his subordinates in denying to a citizen payment of a subsidy, to which he is otherwise entitled, because the administrator may believe that such person may have violated some regulation. If the administrator believes that the person is operating in the black market—as has been mentioned by several Senators this afternoon—all the administrator would have to do would be to file a charge against him. That would result in having payment of the subsidy immediately suspended.

It seems to me the amendment is a very simple one, and it should be adopted.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I think the discussion has clearly shown that there is a difference of opinion regarding the effect of the amendment, regardless of the views expressed by the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] and the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

For that reason, I move that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, for its consideration. That will enable the amendment to receive the consideration it merits, and to be reported in connection with other legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not understand that such a motion is in order.

Mr. CHANDLER. I make the point of order against the motion that it is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

The question is on the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Montana, as modified, to the committee amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I like the intent of the amendment, but I should like to have a survey made and testimony taken regarding the extent to which, and the circumstances under which, such subsidies and benefits are withheld. On the basis of such a study I think we could draft an amendment which would maintain proper control over such practices, or which possibly

would eliminate them altogether, if that should be indicated.

Therefore I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Was the point of order sustained?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was.

The question is on the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Montana, as modified, to the committee amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. I shall ask for a division, but pending that I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	O'Daniel
Austin	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hart	Overton
Ball	Hatch	Pepper
Bankhead	Hawkes	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hayden	Reed
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Brewster	Hill	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Burton	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Bushfield	La Follette	Taft
Butler	Langer	Taylor
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McClellan	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	McMahon	Vandenberg
Cordon	Magnuson	Wagner
Donnell	Maybank	Walsh
Downey	Millikin	Wheeler
Eastland	Mitchell	Wherry
Ellender	Moore	White
Ferguson	Morse	Wiley
Fulbright	Murdock	Willis
George	Murray	Wilson
Gerry	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. May we have the amendment stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the committee amendment it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

No Government officer or agent shall have discretion or authority to deny or withhold payment of sums relating to the production or sale of agricultural or other commodities (including livestock and meat) to any currently eligible person, firm, or corporation through executive set-off for any disputed claim, or as a penalty not specified by statute, or otherwise, except in cases pending in court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment to the amendment, and a division has been requested.

On a division, the modified amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill (S. 502) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments and certain purchase and sale operations by corporations created pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to call the Executive Calendar.

TREATIES

The legislative clerk proceeded to read Executives A and H (78th Cong., 2d sess.).

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is obviously too late to proceed to the discussion of the treaty at this hour. I ask unanimous consent that it be temporarily laid aside, without prejudice, in order that the noncontroversial nominations on the calendar may be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams to be Administrator.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is obvious that that nomination will have to go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be passed over.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Foreign Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Service nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Foreign Service nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc. That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be at once notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order that Senators may know what the program is for tomorrow, I intend to move an adjournment today, so that we will have a morning hour tomorrow, and when that shall be concluded, I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. We have cleaned up the business on the Legislative Calendar, so our legislative program is in good shape. We will proceed at once to consider the executive business.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does that mean that we will proceed with the consideration of the treaty?

Mr. BARKLEY. The treaty is the unfinished business on the Executive Calendar, and is the pending business.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 16, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 15 (legislative day of March 12), 1945:

FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Richard Ford
Robert F. Fernald

TO BE CONSUL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Forrest K. Geerken

POSTMASTERS

MASSACHUSETTS

Eugene Matheson, Ipswich.

MICHIGAN

Gunile Heldmann, Chatham.
Henry Swaffield, Sterling.

OKLAHOMA

Harry N. Patterson, Grandfield.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 15, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art the source of all being, whose glory flames from sun to star, lead us to worship Thee in spirit and in truth. We would seek to learn the lessons in the school of life which are set forth in the teaching of Thine Apostle—peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, and temperance. O bless us with these graces of the spirit, beautiful in the home, helpful in daily toil, and bear no harsh words of envy or strife.

Solemnly, quietly, let Thy words fall through the day and night as they come from the hills of God. O let them echo near and far where opposing forces meet until nations see through the sophistry of wrong and vicious standards. Through the lens of love for God and man, may all master the spirit of

brotherly kindness. In the great emergencies which will come to the future course of our country, grant that our land may be a noble anchor, made strong by sacrifice and trial, holding the world amid the breakers of war and hate. In the name of Him who liveth and reigneth forevermore. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 1752) entitled "An act to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House, agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. BURTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 41]

Anderson, Calif.	Gardner	Madden
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gordon	Mott
Barrett, Pa.	Granger	Patrick
Bates, Mass.	Hagen	Pfeifer
Boren	Hall,	Rayfiel
Case, N. J.	Edwin Arthur	Robinson, Utah
Chapman	Hébert	Rooney
Clevenger	Heidinger	Sikes
Combs	Henry	Slaughter
Curley	Hobbs	Smith, Maine
Daughton, Va.	Izac	Taylor
Dawson	Johnson, Ill.	Thom
De Lacy	Johnson,	Thomas, N. J.
Dirksen	Lyndon B.	Vursell
Domengeaux	Kearney	Weaver
Doyle	LeCompte	Weiss
Eaton	Luce	West
Ellis	McKenzie	White
Fuller	McMillan, S. C.	Wood

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the grounds upon which he desires to be heard on the question of personal privilege.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, my claim to the right to address this House on a point of personal privilege is based on the statement of Columnist Drew Pearson this morning in which he called me a "hogger of the handball courts in the House gymnasium." This is a reflection on me in that it asserts that I take unfair and unjust use of privileges and the facilities for the Members of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it is a very close point, but the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, first I want to read to you the article to which I refer that appeared in Drew Pearson's column this morning:

Representative "CURFEW EARL" WILSON, Indiana Republican, is best known to the public for having urged a curfew for Government girls and complaining because they take a few minutes out for coffee or a soft drink. To his Congressional colleagues, however, he is best known as a hogger of the handball courts in the House gymnasium. The other day WILSON was delivering a long tirade against the Veterans' Administration. The House was almost empty.

Only Representative JERRY VOORHIS of California sat at the Parliamentarian's desk correcting a speech he had delivered earlier. Suddenly Speaker SAM RAYBURN sent a page boy to VOORHIS and asked him to step over to the Speaker's dais so he could have a word with him.

"Jerry," suggested RAYBURN, "why don't you correct your remarks out in the cloakroom? Then WILSON won't have anyone listening."

VOORHIS looked around and saw the House Chamber completely empty. He walked out to the cloakroom. WILSON ranted on for 5 or 10 minutes, talking to no one. Then Majority Whip ROBERT RAMSPECK, of Georgia, came in to move for adjournment.

Now, there is an old saying, "It is better to be cussed than neglected."

Frankly, I would rather have Drew Pearson cuss me any day than have him neglect me. But, for the sake of keeping the record straight, I have a few comments to make. There is an old saying also, "When a stone is thrown, the dog that yells the loudest is the one that is hit."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before he gets into that?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Can the gentleman tell us who it is connected with the House or with the House organization who has the privilege of the floor of the House who could report a remark made by the Speaker to Mr. Pearson?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir; I can do that, and I will gladly do that for the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I hope the gentleman will, because if we have keyhole peepers around here, I think we ought to know.

Mr. WILSON. The man is none other than my fellow Hoosier from Rockport, Ind., who is now Doorkeeper of the House. Does that satisfy the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It does not satisfy me. But I am glad to have the information. I recall not long ago when the Republicans had a conference, much of the proceedings that took place at the conference were reported by Mr. Drew Pearson. We wondered whether it was some Republican who was at the proceedings or whether it was some House employee who was listening in. I would like to know who is listening in on the conferences and sessions.

Mr. WILSON. Now, I have been hurling a few stones of late, and I have incurred the enmity of a pack of arm-chair, day-dreaming New Deal stooges. One of those stones must have struck a tender spot on one Drew Pearson, a man whom President Roosevelt labeled "a chronic liar."

I quote an article which appeared in the Washington Star on December 1, 1943:

Columnist Drew Pearson published an allegation that Secretary of State Hull and other State Department officials had an anti-Russian attitude and wanted to see the Soviets bled white.

This brought from President Roosevelt the assertion that the writer-radio commentator was a chronic liar in his column and that such journalism hurt the press of the Nation. Secretary of State Cordell Hull called him a man of—and I quote—"monstrous and diabolical falsehoods."

That is taken from the Times-Herald of January 26, 1945.

In debate in the other body last April, Mr. Pearson was referred to as a "character assassin, a skunk, an infamous lying scoundrel, and a polecat of journalism."

Vice President TRUMAN referred to this columnist as, and I quote:

One who would not have room on his breast if he had a ribbon for every time he had been called a liar.

I quote in part statements from a distinguished gentleman from the other body which appeared in the RECORD of April 25, 1944, on page 3683, referring to Drew Pearson. I quote:

Really, he is an ignorant ass.

In answer to Pearson's charges that this distinguished gentleman of the other body was a mountaineer, the Member replied:

Only a blatant jackanapes would have made a point of that.

He further referred to this so-called columnist, the gentleman calls him:

Just an ignorant liar, a pusillanimous liar, a peewee liar, even though he is a paid liar.

The gentleman further stated:

His further statement is that I am famous for my patronage. That is simply a willful deliberate, malicious newspaperman's lie out of whole cloth.

Not long ago, this so-called columnist, this character assassin, undertook to assassinate the character of President Roosevelt. The President was compelled to denounce him:

Pearson makes his living by making sensational lying statements about men in high office, and I regard Members of the Senate as men in high office. He actually makes his living that filthy way.

In fact, in the same CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 25, 1944, on page 3684, another distinguished Member of the other body recalled the fact:

That on one occasion General MacArthur, one of our heroes of the Pacific, sued Mr. Pearson for libel.

Another member of that distinguished body described Pearson as a "revolving liar."

I do not know whether the Speaker of the House of Representatives is guilty of what Drew Pearson charged him with being guilty of or not, but I quote Pearson:

The Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, of the House called a Member over and asked him to vacate the floor of the House.

This resulted in unfavorable publicity going out over the country in regard to a Member who was addressing the membership of this House on the care and welfare of veterans of the last World War. My speech is in the RECORD. My speech speaks for itself. If that type of criticism is due me and should be directed at me by the Speaker of the House, why do not you gentlemen, in the name of common decency and respect for this body, bring in a resolution expelling me from the House of Representatives? I beg of you to do that. If I am worthy of those remarks, if I merit the remarks, if my conduct has been out of order in this House in any way, for God's sake bring in a resolution and get me out of here. I beg of you to do that.

This is an Associated Press release that went out and this is my first quarrel with the press. I have defended the press. God pity us when the press is bribed and cannot speak freely. I have defended them on pensions for Congressmen. I will defend them, right or wrong, to remain free to speak. But sometimes there may be intentional emphasis put on things to make them misleading.

I do not know why this was done, but here is the subject of the dispatch that went out:

SPEECH IS SHORT, AUDIENCE SHORTER

WASHINGTON, March 9.—Representative EARL WILSON (Republican, Indiana) spoke 15 minutes in the House yesterday on Veterans' Administration legislation and held 100 percent of his audience for 13 minutes.

The listeners were: One Republican page on the floor, six gallery doorkeepers, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, and four newspaper reporters. The page was called to the telephone in the thirteenth minute of the address.

Now that is all right. I am not criticizing the Members of Congress. I have an editorial from my State paper, the Indianapolis Star, which defends me and to some extent takes Congress over the coals and says it is uncomplimentary of Congress to have business transacted with only two Members on the floor of the House. Mr. Pulliam, editor and publisher, is one of our most respected citizens and always means right but he does not know that we had had a long, tiresome legislative day, and it is not unusual for the membership of this House to leave as early as they can at the conclusion of the regular business of the day and go to their offices and do the work that they have to do—that routine that has to be checked over every day; and then to return home if at all possible in time to get a warm dinner and spend a few hours with their family; and I am for it. I uphold and respect the membership of the House for that. I am going to defend them for leaving the floor of the House.

When I was asked by a veteran of the last World War if I could not help out in getting an investigation of the Veterans' Administration, I felt it my duty and obligation to do so, because I have always been interested in the care of our veterans. I think that goes for every Member of this House. I think you are all interested in the care of our servicemen. I asked the gentleman when he would like to have me do that, and he said "today."

I said:

There are some other previous special orders, and we have a very heavy legislative day. There will not be anybody on the floor of the House.

I did not expect anyone to be there, and I certainly felt that if the Members wished to after a hard day's work they should feel free to leave once the business of the day has been completed. He did not want to extend it. He wanted me to read it into the RECORD. Now, I am very glad that I did read it into the RECORD, for I did not expect anyone in the House, and least of all the Speaker of the House, to go so far out of his way as to ask a Member to leave the floor in order that the House be empty, which resulted in this unfavorable publicity on me and Members of this body.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Has there been any proof that the Speaker did that thing?

Mr. WILSON. There has not. I have only Drew Pearson's statement that he did. I am assuming that the Speaker did not do that, and if he in turn calls Drew Pearson a liar, that will make it unanimous. I have the utmost respect for the Speaker of the House. I think he is a fine gentleman, and that goes for all the Texas delegation as well as other Members from the South.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. He is an able Speaker and a fine gentleman. A number of us have been intrigued here to know what is meant by this man's being a "revolving liar"; does the gentleman have a definition?

Mr. WILSON. My definition would be a liar anyway you look at him—and 24 hours around the clock, 365 days a year, 366 days in leap year.

Mr. SHAFER. And from all angles.

Mr. WILSON. Yes; and from all angles.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. As I understood the gentleman, he made some reference to the effect that the Speaker made the statement about the Member of the House in order that this unfavorable publicity could go out; even if the Speaker made that statement, does the gentleman know that it was for that purpose?

Mr. WILSON. No.

Mr. JARMAN. I am asking, does the gentleman know?

Mr. WILSON. Whether or not he made the statement for that purpose will be determined by the reactions of the Speaker.

Mr. JARMAN. As I understood, the gentleman made a positive statement, and I am asking if he knows it is correct.

Mr. WILSON. If I did make that statement, I did not intend to because what I have said since has been to the contrary.

Mr. JARMAN. Does the gentleman believe that the Speaker did make that statement for the purpose only of having unfavorable publicity go out about the gentleman or any other Member?

Mr. WILSON. Honestly, I do not feel that he did. I think I made that clear just a few minutes ago.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Let us get this clear. The only thing the gentleman referred to was the statement in Mr. Pearson's article that the Speaker did that. Does the gentleman believe the Speaker did it? I do not believe the Speaker did it.

Mr. WILSON. I am not going to comment on that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield this once, but I must proceed from here on my own remarks.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. With reference to another thing the gentleman has brought out, I think it would be a good thing for the country generally to understand that special orders are granted on a request that they follow the legislative business of the day. The editor of the Indiana paper from which the gentleman quoted in the editorial made some reference to the legislative session. I do not remember the exact words. Then the editor was under the impression that when legislative business was being transacted there were only two people present. That of course was not the case. The gentleman had a special order.

Mr. WILSON. Obtained that day following other previously granted special orders.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And all of those orders were based on requests that they follow the legislative business of the day, that the Members having the special orders would not be recognized until the legislative business of the day had been transacted.

Mr. WILSON. That is correct. I do not think it is at all out of order for Members to leave the floor of the House at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day to take care of their own private and personal affairs.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not a fact, however, that what happened to the gentleman happens to a great many of us who have special orders following the legislative business of the day?

Mr. WILSON. I think it is true, and I think it is perfectly in order for them to do so.

I do appreciate the effort of our distinguished editor of the Indianapolis Star to defend the publicity which was given me in Indiana. I want to read the editorial to the Membership of the House. It is entitled "Legislative Travesty." It is from the Indianapolis Star, issue of March 13, 1945:

Readers of the Star may have chuckled over the Associated Press story describing a 15-minute address in the House by Representative WILSON of Indiana on Veterans Administration legislation. His audience consisted of Speaker RAYBURN, four newspaper correspondents, six gallery doorkeepers, and a lone Republican page.

It may have seemed funny to some. But it wasn't. Two Members were in the House Chamber at a regular session and 433 were somewhere else. The public knows, of course, that most of the business of this rather unwieldy body is transacted in committee.

That fact does not excuse absence of almost the entire Membership. No pressing matters may have appeared on the calendar, but, so long as a session was held, more than a single Member besides the Speaker should have attended.

A major reason for the rise of dictatorships in Europe was the collapse of parliamentary efficiency in a welter of irresponsible parties. America, fortunately, adheres to the two-party system. Excusing those who may have been attending committee meetings, conducting investigations or indulging a fondness for political junkets or private speechmaking, at least a reasonable group of those on the Nation's pay roll should evince enough respect for congressional prestige to put in an appearance.

Mr. Speaker, I have already given my answer to that. I am entirely on the side of the membership of the House. I realize how busy they are and the necessity for the Members being in their offices to do work there.

Another distinguished Member of the other legislative body stated that, and I quote, "Drew Pearson is the biggest and most notorious liar in America today. Not only is Pearson recognized as being the biggest liar, but he is also recognized as being the most perfect smear artist of the press and radio. He will go down in history as Drew Pearson, the sponge, because he gathers slime, mud, and slander from all parts of the earth and lets them ooze out through his radio broadcasts, and through his daily contributions to a few newspapers which have not yet found him out."

That will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 12, 1945, page 2010.

The late Hon. Phil A. Bennett, a former Member of this body, referred to Drew Pearson as telling "a barefaced falsehood." That will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 87, part 9, page 9943.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this ruthless, double-barreled, diabolical, puerile liar, Drew Pearson, has attacked me in my efforts toward eliminating overstaffing, inefficiency, and misuse of manpower. The Navy Department has admitted the loss of too many man-hours due to these practices. It has been admitted by authorities in the Navy Department that my efforts a few years ago toward getting the employees on the beam have saved the taxpayer hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers of this land have gone down the line in the last 2 weeks and have paid into the coffers of the United States millions of dollars of their hard-earned cash.

So far as a curfew was concerned, that word is the feather in my story to the American people which made my story fly. I put the barbs in it which made it stick and I have since received thousands of congratulatory letters in regard to my remarks.

I am receiving them every day two or three at a time, but that does not make any difference. That does not entitle Drew Pearson to determine whether or not I am fitted to serve as a Member of this Body. It is up to the House of Representatives and it is up to my electorate. I may say right here that I am the third Republican since the Civil War to carry the 14 counties I represent and the only one who was ever reelected. I was reelected once by an increased majority and I was elected last year by an increased majority and only once in history did even a Democrat carry my district by a larger majority than I carried it last November.

In regard to the statement, "He is best known as a hogger of the handball courts in the House gymnasium," I can honestly say that I have never seen a handball, I have never played handball in my life and do not even know the difference between a handball game and any other ball game.

I do play paddle ball as regularly as I can, for I gained 35 pounds the first year I was up here and my doctor advised this exercise. For Drew Pearson's information there are two paddle ball courts and 90 percent of the time enough Members cannot be gotten together for a game. That should prove conclusively to any reader or listener that the charges made against Pearson by me and many other Members of this august body are correct in that he is a liar, preceded by many uncomplimentary adjectives, and is really everything he has been called and more. I will gladly pay any man $1,000 who can prove that I was ever engaged in a game of handball.

Now, I refer to Mr. Pearson's charges that the Speaker of this body was instrumental in vacating the House of Representatives, which made it possible for the press to write the story that WILSON spoke to an empty House.

But I have talked about that, so I just have one or two more brief comments, and I will insert the rest of my remarks in the RECORD. However, I think the American public is entitled to have the information which I have here in a clipping from the Washington Times-Herald dated January 26, 1945. This clipping is in regard to the sponsors of this man Pearson, the smear artist of all smear artists. Let us see what Pearson advertised and what has been the court action and the judgment against that company:

The manufacturers and distributors of Serutan, a laxative, who sponsor the radio smearbroadcast of Drew Pearson, were found guilty yesterday by the Federal Trade Commission of unfair and deceptive advertising practices which injure the public.

The Commission issued a cease-and-desist order requiring Health-Aids, Inc., of New Jersey, to stop the dissemination of false advertisements which represent Serutan as a cure or remedy for constipation. The company was given 60 days to file a report showing compliance with the order.

The radio blurbs on the laxative found false by the F. T. C. precede and follow Pearson's Sunday night broadcasts. The Washington columnist has been designated "a chronic liar" by President Roosevelt and the author of "monstrous and diabolical falsehoods" by former Secretary of State Hull.

In debate in the Senate last April, Pearson was variously described as "a character assassin," "a skunk," "an infamous, lying scoundrel," and "a polecat of journalism."

Yesterday's action was the climax of more than 4 years of effort by the Commission to curb law violations by the laxative manufacturing corporation and "Dr." Victor H. Lindlahr, editor of the Journal of Living, 1819 Broadway, New York City, who has appeared on the radio program with Pearson.

Based upon a wealth of medical testimony from leading physicians, the Commission found that Serutan consists of equal parts of rice polishings and psyllium seed which acts as a mild irritant upon the intestinal walls.

I am wondering if Drew Pearson's daily diarrhea of the mouth is not caused by taking too much of his own medicine which constantly irritates this condition.

It is not a cure for constipation, as claimed by the distributors, and possesses no therapeutic value in the treatment of constipation, the findings stated.

The order also prohibits advertising through the mails or on the radio which represents that "Serutan" (a trade name coined by spelling "natures" backward) will promote normal or regular action by the digestive or elimination organs, will strengthen these organs or stimulate them.

"The use by respondents of the false, deceptive, and misleading representations with respect to the product Serutan," the Commission stated, "has the tendency and capacity to mislead and deceive a substantial portion of the purchasing public into the erroneous and mistaken belief that such false and misleading representations are true, and as a result the purchasing public is induced to purchase substantial quantities of such product.

"The aforesaid acts and practices as herein found are all to the prejudice and injury of the public and constitute unfair and deceptive acts and practices in commerce within the intent and meanings of the Federal Trade Commission Act."

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Education sometime ago set the date of April 10 to begin hearings on the bill H. R. 1296, the Ramspeck bill, generally referred to as the Federal aid to education bill.

In view of the fact that it is generally expected that we will have a recess beginning probably about the 24th of this month and lasting until the 10th or 15th of April, the committee at the request of and in concurrence with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], the author of the bill, has agreed to change the date of the hearings from April 10 to April 24. I thought this announcement should be made now in view of the fact that the press has carried stories regarding these proposed hearings and that many Members have been receiving correspondence in that connection.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2126) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the

Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Messrs. SNYDER, KERR, MAHON, NORRELL, HENDRICKS, POWERS, ENGEL of Michigan, and CASE of South Dakota.

DETERMINATION AND PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF MEXICO

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) relative to determination and payment of certain claims against the Government of Mexico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 5 of the Settlement of Mexican Claims Act of 1942, approved December 18, 1942 (56 Stat. 1058), is amended by adding a new subsection numbered (d) and reading as follows:

"(d) In any case in which the Commission shall enter an award, it shall, as soon as practicable, certify such award to the Secretary of the Treasury."

SEC. 2. Section 5 (d) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Commission shall, upon the completion of its work, transmit in duplicate to the Secretary of State and to the Secretary of the Treasury the following:

"(1) A list of all claims disallowed;

"(2) A list of all claims allowed, in whole or in part (together with the amount of each claim and the amount awarded thereon); and

"(3) A copy of the decision rendered in each case."

SEC. 3. Section 8 (c) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, out of the sums covered into the fund pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, and after making the deduction provided for in section 10 (b), to make payments on account of awards and appraisals certified pursuant to section 4 (b), 4 (c), and 6 (b) of this act, prior to the date of the enactment of the Settlement of Mexican Claims Act Amendments of 1945 of an amount not to exceed 30 percent of the award or appraisal in each case, exclusive of interest; and, on and after July 1, 1945, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, out of the sums covered into the fund pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, and after making the deduction provided for in section 10 (b), to make an additional payment on account of awards and appraisals certified pursuant to sections 4 (b), 4 (c), and 6 (b) of this act prior to the date of the enactment of the Settlement of Mexican Claims Act Amendments of 1945, of an amount not to exceed 10 percent of the award or appraisal in each case, exclusive of interest."

SEC. 4. Section 4 (b) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) In connection with such cases, the Commission shall, as soon as practicable, notify each claimant, or his attorney, by registered mail to his last-known address, of the appraisals so made. Within a period of 30 days after the mailing of such notice, the claimant shall notify the Commission in writing whether the appraisal so made is accepted as final and binding, or whether a petition for review will be filed as provided in subsection (c). If the claimant fails to so notify the Commission in writing within such period, or if the Commission is notified within such period of the final acceptance of such appraisal, it shall, at the expiration of such period, enter an award on the basis of such appraisal: *Provided*, That if the Commission's efforts to notify the respective claimants, or their attorneys have failed to disclose their whereabouts, the Commission may, at the expiration of a period of 30 days from the date of the enactment of the Settlement of Mexican Claims Act Amendments of 1945, enter an award on the basis of such appraisal."

SEC. 5. Section 2 (d) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The authority of the Commission under this act, and the terms of office of its members, shall terminate at the expiration of 4 years after the date on which a majority of its members first appointed take office, but the President may by Executive order fix an earlier termination date. Upon the termination of the authority of the Commission, all books, records, documents, and other papers in the possession of the Commission shall be deposited with the Department of State."

SEC. 6. So much of section 8 (d) of such act as precedes paragraph (2) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) On or after July 1, 1945, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, to the extent that it may be possible to do so out of the sums covered into the fund pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, and after making the deduction provided for in section 10 (b)—

"(1) to make similar payments of not to exceed 40 percent on account of the principal amount of the awards certified pursuant to section 5 (d) of this act."

SEC. 7. Section 4 (c) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In any case in which the Commission is so notified in writing that a petition for review will be filed, the Commission shall prescribe a reasonable period, which may be extended in the discretion of the Commission, within which such petition, together with written legal contentions in support thereof, shall be filed. If no petition for review is filed within the period or any extension thereof prescribed by the Commission, it shall enter an award on the basis of the appraisal in such case."

SEC. 8. This joint resolution may be cited as the "Settlement of Mexican Claims Act Amendments of 1945."

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATIVE TO COTTON

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 336) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) authorizing the special committee of the Committee on Agriculture, designated by the chairman to study post-war plans for agriculture, particularly as related to cotton, to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the special committee of the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, designated by the chairman to study post-war plans for agriculture, particularly as relate to cotton, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,500 additional copies of the hearings held before the said special committee during the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE BILL (H. R. 2200), TOGETHER WITH ACCOMPANYING REPORT THEREON

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably without amendment (Rept. No. 337) a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 33), authorizing the printing of additional copies of the bill (H. R. 2200) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure", together with the accompanying report thereon; and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed 1,150 additional copies of the bill (H. R. 2200) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure", together with the accompanying report thereon, of which 200 copies shall be for the use of the House document room, 200 copies for the use of the Senate document room, and 750 copies for the use of the Committee on Revision of the Laws, House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE ITALIAN FRONT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Italian front most persons pass by these days without a glance.

That peninsula whose V-shaped peaks terminate almost at the water's edge—of both the Adriatic and the Tyrrhenian Seas. Swift, short rivers dash seaward from the icy peaks, cutting valleys down both slopes of the "spine." These valleys and their ridges must be crossed. Those swift streams must be forded. Every conceivable path of progress is "zeroed in" with deadly 88's and hellish 81 millimeter mortars—all the way back to the Brenner Pass, Salerno, the Rapido, the Volturno, Cisterno, and Cassino. And then a rest. The "rest" was called the Anzio beachhead. Some day we will know the full, true story of the Anzio beachhead.

Rome was liberated the day before the Allies landed in Normandy. The fighting has been equally tough on both fronts. But on the one there has been the glory of the break-through at St. Lo, the destruction of the German Seventh Army in the Falaise pocket, the liberation of Paris, the stand at Bastogne, the hammering back of Von Rundstedt's Belgian

bulge—and, now, the bridge at Remagen. No more glory on the Italian front.

But death is just as rampant and just as ugly there. Fox holes are just as frozen. Mud is just as deep. American blood reddens soil and river alike with the same dye.

It is on the Italian front that, with but equal numerical strength, General Clark and his men are not only containing 27 to 28 German divisions; containing them far from the Remagen bridgehead, but pushing back, ever back, the so-vaunted Wehrmacht.

Lest we forget—a thought—a prayer—words of praise for our American sons of freedom's "forgotten front."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker may send to General Clark and his officers and men an appropriate message from the House of Representatives, congratulating them on their victories and their bravery, and that we of the House of Representatives realize and appreciate, with complete understanding of its great significance, the great work they are performing on the front on which they are engaged, and appreciate the valuable contributions that they have made, that they are now making, and will continue to make, to the early and successful termination of the war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REPORT BY CONFEREES ON BILL CONTINUING COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill (S. 298) continuing Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States Government be given until 12 o'clock midnight to file a report.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us when he intends to call up this conference report?

Mr. SPENCE. We will meet at 4 o'clock, and I suppose we will call it up tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman intends to bring it up tomorrow in the House?

Mr. SPENCE. We intend to bring it up tomorrow if we complete it tonight; yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROE of Maryland asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and make a brief statement on the manpower situation and include a letter from one of his constituents.

Mr. COFFEE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in two instances on two topics, and in one to include newspaper articles.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COFFEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the appendix of the RECORD, first to include a resolution filed by Thomas Dorgan, clerk of Superior Court of Boston, with the Massachusetts Legislature; and, secondly, to include a newspaper item.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein certain statements from Clark C. Griffith.

THE MARINES' ISLAND: IWO JIMA

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a House joint resolution to provide that the island of Iwo Jima shall hereafter be known as the Marines' Island. This official recognition of the bravery displayed by the Marine Corps in the historic and crucial battle just ending is but a slight expression of the profound gratitude of the American people for their remarkable achievement. Its passage by the Congress would express, as perhaps no other official action might just at this time, our appreciation for the courage of our men and their devotion to duty under circumstances unparalleled in history.

Iwo Jima has such special significance that it would seem appropriate to give it immediately a name that would be a constant reminder of this bright chapter in the Marine Corps' history and a perpetuation of what our fighting men did to acquire and hold this strategic piece of land. This proposal is not my own but was originated by my friend, Mr. C. N. Rainwater, of Little Rock, Ark. I am glad to embody the idea in a resolution and trust it will receive prompt approval.

When I first discussed this suggestion with a high ranking officer in the Marine Corps he agreed that a new name would be appropriate, but that the name should also be identified with the Navy, which must be credited with gallantry at Iwo, but I believe that there will be other ways of honoring the Navy and that the men of that great branch of our service would agree in this instance that the marines, having borne the brunt of the fighting and having sacrificed so heavily the lives of their men, should have this special recognition. In that spirit I offer the resolution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the New York County Lawyers' Association.

Mr. NEELY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the railroad men's paper Labor of March 10.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Matthew Woll.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Matthew Woll.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include letters from constituents.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RAMEY (at the request of Mr. HORAN) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem by one of his constituents.

REVISION OF CRIMINAL CODE (H. R. 2200)

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 seconds to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I should like the membership of the House to know that on Monday, when the Consent Calendar is called, it is my intention to ask thot the bill (H. R. 2200) to revise, coordinate, and enact into law title XVIII of the United States Code on Crimes and Criminal Procedure be passed over without prejudice.

A resolution just adopted by the House authorizes the printing of additional copies of the bill and the report thereon. When these copies are printed they will be available to all Members interested.

AT HIS SIDE

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise nd extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FLOOD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

AMERICANS BETRAYED

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. POWELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PVT. CLIFTON JARNIGAN

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JENNINGS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Frank Kent.

Mr. POWERS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address given by Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial on the bread crisis.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Miles City Daily Star.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I expect to make in the Committee of the Whole and to include therein certain excerpts and certain material in tabular form.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a letter addressed to Hon. Chester Bowles, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I regret to have to inflict myself twice upon the Chair, but I find that the article which I previously received permission to extend in the RECORD exceeds the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that it will cost $117. Notwithstanding the estimate I ask unanimous consent that I may extend this article.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the estimate, without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial relative to Maj. Paul Douglas, and an article from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Chicago Considers Its Parks for Public—Not for Tourists."

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the termination of the Canol project.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article and an editorial from the Army and Navy Journal.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next I may address the House for 30 minutes following the legislative business of the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next I may address the House for 15 minutes following the legislative business of the day and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization may sit during general debate on Tuesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND THE FEDERAL LOAN AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2303) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and the Federal Loan Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 2603, the State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill, 1946, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, as we all know, for several years and until quite recently the Honorable Jesse Jones, a very distinguished Texan, was in charge of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. That position is now held by the Honorable Fred Vinson, a former colleague of ours. Without regard to political affiliations, I am sure we all have the very highest respect and esteem for each of these gentlemen.

I think it pertinent at this time to place in the RECORD information with reference to the history and operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was created in January 1932, with a capital of $500,000,000, appropriated by the Congress, and a borrowing authority, with Government guaranty, of $1,500,000,000. In 1941, $175,000,000 of the capital was retired and the funds paid back to the Treasury. The borrowing authority has been increased from time to time until it now stands at something in excess of $14,000,000,000 for general purposes, and in addition, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out certain specific functions such as loans for rural rehabilitation, farm tenancy, rural electrification, preferred stock of banks and insurance companies, funds for War Damage Corporation, and so forth.

The $14,000,000,000 operates as a revolving fund.

Total authorizations by the R. F. C. for all purposes have been $46,500,000,000, of which approximately $10,000,000,000 was found not to be needed, and canceled. Total disbursements for all purposes have been a little more than $28,000,000,000. Receipts and collections from all sources have been $17,500,000,000. The major portion of the amount still outstanding was for war expenditures.

R. F. C. now owes the Treasury $9,200,000,000. Of this amount, approximately $8,000,000,000 was borrowed for general purposes, including war work, and approximately $1,000,000,000 for specific purposes, for which additional borrowing power is provided by statute. This leaves approximately $6,000,000,000 available borrowing authority for general purposes.

Authorizations and commitments exceed the above amount, but a great many of them will not be needed, and will be canceled. Current receipts from collections, sales, rents, and so forth, are very substantial, and will largely meet these commitments and future requirements, including presently contemplated subsidies.

In addition to this remaining borrowing authority, R. F. C. or its subsidiaries have agreements from the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission that, upon request, these Departments will ask Congress for funds to reimburse the R. F. C. for its net investments in the plants and facilities which are built or acquired at the request of those departments, together with interest at 1½ percent per annum, after deducting rentals received from the contractors.

Following is the amount of such takeout letters broken down as to sponsor, dollar amount of letters, and amount received to date:

Sponsor	Amount of letters	Amount received
War Department	$3,900,000,000	$1,056,000,000
Navy Department	648,000,000	278,000,000
Maritime Commission	102,000,000	1,500,000
Agriculture Department (including Commodity Credit Corporation and War Foods Administration)	18,500,000	
Total	4,668,500,000	1,335,500,000

Leaving a balance due the R. F. C. from this source of $3,332,910,000.

Defense Supplies Corporation also has agreements from the War and Navy Departments that, if requested to do so,

they will reimburse the Corporation for extraordinary costs paid by it in moving petroleum and petroleum products from the South and West to the eastern seaboard, for such products as are purchased by the War or Navy Departments, or by contractors engaged in construction or manufacture for these Departments.

Many plants have been built at the request of the War and Navy Departments, and leased to the operators at a dollar a year, for use in production directly for the Government or Government contractors. In such cases the contractor was not allowed to add anything to this cost for plant and facilities. Rent has been charged on other plants built at the request of the War and Navy Departments or the War Production Board.

Of all loans, investments and advances, except those to other Government agencies, R. F. C.'s own war activities, and $286,000,000 to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, which is fully secured by American investments, there remains outstanding only about $1,050,000,000.

Following is a break-down of this amount—the figures are approximate: $130,000,000 for industrial loans; $16,000,000 to banks in liquidation; $112,000,000 for self-liquidating loans; $37,000,000 to drainage and irrigation districts; $322,000,000 for preferred stock of banks and insurance companies; $164,000,000 for mortgage loans; and $270,000,000 to railroads.

Most of these loans and investments will be liquidated within a reasonably short time. Thus you will see that the peacetime purposes of the R. F. C. have been met.

After paying its own operating expenses from earnings, including interest on the money it has borrowed to lend and invest, and after making ample allowance for losses on loans and investments, other than those that will come from war activities, everything that the R. F. C. has done in its more than 13 years of operations in rebuilding the banking structure of the country; in making credit available to business and industry; in its loans to railroads constituting two-thirds of our entire railroad mileage, and which kept most of the roads out of receivership; and in otherwise stabilizing credit for all purposes, has been accomplished without any cost whatever to the taxpayer, but at a profit of almost half a billion dollars to the Government.

While profit was not the motive, careful and economical administration of the Corporation's affairs has made this possible.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to our colleague on the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, during my entire service here I have never been charged with indulging in unwarranted platitudes; but having served on this committee now for 5 or 6 years, and having observed the actions and work of its chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], and the activities of the ranking member of the minority, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], I want to state for the RECORD that you will hardly find another committee with two men who have agreed more often on all great fundamental questions than the delightful and congenial gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] and the highly cultured and able gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. It is not unusual for friends to disagree on many subjects, but it is a little unusual for friends belonging to different political parties to agree so often. I would, therefore, like to see the RECORD show that there is not a committee where you will find greater cooperation between the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member than you will find on this subcommittee handling the appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce.

On yesterday our able chairman, Mr. RABAUT, presented to the House full and complete justifications for the appropriations carried in the bill now before us; therefore, I shall endeavor to avoid repeating the information furnished and confine my remarks to a discussion of the functions and activities of only two of the agencies provided for in the bill. I refer to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Bureau of Prisons, both in the Department of Justice.

We regret the necessity for both of these agencies, but I am glad to call attention to the efficiency records of each. The functions of the Federal Bureau of Investigation are to detect crime, to apprehend criminals, and carry them into the courts where penalties for their crimes are imposed. The primary function of the Bureau of Prisons is to take charge and see that the prisoners receive the penalties imposed and are properly cared for.

THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

The work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has undergone many radical changes in recent years, and its responsibilities have increased tremendously.

At the beginning of the fiscal year 1935 the F. B. I. had a total personnel of 1,035 employees, of which number 493 were special agents handling the numerous general criminal investigative matters under its jurisdiction. At the present time its staff numbers approximately 11,000 employees.

We all remember the crime wave which swept the country in the early thirties. Kidnaping, bank robbery, extortion, and other such crimes were every-day occurrences. The Federal Government was powerless to prosecute criminals for such crimes, but realizing the necessity for prompt action to combat this rising wave of lawlessness, Congress passed the so-called crime bills in 1934 giving the Federal Government jurisdiction over such crimes. Included in these laws were: The Federal Kidnaping Act, originally passed in 1932, was strengthened and amended; the extortion statute; the bank-robbery statute; the unlawful-flight statute; and others.

With the passage of these laws, investigative jurisdiction being placed within the F. B. I., it was encouraging to watch the decline in such activities. In swift succession the long arm of justice, through the medium of the F. B. I., cleansed the country of the worst types of criminals ever known. The Dillingers, the Bradys, the Barkers, the Pretty Boy Floyds, the Karpises, and others were killed or apprehended. Law-abiding citizens again could breathe easily, since a most lucrative racket by graduates of crime had been definitely brought under control. Kidnapings declined. Of a total of 273 such cases reported to the F. B. I. for handling, only 2 remain unsolved. Bank robberies declined, due to the investigative work performed by special agents of the F. B. I. During the fiscal year 1934, 417 such robberies were committed; but 10 years later the fiscal year 1944, only 37 bank robberies were reported. Recognizing this changed condition in 1936, insurance companies reduced bank-robbery insurance rates 20 percent in 25 States. Two years later 46 States reduced such insurance rates by 10 percent, and 1940 certain States reduced the rates from 16 to 25 percent, due to the lessening of the risk of bank robberies. The same effect was shown as a result of the F. B. I.'s work in its investigations of other crimes under its primary jurisdiction. During the ensuing years Congress passed many other statutes increasing and enlarging upon the jurisdiction of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The National Bank Act was amended in 1935. The Kidnaping Act was again amended in January of 1936. In 1938, with the war clouds gathering on the European Continent and elsewhere throughtout the world, Congress, realizing the necessity for this country to be adequately prepared to properly prosecute individuals whose ideologies were those of the enemy, passed certain laws prohibiting the making of photographs, sketches, or maps of vital military and defense installations and equipment. A year later the Registration of Agents of Foreign Principals Act was passed. It became evident that war would be inevitable. It was necessary, therefore, that our Government be properly equipped to protect its citizens during the critical period ahead. The President in a directive dated September 6, 1939, requested all local law-enforcement officials to cooperate with the Federal Bureau of Investigation and made public an announcement at that time that the Federal Bureau of Investigation was to head investigations of espionage, sabotage, and related matters. The President in his directive stated:

> This task must be conducted in a comprehensive manner on a national basis, and all information must be carefully sifted out and correlated in order to avoid confusion and irresponsibility. To this end I request all police officers, sheriffs, and all other law-enforcement officers in the United States promptly to turn over to the nearest representative of the F. B. I. any information obtained by them relating to espionage, counterespionage, sabotage, subversive activities, and violations of the neutrality laws.

Thus the Federal Bureau of Investigation was given jurisdiction over the in-

ternal security of our country during the critical war period. It became increasingly evident that our country was passing through a most critical period in its history. Those who later proved to be our mortal enemies already began their plans to conduct espionage and sabotage activities throughout our country. Our war industry being employed for the benefit of the then United Nations was doing an excellent job. Sabotage could be expected, and those having every qualification to complete such sabotage were already being trained to enter our country and to sabotage our war industry.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation, through a survey of our industrial plants, had pointed out the shortcomings in the protective armor of these plants. Protective facilities were installed. More careful supervision was afforded working conditions and habits in our plants; and, as a result, not one case of foreign-inspired sabotage has as yet been completed.

It is well known to all of us that the Axis enemy had sent to our country by submarine trained saboteurs for the sole purpose of sabotaging our war effort. In the spring of 1942 eight such saboteurs arrived on our shores. They were promptly apprehended, tried by special military tribunal, and six condemned to death. The other two received long prison sentences.

Only recently the German high command again endeavored to land two saboteurs and espionage agents on our shores. These two men were apprehended and they, too, have been convicted by military tribunal and sentenced to death. The Federal Bureau of Investigation has successfully combated and completely broken the espionage rings which had been set up by a methodical and ruthless enemy to secure information of military, naval, and internal security nature for transmission to their principals for the purpose of slowing down our war effort. The work of the F. B. I. in this regard can be best explained through a reading of the war years.

In the fiscal year 1942, 37 individuals were convicted of espionage. In 1943, 19 such individuals were convicted. In 1944, there were 13 such convictions, and during the present fiscal year 3 convictions have been had. The F. B. I. tells us there are no organized groups of Axis espionage agents present in the country today.

Another of the investigative activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is well worth mentioning; that is, the work done by that Bureau in investigating violations of the Selective Training and Service Act. Since the act was passed on October 16, 1940, it has not been necessary nor has Mr. Hoover permitted any of the so-called mass slacker raids which we all remember from the First World War. Almost a half-million individual selective-service cases have been handled to completion. More than 8,000 conscientious objector cases have been handled. During 1944 alone agents of the F. B. I., through their investigation of selective-service matters, located registrants in over 49,000 cases, such registrants subsequently complying with the act. Over 10,000 inductions were effected and more than 5,000 individuals who were willfully violating the act were prosecuted and convicted.

We can be eternally thankful to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for his foresight in building his organization to the point where when danger has threatened our country, both within our borders and without, it was not found wanting but was able to effectively and efficiently combat and defeat those forces of lawlessness.

Even during the darkest of the war period the F. B. I. has warranted the confidence and continued support of law-abiding citizens throughout our country. Not only in the investigative field have they protected us for both domestic and foreign enemies within our shores, but through their many technical and scientific facilities they have been of tremendous assistance to the country. Its Identification Division now contains over 95,000,000 sets of fingerprint records. The majority of the work being handled there is directly connected with the war effort. They have been able to identify many of our unknown dead, whose identities due to battle conditions could not otherwise have been made known, through fingerprint identifications. The Identification Division of the F. B. I. stands as a bulwark against those who have Axis ideologies and desire to enter into any of our war industries, since the fingerprint records of those given such consideration are cleared through the F. B. I. before final employment is made.

In the Technical Laboratory of the F. B. I., the scientists are continuously conducting scientific investigations of sabotage, espionage, counterespionage, and other related activities. Through the efforts of these scientists and technicians, the security of our country has been better guarded.

I have known for many years of the close cooperation between agents of the F. B. I. and local law enforcement. Mr. Hoover in 1935 convened the first session of the National Police Academy which has continued to grow until now more than 900 police officers have attended and graduated from this academy. Under the Presidential directive that I mentioned, the F. B. I. was designated as the coordinating agency in local law enforcement mobilization. We are told that approximately 40,000 police officers attended training and conference sessions held under the auspices of the F. B. I. during the past year. This has done away with the jealousies which had formerly existed between local, State, and Federal law enforcement officers. At the present time, there is an understanding between those officers—the local, State, and Federal—as to their needs and their responsibilities. They are all working toward a common goal—the better protection of our homes and our families. Law enforcement has truly reached the status of a profession during the past decade, and we can expect in the future continued close cooperation between all law enforcement officers in this country.

The F. B. I. is probably the largest and most efficiently organized law enforcement unit in the world and its efficiency and success is a growing inspiration to municipal and State law enforcement officers throughout the Nation. The day is already here when no one can plan the violation of a law and expect to escape apprehension, and when those who have criminal designs fully understand they can expect nothing less than certain apprehension and know there will be no possible way to escape paying the penalty for their offenses, crimes in this country will be reduced to a minimum, which is the goal and objective of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I have been convinced, as have my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee and as have all of you, concerning the many stories that are being circulated concerning the increase in crime, particularly among our juvenile population. There is an increase—a startling one, and one which leads me to state that we must be alert to our responsibilities and do everything within our power to place effective yet just curbs on the growing problem of juvenile delinquency. Mr. Hoover has advised your committee that as a result of crime reports received in the Federal Bureau of Investigation from law enforcement agencies throughout the country, there is a startling over-all increase in arrests of youths under 18 years of age when we compare the war year with the last year before the war, 1941.

During the calendar year of 1943, from reports which have already been received and tabulated, there was an over-all increase in the arrests of girls under 18 years of age by 134.4 percent and an increase of 21 percent for boys. Many of the increases reflect a break-down of morale, character, and fiber of the children involved. Robberies have increased, as have larcenies, burglaries, prostitution, rape, murder, manslaughter, and other crimes in a like category. During the calendar year 1944 males aged 17 lead in the frequency of arrests, and thereafter closely followed are the ages 18, 19, 21, and 16. There has been a further increase of crimes of violence for the arrest of boys 17 and under increasing 14.5 percent for offenses of criminal homicide and felonious assault. During the first 9 months of the calendar year 1944 persons under 21 years of age were responsible for 35 percent of the robberies, 35.8 percent of the larcenies, 42.3 percent of the burglaries, and 53 percent of the automobile thefts.

We must bear in mind also that many juveniles taken into custody are not fingerprinted due to the practice being followed in certain jurisdictions of not fingerprinting youthful offenders.

As I have stated, we must take stock of the juvenile delinquency problem. Those boys and girls growing up today, reaching the state of manhood and womanhood, are the same as those who have grown up in past generations and who will grow up in our future generations. It is the responsibility of their elders to see that the minds and bodies of these children are properly molded so that they develop into useful law-abiding citizens rather than developing into careers of crime. The breaking

down of home influences is one of the greatest contributing factors. We must have crime prevention rather than detection alone, as Mr. Hoover expressed it before our committee. It is our responsibility in every community in the country to see that our children and our children's children have adequate recreational facilities; that they have proper educational and religious facilities to assist them in growing into citizens who will be a credit to the community rather than a liability. The problem of crime prevention, the problem of reduction in juvenile delinquency, is one for our local communities. We know best in our home towns and in our cities and in our neighborhoods as to the needs of our children. We know best the pitfalls which are available and which will beckon these youngsters if we in the home and we in the educational councils do not assume our responsibilities. I do hope that through the years, more and more emphasis will be placed on the return of the home circle of parental care, love and discipline for in this way I feel that much of the so-called juvenile delinquency will be eliminated, for it is my opinion that for every case of juvenile delinquency there is a greater crime—that of adult delinquency in those adults not assuming their responsibilities to properly guide and mold the characters of their children.

During the hearings on the appropriation bill for the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the fiscal year 1946, which bill is now before you, the members of the committee were advised that there is no slackening of crime in the country today. The Axis enemy has redoubled his efforts to infiltrate his agents into our country, into our war industry and into our armed forces. It is essential that our soldiers of the home front, the special agents of the F. B. I., be continually alert to counteract and defeat any such activities. Many cases and many types of crimes, which have arisen out of the war period, are continuing in increasing numbers. Cases of war fraud are being referred continuously to the F. B. I. for handling. Many millions of dollars will be saved for the Government and the citizens of our country through such investigations. We have in this country more than a quarter million Axis prisoners of war. There are escapes from the prisoner of war camps in considerable number. For the first 6 months for the fiscal year 1945, 847 such escapes were made and it has been necessary for the agents of the F. B. I. to investigate and apprehend, with the assistance of local law enforcement, such escaped prisoners. In the regular investigative field, there is continued activity. For instance, for the first 6 months of 1945, 12 kidnaping cases were reported to the F. B. I. and all were solved. Considerable activity is developing in violations of the impersonation statute. Many pseudo war heroes are continuing the vicious practice of mulcting trusting citizens some of whom are parents of our men in the armed services. Thousands of dollars are being fraudulently secured by such impersonators, and it is necessary that every possible step be taken by the F. B. I. to hold such activities in check.

Many extortion cases are still being handled. Thirty-four individuals were convicted of extortion in the first 6 months of this fiscal year. The crime of bank robbery has shown a slight increase, and it is essential that every possible step be taken to quickly and efficiently eliminate this undesirable trend. Hijacking gangs are springing up throughout the country, and as material and produce become scarcer in sections of our country, shipments traveling in interstate commerce are hijacked by these gangs. They are a desperate type of criminal and would not hesitate to use force and violence to gain their ends. There has been more than a hundred-percent increase in this type of crime during the past year. During the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1945 there were 694 individuals apprehended, tried, and sentenced for such crimes. There are increases in violations of the White Slave Traffic Act, the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act, illegal wearing of uniforms and increases in the antitrust and antiracketeering investigations, and many other such investigations. It is essential, therefore, that the present operating investigative staff of the Federal Bureau of Investigation be maintained intact.

The F. B. I. has a tremendous responsibility to the citizens of our country. The pattern of the next generation will in some measure be cut as a result of the unceasing vigilance of law enforcement in this country which has been coordinated under the able direction of Mr. Hoover. We cannot remove from battle half of our troops when victory is in sight. Any false sense of security against the criminal on the home front which would result in the loss of a single special agent from his present duties would be ruinous. We must keep this force intact. We have already seen the tendency for an increase in criminal activities. It is known that our juvenile-delinquency problem is great. We must remove the diseased branches from our tree of life. We must keep it healthy, and we can only do this by having an efficient and loyal agency whose every effort is directed toward service to its fellow citizens rather than service to itself.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

It is interesting to note in connection with the appropriation for the Federal Bureau of Prisons the fluctuations in the population of these institutions, but it is only natural to expect an increase somewhat in proportion to the increased work and activities of the F. B. I.

On March 1, 1935, there were 19,649 Federal prisoners in custody, of whom 14,181 or 72 percent were in Federal institutions and the remainder in State and local institutions—mainly local jails. Ten years later, on March 1 of this year, total Federal prisoners numbered 22,085, or 12 percent increase, and 18,952 of them, or 86 percent were in Federal institutions.

You may ask why the Federal prison population is higher today than it was 10 years ago in view of wartime prosperity and the diversion of thousands of men to service in the armed forces. We can only suggest some of the reasons. It will be found that the Federal prison population, like those of the States, decreased during the early years of the war, but is now moving upward. This is largely due to the commitment of large numbers of violators of special wartime laws and of military prisoners sent to civil prisons by Army courts martial. On last July 20, a fourth of the prisoners in Federal prisons were violators of the Selective Service Act, and another eighth were violators of such other wartime laws as the O. P. A. regulations, illegal wearing of the uniform, sabotage, espionage, and so forth.

On March 1, 1935, the Federal Bureau of Prisons operated 19 institutions; today it operates 27. Unlike 10 years ago, it delegates the responsibility for the treatment and custody of about 800 of its narcotic-drug-addict prisoners to the United States Public Health Service Hospital, Lexington, Ky. The Bureau of Prisons institutions as of March 1, 1935 and 1945, have been classified as follows:

	1935	1945
Total	19	27
Penitentiaries	6	6
Reformatories	5	6
Correctional institutions and detention headquarters	4	8
Prison camps	3	6
Medical center	1	1

You will note that the number of institutions in two of these groups has doubled during the past 10 years—institutions the Bureau formerly referred to as Federal jails but now called correctional institutions and detention headquarters, and prison camps. The increase in the number of correctional institutions reflects Director James V. Bennett's and his predecessor, Mr. Sanford Bates', consistent efforts to develop diversified types of institutions to make it possible to provide adequate penal treatment for all kinds of offenders, the hardened felon, as well as the young first offender. After all, it is the beginner in crime and especially the one who will be back in free society in a few months upon whom efforts at rehabilitation should be expected to yield greatest dividends.

This diversified system of penal institutions, especially the prison camp system, has interested me very much. There are now six of these small institutions which appear to the outward glance very much like the civilian conservation camp with which you are familiar. The camps house inmates serving short sentences who might otherwise be compelled to spend their time in jails in idleness and perhaps in company with hardened offenders. The total capacity of these prison camps at the present time is 1,185 prisoners. Most of these prisoners are draft violators who allege re-

ligious or conscientious reasons for refusing to comply with the Selective Service Act. The camp inmates are required to work on various projects like highway construction, leveling and grading airfields, and on food-raising projects. These camps are inexpensive to construct, costing about $1,000 per inmate as compared with the cost of constructing a penitentiary which prior to the war ran to about $3,000 per inmate. In other words, it costs three times as much to house a man in a permanent prison as it does in one of these camps. Moreover, it is the opinion of prison authorities that these camps are most helpful in promoting the rehabilitation of the inmate. They provide stimulating work activities and make it possible for a gradually increasing amount of trust to be placed in the prisoner.

It is the policy of our committee to encourage the development of these camps as fast as trustworthy inmates can be found. We are in accord with the policy of the Federal Director of Prisons to build institutions of this type wherever possible. Unfortunately, many of the prisoners who have been sentenced for violation of many of the wartime statutes and by Army courts martial are of such a desperate character and have been given such long sentences that it is impossible to commit very many of them at this time to these camps, but for the ordinary moonshiner and short-term violators of the Federal statutes they are quite satisfactory and their use should be expanded wherever possible.

When considering the long-term program of the Federal Bureau we must take into account the possibility of the increase in the amount of crime at the conclusion of the war. It is greatly to be hoped, of course, that we can avoid a post-war crime wave and I do not think we have to accept the conclusion that a large increase in crime is inevitable. Many people argue that our soldiers who have learned to kill Japs and Germans, drive jeeps and airplanes at breakneck speed and deal daily in death, cannot adjust easily to the humdrum pace of civilian living, but we can, I hope, forestall post-war lawlessness by measures similar to those approved when we enacted the G. I. bill of rights. Much, I believe, can be done toward avoiding a resurgence of crime after the war. But if it comes, the Federal Bureau of Prisons can do its part by expanding its prison camp system and continuing to devote every effort to rehabilitating the offender; and even though it does cost an average of about $2 a day for guarding, feeding, and to clothe and train a prisoner, it is money well spent if he can be kept from committing another offense. If we can bring up the entire standard of prison operations, revise and modernize court and sentencing procedures, enlist the help of the community in the prevention of crime, we can, I believe, keep the amount of crime within reasonable bounds. It is a job to which we must give increasing attention and understanding. The Bureau is requesting $16,550,000 to carry on its work this next year. The F. B. I. is requesting $8,000,000 for its regular or normal functions and $27,829,000 for expenses under its national defense program. That is, this fearful thing we call crime is costing the taxpayers of this country upward of $50,000,000 this next year to maintain these two agencies I have been discussing. It is a situation that presents a great problem to the American people—a problem that cannot be shifted from one to another—it is a problem that confronts all, every true American citizen from top to bottom; individually and collectively we must meet the situation successfully or suffer the consequences. We cannot shift the responsibility by saying, "We should increase our school facilities"; we can no longer justify our indifference by suggesting that most crimes are committed by the poor and ignorant, despite their contributing effect.

Mr. Hoover, Director of the F. B. I., testified before our committee, saying that for the year ending June 30, 1944, special agents of his Bureau alone apprehended 14,695 persons charged with some criminal offense and out of this number 13,616 convictions were obtained. Under the Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1938 we are told that only one National Training School for Boys has been established and in speaking of the educational background of juveniles committed to this institution during the fiscal year 1944 with sentences of more than 1 year, Mr. Bennett submitted a table showing the extent of the training received.

Educational background of juveniles committed to Federal institutions under the Juvenile Delinquency Act during fiscal year 1944, with sentences of more than 1 year

	Number	Percent
Grade school:		
Completing first grade	5	0.8
Completing second grade	15	2.3
Completing third grade	12	1.9
Completing fourth grade	37	5.8
Completing fifth grade	57	8.9
Completing sixth grade	88	13.7
Completing seventh grade	124	19.3
Completing eighth grade	149	23.2
Total (number completing)	487	75.9
High school:		
Completing first year	94	14.7
Completing second year	40	6.2
Completing third year	12	1.9
Completing fourth year	3	.5
Total	149	23.8
No Schooling	5	.8
Total with educational background reported	641	100.0
Schooling not reported	5	
Grand total	646	

One outstanding fact gathered from the testimony justifying the appropriations requested in this bill, as we have already pointed out, is the increasing wave of juvenile delinquency throughout the country. I regret I do not have comparable figures for other years, but the table below showing the number of arrests between January 1 and June 30, 1944, of persons under 15 years of age, together with persons from 15 to 20 years of age, will show there is what many of us would consider an alarming number of violations of the law by our younger people.

Arrests, by age groups, male and female, Jan. 1–June 30, 1944

Offense charged	Age							
	Not known	Under 15	15	16	17	18	19	20
Criminal homicide	4	9	12	34	65	74	51	59
Robbery	4	20	39	204	456	484	395	330
Assault	9	16	38	221	376	535	469	449
Burglary—breaking or entering	3	627	476	1,325	1,619	1,311	815	605
Larceny—theft	12	432	392	1,213	1,910	1,715	1,297	1,053
Auto theft	4	155	274	814	1,013	892	622	419
Embezzlement and fraud	2	8	13	54	107	150	120	116
Stolen property; buying, receiving, etc	2	9	1	38	66	66	54	50
Arson		13	10	17	19	17	9	10
Forgery and counterfeiting		14	26	60	110	116	118	95
Rape		11	20	90	215	198	219	164
Prostitution and commercialized vice	2	6	8	59	116	289	328	249
Other sex offenses	6	11	24	91	165	241	219	216
Narcotic drug laws		1		1	6	15	23	31
Weapons; carrying, possessing, etc	3	5	7	94	151	170	112	118
Offenses against family and children	1			11	23	42	53	88
Liquor laws	5	2	12	36	58	70	71	80
Driving while intoxicated	13	2	6	22	65	72	105	102
Road and driving laws	2		3	36	123	124	90	81
Parking violations						1	1	
Other traffic and motor-vehicle laws	2	2	14	67	117	129	131	95
Disorderly conduct	11	34	74	280	658	895	788	734
Drunkenness	41	6	34	138	426	637	661	661
Vagrancy	14	43	85	387	997	1,344	1,179	894
Gambling	2	7	5	40	92	113	106	97
Suspicion	20	228	268	805	1,509	1,302	1,127	925
Not stated	1	3	7	22	67	78	62	48
All other offenses	18	631	564	1,069	1,310	1,063	842	697
Total	181	2,295	2,412	7,228	11,839	12,143	10,067	8,469

It was observed further from the hearings that, while a large percentage of these boys and girls come from broken homes, a considerable number come from what are referred to as the best homes in the country. When the Director of Prisons, Mr. Bennett, was presenting this matter in his testimony we inquired if he had any suggestions to offer as to the cause and solution of this growing juvenile-delinquency problem to which he replied:

Well, Mr. Congressman, I think you are quite right in saying that a number of persons who are getting into Federal courts for violation of Federal laws come from fine

homes where there is a lack of discipline, where the child has been overprotected by one member of the family or another. It seems to me that our experience under the Selective Service Act has shown that the overprotected child, or the mother that overprotects her child, is almost more of a menace to her children than is the negligent mother. It is hard to choose between the two. There ought to be neither.

It seems to me that we do not lay enough stress on the fact that perhaps some of the measures we are taking to keep youth under control nowadays need reexamination. Some of the things we have been advocating perhaps need reconsideration.

I have no single or easy solution. I do not think there is a solution to the problem of juvenile delinquency any more than there is to the problem of crime. It is a perplexing problem which must be attacked from from many angles.

I do feel that we can do more than has been done. If we can arouse right-thinking individuals to study this problem and do some of the things we know will help, then perhaps progress can be made. It is a matter of interest on the part of the parents and the community in the future generation.

When you trace it back you will find that at boyhood that boy had a lack of proper training, either a broken home where divorce entered into it, or a failure on the part of the parents to assume their responsibility for guilding the child in the proper religious and educational and moral training. My answer is that the home has the first responsibility; the other factors can and will aid and assist.

Mr. Hoover, head of the F. B. I., who has also given long and careful study to this problem, was asked if he would express his views as to the cause and solution of the increase in juvenile delinquency and he replied as follows:

My thoughts are these. You cannot replace home training with school training or religious training. In other words, home influence is breaking down. I have on many occasions indicated that I would prefer to refer to juvenile delinquency as adult delinquency because the responsibility rests upon adults, and these youngsters, as you see through this country, are not getting proper home training and discipline in the first instance.

Our schools and our churches step in bearing the brunt of the burden. They are substitutes for home training. They just cannot fully take the place of proper home training.

I believe that prevention should be the keynote as against detection. Prevention must start, as I say, with the home, aided and assisted by the schools and churches, by civic activities and recreational facilities. It is basically a local problem. I have always been averse to any so-called Federal direction dealing with juvenile delinquency as an over-all picture—yes, to help and to coordinate, but basically it is a community problem.

I think that juvenile delinquency goes back to the home on almost every occasion. I have found that to be the case when I have examined these criminals after arrest. We are always interested in finding out why a man turns to crime; why does he go in for kidnaping or bank robbing or for the other crimes that we handle.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I think we all appreciate the great magnitude of the task of a subcommittee such as this in considering the myriad subjects which are involved in this bill. Being a distinguished group of lawyers in the large majority, it is, of course, highly complimentary to their diligence that they should be able to encompass as much of the subject of aeronautics as they have. I qualify myself as an engineer, with professional experience as a transportation engineer, and a former member of the Nichols committee of the House. As a member of that committee I sat through some 700 or 800 hours of hearings encompassing the most technical aspects of aeronautics, and an equal number in discussions. I feel qualified, therefore, to speak on the subject of the aviation appropriations carried in this bill.

May I call the attention of the House to some remarks contained in the hearings, made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], as follows: On page 331, Mr. RABAUT was questioning Mr. Wayne C. Taylor, Assistant Secretary of Commerce:

Mr. RABAUT. I would like to ask you one question, Mr. Taylor: Do you think it is advisable to seek an amendment of the C. A. A. Act? This appropriation is going to be expanded materially, partially to Government's benefit and partially to air-line operators' benefit.

The air lines are over the hump in development and are now making money. What is your opinion on this?

Mr. TAYLOR. What type of amendment do you have in mind?

Mr. RABAUT. Some action that would change the monetary relationship between Federal and private interests so that the Government would get more of a monetary return for the expenditures that are made on the part of Government.

Then on page 332 of the hearings appear these remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR]:

Mr. KERR. The mail carriage is purely a commercial feature. As I understand the chairman and Mr. STEFAN, they think it is about time the Government should get out of carrying the load for this development which is an incident that contributes to private corporations. As the gentlemen have said, we have spent millions and millions of dollars in this C. A. A. program to develop air-line activities.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, to start with, the question of what should or should not be done by the Congress in connection with the C. A. A., the C. A. B., and the allied activities, is a legislative one. As a legislative question, it comes before my Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That committee is very active in its study of these matters. It is the duty of the Committee on Appropriations to determine the needs of the Government agencies for funds as best they can, but it is in no sense a legislative committee. I think that all too frequently the Committee on Appropriations tends to invade the prerogatives of the several legislative committees of this House. I suggest that they refrain from such action in order to permit the legislative committees their part.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield very briefly.

Mr. RABAUT. The Committee on Appropriations is also charged with the matter of saving as much money as possible for the Government. If the Committee on Appropriations recognizes a situation where there should be some retrenchment or savings effected, I think it is perfectly within the scope of its authority to ask such questions as the gentleman has referred to.

Mr. HINSHAW. Likewise, it is the business, I suppose, of the Committee on Appropriations to know all the intricate operations of the business of the departments so that they will be able to act intelligently, but that is a monumental task for anyone.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman, but wish he would give me an additional minute or two.

Mr. RABAUT. Yes; I yield the additional minute to the gentleman and I am very glad to do it.

The point I would like to make is this. It was the Committee on Appropriations which brought up the idea which produced some of the revenues for the Washington Airport. For example, the observation deck they have there where people pay to see the planes and view the field from an elevated position, was one of the things we did to help bring in some funds for the National Airport. We hope to continue making such suggestions from time to time.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is all right. I have no axe to grind with the committee on any suggestion they might make in that regard.

Mr. RABAUT. May I further state that we are very careful in the Committee on Appropriations to guard against doing anything which is legislative in character. We are very careful about that. But we do want to save all the funds that we possibly can for the Government.

Mr. HINSHAW. I appreciate that. I tried to appear before the Committee on Appropriations, and I was informed I might be able to extend my remarks in the record of the hearings. I did not think that would be very beneficial for the committee, so I am going to make some remarks here, with the consent of my friend, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] who has yielded me the time. First, let me mention the subject of costs and the various modes of transportation and their ways of transporting men and material.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me before he goes into that subject?

Mr. HINSHAW. I will yield to the gentleman if he will give me another minute.

Mr. RABAUT. I will give the gentleman additional time.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman has made a statement that he wanted to come before the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. Every Member has the right to appear before the committee. My understanding of it was that the gentleman wanted to appear before the witnesses before the committee, which I

said could not be done. Am I correct in that or not?

Mr. HINSHAW. You have rules in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman from Alabama, Judge HOBBS, appeared before the committee, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] appeared before the committee for the minority side on the Judiciary Committee. In other years, a great many other Members have appeared before the committee.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am not responsible for the rules that the Committee on Appropriations sets up.

Mr. RABAUT. Neither am I.

Mr. HINSHAW. But it seems to me that the legislative committee which is responsible for the legislation in connection with various aspects of Government, should be permitted to sit in on the appropriations hearings, and if they have additional observations over those already made by the witnesses, it would be very expeditious in the handling of the matter, if they could be heard after the other witnesses were heard, after they had heard what the departmental witnesses had said. There is no sense in just making a statement unless you have known what has gone on before. It could add nothing to your committee's information except accidentally.

In my statement here today I intend discussing the various modes of domestic transportation in order that the Federal Airways may stand in true perspective. The figures I shall present have been obtained by me from several sources, all reliable, and some official.

INLAND WATERWAYS

I would like to speak first about inland waterways. By 1936, there were constructed in the United States, wholly with Federal funds without reimbursement, 26,406 miles of inland waterways, divided as follows:

	Miles
Atlantic coast rivers	5,263
Gulf coast rivers and Mississippi system	17,381
Pacific coast rivers	1,796
Intercoastal waterways	1,966
Total waterways	26,406

The cost of construction of these inland waterways was $1,437,816,174 by the end of fiscal 1936. This sum did not include expenditures for construction of terminals, piers, or flood-control facilities. The construction cost alone, the cost merely to make them navigable, was $54,400 per mile. This cost is borne entirely by the Federal Government, and there is no return of money to the Federal Treasury for the use of these waterways.

It may interest you to know that the total cost to fiscal 1939 for both construction and maintenance of the inland waterways is the not inconsiderable sum of $3,637,528,923, and the over-all cost per mile is $138,000, none of it reimbursable to the Federal Government in cash.

The Ohio River system alone, 891 miles from Pittsburgh to Cairo, plus 2,621 miles of waterways on tributary streams, a total of 3,612 miles of waterway, cost $234,000,000 and has an annual cost of maintenance for that system alone of around $7,000,000, I believe.

HIGHWAYS

On highways, in primary, secondary, and urban systems we have a total of 541,841 miles. These roads were built by the States and their subdivisions, with some Federal aid. Incidentally, that Federal aid was collected through taxes on gasoline.

It is difficult to get at the cost of this great network of roads, but the best estimate I can find at the moment is over $33,000,000,000, or around $60,000 per mile. The gas tax and license taxes are charged to vehicles using these roads, but nothing for a franchise.

PIPE LINES

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address my remarks momentarily to the subject of pipe lines. Oil pipe lines were built by private enterprise. Several thousand miles have been added since 1939 by the Government, for which I do not have the cost, but up to the fiscal year 1939 there had been built 98,681 miles of gathering and trunk pipe lines at a cost of $829,646,000, or an average cost per mile of $8,500.

RAILROADS

By 1943 we had 219,073 miles of railroad. That figure is in miles of road, not in miles of track, which is a much larger figure. The railroads' investment in roadway, exclusive of rolling stock, shops, and so forth, is $17,980,000,000. Hence the investment in roads per mile of roadway is $82,000.

AIRWAYS

Let us look at the airways. The total cost for construction and reconstruction, of the 35,000 miles of Federal airways up to and including fiscal 1944 has been——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. The total cost of construction and reconstruction of the 35,000 miles of Federal airways up to and including fiscal 1944 has been $59,957,114. In this amount is included the cost of the primary aids that were long years ago installed by the Post Office Department when the air-mail service was inaugurated. The over-all installation cost of all airways is $1,713 per mile. New airways are installed now at about $1,200 per mile.

United States domestic transport systems

Transportation ways	Year of data	Miles of way	Cost or investment	Cost per mile
Inland waterways	1936	26,406	$1,437,816,174	$54,400
Highways	1939	541,841	33,000,000,000+	[1] 60,000
Pipe lines	1939	98,681	829,646,000	8,500
Railways	1943	219,073	17,980,000,000	82,000
Airways	1944	35,000	59,957,114	1,713

[1] Estimated.

Mr. Chairman, this committee seems to feel that the Federal airways are built for air lines and built for them alone. Let us see who uses the airways—the Weather Bureau facilities and airports. The traffic-control statistics show that of the 1,355,817 airplane movements on which traffic-control services were rendered during the month of December 1944, 86 percent were Army and Navy, 12 percent scheduled air transport, and 2 percent miscellaneous, civil. There were a great number of additional military and a few miscellaneous civil flights which used the communications, weather, radio range, beacon light, and landing-field facilities, but not the traffic control.

While it is true, Mr. Chairman, that airways were installed for use of air carriers on mail routes originally, even before military traffic became so heavy because of war movement there was a high proportion of military and private flying conducted over them. Indeed, it is most fortunate that airways were reveloped and installed when they were. Their small cost has long since been paid off in value to the military air services.

But my friends of the Appropriations Committee speak of revenues to the Federal Government and they speak of mail subsidies. Let us examine that picture from the figures. Now I wish to have the attention of the members of the subcommittee, if I may, for these are some figures that do not appear in their hearings.

AIR-MAIL DEFICITS PAID IN FULL

From 1918 through 1942 there was an expenditure of $321,337,059 for the carrying of mail by air, and a revenue of $192,602,792, thus making for a deficit of $128,734,267.

In 1943, however, air-mail revenue exceeded expenditures by $18,355,360, and in 1944 this almost tripled, with the profit reaching $50,563,490. Thus in 2 years air-mail profits paid off half of the all-time deficit; and current estimates of receipts of Federal air mail show that by the end of the 1945 fiscal year the entire air-mail deficit will be paid off.

On the basis of estimated air-mail revenue projected for 1946 at the present rates it is confidently estimated that the profits of this operation will be more than sufficient to cover the cost to date of the establishment of the Federal airways system, and will exceed the yearly new construction maintenance and operating costs which will not go beyond $50,000,000 for several years to come.

Yes; Mr. Chairman, the subsidy debt of the air carriers will have been paid off this year, and the net revenues to the Government after all expenses of the Post Office Department, including overhead, will be enough at present rates to pay all the current maintenance and operating costs of airways and the Weather Bureau to boot. Think of it. The air-mail net revenues to the Post Office Department are high enough to pay for free airways for military and civil fliers at even a 6-cent postal rate, I confidently believe. Where is the member of this Committee who is concerned over air carrier participation in the cost of operating and maintaining the airways and air facilities?

Why, Mr. Chairman, this is the traffic system in the United States that does pay off to the Government, and pays in full.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. STEFAN. I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, no official figures are available yet for 1944 air-mail revenues and expenses, but a member of the other body placed figures in the RECORD last fall that indicated 1944 air-mail revenues were $103,000,000 and all postal expenses allocable to air mail, including payments to air carriers, were $53,000,000, leaving a net profit to the Government of $50,000,000 for the fiscal year 1944. This year, with the 8-cent air-mail rate should show a much higher Government profit.

Present air-carrier rates for carrying mail average about 60 cents per ton-mile. I note that the C. A. B. is to hold "show cause" hearings to determine why that rate should not be cut to 32 cents per ton-mile. If the rates are cut, a still larger air-mail profit to the Government will be shown.

But, Mr. Chairman, as nearly as I can determine, the average rate paid to railroads for carrying first-class mail is about 28 cents per ton-mile. If air-carrier rates are cut to anything like 32 cents per ton-mile, why not let the air lines carry all the first-class mail the delivery of which can be expedited by air—and then no doubt the air carriers will be able to have that volume of business that will enable them to live and thrive on a 32-cents-per-ton-mile rate.

At this point it should interest this committee to know that the Federal Government pays an operating subsidy to our steamship companies that runs well into $11,000,000 per year.

In conclusion, may I remind the committee that air lines pay landing fees and rents at municipal airports, and gasoline taxes in large volume, and property taxes and other taxes to the States and their subdivisions. Some of them—11 out of 17, certainly—are paying income and profit taxes and social-security and all other kinds of taxes applicable to their business. Six air lines are still in the subsidy class but the other 11 carry 90 percent of the traffic.

For the life of me, Mr. Chairman, I cannot see what is worrying this committee when it comes to appropriations for the C. A. A., the C. A. B., and the Weather Bureau. If there are any operating agencies of Government that are directly profitable to the Government, these agencies most certainly must head the list. Why, this committee and the Bureau of the Budget, both should send up a cheer for them, instead of cutting and eliminating altogether many millions of dollars that are vital to the safety and facility and progress of aviation, and by aviation I mean right now Army and Navy aviation because they comprise 86 percent of all air traffic today. Yes; 86 percent of the use of airway and weather facilities is for military purposes, not the air lines; and if you want to come right down to cases you will find that nine-tenths of all air-line passengers are traveling on Government business or business with the Government. If you do not believe that just try to ride an air line without a priority. The C. A. A. and the Weather Bureau today are really war agencies and very vital war agencies at that, as the hearings will show.

In other words, almost 100 percent of the air traffic today is either military or on Government business. So let us have due regard for all factors in providing for the safety and development of aviation in this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire to say something about the C. A. A.

C. A. A. SERVES IN WAR AND PEACE

Mr. Chairman, there are two facts about the Civil Aeronautics Administration which I would like to impress upon Members of the House:

First, because this is a flying war on a global basis, this civil Federal organization has stood very close behind the men who shoot the guns.

Second, because we now live in the air age, this civil Federal organization faces post-war responsibilities of tremendous importance to the whole Nation.

C. A. A. air traffic controllers now are working on Johnston Island, Kwajalein, and Guam, directing the fighters and bombers who are virtually flying scheduled trips on the "Tokyo run." These men are literally at the front and they are far from being the first C. A. A. men who have served in such distant dangerous posts.

The important thing is that they have taken the know-how developed over many years of operating the world's best system of airways, and applied it to the fighting of a war. I think that is the shining crown that this peaceful, democratic Nation wears. We maintain no large armies and navies. We try to live at peace, and yet when war is forced upon us, all of us, in uniform or out, bring all our talents and skill to bear and ultimately defeat our enemies. Credit the C. A. A. with a major contribution in this respect.

Before Pearl Harbor, the C. A. A. was conducting the highly successful Civilian Pilot Training Program. Started as a peacetime effort to encourage and foster the aviation industry, this program began to assume very great importance when the war clouds gathered. At the time of the Japanese sneak attack one-third of the volunteers joining the Air Forces were young men who had been introduced to flying in this C. A. A. training project.

It is much more dramatic to single out individuals to point up this preparedness. Lt. George Welch and Lieutenant Taylor, Navy flyers, took to the air in their fighters from a Honolulu field and attacked the overwhelming force of Japanese planes. Each shot down two of the enemy. Then they landed, coolly refueled and rearmed their planes and took off again. Welch shot down two more enemy planes. Both were decorated and praised. Both were a relatively few flying hours out of the C. P. T. flying school, and a few months off the college campus.

C. A. A. PRODUCED PILOTS

The C. A. A. did not train military pilots. All of the several hundred thousands of pilots turned out of the 700 schools which worked in this program were only started on their way to fighter status. The important fact is that these embryo pilots were ready when the Army Air Forces and the Navy Air Force began to expand. There was a pool of nearly 100,000 civilian pilots on December 7, 1941, of whom more than half were graduates of the C. P. T., and these boys were taken to the schools operated by the military forces and trained in combat.

A new theory proved in this war is that the best instructor should be the man assigned to a flying student's first lessons. When the C. A. A. started its training, it called in all licensed instructors and rerated them, bringing them up to a standard of efficiency and ability as teachers. Throughout the period when our pilots were being trained, these instructors were called by the hundreds and thousands to the service of the military forces. Literally, our air force pilots were produced in training factories where the workmen were all civilians.

You know, of course, how the products of these training schools have made out. Maj. Dick Bong, Capt. Walter Mahurin, and Maj. Joe Foss, all of whom learned to fly with the C. P. T., are products of civilian know-how and methods.

The Army and Navy have praised this effort. True, the military services usually have been loath to ascribe full credit to civilian effort, preferring to give medals and pay tribute to the men who wear their uniforms. But the extent to which the services used the C. P. T. and its successor, the War Training Service, the Army taking 273,000 trainees and the Navy 103,000, is proof of solid accomplishment.

If aviation is to be the big new industry we expect it to be after the war, it will be based upon pilots and the equipment and service they buy. The C. A. A. has produced the pilots.

THE AIRPORT STORY

For war and peace, we must have airplanes, pilots, and airports. The Army turned to the C. A. A. before the war started for airports for defense. Within 3 years—and the war airport program is now being concluded—we have spent $400,000,000 building airports of which the C. A. A. has built 535. I want to point out something very significant in this connection, and it will probably clarify some misunderstanding among Congressmen and citizens. Some of the war airports we have built may never be useful after the war, and there has been a tendency to criticize officials for building them. This is a part of the waste of war, and the requirements of defense have made it impossible to avoid.

This is the way these war airports have been built: The Army first determined what airports were needed for defense against possible invasion, and for training, that is, the number and class of fields which they would require on which to base fighters, interceptors, and bombers in the event of an attack on our coasts. In a given defense area, 10 large airports of class 4 or 5, and three or four class 3 fields would be required, and the Army sensibly allowed the C. A. A. to locate them. This made it possible to prepare during war for the airport needs during peace, and these fields were placed by

the C. A. A. where they would best serve post-war commercial and private flying needs.

Some military fields had to be located at pin-point positions because defense strategy dictated that location. They may not be useful after the war, at least within the foreseeable future in aviation's development.

Likewise some fields built adjacent to cities and towns have never been used, but they also were necessary for strategic purposes.

Most of these fields are leased from the cities and towns which provided the land, and the Army has agreed to turn them over to the cities within 6 months after the war. Some were not leased by the Army, but were left in possession of the sponsors with the knowledge that they would be available if needed by fighter planes. Already some of these, notably the field at Westchester County, N. Y., has been leased by the city to an oil company which plans to operate it after the war.

As a result of this war program of building fields, we have now nearly all the large airports we need for immediate post-war years. The C. A. A.'s national airport plan proposes construction of 3,000 new fields, and only 100 of these are of large size.

One of the most valuable of our war leftovers is the airport. It is a tool for commercial enterprise that can be picked up at once when we drop our fighting weapons.

Today, we have 37,000 miles of airways in this country, and 8,000 miles in Alaska, including those along the Aleutian Chain. Traffic over these air routes is almost 85 percent military. Here is a dramatic story of the enlistment of civilian know-how in an aerial, and global war. And by dramatic, I mean just that. In 204 places outside continental United States, our C. A. A. engineers, maintenance, and construction men have installed airway facilities, until now there is scarcely an airway over the world on which American men have not installed American equipment. These were obscure men who built the "airway on the ground" for our pilots who have fanned every sea and every continent with their wings. These airways will be tremendously important after the war.

RADIO RANGES TRANSPLANTED

Some of your home-town radio ranges are serving overseas. Perhaps my colleague, Mr. MILLER of the Fourth Nebraska District, has not missed the range that used to guide pilots along the airway past Scottsbluff. That range has been lifted bodily and set up in Trinidad in British West Indies. The range from Elkins, W. Va., is hard at work at Cairo, Egypt. From Yoakum, Tex., the range has moved to Canton Island in the Southwest Pacific. Aberdeen, S. Dak., contributed its range to Accra, Gold Coast of Africa; Evansville, Ind., to Ascension Island; Muscle Shoals, Ala., to Natal, Brazil; and Willmar, Minn., to Brisbane, Australia. In all, there are 50 range stations that have been transplanted abroad.

There were times when there was no longer a spot on the United States Federal airways system which could be robbed, and there still was a void in the world airways which had to be filled. Then the skilled mechanics of the C. A. A.'s Supply Depot at Fort Worth improvised. Out of spare parts, odds and ends, and even salvaged material, they put transmitters together and rushed them to a port where an Army transport plane could fly them overseas.

Airways for our warplanes now extend to India and into Western China. Wherever our Air Forces go, facilities for flying are installed for them. By February 1 the pilots of fighters and bombers along the "Tokyo Run" will be receiving information of air traffic controllers supervised by the C. A. A., stationed on Johnston Island, Guam, and Kwajalein. C. A. A. men were on Guadalcanal putting up a range while the marines were still pushing the Japs back from the air strip. They were on Attu in the Aleutians while the G. I.'s were still rooting Japs out of remote fox holes and caves. They put in an airway up through Canada, across Greenland through Iceland to the British Isles, and another down over the Caribbean, across to Africa and then the hot deserts to the Near East. For labor, they have used Eskimos, Indians, Arabs, Dominicans, Brazilians, Hindus, and natives of Timbuctoo.

When these facilities were installed, the civilian engineers turned them over to the Air Forces for operation, in most cases. The Army Air Forces now operates the communications along these airways, and the Signal Corps, the Army engineers, and the ever-present Seabees deserve their share of credit for the hard work of installing them.

C. A. A. INITIATIVE IN WAR

An outstanding service of the C. A. A. before the war started was in preparing Alaska for defense from Japan. One of the dramatic examples of the vision of these civilians was their construction of the airport at Cold Bay, west of Dutch Harbor. Congress will not feel disturbed, I am sure, to know that an official of the C. A. A. took matters in his own hand and, before money was allocated for this specific purpose, began construction of this important field.

To indicate how important it was, the very few Army and Navy planes stationed there when the Japs attacked Dutch Harbor, drove off the enemy, and so confused him that he failed to follow up his advantage in surprise and superior numbers. If he had followed up, the mainland of Alaska would undoubtedly have been bombed and probably invaded. The Jap did not know this field had been built.

He knows now, however, that our northern Territory is ready, and has been ready since 1942 for the worst he can do. We could have put all the force necessary into Alaska to defend it as early as summer of 1942, because we had the airports on which to base it and the airways over which to move it, thanks to the work of C. A. A. engineers and workers who have been developing Alaska aeronautically since 1939, starting with fewer than 75 employees.

I believe the Territory has only started toward development of its maximum importance as a result of this work. In few other parts of the world will the airplane be so important as in Alaska after the war. Post-war commercial possibilities there, thanks to the airplane, and thanks to the facilities for use of the airplane, are tremendous.

FUTURE CIVILIAN PILOTS

In the midst of its war work, the C. A. A. has found the time to carry out its prescribed function of fostering, encouraging, and regulating civil aviation, both domestic and foreign, as it is charged to do by Congress.

As any new art like flying advances many changes must be made. Regulations in particular, pile up. New ideas are constantly appearing. Methods and equipment change and improve. The C. A. A. has consistently worked at making flying possible for all the people. It has cooperated with the military in the restrictions on such flying imposed by war necessity, but it has always favored elimination of these restrictions, when the war effort was not affected. The requirements for the pilot have been reduced and changes are under way in the requirements for the airplane itself. Wherever it is consistent with safety, the C. A. A. has dropped regulations, and when peacetime comes, a far more simplified set of rules and regulations for safe use of the airplane will be in force.

Here is a most important contribution. More than 300,000 pilots will be certificated in this country when all the boys come home. There are two and a half million men in the military air forces, and two and a half million men and women in the airplane factories who know more about airplanes than they ever did before. We have a tremendous plant in which to manufacture peacetime planes and accessories. Most of us anticipate that the aviation business will move up into the bracket of the top three or four leading industries in the whole country, and if it does, the C. A. A. will be ready.

Today, there is a special assistant to the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in charge of developing personal flying. There is an advisory committee from the industry almost ready to start work with the C. A. A. There is a strong tide toward active and beneficial cooperation between Government and industry. I believe we are ready for vigorous action and rapid progress, as soon as peace comes.

Personally, I think private flying within this country will be by far a larger part of aviation, and of great economic and social importance to us, than any other branch of flying. However, we have our duty to the rest of the world to cooperate in the advancement of international scheduled flying. Through the foresight of our State Department, and using an exceptional degree of tact and knowledge, we produced a most successful Conference on International Civil Aviation in Chicago last fall.

The technical aspects of that conference were in the hands of C. A. A. men, who brought their experience of 18 years of Federal participation in the progress

of flying and laid it out for the world to see and use. The three-hundred-odd pages of technical documents drafted by the C. A. A. provided the basis for the conference, technical discussions, and were praised highly by the foreign delegations. The technical sessions at the conference were literally sales meetings where the American way of flying promotion and control was presented to the world.

Last summer, the C. A. A. finished its job in pilot training for the Army and the Navy, after starting some 300,000 young men on their way as pilots. Its program of air education is well under way, with thousands of high schools throughout the country instructing their students in what the air age means in their lives. The third program of training pilots, mechanics, and technicians selected by various South American countries is under way and a fourth program in this good-neighbor policy will soon start.

Congress also is considering the C. A. A.'s suggestion that we build 3,000 new airports to be ready for the upsurge in flying after the war.

Here we have a civilian Government agency which has gone to war in a most enthusiastic and effective manner, and one which is, at the same time, remembering its responsibilities to the people of peacetime.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to compliment, not criticize, the committee, but to be specific with regard to one item which I find beginning on page 63 of the bill. That is the appropriation for the Coast and Geodetic Survey. I would probably want to increase it.

I come from the far West and I frequently refer to the topography of our intermountain region. In fact, any study involving the physical development of that region is very apt to call for an exact knowledge of the physiography of the area. There seems to be a lack of that scientific knowledge.

I will admit that much has been done since the days of the one-armed Major Powell who established our scientific surveys throughout the West. I have had occasion several times, however, when I wanted specific topographic information about this or that portion of the West, to refer to maps that were 50 or more years old; maps that had been prepared by Major Powell in his day.

I feel that with the progress made in map making and topographic surveys and all that sort of thing which has come about recently on account of this war, that we should, at the first opportunity immediately following the war, take stock of our own land with the same accuracy and detail that we are taking stock of land on which battles are now fought.

We will recall that Napoleon met defeat at Waterloo because he did not know of a ditch or sunken road. He did not have any reconnaissance to tell him that. We hope that in this modern warfare our men on land and sea have maps and accurate pictures of the terrain over which they must pass or on which they must fight. We are led to believe our men are supplied with good maps.

I am not scientific enough to know how that science of mapping has been developed, and to what extent, but I know it has been developed to a remarkable degree. I congratulate the committee on this emphasis of an important work and I want to recommend to the committee in future appropriations that we be very generous, and wisely so, in putting to use the trained men and the skills and the abilities that have been developed during the war toward mapping and picturing the topography of our own country. It is needed in peace as well as in war.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

MATTHEW SMITH—THE WORKER AND PEACE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I preface my very brief remarks by saying that during 12 years of service in this House I have been a member of the Committee on Labor. I have vigorously supported measures in behalf of the rightful purposes of the men and women who toil. I shall continue to do so.

I took the position late in 1940 and early in 1941, as we began to prepare this Nation to produce the materials with which we or our allies fight, that an all-out war effort was necessary. The right of labor to strike in peacetime in private industry is a precious and correctly coveted right. That right, however, should not be exercised by the worker in field, mine, or factory during war in producing or manufacturing the equipment with which our armed forces insure ultimate victory over stubborn and inhuman enemies. I shall pay tribute again and again to the great production record of loyal, on-the-job workers in the ranks of both organized and nonorganized labor.

The reason I call attention to this subject matter is the outrageous statement I have just read in the press which comes from Matthew Smith, secretary of the Mechanics Educational Society of America. In just a moment I shall read the article. I remind the House that Matthew Smith has lived in the United States since 1927. Yet this individual, the leader of approximately thirty to forty thousand key workers in industry, is not yet a citizen of the country in which he resides. He has received the privileges, the profits, and the protection of America, but he has given no loyal code of citizenship in return.

I do not want to be misunderstood. The naturalized citizen is just as important and vital to America as the native-born. But it is a sad travesty on any group of Americans to be led, especially during a period of war, by a man who is not a citizen of this country.

Early in 1944 Matthew Smith fomented a strike of 11 days' duration in the Detroit-Cleveland-Toledo areas. Because of the type of highly skilled work these employees were in they were vital to the production of component parts of planes, engines, landing barges, jeeps, and trucks. It was soon found that approximately 300,000 individuals were involved, which slowed down the production of vital war matériel.

The immediate reason for my discussion of Matthew Smith—and I have spoken of him on previous occasions—is this latest statement he has made. The Washington News carried his words:

GOVERNMENT ACCUSED

Matthew Smith, national secretary of the Mechanics Educational Society, an independent union which has figured in numerous wartime strikes, cynically listed as a bar to top production "the apparent inability of Government spokesmen to sell the war to the average worker and, worse still, to explain the attractions of an early peace."

"Our average Detroit worker," he said, "with acute memories of the long depression, remembers peace as a time when the job would fizzle and he would join the miserable unemployed army. * * * The ever-present unholy fear of a return to this unhappy condition is retarding all-out production in this area by at least 10 percent."

Oh, my colleagues, as if it were necessary for the Government to "sell the war to the average worker," or "to explain the attractions of an early peace."

Think of anyone being called upon to explain the attractiveness of an early peace. Millions of our young men, in the Allied Armies, have died and our own casualties reach into hundreds of thousands. An officer of the Navy a few days ago off Iwo Jima was called to sign the death certificate of his own son who had been lost fighting on that island. Civilization almost collapses. Then think of Matthew Smith, a noncitizen of the United States, with his powerful perverted leadership of 30,000 to 40,000 individuals, talking about the failure of the Government to make peace attractive. Oh, a sad commentary. An act of sabotage of the moral and spiritual values, during total war, is thus committed in a time when sacrifice is strained that peace may come again to suffering mankind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, frankly I am stirred by the estimates that are being submitted by the Bureau of the Budget for enormous numbers of new personnel to be placed upon our Federal pay roll. In connection with this bill as it was submitted to the House by the Bureau of the Budget they asked for 1,100 new employees in the State Department, and for over 500 new employees in the Commerce Department. I am unable to tell from the report just how many of that increase were allowed, but I would hope that the increase was pretty well limited, because these increases in the number of employees are a mounting menace to the integrity of the Government of the United States. I wanted to say that much about the bill.

I also want to call attention to the same thing the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from Ohio called attention to, the enormous number of those on the pay roll of the State Department, as shown on page 280 and from there on through page 289 of the hearings on the State Department, who are doing nothing

but going out and talking. Some of them are, but most of them are not.

I want to say a word or two which it seems to me is necessary to say with reference to the peace which we all hope is to come soon and which we all hope is to be as permanent a peace as it is possible to have.

Now, as one who has been here a good deal of the time since the last war and who has seen the effects of certain things upon ill-feeling between the countries, such as the lending of money after the war is over to other countries very much disturbs me. I know that as a result of that situation there was tremendous bad feeling all through England, France, Italy, and the Low Countries, with respect to that situation after the last war. I know that it made for tremendous bad feeling. When somebody owes you, they do not like it.

I want to see the country go just as far as it can in helping those who are in distress until they get in a position to help themselves. But that should not be too long after the war is over, and we should not create a situation where we are officially to go ahead and loan those people a lot of money for the sake of artificially building up our own industries. If we do that sort of thing, we are going to lay the foundation for more trouble, and we are going not only to do that, but we are going to create inflation in our own country, which will be absolutely impossible to control.

I want to call attention to one or two other things which seem to me to be exceedingly important.

The Pacific situation bothers me. You know, we really had a firm policy on the Pacific situation when the Republicans were in power. Almost everyone in the House is old enough to remember the open-door policy. Almost everyone in the House is able to remember back far enough to know that in 1931, when Japan moved into Manchuria, Secretary Stimson asked the British to join with this country in efforts to keep the Japanese out. The failure of Great Britain to do that resulted, unquestionably, in the Japanese war. Now we are engaged in a terrible war, and we are not taking advantage of the opportunity to get the good will and full support of these Asiatic peoples by declaring in favor of the open-door policy in Asia. If we do not do that sort of thing, we are losing a great opportunity.

I want to call attention also to something that bothers me in connection with the approaching conference. George E. Taylor is at present Chief of the Regional Division, Office of Overseas Director, of the Office of War Information. He was born in England. He has applied for naturalization, but he has not been naturalized. He has been publicity officer at the meetings of the Institute of Pacific Relations. There he has been chief apologist, as I understand it, for the failure of Great Britain to do just what I described she was asked to do in 1931. I am wondering if he is going to be in charge of publicity at the San Francisco Conference. I am wondering, if we have some publicity man at that place, why we cannot have an American citizen. These things disturb me greatly. I feel that America is at the cross roads. I feel that this debt business is going to wreck the peace, and I feel it very deeply. I feel that unless we have at our conference an every-bit, all-American delegation, we are making a great mistake, and that we must be very careful how we proceed in this situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the bill that we are presently considering is of far more importance and more far reaching than some Members of Congress may think at their first perusal of the bill. It really sets up the framework and a blueprint for some future operations in the United States and the world. I have read the bill carefully. I have read most of the hearings. I am concerned about some phases of the bill and some directions that our Government is going.

I want to take these few minutes to discuss some phases that are causing me some concern. The State Department, for instance, recently has been reorganized. We hope it is for the better. The State Department in the past, I am convinced, has not been a strong instrument or arm of the Government.

We are having some new employees in the State Department, some men who have not been schooled in international politics. I am not sure how good a job they are going to do. That remains to be seen. I am concerned, however, about the number of individuals they are putting on the pay roll who are going out to propagandize the public in this country. They are going out to sell a gigantic bill of goods, under high-pressure methods, over the radio, appearing before commercial clubs, and service groups of different types, writing articles for radio speeches, for newspapers, and for magazines. I do not think that all propaganda is bad. I think some propaganda is necessary, but I am hopeful that in the propaganda that is put out we do not just get some half truths. Too frequently material that is put out by Government agencies, who have a vested interest in their job, are only half-truths.

Recently I was interested in looking at some movies. Apparently some departments of government have a rather large movie-development program, because every show you attend you find some movie scripts depicting some phase of Government work. Never do you see anything that is critical of what the Government is doing. They are selling a bill of goods. I am not sure but what if that type of propaganda continues a long period of time, we will eventually slip into a place where the people will say, "Well, the Government cannot do any harm." And then we come to the place they had in Germany and Japan and some of the other countries where the press is no longer free.

I am rather suspicious now that the newsmen who go to the conferences, with the President and with other officials of Government, are told just those things that they can print. There is no question but what during wartime it is necessary that certain items of war news be kept from the public, but I am concerned when we find certain news items and information that the public ought to have being "off the record," so to speak. We have it in our committee hearings. Just recently in one committee which I attended the witness said: "This must be off the record," when there was no reason for its being off the record; as a matter of fact it was information the public ought to have had. I notice in reading the hearings on the pending bill there is occasional reference to something that was off the record.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I will give the gentleman some time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is making reference to off-the-record statements that appear in the hearings. This committee of which I happen to be chairman prides itself on the information it possesses; and it gets that information in many of the off-the-record talks. This bringing of a witness before a committee and having him hedge during the whole of that testimony never results in the committee's getting any information. This committee is proud of the fact that it has received a great deal of information beneficial to it in its conferences in the making up of these appropriations.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; I think the committee has done a good job in bringing this bill in; and I, of course, realize that some information must be off the record.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The point I want to make is that there is some information to which the public is entitled that the public is not getting. It frequently happens both in this country and abroad. I am reminded of a newspaperman who had a story in the paper last Sunday—maybe you read it. It was by a Mr. Brown who writes a syndicated column. He had some information he was going to give about Rumania but he thought he had better call the State Department about it. He did and learned that apparently it was something that should not be published. He did not publish it. But in his news article the next day he tells us how he found that two officers of the military intelligence had come up to the apartment where he stayed here in Washington and inquired what elevator he rode up in, whom he talked to, where he ate at night, what he was doing; in other words they were trying to find out if there was some leak through which this writer was getting information. I am suspicious of those things when they get to a point where they criticize or keep the American public from knowing things they ought to know. We see it in this House.

There are some Members here who have an inferiority complex, who hate to get up here and talk against the administration because they always realize that there are some good supporters of the administration who immediately try to intimidate them. New Deal newspaper writers are always ready to discredit and smear the honest criticism of this administration. We saw this morning an example of where a smear writer tried to smear one of the Members of this Congress because of something that had happened. These are dangerous trends in a democratic form of government, and we are starting out here in this bill with the State Department going out giving lectures trying to sell a bill of goods to the public without always giving the whole picture. It is not a good trend in a republican form of government. I think it is time for us to stop and think for ourselves. People are not unpatriotic just because they oppose certain acts of government in time of war. This war is being fought to insure a way of life in which the people are the masters of their government, not its servants, as in the case of Germany and Japan.

The editor of the Stuart (Nebr.) Advocate sums up my thoughts in a part of an editorial. I now quote:

> The foregoing charges and suggestions might seem to be revolutionary, unless we remember that in America we have a government of the people, by the people, and for the people; and that the men who run the Government are servants of the people and should be kept subservient to the will of the great majority. If to some it may seem unpatriotic to oppose certain actions of the Government in time of war, it must be called to mind that this war is being fought to insure a way of life in which people are the masters of their government and not the servants of it, as is the case in Germany and Japan. There would be no object in winning our freedom from foreign dictators only to lose that freedom here at home. We must see to it that the extraordinary powers granted to our elected servants as a war measure are not abused; we must see to it that such powers are used only to win the war, and not to subject us to the control of our servants in Washington.
>
> We must always remain alert, and not allow high wages, good prices, and propaganda to lull us to sleep. An alert, aggressive citizenry can never be enslaved by government. We are free now and we should fight both at home and abroad to maintain that freedom we in America have always enjoyed.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Supplementing the gentleman's statement in regard to the potency of propaganda, it seems to me that Senator BYRD, Democratic Senator from Virginia, expressed it very realistically when he said:

> If you regulate the thoughts which go into a person's thinking and the amount of money which goes into his pocket, we have little concern to fear the words which will come out of his mouth.

The gentleman knows, perhaps, that during the past 10 years $30,000,000 have been spent for propaganda through the press, the radio, and the movies, not one dime of which was ever authorized by the Congress, and that the books of these governmental agencies spending this money have never been audited by the Comptroller General's office.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. I notice the gentleman feels inclined to criticize the State Department for spending money for speakers at this time from the Department, and he alludes to the remarks of the gentleman yesterday criticizing them for the same thing in regard to the Dumbarton Oaks proposition. I wonder if the gentleman does not believe that since that is the most important thing before the people outside of winning the war it is a good idea to let them know what Dumbarton Oaks is before we adopt it, for instance, at San Francisco. Would that not be much better than to say: "We will go ahead and adopt it in the people's ignorance?" I think it is good to give them a chance to apprize themselves what is in Dumbarton Oaks.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I agree with the gentleman that if it be the whole truth it is a good thing. What I am afraid of is half-truths or part-truths or propaganda that might represent an individual's opinion. Tell the people the truth and give them free expression through the press and the radio and you need have no fear of the future of our country. The truth will make them free.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the legislation before us today appropriates more than a quarter billion dollars for four departments of Government—the Department of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Federal Loan Agency. The measure allocates the funds to be expended by these Departments to carry on their operations for the fiscal year.

Although these expenditures are only a part of the appropriations approved by this committee, they amount to a total of $259,000,000. These Departments are classified as old-line agencies, but they have taken a great many new duties and powers and expanded a great deal in recent years. Part of the increase is due, of course, to the war, and a great deal of it is due to expansion policies, domestic and foreign, adopted by our administration.

The Appropriation Committee is the largest and most powerful of our committees. It is the spending committee of Congress. Members of the House have learned to depend on the good judgment of the members of this committee in determining whether certain expenditures should be allowed or rejected. I think it is conceded that the committee has done a good job in view of the tremendous amount of work required of it and considering its limited facilities for securing information with respect to the hundreds of items in the bills submitted.

I would like to point out some things that in my judgment should be corrected. The Committee on Appropriations has always held closed hearings. I do not think they should be so closed that other Members of Congress are not invited or expected to attend. The only way by which a Member of this body has a chance to find out about the provisions of these measures is to wait until the day the bills come to the floor of the House for consideration. He may be fortunate enough to secure a restricted copy on the day before, and then in a brief time read the bills and the committee reports and attempt to scan the hearings consisting of volumes of printed material. This bill before us today covering 90 pages is supported by hearings of more than a thousand printed pages. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but these committee hearings do not contain all the proceedings held by the committee. A great deal of the important testimony is "off the record."

We have certainly reached a peculiar impasse in this Congress when we admit, as members of the committee have done today, that the important evidence in support of this legislation is told by representatives of our departments "off the record." It is odd, to say the least, that men in places of responsibility must talk "off the record" in order to sustain appropriations for their departments.

I can well understand why certain testimony directly affecting the war effort might be stricken from the RECORD, but too much of it is left out on the flimsy excuse that it might in some way affect the war effort or it is not for the best interests of our country that such evidence or facts be disclosed. We have carried that thing too far. We need more evidence on the record and less off of it.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the only testimony with respect to these expenditures comes from those who spend it. It certainly does not behoove the spenders to suggest reductions. We understand those in charge of agencies should know most about their needs, but there ought to be an independent agency of the Government responsible to Congress that would give careful study at all times with respect to the necessity of the proposed expenditures. Such agency ought to give continuous study as to ways and means by which savings could be made through elimination of waste, duplication, unnecessary activities, and unnecessary agencies.

There ought to be more coordination between the Appropriations Committee of the House and the Ways and Means Committee—the group that is expected to provide ways and means by taxation to raise the money for these expenditures. We have this great Appropriations Committee of the House providing for spending millions and billions of dollars without coordination, cooperation, or understanding with the revenue-raising committee. These two committees should hold sessions at regular intervals so the right hand of government may know what the left hand is doing.

I suggest we have more open hearings in the Appropriations Committee. Members of Congress should be permitted to

attend committee hearings at all times except during executive sessions. Hearings should be on the record except where testimony is definitely detrimental to the war effort. We should have an agency responsible only to Congress to help determine whether the expenditures are justifiable. The agency should also suggest where improvements could be made for more efficiency and savings to our Government and could further recommend whether certain agencies are necessary or not. More time should be given during which Members may study the bills, reports, and hearings before they are considered on the floor of the House. They should not be reported on one day and then be brought to the floor and considered the next. These suggestions if followed will have a wholesome effect and provide economy and efficiency in government.

Mr. Chairman, during the very few minutes allotted me I would like to call your attention briefly to some of the items in the pending bill. One deals with the question of transferring funds without authority.

On page 99 of the hearings it is discovered that a $15,000 item for salaries of ambassadors and ministers was transferred to the representation or entertainment fund for ambassadors so they could entertain foreigners abroad. I do not know how that thing got started, but it ought to be stopped now.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] a member of the committee, asked Mr. Frank about the authority to transfer the $15,000. Mr. Frank admitted there was no authority except there was an approval by the Bureau of the Budget.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] also questioned the authority to transfer 10 percent of funds under this bill for any purpose the Department wants to use it. In other words, under the bill a sort of free fund of 10 percent of $259,000,000 may be used in any way the State Department wants to spend it.

You find a rather interesting item on page 98 where Mr. Frank gives an example of the expenses of sending an ambassador to Poland in a chartered plane. He says it will cost as much as $38,000 to send him there or it might cost twice as much if a different type plane is used. He says, of course, it is a matter of bookkeeping, but why make the charge if it does not finally come out of the taxpayers' pocket? It seems this is rather expensive transportation, especially when you read a little further down here it costs $4,600 to send 8 typewriters to Chungking. Again he says this is a matter of bookkeeping against the State Department, but it is not a matter of bookkeeping against the taxpayers. It looks a little extravagant to me. Incidentally, there are more than 425,000 Government employees outside the United States. In fact they are in almost all parts of the world. That is a pretty good-sized army itself.

Now, I would like to talk about another item. It is with respect to the tremendous amount of money that is being spent for representation abroad. The representation fund, as you know, or if not, I will tell you, is money allowed to our representatives abroad in addition to their salaries, moving expenses, living expenses, and certain other items. It is allowed principally to pay for what is called entertainment. Nearly all of it goes to buy champagne and all kinds of fine liquors. We are told, in order to deal with our representatives in foreign countries and show our good fellowship, we must spend a certain amount of money for fine dinners and champagne parties. Now, what I want to call your particular attention to is the increase in these amounts. In 1941 the amount allowed for this sort of thing was $125,000. The next year it was $250,000. Then last year it was $300,000. Now, the committee is asking that it be increased to $585,000, almost double that of last year and three times as much as the year before. At this rate it will be a million dollars next year, and you are asking the taxpayers to foot the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the whole thing ought to be stricken out. At the proper time I am going to offer a motion that will cut it back to $300,000, the amount allowed last year. That is too much. Mr. Chairman, if we have to resort to an expenditure of $600,000 a year to buy champagne and liquors of all kinds to cultivate friendship and secure better understanding with foreign countries, our influence is falling to a very low ebb.

You might be interested in knowing where some of the larger amounts are spent. Our representatives in London get $14,000. The Ambassadors in Madrid get $10,000. In Lisbon, $5,400. In Cairo, our parties are to cost $5,400. In Berlin, when we get there, it will be $6,000. But in Helsinki we are not spending anything. Neither do we spend anything in Bucharest or Budapest. In Moscow, our share is $6,000, and the same thing goes for Paris. I have not time to read any more, but the whole thing is intriguing.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], wherein he brings up the question about the jobs or the positions that have been allowed in the State Department, may I say that the deficiency subcommittee started the ball rolling with an allowance of 750 clerks for part of this year. Of course, the regular committee is charged with the responsibility of taking care of the people on the rolls, and we are continuing those people that were put on by the deficiency subcommittee for the fiscal year 1946. The distinguished gentleman from New York is the ranking minority member of that deficiency subcommittee. The added request made of our committee for the fiscal year 1946 was reduced by our subcommittee to approximately one-half of the additional employees requested.

I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO].

THE COAL-WAGE DISPUTE

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, we are again faced with the possibility of another strike by the coal miners. When such rumors appear, the entire Nation becomes greatly alarmed and many charges and countercharges are made that are without truth or foundation.

In time of war the coal industry is probably the most vital industry in our war economy. If coal production ceases, steel cannot be made, our transportation system will come to a standstill, and the war will be lost without the firing of another shot by our enemies.

Since coal miners are found in relatively few States, and since they are not concentrated in large population centers, the mine organization does not have as much influence in our legislative halls and in our executive departments as other labor organizations. As a consequence, the coal miner and the coal industry are used as a whipping boy to divert the attention of the American people from other labor troubles.

I know something about coal mining. I worked in the coal mines for about 8 years. I know something about the living conditions of coal miners, as I have lived in a coal-mining camp for many years. During peacetime the coal miner rarely averaged over 160 days a year of employment. His "take home" pay to feed, clothe, house, and educate his family averaged less than $800 a year. I have worked in the mines when my income for an entire month was less than $30. Very few coal miners in peacetime averaged as much as $100 per month. Their homes would be considered slums by our city slum dwellers. Very few of their homes are equipped today with modern conveniences.

Coal mining is a hazardous occupation. It is a skilled occupation. Our mines today are largely mechanized, requiring a higher degree of skill to operate the machines than was ever dreamed of in the pick-and-shovel days. Most jobs in coal mines today are too hazardous for old men; yet our young coal miners have not been given occupational deferments in the same ratio as in other industries.

If we were mining coal today by the same methods used during the last war, with the same number of men employed today, we would be mining less than 300,000,000 tons of coal per year in the United States.

It would be enlightening to those who are so loud in their condemnation of the coal miners to investigate the relative skill and rate of pay of the coal miner as compared with that of employees in aircraft, shipbuilding, and other war industries. In my home county there is a serious shortage of coal miners, yet the War Manpower Commission is daily making efforts to recruit workers to work in shipyards in the Pacific Northwest, paying their transportation and offering them twice the amount they could make in the coal mines, offering them jobs with much better working conditions, surrounded with little or no hazards. There is something wrong with our Government's wage policy when we tell a man that he cannot make over $7 a day in a coal mine and turn around and offer to pay his transportation 3,000 miles and pay him from $12 to $18 a day when he gets there. In all essential war industries there should be little or no discrimination in rates of wages paid for the same skill and the same effort. A coal

miner works during the time he is on the job. There is no slowdown and no leaning on the shovel. His clothing, his food, cost just as much as that of the shipyard worker or the aircraft worker. His children get just as hungry as the children of any other person.

When an effort is made to raise the level of coal miners' wages to favorably compare with those earned by other workers, the attention of the public is immediately directed to the fact that such wage raises will increase the cost of living. Yet during this war, in fixed-fee and cost-pus-a-fixed-fee contracts we have paid out billions and billions of dollars that will have to be paid by the taxpayers of the United States in increased taxes and reduced standard of living. That just does not make sense.

The coal-mining industry was probably harder hit during the depression than any other industry. From 1920 until 1941 mine owners in this country lost over $400,000,000. In no other industry was cutthroat competition so prevalent. Markets were lost to oil, natural gas, and hydroelectricity. Today the taxpayers are paying out millions of dollars a year in the form of transportation subsidies to the competitors of coal. Those subsidies are coming out of the taxes of coal miners and coal operators. Yet the Government has encouraged production of every ton of coal possible during the war emergency. Many operators have expended large sums of money to increase production. Yet the Office of Price Administration will not permit accelerated depreciation to be reflected in the sales price. The coal operator is entitled to a fair return on his investment. This he did not have for over 20 years. The coal miner is entitled to a decent wage, a wage comparable to that of his neighbors who are engaged in other industries. When these conditions do not exist, the entire Nation suffers.

If our coal operators today were on a fixed-fee or cost-plus contract, selling all their coal to the Government, we would have little difficulty in adjusting the coal dispute. Yet our Government is using the mine workers and the operators as a whipping boy to cover a multitude of mistakes already made and being made daily.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, on page 24 of the committee report on H. R. 2603 appears under the heading "Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce" this statement:

> The committee is convinced that the Bureau is taking a decided interest in the serious problems of small business, which may be considered as the economic fiber of this country. This aid should be continued to the greatest extent possible.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on that particular phase of the committee's report and the effect small business will have upon the future and the employment of returning war veterans and those let out of jobs as the result of the termination of war contracts.

Mr. Chairman, the biggest question before the Congress before V-day comes is: How are we going to provide those who have fought our battles and those who have supplied them with the weapons of war with jobs? Where are the oft-repeated, not yet assured, 60,000,000 jobs going to come from?

If full employment is to be achieved, it must come from industry. It must be created by freemen within our representative system of government and within our free-enterprise system. It must be done that way, because the alternative is stateism—the same stateism that has failed so many times on the other side of the world—which has led to wars and revolutions time and time again, and which our soldiers, sailors, and marines are right now fighting to abolish in all parts of the world.

The fate of the Nation, our way of life, our very system of government, will be decided by what this Congress is prepared to do and does, or what it fails to do. Generations of Americans to come are going to look back with gratitude or regret upon what was done by the Congress that charts our course through the fateful years ahead. This is one job we must not delegate to others. For in so doing we would be neglecting our duty and abdicating representative government. Therefore, we must do it ourselves. And the time to start doing that job is now.

Mr. Chairman, the vast majority of these 60,000,000 jobs that we must have must be provided by small businessmen. The difference between full employment and widespread unemployment depends upon small business enterprises being able to keep people employed.

Mr. Chairman, any governmental policy that will encourage small businessmen will create jobs; any governmental policy that will discourage small businessmen will create unemployment, will deny those who fought our battles and those who provided them with the weapons of war their rightful opportunity to find employment in jobs paying good wages. Every precaution should be used to prevent this.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. It is a pleasure to find a new man coming to Congress with constructive and progressive ideas. I thoroughly second the comments of the gentleman from California in his speech today on the rights of small businesses and their essential importance. Too many times in recent years these people have been forgotten and squeezed in the rush when they are actually the bedrock of the country and the base from which every large business in the country has built.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, it is the job of Congress to make sure that the business cards are not stacked against the small businessmen.

Congress must start planning—now—for the post-war years that lie ahead. When V-day comes Congress must have its plans worked out, thoroughly, a plan that will fully take into consideration the needs of labor, the needs of the farmer, and of the small businessman, and must be prepared to act as arbitrator between—not controller or dictator of—the various interests of our citizenry.

The well-being of small business means the difference between full employment and widespread unemployment because in order to have full employment small business must operate at full capacity, and workers must be encouraged to become businessmen and employers themselves, thereby creating more jobs, and promoting free enterprise. There must be an everlasting development of new business enterprises. Unless this happens, there can be no full employment; and jobs for 60,000,000 is but an idle dream.

Every time a worker takes his savings and invests it in a business venture he creates jobs—jobs making machinery or other equipment for his business, jobs operating his establishment, and jobs producing the materials that are used in the operation of his business. He is creating purchasing power, also.

Mr. Chairman, if industry is to do the job of creating full employment, industry must be free to operate as it thinks wisest within the limits of those regulations necessary for the maintenance of fair labor standards and fair business practices. Business must have the opportunity to use its own initiative and ingenuity, without fear of reprisals for not doing as some bureacrat—be he Republican or Democrat—demands.

The shackles of meddlesome bureaucrats—regardless of party—must be shaken off. Neither must it be dependent upon Government for its existence, if business is to remain free, because there must be economic freedom before there can be political freedom. Without economic freedom there can be no freedom, except for the few who are in control. And we all know that the few would operate the controls to suit themselves and for their own benefit. That is the system of national socialism. It is the system under which force replaces the ballot. It is not our system. We want none of it. Mr. Speaker, if we fail in our duties here and now, those who are dying in this Second World War shall have died in vain.

Mr. Chairman, the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively must be maintained and protected. If enormous corporations have a right to exist, if businessmen have the right to organize into trade associations, and chambers of commerce, then the preservation of our system of government demands that labor shall also enjoy the privilege to organize for its own protection. The interests of the various elements of our national life must remain in balance. The preservation of representative government is ever dependent upon the maintenance of the delicate balance that exists between each segment of our economic life.

Like the businessman, the farmer, too, must remain free. He, too, must remain economically independent of government. And at the same time he must be

able to obtain his just share of the national income. Without the farmer having adequate purchasing power, full employment cannot be maintained.

Mr. Chairman, the job of government is to act as mediator between the clashes of interests that are bound to come between the desires of our people. For any gain of one group at the expense of others may lead to disaster for all. The public welfare must ever remain the first duty of Congress.

That is why we must start planning for post-war prosperity now.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time, 13½ minutes, to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee will yield some additional time, for the reason that the gentleman from Minnesota has an important statement to make regarding the situation in China, in which the public is very much interested at this time.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Minnesota 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 33½ minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). Evidently there is no quorum present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 42]

Anderson, Calif.	Hébert	Sheridan
Baldwin, N. Y.	Heidinger	Sikes
Bates, Mass.	Henry	Simpson, Pa.
Boren	Hill	Slaughter
Celler	Hobbs	Smith, Maine
Chapman	Izac	Smith, Wis.
Combs	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Taylor
Crawford	Kearney	Thom
Curley	LeCompte	Thomas, N. J.
Dawson	Luce	Weaver
De Lacy	McKenzie	Weiss
Dirksen	Madden	Welch
Eaton	Morrison	West
Gardner	Mott	White
Geelan	Pfeifer	Wigglesworth
Gordon	Rayfiel	Wood
Hagen	Robinson, Utah	
Harless, Ariz.	Rooney	
Hart		

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2603, and finding itself without a quorum, directed the roll to be called, when 378 members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to be accorded the privilege of making a few remarks on the pending bill, and I wish to express my thanks to the Committee for extending to me this privilege. This measure contains the regular appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary. I was somewhat surprised when I discovered that the appropriation for the Department of State was increased $21,384,562 over the appropriation for the year 1945. It is tragic, indeed, for us to reflect upon our financial situation in this country, and then to discover that the many and various departments of Government are demanding, and in many instances are receiving, additional sums and amounts for the operation of their departments. Just a few days ago this legislative body received, debated, and voted upon an increase of the debt limitation in this country up to $300,000,000,000, and that measure was passed because it was necessary that some legislation be passed upon that subject. We are engaged in this terrible war, and the tremendous expenditure of money required in the prosecution of this war to a final and successful conclusion, and we can readily understand that enormous cost to the people of this Nation. Yet, while this war is costing such a vast sum of money we can understand that the cost of this war is greater than the cost of World War No. 1 because of the use of mechanized and motorized units and outfits, and because of the war being world-wide in scope with two oceans to patrol; however, this war is costing the people and the taxpayers a much larger sum of money than it should cost. There is great waste and much extravagance involved in it. These elements have been largely responsible for the excessive cost of this war, and the people of this Nation now realize that fact. While during war there must be, of necessity, some waste yet, the tragic waste and the willful extravagance of this war has reached such heights and such enormous amounts that the people are appalled because of it. Under lease-lend gifts and credits, it was recently reported that $36,500,000,000 has been allocated to the various countries of the world. Some of this money was extended to countries for the purpose of waging war against our common enemy, while some of this money was given, or loaned, to countries not involved in this war.

Of course, the vast sums of money given, or loaned, to those countries not involved in this war—and which countries can be of no aid to us in winning the ultimate victory which must come—is now being used, and it has been used in the past, in building highways, roads, and streets, and in constructing beautiful buildings, parks, and recreational facilities for their own people—all at the expense and cost to our own people and taxpayers. What is the end of it all? And, pray tell me, how much of this lease-lend money will be repaid to us when this war ends?

Mr. Chairman, all of us remember the loans made to the many and various foreign countries during and immediately after World War No. 1. Those were direct loans, and there was no semblance of a gift involved, and there was a complete understanding that the money we advanced to those countries was a loan—not a gift. With the exception of little Finland, those countries have not responded to make any payment of that debt to this very hour. When we count the noses of the nations who have been the beneficiaries of our benevolence in this war, who have come forward and paid their debt within the next few years immediately following the conclusion of this war, I wonder how many there will be. If I mistake not, we will find the same situation to obtain that we discovered following World War No. 1, and those nations which have been the recipients of our great generosity during this war will find many excuses to present as to why they should not pay their just debts to us. We have been in many instances overgenerous—we have been more than that, we have played the part, in many instances, of "Uncle Sap"—and the people of the country will soon realize the truth of my statement, if they do not already realize it.

Mr. Chairman, those things, just mentioned, relate to our war, and its prosecution. That cost has been, and it still is, terrific. For a few moments I desire to mention some of our own economic matters in this country—because our people are distressed, they are in financial distress. The people are alarmed. They realize if these appropriations for Government increase, and continue to increase, there is no power that can prevent a complete financial collapse in this country. We must win this war—and we must win it as quickly as possible. Whatever is necessary to win this war, the people will give, and they will give gladly. But these things which are not essential for war—these things which relate solely to our own economic situation—must be reduced, not increased. These items of cost for the departments of our Government, which are increased in this measure, should be—they must be—reduced. We must teach these extravagant and expensive departments of Government that the people, the taxpayers, of this Nation are still in control of their Government. They pay the bills, they hold the purse-strings, and they will so continue in the future—but the end will come when their ability to respond has been reached.

It is my considered judgment, Mr. Chairman, that the time has come for every department and agency of our Government to "stop, look, and listen," because their expenditures are mounting higher and higher and without reason or justification. We are in war, the expenditure for that supreme effort must be met, and that comes first. But the cost of our Government, with its overlapping authority, with its innumerable agencies, boards, bureaus, and departments and its countless employees, and with the tremendous increase in the number of such employees in every department of Government, is a huge millstone around the neck of every taxpayer in this Nation. It is high time to stop, and retrace our steps—it is time to discontinue the increases in spending, and to curtail extravagances of every kind and character. This useless and needless spending of the taxpayers' money makes for higher taxes upon all of the people, and the Government is now reaching into the bottom of the pockets

of every laboring man and woman, every farmer, and all classes of our people.

Let us get down to business in this country. Let us win this war, and let us quit the useless spending of the people's money for needless things.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] is recognized for 33½ minutes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I am a little embarrassed to have the Members brought here to hear me, yet I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] who made the point of order that a quorum is not present, because what I want to say about the situation in Asia is, I think, of some importance.

Because our forefathers came from Europe, because our sentimental attachments have been there, and because the foreign history we studied was European history, most Americans have understood fairly well the nature of the struggle raging in Europe. Because we live in this hemisphere and because we have a Monroe Doctrine and a Panama Canal, naturally we have been concerned and informed about problems in this hemisphere. But up until Pearl Harbor Sunday most Americans simply could not or would not believe that either ancient or modern events in Asia could be of real significance to us. Yet when the war ends in Europe, as we hope and pray it will in not too distant a future, America's attention will inevitably shift more and more to the far Pacific, and we must know and understand the situations there better than we have in the past if we are to adopt wise policies which will bring the war there to a decisive conclusion with a minimum of cost in men and money and time, and with a maximum of security and trade for the future.

We got into this war through Asia; and if America gets into another war, almost certainly it will also be through Asia.

There are few subjects about which American thinking is more confused today than it is about China. During 1938, 1939, and 1940, when I was going up and down the country reporting what I had seen in China in the preceding years, including a period of 5 months under the Japanese Army, and trying to awaken my fellow citizens to the dangers of Japan's and our own policies at that time, most people were inclined to say, "Oh, don't worry about the Japanese. You are unduly alarmed. After all, the Japanese can't even lick the Chinese, and of course the Chinese can't fight, so what could the Japanese do to us?"

But that easy thinking was based on two false premises. The first was that the Chinese could not fight. I have always wondered just where anybody got that notion. The second was that we could fight—on short notice. And I have always wondered where anybody got that notion. Where did anyone get the idea we could bring up a generation of youth believing that never again would Americans need to fight for their country, that they had little or no need to think about anything except their own comfortable ways; and then suddenly take them out of the university or off the farm or out of the factory and overnight convert them into trained warriors, conditioned emotionally as well as physically to stand up against the hardened veterans of Europe and Asia who had been taught to glory in killing.

A great many American boys are dead today unnecessarily because we engaged in that sort of wishful thinking.

Then one morning Japan gave us the worst defeat in our whole 168 years of independent history. We woke up with a start and said: "Why, those Japanese are good. And if they can do that to us, how in the world have the Chinese been able to hold out against them for four and a half years? The Chinese must be good, too." Our estimate of the Chinese began to soar.

Then Madam Chiang came to this country and she captured American imagination as few foreigners ever had, and certainly as no Asiatic ever had. Our estimate of the Chinese soared still higher—too high. To hear many Americans talk, including commentators and columnists, practically every Chinese was wholly selfless in his devotion to his country, patriotically sacrificing everything for freedom and his nation's welfare, and so forth. We who had lived there were concerned, and Chinese leaders were even more disturbed, because we and they knew that it was not a true picture of the situation in China or in any country, and that such overidealization would inevitably lead to a swing-back into overdisillusionment. We are in the midst of that swing-back now. Those who a year ago could hardly find words good enough with which to describe our Chinese allies, now can hardly find words bad enough. To hear them talk now, all Chinese are lazy, are crooks, and grafters, are obstructionists, antiforeign, hopelessly inefficient, split up into political factions interested more in preserving themselves than in defeating Japan, expecting us to do all the fighting, and so forth, and so forth. Between those two extremes, where is the truth? Some of you have asked me that question. I thought if you were going to ask my views, I ought to have a fresh look at the situation. I had been home for 6 years and I wanted to get the feel of things as they are in China today. So I went out to China last fall for that purpose.

I had worked there 10 years as a medical missionary, 1 year in Nanking, 5 years in south China, and 4 years in north China. I was able to talk in their own language with many Chinese whom I had known well in the past, doctors with whom I had worked, nurses we had trained in our hospitals, principals and teachers and students from our schools, presidents and deans of universities, businessmen. These people fled to west China to escape Japanese enslavement. They have fairly frequent contact back and forth across the lines with their relatives in occupied China. They know exactly what is going on. And they would sit down and discuss with me as a friend their thoughts and hopes and fears as freely, I suspect, as they would with new American officials or Army officers or reporters, or perhaps even as frankly as they would with Mr. Wallace, who drops in for a few days and comes back with positive views as to just what should be done. I did not talk to high Chinese Government officials until the last 2 days. I talked with Chinese people. It is on the basis of such observations that I want to present some of the high lights, if I can.

The first thing to say, is that we are being deluged nowadays with a flood of reports from people who do not have an adequate background of experience in Asia. Some of you have traveled in the Orient and you remember your first glimpse of it. The poverty, the overcrowding, the dirt, the squalor, the disease, were all right out there in full view; and your first reaction was: "Why, these people are living almost like animals. Their condition is hopeless."

It was just about all you could take under ordinary circumstances, wasn't it? How much worse after almost 8 years of war and invasion?

In former years most reports on China came from Americans who went out as missionaries, or as teachers, or as businessmen, or as long-term reporters or students. They soon observed also the tapestries and cloisonnés, and porcelains, the literary achievements, the mature wisdom, the basic goodness and friendliness of the people. They wanted to live their lives happily there, so they looked for and found the best. They learned what the Chinese have long known, that the loveliest flower of all, the lotus, frequently grows in the most uninviting surroundings.

But thousands of Americans are there today who are not interested in China's culture. They did not go because they wanted to go. They went because they were sent, by their newspaper or by Uncle Sam. They are not looking for the best. They frequently see only the external things, almost all unprepossessing, and they do not like it. I find our boys abroad do not like any country except one, and that is the United States of America. They want only to get back to it. They write home to their families about the filth and the cruelties and the antiquated methods and what seem to be lackadaisical attitudes and all the rest. The fathers and mothers read it, and then they know all about China because their boy, John, well, he is there and he saw and he knows.

Likewise most reporters—they do not want to be sent to that assignment and they do not like it. There are few American girls out in Chungking, and few movies, and hardly any electric light most of the time, no running water, and no fun. It is an awful place to which to be sent.

Understandably, these Americans tend to judge China, not in terms of China's own past but in terms of the West. They assume the bad conditions are the result of the present Government's failures, when in reality conditions became not worse, but very much better under that Government in the years prior to the war.

We must judge China not in relation to conditions in America, but in terms of conditions as they were in China 20 years ago and 200 years ago. Outsiders without adequate background or historical perspective understandably play up the

superficial differences, almost all to China's disadvantage.

The second fact which many fail to appreciate fully is that China was still in the midst of a great revolution when she was plunged into this war against her wishes.

Revolutions are almost always disorderly and long-drawn-out affairs. It took the French 80 years to get through their revolution. There was a revolution and a counter revolution; another revolution and another counter revolution; then the third revolution before they got political stability. It took us 90 years, including a great Civil War, before we got straightened out after our revolution. You will remember that when our Republic was older than China's is, conditions in this country in the latter part of the War of 1812 were so bad, the corruption and factionalism were so rampant in the Government, inefficiencies in the Army were so notorious, and the administration of affairs was so bad that representatives of the people of New England met in Hartford, Conn., and solemnly voted to secede. They were giving up as hopeless the attempt to get internal unity and stability in this struggling Republic. Their problem was child's play compared to China's.

In addition to her internal difficulties, she was undergoing constant interference from without. It was only 4 years after the revolution began in 1911 that Japan tried to force on China the 21 demands which would have made China a vassal state. Four years later a group of 4 white men sitting at Versailles took Shantung, the sacred province of China, and tried to award it to Japan. Japan invaded that province again in 1927, took Manchuria in 1931, and bit off 3 other pieces of Chinese territory in the next 6 years before starting full-scale war in 1937. In addition, several other nations were meddling in China's affairs, trying to prevent her achieving real unity and strength. Naturally the Chinese were not able to get their revolution completed and a modern, efficient, unified, and democratic government set up.

During our election last fall there were people in this country who were profoundly concerned as to what the effects on our country of a possible 16-year dynasty might be. But China had been under one dynasty, not for 16 years but for 267 years when her revolution began, and yet she is expected to have no internal trouble.

Superimposed on the inevitable difficulties involved in carrying through a revolution, getting a new type of government established and the people organized and unified, is a third factor. China is suffering acutely from what Mr. Churchill has well called "the diseases of defeat." She has undergone seven and one-half years of almost uninterrupted reverses. She lost 80 percent of her modern industry in the first 3 months of the war, because that industry was down at the coast, where Japan struck.

She has not had anything that could properly be called an arsenal since the fall of Hankow in 1938—6½ years ago. Yet, we expect her men to be able to fight just as well as our boys can now. But we could not fight very well for a few months after Pearl Harbor, could we? Even with all our industry intact it still took us almost a year to get going. How about the British after Dunkerque? With enormous assistance from us it still took them over 2 years to get back on their feet. And yet the Chinese, after all these catastrophes and with almost negligible supplies, are supposed to be just as fresh as a daisy and are berated as no good if they cannot start right now a vigorous counteroffensive to save our bases in south China.

Mr. Churchill and Mr. Roosevelt made the basic decision right after Pearl Harbor, to hold defensively in the Pacific while disposing of Germany and Italy in Europe. The fundamental strategy was to concentrate on beating Hitler first. So we poured over 98 percent of our supplies into Europe, and sent less than 2 percent to east Asia, and less than 10 percent of that went to the Chinese. Up until a few months ago when we finally began to consider the Chinese armies of sufficient importance to make an all-out effort to get more assistance to them, they had had only two-tenths of 1 percent of all the supplies that we sent abroad to our allies.

Now, suppose Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill had reversed their decision, had decided to beat Japan first and sent 98 percent of our aid to Asia. Where would England have been? She would have been gone long ago. Nobody would have cursed the British as cowards and worthless allies because they could not fight without arms. And Russia could not possibly have held as she did at Stalingrad, and she could not be doing what she is doing now, if she had not had help—lots of it. China did not get such help.

We and our western allies made a decision which gave brilliant results in Europe. But that decision inevitably led to almost disastrous results in Asia. If we take the credit for good results in Europe, there is no way we can escape some of the responsibility for the bad results in Asia. We could not fight at full strength on both fronts. So we chose to concentrate first on one. That is nothing to be ashamed of. Why do we not stand up and admit the bad as well as the good effects of our decision, instead of trying to blame our Chinese allies for defeats that were inescapable if we could not help them more? I am not criticizing; I am merely trying to see thing in perspective.

China lost her major railroads in the first few months of the war. She lost control of the Yangtze River Valley, which is far more important to her transportation than the whole Mississippi River Valley is to us. These things made it impossible to shift troops rapidly or to get food from the areas of plenty to those of acute deficiency.

You have read of Chinese soldiers foraging on the common people, and of Chinese peasants rising up against their own armies. You probably thought, "What kind of troops are these that take food from their own citizens? What kind of allies are these that will not support their own armies?" But the soldiers simply have to live off the land at times, or starve. And I would remind you that the same thing happened in our Revolution. George Washington's men had to live off the land at times and they were royally hated and resisted by some of the Colonists because of that fact.

Frequently the only way to transport food from areas in China where there are surpluses is for men to carry it. A Chinese coolie will carry about 130 pounds of rice 25 to 30 miles a day; but he has to eat, and by the time he gets to where he is taking the rice, he has eaten it all up and has no way to get back. It is not as simple as some of the back-seat drivers in America imagine.

We supplied the Japanese with Dodges, Fords, Chevrolet, Studebakers—I saw them by the thousand. We even sent over representatives of our great automobile and truck-manufacturing companies to establish plants in Japan, so she would be sure to have enough. Her armies are on wheels. The Chinese are still afoot, leading donkeys, pushing wheelbarrows, carrying loads on poles.

In the Reader's Digest of last August, I believe, there was an article written by an American woman who had lived for many years in France. She described the "diseases of defeat" as she saw them developing there. She described friends of hers whom she had known from childhood, people of the noblest birth and background and the finest education and the highest integrity and the most sensitive culture and personal charm. She told how she witnessed those friends being forced by the sheer urge to survive biologically, to abandon step by step all the niceties of civilization and become almost like hungry dogs in the street, fighting for a bone in order to live.

There are social amenities and graces that we take for granted, but which are general only when people have food and order. This is one of the basic reasons why we simply must succeed in devising some other way than war of settling international disputes, because no civilization, no culture, can stand too prolonged or too frequent or too exhausting wars.

What are the diseases of defeat? First, there is physical deterioration. I was shocked last fall by the appearance of many Chinese, particularly among the soldiers. I had seen famine refugees in times past, and thought I was used to malnutrition, but this was even worse. The Chinese soldiers will have to have just plain good food for at least 6 months before anyone can possibly expect them to have the strength and vigor and stamina to start a counteroffensive.

We Americans, if we believe all the advertisements we read, have to take a vitamin pill or two every day to get through that little let-down we are said to have in the middle of the afternoon, and most of us are pretty well supplied with vitamins in our regular diet. But the Chinese haven't had enough vitamins for years and years, and they are more jittery and irritable and restless than ordinarily, and they are tired. They are anemic, they are full of parasites and malaria and tuberculosis and

dysentery. They have got to have adequate food and medical care.

Then there is economic deterioration. China was able to keep her economy in surprisingly good balance until a complete blockade was slapped upon her in 1942, and that was not her fault. We and the British controlled the seas, but we could not keep the sea lanes open to China and the British could not hold Burma and so China was completely cut off. The blockade had the same effect on her as it had on our South in the War between the States. The South was not industrialized, as China is not industrialized. The South had to get supplies and equipment and machinery and munitions from abroad, just as China did. The South had to sell its cotton and other products abroad in order to get foreign exchange to keep its currency stable, just as China did. When the blockade shut off trade the South had to resort to the printing press and inflation resulted. It was this economic break-down and lack of supplies as a result of the blockade which led to the weakening and defeat of the South more than any other single factor.

That same sort of economic deterioration and inflation has taken place in China since the blockade. And how did we try to cure it? One of the ways was by sending in paper money when we began to be able to fly over the hump. Here is a hundred-dollar bill, Chinese money, printed in America, by one of the American bank-note companies. This hundred-dollar bill is worth about 23 cents in American money at the present time. We flew over the hump 100,000 pounds of this paper money. That is a new way to cure inflation—less goods and more paper money. I talked to American officers over there who were bitter about the way we characteristically assume we can cure any problem with more money—and then blame the Chinese because they could not prevent inflation.

Then there is moral deterioration—graft, corruption, profiteering, black market. These things develop in any country in war, and especially in defeat. But there are several things to say about the graft in China. First, while it is bad, it is not nearly as bad as I expected to find, considering the circumstances. Second, there has always been in China the "squeeze" system, which we consider graft, but they do not. Any Chinese who handles a transaction for you takes 10 percent. If he takes 20 percent, he is dishonest; but, if he does not take 10 percent, he is not considered honest, he is just dumb. The Chinese say that dishonesty consists in leaving somebody with the wrong impression. So it is not graft from the Chinese point of view, because everybody knows perfectly well it is being done. It is "old custom," has always been done, and everybody understands it.

When Chinese come to this country and do business with us, they have to do it on our terms. And, Mr. Chairman, when we do business with them in their country, we have got to do it on their terms, that is if we want to get much accomplished. More missionary wives have lost both their money and their religion trying in vain to beat this "squeeze" system than from any other cause.

When the Chinese do it, it is "graft"; when we do it, it is a commission. But it is the same thing.

If some Americans, whether in the General Accounting Office or the War Department, or elsewhere, try to insist that the Chinese do just as we wish, they will not rudely defy us, they will be very obliging and sweet about it, but things will not get done just the same. All through history people have been trying to force the Chinese to do this or that. No one has yet succeeded for long. We will save effort and money, and get better results if we have the sense not to try, even as we are not trying to force Stalin to let his handling of our lend-lease goods be supervised by us.

Newly arrived Americans may be unable to understand why Chinese do not instantly see how much "better" our ways are than theirs. Well, we are only 168 years old and not doing so well in spots. They will wait until we are 1,000 years old and then see how we are coming along before they will scrap all they have learned and take over our system en bloc. Our gadgets are better than theirs, but our manners are much worse. Of the two the latter is to them the more important. They have been as unfavorably impressed by many of our aggressive, rude go-getters as some of our people there have been unfavorably impressed by their mechanical backwardness and their refusal to get as excited about things as we do.

Doubtless you have read Leland Stowe's book or other reports about the graft on the Burma Road—and the graft was there. But, as one American colonel, who has been out there all the time, told me, "If the Chinese had stolen everything we sent over the Burma Road, it still would have been nothing compared to what some of our other allies have stolen." Chiang Kai-shek shot some ringleaders and tried his best to clean things up, but he could not completely eliminate the graft any more than we have been able to stop it in our own Army.

That is the third thing to say. Look at the graft by Americans—and with far less excuse. After I got to China and saw what some Americans were doing, I felt ashamed. You have not heard much about it there, but recently you have read some sorry stories out of France, where hundreds of Americans are engaged in cheating their own Government. And they do not need to do it, in order to exist. They get $50 a month and good food. And there are officers involved, too. When we look at our own corruption without any cause except moral break-down, it seems to me that we ought to be slow about jumping too severely on people who are starving and drain some gasoline out of a bomber or jeep, when no one is looking, and sell it in the black market to keep their families alive another week or so. Let him that is without sin in this respect cast the first stone. If America were to go through half of what China has gone through, for half as long, and come through in no worse condition internally, I should be astonished and proud.

Then there is political deterioration. In any country the "outs" want to get in, and, when the "ins" have almost nothing but defeats to show, the "outs" inevitably increase their opposition. They complain to those in power, "Why did not you follow our advice, our policy, then the country would not be in such trouble? Get out! Let us have some other party in control." You know, we in America do not wait to attack our leaders until they have defeats. We start sniping at them if their victories are not right on schedule—our schedule.

The surprising thing is not that there has been and is opposition in China to Chiang Kai-shek. The miracle is that after 7 years of almost unending defeats he still has the confidence of an overwhelming majority of the Chinese people, that he is still in the ring—a little wobbly, to be sure, but not on the ropes—and that he is still slugging away on our side. We ought to be thanking God that he is still able to divert much of Japan's strength from ourselves, instead of complaining too bitterly because he has not been able in the midst of all his disasters to carry out a lot of internal reforms, desirable and important as they are. Where is our sense of proportion?

And when there is political deterioration, and opposition grows and there are "subversive" attacks on those in power, then, of course, there follows governmental deterioration. When a Nation's unity begins to break down, those responsible for order always reach out and restrict freedoms. They increase censorship, they tighten up on the radio, tighten up on the newspapers, they hand out propaganda instead of information, they have agents to keep watch over any suspected malcontents. If it is in some other country, we call it a Gestapo. If it is in our own country, we call it an F. B. I.

Not a bomb has dropped in our American streets. There has been no internal violence or armed rebellion, and yet would anyone contend that we have all our democratic freedoms in America today?

Mr. Churchill announced today they are going to hold an election in England after the war. England, the mother of parliaments and the oldest democracy, has not dared risk an election for 10 years in a time of trouble. Yet you have heard Chiang Kai-shek cursed up and down because he has not held an election in the midst of a cruel war for sheer survival and in a country which has never before held an election in its 4,000 years of history, and half of which is occupied by an enemy and 80 percent of whose people cannot read and write. It is ridiculous. Yet he has gone to the extreme length of saying that he will call next November, even before the war is over, the constitutional convention which was scheduled for 1937 but which had to be postponed because of the war's outbreak.

The established democracies all restrict their people's freedoms in war, even in victory; but Chiang is supposed to extend freedoms in his country even in the midst of defeat. It is an absurd counsel of perfection.

Then there is deterioration of morale, one more of the diseases of defeat. You can hold on indefinitely as long as you have hope, or can see a turn in the road ahead; but if you begin to lose faith in the ultimate objectives of some of your allies, then something goes out of you. That is what is happening in China's heart and therefore to morale. Under Chiang's leadership they have done their best to hold the line against Japan so that we in the West could concentrate on beating Hitler first. They have tried to do their part loyally according to the strategy which we determined. They did not wholly like that strategy because it put them last, though they had been fighting tyranny first, but they accepted it without complaining. But now there is a mounting fear that, no matter how great their efforts and their sacrifices, they are not going to be given a chance to become really strong, free and independent in their own right. They wonder whether they may not be sold down the river in the peacemaking, whether the western nations in the old power-politics way are not already dividing up Asia and even China into spheres of influence, and will demand so-called friendly, that is, puppet, not free governments.

I witnessed this effect last fall when I was in Chungking. Two white men who had not been in China met in Quebec, and there in North America, in the Western Hemisphere, and without a single Asiatic present, they announced that they had come to settle the fate of Asia, where live one-half of all the people in the world. Was that calculated to increase Chinese confidence and morale? Why should they fight for white men's schemes?

Defeats from one's enemy are bad enough; verbal attacks and pressures from one's allies are even worse. They are the straw which has threatened to break the back of China's resistance.

For over a year there has been in this country a concerted propaganda campaign against the Central Government of China and the Generalissimo. There are three main sources. One is some of the imperialists of Europe. They know the foundation stone of the whole colonial system in Asia is people's continuing to believe that all Orientals are congenitally incapable of governing themselves as democracies. If China gets on her feet and moves along progressively under her own power, that fallacy is automatically exploded and the foundation of the empires begins to collapse. Even if the Filipinos succeed, it will endanger the colonial system. Therefore the imperialists seldom miss an opportunity to point out faults and defects in China.

When Mr. Churchill got back from Quebec, he said, in his first speech in Parliament, that "after all the lavish aid which America has given to China, these defeats in China are most disappointing and vexatious."

I was reminded of a story Jesus once told, about a man who had some very great debts, and he and his family were going to be sold into slavery because he could not pay the debts; but he plead that he be given another chance, and he was forgiven. And then the self-same man went out and grabbed somebody who owed him a hundred pence and without mercy threw him in jail.

England did not do so well in Belgium and France. Did we jump on her? No. She had some rather "disappointing and vexatious" defeats in Greece and Crete and Tobruk and in Burma. Did we spend our time pointing them out? No—we redoubled our efforts to help hold her up. And she had had really lavish aid—millions of tons and billions of dollars worth of supplies. How much had China had?

The Chinese had never complained publicly about the smallness of the assistance they had received, but after that statement by Mr. Churchill a Chinese official spokesman in Chunking called in the newspaper reporters the next day, not to complain even then, but merely to set the record straight. He told them just how much aid the Chinese had received from America. It was the amount required to keep one American division in the field for 1 week.

The next day reporters in Washington asked a high American official about that and he got around it with one of the fast curves at which he is so skillful. He said, "Why, we are shipping more than 20,000 tons a month over the hump to China." That seemed to give the lie to what the Chinese were saying. But it did not. What he said was perfectly true, but it was one of those technically correct statements that nevertheless leave a wrong impression. The catch was in the word "China." The material was going to the place on the map called China, yes, but almost all of it was going to the American Air Force in China. Only a dribble got to the Chinese.

We have trained and equipped two Chinese Armies to fight in Burma. They have done a magnificent job, liberating Burma so it can be taken back into one of the empires. But, to put as much into training Chinese for saving their own country—no.

Now, I understand the military reasons for what we have done in Burma and so do you, but, if you were the last stop on the longest line of communications in the world, and if the stuff which was started to you got diverted elsewhere if anyone anywhere along the line wanted it, and if you had been fighting and starving all these years, you, too, would wonder whether you were not being played for a sucker, whether you were not just being used to hold the line for the white man until he could finish in Europe and then come to Asia to make the final kill, and reestablish himself on top once more, the old status quo restored, with its special privileges for white men. Would that encourage you to fight?

I am not saying anything here which we did not say to members of the British Government, including Mr. Eden—Mr. Churchill was in Quebec—when some of us Congressmen were over there last fall. True friendship for England and determination to cooperate closely with her in the days ahead required us to lay the cards on the table. It is unfair to the British and to our other allies not to make clear that we Americans will never pledge our men and resources to maintain any empire or to prevent other people from doing the same sort of thing we ourselves did in 1776.

One of the reasons that took some of us to England—both Democrats and Republicans—was to try to establish contacts with younger men in the British Parliament and Government with whom we could talk a common language in planning for the future. I speak with the utmost respect and admiration and gratitude for Mr. Churchill as a war leader. America can never fully repay its debt to him. He is unquestionably the authentic voice of the British people for the war. I hope, and I believe I can assure you, that he is not the authentic voice of all the British people for the peace.

I take off my hat to the greatness of the men who build the world's empires. They were giants, but of a day that is gone. I am not talking about the British Commonwealth. That sort of voluntary free association is the hope of the future. But empires are the way of the past. Let us not delude ourselves or anyone else.

Nobody can accuse me of being anti-British. I went up and down this country urging assistance for England 2 years before most Americans would admit her fate was any of our business. It is just because I want closest collaboration with the British people in the years ahead that I plead with them not to make it impossible by trying to restore the status quo in Asia.

Do you remember when we landed in north Africa, and, for the first time in all the war, the tide turned and it became reasonably certain that we could win? Within a week Mr. Churchill made the speech in which he made it clear that he "did not become His Majesty's First Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." You see, he gets there first. He declares his objectives and then, if any of us naive persons come along with the idea that this war has something to do with human freedom, even for Asiatics, we are told, "Oh, you mustn't say that; you are creating disunity among the Allies." What I would like to know is why don't we get there first once? Why not let him or someone else be the one that is creating disunity?

I am not ashamed of the principles of freedom and equality on which this Nation was founded and for which it has stood. Our allies do not hesitate to declare their position, frankly and frequently, just in case, as Mr. Churchill put it, "there should be any mistake about it in any quarter." Why should we be less forthright? Instead of timidly wondering. "What will Mr. Churchill do? What will Mr. Stalin say? What will somebody else think?" Why do not we decide what we ourselves think and then make it clear in unmistakable terms? We do not need to condemn any other nation's position. All we need to do is to declare our own. Seventy-five percent of the people of the world would rally in eager support of a clear statement of

what we really believe and stand for in Asia as well as elsewhere. If we do not do it quickly, it will soon be too late to do it without risking serious clashes with our allies.

Just a year ago in this city an eminent Chinese physician—he is not an official or a politician, he was here on a scientific mission—said, "When we lost our great cities back in 1937, 1938, and 1939, and our cause seemed hopeless, our hearts were heavy, but our spirits were high. We knew we were on the side of right and justice. We knew that eventually even you and the others who were helping the Japanese would realize the true situation and come to our side. Now you are in the war on our side and we have powerful allies. It is clear we can win over Japan. But we are more discouraged now than ever before." I asked, "Why?" He said, "Because, despite all our sacrifices, despite our bleeding ourselves white to buy for you the precious months in which you could rearm and carry out your strategy of beating Hitler first, despite all our efforts to cooperate loyally, we fear that we are likely to be betrayed in the political settlements, that we may not be permitted a real chance to establish a truly free republic."

I asked, "Why do you fear that?" He said, "Because we know Tory England and the other imperialist powers do not want us to be free and strong, for that would put 'dangerous' ideas into the minds of other Asiatic peoples. We have reason to fear that the Russians do not want us to be really free, strong, and independent. We know you Americans do. Your record is perfectly clear. It has been during all your years of contact with Asia and especially in the Philippines. We know you want us to be free, but we fear you are already so deeply involved in compromises and these power-politics deals that when it comes to a show-down you will not be willing to stand up and be counted on the side of human freedom, if to do so means that you have to oppose the wishes and views of your powerful allies, England and Russia. They have might. We Chinese have only right."

They could have had peace by deserting their allies. Instead they have spent themselves to exhaustion; their military weakness is not a disgrace but a badge of honor. But they fear honor will not count—only power. Surely we can understand why there has been deterioration of morale in China.

We have only one objective in Asia, and that is to defeat Japan, but some other nations have two objectives. The second one is to defeat Japan, the first is to restore their empires or to block out new spheres of influence.

We want only to make Japan lose so we can come home; but there are others who want to win the war so they can stay on in control of the resources, manpower, bases, industry, and markets of Asia.

I tell you, the American people have to get down to bedrock and see also that it is not enough to beat Japan, if we would have peace. We have to win the war so it will stay won, and for freedom, or we will have to do it over again under infinitely more difficult circumstances.

The second source of the propaganda against the Government of China and against the Chiangs personally is the Communist group in China, and the Communists in America. I will put documents on this into the RECORD at a later date. I want to be careful not to be misunderstood at this point, because to many Americans the word "Communist" automatically means Russia. One of the things I wanted to find out in China was how much, if any, is the Kremlin behind the Communists in China. Russia's official conduct with regard to the Chinese Communists since they made a pact with Chiang in September 1937 has been perfectly correct and circumspect. There was no evidence that I could find or hear about that Moscow has been backing or supplying, either with materials or with guidance, the Communist government in China during the last 7 years.

So I am not making charges against the Russians. But I am charging that the Communists in China and the Communists and fellow-travelers in this country are working primarily in terms of what they believe will best serve Russia's future policies and interests. I am increasingly convinced the Chinese Communists are first Communist and second Chinese, just as we know American Communists are first Communists and second Americans. In the case of the Chinese Communists this is a reluctant reversal of the opinion I held some years ago. I, too, was taken in for a time by the talk of their being just agrarian reformers, just Chinese patriots struggling only for the freedom of China and for democracy. I am convinced now the primary allegiance of the Chinese Communists is to Russia, whether Russia wants it that way or not, and their purpose is to make Russia overwhelmingly the strongest power in Asia as well as in Europe, which I think would be as bad in the long run for Russia as it would for Asia and for ourselves, requiring enormous armaments and constant tensions and suspicions which I hope profoundly will not have to be in the post-war world.

How can the Chinese Government be asked to furnish arms to a rebel government whose primary allegiance it has every reason to believe is to a foreign power? No government in the world could be rightly expected to do that. The Communists cannot be given full recognition in China until they are willing to give up their separate army. That they have never been, and, I think, never will be, willing to do.

Let me just sketch their history.

Beginning in 1927, the Communists tried to win in China by bloody revolution. For 8 months, May to December in 1930 I was in an area under their control down in south China. I saw first-hand their utterly ruthless purges and slaughterings of anyone who crossed their will. But they could not win converts by that method because the Chinese are basically too peace loving and orderly a people. Then they shifted the party line to confiscation of all property and redistribution among the workers. That too failed. It may be possible in some countries to buy the good will and support of a good many by taking other people's things, whether by taxation or otherwise, and redistributing them by government hand-outs, but the Communists couldn't do it on any large scale with the Chinese because the Chinese have too highly developed a sense of private property, what is mine and what is thine. So, when the Communists in China had reached the end of their rope, they shifted to another method. They adopted a great propaganda program to sell to the world the belief that they are merely downtrodden patriots, seeking to escape the tyranny and oppressions of Chiang Kai-shek in order to get freedom and establish democracy—just like our forefathers were in 1776. By talking about freedom and democracy and unity and so forth, and by calling all who disagree with them Fascists and dictators, they have succeeded in selling to millions of Americans one of the greatest hoaxes any unsuspecting people ever bought in all history. I spent more time and effort in China on this than on any other subject, including a morning discussing it with Mr. Lin Tsu-han, the chairman of their soviet government, the so-called border region government, and I can assure you that their propaganda is a gigantic fraud. They know, like Hitler, that if a big claim is made often enough, a lot of people will come to believe it is the truth. It is amazing how many American people will gullibly take good words as a substitute for facts.

The Communists have said, first of all, that Chiang Kai-shek and his Government will not unite with them in the fight against Japan. Now is it not to our country's interest to have China united? Therefore, must we not insist that Chiang Kai-shek and the established Government of China cooperate with the Communists?

But is it not strange that no one ever insists that the Communists cooperate with the Government?

Their argument is given credence by some Americans on the naive assumption that the Communists are just a political faction, a minority or an opposition and in war we need cooperation, even a coalition, of all parties. We ask why will not Chiang take in the Communists as Roosevelt takes a few Republicans into his Cabinet. But there is a very considerable difference. We Republicans do not maintain a private army exercising arbitrary armed control over whole sections of the country because we do not like some New Deal policies. But the Communists do have a private army and a separate government. They are not just a political party. They are an armed rebellion.

We in America ought to understand such a situation. We had a slavery party in our country, and for 50 years we had compromises such as the Missouri Compromise, the 1850 Compromise, trying to cooperate, reconcile, unite. But when the slavery faction pulled away and went down to Alabama and set up a separate government with a separate flag and a separate currency and separate taxes and a separate army under a separate command, did we unify then? Or reconcile ourselves to the situation? No. We fought them for 4 years in one of

the bloodiest wars of all history. We, who fought for 4 years against our brothers to prevent a splitting of our country, are now in the intolerable position of constantly condemning Chiang Kai-shek because he will not consent to a splitting of his country—and under the name of "unity."

Perhaps you recall seeing this three-quarter page advertisement by the Communists last summer in papers all over the country, in which Earl Browder says: "The time is more than ripe for the United States to insist that the Chungking Government shall put its house in order with a real, not a formal, unification of all Chinese fighting forces." Mr. Chairman, the United States has no more right to insist that Chiang start arming the Communists against himself than Chiang has to insist that Roosevelt "put his house in order" by getting a real unification of all anti-Japanese forces in America. He would have to take into his Cabinet as a starter, William Randolph Hearst, Col. Robert McCormick, and Hamilton Fish, because they were anti-Japanese long before he was.

Mr. Chairman, the word "unity" means one, not two; one government, not two; and one army, not two. Chiang has said from the beginning and during all these 7 years, and reiterated the offer last month, that he will accept them in a coalition government immediately if they will become just a political party; that is, will give up their separate army and their separate government. For us to insist that Chiang Kai-shek reconcile himself to a splitting of his own country and send military supplies to an armed rebellion is to ask him to be a traitor. Of course, he has not been willing to do it, and will not, unless the Communists will, first of all, give up their separate government and army. There is no law or logic whereby the head of a legitimate government can be asked to recognize, let alone assist, a wholly independent sovereignty within his own country.

But Chiang has leaned over backward in long-suffering and patience trying to get the Communists to play ball in the war against Japan. He offered last fall to put the Chinese Government's armies under an American general's command if the Communists would do the same. They refused. In recent negotiations he suggested a committee to try to work out a way to get all the Chinese forces coordinated against Japan. He would put the Chinese Government on a basis of equality with the Communists, each having one representative, and the third man of the committee an American officer if the United States would consent to that. The Communists rejected the offer. Well, just what do they want? Do they expect to appoint all three of the members of the committee? Their pretenses are clearly exposed. It is impossible to get unity with them because there is no concession Chiang can make, short of complete surrender, which they will accept. They do not want unity. What they want is all the advantages of appearing to want unity so they can get arms and sympathy and support from abroad, while at the same time having all the advantages of complete independence. They are stalling along, taking advantage of Chiang's tolerance to expand their own strength while he weakens his in fighting the Japanese.

If they can stall along thus until the war in Europe ends, then they can hope for powerful support from Russia. They can try an "October revolution" in the hope of getting control of all of China. If that fails, they can at least rebel and try to split off north China, including Manchuria—of course, in the name of freedom—and then the new "independent democracy" can invite Russia in to protect it as she is protecting the new "independent" governments in eastern Europe. The new "North China" can even voluntarily insist, if it desires, on being taken in as one of the United Socialist Soviet Republics. I do not like to make such suggestions. But I do not believe any unbiased person can go through all the evidence and escape the belief that this is the sort of thing Communists in China have in mind.

They claim they must have their separate army, because otherwise Chiang will destroy them, and that he is more interested in fighting Communists than in fighting the Japanese. There is no evidence whatsoever in his record to support that accusation. Look at the number of men who fought Chiang Kai-shek and who, after he defeated them, were not destroyed but were taken into his army and government and are today being used in high positions. I do not know of any other record in history that will surpass his in this respect. Feng Yu-hsiang, the Christian general, fought him for years. When Feng had a change of heart, Chiang Kai-shek took him in, and he is now in charge of training Chiang's troops. Yen Hsi-shan, the Governor of Shansi Province, fought Chiang for years. I served as physician for Yen and his family. He finally agreed to unite with the Central Government and he is still in charge of his own troops as a part of the Chinese Armies. Man after man of the war lords and independent leaders, like Li Tsung-jen and Pai Chung-hsi, agreed to give up their separate armies and come in with Chiang Kai-shek, when the nation faced the Japanese peril, and he has not destroyed a single one of them. Only the Communists have refused to unite against the common enemy.

If Chiang's primary purpose had been to destroy the Communists, why did he not do it in 1938 or 1939 when they were much weaker and he much stronger? Can anyone imagine a real dictator or tyrant allowing a rebellion to simmer along for 7 years within his own domain? Such a claim does not make sense. Yet many have believed it.

The Communists are selling us a gold brick when they try to make us think that they must maintain their army or be destroyed. They maintain their separate army because they want to seize power after Chiang has armed them with American supplies under the pretext of unity.

And that brings up the next argument; that Chiang Kai-shek is not democratic, but that the Communists are—that since we Americans are democratic, therefore, we should support all democratic movements and that means support the Communists. But of course, neither Chiang Kai-shek's government nor the Communists are democratic in our sense of protecting the full rights of minorities and of opposition parties. China has never in her history had a political democracy, although there is more social democracy, less of class, than in America.

I investigated this talk about democracy. Since most of the Chinese people still cannot read and write, I asked Mr. Lin how the Communists mark their ballots in their so-called elections. "Well," I was told, "we have a system of bowls, and the voter who cannot read or write drops a bean into the bowl of the man who is his choice."

I said, "I would like to know whether the voting is in private or out in public, because, if it is done in secret, I can imagine how easy it would be for some people I have read about in some cities in America to stuff that ballot box. They could fill the bowl with beans out of the sleeves in one trip into the booth. And if it is out in public so that the ever-present Communist police can be sure that the voter drops in only one bean, you do not imagine he would drop his bean into the wrong bowl, do you, if he wanted to retain his head?" All Mr. Lin could do was grin.

The real low-down on this pretense of democracy came from the experience of the newspaper reporters who went up to the Communist area last fall. Some of them were taken in by the show that was presented to them and are now bringing out the sort of reports I spoke about earlier. But two of them told me that in the whole 5 weeks they were not permitted to talk privately to any Chinese they wished. That tells the story. Of course, they did not hear anything unfavorable. All those Chinese that are living, or that want to live, ardently praised the Communist regime.

It is perfectly true the indoctrinated members are fanatical in their loyalty to it. They are almost monastic in their devotion, as a Catholic priest put it. Unfortunately, a great many people accept such devotion to a cause as meaning the cause must be a good, or even a righteous, cause. But would we admit that Hitler's cause is good just because his storm troopers are utterly devoted to him? The Japanese on Iwo Jima support their Emperor fanatically. That does not mean we should support him, does it?

I have never seen such absolute devotion voluntarily given as in the Communist armies and among their political agitators. I have never seen vice or a case of venereal disease among them, which surely is unique. It is also true that they have done a lot with very little and have improved the condition of some groups, partly by giving the have-nots what they confiscated from the haves, partly by brilliantly skillful propaganda and organization of the peasants. But it is at the price of rigid regimentation and the loss of basic freedoms.

True Marxism cannot win in China as it did in Russia, because its primary appeal is to the totally dispossessed, such as the serfs in Russia were. But China is not a nation of serfs. It is predominantly a nation of lower middle-class

people. Most every family has had a little piece of land for centuries. A hardheaded Chinese family does not take the little piece of land that it has, and just because it is inadequate dump it into a common pot on somebody's promise that up around the corner somewhere is something better. Therefore, those whom the Communists cannot persuade they either coerce, or liquidate as "anti-Marxist counter-revolutionaries"—their own spokesman's phrase.

I think they have real democracy within their own party—that is the source of much of their strength—but when it comes to extending democratic rights to those who disagree with them, their record is infinitely worse than that of the Central Government. They use the word as a slogan by which to get support from abroad.

The most devastating exposure of the fraudulent nature of their so-called democracy is the document I hold in my hand. It is the annual report of Chairman Lin Tsu-han last year to the Communist government. You will note it is not an ancient document from the days before the Communists became, we are told, just agrarian reformers. It is dated August 1944, and Mr. Lin gave it to me personally last October. He thought it would win me over. Actually nothing else could be so eloquent in refuting their claims of democracy. May I read a sentence or two?

He is talking about the four main "defects" in their Communist government which they have striven to remedy. He says one was "the tendency of liberalism which found its expression in the nominal obedience but actual disobedience of government policies, in the neglect of discipline, in the indifference to the mistakes of other fellow workers"—that is, the party members are not spying with proper diligence on other citizens and even other party members—"and in the want of alertness against bad elements." It is a vice if the Communist government is not alert to "bad elements"; that is, to any who disagree with it. But it is a crime if Chiang is alert to "bad elements"; that is, to his opposition, namely, the Communists.

Mr. Lin continues, "Last year this tendency was corrected after the continued movement for purging non-Marxist ideology." That tells you how much freedom of thought and real democracy there are in the movement we are asked to support on those grounds.

The other main Communist argument for foreign consumption is that they are doing the bulk of the fighting against Japan and therefore we should suport them just as we supported Tito rather than Mihailovitch, because Tito was allegedly doing most of the fighting against Germany. Mihailovitch was said to be a collaborationist, and therefore we should not support him. But no one can accuse Chiang of being a collaborationist. As a matter of painful fact, we were the collaborationists with Japan—for four and a half years; and I fear might still be today if Japan had not been so stupid as to attack us. Chiang is the one political leader among the Big Four who has not been a collaborationist, whose record is completely clear on that point.

What are the facts on this matter of fighting the Japanese? There have been hundreds of skirmishes between the Communists and the Japanese, especially when the latter sent out expeditions to seize or destroy the crops. But no neutral observer has seen anything that could be called a battle between the Communists and the Japanese since September 1937. On the other hand, they have witnessed a dozen terrific battles between Chiang's troops and the Japanese, several in the last year.

The Japanese have made no serious effort to destroy the bases of the Communists who are alleged to be the real anti-Japanese elements, but the Japanese have launched repeated campaigns to destroy Chiang Kai-shek's bases and his armies, which are said not to be fighting the Japanese. Is that not odd?

The definitive answer to this argument that the Communists are doing most of the fighting can readily be determined from observing the behavior of the Japanese. Let me make it concrete. I was working in our hospital in Fenchow, Shansi Province, when the Japanese finally captured the city on February 17, 1938. In the next 2 weeks they pushed on west 75 miles to the Yellow River, which separates us from the Communist province of Shensi. There the Japanese have been within a hundred miles of the Communist capital, Yenan, for just over 7 years, and have not made a single major effort to get that Communist capital. I wish somebody would explain that. Have the Japanese ever allowed grass to grow under their feet when there was a real threat to them? When we got air bases in south China last summer that threatened the Japanese, they drove down a thousand miles at terrific cost and captured those bases. No reasonable person can come to any other conclusion than that the Japanese have been shrewd enough to see that since it had proved most difficult to knock the Chinese out by direct assault, then the best way to weaken China is to allow the Communists to continue their work of disrupting and disunifying and discrediting the government of China, breaking it down from within. The real "secret weapon" of the Japanese against China and therefore against us has been the Communists of China, ably assisted by some of our own people, sincere, but in my judgment grievously misguided.

What I want to ask is, whom do such Americans think they are hurting by their propaganda for the Communists? Surely our own country most of all. That means it involves the life of every American boy fighting against Japan.

I dislike even more to mention the third main source of the propaganda against the Government of China. A lot of it is approved, even inspired, by persons in our own War and State Departments. There are several reasons for this sorry spectacle. There has been a fundamental difference of opinion from the beginning between Chiang Kai-shek and some of our leaders as to the best way to fight the war. Chiang Kai-shek maintained we could not beat the Japanese from the air or from the sea; they must be beaten on the mainland of Asia. That means huge ground forces. Did we prefer to use American ground troops or Chinese? If the latter, then we must build up China and her industry. Chiang Kai-shek argued, in effect, that the more limited our tonnage over the hump, the more imperative that we use that tonnage, not for finished munitions, rifles, bullets, and bombs, but rather for machinery to make the munitions in China.

But that program looked so hopelessly long to us, and we could not wait. We were going to lick Japan in a hurry. So we put practically all of our supplies to China into our Air Force. I spent hours last spring arguing against this policy with some of our leaders. I do not know much about military strategy, but I do know something about the Japanese Armies. I lived under them. I begged our experts not to put all their eggs in one basket—air power. You cannot beat a people just by air attack. It has never been done yet. But we thought we could in the case of Japan, and so we poured everything into our Air Force, and one of our air officers in China last September, the day after they blew up our air base at Kweilin, told me, "We were wrong." But some in Washington want to lay on the Chinese all the blame for our reverses.

An air force is no good without air bases, and it is proved that air bases cannot be defended against determined ground assault without ground troops. We did not have any combat ground troops in China. And I was told by Americans there that we did not give the Chinese infantry who had to defend those bases one rifle or one machine gun or even one bullet for the job. We put $60,000,000 into one base at Kweilin and now the Japanese have the base because we did not equip the Chinese to defend it. Does it do anybody any good to alibi by shouting that the Chinese cannot fight? Of course they cannot under those circumstances.

After going along according to our own views for almost 3 years, we were further back in China than when we began, and so last fall we finally had to send out Donald Nelson to start building up China's industry, doing the thing that Chiang Kai-shek had told us 3 years earlier we would have to do. It was a bitter pill for our military pride to swallow. We were wrong in this respect—and the Chinese were right, and we did not like to admit it. It was easier to lay the blame for our failures on someone else; so, the constant barrage from Washington about the inefficiency, cowardice, corruption, and so forth, of Chiang's armies—partly true, but not the whole truth.

You read the article by Hanson Baldwin in the Reader's Digest last summer telling how generally no good the Chinese armies are. Where did he get that line? He hadn't been out there. He got it from our War Department. Where do the columnists get their gossip about conditions in China? Mostly from our own War Department and other Washington officials. I am sorry to say this, and I say it not to criticize our leaders but only because I see what it is doing to the hearts of allies on whose ability to hold on in confidence, our own hopes

of early victory depend. It is too dangerous a pastime.

In a recent issue of the Saturday Evening Post there was a typical article called Vinegar Joe and the Reluctant Dragon. Its main facts were essentially correct, but the main conclusions drawn therefrom were essentially incorrect. Chiang's inability to give General Stilwell all the properly trained troops the latter wanted just when he wanted them was attributed to obstinate refusal by Chiang to cooperate, persistently defensive and obstructionist psychology so that the Chinese are practically incapable of taking the offensive and expect us to fight their war for them, greater concern on Chiang's part with his own internal problems than with fighting Japan, et cetera.

But one could use the same arguments to write just as convincing an article on Uncle Joe and the Reluctant Eagle and Lion. Mr. Stalin wanted us and the British to take the offensive and invade western Europe in 1942. Did we do it? No. He wanted us to do it in 1943. Did we do it? No. Apparently we, too, were obstructionists and defensive-minded, wanting Russia to do our fighting for us, et cetera. Uncle Joe could not force us into a counteroffensive until we were prepared and equipped. Neither could Vinegar Joe nor can anyone else force Chiang to take the offensive until he is prepared and equipped.

Chiang said when the war began that there would be three stages: First, the stage of strategic retreat, trading space for time; second, the stage of stalemate in which China has been for almost 3 years; and, third, the stage of counteroffensive to drive the Japanese out of China. He will not start the third until he is ready, any more than we would.

When we delay till ready, it is to save precious American lives. If he delays till ready, it is because he is a poor ally, a reluctant dragon. Do we expect him to care less about his people's lives and his country's interests than we care about our own? Sometimes I think our intolerable arrogance regarding other peoples is surpassed only by our incredible ignorance of them.

The Chinese have been studying and dealing with Asia and the Japanese a good deal longer than we have. Surely it is not surprising and nothing to be ashamed of that they know more about the situation in some respects than we do. Is it a disgrace for a white man to learn anything from a Chinese?

We do not fool others with our pretenses. Then why fool ourselves with our air of omniscient infallibility? Why cannot we admit it frankly when we make an honest miscalculation—whether it is manpower in this country, or quantities of munitions needed, or our policy in China—then just tighten up our belts and go ahead. A Senator on the Truman committee remarked last year, "The Army seldom will correct, it just covers up." That is why in the last analysis we do not dare allow our country ever to get completely under a military clique or any other hierarchy with absolute power. It would happen here as has happened elsewhere.

All these complicated factors have led to a great struggle in China between three main groups, although not as acute now perhaps as it was last fall—I think we may be around the corner. First, is a group of Chinese who are completely disillusioned regarding the white man. Some of them are in the Japanese puppet governments. They do not consider themselves traitors. They consider themselves the hard-headed patriots and Chiang a misguided fool for trusting the West. Their argument goes like this, "When have white men ever treated colored peoples on a basis of equality? Now, Chiang Kai-shek, come down out of the clouds and get your feet on the ground. Why are we pulling England's and America's chestnuts out of the fire? Why are we having our cities laid waste, our women raped, our economy destroyed, our people homeless and starved? Why are we holding the line in Asia so the white men can concentrate on saving their precious Europe first? Will they treat us decently and justly afterward? Well, why not get peace for ourselves now, stop this slaughter and suffering? How can we fight with nothing but bare hands? Let America and England fight it out with Japan. They made the money arming her, did they not? Why not let them do the fighting? We Chinese will never get a chance to be really free unless the white men and his empires are kicked clear out of Asia. Japan is the only Asiatic nation with the military know-how to do it. All right, let Japan kick the white man out. Let her weaken herself, while we get peace and build ourselves up. Then when the war is over and the white man is out of Asia, we Chinese will be strong. We can defeat the Japanese or absorb them. This is the only way to get real freedom for China and for Asia." These men are not pro-Japanese. They are merely pro-Chinese, and disillusioned regarding the West. I submit that has been a rather potent argument, and all the more honor to Chiang and his government for resisting it.

There is a second group, led by the Chinese Communists. Their argument goes like this: "For 200 years our communication with the rest of the world has been largely by the sea, and therefore we got our ideas—political, economic, social—from the nations that controlled the sea, England and America, the democracies. But now another avenue of communication has been opened up—to Russia. This is a day of land and air transportation. We are no longer dependent solely upon the sea. Now, which of the white allies has been utterly realistic in its thinking and called the turns in this war correctly from the start? Russia. Which is the one that started at scratch and industrialized in 15 years, which is what we Chinese want to do? Russia. Which is the one that has proved itself a master of transportation and supply, by railroads, highways, busses, trucks, and airplanes? Russia. Which is the one that does not discriminate against people of a different color? Russia. Then where do our real Chinese interests lie—in going in with the white countries with their empires and spheres of influence in Asia? Or in going in with Russia?

Their argument continues, "Our great natural resources in China are not at the coast, where we built our great cities, Canton, Tientsin, Shanghai, because it was more convenient for the white man's ships. Most of our iron, our coal, our oil, our copper, our natural resources, are way up in the interior, right next to Russia. Well, then, isn't it sensible for us to go in with the Russians and use, not unemployed American engineers, but Russian engineers and experts to guide our industrialization? Not technology from Chicago or Detroit, but from Russia. Why not build up trade and markets for Russia, rather than for America and England? In cooperation with Russia, we Chinese can build in Central Asia the greatest industrial bloc in the world, in the midst of the greatest land and population bloc on the earth."

That, too, is a rather potent argument, is it not? Would it be in America's interest? And yet some sincere but mistaken Americans vigorously support the Chinese Communist program.

And then there is the third group, the central Government of China led by Chiang Kai-shek and men who are mostly western-trained students, from America and England. There are unquestionably some who have been in power too long, are reactionary, even corrupt. But on the whole they have been loyal to the ideas and ideals they learned here and have tried their best under enormous difficulties to make China a sister republic in Asia. Now for their effort they get kicked in the teeth by the nation whom they tried most to imitate and support.

In a sense, if one wants to be cynical, Chiang Kai-shek has made only two major mistakes. One was that he did not give up at the end of the first three months of the war. Nobody would have criticized him then. That was what everybody expected him to do. How could the unarmed Chinese fight against such superior military might? Nobody criticized the Poles when their nation went down in 18 days, or the Norwegians and Greeks because they could carry on formal resistance for only a few weeks. Nobody criticized the Russians when they retreated 1,000 miles before superior German armored might. Nobody would have said a word against the Chinese if they had folded up after the fall of Nanking in December 1937. But, poor fools, they did not fold up. They kept on fighting almost alone for 7 long years, and now they get criticized because they cannot go on for 7 more, I guess, without help. I ask again, where is our sense of propriety and of elementary fairness?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Could the chairman of the subcommittee yield me any more time?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman the balance of my time, 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JUDD. I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy.

The second mistake Chiang has made, if one wants to be really cynical, is that

he did not completely clean out the Communists in '38 and '39, when some of his generals wanted him to. They said, "You can't trust the Communists. They are just playing for time. They are using the truce to expand their own power and control and to organize all of North China. Clean them out now while there are only 70,000 of them." He could have done it then, liquidated them the way Stalin liquidated the Kulaks, 3,000,000 of them. Of course, he would have been called a great heathen, oriental, barbarian war lord. So was Stalin, but everybody has forgotten it. He is a great hero now, is he not?

But Chiang Kai-shek, instead of being a heathen, barbarian, war lord, was a Christian. He surrounded the Communists so they could not start civil war in China and has spent 7 years trying to get them to give up their separate government, and come along with the rest of China in a united effort against Japan. I talked to him about this. He did not bring it up; I brought it up. It is pretty hard to have the nation which sent over missionaries to ask him and his people to become Christians now berate him because he tried to act as a Christian.

The situation is nearing the crisis. The Japanese made one incredible mistake—they did not knock China out or win the Chinese over to their side by treating them decently, before they attacked us at Pearl Harbor. Now it is a race between Japan's desperate attempt to repair that blunder, knock the Chinese out and get land lines of communication established to take the place of the sea lines that are being destroyed by our air and sea power, and get the coast of China fortified before we can capture the Philippines and get onto the continent with large beachheads where we can unload men and supplies in shiploads. On the surface, it looks as if Japan has the race won, as if once more we are "too little and too late." But I do not think so. One reason is because I have more confidence than ever before in the American fighting man and his officers in the field. And I have confidence in the Chinese. I have learned never to sell them short. They always seem to be able to reach down and get from some invisible source extra reserves of ability to hang on a little longer. I believe they will do it this time. I am sure they will if they know we will stand by them, both in the war and in the peace settlements, as faithfully as they have stood by us.

What can we do to help win the race? Four or five things. I have time only to enumerate them. First, we have got to cut out this irresponsible, unbalanced criticism of the Chinese for things that do not exist or are not their fault or would be present in any country after comparable disasters. We have got to stop trying to force the Chinese to do what we think is best. They are an eminently reasonable people, but they cannot be browbeaten or coerced.

Second, we have got to make constructive the criticisms that are justified, of things that are bad, sometimes very bad indeed. I want to pay tribute to General Hurley and Donald Nelson in this respect. They go off to a wonderful start because they have been sympathetic and constructive as well as critical. Their approach was not, "Now China, you are our problem. What shall we do with you?" But rather, "China, you have some problems. How can we help you with the problems? How can we help each other most?" There is a world of difference.

Third, we have got to get more material assistance, more supplies to China, quickly. I know it seems impossible. It was impossible for China to hold out 7 years, but she has. It was impossible for the British to hold out in the summer and fall of 1940, but they did. It was impossible for the Russians to hold at Leningrad and Moscow and Stalingrad, but they did. Now, we have got to perform a miracle, too. We have got to get across to the Continent of Asia quickly, and I think we will.

Fourth, we have got to get more political assistance to the Chinese, more spiritual assistance. They can and will fight on valiantly and with increasing effectiveness if we will make it clear to them that this is a war for their freedom, too. That will save a good many American divisions and billions of dollars.

Fifth, we here at home have got to get a deeper understanding of the real nature and significance of this struggle in Asia. That is the only reason I have taken your time today, to try and present these high lights of the picture. We must be better prepared for the tough going ahead. I told you here in a speech 2 years ago that the Japanese used to say to me when I was under them, "We will probably have a war with your country eventually. It will be a hard war, because you are stronger and richer and have greater resources and manpower and industry than we have. Nevertheless, we Japanese will win—because we have spirit. Oh, we may not win the first time; but, if we do not win the first time, we will win the second time. And if we do not win the second time, then we will win the next time. Some day, we Japanese will win." Or, as one said to me one day, "At least, you will lose." Which is just as good, of course, from their point of view.

Now, they know they are not going to win this time; but I venture the prediction there is not one-half of 1 percent of the Japanese in or out of the army that is not perfectly convinced—and with some good reasons—that we are going to lose, that we do not have what it takes to carry through. They are prepared to lose 8,000,000 men and never flicker an eyelash. Are we? Indeed we are not. They are prepared to work without any profits whatsoever or any increase in wages, and nothing but sheer subsistence for 20 years, and never waver. Are we? Indeed we are not—yet.

Our test will come when the war in Europe ends. The armed forces cannot decide it. You and I have got to decide it, and we will decide it rightly only if in our hearts we fully understand what is involved.

Here is Mrs. Smith and her boy is home from Europe. Next door is Mrs. Jones and her boy is still out in the jungles or swamps or mountains of Asia, and may be for 2 or 3 years more. There inevitably will be a strong urge, a subtle temptation, to let down and not carry through to complete liberation of China. Well, have we not freed the Philippines and discharged our obligations there, clipped Japan's wings so she cannot attack us again in the Aleutians or Hawaii? Surely we have no obligations to the Chinese that justify our sacrificing more American lives and piling up additional debt. Why, the Chinese cannot govern themselves anyway. Look at them quarreling among themselves. Why not be sensible and get out of this mess and get our boys home and tend to our own business and get back to normal living?

That will be the way the temptation will present itself. If we yield to it, then God help our children's children, because next time the Chinese will not be on our side. The only thing that saved us this time, Mr. Chairman, was a great moral decision on the part of Chiang Kai-shek and of the Chinese people to fight, not on the basis of blood and color, but on the basis of principle; a decision to fight against those of their own race and with us of an alien race because they believed it was a war for human freedom. But if after they have held the line so valiantly, they are let down and our commitments are not fulfilled, then there is no place they can go next time except to the Communists and a world class war, or to Japan and a world race war. If we fail this time, we will have two-thirds of the people in the world who are colored against the one-third who are white. We can win all the battles, but we will still lose that war because they can outwork and undereat the white man, they will outsuffer him, they will outwait him, and they will outbreed him.

This is the issue that we have got to understand if our children would be free and at peace. The decision that is being hammered out in Asia these critical days is not one for 4 years, but one for 40 years or even 400 years. Are the Chinese, the most numerous and incomparably the strongest of the colored peoples, to stay on the side of the democracies, or are they to be driven in despair to the other side. The answer to that is still in our own hands.

We must understand what we are up against, grit our teeth and stay at it until we get, not just defeat of Japan, but a victory which really frees China and assures all Asia of ultimate freedom as its peoples work and struggle and grow to full nationhood and independence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

All time for general debate has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Representation allowances, Foreign Service: For representation allowances as authorized by the act approved February 23, 1931 (22 U. S. C. 12), $585,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 10, line 16, strike out "$585,000" and insert "$300,000."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago under general debate I called attention to the membership of the committee who were present concerning a number of items that I regard as being extravagant, unnecessary, uncalled for, and having nothing whatsoever to do directly or indirectly with the winning of the war or bringing about the peace. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a few days ago suggested that the membership scrutinize these bills and find out whether certain items ought to be passed or whether in their judgment they should be cut out or at least be reduced. I realize it is pretty difficult to change any of these items because we rely so much upon the Committee on Appropriations. They have done a good job, but that does not mean the bill may not be improved.

This is the particular item to which I directed your attention this morning. It is the sum of $585,000 for so-called representation or entertainment for our representatives abroad. The item after all, is for an expenditure for champagne, liquor of all kinds, and all other items of extravagance. Our representatives abroad are paid good salaries, paid living expenses, together with a lot of other items of expense including moving expenses and traveling expenses. Now we have added to that this item of almost $600,000 for that purpose. May I call your attention that only 3 years ago this item was $125,000. Then the next year you doubled it and made it $250,000. Then last year you increased it to $300,000, and now you are asking for $600,000. In 1 more year, at this rate, you will have a million dollars for this representation item. There is no sense in it and no justification for it and you know it.

It is not just a question of liquor. It is really a piece of extravagance that ought not to be allowed. Here is one place you can cut it down to at least $300,000 and you will have plenty of money to squander and use for that purpose. I believe that our understanding and our relations with countries abroad must be reaching a pretty low ebb if we have to use this method to secure a better understanding with other nations.

So I trust the membership of this committee will use a little judgment here and save the taxpayers some $300,000. We ought to cut it all out, but I am asking for a reduction of half of it, hoping you will go along with me and save $300,000 to the taxpayers of this country. As I said a moment ago, there are a good many other items of extravagance in this bill, but here is one not related to the war effort. I wish I could tell you how some of these items are to be used. According to the report some of them are shuffled around a little bit. Last year they took $15,000 salary that was supposed to be paid to an ambassador and put it over into this fund to be used for representation allowance. It should have gone back to the Treasury where it belonged. There was no reason or excuse for it, except somebody in the Bureau of the Budget approved it. It was never approved by this Congress.

So I trust you will see fit to support this amendment. All I am asking is to cut it down to the amount allowed a year ago, which is $300,000. It is rather interesting to know where it is going. According to the hearings $14,000 of it is going to London, about $10,000 is going to Madrid. None is going to Helsinki today. Five thousand four hundred dollars is going to Cairo, and for Berlin, when we get there, is allowed about $6,000, and so on it goes. So I say, use a little good sense and adopt this amendment. It is not a part of the war effort. Let us get rid of it.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in view of our action the other day in being forced to increase our debt limit to $300,000,000,000, these civil function appropriation bills disturb me very much. I have not seen a single bill of this sort in the brief time I have been here which has not involved an increase over the amount appropriated the year before, and this in the face of necessary war expenditures of astronomical amounts. The salvation of our post-war economy rests on a balanced Federal Budget. If we do not start now to exercise some restraint on our non-war expenditures, the prospect of achieving balance after the war is indeed gloomy.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike to intrude myself into this debate. I have read over a good part of this bill, and it seems to be a very liberal appropriation bill. I find myself in complete accord with the gentleman from Kansas. I think we can save possibly $300,000 here in the next 2, 3, or 4 minutes, and it might be well, too, even that small amount. I think probably a number of millions of dollars can very well be stricken from this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is fair to the people of this country that we represent to deal lightly with $100,000, $1,000,000, or a few million dollars. The other day one of the distinguished and old-time Members of this House said, "Why should we quibble about $5,000,000?" I think the RECORD will show that he made that remark a number of times. I think we are not quibbling when we are talking about saving $5,000,000.

I hope I am perfectly sincere when I raise my voice on the part of economy. I think economy next to the winning of the war is likely to be one of the cornerstones of winning the peace and helping to preserve representative constitutional government in this country.

I think we all are worried about the future, about the future of our own country, because of the constant and increasing extravagance and expense the taxpayers of the country are called upon to bear. I hope that just as a friendly gesture on the part of economy this amendment will be approved by this body.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is with reluctance that I take the floor at this time, but after hearing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas my conscience would not let me rest as I should rest if I sat idly by and did not add a word in support of the amendment, because I am in hearty accord with it. If I had my way, I would not only cut it back to the $300,000 which was appropriated last year for this ungodly purpose, I would cut it all out. One of the greatest speeches ever made by a great American in the well of this House in many a day is the speech we heard a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. One of the greatest statements he made in that masterful and enlightening oration was to the effect that Gen. Chiang Kai-shek refused to liquidate because he was a Christian. I do not know how that statement struck with you, but it struck with me. One of the greatest acts that a leader could do. Now, with our enormous debt piling high, each and every dime and every penny must be paid by the taxpayers of our great Commonwealth. They are being called on through this bill and through this appropriation to appropriate their money for intoxicating liquor and beverages for entertainment.

The gentleman from Kansas is right. The people, as a whole, of our great country, will not approve of such an appropriation. In fact, it will stink in their nostrils. You will hear a howl and a cry of righteous indignation from them when they learn of it. Therefore, I again want to congratulate the gentleman from Kansas in trying to bring about that Christian spirit, even in an appropriation, in the same spirit which motivated that great character over there in the Chinese Republic in carrying on for his country.

Let us vote this amendment in and save that much of the taxpayers' money, and at the same time be doing that which our conscience tells us is right and just and fair.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment end in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, if we wish to make the Foreign Service of the United States a rich man's service, then the Members should support the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas. The testimony adduced before the committee is that many of our officers were absolutely unable to carry on without this representation allowance.

It is easy enough every year when this particular appropriation item is before the House to put the chairman of the committee, so to speak, on the spot to defend this appropriation on the floor.

The gentleman from Kansas has made this appeal to this body every year. This body has seen fit, in its recognition of world affairs and its recognition of the customs and habits of the people of the world, to vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the support of the House again on this occasion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RABAUT) there were ayes 41 and noes 43.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses, Foreign Service: For stationery; blanks, record and other books; seals, presses, flags; signs; military equipment and supplies; repairs, alterations, preservation, and maintenance of Government-owned and leased diplomatic and consular properties in foreign countries, including minor construction on Government-owned properties, water, materials, supplies, tools, seeds, plants, shrubs, and similar objects; purchase, rental, repair, and operation of microfilm and motion-picture equipment; newspapers (foreign and domestic); freight; postage; telegrams; advertising; ice and drinking water for office purposes; purchase (not to exceed 40 passenger automobiles), maintenance and hire of motor-propelled, horse-drawn, or other passenger-carrying vehicles, including purchase of 12 automobiles for chiefs of missions at not to exceed $3,000 each; insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by the law of such countries; excise taxes on negotiable instruments; funds for establishment and maintenance of commissary service; uniforms; furniture; household furniture and furnishings, except as provided by the act of May 7, 1926, as amended (22 U. S. C. 292-299), for Government-owned or rented buildings without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; maintenance and rental of launch for embassy in Turkey, not exceeding $3,500, including personnel for operation; rent and other expenses for despatch agencies established by the Secretary of State; traveling expenses, including the transportation of members of families and personal effects of diplomatic officers or Foreign Service officers acting as chargé d'affaires in traveling to seats of government at which they are accredited other than the city of usual residence and returning to the city of usual residence; loss by exchange; radio broadcasting; payment in advance for subscriptions to commercial information, telephone and other similar services, including telephone service in residences as authorized by the act of April 30, 1940 (31 U. S. C. 679); burial expenses and expenses in connection with last illness and death of certain native employees, as authorized by and in accordance with the act of July 15, 1939 (5 U. S. C. 118f); expenses of vice consulates and consular agencies for any of the foregoing objects; allowances for special instruction, education, and individual training of officers of the Foreign Service at home and abroad, not to exceed $50,000; cost, not exceeding $500 per annum each, of the tuition of officers of the Foreign Service assigned for the study of foreign languages; for relief, protection, and burial of American seamen, and alien seamen as authorized by Public Law 17, approved March 24, 1943, in foreign countries and in Territories and insular possessions of the United States, and for expenses which may be incurred in the acknowledgment of the services of masters and crews of foreign vessels in rescuing American seamen or citizens from shipwreck or other catastrophe at sea; for expenses of maintaining in Egypt, Ethiopia, Morocco, and Muscat, institutions for incarcerating American convicts and persons declared insane by any consular court, rent of quarters for prisons, ice and drinking water for prison purposes, and for the expenses of keeping, feeding, and transportation of prisoners and persons declared insane by any consular court in Egypt, Ethiopia, Morocco, and Muscat; for every expenditure requisite for or incident to the bringing home from foreign countries of persons charged with crime as authorized by section 5275 of the Revised Statutes (18 U. S. C. 659); and such other miscellaneous expenses as may be necessary; $8,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for reimbursement of appropriations for the Navy Department for materials, supplies, equipment, and services furnished by the Navy Department, including pay, subsistence, allowances, and transportation of enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps who may be assigned by the Secretary of the Navy, upon request of the Secretary of State, to embassies, legations, or consular offices of the United States located in foreign countries: *Provided further*, That reimbursements incident to the maintenance of commissary service authorized under this head shall be credited to the appropriation for this purpose current at the time obligations are incurred or such amounts are received.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language in the proviso beginning on line 25, page 15, including all of lines 1, 2, 3, and 4 on page 16, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have asked this time in order to discuss some of the aspects of the proposed treaty with the Republic of Mexico, which will be pending in another body within the next few days and which proposes to govern the waters of the Colorado and Rio Grande Rivers.

In the first place, the communities of California have underwritten and made possible the construction of all of the works that now exist upon the lower Colorado River, including Boulder Dam. The Boulder Canyon Act which is still the law of the United States provides that waters conserved by the dam shall be used within the United States, and in recognition of the guaranties of the California communities of the total cost of that great project and related works, the State of California was guaranteed by this legislative act that she should have 4,400,000 acre-feet of water per year, plus one-half of such unappropriated surplus waters as might be available from time to time.

As a matter of fact, as I have already pointed out, it was the communities of our southwestern portion of the country that made possible the development of the Colorado River, that made possible anything like the amount of water that is now available there. Indeed, Boulder Dam alone has approximately doubled the amount of water of the Colorado River available for use by mankind.

Water is our life in the Southwest. All our hopes for the future development of our farms and cities depend upon it. Without it our cities cannot grow, nor can the number of farms—farms that may be settled by returning veterans of this war—be increased.

Under these circumstances naturally we feel very deeply that the waters of the Colorado up to the amount that will in future be needed for domestic use in our communities and in the communities of the surrounding States, together with the waters required for the irrigating of irrigable lands in the United States ought to be available for those purposes. Furthermore, to a very great extent water made available to Mexico will be used to water huge holdings of lands in the hands of a few landowners, whereas waters used in the United States will irrigate mostly small family-sized farms.

I would be the last Member of the House to advocate any agreement with Mexico which I believed would be unfair to her; nor is that position of opponents of the treaty; but we believe that the guaranteeing of a firm supply of 1,500,000 acre-feet of water as this treaty proposes, together with a great deal of additional water which will inevitably flow to Mexico anyway is out of all proportion with real equity, particularly in view of the fact that it is the communities of southern California that have made this possible by expenditures of some $450,000,000.

And if it be said that the problem of our water is a local matter that will affect only the southwestern region certainly other features of the treaty which I shall now discuss will affect most widely this whole great Nation. The house of delegates of the American Bar Association recently passed a resolution regarding this treaty the text of which I should like you to hear:

Therefore be it resolved that the house of delegates of the American Bar Association disapproves the creation by international treaty of a domestic administrative agency exercising legislative and judicial powers respecting persons and property within the territorial limits of the United States without preserving legislative control or judicial review.

Under the terms of this treaty all the dams and works constructed at the expense of the American taxpayers, and even private water rights of private citizens are made subject, without any standards having been set up by Congress, to the absolute and completely discretionary power of one American commissioner. Power is granted this commissioner beyond the control of Congress and beyond the control of the American people, and beyond control of the courts.

Dean Roscoe Pound, of the Harvard Law Schrool, commenting on the treaty had this to say in this same discussion before the American Bar Association, house of delegates:

It subjects the rights of Americans with respect to the most important forms of what we can fairly call property in some of our States to the absolute, unlimited, unchecked power of a single commissioner. In all the extremes of administrative absolutism with which I have come in contact in the 7 years

since I was appointed to look into this matter, I have not encountered any which goes so far in the direction of subjecting the rights of individuals to an absolute, unlimited, unchecked authority. It seems to me to develop administrative absolutism to the nth power.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Dean Pound proceeds to point out further that the interpretation of the treaty is left entirely to this one American commissioner. It is for this reason that I sincerely believe that in opposing this treaty we are not merely attempting to protect the rights to essential waters which indeed have been guaranteed by law to future generations of American citizens, but are also fighting for the preservation of certain basic principles of constitutional government.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore commend to the Members of the House a study of this matter in the most earnest hope that, while it is true the House itself will not have an opportunity to pass upon the treaty, Members may on the basis of adequate information on the subject do what they can to secure modification of this treaty or, if that is impossible, its rejection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Will the gentleman inform the House what benefits he believes the United States will get out of this treaty, if any?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I will say to the gentleman that I have not been able to find anything in the treaty which would be of appreciable benefit compared to the damage that will be done by the abrogation of existing laws of this Nation, by the loss to our section of the country of large amounts of the water that is our lifeblood and the dangerous delegation of irresponsible power which I have just outlined.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Not to exceed 10 percent of any of the foregoing appropriations under the caption "Foreign Service" for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, may be transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, to any other foregoing appropriation or appropriations under such caption for such fiscal year, but no appropriation shall be increased more than 10 percent thereby: *Provided*, That all such transfers and contemplated transfers shall be set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1947.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph starting in line 5, page 16, down to and including line 13 of the same page.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Foreign Service Buildings Fund: For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of the act of May 25, 1938, entitled "An act to provide additional funds for buildings for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States" (22 U. S. C. 295a), including the initial alterations, repair, and furnishing of buildings acquired under said act, $1,466,000, notwithstanding the amount limitation in the act of May 25, 1938 (22 U. S. C. 295a), to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That expenditures for furnishing made from appropriations granted pursuant to the act of May 7, 1926, and subsequent acts providing funds for buildings for the use of diplomatic and consular establishments of the United States shall not be subject to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph beginning in line 14, page 16, down to and including line 3, page 17, on the ground it is a violation of the basic law.

Appropriation is asked notwithstanding the amount limitation in the act of May 25, 1938 (22 U. S. Code, sec. 295a), as follows:

Sections 292 et seq. authorized the acquisition of properties abroad for the State Department, and section 295a authorized "to be appropriated, in addition to the amount authorized by such act, an amount not to exceed $5,000,000, of which not more than $1,000,000 shall be appropriated for any 1 year," and so forth.

No necessity or reason is shown for the lifting of that $1,000,000 yearly limitation on these appropriations, and the present proposal amounts to, and is, permanent and repealing legislation on an appropriation act.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] desire to be heard?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I think the point of order might apply to the language appearing in lines 20 and 21. That is because of the excesses.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to understand the gentleman. The gentleman concedes that the language in lines 20 and 21 is bad and subject to a point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] insist on his point of order against the entire paragraph?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order for a minute?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the citation of the law for that appears in line 18 and the reason for the legislative language in this bill is for the purpose of taking advantage of the situation as it exists today in the money and real estate markets of the world.

In this bill we had $1,466,000 and a part of those funds are necessary for the purpose of taking advantage, for the benefit of the United States in reestablishing where there has been huge destruction of our own diplomatic posts in the form of buildings and necessities, or at least getting hold of the land in many places, so necessary at this time. If it is the gentleman's idea to frustrate this advantage, of course, the point of order should stand, but for the purpose of really being of assistance to the Treasury of the United States it would be very well if this language were left in the bill. It was placed in the bill to enable the agency to move speedily to any place in the world where it would be to our advantage to reestablish housing for our diplomatic corps.

Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order, if the gentleman insists on it, beginning with the word "notwithstanding" in line 20.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I insist on the point of order to the entire paragraph, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the fact that certain language in the paragraph is conceded to be subject to a point of order, the entire paragraph is subject to a point of order.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service: To enable the President to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service, to be expended pursuant to the requirement of section 291 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 107), $16,000,000, of which not to exceed $25,000 shall, in the discretion of the President, be available for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That all refunds, repayments, or other credits on account of funds disbursed under this head shall be credited to the appropriation for this purpose current at the time obligations are incurred or such amounts are received.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language contained in the paragraph, beginning in line 11—

That all refunds, repayments, or other credits on account of funds disbursed under this head shall be credited to the appropriation for this purpose current at the time obligations are incurred or such amounts are received—

That it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

International conferences (emergency): For all necessary expenses, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, of participation by the United States, upon approval by the Secretary of State, in international activities which arise from time to time in the conduct of foreign affairs and for which specific appropriations have not been provided pursuant to treaties, conventions, or special acts of Congress, including personal services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere without regard to civil service and classification laws; employment of aliens; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; transportation of families and effects under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe; stenographic and other services; rent of quarters by contract or otherwise; purchase or rental of equipment, purchase of supplies, books, maps, periodicals and newspapers; transportation of things; contributions for the share of the United States in expenses of international organizations; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act

of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); entertainment; and representation allowances as authorized by the act of February 23, 1931, as amended (22 U. S. C. 12, 23c); $1,500,000.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that part of the paragraph commencing in line 20 on page 21 with the word "printing" and extending down to and including the figure "$1,500,000", in line 24, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and is contrary to the specific law against such expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to include the sum of money contained in the paragraph within his point of order?

Mr. O'HARA. No; I do not intend to include the sum of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman intends, then, to include the language in lines 20, 21, 22, and 23?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 21, line 24, strike out "1,500,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, there is no intention on the part of the gentleman from Kansas who has the floor to put anybody on the spot. I regret that the chairman of the subcommittee saw fit to suggest it. If there are any items in this bill that cannot be held up to the light of day, and examined and debated, they do not belong here. If you want to spend another $1,500,000, a big share of which is for entertainment and representation allowances, that is your responsibility the same as it is mine. I am opposed to it. It is my judgment that we can save some money here. I am not asking you to cut it all out, although we ought to do that, just as we should have cut out the whole $585,000 a while ago. But at least they can get along with $1,000,000. I realize that $1,000,000 does not seem very much in these days. We talk in billions in place of millions. But if you really sincerely are going to commence cutting down expenses, or rather in this case prevent increases where they are not needed, here is your chance to do it. Do the taxpayers of this country a favor, and save $500,000 for them. I think it is our duty to do it.

A little while ago I thought we could save $300,000, nearly a third of a million dollars. A majority of those present seemed willing to spend $585,000 for entertainment. Here is a chance to save a half million dollars and still leave a million for representation. I just cannot believe the people of this country approve this sort of thing. If it would help in the war effort, or promote peace, that would be a different story. No one on this floor will even suggest that it will do either one.

Somewhere along the line we are going to have to cut down some of our extravagance, and here is one place to do it. There are other items I called attention to a while ago. Some are small items, but it just shows how the Government spends money. I called attention to discussion in the hearings where it cost $4,800 to ship a few typewriters to Chungking. It cost $36,000, they say, to take an Ambassador to Poland if they used a certain kind of airplane, and if they used another kind of airplane it might cost twice that much to take the Ambassador to Poland. Incidentally, it looks as if there is some pretty expensive flying going on.

According to the hearings, no particular question was raised as to whether it was extravagant or not. It looks rather extravagant to me.

In the hearings it is said to be a sort of bookkeeping proposition with the State Department, that is, it does not show on their books, but charged to another department. I assume it is the War Department. But, after all the bookkeeping is done, it winds up as a charge against the Treasury. The taxpayers pay the bill, and that means everybody in this country who pays taxes or buys bonds. You just cannot get away from it. No one will dispute that.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, one of the most industrious and painstaking Members of this House.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman could tell us how much money is involved in the representation allowance, it would support his motion to cut the amount because the authority to spend it for representation allowances has been thrown out on a point of order.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not know the exact amount. Perhaps the chairman of the subcommittee knows. He might like to explain how much is for entertainment. It is not itemized in the bill or the report or in the hearings as far as I can find out. So it is difficult to tell. But my information is about a third of it goes for entertainment. So my motion would reduce the item of $1,500,000 down to a million dollars. If there is anyone who can justify the expenditure of the additional $500,000 for entertainment, I'd like to have it done. I am sure no injury will come about if you take out a third of the money. Five hundred thousand dollars is only a third but it is a lot of money. I am sorry there are not more Members here to vote on this amendment. I hope the Committee will support it.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas says he does not wish to put anyone on the spot, but he wants to put the person who is charged with the legislative responsibility of bringing this matter to the floor in a light which is not a pleasant light to be in. It is not the first time that it has been done. In fact, it has been tried for a great number of years, as I said a few moments ago. Every small nation in the world entertains along the same lines. I wonder if the gentleman from Kansas wants to put the United States of America behind the eight ball?

Mr. Chairman, America will come out of this war with 80 percent of the gold, 60 percent of the silver, 60 percent of the war industries, 60 percent of the peace industries of the world, mind you; 65 percent of the naval units of the world, 70 percent of the merchant marine of the world, 75 percent of the transport and commercial planes, and 60 percent of the fighting and bombing planes. Then, we want to get picayunish in this one particular field. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction, operation, and maintenance, Public Works projects: For the construction (including surveys and operation and maintenance and protection during construction) of the following projects under the supervision of the International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, United States section, including salaries and wages of employees, laborers, and mechanics; fees for professional or expert services at rates and in amounts to be determined by the Secretary of State; traveling expenses; rents; construction and operation of gaging stations; purchase (not exceeding eight), maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, machinery and equipment and parts thereof, and map-reproduction machines; drilling and testing of foundations and dam sites, by contract if deemed necessary, and purchase in the field of planographs and lithographs and leasing of private property to remove therefrom sand, gravel, stone, and other materials, without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5); hire, with or without personal services, of work animals and animal-drawn and motor-propelled vehicles and equipment; acquisition by donation, purchase, or condemnation, of real and personal property, including expenses of abstracts and certificates of title; inspection of equipment, supplies, and materials by contract; advertising in newspapers and technical publications without regard to section 3828 of the Revised Statutes; printing and binding; communication services; equipment; purchase of ice, drinking water where suitable drinking water is otherwise unobtainable, rubber boots, waders, asbestos gloves and welders' goggles, for official use of employees, and such other miscellaneous expenses as the Secretary of State may deem necessary.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I do this for the purpose of asking the majority leader a question. I am wondering if the majority leader can tell us what is to be the program for the balance of this week and the first part of next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if we dispose of the pending bill today, there will be no legislative program tomorrow except the conference report on the Commodity Credit Corporation. Of course, if this bill is not finished it will have to go over until tomorrow.

On Monday there are several resolutions extending investigating committees. There is the Lemke resolution with reference to the drafting of farm labor.

There is House Resolution 62, the Lanham resolution, continuing the housing investigation.

There is House Resolution 45, the Kelley resolution, continuing the physically handicapped investigation by the Labor Committee.

House Resolution 154, the Vinson resolution, authorizing the Committee on Naval Affairs to continue to study and investigate progress of the war effort.

House Resolution 96, a resolution by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] continuing the investigation of public land problems and use of land in rehabilitation of veterans.

House Resolution 155, the Lee resolution, continuing the petroleum investigation.

House Resolution 43, the Hobbs bill, to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases.

The above resolutions are assigned for Monday.

The Consent Calendar will be called on Monday. Such of the resolutions I have mentioned as are not disposed of on Monday will be considered on Tuesday.

The Private Calendar will be called on Tuesday.

Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, if necessary, will be devoted to the Agriculture appropriation bill.

Conference reports will be considered if any are reported to the House next week.

Mr. TABER. That is the program as the gentleman sees it at this time?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. I thank the gentleman for the inquiry.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 2 words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to inquire of the chairman of the committee regarding the language appearing in the bill beginning in line 17 on page 23 and ending in line 23 on page 24. I do not see where any money item is included. Is this intended to be an authorization for construction, or is it an appropriation?

Mr. RABAUT. That is just the preamble, general language.

Mr. HINSHAW. Is that in the nature of an authorization to do this work, or is there any law cited that would authorize it?

Mr. RABAUT. It is based on law and on a treaty.

Mr. HINSHAW. There is no law quoted in this language to which I refer, and I do not know of any treaty that authorizes it; none is stated here.

Mr. Chairman, I am forced to make a point of order against the language contained in the lines beginning in line 17 on page 23 and ending in line 23 on page 24, as not being authorized by law.

Mr. RABAUT. It is language that has always been carried, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. HINSHAW. That may well be; but I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must inform the gentleman from California that his point of order comes too late.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Did not the Clerk finish reading it?

The CHAIRMAN. The subject matter of the paragraph was discussed under the gentleman's amendment to strike out the last word, also under the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. Business having intervened the point of order comes too late. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Conference of Allied Ministers of Education in London: For all necessary expenses of the participation by the United States in the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education in London, or its successor, and in addition for surveys and studies related to the work thereof, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere without regard to civil-service and classification laws; travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; entertainment, stenographic reporting and other services by contract, books of reference and periodicals, and rent of office space, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; printing and binding; and the share of the United States in the expenses of the secretariat of the Conference; $172,000, payable from the appropriation "Emergency fund for the President," contained in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, as supplemented and amended.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the entire paragraph, beginning line 7, page 29, and continuing through line 24, on the ground this is not authorized by law.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Cultural relations with China and the neighboring countries and countries of the Near East and Africa: For all expenses, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, necessary to enable the Secretary of State independently or in cooperation with other agencies of the Government to carry out a program of cultural relations with China and the neighboring countries and with countries of the Near East and Africa, $1,390,000 (payable from the appropriation "Emergency fund for the President," contained in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, as supplemented and amended), including the purchase of books, publications, scientific and other equipment, and educational and cultural materials; contributions of money and materials to, and contracts with, educational, cultural, and nonprofit institutions and organizations in the United States and the above countries, directly or through independent agencies; compensation, allowances, and grants to citizens of the United States and the above countries who are students, professors, or technical specialists, at such rates and under such regulations as may be determined by the Secretary of State, including expenses incurred by such persons in traveling between places of residence, Washington, D. C., and posts of duty abroad, and including travel expenses of citizens of the above countries without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; advance of moneys without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes; printing and binding; and not to exceed $20,000 shall be available for temporary employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws; and, subject to the approval of the President, the Secretary of State is authorized to transfer from this appropriation to other departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Government for expenditure in the United States and in the above countries, any part of this amount for direct expenditure by such department, agency, or independent establishment for the purposes of this appropriation and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, or independent establishment to which amounts are transferred.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against all of the paragraph beginning line 25, page 29, to and including line 17, on page 31, on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill and there is no authority in law for such an appropriation.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cooperation with the American republics: For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of State to meet the obligations of the United States under the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Cultural Relations between the United States and the other American republics, signed at Buenos Aires, December 23, 1936, and to carry out the purposes of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the President to render closer and more effective the relationship between the American republics," approved August 9, 1939, and to supplement appropriations available for carrying out other provisions of law authorizing related activities, including the establishment and operation of agricultural and other experiment and demonstration stations in other American countries, on land acquired by gift or lease for the duration of the experiments and demonstrations, and construction of necessary buildings thereon; such expenses to include personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $125,000 for printing and binding; stenographic reporting, translating and other services by contract, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5); expenses of attendance at meetings or conventions of societies and associations concerned with the furtherance of the purposes hereof; and, under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, tuition, compensation, allowances and enrollment, laboratory, insurance, and other fees incident to training, including traveling expenses in the United States and abroad in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended, of educational, professional, and artistic leaders, and professors, students, internes, and persons possessing special scientific or other technical qualifications, who are citizens of the United States or the other American republics: *Provided*, That the Secretary of State is authorized under such regulations as he may adopt, to pay the actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, of citizens of the other American republics while traveling in the Western Hemisphere, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, and to make advances of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes; traveling expenses

of members of advisory committees in accordance with section 2 of said act of August 9, 1939 (22 U. S. C. 249a); purchase (not to exceed five passenger automobiles), hire, maintenance, operation, and repair of motor-propelled and animal-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; purchase of books and periodicals; rental of halls and boats; and purchase, rental, and repair of microfilming equipment and supplies, and colored photographic enlargements, $4,330,000; and the Secretary of State, or such official as he may designate is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to make contracts with, and grants of money or property to, governmental and public or private nonprofit institutions and facilities in the United States and the other American republics, including the free distribution, donation, or loan of publications, phonograph records, radio transcriptions, art works, motion-picture films, educational material, and other material and equipment, and other gratuitous assistance in the fields of the arts and sciences, education and travel, publications, the radio, the press, and the cinema; all without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; and, subject to the approval of the President, to transfer from this appropriation to other departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the Government for expenditure in the United States and in the other American republics any part of this amount for direct expenditure by such department or independent establishment for the purposes of this appropriation and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority herein contained or under the authority governing the activities of the department, agency, or independent establishment to which amounts are transferred: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $100,000 of this appropriation shall be available until June 30, 1947.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on page 33, line 16, beginning with the word "to" and ending with the word "Statutes", on line 22, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and without authority in law.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, a great many points of order are being made on matters which seem to me to be largely administrative. I believe that executives should not need authority in law for many things which in the common ordinary practice of business or operation of Government bureaus are considered to be part of an executive job. The tendency of our courts in recent years has been to do away with legal technicalities which often defeat justice. Sometimes I feel that the House defeats proper legislation by a too strict adherence to superannuated procedure. If you must have laws to authorize every little incidental effort to be made by an executive, it would be impossible, in my opinion, for any executive to carry on properly the business of his office. You could go through any appropriation bill and pick out small duties that an executive is called upon to do which could not be authorized specifically by any act of Congress because they are too multitudinous. I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that in this instance, in my opinion, it is the sort of thing that an executive by virtue of being an executive of a department could perform under his general powers. I do not believe the point of order is well taken when we consider the nature of the job that an executive must do at the head of a department like this.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to point out to the gentleman from Kentucky that the language referred to by the gentleman from Kansas specifically changes existing law.

Mr. O'NEAL. I realize the Chair is probably in the position of having to uphold precedents, maybe of long standing, and perhaps the Chair will be required to so rule, but I still believe that where you are dealing with incidental matters that are of no great importance and which are among the minutiae of duties that an executive must perform, where it is physically impossible to authorize a thousand and one little duties, the change or alteration of one should not be of such importance that it might be ruled out on a point of order.

I realize the position the Chair is in. At the same time, I should like to call to the attention of the Committee of the Whole to the fact that there are many duties an executive is called upon to perform which might not be specifically authorized by law but by the general nature of the job he has to do. He should be permitted to do those things and to alter them and change them in the regular order of his business, without specific authorization. My remarks are not directed only to this point of order, to many that are made, where the general authority of an executive should allow some latitude as to the details of the business of his office.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas insist on his point of order?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas does insist on his point of order and suggests that after all the Appropriations Committee is not a legislative committee, as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas insists on his point of order. The Chair is ready to rule.

The language referred to by the gentleman from Kansas definitely changes existing law and therefore is subject to a point of order. The Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, a further point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language beginning on page 34, line 9, with the word "to" and extending down to and including line 6 on page 35, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and without authority of law.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this is based on 22 United States Code 501, 502, and is in use by other agencies of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls to the attention of the gentleman from Michigan that there is a specific waiver of existing law in regard to the very subject mentioned by him.

Mr. RABAUT. Then, Mr. Chairman, we will have to concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Upon request of the Secretary of State and with the approval of the heads of the departments concerned, personnel of the Army, Navy, Treasury Department, or Federal Works Agency may be assigned for duty as inspectors of buildings owned or occupied by the United States in foreign countries, or as inspectors or supervisors of buildings under construction or repair by or for the United States in foreign countries, under the jurisdiction of the Department of State, or for duty as couriers of the Department of State, and when so assigned they may receive the same traveling expenses as are authorized for officers of the Foreign Service, payable from the applicable appropriations of the Department of State.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 35, line 20, to and including lines 1 and 2 on page 36, that is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read down to and including page 36, line 4.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2603, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its Legislative Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 681. An act to amend the national Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 2126) entitled "An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. REED to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 10 minutes.

RELIGIOUS ADVISORY COUNCIL PROPOSED TO ASSIST SECRETARY OF STATE IN PROBLEMS OF WORLD PEACE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, the quality and permanency of world peace depend upon how closely the peace settlement is made to conform to the Christian pattern of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

Two conclusions, I think, are perfectly justified, namely:

First. If the mighty forces of selfish power politics dominate the peace settlement there will be no permanent peace,

but the seeds will be sown for another world war.

Second. Only upon principles of religious faith—a recognition of the dignity of the human being and mutual respect among nations for the rights of each other—is it possible to build a peace of the ages.

These self-evident truths stand out as a challenge to alert and activate all of the religious forces of America. I do not see how it is possible for any right-thinking American to bypass or disregard them.

All of the great religious groups of this country have recognized the awareness of their responsibility—Protestants, Catholics, and Jews—by issuing statements on the subject. A year ago the Methodist Council of Bishops organized the Crusade for a New World Order by a series of public meetings attended by over 200,000 people. Over 4 years ago the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America organized its Commission on a Just and Durable Peace as a central medium for crystallizing the views and uniting the efforts of the Protestant Churches of America in relation to the matter of a new world order. Two years ago the commission issued its Six Pillars of Peace statement, which has become almost as well known as the Atlantic Charter.

The most recent activity of the Federal Council of Churches was to hold a conference at Cleveland, attended by some 500 Christian leaders from all over the United States. This was perhaps the most representative church gathering ever held in this country and its report has attracted world-wide attention. Last November the archbishops and bishops of the Catholic Church in America made a statement on the coming peace which was received splendidly by the press of the Nation, Catholic and non-Catholic alike. Other great religious groups have issued statements from time to time.

All of these statements are perfectly magnificent. They indicate the intent of Christian and Jewish minds in reference to a new world order, and that intent sets a goal worthy to be striven for by every citizen of the world who has the interests of humanity at heart.

But statements, however necessary they are in the crystallization of public thought and however fine and commendable, are not self-executing. They must be implemented by unified, coordinated action, or else they will remain mere expressions of collective opinion. Some practical machinery needs to be established to bring the religious forces of America into bearing in helping to shape the future peace of the world.

I think, as I believe we all do, that now is the time of all times for religious influence to make its impress in ordering the future of the world. I think, as I believe we all do, that in view of the part our country has taken in the affairs of the world, there is placed upon the religious forces of America the tremendous, almost terrifying responsibility of uniting and assuming leadership. The hour has struck. The opportunity and the responsibility are both upon us.

This resolves the question down to one of procedure.

I repeat that general statements, however fine and commendable they may be, are not self-executing. Consideration must be given to setting up the machinery to bring into bearing and action the religious forces of America on the world-peace situation.

My own belief—and I offer it for the consideration of the religious people of America—is that the following would be a wise program:

First. That there should be created a joint religious advisory council to speak in one voice, Protestant, Catholic, and Jew, for moral ethics and Christian-Judiac spiritual principles in the making of peace, each one of the principal religious organizations of the United States, national in scope, to be entitled to select one member. The council so selected shall meet at some convenient place and organize by electing a president and other necessary officers.

Second. That headquarters for this religious advisory council should be opened in the city of Washington.

Third. That the headquarters be staffed with efficient personnel with training and capacity to keep in constant touch with world trends and to supply the religious advisory council with accurate factual material at all times.

Fourth. That a small executive committee be created from among members of the religious advisory council to keep in constant touch and frequent communicatian with the Secretary of State in presenting the aims and aspirations of the religious forces of America in respect to the problems of the peace settlement and the future of the world.

Fifth. That the advisory council should exert its influence to have a representative of the religious forces of America sit at the peace table.

Such a set-up as is here proposed would be a practical move, I believe, to unify the forces of religion in America, wipe out all minor differences, and transform the splendid, altruistic purposes of our religious people into the machinery of action.

I have no doubt that the people of America, by voluntary offerings at the churches and synagogues, would gladly contribute many times over the cost of maintaining the headquarters proposed, including the salaries of the necessary supporting staff.

If the executive committee were to be small, as I think it should be, I would recommend for its membership such outstanding leaders of religious thought and purpose as Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, president of the Federal Council of Churches in America; Archbishop Michael J. Curley, and Rabbi Stephen Wise.

I think I can state with perfect assurance that Secretary of State Stettinius will gladly give consideration to the views of a religious advisory council in connection with the peace, provided such a council represents the principal religious organizations of the United States. I have talked to Mr. Stettinius and I know that he is sincerely consecrated to the idea of doing all he can to assist in the establishment of a new world order that will be based on the idea of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Mr. Stettinius is a grand man who has the ability and the courage to fight magnificently for the right, as God gives him to see the right.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein an article from the Washington Star.

Mr. BLOOM (at the request of Mr. RABAUT) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial on lend-lease extension which appeared in the New York Times of March 15, 1945.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. RAMEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for 1 week, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 16, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Friday, March 16, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362 railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Friday, March 16, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m., at which time hearings will be had on H. R. 1121 and H. R. 2543, bills to require weekly newspapers enjoying mailing privileges to make sworn statements with respect to their circulation.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold executive hearings on Tuesday, March 20, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m. on the East Indian bills.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Tuesday, March 20, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in room 247, House Office Building, on H. R. 128, a bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will continue hearings on Wednesday, March 21, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in the committee room, room 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 128, a bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection for pensionable purposes for service rendered between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

322. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946, in the amount of $255,000, for the Department of the Interior, together with a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 114); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

323. A letter from the Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the Office of Economic Stabilization for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

324. A letter from the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the National Mediation Board for the period ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

325. A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, transmitting a copy of a proposed bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to accept and dispose of real estate devised to the United States by the late Maggie Johnson, of Polk County, Ark., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. H. R. 48. A bill designating the library at the United States Merchant Marine Academy as a public depository for Government publications; without amendment (Rept. No. 335). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 34. Concurrent resolution authorizing the special committee of the Committee on Agriculture, designated by the chairman to study post-war plans for agriculture, particularly as relate to cotton, to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 336). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 33. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the bill (H. R. 2200) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," together with the accompanying report thereon; without amendment (Rept. No. 337). Referred to House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2624. A bill to amend the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2625. A bill to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSPECK (by request):

H R. 2626. A bill to provide for the extension and application of the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to certain officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 2627. A bill to amend title III, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina:

H. R. 2628. A bill to extend through December 31, 1945, the termination date under the Renegotiation Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2629. A bill to protect Members of Congress in the performance of their duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 2630. A bill to provide for the public registering of patents available for licensing; to the Committe on Patents.

H. R. 2631. A bill to limit the life of a patent to a term commencing with the date of the application; to the Committee on Patents.

H. R. 2632. A bill to require the recording of agreements relating to patents; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2633. A bill to authorize the refund by War Shipping Administrator of certain freights for transportation on frustrated voyages; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 2634. A bill to prohibit the importation of American-made merchandise sold abroad; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONKMAN:

H. R. 2635. A bill to prohibit utilization of the factilities of interstate or foreign commerce in connection with desertion or abandonment of minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 2636. A bill to provide for the promotion of, and the award of a suitable medal to, American prisoners of war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

H. R. 2637. A bill to cancel drainage charges against certain lands within the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY:

H. R. 2638. A bill to grant a temporary increase in certain annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. R. 2639. A bill to fix the salary of the Director of the Bureau of Mines; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 2640. A bill to validate titles to certain lands conveyed by Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes and to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma", approved January 27, 1933, and to validate State court judgments in Oklahoma and judgments of the United States district courts of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution to change the name of Iwo Jima to Marines Island; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 186. Resolution to direct the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to investigate the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LEA:

H. Res. 187. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to continue the investigation with respect to petroleum begun under House Resolution 290, Seventy-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. MOTT: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact House Joint Resolution 65, to amend the Constitution to limit Presidents to two terms of office; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. ANGELL: Memorial of the Forty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the matter of amending the Constitution of the United States of America so as to provide therein a limit upon the tenure in office of the President of the United States to not more than two consecutive terms of 4 years each, and to that end that House Joint Resolution 65, introduced on January 10, 1945, be approved; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as is necessary to safeguard the areas within the State's borders from being named as prohibited, nonuse areas, without first gaining the approval of the State legislature of the State concerned; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make an appropriation for the immediate construction of additional United States veterans' hospital facilities in Boise, Idaho; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BENNET of New York:

H. R. 2641. A bill for the relief of Frank Glen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 2642. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 2643. A bill for the relief of Walter Pawlikowski; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 2644. A bill for the relief of Eli Richmond; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2645. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgments upon the claims of Tampa Shipbuilding Realty Corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. R. 2646. A bill for the relief of George F. Deutschle; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

199. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. F. A. Stone and 24 other citizens of Lakewood,

Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

200. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts urging the War Food Administration to grant relief to farmers in the existing emergency pertaining to the hay situation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

201. By Mr. SHORT: Petition to Congress by several members of the Missouri State Legislature to amend the Federal law to permit the use of live decoys for the 1945 fall duck hunting season; to the Committee on Agriculture.

202. By Mr. SULLIVAN: Petition of Hon. Pascal G. Bryant, Missouri State representative from Vernon County, and 10 other members of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 16, 1945

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

From all the traditions which separate us and write our names in different camps of thought and conviction, we pause for the upward look which makes us one in solemn yet glad communion with Thee, Thou God and Father of us all. When together we face the things that matter most and a revealing sense of Thy eternity seizes us, we pour contempt on our pride of opinion and accomplishment, we abandon our lonely and selfish walk, we lay aside our haughty self-sufficiency, and humbly pray that we may keep step with Thy will for us and for all Thy children. In this night of human tragedy, amid the darkness which envelops us because willful man has turned from Thy light of brotherhood, rise with Thy morning upon our souls, quicken every noble impulse, sanctify our best endeavors, and, no matter of what else the ebbing years may rob us, let the noontide of Thy grace and peace abide. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, March 15, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Murray
Austin	Hart	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Burton	Kilgore	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Taylor
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Connally	McMahon	Tydings
Cordon	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Donnell	Maybank	Walsh
Downey	Mead	Wheeler
Eastland	Millikin	Wherry
Ellender	Mitchell	White
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Willis
George	Murdock	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate on account of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD (S. DOC. NO. 30)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1945, amounting to $35,000 for the National Mediation Board (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

LANDS HELD IN TRUST FOR THE MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

ADDITION OF PUBLIC LAND TO THE GOSHUTE INDIAN RESERVATION, UTAH

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Goshute Indian Reservation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

DRAINAGE CHARGES AGAINST CERTAIN LANDS, UINTAH INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT, UTAH

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his order of October 15, 1943, canceling the sum of $23,090.62 expended for drainage works to serve non-Indian-owned land under the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah, and also a draft of proposed legislation to cancel drainage charges against certain lands within the Uintah Indian irrigation project, Utah (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Archivist of the United States, the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, Director of the Office of Censorship, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, Acting Deputy Director of the Office of Civilian Defense, the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, the Administrator of the National Gallery of Art (Smithsonian Institution), the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending June 30, 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas, transmitting, pursuant to law, an amended estimate of personnel requirements for the Commission for the quarter ending March 31, 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President and referred as indicated:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Arizona favoring the enactment of Senate bill 114, authorizing payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for the lands ceded by them in the agreement of February 25, 1896, ratified by the act of June 10, 1896, and reopening such lands to mineral entry; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MCFARLAND on the 13th instant, p. 2075, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Arizona, favoring the enactment of legislation providing relief of certain property owners of Santa Cruz County, Ariz.; to the Committee on Claims.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MCFARLAND on the 13th instant, p. 2075, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the executive committee of the American Legion, Department of Wyoming, Cheyenne, Wyo., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for universal military training for the youth of the Nation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CLOSING OF BUSINESS HOUSES DURING OPENING HOUR OF SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE

Mr. LANGER presented a resolution adopted by Gilbert C. Grafton Post, No.

2, the American Legion, Department of North Dakota, Fargo, N. Dak., recommending that all business houses in America be closed during the opening hour of the San Francisco Conference on April 25, 1945, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas representatives of the United Nations will assemble in San Francisco on April 25 to draft the charter for a world organization to prevent future wars; and

Whereas, the waste, destruction, savagery, and barbarism of the present war are proof positive that the next world war will result in world chaos and the loss of our civilization; and

Whereas it is the fervent wish of all America that the labors of the San Francisco Conference shall be crowned with complete success in the ultimate objective, the prevention of future wars, to the end that no future generation of Americans will experience the horror and heartbreak that we know today; and

Whereas the current widespread disagreement and bickering, tinged with greed and political malice, accentuate the inadequacy of mere man in the presence of a problem which is of man's own creation, the problem of banishing war from the face of the earth: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Gilbert C. Grafton Post, No. 2 of the American Legion, Department of North Dakota, in regular meeting assembled at Fargo, N. Dak., does hereby recommend to every community in America as follows:

1. That during the opening hour of the San Francisco Conference on April 25, 1945, all business houses in America be closed.

2. That during said hour, services be held in all churches, synagogues, and tabernacles, and in such other places of assembly as may be necessary.

3. That at such services prayers shall be offered to Almighty God for His divine guidance and support in the labors and deliberations of said Conference and for the complete success of the measures there adopted in the prevention of war.

4. That all America attend said services and pray as one Nation for the end of the scourge of war.

SERVICEMEN'S GRAVES AND STRIKES AT HOME

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have a letter which I wish to read. It comes to me from the parents of a soldier who is now in France. The soldier writes, in part:

After we left there, we went back through Epinal to the huge American military cemetery. There is a fellow who was in the Fourteenth with me buried there. He went to the Air Corps with me and we slept next to each other at Sheppard Field. He went to Toledo U while I went to Butler. He was washed out at the same time I was and we were both sent to the Eighty-sixth at Livingston and then came to the One Hundred and Third together. He was killed late in November. I got his grave number so was able to locate his grave with very little difficulty. It sure gives you a funny feeling when you come over the hill and see those little white grave markers all in lines and rows just like they were lined up for inspection. Not tens or hundreds but thousands of little white boards, each with a dog tag on it, and under every one of those markers there is an American boy—damn good kids, fighting and dying for something they don't understand.

On the same day 17,000 workers were on strike in Detroit because 8 men were fired for loafing on the job. If there was any justice in this world, there would be 17,000 different bodies under those board markers. And still a political-minded rather than a practical-minded Senate refuses to pass a work-or-fight bill. Is that all-out support from the home front?

Mr. President, the letter strongly emphasizes the unsoundness of the policy we have been following in this country. Yet, in the face of letters such as this, we are told that there is a manpower crisis in the United States.

REPORT OF THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2404) to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 106) thereon.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY A COMMITTEE WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a report for the month of February 1945, from the chairman of the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises, relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of Senate or any committee thereof, being in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS,
March 1, 1945.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Pursuant to Senate Resolution 55 I am transmitting herewith a list of employees of the Special Committee to Study Problems of American Small Business who are not full-time employees of the Senate. Included with this list is the name and address of each such employee, the name and address of the Department paying the salary of such employee, and the annual rate of compensation for each such employee.

Respectfully yours,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman.
By DEWEY ANDERSON,
Executive Secretary.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

MARCH 1, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of February 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Brainard Cheney	3418 Highwood Drive SE., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	$6,500
Agnes E. Crivella	1408 Buchanan St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,700
Emerald G. Devitt	2425 27th St. South, Arlington, Va.	do.	2,000
Elsie A. Digges	120 C St. NE., Washington, D. C.	do.	1,800
Harry J. Evans	3010 Gainsville St. SE., Washington, D. C.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.	6,500
F. Preston Forbes	510 Fourmile Rd., Alexandria, Va.	Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Carol M. Fuller	2101 S St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	2,100
Scott K. Gray, Jr.	119 Joliet St. SW., Washington, D. C.	Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Stella J. Groeper	1127 Branch Ave. SE., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,600
Kathleen Kimball	1701 Park Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.	do.	2,000
Elizabeth P. Lucas	1730 North Quincy St., Arlington, Va.	do.	1,800
John W. Nelson	1445 Ogden St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do.	5,600
Vernice M. O'Mullane	Alcott Hall, Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	1,620
Grace F. Purdy	230 Rhode Island Ave. NE., Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	3,300
Martha G. Ray	1457 Park Rd. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,100
Arthur G. Silverman	719 D St. NE., Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	5,600
Lt. (Jr. Gr.) George H. Soule	4020 Beecher St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Navy Department, Washington, D. C.	2,000
Lillian Evelyn Spicer	1433 Decatur St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,600
Frederick W. Steckman	4000 Cathedral Ave., Washington, D. C.	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C.	5,000
Margie L. Strubel	4632 12th St. NE., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	1,800
Allen G. Thurman	200 East Shepherd St., Chevy Chase, Md.	Maritime Commission, Washington, D. C.	6,500
Alfred J. Van Tassel	1622 Mount Eagle Pl., Alexandria, Va.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	6,500
Olga Yelencsics	2400 13th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do.	2,100

JAMES E. MURRAY, *Chairman.*

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 752. A bill to amend the act of June 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 811), as amended, relating to the acquisition of stocks of strategic and critical materials for national defense purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the Social Security Act for the purpose of permitting States, and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, to secure coverage of their officers and employees under the old-age and survivor provisions of such act. I expect to make a statement on the floor later about the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill introduced by the Senator from Nebraska will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 753. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, for the purpose of permitting States, and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, to secure coverage for their officers and employees under the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of such act; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill intended to prevent the sort of practices referred to in the newspapers as the Petrillo practices. I am not sure to what committee the bill should be referred, but I respectfully suggest the Committee on the Judiciary. I leave that to the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary as suggested by the Senator from North Carolina.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 754. A bill to protect commerce from certain harmful and disruptive practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 755. A bill to facilitate the receipt of hospital treatment and domiciliary care by former members of the armed forces at institutions nearest to their place of residence; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 756. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to James Brown; and

S. 757. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Alfred Murray; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPRESENTATION OF MEN IN UNIFORM AT THE PEACE CONFERENCE IN SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 104), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the young fighting men of America are consistently called upon to battle and die for their country whenever this Nation becomes involved in international conflict; and

Whereas it is imperative that the youth of America have a voice in the vital decisions to be made at the peace table; and

Whereas the United Nations have been solemnly convened to meet in San Francisco on April 25, 1945, to chart a new international security organization to keep the peace; and

Whereas it is imperative that the best minds of America be represented at this and all future peace conferences: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States respectfully urge the President to select a soldier fighting overseas with a rank no higher than sergeant, to represent the men in uniform at San Francisco and at the peace conference.

PRINTING OF STUDY OF DUMBARTON OAKS PROPOSALS AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS COVENANT

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, there has just come to my attention a comparative study of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and the Covenant of the League of Nations, prepared by Dr. Herbert Wright, professor of International Law at the Catholic University of America and a member of the Board of Editors of the American Journal of International Law. I have known Dr. Wright for a number of years. In fact, as far back as the summer of 1926 we were both members of a group of some 50 professors of international law and relations who made an intensive study of international organization in Paris, The Hague, and Geneva. For 2 or 3 years Dr. Wright was editor of international conferences for the Department of State and in this capacity he attended the London Naval Conference of 1930. About a year ago he wrote a scholarly study of the "Attitude of the United States toward Austria," which was published as House Document No. 477, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, and caused wide favorable comment.

In the same scholarly fashion he has endeavored to make this present study as objective as possible by arranging the provisions of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals in parallel columns with the relevant portions of the Covenant of the League of Nations, interspersing comments on the similarities and differences between the two instruments wherever appropriate. I understand it has been read and approved for publication by Dr. George A. Finch, editor in chief of the American Journal of International Law, but, since the April issue of that journal will not appear before the San Francisco meeting on April 25, he has suggested to the author that he publish it elsewhere now and revise it after that meeting in the light of the action taken there for publication in the July issue. Regardless of whether one subscribes entirely to the views which he may have incidentally expressed, it seems to me that it will be a decided convenience for the experts who will attend the San Francisco meeting to have this handy comparative study. I am therefore submitting a resolution to have it printed as a Senate document, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Printing as requested by the Senator from Utah.

The resolution (S. Res. 103) was referred to the Committee on Printing, as follows:

Resolved, That the document entitled "The Dumbarton Oaks Proposals and the League of Nations Covenant," by Herbert Wright, professor of international law, the Catholic University of America, be printed as a Senate document.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR McCLELLAN TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF ARKANSAS

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator McCLELLAN to a joint session of the General Assembly of Arkansas on February 26, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPPOSITION TO CHANGING THE TWO-THIRDS RULE AS TO TREATIES—ADDRESS BY EDWIN BORCHARD

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Two-Thirds Rule as to Treaties—A Change Opposed," delivered by Edwin Borchard, Hotchkiss professor of law at Yale University, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEECHES IN THE MORNING HOUR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is a matter which will automatically be laid down by the Chair during the morning hour which may consume the entire time of the Senate until the morning hour shall end at 2 o'clock. In order that the Senate may have an opportunity to try to dispose of that matter when it comes before the Senate, I shall be compelled to object to the delivery of any speeches during the morning hour, except upon that subject when it shall come before the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT—PROPOSED CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 541

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 83) submitted by Mr. BAILEY on February 22, 1945, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 541) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes, and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, as the author of the resolution, I rise to present the facts and to make the argument in its behalf.

This matter is of a great deal more importance than might be thought at first glance. If the motion shall prevail as filed, the jurisdiction over all legislative proposals relating to civil aeronautics will remain where it is and where it has long been. If the motion shall not prevail, we shall be confronted with the prospect of the jurisdiction being transferred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and this would be in the midst of the crucial situation regarding the subject of air transportation. There would be an absolute transfer of

the legislative committee authority concerning a great activity.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the transfer generally, but if I were not opposed to it generally, and were in a neutral state of mind regarding it, I should oppose the transfer at this time from a committee which has had the jurisdiction almost without exception from the beginning of the aviation activity in the United States until now. Of course, I intend to be fair about the matter, and give the Senate the facts; but I can state that that is the situation, and as chairman of the Committee on Commerce since the death of Dr. Copeland in midyear 1938, I can say that the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce over matters concerning aviation has never been challenged and never been questioned; and, on the other hand, has been recognized by the presiding officers of the Senate, by the State Department, by the Secretary of Commerce, and by all others concerned, including the Senate of the United States, and the Committee on Interstate Commerce itself.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I am sure the Senator would not intentionally make a misstatement with reference to the situation. The Committee on Interstate Commerce has never recognized the right of the Committee on Commerce to jurisdiction over matters concerning the regulation of interstate commerce, whether it be by air, railroad, or any other means. I think I may say I am entirely familiar with the whole situation which has arisen, and I am sure the Senator does not wish to make an incorrect statement and say that the Senate has recognized entirely the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce, because the question never arose in the Senate as to whether or not legislative proposals were rightfully referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. The first bill dealing with this matter was reported by the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, and came out on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I can make good my statement. I said the Senate has recognized the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee over this subject. The Senate has always sent civil aeronautics bills to the Committee on Commerce. That is all I meant. But let me answer the Senator from Montana before he rises again. I will yield to the Senator in a moment. I am not going to make any statement here which I cannot make good under the challenge of the very acute mind of my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and if I should be caught in an inaccuracy I think he knows I would be happy to correct it. The jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee has been recognized by the Committee on Interstate Commerce in this sense, that bill after bill—and I shall read a list of them and place them in the RECORD—bill after bill, great numbers of them have been introduced in the Senate and referred to the Commerce Committee, and the Interstate Commerce Committee has never moved to discharge the Committee on Commerce. That is what I meant, and I think that is a fact with which the Senator from Montana, who has now risen, and the Senate as a whole, are well acquainted.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say that the Senator from Montana has never moved to discharge the Commerce Committee from consideration of legislation, neither did the Commerce Committee move to discharge the Interstate Commerce Committee when it took charge of this legislation when it first was introduced into the Senate. If the Senator will permit me, I will say that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who probably took more interest in this legislation than anyone else, introduced bill after bill affecting aviation which were referred to the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate, and the bills were reported by that commitee and came to the floor of the Senate. Later I shall give the history of those bills.

It is not correct to say that simply because the Interstate Commerce Committee did not move to discharge the Commerce Committee, the Interstate Commerce Committee did not have jurisdiction over legislation of this character.

Frankly, so far as I am personally concerned, as the Senator from North Carolina knows, I have never wanted to get into a quarrel with any committee on the subject of jurisdiction over legislation, but the members of my committee have repeatedly called my attention to the fact that 90 percent of American aviation involves interstate commerce, as compared with less than 10 percent in overseas transportation, just as the railroads are engaged in interstate commerce, just as trucks and busses are engaged in interstate commerce, and if one of these means of transportation is not engaged in interstate commerce, then another is not. If the Senate wants to turn jurisdiction of interstate commerce over to the Commerce Committee, that is perfectly all right with me; but legislation dealing with interstate commerce should go to the Interstate Commerce Committee, and legislation which deals with commerce should go to the Commerce Committee.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator has now gone from the point we were discussing, into general policy. I can follow him into that general policy, but I do not think it would be advantageous or hardly pertinent at this stage. Of course, if the Senator wants to make the point that all matters of commerce go to his Committee on Interstate Commerce, the Committee on Commerce generally would take notice of the fact that "Othello's occupation's gone!" and a good many of us here in the Senate would find ourselves in Othello's position. So I do not think that argument is good.

But, Mr. President, what I was saying, and what the Senator from Montana was questioning, was that the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee has not been challenged and has been consistently recognized by the Senate.

The matter before us arose in this way—and I hope to say what I am about to say without involving the Vice President in the slightest degree. A bill on the subject of aviation was introduced by the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. The bill, which was Senate bill 541 to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, was introduced on February 15. The bill was referred by the Vice President, at that time presiding, to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. My attention being called to that fact, I at once gave notice of a motion to discharge. There is no question about this bill being a civil aeronautics bill, and it is a fundamental bill, affecting both foreign and domestic aviation activities. It consists of more than 120 pages, somewhat similar to a bill I introduced last year, but not altogether like it, and covering practically all of the civil aeronautics legislation. It is quite a fundamental bill. I made my motion to discharge the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I saw the Vice President, and he simply stated to me "I have done that deliberately. I always thought that civil aeronautics legislation should be under the Interstate Commerce Committee. Several years ago, while I was in the Senate," he said, "I took that view."

Mr. President, I give the Vice President credit for acting in the best of faith; that was his judgment; but his judgment was contrary to his own conduct here during all the years he sat in the Senate, because as I shall show the Senate from the RECORD, scores of bills on the subject of aeronautics transportation were introduced, and all of them were referred to the Committee on Commerce. If anyone had challenged that or had questioned that reference, a motion to discharge the Commerce Committee would have been made years ago.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BAILEY. I do; but I do not think the Senator from Montana can get around that fact.

Mr. WHEELER. I think I can get around it by calling attention to the RECORD. In 1935 the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] introduced Senate bill 1332 to provide for the promotion, regulation, and control by a Federal commission of all phases of civil aeronautics, and for other purposes. That bill went to the Interstate Commerce Committee.

In 1935 the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] introduced Senate bill 3027 for the regulation of the transportation of passengers and property by aircraft in interstate and foreign commerce and for other purposes. That bill went to the Interstate Commerce Committee.

In the Seventy-fifth Congress, on January 6, 1937, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] again introduced a bill, Senate bill 2, to provide for the regulation of the transportation of passengers and property by aircraft in interstate commerce, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The committee held hearings on it and the bill was reported to the Senate.

Mr. BAILEY. What was the last bill?

Mr. WHEELER. Seventy-fifth Congress, on January 6, 1937.

Mr. BAILEY. I have a list of all the bills.

Mr. WHEELER. So when the Senator says that all legislation of this character went to his committee he is in error. Previous to that time much legislation dealing with aviation matters which had been introduced up to that period had gone to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads because the legislation referred to air mail. So it went to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. And if the bills referred in some instances to military matters, they went to the Military Affairs Committee. But the first three bills providing for the regulation of air carriers in interstate commerce which were introduced went to the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate and were referred to that committee by the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

Mr. BAILEY. I am afraid my very accurate friend the Senator from Montana is mistaken. I have the record in my hands, and I am going to read it.

Mr. WHEELER. And I have the record in my hands. Does the Senator from North Carolina challenge the statement that the first bill introduced in 1935——

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator argues that one or two little exceptions constitute the rule. I shall show the Senate what the rule is, and what are the exceptions also.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield further?

Mr. BAILEY. Of course I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Senator challenge the statement I made that in 1935 the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] introduced a bill providing for an independent commission and that that bill went to the Interstate Commerce Committee?

Mr. BAILEY. I will tell the Senate all about that if the Senator will give me the opportunity to do so.

Mr. WHEELER. But the Senator from North Carolina made the statement a moment ago that all legislation dealing with this subject had been referred by the Presiding Officer to the Commerce Committee. I challenge that statement, and I will say that the record does not bear it out.

Mr. BAILEY. I think I can clear the Senator's mind about that.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I understood the Senator from North Carolina to make the statement that since 1938 all bills relating to aviation had been referred to the Commerce Committee.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall not question that statement, but that was not the statement that was made, if I understood the Senator from North Carolina correctly.

Mr. OVERTON. I understood the Senator to qualify it by stating——

Mr. WHEELER. When the statement is made that all legislation of this character went to the Commerce Committee, I call attention to the fact that the very first measure which was introduced on this subject was referred by the Presiding Officer to the Interstate Commerce Committee. The truth about the matter is that subsequently, when Senator Copeland wished to handle a particular aviation bill, he came to me and asked me to let the bill remain in his committee. The Senator from North Carolina says that the Interstate Commerce Committee has never challenged the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce. It certainly did, and wanted me to challenge it.

Mr. BAILEY. I have referred to the view of the Vice President while he was a Senator, and particularly since 1933; and the RECORD will so show. But my very able friend substitutes the word "never" and then makes a good argument. I shall adopt his word "never"; and I think I can convince the Senate that I am correct, allowing for a few minor exceptions. I shall discuss the exceptions frankly.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I simply wished to ask the Senator from Montana whether he denies the fact that all bills relating to aviation, from and including 1938, up to the present time, except for this last bill, have been referred to and acted upon by the Committee on Commerce?

Mr. WHEELER. Of course; but the Committee on Commerce cannot blow hot and cold. Earlier this week, when the question of jurisdiction of the Missouri Valley Authority bill was before the Senate, it was claimed that that bill should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry because of the fact that it had heretofore handled that type of legislation. Then it was argued by the Senator from North Carolina that it did not make any difference that a certain committee had previously handled particular legislation. The argument was that the determination depended upon what the language of the bill provided. Ninety percent of all the aviation legislation which has come out of the Committee on Commerce pertains to the regulation of domestic aviation.

Mr. OVERTON. Does the Senator contend that the Interstate Commerce Committee would have any jurisdiction over legislation relating to international aviation?

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is now asking whether the tail should wag the dog.

Mr. OVERTON. No; I am not asking that.

Mr. WHEELER. I am saying that 90 percent of all aviation legislation pertains to domestic aviation, and 10 percent relates to overseas commerce. It is contended by some that overseas commerce cannot be divorced from domestic commerce. That is a question which has been argued. Some say it can be, and some say it cannot be.

The Committee on Commerce today is in this predicament: It is trying to blow hot and cold. It wants to take away from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry the Missouri Valley Authority bill, because of some language which the chairman pointed out in that bill. He read paragraph after paragraph, which he said pertained to navigation, and he argued that therefore the bill belonged to the Committee on Commerce. Now he is taking the position that it does not make any difference what a bill pertains to; that it is a question whether or not a committee has previously handled that type of legislation. I say that the Commerce Committee cannot take a position one day on one theory, and another position on another day on another theory.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator has given us a perfect illustration of his method of argument in the Senate. He is talking about something entirely different from the question which he himself raises. I think it can be argued that, having lost his foothold on the ground which he took, he has jumped to another precipice. He says that we are blowing hot and cold. I shall not argue that point at this time. I will ask the Senator to keep his seat long enough so that I may read the record on this question.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall be happy to have the record read; but I do not like to have the Senator from North Carolina interpret what is in my mind in answer to a question asked by the Senator's colleague on the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BAILEY. I would not try to bind the Senator from Montana, but when a Senator speaks on the floor, he knows that other Senators interpret what is in his mind. I know that the Senator from Montana would not question my equal right to do so, along with other Senators. I may be mistaken about that.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, I would not question my friend's equal right; but I have never sought to interpret what was in his mind. I have tried to interpret what he has said, but never what was in his mind. I do not think any Senator would try to do that.

Mr. BAILEY. I usually say what is in my mind. The Senator suggests that he does not. There is no difficulty in interpreting what is in my mind, if the Senator will listen to my words.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not so sure about that.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not think one way and talk another. However, this is going to be an impersonal matter so far as I am concerned. I shall try to argue the question on its merits. The Senator and I will agree that there will be no feeling either way.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. BAILEY. Let me go to the record. In the Sixty-eighth Congress——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I made a special request to be allowed to read the record about

half an hour ago. However, if the Senator simply must ask a question, I will yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICE. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to have the Chair explain the basis of the ruling referring this bill to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is unable to answer the parliamentary inquiry. The question now is one for the determination of the Senate, in the consideration of the pending resolution.

Mr. BAILEY. To come to the record, aviation started in this country as a public activity about 1920. The first legislation proposed was introduced by Senator WADSWORTH, at that time an ornament of the Senate, and now an ornament of the House. That was Senate bill 76, introduced by Senator WADSWORTH on December 6, 1923, to create a Bureau of Aeronautics in the Department of Commerce.

That bill went to the Committee on Commerce and was reported by the Committee on Commerce in Report No. 1262. No question was raised.

The next bill was introduced in the Sixty-eighth Congress by Senator WADSWORTH. That was Senate bill 1538, introduced on December 19, 1923, to create a Bureau of Civil Aeronautics. The bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. What year was that?

Mr. BAILEY. Nineteen hundred and twenty-three.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me call the attention of the Senator——

Mr. BAILEY. I knew the Senator would interrupt me before I had finished with the record.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to keep the record straight. Everyone recognizes the fact that at that time aviation was not being used for the transportation of passengers and commodities throughout the country. It was an infant industry. Similarly, as an example, as the Senator knows, originally experimentation with radio was under the Department of Commerce.

Mr. BAILEY. I shall show that when aviation was used for transporting freight, express, and passengers, legislation on the subject went the same way. That was only the beginning. Neither of the bills to which I referred became law. The first one passed the Senate, but did not pass the House.

Let us take the next case. In the Sixty-ninth Congress, Senator Bingham, of Connecticut, who was a Member of the Senate when I first came here, introduced a bill on December 8, 1925, to encourage and regulate the use of aircraft in commerce, and for other purposes. That was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and there was no question about it. It was reported in Senate, Report No. 2. There was a conference report on it, Report No. 1162. It became Public Law No. 254. That was the first act. It originated in the Senate, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, was reported from the Committee on Commerce, and conducted through the Senate by the chairman of that committee.

Now let us come to the next act. It was in the Seventieth Congress. It is Senate bill 5350, introduced by Mr. Bingham on January 14, 1929, an act to amend the Air Commerce Act of 1926, with reference to the examination and rating of schools giving instruction in flying. It was referred to the Commerce Committee, was reported by the Commerce Committee, and became Public Law No. 846. These are the fundamental acts. The first act is known as the Air Commerce Act. It was the great underlying act from which developed the 1938 act. Our whole aircraft activity, transportation and otherwise, developed under that act, until 1938. Let me remind the Senate that it was referred to the Commerce Committee. The reference of the bill to that committee was not questioned by the Committee on Interstate Commerce. The bill was reported by the Commerce Committee. It was enacted, and it continued through 1925 and 1926, and was amended in 1929 by legislation reported out of the Commerce Committee.

Now let us consider the Seventy-first Congress. Senate bill 568 was introduced by Senator Wesley Jones, of Washington, on April 24, 1929, to establish the Wright Transcontinental Airway. It was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and there was no question about it.

Senate bill 1947 was introduced by Mr. Bingham on October 24, 1929. It was a bill to provide for the investigation of accidents in civil air navigation. It was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and no question was raised.

Senate bill 2214 was introduced by Mr. Schall on November 21, 1929, to amend the Air Commerce Act of 1926, so as to provide further encouragement for civilian flying. It was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Senate bill 3399 was introduced by Mr. Bingham on February 1, 1930, to amend section 2 (e) of the Air Commerce Act of 1926. It was referred to the Committee on Commerce. No one raised any question. None was ever thought of, so far as I know. I was in the Senate with Senator Bingham; I qualified as a Member of the Senate just a little time after that bill was introduced.

Senate bill 3984 was introduced by Mr. Bingham on March 21, 1930, to provide for the air marking of certain Government buildings. It was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Senate bill 4188 was introduced by the late Senator McNary on April 16, 1930. I do not like to mention his name without paying a tribute to him—a lovely spirit and a lofty Senator. That bill was to provide for the establishment and development of American air-transport services overseas. The bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce, of which Senator McNary was a member.

Senate bill 5078 was introduced by Senator McNary on December 4, 1930, to provide for the establishment and development of American air-transport services overseas. The bill is similar to the preceding one in this list, but it has a different number, and undoubtedly it provided for certain changes. It was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

In the Seventy-second Congress, Senate bill 421 was introduced by Senator Bingham on December 9, 1931, to provide for the air marking of certain Government buildings. It was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and no question was raised.

Senate bill 717 was introduced by Senator McNary on December 9, 1931. It has the same title as the bill preceding it in this list. It was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Again, we find that Senate bill 3039, which was introduced by Senator Schall, to amend the Air Commerce Act of 1926, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Senate bill 4262 was introduced by Senator McNary on March 30, 1932, and it was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

I have to go through all this detail in order to answer the challenge as to the accuracy of my statement. It may be a little tedious to do so, of course. I obtained this record a few weeks ago; I did not prepare it myself. I obtained it from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

In the Seventy-third Congress, Senate bill 1987 was introduced by Senator McNary on January 4, 1934, to develop American air-transport services overseas. It was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Senate bill 2991 was introduced by the late Senator Sheppard, another man whose memory I revere. It was a bill to encourage civil aviation in the United States. The bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and no question was raised by any other committee.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I raised no question regarding any proposed legislation. As a matter of fact, I have never made a motion in the Senate to take any piece of legislation away from any other committee.

Mr. BAILEY. I am making good my statement that through all the years legislation of the character in question was referred to the Committee on Commerce, without question.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me call attention to the fact that the particular bill which is the subject of the pending resolution was not referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce at my request. As a matter of fact, after it was introduced it was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce by the Presiding Officer, the Vice President of the United States.

I am sure that an examination of the many aviation bills referred to by the Senator from North Carolina will show that most of them did not involve the regulation of interstate commerce, because at that time aviation was only in its infancy, and not an important means of transport. In fact, one of the department heads at that time referred to it as a mere speck in the sky.

Mr. BAILEY. I am now getting to the point in the list where it was not in its infancy. I think it is very important to show that during the infancy of the legislation it went to the Committee on Commerce by common consent.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. What authority would Congress have over the legislation if it did not regulate interstate commerce?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, that question is a simple one to answer. For example, today there is a great deal of legislation which pertains to radio and all of it is within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate Commerce. But when Mr. Hoover was Secretary of Commerce and before that when radio was not an important means of interstate and foreign communication all radio legislation was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and upon the same theory which Senators would apply with reference to early aviation legislation. Of course, at that time the radio industry was in its infancy, and it was a problem of commerce and industry—the building up of an industry—and not the regulation of an interstate carrier.

The point is made that some legislation was referred to the Committee on Commerce when the aviation industry was in its infancy. It is argued that when it was an infant industry and was not engaged in the transportation of passengers, express, and freight, and the principal problem was the building up of the industry as a manufacturing enterprise, legislation relative to it should have been referred to the Commerce Committee.

Mr. OVERTON. No, Mr. President; the point the Senator made was that the early legislation did not affect interstate commerce.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. OVERTON. Congress would have no authority to enact legislation regarding it, if it did not affect interstate commerce.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, we have enacted, and we now enact almost every day, legislation which does not pertain to interstate commerce. There is no question about that. Of course, the Senator does not maintain that the only legislation which Congress can handle refers only to interstate commerce.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Montana has referred to radio and to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Committee over radio legislation. It is true, as I think was suggested by the Senator from Louisiana, that at one time for a brief period jurisdiction over radio legislation was in the Commerce Committee of the Senate, and in the House of Representatives, in the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. However, that was because of the physical characteristics of radio. It was then available and was in use only between ship and ship, and ship and shore, and at that time what I call the marine committees of the two Houses of Congress had jurisdiction over such legislation. But as radio developed and became of infinitely larger use, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives took over the original jurisdiction which the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries had; and in the Senate the Committee on Interstate Commerce took over the jurisdiction which the Senate Commerce Committee had.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; but I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact the Interstate Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives handles all aviation legislation. The bill about which the Senator from North Carolina is now speaking came to the Senate after being considered by the Interstate Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BAILEY. The Senator has called the Committee of the House of Representatives, the Interstate Commerce Committee. I do not like to dispute him, but the correct name of the House committee is the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That is quite a different committee.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; but that committee handles the same kind of legislation as the legislation about which the Senator from North Carolina has been speaking. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the other House ordinarily handles the same legislation that is handled by the Senate Commerce Committee.

Mr. BAILEY. The organization of the committees in the other House is entirely different from that in the Senate. I am sure that every Member of the Senate knows that I have a real affection for my friend the Senator from Montana; but he reminds me of the ancient harps. It was said that they were so delicately tuned and so highly strung that they could be hung from a tree in the desert and the wind would play tunes upon them. I do not believe that I could get very far in my remarks without a question being raised by this very beautifully tuned harp over here.

Mr. OVERTON and Mr. WHEELER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not believe a reference can properly be made to the commerce committee of the other House, because there is no commerce committee in the House of Representatives.

Mr. WHEELER. It is true that there is no commerce committee in the House of Representatives, but every piece of legislation affecting interstate commerce, and the regulation of interstate commerce, when introduced in the other House, is referred to the Interstate Commerce Committee. Legislation affecting commerce is not referred to the Interstate Commerce Committee of the House. It is referred either to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries or to some other committee. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives handles identically the same legislation in that body that the Committee on Interstate Commerce in the Senate is by precedent and jurisdiction supposed to handle in the Senate, although the Senator from North Carolina is now attempting to justify a broadening of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce to include the entire field of interstate-commerce regulations.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I do not think there should be any controversy about the record. It comes from the Legislative Department of the Congressional Library. At any rate, it is not my fallible work. I should like to finish reading it. I wish to do so only for the information of the Senate.

When I was interrupted I had reached 1934. The McCarran bill, S. 3187, was referred to the Committee on Commerce. Then Senator Schall's bill, Senate bill 3328, was referred to the Committee on Commerce. There was another bill, Senate bill 3526, by Senator Stephens, which was also referred to that committee. Senator Stephens was the ranking Democratic member of the Commerce Committee. The McCarran bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There was a bill introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] on June 24, 1935, to authorize the purchase of the *Winnie Mae* by the Smithsonian Institution. It was Senate bill 3135, and was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

We now come to the bill introduced in 1937 by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, by providing for regulation of the transportation of passengers and property by aircraft in interstate commerce, to provide for safety measures therein, and for other purposes. That act was the forerunner of the present act. It was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WHEELER rose.

Mr. BAILEY. If the Senator will be patient I will give him a real opportunity to dispute with me. I need only time to get some facts into the RECORD about which he can debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not want the Senator to skip over lightly the first bills which were sent to the Interstate Commerce Committee, and on which extensive hearings were held.

Mr. BAILEY. I was coming to them.

Mr. WHEELER. If the Senator is coming to them, very well.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not mind the harp playing a melody after I come to it, but when the Senator anticipates me with his melody I become embarrassed.

Mr. WHEELER. I hope the Senator will be careful in his use of the word "harp."

Mr. BAILEY. It is one of the most beautiful of instruments.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand it is one of the most beautiful of instruments, and I also understand that the Senator's remark was intended as a compliment; but I know that at one time in my home State a certain man ran as a candidate for office, and because of the fact that he

referred to someone as a "harp" he was defeated for office.

Mr. BAILEY. So far as I am concerned, I hope that it will never happen to this Senator. However, I am not worried. I am sure the Senator meant his statement to be taken lightly.

I recall some very beautiful lines about the harp, substantially as follows:

By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down, yea, we wept, when we remembered Zion.

We hanged our harps upon the willows in the midst thereof.

For there they that carried us away captive required of us a song; and they that wasted us required of us mirth, saying, Sing us one of the songs of Zion.

When I speak of the harp itself, there can be no reflection on the Senator from Montana.

Let us come back to the subject. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] introduced a bill of this nature and it was referred to the Interstate Commerce Committee. No action was taken on the bill, and it was transferred to the Committee on Commerce. No question was raised. The Committee on Commerce reported the bill to the Senate, and it is the fundamental law today. That was the 1938 act.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BAILEY. Of course, I yield. I like to hear the music. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. I must correct the statement which the Senator made. He said no action was taken. He is mistaken, because action was taken. The present Vice President of the United States was appointed chairman of the Subcommittee on Interstate Commerce which held hearings, and the bill was reported by the committee.

Mr. BAILEY. I understand that.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator said that no action was taken.

Mr. BAILEY. I am sorry that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is not present in the Chamber. He told me about the matter. I do not like to quote a Senator in his absence. However, I asked him about the bill.

Mr. WHEELER. The question is not one of quoting the Senator. I am chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and I know what took place. The present Vice President of the United States was appointed chairman of a subcommittee. Hearings were twice held on two different bills, and they were reported to the Senate calendar. Other bills were also reported.

Mr. BAILEY. I should not undertake to doubt the capacity of the Senator from Montana to ascertain the facts with regard to all things, but I think that the Senator from Nevada, as a humble witness, might be heard.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator from Nevada is not a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee. He undoubtedly stated what he thought were the facts. But there can be no question that a subcommittee was appointed, that it held hearings and that the bill was reported. Every Member of the Senate who was a member of the Interstate Commerce Committee at that time will attest to those facts, and the record shows them. I can furnish the Senator with a copy of the hearings.

Mr. BAILEY. The bill to which I refer was referred to the Commerce Committee before it became law, and the Commerce Committee reported it. The Interstate Commerce Committee did not report it.

Mr. WHEELER. I beg the Senator's pardon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I beg the Senator's pardon, because he is in error with reference to the facts. As I have already said, two bills were reported from the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce. I am sure that the Senator wants to be accurate in his statement. In 1934 the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] introduced the first bill, which provided for an independent commission to have charge and supervision of the regulatory powers of aviation, both civil and commercial. That was Senate bill 3187. The bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce. The President later refused to give his approval to the bill. No action was taken, and, as a result, the McCarran bill was introduced. In 1935 the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] introduced bill 3207 for the regulation of air transportation. The bill was referred to the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate. A subcommittee held hearings, and later a Presidential message of January 21, 1935, recommended that the whole matter be placed under the Interstate Commerce Commission. Senator McCARRAN reintroduced a rewritten bill, S. 3420, which was likewise referred to the Interstate Commerce Committee. The committee reported it promptly, Senator TRUMAN making the report on August 15, 1935, and it remained on the Senate Calendar.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada has come into the Chamber, I am happy to say. The Senator from Montana and I were discussing the bills which preceded the great 1938 act, including certain bills of which the Senator from Nevada was the sponsor. I said in the absence of the Senator from Nevada that the bill which became the 1938 act was anticipated by certain bills which the Senator from Nevada had introduced and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, but no action was taken, and the bill which finally became the 1938 act was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and reported by that committee. I should like to have a statement from the Senator from Nevada about that.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I may say the history of it is as related by the Senator from Montana. In 1933 when I first came to the Senate I became interested in this subject and in 1934 I introduced the first bill on the subject, and that bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I thought that was the proper reference, because my bill dealt with commerce between the States. So it went to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I asked the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Montana, to appoint a subcommittee, and he did so, and, as I recall, made the then Senator from Missouri chairman of the subcommittee. I am not quite certain, but that is my best recollection.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. On that bill hearings were held all during 1934 my recollection is, and a report was made in 1935. My dates could be wrong, but I am stating the history of the matter as I recall it. The bill was reported to the Senate, in 1935 it was taken up on the floor of the Senate, and the Senator from Tennessee, I might say, practically filibustered the bill out of existence—a one-man filibuster. At the next session I introduced the bill, and it went to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. In other words, every bill which I introduced—and my recollection is there were 4 or 5 or 6 of them 1 year after another—went to the Committee on Interstate Commerce; until 1938 they were all referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. That committee was not moving along fast enough to suit me, and in 1938 I had a conference with Senator Copeland, of New York, who was then chairman of the Committee on Commerce, about a bill which I had introduced and which was then pending in the Interstate Commerce Committee. Senator Copeland said, "If you will send that bill to my committee I will get it out for you." So I picked up a printed copy of the bill which was then before the Committee on Interstate Commerce, put another date line on it, introduced it, and had it referred to the Committee on Commerce. Hearings were held by that committee, and the bill was reported. That is the history of the legislation up to that point.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator from Nevada. He has made a correct statement of the facts. The bill came to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and was reported twice. As the Senator from Nevada has said, it was reported toward the close of the session and when taken up by the Senate it was filibustered on the Senate floor by the Senator from Tennessee, and it never passed the Senate because of that fact. The next time it came before the Committee on Interstate Commerce I appointed a subcommittee; but Senator Copeland, who was chairman of the Commerce Committee, was anxious to get the bill into the Commerce Committee, and said he would see that it was reported; so, while the Interstate Commerce Committee considered it, and reported two bills, he as chairman of the Commerce Committee, reported a bill identical with one which had been acted on by the Interstate Commerce Committee. He then came to me and asked me if I would not let his bill come up. I did not desire to become involved in a contest with Senator Copeland over the proposition, because, frankly, I was not then looking for any more work, nor am I now; but, as a

cold matter of logic, if the regulation of transportation by air in this country does not belong, according to the usual jurisdiction of Senate committees, to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, then there is no other piece of legislation with reference to railroads, to busses, to trucks, or the radio, or any other interstate transportation belongs there. That is the only issue in the case. The Senator from Nevada has correctly stated the facts.

I corrected the Senator from North Carolina a moment ago because he said that no action had been taken by the Interstate Commerce Committee.

Mr. BAILEY. No; I said no action was taken; I meant the bill did not become law.

Mr. WHEELER. That is not what the Senator said.

Mr. BAILEY. I said no action was taken.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator said it was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and no action was taken.

Mr. BAILEY. My statement was by way of explaining the fact that it did not become law.

Mr. WHEELER. That is not what the Senator said and it was not the impression which would be conveyed to the minds of Members of the Senate. When a Senator says that a bill goes to a committee and no action is taken, he means that the committee took no action.

Mr. BAILEY. Oh, no. Anybody who accepts my word will understand what I meant when I said no action was taken. I have said the same thing about many bills I have spoken of here. I meant no legislative action.

Mr. WHEELER. There was no final action in this case, but there was an attempt to get legislative action.

Mr. BAILEY. No legislative action occurred after the bill was reported from the Interstate Commerce Committee, and the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Montana both agree to that statement. Is not that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. In 1938 the bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; and the Committee on Commerce took the bill which the Senator from Nevada originally introduced and which was pending in the Interstate Commerce Committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. WHEELER. And while it was pending the then Senator from New York grabbed jurisdiction of the legislation, took it to his committee, and reported it in a very short time.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me interrupt there if I may.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I yield to my witness; I am bound to do that.

Mr. WHEELER. I am inclined to believe the Senator's witness has not substantiated his position.

Mr. BAILEY. I think he has.

Mr. McCARRAN. I would have had the bill referred to the Committee on Reclamation and Irrigation if I could have had it reported from that committee; but the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, after I talked to him, told him I wanted to get the bill out of the committee in which it was pending, and asked how could I do it, he said, "Send the bill to my committee."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I believe I can cap this thing off—the Senator from Nevada learned how to do it and ever since has been sending all his bills on the same subject to the Commerce Committee—he found out that was not the wrong thing to do and not the wrong jurisdiction to which to send them.

There was a little interlude, but do not forget that all these initial bills during the period which I have covered were commerce bills and not interstate commerce bills. There was an interlude in 1934, 1935, and 1936 when certain bills of the Senator from Nevada did go to the Interstate Commerce Committee, but there was no legislative action taken on them. He then had the bill which is the present law, under which we are now operating, and under which hearings are now being held in the Commerce Committee room, referred to the Commerce Committee, and it came out of that committee. That is not disputed. It is now stated here that the late Senator Copeland did something. I suppose Senator Copeland wanted legislation too, and the Senator from Nevada wanted it. But, however that may be, the present law, the first law, and all the fundamental and important acts under which aeronautics has been conducted from the beginning until now came out of the Commerce Committee, and not one of them out of the Interstate Commerce Committee.

It is also true that the bills introduced by the Senator from Nevada on civil aeronautics all went to the Committee on Commerce, and it is also true that every such bill that has been before the Senate, until the Vice President ruled otherwise, was referred without question to the Committee on Commerce.

If the Senator from Montana, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, had seriously objected when he thought that the Committee on Commerce was getting a jurisdiction to which it was not entitled, he had the same remedy which I am using today. He could have made a motion to discharge. He did not do so. He acquiesced.

Mr. AUSTIN and Mr. WHEELER addressed the Chair.

Mr. BAILEY. I now yield to the Senator from Vermont, but I shall be fair and yield to the Senator from Montana a good many more times.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall not bother the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I believe the report for the Committee on Commerce by the late distinguished Senator Copeland, of New York, throws some light on this history. The first reference I make is to the report on safety in the air. In that report Senator Copeland devoted a chapter to the subject of independent authority for civil aeronautics, which, of course, was a byproduct of the jurisdiction of the committee. The committee was considering safety. He said in that connection:

> We recommend the immediate enactment of a compromise measure embracing all the noncontroversial points in Senator McCARRAN's bill, S. 2, substitute of March 3, 1939, and the bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. LEA on March 4, 1938, known as H. R. 9738.

Later in the report he said something historical:

> Testimony before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, March 10, 1938, and before the Senate Committee on Commerce, March 24, 1938, reveals that six executive departments after 2 months' study, have recommended the passage of the House bill (H. R. 9738) which is substantially in intent, if not in detail, the same as the Senate bill (S. 2, with amendments).

Then, when he made the report on the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, to which reference has been made, he made a very brief report, covering only one sheet, and in it he makes another historical reference to this cumulative study by many different committees of Congress. He said:

> Committees of Congress have labored for years in the hope of permanent legislation intended to meet the needs of our country's civil aeronautics. The present bill reflects the coordination of thought of important Senate and House committees in a general recognition of the dependence of safety in the air upon the need for permanent economic legislation, and consequent economic stability, in the air carrier industry.
>
> The bill provides for the usual system of economic regulation of air transportation companies and applies to all air carriers who operate as common carriers or who transport mail by air. The legislation is adapted to the special characteristics of transportation by air and is at present carried no further than is necessary in the interests of the public and of civil aeronautics.

I close with this comment: This was in the period of the service of Senators here present, when the President of the Senate, the Vice President of the United States, adopted and announced a rule of referring proposed legislation to the committees designated by the authors and sponsors of measures. That rule, as we all know, has subsequently been changed so that the question arises upon the jurisdiction of the committee rather than upon the designation by the author of the measure.

As I view the problem before the Senate this morning, it involves the question, Does the pending proposal refer to a subject matter which is principally one of transportation and commerce among the several States? If it does, then the answer seems to me to be the Committee on Interstate Commerce, where it presently rests.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I am very glad to have the statement by the Senator, and his point of view. If that interpretation should prevail, I think we should immediately have to give over the river and harbor jurisdiction; I think we would have to give over the pure food and drug legislation, and probably jurisdiction over measures affecting the Geodetic Survey. I think we might give the Census over. All those things relate to interstate commerce.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

Mr. BAILEY. I am merely trying to answer the argument, and when I get through with the Senator from Vermont, I shall let the Senator from Montana interrupt.

We would practically confine the Committee on Commerce to foreign commerce, and then we would have to assume jurisdiction over radio communications, because clearly interstate commerce does not go beyond the borders, yet the radio and cable cross the sea. But I raise no question about that. I think the question of practice is important, and I am making good the statement with which I began as to what has been the uniform policy from the beginning, not merely starting in 1935 or 1936, but from 1923, when the Wadsworth bill was up, the first act. All these measures went without challenge to the Committee on Commerce, and the report which the Senator from Vermont read came from the chairman of the Committee on Commerce.

I was not aware that there ever was a rule in the Senate that I could write on the back of a bill and determine to what committee the bill would be referred. If there ever was such a rule, it was always subject to the right of any Senator to move to discharge. My point is that not until the recent reference, which is the subject matter of my motion, has there been any motion to discharge.

I said that the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce had not been challenged, and I have not yet seen anyone who said it had been.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not true that the question of the exclusive jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate Commerce has not applied in the case of water transportation, that the Committee on Commerce has always dealt with water transportation, which does include a very vast amount of interstate commerce?

Mr. BAILEY. That is true with the exception of a measure which was discussed several years ago, which proposed to give to the Interstate Commerce Commission certain jurisdiction over rates on the inland waters; and a good many of the members of the Committee on Commerce were fearful that that would have a bad effect. They were inclined to resist it, but I raised no question of jurisdiction, because the bill was a railroad bill. Where a bill is of a mixed character, I think we can well waive our rights. I have not made any motion about the bill introduced by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. BAILEY. I wish to clear up this point. I have the bill on my desk. Here is a bill to coordinate and consolidate, by way of committee study, all the modes of transportation in this country. That includes air, it includes rail, it includes water, it includes trucks. Very clearly the Committee on Commerce has jurisdiction, if it has any at all, over only two aspects. I made no motion about that bill, but I looked at it with the utmost misgivings. I do not want air transportation to be made an auxiliary of or the tail to railroad or truck or water transportation. But I decided that instead of raising that question here, since the subjects were mixed, and crossed the committees, I would bide my time and see what happened. I am, however, summoning the Senate right now to keep an eye on this matter of aviation. It is a great subject of industrial and commercial importance.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I am perfectly willing to yield if Senators will be good enough to let me finish a thought, and then ask me to yield. I have started out to make an argument today, and I hope the Senate will bear with me, because I have been rather patient about it. It is with the greatest of difficulty that one can make a connected argument if he is to be asked questions every minute. If Senators ask me one every now and then, it is all right, but to have speeches thrust all the way through one's remarks, extraneous matter thrown in which is not on the point that is in the speaker's mind, is disconcerting. I do not do that with other Senators; I try to ask them questions which I think will count, but I have never tried to bore auger holes through a Senator's remarks with all sorts of speeches. At any rate I think the Senator who is speaking and is making an argument should be allowed to finish at least the sentence, and I should say ordinarily the paragraph, which is in his mind. It would make for the enlightenment of the Senate, perhaps.

On the other hand, and notwithstanding that it is difficult for me to speak as long as I once did, I am so averse to standing up here and refusing to stand the test of a question, that notwithstanding the pains and penalties of it I cannot forbear, when Senators ask me to yield, and I say "Why certainly." I think it is a courtesy, and I always think that Senators who do not yield tend to make the impression that they are afraid of something about the argument. So the two things together have counseled me always to pursue the policy of yielding.

I will now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the Senator's speech. I have a few remarks to make after he finishes his speech.

Mr. BAILEY. Very well. When the Senator rose he thought perhaps I had finished. I shall look forward to hearing the Senator. I believe it will be his first effort on the floor, and I wish him well in making it. He is the author of the bill. He will probably take a view different from mine, but I shall applaud him in any event.

Mr. President, I continue with my list of aviation bills. Senate bill 2170, introduced on April 15, 1937, by Mr. JOHNSON of California, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Senate bill 2817, introduced on July 22, 1937, by Mr. Copeland, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Senate bill 2898, introduced on August 3, 1937, by Mr. Brown of Michigan, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Senate bill 3078, introduced by Senator Copeland, on December 2, 1937, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

I think I have gone far enough along that line, but there were three more bills introduced, one by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the then Senator from New York, Mr. Copeland, and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] in the Seventy-fifth Congress.

That brings us to April 14, 1938, and all the bills have gone to the Committee on Commerce, except the three or four introduced by the Senator from Nevada, 1934–36.

I now come to the Seventy-sixth Congress. Instead of undertaking to go through the bills in detail I shall presently ask leave to have this statement printed in the RECORD. I shall count the number of bills. There were 16 bills in the Seventy-sixth Congress on the subject of aviation referred to the Committee on Commerce, without any motion being made to discharge.

We come now to the Seventy-seventh Congress. Six bills dealing with aviation were introduced by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. All told, there were 11 bills dealing with aviation, and all were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Then we have the House bills which came to the Senate. When a House bill comes to the Senate the Presiding Officer acts. His action is not based on something that the chairman of the Committee on Commerce writes on the bill. The bill is simply sent over to the Senate. The Presiding Officer that year sent to the Commerce Committee H. R. 5695 by Mr. RANDOLPH, dated September 19, 1941, a bill to amend the Civilian Pilot Training Act. It passed after approval by the Committee on Commerce, and it is a great act. That act tended to prepare us for the war.

H. R. 6799 by Mr. LEA of the House, introduced March 16, 1942, a bill to increase the monthly maximum number of flying hours of air pilots, was referred to the Committee on Commerce by the Presiding Officer. That was not done by action of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce. No one raised a question about it. That bill became Public Law 535.

Coming to the Seventy-eighth Congress, eight bills were introduced by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. It is usual for the author to write on the bill where it should be referred, and all those bills were referred to the Committee on Commerce. Those are not all the bills that were introduced, however. I will count the bills. Twenty-one Senate aviation bills were introduced and referred to the Committee on Commerce, and no question was raised about it.

Now I come to the House aviation bills which came to the Senate. H. R. 1670 by Mr. LEA, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and it became Public Law 69.

H. R. 4935, by Mr. BULWINKLE, was referred to the Committee on Commerce,

and became Public Law 416 upon the favorable report from that committee.

H. R. 5255 by Mr. BLAND, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and passed the Senate, and became Public Law 451.

House Joint Resolution 175 by Mr. Jeffrey, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, but it did not pass the Senate. It was not reported by the committee.

We now come to the Seventy-ninth Congress, that is 1945, the present Congress. On January 6, 1945, Senate bill 1 to create an independent Civil Aeronautics Authority and an independent Air Safety Board was introduced by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. That bill is pending at this moment in the Committee on Commerce, and no one has challenged it, and no one will get it away unless a motion to discharge the committee is filed. I do not think there is any other way to do it.

On January 6, 1945, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] introduced Senate bill 2 to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repair of public airports. The Senator from Nevada made a very powerful statement to the committee in the hearing this morning. I am supposed to go back to the hearings at 2:30. I do not think I shall be allowed to go, but I may go. That bill provides for the building of airports throughout the country. There are four or five pieces of legislation pending on the subject, three in the House and two in the Senate. It is a bill of the utmost importance. It was referred to the Committee on Commerce. It is now in process of being heard in public hearings before the Committee on Commerce. The father of the bill to which I am referring is the Senator from Nevada. I think he knows as well as anyone where aviation legislation should go and does go.

On the same date Senate bill 3 to provide for the training of air traffic control-tower operators, was introduced by the Senator from Nevada and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The Senator from Nevada also introduced Senate bill 4, to enact the Aviation Salvage and Sea Convention into statute law in the United States. That bill was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and no motion was made to discharge.

Mr. President, I fully appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Montana. It had not occurred to him to make such a motion. This thing did not originate with him. He was not challenging the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce. But when the bill under consideration was referred to his committee, and I made a motion to discharge his committee, I think he felt he should defend the jurisdiction of his committee.

Senate bill 5, to authorize the advanced training in aeronautics of technical personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Administration was introduced by the Senator from Nevada and was referred to the Committee and Commerce and it is now there.

Senate bill 6, to provide adequate aeronautical training for the youth of the United States, introduced by the Senator from Nevada, is now in the Committee on Commerce, to which it was referred.

Senate bill 34, to provide for Federal aid for the development, construction, improvement, and repairs of public airports of the United States, was introduced by me. Of course, it is not quite like the bill introduced by the Senator from Nevada, but is not greatly different. It is somewhat like the bill introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH in the House. That bill is being heard at the present time, and great interest is being manifested in it.

Senate bill 326, introduced by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] on January 15, 1945, a bill to create the All-American Flag Line, Inc., and to assure the United States world leadership in the field of air transportation, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and hearings on it are set for next week. That is a very important measure. It would practically change the present 1938 act in a fundamental way.

Mr. President, I have made a statement about the Interstate Commerce Committee. Whenever there has been mixed jurisdiction, or a mixture of subjects, I have not felt inclined to challenge the right of any other committee. The other day I submitted a substitute resolution dealing with the bill relating to the Missouri Valley Authority, taking great pains to preserve the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry where I thought it attached; to preserve the jurisdiction of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation where I thought it attached; and seeking to preserve the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce only where I thought it attached. That may be unsound, but that is the only way I know to avoid endless friction in days when legislation so frequently exceeds the jurisdiction of one committee and overlaps that of another.

A few bills might be mentioned—and some have been mentioned—which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I have a list of them. Most of them are bills involving mixed jurisdiction. If a bill involved radio, I have said, "Let the Committee on Interstate Commerce have it." I have raised no question. The other day a bill was introduced involving both air transport and surface transport. I said, "The question of jurisdiction is somewhat debatable. Let it go. We shall have our day in court when the bill reaches the floor of the Senate."

But when legislation clearly relates to air transportation or aeronautics I assert that it has been the practice of the Senate for 23 years, from 1922 to 1945, in an almost unbroken series, to refer such bills to the Committee on Commerce. That practice has never been challenged. From 1938, when the fundamental act under which we now operate was passed, until the present time the consistent practice of the Senate, of its presiding officers, of the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and of the Committee on Commerce has been to recognize the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce.

In conclusion let me add just a word. This matter is of very great importance to the industry. It is of no importance to me personally. The idea that I would fight a battle to save my face is an absurdity. The idea that I would take the verdict of the Senate, or the vote of any Senator, in a personal way is ridiculous. I think I have been a Member of the Senate long enough to know that such things are not personal. Ten minutes afterward I do not remember how any Senator voted. I do not raise any question about any Senator's vote; and I do not like to have any Senator raise a question about how I vote. I believe that a Senator ought to do his duty and go his way. That is the standard which I wish to maintain. If the Senate feels that rightfully the Committee on Interstate Commerce should have jurisdiction, let it say so, and then let a motion be made to discharge the Committee on Commerce from the consideration of all the bills we have of this nature. I read a list of eight or nine of them. Let the Senate discharge us from all further responsibility. I will transfer the papers.

Last year we worked all the year. It might be said that, like the disciples of old, we toiled all night and caught nothing. I do not think so. In the Committee on Commerce, ever since I have been chairman, we have had a standing subcommittee on the subject of civil aeronautics. It is a great subcommittee. When I say that, I leave myself out of consideration. The members of that subcommittee are the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD].

Former Senator Clark, of Missouri, who is no longer with us, was the chairman of the subcommittee. We held executive hearings, and made prolonged and very earnest studies of this whole subject. We did not print the hearings. I have them on my desk. To some degree they are confidential. We have the situation of national defense, and the war.

That is some evidence of the work which our committee did. We are entering another year, stronger because of the studies we have made. I do not say that those studies would be wasted if our committee were deprived of jurisdiction. We should still be here, with the knowledge which we possess.

The Committee on Interstate Commerce is able and diligent. It is composed of fine men. It is just as capable as the Committee on Commerce or any other committee. I would not raise any question on that score. If I had to make any comparison, I should say that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is far superior to me. I would not compare myself with him. I think a great deal of him, and get along well with him. Sometimes we dispute, but nothing that ever happens causes him to fall in my estimation. Sometimes I think that the more we dispute against each other the better we like each other. At any rate I hope that will be the result.

A great new means of transportation has been given to us as a gift of the ages. It opens a new world to us. When I think about the subject—and I have thought about it a great deal—I frequently think of the lines from Keats' sonnet on reading Chapman's translation of Homer:

Then felt I like some watcher of the skies
When a new planet swims into his ken.

Aviation is a new planet. It is an exceedingly swift and reasonably safe means of universal transportation. It has brought all the world within 60 hours' travel. It exceeds the fulfillment of Tennyson's inspired prophecy. Let us handle it carefully. Sometimes complaint may be made against the committee for not moving fast. We should not move too fast in connection with this subject. I have not wished to move fast. I wish to be sure. I wish to make no mistakes in so great a matter.

We are dealing with Britain. This morning I received from the State Department the British White Paper. To be sure, if the State Department had thought that my committee did not have jurisdiction, it would not have sent it to me. I shall place it in the RECORD. It shows how diligently, carefully, and skillfully our British friends are working on this great subject. They know all its implications. They know what is involved for their country as well as for its commerce. As I read the report, it seemed to me that they had done a very fine job of planning about the subject.

Last year and this year I have repeatedly tried to write something in the nature of a statement of policy. The more I think about it the less prepared I feel, the more appalled by the size of the task, and the more reluctant to make any final statement on such a great subject.

Mr. President, that is the situation. I submit it to the Senate, for it to dispose of as it thinks best. Look at it from the standpoint of aviation and the country. Forget the committee; forget me. I want to have the proper thing done. I want the Senate to understand the situation.

I think I shall conclude with the statement that there are 23 years of experience back of this matter in the Commerce Committee. There have been at least 6 years of very diligent study of this matter in the Commerce Committee. In that committee there are some devoted men who are working on this matter. They have been working very hard.

I greatly honor our present Vice President. He is my friend, and I would not say anything against him on any account. However, merely because several years ago he took the view, and still holds it, that the Interstate Commerce Committee should have such legislation referred to it, should the whole process of handling such matters in the Senate for 23 years be upset? I respect his judgment; but should the Senate merely for that reason overturn the whole history of the procedure in such matters, and cast aside the Commerce Committee and the subcommittee, of which, with all its faults, it must be said that it has not been wanting in interest, nor has it been wanting in diligence.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to take a leaf from the books of other Senators, and to interrupt him?

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly.

Mr. BAILEY. I have just received from the State Department the text of the British White Paper on the subject of aviation. I know it is too long to be printed in the first instance, but I will send it to the desk and ask for its publication in the Appendix of the RECORD, with a view to having it submitted to the printer for an estimate; and when I receive the estimate of the cost of printing it——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, if the Senator from North Carolina will permit an interruption?

Mr. BAILEY. I will.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me suggest to the Senator from North Carolina that it might be advisable to have the paper printed as a Senate document, so that all Senators can read it. I know it is of very great value. Will the Senator request unanimous consent to have that done?

Mr. BAILEY. Very well, Mr. President; I ask unanimous consent that the paper I have just sent forward be printed as a Senate document.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed as a Senate document (S. Doc. 29).

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] that this question is a very important one. It is important because we must determine once and for all what committee is the proper one to handle such legislation. The hour is now 1:45. I understand that the morning hour concludes at 2 o'clock. A proper presentation of this matter will take a little longer than 2 o'clock. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the pending resolution (S. Res. 83) be made the unfinished business, and that its consideration be continued until it is disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that right now the Commerce Committee is going forward, and has been for several days, holding hearings on one of these bills, namely Senate bill 2, which has to do with airports. Representatives of the several States and representatives of the large cities of the country have been called before the committee. The mayors of various large cities are now waiting for the reconvening to the committee. They have been with us all morning, and some of them were with us yesterday.

If this bill is to continue in the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee, we should know it, because if the bill is to be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, it and all related bills which are now before the Committee on Commerce should be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. We should know now whether the Committee on Commerce should hold these hearings and continue with them to the end.

The chairman of the committee and the chairman of the subcommittee have set the hearing on Senate bill 1 for next Monday morning. Senate bill 1 is what is known as the All-American-Flag-Line bill, a measure which has aroused a great deal of interest pro and con throughout the country. People are coming here and are making preparations to come here Monday morning and following. It seems to me that we should dispose of this matter today.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, of course I should like to continue with it, but I am afraid there may be some serious objection to doing so. I notice that the Democratic leader is not in the Chamber at the moment. I should like to continue with the matter and dispose of it, but possibly there may be some objection. In view of the fact that a number of Senators are not now in the Chamber, I would hesitate to urge that we decide now to continue with the discussion. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum, if the Senator will yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield for that purpose?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Murray
Austin	Hart	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Burton	Kilgore	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Taylor
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Tunnell
Connally	McMahon	Tydings
Cordon	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Donnell	Maybank	Walsh
Downey	Mead	Wheeler
Eastland	Millikin	Wherry
Ellender	Mitchell	White
Ferguson	Moore	Wiley
Fulbright	Morse	Willis
George	Murdock	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY].

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] has asked unanimous consent to continue consideration of the resolution until it shall be disposed of. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry that we are not able to proceed so that we can dispose of the matter today. I had hoped that it would be disposed of today, because it is of the utmost importance that we know what committee has jurisdiction of this legislation. I was appointed chairman of a subcommittee of Interstate Commerce to consider Senate bill 541 and Senate bill 556.

Mr. President, the history of this matter has been well covered by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. I invite attention to the statement made by the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] which, together with the statement of the Senator from Nevada, fully explained how some aviation bills were referred to the Senate Committee on Commerce.

The Senator from Vermont explained to us that there had been a time in the United States Senate when a bill which had been introduced by some Member of the Senate was referred to whatever committee the Senator requested. That practice, for a time, grew to be more or less of a precedent in the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada has stated that he did not obtain action fast enough in the Interstate Commerce Committee on the bills which he had introduced in 1937 and 1938 and that he had reintroduced an identical bill and asked that it be referred to the Commerce Committee. Do we want to follow that kind of practice in the United States Senate? Do we want to say that when consideration by the committee to which a bill has been referred is not quite as prompt as the Senator who introduced the bill thinks it should be, he should be allowed to reintroduce his bill and have it referred to another committee?

Much has been said about criticism of Congress. The practice to which I have referred should be criticized. A bill should be referred to the committee which has jurisdiction of the subject matter contained in the bill, and Senators should respect such jurisdiction.

In discussing this subject yesterday, what did the distinguished majority leader of the Senate have to say? When the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] was discussing his bill to create a Missouri Valley Authority, the distinguished majority leader said:

> There should be a definite rule regarding where it should go, dependent upon the substance of the bill and, at least, the major portion of the matters with which it deals. I may feel somewhat strongly about this subject because of my long service in the House of Representatives, where there are definite rules relative to the committees to which measures shall be referred.

The Senate has, I understand, abandoned its former temporary policy of referring bills to whatever committees the sponsors of the bills may request. Our distinguished Vice President has tried to establish a precedent in the Senate in accordance with the rule suggested by the majority leader, as well as by many Members on the other side of the Chamber.

The question confronting us at the present time is whether the subject matter of the bill under discussion falls chiefly under the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce. That question should be the only one involved. It has developed that the only reason for wishing to refer the bill to the Commerce Committee was that the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada thought that the Interstate Commerce Committee was not acting fast enough. If that situation is to be accepted as a proper basis for changing jurisdiction of proposed legislation from one committee to another, we shall jump around until we do not know where we are. That is not the manner in which legislative bodies should proceed; that is procedure under the whim of individuals; it certainly is not proper procedure in a nation where law rules.

Unfortunately, as pointed out by the distinguished majority leader, there are no rules of the Senate which definitely prescribe jurisdiction of committees over legislation. In general, the reference of bills lies with the Presiding Officer, who follows precedents long established. The references are based in large part on the subject matter of the proposed legislation and the title of the particular committee to which it should be referred.

It seems to me to be important at this time to take note of the history of the Committee on Commerce, and of the Committee on Interstate Commerce. Originally there was only one Commerce Committee of the Senate. The full name of the committee was the Committee on Commerce and Manufactures. It was established in December 1816. Subsequently, in 1825, a Committee on Manufactures was established, and the Commerce Committee was left with jurisdiction over public works, navigation, and commerce, including water commerce.

The Presiding Officer of the Senate always has been forced to choose the various committees to which bills should be referred by the title of the committee. What should be referred to a commerce committee? Webster describes the word "commerce" as "business intercourse, especially the exchange or buying and selling of commodities, and particularly the exchange of merchandise on a large scale between different places or communities; extended trade or traffic."

Mr. President, it would appear, therefore, that at the time of its creation the Senate had in mind that the Commerce Committee would handle legislation dealing with trade and commerce in commodities.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Inasmuch as we are approaching the close of the morning hour, the question has been raised with regard to continuing the discussion of the pending matter. In view of the fact that the resolution will go to the calendar, I propose that on Monday next the Senate resume consideration of the subject during the morning hour.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, under the precedents of the Senate, Senate Resolution 83 goes to the calendar under rule VIII.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the resolution goes to the calendar as in the case of other bills or resolutions, and inasmuch as the Senate may not have a morning hour Monday, and I think it is impossible to determine now just what the juncture of the situation will be on Monday; 2 o'clock having arrived, and there being no legislative program on our desks, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have not yielded the floor. Notwithstanding the fact that the morning hour has expired, I still have the floor, I assume.

Mr. BARKLEY. I beg the Senator's pardon; I do not want to take him from the floor, but, inasmuch as the resolution which has been under consideration automatically goes to the calendar, it was my theory that we should proceed with the consideration of the business in order after 2 o'clock. If the Senator desires to discuss further the question which has been under consideration I have no objection.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have not finished my remarks, but I have no objection if the Senator desires to proceed with something else.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will withhold the motion until the Senator from Arizona concludes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it is not my intention to make any extended argument on this question and it is for that reason that I desire briefly to continue the few remarks I have to make in regard to the subject.

I believe that the record of the legislation handled by the Commerce Committee will bear out the contention I make in this regard. Legislative history shows that such subjects as public works, maritime shipping, river and harbor improvements, and legislation affecting the water commerce of the United States have been handled by the Commerce Committee. It is obvious that this is an extensive field and it is one which is growing and is sufficiently broad to occupy the fullest talents of a standing committee. But nowhere, Mr. President, is there any record of the Commerce Committee handling legislation involving the actual regulation of interstate carriers, until 1938 when bills involving air transportation were introduced and referred both to the Commerce Committee and the Interstate Commerce Committee. That is the history of the situation.

Of course, Mr. President, in the early period of aviation it may be that it was

more a matter of commerce, and, in fact, it was a matter of commerce, as Webster defines it and we recognize it, because there was no interstate commerce problem involved. It was a matter of developing the aviation manufacturing industry and the science of aviation, and there were no interstate air carriers transporting goods and passengers from one State into another. Therefore legislation dealing with aviation prior to that time would not fall within the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Committee; but I submit, Mr. President, that if today aviation is not interstate commerce there is not any interstate commerce.

There are other fields of importance for the consideration of the Committee on Commerce. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that a Small Business Committee has been created. Legislation on the subject of small business would properly fall within the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee, but the Senate in its wisdom saw fit to create a Small Business Committee and whatever legislation may be recommended by the Small Business Committee would probably fall to the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator does not contend, does he, that a bill would be referred to the Small Business Committee?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; I do not so contend.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Small Business Committee is not a legislative committee, but merely a special committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; I am merely stating that there is a very large field for the Commerce Committee at this time, and particularly will there be a large field for it in the post-war period when it will be necessary to promote business in every possible way in order that more jobs may be provided for returning veterans and for others who are now working in defense industries.

The Commerce Committee is one of the most important committees of the United States Senate, but it is not a committee that deals with interstate transportation nor the regulation of interstate carriers. That is the point we are making, and which I hope will be sustained when the vote is taken, namely, that measures which affect and relate to interstate transportation should go to the Interstate Commerce Committee. There may be phases of aviation, such as the manufacture of airplanes or measures affecting the sale of airplanes, or something of that kind, which probably should go to other committees but when it comes to the matter of transporting goods and passengers from one State to another interstate commerce is certainly involved and all measures affecting such matters should go to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The Committee on Interstate Commerce was created on December 12, 1887, at the height of the granger movement in this country when there was insistent demand for Federal action to cope with railroad transportation matters. The committee was created expressly for the purpose of handling legislation dealing with the regulation of interstate commerce as provided by the second article of the Constitution. The Committee on Interstate Commerce has been handling legislation of that character continuously since that time, with the exception of one bill in 1938, to which reference has already been made.

Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to only one other matter, and that is that the Interstate Commerce Committee is handling measures affecting communications, railroads, busses, and trucks. A very important question will arise in the post-war era, namely, the allocation of wave lengths and use of radio as a safety device. I shall not take further time now because I know the Senate desires to proceed with other business. I intend to discuss this subject more fully when the Senate again considers the pending resolution. But I desire to emphasize that the committee which has jurisdiction over all such matters of interstate commerce as railroads, busses, trucks, inland waterways, and communications certainly has jurisdiction over interstate aviation transportation, if for no other reason, than there should be coordinated consideration of the entire transportation problem.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Capt. William K. Scammell, United States Coast Guard, to be a commodore for temporary service in the Coast Guard, to rank from March 1, 1945, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will call the calendar.

TREATY WITH MEXICO RELATING TO THE UTILIZATION OF THE WATERS OF CERTAIN RIVERS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the treaty, Executive A (78th Cong., 2d sess.), between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed at Washington on February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande from Fort Quitman, Tex., to the Gulf of Mexico, and executive H (78th Cong., 2d sess.), a protocol, signed in Washington on November 14, 1944, which is supplementary to the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed at Washington on February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande, from Fort Quitman, Tex., to the Gulf of Mexico, signed in Washington on November 24, 1944, which were read, as follows:

TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO, RELATING TO WATERS OF THE COLORADO AND TIJUANA RIVERS AND OF THE RIO GRANDE

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Mexican States: animated by the sincere spirit of cordiality and friendly cooperation which happily governs the relations between them; taking into account the fact that Articles VI and VII of the Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Limits between the United States of America and the United States Mexican States signed at Guadalupe Hidalgo on February 2, 1848, and Article IV of the boundary treaty between the two countries signed at the City of Mexico December 30, 1853 regulate the use of the waters of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) and the Colorado River for purposes of navigation only; considering that the utilization of these waters for other purposes is desirable in the interest of both countries, and desiring, moreover, to fix and delimit the rights of the two countries with respect to the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers, and of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) from Fort Quitman, Texas, United States of America, to the Gulf of Mexico, in order to obtain the most complete and satisfactory utilization thereof, have resolved to conclude a treaty and for this purpose have named as their plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State of the United States of America, George S. Messersmith, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America in Mexico, and Lawrence M. Lawson, United States Commissioner, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico; and

The President of the United Mexican States:

Francisco Castillo Nájera, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United Mexican States in Washington, and Rafael Fernández MacGregor, Mexican Commissioner, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico; who, having communicated to each other their respective Full Powers and having found them in good and due form, have agreed upon the following:

I—PRELIMINARY PROVISIONS

Article 1

For the purposes of this Treaty it shall be understood that:

(a) "The United States" means the United States of America.

(b) "Mexico" means the United Mexican States.

(c) "The Commission" means the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, as described in Article 2 of this Treaty.

(d) "To divert" means the deliberate act of taking water from any channel in order to convey it elsewhere for storage, or to utilize it for domestic, agricultural, stock-raising or industrial purposes whether this be done by means of dams across the channel, partition weirs, lateral intakes, pumps or any other methods.

(e) "Point of Diversion" means the place where the act of diverting the water is effected.

(f) "Conservation capacity of storage reservoirs" means that part of their total capacity

devoted to holding and conserving the water for disposal thereof as and when required, that is, capacity additional to that provided for silt retention and flood control.

(g) "Flood discharges and spills" means the voluntary or involuntary discharge of water for flood control as distinguished from releases for other purposes.

(h) "Return flow" means that portion of diverted water that eventually finds its way back to the source from which it was diverted.

(i) "Release" means the deliberate discharge of stored water for conveyance elsewhere or for direct utilization.

(j) "Consumptive use" means the use of water by evaporation, plant transpiration or other manner whereby the water is consumed and does not return to its source of supply. In general it is measured by the amount of water diverted less the part thereof which returns to the stream.

(k) "Lowest major international dam or reservoir" means the major international dam or reservoir situated farthest downstream.

(l) "Highest major international dam or reservoir" means the major international dam or reservoir situated farthest upstream.

Article 2

The International Boundary Commission established pursuant to the provisions of the Convention between the United States and Mexico signed in Washington March 1, 1889 to facilitate the carrying out of the principles contained in the Treaty of November 12, 1884 and to avoid difficulties occasioned by reason of the changes which take place in the beds of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) and the Colorado River shall hereafter be known as the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, which shall continue to function for the entire period during which the present Treaty shall continue in force. Accordingly, the term of the Convention of March 1, 1889 shall be considered to be indefinitely extended, and the Convention of November 21, 1900 between the United States and Mexico regarding that Convention shall be considered completely terminated.

The application of the present Treaty, the regulation and exercise of the rights and obligations which the two Governments assume thereunder, and the settlement of all disputes to which its observance and execution may give rise are hereby entrusted to the International Boundary and Water Commission, which shall function in conformity with the powers and limitations set forth in this Treaty.

The Commission shall in all respects have the status of an international body, and shall consist of a United States Section and a Mexican Section. The head of each Section shall be an Engineer Commissioner. Wherever there are provisions in this Treaty for joint action or joint agreement by the two Governments, or for the furnishing of reports, studies or plans to the two Governments, or similar provisions, it shall be understood that the particular matter in question shall be handled by or through the Department of State of the United States and the Ministry of Foreign Relations of Mexico.

The Commission or either of its two Sections may employ such assistants and engineering and legal advisers as it may deem necessary. Each Government shall accord diplomatic status to the Commissioner, designated by the other Government. The Commissioner, two principal engineers, a legal adviser, and a secretary, designated by each Government as members of its Section of the Commission, shall be entitled in the territory of the other country to the privileges and immunities appertaining to diplomatic officers. The Commission and its personnel may freely carry out their observations, studies and field work in the territory of either country.

The jurisdiction of the Commission shall extend to the limitrophe parts of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) and the Colorado River, to the land boundary between the two countries, and to works located upon their common boundary, each Section of the Commission retaining jurisdiction over that part of the works located within the limits of its own country. Neither Section shall assume jurisdiction or control over works located within the limits of the country of the other without the express consent of the Government of the latter. The works constructed, acquired or used in fulfillment of the provisions of this Treaty and located wholly within the territorial limits of either country, although these works may be international in character, shall remain, except as herein otherwise specifically provided, under the exclusive jurisdiction and control of the Section of the Commission in whose country the works may be situated.

The duties and powers vested in the Commission by this Treaty shall be in addition to those vested in the International Boundary Commission by the Convention of March 1, 1889 and other pertinent treaties and agreements in force between the two countries except as the provisions of any of them may be modified by the present Treaty.

Each Government shall bear the expenses incurred in the maintenance of its Section of the Commission. The joint expenses, which may be incurred as agreed upon by the Commission, shall be borne equally by the two Governments.

Article 3

In matters in which the Commission may be called upon to make provision for the joint use of international waters, the following order of preferences shall serve as a guide:

1. Domestic and municipal uses.
2. Agriculture and stock-raising.
3. Electric power.
4. Other industrial uses.
5. Navigation.
6. Fishing and hunting.
7. Any other beneficial uses which may be determined by the Commission.

All of the foregoing uses shall be subject to any sanitary measures or works which may be mutually agreed upon by the two Governments, which hereby agree to give preferential attention to the solution of all border sanitation problems.

II—RIO GRANDE (RIO BRAVO)

Article 4

The waters of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) between Fort Quitman, Texas, and the Gulf of Mexico are hereby allotted to the two countries in the following manner:

A. To Mexico:

(a) All of the waters reaching the main channel of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) from the San Juan and Alamo Rivers, including the return flow from the lands irrigated from the latter two rivers.

(b) One-half of the flow in the main channel of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) below the lowest major international storage dam, so far as said flow is not specifically allotted under this Treaty to either of the two countries.

(c) Two-thirds of the flow reaching the main channel of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) from the Conchos, San Diego, San Rodrigo, Escondido and Salado Rivers and the Las Vacas Arroyo, subject to the provisions of subparagraph (c) of paragraph B of this Article.

(d) One-half of all other flows not otherwise allotted by this Article occurring in the main channel of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo), including the contributions from all the unmeasured tributaries, which are those not named in this Article, between Fort Quitman and the lowest major international storage dam.

B. To the United States:

(a) All of the waters reaching the main channel of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) from the Pecos and Devils Rivers, Goodenough Spring, and Alamito, Terlingua, San Felipe and Pinto Creeks.

(b) One-half of the flow in the main channel of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) below the lowest major international storage dam, so far as said flow is not specifically allotted under this Treaty to either of the two countries.

(c) One-third of the flow reaching the main channel of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) from the Conchos, San Diego, San Rodrigo, Escondido and Salado Rivers and the Las Vacas Arroyo, provided that this third shall not be less, as an average amount in cycles of five consecutive years, than 350,000 acre-feet (431,721,000 cubic meters) annually. The United States shall not acquire any right by the use of the waters of the tributaries named in this subparagraph, in excess of the said 350,000 acre-feet (431,721,000 cubic meters) annually, except the right to use one-third of the flow reaching the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) from said tributaries, although such one-third may be in excess of that amount.

(d) One-half of all other flows not otherwise allotted by this Article occurring in the main channel of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo), including the contributions from all the unmeasured tributaries, which are those not named in this Article, between Fort Quitman and the lowest major international storage dam.

In the event of extraordinary drought or serious accident to the hydraulic systems on the measured Mexican tributaries, making it difficult for Mexico to make available the run-off of 350,000 acre-feet (431,721,000 cubic meters) annually, allotted in subparagraph (c) of paragraph B of this Article to the United States as the minimum contribution from the aforesaid Mexican tributaries, any deficiencies existing at the end of the aforesaid five-year cycle shall be made up in the following five-year cycle with water from the said measured tributaries.

Whenever the conservation capacities assigned to the United States in at least two of the major international reservoirs, including the highest major reservoir, are filled with waters belonging to the United States, a cycle of five years shall be considered as terminated and all debits fully paid, whereupon a new five-year cycle shall commence.

Article 5

The two Governments agree to construct jointly, through their respective Sections of the Commission, the following works in the main channel of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo):

I. The dams required for the conservation, storage and regulation of the greatest quantity of the annual flow of the river in a way to ensure the continuance of existing uses and the development of the greatest number of feasible projects, within the limits imposed by the water allotments specified.

II. The dams and other joint works required for the diversion of the flow of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo).

One of the storage dams shall be constructed in the section between Santa Helena Canyon and the mouth of the Pecos River; one in the section between Eagle Pass and Laredo, Texas (Piedras Negras and Nuevo Laredo in Mexico); and a third in the section between Laredo and Roma, Texas (Nuevo Laredo and San Pedro de Roma in Mexico). One or more of the stipulated dams may be omitted, and others than those enumerated may be built, in either case as may be determined by the Commission subject to the approval of the two Governments.

In planning the construction of such dams the Commission shall determine:

(a) The most feasible sites;

(b) The maximum feasible reservoir capacity at each site;

(c) The conservation capacity required by each country at each site, taking into consideration the amount and regimen of its allotment of water and its contemplated uses;

(d) The capacity required for retention of silt;

(e) The capacity required for flood control.

The conservation and silt capacities of each reservoir shall be assigned to each country in the same proportion as the capacities required by each country in such reservoir for conservation purposes. Each country shall have an undivided interest in the flood-control capacity of each reservoir.

The construction of the international storage dams shall start within 2 years following the approval of the respective plans by the two Governments. The works shall begin with the construction of the lowest major international storage dam, but works in the upper reaches of the river may be constructed simultaneously. The lowest major international storage dam shall be completed within a period of eight years from the date of the entry into force of this Treaty.

The construction of the dams and other joint works required for the diversion of the flows of the river shall be initiated on the dates recommended by the Commission and approved by the two Governments.

The cost of construction, operation and maintenance of each of the international storage dams shall be prorated between the two Governments in proportion to the capacity allotted to each country for conservation purposes in the reservoir at such dam.

The cost of construction, operation and maintenance of each of the dams and other joint works required for the diversion of the flows of the river shall be prorated between the two Governments in proportion to the benefits which the respective countries receive therefrom, as determined by the Commission and approved by the two Governments.

Article 6

The Commission shall study, investigate, and prepare plans for flood control works, where and when necessary, other than those referred to in Article 5 of this Treaty, on the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) from Fort Quitman, Texas, to the Gulf of Mexico. These works may include levees along the river, floodways and grade-control structures, and works for the canalization, rectification and artificial channeling of reaches of the river. The Commission shall report to the two Governments the works which should be built, the estimated cost thereof, the part of the works to be constructed by each Government, and the part of the works to be operated and maintained by each Section of the Commission. Each Government agrees to construct, through its Section of the Commission, such works as may be recommended by the Commission and approved by the two Governments. Each Government shall pay the costs of the works constructed by it and the costs of operation and maintenance of the part of the works assigned to it for such purpose.

Article 7

The Commission shall study, investigate and prepare plans for plants for generating hydro-electric energy which it may be feasible to construct at the international storage dams on the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo). The Commission shall report to the two Governments in a Minute the works which should be built, the estimated cost thereof, and the part of the works to be constructed by each Government. Each Government agrees to construct, through its Section of the Commission, such works as may be recommended by the Commission and approved by the two Governments. Both Governments, through their respective Sections of the Commission, shall operate and maintain jointly such hydro-electric plants. Each Government shall pay half the cost of the construction, operation and maintenance of such plants, and the energy generated shall be assigned to each country in like proportion.

Article 8

The two Governments recognize that both countries have a common interest in the conservation and storage of waters in the international reservoirs and in the maximum use of these structures for the purpose of obtaining the most beneficial, regular and constant use of the waters belonging to them. Accordingly, within the year following the placing in operation of the first of the major international storage dams which is constructed, the Commission shall submit to each Government for its approval, regulations for the storage, conveyance and delivery of the waters of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) from Fort Quitman, Texas, to the Gulf of Mexico. Such regulations may be modified, amended or supplemented when necessary by the Commission, subject to the approval of the two Governments. The following general rules shall severally govern until modified or amended by agreement of the Commission, with the approval of the two Governments:

(a) Storage in all major international reservoirs above the lowest shall be maintained at the maximum possible water level, consistent with flood control, irrigation use and power requirements.

(b) Inflows to each reservoir shall be credited to each country in accordance with the ownership of such inflows.

(c) In any reservoir the ownership of water belonging to the country whose conservation capacity therein is filled, and in excess of that needed to keep it filled, shall pass to the other country to the extent that such country may have unfilled conservation capacity, except that one country may at its option temporarily use the conservation capacity of the other country not currently being used in any of the upper reservoirs; provided that in the event of flood discharge or spill occurring while one country is using the conservation capacity of the other, all of such flood discharge or spill shall be charged to the country using the other's capacity, and all inflow shall be credited to the other country until the flood discharge or spill ceases or until the capacity of the other country becomes filled with its own water.

(d) Reservoir losses shall be charged in proportion to the ownership of water in storage. Releases from any reservoir shall be charged to the country requesting them, except that releases for the generation of electrical energy, or other common purpose, shall be charged in proportion to the ownership of water in storage.

(e) Flood discharges and spills from the upper reservoirs shall be divided in the same proportion as the ownership of the inflows occurring at the time of such flood discharges and spills, except as provided in subparagraph (c) of this Article. Flood discharges and spills from the lowest reservoir shall be divided equally, except that one country, with the consent of the Commission, may use such part of the share of the other country as is not used by the latter country.

(f) Either of the two countries may avail itself, whenever it so desires, of any water belonging to it and stored in the international reservoirs, provided that the water so taken is for direct beneficial use or for storage in other reservoirs. For this purpose the Commissioner of the respective country shall give appropriate notice to the Commission, which shall prescribe the proper measures for the opportune furnishing of the water.

Article 9

(a) The channel of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) may be used by either of the two countries to convey water belonging to it.

(b) Either of the two countries may, at any point on the main channel of the river from Fort Quitman, Texas, to the Gulf of Mexico, divert and use the water belonging to it and may for this purpose construct any necessary works. However, no such diversion or use, not existing on the date this Treaty enters into force, shall be permitted in either country, nor shall works be constructed for such purpose, until the Section of the Commission in whose country the diversion or use is proposed has made a finding that the water necessary for such diversion or use is available from the share of that country, unless the Commission has agreed to a greater diversion or use as provided by paragraph (d) of this Article. The proposed use and the plans for the diversion works to be constructed in connection therewith shall be previously made known to the Commission for its information.

(c) Consumptive uses from the main stream and from the unmeasured tributaries below Fort Quitman shall be charged against the share of the country making them.

(d) The Commission shall have the power to authorize either country to divert and use water not belonging entirely to such country, when the water belonging to the other country can be diverted and used without injury to the latter and can be replaced at some other point on the river.

(e) The Commission shall have the power to authorize temporary diversion and use by one country of water belonging to the other, when the latter does not need it or is unable to use it, provided that such authorization or the use of such water shall not establish any right to continue to divert it.

(f) In case of the occurrence of an extraordinary drought in one country with an abundant supply of water in the other country, water stored in the international storage reservoirs and belonging to the country enjoying such abundant water supply may be withdrawn, with the consent of the Commission, for the use of the country undergoing the drought.

(g) Each country shall have the right to divert from the main channel of the river any amount of water, including the water belonging to the other country, for the purpose of generating hydroelectric power, provided that such diversion causes no injury to the other country and does not interfere with the international generation of power and that the quantities not returning directly to the river are charged against the share of the country making the diversion. The feasibility of such diversions not existing on the date this Treaty enters into force shall be determined by the Commission, which shall also determine the amount of water consumed, such water to be charged against the country making the diversion.

(h) In case either of the two countries shall construct works for diverting into the main channel of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) or its tributaries waters that do not at the time this Treaty enters into force contribute to the flow of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) such water shall belong to the country making such diversion.

(i) Main stream channel losses shall be charged in proportion to the ownership of water being conveyed in the channel at the times and places of the losses.

(j) The Commission shall keep a record of the waters belonging to each country and of those that may be available at a given moment, taking into account the measurement of the allotments, the regulation of the waters in storage, the consumptive uses, the withdrawals, the diversions, and the losses. For this purpose the Commission shall construct, operate and maintain on the main channel of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo), and each Section shall construct, operate and maintain on the measured tributaries in its own country, all the gaging stations and mechanical apparatus necessary for the purpose of making computations and of obtaining the necessary data for such record. The information with respect to the diversions and consumptive uses on the unmeasured tributaries shall be furnished to the Commission by the appropriate Section. The cost of construction of any new gaging stations located on the main channel of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) shall be borne equally by the two Governments. The operation and maintenance of all gaging stations or the cost of

such operation and maintenance shall be apportioned between the two Sections in accordance with determinations to be made by the Commission.

III—COLORADO RIVER

Article 10

Of the waters of the Colorado River, from any and all sources, there are allotted to Mexico:

(a) A guaranteed annual quantity of 1,500,000 acre-feet (1,850,234,000 cubic meters) to be delivered in accordance with the provisions of Article 15 of this Treaty.

(c) Any other quantities arriving at the Mexican points of diversion, with the understanding that in any year in which, as determined by the United States Section, there exists a surplus of waters of the Colorado River in excess of the amount necessary to supply users in the United States and the guaranteed quantity of 1,500,000 acre-feet (1,850,234,000 cubic meters) annually to Mexico, the United States undertakes to deliver to Mexico, in the manner set out in Article 15 of this Treaty, additional waters of the Colorado River system to provide a total quantity not to exceed 1,700,000 acre-feet (2,096,931,000 cubic meters) a year. Mexico shall acquire no right beyond that provided by this subparagraph by the use of the waters of the Colorado River system, for any purpose whatsoever, in excess of 1,500,000 acre-feet (1,850,234,000 cubic meters) annually.

In the event of extraordinary drought or serious accident to the irrigation system in the United States, thereby making it difficult for the United States to deliver the guaranteed quantity of 1,500,000 acre-feet (1,850,234,000 cubic meters) a year, the water allotted to Mexico under subparagraph (a) of this Article will be reduced in the same proportion as consumptive uses in the United States are reduced.

Article 11

(a) The United States shall deliver all waters allotted to Mexico wherever these waters may arrive in the bed of the limitrophe section of the Colorado River, with the exceptions hereinafter provided. Such waters shall be made up of the waters of the said river, whatever their origin, subject to the provisions of the following paragraphs of this Article.

(b) Of the waters of the Colorado River allotted to Mexico by subparagraph (a) of Article 10 of this Treaty, the United States shall deliver, wherever such waters may arrive in the limitrophe section of the river, 1,000,000 acre-feet (1,233,489,000 cubic meters) annually from the time the Davis dam and reservoir are placed in operation until January 1, 1980 and thereafter 1,125,000 acre-feet (1,387,675,000 cubic meters) annually, except that, should the main diversion structure referred to in subparagraph (a) of Article 12 of this Treaty be located entirely in Mexico and should Mexico so request, the United States shall deliver a quantity of water not exceeding 25,000 acre-feet (30,837,000 cubic meters) annually, unless a larger quantity may be mutually agreed upon, at a point, to be likewise mutually agreed upon, on the international land boundary near San Luis, Sonora, in which event the quantities of 1,000,000 acre-feet (1,233,489,000 cubic meters) and 1,125,000 acre-feet (1,387,675,000 cubic meters) provided hereinabove as deliverable in the limitrophe section of the river shall be reduced by the quantities to be delivered in the year concerned near San Luis, Sonora.

(c) During the period from the time the Davis dam and reservoir are placed in operation until January 1, 1980, the United States shall also deliver to Mexico annually, of the water allotted to it, 500,000 acre-feet (616,745,000 cubic meters), and thereafter the United States shall deliver annually 375,000 acre-feet (462,558,000 cubic meters), at the international boundary line, by means of the All-American Canal and a canal connecting the lower end of the Pilot Knob Wasteway with the Alamo Canal or with any other Mexican canal which may be substituted for the Alamo Canal. In either event the deliveries shall be made at an operating water surface elevation not higher than that of the Alamo Canal at the point where it crossed the international boundary line in the year 1943.

(d) All the deliveries of water specified above shall be made subject to the provisions of Article 15 of this Treaty.

Article 12

The two Governments agree to construct the following works:

(a) Mexico shall construct at its expense, within a period of five years from the date of the entry into force of this Treaty, a main diversion structure below the point where the northernmost part of the international land boundary line intersects the Colorado River. If such diversion structure is located in the limitrophe section of the river, its location, design and construction shall be subject to the approval of the Commission. The Commission shall thereafter maintain and operate the structure at the expense of Mexico. Regardless of where such diversion structure is located, there shall simultaneously be constructed such levees, interior drainage facilities and other works, or improvements to existing works, as in the opinion of the Commission shall be necessary to protect lands within the United States against damage from such floods and seepage as might result from the construction, operation and maintenance of this diversion structure. These protective works shall be constructed, operated and maintained at the expense of Mexico by the respective Sections of the Commission, or under their supervision, each within the territory of its own country.

(b) The United States, within a period of five years from the date of the entry into force of this Treaty, shall construct in its own territory and at its expense, and thereafter operate and maintain at its expense, the Davis storage dam and reservoir, a part of the capacity of which shall be used to make possible the regulation at the boundary of the waters to be delivered to Mexico in accordance with the provisions of Article 15 of this Treaty.

(c) The United States shall construct or acquire in its own territory the works that may be necessary to convey a part of the waters of the Colorado River allotted to Mexico to the Mexican diversion points on the international land boundary line referred to in this Treaty. Among these works shall be included: the canal and other works necessary to convey water from the lower end of the Pilot Knob Wasteway to the international boundary, and, should Mexico request it, a canal to connect the main diversion structure referred to in subparagraph (a) of this Article, if this diversion structure should be built in the limitrophe section of the river, with the Mexican system of canals at a point to be agreed upon by the Commission on the international land boundary near San Luis, Sonora. Such works shall be constructed or acquired and operated and maintained by the United States Section at the expense of Mexico. Mexico shall also pay the costs of any sites or rights of way required for such works.

(d) The Commission shall construct, operate and maintain in the limitrophe section of the Colorado River, and each Section shall construct, operate and maintain in the territory of its own country on the Colorado River below Imperial Dam and on all other carrying facilities used for the delivery of water to Mexico, all necessary gaging stations and other measuring devices for the purpose of keeping a complete record of the waters delivered to Mexico and of the flows of the river. All data obtained as to such deliveries and flows shall be periodically compiled and exchanged between the two Sections.

Article 13

The Commission shall study, investigate and prepare plans for flood control on the Lower Colorado River between Imperial Dam and the Gulf of California, in both the United States and Mexico, and shall, in a Minute, report to the two Governments the works which should be built, the estimated cost thereof, and the part of the works to be constructed by each Government. The two Governments agree to construct, through their respective Sections of the Commission, such works as may be recommended by the Commission and approved by the two Governments, each Government to pay the costs of the works constructed by it. The Commission shall likewise recommend the parts of the works to be operated and maintained jointly by the Commission and the parts to be operated and maintained by each Section. The two Governments agree to pay in equal shares the cost of joint operation and maintenance, and each Government agrees to pay the cost of operation and maintenance of the works assigned to it for such purpose.

Article 14

In consideration of the use of the All-American Canal for the delivery to Mexico, in the manner provided in Articles 11 and 15 of this Treaty, of a part of its allotment of the waters of the Colorado River, Mexico shall pay to the United States:

(a) A proportion of the costs actually incurred in the construction of Imperial Dam and the Imperial Dam-Pilot Knob section of the All-American Canal, this proportion and the method and terms of repayment to be determined by the two Governments, which, for this purpose, shall take into consideration the proportionate uses of these facilities by the two countries, these determinations to be made as soon as Davis dam and reservoir are placed in operation.

(b) Annually, a proportionate part of the total costs of maintenance and operation of such facilities, these costs to be prorated between the two countries in proportion to the amount of water delivered annually through such facilities for use in each of the two countries.

In the event that revenues from the sale of hydroelectric power which may be generated at Pilot Knob become available for the amortization of part or all of the costs of the facilities named in subparagraph (a) of this Article, the part that Mexico should pay of the costs of said facilities shall be reduced or repaid in the same proportion as the balance of the total costs are reduced or repaid. It is understood that any such revenue shall not become available until the cost of any works which may be constructed for the generation of hydroelectric power at said location has been full amortized from the revenues derived therefrom.

Article 15

A. The water allotted in subparagraph (a) of Article 10 of this Treaty shall be delivered to Mexico at the points of delivery specified in Article 11, in accordance with the following two annual schedules of deliveries by months, which the Mexican Section shall formulate and present to the Commission before the beginning of each calendar year:

Schedule I

Schedule I shall cover the delivery, in the limitrophe section of the Colorado River, of 1,000,000 acre-feet (1,233,489,000 cubic meters) of water each year from the date Davis dam and reservoir are placed in operation until January 1, 1980 and the delivery of 1,125,000 acre-feet (1,387,675,000 cubic meters) of water each year thereafter. This schedule shall be formulated subject to the following limitations:

With reference to the 1,000,000 acre-foot (1,233,489,000 cubic meter) quantity:

(a) During the months of January, February, October, November and December the prescribed rate of delivery shall be not less than 600 cubic feet (17.0 cubic meters) nor more than 3,500 cubic feet (99.1 cubic meters) per second.

(b) During the remaining months of the year the prescribed rate of delivery shall be not less than 1,000 cubic feet (28.3 cubic meters) nor more than 3,500 cubic feet (99.1 cubic meters) per second.

With reference to the 1,125,000 acre-foot (1,387,675,000 cubic meter) quantity:

(a) During the months of January, February, October, November and December the prescribed rate of delivery shall be not less than 675 cubic feet (19.1 cubic meters) nor more than 4,000 cubic feet (113.3 cubic meters) per second.

(b) During the remaining months of the year the prescribed rate of delivery shall be not less than 1,125 cubic feet (31.9 cubic meters) nor more than 4,000 cubic feet (113.3 cubic meters) per second.

Should deliveries of water be made at a point on the land boundary near San Luis, Sonora, as provided for in Article 11, such deliveries shall be made under a sub-schedule to be formulated and furnished by the Mexican Section. The quantities and monthly rates of deliveries under such sub-schedule shall be in proportion to those specified for Schedule I, unless otherwise agreed upon by the Commission.

Schedule II

Schedule II shall cover the delivery at the boundary line by means of the All-American Canal of 500,000 acre-feet (616,745,000 cubic meters) of water each year from the date Davis dam and reservoir are placed in operation until January 1, 1980 and the delivery of 375,000 acre-feet (462,558,000 cubic meters) of water each year thereafter. This schedule shall be formulated subject to the following limitations:

With reference to the 500,000 acre-foot (616,745,000 cubic meter) quantity:

(a) During the months of January, February, October, November, and December the prescribed rate of delivery shall be not less than 300 cubic feet (8.5 cubic meters) nor more than 2,000 cubic feet (56.6 cubic meters) per second.

(b) During the remaining months of the year the prescribed rate of delivery shall be not less than 500 cubic feet (14.2 cubic meters) nor more than 2,000 cubic feet (56.6 cubic meters) per second.

With reference to the 375,000 acre-foot (462,558,000 cubic meter) quantity:

(a) During the months of January, February, October, November, and December the prescribed rate of delivery shall be not less than 225 cubic feet (6.4 cubic meters) nor more than 1,500 cubic feet (42.5 cubic meters) per second.

(b) During the remaining months of the year the prescribed rate of delivery shall be not less than 375 cubic feet (10.6 cubic meters) nor more than 1,500 cubic feet (42.5 cubic meters) per second.

B. The United States shall be under no obligation to deliver, through the All-American Canal, more than 500,000 acre-feet (616,745,000 cubic meters) annually from the date Davis dam and reservoir are placed in operation until January 1, 1980 or more than 375,000 acre-feet (462,558,000 cubic meters) annually thereafter. If, by mutual agreement, any part of the quantities of water specified in this paragraph are delivered to Mexico at points on the land boundary otherwise than through the All-American Canal, the above quantities of water and the rates of deliveries set out under schedule II of this article shall be correspondingly diminished.

C. The United States shall have the option of delivering, at the point on the land boundary mentioned in subparagraph (c) of article 11, any part or all of the water to be delivered at that point under schedule II of this article during the months of January, February, October, November, and December of each year, from any source whatsoever, with the understanding that the total specified annual quantities to be delivered through the All-American Canal shall not be reduced because of the exercise of this option, unless such reduction be requested by the Mexican section, provided that the exercise of this option shall not have the effect of increasing the total amount of scheduled water to be delivered to Mexico.

D. In any year in which there shall exist in the river water in excess of that necessary to satisfy the requirements in the United States and the guaranteed quantity of 1,500,000 acre-feet (1,850,234,000 cubic meters) allotted to Mexico, the United States hereby declares its intention to cooperate with Mexico in attempting to supply additional quantities of water through the All-American Canal as such additional quantities are desired by Mexico, if such use of the Canal and facilities will not be detrimental to the United States, provided that the delivery of any additional quantities through the All-American Canal shall not have the effect of increasing the total scheduled deliveries to Mexico. Mexico hereby declares its intention to cooperate with the United States by attempting to curtail deliveries of water through the All-American Canal in years of limited supply, if such curtailment can be accomplished without detriment to Mexico and is necessary to allow full use of all available water supplies, provided that such curtailment shall not have the effect of reducing the total scheduled deliveries of water to Mexico.

E. In any year in which there shall exist in the river water in excess of that necessary to satisfy the requirements in the United States and the guaranteed quantity of 1,500,000 acre-feet (1,850,234,000 cubic meters) allotted to Mexico, the United States Section shall so inform the Mexico Section in order that the latter may schedule such surplus water to complete a quantity up to a maximum of 1,700,000 acre-feet (2,096,931,000 cubic meters). In this circumstance the total quantities to be delivered under Schedules I and II shall be increased in proportion to their respective total quantities and the two schedules thus increased shall be subject to the same limitations as those established for each under paragraph A of this Article.

F. Subject to the limitations as to rates of deliveries and total quantities set out in Schedules I and II, Mexico shall have the right, upon thirty days notice in advance to the United States Section to increase or decrease each monthly quantity prescribed by those schedules by not more than 20% of the monthly quantity.

G. The total quantity of water to be delivered under Schedule I of paragraph A of this Article may be increased in any year if the amount to be delivered under Schedule II is correspondingly reduced and if the limitations as to rates of delivery under each schedule are correspondingly increased and reduced.

IV—TIJUANA RIVER

Article 16

In order to improve existing uses and to assure any feasible further development, the Commission shall study and investigate, and shall submit to the two Governments for their approval:

(1) Recommendations for the equitable distribution between the two countries of the waters of the Tijuana River system;

(2) Plans for storage and flood control to promote and develop domestic, irrigation, and other feasible uses of the waters of this system;

(3) An estimate of the cost of the proposed works and the manner in which the construction of such works or the cost thereof should be divided between the two Governments;

(4) Recommendations regarding the parts of the works to be operated and maintained by the Commission and the parts to be operated and maintained by each Section.

The two Governments through their respective Sections of the Commission shall construct such of the proposed works as are approved by both Governments, shall divide the work to be done or the cost thereof, and shall distribute between the two countries the waters of the Tijuana River system in the proportions approved by the two Governments. The two Governments agree to pay in equal shares the costs of joint operation and maintenance of the works involved, and each Government agrees to pay the cost of operation and maintenance of the works assigned to it for such purpose.

V. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 17

The use of the channels of the international rivers for the discharge of flood or other excess waters shall be free and not subject to limitation by either country, and neither country shall have any claim against the other in respect of any damage caused by such use. Each Government agrees to furnish the other Government, as far in advance as practicable, any information it may have in regard to such extraordinary discharges of water from reservoirs and flood flows on its own territory as may produce floods on the territory of the other.

Each Government declares its intention to operate its storage dams in such manner, consistent with the normal operations of its hydraulic systems, as to avoid, as far as feasible, material damage in the territory of the other.

Article 18

Public use of the water surface of lakes formed by international dams shall, when not harmful to the services rendered by such dams, be free and common to both countries, subject to the police regulations of each country in its territory, to such general regulations as may appropriately be prescribed and enforced by the Commission with the approval of the two Governments for the purpose of the application of the provisions of this Treaty, and to such regulations as may appropriately be prescribed and enforced for the same purpose by each Section of the Commission with respect to the areas and borders of such parts of those lakes as lie within its territory. Neither Government shall use for military purposes such water surface situated within the territory of the other country except by express agreement between the two Governments.

Article 19

The two Governments shall conclude such special agreements as may be necessary to regulate the generation, development and disposition of electric power at international plants, including the necessary provisions for the export of electric current.

Article 20

The two Governments shall, through their respective Sections of the Commission, carry ou the construction of works allotted to them. For this purpose the respective Sections of the Commission may make use of any competent public or private agencies in accordance with the laws of the respective countries. With respect to such works as either Section of the Commission may have to execute on the territory of the other, it shall, in the execution of such works, observe the laws of the place where such works are located or carried out, with the exceptions hereinafter stated.

All materials, implements, equipment and repair parts intended for the construction, operation and maintenance of such works shall be exempt from import and export customs duties. The whole of the personnel employed either directly or indirectly on the construction, operation or maintenance of the works may pass freely from one country

to the other for the purpose of going to and from the place of location of the works, without any immigration restrictions, passports or labor requirements. Each Government shall furnish, through its own Section of the Commission, convenient means of identification to the personnel employed by it on the aforesaid works and verification certificates covering all materials, implements, equipment and repair parts intended for the works.

Each Government shall assume responsibility for and shall adjust exclusively in accordance with its own laws all claims arising within its territory in connection with the constructon, operation or maintenance of the whole or any part of the works heren agreed upon or of any works which may, in the execution of this Treaty, be agreed upon in the future.

Article 21

The construction of the international dams and the formation of artificial lakes shall produce no change in the fluvial international boundary, which shall continue to be governed by existing treaties and conventions in force between the two countries.

The Commission shall, with the approval of the two Governments, establish in the artificial lakes, by buoys or by other suitable markets, a practicable and convenient line to provide for the exercise of the jurisdiction and control vested by this Treaty in the Commisison and its respective Sections. Such line shall also mark the boundary for the application of the customs and police regulations of each country.

Article 22

The provisions of the Convention between the United States and Mexico for the rectification of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) in the El Paso-Juárez Valley signed on February 1, 1933, shall govern, so far as delimitation of the boundary, distribution of jurisdiction and sovereignty, and relations with private owners are concerned, in any places where works for the artificial channeling, canalization or rectification of the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo) and the Colorado River are carried out.

Article 23

The two Governments recognize the public interest attached to the works required for the execution and performance of this Treaty and agree to acquire, in accordance with their respective domestic laws, any private property that may be required for the construction of the said works, including the main structures and their appurtenances and the construction materials therefor, and for the operation and maintenance thereof, at the cost of the country within which the property is situated, except as may be otherwise specifically provided in this Treaty.

Each Section of the Commission shall determine the extent and location of any private property to be acquired within its own country and shall make the necessary requests upon its Government for the acquisition of such property.

The Commission shall determine the cases in which it shall become necessary to locate works for the conveyance of water or electrical energy and for the servicing of any such works, for the benefit of either of the two countries, in the territory of the other country, in order that such works can be built pursuant to agreement between the two Governments. Such works shall be subject to the jurisdiction and supervision of the Section of the Commission within whose country they are located.

Construction of the works built in pursuance of the provisions of this Treaty shall not confer upon either of the two countries any rights either of property or of jurisdiction over any part whatsoever of the territory of the other. These works shall be part of the territory and be the property of the country wherein they are situated. However, in the case of any incidents occurring on works constructed across the limitrophe part of a river and with supports on both banks, the jurisdiction of each country shall be limited by the center line of such works, which shall be marked by the Commission, without thereby changing the international boundary.

Each Government shall retain, through its own Section of the Commission and within the limits and to the extent necessary to effectuate the provisions of this Treaty, direct ownership, control and jurisdiction within its own errítory and in accordance with its own laws, over all real property—including that within the channel of any river—rights of way and rights *in rem*, that it may be necessary to enter upon and occupy for the construction, operation or maintenance of all the works constructed, acquired or used pursuant to this Treaty. Furthermore, each Government shall similarly acquire and retain in its own possession the titles, control and jurisdiction over such works.

Article 24

The International Boundary and Water Commission shall have, in addition to the powers and duties otherwise specifically provided in this Treaty, the following powers and duties:

(a) To initiate and carry on investigations and develop plans for the works which are to be constructed or established in accordance with the provisions of this and other treaties or agreements in force between the two Governments dealing with boundaries and international waters; to determine, as to such works, their location, size, kind and characteristic specifications; to estimate the cost of such works; and to recommend the division of such costs between the two Governments, the arrangements for the furnishing of the necessary funds, and the dates for the beginning of the works, to the extent that the matters mentioned in this subparagraph are not otherwise covered by specific provisions of this or any other Treaty.

(b) To construct the works agreed upon or to supervise their construction and to operate and maintain such works or to supervise their operation and maintenance, in accordance with the respective domestic laws of each country. Each Section shall have, to the extent necessary to give effect to the provisions of this Treaty, jurisdiction over the works constructed exclusively in the territory of its country whenever such works shall be connected with or shall directly affect the execution of the provisions of this Treaty.

(c) In general to exercise and discharge the specific powers and duties entrusted to the Commission by this and other treaties and agreements in force between the two countries, and to carry into execution and prevent the violation of the provisions of those treaties and agreements. The authorities of each country shall aid and support the exercise and discharge of these powers and duties, and each Commissioner shall invoke when necessary the jurisdiction of the courts or other appropriate agencies of his country to aid in the execution and enforcement of these powers and duties.

(d) To settle all differences that may arise between the two Governments with respect to the interpretation or application of this Treaty, subject to the approval of the two Governments. In any case in which the Commissioners do not reach an agreement, they shall so inform their respective governments reporting their respective opinions and the grounds therefor and the points upon which they differ, for discussion and adjustment of the difference through diplomatic channels and for application where proper of the general or special agreements which the two Governments have concluded for the settlement of controversies.

(e) To furnish the information requested of the Commissioners jointly by the two Governments on matters within their jurisdiction. In the event that the request is made by one Government alone, the Commissioner of the other Government must have the express authorization of his Government in order to comply with such request.

(f) The Commission shall construct, operate and maintain upon the limitrophe parts of the international streams, and each Section shall severally construct, operate and maintain upon the parts of the international streams and their tributaries within the boundaries of its own country, such stream gaging stations as may be needed to provide the hydrographic data necessary or convenient for the proper functioning of this Treaty. The data so obtained shall be compiled and periodically exchanged between the two sections.

(g) The Commission shall submit annually a joint report to the two Governments on the matters in its charge. The Commission shall also submit to the two Governments joint reports on general or any particular matters at such other times as it may deem necessary or as may be requested by the two Governments.

Article 25

Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Treaty, Articles III and VII of the Convention of March 1, 1889 shall govern the proceedings of the Commission in carrying out the provisions of this Treaty. Supplementary thereto the Commission shall establish a body of rules and regulations to govern its procedure, consistent with the provisions of this Treaty and of Articles III and VII of the Convention of March 1, 1889 and subject to the approval of both Governments.

Decisions of the Commission shall be recorded in the form of Minutes done in duplicate in the English and Spanish languages, signed by each Commissioner and attested by the Secretaries, and copies thereof forwarded to each Government within three day after being signed. Except where the specific approval of the two Governments is required by any provision of this Treaty, if one of the Governments fails to communicate to the Commission its approval or disapproval of a decision of the Commission within thirty days reckoned from the date of the Minute in which it shall have been pronounced, the Minute in question and the decisions which it contains shall be considered to be approved by that Government. The Commissioners, within the limits of their respective jurisdictions, shall execute the decisions of the Commission that are approved by both Governments.

If either Government disapproves a decision of the Commission the two Governments shall take cognizance of the matter, and if an agreement regarding such matter is reached between the two Governments, the agreement shall be communicated to the Commissioners, who shall take such further proceedings as may be necessary to carry out such agreement.

VI—TRANSITORY PROVISIONS

Article 26

During a period of eight years from the date of the entry into force of this Treaty, or until the beginning of operation of the lowest major international reservoir on the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo), should it be placed in operation prior to the expiration of said period, Mexico will cooperate with the United States to relieve, in times of drought, any lack of water needed to irrigate the lands now under irrigation in the Lower Rio Grande Valley in the United States, and for this purpose Mexico will release water from El Azucar reservoir on the San Juan River and allow that water to run through its system of canals back into the San Juan River in

order that the United States may divert such water from the Rio Grande (Rio Bravo). Such releases shall be made on condition that they do not affect the Mexican irrigation system, provided that Mexico shall, in any event, except in cases of extraordinary drought or serious accident to its hydraulic works, release and make available to the United States for its use the quantities requested, under the following conditions: that during the said eight years there shall be made available a total of 160,000 acre-feet (197,358,000 cubic meters) and up to 40,000 acre-feet (49,340,000 cubic meters) in any one year; that the water shall be made available as requested at rates not exceeding 750 cubic feet (21.2 cubic meters) per second; that when the rates of flow requested and made available have been more than 500 cubic feet (14.2 cubic meters) per second the period of release shall not extend beyond fifteen consecutive days; and that at least thirty days must elapse between any two periods of release during which rates of flow in excess of 500 cubic feet (14.2 cubic meters) per second have been requested and made available. In addition to the guaranteed flow, Mexico shall release from El Azucar reservoir and conduct through its canal system and the San Juan River, for use in the United States during periods of drought and after satisfying the needs of Mexican users, any excess water that does not in the opinion of the Mexican Section have to be stored and that may be needed for the irrigation of lands which were under irrigation during the year 1943 in the Lower Rio Grande Valley in the United States.

Article 27

The provisions of Article 10, 11, and 15 of this Treaty shall not be applied during a period of five years from the date of the entry into force of this Treaty, or until the Davis dam and the major Mexican diversion structure on the Colorado River are placed in operation, should these works be placed in operation prior to the expiration of said period. In the meantime Mexico may construct and operate at its expense a temporary diversion structure in the bed of the Colorado River in territory of the United States for the purpose of diverting water into the Alamo Canal, provided that the plans for such structure and the construction and operation thereof shall be subject to the approval of the United States Section. During this period of time the United States will make available in the river at such diversion structure river flow not currently required in the United States, and the United States will cooperate with Mexico to the end that the later operate with Mexico to the end that the latter may satisfy its irrigation requirements within the limits of those requirements for lands irrigated in Mexico from the Colorado River during the year 1943.

VII—FINAL PROVISIONS

Article 28

This Treaty shall be ratified and the ratifications thereof shall be exchanged in Washington. It shall enter into force on the day of the exchange of ratifications and shall continue in force until terminated by another Treaty concluded for that purpose between the two Governments.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty and have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate in the English and Spanish languages, in Washington on this third day of February, 1944.

For the Government of the United States of America:

CORDELL HULL [SEAL]
GEORGE S. MESSERSMITH [SEAL]
LAWRENCE M. LAWSON [SEAL]

For the Government of the United Mexican States:

F. CASTILLE NÁJERA [SEAL]
RAFAEL FERNÁNDEZ MACGREGOR [SEAL]

PROTOCOL

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Mexican States agree and understand that:

Wherever, by virtue of the provisions of the Treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed in Washington on February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande from Fort Quitman, Texas, to the Gulf of Mexico, specific functions are imposed on, or exclusive jurisdiction is vested in, either of the Sections of the International Boundary and Water Commission, which involve the construction or use of works for storage or conveyance of water, flood control, stream gaging, or for any other purpose, which are situated wholly within the territory of the country of that Section, and which are to be used only partly for the performance of treaty provisions, such jurisdiction shall be exercised, and such functions, including the construction, operation and maintenance of the said works, shall be performed and carried out by the Federal agencies of that country which now or hereafter may be authorized by domestic law to construct, or to operate and maintain, such works. Such functions or jurisdictions shall be exercised in conformity with the provisions of the Treaty and in cooperation with the respective Section of the Commission, to the end that all international obligations and functions may be coordinated and fulfilled.

The works to be constructed or used on or along the boundary, and those to be constructed or used exclusively for the discharge of treaty stipulations, shall be under the jurisdiction of the Commission or of the respective Section, in accordance with the provisions of the Treaty. In carrying out the construction of such works the Sections of the Commission may utilize the services of public or private organizations in accordance with the laws of their respective countries.

This Protocol, which shall be regarded as an integral part of the aforementioned Treaty signed in Washington on February 3, 1944, shall be ratified and the ratifications thereof shall be exchanged in Washington. This Protocol shall be effective beginning with the day of the entry into force of the Treaty and shall continue effective so long as the Treaty remains in force.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed this Protocol and have hereunto affixed their seals.

Done in duplicate, in the English and Spanish languages, in Washington, this fourteenth day of November, 1944.

For the Government of the United States of America:

[SEAL] E. R. STETTINIUS, JR.
Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America.

For the Government of the United Mexican States:

[SEAL] F. CASTILLO NÁJERA
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United Mexican States in Washington.

Mr. DOWNEY (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of California) submitted five amendments and Mr. JOHNSON of California (for himself and Mr. DOWNEY) submitted four amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed at Washington on February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande from Fort Quitman, Tex., to the Gulf of Mexico, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the matter now before the Senate is one to which I urgently invite the attention of all Senators because it involves a matter of the highest international importance to the United States and furthermore, aside from its international aspects, it involves the welfare of the people of the United States residing within the areas of the rivers which are affected by the treaty.

Permit me to say that the Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings on this treaty which extended over 4 weeks, almost 5, in which every interest was given unlimited opportunity to express its views, to submit documents and arguments. It was an unusual hearing in that no limitation was placed on anyone. Every interest which cared to be heard was heard exhaustively, and in some instances at length. After the hearings were concluded, the committee by a vote of 18 to 4 voted to report the treaty favorably, and recommended ratification by the Senate.

Mr. President, I shall invite attention to the list of Senators who are members of the committee and who voted to report the treaty favorably. I shall not at this time mention the names, but I hope to do so in the course of my remarks.

There is on the wall of the Senate here [indicating] a map which shows some of the territories which are affected. It is my hope to have tomorrow another map supplementing this map, which will show the States in what is called the upper basin of the Colorado River.

The treaty relates to a division of the waters of the Rio Grande, which rises in the southern portion of Colorado, flows down through New Mexico, and becomes the international boundary between Texas and Mexico. The treaty relates only to that portion of the Rio Grande from Fort Quitman, which is indicated on the map, to its mouth in the Gulf of Mexico.

The treaty further relates to the waters of the Colorado River. The Colorado River rises in the far reaches of Wyoming, not shown on the map on the wall. It flows down through Colorado and Utah, touches Nevada, and flows between Arizona and California to where it enters the Mexican territory. Senators will notice there are two boundaries, the one between California and Mexico, and the one between Arizona and Mexico, which do not connect, but both touch the river. The river originates in Wyoming, but the State of Colorado furnishes the overwhelming volume of water which flows into the Colorado River.

California resisted the adoption of the treaty. As Senators know, the Colorado River borders Arizona and California until it reaches the California boundary at the point on the map to which I am pointing. California does not contribute any water whatever to the river's flow. I do not say that in criticism, because of course California cannot help it, nature just made it that way; but California contributes no water to the river.

It will be noticed that the map illustrates certain areas which are supposed to represent the cultivated lands on either side of the border. Some years ago California, through the Imperial Valley irrigation district, the territory to which

I am pointing on the map, organized companies and constructed works, one of which was a canal originating, according to my recollection, in Mexico. In other words, they tapped the river at a point near the California border, and the canal then went down through Mexican territory and back into the United States, where the water was delivered to the Imperial Valley irrigation district. As a matter of fact, the works within Mexico cost considerable sums, and the property of the irrigation district operated through a Mexican subsidiary, which secured certain concessions from the Mexican Government. The Imperial Valley irrigation district, of course, has been receiving revenues from Mexican residents for water which came down through the All-American Canal, which was not the All-American Canal at that time, but it was a canal within Mexico.

Boulder Dam is shown at the point I indicate, at the top of the map. All Senators are familiar with the fact that the Boulder Dam Act contemplated the construction of a great work on the Colorado River for the purpose of conserving the waters, and distributing them among the States affected.

Prior to the enactment of the Boulder Dam Act, all the States in this area, the seven States—only six at first, as I recall—entered into what they called the Colorado River compact. If I fall into error in any of my statements, I shall be glad if members of the committee or other Senators will correct me, because such a mass of detail is involved that I am not able to carry all the facts in my mind.

The Colorado River compact was an agreement among the States in the territory affected as to the division of the waters of the Colorado River. Under that compace the territory was divided into what they call the upper basin States and the lower basin States. The upper basin States were Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico, as I recall. The lower basin States were Nevada, California, and Arizona.

It was provided that of the waters of the Colorado River the upper basin States should be allocated 7,500,000 acre-feet annually. In the case of the lower basin States it was provided that they should receive a similar amount, 75,000,000 acre-feet, over a period of 10 years, which would be an average of 7,500,000 a year. The lower basin was to receive an additional allocation dependent upon the occurrence of certain conditions.

It is contended by the opponents of the treaty that Mexico would not be entitled to any more water than she was using from the river prior to the enactment of the Boulder Dam Act, and their contention is that at that time they were using only 750,000 acre-feet annually. Their thesis is that because of the construction of Boulder Dam, Mexico would not be entitled to receive anything by reason of the storage of waters through a structure created by the United States itself.

The testimony revealed, not without some controversy, however, that at the present time Mexico is utilizing, of the Colorado waters, 1,800,000 acre feet annually for agricultural purposes. The treaty provides that the United States shall deliver to Mexico 1,500,000 acre-feet, and it is contended by the proponents of the treaty that that is a smaller amount than is actually being used by Mexico at the present time.

It is also contended by the proponents of the treaty that at present there are approximately 10,000,000 acre-feet of water being discharged into the Gulf of California, without any useful purpose whatever. No one is using it. It is contended by the proponents that if there is no treaty, as time goes on Mexico may see fit to use largely increased amounts of this water for irrigation purposes, and thereby may acquire at least an equitable claim that by reason of prior appropriation she would be entitled to an additional amount of water from the river.

The United States has an arbitration treaty with Mexico, and, as I recall, 20 other American republics, providing that all matters of international controversy may be and shall be arbitrated where there is no other method of settlement, such as by negotiation. So it is contended by the proponents of the treaty that if there is no treaty, Mexico could invoke the arbitration agreement, and that with her expanded use of the water of the Colorado within her own territory, it would be very likely that in any arbitration settlement she would be allocated much more water than the treaty provides and much more water than she is now employing and using within her own territories.

I want to say to the Senate that, from our standpoint, much misleading information has been furnished and many misleading statements have been made to Senators with respect to the treaty and its effect. I make no serious complaint, but during the pendency of the hearings in the committee, information came to many of us informally that the great army of witnesses who were here from California were spending most of their time interviewing Senators and carrying on propaganda and lobbying activities. Of course they have the right to do that. I am not complaining, but I think it is a little unfair to overpower us with a great force of witnesses of that character.

I might also indicate that the hearings disclosed that the State of California had appropriated $50,000, through its legislature, for expenses in connection with opposition to the treaty.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield for a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to ask this question of the Senator from Texas: Over what period of time has the effort been in progress between the United States Government and the Government of Mexico to arrive at an understanding or a treaty with reference to the subject under discussion?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be very glad to answer the question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so I may ask the majority leader a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama if he desires to ask the majority leader a question.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have been under the impression that we would be given an opportunity to move to displace the treaty temporarily and proceed with the Aubrey Williams nomination, and that such an opportunity would be afforded us today. I do not have an understanding about it, but I should like to know what the Senate is going to do with the Aubrey Williams nomination. Will opportunity be given me, as I understood from a conversation yesterday that it would, at least to make a motion to proceed with the consideration of the Aubrey Williams nomination? The Senator from Texas is entitled to the floor if he seeks to hold it, but if we can reach an understanding with respect to the matter I think we should do so. I understand there is to be no session tomorrow. We are anxious to have a vote on the Aubrey Williams nomination today. I should like to know if the Senator will give me an opportunity to make that motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator from Alabama that I have had no understanding with the Senator from Alabama or anyone else about when he can make a motion to displace the treaty in order to consider the Aubrey Williams nomination. I have understood in an informal way that at an appropriate time the Senator from Alabama intended to make such a motion. But the treaty is the unfinished business, in executive session. The Senator from Texas, as the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, which has reported that treaty for consideration by the Senate, has the floor. Certainly I would not want to take the Senator from Texas off the floor in order that a motion be made to displace a treaty between the United States Government and the Government of Mexico, to take up the infinitely more important problem of whether Aubrey Williams is to be head of the REA! I imagine the Senator from Texas desires to make a connected statement about the treaty, and I certainly would not be a party to taking the Senator from Texas off the floor in order to afford the Senator from Alabama or any other Senator the opportunity to make a motion to displace the treaty by the Aubrey Williams nomination. Whenever the Senator from Texas shall have concluded his remarks and has yielded the floor it will be in order for any Senator, if he gains recognition, to make any motion he desires to make. But I have not had any understanding at all with anyone about this matter. It has been my understanding that the Senator from Texas, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, desires to go forward with consideration of the treaty on the theory that the treaty itself now is the most important problem before the Senate, and I certainly would not wish to interfere with the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I understand the Senator will not contribute to obtaining a vote on the Williams nomination, but I did understand from conversation that an opportunity would arise to enable me to make the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Undoubtedly an opportunity will arise, but I never had an understanding as to when that opportunity would arise, whether today or at any other time. I certainly would not be a party to any effort to take the Senator from Texas off his feet in the explanation of the pending treaty in order to accord to any Senator the opportunity to make a motion to take up something else. I never had any understanding of that kind.

Mr. BANKHEAD. No, not to take the Senator from Texas off his feet.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the only way any other Senator can now obtain recognition.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator could express a willingness that the Senate vote on the Aubrey Williams nomination.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not in charge of the treaty. The able, hard-working and consistent and devoted chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who sat in committee a month or 5 weeks listening to testimony, is in charge of the treaty. I do not wish to be a party to any effort to take him off his feet now. I do not know whether a vote on the Aubrey Williams nomination would result in more votes today than on Monday, and I am not concerned about that. I doubt very seriously whether there will be a difference of two votes on the Aubrey Williams nomination or a motion to displace the treaty for consideration of the Aubrey Williams nomination, today or next Monday or next Tuesday. Certainly the Senator from Texas, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, is entitled to discuss the treaty and to complete his statement before any effort is made to consider something else. That is my honest opinion about the matter, and it is in conformity with my understanding and views as expressed by me in private conversation with all the Senators involved, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] and other Senators who seem to be in a hurry to have the Aubrey Williams nomination considered.

The nomination of Mr. Williams is on the calendar. His nomination is before the Senate on an adverse report from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He cannot get on the pay roll until he is confirmed by the Senate and is commissioned by the President. I do not know what harm he is doing by occupying a position on the calendar with an adverse report. If we keep him on the calendar for the next 6 months he would not get anywhere. I suppose the Senate will sooner or later pass on the question whether Aubrey Williams or the treaty with Mexico is more important.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield but not for a motion.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Oh, no. I simply wish to ask the Senator a question. So far as I am concerned—and I think so far as other Senators who are opposed to Mr. Williams are concerned—very little will be said on the subject, and I was wondering if the Senator from Texas would not permit us to postpone the treaty, say, to an hour certain, or to a day certain, say, next Monday or Tuesday at the outside. We probably will not have a session tomorrow. Anyway, we might not. Then we could take up the Aubrey Williams nomination and discuss it, if any Senator wished to discuss it. So far as I am concerned, I would be perfectly willing to let it come to a vote without discussion. I would make an agreement to that effect if it were desired by those on the other side, and let the nomination come to a vote right away. It would take only a short time, and the matter could be settled. I am wondering whether the Senator from Texas would be good enough to yield to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], a member of the committee, to make a motion to postpone consideration of the treaty to a day certain, or an hour certain, and let us go ahead with the Williams nomination. I believe that time would be saved.

Mr. CONNALLY. What is the implication?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I understand that consideration of the treaty will require a long time. I believe that only a short time would be required to dispose of the Williams nomination.

Mr. CONNALLY. How would time be saved by postponing the consideration of the treaty? What was the Senator's implication when he said that he thought time would be saved?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Undoubtedly the Senate is considerably interested in the nomination of Mr. Williams, and more interested at the moment——

Mr. CONNALLY. In other words, as soon as Senators act on the nomination, they will lose interest and go home?

Mr. MCKELLAR. No. I expect to be convinced with regard to the treaty. My mind is entirely open. I shall pay a great deal of attention to what the Senator has to say about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. May I inquire if the mind of the Senator from Tennessee is equally open with regard to Aubrey Williams?

Mr. MCKELLAR. No. I have made up my mind about Aubrey Williams. I do not believe that his nomination ought to be confirmed; and I think everyone in the country knows it, including every Member of the Senate. I hope the Senator will yield to the Senator from Alabama to make a motion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I very much regret that Senators have put me in the attitude in which I have been put.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I do not wish to put the Senator in any attitude. I love the Senator, and have loved him for a long time.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not worried about Aubrey Williams. The Senator from Alabama cast my proxy the same way he voted, against Mr. Aubrey Williams; but I think there are things in the world more important than Aubrey Williams.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I entirely agree with the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have the responsibility of handling this treaty. After 5 weeks of hearings I do not see how I could consistently, voluntarily quit and let the Senate go off on a rabbit hunt.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Does the Senator's present disinclination to yield for the purpose of a motion by the Senator from Alabama hold good for some time, or is it for this afternoon only?

Mr. CONNALLY. So far as I am concerned, I expect to conclude my remarks this afternoon. Of course, it is within the power of the Senate, if it wishes to do so, to set aside consideration of the treaty by a vote, and proceed to consider the Williams nomination. It can do so if it wishes. However, the treaty is now the pending business of the Senate. For some time we have wanted to have it considered. It is a matter of great importance. I do not think I should be asked voluntarily to stand aside and let the Senate have a race with Aubrey Williams.

I do not know that I ever saw Aubrey Williams in my life. I would not know him if I were to meet him in the road. The other day I voted against him. I hope my friends, the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Alabama, will not make things any more uncomfortable for me than they have already done. I do not like to say "No" to their request. Let me say to the Senator that there is just as strong pressure on the other side urging me not to agree to the request.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I thought that if we could agree to an hour certain or a day certain—say next Monday——

Mr. CONNALLY. When the Senator obtains a uninimous-consent agreement for a definite hour, I shall be glad to talk with him further.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the Williams nomination, and vote before we adjourn this evening?

Mr. CONNALLY. I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is obvious that such an agreement could not be entered into. The Senator from Texas did not yield for any such purpose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not yield for that purpose.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of moving postponement of the consideration of the treaty until next Tuesday at 12 o'clock?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I cannot. If the Senator can work out some agreement for an immediate vote, or a vote within an hour or 2 hours, I shall be glad to consult with him again. I shall not hold the floor always.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I shall be glad to consult with the Senator at any time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I simply wish to say that the charges against Mr. Williams have

been very widely publicized. It seems to me quite unfair to restrict the debate when his nomination comes up. It seems to me that at least 3 or 4 hours would be required properly to present the case for and against Mr. Williams. I hope the Senator from Texas will not yield with the expectation that the Williams nomination will be disposed of in an hour this afternoon.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. It does not make any difference to me when the Senate takes up the Aubrey Williams case. I hope the Senator from Texas will continue the discussion of the treaty. I cannot understand the reason for the constant pressure to take up the Aubrey Williams nomination. One might think that that was the most important thing that ever came before the United States Senate. It is a little difficult for me to understand.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I have already expressed my regret at not being able to comply with the requests made of me. When I surrender the floor, the floor will be open. The Presiding Officer will be in his place; God will be on His throne; and any Senator who is able to obtain recognition can get the floor. I am not trying to dictate. I am merely trying to discharge a small part of the responsibility which the Senate has placed upon me as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, as I have pointed out, the treaty deals not alone with the Colorado River but also with a small stream known as the Tijuana, which originates in Mexico and flows into the United States across the southern border of California. It also deals, as I pointed out a moment ago, with the Rio Grande, from Fort Quitman down to the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that, although the hearings were somewhat protracted, we finally reached a conclusion. That conclusion enabled the Senator to make the celebrated trip to Mexico, and he has just returned, has he not?

Mr. CONNALLY. I returned on Saturday.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I will not quibble over a few days. If this body was able to transact its business while the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations was absent and to do whatever it saw fit to do, why could it not take a brief period from the time which the Senator now seeks to occupy to permit the Senate to pass upon the nomination of Mr. Aubrey Williams?

The time would be justly spent. I have no feeling toward Mr. Williams; I do not know him. I propose to wait until I hear what is said in regard to him, and to cast my vote accordingly. But what is the rush now, on this day, Friday, to carry this treaty to a finality in this body? I do not see any reason for it. I can assure the Senator, as one Member of the Senate who believes that this treaty does wrong, that it is wicked, that it is of a sort that can never be justified in any terms whatsoever, that there is one man who will stand here as long as he is permitted—I do not mean by that that I shall indulge in a filibuster—but there is one man who will stand here in opposition to that treaty and will present a full and complete report on it to this body. If the Senate sees fit to overrule that report, to pay no attention to it, as no attention was paid to the people who appeared against the treaty in the committee hearing, then I shall bow my head, of course, and accept the result. But I will not accept any result that is short of a full and complete exposition of this treaty.

I say that to the Senator in all good faith. If we are faced with two propositions, we should determine which one we will proceed with. If one can be proceeded with, and thus do the other no harm, I think it should be proceeded with. If Mr. Aubrey Williams is waiting for a determination of his case, he is entitled to it, of course. The mere fact that we have a treaty with a foreign nation—in this case with Mexico—is no reason why this body should deny him his rights.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have already stated my attitude with regard to that matter. I may say to the Senator from California that the treaty was reported to the Senate a considerable time ahead of the Aubrey Williams nomination, so it has priority on the docket.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Have all the documents relative to the treaty been printed?

Mr. CONNALLY. Most of the hearings have been printed, and the others will be ready before the debate proceeds very far. Some of them are already on the desks of Senators.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is a nice way to go into the debate on a treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. I tender some of the hearings to the Senator now.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No; I do not care for them now.

We are about to consider an important treaty between two nations. We should deal with such a matter in the most delicate fashion. Yet we find that a portion of the testimony which has been taken is yet to be printed. I cannot understand such procedure. What is the hurry? What is there about the country to the south of us which entitles it to treatment different from that accorded any other country on the face of the earth? I insist that we should proceed as we would proceed in the case of any other country. We should proceed only when all the printed hearings and other documents which generally are prepared in connection with matters of this sort has been given each member of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no disposition to deny to the Senator from California or any other Senator an opportunity for thorough discussion of the treaty and its important aspects. I think the Senator from California will bear witness to the fact that in the committee the chairman accorded all the time which anyone requested. We undertook to place no time limit on anyone. I am sure the Senator will verify that statement on the part of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; so far as the Senator could contain himself, he did it magnificently; but when he was unable to contain himself he made perfectly plain to the witness who was testifying or to the others who were present that they must obey him. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. "They must obey him"—there is no such word as "obey" in the bright lexicon of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee is a very independent one. The chairman of the committee may have been a little impatient now and then, when there were evidences of perpetual motion on the part of some of the witnesses. [Laughter.] But other members of the committee will verify my statement that the chairman of the committee did not deny anyone all the time he desired.

Mr. President, in connection with the treaty with Mexico the Senator from California said something about the interests of Mexico. I am not presenting the treaty as an act of grace or generosity to Mexico, but I am presenting it as one that is in the interest of the people of the United States and of the States in this basin that are affected. In this great basin there are seven States; Wyoming, Colorado, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, California, and New Mexico. Of those seven States in the Colorado River Basin, five are enthusiastically supporting the treaty.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I rise for the purpose of being informed as to what action on the part of Utah—my State—indicates that the State has taken any official action with reference to the treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that probably my statement is subject to correction on that point. I do not recall that there was any action on the part of the State Legislature of Utah, either for the treaty or against it.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is correct, so far as I know.

Mr. CONNALLY. However, a committee from Utah did come to the hearings. I understood that one of them was the State water engineer or the State conservation engineer.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I know the Senator desires to keep the record straight.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; and I want to be fair.

Mr. MURDOCK. Three witnesses from Utah did appear before the committee. Two of them were officials, namely, the Attorney General and the State engineer.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. They were proponents of the treaty, and I would say that they are enthusiastic proponents.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. On the other hand, there appeared before the committee three witnesses from Utah who were representing groups of water users; and

probably it is fair to say that they were just as enthusiastically and emphatically opposed to the treaty. I think the Senator will agree with me about that.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the State of Utah has taken any official action, I should like to be informed what it is. I do not know of any.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Utah would be better informed about that matter than would the Senator from Texas. I do not make any claim that the State Legislature of Utah took any action relative to the treaty. However, the attorney general of the State was present at the committee hearings, and he made a very enthusiastic argument. The State engineer, whose functions cover water legislation, attended the committee hearings and made a very strong statement. Probably I concluded that they, being in official life, more properly represented the State, if it was to take action, than did the several witnesses who appeared in their private status.

I withdraw any statement as to Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I know the Senator would not intentionally misinform anyone.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wished to bring out the fact that, so far as I know, no official action on the part of the State of Utah has been taken relative to the treaty. However, I thought the distinguished chairman of the committee might have information which was not available to me.

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. MURDOCK. I have written to the legislature for the purpose of ascertaining whether any such official action has been taken, but I have not as yet been informed of any.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not know that any official action has been taken by the State of Utah; but I did note, with some degree of credibility, that the State water engineer, who has jurisdiction over such matters, was here and that the attorney general, who has authority over legal matters, was here, and that both of them were strongly urging the treaty. Furthermore, there were other private witnesses, notably Colonel Watson, from the State of Utah, who had been connected with reclamation and water matters for many years, who appeared in advocacy of the treaty.

Mr. President, the point which I am trying to make is that I am advocating the ratification of the treaty not as a gesture toward Mexico or as an act of generosity toward her, but as being in our own national interest and in the interest particularly of the people of the seven basin States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Earlier I asked the Senator a question, the answer to which, I believe, he was diverted from making.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will answer the Senator's question now.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. From time to time the United States and Mexico have conducted negotiations with regard to the waters of the Colorado and the Rio Grande. Such negotiations were conducted over a long period of years. They went back practically to the beginning of the present century. Not until this treaty was concluded were the United States and Mexico able to arrive at an agreement.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. What States are opposed to the treaty?

Mr. CONNALLY. California, Nevada, and possibly Utah.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The Senator has omitted naming certain other States.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Kentucky asked me what States were opposed to the treaty and I stated to him that California and Nevada were opposed to the treaty.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; but the Senator omitted naming four other States.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not believe they are opposed to the treaty. I have qualified my statement with respect to Utah. Under the statement of the Senator from Utah, it may finally appear that Utah is either opposed to the treaty, or divided within herself with regard to it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Perhaps the inquiry propounded made me a bit suspicious.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Texas if it is not true that representatives of very important irrigation groups in Arizona appeared and vigorously protested the ratification of the treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certain witnesses appeared for that purpose.

Mr. DOWNEY. I also ask the distinguished Senator from Texas if it is not true that the interests and rights of the upper basin States, and those of the lower basin States are very different, and that at least two out of three of the lower basin States are emphatically opposed to the ratification of the treaty?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have already stated that California and Nevada are opposed to ratification. So far as I know they are the only two States which are opposed to the treaty. There is some difference between the situation with respect to the upper basin States and that with respect to the lower basin States. But the rights of those areas are all defined in the interstate compact between the States themselves, and the Boulder Dam Act requires that an agreement be entered into between the States, as already set forth in the interstate compact.

Mr. President, when I was interrupted I was about to say that the United States and Mexico had long been negotiating over those waters. The negotiations extended back almost to the beginning of the present century.

In 1906 the United States and Mexico agreed upon a treaty relating to the waters of the Rio Grande as affecting interests in Mexico. In the treaty the United States agreed that a certain amount of water rising within the United States, and supposedly impounded by the Elephant Butte Dam in New Mexico, should be allocated to the Mexican interests opposite the city of Juarez on the theory that before the erection of the dam the Mexican residents had utilized the waters of the Rio Grande for irrigation purposes, and that they had thereby become entitled to an equitable right, at least by prior appropriation, to the continuance of the use of those waters. We have had no difficulty in the administration of that treaty in the past. By that treaty the United States acknowledged the equitable right which lies within the boundary of prior use.

It has been contended by some that under the claim of prior utilization, if no treaty is ratified Mexico may continue expanding the use of the waters on the Mexican side of the border where 10,000,000 acre-feet annually now flow to waste, thereby forming the basis of an equitable claim for a great deal more water than she is now using, and for a great deal more water than is proposed to be given her under the treaty now before the Senate.

Reverting for a moment to the matters touched upon a few minutes ago, in 1927——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why are the Mexicans so concerned about this water if 10,000,000 feet of it are annually going to waste?

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say to the Senator from Arkansas that while at the present time the people of Mexico are not equipped to utilize the water, it is expected that later they will be in position to utilize it. Estimates were made that 50 or 100 years will elapse before the States in the lower basin and the States in the upper basin can utilize the maximum water for which they might find use. It is said that when that time comes 750,000 acre-feet annually will be required.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If there were no treaty then it might be possible within approximately 50 years to arrive at the point where the amount of water given to Mexico might interfere with the users in the north.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is the Senate not under the obligation of protecting the States in their use of the maximum amount of water which they may find necessary for their comfort and welfare?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; if no one else has a better right to the water.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does any foreign country have a greater right to the use of the water than the States?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I contend that by the ratification of this treaty we shall not only be serving our own interests, but that we shall be fair, just, and equitable with a sister country beside whom we must reside as long as

the flag flies. We cannot do differently. We are residing by the side of Mexico. We are strong and powerful. We have the power, of course, to say that we shall bottle up every acre of our water and not allow a single gallon of it to go down the Colorado River to where it may be used by the people of Mexico. But even now, with the use of Boulder Dam, 10,000,000 acre-feet annually are going down the Colorado River to waste.

Mr. President, power is generated at Boulder Dam. California receives power from that dam. When power is generated the gates must be opened and the water allowed to flow through, and when it flows through it flows back into the river. It must go somewhere. This treaty will be of aid to the people in that region because it provides for an additional dam at Davis. Possibly another dam will be constructed which will help hold and conserve the waters, thereby making available for use of the States greater quantities of water than they can possibly obtain under present conditions.

I may say to the Senator from Kentucky that I realize the truth of his general statement. Our interests are the interests of the United States. But our interests do not require that we claim for the United States something to which someone else is equitably entitled.

According to the testimony, Mexico is now using 1,800,000 acre-feet of water annually. This treaty would give her only 1,500,000 acre-feet, or 300,000 acre-feet less than she is now using. If California thinks that we ought to allow Mexico 750,000 acre-feet because she was using that much before the construction of Boulder Dam, very well; but if the Senator from Kentucky means to imply that we should not let Mexico have——

Mr. CHANDLER. No; I mean that our first obligation is to the United States. The Senator from Texas should not feel too critical of the position of certain of the States that contend they should be given more water. I do not believe that any foreign country should take water which is badly needed by one of our sister States. I know the Senator from Texas is fair; but if he lived in California and not Texas would he consider this to be a fair treaty?

Mr. CONNALLY. I would consider it to be a fair treaty. I do not believe that I am being entirely seduced by geography.

Mr. CHANDLER. I appreciate the concern of Senators for other countries, but we must also be concerned about our own country.

Mr. CONNALLY. My chief concern in this matter, as well as in other matters, is the United States of America; but my concern for my own country does not blind me to the rights of other peoples and other countries. I wish, of course, to be just.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have not decided the question in my own mind, but ought we not be careful before we impose upon an American State? Some of the States think we are imposing upon them, and I know their representatives have appeared here and insisted that to ratify this treaty and to take water which in the future may be needed by them and which may not then be available to them will work a hardship on them. I think we ought to be careful before we ratify the treaty if their contention is well-founded. I do not say that it is, and I know the Senator from Texas does not want to work a hardship, but ought not we be patient about it and give them the greatest consideration in the contention they are making and which they will continue to make?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator we certainly want to be patient, and if the Senator from Kentucky had honored us by his presence at the hearings which consumed nearly 5 weeks and at which every witness who appeared was given all the time asked for, he would be convinced we were patient.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have no doubt of that. I am not a member of the committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. We have weighed the matter very carefully, and we have come to the deliberate conclusion that this treaty is in the interest of the people of the United States, and I think it is in the interest of California herself.

Mr. CHANDLER. I want to say to my friend from Texas that I have received protests from at least four of the States affected, and from those States persons who say they represent a considerable number of people whose interests are involved have come to see me to protest the ratification of this treaty. I know, now that the committee has acted upon it and has presented it to the Senate, there is still going to be much consideration given to it, because the views of these people are entitled to the fullest measure of consideration by Senators who are not familiar with the matter and who are not members of the committee and did not have an opportunity to hear the testimony given there.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that the committee has tried to be patient, and fair, and certainly we want to be patient and fair in the Senate. We have no disposition to do anybody a wrong.

A suggestion has been made about geography. I suppose the implication is that because I live in Texas, because the Rio Grande flows between the United States and Mexico, and because this treaty affects the Rio Grande, I let that interest overcount all my other interests. Of course I am interested; I am interested, as a Texan, in the ratification of this treaty because it settles a matter which has been agitating our people for 40 years or more; but I am not letting—I hope; I pray God I am not—the fact that this treaty is of benefit to Texas outweigh my interest in the Government of all the people of the United States.

I do not charge that because people come here from California and appear against the treaty, they are blinded to all other considerations except the interests of their identical State.

The Rio Grande from Fort Quitman down to the Gulf is a border stream. We cannot build any kind of dam on the Rio Grande without a treaty, for the simple reason that it is an international stream and requires the consent of Mexico. There are now 4,000,000 acre-feet of water each year flowing out of the Rio Grande into the Gulf serving no useful purpose.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, before the distinguished Senator leaves the question of California will he yield to me for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. May I ask the distinguished Senator if he believes that he has given the Senator from Arkansas and the other Senators an understanding of the true issues in this case? While many million acre-feet of water flowing down, principally from the Upper Basin States, are probably involved in this issue, the particular additional 750,000 acre-feet to be given Mexico above what she ever used, without Boulder Dam, will in all probability come from 750,000 acre-feet of water contracted by the Department of the Interior to the State of California, for which aqueducts already costing hundreds of millions of dollars have been constructed to carry water which is essential and vital for the continued growth and development of Southern California during the next 10, 20, 30, and 40 years. Does the Senator truly give the other Senators to understand that the terms of this treaty affect most vitally conditions in California?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have not done so as yet; but of course I have not concluded my remarks. I have tried to be fair and point out what the opponents of the treaty claim. One of their claims is that expressed by the Senator from California. I do not subscribe to that claim; I do not agree that it is valid; I do not think the treaty would have the consequences the Senator from California thinks it would have, but I am not trying to evade it; I am not trying to conceal anything from the Senate.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question or two?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I came into the Chamber a few moments ago. I did not attend any of the sessions at the extended hearings which I understand were conducted in regard to the treaty; but, as I understand, we have never had a treaty at all with Mexico pertaining to this water supply. Is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. We had a treaty regarding water from above Fort Quitman, Tex., involving the Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande, but nothing as to the Colorado River.

Mr. STEWART. The water, of course, of the Colorado River flows into the Gulf of California?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. STEWART. What will be the situation if the treaty is not ratified? I am asking the question for information.

Mr. CONNALLY. I undertook to point out that if the treaty is not ratified millions of acre-feet of water, 10,000,000 acre-feet at the present time, will continue to flow into the Gulf of California unused and unemployed.

Mr. STEWART. If the treaty is ratified, then it would obligate the United States during the life of the treaty to permit Mexico to have a minimum amount of water?

Mr. CONNALLY. A maximum amount,

Mr. STEWART. A maximum amount of——

Mr. CONNALLY. A maximum of 1,500,000 acre-feet.

Mr. STEWART. In the event the southern section of California continues to grow, as suggested by the Senator from California and the demand and need for water become greater, could they, or those who live by the stream take this water in spite of the treaty?

Mr. CONNALLY. No. A million and a half acre-feet would have to go to Mexico.

Mr. STEWART. That is the maximum.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. STEWART. Let me ask one other question.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator was not here probably when I pointed out that 10,000,000 acre-feet of water are now flowing down that river unused and the testimony is that it will be 50 or perhaps 100 years before all the States interested can build works necessary to utilize to its full capacity all the water available on lands within the area. Furthermore there is testimony that the river itself produces more water than is allocated to both the upper basin and the lower basin by an amount in excess of one million or two million acre-feet. Furthermore, there is testimony that the river itself produces more water than is allocated to both the upper basin and the lower basin by more than a million and a half acre-feet.

Mr. STEWART. In the event the treaty should not be ratified, is there any tribunal to which Mexico could complain?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; she could go to the arbitration tribunal and ask for an arbitration with the United States. I shall secure the arbitration treaty and refer to it during my remarks. We have an arbitration treaty with Mexico and the other Latin-American republics by which we agree to arbitrate such matters, although some Senators contend that it does not amount to anything because the treaty provides that the form of submission on the issue before the tribunal shall be made by a proclamation of the President and must be ratified. Some Senators contend that because of that we could arbitrarily refuse and say, "No; we will not arbitrate anything." Others of us contend that that is merely a provision as to the form of the submission, that it does not remove the obligation we have to submit the question to arbitration. Otherwise, there would be no use having a treaty.

Mr. STEWART. Let me ask one more question, and I shall be through. Was anything developed in the hearings to the effect that there was a definite guaranty that the use of this water which would follow if the treaty were ratified would develop cotton growing in Mexico to the extent that it would be increased by two or three hundred thousand bales annually?

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. STEWART. I had heard of such a statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is one of the scarecrows which have been waving their rags around the Senate ever since the hearings. The testimony is that Mexico is now using 1,800,000 acre-feet a year. Mexico is a cotton-raising country. Cotton is the predominant industry in that territory.

Mr. STEWART. They irrigate.

Mr. CONNALLY. This treaty, instead of allowing them 1,800,000 acre-feet, as they have now, would cut them down to 1,500,000, so that it is perfectly fantastic to claim they could increase their cotton production by two or three hundred thousand bales. That is pure buncombe.

Mr. STEWART. There was no such evidence as that?

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no. Someone may have said that he claimed it, but there was no proof.

The Senator asked a moment ago what else would happen if the treaty were not ratified. If the treaty shall not be ratified, Mexico, having complete liberty within her own borders and within her own sovereignty, might expand her use of the waters of the Colorado River. She might build up a use to two or three times the amount she is now using, devoted to the production of cotton, and without a treaty we could not stop her, because the water is coming down there unimpeded and unhindered.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield if the Senator from Tennessee has concluded.

Mr. STEWART. I have, and I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator does not take the position, does he, that the treaty in any way would control the use by Mexico of the surplus water which the Senator says would flow into that country for a period of from fifty to a hundred years?

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. MURDOCK. There is nothing in the treaty about that?

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let us assume, then, that the Senator is correct that it would take fifty or a hundred years——

Mr. CONNALLY. I said the testimony varied on that point. That is not my testimony, it is the testimony of the witnesses.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let us explore that a little, if the Senator will be patient, in line with cotton growing in this part of Lower California. Let us assume that the testimony is such as the Senator has stated it, that it will be, we will not say a hundred years, but let us say 50 years, during which time there will be a surplus of water running down the Colorado River into Mexico. There is nothing in the treaty whatever which deprives Mexico of the use of that water?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator take the position that Mexico would sit idly by and watch 10,000,000 acre-feet flow into the ocean and not increase its production of cotton?

Mr. CONNALLY. Suppose it does; it will do that without a treaty.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is the point I wish to make. We have exactly the same situation with the treaty as without it, so far as increased production of cotton in Lower California is concerned.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that, of course, without a treaty Mexico would utilize all she desired to utilize. Some Senators say, "Oh, she will not do it because she cannot construct the works, and so forth and so on." With the treaty, of course, she can utilize any waters which flow down the stream, which we let flow down the stream, but allowing a limitation of a million and a half acre-feet, when the time came that we put on the limitation and she could not get any more water, her values in all this expanded territory would be destroyed, it would have no value whatever, because she could not get more than a million and a half acre-feet of water.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think my colleague has answered the question I had in mind. If this treaty shall be ratified, will it not be possible then that we in the United States might build more reservoirs to hold the surplus water, and that Mexico would not be entitled to a division of that surplus if we held it here? She could get only what is provided in the treaty?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Consequently, without the treaty she will get the water, with the treaty there is an opportunity for the United States to retain the water in reservoirs and appropriate it to our own use?

Mr. CONNALLY. My colleague is entirely correct. The treaty provides for building additional reservoirs, notably, the Davis Dam, which will supplement Boulder Dam, and make more water available for all the lower border States. I do not definitely know whether there will be a dam at the Sentinel Dam site or not.

Let me say one additional word now about the Rio Grande.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it true that by using more water in Mexico the Mexicans would in a sense establish a right by user similar to the practice we have in the United States so that in 50 years they could establish, under our arbitration treaty, the right to use three or four times as much?

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly. I tried to point that out a little while ago, that the United States recognized the equity of prior appropriation when it made the treaty with regard to Juarez and the water from the Elephant Butte Dam. If there is no treaty, as was well suggested by the Senator from Arkansas, under the doctrine of prior use and prior appropriation, there being no obligation whatever on Mexico to restrict her expansion, she could go on to the limit of her requirements and put more land in cotton or any other crop she might seee fit to raise.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Not yet, but in a moment. Then, having established an equitable claim by prior use and appropriation, she could go before an arbitra-

tion tribunal and probably get three or four times as much water as this treaty gives her.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator if he is now representing to the Senate that if this treaty shall not be ratified, Mexico, without the use of facilities, dams, and diversions in the United States, can, nevertheless, appropriate and use in Lower California several million acre-feet of water? Is that his contention?

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will not engage in arguments. I have been very liberal with the Senator, but that is not a question; it is an argument.

The Senator now is referring, of course, to Boulder Dam, and all the works up the river. Boulder Dam is there. Regardless of its effect, or who built it originally, there now goes down the Colorado River to the sea 10,000,000 acre-feet of water. My claim is that without this treaty Mexico may, if she can provide the facilities, employ that additional water for the expansion of agriculture and irrigation within her own boundaries, and no one can deny her that right or power. If she does that, she will create an equitable claim, at least, an equitable claim under the doctrine of prior appropriation, that she is entitled to continue the use of the water. That exact doctrine is laid down and approved in the making of treaties respecting waters of an international character.

Mr. DOWNEY. If the Senator will yield further, I will ask him if it was not the contention of the opponents of the treaty that Mexico can only divert and use this water in the way the Senator has indicated if the treaty is made effective, and gives Mexico the right to use diversions, structures, ditches, and dams, in the United States, which otherwise she could not use?

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not so understand the testimony. It was contended by the opponents of the treaty that she was not capable of diverting water from the Colorado River because of the difficulty of terrain which might make it difficult to build dams. But the testimony in that respect was conflicting. I am not trying to indicate what particular works she should construct. All I am saying is that the water is there, the water goes down that river, and if she can get it without a treaty it is no one's business, and she can do what she feels like doing with it.

Let me say another word and then I shall dismiss the Rio Grande. I was saying a little while ago that the Rio Grande, of course, was the boundary stream between Texas and Mexico. Millions of acre-feet of valuable water now escape into the Gulf of Mexico. Why? Because we cannot build any reservoirs on the river without a treaty. The Rio Grande is an international stream, and we must have the consent of Mexico to build such dams. We have tried to erect such structures.

In the meantime, beginning in the early part of this century, about 1906, 1907, 1908, or 1910, there has grown up within the Rio Grande Valley affected a magic territory. There are three or four counties in that territory which were in the early part of this century a rank area of mesquite and prairie dogs, and so forth and so on. An agricultural industry was established there which produces grapefruit and oranges such as many Senators have on their breakfast tables. Dams could not be built. So in order to irrigate that land so as to make it fruitful it was necessary to pump from the river every gallon of the water used on the land. Literally millions of dollars were spent in erecting pumping plants to pump the water from the river.

As a matter of fact, counting the tributaries on the Mexican side of the Rio Grande, the greater amount of water flowing down the Rio Grande originates in Mexico. By damming up those tributaries Mexico could cut off a large part of the water supply of the Rio Grande Valley. She has already built reservoirs on some of those tributaries which threaten the economic life and the safety of this rich agricultural territory on the Texas side of the river.

But, Mr. President, the crisis in the situation is caused by the fact that there are periodic floods on the Rio Grande which nothing but dams and reservoirs could control. The waters of those floods flow on to the sea and are not made use of. Then 2 or 3 months later there are protracted droughts which almost parch the orchards. With the building of the reservoirs provided by the treaty there will be plenty of water for the territory on the Texas side of the river and plenty of water for those residing on the Mexican side of the river.

The Mexicans have been tardy in their development on the Mexican side, but now they are beginning to develop the land, and they can divert water from the river by gravity and have already done so. They have built a canal almost paralleling the river in its lower reaches, which diverts water from the river, whereas we have to pump it from the river onto a high elevation, and we are absolutely at the mercy of Mexico with regard to the supply of water obtained from that river.

Under the treaty the waters of the river are equally divided between the United States and Mexico. There is no objection on the part of anyone to the treaty so far as it relates to the Rio Grande. It is of mutual advantage to both countries. Under it, the water in the reservoirs, which are provided for in the treaty, during periods of floods, would be held and then let out during periods of low water or drought. So there would result an economic saving. The treaty provides an absolute assurance that these millions of acre-feet of water shall not escape into the Gulf of Mexico unused, but shall be devoted to the fruitful production of food and articles of sustenance.

Mr. President, I now come back to the Colorado River. I want to be fair to the people of California. California admits that Mexico is entitled to 750,000 acre-feet under the doctrine of prior appropriation, because it is admitted that Mexico was using that amount before the erection of Boulder Dam. How can Mexico become entitled to 750,000 feet except on the doctrine of prior appropriation? She is now using 1,800,000 acre-feet, whereas under this treaty the limit is reduced to 1,500,000 acre-feet.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think it is interesting to observe that so far as actual usage of the water of the river is concerned, Mexico is using something more than 20 percent of it at the present time, and under the operation of the treaty, when the stream is fully developed, she will be entitled to use only about 8 percent of the water of the stream.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Colorado. The Senator from Colorado is thoroughly advised with regard to all these matters. He comes from a great water State. He comes from a State which provides about 80 percent of the water of the Colorado River, I believe. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Colorado furnishes about 80 percent of the water that flows down the Colorado River.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Under the doctrine of prior appropriation, if the United States does not enter into a treaty with Mexico at this time, sooner or later the Mexican Government will be able to substantiate a 20-percent water right under the same doctrine by which they are now getting the 750,000 acre feet a year.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Illinois. I think he is correct in his statement. Mexico is limited only by physical ability to appropriate the water and put it on the land. Every foot of water that is so used to irrigate the land gives Mexico an equitable claim to a prior appropriation.

Mr. President, there were many arguments advanced against the treaty, chiefly by California interests. I have no bitterness against California. I have no feud with California. California is entitled to a hearing. We gave California interests very complete hearings in the committee, and of course they are entitled to a complete hearing in the Senate.

Their argument first was that Mexico was entitled to only 750,000 acre-feet, because that was all Mexico used prior to the building of Boulder Dam. Then they contended that the water which would be given Mexico by the terms of the treaty, one and a half million acre-feet, would be so saline and so saturated with salt that it would not be fair to Mexico. I never did understand their point in that argument. I could not understand them when they insisted on not giving Mexico more than 750,000 acre-feet, and yet complaining that the water Mexico would obtain would be so salty that its use would be impractical.

Mr. President, the All-American Canal carries water from the river into California. That canal originates, of course, in the river, and carries water for irrigation down to the Imperial Valley in the lower part of California. Prior to the

use of the All-American Canal, another canal, which went down into Mexico and back into California, was used entirely for the carrying of water, a part of which is sold to Mexico. I want to be fair about this matter. It is claimed that the water is not sold to Mexico. It is said that the Mexicans are simply charged for the use of facilities in getting the water to them, but there is no charge for the water as such; that there is merely a charge for piping the water to them. That is something like the old colored brother's statement that religion was free, but somebody had to pipe it to you, and therefore those who did so were eligible to charge a little something for piping it. I wish to be fair. They contend that they do not sell it; but that element does enter into the picture.

The water which now goes to Mexico goes down through the All-American Canal and into the Alamo Canal, the Mexican canal, and is there distributed for use by Mexican users.

Mr. President, I think I shall conclude my remarks at this time. I am sure that I shall find it necessary during the debate to take the floor now and then to answer some of the arguments and contentions of those who are opposed to the treaty. Unless there is some question by a Senator on some particular point——

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think my colleague has made it perfectly plain—at least, it is my understanding—that this treaty is divided into two parts, namely, the part affecting the Rio Grande and the part affecting the Colorado River.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think there is no objection on the part of anyone in this country to the terms of the treaty relating to the Rio Grande River. The objection is all centered on the terms which affect the Colorado River.

Mr. CONNALLY. My colleague is correct in his statement. There was no controversy before the committee as to the part relating to the Rio Grande, and I do not recall any controversy with regard to the part which relates to the Tijuana, which originates in Mexico and flows into the United States in southern California.

I invite the attention of Senators to the testimony in this case. I hope they will listen to the arguments, both pro and con. I believe that when they do, they will conclude that 18 out of 22 of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations who heard this question for more than 4 weeks came to a fair and just conclusion when they reported the treaty to the Senate.

Mr. President, it has been insinuated many times in the committee that we were more concerned with Mexico than we were with the United States. I believe that every Senator, regardless of party and regardless of seniority or service, is more interested in his own country and in the welfare of the people of the United States than he is an any other country on the face of the earth, even though he may have been born somewhere else. It would be a sorry philosophy for us to impugn the motives of Senators or others by intimating that they love some other country more than they love their own country.

Mr. President, I am confident that a study of the record in this case and a careful consideration of the facts and the consequences will convince any unbiased mind that this treaty is in the interest of the people of the United States. I am not advocating it because I have any undue affection for Mexico. I have no undue regard for Mexico over any other nation on earth. I wish to be fair and just, not only to Mexico, but to any other nation with which we have dealings.

This treaty is in the interest of our own people. Representatives of the upper basin States, which will be shown by the map tomorrow, came before us and said, "We want the treaty because when we get the treaty it will stabilize conditions on this river. We shall know how much water Mexico is going to receive. We can then proceed with our planning in developing irrigation works within our territories, because we shall know just where we stand. But without a treaty, without an assurance of stability, it is difficult for us to finance works when we do not know what their future is to be. With the settlement of this question, which has been agitating us for many, many years,, and with the definite understanding that Mexico can receive one and a half million acre-feet of water and no more, we can proceed with our developments." Witnesses stated that such development might require 50 years, or even a hundred years; but at least they could proceed with them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator has already stated that the effort to arrive at an agreement or understanding with Mexico has covered a period of nearly half a century.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. All of this century from 1900 on.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. According to the right of priority of use, Mexico might claim, as time goes on and she develops her own resources from year to year, priority of use for a larger and larger amount of this water.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. If this treaty should be rejected by the Senate, disregarding the question of how long it would require in the future for the United States and Mexico to arrive at another agreement, it is not reasonable to assume, according to the laws of nature, that as Mexico develops her resources she will use more and more of this water? The water comes into Mexico. God Almighty created the river, and it flows through the United States into Mexico. We cannot deny to Mexico the use of some of the water; and as time goes on, if we do not ratify this treaty, if Mexico develops in the ordinary course of events from year to year, she will be entitled to claim more water because of priority of use than she has now.

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly.

Mr. BARKLEY. So it is in the interest of the United States to ratify an agreement which has required a long time to arrive at, rather than to leave the whole question open for a long period of future negotiations, with the prospect against finally arriving at any treaty at all.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. In line with what the Senator from Kentucky has said, that Mexico might have a claim for a larger use of water, let me ask the Senator from Texas a question: If Mexico appropriates the water and applies it to beneficial use first, does she not have more than a mere claim? She has a valid right to those waters which she has appropriated and applied to beneficial use.

Mr. CONNALLY. I agree with the Senator from New Mexico, although I wish to make the point that opponents of the treaty say that she might have an equitable right, but that she would have no legal right, meaning that there is no agency or tribunal to which she could go for legal redress. That may be true, but that does not destroy her equitable right to the water.

Mr. HATCH. In speaking of a legal right, I was speaking of the law of waters, as we understand it in the Western States.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand that that is the law in the Western States. Prior appropriation and devotion to some useful purposes gives an absolute legal right. However, in the case of international questions, there would be no tribunal to which Mexico could go with a strict legal suit. But she has a court. She has a forum. She has our solemn treaty, in which we agree to arbitrate matters of this character. If we have no treaty, and Mexico continues to develop and expand her industries, the time may come, and undoubtedly will, when we cannot adjust these differences. She will then appeal to the forum which we have approved, and say, "We want an arbitration of this matter." The arbitration would be by an impartial board, and the chances would be that Mexico would get a great deal more water than is allowed by this treaty.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield,

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the very thing to which I was about to call the Senator's attention.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. In the event that the treaty should fail on the floor of the United States Senate, the testimony before our committee demonstrates, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that under the present basic law arbitration would be the next step.

The testimony from the witnesses, as I recall it, shows that the chances are that we would receive worse treatment

under arbitration than we would receive under this treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator will recall that the State Department witnesses testified at the hearings that under the existing treaty we would be compelled to arbitrate, unless we were to violate every canon of good faith and honor. The testimony was that the arbitration treaty covered these very matters, and that in good faith we would be compelled to arbitrate.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think there was any witness before the committee who ever disputed that statement.

Mr. CONNALLY. There was none that I know of; I do not recall any.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Am I correct in understanding that if the treaty is ratified, it will impose a limit on the amount of water which Mexico could ever claim in the future?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct. In other words, under the treaty the maximum amount of water which Mexico could demand—of course, if the water goes down there anyway, and we do not use it, she could use it——

Mr. FERGUSON. But she could not make a demand for any water over and above the amount covered by the treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. She could not make a demand for a gallon more than a million and a half acre-feet, in perpetuity, forever. That is the plain language of the treaty. She could claim only 1,500,000 acre-feet, for all time.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The point which bothers me is that at times there have been droughts in the western section of the country. Consequently, it is rather difficult to guarantee anyone so many acre-feet of water. In that event, if we had guaranteed someone farther down the stream a certain amount of water, our own people would be deprived of water.

It would seem to me that the equitable thing to have done—unless there is something I do not understand—would have been to guarantee Mexico a certain proportion of the water.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me state what the treaty provides in that connection. First, I will say to the Senator from Montana that, because of the tremendous storage facilities at Boulder Dam, more than 30,000,000 acre-feet of water can be stored there. In addition to that storage, it is proposed to build Davis Dam to store the water which comes from Boulder Dam by reason of the operation of the electric-power machinery there. Consequently, we will have that much more water. The theory of the treaty is that, because of the stored waters, in the case of a drought there would be some water from Boulder Dam and the other dam which we could utilize. But it is provided that in the case of an unusual drought, the upper basin and the lower basin shall receive reduced amounts of water, and that the allowance to Mexico shall be temporarily reduced in the same percentage that the allowances to the upper and lower basins are reduced. In other words, if the allowances for the upper and lower basins should be reduced 10 percent, the water supply to Mexico would be reduced 10 percent.

Let me ask the Senator from Colorado whether I have stated the matter correctly?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think that is correct.

I should like to add that at the present time the question does not arise, practically, because there is so much water which wastes into Mexico all the time. As the use of water increases on the American side, such use will carry with it increasing regulating works, not only at and below Boulder Dam, but all through the upper basin. As we build those works we will reach more and more the status of an equated stream. When we reach that status we then will have achieved, roughly, a regulated water supply of the average water of the stream over a long period of time; and under that supply there should be enough water to meet all obligations.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I recall the testimony by the engineers representing the State Department, it was to the effect that not only would Davis Dam be built as a supplement to Boulder Dam, but other reservoirs would be built throughout the upper basin.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. As I remember, it is now contemplated that several dams will be constructed, so that all of them could store the water to take care of such an extraordinary drought period, if one came. I think I am correct about that.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to make the observation, directly along the line of the comment of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, that if we did not have an arbitration system with Mexico and the other republics to the south of us, we on our part probably would be pressing for an arbitration, outside of an arbitration system, in order to get the matter settled; because we cannot go ahead with the developments in the upper basin until we know what the Mexican allocation is going to be.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

A while ago I adverted to the fact that one of the advantages to the treaty is that it will stabilize conditions, so that our people in the upper basin States, as well as those in the lower basin States, will understand their situation and will be able to proceed with the development of their projects, knowing that Mexico can never demand more than a million and a half acre-feet of water, as was suggested a short time ago by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

In connection with what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] said, let me add that the testimony clearly revealed that nearly every one of the projects in Utah, Colorado, and north of there makes some provision for dams and reservoirs to impound the waters in the upper reaches before they ever reach the Colorado River, thus providing for an amelioration of the conditions which might be caused by a drought, as suggested by the Senator from Colorado.

All through the treaty stands out the desire and purpose, not to waste the waters, but to conserve them. That is why we provided for the creation of the dams on the lower Colorado, namely, to conserve the water and to make it the servant, rather than the master, as it now is when it flows to the ocean unused, unfruitful, barren.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am concerned about the provisions of the treaty relative to its administration. It is my understanding—and I hope the Senator will correct me if I am in error—that if the treaty is approved there will be a Mexican commissioner and a United States commissioner.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. The treaty contains provision for an umpire in case the commissioners are unable to agree. This treaty differs from the Canadian treaty of 1909, in that under the pending treaty the Commissioner seems to be given absolute authority, without any right of appeal from his decision to the courts. What can the Senator say about that point as an abandonment of the traditional policy of the people of the United States? I wonder if the situation would be as Dr. Timm described it; and I now read part of his statement:

> All existing irrigation, drainage, flood control, and power projects in these river systems should be nationalized and all such future projects should be undertaken by the respective national governments. Privately owned utilities and irrigation companies should be excluded altogether; and present ownership by local governments, wherever it exists, should be replaced by national ownership.

I wish to express on my own behalf a fear of giving absolute power to a commissioner.

As I understand the treaty of 1909 with Canada, under it provision was made that the commissioners be authorized only to recommend, and the governments could later recommend propositions as between them. But under the pending treaty the commissioners will have absolute authority, unless I misunderstand.

Mr. CONNALLY. Authority to do what?

Mr. CHANDLER. Authority to do almost anything, without any right of appeal. It seems to me the Commissioners would have complete, absolute power. Does the Senator so understand?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; the Senator from Kentucky has referred to the testimony of Dr. Timm.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have read from a statement by Dean Roscoe Pound, of Harvard University, which includes a quotation from a statement by Dr. Timm.

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand neither one of the provisions referred to was incorporated in the treaty. I must go by

the treaty, not by what Dean Pound or someone else may have said.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course.

Mr. CONNALLY. As a matter of fact, the International Boundary Commission has been in existence for many years. Under the pending treaty we would not change it at all. It would be the same boundary commission. The Commission has been in existence for 50 years, as I recall. During all that time it has been devoting its time and attention in the interest of rectifying the boundary. A great many bancos, as they are called, have been cut off by the shifting of the river bed. A part of the duty of the Commission is to determine on which side of the boundary the bancos belong, and similar matters. The Commission has been studying the problem for 40 years.

In that connection let me say that the former Mexican Commissioner who has served on the Boundary Commission is now the Minister of Commerce and Economics in the city of Mexico. He is a member of the national cabinet of Mexico. That statement will convey to Senators some idea of his prestige and standing in the Republic of Mexico. The American member of the Boundary Commission who has dealt with this matter is Mr. L. M. Lawson. His post is at El Paso, Tex., but he is not a native Texan. He has been in the United States service for perhaps 40 years. He was with the Reclamation Service for many years, and was finally transferred from the Reclamation Service to the Boundary Commission.

Answering the question of the Senator from Kentucky, the treaty provides for certain engineering works with regard to plants for the delivery of water to Mexico, and certain measurements up and down the river. The Boundary Commission has jurisdiction over those matters, and no others. It has no jurisdiction whatsoever over water rights. The question of water rights within any State—California, Arizona, or any other State—is determined not by the Commission, but by the State laws of the particular State involved.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER Is it not a fact, however, that under the treaty the American commissioner, without any regulation or check to be exercised over him, is given authority to establish all kinds of projects, and that no appeal can be made from his decision? Is that not true?

Mr. CONNALLY. No. That is not my interpretation of the treaty. A copy of the treaty is before the Senator. The Senator can read it. I do not agree with his interpretation of it.

Mr. HAWKES and Mr. DOWNEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield first to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. As the distinguished Senator from Texas knows, I attended some of the hearings.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true. We were very pleased to have the Senator present.

Mr. HAWKES. I may say that I was treated with great courtesy by the committee.

I come from the little State of New Jersey, which is almost as far from California as any State of the United States can be. I intend to speak further on the subject before it has been disposed of. I think the treaty should not be ratified. I believe the Senator from Texas will agree with me that the testimony before the committee clearly showed that the American Commissioner would be empowered to do many things, and could commit this country without first coming to Congress. I am sure that the statement was made that if the Commissioner committed this Nation to perform some act, any necessary appropriation as a result thereof would have to be made by Congress. It was stated that following the Commissioner's commitment of the Nation to some act, it would be very difficult for Congress to refuse to grant an appropriation for the purpose of carrying out any commitment under the treaty to which the Commissioner had bound the United States. That is my understanding of the situation.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not dispute the statement that someone may have testified before the committee as the Senator from New Jersey has stated, but I do not understand that the Commissioner may commit this country to anything. The treaty provides for the erection of certain works along the border. Who, if not the Boundary Commission, in its representation of the two governments, should have authority to supervise the construction of works on the international boundary in carrying out obligations under the treaty?

Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator agree that this treaty is radically different from the Candian treaty?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not fully understand the Canadian treaty. I can deal at the present time only with the treaty before the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. I believe that under the provisions of the pending treaty the American Commissioner would have the right to do anything he wished to do with respect to those projects, and that from his decision there could be no appeal. If the Senate wants to give him such broad authority, well and good, but it seems to me to be an almost complete abandonment of principles contained in the Canadian treaty which have been adhered to for a long time. We have gotten along pretty well under the Canadian treaty. The treaty now before the Senate would give to two men more authority than we have ever given to any other persons in our history.

I read from article 2:

> The Commission shall in all respects have the status of an international body.

That is a new one to me. We have many bodies, but I do not recall that we ever had an international body before.

Mr. President, the powers given to the commissioner under the treaty are absolute. Of course, if the Senate wants to give him such powers, very well. I probably would not vote for them, but whether he shall be given such powers is something for the Senate to decide.

Mr. CONNALLY. Allow me to say to the Senator from Kentucky that there is very much more in this treaty than will be found in the Canadian treaty. By giving power under the treaty to the Commissioner we should be doing no more than we do very frequently in the Senate when we authorize the construction of a bridge, or a building, and turn its construction over to the secretary of the particular department involved in order that he may go ahead with the work. That is all that would be done under this treaty. It is necessary to have certain works at the boundary for the control of the waters. Who else should have the authority to construct those works if not the International Boundary and Water Commission? The Boundary Commissioner is under the control of the Department of State. If he does something which he should not do, he will be subject to the jurisdiction of the State Department. Do we want him to come to Congress every time he wants a few more barrels of cement in order to complete a project? Shall we insist that he come back to the Appropriations Committee and pester the Senator from Tennessee each time he wants to put in a new span or something of that character? The Commission would be given authority to construct works, and after they were constructed the Commission would have authority to maintain them. Who will maintain them if the International Boundary and Water Commission does not maintain them? Under the treaty we promise to give the water in certain stages. The representative of Mexico has the right to believe that we will live up to the treaty. Is it not our business to have someone there representing this Government in order to see that the provisions of the treaty are performed and not violated?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator said something about the construction of works along the boundary line. Will the Senator give us an idea of what the cost of the construction will be?

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot do so at the present time. I think the information can be found in the printed copy of the hearings. I will try to look it up for the Senator; but he does not need to lose any sleep over that matter because, as acting chairman of the Appropriations Committee, he will have an opportunity to vote against an appropriation if necessary.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to have the Senator put the information in the RECORD if he can do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. The request for an appropriation would have to come to the attention of the Senator's committee.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. As I read the provisions of the treaty, the acts of the United States Commissioner would be subject to no review. The United States commits itself to that situation.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is not correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. Very well. It must be remembered that he will give orders which will affect the individual rights of persons possessing valuable water rights, which are among the most important forms of property rights of which we know. The interpretation of the treaty would be left entirely to the Commissioner.

Mr. CONNALLY. From what is the Senator reading?

Mr. CHANDLER. Partly, it is my own statement and partly a statement made by Dean Pound for the American Bar Association, undertaking to analyze the effect of the administration of the treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not agree that the International Boundary Commission would have any authority to interfere with any private property rights at all, unless it might be with regard to someone who was in the way of the work they were about to construct.

Mr. CHANDLER. Under the treaty, he would have no one to whom to appeal, if the Commissioner decided the matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. He would have compensation, of course. His property could not be taken without compensation. The Commission would have no right to decide as to water rights or anything of the kind, because such matters are under State law. That was made clear in the hearings, it was made clear in the language.

I now yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I wish to say to the junior Senator from Kentucky that I feel very distinctly the way he has expressed himself. If he will turn to article XIII, on page 26, he will find this provision:

> The Commission shall study, investigate, and prepare plans for flood control on the lower Colorado River between Imperial Dam and the Gulf of California, in both the United States and Mexico, and shall, in a minute, report to the two Governments the works which should be built, the estimated cost thereof, and the part of the works to be constructed by each Government.

Now, reading further:

> The two Governments agree to construct, through their respective Sections of the Commission, such works as may be recommended by the Commission and approved by the two Governments, each Government to pay the costs of the works constructed by it.

I also wish to touch on the question asked by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] regarding the appropriation. The Senator from Texas says the Appropriations Committee will have control over these appropriations when they are brought back to the Congress. I say that if our Commissioner, under the terms of the treaty, agrees to do certain work the cost of which will run into millions of dollars, we will find this Nation in a very unfavorable light in the world if the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and his committee on appropriations refuse to appropriate the money that is necessary to carry through what is done under the treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I fail to grasp the significance of the objection of the Senator from New Jersey. The treaty provides:

> The Commission shall study, investigate, and prepare plans for flood control on the lower Colorado River.

Who should do it but the Commission? Is it not valuable for it to know what works are necessary on the section of the river shown on the map (indicating) in order to conserve the waters for all the people of the valley? Congress is not bound to do anything about it. The treaty provides that the commission shall study these matters and report to the Congress.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Calling attention to the paragraph to which the Senator referred, that is, the second paragraph in article 2, page 7, we find it provided:

> The application of the present treaty, the regulation and exercise of the rights and obligations which the two Governments assume thereunder—

And particularly the next phrase—

> and the settlement of all disputes to which its observance and execution may give rise are hereby entrusted to the International Boundary and Water Commission, which shall function in conformity with the powers and limitations set forth in this treaty.

Let us assume that in the execution of the treaty and in its application a dispute arises between the upper basin and the lower basin as to which basin should furnish a deficiency which arises in the supply to Mexico. The Senator admits that such a dispute could arise, does he not?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Then, if I understand the plain language of the treaty, such a dispute between the upper- and the lower-basin States which arises in the execution of the treaty is to be settled by the International Boundary Commission.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not so understand. The rights of the upper basin and the lower basin are all set forth and determined in the Colorado River Compact Act. That was the act of the States themselves. It carefully deals with the amount of water to which each group of States is entitled and also with the conditions which may arise whereby their supply may be reduced. It provides all those details. I do not agree that the Boundary Commission would have anything on earth to do with that.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator permit me to propound one other question?

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator is cognizant, I am sure, of the fact that a dispute did arise during the hearings—and it was quite a pronounced dispute—between the position taken, as the Senator will remember, by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], on return flow below a point where the water could be again used in the United States, and the position I took, and in which I thought the Senator from Texas supported me. If such a dispute arises—and certainly it will arise—as I understand the plain language of the treaty, my State and the State of Arizona must let the International Boundary Commission decide the dispute. If that is the meaning of the treaty, I know that the distinguished Senator from Texas would not ask the Senator from the State of Utah to vote to ratify it, and take the right of going to court away from my constituents and lodge the decision in an international boundary commission.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am somewhat amazed that the ordinarily acute, analytical mind of the Senator from Utah should ever have taken such an attitude with respect to the particular clause to which he refers. The duties of the Boundary Commission, according to my view, are all on the boundary. They have no authority whatever to decide as between different property owners or between the upper and lower basins.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If that is the intention of the treaty, then I say to the Senator, why can it not be written in the treaty in language about which there can be no question?

Mr. CONNALLY. We are not writing the treaty here; it is already written, and is before us. I suppose we could make a reservation, but if we made a reservation on every provision in the treaty which any Senator thought was not according to his style and language, we would have more reservations than treaty, perhaps.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is certainly simple to limit the jurisdiction of the International Boundary Commission.

Mr. CONNALLY. The treaty does limit it. Did the Senator read the language?

Mr. MURDOCK. I read the language.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Senator read the limitrophe section?

Mr. MURDOCK. That is on one particular point, but if a dispute arises, the comprehensive jurisdiction conferred not only takes them along the limitrophe section of the river, but takes them clear up into the uppermost courses of the Colorado.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator is absolutely wrong in his contention. Let us see:

> The application of the present treaty—

It is talking about the treaty, it is not talking about the compact between the States, it is not talking about the mutual obligations between the upper States and the lower States under the compact—

> the regulation and exercise of the rights and obligations which the two Governments assume thereunder—

That means the obligations of the Governments one to the other.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let me ask another question.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have not quite finished. If, in the interest of priority, the Senator will indulge me a moment until I

answer his other question, I shall attempt to answer the next one.

The regulation and exercise of the rights and obligations which the two Governments assume thereunder—

Those are only the obligations the Governments assume. It is not dealing with the rights of a private owner, it is not dealing with the rights of the upper States against those of the lower States—

and the settlement of all disputes to which its observance and execution may give rise are hereby entrusted to the International Boundary and Water Commission, which shall function in conformity with the powers and limitations set forth in this treaty.

Mr. President, someone must have authority and jurisdiction to exercise the function which the treaty prescribes. Who else but the Boundary Commission which studied this problem for 50 years should do it? The Commission is limited absolutely to the obligations of our Government to Mexico and the obligations of Mexico to our Government. It does not in anywise deal with private rights or the rights of individual States.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. One of the obligations of our Government is a guarantee to deliver to Mexico, according to the schedule, 1,500,000 acre-feet of water.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. So long as there is an abundance of water in the river no questions will arise. But suppose the treaty is ratified. I am looking forward to the time when there is a scarcity of water, when there will be a deficiency, and the obligation of my Government still exists to deliver 1,500,000 acre-feet of water to Mexico. Under that obligation the International Boundary Commission says, "You must send water down in order to fulfill the obligation." Then the dispute arises, and certainly the distinguished Senators can envision the dispute that will arise between the State of Arizona and the State of Utah as to which State or which basin will furnish the deficiency, and in what proportion. If such a dispute arises, just as surely as the Senator and I are here today, it can, under this treaty, be settled by the International Boundary Commission.

Mr. CONNALLY. How does the Senator want to settle it? Let us leave out the Boundary Commission. Suppose that situation should arise without a treaty or with a treaty, how would the Senator want it settled?

Mr. MURDOCK. I would want it settled by the tribunal of this country that has settled it since the inception of the country. That tribunal is the United States Supreme Court. I am unwilling to delegate the power which has been reposed in that Court to a couple of men on an International Boundary Commission.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am not averse to court decisions and court controls where they are appropriate. If I were to build a dam across a river I think I would say to the engineers, "Go out there and build that dam," and I would leave it to the engineers. I wish to say to the Senator from Utah that the matters to which he adverts are matters which ought to be settled under the interstate compact.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator, in my opinion, has now put his finger on what should happen. Before there is any treaty with a foreign country involving a delivery by this country of water in perpetuity, certainly the United States Government should say to Arizona and California and Utah and Colorado and Wyoming and New Mexico and Nevada, "You States get together and settle these matters between yourselves before we butt in and in perpetuity guarantee a water right to Mexico."

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator's hypothesis is based on something that will never happen.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall yield in a moment. There was diversity of opinion among the States in the testimony given before the committee. If we wait until all the States agree, of course, we will never have any settlement at all.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, as a practical matter, if this treaty is ratified we are going to guarantee Mexico so much water. If we ever become short of water the Commissioner is going to have to deliver the water, and if he cannot find the water in one place he will find it some place else. If he decides to take it from Arizona he will take it from Arizona; and if he decides to take it from Utah he will take it from Utah. He will be bound to deliver water to Mexico in the quantity provided by the treaty.

Mr. President, I want to suggest in all earnestness to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Texas, that some consideration should be given to adopting a procedure similar to that adopted in the treaty with Canada of 1909, which provided for a commission which should make recommendations to the Governments on both sides of the line and the Governments themselves should make the decision. Unless I am mistaken in reading the pending treaty, if we agree to it, we place absolute and unchecked authority in the hands of one man, who will be found to deliver water in certain quantities to the Mexican Government, and he will have to take the water away from the American States.

I am not an expert on treaties, but I know the treaty with Canada has worked very well since 1909. It does not provide a hard and fast policy, and does not place complete power in the hands of one man, as I believe this treaty does. I think the Senate would perhaps make a very serious mistake if it did that, because trouble would certainly arise between our own States in the future if there should ever be a shortage of water.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CONNALLY. Not for the present, Mr. President. I wish to answer the Senator from Kentucky. The fears of the Senator from Kentucky are not well founded, I believe. If he will read article 2 he will see that the International Boundary Commission shall make plans and report to the Congress regarding these works.

Mr. DOWNEY. May I ask the distinguished Senator where in article 2 he finds the language "shall report to the Congress," which he just used?

Mr. CONNALLY. It is not in article 2, but in article 13.

Mr. DOWNEY. Oh, in article 13.

Mr. CONNALLY. It ought to be just as good in article 13 as in article 2 if it is there. I read from article 13:

The Commission shall study, investigate and prepare plans for flood control on the lower Colorado River between Imperial Dam and the Gulf of California, in both the United States and Mexico, and shall, in a minute, report to the two Governments the works which should be built, the estimated cost thereof, and the part of the works to be constructed by each Government. The two Governments agree—

And so forth.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Is it not true that in article 2 it is expressly stated that whenever the two Governments, or both Governments, are referred to, it is meant the respective Secretaries of State of the two Nations, and that that definition carefully excluded the Congress of the United States from being entitled to any notice?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I do not think so.

Mr. DOWNEY. I will read:

Whenever there are provisions—

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not yield to the Senator to read a long screed. I yielded for a question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield for a question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. May I point out that when Davis Dam is constructed it will serve as a regulating dam for the purpose of supplying Mexico's allocation of water. That was one of the stated objectives in the report basic to the authorization of Davis Dam. May I point out also that under the compact the upper basin States have got to let down 75,000,000 acre-feet in each progressive series of 10 years.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. We have no alternative about that in the upper States. We have to let that water down. It will find its way into Lake Mead, from Lake Mead it is regulated into and through Davis Dam, and Davis Dam is built for the specific purpose of enabling us to make the allocation of water to Mexico.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Colorado. That is true. That is the way it is provided in the treaty. The treaty provides for the creation and erection of the Davis Dam for the very purpose of serving to feed the water to Mexico.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator for one definition?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In article 13 on page 16, which the able Senator from New

Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] was quoting in respect to the extent of the authority of the Commission, I read this sentence:

> The two Governments agree to construct, through their respective sections of the Commission, such works as may be recommended by the Commission and approved by the two Governments.

How is approval by the American Government registered at that point?

Mr. CONNALLY. The treaty does not make any specific provision other than what the Senator has read. I assume that it really has to be, in the final analysis, by Congress in supplying the funds for the appropriations. It might be construed that the Secretary of State in carrying on the foreign relations of the United States could indicate the American Government's approval. Certainly in the final analysis the Congress will have to approve it, because it would have to grant the funds for the construction.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think it is rather important that that point should be illuminated and defined.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is a little difficult to change the language of the treaty unless we wish to adopt reservations; and, as I indicated a while ago, if we adopt reservations every time a Senator does not like the provisions of a treaty, we shall have more reservations than treaties. I see the Senator's point, and I have no quarrel with him for pointing it out. The language is "approved by the two Governments." Ordinarily that would mean approved by the two Governments under their constitutional processes, whatever they are.

Mr. VANDENBERG. At any rate, this is some method of approval other than approval by the Commission.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly. It is not up to the Commission alone. It must be approved by the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. When the Senator obtains information as to how much money will be required to construct these improvements on the Colorado River, will he be good enough to include with that information the expense which will have to be borne by the United States Government, and the amount to be borne by the Mexican Government?

Mr. CONNALLY. It will be difficult to do that. Studies and reports will be made, and a division of the cost will be made between the two Governments. Davis Dam, which involves the largest expenditure of all, has already been authorized by this Government. I believe the hearings disclose that the appropriation had been made, but was held up because of the war.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not care anything about Davis Dam, which is entirely on the American side. I was thinking of the improvements with respect to which the cost is to be divided.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall obtain the information if it is possible to obtain it; but it may be a little late.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think upon further study perhaps the answer to the question which I submitted to the able Senator will be found in the language in article 2 of section I. I read from page 18 of the report:

> Wherever there are provisions in this Treaty for joint action or joint agreement by the two Governments, or for the furnishing of reports, studies, or plans to the two Governments, or similar provisions, it shall be understood that the particular matter in question shall be handled by or through the Department of State of the United States and the Ministry of Foreign Relations of Mexico.

I presume that identifies the process referred to in the language of the treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. Probably so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The process still remains rather vague.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, the Boundary Commissioner is now and has always been under the general jurisdiction of the Secretary of State. I assume that that is why this particular procedure was adopted.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish to express my appreciation for the courtesy the Senator has shown me. Does the Senator believe from his study of this treaty, and the long days which he spent in hearing the evidence, that the Commissioner would have the power to bind this country in matters of considerable magnitude without coming to the Congress?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not.

Mr. HAWKES. Is it the Senator's firm conviction that he would have no such power?

Mr. CONNALLY. As to his rights, I do not know; but I have already read articles 2 and 13.

Mr. HAWKES. They must be read all together.

Mr. CONNALLY. Those articles simply consign to him the authority to consider the works which are necessary on the lower river, and report to Congress and to the Secretary of State as to what those works should be, their cost, and what part of the costs each government should pay. There is another clause in the treaty which binds Mexico to pay a part of the costs of the works on the border, the United States paying the other part. As to the actual construction of the works after they have been approved and appropriations have been made for them, I think the Boundary Commission would have authority to proceed to build them, without interference from any one.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Does the Senator believe that when our Commissioner agrees with the Mexican Commissioner that a certain piece of work should be done, and the costs should be divided in a certain percentage, that decision is final? Or must Congress approve it?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Government must approve it.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator thinks that that question must be referred to the Congress?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Government must approve it, as provided in article 13.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think the question which has been raised by the Senator from New Jersey is very important. I believe that all his fears, or any other fears, might be allayed by a reading of article 2, which provides that the Boundary and Water Commission shall function in conformity with the powers and limitations set forth in this treaty. That limits their functions and powers.

Again, under article 13, all the recommendations of the Commission must be approved by the two Governments. In addition to approval by the two Governments, each Government must then pay the cost of the works constructed by it, which gives an additional protection to each Government. If the works are not approved by the legislature of each Government, the appropriations can be withheld.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator. He is entirely accurate.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not intend to prolong the argument at the moment; but I should like to know finally, before I vote on the pending treaty, Who in this Government is to give approval to the commitments of the Commissioner?

Mr. CONNALLY. I believe I can throw some light on that question, if the Senator will indulge me. I invite the attention of Senators to the protocol supplementary to the treaty with Mexico. Some question arose about these matters. This is what the protocol provides:

> The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Mexican States agree and understand that:
>
> Wherever, by virtue of the provisions of the treaty between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, signed in Washington on February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande from Fort Quitman, Tex., to the Gulf of Mexico, specific functions are imposed on, or exclusive jurisdiction is vested in, either of the sections of the International Boundary and Water Commission, which involve the construction or use of works for storage or conveyance of water, flood control, stream gaging, or for any other purpose, which are situated wholly within the territory of the country of that section, and which are to be used only partly for the performance of treaty provisions, such jurisdiction shall be exercised, and such functions, including the construction, operation and maintenance of the said works, shall be performed and carried out by the Federal agencies of that country which now or hereafter may be authorized by domestic law to construct, or to operate and maintain, such works. Such fuctions or jurisdictions shall be exercised in conformity with the provisions of the treaty and in cooperation with the respective section of the Commission, to the end that all international obligations and functions may be coordinated and fulfilled.

It is my understanding that that provision of the protocol, so far as the United States is concerned, would turn over many of the operations to the

Reclamation Service. For instance, the Davis Dam would not be operated by the Boundary Commission. It would be operated by the Reclamation Service, because under our domestic law that is the agency which performs service of that sort. So the Davis Dam would be constructed and operated by the Reclamation Service, not by the Boundary Commission. Yet some Senators say the Boundary Commission could do anything it wished to do. It could not, because provision is made otherwise, as in the case of the Reclamation Service itself.

In conclusion let me say to the Senator, Mr. President——

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. For the further information of the Senator from New Jersey and other Senators who may be interested in the matter, let me quote from article 25, reading as follows——

Mr. HAWKES. Article 25 of what, please?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Article 25 of the treaty, on page 34:

ARTICLE 25

Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Treaty, Articles III and VII of the Convention of March 1, 1889, shall govern the proceedings of the Commission in carrying out the provisions of this Treaty. Supplementary thereto the Commission shall establish a body of rules and regulations to govern its procedure, consistent with the provisions of this Treaty and of Articles III and VII of the Convention of March 1, 1889, and subject to the approval of both Governments.

Decisions of the Commission shall be recorded in the form of Minutes done in duplicate in the English and Spanish languages, signed by each Commissioner and attested by the Secretaries, and copies thereof forwarded to each Government within three days after being signed. Except where the specific approval of the two Governments is required by any provision of this Treaty, if one of the Governments fails to communicate to the Commission its approval or disapproval of a decision of the Commission within thirty days reckoned from the date of the Minute in which it shall have been pronounced, the Minute in question and the decisions which it contains shall be considered to be approved by that Government. The Commisioners, within the limits of their respective jurisdictions, shall execute the decisions of the Commission that are approved by both Governments.

If either Government disapproves a decision of the Commission the two Governments shall take cognizance of the matter, and if an agreement regarding such matter is reached between the two Governments, the agreement shall be communicated to the Commissioners, who shall take such further proceedings as may be necessary to carry out such agreement.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, that only means that the State Department approves of the Commission. I listened to what the Senator from New Jersey said. Frankly, nothing which has been said so far indicates in the slightest degree that the commitments which have been made by the Commission will not have to be carried out. This Government is bound to carry them out.

Mr. CONNALLY. What kind of commitment can they make, except for an appropriation? They cannot make even that unless they come back to the Congress.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree. But think of the complication we shall have if both members of the Commission say, "We agree that the Government of the United States should spend so much money." Of course, the Congress could say, "We will not appropriate the money"; that is true; but if we should say that, it seems to me we would immediately get into difficulty with the Mexican Government, because we would not be carrying out what the commissioners had agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is a curious argument that demands that the Government must approve something before it is done, and then says that if the Government does not approve it, that will not do because we will get into difficulty. I do not see how we can implement that sort of an argument, I say to my eminent friend the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. It seems to me the Commission should make recommendations before it agrees to do something.

Mr. CONNALLY. The treaty so provides. It provides that the commissioners shall recommend and report.

Mr. WHEELER. It goes further than that. It says that the two governments agree to construct, through their respective sections of the Commission, such works as may be recommended by the Commission. In other words, if the two commissioners agree, and make certain recommendations to their governments, we will be bound to carry them out.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator that the entire treaty must be read. There are several clauses of the treaty which relate to the same thing. No one can pick out one line of the treaty and say that is the treaty. There are numerous provisions relative to reporting to the Government.

The provision is, "approved by the Government."

That does not mean approved by Mr. Lawson.

Let me say that in connection with the administration of the Elephant Butte Dam and the provisions of the 1906 treaty with Mexico, there never has been any trouble. The Boundary Commission has had the same jurisdiction over that treaty and over the water from the Elephant Butte Dam for many years, and the testimony was that there has never been any difficulty. No one has complained about any arbitrary or dictatorial powers of that Commission.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As a practical matter, that is the only possible way, namely, to have such approval given by our Government.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In other words, the necessity for such approval arises under our system of government. If we did not have a parliamentary system of government, that necessity would not arise. In other words, there is nothing peculiar about the treaty in that respect.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Likewise, that necessity will arise in connection with every treaty which comes up in the future; will it not?

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course it will.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. Let me say I think there is something in this treaty very different from provisions to be found in any other treaty of which I have ever heard, or in connection with any other pattern. I think the pattern of this treaty is a new one.

In my opinion certain things the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has said are correct. Certain things must be performed by the executive and administrative branch of the Government; but I am not one of those who are willing to leave in the hands of the administrative and executive agency of government a commitment to spend millions upon millions of dollars. I think such matters should come back to the Congress, and I think means to have that done can be devised.

Some persons, including the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, have said that if the matter comes back to Congress, the Appropriations Committee will have control of it. I ask the Senate to consider the light we would be in, in the eyes of the rest of the world, if after ratifying such a treaty as this one, which authorizes the Commissioner to commit our country to a certain extent, we subsequently were to refuse to appropriate the necessary funds. I know the Senator from Texas does not agree with me on this point, but of course I have a right to my own opinion of the provision.

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not say how I will vote on the treaty. I am in favor of anything that is sound that will promote good-neighbor policies; but I am not in favor of trying to buy friendship, and I am not in favor of breaching faith with our own citizens.

I should like to leave this thought in the minds of Senators, if the Senator will further yield to me; he has been extremely courteous in doing so. When the Boulder Dam Act was passed, people had been led to believe that Mexico was using 750,000 acre-feet of water each year. That was the maximum she ever used. Sometimes, in certain years, only 200,000 or 250,000 acre-feet of water trickled down the river to Mexico.

Now we are talking about 1,500,000 acre-feet of water. How could it be possible for 1,500,000 acre-feet of water to be available for use in Mexico? It could only be possible because we passed the Boulder Dam Act, and spent hundreds of millions of dollars in building Boulder Dam and other dams in order to conserve water. Do not forget, I say to the Senate, that after the Boulder Dam bill came back from the House of Representatives to the Senate, it was debated in this very Chamber where we stand today, and it was very definitely amended so as to provide that the water conserved by the Boulder Dam should be for the exclusive use of the citizens of the United States.

I think this Government has already breached faith too many times with its citizens. I am very definitely not in favor of having our Government breach faith with its citizens again.

I have been in California many times. I do not love it any better than I love Texas. I have some very dear friends in Texas. I say that Senators who cannot close their eyes and visualize the absolute, vital need of water for the development of the great arid sections of the West—some of the Senators who are in favor of the treaty—cannot visualize what will be needed, and they fail to realize that when we give a water right in perpetuity, with all the good faith of the Nation back of the gift, we cannot afterward change our minds. It has been done, and it is a thing of the past. We should think well and wisely before we bind ourselves to take natural resources away from the people of the United States which we may need for the development of this great country.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. So that there may be no serious misunderstanding of the RECORD, I think it should be said without delay that the Boulder Canyon Act, by the most specific——

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator from New Jersey will give heed, because the Senator from Colorado is about to answer his question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Lest there be a serious misunderstanding of the RECORD, I say that I believe it should be said without delay that the Boulder Canyon Act provides that its provisions shall be subject to the compact between the States. The provisions of the compact between the States definitely foreshadow a treaty with Mexico.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not deny that; but it does not in any way affect the statement which I made.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I disagree with the statement of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that the pending treaty is not a radical departure from other treaties. In the Canadian treaty recommendations were made to the Governments on both sides of the line. Later such recommendations were either crystallized into law by some legally constituted authority, or were rejected. I believe that by the ratification of this treaty we would resign absolute power to the Commissioner, who could issue orders which would not be subject to review. The policy which was declared in the Canadian treaty is not declared in this treaty. The suggestion was made by one of the chief proponents of the treaty that it could be used to destroy, if necessary, local private ownership of water rights in the interest of a national policy. He stated that the rights of individuals should not be taken into consideration, and that no attention should be paid to them; that they should be merely brushed aside. If the Senate is ready to vote such absolute authority into the hands of one commissioner, it is ready to do something which it has never done before. I think it would be a serious step to take against the American States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, later I shall have a condensation of the various clauses of the treaty which will completely dispel the fear of Senators that the boundary commissioner will be a czar with power to do anything he pleases. I assert, however, that he could not get a dollar out of the Treasury without first coming to Congress. He could recommend to the Department of State or to the Government of the United States that certain appropriations be made; but Congress would have to grant the appropriations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from New Jersey spoke about a commitment. The President referred to the subject in his last address to the joint session of Congress. The constitutional process of Mexico is similar to ours. Mexico knows that any money to be paid by the United States will have to be appropriated by the American Congress. There would be no hokus-pokus about it, and there would be no breach of good faith if Congress did not make a requested appropriation. That is the part in which the Senator is interested, namely, the money which it would be necessary to spend.

Mr. HAWKES. I am not interested in the money. I was arguing the question of whether the control over the money should be completely exercised by a commission. I am not any more concerned over the money than any other Senator should be.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I meant that we would still retain control over actual construction.

Mr. HAWKES. I wish I could feel as the Senator feels about it. The President has said that the Government of Mexico is familiar with the constitutional system of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. If they are not, we are.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is correct. As a matter of fact, the constitutional systems of both Mexico and the United States are practically identical. Mexico cannot appropriate money except by an act of her legislature.

If any Senator is interested, I may say that I am advised that heretofore in the functioning of the Boundary Commission, from time to time the Commissioners have made recommendations with regard to certain improvements along the river which required appropriations, and that they never have done anything except in that manner. Sometimes Mexico refused to appropriate, and the project failed. At other times we have refused to appropriate, and the project was abandoned. In each case the Commissioners came to the Congress of the United States and to the Legislature of Mexico for funds. Whether the funds were granted depended on the action of those legislative bodies.

Mr. President, what higher control could be asked for? Every time the Boundary Commission decides to dig a ditch, do we wish to require them to come to Congress and ask for authorization to dig the ditch? In straightening the boundary line, every time the Boundary Commission strikes a snag where the river has shifted, do we expect the Commission to come to Congress and ask for approval before it can proceed with its work? Those are a few things which necessitate the existence of a Boundary Commission instead of a committee of the Senate. I want to preserve within the Congress of the United States every legitimate prerogative which it should have; but it is ridiculous to say that in a matter involving technical skill and engineering problems, such as are involved in building a dam, the Congress should undertake to sit on the lid and prescribe every little provision which must be observed. Those are responsibilities with which the Commission must be entrusted, just as we entrust responsibilities to various departments of the Government.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude. I assert to the Senate of the United States, and to those who have dealt with water problems on the Tijuana, the Rio Grande, and the Colorado for nearly half a century, and have studied those matters, that the Boundary Commission has no particularly selfish interest. It is unqualifiedly supporting this treaty as being in the interest of the United States and the water users of the United States. The interest of the Commissioner of Reclamation of the United States is not a local interest. He is not only interested in the Imperial Valley reclamation district; he is interested in irrigation in every State. The Commissioner of Reclamation came before the committee and unqualifiedly approved the treaty, and said that it should be ratified in behalf of all the seven States in the basin area. Mr. President, five out of seven States—with apologies to the Senator from Utah—are supporting the treaty with the qualification which I stated to the Senator from Utah. Wyoming is for the treaty; Colorado is for it; Arizona is for it; New Mexico is for it; and California and Nevada alone are out in the open in opposition to it. In the face of that sort of a situation, in the face of a hearing lasting for nearly 5 weeks, members of the committee who were unbiased, members of the committee from other sections of the Union, after hearing all the testimony, the protests, as well as statements of those sponsoring the treaty, came to the deliberate conclusion, by a vote of 13 to 4, to recommend that the treaty be ratified.

Mr. President, I thank the Senate for its patient hearing. I apologize for my rather informal manner of discussing the treaty. I could have consumed a great deal more time. I wanted merely to outline the framework of the treaty and to indicate briefly the reasons back of the positions of those who propose the treaty and of those who oppose the treaty.

I do not wish to make a selfish claim, Mr. President, but whenever, in behalf of California and this little irrigation district, the Senate defeats this treaty because we want to save 750,000 acre-feet of water which will not be

available to them for 50 years, and perhaps 100 years—when we do that, we are consigning the territory along the Rio Grande to great and useless hardship, because now millions of acre-feet of water flow unused to the Gulf. We cannot harness it, we cannot reclaim it, we cannot utilize it, except with the consent of the Republic of Mexico. We cannot build a dam across that river, we cannot build a reservoir, unless we have a treaty with the Republic of Mexico.

With this particular treaty we shall have ability, along with Mexico, which agrees to pay half the cost, to construct these reservoirs, thereby to reclaim and conserve enough water not only to meet all the needs of my State for the moment, but to meet its needs for many years to come, and at the same time not dispossess Mexico of any of her rights, but enable her to make a greater utilization of the waters from these reservoirs on her side of the river.

Mr. President, I hope Senators will look at this matter in a national way. According to my view, five of the States in the basin feel that it is to their interest to have the treaty ratified. They have spent time and money and study over a period of years. The so-called Six-States Committee has been agitating and studying and proposing the adoption of some sort of treaty with Mexico, because they want to stabilize conditions; they want the treaty so that they will know that Mexico is limited definitely to a certain amount of water and no more, and so that they can then proceed to the development of their works and the utilization of their possible water resources throughout the years of the future. They feel that it is in the interest of every one in the valley, and I hope that California will not be insistent.

California does not put a gallon of water into the Colorado River. It has already received from the Colorado, and is now receiving, more water than any other State in the whole basin, though not quite so much as all the other States in the basin put together. I say that in no spirit of animosity toward California. I say it because California is the chief opponent of the treaty. I say it because California has taken aggressive measures against the treaty.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does Mexico contribute any of the water to the Colorado River?

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. CHANDLER. As between Mexico and California, would not California be entitled to have at least first opportunity to satisfy her requirements for water?

Mr. CONNALLY. She has it now, and she wastes 10,000,000 acre-feet which flow on down to the sea unused. The Senator's question is such a platitude that of course there is no other answer but one.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator said California did not contribute any water to the Colorado River, nor does Mexico, and as between Mexico and California, it seems to me the answer is clear. I do not mean it as a platitude, but I mean it as a statement of fact and of justice to an American State.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is only one answer to anyone who would say "Do you prefer California or Mexico?" Of course, I would prefer California.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am entitled to have some basis on which to predicate my opinion, and of course if that becomes an issue, I am going to prefer California.

Mr. CONNALLY. I said California did not contribute any water to the Colorado River.

Mr. CHANDLER. That does not disqualify her.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; she is just as much entitled to the waters of the river that flows by her as anybody else.

Mr. CHANDLER. She is more entitled to it than a foreign country, is she not, if she needs it?

Mr. CONNALLY. It may be she is and it may be she is not. That depends on the facts.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. I am sure the Senator desires to be perfectly fair, and to place all the facts before this body, so that Senators may come to a sound and proper conclusion as nearly as possible. Does not the Senator thinks Senators should know that one of the reasons why California has a great interest in preserving this water, so that her citizens and those who go to California later may have the advantage of it, is that she has put hundreds of millions of dollars into aqueducts and a system based on the Boulder Dam Act and the compact and an agreement with the Government? I think everyone should know that.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am sure that so long as the Senator is in this body, and the other opponents are here——

Mr. HAWKES. They will know it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator is quite right. I wish to ask another question. Does not the Senator think it is fair to say to the Senators who are listening this evening that while the officials of five States out of the seven may be for the treaty, there is tremendous opposition to the treaty on the part of some of the greatest organizations and the finest people in each and every one of the States? I shall bring the information to the Senate Monday and give the Senator the evidence of the institutions and the organizations which are opposed to the treaty, regardless of whether the Senators or the governors or engineers are for it or not.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well; I have no objection. We have had that before the Senate already, but I shall be glad to see it again.

Mr. HAWKES. Has it been put in the RECORD this afternoon?

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. HAWKES. I think it should be.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well; but if I had made an opening speech for the treaty and had then made a speech against the treaty anything comparable to those made before the committee, I would not have concluded tonight, but it would be day after tomorrow before I could conclude.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely wish to ask the Senator, regardless of the merits of the circumstances that California contributes no water to the Colorado in the sense that none of the water that falls on California, if any does fall on California, goes into the Colorado River, is it not a fact that this river does run into and through Mexico?

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly.

Mr. BARKLEY. And we as a Nation cannot, according to the ordinary doctrine of riparian rights which is recognized among individuals who live along a river, utilize it so as to deny to the other country through which it runs its fair share of the enjoyment of the water that comes into that river, no matter where it is contributed, no matter through what States it runs in order to get into it.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. CHANDLER. We can use it before it ever gets to Mexico, and if our States use it, it never would get there.

Mr. CONNALLY. Exactly.

Mr. CHANDLER. We have not any right to agree to give it away without finding out whether we are going to use it.

Mr. BARKLEY. On the contrary, we have no right to use it all so that none of it would get into the country through which it could flow.

Mr. CHANDLER. It has no way of getting to Mexico if we use it.

Mr. CONNALLY. The testimony shows there is no possible way for our using it now. Most of the testimony was to the effect that we would never be able to utilize it within 50 years, and some of the witnesses testified it would probably be a hundred years before it could ever be used. The point made by the senior Senator from Kentucky is entirely sound. California by nature and by geography was placed adjacent to the river. The river did not stay in California, it went on into Mexico.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. According to the theory of the junior Senator from Kentucky, the United States, if we had the proper reservoirs and dams, could store every drop of water which comes into the Colorado River and keep it all from Mexico. That is not quite fair. There is not a single individual from California and the other States who is against the treaty or who is interested in the treaty who does not agree that Mexico at the present time is entitled, under the doctrine of prior appropriation, to at least 750,000 acre-feet a year.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. And the great question we now have to consider, as I see it, as the result of the continued use of the water by the Mexican people, is not 750,000 acre-feet a year, but approximately

2,000,000 acre-feet a year. Am I correct in that figure?

Mr. CONNALLY. One million eight hundred thousand acre-feet a year.

Mr. LUCAS. One million eight hundred thousand acre-feet a year that is going down there now. If the doctrine of prior appropriation applies to the 750,000 acre-feet a year, as is admitted by everyone, then sooner or later, unless we enter into a treaty, the same doctrine is going to apply to 1,800,000 acre-feet a year, notwithstanding the fact that some claims are made that we can take all this water. I do not agree with that doctrine either.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is not entirely correct. Mexico is entitled to a maximum of 750,000 acre-feet. She would be entitled to the normal flow of water. Suppose there should be a drought. The United States is going to be required to guarantee by treaty to furnish Mexico with 1,500,000 acre-feet. No one has guaranteed to furnish California or Nevada anything. If we have a prolonged drought—and in 20 out of 24 years we have one—then it will be necessary to take water from the other States and give it to Mexico. If the Senate wants to do that, very well.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want to do that, but the Senator made the statement a while ago that the United States was entitled to all this water.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator said we guarantee 750,000 acre-feet. That is not correct. That is the maximum.

Mr. LUCAS. I am taking the statement the Senator made. The Senator said we were entitled to all this water if we wanted it, and I am stating that we are not entitled to all the water, under the principles of international law, under the doctrine of prior appropriation, and according to the testimony of every witness, even the California witnesses, who agree to give Mexico at least 750,000 acre-feet a year, and guarantee a maximum of 750,000 acre-feet a year.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the statement made by the Senator from Illinois is correct, Mexico can acquire any quantity of water she can put to beneficial use as against the United States. If the Senator from Texas is correct in his statement that it will take 50 or 100 years for us to put this water to use, and there are eight to ten million acre-feet flowing into Mexico, I wonder why Mexico wants a treaty? Why does she not simply go ahead and appropriate the water?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will not deny that Mexico is entitled to 750,000 acre-feet a year at the present time?

Mr. MURDOCK. No. That is the quantity which Mexico used prior to the construction of Boulder Dam. All the witnesses agreed to guarantee to Mexico 750,000 acre-feet a year.

Mr. LUCAS. All the witnesses agreed to guarantee to Mexico 750,000 acre-feet a year.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not say that I would not guarantee to give her some water, but I say that, so far as having any rights against my people are concerned or any other people in the United States, Mexico does not have any rights in excess of 750,000 acre-feet.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator should not take that position in view of his previous statement. He ought to hold everything for the United States and not give Mexico anything.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. My only disagreement with the Senator from Illinois is over his statement as to what the law is. I do not know of any international law or any other law that provides as against the people of the United States that if somebody down in Mexico establishes a right to some water under Mexican law that we in the United States must respect such right if it would deny to our nationals the right to the use of any waters available to them. But I do agree with the able Senator that Mexico does have a claim to 750,000 acre-feet.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to point out that the States themselves in the Colorado River Basin foreshadowed a treaty with Mexico and foreshadowed that such a treaty might hurt. I think it might be a good thing to quote the pertinent paragraph now.

Mr. CONNALLY. Read it now.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I read from subclause (c) of article II of the compact between the Colorado River Basin States:

> If, as a matter of international comity—

This is a very important provision, because it runs through the Boulder Canyon Act, it runs through all the power contracts, it runs through every instrument we will have to consider in this debate. Everything is made subject to what I am about to read:

> If, as a matter of international comity, the United States of America shall hereafter recognize in the United States of Mexico any right to the use of any waters of the Colorado River system, such waters shall be supplied first from the waters which are surplus over and above the aggregate of the quantities specified in paragraphs (a) and (b)—

Paragraphs (a) and (b) specify seven and one-half million feet for the upper basin and eight and one-half million feet for the lower basin—

> and if such surplus shall prove insufficient for this purpose, then the burden of such deficiency shall be equally borne by the upper basin and the lower basin, and whenever necessary the States of upper division shall deliver at Lee Ferry water to supply one-half of the deficiency so recognized in addition to that provided in paragraph (d).

I read that, Senators, to make the point that the States themselves foreshadowed a treaty with Mexico and assumed that it might hurt, and provided the means for dividing the burden.

Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. MURDOCK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. In a moment I shall be glad to—to both Senators. I yield to myself first. I do not mean that offensively. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky in a moment.

Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado. He read from the interstate compact which forms the basis for all the agitation concerning water rights in the Western States. Here was the solemn pronouncement of all the States which signed that compact.

Mr. BARKLEY. Give the names of the States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Wyoming. Arizona did not sign originally, but she signed later. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. MURDOCK. She signed the compact to begin with, but she did not ratify.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, California, Arizona, and New Mexico. Seven of the States. California signed the compact, did she not?

Mr. MURDOCK. All seven States signed it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. California signed it. The other States signed it. In that compact, years before this treaty was written, years before this matter came before the Senate, they knew that some time or other we would have to enter into a treaty with Mexico, or go on endlessly with the uncertainties of the present situation. They stated in the compact that the United States might make this treaty. What shall we do about it? Let us provide how we are going to divide the sacrifice when the time comes when sacrifice may be involved. As read by the Senator from Colorado the compact points out how each basin shall be affected as to the necessary reduction in the water that is available in order to make up any equity that the treaty may pledge to Mexico.

Mr. President, it is suggested by some Senators that we do not have to give Mexico a drop of water. No, we do not have to give Mexico a drop. We are powerful, we are mighty, we have armies and we have navies. If we could throttle the river—which we cannot do—but if we could throttle it and say that we will bottle up every gallon of water which flows down the river, we have the might, we have the armies, we have the striking power to do it. But are we not ashamed to do it? Are we not ashamed to rely upon our brute force? Do we not recognize that smaller and weaker nations have their equitable claims, and that under the law of prior usage there is an existing right to the use of water by the people in Mexico, the little homesteaders there who for years have been sustaining themselves by irrigating land with water drawn from the river, water which we have not appropriated, which we have not used, which we have let go on down the river in a mad rush in time of flood and which we have let dry up in times of drought?

Shall we say to them "You made a prior appropriation of this water. You have been using it; but by our brute force we are going to prevent you from using it any longer. Though we are not using it, we will cut you off. You shall not have a gallon. Because we are mighty and strong, we will deny you the elemental equities and rights to which you are entitled under the law and precedents

governing treaties on similar questions in other parts of the world, where the doctrine of prior appropriation has been adopted and approved."

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is it not actually the law that without this treaty Mexico would not be entitled to more than the natural flow of the river? Without this treaty, we would not have to guarantee to Mexico any amount of water. Those of us who disagree with the Senator so far do not wish to use the might of the people of the United States to deny Mexico a drop of water. However, too often we give away too freely to someone else the water which we have. I think it is time to be concerned, when our own States say that they are concerned.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that the one and a half million acre-feet proposed to be given to Mexico is only a small percentage of the water flowing down that stream.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand; but is it not a fact——

Mr. CONNALLY. Eighteen million acre-feet flow down that river every year. One and a half million acre-feet is only one-twelfth of the water in the river. Whether we wish it or not, a certain amount of water must go down that river. After California and Arizona use water for irrigation, what is left of it must flow back into the river. When Boulder Dam produces electric power the water must be let out, and it must go down the river. So whether we wish it or not, some water will go down the river into Mexico.

Mr. CHANDLER. But we are not now guaranteeing any water to Mexico except the natural flow of the river.

Mr. CONNALLY. We are not a guarantor, without a treaty.

Mr. CHANDLER. At present all Mexico is entitled to is the natural flow of the river?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Suppose we guarantee a certain amount of water and there is a shortage of water. Cannot Mexico demand that we open the flood gates at Boulder Dam and let down more water?

Mr. CONNALLY. If we guarantee it, certainly. With me a guaranty means a guaranty.

Mr. CHANDLER. I merely wish to understand what we are doing.

Mr. CONNALLY. The testimony of the engineers, in the main, was to the effect that with the Davis Dam, the Boulder Dam, and other works, the flood waters would be so regulated and controlled that there would be no hardship whatever. They testified that it is wholly improbable that there will ever come a time when there will be a serious condition caused by drought. The flow of the river would be equated by reason of the conservation in the upper dams and the lower dams.

Mr. President, this treaty must be considered as a whole. It must be considered in the light of the interest of the people of the United States from a cold-blooded standpoint; but it must also be considered from an international standpoint. This troublesome matter has been with us for nearly 50 years. We have at last, after many years of study and negotiation, come to the point where an agreement between the governments has been reached.

If Senators wish to oppose this treaty, of course they can find places in it where the language could be improved. They can find clauses which, if they were permitted to write them, could be improved and embellished. If Senators make up their minds in advance that this treaty must be doomed, they can find commas where semicolons ought to be, and periods where commas should reside. But, Mr. President, after the most painstaking hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, 18 votes out of 22 were cast for the treaty. Most of those votes were the votes of Senators from States not contiguous to the territory involved. They were votes of Senators who were not actuated by personal considerations. They came from Senators who were not influenced by geography or the claims of constituents. The vote was taken after the most painstaking and careful consideration, and after more than 4 weeks of hearings.

I believe that the hearings before the committee disclose that the engineering skill of the Nation which is concerned with water approves this treaty. The Commissioner of Reclamation approves the treaty. Secretary Hull was the originator of the movement to have the treaty ratified. Secretary of State Stettinius is for the treaty. The President sent the treaty to the Senate and asked for its ratification.

Mr. President, we must consider the international aspects of the treaty as well as the fact that five of the seven States in that great valley are advocating it, not because they want to make a gesture to Mexico, but because they feel that it is to their own interest, and in the interest of the safety and stability of their institutions. I appeal to the Senate to give the treaty consideration; and I hope that that consideration may result in the vote of Senators for its ratification.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief observation. I am aware of the fact that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] has been waiting, like a cat at a rat hole, for any opportunity to move to displace the treaty.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There has been a bigger cat there trying to prevent me from doing so. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not interested in when he makes his motion. It will be in order, whenever he obtains recognition to move to take up the nomination of Aubrey Williams and displace the treaty.

So far as I am personally concerned, it is utterly immaterial to me whether he makes the motion today or waits until Monday to make it. It is my purpose to move that the Senate take a recess in executive session, so that when we reconvene on Monday we shall still be in executive session; and the motion would be just as much in order then as it is now. So far as I am concerned, it makes no difference when the motion is made. If the Senator wishes to make it now, and let it be the pending business when the Senate convenes on Monday, that is satisfactory to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Alabama for the purpose of making a motion?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield the floor for a very brief, temporary moment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move that further consideration of the pending treaty be postponed until next Wednesday.

Mr. BARKLEY. No, Mr. President; that is not the motion which I understood the Senator would make. I do not think such a motion should be made. I yielded to the Senator so that he could move that the treaty be temporarily laid aside, and that on Monday the Senate proceed, in executive session, to consider the Williams nomination.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have tried to do what the Senator said he thought I should do; but I have been advised that my motion is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, it is in order to move to postpone any unfinished business to a definite day. However, it seems to me that the orderly and proper motion for the Senator to make, if he wishes to make it, is a motion to lay the pending business temporarily aside and to have the Senate take up the Williams nomination.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I make that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama that further consideration of the pending business be postponed until next Wednesday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me say frankly, that under the motion, if it is carried, I have no way of predicting how long the Williams nomination will be pending, if it is taken up. It is for the Senate to decide, if further consideration of the treaty is postponed until next Wednesday, and if consideration of the Williams nomination has not been concluded by that time, whether it will then be necessary to make a motion to further postpone consideration of the treaty.

So it seems to me that the appropriate motion—which I will be against when it is voted on——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me make a parliamentary inquiry: If the Senate takes a recess today, as in executive session, that motion will be the pending business before the Senate when it reconvenes, will it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is correct, the

motion will be the pending business when the Senate reconvenes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that is all the Senator from Alabama desires.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want it acted on.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will not be able to have it acted on now.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, can the Senator from Kentucky say whether it will be acted on today?

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, no. It will not be acted on today, and I do not suppose the Senator from Alabama contemplated that it would be acted on today.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am perfectly willing to have it go over until Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know how much debate there will be on the motion, but I suppose there will be some. I think the Senate should be able to decide with reasonable promptness what it will do with regard to the nomination and what it will do with regard to consideration of the treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky that if the motion of the Senator from Alabama is adopted, and if debate on the nomination runs along, I shall renew the motion that the Senate proceed with consideration of the treaty, because assurances have been given that there will not be much debate. However, we all know how debates expand and grow under the influence of warmth and enthusiasm.

So I now serve notice that I am not willing to agree to set aside consideration of the treaty for a long discussion of the Aubrey Williams nomination or any other matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the motion made to temporarily lay aside consideration of the treaty and to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Aubrey Williams to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, it would be in order at any time for the Senator from Texas to move that the Senate proceed with the regular order; and if such a motion were adopted, the treaty would again be before the Senate; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I have not yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama has the floor.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I merely wish to say, in answer to the Senator from Texas, that I assure him there is no intention to have protracted debate, so far as the opponents of Mr. Williams on this side of the aisle are concerned; and I have had similar assurances from Senators on the other side of the aisle. I wish to say to the Senator from Texas and to the majority leader that if there is protracted debate, it will be by the supporters of Mr. Williams; and, of course, we cannot give assurances in that connection.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say that the question of priority in the Senate as between the treaty between the United States and Mexico and the nomination of Mr. Williams is one for the consideration of the Senate. I have no way of knowing how many Senators will desire to speak on the pending motion. I do not suppose there will be protracted debate, in the sense that it will be unreasonably long; but certainly the Senate has the right to consider whether the destiny of this Nation is at stake in determining whether Aubrey Williams goes on the pay roll or remains off the pay roll.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I think that statement is totally unfair, because the Senator from Kentucky knows that the administration of the whole rural electrification program, not Mr. Aubrey Williams, is involved.

Mr. BARKLEY. The cooperatives of the Rural Electrification Administration are now operating and going along. They have been going along several months with an Acting Administrator. What I had in mind was that it would not make a great deal of difference, for the next week or two, whether there was a new Administrator or whether the Acting Administrator continued, which he will do until there is an appointment, a confirmation, and the issuance of a commission. I had no intention of reflecting on the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. WHITE and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield first to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think I am wholly correct when I say there will be few speeches by Senators on this side of the aisle either on the motion or on the nomination, if the motion prevails. At the moment, I know of only two short speeches which are contemplated, but there may be more.

Let me say to the Senator from Texas that some of us on this side of the aisle wish to have the Williams matter disposed of; but we recognize the importance of a treaty between the United States and a foreign nation, and if it develops that there is prolonged debate, I think there will be strong support on this side of the aisle in favor of resuming consideration of the treaty.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Maine is not among the supporters of Mr. Williams. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHITE. I assume there will not be a filibuster. I assume that Senators will address themselves to the matter then pending, and that they will be anxious to proceed to its determination.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, someone indicated that the supporters of Mr. Williams might wish to have prolonged debate. That is not the question. The supporters of the treaty might have something to say about it; and in that connection the Senator from Texas, I assume, might wish to give expression to his views as to the relative importance of the two—not in a prolonged way, but in a legitimate way.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that yesterday or the day before I made it clear that I was unwilling to have consideration of the treaty postponed for the purpose of having the nomination of Mr. Williams considered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think a great deal depends upon what action is now taken. If the Senate takes a recess as in executive session, it seems to me a great deal of time will be saved.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what I have announced that it is my intention to request.

Mr. McKELLAR. That will be entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have announced on three different occasions that I intend to move a recess.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the motion of the Senator from Alabama is now pending, and I understand that is all the Senator would like to accomplish today.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without prejudice either to the treaty or to the nomination of Mr. Williams, the Senate proceed to consider the uncontested nominations on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the uncontested nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that, while in executive session, the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 29 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until Monday, March 19, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 16, 1945:

IN THE COAST GUARD

Capt. William K. Scammell, United States Coast Guard, to be a commodore, for temporary service, in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of March 1945, while serving as district Coast Guard officer, Twelfth

Naval District, or in any other assignment for which the rank of commodore is authorized.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 16, 1945:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

James G. Rea, Notasulga.

KANSAS

Marie F. Jehlik, Cuba.
Harvey E. Yauk, Durham.

KENTUCKY

Daris U. Foley, Jamestown.

MAINE

Hattie M. Higgins, Mapleton.

MISSOURI

Collis P. Lindimore, Montrose.

VIRGINIA

J. Frank Walsh, West Point.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 16, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, merciful and compassionate, whose glory and might fill the world, bring us into those relations where we can discern the splendor of spiritual life without which the human soul becomes blank and barren. Bless us with that assurance and composure which give power in the midst of threatening passion and temptation.

O Saviour Divine, so fill us with Thy spirit that we may think Thy thoughts, feel something of Thine emotions, and strive to carry out Thy mission in the midst of this suffering world. We think of the lonely and the vicarious devotion on the field of battle; the nurses, the Medical Corps, the Red Cross, and all others who wear no great insignia of rank; to Thee we lift our prayer for them. "Let Thine enemies be scattered; let them also that hate Thee flee before Thee. As smoke is driven away, so drive them away; as wax melteth before the fire, so let the wicked perish in the presence of God, but let the righteous be glad and exult before Thee." In the name of Him who endured the cross and despised the shame for us. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 197. An act to establish the grade of general in the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 242. An act for the relief of Ruben M. Herren;

H. R. 249. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper;

H. R. 256. An act for the relief of Dr. Luther J. Head;

H. R. 257. An act for the relief of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased;

H. R. 687. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions;

H. R. 946. An act for the relief of the estates of Robert C. Meals and Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, Donald Meals (a minor), and Betty Wrightstone (a minor);

H. R. 987. An act for the relief of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.;

H. R. 1149. An act for the relief of Dane D. Morgan;

H. R. 1429. An act to permit the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and the United States Maritime Commission, during the national emergency, to pay the tax imposed under section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code without regard to the $3,000 limitation in section 1426 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 1485. An act for the relief of Henry B. Tucker;

H. R. 1646. An act to establish the grade of admiral in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2506. An act to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1308. An act for the relief of Sam Swan and Ally Swan; and

H. R. 1360. An act for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 46. An act to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended, to provide for the appointment of five additional inspectors, and to provide for adjustments in salaries;

S. 58. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," approved July 24, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 70. An act for the relief of Maria Manriquez Ruiz;

S. 71. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Estella Ruiz;

S. 93. An act for the relief of Mary G. Marggraf;

S. 194. An act for the relief of Mrs. Glenn T. Boylston;

S. 288. An act for the relief of the Lawrence Motor Co., Inc.;

S. 316. An act for the relief of June I. Gradijan;

S. 321. An act for the relief of James M. Hiler;

S. 397. An act to provide for the presentation of medals to members of the United States Antartic Expedition of 1939–41;

S. 407. An act for the relief of Pierce William Van Doren and Elmer J. Coates;

S. 411. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mae E. Sutton;

S. 426. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter M. Johnson;

S. 467. An act for the relief of Maj. Malcolm K. Beyer;

S. 491. An act for the relief of John H. Gradwell;

S. 502. An act to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments and certain purchase and sale operations by corporations created pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 514. An act for the relief of the Baldwin Bros. Paving Co.;

S. 515. An act for the relief of Wallace Robertson, Henry Bowker, and Edward Parisian, and for other purposes;

S. 519. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles A. Straka;

S. 525. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval training center, Farragut Idaho, on July 10, 1944;

S. 530. An act authorizing the Administrator of Veterans Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration, Dallas, Tex., to Dallas County, Tex., for highway purposes;

S. 531. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for fire-station purposes, the title to certain land located at Veterans' Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif.;

S. 544. An act for the relief of Dave Hougardy;

S. 569. An act to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the training building at the Marine Corps air station, Cherry Point, N. C., on June 2, 1944;

S. 591. An act for the relief of Chesley Brazil;

S. 645. An act to suspend until 6 months after the termination of the present war section 2 of the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 481), as amended;

S. 646. An act to provide for the advancement of Capt. Edward Macauley, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of rear admiral; and

S. 647. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the State of Rhode Island, for highway purposes only, a strip of land within the naval advance base depot at North Kingstown, R. I.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1984. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GLASS, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. GREEN, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. BROOKS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 46. An act to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act of February 17, 1911, as amended, to provide for the appointment of five additional inspectors, and to provide for adjustments in salaries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 58. An act to amend an act entitled "An act authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," approved July 24, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 70. An act for relief of Maria Manriquez Ruiz; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 71. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Estella Ruiz; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 93. An act for the relief of Mary G. Marggraf; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 194. An act for the relief of Mrs. Glenn T. Boylston; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 288. An act for the relief of the Lawrence Motor Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 316. An act for the relief of June I. Gradijan; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 397. An act to provide for the presentation of medals to members of the United States Antarctic expedition of 1939–41; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 407. An act for the relief of Pierce William Van Doren and Elmer J. Coates; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 426. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Walter M. Johnson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 467. An act for the relief of Maj. Malcolm K. Beyer; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 491. An act for the relief of John H. Gradwell; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 502. An act to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments and certain purchase and sale operations by corporations created pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 514. An act for the relief of the Baldwin Bro. Paving Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 519. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles A. Straka; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 544. An act for the relief of Dave Hougardy; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 569. An act to reimburse certain Marine Corps personnel and former Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in the training building at the Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C., on June 2, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 591. An act for the relief of Chesley Brazil; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 645. An act to suspend, until 6 months after the termination of the present war, section 2 of the act of March 3, 1883 (22 Stat. 481), as amended; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 646. An act to provide for the advancement of Capt. Edward Macauley, United States Navy, retired, to the rank of rear admiral; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 647. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the State of Rhode Island, for highway purposes only, a strip of land within the naval advance base depot at North Kingstown, R. I.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 681. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands a Member-elect from the State of Virginia is present. He will present himself at the bar of the House and take the oath of office.

Mr. J. VAUGHAN GARY appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact we have an appropriation bill up today——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not received recognition except on a point of order. What is the gentleman's point of order.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there are less than 30 Democrats on the floor of the House, therefore a quorum is not present.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order. If the gentleman wants to make the point of order that a quorum is not present, that is a different proposition.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 43]

Anderson, Calif.	Gibson	Rabin
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gordon	Ramey
Bates, Mass.	Hagen	Rayfiel
Boren	Hall,	Reed, N. Y.
Buckley	Edwin Arthur	Robinson, Utah
Cannon, Fla.	Harless, Ariz.	Rogers, N. Y.
Celler	Hart	Sikes
Combs	Heidinger	Slaughter
Curley	Hobbs	Smith, Maine
Dawson	Isac	Smith, Va.
De Lacy	Johnson	Starkey
Dirksen	Lyndon B.	Stockman
Earthman	Kearney	Taylor
Eaton	King	Thom
Ellis	LeCompte	Thomas, N. J.
Elsaesser	Luce	Weaver
Flood	McKenzie	Weiss
Fuller	Madden	West
Fulton	Morrison	White
Gardner	Mott	Winter
Gearhart	Pfeifer	Wood

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventy members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. McCORMACK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PERISHABLE FOODSTUFFS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the other day I said something about lard in connection with the Commodity Credit Corporation. The next day there appeared this advertisement in the Cincinnati Enquirer for March 10, 1945:

> Government lard in steel drums have broken away from the Cincinnati Warehouse, 7 West Front Street. Finders of this property please notify NA 4117, as this is Government property being held in storage for the armed forces.

Imagine! That condition continues to exist. Lard rationed and being stored in open warehouses without cold-storage facilities. Is not that a travesty?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RYTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a declaration of the supreme board of the Polish Women's Alliance of America relative to the Crimean Conference and an editorial from the Hartford Courant.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a portion of a letter from the city attorney of the city of Long Beach, Calif.

Mr. HEDRICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Charleston Gazette of Charleston, W. Va.

DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, "get men for the armed forces, and if necessary close the farms and we will eat grass."

One of my constituents advised me that one of the officials of the selective-service headquarters in my State had made this statement to draft boards and to him when he conferred with selective service in regard to his son.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of a committee of 11 appointed at a meeting of over 200 Congressmen, I am asking that the Lemke resolution, No. 29, voted out by the Rules Committee be presented to the House for action.

Mr. Speaker, we are calling to your attention the importance of the consideration of the Lemke resolution due to the critical food shortage as selective service is not paying any attention to the deferment of essential farm and dairy workers under the terms of the Tydings amendment.

Mr. Speaker, our farm boys are patriotic and want to serve in the armed forces, but the question of the essentiality of food for our armed forces and the civilian population is of paramount importance, and something must be done about this situation—now.

OUTLAWING OF CARTEL SYSTEMS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform the Congress that on Wednesday of this week I introduced H. R. 2612, having as its object the outlawing of the insidious and dangerous cartel system by the revocation of letters patent of individuals, firms, associations, and combines who in any way become a party to or otherwise aid or abet the formation or maintenance of such cartels in an effort to control, restrict, or interfere with the free flow of commerce—domestic and foreign.

Realizing, Mr. Speaker, that the subject of cartels is an intricate and involved matter, I wish to call attention to the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1000, page A1068, and

page A1079, where there is printed a lengthy definition of cartels. I might add that the data so printed were taken from the forthcoming 1945 edition of the Encyclopedia Americana now in the hands of the printer, and its publication as a public document was authorized by the editor of said publication.

It is my sincere hope that every Member of this House studies this information as a basis of understanding the necessity for the legislation contained in H. R. 2612.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include a law passed by the House of Representatives of the State of Utah, and in the other to include an editorial.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from a university publication.

Mr. BENNET of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter addressed to the President of the United States.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and after any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO SERVICEMEN'S DEPENDENTS ALLOWANCE ACT OF 1942

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PHILBIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE WALL AND THE LOOPHOLE

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the able journalist, Mr. George Rothwell Brown, in this morning's Times-Herald, quoted my remarks pointing out "the amendment barring the use of lend-lease as a post-war mechanism is not airtight," but "prescribes as clearly as Congress can lay down directives for administration, what the dividing line shall be." He then queries, "Why was this amendment drawn as clearly as Congress can lay down directives, drawn so loosely, with so many loopholes?" That is a very good question. There are three answers.

First, if we had attempted to draw it any more airtight we might not have gotten the necessary votes, probably resulting in no post-war limitation at all.

Second, you cannot draw an airtight wall between war and peace because such a wall does not exist in the facts of life in the world. Therefore, the purpose of the amendment was to permit war agreements which might run into the peace period, but to put limitations on those agreements requiring cash payments for everything after the shooting stops.

Third, since Justice Frankfurter held that the mere plain meaning of the language used does not necessarily show what a law means, it is obviously impossible to draft a law that is airtight, or Frankfurter-tight. The only thing to do is what we did in this instance, we agreed on language that clearly shows the policy Congress wants administered; in explanatory statements and speeches we reinforced that congressional intent; then a few of us publicly pointed out the possible loopholes, so that Congress and the press and the public would be watching those loopholes.

The wall we built, however, is much bigger and more important than any loophole in it. The House voted to wall out lend-lease from the post-war period.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

VETERANS' SOCIAL-SECURITY PAYMENTS

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WEICHEL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHIPERFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram from a constituent bearing on the meat crisis in northern New Jersey.

TARIFF RATES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I see in this morning's paper that there is a move under way to lower the tariff rates. I want to say here that the business interests of this country and the hard-working people of the United States in the last 160 years have made this country the greatest country on the face of the earth. It was the capitalistic system under which we built this great Nation of ours. The great freedom and liberty of Americans caused them to be thrifty. But now you have been tearing it down. We are taking the props out from under business by permitting the lower-paid workers of Europe to come in here and undermine the high wages paid to the American people in order to raise their standard of living. You will find out that we will tear down American standards. I want to say, furthermore, keep your eye on this reciprocal trade agreement so that we will not put our farmers out of business, because it will only be a short time until this Nation of ours will be sold down the river to the foreign countries. I want to say here, as far as I am concerned, I am for America first, last, and all the time, and let us keep America for Americans. You will find out within 3 years that American people have been sold down the river.

JOHN L. LEWIS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, John L. Lewis has asked for a royalty on all coal mined. Some people think he will get it. That privilege has been granted once before. I wish to include in my remarks an article appearing in the Washington Star which will give you an idea of what may happen if we are going to continue paying royalties.

A LOGICAL PROSPECT

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

John L. has a swell idea, but we must carry it along further. For example:

To poultry raisers: 10 cents royalty per crate.

To cement makers: 10 cents per ton.

To the C. I. O. auto: $5 per auto.

To farmers: 1 cent per bushel for corn, ditto wheat, ad infinitum.

To fishermen: $1 per ton.

To Government employees: 10 cents per 100 documents handled.

To telephone operators: 1 cent per local and 10 cents long distance.

To soldiers: $1 per 100 rounds of ammo with a bonus for prisoners.

To milkmen: One-fourth of a cent per quart delivered.

To streetcar and busmen: 1 cent per passenger.

To firemen: $10 per fire.

To auto mechanics and greasers: 5 cents per car worked on.

To newsboys: 10 cents per 100 sold.

Ad infinitum.

To John Q. (so he can pay it all): 10 cents per annum for each union member.

Nuts.

ABSURDUM.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, we have an appropriation bill before the House today calling for some $200,000,000 plus. When I arrived on the floor of the House there were few Members on the floor. Since allegedly, or purportedly, the Speaker of the House has set the precedent of vacating the Democratic side of the House when a Republican speaks, I thought it might be well to have more Members present to hear the debate on

this appropriation bill; to hear a little good old Republican doctrine. While our taxpayers are being bled white to keep our Federal coffers from becoming empty, I feel we owe it to them to be here and carefully scrutinize each and every appropriation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an item from the National Rural Letter Carrier.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from a speech recently delivered by Donald Douglas, aircraft manufacturer.

MEAT SHORTAGE COULD HAVE BEEN AVOIDED

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JENKINS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, if I may proceed for one observation, I know I am asking for special indulgence of the House, which I seldom like to do, but I think we might well say this whole incident is greatly magnified. Of course, when Members of the House speak after 5 o'clock, they are naturally going to have a very small gathering on either side of the House because the day's work is practically done and the Members go to their offices. It is no reflection upon the gentleman from Indiana or any other Member of the House if there is a small gathering at that time.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is absolutely correct. That is clearly understood by every Member of the House. At that hour in the evening the legislative business of the House is over.

THE TARIFF QUESTION

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say in reply to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] that I disagree with him on the tariff question. I am personally very fond of the gentleman. I do not think there is a better American in this House than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. So, whatever we have to say, I trust will be on a high plane without any personalities or any ill feelings.

I am opposed to high protective tariff, because a tariff is an indirect tax. It levies a tax upon one man for the benefit of another man. I was here in 1921 when the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill was passed. It levied a tax on everything the farmer had to buy, from the swaddling clothes of infancy to the lining of the coffin in which old age was laid away.

All through those years our economy was thrown out of balance, and as a result we finally headed into the crash of 1929. I sincerely trust we will not go back to those old high-protective-tariff days of the Harding-Coolidge-Hoover administrations.

If a protective tariff is to be levied at all it should be accompanied by a reciprocal debenture on agricultural exports, in order not to grind our farmers into the economic dust.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and include a resolution passed by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND THE FEDERAL LOAN AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1946

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2603) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and the Federal Loan Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 2603, the State, Justice, Commerce appropriation bill, 1946, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Not to exceed 5 percent of the foregoing appropriations for personal services shall be available interchangeably, subject to the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, for expenditures in the various offices and divisions named, but not more than 5 percent shall be added to the amount appropriated for any one of said offices or divisions and any interchange of appropriations hereunder shall be reported to Congress in the annual Budget, and not to exceed $250,000 of said appropriations shall be available for the employment, on duties properly chargeable to each of said appropriations, of special assistants to the Attorney General without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 36 beginning with line 23 and continuing to the end of the page, and on page 37, the first 10 lines, inclusive, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill not provided for by law.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order. It has been in the bill for many years, however.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Customs Division: For necessary expenses, including travel expenses, purchase and exchange of lawbooks and books of reference, and employment of special attorneys and experts at such rates of compensation as may be authorized or approved by the Attorney General or his Administrative Assistant, $146,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning in line 10 on page 38 and continuing down into line 13, which reads as follows: "and employment of special attorneys and experts at such rates of compensation as may be authorized or approved by the Attorney General or his Administrative Assistant," on the ground that that is legislation in an appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Antitrust Division: For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws, including traveling expenses, and experts at such rates of compensation as may be athorized or approved by the Attorney General, except that the compensation paid to any person employed hereunder shall not exceed the rate of $10,000 per annum, including personal services in the District of Columbia, $1,700,000: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall be expended for the establishment and maintenance of permanent regional offices of the Antitrust Division: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the payment of any person hereafter appointed at a salary of $7,500 or more unless such person is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the clerk has just read the item for the Antitrust Division. I cannot let this pass without reviewing some of the things that have happened in the last few years in this division of the Department of Justice. Well do I remember the days of the N. R. A. before the Supreme Court kicked it out of the window and raised so much trouble for a lot of people here in Washington. Now the Supreme Court is packed for action.

We on the Joint Committee on Printing were faced with the problem of getting bids on paper. Under N. R. A. the Government compelled—yes, I say compelled them to break the Sherman antitrust laws—the paper manufacturers had to get their heads together and fix the price for their commodity. It was the duty of the Committee on Printing according to N. R. A., however, to ask for bids on paper, yet the Government was not permitted to buy paper from any company that did not agree to be bound by the set price by N. R. A. I was a member of the Joint Committee on Printing. I maintained my position that the law directed that we should

award the bid for the purchase of paper to the responsible company making the lowest bid. I tried to stick to that law and felt I was doing the right thing. I would not go along with the majority of the committee who wanted to make the purchases from these manufacturers who got together according to N. R. A. and said that the United States Government must buy in accordance with the rules and regulations laid down under N. R. A.; but being of the minority I was overruled, and the committee disregarded the Sherman antitrust laws.

What position do we find ourselves in today? We find ourselves in exactly the opposite position where we must accept the bid of the lowest responsible bidder. This is the American way of doing business, but I just wanted to call the attention of the House to the ridiculous things you do, going from one extreme to another. That is the history of this administration from 1933 to date.

If we would stick to the old laws that were passed and laid down by our founding fathers, we would have a better Government, we would have better manufacturing concerns, and we would have better business people in this country. Our business people today are regulated to the point where there is practically no competitive bidding and you know the old adage, "Competition is the life of trade." When we have competition we know that men have to be on their toes and manufacture or produce an article for the public at the cheapest possible price. That helps the taxpayer.

There is appropriated in this bill the sum of $1,700,000 for antitrust matters. I do not know why the committee should not cut that down about $700,000. Of course, I would offer amendment to that effect, but I get licked on every amendment I offer because I find that the Congress does not seem to want to economize, they do not want to cut down on anything. You are here to spend and spend you do. Where you are going to get the money I do not know. You are responsible; for you Democrats are driving this legislation through the Congress.

This whole matter of economy, or the lack thereof, grieves me greatly, but I want to say to the Congress if you do not stop soon you are building a great pyramid of debt and when it falls over on you, and it cannot last but a few years longer, then beware. It is the responsibility of the Congress and you Democrats will have a lot to account for.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. This appropriation is for just what the gentleman is talking about, for the purpose of bringing back the old-fashioned competition to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. RICH. Then let us leave the $1,700,000 in the bill. I, however, question it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Examination of judicial offices: For the investigation of the official acts, records, and accounts of marshals, attorneys, clerks of the United States courts and Territorial courts, probation officers, and United States commissioners, for which purpose all the official papers, records, and dockets of said officers, without exception, shall be examined by the agents of the Attorney General at any time; and also the official acts, records, and accounts of referees and trustees of such courts; travel expenses; in all, $78,000, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General.

Salaries and expenses, Lands Division: For personal services in the District of Columbia and for other necessary expenses, including travel expenses, employment of experts at such rates of compensation as may be authorized or approved by the Attorney General, stenographic reporting services by contract, and notarial fees or like services, $3,400,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning in line 17, including all of the language in that line and through the words "Attorney General" in line 18.

The CHAIRMAN. Beginning with the word "at" in line 17, and ending with the word "General" in line 18?

Mr. TABER. That is correct; on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that many provisions of the pending bill are being eliminated by House action by reason of points of order which have been conceded by the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill, many Members of the House have asked me what may be the ultimate effect of this House action. In view of the fact that the Appropriations Committee has been the subject time and time again, on the floor of the House, of rather severe denunciation by certain Members because of the inclusion of legislative language in an appropriation bill, and because the Appropriations Committee has sometimes included items for which there is no legislative authorization, I felt that perhaps it would be somewhat clarifying at this time if I made a statement on that subject.

It seems to me what happens is this: The raising of points of order either on the ground that the language complained of is in violation of the rules of the House, because it is legislation on an appropriation bill, or seeking to eliminate an item of appropriation on the ground that the item is not authorized by law, is the performance of a real service to the Congress and the people of the United States. The mere fact that the other body, with rules similar to those in the House, may waive those rules and restore the items or the language that has been stricken by House action in conformity to its rules, is not sufficient justification in my humble judgment to permit the inclusion in an appropriation measure of either language or figures that are in direct violation of the rules of the House. Therefore these points of order that are being made are being made in conformity to the rules of the House.

What happens, as I understand, is this: When this bill with the deleted language goes to the other body they may—and my observation has been they very frequently and most generally do—restore the language or the figures that have been stricken by action of the other body. That, therefore, throws the matter into conference and the differences between the House and the Senate action as to each particular item are therefore in dispute and must be brought back to the House as amendments in dispute and require the action of the House with respect to each amendment. That gives to the House of Representatives not only the right and the power and the duty to enforce the performance of its own rules but gives the House an opportunity to express itself by a vote of the House when the bill comes back out of conference on the specific items that have been eliminated on points of order.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman's remarks are a contribution in this particular case on the raising of many points of order. There is a philosophy of some members in legislative committees in this House that perhaps we should return to the old custom of 1922 and allow the legislative committees of the House also to appropriate. There has been considerable complaint that perhaps the Committee on Appropriations does write too much legislation in appropriation bills. We have present a great parliamentarian, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and I wonder if a little contribution from that great authority would be in order at this time.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman that I rose to take this time because a good many Members are interested in the procedure that is being indulged in in the Committee here this afternoon, especially the newer Members. I think the question that has been addressed to me is a very proper question. The man who says that the action of the House is ineffectual merely because it has been the custom in the other body to restore the language in the bill which goes out of the bill here by reason of compliance with the rules of the House, has no sound argument against the procedure which is being indulged by the minority members of this subcommittee. I believe that the integrity of the House is better preserved by insistence upon compliance with the plain rules of the House. The Committee on Appropriations will not in the future be subjected to the complaints that I have heard time and time again from the well of this House that the Committee on Appropriations is trying to usurp the privileges and prerogatives of legislative committees.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. As I understand the language that was stricken out on the point of order a minute ago, if it had remained in the bill and become law the Attorney General could, if he so desired, have paid a salary of an unlimited amount out of this appropriation. If the language is put back by the Senate, we certainly should not agree to it here, even though it requires a roll call to keep it out.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly the point. By striking that provision out on a point of order the situation is squarely presented to the other body. If they see fit to restore the language, that language will have to come back to the House from the conferees in disagreement, and we then can insist upon a vote and a roll-call vote if necessary so that the membership of the House may thus express itself.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Upon each amendment that is placed in the bill by the Senate in violation of the rules of the House a separate vote can be had.

Mr. KEEFE. Exactly. I want to make it clear that as far as I personally am concerned I think the House by the action which it is taking with respect to the objections to the items in this bill that are in violation of the rules of the House is upon absolutely sound ground, and we are preserving the integrity of the rules of the House and our own method of doing business.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. If the conferees do not disagree and it comes back to the House, then it stays there, because the House cannot strike it out. Is not that true?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. May I ask the gentleman why it is that this legislation is written into this appropriation bill? Who wrote it into this bill?

Mr. KEEFE. I think it ought to be perfectly clear to the Members of the House that there are many matters of urgent character that come up from time to time that require the inclusion of language that might be subject to a point of order on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. I have in mind, for example, the development of the Emergency Maternal and Infant Care program, which has developed into one of the great programs of this Nation, but which to this very hour has no legislative authorization, so that a point of order may be directed against it if anyone sees fit to raise such a point of order. However, in the ordinary operations of governmental business, it seems to me, with the legislative committees of this Congress in session, as far as possible there should be legislative authority for every appropriation and there should be no legislation on an appropriation bill that could properly be handled and should properly be handled by a legislative committee of the House.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Further, the gentleman might add that in connection with points of order raised on the ground that certain language is legislation on an appropriation bill, some of the points of order are raised because there is no authority of law for the expenditure of that money—giving the various departments and bureaus blanket authority to spend the taxpayers' money—so there are two categories of points of order which have been raised by the minority on this bill.

Mr. KEEFE. As far as I am concerned, I compliment the members of this subcommittee, who have very, very carefully examined this bill and very carefully watched it during its progress through the House. They have had the courage and the good judgment to raise proper and suitable points of order against the inclusion of language or figures in this bill that are not in compliance with the rules of the House.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Would it not have been most helpful if the Committee on Appropriations itself had taken these matters more into consideration before the bill came to the floor of the House?

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to the gentleman, I do not run the Committee on Appropriations nor do I make its rules; but I understand normally—and the chairman of the committee is here and will correct me if I am in error—that it is the practice of the committee not to entertain points of order when the committee considers the bill in full committee. Is that correct, Mr. Chairman—that points of order are reserved for presentation on the floor of the House? I yield to the gentleman, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and as a great parliamentarian, to make a contribution for the RECORD to the extent of indicating what portion of my statement is incorrect, if any.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct. I shall be glad to go a little further in the matter when the gentleman has concluded.

Mr. KEEFE. I am very, very happy to know, with that statement from the greatest parliamentarian in the world, that the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is now addressing the Committee, is for once in his life correct in a statement with respect to parliamentary procedure.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman,

Mr. RICH. I was formerly a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I am not on that committee now. But the Committee on Appropriations permits too much legislation to come out of the committee onto the floor of the House. It takes somebody like the minority members here now to make these points of order. I think we ought to make them on every piece of legislation that is in an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin who always contributes materially to the elucidation of any parliamentary problem arising in connection with the proceedings of the House whenever he speaks, is correct in his statement that it is in contravention of the rules of the House for the Committee on Appropriations to include in its bills any appropriation for which previous legislative authority has not been provided in a bill reported by a legislative committee of the House having jurisdiction of the subject matter. He is correct in saying that these provisions which are stricken out on points of order go to the Senate and usually are incorporated by the Senate in the bill in largely the same language in which they appeared in the bill as submitted to the House and then come back in conference and are agreed to by the House.

But, Mr. Chairman—and this cannot be emphasized to strongly—the Committee on Appropriations has a strict policy against including major legislation, new legislation, or legislation of any particular significance in any of its bills. It does not legislate in the strict acceptance of the terms. The only provisions without authority of law which are included by the Committee on Appropriations in its bill are provisions which are of minor administrative character, and practically all of them are items which have been carried for many years in the annual bill. They are of such small moment that the legislative committee of the House having jurisdiction, has never taken the trouble to enact law authorizing them. If all the legislative committees of the House brought in bills and enacted laws authorizing all the details in appropriations bills which are necessary for the carrying on of the business of the Government, it would increase immeasurably the already voluminous enactments crowded into the Federal statutes.

These amounts stricken out here today on technical points of order are largely matters administrative minutae necessary in order for the department adequately to carry out the work of the Government departments. They were in the bill last year and have been carried in the bill for many preceding years.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has said, if they are stricken out on a point of order the Senate usually puts them back, and they are agreed to in conference.

So, the only effect of these points of order, striking out provisions in this bill, is to prevent their consideration in the House. These points of order preclude

debate in the House. We are denied the privilege of amending them. We are denied our constitutional privilege of legislating on them. Through these points of order the House abdicates its constitutional functions to defer to the Senate to legislate for the country and waives its prerogative as an equal branch of the American Congress.

Now, if there is any real reason for striking out these items—and there seldom is—but if there is any legitimate reason for eliminating them, the thing to do is to permit them to be debated in the House, explained, criticized and, if necessary, amended, and then voted on. The House should have an opportunity to consider them on their merits. That is what Congress is for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The House has never had an opportunity to hear them explained or to meet any objection which might be advanced against their adoption. If they are needed, but are not in good form, we ought to have the opportunity to discuss them, to amend them, and to adapt them to the needs of the country. Or, if they should not be in the bill, an amendment to strike them out is in order, and this committee can vote them out.

Now, I am not saying that the Committee on Appropriations should legislate. As the House knows, I have for many years taken an emphatic position against any such policy. It has long been the policy of the committee to exclude all legislation from these bills. It is only on minor matters that legislation is ever incorporated in the supply bills.

That does not mean that the legislative committee, having jurisdiction of the subject, has any objection to bringing in legislation authorizing such appropriations.

Let us take, for example, one notable instance. For a number of years we have included in annual bills appropriations for the Farm Security Administration. There is no legislative authority for such appropriations. Year after year it has gone out in the House on a point of order. It has then gone over to the Senate and invariably the Senate has put it back in the bill. Through the interposition of technical points of order, the House had no opportunity to act on this highly important appropriation except in conference.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In just a moment. Now, it has repeatedly been called to the attention of the Committee on Agriculture, which has legislative jurisdiction of the subject. That committee repeatedly has been asked to bring in legislation authorizing it. And the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture will tell you that he favors the item and a large majority of the committee approves an appropriation for the Farm Security Administration. Still they have never taken the trouble to bring it in, and when it is necessary for us to continue support of that very essential activity, we bring it in. It goes out on a point of order. Then the Senate puts it back every year and we agree to it in conference. The only effect of these points of order, has been to deny the Members of the House the right to consider such provisions and to debate them and adapt them to the form in which they are agreeable to the House and the country.

May I say again—that I will then yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin—may I say again that if there is anything objectionable in these provisions which have been striken from the bill on points of order, the thing to do is to permit them to be considered, and then submit motions cutting them out of the bill. That is the way to legislate; that is the only way in which the House can discharge its function as a coordinate body of the legislative branch of the Government.

I yield now to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has made a fine statement, but he skipped very hurriedly over one part of these legislative processes. As I understand it, these matters that go out of the bill on points of order may be reinserted in this bill by the other body. If they are reinserted in the bill and the bill goes to conference, the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate may agree to the restoration to the bill of the Senate language. Does that action on the part of the conferees require bringing that report back to the House? And does not this give an opportunity for the House to have a separate vote on each and every Senate amendment that has been put into the bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It does.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it not a fact, therefore, that as to each amendment in disagreement when the bill comes back from conference we are entitled under the rule to an hour's discussion on each amendment? Is not that true? Mr. Chairman, is not that true?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is entirely correct. But as a matter of practical procedure, all such items are almost without exception agreed to by the House—and usually without extended debate. That is what will happen to all these items stricken out on points of order except those which would have been stricken out by vote of the committee had consideration been permitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, in discussing these points of order, I believe it necessary to point out that in making the points of order we are preserving the basic law of the land and the statutes that were enacted in most instances many, many years ago. On the points of order that were made yesterday we were supported by provisions of law that go back as far as 1809, placed on the statute books by this Congress at a time when safe and sane consideration was given to the expenditure of money. I call attention to page 17 of the bill under consideration where it is proposed to provide funds for the operation of commissaries. We are making an initial appropriation for that item. Let us see what the point of order struck out:

> That all refunds, repayments, or other credits on account of funds disbursed under this head shall be credited to the appropriations for this purpose current at the time the obligations are incurred or such amounts are received.

What does that mean? That means that instead of following the general law requiring that all moneys collected by these departments and agencies shall be turned into the general fund of the Treasusy as miscellaneous receipts, the State Department would not have had to turn the money into the Treasury if this provision had not gone out on a point of order. It would have meant they could have put that money into a revolving fund, in common parlance called a "kitty" to be used over and over again to supplement appropriations, and the Congress of the United States would never be able to tell what amounts were being expended.

We are upheld in making points of order by laws of the land that have been tried and proved, for the purpose of maintaining the integrity of the officers and helping them stay honest. In addition, with the language stricken out by point of order helps the Congress to know what money is turned into the Treasury and how much it will cost to operate the commissaries the next fiscal year.

Let us take the item for the foreign service buildings fund. It is an old law that requires that not more than a million dollars shall be spent in any one year. A point of order was made by a Member on the minority side to see that that old tried and proved law on the statute books was observed. The item in the bill was for $1,466,000, more than the $1,000,000 expendable under the law. In the committee, I opposed that amount because it was excessive. My questions in the hearings will show that they did not have a proper foundation of planning to know just what kind of buildings they would need. So naturally, the law would be relied upon to see that those old statutes are complied with. In any event, the points of order so far made have been to maintain the integrity of laws upon which there was debate many years ago and by majority action of the House and Senate and presumably by the signature of the President at the time these laws were passed and became the laws of the land. Congress should abide by the statutes now in making appropriations.

I point out these considerations because in the last 12 years I have watched and observed that there has attempted to be appropriated to these various agencies funds for which the agencies, departments, and independent establishments set the rules and regulations insofar as expenditure is concerned, without regard for general law. For the purpose of

making the departments and agencies abide by the laws of the land the minority Members have made these points of order. Congress will know then for what the appropriated money is being expended.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I notice in nearly all of these appropriation bills that funds are appropriated to be spent for material without regard to section 3709 and time and time again the Classification Act and Civil Service Act are exempted when the funds are being expended. What were these acts for originally if they are not to be abided by?

Mr. JONES. They were passed as salutory measures to protect the Treasury of the Government. Section 3709 covers public bidding on contracts and provides that the Government may not purchase except through the bidding practice and that the contract shall go to the lowest bidder. A great many of these provisions that were knocked out yesterday would have exempted these appropriated funds from the operation of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Why does the committee avoid those acts?

Mr. JONES. These bills are prepared by the Bureau of the Budget and the departments. They are sent down here for approval and no points of order may be made in committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, in reply briefly to the last speaker, the foreign building fund was established by law enacted in 1938 and the reason for the additional money, which was stricken from the bill yesterday, was to give the United States or its agents an advantage in the money and real estate market of the world for the benefit of the United States Government. We have not won a thing by striking this from the bill, but, on the contrary, have frustrated and prevented the Government from taking advantage of peculiar situations for the benefit of this Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk about a few other things. Oh, consistency, thou art a jewel. Yesterday we yielded time on this floor for the longest speech in the whole debate. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] at that time paid a wonderful tribute to the Chinese people. Then we proceeded within a half hour after he left the floor, after he was given a rising vote of appreciation, to prove the lip service to China by striking from the bill through efforts on the minority side of the House $1,390,000 to help China and the Far East. That is the kind of consistency we have in the debate that is going on in this House today.

With reference to what the gentleman from Wisconsin said a few minutes ago about reinsertion of these items stricken from the bill in the House by the Senate, they will be reinserted by the Senate in the language of the Senate, not in the language which your committee has labored on and brought to the floor. You have frustrated debate upon the very matters that you have intrusted to your committee and you have handed it to the other body, after which it will come back here to be accepted in toto or turned down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, many items in this bill have come to be there in violation of the rules of the House. The Committee of the Whole has been going over those items quite carefully, and many points of order have been made with reference to them. Not many of those points of order are debatable from the standpoint of desirability. As to some of them there might be a question whether or not they should be made.

But look at some of them. One was an item for $16,000,000 where the State Department was entitled to put in any recoveries that it might make and add them to the appropriation. May I say to the House that the proper way for us to do business is to review the needs of these organizations and make appropriations for what they need and not for some concealed amount.

Just a moment ago this language was thrown out:

> At such rates of compensation as may be authorized or approved by the Attorney General—

That language appears almost on every page of the Department of Justice bill. There is no reason that any fair-minded person can conceive of for the conclusion of that language. That rate of compensation is without any limit whatever.

Is there to be any protection to the Treasury of the United States from bureaucrats, or are they to have full swing? Are we to have regulations? Are we to pay any attention to what is going on? These points of order will result, perhaps, in the Senate putting that language back in, but I am saying that if the Senate puts it back, so long as I shall be here and so long as I can take part in debate—and everyone of these items must come back for a separate vote if they are put in—I shall endeavor in the hour that is available to see that the House understands that such unrestricted language should not remain. Unless we have a cleaning up of the situation, I do not think we are doing our duty to the people at home or to those who send us here to protect the interests of the United States of America.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. There is a legal and a proper way to obtain these appropriations, and that is for the departments to come before the proper legislative committee and obtain authorizations from that committee for the use of those funds. I am getting tired of having Members of the House criticizing the Committee on Appropriations for trespassing upon legislative prerogatives and then come back and say, "You should provide funds without regard to legislative prerogatives, or without regard for the committees passing those authorization bills."

Mr. TABER. I hope that points of order will be raised on such items as appear in this bill that are unrestrained and which do not protect the interests of America.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that, as someone has said, there are three sides to every question, your side, my side, and the right side. I am somewhat inclined to think the members of the Committee on Appropriations are forgetting that some of these things which are being stricken out on points of order are here simply to facilitate business. You could not expect to send these matters to a legislative committee; it cannot pass on every little detail that an executive might need to assist him in carrying on the work of his office. That is just not a practical thing to do. Further, any business in the world has to put a certain amount of discretion in the hands of an executive. In the same way, I see nothing wrong in empowering an executive, in his discretion, to handle ordinary executive problems and also to implement that power with legislation on an appropriation bill, without reference to a legislative committee.

Certainly the Committee on Appropriations does not want to be a legislative committee, but as a matter of practical, sound business, in order to expedite business, it is necessary to put something here and there in appropriation bills which will help to carry on the business of the departments.

Let us look at the patient and not discuss the disease so much. This is a matter of long practice in appropriation bills. Let us see some of the things against which points of order were made. They hardly seem to be so important that they will actually defeat the proper conduct of business. I wish I could go through all of them. Some of the points may be meritorious, but most of them are striking provisions of law which we should pass to help the work of the department and to carry on the job. I am just picking up the bill as I have it where points of order were made. The following was stricken out on a point of order:

> That reimbursements incident to the maintenance of commissary service authorized under this head shall be credited to the appropriation for this purpose current at the time obligations are incurred or such amounts are received.

That is a simple matter of business detail. To send it back to the legislative committee to be enacted would be a foolish procedure.

Such points of order obstruct good administration. The civil service law was very rigid and the Committee on Appropriations has found it quite desirable at times to waive some of those rigid rules by simple language in the bill. We in the House have voted on such provisions many, many times, and this House has always had the opportunity to vote on any such supplementing legislation. It is just common sense to do it in an appropriation bill and not refer such little

matters by the hundreds to some legislative committee.

Further, the laws requiring competitive bidding, the very thing that has been discussed here, have been too exacting. Unless something had been done about competitive bids in some of the appropriation bills it would have been necessary for items as low as 50 cents to require competitive bids or to go to a legislative committee for relief. If we can correct some little matters here with some wording in an appropriation bill, not affecting great matters of policy, what is the objection to having the House do it on an appropriation bill?

Let us look at the patient again. I am just taking these points of order as they come. Here is another provision that went out on a point of order:

> That all refunds, repayments, or other credits on account of funds disbursed under this head shall be credited to the appropriation for this purpose current at the time obligations are incurred or such amounts are received.

What in the world is the objection to having that in an appropriation bill and letting the House consider it? If it is not good practice we can debate it and take it out.

It seems to me that the Committee on Appropriations itself in making these points of order is really putting a great obstruction in the way of the proper drawing of bills providing money. We should not let things go through here where the executive is taking too much authority, but most of this stuff is comparatively trivial along the lines of executive duties, and it will expedite business to allow such legislation to remain in the bill. The Appropriations Committee should not only wish to save money, but should seek to act with departments in doing a better job.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret very much to have to quarrel with my colleagues about anything. But I cannot help feel a little resentful, inasmuch as I am a member of the subcommittee which has gone over this bill so carefully for so many weeks. I suppose almost every Member of the Congress knows what it means to work on and construct a bill of this kind. There is much money involved in it. There is much industry and work involved in it. Many times there is much history involved in it. We work for weeks and weeks and sometimes months, Members both on the Democratic side and the Republican side, to get out what we think is a bill which will best subserve the interests of our Nation, and then to have that bill attacked by the making of points of order against it, which the gentlemen who make them know is futile and they know they take legislation out of the hands of the House and often put it in the hands of the Senate. I asked my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, this question, and answer it myself, because I know the answer is correct. When these points of order are made against bills because there is no legislation which provides for the appropriation, of course, they go out. Everybody on the committee knows that. Everybody who has been here long enough to know anything about the rules of the House or the Senate knows it. When it goes out, what becomes of it? It goes over to the Senate and the Senate reinstates it. Then, when the conferees agree, as they will agree, and they rarely disagree it comes back to the House and it cannot be taken out by such a motion.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. RICH. If the House conferees would have backbone enough to say we will not allow it, and if the Democrats would stand with the minority Republicans, you will not find it in the legislation, and you will knock it out.

Mr. KERR. The conferees have just as much backbone, I suppose, as the average Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. RICH. I do not think they have.

Mr. KERR. Any intimation that they have not is a gratuitous remark and unworthy of any Member of this House.

Mr. RICH. No; I have been on the Committee on Appropriations. Many times I have gone into the committee, and I find that we have wishbones where our backbones ought to be.

Mr. KERR. Well, if you are criticizing your colleagues and your Congress, of which you are a Member, you are welcome to do so. I hope, however, the people of this Nation will not agree with you. A great majority of us are trying to do a good job.

Mr. RICH. I am criticizing some of the things that are done. You will find it is going to be a sorrowful time for this country when the taxes become so oppressive that the people can no longer pay them.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have said just what I have wanted to say. We are doing, I am inclined to say, a foolish thing; but I will not say it because I have such great respect for all the Members of this House, and especially the gentleman from Wisconsin, who is sitting before me, and of whom I think very highly.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. The gentleman did not answer my question a while ago. I have answered it for him.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry. I think the judge will remember my time had expired before I had an opportunity to answer him. But did I not answer the gentleman when I asked the question of the gentleman from Missouri? I will ask the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina now whether it is not a fact that any amendment which is placed in this bill by the Senate constitutes a Senate amendment; and are not the conferees required under rules of the House to bring those Senate amendments thus inserted back into the House in disagreement? Then, does not that permit, if it is desired on the part of the House 1 hour debate on each and every amendment that the Senate has put in?

Mr. KERR. That is correct, when there is a disagreement.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, there is a disagreement.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman knows when there is no disagreement it comes back to the House and this House cannot take it out on a point of order.

Mr. KEEFE. I think the gentleman is utterly in error on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a telephone call took me off the floor a few minutes and I missed a part of this interesting debate that has been in progress.

If I may have the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], did I understand the gentleman to say that if an item were brought back in a conference report, that was legislative in character, the House was powerless to take it out?

Mr. KERR. I said if the conferees agreed on it and it came back to this House, then you could not make any objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think we could. My understanding is that in a situation like that, if some Member of the House were opposed to a legislative item that was brought back in a conference report, the Member could object to the statement being read in lieu of the report, and call for the report itself to be read. Then, if in the reading an item legislative in character was found, a point of order would lie against the report.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The rule is that when the report is read, upon that objection a point of order lies to the whole report, and the whole report will go out on the point of order, if it contains legislation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Exactly. Consequently the normal practice is to bring back legislative items for a separate vote, even though the conferees may all be agreed intending to support a motion to concur.

Thus, it will be seen that the House is not powerless in a situation such as described. A member may object to the statement being read in lieu of the report and require the report to be read, and can then make his objection, so that the legislation is still within the control of the House.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, I respect the rights and privileges of legislative committees and I have no complaint to make of any Member of the House who makes points of order against an item which is not properly authorized.

I recall that about a year ago the entire Committee on Agriculture went before the Rules Committee and urged that a rule be not granted to the Appropriations Committee which at that time sought to bring before the House an appropriation for the Farm Security Administration. To the end that the House may be advised as to the activities of the Committee on Agriculture regarding

basic legislation for the Farm Security Administration, I desire to call attention to the fact that on May 24, 1944, I introduced H. R. 4876, and on June 23, 1944, the House Committee on Agriculture reported that bill to the House. The report is No. 1747. The committee, after full and careful consideration of all the provisions of that bill, reported it by a substantial majority vote, but unfortunately no action was taken upon the measure. Frankly, I think no action was taken because of the opposition of some of the farm organizations, not so much to the provisions of the bill, but on account of the fact that the bill did not go far enough and coordinate all of the lending agencies of the Government engaged in making loans to agriculture under one nonpartisan board.

Faced with that opposition, our committee did not ask for a rule on H. R. 4876. Prior to the time that bill was reported, or at or about that time, the House authorized our committee by select committee to investigate the entire farm credit structure with the idea of bringing in legislation such as might be indicated as desirable. That investigation unfortunately did not get under way or, rather, was not completed because of many things. As chairman of that subcommittee, I asked the Farm Credit Administration for a lot of information. It took weeks of effort by several people to prepare the information. I think I requested it in June, and the information was submitted to me in September. At that time all the Members of Congress were engaged in campaigns, we had a number of recesses, the Thanksgiving, Christmas, and other holidays intervened, and the committee was prevented from carrying through its investigation; but at this session of Congress the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] has indicated that the investigation will go forward and will be made by the full Committee on Agriculture. I introduced in the present session H. R. 2239 as a basis for study, and I wish to read the title of the bill into the RECORD at this time:

To simplify and improve credit services to farmers and promote farm ownership by abolishing certain agricultural lending agencies and functions, by transfering assets to the Farmers' Home Corporation, by enlarging the powers of the Farmers' Home Corporation, by authorizing Government insurance of loans to farmers, by creating preferences for loans and insured mortgages to enable veterants to acquire farms, by providing additional specific authority and directions with respect to the liquidation of resettlement projects and rural rehabilitation projects for resettlement purposes, and for other purposes.

I think it is a very worth-while piece of legislation and regret very much that we did not enact it during the last session of Congress, and that we are now faced with the fact that we have no basic legislation. Likewise, we have no specific direction with regard to the liquidation of many resettlement projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is the move going to be made here shortly to cut off debate? I have no objection to the gentleman's proceeding if some of the rest of us can be heard before the day is over.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman will be recognized. We had a lot of discussion on this subject yesterday and tossed some very good legislation out of the window.

Mr. RICH. I think it is about time somebody spoke about the bill or got consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is out of order. The gentleman from Michigan has the floor under a reservation of objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not yet understand the situation. Is an effort going to be made shortly to shut off debate?

Mr. RABAUT. Does the gentleman want some time?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do, if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Michigan and the Chairman.

Mr. RABAUT. I shall be very glad to see that the gentleman gets some time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Pending disposition of the bill authorizing appropriations for the Farm Security Administration, would the gentleman have any objection to the Committee on Appropriations' including an appropriation for the support of that agency in the coming agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. COOLEY. Personally, I have no objection whatever. I might say in that connection that I believe the present Administrator of the Farm Credit Administration has, as far as possible, put into effect the provisions of the bill which we reported during the last session. I think the gentleman himself probably was pleased with the report that Administrator Frank Hancock made to the Appropriations Committee on the progress that is being made in the directions indicated in that bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina that the subcommittee was much impressed by the report of the Administrator and the efficiency with which the work has been handled in his office.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, while, of course, I cannot speak for the Committee on Agriculture, I say frankly that I do not believe we have any right now to go before the Committee on Rules and insist upon the Appropriations Committee's not being given a rule to make an appropriation and provide money for an agency which is now back on the beam and apparently doing a good job, especially in view of the fact that our committee has failed to bring to the floor of this House basic legislation for that agency.

Mr. Chairman, I may say in conclusion that I hope that during the current session we will be able to agree upon basic legislation and that we will be able to make the agency function in the interest of the farmers of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if we can arrange for some time on this matter and close debate.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I want 5 minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section, including the time allotted the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if that is granted, will I get 5 minutes and 30 seconds?

Mr. RABAUT. There were only five Members standing.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, the minority Members of the House have no monopoly in trying to preserve the rules of the House. Time and time again I have seen Members of the majority rise and make points of order against provisions in appropriation bills. I am not in the habit of making a point of order against an item in an appropriation bill which I think is necessary, although I know it is subject to a point of order. Many, many times the minority also waive points of order. I do believe, and I think every fair-minded Member of this House will admit, that if a motion was made to strike out the language which just went out on a point of order and a vote taken, the majority of the Members of the House would vote to strike out the language. You cannot justify such a provision.

The language provides that the Attorney General could use a lump sum appropriation of over $3,000,000 to employ experts and so forth and pay them any amount he desired. Where is the legislator who wants to put legislation of that character on the statute books, no matter who the Government official may be that will make the appointment? As has been said here, and as I said when the gentleman from Wisconsin had the floor, the salary would be unlimited, the decision to be made by one man.

We have had a discussion about points of order being made against legislation on appropriation bills. I think most of the Members of the House know and have known for a number of years there

has been a movement on foot to try to change the rules so that some of the appropriation bills will go back to the legislative committees. I heard a half-dozen Members of the House speaking about that out in the hall this morning. I know chairmen of legislative committees here are continually advocating that. Part of the argument is predicated on the action of the Appropriations Committee in placing legislative riders on appropriation bills. There is quite a feeling on this subject.

If the Committee on Appropriations is going to continue to put legislation in appropriation bills, a movement of that kind is likely to spread. You may remember the situation that occurred here last year. We had been placing in the agricultural appropriation bill many items that were never authorized by law. So last year notice was served on the Committee on Agriculture that if they did not provide by law, those items are not going to be put in the agricultural appropriation bill because points of order would be made against the appropriations not authorized by law. What happened? The first time that I can remember—and I have been around here a long time—they brought in an omnibus bill with about two dozen authorizations in it. Well, of course, it was all for the farmers and naturally, with the great majority of the House representing rural constituencies, why the bill passed immediately. It went over to the Senate and it passed there. In that instance I would personally liked to have seen the items included in an agricultural appropriation bill, rather than the authorization bill, because some day you are going to have an economy wave and some of these appropriation bills are going to be drastically reduced.

If those items were in the appropriation bill and that authorization bill had not been passed, you could have eliminated them merely by making a point of order. Now you eliminate them individually by a vote or not at all.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman honestly think that we will ever have an economy wave in the House of Representatives?

Mr. COCHRAN. I think so. I know it is coming, but how soon I will not predict.

Mr. RICH. That is fine.

Mr. COCHRAN. I know it is coming. I am sure it is coming, because the time is going to arrive when it must come. As soon as this war is over, and probably before the war is over, it is going to be necessary that we eliminate as much as we possibly can of the appropriations that we are making for what you might call normal activities of the Government, and when that time comes I am going to vote for the reduction and so will the majority of the Members because the public will demand that you do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] certainly gives me hope. I always have a great deal of regard and respect for him, and his judgment is generally pretty good, and I hope that he is right in this instance, when he says we will get economy in government.

May I now say a word to my colleague from North Carolina, who had the floor a few minutes ago, a member of the Committee on Appropriations, in reference, to my criticism of the Committee on Appropriations, that the conferees should, when they bring a bill back to the House, have the backbone to insist on the position of the House in regard to language that was stricken from the bill on points of order, so that the Senate cannot write anything into the bill they would like to write into it.

I served on the Committee on Appropriations for a number of years. I want to tell you right here that we did not have the men from the House of Representatives who were conferees fighting to bring back here the economies that the House had in the will, but they agreed to too many things the Senate wanted, and that is the point that I object to. The House conferees did not have the will to fight. I do not think I am criticizing the membership of the House when I say that. The results speak for themselves. That might be the opinion of the individual Members of the House, but that is not the way to write an appropriation bill when the House has a bill that it passes and then agree to everything that the Senate wants to write into that bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Let me first answer the gentleman from Missouri, a member of the committee, before I do that. I notice that, according to the March 13 Treasury Department statement, they are in the red $235,259,000,000 and more.

For 15 years you have been going in the red, and I refer especially to the 10 years before the war, not wartime. I say to the Members of Congress, when they permit a deficit of a billion and a half to fifteen billions deficit a year to exist, and go on legislating with the idea of spend, spend, spend, you can bet your bottom dollar there is going to be a wreck ahead unless you get that economy I am talking about, because it will be a sad day for the American people when they get through paying the taxes, taxes, taxes that this administration has placed upon them.

I want to read an ad I saw that was put out by the American National Bank of Newport, Ky. Think of me quoting from a bank down South, but it is a good one:

SAVE

When I was just a little tot
I used to laugh and cry a lot,
A loving care my mother gave
But never taught me how to save.

As I grew older bye and bye
Tho' still a child I used to cry
For everything that children crave
But I was never taught to save.

When in my teens I couldn't see
Hardships of life ahead of me,
The easy road I tried to pave,
For I was never taught to save.

An old man now and almost done
You may tell this to your son:
If he would never be a slave,
To start today and learn to save.

MOTTO

'Tis not your earnings which really count
But what you save from that amount.

Let me say to the Congress that you should measure your cloth. You ought to know how much it is going to take to make the suit, and then you ought not to waste any of that cloth in order to make the suit. It is the same way when you want to spend; you ought to have the Appropriations Committee get together with the Ways and Means Committee. I have been advocating that for years. You ought to know how much you have to spend before you start to spend, because if you do not, you have to tax and tax and tax the people to get that money or else you have to borrow from them or in some manner make arrangements to get the money to pay the bills you are contracting. We must cut down on our spending or you can never reduce taxes. If you do, you go into bankruptcy.

I hope the prediction of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] comes true, that the House will become economy-minded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the majority expect the Members on the minority side, as the majority seem to expect them, to follow their advice, I, for one, wish they would get together and be consistent. I can read My Day. I can read the editorials in the Washington Post. I can come up here every day when the House is in session and listen with a great deal of pleasure, as I do, to the scoldings that are given us. My Day, the articles from the New Deal columnists, map a complete course for us to follow. Our thinking and conduct are outlined in detail. Some seem to think it a sin we do not blindly follow. Then after I have listened to and read what we should do, what I should do, have been told what I should do, along comes another Member from the other side, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] did today, and he says, "Well, you fellows are all right. That policy of making a point of order that a provision is legislation on an appropriation bill which you are following is legal and it is a sound one." So what is a poor Republican to do? We surely cannot follow both of the gentlemen from Missouri [Mr. CANNON and Mr. COCHRAN].

Now, go back to the argument of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the author of Cannon's Precedents, the great parliamentarian.

Remember that on the first day of the session the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], moved here and had the majority adopt the old Rules of the House. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] made no objection—found no fault. Now, when the Republicans go along under those rules, and, as they have a right to do, following the rule, make a point of order against a provision in this bill, up jumps the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and gives us a verbal spanking. He takes us, I would say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], right out in the woodshed, and

he does not use a slipper or a shingle; he gets a barrel stave and goes right after us. He is followed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], and each one reads us a lecture on the evils of following the rules which their party suspended. They are horrified because we exercise our right as Members of the House. It shows what a feeling of self-satisfaction has grown up here.

Now, the absurdity of the argument of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], when you analyze it, makes it ridiculous. He had as much to do with making the rules as anyone. He has as much to do with enforcing them as anyone. He knows very well that his party has control of the House. They can change the rules any time they wish. If legislation is needed for a useful purpose, they can get it. They have a clear majority of around 50. They do not need to ignore the law or violate the House rules to get an appropriation. The gentleman takes the position—I will strike that out—from his argument you might draw the inference that while he believes in the commandment "Thou shalt not steal," while he believes in the law which prevents stealing, he would, according to his argument—I will have to change that again—according to that argument, you could draw the inference—let me put it that way—you may steal a little if you do not steal too much. "You can make some objections," he says, "but do not make too many. In particular, do not make any objections which I do not think should be made." That is what his argument sums up to.

Then, he proceeds during 10 minutes to argue that because an item is stricken out here on a point of order and because it can be put in over in the other body, therefore, it becomes a law without opportunity for debate and without being considered on its merits by the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just a minute. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] knows better than anyone else, I think, he knows very well that when that item comes back here, it will be, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] twice, that there may be 1 hour's debate on each item and the House can then determine whether or not the item should go in. I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Which gentleman from Missouri do you refer to?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], and not the writer of the rules or the author of the precedents. I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], the great economy expert for his announcement that he believes we must begin to practice economy. I hope at least a few Members of his own party will go with him on that.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will yield, I will.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to thank the gentleman for agreeing with the Republicans that ultimately we will have to have some economy. I cannot agree with him in his statement that we are going broke, as the country boy would say, "busted." We are there now; as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has so often pointed out. What gets me, and what makes it so difficult for me to follow the gratuitous advice which comes in such volume from that side, is that while they applaud his statements about economy, while they preach economy, they go right on spending day after day, billions upon billions of dollars, not only in this country, but by means of the fund and the bank which is to be created internationally where we are to kick in something like $5,500,000,000 for the benefit of the folks abroad. Why, it has gotten so bad that in the other body the other day a gentleman rose there, a member of the majority party, and he declared, think of it now—I hope that Walter Winchell does not hear of it—but he declared they were going to feed America first because the gentleman from Mississippi said they could not get salt pork in his State for the farmers. And because that was one of the principal items of food, the farmers lacking it could not work. I am glad to welcome the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], into the ranks of those who believe in economy as applied to governmental affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my chief reason for taking the floor at this time is because I am one of those who made points of order and offered amendments to this bill. We have just had a lengthy discussion and some criticism with respect to this matter. I recall very well a few days ago the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House made a very splendid talk in which he asked the Members of the House to be present on the floor, to scan the bill carefully, and to be sure to offer amendments where we thought they should be offered, and make any suggestions or points of order which were in order. I was glad to hear him and have today, tried to follow his admonition. It was said yesterday by a member of the committee that in offering amendments I was attempting to put the chairman of the subcommittee behind the 8-ball and things of that kind. I was really and sincerely trying to save the people of this country some money, when I offered amendments to cut down certain items, including an item of several hundred thousand dollars to buy liquor to pay for parties given by our representatives abroad. I did not think the people of this country wanted to pay for such extravagance. Not all points of order were made on the minority side, although almost all of them were. One of the minority members of the committee yesterday, I believe, made a point of order which was sustained by the Chair with respect to a part of the bill that is now before us. What I want to say is this: Let us find out now, whether we are going to follow the regular procedure or not. I think this discussion today has been worth while. Is this great Committee on Appropriations going to continue to bring expenditures to the floor of this House, in violation of the rules and without authority of law, or is the House going to expect this committee to comply with the rules and the statutes. If they are not expected to comply, then why not repeal the rules that were made to safeguard legislation? These departments, who ask for these unauthorized appropriations, know they are not in compliance with law, and should go to the proper committees and get authorization, and not try to short-circuit this House. It just is not right.

Some of us who are not members of the Committee on Appropriations have been wondering about this very problem, that this great committee, the largest committee in the House, a committee that commands the respect on both sides of the aisle, does bring legislation to this floor, and advocates it, and then when a point of order is made, they admit the point of order, and the matter goes out. Let us find out whether we are going to follow the regular procedure; whether we are going to follow the law that has been passed by the Congress with respect to this thing or whether we are expected to come to the floor, offer points of order, and then when we make points of order to be criticized severely for doing so, even to the extent of being charged with frustrating the committee, as was done by a member of the committee yesterday. Let us find out whether you want these appropriations authorized or whether you do not. If you are going to leave it to the great Appropriations Committee to bring authorizations to the floor and pay no attention to the law, that is one thing, but if we are going to have the regular procedure, let us do that. Let us find out where we are, and then go at this thing in a sensible way.

Of course, the very unfortunate thing about it is that if we follow the procedure here and measures go to the other body, they pay no attention to our action, but in many instances put the provisions that the House rejected right back in the bill and send them back as the legislation of that body, and not subject to points of order. Then the only way we can get at them, of course, is by voting on each one of them separately.

I think the distinguished chairman of the committee offered the criticism that we do not debate these items that come before us when they go out on a point of order. The difficulty is that if we proceed to debate them, then under the rules we lose the right to make a point of order because the Chair would then hold, and, of course, rightly so, that the point of order comes too late.

So I say let us clarify this thing once and for all. Let us follow the law, unless this House wants to do differently. There are a great many items in this bill which in my judgment should be stricken out on points of order or on motion, if we want to save some money for the Treasury and not interfere with the war effort.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Michigan who has studied this problem, who has made speeches on the floor with respect to it. I would like to have his suggestions and advice as to how we can cure this situation once and for all.

Mr. MICHENER. At the fear of repetition, may I suggest if the Appropriations Committee and subcommittees thereof would state to the departments, "We will not include any items you ask for unless you first get authority of law," the problem of the committee would be solved, and this annual farce would be eliminated. It rests within the power of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The contribution of the distinguished Member from Michigan is appreciated. The departments ought to be told they should go before the proper legislative committees and have their requests justified before asking the Appropriations Committee to consider them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee is a conscientious member of the Committee on Appropriations. I have found that to be true during my service in the past 2 years; but I do not yield to him in my desire likewise to render conscientious service to the Congress as a member of that influential committee.

I regret that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] a few minutes ago saw fit to impugn the good faith of the Member of the House who happens to be the speaker, who made a point or order against the item on page 29 of this bill providing for an appropriation of $1,390,000 for cultural relations with China and countries in the Near East and Africa. The chairman accused me of rendering lip service to our good ally. I say to the chairman he is rendering lip service to our rules of the House and to constitutional procedure in this body. So he was somewhat confused in the insinuations which he made.

May I say, particularly for his information, that we have in this body a Committee on Foreign Affairs, and I believe that when any far-reaching program, embracing cultural or any other relations with our allies or with any other countries is considered, if should rightfully and constitutionally be considered by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. So I think I am taking a definite stand in defense of the House rules.

The membership of this body may be interested in knowing why this question is being raised, and why it was raised last week. It is primarily because the independent offices appropriation bill for 1945 carried the so-called Russell amendment, which sought to end the practice which has grown up during wartime whereby the Chief Executive has made Executive orders the basis for appropriations in this body. The Russell amendment provides that any agency which has been in existence 1 year must come to Congress for appropriations—instead of operating on allocations from the President's emergency funds. That is why we now find these various appropriation bills containing these items of appropriations for agencies which have never been authorized by any legislative committee of the House of Representatives.

And so I resent the imputation of the chairman of this subcommittee that I or any other Member who objects to any provision of this bill is merely paying lip service to China or to any other ally. I will take my stand in defense of constitutional procedure. We have a House Manual and Rules of Procedure, we have a Parliamentarian, and every member of the Appropriations Committee should know that the only way we can make constitutional progress is by having government by law and not government by the whim or caprice of executives in these various departments of the Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not the substance of the argument this: "We want it, and it does not make any difference how we get it just so we get it"?

Mr. DWORSHAK. That may be the objective of some Members of this body, but certainly I shall not impugn their motives.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield briefly.

Mr. JONES. I wonder if the gentleman noticed in last Saturday's Evening Star the announcement that the Foreign Economic Admfnistration had just completed an industrialization post-war program for China that would cost $20,000,000,000? If that is the kind of program being executed by the F. E. A. then certainly the amount that would be knocked out of this bill by the gentleman's point of order would warrant the gentleman's action in making the point of order.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes; I believe the House Committee on Foreign Affairs is qualified to consider such a far-reaching program, and I sincerely hope that before we provide appropriations for such so-called cultural relations, with China or any other United Nation, the procedure be in complete accord with the rules of this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired; all time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, War Division: For all salaries and expenses in the District of Columbia and elsewhere necessary for the enforcement of acts relating to the national security and war effort and in connection with the registration and control of alien enemies, including the employment fo experts; supplies and equipment; printing and binding; travel expenses, including attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; stenographic reporting services by contract; books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers (not exceeding $4,000), $390,000.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph for the reason that on page 40, lines 2 and 3, the following language is carried:

Including attendance at meetings of the organizations concerned with the purposes of this appropriation—

On the ground that it is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. This item is "Salaries and expenses, War Division." There could not be any better name for this relationship to the war.

We concede the point of order if they wish to eliminate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a short statement at this point of the record. The designation of the preceding item is a misnomer. It is called salaries and expenses, War Division. A request came to us for $670,000 for this item, but the committee cut it down to $390,000. In my opinion, the committee cut out only the amount that had theretofore been provided for this agency through transfer of funds from the Foreign Economic Administration. If these services were performed they were performed with transferred funds.

I call further attention to the fact that a portion of the work of this division, is in regard to reviewing the files of enemy aliens. According to the testimony of Mr. Hoover of the F. B. I. and the testimony of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, alien-enemy work is practically over. The remainder of the work justified in this particular item is for the coordination of State laws on execution of wills or on making the State statutes conform to the ideas of the Attorney General.

These are items of questionable value and I made a point of order against the entire provision because I want to have an opportunity when it comes back to the House in the form of a conference report if the Senate approves this paragraph, to have a separate vote on it and to go into the value of the entire item more thoroughly.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, may I say that if we were proceeding in order the gentleman was not in order in his statement because he should, under the rules, confine himself to the last word. Let us observe the rules on both sides of the House from now on.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miscellaneous salaries and expenses, field: For salaries not otherwise specifically provided for (not to exceed $160,000), and for such other expenses for the field service, Department of Justice, including travel expenses, experts, and notarial fees or like services and stenographic work in taking depositions, at such rates of compensation as may be authorized or approved by the Attorney General, or his administrative assistant, so much as may be necessary in the discretion of the Attorney General for such expenses in the District of Alaska, and in courts other than Federal courts; patent applications and contested proceedings involving inventions; firearms and ammunition therefor; purchase of lawbooks, including exchange thereof, and

the Federal Reporter and continuations thereto as issued, $400,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning with the word "at", line 12, and ending with the word "courts", in line 17.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses of marshals, etc.: For salaries, fees and expenses of United States marshals, deputy marshals, and clerical assistants, including services rendered in behalf of the United States or otherwise; services in Alaska in collecting evidence for the United States when so specifically directed by the Attorney General; traveling expenses, including the actual and necessary expenses incident to the transfer of prisoners in the custody of United States marshals to narcotic farms without regard to the provisions of the act approved January 19, 1929 (21 U. S. C. 227); purchase, when authorized by the Attorney General, of two motor-propelled passenger-carrying vans at not to exceed $2,000 each; and maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, $3,980,000: *Provided*, That United States marshals and their deputies may be allowed, in lieu of actual expenses of transportation, not to exceed 4 cents per mile for the use of privately owned automobiles when traveling on official business within the limits of their official station.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language in line 11, running down into line 13, which reads as follows: "without regard to the provisions of the act approved January 19, 1929 (21 U. S. C. 27)" on the ground that it is amendatory of existing law.

Mr. RABAUT. We concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language in line 17, beginning with the word *"Provided"* to the end of the paragraph, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. We concede the point of order, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Fees of witnesses: For expenses, mileage, and per diems of witnesses and for per diems in lieu of subsistence, such payments to be made on the certification of the attorney for the United States and to be conclusive as provided by section 846, Revised Statutes (28 U. S. C. 577), $700,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $25,000 of this amount shall be available for such compensation and expenses of witnesses or informants as may be authorized or approved by the Attorney General or his administrative assistant, which approval shall be conclusive: *Provided further*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be used to pay any witness more than one attendance fee for any one calendar day, which fee shall not exceed $1.50 except in the District of Alaska: *Provided further*, That whenever an employee of the United States performs travel in order to appear as a witness on behalf of the United States in any case involving the activity in connection with which such person is employed, his travel expenses in connection therewith shall be payable from the appropriation otherwise available for the travel expenses of such employee.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language appearing on page 43, line 5, reading "or his administrative assistant" on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order. May I say that the appropriation for this item in 1936 was $2,100,000. The amount suggested in this bill for 1946 is $750,000. This will bring to the attention of the Committee the savings that have been attempted to be made by the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, detection and prosecution of crimes: For the detection and prosecution of crimes against the United States; for the protection of the person of the President of the United States; the acquisition, collection, classification, and preservation of identification and other records and their exchange with the duly authorized officials of the Federal Government, of States, cities, and other institutions; for such other investigations regarding official matters under the control of the Department of Justice and the Department of State as may be directed by the Attorney General; personal services in the District of Columbia; hire, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; purchase at not to exceed $7,000 of one, and maintenance and operation of not more than four armored automobiles; firearms and ammunition; stationery, supplies, floor coverings, equipment, and telegraph, teletype, and telephone service; not to exceed $10,000 for taxicab hire to be used exclusively for the purposes set forth in this paragraph; traveling expenses, including the cost of a compartment or such other accommodations as may be authorized by the Director for security when authorized personnel are required to transport secret documents or hand baggage containing highly technical and valuable equipment, and including expenses, in an amount not to exceed $4,500, of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of such Bureau when authorized in writing by the Attorney General; not to exceed $1,500 for membership in the International Criminal Police Commission; payment of rewards when specifically authorized by the Attorney General for information leading to the apprehension of fugitives from justice; and not to exceed $20,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General, who shall make a certificate of the amount of such expenditure as he may think it advisable not to specify, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended; $7,900,000.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to make inquiry as to why it is that nobody has made a point of order against the language in this particular paragraph. There are one or two places in this paragraph where a point of order could be raised. They are remarkably silent across the aisle now. I should like to know the reason why.

The Clerk read as follows:

None of the funds appropriated for the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall be used to pay the compensation of any civil-service employee.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have just finished reading the section making appropriations for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. As ranking minority member of this subcommittee, I wish to state that the testimony brought to the committee and the justifications which were made for those appropriations by the very efficient staff of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, led by the Director, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, were unusually complete. The printed hearings disclose this fact. I urge you to read them. The Department has returned to the Treasury of the United States millions of dollars. Its work is so effective that it has earned and won the admiration and confidence of the entire country. In answer to the question propounded by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, I call attention that limitations are placed on expenditures for the F. B. I. They are controlled. I can also say that I voice the sentiment of the minority, that we have great faith and confidence in J. Edgar Hoover and the Department known as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which he so ably directs. I know that the chairman of the majority and his colleagues join me in this view.

The Clerk read, as follows:

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses, Immigration and Naturalization Service: For all expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the administration and enforcement of the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and alien registration; including personal services in the District of Columbia; care, detention, maintenance, transportation, and other expenses incident to the deportation, removal, and exclusion of aliens in the United States and to, through, or in foreign countries; payment of rewards; stationery, supplies, floor coverings, equipment, and telegraph, teletype, and telephone services; traveling expenses, including attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; purchase (not to exceed 150), hire, maintenance, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; purchase (not to exceed one), maintenance and operation of aircraft; firearms and ammunition; lawbooks, citizenship textbooks for free distribution, books of reference, and periodicals, including the exchange thereof; refunds of head tax, maintenance bills, immigration fines, and other items properly returnable, except deposits of aliens who become public charges and deposits to secure payment of fines and passage money; mileage and fees of witnesses subpenaed on behalf of the United States; stenographic reporting services by contract; and operation, maintenance, remodeling, and repair of buildings and the purchase of equipment incident thereto; $21,000,000: *Provided*, That the Attorney General may transfer to, or reimburse, any other department, agency, or office of Federal, State, or local governments, funds in such amounts as may be necessary for salaries and expenses incurred by them in rendering authorized assistance to the Department of Justice in connection with the administration and enforcement of said laws: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes or section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (40 U. S. C. 278a), when authorized or approved by the Attorney General, for the acquisition of or alterations, improvements, and repairs to premises for detention of alien enemies, including the construction of temporary buildings, and for all necessary expenses, including household equipment, incident to the

maintenance, care, detention, surveillance, parole, and transportation of alien enemies and their wives and dependent children, including transportation and other expenses in the return of such persons to place of bona fide residence or to such other place as may be authorized by the Attorney General, advance of cash to aliens for meals and lodging while en route, and for the payment of wages to alien enemy detainees for work performed under conditions prescribed by the Geneva Convention: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $30,000 of this appropriation may be expended for the employment of personnel, exclusive of attorneys, without regard to the Civil Service Act and regulations or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and not to exceed $5,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General, who shall make a certificate of the amount of any such expenditure the purpose of which he may think it advisable not to specify, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further,* That the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization may contract with officers and employees for the use, on official business, of privately owned horses: *Provided further,* That provisions of law prohibiting or restricting the employment of aliens in the Government service shall not apply to the employment of interpreters in the Immigration and Naturalization Service (not to exceed 10 permanent and such temporary employees as are required from time to time) where competent citizen interpreters are not available.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 47, in lines 22, 23, and 24, "including attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation." I make the point of order on the ground that it imposes an expenditure not authorized by law.

In that connection, I invite attention to the fact that there is some difference between this language and that which was proposed for attendance at meetings in connection with the F. B. I. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] asked why no points of order were not made against the section relating to the F. B. I. In that section, where the language made money available for attendance at meetings, it carried a limitation of $4,500 as a total, which should not be exceeded. It further provided that attendance at meetings would only be when authorized in writing by the Attorney General. In the pending section, however, there is no limitation of any sort whatsoever. Therefore I make the point of order.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, it appears to me this is an item of regular expense in carrying out the provisions of this law and it does not require a separate act.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. To refresh the memory of the Members, I would state that in connection with the consideration of the Independent Offices appropriation bill, among the legislative provisions there proposed was one to establish a general blanket authorization for attendance at meetings, both at home and abroad, without any restrictions. The question was raised at that time and it was recognized that attendance at meetings in this broad sense, without any limitation, without any regard to whether they were at home or abroad, was a new legislative provision, and consequently called for action by the House.

Mr. RABAUT. As I understand, it went out of the Independent Offices appropriation bill because it covered other appropriations.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That was also involved, that is true.

Mr. RABAUT. And that is all that was involved, I will say to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to ask the gentleman from Michigan, does the gentleman have any authority in law that he can cite specifically authorizing this type of activity for this type of appropriation?

Mr. RABAUT. Here is an item for the Immigration and Naturalization Service. This is a normal function under that service. I have no citations of law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has no authority that would indicate that such attendance at meetings is authorized?

Mr. RABAUT. No; I have not, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the fact that the gentleman is unable to supply the Chair with specific authorization for such language in the appropriation, the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order made by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing between line 18, page 48, beginning with the word "provided" and ending on line 24 with the word "premises" on the ground that it is legislation not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. We concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning with the word "provided" in line 10, on page 49, and ending with the word "expended" in line 21 on the ground that it is an appropriation not authorized by law.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: On page 47, line 25, after the words "operation of" insert the word "used."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will have the effect of requiring cars purchased by the Immigration and Naturalization Service to be used cars. It will be noted that the language of the bill proposes to make funds available for "the purchase of (not to exceed 150), for the hire, maintenance and operation of motor-propelled, passenger-carrying vehicles."

About January 1, the announcement was made that there were 15,000 new cars left in the country—only 15,000 new cars to satisfy the entire needs of the country—only 15,000 new cars in the entire country.

We considered this matter in the bill providing funds for the civil functions of the War Department and inserted in that bill the word "used" so that on certain work of the Army engineers they would be allowed to purchase only used automobiles. In that connection we noted that the War Department itself was offering surplus cars for sale in various parts of the country and we thought it would only be appropriate that where used cars would be satisfactory that the appropriation be restricted to the purchase of used cars. We made that applicable to only one branch of the Army engineers at the time the bill passed the house. But in the other body I notice by reading the report of the Senate committee on the bill that they expanded that idea and inserted the word "used" in three other places.

It occurs to me that if we are going to recognize this new-car and used-car situation and limit the War Department in its civil functions to the acquisition of used cars only, that it would be appropriate to do it here. It will be noted that here is an appropriation for the purchase of 150 cars. That is 1 percent of all the new cars in the country as of January 1. This is for the Immigration and Naturalization Service. If the Army engineers can function with used cars it seems to me the Immigration Service can likewise.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Why limit it to used cars when you are compelling them exclusively to use used cars?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Because we did it in the bill in which the gentleman participated in preparing, the bill covering the civil functions of the War Department.

I can conceive cases in which new cars should be used; for instance by the Department of Justice in tracking down criminals. They would need some new cars; but we should try to limit these appropriations to the purchase of used cars wherever possible.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Does the gentleman desire to give used cars to the members of the border patrol? Would he give them some old jalopies that would break down when put to the test? If there is one thing I pride myself on it is my knowledge of automobiles. An old car is more expensive to operate than a new one.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I must refuse to yield further. If these were the only cars that the Immigration and Naturalization were able to use, the argument of the gentleman from Michigan might be correct, but there is nothing in the evidence to indicate that the Immigration and Naturalization Service is entirely without cars or that all of its cars are worn out and not capable of good service. Here is a proposal for the purchase of 150 additional cars and it seems to me that we ought to recognize the situation. A Member on the floor calls my attention

to the fact that the latest estimate shows only 10,000 new cars in the country at this time. Certainly we ought to preserve some of those for use by higher priorities. Your folks back home are not able to buy new cars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. Chairman, down on the Mexican border we are not only using fine, fast new cars but the Service actually have in operation down there at the present time an airplane. Four thousand people have been apprehended on the border through the alertness of this department during the first 6 months of this fiscal year.

A few moments ago right in this same bill the same gentlemen watching so closely for the purpose of checking what might be cut out passed over an item for 200 cars for the F. B. I., and they were new cars. Nobody said a word about that because the committee felt that so far as the F. B. I. is concerned, if it needed 200 cars it should have them.

The security of this country is at stake and if the Immigration and Naturalization Service needs new cars they ought to have them and we ought to quit playing politics with these items on the floor of the House today.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section end in 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman is a little disturbed, unduly so, by what has taken place earlier on the floor, when he uses the words "playing politics."

Mr. RABAUT. I may say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Michigan is also human. This is the third day of debate for no apparent purpose than to take advantage of technicalities.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman certainly is not personal in his references when I offer an amendment of this type.

Mr. RABAUT. There have been any number of amendments offered to this bill, which are coming back from the Senate in increased amounts. If the gentleman will review the appropriation records he will find that the amounts curtailed in the House are greater when compared with the actions of the other body. Today we have had points of order, some of them very picayunish. We are knocking out one little line after another and I cannot regard it as anything else, especially when you pass over a division in which legislation was called to the attention of the Members who have been making points of order in connection with other divisions, and let it pass without a word. If that is not politics I do not know politics when I see it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On this particular matter, when the bill comes back from the Senate, may I say that the gentleman perhaps missed the point I made in my remarks. In the Civil Functions bill we applied this used-car idea and when the bill came back the word "used" was inserted in three other instances.

Mr. RABAUT. That is one that stands out like a sore thumb and the gentleman can cite it at once, but go back and look at the record and you will find that the savings have been effected in the House on the basis of work done by a subcommittee on appropriations. The big surprise of the whole thing is that the majority of the fight against the bill that is now being considered on the floor of the House is raised by members of the Appropriations Committee on the minority side who sat downstairs in the full committee and never said a word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 5 minutes. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the gentleman in charge of this bill lost his temper and accused the Republicans of making political attacks on this bill. I am sorry that he is unable to recognize constructive efforts to do away with things that are bad practice on the part of the Government. If he would address himself to any particular item which has been attacked, I am sure that the Member who made the point of order would be glad to support the reasons why he made it in the interest of the Government. I raised one or two points of order myself. There is absolutely no dispute and no possibility of dispute that those points of order ought to be made. The gentleman referred to one item in connection with the Bureau of Investigation where points of order were not made. In that instance there were limitations that controlled the amount that might be allowed, whereas in the other instances where the points of order were made there were not.

It is about time that the chairman of the subcommittee began to follow the bill and recognize the merits of those points of order and try as best he may, if the other body should be so prone as to insert the same language again, to correct that language before he attempts to bring it back to the House.

I hope that the gentleman from Michigan will pursue a constructive attitude and not simply a destructive attitude.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the House—and I can say "Members of the House" because I do not believe we have 50 Members on the floor right now—we are here talking about spending money of the Federal Government.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 44]

Baldwin, N. Y.	Fulton	Norton
Bates, Mass.	Gardner	Pfeifer
Bennet, N. Y.	Geelan	Quinn, N. Y.
Bloom	Gordon	Ramey
Boren	Gossett	Rayfiel
Buckley	Green	Reed, Ill.
Bunker	Hagen	Reed, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Hall,	Robinson, Utah
Celler	Edwin Arthur	Rogers, N. Y.
Cole, Mo.	Hand	Scrivner
Combs	Hébert	Sikes
Courtney	Heidinger	Simpson, Pa.
Curley	Hobbs	Slaughter
Curtis	Izac	Smith, Maine
Daughton, Va.	Johnson,	Taylor
Dawson	Lyndon B.	Thom
De Lacy	Kunkel	Thomas, N. J.
Dickstein	LeCompte	Tibbott
Dirksen	LeFevre	Wadsworth
Eaton	Luce	Weaver
Ellis	McKenzie	Weiss
Ellsworth	Madden	West
Elsaesser	Morgan	White
Flood	Morrison	Whitten
Fogarty	Mott	Wood
Fuller	Murphy	Woodrum, Va.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2603, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 354 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a brief statement. I had nothing whatsoever to do with making the quorum call, but in view of the fact that the parliamentary situation is such that immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania we will have a vote on an amendment. I would like very briefly to state what that amendment is.

All it proposes to do is to insert the word "used" in the clause where the Immigration Division is given funds for the purchase of 150 cars. Evidence has come out that there are only 10,000 new cars in the country. They just will not go around. The Department of the Interior, I understand, is asking for 900 cars and other agencies are asking for many more. In the civil-functions bill we have already provided that the purchase of cars by the Army engineers should be restricted to used cars. So I offered here an amendment to insert the word "used"

and I hope favorable action will be taken at the conclusion of the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I can assure you it was not my fault that the roll was called which brought you back here on the floor, because I do not think that many of you would want to come here to hear me talk economy in government.

I rise in opposition to the statement that was made by the chairman of the subcommittee on appropriations when he accused us of playing politics when, as a matter of fact, we were trying to cut down these appropriations. May I say to the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that when the conferees are appointed, if the Democratic members will work with the Republican conferees, and they in turn will work with the Senate conferees who are desirous of cutting down this appropriation to where it ought to be cut down, I will not fear any trouble from the report that is going to be brought back to the House when the conferees have finished their job.

I take exception to the statement that we are playing politics, when we work hard and we try to knock out of this appropriation bill provisions, by making points of order to any section or any subsection of the bill in order that we can save money. That is the only way that I find that we can knock anything out of the bill or cut down expenses. I have offered so many amendments to appropriation bills, not only this year, but for the 10 years in which I was a Member of the House. When I left the House a few years ago, I never could get very far then, because the majority of the House was such that there were anywhere from 50 to 200 more Members on the Democratic side of the aisle than there were over on the other side. I do not believe that anybody can attribute to me these great expenditures of Government funds. I have always been for economy in government. I am here to fight and I am going to fight in every way I know how for economy in government, and if any of you Members on that side want to raise the point of no quorum in the House so that we will have more than 50 Members, that is all right with me. I think we should have the Members present to see how they spend.

Mr. RABAUT. I wonder if the gentleman would permit me to say that the reason we have used cars——

Mr. RICH. The gentleman can get his own time to answer that.

Mr. RABAUT. There is no time left.

Mr. RICH. Then I cannot yield to him. I say, let these departments here use some of these jeeps that they have lying around. The Government is selling thousands and thousands of jeeps, and you can buy them for $10, $15, or $20 apiece. I say do not sell those jeeps; keep them for the Treasury Department; keep them for all of the departments of the Government, and if we do that, then we will have transportation for these men to get around the country. Let us save what we have. Let us stop taxing the people.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CASE of South Dakota) there were—ayes 77, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, penal and correctional institutions: For salaries and expenses for the support of prisoners, and the maintenance and operation of Federal penal and correctional institutions and the construction of buildings at prison camps; expenses of interment or transporting remains of deceased inmates to their relatives or friends in the United States; expenses of transporting persons released from custody of the United States to place of conviction or arrest or place of bona fide residence within the United States or to such place within the United States as may be authorized by the Attorney General, and the furnishing of suitable clothing and, in the discretion of the Attorney General, an amount of money not to exceed $30, regardless of length of sentence; purchase of not to exceed 14 passenger-carrying automobiles; purchase of 1 bus at not to exceed $20,000; maintenance and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Federal Prison System when authorized in writing by the Attorney General; traveling expenses, including traveling expenses of members of advisory boards authorized by law incurred in the discharge of their official duties; furnishing of uniforms and other distinctive wearing apparel necessary for employees in the performance of their official duties; newspapers, books, and periodicals; firearms and ammunition; purchase and exchange of farm products and livestock, $13,300,000: *Provided*, That any part of the appropriations under this heading used for payment of salaries of personnel employed in the operation of prison commissaries shall be reimbursed from commissary earnings, and such reimbursement shall be in addition to the amounts appropriated herein: *Provided further*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not be construed to apply to any purchase or service rendered under this appropriation when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $500: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $35,000 of this appropriation shall be available for the acquisition of land adjacent to any Federal penal or correctional institution when, in the opinion of the Attorney General, the additional land is essential to the protection of the health or safety of the institution.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on page 51, beginning with *"Provided"*, in line 15, and extending to the end of line 3, on page 52, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. We concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I hope those communistic crackpots throughout the United States who are clamoring for a totalitarian system in this country will read the speech of Prime Minister Churchill in the House of Commons on yesterday. We have been told by Earl Browder and probably by Sidney Hillman or his close associates, by PM and the Daily Worker, and that lunatic fringe of our population, that we are headed for a communistic or totalitarian state. They have been using as an argument that the British Empire was going to become Communist and adopt the totalitarian system.

As far as its economic and its governmental effect are concerned, about the only difference between fascism and communism is that difference we find in malaria patients. One of them is a fever and the other is the chill of a dying civilization. They are both symptoms of the same disease.

On yesterday, Prime Minister Churchill, in the House of Commons, it seems to me, so far as he and the intelligent element of the British Empire are concerned, put to rest that argument which is being made by those Trotsky-ites who have infiltrated into the United States and into Great Britain, to the effect that they are going to establish a communistic or a totalitarian state in Great Britain when this war is over.

Mr. Churchill said:

If we are to recover from the measureless exertions of the war, it can only be by a large release from the necessary bonds and controls which war conditions have imposed upon us.

Yet, these practical elements in this country, which are knifing the Congress, and that the smear bund represent on the radio and in the press, are advocating permanent control by the Government of every phase of American life.

Mr. Churchill further said:

No restriction upon well-established liberties that is not proved indispensable to the prosecution of the war and the transition from war to peace can be tolerated.

Our system of Government is based upon the fundamental principles of the Christian religion. Out of it grew the common law, the greatest system of jurisprudence the world has ever known. Out of that grew the Constitution of the United States with its sacred Bill of Rights—"the greatest document ever struck at a given time by the brain and purpose of man," as Gladstone once said.

That is what we are fighting to perpetuate for our children and our children's children. These boys who are coming home, many of whom are sitting in the gallery today, wounded, bearing the scars of conflict, are expecting you and me to maintain the Constitution of the United States and the American way of life, just as Prime Minister Churchill and those great Englishmen propose to

maintain that system in the British Empire when this war is over.

Control for control's sake—

Says Mr. Churchill—

is senseless.

I wonder if you will see that statement in PM tomorrow? I wonder if you will see that in Earl Browder's speech next week? I wonder if you will see that statement in the Communist Daily Worker or hear Walter Winchell or Drew Pearson spout it over the radio?

Control for control's sake is senseless—

Continues Mr. Churchill—

Controls under the pretext of war or its aftermath which are, in fact, designed to favor the accomplishment of a totalitarian system, however innocently designed or whatever guise they take, whatever liveries they wear, whatever slogans they mouth, are fraud which should mercilessly be exposed to the British public.

Those are the sentiments of the patriotic Americans whose sons are fighting the battles of this war, and of those sons who are offering up their lives for our American institutions.

While the British are saving their institutions and their way of life, let us see to it that our form of government and our way of life are preserved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi has made reference to the speech delivered yesterday by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. I read something about that speech myself. Of course, I am in accord with what the gentleman from Mississippi had to say about there being no sense in control for control's sake. I agree with that heartily. The only controls that can be justified are those which promote justice or protect the weak or the handicapped in their human rights or are essential to preserve to the people the fruits of their own labor or the benefits of the bounty of God. I also agree with him that so far as the fundamental principles of America, the principles of constitutional government, of liberty and opportunity and fair dealing, are concerned, it is the duty of every Member of this House to preserve those things for the returning veterans of this terrible war.

But, since, Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister has been mentioned, I cannot refrain from saying this about his speech, and as I do so, I expect I shall be in disagreement, not only with the Prime Minister of Great Britain, but also with some of the organs of opinion which the gentleman from Mississippi mentioned in his speech.

As I understood the Prime Minister's answer to a question directed to him by a member of the House of Commons, he said that there were to be two different classifications of nations in the world. He said that it was proposed to treat the greatest nations in a different manner from that in which smaller nations are treated. If I understand the aims and purposes of these United States, if I understand the ideals upon which this Nation has been founded, the voice of America will be raised not for two classifications of nations, but for one. The voice of America and her influence will be exerted at San Francisco and beyond, that all nations and peoples great and small, may stand together on a plane of substantial equality in this world, with the rights of all preserved. Yes, and the American people will stand on the principle that neither great nations, nor small ones, shall be above the law or free of obligation to contribute, in proportion to their strength to the peace of the world and the hope of freedom of all peoples.

If I understand the deep will of the people of the United States it is that, to keep faith with our honored dead, we will insist insofar as power lies within us that great nations, as well as small ones, shall be subject to such restraints as world organization to preserve peace and world opinion as a whole may place upon their actions, to the end that the world may not be plunged into the holocaust of war again.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not disagree with the gentleman on that point, but I was talking about control of our own internal affairs.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understood what the gentleman meant. I have said what I had to say. I say it with respect for the Prime Minister of Great Britain, but I say it as an American. I say it also with earnest reverence to the great speech that was delivered on the floor of this House yesterday by the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD. For what he said for China will, I profoundly hope and believe, be said by millions of Americans on behalf of every smaller nation in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to address the House because of the fact that we have a considerable audience present at this moment.

I want to address myself on the subject of county jails, inasmuch as we are considering at this time the Federal system of prisons. I said the other day the county jails of the Nation are a cancer, for the most part, upon the American Government.

Let me give you an example of what is happening in these jails. On December 24, 1944, the eve of the great festival commemorating the birth of our Saviour, young John Emberg, a sensitive boy of 16, was brought to the King County jail in Seattle, Wash. He was booked only for delinquency. He was placed in the so-called juvenile section of the jail, which later investigation showed to be a hellhole of brutality and perversion. He was then promptly forgotten. He was not even given a preliminary hearing. Before anyone got around to his case his lifeless body was found—the victim of a brutal and sadistic murder by other inmates of the jail. During the month he was forgotten and held without a hearing he was persecuted, literally tortured and subjected to the most atrocious indignities, and finally beaten to death by other stronger boys because he refused to participate in their bestial activities. He was frequently tried by the "kangaroo court," which was permitted to operate in the jail, because he would not engage in their orgies. He was tied to the bars with his feet high, the weight of his body resting on the back of his neck on the floor, and cigarettes and matches were burned between his toes. After 3 weeks of such unbelievable torture, death came to John Emberg's rescue. And, mark you, all of this occurred within a few yards of the office of the jailers.

During the court's investigation concerning this case a jailer testified that he knew that smaller boys were beaten and tortured by older boys and that a kangaroo court ruled the juvenile quarters but he did nothing about it; and the sheriff who was elected by the people and in whom they placed their confidence and trust to fulfill his responsibilities and obligations and to protect the individuals committed to his care, knew that the kangaroo courts and their unspeakable abuses flourished in the King County jail.

I call this to the attention of the Congress because I intend to introduce a bill which will implement the constitutional provisions respecting the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States who are in the custody of peace officers.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. In just a moment.

After all, human beings even in custody, under the Constitution of the United States have their rights and they should be protected by law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

By unanimous consent the pro-forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the office of the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary) including personal services in the District of Columbia; newspapers (not exceeding $500); contract stenographic reporting services; teletype news service (not to exceed $1,000); lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals; purchase of one passenger automobile at not exceeding $1,800, and maintenance, operation, and repair of motor vehicles; not exceeding $2,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the office of the Secretary; $570,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the Secretary may designate an officer of the Department to sign minor routine official papers and documents during the temporary absence of the Secretary, the Under Secretary, and the Assistant Secretary of the Department.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on

page 54, line 15, as follows: "teletype news service (not to exceed $1,000)" as not authorized by law, and to the language beginning in line 21, same page, starting with the word *"Provided"* and continuing to the bottom of that page and including the first two lines on page 55. It is legislation on an appropriation bill not authorized by law.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, we concede both points of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The points of order are sustained.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 54, line 19, after the word "vehicles", down to line 21, including the word "Secretary", as legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, that is covered by title V, section 83.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, section 83 of title V is a restriction upon the use of funds carried in an appropriation bill. It is not in any sense an authority to the Appropriations Committee to make any appropriation. It simply says that none of the funds that are appropriated for any purpose shall be used for attendance at meetings unless there is specific approriation for that purpose. It in no way and in no manner attempts or does authorize any appropriation to be made for the purpose of attendance at meetings.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] desire to be heard?

Mr. RABAUT. No, Mr. Chairman; I will let the Chair decide it.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is ready to rule.

It is the opinion of the Chair that the language referred to by the gentleman from New York, which the Chair desires to read for the information of the committee, permits the appropriation contained in the language objected to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Chair will read the language:

No money appropriated by any act shall be expended for membership fees or dues of any officer or employee of the United States or of the District of Columbia in any society or association or for expenses of attendance by any person at any meeting or convention of members of any society or association unless such fees or expenses are authorized to be paid by specific appropriation for such purposes or are provided for in express terms in some general appropriation.

The Chair will rule, unless the gentleman from New York desires to be heard further.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the language the Chair has read is prohibitive language, designed to prevent the use of general funds for the purpose of attendance at meetings.

It does not in any way authorize appropriations to be made, and they can only be made as the result of language which is specific for that purpose. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that that language does not in any way authorize anything to be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must hold, however, that the language referred to in the latter part of the sentence clearly permits the Committee on Appropriations to specifically, in express language, appropriate for attendance at meetings of organizations as carried in the bill on page 54, lines 19, 20, and 21, and therefore overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Compiling census reports and so forth: For salaries and expenses necessary for securing information for and compiling and publishing the census reports provided for by law, the collection, compilation and periodic publication of statistics showing United States exports and imports, and for sample surveys throughout the United States for the purpose of estimating the size and characteristics of the Nation's labor force and population, including personal services at the seat of government; temporary employees at rates to be fixed by the Director of the Census without regard to the Classification Act; the cost of transcribing State, municipal, and other records; preparation of monographs on census subjects and other work of specialized character by contract or otherwise; travel expenses, including not to exceed $4,000 for attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the collection of statistics, when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary; reimbursement for actual cost of ferry fares and bridge, road and tunnel tolls, and not to exceed 3 cents per mile for travel performed in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official posts of duty, of employees engaged in census enumeration or surveys; maintenance, repair, and operation of three motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; construction and repair of tabulating machines and other mechanical appliances, and the rental or purchase and exchange of necessary machinery, appliances, and supplies, including tabulating cards and continuous form tabulating paper; books of reference, periodicals, maps, newspapers (not exceeding $200), $4,757,000.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on page 56, beginning with the words "and for" in line 12, continuing through lines 13, 14, and 15, and so much of line 16 up to and including the word "Government" on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. There is no authority in law for it.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on page 56 beginning in line 16 with the word "temporary" and ending in line 18 with the word "act" that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language beginning with the words "and not to" at the bottom of page 56 and continuing through the word "surveys" in line 3 on page 57 that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and without authority of law.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 57, line 11, strike out "$4,757,000" and insert "$4,000,000."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I realize the reply from the chairman of the committee will of course be that I am just striking out an arbitrary sum of money that is not itemized.

The item I seek to reduce or cut is an item of $4,757,000 for the Bureau of Census for salaries and expenses for securing information for and compiling and publishing census reports. I am asking for a 15 percent reduction. We can save $757,000 by this amendment and still render all necessary service to the public.

First, may I compliment the committee on having cut the amount requested by the Census Bureau and having reduced greatly the amount carried in the Budget, and thereby doing away with a lot of unnecessary activities. The distinguished Member from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], has rendered valiant service to this country in insisting on reductions and savings to the people of this country amounting to millions of dollars. I feel it could well be reduced by $757,000 and still render more service than necessary, at a crucial time when there is crying need of saving of manpower, material, and money.

Members of this House are familiar with the hundreds of reports that come to their desks, and that go all over the country, that are really of no important use right now.

Of course, the Census Bureau renders important service, but it can be done with $4,000,000. Of course, this is not the only item for the Bureau of Census in this bill. The whole thing is overdone. The members of this Committee are aware of that.

We can cut out a lot of it and get along a whole lot better. We can save a lot of manpower and material needed elsewhere. You can take off $750,000 and still leave $4,000,000, which is more than enough to carry on.

I could give you example after example of things that could be eliminated. For example, you have hundreds and thousands of figures with respect to the number of marriage licenses issued in July 1944, and then there is a new report for August, September, and October as it applies to cities of 100,000; then there is another one that applies to cities of 50,000, and so on ad infinitum. If that information helps the war effort, tell me where and how. Then another report shows the number of those who filed intention to be married. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, information published by the Census Bureau is duplicated by the Labor Department and other departments. We have a tremendous amount of information and statistics that comes to us from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, so we have duplication after duplication. The Bureau sends out tons and tons of reports that we do not need right now. It would be shocking to know how

much of it goes right to the waste basket without even being examined.

There is no need for me taking your time on that. You are just as familiar with it as I am. Talk to your newspaper editors at home about the amount of it that is not even opened, let alone be read.

All I ask is that they cut it down and use a little judgment. Reexamine with a view of cutting down where possible, and avoid duplication. I say again to my distinguished chairman that we understand that much of this information is required, but a tremendous amount of it is not required at all and is useless, in my judgment. So I am sure we can save this $750,000 to the taxpayers and the Treasury, and save a lot of paper and material and manpower.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, who is always interested in economy.

Mr. JENNINGS. May I say that I was talking to a friend of mine one day, and in referring to a rather able associate of his he said, "Charlie has more useless information than any man I ever knew." I believe that would apply to much that is gleaned by the census. It is the most useless tabulation of information that was ever gathered in the history of the world.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We have information by regions, by States, and by districts, and so on ad infinitum. There is too much of it. It is overdone. Here is a chance to save $757,000 to the taxpayers of this country and save manpower and a lot of material along with it. I trust you will support my amendment.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee saw fit to allow $4,757,000 for this item. The amount requested was $11,250,000. There were many cuts in this item to which I did not agree and concerning which I expressed myself in my opening remarks on this subject of the census. However, the committee has reduced the item drastically and I believe the amount recommended should be approved. I hope the committee will defeat the amendment.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that my chairman has brought up the subject of an item of decrease which he opposed in the Bureau of the Census, I feel it my duty to give the membership of this House the information regarding the item to which I believe he is referring. Many of you have received telegrams and letters from your constituents opposing what was proposed by the Bureau of the Census with reference to some new activity by way of taking sampling censuses throughout the country. This would have required the employment of 14,000 to 20,000 additional employees at a time when our businessmen and our farmers are unable to find men to work on the farms or in their shops.

You recall the controversy over the agricultural census, which in my opinion will take approximately 40,000 people out of normal work, and which is now disturbing many of our people in this country at a time when they need labor. I thought that activity could wait until next year or later.

The items to which my chairman referred, and which he favored and I opposed, are as follows:

Three million dollars for a new annual sample census of population.

Two million three hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars for an expanded labor force, statistics, and reports.

Five hundred and sixty-one thousand dollars for industrial statistics, which is now being financed by other agencies.

One hundred and fifty thousand dollars for expanded governmental statistics.

One hundred and fifteen thousand seven hundred and thirty-seven dollars for an expanded technical and service function.

One hundred and ten thousand dollars for the establishment of marriage and divorce statistics.

One hundred and six thousand eight hundred and sixty dollars for an expanded vital statistics consulting service.

Four-nine thousand dollars for expanded vital statistics reports.

Thirty-nine thousand dollars for expanded population, economic and housing statistics.

Twenty-six thousand two hundred and fifty dollars for expanded current business statistical service.

A total of $6,492,912.

Mr. Chairman, a majority of your subcommittee, after very careful consideration, in view of the fact that another committee had eliminated requests for a sample census, in view of the fact that this House passed the agricultural census, and in view of the fact that thousands upon thousand of people are taken out of regular employment to gather these statistics which, in our opinion, could go over until some other time, eliminated this $6,492,912.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is the reason you could not go along with the gentleman from Kansas because you have had an agreement with the committee?

Mr. STEFAN. I am absolutely independent. After careful consideration of the bill, I fought for this reduction. I am sorry I cannot support the amendment of the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]. I felt I had made a fair cut. The gentleman from Kansas is and has been rendering a great service to the country, and I usually go along with him. He is a great fighter for the taxpayer. I am glad to have joined him on most reductions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment do now close.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HOOK. The regular order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate close at this time.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

All I wanted to do, Mr. Chairman, with reference to this motion was this: I inferred from the statement of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] that the reason he was opposing the amendment was because, as we did heretofore in work in our committee, after cutting down all we could we came to some compromise agreement. I did not want to infer that the gentleman from Nebraska was in any way making an agreement that we would put something through that was not right.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is absolutely right in his assumption that sometimes there may be agreements, but I assure the gentleman that in my work in committee I make no agreements. I leave myself absolutely independent on all items in spite of the fact that I do everything possible as ranking minority member of the subcommittee to eliminate all unjustified and unnecessary expenditure. If the gentleman will read the hearings he will find page after page of my interrogation which in my opinion resulted in very substantial decreases in the appropriations in all categories.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from Nebraska has made that statement; but in connection with the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Kansas, it seems to me that wherever we can cut down any item in an appropriation bill, if it has not been cut down in the committee, it is our right and privilege to have it considered in the House, and if we can cut it down there, we should.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman has a perfect right to his belief and to make the effort to carry out what he feels is his duty to his district and his country.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will do everything he can to save expenditures I will help him.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

General administration, Office of the Administrator: For necessary expenses of the Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics

in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; contract stenographic reporting services; not to exceed $14,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with aeronautics, when specifically authorized by the Administrator; newspapers (not exceeding $200); not to exceed $5,000 in fiscal year 1946 for entertainment of officials in the field of aviation of other countries when specifically authorized and approved by the Administrator; fees and mileage of expert and other witnesses; expenses of examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles; $2,680,000.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 57, line 22: "not to exceed $5,000 in fiscal year 1946 for entertainment of officials in the field of aviation of other countries when specifically authorized and approved by the Administrator," on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Establishment of air-navigation facilities: For the acquisition and establishment by contract or purchase and hire of air-navigation facilities, including the equipment of additional civil airways for day and night flying; the construction of additional necessary lighting, radio, and other signaling and communicating structures and apparatus; the alteration and modernization of existing air-navigation facilities; the acquisition of the necessary sites by lease or grant; personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; and hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles, $9,400,000: *Provided*, That the consolidated appropriation under this head for the fiscal year 1945 is hereby continued available without warrant action until June 30, 1946, and is hereby merged with this appropriation, the total amount to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language appearing on page 58, line 16, "without warrant action" on the ground that it is an appropriation not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. RABAUT. I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HINSHAW: Page 58, line 14, strike out $9,400,000 and insert $12,219,000.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the original request from the Civil Aeronautics Administration to the Bureau of the Budget is contained in the hearings on this item and was $23,000,000. The Bureau of the Budget reduced it to about $9,800,000, and then the committee made a further reduction to $9,400,000. I have read the hearings very carefully and desire to compliment the committee for the fine information they obtained from the officials of the Civil Aeronautics Administration—but they failed to heed the information they obtained.

The object of my amendment is to provide funds for the following purposes which are left out: $220,000 for two air strips to be built in Alaska; $402,000 for transoceanic radio ranges; $1,407,000 for overocean communications, and $780,000 for a traffic-control automatic posting system for installation between Washington and New York.

I am sure; upon reading the hearings, that the committee itself was very anxious to consider these items favorably, and I assume that they did not include them in the bill with certain other items they omitted likewise because they did not want to exceed the Budget's recommendation.

Let me call attention to the fact that the Bureau of the Budget allowed two air strips in Alaska and turned down two others for no particularly good reason. They just cut the request in half. However, these air strips, as appears from the testimony on pages 118 and 119, are absolutely necessary to the servicing of important observation and radio stations in Alaska. Both of the stations which have been left out are above the Aleutians and above the pack-ice line, one of them on St. Lawrence Island, just south of the Bering Strait, and the other at Kotzebue, Alaska, which is northeast of the Bering Strait and due north of Nome. These places cannot be serviced without an air strip very well because of the ice conditions and the danger to ships. They have already lost one ship with all of its cargo in attempting to service one of these important stations.

Then, with reference to the transoceanic radio ranges, military ships have been lost in going across the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans because they did not have radio-range signals and proper weather information concerning the middle portion of their voyage. I ask you, should we not install these radio ranges to guide our military aircraft across the several oceans over which they are flying? Of course we should. Likewise, we should install the overocean radio transmission equipment in order that we may be in closer contact. We need this additional equipment badly. I cannot understand why the Bureau of the Budget cut it out when practically all the traffic using these radio ranges and the overocean transmission by radio is military.

To cope with the ever-increasing military demands imposed upon the inter-transcontinental communications system developed and operated by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, it requested that the Bureau of the Budget approve an appropriation of $1,407,915 for three projects which not only will serve the steadily increasing wartime need, but would prove of tremendous value in handling the transoceanic traffic of the post-war period; also an amount of $482,000 for transoceanic radio ranges at New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Honolulu, and two in the Caribbean.

These three projects included: First, the establishment of communications stations in the Virgin Islands and augmented services at other points in the Caribbean; second, the establishment of a transcontinental aeronautical communication station at Los Angeles and Brownsville, Tex.; third, the expansion of existing transoceanic communications facilities at New York, San Francisco, Honolulu, and Canton Island.

Today a large volume of transcontinental communications is by means of radio teletype, which eliminates many of the disadvantages of long-distance voice traffic. Inasmuch as the bulk of the present air-traffic pattern between the United States, Europe, and north Africa is via the Caribbean, the demands upon the existing stations are so large that it has been necessary that a new operation be installed in the Virgin Islands and the facilities of other Caribbean points be augmented. These also will serve a definite post-war need in maintaining communications and giving vital information to transoceanic planes using these lanes.

The station contemplated at Los Angeles will serve a dual purpose. It will hook up with the Brownsville, Tex., operation which serves all traffic flowing between the United States and Latin America and also will relieve the San Francisco station of a portion of the tremendous burden imposed by the heavy flow of military air traffic to the Pacific area. So large has become this flow that the communications system has reached the limit of efficient operations of its present physical facilities.

The establishment of this station at Los Angeles will supplement the present San Francisco station and would provide for more direct handling of overseas communications and in the post-war years traffic emanating and functioning at the Los Angeles area.

Although the New York, San Francisco, Honolulu, and Canton Islands C. A. A. installations have proved most efficient until now, yet it is inevitable that with the constantly expanding Pacific operations the present facilities will prove insufficient to cope with the burden which is growing rapidly day by day.

The services of these stations will be even more vital in the post-war period for the civil air transportation to Asiatic and Australian points.

The traffic in the United States alone is 86 percent military and on the air lines at least four-fifths of the traffic is either military or Government or on Government business. It is absurd to think we do not need these items and need them now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I am forced to object to additional time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman want to accept my amendment? I hope he will.

Mr. RABAUT. I was going to address myself to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan objects to the request of the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California to proceed for 1 additional minute?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, when it comes to the automatic-posting system for traffic control between Washington and New York, may I say that the airways traffic control system in various areas of the United States is terrifically congested. A new system is going to be necessary very soon, that will be able to handle the traffic. A new system has been devised. These funds are for only a partial installation.

The C. A. A. asked for $5,500,000 for what is the equivalent of a radar automatic posting system in the area generally lying between Washington and New York. They can make a test of this equipment with $790,000, over a portion of the area.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee and the House will grant these funds because they are exceedingly necessary for the proper control of air traffic, the promotion of safety, the safety of passengers as well as our military pilots.

With the existing tremendous increase in traffic over the 35,000-mile system of Federal airways in this country and the anticipated and inevitable expansion of air traffic in the peace years, it has been apparent to the C. A. A. for some time that it is necessary that a new system of spacing this traffic be developed through utilization of the latest developments and techniques, including radar and electronics.

At the present time the position of aircraft on the airways is reported to traffic-control centers by pilots and land stations along the route traversed by use of the Federal Airways teletype and interphone communications system. The positions of these craft then are posted on a board and their separation along the Federal airways is thus controlled to avoid possible collision. It has been known for some time that the saturation point of such manual operations has been 500 postings during peak periods.

Technicians of the C. A. A. Federal airways service, anticipating this confusion and obvious hazards to air traffic, have been experimenting with systems of automatic posting to obviate the inevitable safety hazard resulting from human error. It, therefore, requested the Bureau of the Budget to approve an appropriation of $5,497,000 to develop and install a test-automatic communication and posting system which would eliminate this hazard and make for greater safety. Because today the heaviest amount of traffic is flowing between New York and Washington, the preliminary testing of such a system would be used on this run, where the traffic danger point already has been exceeded. The Congress, by acceding to the denial of this appropriation by the Budget Bureau would, in my opinion, delay the advancement to air safety and merely postpone a greater cost in the very near future.

After failing to secure Budget approval, C. A. A. worked out a plan to apply this system to a very much smaller segment of the airways system at an estimated cost of $790,000, with the object of proving its effectiveness and necessity on a less-expensive scale.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] for 5 minutes.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I will not take the 5 minutes. I do not intend to address the Committee concerning this amendment. Unless the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] has something to say, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities: For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of air-navigation facilities and air-traffic control, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase (not to exceed 15), hire, maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles; and not to exceed 3 cents per mile for travel, in privately owned automobiles within the limits of their official posts of duty, of employees engaged in the maintenance and operation of remotely controlled air-navigation facilities; $24,000,000. There may be credited to the appropriation "Maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities" sums received from States, counties, municipalities, and other public authorities for expenses incurred during the existence of the present war and for 6 months thereafter in the maintenance and operation of airport traffic control towers.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language beginning with the words "and not", appearing on page 58, line 25, down to and including the word "facilities" on page 59, line 4, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Technical development: For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), relative to such developmental work and service testing as tends to the creation of improved air-navigation facilities, including landing areas, aircraft, aircraft engines, propellers, appliances, personnel and operation methods including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; cleaning and repair of uniforms for guards; operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; and purchase of reports, documents, plans, and specifications, $675,000.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, it so happens that I have some of my constituents come to the House once in awhile and visit me, and they happen to be in the gallery now. I was in the gallery when I heard the statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee, and immediately started down.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOOK. If I understand the rules correctly, no reference is to be made to any parties in the gallery. I make the point of order against the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan properly understands the rules of the House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will proceed in order.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I think, from what I have learned since I came to the well of the House, that the gentleman from Michigan wanted me to oppose an additional amount in this bill that was suggested by a Republican. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the subcommittee, that I would oppose a Republican for increasing an appropriation just as much as I would oppose anybody on his side of the House. I think the gentleman from Michigan would agree with me on that. I do not believe, when it comes to doing things that are irregular, that any Member of the House can accuse me of that, ever since I have been a Member, because I have been for economy in government from the time I entered the House of Representatives in 1931.

I have always been for a government that was solid and sound, a government that permitted the people of this country to continue under our Constitution with the greatest amount of liberty as long as they did not interfere with the rights of other citizens. I want to continue to do that.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HINSHAW: On page 59, line 22, strike out "$675,000" and insert "$903,543."

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to restore to the bill some vitally needed funds. These funds are for research and technical development on some exceedingly important items. We have, for example, in Indianapolis right now at the C. A. A. laboratories several pieces of equipment that have been developed for the use of the War Department, which it is desired to test for development into various devices to be used on or for the protection of aircraft in flight and in landing. A good many tons of this equipment are sitting there and have been sitting there, yet nothing can be done with this equipment until the funds are appropriated.

May I quote from the hearings, page 142? When Mr. Wright testified before the committee he said:

Therefore, I do not think the committee could do anything better than to lean over backward to help us in any way they can on this experimental work in electronic devices,

because such may well be the control of the future.

In another place he went on to say that the failure to obtain this money would mean that we would be put back 2 years behind where we should be in our development work.

I know the committee is not in a very good temper at the moment, but I hope and trust the House will consider this amendment favorably, because it is vitally needed for the promotion of aviation in the future.

May I ask the chairman of the committee if he would not be willing to accept the amendment?

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman permit me to make a little explanation of the figure?

Mr. HINSHAW. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. RABAUT. The amount in the bill is $675,000. The amount allowed by the Budget for this item was $700,000. The gentleman's proposal is to go beyond the Budget.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. The only place in this whole bill where we have gone beyond the Budget was in the exception to our normal procedure in the item for the F. B. I. Some in the Budget Bureau seemed to know when the war would be over, but we decided no one knew about that so we increased the funds and exceeded the amount allowed by the Budget. So the gentleman knows we could not accept this amount at this time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Of course, the Budget is not a fetish with me. I realize it has limitations. I do not believe the Budget is always right. I think the Budget can make a mistake, and I think it has made a big one here and in two or three other places in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of safety regulations: For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 401), relating to safety regulations, except air-traffic control, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; hire, maintenance, repair and operation of passenger-carrying automobiles; $3,050,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we are now debating the section dealing with the C. A. A. The country and the world is intensely interested in future civilian aviation. The current operation and future plans receiving the consideration of the C. A. A. are well outlined in a statement made some time ago by Mr. T. P. Wright, the new administrator of Civil Aeronautics. I include part of this statement as part of my remarks for the information of the Congress and the country:

AVIATION PLAN FOR THE FUTURE

The relative roles of Government and industry in the development of civil aviation in the United States are well established as a result of our historical policies. The value of intelligently applied Government assistance in accelerating the development of the industry has been amply proven by our highly successful achievements in the air transport field.

In our opinion, the United States Government's civil aviation policy in the immediate post-war period should provide for the following:

1. The fundamental facilities necessary for the expansion of air transport.

a. An adequate and efficient system of conveniently located airports.

b. Modernized and expanded airway facilities.

2. The fundamental facilities which will aid in the development of private flying.

a. A large number of small airports conveniently located to population centers, both in the urban and rural areas of the country.

b. Stimulus to the development of improved aircraft types.

c. Government-assisted flight training.

3. Steps which will aid in development of the air-mindedness of our youth.

a. The provision of technical aviation information to our educational institutions.

b. The encouraging of flight experience in our high schools and flight training in our colleges.

4. Steps which will enable us to take our proper place in the international aviation field.

a. By appropriate contacts with foreign government civil aviation agencies.

b. By training and informing foreigners in American aviation techniques.

c. By assisting our aircraft manufacturing and transport industries in their expansion abroad.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration is considering requirements as indicated above in terms of the several headings listed below. Currently the organization of the Civil Aeronautics Administration is being somewhat rearranged in order to be prepared not only to carry out its present activities more efficiently, but to be in a position to expand should the future plans outlined be authorized by Congress through suitable legislation or appropriations. The headings into which these plans can be logically divided are the following:

1. The airport program: Our airport system is the foundation of our civil aviation development—both transport and private—as our highway system has been the foundation of our automotive development. The Civil Aeronautics Administration, at the request of Congress, has prepared a long-range plan for the orderly expansion and modernization of our civil airport system. It is essential, in our opinion, that this program be implemented by a long-range Federal-aid program for civil airport construction along the lines of our successful Federal highway program.

It is necessary that, in the case of airports accommodating scheduled airline operations, the number be somewhat increased and the quality substantially improved in many cases in order to take care of the larger traffic load that is anticipated. In order to provide suitable landing areas for privately owned airplanes a large expansion in the number of smaller airports is required. The overall program is based on the expansion of the existing 3,000 airports to a total of 6,000. The larger proportion of this expansion will be in the smaller landing areas suitable for use of individuals flying personally owned aircraft. However, there is a substantial need for modernizing a great many existing airports which have become inadequate for the traffic which they are now called upon to bear and particularly with a view towards the future needs. In addition, there is a need for the establishment of some new airports in the larger categories to facilitate the expansion of air transport and air cargo carriers in the post-war period and, as well, to provide for suitable ports of entry for the international air-transport systems for which plans are now being made. Legislation is now under consideration by the Congress in this regard. In our opinion, it is essential that a long-range Federal aid airport program be initiated in the near future.

2. Modernization of airways: Paralleling the development of airports and the creation of new landing areas, there is the need for modernizing the airways to keep pace with the rapid technical development in navigational aids. This modernization will pay dividends in increased safety and reliability for both transport and private flying. A modernization program was planned before the war and appropriations were made last year for putting the first increment into effect. The program should be completed as rapidly as manpower and the availability of equipment permit. Some expansion of our airway system will also be necessary to accommodate the extension of domestic air transport operations and of private and contract flying.

3. Airport traffic control towers: Airport traffic control constitutes an integral part of an airways system. The traffic control tower is the link between the Federal airways as now operated and the point where the flight is completed by the disembarkation of passengers or the removal of cargo at the airport itself. At present, most towers take over the control from the airways at a point 3 miles from the airport and supervise the landing of the aircraft and control the taxiing operations to the point of disembarkation. The area of tower control is now limited by contact weather conditions, but is being extended in order to handle approaching and departing flights under instrument weather conditions to roughly 15 miles. Consequently, as traffic greatly increases, and in the interest of uniformity of operation and of maintaining safe control during the crucial landing period, it is believed essential that airport towers be operated by the Civil Aeronautics Administration as an integral part of the Federal airways system, thus bringing the whole traffic control problem under one agency.

4. Private flying: A great many civil and Government organizations are now giving careful attention to the problem of the private owner pilot. The importance of the personal aircraft to the well-being of the Nation is believed to be such as to warrant this consideration and to make it necessary for the Civil Aeronautics Administration to plan for the expansion which may well take place. The duty lies not only in increasing the pleasure of the flying public, but also in furnishing a very important source of business for the aircraft industry to supplement that which has heretofore been furnished largely by the military agencies. Estimates derived from many sources have pointed toward the probability of a total licensed personal aircraft field of 400,000 airplanes at the end of 10 years after the war. In the attainment of this licensed strength it would be necessary that at that time there be an annual market for this class of airplane of approximately 175,000 aircraft. It should be noted that such a market would mean a business for the industry of the order of $350,000,000 a year. This will be some four times that which is likely to exist for the transport airplane manufacturers and a sufficiently large proportion of probable military purchases to make this development important from the standpoint of maintaining a healthy manufacturing industry capable of more rapid expansion in the event of another national emergency.

Furthermore, the amount of flying involved will develop a large backlog of young men experienced in the air and in associated occupations necessary to keep pilots and airplanes flying, all of which is important from the standpoint of national defense. It is, therefore, the view of the Civil Aeronautics Administration that appropriate plans should be made for properly encouraging and fostering an industry with these potentials.

5. Civilian pilot-training program: The civilian pilot-training program as operated during the last 5 years has been the most successful method of stimulating the development of civil pilots which has been evolved by any country in the world. Its resumption is essential for the development of the large private-owner field outlined in the last paragraph. It is also of potential national-defense value in insuring a continuing backlog of large numbers of young pilots suitable for further military training in the event of emergency. A specific program for future civilian pilot training, together with estimates of costs, is in the course of preparation.

Such a program would encompass the approval of suitable schools for carrying out the training operations and the supervision of the expenditure of the appropriate proportion of the expense which the National Government should bear in this work in view of the importance of the market to which it will contribute and in view of its military importance. The program would also encompass educational assistance to high schools and colleges, to the extent of making suitable aeronautical material available so that the educational systems themselves could properly carry on with their normal functions in regard to aeronautics courses.

6. International aviation: The State Department has recently invited delegates from some 50 nations to participate in an aeronautical conference in this country during November. The agenda of this conference calls for the tentative establishment of international air routes; the agreement on standardization of flight procedures and of safety regulations to the extent of adopting minimum requirements; the establishment of an international convention with a proper organization for continuing studies on standardization and other problems involved in setting up the air routes of the world. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has been asked to take an active part in this undertaking and has, as a consequence, recently inaugurated a foreign operating division charged with the duty of preparing the technical annexes and participating otherwise in the conference. Assuming that reasonably firm agreements are attained and that continuing obligations on the part of agencies of this country must be undertaken after the current conference, it may be anticipated that the duties and obligations of the Civil Aeronautics Administration will substantially increase in connection with this foreign field.

7. A program for technical assistance to foreign countries: Believing that it is beneficial to the United States that American equipment should be used in as many foreign countries as possible and that in the interest of world commerce American technique in civil aviation regulations and other matters concerning airways operations has much to offer, the Civil Aeronautics Administration has plans which contemplate making available such technical assistance as is appropriate. Such program will enhance the export market of American equipment and will facilitate the operations of American air lines in foreign countries. In addition, there is the aspect of the "good neighbor policy" involved in making available to foreign governments the technique of air line operations which has risen to such a high degree of excellence in this country. There is, of course, also the general benefit to all peoples in enhancing and extending world commerce in the form of air transportation. This program contemplates the sending of occasional missions or individuals technically qualified to foreign countries to render such assistance and, in addition, the need for displaying our own equipment to missions visiting this country. There is also the current problem involving the actual training of technicians, pilots, and mechanics in this country as now carried on in the inter-American aeronautics program.

8. New aircraft: The expanding needs of the Civil Aeronautics Administration can be carried out with greatest efficiency if new types of aircraft are made available to the technical personnel of the Administration. It is, therefore, believed essential that sample aircraft of newer types be secured by the Civil Aeronautics Administration for investigation at our development and standardization centers. It should also be noted that efficiency is engendered substantially by making available modern aircraft to permit Civil Aeronautics Administration inspectors to travel rapidly from airport to airport where their duties may call them. Obviously, additional personnel in this regard as in the other expanding activities are required.

9. C. A. A. aid in the development of new types of aircraft: In the field of aircraft development Government assistance has been rendered the industry through two agencies. First, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics in the form of fundamental research made available to the technical staffs of the industry. Second, the provision of funds to the industry by the Army Air Forces and the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics in the form of development contracts which make it possible for the industry constantly to reach out for the improvements so essential to the military services in time of war and, perhaps especially in time of peace from the standpoint of preparedness. No similar provision is now made for civil aircraft development. It is, therefore, felt appropriate to consider the possibility that Government funds should be made available through the Civil Aeronautics Administration for furnishing an occasional stimulant to industry in the development of civil aircraft. Although no concrete plans have yet been formulated on the part of the Civil Aeronautics Administration in this regard, it nevertheless is believed worthy of consideration as a possible means of encouraging improvement of civil aircraft types as well as military. This is believed particularly important in the private owner field where such development is essential to the realization of the potential market alluded to above.

10. Adequate housing for C. A. A. personnel: It is believed essential in the interest of efficient operations that all Civil Aeronautics Administration personnel now housed in six or seven separate buildings scattered throughout Washington should be brought into one building or space. Preferably, the personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Board should be in the same location. Emphasis cannot be placed too strongly on this need, and it is indeed our hope that the Congress will provide funds in order that this much needed reassembly of all Administration and Board personnel in one building can take place.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Airport advisory service: For necessary expenses in furnishing advisory services to State and other public and private agencies in connection with the construction and operation of airports and landing areas, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and the operation, repair, and maintenance of passenger automobiles, $300,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the words "and private agencies" on lines 6 and 7, page 60, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, that is authorized under the provisions of Forty-ninth United States Code, section 451, under authority to foster and promote the development of aviation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the subcommittee, called to the attention of the Chair certain language which the Chair desires to read:

The Administrator of Civil Aeronautics is empowered and directed to encourage and foster the development of civil aeronautics and air commerce in the United States and abroad, encourage the establishment of civil airways, landing areas, and other air navigation facilities. The Administrator shall cooperate with the Board in the administration and enforcement of this chapter.

It seems to the Chair that the language referred to is at least broad enough to authorize the appropriation objected to by the gentleman from Kansas.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Development of landing areas: For completion of the program for the construction, improvement, and repair of public airports for national defense the consolidated appropriation under this head in the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act, 1943, shall remain available until June 30, 1946, without warrant action, and the portion thereof available for administrative expenses shall be available also for the operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles, and not to exceed $3,000 for printing and binding: *Provided*, That the total number of sites shall not exceed 535: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $83,000 may be transferred to the appropriation "General administration, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics," for necessary expenses in connection with the general administration of the development of landing areas program.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make a point of order against the words on page 61, line 10, "without warrant action", that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Civil Aeronautics Board, salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including personal services in the District of Columbia; traveling expenses; contract stenographic reporting services; fees and mileage of expert and other witnesses; temporary employment of attorneys, examiners, consultants, experts, and guards on a contract or fee basis without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; salaries and traveling expenses of

employees detailed to attend courses of training conducted by the Government or industries serving aviation; expenses of examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; not to exceed $4,466 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury, for cost of penalty mail, as required by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364); purchase of aircraft (not to exceed 12) and motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles (not to exceed 6) and hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of same; purchase and hire of special wearing apparel and equipment for aviation purposes (including rubber boots, snowshoes, and skis); $1,675,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available when specifically authorized by the Chairman of the Board, for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with aeronautics (not to exceed $4,000).

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I make a point of order against the language on page 62, line 12, beginning with the word "without", down to and including the word "statutes", on line 13, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

WEATHER BUREAU

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for carrying into effect in the United States and possessions, on ships at sea, and elsewhere when directed by the Secretary, the provisions of sections 1 and 3 of an act approved October 1, 1890 (15 U. S. C. 311–313), the act approved October 29, 1942 (15 U. S. C. 323), and section 803 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (49 U. S. C. 603), including investigations of atmospheric phenomena; cooperation with other public agencies and societies and institutions of learning; purchase of books of reference; purchase of newspapers (not to exceed $50); traveling expenses, including not to exceed $1,500 for attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Bureau when authorized by the Secretary; purchase (not to exceed five), maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger automobiles; repair, alterations, and improvements to existing buildings and care and preservation of grounds, including the construction of necessary outbuildings and sidewalks on public streets, abutting Weather Bureau grounds; the erection of temporary buildings for living and working quarters of observers; telephone rentals, and telegraphing, telephoning, and cabling reports and messages, rates to be fixed by the Secretary by agreement with the companies performing the service; and establishment, equipment, and maintenance of meteorological offices and stations; $12,140,000, of which not to exceed $1,142,000 may be expended for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $1,500 for the contribution of the United States to the cost of the office of the secretariat of the International Meteorological Committee; and not to exceed $10,000 for the maintenance of a printing office in the city of Washington for the printing of weather maps, bulletins, circulars, forms, and other publications: *Provided*, That no printing shall be done by the Weather Bureau that can be done at the Government Printing Office without impairing the service of said Bureau.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HINSHAW: Page 74, line 2, strike out $12,140,000 and insert $12,400,000.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have offered an increase in the Weather Bureau appropriation in the amount of $350,000.

This increase is to enable the Weather Bureau to commence to install what is known as a system of in-flight weather reports. I cannot think of anything more important to the armed services today; 86 percent of all flights being Army flights, than the so-called in-flight weather reports. These in-flight weather reports come from pilots in the air. It is perfectly easy to tell from the ground what the bottom side of a cloud layer looks like, but if there is a cloud ceiling over the ground there is no possible way in the world for anyone on the ground to tell what is above that ceiling.

In-flight weather reports are reports from pilots in flight, pilots who are above the lower cloud layer and can see what is ahead of and around them. I have no doubt whatever but what this accident that took place recently southwest of here would not have happened if there had been proper in-flight weather reports. There was the crash of an Army bomber on the side of a mountain in California the other day and there have been other crashes, many of which can be attributed to the lack of proper knowledge and information concerning the weather above the ceiling.

I hope my colleagues in the House will consider this amendment favorably as it is a vital thing. I recognize that aviation and meteorology are very technical subjects, but I assure you I am qualified to speak on these subjects. I hope and trust the amendment will be agreed to. The House has not accorded me the honor of agreeing to the two previous amendments I offered and I think the House made mistakes, but that is only my opinion. I am sure the House will make a mistake if they fail to give this money to the Weather Bureau for the installation of a system of in-flight weather reports. They are absolutely vital, Mr. Chairman, and are necessary for the saving of the lives of our military personnel likewise of our civilian flyers.

Mr. Chairman, under authority granted to extend my remarks, I include the following:

NEED OF AIRCRAFT WEATHER REPORTS FOR SAFETY IN THE AIR

The urgent need for an organized system of collecting and using reports of weather conditions encountered by aircraft in flight is becoming more and more acute as aircraft operations, and especially military flights, increase on airways in this country and on air routes to foreign destinations. The extent to which air commerce has fallen behind in this regard is immediately obvious when we consider the fact that there is an International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea which makes it mandatory for the master of every ship which meets with dangerous ice, a dangerous derelict, a dangerous tropical storm or any other direct danger to navigation to communicate the information by all the means of communication at his disposal to the competent authorities at the first point on the coast with which he can communicate. For safety in the air, where by comparison bad weather is a more serious threat to aircraft than the dangers of storms at sea to surface navigation, it is surprising to find that our Government has not provided the funds or the authority to set up an organized system for reporting bad weather encountered by pilots in the air.

A centralized organization is absolutely necessary. Weather conditions encountered by military aircraft and by the pilots employed by the various airlines in the United States must be gathered together by a responsible Government agency so that the results can be made known to all concerned. Every maritime nation in the world of any importance has recognized this need so far as it applies to surface navigation. There are international arrangements under the Safety of Life at Sea Convention and in other conventions which provide for the communication of ship reports of dangerous weather to the weather bureaus of maritime nations so that they can issue warnings and advices to all ships.

So far as aviation is concerned, reports of this kind go to the company offices or to military air fields, but they are not assembled and distributed generally to other pilots, so that the dangers of bad weather may be avoided.

The Weather Bureau collects a great deal of information in the form of observations at airports and other strategic places, but these observations include only what the ground observer can take from his instruments and what he can see by looking into the sky. In addition, balloons are released to send back radio weather signals. All of this is exceedingly helpful in forecasting. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the pilot flying above a layer of clouds, or between two cloud layers, can see weather conditions which the ground observer cannot see because of the intervening cloud layer. Instruments sent aloft by balloon can send back the temperature, barometer reading, and humidity, but these instruments cannot see the cloud banks, the cloud layers, the ice beginning to form on the wings of the airplane, or the severe turbulence which makes flying dangerous.

All of our pilots while in the air, or before take-off, want to know about these things which cannot be seen from the ground—the thickness of the clouds; the number of layers of clouds, whether they are evaporating or closing in, the height of tops and bases of thunderclouds and other cloud formations; rain, snow, or freezing rain above the lowest cloud base; visibility between cloud layers; turbulence and ice formation. All of this will be exceedingly important to private pilots after the war. They will not have ground facilities of their own or highly specialized flight instruments and

must therefore avoid being caught in dangerous conditions en route.

We must be realistic about this. The atmosphere over the United States is a vast fluid complicated by many eddies and whirls, by local and general storms, and by clouds and rain or snow which render observation difficult. It is a three-dimensional problem which becomes four-dimensional in its complexity when we take into account the fact that it is constantly in motion and subject to tremendous widespread changes from hour to hour.

International agreement in the Chicago convention for air navigation will make the Weather Bureau and the Civil Aeronautics Administration responsible for certain safety services, not only for aircraft of United States registry, but for aircraft of foreign registry which will come to our international airports and under certain agreements will pass through or over this country en route to other destinations. We will need to have reports in flight not only from aircraft of United States registry, but we will want also the reports from foreign aircraft in order that our own pilots can receive warnings and advices of the conditions which foreign aircraft encounter in coming to the United States or passing through or over our country.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration now operates the weather teletype circuits over which aircraft reports can be transmitted for the information of all concerned. Some of these reports from pilots will be of no particular value except for the assurance that dangerous conditions do not exist at flying levels. All of this vast collection of reports is not needed on the weather teletype systems all over the country. Discrimination is essential in deciding what is important and what is of limited value. Unrestricted transmissions would crowd out some of the useful information which is regularly collected for the purpose of preparing weather forecasts for airways and terminal airports. The weather reports sent from air to ground by pilots must be examined and studied by competent weather personnel, and the reports which are vital for safety in the air must be selected and transmitted over the circuits, and the remainder of the information must be eliminated.

The pilot himself cannot always determine whether or not his reports, in relation to the ground and balloon observations and the reports from other pilots, contain vital information which ought to be disseminated. It is necessary to have the judgment of competent weather personnel to study the collections and select the reports for dissemination.

It seems remarkable that we have been so slow to recognize the importance of aircraft weather reports and to give our Weather Bureau the support needed to collect and transmit this information. We see many analyses of air accidents which emphasize the importance of these weather reports from pilots. A report of an investigation by the Nichols committee, of which I was an active member during its entire life, says that—

Generally speaking, adverse weather is a major contributing factor in the more disastrous air crashes. The Congress cannot change the weather, but it can provide for better observations and more accurate forecasts of weather.

There have been a large number of fatal accidents to military aircraft in the United States. Military pilots while in the United States must depend to a large extent on the weather reports and forecasts of the Weather Bureau and the weather information carried on the teletype circuits of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. It would be a gross waste of manpower and would contribute further to confusion and accidents if the military services were to duplicate all of this basic Nationwide system for collecting and distributing weather information in the United States. One system must serve both. All of this, both civil and military, is a responsibility which we cannot escape. It is high time for us to take our cue from the long history of accidents, shipwrecks, and loss of life at sea which the surface navigation people went through before the maritime nations of the world finally got together and agreed in the convention for safety of life at sea to take measures to avert these catastrophes.

Aircraft accidents, as reported to the Safety Bureau of the Civil Aeronautics Board during the calendar year 1943, totaled nearly 6,000. Many of them were minor accidents but in many of them weather conditions in one way or another contributed to the accident. We know that even when weather is not the cause of the accident the chances of survival are very much less if the weather is bad at the time. Certainly it seems imperative that the pilots who become involved in conditions which are likely to contribute to an accident shall immediately report those conditions to a ground station where the information can be made available to all other pilots who might fly into that area.

Technical progress in aeronautics has carried the airplane to ever higher altitudes. Air commerce in the future, especially long-haul flights, will travel at fifteen, twenty, thirty thousand feet or higher. At these levels atmospheric conditions are usually quite different from those on the ground and, in many cases, for example, when the sky is overcast, it is impossible for an observer on the ground to obtain a true picture of what the conditions are at the higher levels.

What is really needed is a crew of 5 trained employees at each of 25 flight-control centers in the United States to collect these reports as they are transmitted from air to ground, make selections of the reports which give vital information, and enter them on the weather teletype circuits. This is a job which must be carried on 24 hours a day and 7 days a week at each of these centers. In addition, local teletype circuits from control offices to the 5-man units of the Weather Bureau are needed to handle the reports. For the United States this means 125 people. This is not a question of manpower. It is a question of saving lives which in the aggregate may amount to far more than the people employed in this project. In the last 12 months nearly 200 people were killed in scheduled air-carrier accidents in the United States. If this reporting system will save any considerable number of these lives each year it will mean not only a saving in life but a saving in manpower.

As an example of the haphazard way in which aircraft weather reports are necessarily handled at present, we might find the following:

A scheduled air-carrier flight from New York to Chicago might report weather en route back to the company radio station in New York. While en route the C. A. A. radio stations providing air-navigation facilities might also intercept the report. In some cases observations which were not transmitted in flight might be available when the pilot landed in Chicago. Military aircraft flying the same route would report back to a base communications station at the Army airport. Reports from private pilots in most cases would be intercepted by the C. A. A. ground stations. Aircraft weather reports from these several sources might therefore be received in any one of the following places and go no further: The company dispatching office; the company intermediate station where the plane stopped or passed over; a C. A. A. communications station on the route; an Army base operations office; or the dispatching office of a commercial company operating aircraft for private purposes.

It would be impossible to have all of these offices without coordination entering reports, both good and bad, on the national teletype circuits. Not all of these reports would be vital for safety in the air, but the report of any one might be of extreme importance to all the others flying the same route. All we need is a Weather Bureau unit here and there at strategic control centers to assemble the reports, examine them, and see that the important ones are transmitted immediately on the circuits according to agreed schedules.

All of the air-carrier companies have expressed willingness to furnish the reports to the Weather Bureau, but the company personnel do not have the time or the responsibility or the communication channels to insure that the reports are delivered to a Weather Bureau office. The collection of the reports and the selection and analysis and teletype transmission is a responsibility of the Government.

The cost of this in-flight reporting service is relatively very small compared with other methods of taking weather observations in general, and in obtaining pilots' weather reports by contract. For example, from 1929 to 1937 the Weather Bureau paid as high as $50 for a single airplane weather flight to get information at upper-flying levels. The fact is that the pilots are glad to furnish the reports, the air carrier companies are willing to cooperate, the Government is maintaining a Nation-wide weather teletype system at considerable cost, and all that is needed is this simple link between the operating companies and military

units on the one hand and the national teletype distributing system on the other.

All the procedures have been worked out by the Weather Bureau and the air carriers, including the form of the report, the items to be reported, and the part to be played by the Weather Bureau in giving adequate distribution to important reports. The system cannot be put into operation owing to lack of staff and communication facilities.

One of our most distinguished citizens of all time, Matthew Fontaine Maury, an officer of the United States Navy, whose researches form the basis of all pilot charts of the oceans in use today, encountered the same difficulties in getting weather reports from ships 100 years ago. For a long time he had to do the job almost single handed, with the cooperation of forward-looking seamen. But our country finally got it organized and in later days of the clipper ships, United States was the leader in world commerce. Safety of life at sea depends largely on weather reports from ships and likewise safety in the air will depend in a large measure on how we use aircraft weather reports.

In connection with aviation we hear a lot about backward nations. I do not mean to say that the United States is a backward nation, but I do mean to say that aviation is now going forward at such a rapid pace that we must not overlook or delay important safety factors such as these vital weather reports from aircraft in flight if we are to hold our position in the forefront of progress in aviation.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

The gentleman from California proposes $12,490,000. The committee allowed $12,140,000. The Bureau of the Budget suggested a figure of $12,210,000, so there was a cut of $70,000 on the part of the committee, a reduction of $70,000 in the amount requested for the study of the structure of thunderstorms. The committee allowed all of the other items requested.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman realizes, of course, that the item was stricken from the Department's request by the Bureau and that the Department requested $550,000 for this item?

Mr. RABAUT. I understand that.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman agrees with the Bureau, it is not needed and of course he will not vote for it.

Mr. RABAUT. We did not agree with the Bureau. We cut it $70,000.

Mr. HINSHAW. This item was not included at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The appropriations "Maintenance and operation of air-navigation facilities," Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics; "Salaries and expenses," Civil Aeronautics Board; and "Salaries and expenses," Weather Bureau, shall be available, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, for furnishing to employees of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Weather Bureau in Alaska free emergency medical services by contract or otherwise and medical supplies, and for the purchase, transportation, and storage of food and other subsistence supplies for resale to such employees, the proceeds from such resales to be credited to the appropriation from which the expenditure for such supplies was made; and appropriations of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Weather Bureau, available for travel, shall be available for the travel expenses of appointees of said agencies from the point of engagement in the United States to their posts of duty at any point outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. On page 75, line 3, the last word "the", all of line 4 and all of line 5. It is legislation on an appropriation bill and in violation of law.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

During the fiscal year 1946 the Secretary of Commerce may delegate his authority to subordinate officials of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Weather Bureau, and the Civil Aeronautics Administration, to authorize payment of expenses of travel and transportation of household goods of officers and employees on change of official station: *Provided*, That in no case shall such authority be delegated to any official below the level of the heads of regional or field offices.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. On page 75, beginning with line 12, the entire paragraph down to and including line 20, on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill, not authorized by law.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miscellaneous salaries: For salaries of all officials and employees of the Federal judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for, $1,400,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges (exclusive of any temporary additional compensation) shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the salary of a secretary shall conform with that of the main (CAF-4), senior (CAF-5), or principal (CAF-6) clerical grade, or assistant (CAF-7), or associate (CAF-8) administrative grade, as the appointing judge shall determine, and the salary of a law clerk shall conform with that of the junior (P-1), assistant (P-2), associate (P-3), full (P-4), or senior (P-5) professional grade, as the appointing judge shall determine, subject to review by the judicial council of the circuit if requested by the Director, such determination by the judge otherwise to be final: *Provided further*, That (exclusive of any temporary additional compensation) the aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law clerks appointed by one judge shall not exceed $6,500 per annum, except in the case of the senior circuit judge of each circuit and senior district judge of each district having five or more district judges, in which case the aggregate salaries shall not exceed $7,500.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on page 83, line 11, beginning with the word "provided" down through the remainder of page 84, to and including the word "final", page 84, line 1, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and not authorized by law.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, to amplify the point of order raised by the gentleman from Kansas, I make the point of order against the entire paragraph that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman from Kansas withhold his point of order for a moment?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will reserve it.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I concede the first part of the point of order made by the gentleman from Kansas, but I hold that the balance of the paragraph is a limitation. May I be heard on the point of order for a moment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will remind the gentleman from Michigan that the gentleman from Georgia is raising a point of order against the entire paragraph. If any part of the paragraph is subject to a point of order it makes the language of the entire paragraph subject to a point of order, and the Chair will have to so hold. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Michigan, however.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this particular paragraph deals with salaries for law clerks and law secretaries. There is no authorization for secretaries to the judges, although the system has been in vogue for 20 to 30 years. Of the 257 circuit and district judges, 133 now have law clerks. In this bill we propose to allow 43 more, making a total of 176. Of the 257 judges 253 have secretaries, and the additional amount in this bill is to reclassify some of them to reward long periods of service.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Not just now.

The point I wish to make is this. There are three divisions of the Government—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. Far too long have two divisions of this Government, in the opinion of this speaker, been held in what might be called the stepchild class of the official family. This Congress saw fit in the last session to increase the number of clerkships for the Members of Congress, and rightfully so. What we are proposing to do here is to give a similar privilege to the judiciary. If anything belongs to the "horse and buggy" age, it is the facilities provided for the judiciary. We are postponing legislation ourselves by denying them the ordinary tools——

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not discussing the point of order. Had he yielded to me I would not have made it, but since he does not yield I must insist on this point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has somewhat disturbed the Chair by not addressing himself to the Chair on the point of order, for

which purpose the Chair recognized the gentleman. The Chair is particularly interested in whether or not the paragraph is authorized by law.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, we will have to concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia insist on his point of order?

Mr. TARVER. Certainly, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is constrained to rule first upon the point of order made by the gentleman from Georgia, in view of the fact that it goes to the language of the entire paragraph. The Chair must hold that the language is subject to a point of order and, therefore, sustains the point of order made by the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miscellaneous expenses (other than salaries): For miscellaneous expenses of the United States courts and their officers, including procurement of stenographic reporting services without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, provided that the rates of payment shall not exceed those fixed by the district court, pursuant to rule 80 (b), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, of the jurisdiction in which the services are rendered; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals; purchase of firearms and ammunition; purchase of envelopes without regard to the act of June 26, 1906 (34 Stat. 473); and not to exceed $84,000 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail for the United States courts and the Administrative Office of the United States courts as required by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364); $540,000.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the language on page 84 beginning in line 10 with the word "including" and extending through line 15, ending with the word "rendered", is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I think the point of order comes too late. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has offered an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] was on his feet. Inasmuch as the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Nebraska has not been reported, the Chair will hold that the gentleman from Ohio is not out of order and that his point of order has been presented in time.

Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, we concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Does the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] desire to offer an amendment?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I intended to offer was to strike out that paragraph.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HANCOCK: On page 84, line 22, after the last semicolon, strike out "$540,000" and insert "$440,000."

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, under our practice heretofore we have had no official reporters in the United States district courts, but the district attorneys have had authority to employ private stenographers on a contract basis in criminal cases and whenever the United States was a party to an action. We were informed by Judge Parker, who is chairman of the subcommittee of the Judicial Conference, which looked into this matter, that the expense of these contract reporters has run from $100,000 to $150,000 per annum. We can very safely cut this item by $100,000, because henceforth, I am happy to say, we will have official reporters on a full-time basis.

Another provision in this bill provides funds for the official reporters, which you gentlemen will remember were authorized by an act of the Seventy-eighth Congress, Public Law 222. We do not need to appropriate funds for contract stenographers when we are providing salaries for permanent official reporters in the United States district courts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the point of order which I submitted against the item on page 83, "Miscellaneous salaries," and the statements made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] with reference to what is contained in that item, I think it appropriate that the RECORD should show the reasons which motivated me in making the point of order. Last year the Budget proposed, or at least this subcommittee proposed, an increase in the salaries of law clerks and secretaries to district and circuit Federal court judges. This House rejected that increase. The House took the position that since these employees were receiving overtime pay just as were other employees of the Federal Government, they ought not to be given preferential treatment and accorded increases in their basic salaries when salaries of other classes of Federal employees were not being so increased. But the bill went to the Senate, and, as is usual, the Senate granted everything which was asked. Then, in conference an amount of increase was agreed upon, $162,000, applicable to the salaries of 386 employees, who thus received an increase in their basic salaries averaging $420 each. Not satisfied with that, they come back again this year and ask for what amounts to an additional increase in their basic salaries. One hundred seventy-two thousand eight hundred dollars, according to the information I have, is included in this item for increases in salaries of incumbent employees, and for the procurement and payment of additional law clerks.

Now, had it been possible to secure the elimination of that proposed increase, I would have no objection to the remainder of the paragraph, but the paragraph was written in such manner as to provide classifications for these employees, the effect of which classification would have been to increase their salaries. Now, surely this is not the time to be granting additional increases in salaries to people who were granted a substantial increase last year, $420 each, on the average. Certainly not when you are going to take up the question of increasing the base pay of all types of Federal employees.

As chairman of the subcommittee on agriculture appropriations of the Committee on Appropriations, I know if we start this with the judges, increase the salaries of their employees year after year, we are going to have from the Department of Agriculture, organizations of employees coming before our committee and asking that we make provision for increasing their salaries, and all other subcommittees will have similar trouble. So it is not so much the amount of money involved. It is a question of the precedent you establish if you do this sort of thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. I know that lawyers view with favor the requests of judges and the courts. I know it is difficult to resist them when they come in and say "We cannot get the type of employees we want and we cannot retain them after we get them unless we pay them better salaries." But, after all, this is not a time when people who are getting good salaries, ranging up to $4,600 a year, should be trying to get more money out of the Federal Treasury, and coming back year after year getting additional increases, when 12,000,000 American boys are fighting, most of them at $50 a month; some at $55, risking their lives on the battle fronts all over the world for very little in the way of financial compensation. Surely, these clerks and these secretaries to judges, having had one increase of $420 on the average last year, can wait awhile longer before they try to get additional money out of the Federal Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the reference to the civil-service classification for secretaries is set forth in the bill and it is suggested as a measuring rod for the salaries to be paid in accordance with the ability and years of service of persons holding such positions.

It is the intention of the committee to make careers of such positions, both for the benefit of the person so employed and to the benefit of the office which he holds.

The Congress took care of itself as far as clerks were concerned and established certain salaries for our own clerks, both

as to minimum and maximum pay. Here we propose to give to the judiciary the needed assistance for their office that they may the better serve the public.

Why should law clerks be provided for judges? To speed up the system and get the work out of the judges. A law clerk can look up the law, but he cannot preside in court. A judge can do both. Both activities take time. If you want a judge in court, this is the method of getting him there. Any layman would realize, as Judge Miller said before the committee, why a judge should have a good stenographer, although he could write his own letters or he might even sweep out his own office.

It all depends on your point of view, your appraisal of the judiciary, the esteem in which you hold the office, the dispatch desired in rendering justice, and the beneficial results of prompt service, on the one hand, as opposed to a necessary inefficiency resulting from what may be called the extracurricular activities of the judge.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the proviso in this bill against which I have just made a point of order attempts to write into this act a civil-service formula for the judges of the courts of this country. They go around the Civil Service Classification Act and set up grades of their own for their employees. Of course, it is clearly in violation of the basic act and the Committee on Appropriations knows it. Those who made the request for this proviso knew it, too. They know they should go before the proper committee of Congress and secure authority for this legislation. In all likelihood they did go to another bureau or commission and secure approval, but not a legislative committee of Congress. The proposal may be equitable, but if this is the precedent you are going to follow, then why not let the Department of Agriculture, Department of the Interior, and the rest of them, do the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, the whole civil-service system needs a real overhauling. As a civil-service merit system it is falling short of its mark, especially as the terms "classification" and "merit" are understood. Mr. Chairman, with respect to this bill and especially that part dealing with the Bureau of Census, I feel the Census Bureau could cooperate and assist greatly by really going over its activities and cut out every one of them we do not have to have during this critical period of manpower shortages. The War Manpower Commission could render a little assistance too.

For example, Mr. Chairman, the Census Bureau has a flock of employees they call samplers—there are about 100 of them that are traveling over the country in Pullman cars and by planes, taking samples of statistics in cities and towns and in rural districts throughout the country. I am informed they also sample public opinion as they go along. There is nothing in the hearings or in the report to indicate the cost of this service, but salaries and expenses could easily run as much as $300,000 or $400,000. Figure it out for yourself. We could easily dispense with service for a year, at least, and not even miss their services. In fact we might find we can continue to get along without them. It would save a pretty good item of expense. It would release some manpower for more important war activities where needed right now.

The Clerk read as follows:

Miscellaneous expenses: For stationery, supplies, materials and equipment, freight, express, and drayage charges, washing towels, advertising, purchase of lawbooks and books of reference, periodicals and newspapers, communication service and postage; for the maintenance, repair, and operation of one motor-propelled delivery truck; for rent in the District of Columbia, and elsewhere; for official traveling expenses, including examination of estimates for appropriations in the field, and other miscellaneous expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to effectively carry out the provisions of the act providing for the administration of the United States courts, and for other purposes, $26,000.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JONES. I make a point of order against the language appearing on page 86, line 4, beginning with the word "including" and ending with the word "for" on line 16.

I believe this is in violation of, or broader than, the power authorized to the administrative office of the court in accordance with title 28, section 447 of the code; and, further, it is not authorized by law. I therefore make a point of order against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman objects on the ground that it is not included within the language of the code referred to.

Mr. JONES. Yes; Mr. Chairman, I wish to amend my point of order and restrict it more. I make a point of order against the language beginning in line 15 with the word "and" and ending in line 16 with the word "for."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes a point of order against the language reading:

And other miscellaneous expenses not otherwise provided for?

Mr. JONES. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, this provides merely for regular expenses that are authorized by law. I do not see anything in this subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair fails to see any reason why the language referred to should be subject to a point of order, and unless the gentleman from Ohio can be more specific in his objection the Chair is constrained to overrule the point of order.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Not to exceed $33,000,000 of the funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, established by the act of January 22, 1932 (47 Stat. 5), shall be available during the fiscal year 1946 for its administrative expenses and the administrative expenses of Defense Plant Corporation, Defense Supplies Corporation, Disaster Loan Corporation, Federal National Mortgage Association, Metals Reserve Company, the R. F. C. Mortgage Company, Rubber Reserve Company, and War Damage Corporation, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; maintenance and operation of aircraft; travel expenses, in accordance with the Standardized Government travel regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821–833); printing and binding; lawbooks, books of reference, and not to exceed $1,700 for periodicals and newspapers; rent in the District of Columbia; use of the services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks; and not to exceed $131,250 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail as required by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364): *Provided*, That all necessary expenses (including services performed on a force account, contract, or fee basis, but not including other personal services except those which the corporations' prescribed accounting system requires to be capitalized) in connection with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to said corporations, or in which they have an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provisions of this act, except for the limitations in amounts hereinbefore specified, and the restrictions in respect to travel expenses, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the corporations shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of said act of January 22, 1932, as amended: *Provided further*, That any of the funds made available by this act for administrative expenses of supervising loan agencies by the Federal Loan Administrator or for the administrative expenses of such loan agencies, which may not be required for defraying the expenses of auditing financial transactions in consequence of the provisions of section 5 (a) of Public Law 4, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved February 24, 1945, shall not be available for any other expenses provided for under this title.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: On page 89, line 22, after the word "amended", insert a period in lieu of the colon, and strike out the proviso beginning in line 22 and ending with the word "title", page 90.

Mr. RABAUT. This is a committee amendment and the committee has agreed to take out this proviso. The reason for the amendment is that they have no funds in the administrative division for this purpose. All of their figures are checked by the General Accounting Office.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the committee to page 360 of the hearings and particularly to the following part of a conversation between Mr. Henderson and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]:

Mr. HENDERSON. Is it not also true that if the value of a war plant is over a million

dollars, the Department of Justice must be informed, and the Congress; and we cannot sell it until then?

The point I want to make is that the public law passed during the last Congress does not specify that if a plant costs over a million dollars the Congress has any control over it. As a matter of fact, the law provides "over $5,000,000."

Mr. Chairman, a million dollars does not seem to be a lot of money considering the billions we are handling, nevertheless it means that the disposal of surplus property up to $5,000,000 is now out of the hands of the Congress.

I have introduced a bill to amend the Surplus Property Act passed by the last Congress, to bring within the control of Congress any property up to a million dollars, so that any property of a value of from one to five million dollars will have to be taken up and passed on by the Congress before it may be disposed of.

We had some experience in the hearings before the Senate War Investigating Committee in connection with the actions of Surplus Liquidators, Inc., of New York, working for the Defense Plant Corporation, in which some not-according-to-Hoyle practices have been brought to light. Senator MEAD now says he is preparing a report suggesting better methods for the disposal of surplus property. I think it is the responsibility of this Congress to see that we do insist upon better methods in the disposal of the billions of dollars of surplus plants and material that will be subject to disposal between now and after the end of the war. It is our responsibility to the people of this Nation to bring under our control United States property costing up to $1,000,000 instead of $5,000,000, as the law now reads. I urge the adoption of my bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 601 No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment, the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act, shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 90, line 25, after the word "for", strike out "not more than", and after the word "year", insert "and a day."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I will take but a minute to explain this amendment. The language of the bill attempts to make the violation of the provisions of section 601 a felony, but the punishment provided is for imprisonment for not more than 1 year. The courts have repeatedly held that regardless of what language is used in defining a crime, the punishment controls. This amendment provides for imprisonment for a year and a day, which would make the punishment of imprisonment conform to the language described in the bill in line 23; in other words, punishment for a felony.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 20, noes 26.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2603) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the judiciary, and the Federal Loan Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JONES. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JONES moves to recommit the bill H. R. 2603 to the Committee on Appropriations with instruction to reduce the appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, and Justice and the Judiciary to the amounts appropriated for said Departments and the Judiciary respectively for the fiscal year 1945, less overtime, provided that the appropriations for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Federal Loan Agency remain the same as carried in the bill H. R. 2603 for the fiscal year 1946.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 21, noes 40.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 75, nays 128, not voting 230, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—75

Adams	Gross	Mundt
Andersen, H. Carl	Gwinn, N. Y.	Murray, Wis.
Angell	Hale	O'Hara
Bishop	Halleck	O'Konski
Blackney	Harness, Ind.	Phillips
Bolton	Hesselton	Pittenger
Brehm	Heeven	Reed, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Rees, Kans.
Buffett	Holmes, Wash.	Schwabe, Mo.
Butler	Horan	Schwabe, Okla.
Campbell	Jenkins	Scrivner
Case, S.D.	Jennings	Shafer
Chenoweth	Jensen	Simpson, Ill.
Church	Johnson, Calif.	Springer
Cason	Johnson, Ill.	Stevenson
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Ind.	Stockman
Corbett	Jones	Taber
Cunningham	Jonkman	Talle
Dworshak	Knutsen	Vorys, Ohio
Ellsworth	LeFevre	Vursell
Elston	Lewis	Welchel
Gavin	McCowen	Wilson
Gillespie	McGregor	Wolcott
Goodwin	Martin, Iowa	Woodruff, Mich.
Griffiths	Martin, Mass.	

NAYS—128

Abernethy	Harless, Ariz.	Patterson
Allen, La.	Harris	Peterson, Fla.
Andrews, Ala.	Havenner	Peterson, Ga.
Bailey	Hays	Pickett
Barden	Healy	Poage
Bates, Ky.	Hendricks	Priest
Beckworth	Hinshaw	Rabaut
Bonner	Holifield	Rains
Boykin	Hook	Ramspeck
Brooks	Huber	Rankin
Brown, Ga.	Hull	Reece, Tenn.
Bryson	Johnson, Luther A.	Resa
Burch	Johnson, Okla.	Riley
Camp	Kefauver	Rivers
Cannon, Mo.	Kelley, Pa.	Rogers, Fla.
Carnahan	Kelly, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.
Chapman	Kerr	Rowan
Coffee	Kilday	Russell
Cooley	King	Ryter
Cooper	Kirwan	Sabath
Cravens	Kopplemann	Sadowski
D'Alesandro	Larcade	Sasscer
De Lacy	Lesinski	Savage
Dingell	Link	Sheppard
Doughton, N. C.	Ludlow	Smith, Va.
Douglas, Calif.	Lyle	Snyder
Douglas, Ill.	McCormack	Sparkman
Doyle	McDonough	Starkey
Earthman	Mahon	Stefan
Eberharter	Manasco	Stewart
Elliott	Miller, Calif.	Stigler
Engle, Calif.	Mills	Sullivan
Fernandez	Monroney	Sumners, Tex.
Fisher	Murdock	Tarver
Folger	Murray, Tenn.	Thomas, Tex.
Gallagher	Neely	Tolan
Gore	Norrell	Trimble
Gorski	O'Brien, Ill.	Voorhis, Calif.
Gossett	O'Brien, Mich.	Whittington
Grant, Ala.	O'Neal	Wickersham
Gregory	Patman	Winstead
Hancock	Patrick	Worley
Hare		Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—230

Allen, Ill.	Auchincloss	Bender
Anderson, Calif.	Baldwin, Md.	Bennet, N. Y.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Baldwin, N. Y.	Bennett, Mo.
Andresen, August H.	Barrett, Pa.	Bloemiller
Andrews, N. Y.	Barrett, Wyo.	Bland
Arends	Barry	Bloom
Arnold	Bates, Mass.	Boren
	Beall	Bradley, Mich.
	Bell	Bradley, Pa.

Brumbaugh	Granahan	O'Toole
Buck	Granger	Outland
Buckley	Grant, Ind.	Pace
Bulwinkle	Green	Pfeifer
Bunker	Gwynne, Iowa	Philbin
Burgin	Hagen	Ploeser
Byrne, N. Y.	Hall,	Plumley
Byrnes, Wis.	Edwin Arthur	Powell
Canfield	Hall,	Powers
Cannon, Fla.	Leonard W.	Price, Fla.
Carlson	Hand	Price, Ill.
Case, N. J.	Hart	Quinn, N. Y.
Celler	Hartley	Rabin
Chelf	Hébert	Ramey
Chiperfield	Hedrick	Randolph
Clark	Heffernan	Rayfiel
Clements	Heidinger	Reed, N. Y.
Clevenger	Henry	Rich
Cochran	Herter	Richards
Cole, Kans.	Hill	Rizley
Cole, N. Y.	Hobbs	Robertson,
Colmer	Hoch	N. Dak.
Combs	Holmes, Mass.	Robertson, Va.
Courtney	Hope	Robinson, Utah
Cox	Howell	Robsion, Ky.
Crawford	Izac	Rockwell
Crosser	Jackson	Rodgers, Pa.
Curley	Jarman	Roe, Md.
Curtis	Johnson,	Roe, N. Y.
Daughton, Va.	Lyndon B.	Rogers, N. Y.
Davis	Judd	Rooney
Dawson	Kean	Sharp
Delaney,	Kearney	Sheridan
James J.	Kee	Short
Delaney,	Keefe	Sikes
John J.	Keogh	Simpson, Pa.
Dickstein	Kilburn	Slaughter
Dirksen	Kinzer	Smith, Maine
Dolliver	Kunkel	Smith, Ohio
Domengeaux	LaFollette	Smith, Wis.
Dondero	Landis	Somers, N. Y.
Drewry	Lane	Spence
Durham	Lanham	Sumner, Ill.
Eaton	Latham	Sundstrom
Ellis	Lea	Talbot
Elsaesser	LeCompte	Taylor
Engel, Mich.	Lemke	Thom
Ervin	Luce	Thomas, N. J.
Fallon	Lynch	Thomason
Feighan	McConnell	Tibbott
Fellows	McGehee	Torrens
Fenton	McGlinchey	Towe
Flannagan	McKenzie	Traynor
Flood	McMillan, S.C.	Vinson
Fogarty	McMillen, Ill.	Wadsworth
Forand	Madden	Walter
Fuller	Maloney	Wasielewski
Fulton	Mansfield,	Weaver
Gamble	Mont.	Weiss
Gardner	Mansfield, Tex.	Welch
Gary	Marcantonio	West
Gathings	Mason	White
Gearhart	May	Whitten
Geelan	Merrow	Wigglesworth
Gerlach	Michener	Winter
Gibson	Miller, Nebr.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gifford	Morgan	Wolverton, N. J.
Gillette	Morrison	Wood
Gillie	Mott	Woodhouse
Gordon	Murphy	Woodrum, Va.
Graham	Norton	

Mr. BLACKNEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is the regular order now?

The SPEAKER. The regular order is to see if a quorum develops.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it in order to adjourn?

The SPEAKER. That motion is always in order in the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If there is not a quorum, Mr. Speaker, I move we adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the Chair is refusing recognition, I will.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot do that.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, March 17, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Brand Names and Newsprint Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Monday, March 19, 1945, to resume public hearings on newsprint.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Tuesday, March 20, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold executive hearings on Tuesday, March 20, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m. on the East Indian bills.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Tuesday, March 20, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in room 247, House Office Building, on H. R. 128, a bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will continue hearings on Wednesday, March 21, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in the committee room, room 247, House Office Building, on H. R. 128, a bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection for pensionable purposes for service rendered between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

326. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting copies of the documents for determining the number of employees required by this Department during the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

327. A letter from the Acting Administrator of Federal Security Agency, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements, for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1945 for the Federal Security Agency; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

328. A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1944; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

329. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 1379. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer by quitclaim deed to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., for fire-station purposes, the title to certain land located at Veterans' Administration facility, Los Angeles, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 2123. A bill authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement in certain lands of the Veterans' Administration, Dallas, Tex., to Dallas County, Tex., for highway purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURCH:

H. R. 2647. A bill to restore the 2-cent-per-ounce rate of postage on first-class mail for local delivery; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 2648. A bill to provide for the control of the floodwaters of the Savannah River and its tributaries, the improvement of the navigability of such rivers, the storage and delivery of the waters thereof for beneficial uses, the development of electrical power with such waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2649. A bill to prevent the disposition as surplus property, without further authority from Congress, of certain plants which cost the Government $1,000,000 or more; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 2650. A bill declaring to be citizens of the United States certain spouses of United States citizens serving honorably in the armed forces during the Second World War; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 2651. A bill to prevent restaurants operated in connection with stations and terminal facilities of common carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act from discriminating against members of the armed forces on account of race or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina:

H. R. 2652. A bill to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 2653. A bill to amend section 209 (e) of the Social Security Act, approved August 14, 1935, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DE LACY:

H. R. 2654. A bill to create a commission to be known as the Alaskan International Highway Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 2655. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 210 of the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942, as amended (56 Stat. 381, 37 U. S. C. Supp. 201); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 2656. A bill to provide for improved agricultural land utilization by assisting in the rehabilitation and construction of drain-

age works in the United States, its Territories, and possessions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2657. A bill to facilitate the receipt of former treatment and domiciliary care by former members of the armed forces at institutions nearest to their places of residence; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 2658. A bill to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service or former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable and certain other persons as provided for in United States Code, title 24, sec 281, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 2659. A bill amending title 11 of the Social Security Act to provide for crediting service in the armed forces for old-age and survivors' insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 2660. A bill to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments and certain purchase and sale operations by corporations created pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. Res. 188. Resolution to appoint a serviceman to attend the San Francisco Conference, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. Res. 189. Resolution requesting certain information from the Department of State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 2661. A bill for the relief of W. D. Jones and Ethel S. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 2662. A bill for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered personal injuries, property damage, or other loss as a result of the explosion of a munitions truck between Smithfield and Selma, N. C., on March 7, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 2663. A bill for the relief of W. C. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 2664. A bill to extend Letters Patent No. 1,617,287; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 2665. A bill for the relief of Acchille Guillory and Olivia Guillory; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 2666. A bill for the relief of Oscar N. McLean; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 2667. A bill granting an increase of pension to Matthew A. Summers; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

203. By Mr. CANFIELD: Joint resolution of the New Jersey State Legislature, memorializing Congress to provide a general medical and surgical hospital for veterans in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

204. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Frances Dollar of Denton, Tex., favoring House Resolution 1740; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

205. Also, petition of Miss Jean Harper, Mexia, Tex., favoring House Resolution 1740; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

206. By Mrs. NORTON: Senate Joint Resolution 10, State of New Jersey, memorializing Congress to provide a general medical and surgical hospital in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

207. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. Will Ross and 30 other citizens of Watertown, S. Dak., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

208. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Brooklyn Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to prevention of the return of any form of prohibition, wartime or otherwise; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

209. By Mr. SUNDSTROM: Joint resolution of the New Jersey State Legislature, memorializing Congress to provide a general medical and surgical hospital in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

210. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. John Matson, Sr., and 36 other citizens of Spearfish, S. Dak., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, MARCH 17, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, in whose holy presence we wait, we pray for Thy grace that we may not yield to temptation or be disturbed with burdens. We praise Thee for our Republic, which is a goodly vine; its clusters of blessings hang richly and its roots hun out in many ways for the welfare of all men. Open the fountain of the inner temple and so cleanse us that we may be worthy of the place we occupy and capable to meet the challenge of these times.

We are deeply grateful, blessed Lord, for the witnesses and the leaders of Thy holy truth who recovered the broken purposes of men with their faltering faith; they led them forth into the promised land of a blessed assurance, calling for a renewed humanity. We are mindful today, Father, of the buoyant soul and the chivalrous faith of that patron saint whose message and mission brought inspiration and guidance to the peoples of many lands and opened the pathway of our Master. In the name of St. Mary's holy Child. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOFFMAN) there were—ayes 76, noes 11.

So the motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, March 19, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

330. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter beginning April 1, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

331. A letter from the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas, transmitting a copy of the report on amended quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 2668. A bill to transfer Ben Hill County, Ga., from the Waycross division of the southern judicial district of Georgia to the Americus division of the middle judicial district of Georgia; to the Commttee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2669. A bill to establish the status of funds and employees of the midshipmen's store at the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of San Juan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to request that there be extended to Puerto Rico the benefits of crop insurance, in conformity with laws enacted by the Congress of the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide a general medical and surgical hospital in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to wage scales for common labor in New Mexico; to the Committee on Labor.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. HILL introduced a bill (H. R. 2670) for the relief of the legal guardian of Kathleen Lawton McGuire, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

211. Mr. BELL presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State Legislature of Missouri upon resolution of 11 members of that body urging that hunters be permitted to use live decoys during the 1945 fall duck hunting season. Framers of the adopted memorial resolution were Hon. Pascal G. Bryant, Vernon County; Hon. R. H. Linneman, St. Charles County; Hon. Edde B. Pope, Hickory County; Hon. J. Merrill Woods, Barry County; Hon. Herman W. Meyer, Cooper County; Hon. A. Ives Reid, Cass County; Hon. Ben Meeks, Oregon County; Hon. John L. Sando, Dunklin County; Hon. R. F. Whiteside, Lincoln County; Hon. J. E. Burruss, Saline County; Hon. Fred A. Neel, Randolph County. The memorial was referred to the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 19, 1945

(Legislative day of Friday, March 16, 1945)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Maj. William C. Taggart, chaplain, United States Army Air Forces Hospital, Miami Beach, Fla., offered the following prayer:

Our Father which art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven.

Grant us this day the leadership of Thy Holy Spirit. Reveal to us the light of Thy word that this great body of national leaders may be able to undertake great things with Thee and to expect great things of Thee. If Thou art with us, who can be against us? Help us to be thankful for all the good that has been accomplished by the sacrifices of our American men and our allies. May we be able to keep the death of these men from having been in vain. Richly bless, lead, and empower the Members of our United States Senate as they face these dark days and bear the burdens of our Nation. Grant these favors, we pray, in the name of Thy Son and because of our love of Thee. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On the request of Mr. HATCH, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, March 16, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on March 15, 1945, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 177) for the relief of Oscar Griggs.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) relative to determination and payment of certain claims against the Government of Mexico, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the bill (H. R. 2200) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 18 of the United States Code entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," together with the accompanying report thereon; and

H. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution authorizing the special committee of the Committee on Agriculture, designated by the chairman to study post-war plans for agriculture, particularly as relate to cotton, to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 197. An act to establish the grade of general in the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 242. An act for the relief of Ruben M. Herren;

H. R. 249. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper;

H. R. 256. An act for the relief of Dr. Luther J. Head;

H. R. 257. An act for the relief of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased;

H. R. 687. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions;

H. R. 946. An act for the relief of the estates of Robert C. Meals and Bessie Mae Morgret, Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, Donald Meals, a minor, and Betty Wrightstone, a minor;

H. R. 987. An act for the relief of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.;

H. R. 1149. An act for the relief of Dane D. Morgan;

H. R. 1429. An act to permit the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and the United States Maritime Commission, during the national emergency, to pay the tax imposed under section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code without regard to the $3,000 limitation in section 1426 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 1485. An act for the relief of Henry B. Tucker;

H. R. 1646. An act to establish the grade of admiral in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2506. An act to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bridges	Capehart
Austin	Briggs	Capper
Bailey	Brooks	Chandler
Bankhead	Buck	Connally
Barkley	Burton	Cordon
Bilbo	Bushfield	Donnell
Brewster	Byrd	Downey
Eastland	McCarran	Robertson
Ellender	McClellan	Russell
Ferguson	McFarland	Saltonstall
Fulbright	McKellar	Shipstead
George	McMahon	Stewart
Gerry	Magnuson	Taft
Guffey	Maybank	Taylor
Gurney	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Hart	Millikin	Thomas, Utah
Hatch	Mitchell	Tobey
Hawkes	Moore	Tunnell
Hayden	Morse	Tydings
Hickenlooper	Murdock	Vandenberg
Hill	Murray	Walsh
Hoey	Myers	Wheeler
Johnson, Calif.	O'Daniel	Wherry
Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	White
Johnston, S. C.	Overton	Wiley
Kilgore	Pepper	Willis
La Follette	Radcliffe	Wilson
Langer	Reed	
Lucas	Revercomb	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate on account of illness.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present the credentials of MILTON R. YOUNG, the Senator-designate from North Dakota, appointed by the Governor of the State. I have examined the credentials, and they are correct as to form. Mr. YOUNG is now present in the Chamber and ready to take the oath. I send the credentials to the desk and ask that they be read.

The credentials were read by the legislative clerk and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To all to whom these presents shall come: the Governor of said State to the President of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of North Dakota, I, Fred G. Aandahl, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint MILTON R. YOUNG a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein, caused by the death of John Moses, is filled by election as provided by law.

Witness: His excellency, our Governor Fred G. Aandahl, and our seal hereto affixed at Bismarck, N. Dak., this 12th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1945.

By the Governor:

FRED G. AANDAHL,
Governor.

[SEAL]

THOMAS HALL,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-designate will present himself at the desk, the oath will be administered to him.

Mr. YOUNG, escorted by Mr. LANGER, advanced to the Vice President's desk,

and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to him by the Vice President.

STATEMENT AS TO RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement for the benefit and information of the Senate in regard to the proposed recess of the two Houses over Easter. The suggestion for a recess was advanced some 2 weeks ago on the part of the House, in an informal way, the feeling being that by the coming Saturday the two Houses might shape their legislative programs in such a way that it might be possible to take a vacation for a couple of weeks before and after Easter.

So far as the Senate is concerned, our legislative program is in fairly good condition. We have pretty well cleaned up the calendar of legislation. But we now have before us the Mexican Treaty, the debate on which we have been advised may extend over a couple of weeks.

The House Committee on Banking and Currency is now holding hearings on the Bretton Woods agreement, and following their hearings the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate will hold hearings on it. If Congress should take a recess of 2 weeks the committees would feel justified also in taking a recess, because neither House could expect the committees to remain in session and work during a recess if the other Members of Congress should leave Washington. So that I think we would have to assume that if, by concurrent resolution involving both Houses, we took a recess, it would involve all the Members of Congress, and such a number of members of the active committees that it would be impracticable to attempt to hold hearings during the recess. The net result would be that even after the recess expired, it would take another week to get back into our stride so that we could proceed with the legislative program before the Senate.

In view of this situation, in view of the fact that the treaty now before the Senate, regardless of what action the Senate may take on the motion now pending—and my remarks about the recess have nothing to do with that—in view of the great desire and desirability of disposing of the Mexican Treaty prior to the assembly at San Francisco to deal with the question of world organization, and in view of the fact that the result of our deliberations on the Mexican Treaty may have a very strong psychological as well as practical effect upon the atmosphere which may prevail at San Francisco, it seems to me unwise for the Senate to enter into any program for a recess over Easter.

I do not see how we could justify a recess on the part of the Senate, or, as a matter of fact, on the part of Congress, with the war situation perhaps arriving at its peak, with the fighting on all fronts going forward, with our men all over the world, who themselves will have no recess, fighting to bring the war to a successful termination at the earliest possible date. With all the matters we must consider in connection with the entire situation, I think a recess at this time would be wholly unjustifiable. I feel that the Senate should know that, so far as I am concerned, I do not propose to offer any concurrent resolution providing for a recess of the two Houses of Congress. In order that Senators might make their plans, I felt they were entitled to know the situation, and that I should make a statement at this time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. In my opinion, the conclusions reached by the majority leader are altogether sound, and reflect his good judgment. We do have matters immediately pending which should be disposed of. What the future holds, no one of us can say. I have somewhat cherished the hope that along about the latter part of April, when two of our most distinguished and active Members will leave for a substantial time upon the work of the forthcoming San Francisco Conference, it might be possible for Congress to take a brief period of rest. But, as for the present, I think what the majority leader has said is wholly justified.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Maine, the minority leader. I know we all would enjoy a brief respite from our labors; I am sure it would help us if we could get back among our people; but I do not believe this is the time to attempt it, and I express the hope that later on, whether the latter part of April or sometime later on, even in the summer, we may find it justifiable, by reason of the state of public business, then to take a recess. At the moment, however, I see no justification whatever for it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to make an observation in connection with the remarks made by the leaders of the Senate. Recently I read in a newspaper that the failure of the Senate to agree to a recess was due to over-optimism on the part of the Senate as to the early termination of the war. I merely wanted to say now, and I hope it will be clearly understood, that the Senate of the United States is not indulging in any over-optimism about the early termination of the war. Frankly, I do not think that type of information does any good to the public or to the war effort, and, as one Senator, I want to be on record as saying I am not overly optimistic as to the termination of the war, but I do thoroughly agree with what the leaders of the Senate have said.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, my remarks with reference to a possible recess were not in any way based upon any optimism on my part or on the part of the Senate as to the early termination of the war. I think the position we have taken this morning about a recess would be eminently justifiable if we knew beyond any uncertainty at all that the war would last two or three years more. I am talking about the present legislative situation and the importance of business pending in the Senate, which it seems to me would make it inexcusable for the Senate to attempt to recess, and I do not believe such an action would find any basis for justification among the people of the United States.

Mr. HATCH. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky. I merely wanted to make it clear that I for one think it is bad to create false impressions as to optimism on the part of the Senate, or on the part of any Government officials, as to the early termination of the war.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have frequently said in public, and I repeat, that I think the most useless and the most harmful activity which any man can be engaged in who is laboring under any degree of responsibility now, either legislative or executive or other branches of our Government or any other Government, is to begin to make predictions about when this war is going to end.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I am in thorough accord with the sentiments expressed by the majority leader and emphasized by the minority leader and by my colleague the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH].

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Letters from the Secretary of State and the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending June 30, 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution 9

"Whereas the forty-ninth general assembly memorialized the Congress of the United States, by the passage of House Concurrent Resolution No. 15, urging the submission of an amendment to the Federal Constitution for ratification by three-fourths of the various States, which amendment, among other things, proposed to place a limit of 25 percent on the amount of tax that might be levied and collected on incomes, inheritances, and transfers of property; and

"Whereas said House concurrent resolution may be found set out in full on pages 395 and 396 of the House Journal of 1941; and

"Whereas in the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress a similar amendment was proposed for ratification known as Senate Joint Resolution No. 160; and

"Whereas since the adoption of said memorial to Congress known as House Concurrent Resolution No. 15, events and circumstances have arisen which have increased the national debt to unprecedented heights, the payment of which will be greatly jeopardized if such limitation is placed upon the taxing power of Congress, since a substantial source of revenue from those persons with large incomes will be irretrievably lost; and

"Whereas the size of the national debt is a matter of great concern to the people of

the State of Iowa, the ultimate payment of which is deemed imperatively necessary, and the general assembly, as now constituted, believes it would be a grave mistake to place such limitation on the taxing power of Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Iowa (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized that the General Assembly of the State of Iowa is opposed to any constitutional limitation being placed on the taxing power of Congress under present conditions. The action of the forty-ninth general assembly heretofore referred to is rescinded."

By Mr. TAFT:

A petition of sundry citizens of Springfield, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the marketing of soya butter for American citizens; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BRIGGS:

A memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Memorial to Congress memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to permit the use of live decoys for the 1945 fall duck hunting season

"Whereas the duck population has increased from 30,000,000 a few years ago to 150,000,000 in 1944; and

"Whereas only a few hunters in Missouri and surrounding States have been able to bag any ducks because live decoys have been prohibited, and ducks have not decoyed to wooden or artificial decoys; and

"Whereas many large flights of ducks passed over Missouri the past season, and many of these ducks would make one circle at a distance from the artificial decoys and pass on. Many hunters would shoot at these ducks out of killing range which resulted in many wounded ducks but few killed: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States of America be memorialized to amend the Federal law to permit the use of live decoys for the 1945 fall duck hunting season; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be sent to President Roosevelt, Harold Ickes, Ira N. Gabrielson, and each Senator and Congressman from Missouri, and to Mr. Irwin T. Bode, director of State conservation commission at Jefferson City, Mo."

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States to take appropriate measures to open Palestine to free immigration and colonization by the Jewish people

"Whereas the Nazi persecution and wholesale slaughter of Jews in Europe have outraged the conscience of the civilized world and have vastly aggravated the tragedy of the Jewish problem there; and

"Whereas at the end of the present war large numbers of Europeon Jews will find themselves in desperate need for a new home where they can rebuild their lives in dignity and security; and

"Whereas after World War No. 1, Great Britain had accepted at the instance of the Allied and Associated Powers the mandate for Palestine and had undertaken 'to facilitate the establishment of a Jewish National Home in Palestine,' an undertaking subsequently approved by 52 nations, including the United States; and

"Whereas this policy was concurred in by a joint resolution unanimously adopted by both Houses of the Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922; and

"Whereas the Democratic and the Republican Parties in their national conventions of 1944, adopted platforms in favor of the reestablishment of Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish Commonwealth; and

"Whereas the President of the United States on October 15, 1944, expressed his approval of this aim which he stated to be 'in accord with the traditional American policy and in keeping with the spirit of the "four freedoms" ': Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, express our profound sympathy with the millions of innocent victims of the enemy's ruthless extermination policy, and that we demand just punishment of all those who perpetrated these horrible crimes against humanity; and be it further

Resolved, That the United States should take appropriate measures to the end that Palestine should be opened for free immigration and unrestricted colonization so that the Jewish people may rebuild their ancestral homeland as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth, and that the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby memorialized to take proper action for that purpose; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of the memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Senate, and the House of Representatives of the United States of America.

"Approved February 23, 1945.

"LESTER C. HUNT,
"*Governor.*"

MANFACTURE, SHIPPING, AND USE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS—PETITION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference a petition signed by various residents of West Lebanon, Maine, with respect to the manufacture, shipping, and use of intoxicating liquors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petition presented by the Senator from Maine will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

NATIONAL REPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from the officers of the Mid-City Citizens Association, Washington, D. C., resolutions adopted at their recent meeting taking a stand in favor of Joint Resolution 9, to provide national representation in Congress for the District of Columbia. The organization states that there is no other civilization in the world whose Government deprives any part of its citizenship of their right to vote, as is done in the District of Columbia. The protest set forth by this organization is, in my opinion, unanswerable. The Congress should not longer delay enacting legislation which will give the people of the National Capital their right to vote.

I ask unanimous consent to present the resolutions for appropriate reference and that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 16, 1945.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: The Mid-City Citizens Association of the District of Columbia has unanimously approved the Sumners-Capper proposed amendment to the Constitution, to provide national representation for the District of Columbia, known as House Joint Resolution 62, Senate Joint Resolution 9.

The undersigned respectfully submit to the Judiciary Committee the following reasons why both Houses of Congress should adopt the Sumners-Capper proposed amendment to the Constitution to provide national representation for the District of Columbia:

1. In a free government there should be no taxation without representation. This is an axiom of political science, a principle for which our forefathers fought in the War of Independence.

2. There is no civilized nation in the world whose government deprives either all of its citizens or a portion thereof of their right to vote and at the same time calls itself a democracy. According to logical necessity, only a dictatorship can deprive its citizens of their right to vote.

3. The citizens of the District of Columbia claim almost unanimously this inalienable right, which is enjoyed by all the other citizens of our country.

4. Those other citizens of our country who reside in the District of Columbia do not ipso facto lose their right to vote in their respective States.

5. Only for the imperative purpose to protect absolutely the seat of the Federal Government have the authors of the Constitution deemed it necessary to withhold the vote from the people residing here. But even after they would be given this right by the proposed amendment, Congress would still keep in its control the government of the District of Columbia.

6. The proposed amendment does not conflict with the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government over the District.

7. The restoration of the right to vote to the citizens of the District would be in perfect harmony with the fundamental policy of our Government to encourage by both precept and conduct the adoption of sound political principles by all nations and the establishment of democratic regimes in all the countries of the world, and it would, therefore, be acclaimed heartily by the legislative bodies of the individual States of the Union.

Respectfully submitted.

A. J. DRISCOLL,
President, Mid-City Citizens Association,
SOTERIOS NICHOLSON,
Committee, Law and Legislation,
Mid-City Citizens Association.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY SIXTH ANNUAL VERMONT FARM-LABOR CONFERENCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, for the past 6 years a unique conference has been held annually in the State of Vermont. Leaders of the grange, the Farm Bureau Federation, and other farm organizations get together with the leaders of the A. F. of L., the C. I. O., and the railroad brotherhoods, to consider not only their own problems, but the problems of the other fellow as well. They set an example which would be productive of much good if it were more commonly followed in all parts of the country. This year the meeting was held at Plainfield, Vt., on February 23 and 24. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolutions adopted at the Sixth Annual

Vermont Farm Labor Conference printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions adopted by the sixth annual Vermont farm-labor conference, Plainfield, Vt., February 23 and 24, 1945

1. Whereas the maintenance of a high level of wages and of farm income are both essential to the continuance of a purchasing power sufficient to maintain economic prosperity and whereas the attainment of these goals requires the utmost intelligent and cooperative effort on the part of all available agencies, be it resolved that we hereby recommend the closest cooperation of both farm and labor groups, and of both jointly with governmental agencies at local, State, national, and international levels for the achievement of these goals.

2. Whereas the attainment of a stable national economy is irrevocably linked with the achievement of a stable international economy, and whereas controls for realizing such international economic stability have been decided upon at the Bretton Woods Monetary Conference: *Be it resolved*, That we recommend to our Senators and authorized agents of government the fullest cooperation in implementing the Bretton Woods agreement and all other measures of international cooperation which will promote world, and thereby national, stability.

3. *Be it resolved*, That we go on record in favor of the expansion of cooperative marketing by producers and more particularly the development and expansion of consumer cooperatives.

4. *Be it resolved*, That we recommend that all employees not otherwise covered by existing laws should be included under social security laws. The question of including those persons not covered by the word "employees" should be referred to farm and labor groups for further study.

5. *Be it resolved*, That we recommend that the kind of benefits under social security should be broadened to include payments for sickness and disability and compensation for loss of time therefrom.

6. *Be it resolved*, That we are agreed on the need of health insurance for all, and recommend further study as to the means of providing it.

7. *Be it resolved*, That we endorse the efforts of the present legislature for a minimum salary of $1,000 for school teachers and $25 per equated pupil, and we advocate further study of means to increase pay for all teachers and to further improve our schools.

8. *Be it resolved*, That we recommend that the head of the Vermont State Farm Bureau and one other from that organization, the head of the Vermont State Grange and one other from that organization, the heads of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, the State C. I. O. and State A. F. L., come together under the auspices of Goddard College to set up a committee to look into the advisability of the following measures and to report its findings to the next farm-labor conference at Goddard College:

(1) The creation of a State Power Resources Authority to develop and execute a plan for the development of our water power resources, the control of floods, and the use of our streams and lakes in the public interest.

(2) The creation of a Connecticut River Valley Authority to be similar in nature and purpose to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

(3) The utilization of flood-control dams wherever possible for power development by some public authority.

(4) Supporting the bill now in Congress providing for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway.

(5) The appropriation of funds to the Vermont Forest Service for the purpose of increasing substantially the area of State forests.

(6) The continuation and extension of the functions of the soil- and agricultural-conservation activities.

9. *Be it resolved*, That we support the recommendations with regard to taxation made by the Governor's Labor Committee on Postwar Planning, and we, therefore, (1) petition the Governor to appoint forthwith a commission to study the tax problem in Vermont with a view to reducing and equalizing the burden on real estate, placing the income tax on a progressive basis, furnishing an incentive to business, and searching out further sources of revenue; (2) request that this commission be composed of representatives of agriculture, labor, business, consumers, and the professions; (3) request that this commission present its findings at the next session of the legislature.

10. *Be it resolved*, That we recommend and urge that all unions study cooperatives, and that unions and farms work together toward organizing building supply cooperatives which would include plans for new homes.

11. *Be it resolved*, That we recommend that the chairman of this conference appoint a committee to study a standard of rental housing to be recommended to the Vermont Legislature. In conjunction with this study, we recommend that this conference go on record as desirous that all persons renting homes to the public, be they farmers or others, shall maintain such property in a condition commensurate with the American standard of living.

12. *Be it resolved*, That we recommend that home owners make full use of Government lending agencies in conjunction with cooperatives for supplying building materials.

13. *Be it resolved*, That we recommend a community council for every community, such council to be made up of a representative of each organization now functioning in the community, to study recreation, landscaping, business opportunities, and any matter of community interest.

14. *Be it resolved*, That we go on record to commend the study for the preservation of economic freedom conducted by the Temporary National Economic Committee and to support the following recommendations made by Chairman Senator O'MAHONEY at the closing public session on March 11, 1941;

(1) National charters for national corporations, in order that these agencies may have a definite and a free place in our economy and local business may be differentiated and protected from national business;

(2) The effective and thorough enforcement of the antitrust laws to maintain competition and to prevent all combinations and agreements that destroy business;

(3) The encouragement of new business and small enterprise by revision of the tax laws for the purpose of encouraging new employment and new industry;

(4) A national conference called by Congress of the various organizations, representative of business, labor, agriculture, and consumers which have for years been working on diverse phases of this central problem might concentrate public thought and action on the objectives on which there is general agreement instead of, as now, on the objectives concerning which there is only misunderstanding, suspicion, and disagreement.

15. *Be it resolved*, That we recommend and urge that more than one farmer-labor conference be held each year and that the chairman of this conference appoint a committee to plan further conferences.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

H. R. 914. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado and Kansas to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Arkansas River; without amendment (Rept. No. 107).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

S. 37. A bill to amend sections 4, 7, and 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187) for the purpose of extending the time in which amendatory contracts may be made, and for other related purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 108); and

H. R. 1534. A bill to amend the Fact Finders' Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 109).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

INVESTIGATION OF FOOD PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, during the last session of Congress a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was appointed to make a study and investigation of matters pertaining to production, transportation, distribution, and consumption of food products in this country. That committee held extensive hearings and submitted a report. As I recall, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was then chairman of that subcommittee.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has reported Senate resolution 92, which was then referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, of which I am chairman. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I now ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, Senate resolution 92, which provides an appropriation of $5,000 for continuation of the investigation, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 92), submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, on March 6, 1945, and which had been previously reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized (a) to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to any matters relating to the production, transportation, distribution, exportation, utilization, and consumption of food and allied products produced within or imported into the United States and its Territories and possesions, and of all products, commodities, and factors involved therein, including farm prices and shortages of farm labor, machinery, fertilizer, and feed or other commodities necessary to crop and livestock production; and (b) to make inquiries into any policies and practices of the Government which appear to imperil the production and distribution of adequate supplies of food for our armed forces,

our civilian population, or our allies. The committee or subcommittee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the result of its investigations, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the remainder of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $5,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Illinois whether this resolution has the approval of the minority members of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate?

Mr. LUCAS. I have conferred with the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and he agrees that the resolution should be adopted.

Mr. WHITE. I defer to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, as a minority member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I have cooperated with the chairman, and sincerely hope that the resolution will be adopted at once. I know of no more timely matter to come before the Senate than the question of the distribution of food products and supplies for the Army and Navy, as well as the civilian population. The resolution is in the right hands, in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which has previously conducted the investigation, and knows whereof it speaks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

S. 758. A bill to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of members of the Armed Forces of the United States dying in the service or former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable and certain other persons as provided for in United States Code, title 24, section 281, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN (by request):

S. 759. A bill to provide for the detention, care, and treatment of persons of unsound mind in certain Federal reservations in Virginia and Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 760. A bill to prescribe the period within which actions may be commenced under section 16 (b) of the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 761. A bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in Quonsett Hutt occupied by Eighty-third United States Naval Construction Battalion at Camp Rosseau, Port Hueneme, Calif., on December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 762. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs Everett McLendon, Sr., Everett McLendon, Jr., and Nadine McLendon; to the Committee on Claims.

AMENDMENT OF THE BANKRUPTCY ACT—PROPOSED CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF HOUSE BILL 37

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 94) changing the reference of House bill 37, amending the Bankruptcy Act, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce to the Committee on the Judiciary, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) relative to determination and payment of certain claims against the Government of Mexico, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOURLY MINIMUM-WAGE STANDARDS

Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11), which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

Whereas pursuant to the act of October 2, 1942, which was designed to aid in stabilizing the cost of living, the President, in Executive Orders Nos. 9250 and 9328, conferred authority upon the National War Labor Board to correct substandards of living; and

Whereas substandard wages not only undermine the health and strength of the Nation but curtail production; and

Whereas Congress deems it desirable to determine a rate below which wage rates shall be considered substandard: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that a straight-time hourly rate of 65 cents per hour is the minimum below which the National War Labor Board shall consider any wage rate substandard.

PROBLEMS OF WAR AND PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARKLEY BEFORE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Foreign Policy Association at a luncheon at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on March 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ALL-AMERICAN FLAG LINE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

[Mr. McCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "All-American Flag Line" made by him before the Senate Committee on Commerce March 19, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. PATRICK'S DAY ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT E. HANNEGAN

[Mr. BRIGGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Robert E. Hannegan, chairman, Democratic National Committee, at a St. Patrick's Day dinner at Rochester, N. Y., on March 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS TO THE FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK BY REV. EDMUND A. WALSH, S. J.

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president of Georgetown University, before the Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of the City of Washington, March 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE WAY TO 60,000,000 JOBS—ADDRESS BY MARSHALL FIELD

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Way to 60,000,000 Jobs," delivered by Marshall Field before the Advertisers' Club of Cincinnati on March 7, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY'S LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY HON. PAUL E. FITZPATRICK

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Democratic Party's Legislative Program," delivered by Hon. Paul E. Fitzpatrick, Democratic State chairman of New York, on March 11, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY NAT BASS AT SGT. MEYER LEVIN MEMORIAL HALL ASSOCIATION DINNER

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Nat Bass, president of the Hebrew Educational Society of Brooklyn, at the Sgt. Meyer Levin Memorial Hall Association Dinner, Brooklyn, N. Y., March 7, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ROAD AHEAD—ARTICLE FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Road Ahead," by John W. Owens, published in the Baltimore Sun of March 14, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a series of editorials appearing in magazines devoted to the profession of dentistry, relating to a bill introduced by him to establish a national institute of dental research, which appear in the Appendix.]

SOMETHING TO BARGAIN WITH—ARTICLE BY MAURICE R. FRANKS

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Something to Bargain With," written by Maurice R. Franks and published in the official organ of the Railroad Yardmasters of North America, Inc., which appears in the Appendix.]

NONFERROUS METALS—LABOR'S VICTORY PROGRAM FOR WAR AND PEACE

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Nonferrous Metals—Labor's Victory Program for War and Peace," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MEAT SHORTAGE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, a report made by the American Meat Institute, calling attention of the public generally to the fact that the present meat shortage is almost at the famine stage in this country. The report is contained in a newspaper article under a Chicago date line.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

O. P. A. HELD PARTLY TO BLAME—MEAT SHORTAGE ALMOST FAMINE, PACKERS' ORGANIZATION REPORTS

CHICAGO, March 18.—Severe and growing shortages of all kinds of meat for the American public, so serious that they are "bordering on a meat famine in many parts of the country," was reported today by the American Meat Institute.

Announcing results of a Nation-wide survey made for the Office of Price Administration, the institute said:

"For the first time since meat rationing began, many meat items now are reported for the country as a whole as being 100 percent in short supply in relation to the needs of the trade; most beef and pork cuts reported as being over 97 percent in short supply.

"The severe and growing shortages * * * border on a meat famine in many parts of the country.

"The only exceptions to the extreme shortage are some sausage and variety meats, but even these are shorter than a month ago. * * *

"It is true, too, that the supply of meat for vital war purposes—for our Army and Navy—and for domestic consumers, undoubtedly will continue to get much worse before it gets any better. Reasons for this are—

"1. Uncontrolled, extensive, and growing black market in all kinds of meat.

"2. Diversion of large quantities of meat from normal, legitimate commercial channels of trade—from which supplies for war purposes must be obtained.

"3. Regulations which have the effect of discouraging cattle feeders from taking more young range animals and bringing them to the maturity and weight of finished beef.

"4. Government price controls which have resulted in wholesale ceiling prices for meat—especially beef and pork—not being sufficient, in the case of legitimate operators, to reflect the prices paid currently for livestock."

BACON VERSUS BEVERAGES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a letter addressed to me by J. H. Meek, director, division of markets, Commonwealth of Virginia, under date of March 15, 1945, enclosing a copy of a statement entitled "Bacon Versus Beverages" in which he said:

> The way that the livestock and meat problems have been handled is tragic.

I also ask to have printed at this point the statement entitled "Bacon Versus Beverages." The statement will throw much light on the failure to produce pork in this country.

There being no objection, the letter and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
Richmond, March 15, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: I understand from the press today, that you are urging an investigation of the situation relating to food.

For your information, enclosed is a copy of a statement entitled "Bacon Versus Beverages." The way that the livestock and meat problems have been handled is tragic. If there is an investigation, I will be glad to testify before a committee, and will appreciate your informing me upon developments.

Wishing you success in securing a strong movement to make an investigation, I am,

Sincerely yours,

DIVISION OF MARKETS,
J. H. MEEK, *Director.*

BACON VERSUS BEVERAGES

(By J. H. Meek, director, Division of Markets, Virginia Department of Agriculture)

Bacon is defeated by beverages. Those interested in profits from beverages have not only ruthlessly disregarded the moral and religious forces of this country but they have defeated the social, economic, and health forces.

In the middle of 1943 the cost of producing pork increased about one-third within a short period. Realizing glutted markets and sharp reduction in volume of production would follow, we warned Federal officials time and again that disastrous results would follow. During the week of December 6 to 11, 1943, it was estimated that hog producers selling on the Richmond market lost from $25,000 to $30,000 and that approximately 20,000 pounds of meat went to waste with potential loss to consumers of 450,000 to 500,000 pounds of meat. Similar conditions prevailed for a number of weeks throughout the country. Therefore, for the whole country producers lost many millions of dollars in food that went to waste and several hundred millions of pounds of potential production of pork were destroyed. All of this was on account of officials failing to recognize the situation and make a few simple adjustments in time to meet it.

On November 1, 1943, Hon. Chester Bowles, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, and Hon. Marvin Jones, Administrator, War Food Administration, were informed that livestock producers were liquidating and that many immature, unfinished animals and those that should be kept for breeding, particularly hogs, were being disposed of on low, glutted markets because farmers did not see how they could finish them or continue breeding without losses. It was suggested that producers needed immediate assurance of higher support and ceiling prices. Regardless of this and other appeals by those interested in livestock producers throughout the Nation, producers were urged to reduce livestock numbers drastically on account of the feed being short, and there were announcements that support and ceiling prices would be reduced in the face of producer costs increasing one-third.

Farmers did not need official representatives to tell them to decrease on account of the lack of feed. They have some judgment of their own and use it without the need of such simple advice and would have reduced in proportion to the feed available without anybody saying anything about it. The astounding thing is why they were not only asked but forced to reduce drastically—yes; dangerously—on account of support and ceiling prices being made so as to force them to take losses.

Reliable sources throughout this country report that there is only a small percent of the bacon that civilians want available at this time. Other pork is critically short for civilian use, and other meats are getting shorter as time goes on. There are mounting needs in foreign countries where people are starving, and restrictions upon civilians in this country who have plenty of money to buy their needs at prices that would give farmers reasonable profits instead of losses that they have sustained during the last 18 months on hogs. In the face of all this, grains are more plentiful and distilleries are allowed to make beverages. Last August, according to the best information available, from 50,000,000 to 54,000,000 proof gallons of beverage spirits were produced. Up to this time official information upon the production in January is not available, but indications are that as much was produced in January as last August. Press reports recently stated because of increased facilities the industry could produce in 1 month more than the normal year's supply of liquor. Therefore, distilleries running in August 1944 and January 1945 are supposed to produce enough liquor for this country for 2 years.

After more than 12 months shouting by various Government representatives that livestock producers should cut down their numbers on account of lack of feed, farmers were forced to take severe losses on hogs by support and ceiling prices fixed and maintained. Not only bacon but other pork, poultry, and beef are scarce for civilian needs, and reports indicate that black markets are running rampant throughout the country because high officials have forced farmers to sell on "yellow markets" (markets made by Government regulations which force farmers to take losses).

INCREASE OF HOG PRODUCTION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate the other day some Senator asked if we could not do something constructive with reference to the production of meat. I have in my hand a telegram and a letter from Roy Tucker, who is associated with the Auction Sales Organization of the State of Nebraska, which has over 250 members. In order to increase pork production he makes the suggestion that the ceiling price be taken off feeder pigs under 140 pounds, and that the farmers be permitted to buy such pigs and put fat on them up to about 300 or 230 pounds. We already have control over retail sales, but it would help production of pork, in Nebraska especially, if stock hogs of all weights were exempted from ceiling prices when sold for feeding purposes, since, with low grade unsalable wet corn, the cost of grain per 100 pounds of pork justifies open competition among farmers who need to feed their corn.

I ask that the telegram and letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YORK, NEBR., *March 16, 1945.*

KENNETH S. WHERRY:

For urgent immediate action exempt stock hogs all weights from ceiling prices when sold for feeding purposes. Reason; with low grade unsalable corn the cost of gain per hundred pounds of pork justifies open competition among farmers who need to feed their corn. Present ceiling will force this weight hogs into illegitimate trading. Some auction markets are selling only to packers when pork is needed and corn is spoiling. The final ceiling for finished hogs will give sufficient control for all weights of stock and feeding hogs. Release is extremely urgent.

ROY TUCKER.

YORK LIVESTOCK COMMISSION CO.,
York, Nebr., March 16, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR KENNETH: You have received my message by now regarding stock hogs weighing 140 pounds or more being subject to the ceiling of fat finished hogs.

I wish to add a little additional explanation.

On the open public market (auction), farmers have been paying around $15.25 for heavier feeding hogs that need additional finish. Some, of course, are less, and few more, depending upon weight, condition, quality, etc.

A 175-pound feeding hog can stand an additional hundred pounds to put on the proper finish. Some move them because they have spring pigs coming on; other farmers want them for their wet corn.

Corn here can be bought from 50 to 60 cents. At this price a hundred pounds can be put on a hog for $8 per hundredweight. This hog, bought on the present market at around $15, still makes the feeder $4.50 per head.

Of course, in the end the hog goes to the packer at $14.10, and we contend the ceiling on the finished product is sufficient for control of the price of stock hogs of all weights.

If this hog is to be sold at $14.10, who gets it? What method must we use to dispose of it and be fair to all?

Now, what will happen is this: Traders will do the business in the country at prices to suit themselves and the farmers, and the trading will not be done where we can't see what is going on. It will give them a chance to black market some of these to the killers.

The question is a very serious one in this particular territory on account of our wet-corn deal, and in countries where corn is of high quality and grade the release will do no harm. Farmers know what they can pay another farmer for feeding stock of all kinds when they know their limits on the finished product.

The weighing agreement on all general farm sales and ranch sales where the farmer or rancher is retiring from business is another very bad deal.

We are trying to save gas, tires, and labor. These boys are not paying more than ceiling; they are not so easily fooled. As far as the markets are concerned, we can weigh them—fact is, most of us do weigh all but the breeding animals and little buck calves, but we can get used to weighing these little 67- and 70-pound calves, too. But when it comes to a farmer on a general farm sale having to pay someone to haul a little wabbly calf to town to a scale, it just don't make sense.

A ranchman lives 35 or 40 miles from town; he closes out his livestock and equipment and retires. Wouldn't it be something to drive these cattle to town to have them weighed?

When a man buys at a country sale by the pound, how does he know within 50 cents per hundredweight what he is paying? Maybe the buyer gets a big shrink in weight and maybe the farmer holds them off of water and salts them and has them too full when the buyer is ready for delivery. On the market you know we can see what we are doing.

I don't make farm sales, and this won't hurt me any—fact is, if they stand pat and force them to sell by weight, the farmer might just as well send his stock to me in the first place, and I would be better off; but you and I know it should be released.

I feel like I can talk hogs and cattle to you and you know what I am talking about. You will understand, and I know you are doing all possible to make things practical—and how we do appreciate having you there at this time.

They, I feel, will welcome suggestions from people in the business, and I want you to know how we look at these things from this distance. The ceilings are not so bad, but try and get them to stop there. We don't want inflation. I think they are doing a great job holding things down. I'm willing to work with the O. P. A., and that is why I am writing you at this time.

With kindest personal regards,

ROY TUCKER.

SHORTAGE OF FARM MACHINERY AND MANPOWER

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter which is typical of hundreds of letters I have received relative to the purchase of farm machinery with which to produce more food. The letter comes from my own State, and is from Peter Hilt, of Waverly, Nebr.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAVERLY, NEBR., *March 16, 1945.*

Hon. KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senator from Nebraska, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Minneapolis Moline dealer here in Lincoln (Retzloff Implement Co.) has just received the shipment of M. M. model U tractors, for nonfarm purposes. Altogether now they have between twenty and thirty nonfarm-purpose tractors standing around. This includes the M. M. model U's and smaller types of M. M. tractors. I am still trying to get one of these nonfarm model U tractors released to me. Hoping that Mr. Norstrand in your next letter will be help to you and me.

Thanking you again,
I remain your friend,

PETER HILT.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, not only is the question of farm production affected by the shortage of farm machinery, but the question of manpower is also involved. I have before me a typical letter from C. D. Hicks, of St. Louis, Mo., a farmer, who was forced to sell out because of the manpower situation in his territory which handicapped him in his production of food. I ask that the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *March 17, 1945.*

Hon. KENNETH WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WHERRY: The press says you stated, "When it comes to belt tightening to feed our allies, we'll all do that. But that doesn't explain why there isn't more food for both us and our allies. We want to know why, when we have near-record amounts of corn and cattle, we don't have more beef and pork," and you go on to say farmers are afraid and mention loss of faith on hogs. I assume you mean price ceilings or regulations.

In the first place, we do not have near record of cattle and hogs. I don't think you have hit the trouble at all. Commencing more than 18 months ago, I wrote Senator TYDINGS and sent copies of my letters to other Senators and Congressmen calling attention to the lack of proper ceilings on cattle and hogs and urged that at that time rationing restrictions be reduced. But the important thing I called attention to was the disregard for the manpower situation on the farms. Farm boys and farmers were being taken without regard to the future farm production and the necessity for producing basic food supplies. If you will refer to the files, I am sure that you will find wherein I advocated at that time that unless something was done to protect the farm manpower situation and unless something was done to assure the farming industry that they would be able to keep sufficient farm help we would be confronted with a food shortage before the end of 1945.

I am a farmer. All last year farmer after farmer was advertising his stock, his farm machinery, and his household goods, selling out due to the lack of farm help or also all of his sons had been drafted into the armed services. Farmer after farmer was selling his base sows and base cows. I found many farmers disposing of all of their base sows and they were producers that maintained an average of 10 to 20 sows all the time. In each case the going out of business was silently stated to be due the fact that they had no farm help and that all their help had been taken from the farms into the armed services and those that had not been drafted into the armed services had left for war defense plant jobs. This is still going on this spring. Last March of last year I sold all of my beef cows and breeding stock and also all of our breeding sows all due to the lack of farm help for attending to them and at the same time producing crops and feed for them. It is the millions of small farmers and producers that have been affected and either gone out of business or reduced their actual activity.

The largest period of drain on farmers under the deferment and draft is in March and April, and October and November. This is due to the 6 months' deferment. But each March and April and each October and November deferments are not renewed and more farm boys and farmers are going away from the farm. Unless something is done to clarify this situation with local draft boards or unless the new manpower law is enacted with clarification of the meaning of the Tydings amendment prior to the middle of April, thousands of deferments expiring between now and that date will not be renewed and the farm situation thus further and seriously impaired.

FOOD SHARING AND THE COUNTRY'S FOOD PROBLEM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD two editorials with which I agree 100 percent, one from the Washington Post of March 18, 1945, entitled "Food Sharing," and the other from the Washington Star of March 18, 1945, entitled "The Facts Would Help."

I agree with the President that everyone should tighten his belt to help in the present food situation; but, Mr. President, that is no reason why constructive criticism should not be offered to help increase food production, if that can be done. It is our job to see that it is done. I think all Americans, 130,000,000 strong, will comply with the President's request to tighten their belts, but that should not deter us from endeavoring to help in increasing food production with which to feed our armies and the civilian population in the months and years ahead.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of Sunday, March 18, 1945]

FOOD SHARING

The President was stating a simple truth when he pointed out that people who oppose cutting our food consumption for the sake of feeding the starving of other countries are not decent. We share the President's belief that the vast majority of Americans are the decent sort who are prepared to make sacrifices to alleviate the sufferings of others. However, the agitated debate over food short-

ages and export demands has taken an acrimonious turn that threatens to obscure and distort the real issues and to give a wrong impression of the temper of the civilian population.

Faced by the simple question whether we are willing to share our comparative abundance with the starving people of liberated areas the answer is unequivocally "yes." Moreover, we could, and probably we shall be forced to, get along with less food than is now available without impairment of health and efficiency. Starting from that premise, the discussion of our food problem becomes motivated by a desire to utilize our resources to the best advantage and to give the most aid with the means at our disposal.

Attacks on the administration for the loose, uncoordinated character of its food-relief program are warranted, and constructive critics will not be turned aside by Presidential rebukes addressed to a selfish minority. Criticism has already proved its value in bringing out the need for the kind of interagency committee set up under F. E. A. Administrator Crowley. This committee however, has only limited authority to coordinate and allocate relief shipments of food among various claimants. The next essential step is to work out a plan in cooperation with the British that will enable the latter to part with some of their large stock piles of food or else cut back their import program for a few months. As we stated some time ago, the United States ought to be doing more than it is doing to provide aid for liberated areas not only in respect to food but other commodities. The responsibility should, however, be shared since shipments can be made much more speedily and with great economy of shipping space by drawing on excess British supplies. As an anonymous British Food Mission official says: "What we should do instead of quarreling about this [the volume of Britain's food stock piles] is to get together and work out the food problem realistically. It is a bad situation. The squeeze is on. But it can be met, and we know it is up to the United Kingdom and the United States to meet it for what it is." That sums up the need, and if we follow good advice of this sort, there will be an end to petty squabblings that invite Presidential rebukes.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of March 18, 1945]

THE FACTS WOULD HELP

A congressional investigation of this country's food problems—if properly conducted—would serve a useful purpose.

There can be no doubt that there are serious shortages in some food lines and that these will grow more serious as the war progresses. A few months ago the tone of official comment was reassuring. We were told that, while Americans might not be able to get as many steaks and roasts as they would like to have, the over-all food picture was not bad and that there would be enough to insure a good, healthful diet. It is now becoming difficult in many areas to get any cuts of beef or pork, and the indications are that the shortages in these lines, as well as others, will get worse before they get better.

Nevertheless, the President is right in saying that the people of some other countries are faced with infinitely more serious conditions. They are looking to us for help, and it is both right and sensible that we should aid them to the extent that our own resources permit.

This is not, as the President implies, essentially a question of decency on our part. It may be doubted that all, or even most, of the people in this country who are opposed to further reduction in our own food consumption are influenced by any lack of a sense of decency or justice. More probably they are victims of the enormous confusion that has come to surround the whole question of food production and supply—past, present, and prospective.

This is where the right kind of congressional inquiry could serve a constructive purpose. It could sift down the mass of conflicting statements and arrive at the approximate truth as to what we have on hand in the way of food, how much food can be produced and what is necessary for minimum needs at home. It could profitably look into the question of why our production in some lines is falling off and determine the extent to which faulty policies and poor administration may have contributed to shortages. It could determine whether other nations have built up excessive stock piles at our expense and whether some are still drawing too heavily on the American larder. It could appraise the validity of suggestions which have appeared that other nations—Canada, for example—could contribute more food to those who are in need.

An intelligent and nonpolitical investigation of these and related matters might point the way to more production and better use of what we have. But if it did no more than establish the facts so that the American people, when called upon to tighten their belts, could know whether the sacrifice was really necessary, it would have served a very sound and desirable purpose.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, RELATING TO COTTON

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is on the desk House Concurrent Resolution 34, which I ask to have laid before the Senate.

There being no objection, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 34) authorizing the special committee of the Committee on Agriculture, designated by the chairman to study post-war plans for agriculture, particularly as relate to cotton, to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the special committee of the Committee on Agriculture, House of Representatives, designated by the chairman to study post-war plans for agriculture, particularly as relate to cotton, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,500 additional copies of the hearings held before the said special committee during the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I understand, this is a resolution authorizing the printing by the House of additional copies of hearings.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] that the Senate concur in House Concurrent Resolution 34.

The motion was agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE BILL 2200

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask that House Concurrent Resolution 33 be laid before the Senate.

There being no objection, the President pro tempore, laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 33), authorizing the printing of additional copies of the bill (H. R. 2200) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," together with the accompanying report thereon, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there shall be printed 1,150 additional copies of the bill (H. R. 2200) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedures," together with the accompanying report thereon, of which 200 copies shall be for the use of the House document room, 200 copies for the use of the Senate document room, and 750 copies for the use of the Committee on Revision of the Laws, House of Representatives.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

SALUTE TO NORTH DAKOTA—ARTICLE FROM NORTHWEST INSURANCE MAGAZINE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Salute to North Dakota," published in the Northwest Insurance magazine for February 1945. I should like to read the first paragraph:

In 1944 the people of North Dakota, on the basis of their income, purchased more war bonds of series E than any other commonwealth of the Union. Purchases totaled $66,100,000 (issue price), or 11.12 percent of the income of the people of North Dakota.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire editorial printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALUTE TO NORTH DAKOTA

In 1944 the people of North Dakota, on the basis of their income, purchased more War bonds of series E than any other commonwealth of the Union. The purchases totaled $66,100,000 (issue price), or 11.12 percent, of the income of the people in North Dakota.

Iowa ranked second with the percentage of 10.91 on sales of $281,700,000; Nebraska third, with a percentage of 10.68 percent on sales of $138,600,000; and Montana fourth, with 10.48 percent on sales of $59,000,000.

Other States ranked next as follows: South Dakota, 10.39 percent on sales of $56,800,000; Oregon, 9.92 percent, $170,700,000; Minnesota, 9.81 percent, $262,400,000; Wyoming, 9.67 percent, $25,700,000; and Michigan, 9.34 percent, $705,800,000.

The United States Treasury Department released the figures on February 19.

Before the entrance of the United States into World War No. 2 it was common to hear prominent personages domiciled in the East sneer at the supposed dearth of patriotism in the Middle West. It is now an established fact that the greatest strength of the Nation is to be found in the States of the central northern zone. The figures quoted above constitute evidence that points to the patriotic solidarity of the Middle West.

MODIFICATION OF CURFEW REGULATIONS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the radio last night and the press this morning announced that Mayor LaGuardia, of New York City, had openly defied the order of Mr. Byrnes, the Director of War Mobilization, closing after midnight places of amusement and places where liquor is sold and entertainment is provided. He has announced that in New York such places will remain open until 1 o'clock a. m., and that the midnight curfew will be openly disregarded.

I hold in my hand a copy of the New York Times of today, from which I read the following headline:

LaGuardia eases curfew to 1 a. m.: Byrnes is silent. Mayor sanctions sale of food and liquor after midnight on his own initiative; move stirs other cities; favoritism is charged, but Chicago and others hold to original closing hour.

I merely wish to say that the city of New York and Mayor LaGuardia are not bigger nor more important than the rest of the country. Either the midnight curfew should hold for the Nation as a whole and Mayor LaGuardia and the city of New York should be made to conform or else it should be lifted for the Nation as a whole. The country must be treated as a whole. There is no reason for one city being treated differently and there is no excuse for one man, even if he is Mayor LaGuardia, openly defying the rules made in the interests of the war effort. I wish to compliment the mayors of the other cities, who are in the same predicament as is Mayor LaGuardia of New York, for living up to the rule while it is in force. I believe Mr. Byrnes, as Director of War Mobilization, should take immediate action in connection with the New York situation, or else he should lift the midnight curfew as applied to the Nation as a whole.

TREATY WITH MEXICO RELATING TO THE UTILIZATION OF THE WATERS OF CERTAIN RIVERS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty (Executive A, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session) between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, relating to the utilization of the waters of certain rivers, and (Executive H, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session) a protocol supplementary to the treaty.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in executive session, the treaty with Mexico is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and the question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] that the pending treaty be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as I understand, the question now recurs on the motion of the Senator from Alabama to displace the treaty and to take up the nomination of Mr. Aubrey Williams.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct; that the treaty be temporarily laid aside and the nomination be proceeded with.

Mr. CONNALLY. I feel some reluctance to oppose the motion because of my high regard for the maker of the motion, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and for the distinguished Senator who now occupies the chair, our President pro tempore, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]; but I feel a certain responsibility for the treaty as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. In the committee we spent almost 5 weeks in conducting long, meticulous, laborious, detailed hearings on the treaty, after which the committee, by a vote of 18 to 4, reported it favorably to the Senate.

So, personally—and officially, if I have a right to speak officially—I simply cannot consent to agree to have the Senate lay aside consideration of the treaty. It is a matter of high international importance; it is also vital to the interests of every man, woman, and child within the United States; and particularly is it of vital concern to the seven States in the Colorado River Basin and the State from which I come, in the Rio Grande Basin.

So, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not vote to lay aside consideration of the treaty to take up the nomination of Mr. Aubrey Williams.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I simply wish to make a brief statement in connection with the important question which is before the Senate at the present time. I hope the Senate will take the position now being advocated by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It does seem to me to be very unusual to have a request made that the Senate, when in the midst of a grave debate upon a treaty, the highest kind of document into which nations can enter, should lay aside its consideration in order to discuss the confirmation of the nomination of Aubrey Williams, whose nomination to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration has been sent to the Senate by the President. I simply cannot understand it, Mr. President. I could not vote in favor of a motion of this kind at this time, regardless of how I might feel about Mr. Williams. I do not believe the Senate should place itself in the position of sustaining a motion to lay aside for the moment a matter as important as a treaty in order to take up the nomination of an individual to such an office, when everyone agrees that nothing serious or important is to be gained by acting upon the Williams nomination at this time.

The other day some reference was had in the debate in the Senate to the time it might take to complete the consideration of the nomination of Aubrey Williams. I do not know how long that will take, Mr. President; but the debate on the nomination will not be over in a day or two, in my humble opinion. There will be a good deal said on both sides of the question. It does seem to me to be out of order now to suspend debate upon this important treaty, and then have the Senate proceed for 3 or 4 days, or perhaps a week, with consideration of the nomination of Aubrey Williams, and after that return to consideration of the treaty.

I am making no argument about the question of delay for the purpose of aiding Williams. I am ready to vote at any time, so far as that is concerned, after the arguments are in; but I am talking about a practice in the Senate. I am talking about the question of procedure in the Senate of the United States. I am getting just a little impatient about having the Senate take up various matters at any time when certain Senators see fit to request that they be taken up.

I think the Senate should sustain the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations in connection with this very important matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois.

I have said all I have to say at this time, Mr. President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall not argue the merits or the demerits of the Williams nomination. I do not know that anything I might say would have any effect on the vote of any Senator. Regardless of that, and admitting it to be true, I wish the record to show what may feeling is about the matter.

I do not suppose anyone could argue before the American people the comparative importance of this treaty with Mexico and the nomination of Mr. Williams. I do not suppose that Mr. Williams' most ardent supporter or friend would take the position that the confirmation of his nomination is more important to the American people than is the treaty. I have heard no argument of that sort.

Mr. Williams nomination is on the calendar with an adverse report. It is not doing any harm there. Its presence on the calendar does not offer any threat to anyone. I dare say that there will not be two votes difference, assuming that all Senators were on the floor of the Senate and voting, between the votes cast for and against Mr. Williams today and the votes cast for and against him 2 weeks from today or 3 weeks from today or at any other time in the future.

I do not know how Senators are going to vote on the nomination of Mr. Williams. I have not lobbied with any Senator on the subject, one way or the other. I have not personally attempted to influence the vote of any Senator on the nomination. I think I have a right to assume that Senators will vote as they honestly conceive it to be their duty—always recognizing the possibility that Senators who have made up their minds irrevocably may be influenced by the debate on one side or the other. But, by and large, I do not think the result would be any different if the vote were taken after the treaty is disposed of rather than today or the day after tomorrow. I feel that the Senate would put itself in a peculiarly indefensible position if it were to sidetrack the treaty in order to take up the nomination of anyone.

The Rural Electrification Administration is going forward. It has an acting director who has been designated because he was the deputy under the retir-

ing director. The Rural Electrification Administration is functioning. The delay in determining whether Mr. Williams shall occupy the position will not in any way affect its efficiency or its continuity. But here is a treaty embodying an agreement between two neighboring nations on a matter which has been pending for 40 or 50 years. During all those years efforts have been made to come to an agreement regarding the distribution and the use of the water in the rivers that are involved in the pending treaty.

After all those labors, an agreement was finally entered into. I do not believe that any Senator can say with any degree of certainty that our attitude toward that agreement at the present time may not have a profound effect, psychologically or otherwise, upon the situation which exists in the Western Hemisphere. I may say in all seriousness, and without in any way impugning the motives of other Senators, or attempting to deny the rights of any Senator, that after 45 or 50 years of effort on the part of the United States and Mexico to get together, the Senate now having before it as its unfinished business a treaty which will occasion considerable debate—I hope not unusually long—we shall put ourselves in a peculiarly frivolous attitude by announcing to the world that we think the nomination of Aubrey Williams is more important than the consideration of this treaty.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wish to say that my feeling is that the less important matters should first be cleared out of the way. The last time the Senate was in session it disposed of all matters on the legislative calendar and all nominations on the Executive Calendar with the exception of the nomination of Aubrey Williams. My feeling is that the question of importance has nothing to do with it. This is a matter of minor importance which can be disposed of quickly. It seems to me that since it has been on the calendar for some time it should be cleaned up before we proceed with consideration of the important matter of the Mexican water treaty. I agree with the Senator on the subject of importance, but that is why I want to take up the Williams nomination and dispose of it as quickly as possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. The other matters to which the Senator referred, which we disposed of last week, involved legislation much of which was important. They involved the extension of certain functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which were soon to expire.

Mr. TAFT. The entire afternoon was consumed in cleaning up the calendar, on which were all kinds of minor matters, as well as matters of importance.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand. We disposed of them in half a day.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I will yield in a moment. Those were legislative matters of importance, and represented favorable and affirmative actions of Senate committees. Although I am in favor of getting the nomination off the calendar as soon as possible, I assume that if it were never acted upon the foundations of the Republic would not crumble. I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I merely wish to remark that the welfare of 30,000,000 farm people in being afforded electric light and power is not a matter of minor importance with me. The inability at the present time of 4,300,000 farmers to obtain electric light and power is a very important part of their welfare. In the opinion of 1 Senator, at least, it is not a minor matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the fact that the total electrification of the farm life of this Nation is not a matter of minor importance; but that program is going forward now as rapidly as possible under war conditions. The Senate should deal with what seems to me to be infinitely more important, namely, the treaty, rather than the identity of the man who may be associated with the program of rural electrification.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Judging from the mail which I receive nothing is of greater importance to the farmers of my State than their right to obtain the services of the R. E. A. all over the State. Fewer than 7 percent of the farmers of my State now have the advantages of electric light and power. However, I believe that that matter should be taken up when we have plenty of time to discuss it. I certainly agree with the statement of the majority leader that we should not argue the Williams nomination and dispose of it merely to get it out of the way, and then take up the treaty, although, as a matter of fact, the Williams nomination is very important to the farmers of my State.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I do not want to take issue with my colleague from Vermont, but I point out that the R. E. A. is still functioning under a Deputy Commissioner, and I think the interests of the rural electrification program are being cared for pending final disposition of the Williams nomination.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the point which I have tried to make. There has been no lapse in the activities of the R. E. A. There is at present no emergency requiring the Senate to set aside consideration of the treaty which was arrived at as the result of work over a period of half a century in order to take up a nomination, even if it had been favorably reported to the Senate.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it is immaterial to me personally when the Senate proceeds to consideration of the Aubrey Williams nomination. I, for one, do not want any attempt made to cut off debate on the subject for the purpose of resuming consideration of the Mexican Water Treaty within a specified limit of time. When the nomination is taken up we want time to discuss thoroughly both sides of the question involved. When the matter is taken up, I want it to be understood that I shall object to any limitation of debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, no one can tell how long the debate on Aubrey Williams will take because issues are involved which are more far reaching than those connected with the identity of Mr. Aubrey Williams.

That is all I have to say, Mr. President.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I entertain the view that the debate on the Aubrey Williams nomination will not take long. I believe that 2 days would be ample in which to dispose of the matter. I suggest that the majority leader make a unanimous-consent request that the Senate vote on the nomination of Aubrey Williams not later than 5 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. LUCAS. If the majority leader makes such a request I shall object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I cannot announce that any such agreement would be justified at this time, and I do not now feel justified in proposing one. The Senate must vote on whether it will lay aside the treaty, which is the pending business, and take up the nomination of Mr. Aubrey Williams. If it does, we shall have to be guided by conditions which exist during the consideration of Mr. Williams' nomination. We cannot at this time dispose of the questions which may be raised.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, at this time I have nothing to say with regard to proceeding to the consideration of the Williams nomination, but I should like to make an observation about the relative importance of the R. E. A. and the Mexican water treaty.

The Mexican water treaty affects approximately 5 or 6 States. I understand that about 30 or 35 Senators will discuss the treaty before it shall have been finally disposed of. That will be almost tantamount to a filibuster. I am not suggesting that those who oppose the treaty should filibuster it, but their action will be tantamount to a filibuster because it will last for several weeks.

There are 48 States in the Union. Forty-six of those States now have the service of the R. E. A. In other words, all the States of the Union, with the exception of 2, are interested in the success of the R. E. A. program. I am not accusing my colleagues who are supporting the nomination of Mr. Williams, and who seem to be anxious to delay a vote on his confirmation; but their line of thought seems to induce a somewhat subtle, psychological argument in an attempt to minimize the importance of the R. E. A. Administrator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator will agree that the R. E. A. is functioning, will he not?

Mr. BILBO. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is functioning with an Acting Director at its head.

Mr. BILBO. That is the point to which I wish to speak.

Mr. BARKLEY. I assume that the Senator will also agree that, so far as a vote on the nomination is concerned, Mr. Williams' nomination is doing no harm by remaining on the calendar.

Mr. BILBO. It is a very unpleasant thing to have before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. That still does not make it harmful.

Mr. BILBO. Well, I do not know—

Mr. BARKLEY. I cannot, of course, speak for the Senator from Mississippi; it may be doing him harm, but I think, as a whole, it is not doing the Senate or the R. E. A. any harm.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, the Government has advanced more than $500,000,000 for the R. E. A. program, which has brought light, happiness, and pleasure to millions of neglected farmers throughout the Nation who heretofore have been denied the blessings of electrical energy. The importance of action on this nomination at the earliest possible moment is that those who are interested in the great work the R. E. A. is doing for the neglected farmers are now mapping out, laying the plans, and making a survey in order that this service may be extended to twice as many farmers in the 46 States as now enjoy it. Of course, the R. E. A., without a fixed, definite head, is more or less handicapped in the inauguration and planning that is necessary in order to put this program over as a post-war effort. Therefore, it ought to be settled, it ought to be settled once and for all, and a vote should be had on the question.

It is not necessary to be in such a hurry about the Mexican treaty. It has been pending before the Senate for years, and I am informed that the Congress of the Republic of Mexico will not meet until September and nothing would be accomplished and nothing would be effective until the Mexican Congress passed upon the treaty. So we need not to be in a hurry about the treaty. If we have Easter recess or a recess at any time soon we will have to have it before we get through with the treaty because of the great number of speeches which are to be made on it before the debate is finally concluded.

I think the determination of the Aubrey Williams case and the induction into office of a proper Director for this great undertaking is important, and that is one reason why I am opposing the nomination of Mr. Williams. Here is a $1,000,000,000 enterprise to be administered, and I do not want to see placed in charge of it someone who has had no successful experience of his own. We need the biggest businessman we can get in the country to give attention to this great sprawling corporation that covers the entire Nation.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I did not clearly understand what the Senator said about the legislative body of Mexico. I am told it will not meet until September. Did the Senator from Mississippi say that?

Mr. BILBO. Yes; I made that statement.

Mr. HAWKES. That is something which, I think, would affect our position on this matter. If the Mexican Congress does not meet until September, why should we now rush the treaty through the Senate?

Mr. BILBO. That is the point I am making. There is no need to be in a hurry about the Mexican Treaty and the water proposition. We will reach it in plenty of time to enable Mexico to act on it. But a good Director to manage a billion-dollar undertaking in behalf of the farmers of this Nation is vitally important to the people of this country, and it should be important to the Senate. The nomination has been pending since the 22d day of January and I think it is about time we were passing on it, and I hope we will unfavorably pass on it and give the President time to select a good man for the position.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. BILBO. I yield the floor, unless the Senator from Louisiana desires to ask me a question.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. BILBO. Very well.

Mr. OVERTON. I do so because I do not care to take part in the debate, and am merely seeking information.

In view of the fact that delay in passing upon this nomination is so serious insofar as the R. E. A. is concerned and its future planning and operations, in the event the President's nominee is rejected there will be a further delay until another nomination is sent to the Senate and acted upon by the committee and reported to the Senate and finally acted upon by the Senate. That may involve considerable delay. Therefore, I think the more promptly we act upon it probably the better. Does not the Senator agree with me?

Mr. BILBO. I most assurely agree with the Senator from Louisiana, and that is one reason why I insist on immediate consideration of the nomination, not that I want to detract from the importance and wisdom of the course pursued by the Senator from Texas in urging the consideration and ratification of the Mexican Treaty. I do not know how I am going to vote on it as yet; I have got to hear the 35 speeches before I make up my mind; but I am sure that as between a matter affecting the welfare of the people of just a handful of States and one in which the people of 46 States are interested, it is more important to me that the question of the nomination be settled.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Two or three times the Senator from Mississippi has said that only a handful of States are involved. I truly regret that any Senator of the United States should say that the peaceful, harmonious, and happy relations between nations affect only a handful of States, and I hope no other Senator will take such a narrow or constricted view.

Mr. BILBO. I do not think I have gone so far in my statement as to intimate that we are going to have a clash with Mexico if we do not ratify this treaty. I do not foresee any militant operations as a result of failure to agree upon a water proposition.

I am not decrying or belittling the importance of the treaty which is before the Senate because I have constituents all over my State who have written me about the importance of this water treaty. I am trying to make up my mind. I have my mind made up about half of it, but as to the other half of the treaty I am not ready to vote. I realize that I cannot vote on one part of it unless I vote on all, and I am going to try to find out the equities involved in the whole proposition. But, I repeat, the good people of 46 States of this Nation are interested in the success of the R. E. A., and we need to settle once and for all the question of who is going to head this $1,000,000,000 organization, and we should settle it promptly so that we can be ready for the post-war period, when we are supposed to put light in every dark place in America.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I had not intended to make a statement with respect to the nomination of Mr. Williams until the motion was made to supplant the regular order of business by the nomination. Being a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that considered the nomination, I think I should make a statement.

I have been a Member of the Senate for some time; as I look around me, there are only five or six Senators who were here when I came here. That would indicate that I should have some idea of the time it might take to dispose of proposals, and I am of the opinion that when we properly reach this nomination it will take some time to dispose of it.

My statement is based principally upon the following facts: The nomination came to my committee on the 2d day of February; the committee held hearings, not constantly but frequently, between the 2d day of February and the 19th day of February, and during that period 320 pages of testimony were taken.

The committee did not see fit to hear numerous witnesses who desired to be heard. Even when the adjournment was taken, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] was not satisfied, he wanted the hearings to continue, and wanted the committee to go still further into the matter. I think it only fair to state to the Senate that the main reason why the Senator from Minnesota desired to proceed further was that he is joint author of a bill which provides for transferring the R. E. A. from the Department of Agriculture to an independent agency. That feature will enter into the discussion when the nomination is reached on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have no particular reason for wanting the hearings continued. A subcommittee conducted hearings for approximately 5 or 6 months, and all the testimony that was offered was sworn testimony, and the

committee made a unanimous report on the matter at that time. At the time the committee last adjourned I stated that I was not through, and asked leave to direct some questions to Mr. Wickard on some of the statements he had made. But that is not important, and I shall not insist upon it. So far as I am concerned, the record of the sworn testimony should afford plenty of evidence on which to base judgment, if Senators will take the time to read it.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I think it safe to say that when this matter shall be reached upon the floor, much of the testimony embraced in 5 volumes, making up 2,000 pages, directed to the point that the R. E. A. should no longer be a branch of the Department of Agriculture but that it should become an independent agency of the Government, will be brought into the debate, and that of itself will take some time.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, it seems to me that matter should come up at the time when Congress wishes to consider the bill which has been referred to. Of course, the testimony will furnish some information as to conditions in the R. E. A. under the Department of Agriculture, if any Senator desires to base his judgment on the nomination on what can be done under the set-up now in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, if I may construe the motive back of the pending motion, it is not an effort to get Mr. Williams into the office, it is an effort to remove him from consideration, and to keep him in that status. He is not in the office today, he cannot assume the office until the Senate, after full consideration, votes for his confirmation, and not thereafter until the President shall issue to him a certificate of appointment.

Mr. President, when this matter comes before the Senate, much of the testimony in the volume I have in my hand will have to be considered, because it embraces the opposition to Mr. Williams.

This nomination is different from some others which come before us. If this were an appointment to serve in a State, like the appointment of a Federal district judge, or a district attorney, or a United States marshal, it would be very largely up to the Senators from the State affected whether or not the appointment should be confirmed by the Senate. As a rule, the administration does not submit the name of a man to serve within a State until the administration is satisfied that at least the Senators from the State will support the nomination.

Mr. Williams' nomination falls in a different category. He is to serve the Nation at large; so no one person can interfere and be successful, no group of persons can interfere and defeat the confirmation, unless they belong to a majority group. So this nomination will have to be passed upon by the Senate as a whole, and a majority vote will have to be registered either for or against confirmation.

The record shows the complaints against Mr. Williams to be numerous. One complaint is that he did not enjoy the opportunity of going to school during his youth. The record shows he was born in 1890 in the State of Alabama. The record further shows that he did not have the benefit of an education in his youth. At the age of 9 he began to work, and he worked until the time of the World War. At that time he reached maturity, and decided that he should have an education, and the record shows how he obtained an education. He went to Tennessee and tried to get an education there, having failed in Alabama, and he was not very successful in Tennessee. The record shows he did not have any money, but, being of a serious mind, a group of persons took notice of Williams and tendered him funds with which to pay his expenses in a college in Tennessee. The record further shows he expended the funds and went to the college, presumably at that time studying for the ministry. The record shows that after a while he decided that he might not make a very good preacher, and, rather than inflict his lack of ministerial ability on people, he decided he could do more good in some other line, perhaps, than in the ministry; so he did not become a minister.

Because he was educated for the ministry and later decided not to enter the ministry, he is now charged with having denied the divinity of Christ. The record contains telegrams from someone who claims to know that he has denied the divinity of Christ. Our committee sent a telegram to the man who made the charge and tendered him the opportunity to come to Washington and appear before the committee and give his testimony. He failed to come, and did not appear before the committee.

Mr. President, when the nomination comes before the Senate this religious question will have some consideration, the question as to whether or not it is necessary for a person to believe anything about religion as a prerequisite either to appointment or election to serve the Federal Government.

The record shows that Williams was accused of being a Communist, an undesirable citizen, and these matters must all be gone into, because charges stand against him, and I feel certain he will have a sufficient number of friends on the floor of the Senate to take time enough to make a record.

I realize that when the vote came in my committee it was 12 against confirmation to 8 for confirmation; so, as chairman of the committee, I was directed to report the nomination adversely. Personally, I voted for Mr. Williams in the committee, and personally I favor his confirmation now, as I shall state more elaborately at a later date.

If the nomination of Mr. Williams shall be rejected, I do not know who will take his place. There is no special need immediately for anyone to take his place. I am advised that a very efficient man by the name of Neal is serving as Director of the R. E. A.

Mr. TOBEY. And he comes from New Hampshire.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire if he wishes to make a statement on behalf of Mr. Neal.

I am advised that Mr. Neal has sufficient standing in the State of New Hampshire to justify the Democrats of that State in nominating him for Governor. While that is a compliment to him from my standpoint, I further understand that the voters of New Hampshire did not share the high opinion of Mr. Neal the Democrats entertained, and as a result, in place of being the Governor of New Hampshire, he is now Director in fact of the R. E. A.

I think I should say that the R. E. A. is a going concern. It serves about 43 percent of the farmers of the Nation. It has expended to date more than half a billion dollars, and applications are pending for another half billion in R. E. A. activities.

In the present situation, the R. E. A. cannot expend very much at this time. In the first place, it cannot get the poles upon which to string wires; it has not the manpower to cut the poles. If the poles were cut it could not get the transportation to move them back and forth where needed. If it had the transportation, it could not process the poles as they should be processed. The manpower situation is such that poles are practically out of the question. It cannot dig the holes, it cannot set the poles, it cannot string the wires. By reason of the lack of poles, of course, no wires can be strung. If the R. E. A. had the poles, it could not obtain copper wires to string on the poles. So, there is no chance now of a material expansion or extension of the present R. E. A. system, and until the war is over, of course, that situation will not be greatly improved. Therefore there is no particular occasion at the present moment to have anyone at the head of this organization. I know that the Government desires to have a head to each of the executive branches and I think that is entirely proper, but there is no immediate urgency that this nomination should be acted on forthwith.

Mr. President, I am not directly interested in the matter of the treaty between the United States and Mexico, although it does affect a great number of my constituents. I have received many letters and telegrams from citizens of my State who own land in Texas along the Rio Grande. I have had conferences with some of them. So far as I know, all my constituents who know about the treaty are favorable to it. I have received protests from California, and delegations from California have visited me in opposition to ratification of the treaty. I still have an open mind respecting the treaty, save for the direct interest of my own people. So I shall be very glad to hear the statements and discussion with respect to the treaty, and pass judgment on it when the time comes to do so.

Mr. President, I thought perhaps I should make this statement for the record because I am certain that if the nomination of Aubrey Williams becomes the unfinished business of the Senate it will take some time, and no one can control that situation because there is

much to be said on both sides, and Senators will insist on saying for the record what they want to say.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I regret the necessity for speaking again, but I do not want to let go unchallenged the statement made by my good friend the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when he says that the question of Mr. Williams' religion should be discussed or will be discussed in connection with the consideration of his nomination. Mr. Williams' religion has nothing on earth to do with the confirmation of his nomination. I hold in my hand a copy of the hearings, and I defy the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee or anyone else to show by that written record that any member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or any Members of the Senate who visited the committee hearings asked Mr. Williams one word concerning his religious convictions. The only thing that happened in committee along that line is that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] inserted in the record a telegram from Dr. Broady, who was for 30 years pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Birmingham, from which town Mr. Williams came, in which Dr. Broady stated that the church had furnished the money necessary for Mr. Williams to go to school.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The Senator has made the statement which was the basis of my original statement. The telegram came to Washington and was presented to the committee, and is now a part of the record.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator certainly knows that what was said about Mr. Williams' religious convictions, his denying the divinity of Christ, had no effect on the committee. It did not influence any Senator's vote. No Senator asked anything about it; no Senator cared anything about it. If we should use that as a criterion for selecting men for office, we should be obliged to throw out one-half of our Jewish friends who do not believe in the divinity of Christ at all.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. After listening to the testimony for 3 weeks, in hearings which now comprise 320 pages, I cannot see anything in the record which would influence any Senator against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Williams.

Mr. BILBO. If the Senator will stay in the Senate until I finish my speech I think I can convince him that he is wrong.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Mississippi says there is no religious issue in this case. Then why did the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] read the telegram into the record.

Mr. BILBO. The reason for placing the telegram in the record was that Dr. Broady said the man was not entitled to any consideration.

Mr. LUCAS. But what did the telegram say?

Mr. BILBO. I presume that is what the Senator had in mind.

Mr. LUCAS. What did the telegram say? The Senator knows, and I can read it, and the Senate can discover now whether there was anything involving the religious issue so far as that telegram is concerned. Anyone who reads the telegram knows that some suspicion was being cast upon Mr. Williams for not believing in the divinity of Christ, or the telegram never would have been read into the record.

Mr. BILBO. I repeat—

Mr. LUCAS. Read the telegram to the Senate.

Mr. BILBO. I repeat that no member of the committee was influenced by that telegram, because all members of the committee, I presume, have read the Constitution, and know that it specifically provides that a man's religious views shall have nothing to do with his qualification to hold any office under the Constitution of the United States. I trust all Members of the Senate will continue to be bound by their oaths and their obligations and comply with the Constitution. The telegram was placed in the record by a Senator not a member of the committee—the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]. I do not know why he placed the telegram in the record unless he wanted to show by it that this man was not worthy of consideration.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I will read this telegram into the RECORD now, if the Senator will yield for that purpose.

Mr. BILBO. Does the Senator want to read it?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I want to read it.

Mr. BILBO. Very well, read it.

Mr. LUCAS. I read as follows:

Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Washington, D. C.

Aubrey Williams grew up in the Sixth Avenue Presbyterian Church, of Birmingham, where I was pastor for 30 years. W. M. Cosby paid his high-school expenses and the Presbyterian Church paid his college expenses. He denied the divinity of Christ after the church educated him for the ministry. He is utterly unworthy of any official place in our Government.

DR. JOSEPH M. BROADY.

Take that for what it is worth so far as raising the religious issue is concerned. Not only was the telegram placed in the record, but the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] saw fit to repeat the telegram on another page of the hearings.

Mr. BILBO. I do not know whether Dr. Broady concluded that Mr. Williams was not worthy of holding any office in the Government because of his denial of the divinity of Christ or because Mr. Williams obtained the money with which to go to school, $750, under false pretenses, and then did not pay it back.

Mr. LUCAS. But the telegram did not say one word about that, and that was an afterthought which came to the Senator from Mississippi as the result of conversations he had with Dr. Broady. There is nothing in the telegram stating that Aubrey Williams did not pay back the money. That evidence was produced after the telegram was placed in the record.

Mr. BILBO. When Dr. Broady sent the telegram he knew that Aubrey Williams had obtained the money with which to go to school under false pretenses, and had not paid it back.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I wish to make the observation respecting the telegram which my colleague placed in the record, that it was placed in the record, as I understand, for the purpose of showing that this man Williams obtained his education with funds given him by the Presbyterian Church, which paid his college expenses, and that he obtained his education in that way under false pretenses. There is no religious issue raised by placing the telegram in the record—at least I hope there is none. There should not be. Anyone who would vote for or against the confirmation of this man's nomination because of his religious belief is doing himself an injustice.

I shall vote against the confirmation of Mr. Williams when the time comes to vote on the question. As a member of the committee, I voted against him. I did not vote against him by reason of the religious issue. I was already opposed to him before the telegram came in; even before I knew about the telegram. I was opposed to him for other reasons which are quite important. There is no religious issue involved in this matter. I hope those who have not made up their minds about voting respecting the confirmation of Mr. Williams' nomination will not make up their minds by reason of discussion of religious issues. So far as I am concerned, it will not be discussed; and, in my opinion, it is nothing but camouflage in this record. If it is used for the purpose of persuading any Senator to vote for or against Williams, it will be used for an improper purpose. The telegram was not placed in the record for such a purpose; it was placed in the record to show that this man obtained his education on the basis of false pretenses.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I do not have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STEWART. I should like to be allowed to complete my statement.

Mr. BILBO. Does the Senator wish to have me yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. STEWART. I should like to complete the statement which I was making.

The telegram was placed in the record of the hearings for the purpose of showing that the man obtained his education under false pretenses. The record shows further that there was some question about whether he refunded the money which was advanced to him by the church, which educated him at one of the church schools in my State. No religious issue is raised, and it cannot be fairly raised here, because I do not know of any Senator who is opposed to Williams on that ground or who opposed him on that ground to begin with. The

information in this telegram contains a factual statement which ought to be known to Members of this body who will be called upon to vote on the confirmation of the nomination, I hope within a very few days. He has been nominated to an office of tremendous importance. There is no religious issue involved.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest to my colleagues that for nearly an hour we have been discussing Mr. Williams. In order to expedite matters, I suggest that we immediately take a vote on the pending question, namely, the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] to proceed to consider the nomination. That is the way to save time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to delay a vote on the nomination of Aubrey Williams; but I am wondering why it is necessary for this great body to set aside the pending business. Why not proceed in order? Why the haste on the part of some to force the immediate consideration of the nomination? I have been a Member of the Senate for over 8 years, and during that period of time I have never witnessed a nomination which has caused so much stirring around all over this Chamber—may I add not only in it but out of it as well—and particularly among our friends across the aisle.

In this connection, I believe that the honor and integrity of this great body are at stake in considering this nomination. I have heard Senators admit openly and publicly that no matter what evidence is produced, no matter what facts are presented to them, their minds are made up and they will vote against Aubrey Williams. I hope that they will reconsider and keep an open mind. I propose to present to the Senate legitimate and substantial evidence in answer to every charge which has been lodged against the character of that good American. I hope and pray, Mr. President, that my arguments will not fall on deaf ears, but that Senators will weigh the evidence carefully and do what honorable men are expected to do.

Mr. Williams served in World War No. 1. He volunteered his services and made a fine record. He fought in many battles and was wounded in defense of his country. Today he is fighting to clear himself of charges which have been lodged by the only witness who appeared against him, namely, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. I know that all of the charges made have been sufficiently answered so as to lead any reasonable man to brush them aside and rally to the support of Mr. Williams. However, I am free to confess, that I am terrified at the position taken by Senators on the issues involved.

While this good man is fighting to save his reputation, his only children, four sons, are today enlisted in our armed forces, fighting to maintain our form of government, and willing to die to perpetuate our freedom. I am wondering why the membership of this great legislative assembly should not wish to hear the facts and base their decision on the evidence. To take any other course, Senators, is not conducive to good government and the American people will have just cause to criticize our action.

A little while ago the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] charged that Mr. Williams had obtained his education through misrepresentation; and that question was debated to some extent by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. At first I treated the charge as a joke. I did not think it was necessary to pursue it any further. However, when I heard the distinguished Senator from Mississippi state during the committee hearings that even if he had come to the committee with an open mind, the fact that Mr. Williams had obtained his education under false pretenses would be sufficient ground to justify a vote against him, I got busy. I immediately telegraphed Cameron Hall, social education and action division, Presbyterian Church, room 826 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa., to learn the fact. This is the telegram which I sent:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 2, 1945.*

CAMERON HALL,
Social Education and Action Division,
Presbyterian Church,
Philadelphia, Pa.:

Re Aubrey Williams. Evidence produced that you gave scholarship to Williams so he could pursue education for ministry. Please wire Government collect concerning value scholarship and whether or not demand was made by you for return of funds advanced when Williams failed to follow the ministry. What is your policy in that regard. Would appreciate your immediate reply.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senator.

A few days thereafter I received the following reply:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *March 5, 1945.*

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Senate Office Building:

Aubrey Williams was granted $480 from Presbyterian National Agency 1912–17 in preparation for ministry but no demand was made for return of the amount because such repayment procedure was not initiated until 1919. Thus he is not now indebted to the church.

JOHN OLIVER NELSON,
Director, Presbyterian Service Loan Funds.

It would seem to me that the telegram I have just read should answer the charge that he obtained his education through false pretenses. I feel certain that many young men took the same course as Mr. Williams. They started in good faith to study the ministry or the priesthood and after a while abandoned the idea. I see nothing wrong in that.

As I indicated a while ago, the only witness who appeared against Aubrey Williams was the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee. We invited others to come but they did not appear. Many of the charges preferred against Mr. Williams were by telegram, letter, and other methods. They were only charges. There was no proof submitted. Under cross-examination I often suggested to the senior Senator from Tennessee who charged Williams with being a Communist, "Senator, produce the evidence." I was referred to the Dies Committee. He apparently had no proof. On the charge of falsifying records, misapporpriation of funds, and the like, I was referred to the report of the General Accounting Office. I suggested that Mr. Lindsay Warren the Comptroller General, be summoned to appear before the committee. He appeared. He testified that there was nothing unusual as to all charges made by his department against N. Y. A. All departments of government, without exception, were similarly charged and in answer to a question from me, as to whether the charges reflected on the character of Mr. Williams, he said, "Senator, there was not one single solitary charge against Williams that in any way reflected against his character and integrity."

I ask Senators, in all fairness and justice, to look at the record, and not make up their minds in advance and thereby convict Mr. Williams without studying the record. We are called upon to pass judgment upon one of our fellow men, a man against whom serious charges have been made. I am here to tell the Senate that those charges are false and they can be satisfactorily answered.

Are we going to close our eyes and refuse to consider the evidence submitted by Mr. Williams in his defense?

Mr. President, in considering this nomination the Senate sits as a jury. One of its standing committees has heard evidence and has submitted a printed record. The Senate is duty bound to study the evidence, whether false or true, against the nominee and then make up its mind. It is unfair to prejudge the case. Such a course is beneath the dignity and honor of the Senate. I am asking Senators to do their solemn duty and let their conscience be their guide.

Mr. President, I do not know of any reason why consideration of the treaty should be set aside at this time. None has been presented to us. As the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] said a few days ago, it is important that the treaty be considered at once because of the effect it may have in connection with the meeting which will be held in San Francisco, Calif., the coming April. Why take a chance? Why not proceed with consideration of the treaty and take action before that momentous occasion arises? The Rural Electrification Administration will not suffer. The records show that today the Rural Electrification Administration is in the hands of a competent Acting Administrator. The records further show that for the past 3 or 4 years the R. E. A. has been unable to expand very much for the reason that it is difficult to obtain materials.

As I have previously stated, no harm will be done by letting the Senate proceed with its business in the usual manner. I plead with Senators to let the business of the Senate take its ordinary course, and in the meantime I suggest that Senators read the record in the Williams nomination. I ask Senators not to be influenced by hearsay evidence. Every Member of this great body owes it to the nominee, their fellow American,

to look into every charge and form their judgment on the evidence.

Just imagine, Mr. President—this man stands charged with being a Communist! He stands charged with having taken money illegally and unlawfully while he was Administrator of the National Youth Administration. Everyone knows that if he is not confirmed, he will stand convicted of those charges. Is it fair to his four gallant sons, who are now risking their lives on the front, for the Senate to treat him in such a manner? No; Mr. President, I refuse to believe that Senators will be so unfair, so unjust, as not to give Mr. Williams a square deal.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator is making his statement about this matter rather strong. Let me read what Mr. Williams said under oath:

> The matter with reference to the Presbyterian Church paying for my education and then later on my not going into the ministry, I would like to state for the record also that the Presbyterian ministerial board did grant me a scholarship of $150 a year for a period, I think, 5 years—it might have been 4, but I think it was 5.

Mr. ELLENDER. I think it was 3 years.

Mr. BILBO. Look at this:

> That money was a part of a grant that they gave to a great number of young people like myself, with the understanding on my part at the time it was given that I intended to go into the Presbyterian ministry. There was, as I understand it and as I recall, although I could be wrong about this, no contractual arrangements whereby if I did not go into the ministry I was expected to repay the funds. It has been 30 or 35 years, I am not quite clear on that, but in any event I never received any request or communication from the ministerial board indicating to me that they felt I should repay the funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what was stated in the telegram I read into the RECORD a minute ago. Did not the Senator listen to it?

Mr. BILBO. I listened to it; but the telegram did not contain a statement to the effect that at the time when he took the money there was an understanding between him and the ministerial board that he would enter the ministry when he finished at the college. However, when he got through he laid his Bible down.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know of many boys who started to study to be priests and later changed their minds. It is nothing unusual. I do not see anything wrong with that. I am confident that many boys who started to be ministers changed their minds because they felt they were not fitted for such a calling.

Mr. BILBO. He laid his Bible down when he got through at college, and he was not willing to pay back the money so as to enable other boys to study for the ministry. I think that indicates the type and character of man he is.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not care to argue the point further. I do not wish to delay the Senate any longer. I repeat that nothing will be lost by taking up the nomination in its regular order; but, on the contrary, it may be that by proceeding with and disposing of the Mexican treaty before the nations of the world meet next month, a great deal of good can be accomplished.

As I have just said, the Rural Electrification Administration is now operating under an efficient assistant administrator. Nothing will be lost by permitting the consideration of the nomination to take its regular course. My hope is that in the meantime Senators on both sides of the aisle will study the record and will give to their fellow man, Mr. Williams, a square deal, while his only four sons are now battling in order to preserve our democracy and their perpetuation of this great body.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. I wish to ask the Senator whether he thinks that every man in America who has four sons in the Army is qualified to be head of the R. E. A.?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, that is a silly question. It does not deserve an answer.

Mr. BILBO. That is the argument of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	O'Daniel
Austin	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hawkes	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Buck	Kilgore	Shipstead
Burton	La Follette	Stewart
Bushfield	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Taylor
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Tobey
Connally	McKellar	Tunnell
Cordon	McMahon	Tydings
Donnell	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Downey	Maybank	Walsh
Eastland	Mead	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Mitchell	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Willis
Gerry	Murdock	Wilson
Guffey	Murray	Young
Gurney	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have no objection to an order being entered that the question now before the Senate shall be disposed of by a yea-and-nay vote if by so doing it will satisfy Senators across the aisle. However, the insistent demand for a vote forces me to make a brief statement with regard to the Williams nomination.

When the committee began to hear the evidence it understood that a flood of protests would be made and that many persons would desire to be heard in opposition to the confirmation of Mr. Williams' nomination. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] requested the committee to invite a gentleman from New York to come before the committee and testify. At the request of the Senator from South Dakota a telegram was sent to the gentleman in New York inviting him to appear. I now read the telegram which was sent at the instance of the committee—it appears that similar telegrams were sent to others who had evinced a desire to be heard:

> In connection with the hearings on confirmation of Aubrey Williams to be Administrator for Rural Electrification Administration at the request of Senator BILBO you are invited to appear before the Agriculture Committee of the Senate at 10 a. m., Monday, February 19. Expenses as authorized by law will be paid for trip. Please advise if you can be present.
>
> ELMER THOMAS,
> *United States Senator.*

The gentleman telephoned to me and advised me that he did not care to be heard, and he did not appear.

Later, at the request of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] an invitation was extended to Mr. J. C. Hodges, of Birmingham. When the message was sent I understood that Mr. Hodges was either the man who had furnished the money for the education of Mr. Williams, or that he was connected with the board which had furnished the money. The same kind of a telegram as that I just read, with the exception of the date and name, was sent to Mr. Hodges. After waiting for some time we received the following reply.

> Contacted J. C. Hodges and he states impossible for him to appear before Agriculture Committee Monday.

The telegram was signed Crosby Hodges Milling Co., Birmingham, Ala., February 16, 1945, and was sent to me as chairman of the committee.

At the suggestion of a member of the committee a telegram was sent to Dr. Broady, who had made a charge against Mr. Williams with regard to his religion. Dr. Broady is a resident of the State of Ohio. The following reply was received from him, addressed to myself:

> MY DEAR SENATOR: I had your telegram inviting me to appear on Monday at 10 a. m. before the Agricultural Committee relative to Aubrey Williams. Because of another engagement it will be impossible for me to be present. I talked to Senator BILBO about it and you can confer with him.

Of course, I give full credit to those gentlemen for having good reasons for not coming to Washington.

The committee received a vast number of communications, such as letters and telegrams, in connection with this nomination. They numbered not only into the hundreds, but into the thousands. In order that the RECORD may show samples of the telegrams received by the committee in favor of Mr. Williams, I shall take time, but only briefly, to read into the RECORD a few of the communications.

The first one is from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. It is dated at Miami, Fla.,

February 9, 1945. The telegram, addressed to me, reads as follows:

MIAMI, FLA., *February 9, 1945.*

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I regard Aubrey Williams as most capable and well qualified to serve as Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration. I have known him for some time and have learned to admire his sterling character and qualifications. I respectfully urge that you approve his appointment and vote for his confirmation.

The second communication is in the nature of a letter from Dr. Arthur W. Calhoun of Sterling College, Sterling, Kans., and reads as follows:

STERLING COLLEGE,
Sterling, Kans., February 16, 1945.

MY DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: I taught Aubrey Williams economics when he was a freshman and I have been in touch with him since. Not long ago I wrote him about the problems and outlook in his present work.

I am sure that he is sound, and that there is no likelihood of another as suitable person's being appointed to the post of R. E. A. Administrator.

Williams is no blind supporter of any man or of any movement. The fact that he happens to be working for the Farmers' Union is nothing against him, and if he should not be confirmed he would very likely be just as useful in his present job. If, however, the R. E. A. is to be a real cooperative and not a political system, such a person as Williams has to be put at the head of it.

On the whole, the cause of agricultural advance would probably be better served if Williams were made head of R. E. A. than if he remains in the service of just one of the farm organizations, but those that object to his being confirmed might well realize that his style will not be cramped or his usefulness impaired if he is left in his present job. The friends of R. E. A., as an asset to the farmers' cooperative movement, do well, however, to try to overcome the opposition to his confirmation.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR W. CALHOUN.

I invite attention to a telegram which was received by the committee from the board of directors of the Beltrami Electric Cooperative, Inc., at Bemidji, Minn. It is signed by Ben Goranson, secretary, and is as follows:

BEMIDJI, MINN., *February 6, 1945.*

SENATE AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE,
United States Senate:

We, the directors of Beltrami Electric Cooperative, Inc., at our regular monthly directors meeting, have today unanimously gone on record as favoring the appointment of Aubrey Williams as the new Administrator of R. E. A. We respectfully request and urge the Senate Agricultural Committee to recommend Mr. Williams' appointment.

The next telegram, from B. T. Kaylor, of Magnolia, Miss., is as follows:

MAGNOLIA, MISS., *February 7, 1945.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee:

Representing 323 small farmers in Pike County we urge the support of Aubrey Williams for Director of R. E. A.

The next message is from Boyd McWhorter, president of Lafayette County Purchasing and Marketing Association, Oxford, Miss., and reads as follows:

OXFORD, MISS., *February 7, 1945.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Washington, D. C.:

Representing 300 members Lafayette County Purchasing and Marketing Association urge your support of Aubrey Williams for Director of R. E. A.

The next telegram is from J. P. Newman, secretary of Tallahatchie Purchasing and Marketing Association, Charleston, Miss., and reads as follows:

CHARLESTON, MISS., *February 7, 1945.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agriculture Committee, Washington, D. C.:

Three hundred members Tallahatchie Purchasing and Marketing Association urge your support Aubrey Williams, Director of R. E. A.

I now read a telegram from C. E. Martin, president of Rankin County Farmers Exchange, Jackson, Miss.:

JACKSON, MISS., *February 7, 1945.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS:
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Washington, D. C.:

We solicit your influence and support in behalf of Aubrey Williams for Director of R. E. A.

The next telegram, which is from George W. Gifford, president of San Miguel County Farm Livestock Bureau, Las Vegas, N. Mex., reads as follows:

LAS VEGAS, N. MEX.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS:

We, the board of directors of San Miguel County Farm and Livestock Bureau, wish to recommend the confirmation of Aubrey Williams as Administrator of R. E. A.

The next is from Roxton, Tex., signed by J. P. Maxwell, director, Texas Farm Bureau, and reads as follows:

Farmers will be pleased to have Aubrey Williams head R. E. A.

The next is from Gatesville, Tex., signed by N. Foote, president, Texas Agricultural Mobilization Committee, and reads as follows:

Urge that you confirm Aubrey Williams as R. E. A. Administrator. Agricultural producers in this section have faith in his ability to serve R. E. A. Those of us who are members of R. E. A. believe he has initiative and ability to fully administer the R. E. A.

The next is from Amarillo, Tex., signed by J. J. Berg, president, Texas Farmers Union, and reads as follows:

I strongly urge you to use all your influence for Aubrey Williams as national R. E. A. Administrator.

The last one to which I call attention at this time is from Washington, D. C., signed by Henry Daniels, president, Agriculture Branch Local, United Federal Workers of America. His telegram reads as follows:

Urge confirmation Aubrey Williams as R. E. A. Administrator. Believe him well qualified by experience in public life.

Mr. President, when the matter comes before the Senate for discussion and further consideration, I think the RECORD should show the forces and organizations in this country that are for Mr. Williams and likewise show the forces and organizations that are against him. I have the record which I shall produce at a later time in connection with the consideration of the nomination.

Mr. MURDOCK subsequently said: Mr. President, when the discussion on the motion of the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] was pending and was being debated, I was occupying the chair. I have been notified over the week end that the State legislature of my State has appointed a committee of the legislature to study the pending treaty between this country and Mexico. This indicates to me that at least one of the States vitally concerned in the provisions of the treaty relating to the Colorado River has not yet officially made up its mind as to whether the treaty should be ratified or not ratified. Because of that, it is my opinion that the Senate should not hurry too much in the consideration of the pending treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] that the pending treaty be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MCKELLAR, and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays and they were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who, I understand, on the pending motion would, if present, vote "nay." I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], who, if present, would vote as I am about to vote. I am therefore at liberty to vote, and I vote "yea."

Mr. TOBEY. On this question I have a pair with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. If he were present he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who is absent because of illness, has a pair on this question with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], who is absent because of illness in his family. If present the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

I am advised that if the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the

Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] were present and voting, they would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 33, as follows:

YEAS—52

Austin	Ferguson	Reed
Bailey	Fulbright	Revercomb
Bankhead	George	Robertson
Bilbo	Gerry	Russell
Brewster	Gurney	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hart	Shipstead
Brooks	Hawkes	Stewart
Buck	Hickenlooper	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Tydings
Bushfield	McCarran	Vandenberg
Byrd	McClellan	Wherry
Capehart	McKellar	White
Capper	Millikin	Wiley
Chandler	Moore	Willis
Cordon	Murdock	Wilson
Donnell	O'Daniel	Young
Downey	Overton	
Eastland	Radcliffe	

NAYS—33

Aiken	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Barkley	Kilgore	Murray
Briggs	La Follette	Myers
Connally	Langer	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Lucas	Pepper
Guffey	McFarland	Taylor
Hatch	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Hill	Maybank	Tunnell
Hoey	Mead	Walsh
Johnson, Colo.	Mitchell	Wheeler

NOT VOTING—11

Andrews	Glass	Thomas, Idaho
Ball	Green	Tobey
Butler	Scrugham	Wagner
Chavez	Smith	

So Mr. BANKHEAD's motion was agreed to.

ADMINISTRATOR, RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—AUBREY W. WILLIAMS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion of the Senator from Alabama having been agreed to, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. We have just witnessed an exodus of Senators from the Chamber. The Senator from Illinois is about to speak. He is a member of the committee which has considered the pending nomination. He should have the attention of Senators, many of whom now, of course, are engaged in eating lunch. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capper	Hatch
Austin	Chandler	Hawkes
Bailey	Connally	Hayden
Bankhead	Cordon	Hickenlooper
Barkley	Donnell	Hill
Bilbo	Downey	Hoey
Brewster	Eastland	Johnson, Calif.
Bridges	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Briggs	Ferguson	Johnston, S. C.
Brooks	Fulbright	Kilgore
Buck	George	La Follette
Burton	Gerry	Langer
Bushfield	Guffey	Lucas
Byrd	Gurney	McCarran
Capehart	Hart	McClellan
McFarland	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Utah
McKellar	Overton	Tobey
McMahon	Pepper	Tunnell
Magnuson	Radcliffe	Tydings
Maybank	Reed	Vandenberg
Mead	Revercomb	Walsh
Millikin	Robertson	Wheeler
Mitchell	Russell	Wherry
Moore	Saltonstall	White
Morse	Shipstead	Wiley
Murdock	Stewart	Willis
Murray	Taft	Wilson
Myers	Taylor	Young
O'Daniel	Thomas, Okla.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

RESCINDING OF RESOLUTION REQUESTING CERTAIN REPORTS FROM NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD CONCERNING WAGE INCREASES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent to offer a resolution for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 105), as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 130, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, requesting certain reports from the National War Labor Board concerning wage increases, agreed to April 9, 1943, be, and the same is hereby, rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and the resolution is before the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief explanation. Several months ago I offered a resolution asking for certain information from the War Labor Board. The information was very valuable at that time, but the need for the information has now passed, and I wish to relieve the War Labor Board of the trouble and expense of making the reports requested.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADMINISTRATOR, RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—AUBREY W. WILLIAMS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I propose to debate at some length the question as to whether or not the Senate of the United States should confirm the appointment of Aubrey Williams as Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, and I shall do so in order that I may satisfy myself, as one who in part represents a great State with seven and one-half million people, that I have conscientiously and sincerely performed my duty as a United States Senator toward my fellow men.

I should like to have the Senate understand that when the name of Aubrey Williams was sent to the United States Senate I was opposed to his nomination. That inward decision had been reached primarily upon what I had heard through rumor and innuendo and conversations around here in the United States Senate about this man Williams. But, Mr. President, I have often changed my mind on questions of importance that have come before the United States Senate, and I have never been one to go out on the avenue of vindictiveness. Throughout my life I have attempted to examine the facts—whether they were with respect to a piece of legislation pending in my home State or whether it has been before the United States Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has just voted that the most important thing under consideration by this body is the nomination of Mr. Williams. I notice, Mr. President, that there are seven Members of the United States Senate present. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has any business been transacted since the last call of the roll?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] submitted a resolution which was acted upon. Business has been transacted.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	O'Daniel
Austin	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hawkes	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Buck	Kilgore	Shipstead
Burton	La Follette	Stewart
Bushfield	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Taylor
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Tobey
Connally	McKellar	Tunnell
Cordon	McMahon	Tydings
Donnell	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Downey	Maybank	Walsh
Eastland	Mead	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Mitchell	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Willis
Gerry	Murdock	Wilson
Guffey	Murray	Young
Gurney	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I dislike to make such a suggestion but I hope Senators will not seek to present

extraneous business at this time. It means a quorum call, which consumes time. So I very regretfully state that I shall be obliged to object to unanimous-consent requests, for a while, at any rate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. With all due regard to the Senator from Tennesse, I have no request to make.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the scene which we have just witnessed points out to my mind one of the vices in the procedure of the Senate. Senators vote to proceed to consider what they regard as an important matter—and I have no criticism whatever to offer—namely, the nomination of a man to be the head of the Rural Electrification Administration, and to set aside consideration of a treaty. Then, as soon as they vote, they immediately leave the Chamber.

I have no objection whatever to Senators going to lunch. We all have to eat.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope the Senator will not be too severe on the Senators who are absent. I am sure they have all gone out to read the hearings on Aubrey Williams, which lie on our desks and consist of 320 pages of printed matter. [Laughter.]

Mr. HATCH. Really, Mr. President, by suggesting the absence of a quorum I sought to point out just how the Senate operates. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is a member of the committee. He attended the hearings, and he is able to give information regarding whether the nomination of Mr. Williams should be confirmed by this body. Unfortunately some Senators are at lunch, where I myself hope to be very soon.

Mr. President, I shall now take my seat; and I say to the Senator from Tennessee that I shall not try to present any extraneous business.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thank all the Senators for the marvelous contributions they have made to the cause this afternoon, including my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Tennessee, because I am satisfied that he wants to get along with this business just as fast as possible; he wants to pursue this cause just as expeditiously as possible. He has demonstrated that attitude from the beginning of the hearings until now, and he will never quit until the final vote. Of course, that is his prerogative.

There is a great deal of truth to what the Senator from New Mexico said a minute ago with respect to the Senate's being a deliberative body. I shall make no remarks about any particular Senator. It is a Senator's own business to determine how he will vote on the nomination of Aubrey Williams. After I have stated my position as I see it, I shall be through, and I shall have nothing more to say about how other Senators vote.

Senators have referred to the deliberations in the Senate. Mr. President, time after time on the stump it has been said—I see the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is smiling, he knows what is coming—time after time it has been said on the stump that the Senate is the greatest deliberative and legislative body in the entire world. Mr. President, the minds of Senators are made up, 9 times out of 10, before any evidence is taken.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to point out that Mr. Aubrey Williams himself and his friends by this time have gone to every Senator and have made him say whether he is on one side or the other; and Mr. Aubrey Williams himself published, at a press conference, a poll of all Senators as to whether they were for him or against him. Certainly, the result of all that has necessarily been that most Senators here have made up their minds.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what I have been saying.

Mr. TAFT. That does not mean there is no deliberation. This matter has been before Senators for approximately 2 months, and over and over again we have practically been forced to consider the question and to make up our minds. While we listen with the greatest interest to what the Senator has to say, it is true that he is quite correct in saying that today most Senators in the Chamber have by this time made up their minds.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to thank the able senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] for corroborating the statement I made. What he said not only has happened in the Aubrey Williams case but it happens in regard to every other appointment which is sent to the Senate by the President of the United States. Testimony could be taken from now until doomsday regarding the qualifications of an appointee; but there is not 1 Senator in 10 who does not make up his mind the moment he hears of the matter.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1984) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. MAHON, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. DWORSHAK were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ADMINISTRATOR, RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—AUBREY W. WILLIAMS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio whether I understood him correctly. Did he say that the friends of Aubrey Williams have gone to all Senators now present in the Senate Chamber and have required them to express themselves on the question how they would vote on the nomination?

Mr. TAFT. I was asked, and I think my statement was a fair one. I know of many Senators who were questioned. My chief basis for the statement is the fact that Mr. Williams himself published a poll of Senators on the question, so apparently he had been to every Senator to find out how each one stood on the question. That is the basis for the rather comprehensive statement I made about the procedure which evidently was followed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the interest of the honor and the rectitude of the United States Senate, and particularly in the interest of my own honor, I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio that not one person has ever approached me regarding how I would vote on this particular nomination except a gentleman who now sits in the Press Gallery, a man with rather gray hair, whose name is Jack Bell, of the Associated Press. As a matter of news, last Saturday a week ago when I was staying at home he telephoned my secretary to find out how I would vote. My secretary telephoned me, and at that time I expressed myself as to how I intended to vote. He is the only person who has ever asked how I would vote or who has ever indicated to me any interest in my vote. I may further say that I believe the interest the Associated Press was taking at the time was a perfectly legitimate one.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I merely wished to say that everyone knew the Senator had made up his mind, and everyone knew on which side he had made it up. Therefore, he was counted, perhaps without absolutely checking, as being in favor of Mr. Williams.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. What the Senator from Ohio has just said refutes the declaration he made a short time ago. If he wishes to deny the accuracy of his own statement, he may do so.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I can understand how the Senator from Ohio gained the impression that every Senator had been contacted with respect to how he would vote on the nomination of Mr. Williams, because, for some cause or other, on his side of the aisle there has been one of the most vigorous campaigns among the leaders over there against Mr. Williams—and I know what I am talking about—that has ever been made in connection with any nomination which has ever come to the Senate of the United States.

I dare say that very few persons have read the testimony, and seldom have fewer persons cared about reading testimony. That is the point I made at the beginning of my remarks. I, too, was against Mr. Williams on the basis of what someone told me. I was against the confirmation of his nomination from the beginning, until I examined the testimony and listened to the witnesses and heard the arguments made by the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], refuted upon every hand with respect to the charges of communism, the charges that Mr. Williams was a crook when he was head of the National Youth Administration, and all the other charges. So far as I am concerned, all the charges have been completely refuted.

I am one of those who can frequently change their minds. I am not going to crucify any man simply because of something which happened years ago. I know what I am talking about when I speak of some of the votes which will be cast against this man. If I were to permit myself to be influenced by the considerations which motivated some Members of this body, I would be against him because in 1938, in my campaign in the primary, the Works Progress Administration, to a man, so far as the foreman and the leaders of that organization in Illinois were concerned, were supporting my opponent. But, Mr. President, I can forgive and forget some things. I know Mr. Williams had nothing to do with what was going on in connection with the W. P. A. in Illinois. I know what the local politicians in the counties and precincts do with respect to the W. P. A. and every other Federal agency if they can get away with it, and I know what they did in that particular case.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I rose because I rather resented the statement that Mr. Williams and his friends had been to every Senator and had obtained a statement from every Senator as to how he stood on the nomination. I never saw Mr. Williams in my life, so far as I know. I would not know him if he walked in the room. He may be here, for all I know. I have had no friends of his attempt to find out from me how I stood, so far as I know, and I certainly have not told them if they did. So I resent that reflection on the Members of the Senate. I do not think that every Senator can be polled so that it can be ascertained how he expects to vote. I think that the Senator from Ohio has the wrong idea of Members of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Delaware. I concur in what he has said. We cannot poll every Member of the Senate, but there are certain individuals who are always trying to do so in connection with votes to be taken on important matters. I do not object to it. What I am objecting to in connection with the nomination of Aubrey Williams is having a man crucified as Williams apparently will be by United States Senators who have never read the record with respect to him. That is what I am talking about, and I assert that it is a serious situation.

In my early youth I had some trouble. I suffered a good deal from trouble and toil. I saw individuals who, because of prejudice, were unfair in an attempt to mistreat me and take advantage of a situation against which it was difficult for me to defend myself in those early days. I see the same thing taking place here. I see prejudice and partisan politics operating overtime simply because certain individuals want to win a victory, gloat about it, and get even with someone by evening up a score. Think of it, Mr. President—a United States Senator evening up a score when the world is on fire.

Allow me to tell what the record shows with regard to Aubrey Williams. The Senator from Tennessee has said that we should have a director of the R. E. A. who has had a lot of experience, someone who knows a great deal about electricity and about farming. I invite attention to the fact that the Senate recently confirmed the nomination of Mr. Fred Vinson to be the head of an organization having under its control the disbursing of billions upon billions of dollars through various lending agencies of this country. I do not believe he ever had a day of banking experience in his life. But, of course, he was all right. His philosophy of government was just a bit different. He was in between a real liberal and a reactionary. Let me say I think that Fred Vinson is one of the outstanding men in government. I served with him in the House. He is my personal friend.

Mr. Krug never had any experience along the lines of the work he is now doing. However, he is head of the War Production Board.

Senators can go down one avenue after another in government and find men at the head of various departments who had never had any specialized experience in connection with what they are now doing until they took up their duties in their respective departments. Yet, they are making a success of their work. But merely because this man Williams made some unfortunate statements in behalf of the underdogs and the underprivileged people in the country, it has been said that he is unqualified to be the head of the R. E. A. on the ground that he is not a farmer and knows nothing about electricity.

Mr. President, $550,000,000 is tied up in the R. E. A. at the present time. Much more money will be forthcoming through appropriations to be made by the Congress of the United States to maintain and operate that worthy and liberal program for helping the farmers of America in the future. I, too, want someone to be the head of the R. E. A. who is qualified and competent to administer an important agency of that kind. I believe that Aubrey Williams is qualified to handle the money which the director of the R. E. A. will be called upon to disburse and I will state why I believe so.

So far as the qualifications of Aubrey Williams are concerned, the record in this case is fairly complete. Back in 1933 he became the Deputy Administrator of the W. P. A. under Harry Hopkins. That is where all his troubles started. Later, he became Executive Director, and finally the Director, of the National Youth Administration in 1939. He had the responsibility of conducting the entire operation of the W. P. A. agency under Harry Hopkins. When he took over the N. Y. A. he also was given full responsibility for what I always believed was a tremendously fine institution, established in the days when the youth of this country needed help from their Government.

I read from page 5 of the printed hearings the testimony with regard to what Aubrey Williams himself said he did in respect to the N. Y. A.:

> In N. Y. A. we expended a total of something like $662,000,000 through a period of 8 years, from 1935 to 1943. The highest expenditure in any one year was something like $155,000,000.
>
> During that period we gave employment on out-of-school projects and on in-school projects at the high-school and college levels to 4,800,000 separate individual youths. We had organizations in each of the States of the Union. We had at one time something like 23,000 paid employees other than project employees, and these people represented every form of professional and technical background.
>
> In that work we had to do with some 29,000 high schools, where we had organized the work in high schools in cooperation with the respective administrative officers.
>
> In providing work for young people, we sought as much as we could to work projects out in terms of the ideas and desires of the local communities, and in order to do that we established local committees of citizens who were interested in young people. This continued over a period of years. At one time we had some 2,500 citizens' committees who, in connection with our administrative personnel, worked out the type of project that we were to carry on.

Of course, Mr. President, if we believe some of those who are opposing the nomination of Aubrey Williams, each one of those 2,500 citizens' committees was filled with Communists.

I continue reading from the testimony of Aubrey Williams:

> In 1 year, particularly, the highest year, where we had the largest number employed, we were operating at one time something above 19,000 separate projects for young people. These projects were of all character and variety, as you gentlemen are fully aware, I think. It was a part of the philosophy of the thing, as some of us conceived it, that these young people should do much of the work in connection with building of shops and dormitories, and so forth. They built their dormitories. They built their buildings. They did their own cooking. They did their own housekeeping. They made a great part of their own clothing. They made the furniture. They repaired automobiles. They salvaged thousands of automobiles which were used on projects.
>
> In other words, it was a training project for them, and we used the opportunity, in the building of a plant, to give them work. So that it did two things: It provided them with practical work experience, and it cut down the total overhead cost that would be required to carry it on.

I now read what Representative TARVER of the other House said in connection with appropriations for the N. Y. A.

when the subject came before his subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Judge TARVER is a very independent and conservative type of man. I served with him when I was a Member of the other House. I have great respect for his ability and judgment. Briefly, this is what he said about the N. Y. A.:

I also indicated my opinion that a great many people who are interested in not carrying on an educational program in the National Youth Administration have a misconception of just what is proposed in this appropriation. This is a war-training program. These young people manufacture needed articles for the Army and the Navy of the United States, running up into millions of dollars' worth, and in the manufacturing they receive training. They are not being educated in the usual sense of that term.

For the information of the House I desire to add the following concise statement of some of the accomplishments of National Youth Administration as of the present fiscal year:

A WAR PRODUCTION TRAINING PROGRAM

From July 1, 1942, to March 1, 1943, the National Youth Administration gave war production training to 303,000 previously unemployed boys and girls. It is conservatively estimated that over 400,000 will have been given training in the 12-month period of fiscal year 1943.

Over a thousand youths a day leave the program and a thousand other youths, mostly without any work experience, take their places. Of those who leave, between 650 and 700 a day enter employment, the majority of them in war industries. While it is not practical to follow through on every youth who leaves the program, there is ample reason for assuming that many of the remainder likewise find employment in essential industry. Some enter the armed services, greatly advantaged by their training in mechanics.

The National Youth Administration war production training program utilizes approximately 39,000 work stations (a machine or equivalent training facility for 1 person per shift) concentrated in 640 shops located in 510 communities and in every State of the Nation. How closely these work stations are related to war production is apparent from the following list, which gives the number of work stations for each type of training activity carried on by the National Youth Administration:

Machine	9,739
Sheet metal	5,636
Welding	6,858
Patternmaking and foundry	1,005
Forge	208
Radio and electrical	3,543
Auto mechanics	1,105
Aircraft and aircraft engine mechanics	1,079
Joinery	207
Aircraft woodwork	748
General woodwork	1,430
Industrial sewing	2,570
Mechanical drafting	638
Other shop activities	40
Clerical	2,162
Other activities	258

In 225 of the above 510 communities, and in 11 additional places, residence centers for the housing of youth are provided. This makes it possible to bring in youth from sparsely settled areas where it would be impractical to set up training facilities and to give them training which enables them to make the maximum contribution to the war effort of which they are capable. These residence centers have a second important function, for they are the basis of the youth transfer system whereby the demands of one area for semiskilled labor may be met by transferring youth having the specific skills needed from an area that has a relative surplus. By the end of this month over 31,000 National Youth Administration trained youth will have been transferred to critical labor shortage areas. Shipyards alone have been provided with 14,000 National Youth Administration trained youth.

The average cost per month, for each youth, including subsistence of those in residence centers, the wages paid to youth and all training and administrative cost is $66.91. The average cost for each different trainee for the entire period of time spent in training is $108.44.

Actual production work of material, principally for the armed forces, is the basis of National Youth Administration training. The Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, and other agencies provide the materials; National Youth Administration processes them at no charge. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are thus saved the Government, and the youth profit by the best kind of training it is possible to give. In many cases parts that must be had by the Navy shore establishments or Army arsenals without a moment's delay in order to break a production bottleneck can be and are sped through National Youth Administration shops, the saving of time in such cases being far more important than the saving in cost. Some idea of the extent of this production may be had by citing the number of parts or articles made for a few Government establishments in the past 10 months:

Portsmouth Navy Yard, Portsmouth, N. H.	1,214,318
Brooklyn Navy Yard, Brooklyn, N. Y.	406,047
Norfolk Navy Yard, Norfolk, Va.	102,731
United States Naval Coast Guard, New England	20,884
United States Submarine Base, Connecticut	1,384
United States Maritime Commission, various shipyards	13,795
Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.	1,282,747
Watervliet Arsenal, Watervliet, N. Y.	8,129

One-half of all National Youth Administration trainees are females. Youth of draft age now represent approximately one-third of the males. Many in this group, while acceptable to industry, are not up to the physical standards of the armed services.

In the past year National Youth Administration moved 10,500, or more than 25 percent of its work stations to new locations, as the urgency of training needs developed in various parts of the country. It has proved to be the only training agency that is capable of rapidly moving and setting up its facilities to meet immediate needs.

Now, as to the student work program:

By keeping 40,000 youths in college, National Youth Administration has this year assured the training of 3,106 additional engineers, 2,084 chemists, 410 physicists, 1,129 mathematicians, 277 pharmacists, 68 metallurgists, 1,613 doctors, 270 dentists, 1,033 biologists and bacteriological specialists, 361 nurses, 2,624 dietitians and home economists, 1,256 agricultural specialists, 6,276 teachers, 1,233 physical-education directors, 5,073 business and commerce technicians, 2,593 social scientists, and 9,952 other technical personnel, all of whom would have been unable to continue their college education without National Youth Administration assistance.

That is Representative TARVER, of Georgia, speaking, not Aubrey Williams. That is what the National Youth Administration under Aubrey Williams was doing at that particular time, and that work contributed its part to the great success the American armies are having at this very moment upon every battle front in the world. Yet it is said that Aubrey Williams is not competent; that he is not capable; that he is not qualified to handle the rural electrification organization.

Mr. President, the truth of the matter is that those who oppose confirmation of the nomination know that Mr. Williams is competent. It is not a question of competency; it is not a question of qualification or capability; it is a question of prejudice, a question of politics. That is what is involved in this fight, and that is all.

I read a statement by Secretary Stimson with respect to this matter. In 1940 Secretary Stimson wrote this letter to Mr. Williams:

DEAR MR. ADMINISTRATOR: I have been informed that the National Youth Administration is engaged in training radio operators at certain work projects. Further, I have been informed that the Administrator of the National Youth Administration is agreeable to expanding this type of training if it is of benefit to the military service. Such training as will qualify enrollees in the National Youth Administration as amateur radio operators will be of direct benefit to our national defense.

In time of an emergency the Army will need a large number of radio operators. It is requested that the National Youth Administration program for the training of radio operators be expanded to 5,000 youths, if practicable, within the limitation of available funds.

It will be noted that in the letter the Secretary of War asked Mr. Williams to increase the radio operators in training 5,000 over and above the number in training at that time. Mr. Stimson at that time thought fairly well of this man, Mr. President, in connection with the training for this important work of men who are now so effectively carrying on the battle for democracy throughout the world.

I desire to read a statement also from Representative Cox, of Georgia, who said this:

(From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 4, p. 4914)

Representative EUGENE E. COX (Georgia). It is no mistake to say that these young peopl were able to get jobs in these war plants because of the National Youth Administration training program. It is no mistake to say that they are better workers as a result of their National Youth Administration training. War industries of all kinds, not only from Georgia, but from all over the country, have gone on record in support of this organization because of the important job it is doing in the preparation of young people for war work. Representatives of both branches of the armed forces and of the Maritime Commission have likewise testified to the contribution the National Youth Administration is making to the war effort.

So, Mr. President, we find the Secretary of War, the Maritime Commission, and other war agencies asking for the continuatio of the National Youth Administration back in 1942 when the Nation and the world were so hard-pressed by despots in Japan and in Nazi Germany.

No; Mr. Williams did not know a single thing about organization. He merely had all these thousands of boys and girls on the pay roll scattered all over the United States, and the Army and the

Navy and the Maritime Commission were asking him to train more of them. Oh, no; he does not know a single thing about organization. He has no qualifications, no ability to spend the money appropriated for the Rural Electrification Administration, notwithstanding the millions upon millions of dollars he has spent as the man in charge of one of the most technical pieces of work which has ever been carried on by a single individual who has ever been an administrator for a Government agency. No; it is not a question of ability; it is not a question of competency. They are going to get somebody, that is all; they are out to get somebody and Williams has got to be the one.

Did Mr. Williams handle the money provided for the National Youth Administration efficiently? My distinguished friend, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], who has been here all these years and who is so tolerant in his views about everything, submitted a long statement, in line with a letter which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] got from Lindsay Warren, telling how inefficiently and dishonestly Aubrey Williams had been handling those millions of dollars all these years. A long list of charges was made by the Senator from Tennessee against Mr. Williams. I desire to read a few of them. He produced a statement which had been prepared by Mr. Warren or employees in his department and at different places in the statement it appears that there were questionable transactions such as traveling expenses—mingling of private and public business; intermingling of private and official business; acceptance of fees for participation in lectures at meetings; dual compensation. There were some 16 different charges, including Christmas cards, the use of Government telephones, and so forth.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] asked:

> Is there anything in the report to substantiate the charges?

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] said in reply:

> There surely is; all you have to do is to read it.

Mr. President, that is the kind of testimony that was offered. The Senator from Tennessee made a statement of that kind before the committee, and saying it was true, when in fact all he had to do was to call Lindsay Warren, himself, to get a true bill of character about Williams. That he failed to do so demonstrates that he does not want the Senate to know what were the facts, and is willing for us to find out whether there is any answer to the charges he made.

We called Lindsay Warren before the committee. What did Lindsay Warren say, Mr. President, about all these charges involving thousands of dollars? Lindsay Warren, during the course of a lengthy examination said, that, notwithstanding the fact that there had been these charges made against Aubrey Williams, there was not one iota of evidence against his character and integrity; that the disbursing officers had made mistakes, as mistakes are made in every department. He then proceeded to say that only last year he had to send to the railroads a bill for approximately twenty-five or thirty million dollars because of overcharges and mistakes which they had made. But that is all right.

It would be possible to get a railroad president appointed to this job any minute, notwithstanding he makes $25,000,000 worth of mistakes. It would be possible to get that kind of a fellow appointed; and I do not cast any reflection against the railroads. It is a common practice, as was said by Mr. Lindsay Warren himself. Every department, through its disbursing officers, is daily making mistakes because of failure properly to interpret the laws, as to whether one particular matter should be applied to expense or another should be applied.

Mr. President, that did not satisfy the Senator from Tennessee. He came in with long records making these charges against this man. Yet Lindsay Warren said, "Nothing doing, because his record is as clean as a hound's tooth, as far as his integrity and his honesty and his character are concerned." Of course, he could not watch every individual throughout that wide organization. Of course some mistakes were bound to creep in. That was the testimony with respect to that matter. I say he did handle it efficiently, I say he did handle it honestly, and I say he did a marvelous job with regard to the N. Y. A. There is nothing in this record that shows that the man is inefficient.

Aubrey Williams himself testified in connection with these claims. I shall not read all the testimony, because the statements are too long. I merely refer to pages 68 and 69. In those two pages he explains in detail and in full exactly every item in connection with the charge against him. He told the committee it took him almost 2 years before he got that matter cleared up so completely that no one would be able to point the finger of suspicion at his record from the standpoint of honesty, efficiency, and integrity. It was worked out.

It is said that Aubrey Williams is a Communist. That is the second charge. The first charge, be it remembered, was that he was not competent, that he was not able, and the second charge was that he was a Communist.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Who made the charge that Mr. Williams was a Communist?

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the Senator from New Mexico that I shall read the testimony that was submitted for the RECORD by the Senator from Tennessee, and he testified at length, and quoted from the famous Dies committee. It was the famous Dies committee—not the Dies committee, but the individual who represented the Dies committee, a gentleman by the name of Matthews, who was the investigator, who found that Mr. Aubrey Williams was a Communist. The Senator from Tennessee read that man's testimony into the RECORD, and I take it he was using that as his own. Whether the Senator from Tennessee contends he was a Communist he will probably tell us when he speaks. I do not know whether he intends that or not.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator should be fair, especially to a colleague. He talks about my reflection on Mr. Williams' intelligence. Let me read what I said.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield to me a moment?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator. I thought the Senator yielded to me, but if he desires to yield to the Senator from New Mexico——

Mr. LUCAS. I did not yield to the Senator from New Mexico at all. He merely interrupted the conversation, and I yield to my dear friend from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is what was said about his intelligence. The question was as to my own view about it.

> If the Senator says I reflected upon Mr. Williams' intelligence yesterday he is certainly mistaken, because Mr. Williams is one of the best hands at explaining things that I ever knew. I take off my hat to him.

My whole testimony was very pleasant toward him. There were two reports from the committees, both of which did reflect on Mr. Williams. One of them was from the Dies committee, and there was another investigating committee which said exactly the same thing. Both of them brought in reports.

There was a report from the General Accounting Office charging him with being behind in his accounts, charging that his accounts were not correct, and he brought in another statement about a subsequent report from another officer. He did not say he was as clean as a hound's tooth, but he said some of the mistakes had been corrected, and I think a small amount of money had been paid in which had not been paid in when the first investigation was made.

I hope the Senator will not attempt to quote me unless he quotes my language. I certainly would not do that to the Senator. I have had a good deal of experience with Mr. Williams. Remember, it took me two years and a half, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, to separate him from the N. Y. A. We had a very hot fight about it, and the Senator recalls it. We had the same fight on the floor. My distinguished friend from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], one of the most lovable men in the Senate, took Mr. Williams' side and fought for him in as manly a fashion as I ever knew of. With all that, the Senate turned Mr. Williams down, and abolished his office. That was the only way we could separate Mr. Williams at that time from Government service. He got a job somewhere else, and I was delighted that he got a job. Mr. Williams is a very kindly, persuasive, delightful gentleman. A man in social-service work ordinarily is that kind of man, and Mr. Williams is that kind of an individual. I took the position that he had no possible equipment for the particular job to which he has been appointed, and I hope the Senate will take

the same view. But I have not reflected on Mr. Williams in any way in the world, except to say that I did not think he was qualified.

Mr. LUCAS. That is all I said a while ago. The Senator from Tennessee said he was not qualified and was not competent. I said nothing about his reflecting on the intelligence of Mr. Williams, but I did say that the Senator constantly insisted that he should be a farmer, that he should be an electrician, should know something about the Rural Electrification Act, and that he was not qualified and was not competent.

I know all about the facts. The contest is still going on. The Senator is glad to see him get a job, of course, but not with the United States Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct; the Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has much sympathy for him, and likes him. He is very seductive and very praiseworthy, and the Senator just loves the man, but he does not want him to get a job with the Government.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely correct. [Laughter.]

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Illinois has just graciously yielded to me. I had no desire to interrupt the discourse of the Senator from Tennessee regarding the intelligence of the nominee, Mr. Williams. The Senator from Illinois was discussing the charge about communism. I had asked him about that particular charge, and the Senator from Tennesse interrupted. I did not ask about his intelligence, or anything of the kind. I am interested in the charge of communism. Will the Senator from Illinois please speak of that?

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will permit, the record shows that $155,000,000, if I remember the exact amount, went to a Communist organization for the purpose of teaching the youth of the country along the line of communism. The $155,000,000 went either to the Communist organization, or the fellow traveler, or fellow travelers, which is a halfway Communist organization. There was another name for it too. About $155,000,000 of the people's money went to teaching liberal, fellow-traveler views to the youth of the country.

Mr. President, I happen to be an American. I have great admiration for the Russian Government, and the Russian fighting, I have every admiration for it, the Russians having made a wonderful fight in this war, and I take off my hat to them. Yet I do not want to have their system of government brought here. I am satisfied with the Government I held up my hand to high heaven and took an oath to protect and defend—the Government of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. I have heard the Senator make that statement many times.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; and the Senator will hear me make it a great many more times.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, Mr. President; I have heard the Senator from Tennessee make that statement so many times.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, and the Senator will hear me make it a great many more times.

Mr. LUCAS. I have heard the Senator from Tennessee verbally wrap himself around the Constitution at least 50 times in the last 6 years I have been in the United States Senate. If any individual will read the record and reach the conclusion that Mr. Aubrey Williams had a constitutional defense under the cross-examination by the Senator from Tennessee, then I do not know anything about the Constitution.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not cross examine him at all.

Mr. WHEREBY rose.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not yield, Mr. President. I am not yielding to anyone, not even to the acting leader on the other side of the aisle, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. I know how well he loves to talk, and how he would like to get into the discussion. While the minority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is out of the Chamber he has taken his place.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. I do not yield at all.

Mr. WHERRY. I yielded to the Senator the other day.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not yield. I wish to continue my statement now.

Mr. WHERRY. I yielded to the Senator from Illinois the other day.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Tennessee speaks of the Constitution—God bless it! The Senator is a good American, of course. Simply because I defend Aubrey Williams there might be some implication——

Mr. McKELLAR. No, no; I do not make it. The Senator is a fine man, one of the best.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad the Senator says so. I will test my Americanism by that of the next individual, though I defend someone the Senator does not like.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I will not yield for an observation. I like the Senator from Nebraska, but I wish he would cease and desist, because he is so disconcerting.

Mr. WHERRY I will tell the Senator something. I should like to talk about something different for just a moment.

Mr. LUCAS. I know the Senator would. No, Mr. President; the Senator from Tennessee has been rather—well, just slightly reprimanding me for getting out of the record. I want him to show the Senate of the United States where $155,000,000 was ever appropriated or spent by a Communist organization in this country. The Senator is talking about Communists. He is going to prove everything by the famous Dies committee; that is all. That is his record here, and that was the record on which his testimony was based before. I want to go into that.

Mr. President, what is a "Communist"? That term is more loosely used around in this country by people who do not know what it is than any other one name that I know anything about.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I will say that I do not——

Mr. LUCAS. No, Mr. President; I do not yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know what it is. I do not want to know. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. Well, I am glad to hear the Senator finally admit——

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not want to know.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to hear the Senator finally admit that he does not know what it is, because he tried for a whole day to convict Aubrey Williams of communism by reading long reports of the Dies committee record before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and gave me at least the impression that he had concluded, because of what the Dies committee said against this man, that he was a Communist. That is the Senator's testimony, and I want to read that testimony. I want to read just what the Senator from Tennessee said to show that Williams was a Communist.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] started out in this case for Aubrey Williams. He started out in favor of him.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] is not present. If the Senator from Illinois is about to discuss the Senator from Alabama, I think——

Mr. LUCAS. I am not going to discuss him at all.

Mr. HATCH. I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum, if the Senator is about to discuss the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, has any business been transacted since the last call of the roll?

Mr. HATCH. I am not interested in whether any business has been transacted. It is simply a matter of fairness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No business has been transacted since the last call of the roll.

Mr. McKELLAR. I make the point of order that no business has been transacted since the last call of the roll.

Mr. HATCH. I have not made a point of no quorum, Mr. President. I merely suggest that if the Senator from Illinois is going to discuss the attitude of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Alabama should be present.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think the Senator is correct in that suggestion; I shall be glad to send for the Senator from Alabama. But I do not think a point of no quorum should be made.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as long as the Senator from Tennessee is directing the Senate of the United States, he might well send for the Senator from Alabama, instead of raising a point of order against a suggestion which has not been made.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not care whether a quorum is present or not. I am simply doing what I feel it is my duty to do. I am going to continue to do

so. I was about to say that in the beginning of the hearings, before the cross-examination, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I still think——

Mr. LUCAS. I do not yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Alabama at first supported Aubrey Williams. There is no secret about it. He will tell Senators so himself. It is common knowledge that the White House asked the two Alabama Senators whether they could be for Aubrey Williams, and they both said they could, and on the basis of that statement Aubrey Williams' name came before the Senate for appointment. There is no question about that. That is common knowledge around here. A little statement was made by Aubrey Williams in the newspaper he was writing for—I have forgotten the name of the paper; the Farmers' Union, I believe it was—in which Mr. Williams discussed some of the same principles as were debated in connection with the soldiers' vote legislation before the Senate, last session. Statements and theories were delivered by some distinguished Senators from the South on this side of the aisle in combination with some distinguished Senators from the North over on the other side of the aisle. Because of that statement the Senator from Alabama changed his position over night and said, "I am against Aubrey Williams." That position was taken on the basis of one statement made by Aubrey Williams.

Mr. President, if we were to examine the statements made by Senators now on the floor, and others who are not now on the floor, made over a long period of time, and carefully analyze them to see what the Senators said, there would not be a single Senator who could be confirmed for anything by the Senate. Simply because Mr. Williams made one statement the Senator from Alabama said, "I cannot be for him."

The Senator from Alabama, a member of the Agriculture Committee, interrogated Mr. Williams as follows:

> Before you get to that, Mr. Williams, it has been suggested in some quarters that you are a Communist—

This was when the Senator from Alabama was for him—

> or you are communistic in feelings and leanings.
>
> Have you ever been affiliated with any communistic association?
>
> Senator CAPPER. I did not hear that. What was the question?
>
> Senator BANKHEAD. I asked him if he had been affiliated with any communistic association. Did you ever have any membership in any communistic group? Did you ever associate with a group of Communists or communistically inclined people?
>
> Mr. WILLIAMS. No, sir; and I am very glad to make a statement to that effect. I have never been a member of any communistic organization. I never attended a meeting. I have never knowingly employed a Communist. I have never knowingly retained a Communist.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. What is a Communist?

The question, "What is a Communist?" was never answered.

That, Mr. President, is the beginning of the testimony concerning communism with respect to Mr. Williams.

On page 148 of the hearings we find this with respect to the one witness who appeared against Mr. Williams, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. This is what the Senator from Tennessee said:

> All of you have heard of the celebrated Dies committee, and most of you have heard of volume 17 of that committee. Incidentally I had a very hard time getting volume 17, but I finally did get it. I did not get it from an assistant either; I got it from the head of the show.
>
> Before I get to that, I was present here yesterday or the day before for a short time, while Senator BUSHFIELD was asking Mr. Williams questions about his connection with the Communist organizations of the country. Of course, that, as we all know, has been the question that has been very greatly discussed for some time. The Dies committee made its report and the evidence is given here in volume 17, so far as Mr. Williams' connection with Communists or Communist-front organizations is concerned. It seems that the matter finally got to the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General held that there were a number of Congressman-front organizations.
>
> Senator WILLIS. Will you restate that?
>
> Senator TOBEY. Will you indict yourself, too? You said "Congressman front"?
>
> Senator MCKELLAR. Did I say "Congressman front"?
>
> Senator TOBEY. Yes.
>
> Senator MCKELLAR. I mean Communist front—

And so forth. The Senator from Tennessee continued:

> Now the facts about these communistic societies are all of record and I have them here somewhere, which I will give you in just a moment, Mr. Chairman, I have them right here somewhere with the pages marked. This is still volume in 17 of the Dies committee hearings.
>
> The American Youth Congress was one of them. Mr. Matthews had this to say about it while he was testifying before the Dies committee—

It is well for the Senate to remember just who Mr. Matthews is. I shall talk about him in a few moments. He is the individual upon whom the Dies committee relied in its finding, if it ever made a finding, that Aubrey Williams, George Norris, and many others were Communists.

The Senator from Tennessee quoted Mr. Matthews as follows:

> Mr. MATTHEWS. On this list there are 142 names. The Honorable George Norris has since died, leaving 141 names.

I continue reading from the hearings:

> Senator WILLIS. Senator what list is that?
>
> Senator MCKELLAR. This is a list produced by Mr. Matthews as an exhibit to his testimony.
>
> Senator WILLIS. A list of members?
>
> Senator MCKELLAR. A list of members. I will read this to you.
>
> Senator ELLENDER. Was George Norris considered a Communist?
>
> Senator MCKELLAR. He was found to be that here.
>
> Senator ELLENDER. The Senator does not believe the late Senator George Norris was a Communist, does he?
>
> Senator MCKELLAR. I will say this of Senator Norris: I have never spoken ill of my colleague and never expect to. He was one of my colleagues for many years, but Senator Norris had very liberal views, and I knew him well.

That is the way he left the late Senator Norris. He did not say whether or not he believed that he was a Communist.

> Senator TOBEY. If Senator Norris was a Communist, I wish we had more in the United States.

Matthews is the individual who found that Williams and Norris were Communists. He was an investigator for the Dies committee. It is significant to note that at no time did the Dies committee, as a committee, ever state, "We, the undersigned members of the Dies committee, find the following individuals to be Communists," and then proceed to set out the proof upon which they based the statement. They did not do that. They used Mr. Matthews, the great investigator; and upon his testimony word has gone out all over the country that men like Aubrey Williams, George Norris, and others, were Communists.

It does not mean much to be called a Communist these days. The Chicago Tribune, a great newspaper in the Midwest, called me a Communist during the last campaign. It published an editorial entitled "Comrade LUCAS," and proceeded to tell what a great Communist I was, and how the money which was being used in my campaign was coming from Hillman and Browder. I know neither one of them.

The name "Communist" has been bandied about so much that it means nothing. If I am a Communist, then every other Member of the Unted States Senate, including the Senator from Tennessee, is a Communist. That includes the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The junior Senator from Florida derives considerable satisfaction from the admission of the Senator from Illinois that he has been called a Communist, because not long ago I learned from the press that in the files of the Dies committee were the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], one of the finest gentlemen I have ever known, and the junior Senator from Florida. They were at least on the suspect list. At least there was a file on them. I have never got around to an examination of the file to see just what data were included in it. I was thinking that some of my good old Baptist ancestors would be a little uncomfortable in their graves when the omniscients from the other side of the River Styx advised them that one of their descendants was on the suspect list of so sacrosanct a committee as the Dies committee.

I have heard it said that perhaps Speaker RAYBURN was also on the suspect list, or at least his name was in the file. I do not know what other ramifications the inquiry may have followed. I am sure that if the examination were to be retrospective, good old Thomas Jefferson

would be expatriated and sent back retroactively to some foreign country, because assuredly he never would be able to pass the Dies committee.

Mr. LUCAS. It would be too bad if Mr. Jefferson were alive today, with the Dies committee in operation.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure that Thomas Jefferson never would have permitted his name to be submitted to the Senate if he were subject to that charge, because assuredly he would have been convicted by the Dies committee, and his nomination would have been rejected by the Senate.

I wonder if the Senator has given any consideration to the chances which a man named Franklin D. Roosevelt might have of passing muster with the Dies committee. I can imagine the glowing report which the Dies committee would issue with regard to a man named Franklin D. Roosevelt if he did not happen to be President of the United States, and if he had not been elected by the people of the United States as many times as he has been elected. In political campaigns I have heard something said even about the communism of Mr. Roosevelt; so it may be that the company which the Dies committee condemns is not so disreputable after all.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with everything the Senator has said. The thing which I cannot understand is that any United States Senator should use the Dies committee reports in an attempt to convict a man of communism in order to smear him to the point where his nomination would not be confirmed by the Senate.

If I ever go before an important committee of the United States Senate and charge some individual with communism, I will have the facts to support the charge. I will not rely upon the statement of an irresponsible investigator who investigates for the coin of the realm and nothing else. That man Matthews would do anything for a few paltry dollars.

Let me read into the RECORD the background of Mr. Matthews. It ought to satisfy the Senator from Tennessee. The next time he quotes from someone he ought to know from whom he is quoting before he attempts to malign an individual who has been nominated for high office.

Let me read from the hearings the background of Mr. Matthews:

Joseph B. Matthews was born at Hopkinsville, Ky., June 28, 1894.

He graduated from a small local college and spent about 7 years in Java as a missionary.

Returning home, with his wife and children, he went back to school, scraping along on small scholarships, finally becoming master of sacred theology at Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

He was instructor at Scarritt College, Nashville, Tenn. He was forced to resign from Scarritt for violence in preaching against child labor and Jim Crowism.

He was instructor at two Negro universities—Fisk, at Nashville, and Howard, in Washington, D. C.

1929: Executive secretary of Fellowship of Reconciliation, American branch of pacifist international; joined Socialist Party and became vehement Marxist, preaching necessity of class warfare.

That is the man whose testimony is being used to convict Aubrey Williams of communism.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. If Mr. Matthews had been investigating a man of another name, who had had no Socialist associations, and who had made those socialistic utterances, I wonder what he would have called him.

Mr. LUCAS. It is difficult for anyone to say what he might have called him. I cannot answer that question.

I continue to read the statement of Mr. Matthews' background.

1933: Fired by Fellowship of Reconciliation and expelled from Socialist Party for the violence of his extreme views.

Took Rex Tugwell to task for rejecting the tenet of class conflict.

1934: "Fascism is capitalism gone nude."

1934: Joined Consumers' Research and published Partners in Plunder (1935), a vicious attack upon the business community as a gang of pirates, cheats, and swindlers.

1935: Fought strike of underpaid employees of Consumers' Research, whose case was upheld by N. L. R. B.—forced to leave Consumers' Research.

I am still talking about Mr. Matthews, the star witness upon whom the Senator from Tennessee relied in attempting to convict Aubrey Williams of communism.

At Pittsburgh in 1934 Matthews said:

Even if Japan attacks America, I am not fighting for America.

Williams is, and has been. His four sons are now fighting for America. One has been in the Navy for two and a half years; another is in the Army in France; a third is in this country getting ready to go overseas; and another boy, at the age of 18, has just recently entered the service. But the star performer in this communistic proceeding said:

Even if Japan attacks America, I am not fighting for America.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has any business been transacted since the last roll call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that no business has been transacted since then.

Mr. McKELLAR. I make the point of order that unless business has been transacted, the roll cannot be continuously called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. With all due deference to the ruling of the Chair—and I have the utmost respect for the present occupant of the chair—I desire to point out that a message was received from the House of Representatives. There is dispute whether that constitutes the transaction of business. Therefore, I most respectfully appeal from the ruling of the Chair, and I request a vote by the Senate.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if no business has been transacted——

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator from Illinois abandoned the floor and yielded to the Senator from New Mexico. Then the Senator from New Mexico made a speech. Then I obtained the floor, and I suggested the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico appealed from the ruling of the Chair. That appeal is now the business pending before the Senate.

The question now is whether the Senate will support the Chair in its ruling on the point of order made by the Senator from Tennessee, from which an appeal has been taken by the Senator from New Mexico. All in favor——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, at the earnest request of the Senator from Kentucky, I withdraw my appeal.

Mr. CHANDLER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Myers
Austin	Hart	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hawkes	Overton
Barkley	Hayden	Pepper
Bilbo	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Brewster	Hill	Reed
Bridges	Hoey	Revercomb
Briggs	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Burton	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bushfield	La Follette	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capehart	Lucas	Taylor
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McFarland	Tobey
Cordon	McKellar	Tunnell
Donnell	McMahon	Tydings
Downey	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Eastland	Maybank	Walsh
Ellender	Mead	Wheeler
Ferguson	Millikin	Wherry
Fulbright	Mitchell	White
George	Moore	Wiley
Gerry	Morse	Willis
Green	Murdock	Wilson
Guffey	Murray	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article by David Lawrence appearing in the Washington Star of Saturday.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, we are having so many quorum calls that evidently a filibuster is on. I wonder if the Senator will postpone his request until a little later? For the present I shall object, but I will not do so a little later.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I resent the statement made by the Senator from Tennessee with respect to a filibuster. I have been speaking approximately only an hour and a half, and this is the first time I have heard a Senator charge another Senator with filibustering.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am not charging—

Mr. LUCAS. I am likely to filibuster if the Senator wants me to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am not charging the Senator with conducting a filibuster. The Senator did not suggest the absence of a quorum, but several quorum calls have been had. A question was raised almost every time as to whether any business had been transacted in the meantime. So in order that the Senator from Illinois may talk to us freely and fully, I am merely suggesting to the Senator from Montana that in order that he may talk to us I shall object to any business being transacted at the present time.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that I have suggested the absence of a quorum but twice.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was two or three times, and possibly one other time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators desiring recognition should address the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. I apologize to the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico may proceed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, twice I suggested the absence of a quorum because I hoped Senators would be present to hear the discussion of the Senator from Illinois, who is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I also suggested the absence of a quorum a third time. On that suggestion the Senator from Tennessee made a point of order. The Chair sustained the point of order. The Senator from New Mexico appealed from the ruling of the Chair. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] suggested to the Senator from New Mexico that if he would withdraw his appeal he, the Senator from Kentucky would suggest the absence of a quorum. That was done, and the quorum call was allowed. Now the Senator from Tennessee accuses me, or the Senator from Kentucky, with conducting a filibuster.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was not accusing any Senator. I merely stated that there had been a number of quorum calls. I was not accusing my friend from New Mexico or my friend from Kentucky. But I think the Senator from Illinois is entirely correct. He should have an audience to hear him. I hope Senators will remain in the Chamber and listen to the Senator from Illinois. I hope there will not be any more quorum calls. I think the Senator from Illinois should be allowed to speak.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator from Kentucky was trying to make a recommendation.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. I was about to say, "Blessed are the peacemakers." [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, when the purported filibuster was taking place a while ago, responsibility for which I challenge and deny, I was reading from the evidence given before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in connection with the nomination of Aubrey Williams. I was discussing the background of the individual Joseph B. Matthews, whom the Senator from Tennessee had used as a witness, and upon whom he relied more or less in convicting Aubrey Williams of being a Communist. I had just read the record of Mr. Matthews for 1936. In that year he published Guinea Pigs No More.

In 1938 Mr. Matthews was asked to appear before the Dies committee, and invited to join the staff at $3,600 a year. He was raised to $6,000 in 1940, to $7,200 in 1941, and he has worked with the Gannett League for Constitutional Government.

Mr. President, that is the background of the individual who has done all the famous work for the Dies committee. That is the background of the individual upon whom the Dies committee convicted men like the late Senator George Norris of being a Communist. That is the kind of testimony which has been placed in the record of the Dies committee, which received publicity from one end of the this land to another, and because this fellow, Matthews, with the unsavory background that he has, for a few paltry dollars, appeared and testified as an investigator, the Dies committee used that to convict important and notable people of communism in this country.

In addition to that, the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from South Dakota picked up a lot of other things about Mr. Aubrey Williams through a little pamphlet called Headlines and What Is Behind Them. I had occasion to look up the individual who is responsible for that publication. The Senator from Tennessee took particular delight when he appeared before our committee in reading various articles from Headlines and What Is Behind Them, and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] reechoed the sentiments of the Senator from Tennessee when he proceeded to encumber the record with a repetition of what the Senator from Tennessee had already given to the committee.

I took occasion to find out who this fellow is, and what I am telling about Kamp and about Matthews can be documented. There is no doubt about it. I am not relying upon hearsay and statements from the press the source of which we do not know. What I say about these men I can prove without any question of doubt.

So Mr. Kamp, of Headlines and What Is Behind Them, had one article after another about Aubrey Williams, the Communist, and the two Senators who were appearing before our committee against Williams in this case, took particular delight in reading his articles. When I looked up Mr. Kamp's background, what do Senators suppose I found it to be? Let me tell them. There is no question about this, regardless of what Mr. Kamp says, regardless of what anyone else says. If necessary we can go to the highest authorities in Government and obtain the proof.

After the Senator from Tennessee had already quoted one day from Kamp, and the Senator from South Dakota came along and reechoed the sentiments of the Senator from Tennessee, finally the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] said:

> May I ask what paper it is that the Senator is reading from?
>
> Mr. BUSHFIELD. Headlines.
>
> Mr. AIKEN. Who published it?
>
> Mr. BUSHFIELD. Published by the Constitutional Educational League, 42 Church Street, New Haven, Conn.
>
> Mr. AIKEN. What is that?
>
> Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am afraid I cannot answer the Senator.
>
> Mr. AIKEN. It seems to me we ought to know.
>
> Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator permit me to tell the committee who Kamp is?

This was after 3 pages had been read into the record—pages 297, 298, and 299—by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] of the statements made by Mr. Kamp in a publication the Senator did not know anything about, and admitted that he did not before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and it is said folks want to be fair and want to deliberate and want to investigate in the United States Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me just for a moment?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not yield just for the moment. Men sent here by the people from their States, men sent here by popular vote, by the people of their States, to represent people like Aubrey Williams fairly and impartially, when they come before the Committee on Agriculture go to the lowest depths and get the darkest dregs they can find without a single iota of foundation for any of it.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I rose to ask the Senator from Illinois a question. He was talking about deliberation in the Senate of the United States. I have been looking over the floor of the Senate and I have counted 24 Senators present out of 96. Does the Senator from Illinois think that the suggestion of the absence of a quorum might be in order, in spite of a protest and point of order by the Senator from Tennessee? I call attention to the fact that 24 Senators, perhaps 27, are present, out of 96.

Mr. LUCAS. I say to the Senator from New Mexico that of course I am not in charge of the Senate at this particular time. If the Senator wishes to make the point of no quorum he can make it, and then we will have a speech from the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HATCH. I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. I make the point of order that no business has been transacted since the last roll call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HATCH. At this time I shall not appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall proceed. I do not want the Senator from Tennessee to get the opinion I am attempting to filibuster.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am perfectly delighted. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A Senator desiring to interrupt shall address the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will have to listen to this Aubrey Williams case a week, notwithstanding what he has said.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I apologize to the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield for that purpose?

Mr. LUCAS. What was the purpose?

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to apologize to the Chair for not addressing the Chair. I should have addressed the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. I think that is perfectly proper; the Senator was out of order in not addressing the Chair, and I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Now let me read what was said about Mr. Kamp; I finally have reached it. I quote from page 299.

Senator LUCAS. Will the Senator permit me to tell the committee just who Kamp is?

Senator BUSHFIELD. Yes; of course.

Senator LUCAS. I will read this, and what I read here can be proven with the document if there is any question as to what I am putting into this record.

Senator BUSHFIELD. First, let me ask the Senator: Is this man mentioned?

Senator LUCAS. The man whose paper you are reading from now, who published Headlines, is Joseph P. Kamp, alias Joseph William Kamp, the publisher of Headlines. Born in Yonkers, N. Y., 1900.

He went to the Fordham Preparatory School, but never graduated; 1918–21, newspaper work in various towns; joined Constitutional Educational League, founded in 1919 during Red hysteria after last war.

In 1922–26, worked as superintendent of construction of Semet-Solvay Co., Syracuse, and Henry Ford.

In 1927, with his brother, organized Kamp Construction Co., which folded up in 1931—Kamp has been in the "patriot" racket ever since.

Helped found Friends of Germany and Friends of New Germany, which became German-American Bund—appeared frequently on platform with Fritz Kuhn, and worked closely with George Sylvester Viereck and Karl Orgell, another unregistered Nazi agent, now in jail.

In 1934, founded the Awakener, mouthpiece of Lawrence Dennis, author of the Coming American Fascism, now under indictment for sedition and impairing the morale of our armed forces—Dennis was associate editor of the magazine.

In 1937, became chief executive of Constitutional Educational League, which specialized in turning out pamphlets widely used and circulated by the K. K. K., Gerald L. K. Smith, William Kullgren, Gerald Winrod, and most of the others now under indictment for sedition.

Worked closely with John Eoghan Kelly, now in jail as an unregistered agent of Franco and the Spanish Falange, and shared offices with the late Cloyd Gill, who was a paid propagandist for the Japanese.

Just before the elections in 1942, Elizabeth Dilling sent a postcard to her mailing list, urging them to buy the latest of Kamp's pamphlets, a vicious attack on the administration—"Get it. Read it. Push it. Lend copies to friends and neighbors before election time."

In 1942, got into trouble with Selective Service for ignoring their requests for information.

In 1944, summoned to appear before the House committee appointed to investigate campaign expenditures—refused to open books of league or even to name its officers—cited for contempt of the House, and now under indictment by District of Columbia grand jury for violation of the Corrupt Practices Act of 1925.

That, Mr. President, is the second witness upon whom reliance is placed to convict Aubrey Williams of communism. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] very politely and very rightly immediately abandoned further examination after he had heard the evidence of what was in the record against Mr. Kamp. I know Mr. Kamp will tell everyone he can, and will send telegrams to many persons telling them that what I say is untrue. But I say to the Senate of the United States that I have the proof, and there is not any doubt about it.

Mr. President, so long as I am in the United States Senate I hope I shall never be guilty of using a man either like Matthews or Kamp through whom I attempt to convict another man such as Aubrey Williams, an individual who is a battle-scarred veteran of the last war, who fought in the Foreign Legion, and who has four boys in this war. I shall never be guilty of using tactics of that character against a man like Aubrey Williams.

Here, Mr. President, is some more. Who else says that Aubrey Williams is not a Communist? I come now to the State of the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] and the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and I quote from one of the outstanding Republicans from that State, Representative FRANK B. KEEFE. Congressman KEEFE is no fool. Congressman KEEFE is a fair-minded man, he is a tolerant man. Congressman KEEFE is not a bigot, if you please, and I am defending him. I am talking about a Republican whom I like, whom I honor and respect, because he is a gentleman and is willing to give a man, whether he be a Republican or a Democrat, a chance for his white alley, and not vote the voice of prejudice, intolerance, and bigotry, as I know is going to be done by some Senators here on the floor against Aubrey Williams. This is what Representative FRANK KEEFE said:

I have known in the past many great liberal minds that have offered legislation to the Nation and to the various States who have been accused of being Bolshevists. That was the name applied them 25 years ago. Yet today the advocacy of those gentlemen finds expression on the statute books of almost every State in the Union. So it is not with good grace, it seems to me, always to attack as being communistic everything and everybody with which you may not agree. I believe that in my short service in this House I have demonstrated my attitude toward communism and subversive activities.

If I felt for one moment that Mr. Aubrey Williams was a Communist I would be here in the well of this House denouncing him in no uncertain terms. But I want to say to the membership of this House that I have taken it upon myself as a member of this subcommittee—

Ah, Mr. President, here is the great question—

in the interest of truth, honor, and decency, to investigate Mr. Williams in my own way; and I can say to you on my oath as a Member of this House that while I do not agree with some of his expressed philosophy I do know that Aubrey Williams is not a Communist, and it is unfair even to give that implication to the public.

Mr. President, that expresses my sentiments. I do not agree with all the things Mr. Aubrey Williams has said and done. I would not have done all the things he has done. I would not have made some of the statements he has made. But as a matter of truth, honor, and decency, as FRANK KEEFE said, those who attacked him and used the unsavory tactics they did to attack him should have done what FRANK KEEFE did—have made a personal investigation of their own to find out what this thing is all about. Representative KEEFE further stated:

It seems to me—

Listen to this, Senators—

It seems to me a man's past record, which is a thing all of us like to point to, ought to be given some consideration as proof. Aubrey Williams has been referred to as a cultured, educated, refined gentleman. The fact of the matter is he had no schooling at all until he was 20 years of age. Whatever Aubrey Williams has accomplished in life he has accomplished the hard way as a result of his own self-education. He did go to the University of Cincinnati and study for the ministry, but he left that effort at education in order to go to France representing the Young Men's Christian Association, and then joined the Foreign Legion and went to the front to fight in the World War. When the United States entered that war, Aubrey Williams joined the American Expeditionary Forces and remained at the front until the conclusion of the hostilities.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I think the Senator from Illinois is surely reading from a record which is entirely wrong, because as I have understood the record, Mr. Williams is a Communist, he is against our form of government, and surely he would not have fought in the United States Army in the last war, nor would he have four sons fighting for us in this war, if he is against our form of government.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am reading from the statement of a distinguished Representative from Wisconsin, which he made in the House and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 86,

part 3, page 3464. Representative KEEFE further said:

For me, at least, I think perhaps his record is one reason why the American Legion in my State and all of the patriotic organizations have unalterably expressed their opinion in letters which I have in my files commending the work of the National Youth Administration.

Here is the crux of his statement, Mr. President:

It may be that Mr. Williams has made some unfortunate statements. Who has not? Who is there here who has not made statements in public life that he has not afterward perhaps regretted? I know I have, and I would hate to have my career put under the microscope of public inspection as has been the career of Mr. Aubrey Williams. At least let us understand, Mr. Chairman, that we must judge the work of Mr. Williams by what he has done in National Youth Administration. So far as I am concerned, I am judging the worth of that experiment or that organization by what it has done in my State.

The administrator of National Youth Administration in Wisconsin is a past post commander of the American Legion, and every man in the organization that I know of is an American of the very highest standards with the most patriotic impulses motivating his every action. National Youth Administration has brought relief of 20,000 young people in the State of Wisconsin who are being given an opportunity to work. This is not a subsidy out of the Treasury of the United States given to youth; it is an appropriation that provides an opportunity to work. These young people who are kept in colleges and schools have to work for the opportunity of remaining in school, and the pitifully small amounts that are allocated to them for that work represents a bare sustenance, but it does represent the difference between an education and the lack of an education. In the out-of-school work which I have seen in my State it has trained young people for jobs, and thousands have been placed in private employment due to the training they have received in the National Youth Administration. Let us be fair in the discussion of this situation and let us not try to get away from the fact and the real problem that is before us—let us try not to assassinate National Youth Administration over the body of Aubrey Williams.

Mr. President as one member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I was not convinced as to whether or not I should be for Aubrey Williams until I read the statement in the RECORD. When the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana caused that statement to be placed in the RECORD, a statement from a Republican Member of Congress who took it upon himself to make an examination of the background and qualifications of this man, presenting testimony of that character, that was the one thing which started me on the road for Williams in this fight. I said to myself, "Surely if FRANK KEEFE, a Republican Representative, has the good sense, tolerance, and fairness to give Aubrey Williams, a Democrat, his just dues, then I too ought to place myself in the same position."

From that time on I was convinced that my preconceived notions about this man were wrong. That is why I am fighting here on the floor of the Senate today to try to have the nomination of Aubrey Williams confirmed. I believe that no greater tribute has even been paid to a man by a member of the Republican Party of this country than was paid to Aubrey Williams by Representative FRANK KEEFE. It might be well to say in passing that FRANK KEEFE knows Aubrey Williams. The people of Wisconsin know him, because for 10 or 12 years he was engaged in important social work in that State before he became Assistant Director of the W. P. A.

Mr. President, I should like to call attention to one further matter in connection with the charges of communism. I asked Mr. Aubrey Williams when he appeared before the committee whether or not he had ever been called as a witness before the Dies committee for questioning along this line. It seemed to me then, and it still seems to me, that if I were a member of an important Senate Committee on Un-American Activities, before my committeee's records would even be permitted to show definitely that some important and outstanding character in American history, like the late Senator George Norris, was a Communist, I should want all the proof that American investigators could afford. I believe that is the way it should be. That is the American method of procedure. No one will ever change my mind on that score, because that is the decent, fair, and right thing to do.

So I asked Mr. Williams, "Were you ever called before the Dies committee for interrogation or examination?" He said, "No, sir; I never was." I asked him, "Did you do anything about getting before the committee?" He replied that he had. I cannot now recall where the evidence is in this record, but it is in the record. He said, "I wrote the Dies committee asking for an opportunity to appear before the committee to challenge the statements which it had made about my belonging to four different Communist organizations, and I never heard a word from them."

That is the famous Dies committee, which was investigating un-American activities in this country in such a haphazard manner. Talk about prejudice! Talk about bigotry! Talk about unfairness! The Senator from Tennessee stated that if any committee ever called him a Communist he would want to appear before the committee and deny it publicly. That is exactly what Aubrey Williams sought to do, but he could not obtain a hearing. He is denied a hearing by some at this very moment. That is the truth of the matter. He is still being denied his rights as a citizen of this country.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. It has been my experience that the famous Dies committee has never been willing to face the men and women whom it accused of being Communists. I recall that just before I came to the Senate, while I was still Governor of my State, a list of known or supposed Communists was widely published throughout the country. In that list were a good many names of some of our most respected Scotch citizens of Vermont, who are as far from being Communists as any group of people could be.

They happened to be members of the C. I. O. by reason of the fact that the local union to which they belonged had become affiliated with the C. I. O. One of those men is now on the draft appeals board of the State. He is on that board by virtue of having been appointed to that position by three Republican governors; and yet he is labeled a Communist.

When I came to Washington I determined to find out, if I could, why so many respectable citizens of my State were labeled as Communists. So I called the Dies committee time and again. I never could obtain a single word out of the committee in writing. I could never obtain any explanation as to why certain persons were labeled Communists. The particular man to whom I refer rates very highly in the State, and, as I say, has been appointed to office by three Republican governors.

Finally, some clerk informed my office over the telephone that the committee had a photograph of a crowd gathered somewhere at one time; that this man was in it; that there was also a man in the crowd whom the committee knew to be a Communist; and therefore that made everyone in the crowd a Communist. That seems to be typical of the methods which the committee used.

The Dies committee could have done a great deal of good in tracing down subversive activities in the country; but it appears to have used the authority given it—or misused it—in such a manner that the harm which was done actually outweighed any good which might have been accomplished. It is a fact that the committee included in its lists not only George Norris and other highly honored citizens of our country, but also less well known citizens, whose integrity, however, was equal to that of the better known victims of this vicious campaign.

Including Aubrey Williams in a list of highly respected citizens certainly should be no discredit to him.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Vermont for that contribution.

Mr. President, I wish to make one or two further observations before I conclude my statement—at least for this afternoon—on the confirmation of the nomination of Aubrey Williams.

In the course of the debate before we took up the nomination of Mr. Williams, some question was raised with respect to whether or not the religious issue had been brought into the debate. If there is no religious issue, as is contended by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] and the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], then it is difficult for me to understand why, in the first instance, the telegram about this man was inserted into the record by the senior Senator from Tennessee. The telegram appears on page 168 of the hearings. Just before the Senator from Tennessee concluded he said:

There is one other thing, Mr. Chairman, and I believe I am through.

I now read a telegram that I received this morning, dated Findlay, Ohio, February 8:

Senator KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Washington, D. C.:

Aubrey Williams grew up in the Sixth Avenue Presbyterian Church of Birmingham, where I was pastor for 30 years. W. M. Cosby paid his high-school expenses and the Presbyterian Church paid his college expenses. He denied the divinity of Christ after the

church educated him for the ministry. He is utterly unworthy of any official place in our Government.

Dr. JOSEPH M. BROADY.

When Dr. Broady was requested by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to appear, as was stated for the record by the able chairman of our committee [Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma] he found reasons for not appearing before the committee.

The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], in his colloquy with the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and other Senators earlier today, attempted to say that the telegram was read into the record for the purpose of demonstrating that Aubrey Williams had received his ministerial education at the college in Alabama under false pretenses. However, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that when the telegram was read into the record there was not a single bit of evidence at that time about Mr. Williams ever owing any ministerial association a single dime for any of his education. Everyone is entitled to reach his own conclusion about why the telegram was read into the record, but there can be no question that when that minister, Dr. Broady, said this man denied the divinity of Christ, he stated the real reason why the telegram was read into the record. Not only that, but somewhat later the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] proceeded to read the telegram into the record again. When Mr. Williams was asked about the matter, he aptly said before the committee, and apparently gave some Senators some information at that time which they did not have, that in this country there is a constitutional right of freedom of worship. He advised the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that the question of what was his religion was a matter only between his conscience and his God, and that he regretted that the matter had ever been brought up before the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is no secret about why the telegram was sent. The man had borrowed money from a church organization for his education, and after he had gotten his education he had changed his mind about doing the thing for which the church had loaned him the money, and he never paid it back. I think Mr. Williams made one of the greatest mistakes in the world in not paying it back. There are very few people in this country who do not know that there is a provision in the Constitution guaranteeing religious freedom, and it is a wise and proper one. It had nothing to do with this matter, which is a matter of the greatest ingratitude, it seems to me, namely, after using the church's money, not to pay it back. There are very few men who would act as he did.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. LUCAS. In just a moment. First, I wish to reply to the statement of the senior Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Tennessee rose in defense of the telegram. I should like to have the Senator from Tennessee point out to the Members of the Senate where in his testimony at the time when he introduced the telegram there is one word about Aubrey Williams owing any money to the ministerial association. That point came up afterward in a conversation which the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] had with the minister over the telephone, or in a letter which he received.

On page 168 of the hearings, at the conclusion of his testimony, there is not one word of explanation by the Senator from Tennessee about why he placed the telegram in the record at that particular point.

Mr. McKELLAR. It shows on its face. It is perfectly plain what it was. Anyone who runs can read it.

Mr. LUCAS. I can run and I can read, but let me point out what it says:

Aubrey Williams grew up in the Sixth Avenue Presbyterian Church of Birmingham where I was pastor for 30 years. W. M. Cosby paid his high-school expenses and the Presbyterian Church paid his college expenses. He denied the divinity of Christ after the church educated him for the ministry.

There is not one word in the telegram to the effect that he did not pay back the money. That point came up afterward.

There is a great deal to be said about the question of the divinity of Christ. I resent what the Senator from Mississippi said this afternoon on the floor of the Senate about the Jews in this country. That is another intolerant remark which is constantly being made. It does not dignify the Senate of the United States or any Member of the Senate to refer to the Jews in this country in any such fashion as the Senator from Mississippi referred to them this afternoon. Such things bring on intolerance and bigotry—the very things that are back of the fight against Aubrey Williams at this time. Such a situation cannot continue in the United States of America, under the Constitution of the United States, to which the Senator from Tennessee constantly refers. It cannot continue under it, Mr. President, without something very serious happening.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that I will not only talk about it——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I have already promised to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois yielded to me.

I merely rose to say that there is no more important topic of consideration in this country than tolerance, and especially religious tolerance. I look about me, and I observe present in the Chamber 21 Senators out of 96. Would the Senator from Tennessee insist on his point of order if I suggested the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, Mr. President——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has suggested it so often that I hoped he would let the Senator from Illinois continue with his speech.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has the floor. Does he yield for the purpose of the suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do want the Senator from Illinois to continue with his speech exactly as he has been making it, but I should like to have a number of Senators present. I insist on my point that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I make the point of order that no business has been transacted since the last roll call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's point of order is well taken.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, with all due respect to the Presiding Officer, I think I shall be compelled to appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. HATCH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

On a viva voce vote the Senate sustained the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's point is in order. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the hour is getting late. I see the Senator from Alabama in the Chamber——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Debate is out of order. The clerk has been ordered to call the roll, and the clerk will proceed with the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hart	O'Daniel
Austin	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hawkes	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Buck	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bushfield	La Follette	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Taylor
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Tobey
Connally	McKellar	Tunnell
Cordon	McMahon	Tydings
Donnell	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Downey	Maybank	Walsh
Eastland	Mead	Wheeler
Ellender	Millikin	Wherry
Ferguson	Mitchell	White
Fulbright	Moore	Wiley
George	Morse	Willis
Gerry	Murdock	Wilson
Guffey	Murray	Young
Gurney	Myers	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, when my distinguished colleague from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] suggested the absence of a quorum, I had just finished a brief discussion of the religious issue. If necessary, I am prepared to go into that subject further. I shall not do so at this time. I think it is most unfortunate that the telegram was ever placed in the record. I care not how much defense is placed before the United States Senate as to why the telegram was placed in the record. I shall never be convinced that it was not just one more link in the chain of vicious acts which opponents of Aubrey Williams wish to bring to bear upon his confirmation.

How easy it is, Mr. President, to discover evil qualities in any appointee if the forces of reaction are not satisfied. If evil qualities do not exist, they will be found in some way. Gentlemen will satisfy their conscience by using the testimony and statements of unsavory characters so long as it proves their point.

The apostles of prejudice and reactionism, when out to get their man, will use any expedient weapons. Libelous and scurrilous statements issued by corrupt and irresponsible individuals are resurrected from the dead past as evidentiary facts to prove the unworthiness of one affected.

Mr. President, my life has been one of toil and struggle. I have suffered from the voice of inhumanity and bigotry. In my early youth I saw the ugly heads of prejudice and synthetic importance turn outmoded political weapons upon any humanitarian ambitions that I cherished.

I could have become intensely embittered, but instead I concluded to fight prejudice, bigotry, and reaction. I knew then and know now that no barrier can ever destroy or impede the progress of justice, reason, humanity, and liberty under our democratic form of government.

I hope that I shall never find myself confronted with mental limitations which will cause me unjustly to appraise my fellow man, irrespective of what his political affiliations may be. I know that Aubrey Williams has made unfortunate and erring statements. I know that he has made mistakes. Who, under God's heaven, has not made mistakes, if he has been long in the public eye?

If Aubrey Williams shall be defeated, it will not be because he is not qualified, it will not be because he is not competent and honest, not because he does not believe in the divinity of Christ; no, it will be because of prejudice and politics, prejudice and politics.

Mr. President and my colleagues, it will be a sad return for the four Williams boys when they discover that the United States Senate placed the black mark of disapproval upon their dad's appointment. They will not be able to understand the specious arguments made against his confirmation. They will understand the true reason. They will know, as everyone else knows, that personality, prejudice, and partisan politics raised their ugly heads in complete accord, and sent their father, World War battle-scarred veteran, down to defeat, doom, and disappointment.

Mr. President, there is the picture. That is what the opposition must bear. These Williams boys can fight and die for the glory and the tradition of the United States Senate, while their humanitarian father is condemned forever by men in the Senate.

Mr. President, I do not want such a vote upon my conscience.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is nearly 5 o'clock, and I ask the Senator from Tennessee whether he insists that I proceed at this time. I am perfectly willing to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. The hour is growing late, and so far as I am concerned, I am going to ask that the postmaster nominations on the Executive Calendar be confirmed.

Mr. HATCH. A point of order. Does the Senator from Tennessee ask the Senate to transact business?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; I am asking the Senate to transact business.

Mr. HATCH. I graciously yield. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I think we have had very little business transacted this afternoon, and it is time to transact some.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

CONFIRMATIONS OF POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield to me, I ask unanimous consent that the two postmaster nominations on the calendar, one in Iowa, the other in North Carolina, be confirmed and the President notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate——

Mr. HATCH. I have the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. As chairman of the committee having in charge the Williams nomination, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. McKELLAR. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not have a chance to put the request of the Senator from Tennessee. Is there objection to the confirmation of the two postmasters on the Executive Calendar?

Mr. HATCH. I object, for the moment——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico objects.

Mr. HATCH. In order to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma only.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Having in charge the pending nomination by virtue of the fact that I am chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I wish to say that it is obvious we cannot dispose of the nomination this evening, it now being 5 minutes to 5 o'clock. I know of a number of Senators who desire to speak. I know of none who wish to speak at any great length, but it cannot be said there has been a filibuster, this being the first day of the discussion. So, because of the lateness of the hour, and because of our custom, I move that as in executive session, the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McKELLAR. Was my request granted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified immediately.

RECESS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I renew my motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 20, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 19 (legislative day of March 16), 1945:

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Julius G. Luhrson, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 29, 1949, vice Lee M. Eddy.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Francis R. Smith, of Philadelphia, Pa., to be collector of internal revenue for the first district of Pennsylvania, in place of Walter J. Rothensies, resigned.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Clara E. Sarvela, of Duluth, Minn., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 36, with headquarters at Duluth, Minn., to fill an existing vacancy.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 19 (legislative day of March 16), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

IOWA

Glen W. Heath, Rake.

NORTH CAROLINA

Clarence H. Mason, Timberlake.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 19, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our prayer rises unto Thee, O Saviour, who art waiting to hear; love always waits! May we not be bounded by ourselves, but always endeavor to advance the rule of true brotherhood. Steady our moral conduct and help us to be true to our pledged word with belief in our great cause, accepting the adventures which life discloses.

Thou who wert sent to this world with a divine mission, gird the souls of troubled men and women in their conflicts and make living for them less of a burden; grant that the trail of Thy heart may ever be with the least of Thy children. Raise us up as courageous servants of state, with strong wills to stand before God and man, laying our ability and influence on the high altar of personal sacrifice. O send us forth to interpret in politics, commerce, and in reform those truths which will make clear the righteous duty and responsibility of our fellow countrymen. Bind us together as Thy loyal colaborers, promoting every plan which means greater stability to our free institutions and richer blessings to all our people. In the name of Him who came to mend the broken threads of life. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, March 17, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE TO LT. GEN. MARK W. CLARK

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement of the House on Thursday March 15, 1945, he did on Saturday, March 17, 1945, send the following message to Lt. Gen. Mark W. Clark, commanding general, Fifteenth Army Group:

At the request of the United States House of Representatives, unanimously expressed, I send to you, the officers and men of all forces under your command, our grateful thanks for the splendid courage and magnificent victories achieved on the Italian front under difficult circumstances which have brought prestige and glory to our combined arms.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, United States
House of Representatives.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, THE JUDICIARY, AND THE FEDERAL LOAN AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1946

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] to recommit the bill H. R. 2603.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 49, noes 53.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 134, nays 200, not voting 99, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—134

Adams	Graham	Merrow
Allen, Ill.	Grant, Ind	Michener
Andersen, H. Carl	Griffiths	Miller, Nebr.
	Gross	Murray, Wis.
Andresen, August H.	Gwinn, N. Y.	O'Hara
	Gwynne, Iowa	O'Konski
Angell	Hale	Pittenger
Barrett, Wyo.	Hall, Leonard W.	Ploeser
Beall		Powers
Bennett, Mo.	Halleck	Reed, N. Y.
Bishop	Harness, Ind.	Rees, Kans.
Blackney	Hartley	Rich
Bolton	Henry	Rizley
Brehm	Heselton	Robertson, N. Dak.
Brown, Ohio	Hess	
Buffett	Hill	Robsion, Ky.
Butler	Hoeven	Rockwell
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman	Rodgers, Pa.
Campbell	Holmes, Wash.	Schwabe, Mo.
Canfield	Hope	Schwabe, Okla.
Carlson	Horan	Scrivner
Case, S. Dak.	Howell	Shafer
Chenoweth	Jenkins	Sharp
Church	Jennings	Short
Clason	Jensen	Simpson, Ill.
Clevenger	Johnson, Calif.	Simpson, Pa.
Cole, Kans.	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Cole, Mo.	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Wis.
Cunningham	Jones	Springer
Curtis	Jonkman	Stevenson
Dolliver	Judd	Stockman
Dondero	Kean	Sumner, Ill.
Dworshak	Kilburn	Sundstrom
Ellis	Kinzer	Taber
Ellsworth	Knutson	Talbot
Elston	Kunkel	Talle
Engel, Mich.	LeFevre	Taylor
Fellows	Lemke	Tibbott
Fenton	Lewis	Towe
Fuller	McConnell	Vorys, Ohio
Gamble	McCowen	Vursell
Gifford	McGregor	Weichel
Gillespie	McMillen, Ill.	Wilson
Gillette	Martin, Iowa	Wolcott
Gillie	Martin, Mass.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Goodwin	Mason	Woodruff, Mich.

NAYS—200

Abernethy	Cravens	Havenner
Allen, La.	Crosser	Hays
Anderson, N. Mex.	D'Alesandro	Healy
	Davis	Hedrick
Andrews, Ala.	Dawson	Hendricks
Andrews, N. Y.	De Lacy	Herter
Bailey	Delaney, James J.	Hinshaw
Baldwin, N. Y.		Hoch
Barden	Delaney, John J.	Holifield
Bates, Ky.		Holmes, Mass.
Beckworth	Dickstein	Hook
Bender	Domengeaux	Huber
Biemiller	Doughton, N. C.	Hull
Bland	Douglas, Calif.	Jackson
Bloom	Douglas, Ill.	Jarman
Boykin	Doyle	Johnson, Luther A.
Brooks	Durham	
Brown, Ga.	Earthman	Kee
Bryson	Eberharter	Keefe
Bulwinkle	Elliott	Kefauver
Bunker	Engle, Calif.	Kelley, Pa.
Burch	Ervin	Kelly, Ill.
Burgin	Fallon	Kerr
Byrne, N. Y.	Feighan	Kilday
Camp	Fernandez	King
Cannon, Mo.	Fisher	Kirwan
Carnahan	Flannagan	Kopplemann
Case, N. J.	Folger	LaFollette
Celler	Gallagher	Lanham
Chapman	Gary	Lea
Chelf	Gathings	Lesinski
Chiperfield	Gearhart	Link
Clements	Gore	Ludlow
Cochran	Gorski	Lyle
Coffee	Gossett	McCormack
Cole, N. Y.	Granger	McDonough
Colmer	Grant, Ala.	McGehee
Cooley	Gregory	McKenzie
Cooper	Hare	McMillan, S. C.
Courtney	Harless, Ariz.	Mahon
Cox	Harris	Maloney
Manasco	Rabaut	Stigler
Mansfield, Mont.	Rabin	Sullivan
	Rains	Sumners, Tex.
Marcantonio	Ramspeck	Tarver
May	Randolph	Thom
Miller, Calif.	Rankin	Thomason
Mills	Resa	Tolan
Monroney	Richards	Traynor
Murdock	Riley	Trimble
Murray, Tenn.	Roe, Md.	Vinson
Neely	Rogers, Fla.	Voorhis, Calif.
Norrell	Rogers, Mass.	Wadsworth
Norton	Rowan	Walter
O'Brien, Ill.	Russell	Wasielewski
O'Brien, Mich.	Ryter	Weaver
O'Neal	Sabath	Weiss
O'Toole	Sadowski	Welch
Outland	Sasscer	West
Pace	Savage	Whitten
Patman	Sheppard	Whittington
Patrick	Slaughter	Wigglesworth
Patterson	Smith, Va.	Winstead
Peterson, Fla.	Snyder	Wolverton, N. J.
Pickett	Sparkman	Woodrum, Va.
Poage	Spence	Worley
Price, Fla.	Starkey	Zimmerman
Price, Ill.	Stefan	
Priest	Stewart	

NOT VOTING—99

Anderson, Calif.	Gavin	Morrison
Arends	Geelan	Mott
Arnold	Gerlach	Mundt
Auchincloss	Gibson	Murphy
Baldwin, Md.	Gordon	Peterson, Ga.
Barrett, Pa.	Granahan	Pfeifer
Barry	Green	Philbin
Bates, Mass.	Hagen	Phillips
Bell	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Plumley
Bennet, N. Y.		Powell
Bonner	Hancock	Quinn, N. Y.
Boren	Hand	Ramey
Bradley, Mich.	Hart	Rayfiel
Bradley, Pa.	Hébert	Reece, Tenn.
Brumbaugh	Heffernan	Reed, Ill.
Buck	Heidinger	Rivers
Buckley	Hobbs	Robertson, Va.
Cannon, Fla.	Izac	Robinson, Utah
Clark	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Roe, N. Y.
Combs		Rogers, N. Y.
Corbett	Johnson, Okla.	Rooney
Crawford	Kearney	Sheridan
Curley	Keogh	Sikes
Daughton, Va.	Landis	Smith, Maine
Dingell	Lane	Somers, N. Y.
Dirksen	Larcade	Thomas, N. J.
Drewry	Latham	Thomas, Tex.
Eaton	LeCompte	Torrens
Elsaesser	Luce	White
Flood	Lynch	Wickersham
Fogarty	McGlinchey	Winter
Forand	Madden	Wood
Fulton	Mansfield, Tex.	Woodhouse
Gardner	Morgan	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Hobbs against.

Mr. Winter for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Brumbaugh for, with Mr. Sheridan against.

Mr. Arends for, with Mr. Lynch against.

Mr. Bates of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Gordon against.

Mr. Arnold for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Reed of Illinois for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Mr. Phillips for, with Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Bradley of Michigan for, with Mr. Madden against.

Mr. Reece of Tennessee for, with Mr. Combs against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Drewry against.

General pairs:

Mr. Barry with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Forand with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Ramey.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Hunt.
Mr. Torrens with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Gerlach.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Easton.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Geelan with Mr. Landis.
Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Bell and Mrs. Corbett.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Buck.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Quinn of New York with Mr. Elsaesser.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Heidinger.
Mr. Rayfiel with Mr. Hancock.
Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mrs. Smith of Maine.

Mrs. BOLTON changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on that, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 323, nays 18, not voting 92, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—323

Abernethy	Cooper	Hall,
Adams	Courtney	Leonard W.
Allen, Ill.	Cox	Halleck
Allen La.	Cravens	Hare
Anderson,	Crosser	Harless, Ariz.
N. Mex.	Cunningham	Harness Ind.
Andresen,	Curtis	Harris
August H.	D'Alesandro	Hart
Andrews, Ala.	Davis	Hartley
Andrews, N. Y.	Dawson	Havenner
Angell	De Lacy	Hays
Bailey	Delaney,	Healy
Baldwin, Md.	James J.	Hébert
Baldwin, N. Y.	Delaney,	Hedrick
Barden	John J.	Hendricks
Barrett, Wyo.	Dickstein	Henry
Bates, Ky.	Dingell	Herter
Beall	Dolliver	Heselton
Beckworth	Domengeaux	Hess
Bell	Dondero	Hill
Bender	Doughton, N. C.	Hinshaw
Bennett, Mo.	Douglas, Calif.	Hoch
Biemiller	Douglas, Ill.	Hoeven
Bishop	Doyle	Hoffman
Blackney	Durham	Holifield
Bland	Dworshak	Holmes, Mass.
Bloom	Earthman	Holmes, Wash.
Bolton	Eberharter	Hook
Boykin	Elliott	Hope
Brehm	Ellis	Horan
Brooks	Ellsworth	Howell
Brown, Ga.	Elsaesser	Huber
Brown, Ohio	Elston	Hull
Bryson	Engel, Mich.	Jackson
Buffett	Engle, Calif.	Jarman
Bulwinkle	Ervin	Jenkins
Bunker	Fallon	Jennings
Burch	Fellows	Johnson, Calif.
Burgin	Fenton	Johnson, Ill.
Butler	Fernandez	Johnson, Ind.
Byrne, N. Y.	Flannagan	Johnson,
Byrnes, Wis.	Folger	Luther A.
Camp	Fuller	Johnson, Okla.
Campbell	Gallagher	Jonkman
Canfield	Gamble	Judd
Cannon, Mo.	Gardner	Kee
Carlson	Gary	Keefe
Carnahan	Gathings	Kefauver
Case, N. J	Gearhart	Kelley, Pa.
Case, S. Dak.	Gifford	Kelly, Ill.
Celler	Gillette	Kerr
Chapman	Gillie	Kilday
Chelf	Goodwin	King
Chenoweth	Gore	Kinzer
Chiperfield	Gorski	Kirwan
Church	Gossett	Kopplemann
Clason	Graham	Kunkel
Clements	Granger	LaFollette
Clevenger	Grant, Ala.	Lanham
Cochran	Grant, Ind.	Latham
Coffee	Gregory	Lea
Cole, Kans.	Griffiths	LeFevre
Cole, Mo.	Gross	Lesinski
Cole, N. Y.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Lewis
Colmer	Gwynne, Iowa.	Link
Cooley	Hale	Ludlow
Lyle	Plumley	Springer
McConnell	Poage	Starkey
McCormack	Powers	Stefan
McCowen	Price, Fla.	Stevenson
McDonough	Price, Ill.	Stewart
McGehee	Priest	Stigler
McGregor	Rabaut	Stockman
McKenzie	Rabin	Sullivan
McMillan, S. C.	Rains	Sumners, Tex.
McMillen, Ill.	Ramspeck	Sundstrom
Mahon	Randolph	Talbot
Maloney	Rankin	Talle
Manasco	Reed, Ill.	Tarver
Mansfield,	Reed, N. Y.	Taylor
Mont.	Rees, Kans.	Thom
Marcantonio	Resa	Thomas, Tex.
Martin, Iowa	Richards	Thomason
Martin, Mass.	Riley	Tibbott
Mason	Rizley	Tolan
May	Robertson	Towe
Merrow	N. Dak.	Traynor
Michener	Robsion, Ky.	Trimble
Miller, Calif.	Rockwell	Vinson
Miller, Nebr.	Rodgers, Pa.	Voorhis, Calif.
Mills	Roe, Md.	Vorys, Ohio
Monroney	Rogers, Fla.	Wadsworth
Murdock	Rogers, Mass.	Walter
Murray, Tenn.	Rowan	Wasielewski
Murray, Wis.	Russell	Weichel
Neely	Ryter	Weiss
Norrell	Sabath	Welch
Norton	Sadowski	West
O'Brien, Ill.	Sasscer	Whitten
O'Brien, Mich.	Savage	Whittington
O'Hara	Schwabe, Mo.	Wigglesworth
O'Neal	Scrivner	Wilson
O'Toole	Sheppard	Winstead
Outland	Simpson, Ill.	Wolcott
Pace	Simpson, Pa.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Patman	Slaughter	Wolverton, N. J.
Patrick	Smith, Va.	Woodrum, Va.
Patterson	Smith, Wis.	Worley
Peterson, Fla.	Snyder	Zimmerman
Pickett	Sparkman	
Ploeser	Spence	

NAYS—18

Andersen,	O'Konski	Smith, Ohio
H. Carl	Pittenger	Sumner, Ill.
Gillespie	Rich	Taber
Jones	Schwabe, Okla.	Vursell
Kean	Shafer	Woodruff, Mich.
Kilburn	Sharp	
Lemke	Short	

NOT VOTING—92

Anderson, Calif.	Geelan	Mott
Arends	Gerlach	Mundt
Arnold	Gibson	Murphy
Auchincloss	Gordon	Peterson, Ga.
Barrett, Pa.	Granahan	Pfeifer
Barry	Green	Philbin
Bates, Mass.	Hagen	Phillips
Bennet, N. Y.	Hall,	Powell
Bonner	Edwin Arthur	Quinn, N. Y.
Boren	Hancock	Ramey
Bradley, Mich.	Hand	Rayfiel
Bradley, Pa.	Heffernan	Reece, Tenn.
Brumbaugh	Heidinger	Rivers
Buck	Hobbs	Robertson, Va.
Buckley	Izac	Robinson, Utah
Cannon, Fla.	Jensen	Roe, N. Y.
Clark	Johnson,	Rogers, N. Y.
Combs	Lyndon B.	Rooney
Corbett	Kearney	Sheridan
Crawford	Keogh	Sikes
Curley	Knutson	Smith, Maine
Daughton, Va.	Landis	Somers, N. Y.
Dirksen	Lane	Thomas, N. J.
Drewry	Larcade	Torrens
Eaton	LeCompte	Weaver
Feighan	Luce	White
Fisher	Lynch	Wickersham
Flood	McGlinchey	Winter
Fogarty	Madden	Wood
Forand	Mansfield, Tex.	Woodhouse
Fulton	Morgan	
Gavin	Morrison	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Brumbaugh with Mr. Sheridan.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Arnold.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Phillips.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Knutson.
Mr. Forand with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Ramey.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Hunt.
Mr. Torrens with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Gerlach.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Geelan with Mr. Landis.
Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Quinn of New York with Mr. Corbett.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Buck.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Heidinger.
Mr. Rayfiel with Mr. Hancock.
Mr. Peterson of Georgia with Mrs. Smith of Maine.
Mr. Combs with Mr. Jensen.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION, 1946

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1984) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes," with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. MAHON, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. DWORSHAK.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent after the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 1 hour today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on two different subjects and to include therewith certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. SPARKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on three different subjects, in one to include a newspaper article, in another a speech made by him, and in another a speech made by Captain Montgomery, of the United States Navy.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therewith two letters.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. McKENZIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. JARMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Rev. C. E. Buxton at Pohick Church.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution by the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut memorializing Congress.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address made by himself.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Dr. Jay Cooke Howard.

Mr. RANDOLPH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial comment.

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the treatment of Poland. I am informed by the Public Printer that this article exceeds the limit and will cost $52. I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

CANES FOR DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, in the pre-war days America was a nation of convention goers. During those conventions there was, of course, the usual business and then the fun and the parades. Out of that was born the habit of acquiring souvenir walking canes. The majority of those canes were of cheap construction, but they were sturdy. Today with something like 800,000 casualties, and with those casualties being returned to the United States at the rate of hundreds every day, I am informed the hospitals are badly in need of good, sturdy canes. I appeal to all of those civic and fraternal organizations, every one thoroughly American, to gather up these canes and have them available to offer to the Army and Navy hospitals if, when, and as they can use them. It is a worthy cause and will be helpful to many a battle-worn veteran.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Manchester Union entitled "Extending Lend-Lease."

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two instances: in one to include a letter from J. N. Dribben, proprietor of the Expert Studios of LaCrosse, Wis., on the subject, "What the People Are Thinking Back Home"; and in the other to include an editorial from the Wausau Daily Record Herald entitled: "A Drifter." It is a description of the good work of the ship *Gripsholm*.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of Iowa.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper clipping relative to a questionnaire he recently sent out.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Demaree Bess. I am advised by the Public Printer that it exceeeds the limit set by the Joint Committee on Printing, that it will take 2½ pages, and that the total cost will be $130. Notwithstanding the excess I ask unanimous consent to make the extension.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the estimate, without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCOWEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include a news item.

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein a letter from President Mitchell of the United States Civil Service Commission to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], chairman of the House Committee on the Civil Service.

OVERTIME COMPENSATION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CLASON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement showing that the call by Chairman Hannegan for the $100-a-plate dinner is really one that is insisted on by the P. A. C. I am trying to give a little proof of that and will insert it in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

THE FOOD SITUATION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday there was an announcement in the New York Herald Tribune that the War Food Administration is trying to dispose of 9,600,000 cans of string beans of the 1942–43 pack. This indicates that their stocks have not been kept current and the things that were old have not been cleaned out as they should have been. As a result, there has been considerable spoilage and expense.

They are having difficulty and they have been having difficulty for about 4 months trying to do this. I called attention to this situation when that agency appeared before the Appropriations Committee last May, also last fall, and again a month ago. It is time that this was straightened out.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

INVESTIGATION OF FOOD SHORTAGES

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution providing for an investigation by the Committee on Agriculture with respect to food supplies, distribution, and shortages, especially meat. The War Food Administration has issued a warning of a dire scarcity of meat in this country. The American Meat Institute says, "The situation is so serious we are bordering on a meat famine." The O. P. A. says the supply of meat is continually growing less. Newspaper headlines say the British are concerned about the greatest food crisis because of curtailment of lend-lease shipments.

Mr. Speaker, only a few months ago stockmen and farmers of the Middle West were advised there was a sufficient supply of meat, especially beef, and called attention to the number of livestock on ranges and feed lots for future supplies.

Mr. Speaker, farmers and producers of this country have done a marvelous job in providing the biggest supply of food, including meat, ever produced in our history. They have done it, in many cases, under adverse circumstances. They will continue to do their part.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the grave situation that appears to face the country, the entire problem should be examined now. We must have sufficient meat for our armed forces and provide as much as we can for our allies and civilian use.

Mr. Speaker, if it is a question of production, or a problem of distribution, we ought to know it. If it is a matter of bungling on the part of Government agencies, let us find it out now and correct it before we have an aspect of too little and too late. The situation again proves my contention that the whole food problem should be under one agency

and not divided among a half dozen working at cross-purposes.

MANUFACTURE OF CLOTHING

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the new slogan of the War Production Board is "Back to Adam and Eve."

Under WPB Regulation M-388, thousands of clothing manufacturers are going to stop turning out the very clothes that American men and women need most. In my mail, I have letters declaring that men's pajamas, underwear, and shirts, as well as women's good clothing are going out of style. Not because folks will not wear them, but because they cannot be made. Under the new Adam and Eve ruling, the kind of lightweight sport shirts worn by 75 percent of the men working in war plants cannot be manufactured. It begins to look as if the War Production Board is trying to put all of us in the Mahatma Ghandi three-cornered loin cloth standard. This is a serious matter for manufacturers and consumers. Maybe the idea behind the order is to enforce the midnight curfew. If folks have not any clothes to wear, they are going to have to stay home nights. Mr. Krug, if you cannot leave us our shirts, please leave us our shorts.

RATION POINTS FOR BUTTER AND FATS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there is something very wrong in the use of the same kind of points for butter and meat. We hear a great deal about butter turning rancid in storage, and in my opinion, this is because the people do not have sufficient points to buy butter. If we could separate these ration points and have one set for fats and butter and another set for meat the situation would be very much improved.

Other Members, including the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] and myself, have been taking up this matter for months. If the House would unite and request that O. P. A. grant one set of points for fats and butter and another kind for meat, everyone would have more meat and everyone would have more butter. No one is unwilling to give up food if it is necessary for the war effort, but there is no reason for giving up food if it is unnecessary and when persons are becoming weakened on account of a lack of food.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

THE CRISIS IN TECHNICAL MANPOWER

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GIFFORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DUMBARTON OAKS PROPOSALS

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, since the announcement of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals the people of New Hampshire are the first in the Nation to express themselves emphatically in favor of a world organization to preserve the peace. In 1942 the people of Massachusetts were the first to support a proposal for the convention of free nations to frame a constitution under which they might unite in a democratic world government. Tuesday in New Hampshire was town-meeting day. Of 204 towns expressing opinions on the question of supporting United States membership in a system of international cooperation, 202 towns voted their approval, 103 of them unanimously. The recorded vote was 18 to 1 in favor of international organization of nations to preserve international law and order. Primarily, this expresses the fervent desire of all of our people for peace. It expresses, I hope, the willingness of our people to make the sacrifices that will make that peace possible. Even more, it voices the determination of a freedom-loving people to preserve and protect not only their peace but their freedom.

FOOD SHORTAGE

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Rural New Yorker.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Lothrop Stoddard over Station WHAL on yesterday.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence entitled "The Primer of Peace."

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and to include in one a letter from the Honorable Henry Morgenthau.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain letters, tables, and excerpts.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain correspondence he has had with the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a list of organizations that are opposed to the present terms of the Mexico-United States Water Treaty.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and an article written by a veteran, Dr. Smith, in Texas, on the subject of the care of our veterans and veterans' hospitals.

PRAISE OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN AMERICAN WAR EFFORT

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTLAND. Mr. Speaker, it has been a long time since I have heard as many gloomy predictions as I have heard on the floor of the House this afternoon. We have a food shortage, we have a meat shortage, we have a bean shortage, and we are going to have a clothing shortage. But we have no shortage of Republican political sniping. I sometimes wonder if, instead of making such gloomy predictions and instead of quibbling about some of the details of the war effort, we could not have praise for the all-out war effort and for the accomplishments of the over-all goals.

I recall that a year ago last February a rather noted Representative of the opposition party, writing in a national magazine, predicted that in 4 months we would have no food at all. The farmers of America proceeded to show the biggest year of production we have had in American history, and, incidentally, to show up this particular false prophet.

I for one wish we would have sometimes on the floor of this House an occasional word of praise for the efforts of the American farmers, American production, and the American agencies that are doing their best to win this war. Must we always tear down? Cannot we occasionally build up?

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, I have been impressed this morning by the parade of those who were attacking the O. P. A. I want to say that an agency doing a job of that kind is bound to have a lot of people against it. Apparently the only people who are really for it are the buying public.

Out in my district we have discovered that while 78 percent of the landlords are complying with rent control 22 percent are violating it and are doing so in order to gouge the public. I have had to ask Mr. Bowles for a special enforcement drive for Seattle and Bremerton, which he has promised to make as soon as he can get the necessary additional personnel. But if it were not for the O. P. A. we could not hold the home front in this war. No wages or salaries, however high, could keep war workers and their families in our area or anywhere else eating and sleeping and with clothes to wear, if it were not for O. P. A.'s rent and price controls. O. P. A. is doing a pretty good job over all, and that fact, too, should be recognized.

COMMISSIONING OF COMMUNISTS IN UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, there is a yellow scum in the United States practically all of whom have Communist or subversive records before both the Dies Committee and the F. B. I., who are writing every scurrilous attack on me that can be imagined because of my fight to keep America American. They are doing the same thing in Great Britain.

Both yesterday and today the Communist Daily Worker ran a column full of names of people who are now trying to bring pressure to bear on the Committee on Military Affairs to keep them from putting a stop to the commissioning of Communists in our Army I checked up on them, and found that practically every one of them has a subversive record at least according to the records of the Dies Committee and probably in the files of the F. B. I.

From London dated the 16th of March 1945 we find this U. P. dispatch:

> Prime Minister Winston Churchill told a deputation of trade unionists today that the Government would not reconsider its ban on allowing the Communist newspaper Daily Worker to send correspondents to battle areas.

Great Britain would not even let these Communists go into the battle area, much less commission them in her Army or Navy.

What Great Britain is doing to keep these Communists out of public office and out of places where they can do the most harm, America might well follow.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow and the next day, after the conclusion of legislative business and other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

NEW DEAL AGENCIES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, so far as I know, there is no law, rule, directive or regulation of any executive agency which will prevent the gentleman from California from speaking all the words of praise which he may choose to utter about the New Deal and the various agencies which are running this Government. He can do a great favor to every Member of this House if he will by his words of praise of O. P. A., W. P. B., and other administrative agencies just convince the people back home that everything is all right. So far as I know, not a single Member of this House utters a complaint on this floor except as he transmits some that come from the people who help in paying the salary of those who sit in this House. If he will just convince the people back home that everything is all right I will be very grateful to him personally because it will save me a lot of trouble; it will relieve my heart of a great load of depression; and it will help every one of us because we will not then have to transmit the complaints which come to us from those whose sons and daughters are fighting this war—who want to aid in the war effort. If there is reason for complaint the people have the right to complain to their Representative and it then becomes our duty to pass the complaint to the proper agency and often to give it publicity. If the gentleman from California will remove the cause, the New Deal inefficiency, the fault-finding will cease.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

KING OF THE FIGHTING IRISH

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 17th of March it was the royal prerogative of the King of the Fighting Irish, our former colleague, Joseph J. O'Brien, of New York, with his inimitable wit and humor to aline and reclassify the Irish of the House.

Now that Joe is on sabbatical leave temporarily, the O'Rayburns, the O'McCormacks, the O'Martins, the O'Blooms, the O'Konskis, the O'Dicksteins, and all of the other Irish of the House not only miss our good friend Joe O'Brien but confess the need of the touch of his royal shillalah to keep them in line.

Inasmuch as no business was conducted in the House on March 17 I take this occasion to pay tribute to the American Irish with greetings to all of them and particularly to our much loved friend, Joe O'Brien of New York.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein three memorials from the State Legislature of Arizona.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the ground for the question of personal privilege.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the ground on which I make my request is the report which has gone all over the land through the press, leaving the inference that the distinguished majority leader referred to me in his remarks that there is nothing to stop a man making a damn fool of himself if he wants to.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the concluding sentence in which the majority leader is quoted as saying, now that it has served its purpose, he agrees to erase his remarks from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Indiana is certain that the gentleman from Massachusetts was referring to him, the Chair thinks he has a right to proceed on the question of personal privilege.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I will confine my remarks to a very few brief statements and promise the membership I will not impose upon their indulgence for more than 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in order to expedite this situation and get it off the program, I think it best that I do not yield to anyone.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday last upon arriving on the floor of the House I found a mere handful of Members present at a time when there was an appropriation bill coming before this House calling for some $270,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. This bill also came before the House at a time when the taxpayers had just finished paying their last year's income taxes with their hard earned cash, and I mean paying to the hilt. It also came at a time when we just increased our national debt limit to $300,000,000,000, which amounted to more than $7,000 per family in the United States. It also came at a time when we are asking every man, woman and

child—yes, even the little school children—to save their pennies in order to back the attack by buying War bonds.

I made a point of order that a quorum was not present in the House. To spend the taxpayers' money recklessly and ruthlessly, without adequate consideration before at least a quorum of this body, is an insult to Congress. If it is true that to make a point of order and demand a quorum when we are spending the taxpayers' money in that way, and especially in times like these, is making a damn fool out of me, I am glad to be called that.

It also happens that after we had debated that bill all afternoon, during which time more amendments were added because matters contained therein were not germane, than any bill since I have been a Member of this House, a bill which was probably drawn up by some of the bureaucrats downtown, we found ourselves without a quorum and unable to act. That is the situation we found ourselves in on last Friday.

Now some of my good friends over here—and some good friends on the Democratic side have shown some concern over the remark of the distinguished majority leader and its effect upon me.

I regret to have to bring this up, but since it was flashed all over the country, I think I deserve the privilege to stand in front of this body and state that I was entirely in order and that I did proceed in order. I have seen points of order made against men who used the same language as the distinguished majority leader used on the floor of this House, and those words have been ordered taken down. In fact, there has been further disciplinary action within the past 2 weeks against Members on the majority side which went very little farther than that.

Mr. Speaker, my friends, of course, feel it is uncomplimentary to be called a damn fool by anyone.

But let me say to them that I defeated a man for Congress who had been here for 10 years and who had been complimented by the majority leader of the House, by the Speaker, and by others on his side because he was a rubber stamp for everything this administration wanted. He went down the line with them, and my constituents voted him out. I do not believe my constituents expected me to come over here and play for compliments from the majority side. I do not feel that I have been out of order, and according to the editorials from papers in my district and letters I have not been out of order insofar as they are concerned. Only one of them was uncomplimentary; the rest of them said: "Give them hell, WILSON; we are with you. If you keep this up there won't be 2,000 votes cast against you in the district come next election."

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar Day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 689) to enable the Department of State, pursuant to its responsibilities under the Constitution and statutes of the United States, more effectively to carry out its prescribed and traditional responsibilities in the foreign field; to strengthen the Foreign Service permitting fullest utilization of available personnel and facilities of other departments and agencies and coordination of activities abroad of the United States under a Foreign Service for the United States unified under the guidance of the Department of State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to know a little more about this measure. It seems to me it goes rather far to be taken up under unanimous consent.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. I intended to ask to have this bill passed over without prejudice, being of the same opinion as the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN, Mr. COLE of New York, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM objected, and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

ENACTMENT OF TITLE 1 OF UNITED STATES CODE INTO POSITIVE LAW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2195) to codify and enact into positive law, title 1 of the United States Code, entitled "General Provisions."

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. COOPER]. Is there objection?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] if he is present——

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] announced last week, and it appears in the RECORD, that he was going to ask that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

ENACTMENT OF TITLE 4 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE INTO POSITIVE LAW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2196) to codify and enact into positive law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and Seal, Seat of Government, and the States."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

CODIFICATION OF LAWS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, Calendar Nos. 36, 37, 38, and 39 are similar bills dealing with the codification of the laws. In order to save time, I ask unanimous consent that these bills may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Accordingly the bills, H. R. 2197, to codify and enact into positive law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds"; H. R. 2198, to codify and enact into positive law, title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration"; H. R. 2199, to codify and enact into positive law title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights"; H. R. 2200, to revise, codify, and enact into positive law, title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," were passed over without prejudice.

AMENDING THE ANTIRACKETEERING ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 32) to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

Mr. MARCANTONIO, Mrs. DOUGLAS of California, and Mr. BIEMILLER objected.

AMENDING THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 577) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation.

Mr. TARVER, Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, and Mr. KEAN objected.

PRESERVING THE RESIDENCE FOR NATURALIZATION PURPOSES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 513) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1137) and to amend subdivision (d) of section 10 of the act approved May 26, 1924 (43 Stat. 158–159).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is the first one of some six or eight bills reported by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, each of which in some respects modifies the Nationality Act of 1940. The truth is most of these bills passed through the House during the last session of Congress, but at that time the question was raised by some of us who are working on the Consent Calendar, principally the gentleman from North Carolina, as to why modifications of the Nationality Act could not be provided for in one bill so that the entire House might devote a day or two to the consideration of the matter rather than modify the Nationality Act by small bites at a time as these bills seek to do.

Frankly, in my opinion, many of the bills have merit and I would vote for them, but I feel it is a mistake, first, to modify the Nationality Act piecemeal, as we are doing in this fashion; and second, to have approval granted by unanimous consent.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say to the gen-

tleman from New York [Mr. COLE], whose views and statements are respected by every Member of this House, that I am of the same opinion that I was when I raised the question, and I think the gentleman is exactly right in his views. Personally, I do not like to continue to be one of the objectors, responsible maybe to a little greater degree than the average Member of the House, to these bills passing, and at the same time to be placed in the position of picking on a particular committee or trying to persecute a chairman or take the attitude that I am just disagreeable. As I said, there are some 6 or 8 bills on this calendar of similar purport, amending the same law. I do not intend to say anything else about it, because I gave the House my views and I think the responsibility is now with the House, but it seems to me, in line with what the gentleman from New York said, if it is true that so many amendments are needed, we ought to give a bill covering that matter some consideration. Here are 6 or 8 bills to amend the immigration and naturalization laws, and they amend those laws principally by reference to sections. There is no way to fit them in the whole picture. And this has been happening from 1 to 10 times every time this calendar is called.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] has very clearly expressed himself, as he always does. I have done my best to express my views, and I may say to the House very frankly that I would like the House to express itself as to whether it wants to keep on that way so far as its policy is concerned. If it does, that suits me all right.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I certainly join the gentleman from North Carolina and the gentleman from New York in opposing these seven bills.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. BARDEN. I did not say that I would oppose all seven bills.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that.

Mr. BARDEN. I simply said that in my opinion the House ought to realize what is going on.

Mr. RANKIN. These bills should not be passed by unanimous consent. In my opinion, they should not be passed at all. The old-line Americans who send me to Congress do not expect me to transfer the right somewhere else to say who is to become citizens of the United States.

They do not want us to permit the unloading upon this country of the riffraff of the Old World, while our young men are fighting to save America for Americans.

I am going to ask that all eight of these bills be passed over without prejudice—if I am here when they come up next time—I am one Member who attends the sessions of the House, and if you expect to bring these measures all out under one bill and bring it up under a rule and debate it on the floor of the House, all right. But this way of tearing down our immigration laws by piecemeal must stop.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman kindly give the numbers of those bills?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill bearing Calendar Nos. 49, 50, 51, 58, 59, 60, 61, and 62, be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I do so in order to make an explanation—the question that was asked by the gentleman from New York was, Why can these bills amending the Nationality Act not all be placed in one composite bill? They can all be included in one bill. But the question is whether that would be the best method of arriving at a solution of this problem. Each of these bills deals with different sections of the Nationality Act, and they are not tied together in substance. These bills have all passed the House in a previous Congress. They were held up in the Senate because of a jam over there at the last minute. They have all been approved and reported out of the committee, which committee has given careful consideration to the provisions of these bills. Therefore, I do not see why they should be sent back to the committee to be incorporated in one bill and further delay the action of the Congress on these matters. Some of the bills are very urgent at the present time.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, now that the bills have been reported to the House and are on the calendar, I see no good to be accomplished by sending them back, but that is not going to prevent the committee from taking them up for consideration by the full House on any Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not say that they should be sent back. I ask that they be passed over without prejudice. Let them bring a rule in here, if they want this kind of legislation considered. I will tell you what is happening. In 1924, under the pressure of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the D. A. V., and other patriotic organizations, we fought here for months to pass an immigration law. We now see that law being destroyed piecemeal, and I for one am opposed to that procedure.

Mr. MASON. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that not one of these bills deals with the immigration laws.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, they go beyond that.

Mr. MASON. They deal with the Nationality Act.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, they go beyond that and undertake to naturalize people who never have been in the United States, and some of whom never had on a uniform.

Mr. MASON. No.

Mr. RANKIN. I know what I am talking about. I have read what is here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How many objections does it take?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Just one objection to that request.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then I am objecting, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan objects.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill H. R. 513?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that that measure be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I object to the consideration of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN ALIEN VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 578) providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the Spanish-American War, the First World War, and members of the Regular Army, or National Guard who served on the Mexican border from June 1916 to April 1917.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN and Mr. CLEVENGER objected.

NATURALIZATION PROCEEDINGS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 669) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 so as to permit naturalization proceedings to be had at places other than in the office of the clerk or in open court in the case of sick or physically disabled individuals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Then I object to the consideration of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

MILITARY PERSONNEL CLAIMS BILL OF 1945

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2068) to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the repeal of half a dozen acts. I cannot find in the report the wording of these acts that are to be repealed. Therefore, I do not believe the report is in line with

the Ramseyer rule. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 18) providing for the celebration in 1945 of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolutions, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That in order to provide for the commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the United States Naval Academy there is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States Naval Academy Centennial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), to be composed of three Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate, three Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the person occupying the office of President of the United States on the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the Governor of the State of Maryland, the Secretary of the Navy, the Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy, and five persons to be appointed by the President. The members of the Commission shall select from among their number, a Chairman and a Vice Chairman. The Superintendent of the United States Naval Academy shall appoint, subject to the approval of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Commission, a secretary for the Commission. If any vacancy occurs in the office of secretary, such vacancy shall be filled in the manner provided for the original appointment. The authority of the Commission under this joint resolution shall cease and terminate on June 30, 1946.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Commission to formulate plans for the celebration to be held on or about October 10, 1945; in commemoration of such anniversary.

SEC. 3. The Commission is authorized to cooperate with the State of Maryland, the city of Annapolis, the Navy Athletic Association, and other organizations, in order to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. The members of the Commission shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

SEC. 5. The Commission is authorized to make such expenditures for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution as it may deem advisable, but no expenditure shall be made except for the purposes authorized by a majority of the members thereof. Expenditures of the Commission shall be paid upon the presentation of vouchers approved by the Chairman of the Commission.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall make a report to the Congress, as soon as practicable, of the plans formulated and the recommendations of the Commission for the observance of such anniversary.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $5,000, to be expended by the Commission for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: On page 2, line 2, strike out "person occupying the office of"; and in lines 3 and 4 strike out "on the date of the enactment of this joint resolution."

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is by way of a clarifying amendment. The wording of the joint resolution states who shall be the members of this Commission and identifies them as being Members of the House and of the Senate, and then states that another member of the Commission shall be, and I quote from the joint resolution as it is written, "the person occupying the office of President of the United States on the date of the enactment of this joint resolution."

That phraseology arrested my attention. Remembering that this bill was on the Consent Calendar last year, I realized that there might be some reason then for fixing the identity of this particular member as being the one who occupied the office of the Presidency at the time that joint resolution was signed. Now that November has come and gone, however, I see no reason why we cannot make this particular member of the Commission the President of the United States, irrespective of who it is at the time the joint resolution is passed. The amendment is designed to make that correction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAFEGUARDING THE ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE IN CERTAIN CASES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 43) to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to know what this is about. The rules of evidence are pretty well established in all the courts.

Mr. COLE of New York. May I say to the gentleman a rule has been granted on this bill, and a request will be submitted that the bill be passed over without prejudice at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. What the gentleman from New York says is correct. This bill is on the legislative program for either today or tomorrow.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

SAN JACINTO MILITARY RESERVATION, GALVESTON COUNTY, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 510) granting to Galveston County, a municipal corporation of the State of Texas, certain easements and rights-of-way over, under, and upon the San Jacinto Military Reservation in Galveston County, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to Galveston County, a municipal corporation existing under the laws of the State of Texas, its successors and assigns, in connection with the construction by said grantee of a tunnel and trestle or causeway across Bolivar Roads between Galveston Island and Bolivar Peninsula at the mouth of Galveston Bay, Tex., a perpetual easement for a right-of-way for a public road or highway in, on, over, across, and upon that part of San Jacinto Military Reservation in the county of Galveston, State of Texas, described as follows:

Parcel A: All of that piece or parcel of land lying within two hundred feet, measured perpendicularly from or radially from each side of the following-described centerline: Said centerline beginning at the intersection of the centerline of the South Jetty, Galveston Harbor, Galveston Island, Tex., and a line having a line bearing of south two degrees thirty-eight minutes no seconds east from the abandoned Bolivar Lighthouse, said point of intersection being one thousand eight hundred ninety-seven and ten one-hundredths feet north eighty-two degrees thirteen minutes nineteen seconds west of T. P. No. 6 on said South Jetty centerline; thence from said point of beginning south two degrees thirty-seven minutes eight seconds east nine hundred fifty feet to the beginning of a four-degree curve to the right, concave to the west; having a radius of one thousand four hundred thirty-two and sixty-nine one-hundredths feet, and tangent to the last mentioned course; thence on said curve a distance of five hundred fifty feet, or for an internal angle of twenty-two degrees to the point of termination.

Parcel B: All of that piece or parcel of land lying within seventy-five feet, measured perpendicularly from or radially from the following-described centerline: Said centerline beginning at the point of termination of the described centerline of parcel A; and tangent to a true bearing of south nineteen degrees twenty-two minutes and fifty-two seconds west; thence continuing four degrees curve to the right, concave to the west, said curve having a radius of one thousand four hundred and thirty-two and sixty-nine one-hundredths feet, a distance of five hundred and twenty-seven and eighty-three one-hundredths feet or for an internal angle of twenty-one degrees six minutes and eight seconds; thence south forty degrees and twenty-nine minutes west, a distance one thousand two hundred and nineteen and fifty one-hundredths feet to the beginning of a four-degree curve to the left, concave to the east, having a radius of one thousand four hundred and thirty-two and sixty-nine one-hundredths feet, and tangent to the last-mentioned course; thence on said curve a distance of five hundred and sixty-four and seventeen one-hundredths feet or for an internal angle twenty-two degrees thirty-four minutes no seconds; thence south seventeen degrees fifty-five minutes no seconds west, a distance of one thousand four hundred and sixteen and seventy-one one-hundredths feet to the intersection of the said centerline and the westerly property line of the United States San Jacinto Military Reservation, said point of intersection being one thousand eight hundred and seventy-six and seventy-nine one-hundredths feet south sixteen degrees forty-two minutes and thirty seconds east of a United States property line monument; said monument being eight and eight one-hundredths feet south fifty-nine degrees one minute east of M. K. "D" on the centerline of the South Jetty, Galveston Harbor, Galveston Island, Tex.,

together with the right to construct, use, operate, and maintain thereon a tunnel,

ventilation building, toll houses, and other incidental structures and appurtenances thereto, with the right of ingress and egress upon such part of the lands in the reservation which adjoins said right-of-way as may be necessary from time to time as occasion may require for the purpose of maintenance and repair of any of the objects for the construction of which the aforesaid easement is granted, subject, however, to the following provisions and conditions:

1. No monetary consideration.

2. That no structure of any kind shall be constructed in navigable water of the United States by the county of Galveston until it has obtained a permit under the provisions of sections 9, 10, 11, and 12 of the act of March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1151; 33 U. S. C. A. 401, 403, 404, and 406), governing the construction of structures on navigable waters.

3. That the use and occupation of said military reservation for the purposes authorized by this instrument shall be subject to such rules and regulations as the commanding officer of the harbor defenses of Galveston or other competent military authority may prescribe from time to time in order to properly protect the interests of the United States.

4. That the construction, use, and maintenance of said road or highway and tunnel, including all appurtenances thereto, shall be performed without cost or expense to the United States of America.

5. That the grantee shall at all times maintain said road and tunnel in good condition and shall promptly make all repairs thereto needed to preserve a smooth surface highway and a safe tunnel.

6. That any property of the United States damaged or destroyed by the grantee incident to the use and occupation of said premises shall be promptly repaired or replaced by the grantee to the satisfaction of the said United States engineer, Galveston district, or his duly designated successor, hereinafter referred to as the district engineer and/or said commanding officer or other competent military authority, or in lieu of such repair or replacement the grantee shall, if so required by said officers or other competent authority, pay to the United States money in an amount sufficient to compensate for the loss sustained by the United States by reason of damages to or destruction of Government property.

7. That the United States of America shall in no case be liable for any damages or injuries to the said road or tunnel and appurtenances which may be caused by or result from any operations undertaken by the Government, and no claim or right to compensation shall accrue from any such damages or injuries.

8. That the United States reserves the right to locate, construct, or install any instrument, equipment, or facility upon the property covered by the easement as may be required in the functioning of the harbor defenses and the United States further reserves the right to make such connections between the road or highway herein authorized and the roads and highways on said lands of the United States as the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, may from time to time consider necessary, and also reserves to itself rights-of-way for all purposes across, over, and/or under the right-of-way hereby granted: *Provided, however,* That such rights shall be used in a manner that will not create unnecessary interference with the use and enjoyment by the grantee of said right-of-way for highway purposes.

9. That it is to be understood that this instrument is effective only insofar as the rights of the United States in the lands over which the said road or highway is to be extended are concerned, and that the grantee shall obtain such permission as may be necessary on account of any other existing rights.

10. That all or any part of such right-of-way herein granted may be annuled and forfeited by the Secretary of War for failure to comply with any or all of the terms and conditions of this grant, or for nonuse for a period of 5 consecutive years, or for abandonment of rights granted herein.

11. That the county of Galveston will cause to be deposited at such location as is approved by the commanding officer and district engineer on the San Jacinto Reservation such surplus dredged spoil as is not required for the construction of the tunnel, ventilation building, toll houses, highways, and other incidental structures and appurtenances, nothing herein, however, shall require the county of Galveston to so deposit materials dredged to the north of the centerline of the main ship channel.

12. That the county of Galveston shall as a part of the tunnel project construct and maintain on the east side of said easement a climb-proof wall or fence, incuding gates, at the intersection of the new highway with the old abandoned State Highway 87 from the south jetty to the west boundary of the reservation should it be deemed necessary by the commanding officer, harbor defenses of Galveston, and the design of said fence and the design, security, and operation of said gates shall be subject to the approval and under the exclusive control of the commanding officer, harbor defenses of Galveston.

13. That the county of Galveston, its successors and assigns, will permit free use of the tunnel by military personnel of the United States Army when in uniform and when in official vehicles and while engaged in the official business of the United States Army: *Provided,* That this requirement shall not include troops on foot, ammunition, wagon convoys, vehicles transporting explosives or chemicals of a highly inflammable or incendiary nature except insofar as the Government official business may require in case of a great emergency.

14. That the operation of the tunnel, ventilation building, toll houses, highways, and other incidental structures and appurtenances on the reservation may be suspended by the Secretary of War at his will in case of a declared public emergency, without giving rise to claims for damages from the grantee or its successors or assigns.

15. That upon the relinquishment, revocation, or termination of this easement, the county of Galveston shall, within such time as the Secretary of War designates, remove all property it may have on said reservation and restore the premises to as good condition for use by the United States as they were on the date of this grant, and upon its refusal, neglect, or inability to do so, the said property will, at the election of the Secretary of War, either become the property of the United States or it may be removed and the premises restored by the Secretary of War at the expense of the county of Galveston, and no claim for damages against the United States, its officers, or agents, shall be created by or made on account thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to grant to the county of Galveston, Tex., an easement for a right-of-way for a public road or highway and tunnel over, upon, and under a portion of the San Jacinto Military Reservation at Galveston, Tex., in such location as may be agreed upon by the War Department and the county of Galveston, in connection with the construction by the county of a tunnel and trestle or causeway across Bolivar Roads between Galveston Islands and Bolivar Peninsula, at the mouth of Galveston Bay, subject to such conditions, restrictions, and reservations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, with the right in the county of Galveston to construct, use, operate, and maintain thereon, a tunnel, ventilation building, toll houses, and other incidental structures and appurtenances thereto, together with the right of ingress and egress upon such part of the lands in the reservation which adjoin said right-of-way as may be necessary for the purpose of maintenance and repair of any of the improvements for the construction of which the aforesaid easement is granted: *Provided,* That whenever the county of Galveston shall cease to occupy and use the land and premises for highway, tunnel, and related purposes as authorized herein, then the same shall revert to the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 5, PUBLIC LAW 140, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1701) to amend section 5, Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Military Affairs. But I feel obliged to advise the House that the report from the Committee on Military Affairs contains a letter from Secretary Stimson of the War Department indicating that this bill is not in conformity with the financial program of the President and, therefore, did not receive clearance from the Bureau of the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent under those circumstances that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to say this bill was passed by the House last year and went to the Senate and was reported out favorably by the Senate Military Affairs Committee. It simply got caught in the last minute legislative jam in the Senate last year. While it is true that the Secretary of War says in his letter that it is not in conformity with the financial program of the President, nevertheless the War Department says it has no objection to the enactment of the bill and recognizes the equities contained in it.

Mr. RANKIN. I am not complaining about that phase of the question. I would like to know what is in the bill, what the bill does.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The bill simply does this. In 1941, we passed a law giving retirement rights to enlisted men of the Regular Army and to the Philippine Scouts who served at least 20 years and who had to be discharged by reason of permanent and total disability. We gave them the right to go on the retirement list. But at that time we failed to put a provision in the bill taking care of those who had already been put out

of the Army and who had had 20 years service. Those were retired without the benefit of this retirement law. This simply goes back and picks them up. It provides no back pay shall be paid. The amendment in the bill as reported by the committee is in the language suggested by the War Department.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress, is hereby amended by adding a colon at the end thereof and the following: "*Provided*, That this act shall apply to all former enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Philippine Scouts who have served for 20 years, or more, and who were honorably discharged therefrom for disability incurred in line of duty."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 2 of Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress, is hereby amended by adding a colon at the end thereof and the following: '*Provided*, That this act shall apply to all former enlisted men of the Regular Army and the Philippine Scouts who have served for 20 years or more, and who were honorably discharged therefrom by reason of becoming permanently incapacitated for active service due to physical disability incurred in line of duty: *Provided further*, That any former enlisted man placed upon the retired list in accordance with the provisions of the foregoing proviso shall not be entitled to receive retirement pay for any period prior to the effective date of this amendment.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 2, Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress."

PROVIDING FOR ENLISTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY DURING THE WAR PERIOD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2388) providing for enlistments in the Regular Army during the period of the war, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask members of the Committee on Military Affairs some questions about this bill. As I understand it, this is offered to make it possible to have a Regular Army in view of the fact that the 3-year enlistments were expiring and probably most of them have expired as of this date; and that while men are still in the Army as part of the Army of the United States, they are not in the Regular Army as such.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. They are in the Army of the United States. This bill authorizes the Secretary of War to accept enlistments in the Regular Army and reenlistments with a view to building up the Regular Army after the war.

If the gentleman will permit me to read from the committee report, it says:

H. R. 2388 would authorize the Secretary of War, during the existence of any war in which the United States is presently engaged and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to accept original enlistments and reenlistments in the Regular Army of male persons honorably serving in the Army of the United States, or any component thereof, or who were honorably discharged therefrom not more than 3 months prior to the date of such original enlistment or reenlistment. The term of such service would be for the duration of any war in which the United States is presently engaged and for 6 months thereafter or for 3 years, whichever is the longer period.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seems to me that legislation of this sort is properly in order and should be considered at this time.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It is very necessary. We have to make a start some time to rebuild the future Regular Army. No matter how small it is, we must have a nucleus of noncommissioned officers.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; that is true, but I wanted to raise the question for the purpose of bringing up the problem that is coming up in connection with the men who have returned from overseas theaters of action, who have had so much overseas work, or because of their physical condition or the length of service they have had, the Army does not feel like assigning them to overseas duty again. Some of those men would have very good ratings. Some of them would like to be discharged, but, as I understand, it is the present policy of the War Department to hold them in the Army, even though they have no particular post to which they can be assigned that is commensurate with the rank they hold or with the training they have had. In view of the manpower shortage generally throughout the country, I have felt that the Committee on Military Affairs should propose some method by which the services of these men could be utilized, instead of just being wasted by assigning them to a sort of inactive status at some military post. I am wondering if, in connection with the consideration of this general manpower problem and the continuation of the Regular Army, the Military Affairs Committee has considered recommending anything in the way of an extended furlough for those men so they might be assigned to industry or might take on jobs and yet perhaps still retain military status until such time as there is a general demobilization.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Of course, the gentleman presents a subject that is without the scope and provisions of this bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is related to it in this way: You are proposing to reenlist men in the Regular Army. It has to do with the continuation of the Regular Army as such. This other thing is related in that some of these men coming back would like to get a Regular Army status, but at the present time they are not being given very much to do. Some of them could do peacetime Army work; some of them could garrison supply depots.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I may say the War Department is making a very careful survey of all ranks through questionnaires in order to arrive at the desires of men in all categories. It unquestionably would be true that some of those men who desire to remain in the Regular Army would have an opportunity to do so with the provisions of this bill. This bill in no way covers men who would like to be discharged. The attitude of the Department is to discharge men for whom there is no place in its scheme of things, under certain qualifications, of course.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, the incentive for these men to reenlist is that they get a reenlistment bonus at the present time. Is this correct, and how much does it amount to?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. KEAN. Approximately how much?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Fifty dollars, depending upon the number of years. It is in conformity with the Regular Army regulations:

An enlistment allowance equal to $50, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the first three grades who reenlists within a period of 3 months from the date of his discharge, and an enlistment allowance of $25, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the other grades who reenlists within a period of 3 months from the date of his discharge.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of the last paragraph of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (54 Stat. 213), the Secretary of War is authorized, during the existence of any war in which the United States is presently engaged and under such regulations as he may prescribe, to accept original enlistments or reenlistments in the Regular Army of male persons who are honorably serving in the Army of the United States, or any component thereof, or who were honorably discharged therefrom not more than 3 months prior to the date of such original enlistment or reenlistment. The term of service of persons enlisted or reenlisted under authority of this act shall be for the duration of any war in which the United States is presently engaged and for 6 months thereafter or for 3 years, whichever is the longer period.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE EFFECT ON NATIONALITY OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS BY COMPULSORY VOTING IN A FOREIGN STATE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 434) to provide that nationals of the United States shall not lose their nationality by

reason of voting under legal compulsion in a foreign state.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Nos. 58, 59, 60, 61, and 62, be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RANKIN. Then, Mr. Speaker, in order to conserve time I enter an objection to each one of these five bills.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I object; the bills have not been called up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises the gentleman from Mississippi that the bills will have to be considered separately, permission to consider them en bloc having been refused.

Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. I object.

AUTHORIZING THE NATURALIZATION OF FILIPINOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 776) to authorize the naturalization of Filipinos.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

TO PRESERVE NATIONALITY OF CERTAIN CITIZENS UNABLE TO RETURN TO THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 387) to amend section 401 (a) of the Nationality Act of 1940.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDING THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 511) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

AMENDING SECTION 201 (G) OF THE NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 388) to amend section 201 (g) of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1138–1139; 8 U. S. C. 601).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

DISCONTINUING CERTAIN REPORTS NOW REQUIRED BY LAW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2504) to discontinue certain reports now required by law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as indicated by the title, this bill authorizes the discontinuance of the submission of some 60 reports which the executive departments have heretofore sent up to the legislative branch of the Government. I think it is an entirely worth-while proposal.

My reason for requesting that this bill be passed over to be called up on a Calendar Wednesday or under a rule is so that all of the committees of the House who are affected by this legislation may be advised as to what reports are being repealed.

If the gentleman can assure us that all committees which are interested in these reports have been contacted by his committee and have indicated their readiness to have these reports discontinued, then I will withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman from New York and the Members of the House that a similar bill passed the House in the last Congress. It likewise passed the Senate, but that afternoon one Senator asked that the vote be reconsidered as he desired to look over the bill. It so happened that there was a jam in the Senate and the bill never was reached for reconsideration.

The pending bill is the result of 3 years' study by the Bureau of the Budget. The committee held 3 days' hearings. It had representatives of the departments before it.

Some of the reports are the result of laws over a hundred years old. They call for a Government agency to make a report to the Congress in the case of a service that is no longer in that department but has been transferred to another.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman advise us as to whether his committee consulted the chairmen of the Committee on Agriculture, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Military Affairs, the Committee on Naval Affairs, the Committee on the Library, and all these committees?

Mr. COCHRAN. I may say to the gentleman from New York that every standing committee of the House received a letter asking if they had any objection, and a copy of the bill was included. Only one chairman up to this morning offered any objection, and that was the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who thought that one of the reports should not be discontinued. The committee struck that item from the bill.

This morning the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, expressed a desire to have one of the paragraphs eliminated from this bill. If the bill is considered, I will offer an amendment to eliminate it.

I wish to show the gentleman a sample of one of the reports. I have it here. It is a volume 2 inches thick, every page crowded with figures. It cost over $10,000 and took 10,000 man-hours to prepare. All it tells you is the cost of bolts, nuts, and so forth, made at a United States arsenal.

May I call the attention of the gentleman to the last paragraph in the bill requiring the Superintendent of Documents of the Government Printing Office to make a report to his superior, the Public Printer. He has accountants and auditors in the office of the Superintendent of Documents every day checking and auditing. They must go over 66,000 items at a cost of $20,000 to make up that report, yet the Public Printer says he has the information at his fingertips at any time he wants it, but a recapitulation has to be made because of the law.

Mr. COLE of New York. I would like to ask the gentleman in regard to one item which it is proposed to be discontinued.

Mr. COCHRAN. The one that it is suggested we discontinue is No. 9, page 4, lines 1 to 4, inclusive.

Mr. COLE of New York. If the gentleman will direct his attention to item No. 3, which authorizes the discontinuance of the report of the Secretary of Agriculture of those recipients of triple A benefits in amounts exceeding $1,000, I would appreciate it.

Mr. COCHRAN. That was discussed at length by the committee. We went into that probably more than any other item.

Mr. COLE of New York. We have required that report and I am surprised that the Agricultural Committee of the House has indicated its readiness to have that discontinued.

Mr. COCHRAN. The Agricultural Department and the Bureau of the Budget say the information is there any time Congress wants it. You can get it. That report costs between $25,000 and $30,000. I do not know how many man-hours and how much paper it takes to prepare the report.

Mr. COLE of New York. I see the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture present and I yield to him.

Mr. HOPE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri, who has indicated this matter was taken up with the Committee on Agriculture, just when and how it has been taken up? It has not been taken up to my knowledge.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know about the gentleman from Kansas, but I know that the letter went to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. HOPE. Did the gentleman get a reply from the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. COCHRAN. In the letter that was sent out I asked if any chairman had any objection to any item in the bill, and if he did to please advise the committee, and we would strike it out. No complaint was made.

Mr. HOPE. I see the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture present. I will be glad to have him express himself on the subject. As far as I know, it has never been discussed in the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. COCHRAN. I know I sent the letter to the chairman of that committee as well as all the others.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I may say that that report giving the amount paid of $1,000 or more is published and the information is given to the Committees on Agriculture of the Senate and the House. It costs a lot of money to publish that. The information is available in the Department and any Member of Congress who wants to see it can very readily ascertain what the amounts are. I am going to mention some of those amounts when we consider the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture this week. I think the Congress and the country ought to

know what some of these amounts are and who is getting the money. However, I believe that a saving can be made by including that in this bill to which the gentleman from Missouri refers, because I now observe that he has a desire for economy. He said the other day that we are going to economize. The Members of Congress better realize that pretty soon, so I am joining the gentleman from St. Louis in trying to eliminate certain of these publications.

Mr. COLE of New York. I am not sure that by saving this $25,000 we will accomplish any eventual savings to the Treasury because bear in mind if this particular list about which we are talking is not disclosed to the public, it is very possible that exorbitant and unconscionable fees may be paid about which the public would not be aware.

Mr. RICH. I realize that, but we ought to stop spending money.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I sought to get a copy of the bill and the report earlier in the day, and the page informed me that the report was out of print and it was impossible to get one. If that is the situation the Members cannot tell what this bill covers. While I have no objection to the bill going over, for I think it should go over, I think somebody should ask permission that a copy of the bill or text be printed in the RECORD so that we can determine what it is that this bill covers.

Mr. COCHRAN. The report covers 13 pages and was printed over a week ago.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there may be inserted the report of the bill just passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

STATEMENT IN THE REPORT IN SUPPORT OF THE BILL, ITEM BY ITEM, IN THE ORDER OF THEIR APPEARANCE IN THE BILL

Item No. 1. Quarterly report to the President, required by Appropriation Act of March 15, 1898 (30 Stat. 316), of executive departments or other Government establishments at the seat of government not under an executive department, as to the condition of public business therein and whether any branch thereof is in arrears.

With the growth of the Government and the fiscal and policy procedures that have been established since 1898, which keep the President informed of activities in the various agencies, and the fact that the President may call upon any department or agency at any time for information which he may desire, there is no need for the continuance of this statutory requirement. As a matter of fact, with but few exceptions the departments and agencies are not cognizant of, and do not submit, reports as prescribed by the 1898 statute.

Item No. 2. Report of work status of projects on forest roads and trails, the allocation of appropriations, expenditures, and receipts, names of employees and their duties, salaries, etc., required by legislative enactment of November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 216; 48 Stat. 995).

The Department of Agriculture pointed out that a conservative estimate of the time spent in the compilation and typing of this report in the Washington office alone was approximately 1,175 man-hours; that the cost of making the report, including the photographic expenses, was $1,588; that in addition at least an equal amount of time and money is expended by the regional and field offices in gathering the data needed; that the Federal Works Agency also submits reports to Congress relative to work done under the Federal Highway Act, and that it is believed that the repeal of this statutory provision would not deprive either the Congress or the taxpayers of essential information, especially since such information will be, as it has been in the past, included in the annual reports of these agencies. It appears, therefore, that the preparation of this separate report serves but little purpose and certainly does not justify the expenditures involved.

Item No. 3: Report by the Secretary of Agriculture to the Congress, required by legislative enactment of February 16, 1938 (52 Stat. 68), showing the names of persons receiving Agricultural Adjustment Agency payments in excess of $1,000.

The Department points out that the accumulation of material for preparation of this report involves a review of each application for payment submitted during the year and the preparation of a summary card for each producer who received in excess of $1,000. Each year these cards are transmitted from each State to a centrally located office of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, where they are arranged alphabetically, tabulated, and used in the formulation of this voluminous report. The Department of Agriculture has expressed the opinion that the report is of no benefit insofar as its operations are concerned, and that the preparation of the report each year costs approximately $25,000.

Item No. 4: Report by the Secretary of Commerce, required by act of May 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 292), showing the names of persons for whom work has been performed, nature and price of service, and the disposition of moneys received therefor.

This information is available at all times through the medium of fiscal reports prepared to meet the requirements of the Treasurer of the United States and the General Accounting Office, and there appears to be no need for compilation in the special form required by the above-mentioned statute.

Item No. 5: Report required of the Coast and Geodetic Survey by legislative enactment of March 3, 1853 (sec. 4690 of the Revised Statutes), showing certain information and charts respecting the coasts of the United States.

The information contained in this special report involves, in fact, a duplication of information shown in the annual report of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Item No. 6: Report required of the Secretary of the Interior by legislative enactment of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1975), respecting his investigation of certain dams, waterworks, or other projects constructed in the Clear Lake watershed, in the State of California.

This involves, in fact, the issuance of only a single as distinguished from a recurring report. A single report, however, is not forthcoming for the reason that the investigation has not been initiated, due to the fact that the irrigation districts have declined to enter into contracts to repay the costs of such an investigation.

Item No. 7: Report by the Secretary of the Interior respecting the feasibility and costs of irrigation projects, required by legislative enactment of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388).

The report required has, in fact, been discontinued for the past several years, although the statutory provision has not been repealed.

Item No. 8: Report by the Secretary of the Interior of all moneys expended on each irrigation project, required by appropriation act of April 4, 1910 (36 Stat. 270; 38 Stat. 583).

Item No. 9: Report by the Secretary of the Interior of the fiscal affairs of Indian tribes for whose benefit expenditures from public or tribal funds were made, required by Appropriation Act of March 3, 1911 (36 Stat. 1077).

Item No. 10: Report by the Secretary of the Interior of transactions under the receiving fund for loans to Indians and Indian-chartered corporations, required by legislative enactment of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 986).

Item No. 11: Report by the Secretary of the Interior of expenditures made for the relief of destitute natives of Alaska, now required by Appropriation Act of August 9, 1937 (50 Stat. 584).

Item No. 12: Report by the Secretary of the Interior of the operation of the Geological Survey, required by Appropriation Act of March 3, 1879 (20 Stat. 395).

Item No. 13: Report of amounts expended from the appropriation "Mineral leasing (year), Geological Survey," for the benefit of Indian tribes and Indian allottees, required by Appropriation Act of May 10, 1926 (44 Stat. 487).

Item No. 14: Report by the Secretary of the Interior of field employees temporarily detailed to the District of Columbia, required by Appropriation Act of August 9, 1937 (50 Stat. 603).

Item No. 15: Report of all operations under section 5 of the act of March 2, 1919, including receipts and disbursements, required by legislative enactment of March 2, 1919 (40 Stat. 1272).

Item No. 16: Report of projects undertaken and expenditures made in connection with Federal aid to wildlife restoration, required by legislative enactment of September 2, 1937 (50 Stat. 919).

The information contained in each of the reports required under items 8 to 16, both inclusive, is of a fiscal character and is therefore shown in the accounting reports required by the Treasury Department and the General Accounting Office. The preparation of the special reports required by these statutes requires a special compilation, but is, in fact, a duplication for the most part of information contained either in the Budget estimates or annual reports of the respective bureaus of the Department. Information on any of the subjects above indicated can be readily compiled on short notice, should a need arise for such information.

Item No. 17: The report required of the Secretary of Labor by legislative enactment of April 13, 1934 (48 Stat. 583; 53 Stat. 581), giving data relating to special statistical studies made by the Labor Department for others upon payment of the cost thereof.

Item No. 18: Report by the Secretary of Labor showing the names of persons for whom work has been performed, nature and price of service, and the disposition of moneys received therefor.

The reports called for in items 17 and 18 concern rather small and incidental activities of the Department, and since the information contained in the reports is available in a different form in the estimates of appropriations submitted to the Congress and in financial reports of the Department, there appears to be no reason why these two reports should not be eliminated.

Item No. 19: Report of the Navy and War Departments' operations in the purchase of aircraft, the names and addresses of the con-

tractors, prices paid, etc., required by legislative enactment of July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 787).

These reports include the number of airplanes contracted for under the statute, the names and addresses of the contractors, as well as others who competed in the bidding, the prices paid for aircraft, and the reasons for awarding the contracts to the successful bidders. At the time of enactment of this statute—1926—the aircraft industry needed encouragement, so far as expansion and development were concerned. Likewise, it was desirable that aircraft producers be afforded as nearly equal opportunities as possible in obtaining contracts from the Government for the production of aircraft. The number of aircraft then authorized were extremely limited, and preparation of the reports was not unduly burdensome. However, under emergency and wartime conditions all aircraft-production facilities of the country are being utilized. The volume of aircraft and aircraft accessory procurement has increased to such enormous proportions that preparation of the report is extremely burdensome and consumes a great deal of manpower. The nature of the report is such that for national security reasons certain parts thereof should not be made public.

The compilation of this information by the Navy alone consumes approximately 300 man-hours annually, and upon completion is insufficient for a satisfactory audit of any single transaction.

Item No. 20: Report required of the Secretary of the Navy (or the Secretary of War, as the case may be) by legislative enactments of June 25, 1936, and April 3, 1939 (48 Stat. 505; 49 Stat. 1926; 53 Stat. 560), of exemptions on account of contracts or subcontracts for scientific equipment used for communication, target detection, navigation, and fire control.

Due to the fact that this equipment is of a scientific and technical nature, frequent exemptions of contractors and subcontractors from the provisions of the Revenue Act of 1934 have been necessary in order to obtain production of the equipment in the quantities and at the times required by emergency and wartime conditions. Whenever such exemptions are made, the statute requires a report of the names of the contractors and subcontractors "together with the applicable contracts and the amounts thereof" to the Congress. Disclosure of such vital information to enemy agents necessarily would be detrimental and damaging to the United States. The information contained in the reports can be obtained by the Congress readily upon application, and under such conditions that the danger of disclosure is not present. It is believed, therefore, that the report can be dispensed with without injury to the public service or without depriving the Congress of needed and useful information.

Item No. 21: Reports required of the Secretaries of War and Navy, by Appropriation Act of August 25, 1941 (55 Stat. 686; 56 Stat. 244), showing the names of those who, on behalf of the Government and the contractors, participated in negotiating contracts, and the reason for selecting the contractor in cases where contracts are awarded without competitive bidding.

The statute requires that there be submitted to the Congress within 60 days after the end of each fiscal year a complete list of all contracts in excess of $150,000, including contracts for the purchase of land, which were undertaken during such fiscal year, the report showing (1) a statement of the subject matter of each contract; (2) the names of the contractors; (3) the names of the persons who approved the specifications, consummated the making, or concluded the negotiation of any such contract on behalf of the Government, and of all persons who participated in the negotiations on behalf of the contractor; (4) if any such contract was awarded without competitive bidding, a statement of the principal or controlling reason for the selection of the contractor; and (5) as to contracts for the purchase of land, the location, area, intended use, the purchase price, and the assessed value thereof.

This report is extremely burdensome to the War Department. Its report for the fiscal year 1943 comprised approximately 1,800 pages and involved 19,000 purchase actions. For 1944 the report is of approximately the same proportions. Due to its voluminous nature, the value of the report for reference purposes is considered doubtful. All of the information embodied in the report is currently available to Congress upon request. Preparation of the report requires a great deal of time and attention on the part of War Department personnel. Discontinuance of the report would effect an important saving in man-hours involved in typing, checking, reproducing, and assembling the various elements of the report.

In the Navy this report consumes approximately 3,500 man-hours annually for its preparation, and the most recent report contained 290 closely printed pages with supplements aggregating 3,171 pages and listed approximately 22,720 contracts. The report is so voluminous that it would appear that its value for reference or informational purposes is nil.

All of the contracts covered are audited by the General Accounting Office and any information desired can be obtained from the War and Navy Departments.

Item No. 22: Reports by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy of persons commissioned from civilian life, required by legislative enactment of June 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 369).

At the present time preparation of this report in the War Department is not particularly burdensome, but its discontinuance is believed to be in the public interest because its usefulness to Congress is considered doubtful.

In the Navy Department applications are currently being received at the rate of 900 each month. Approximately 600 of these applicants receive commissions and the forms for these approved applicants are forwarded as the report. In addition to the expense involved in the preparation and distribution of the necessary forms and in their completion and typing, the time involved in preparing the report amounts to approximately 415 man-hours per month or approximately 5,000 man-hours annually. The information contained in the report duplicates information maintained in the files of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, which is available, and in greater detail, to the Congress. In the past this report has required the use of a motor vehicle to transport it to the Congress. It is understood that usually this report has been stored in a vault from which it has not been removed for inspection or use.

Item No. 23: Report required of the Secretary of the Navy by Appropriation Act of July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 132), of disbursing officers relieved of responsibility on account of loss or deficiency or Government funds, vouchers, etc.

The making of this report was discontinued some years ago. The subject information duplicates information furnished the Comptroller General for action under the statutory authority.

Item No. 24: Report by the Secretary of the Navy, required by legislative enactment of July 18, 1935 (48 Stat. 482), of expenditures in excess of $450,000 for repairs to any one naval vessel for any 18 consecutive months.

This report has never been made because of the nonexistence of the factual situation upon which it is predicated. The requirement of report is considered obsolete in view of subsequent legislation waiving the substantive provisions of law.

Item No. 25: Report required of the Secretary of the Navy by legislative enactment of April 25, 1939 (53 Stat. 590), of all contracts involving the construction of certain public works.

The report is believed to be of little practical value because the information contained therein is covered, more fully and more currently, in the monthly report of contract awards issued by the Buerau of Supplies and Accounts. Furthermore, the information is available, and in more detail, upon request by the Congress.

Item No. 26: Report by the Secretary of the Navy of vessels whose names have been stricken from the Navy Register, required by Appropriation Act of August 5, 1882 (22 Stat. 296).

Records do not indicate that this report has been made to Congress for many years. However, the information is contained in a monthly report submitted by the Chief of Naval Operations to the General Accounting Office.

Item No. 27: Report of the advance payments made to contractors under authority of section 1 of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676).

Executive Order 9001 under the First War Powers Act of December 18, 1941, authorized the Navy to enter into contracts and to make advance payments thereon of any percentage of the contract price without regard to preexisting provisions of law. Inasmuch as all advance payments are now made under the authority of the President's Executive Order 9001 rather than under the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), there no longer exists the necessity for this report.

Item No. 28: Report of contracts entered into without competition under the authority of section 2 of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676, 677).

Item No. 29: Report of the cost of special additional equipment and facilities to be borne by the Government under each contract negotiated under authority of section 4 of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 678).

Item No. 30: Report of the contracts entered into under authority of section 8 (b) of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 680).

The reports under items 28, 29, and 30 relate to operations under different sections of the same statute, and have been superseded by item 21. The information is substantially the same as that given in item 21 and the time required for preparation would be virtually the same (i. e., 3,500 man-hours annually).

Item No. 31: Submission to the respective chairmen of the Committees on Naval Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives of copies of each contract, order, or agreement covering the exchange or other disposition of surplus naval equipment, as required by section 14 (b) of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 681).

This requirement is obsolete and the need for a report unnecessary in view of subsequent congressional action on this same subject matter. (For example, the act of October 3, 1944, Public Law 457, 78th Cong., as well as regulations of the Surplus Property Board.)

Item No. 32: List of all contracts in excess of $10,000 in value, including contracts for the purchase of land (55 Stat. 686).

Item No. 33: Report every 3 months of the contracts entered into under authority, title III, Priorities Powers, section 2 of the act of March 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 178).

Item No. 34: Report every 3 months of the contracts entered into under the provisions of section 1 of the act of December 17, 1942 (56 Stat. 1053).

The reports referred to in items 32, 33, and 34 deal with the same subject matter as that covered by item 21, and have been superseded by that report.

Item No. 35: Reports of designs, aircraft, aircraft parts, and aeronautical accessories purchased by the Navy Department as required under section 10 of the act of July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 787).

This report is practically identical to that report mentioned in item 19.

Item No. 36: The report covering data setting forth special contracts with railroad companies (39 Stat. L. 427).

The Post Office Department, in recommending the discontinuance of this report, pointed out that the information contained in the report was no longer of value since the weight basis of pay was superseded by the space basis, and the rates for postal service are now fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Item No. 37: Report by the Secretary of State, required by legislative enactment of August 16, 1842 (5 Stat. 507), of all changes and modifications in the commercial systems of other nations, whether effected by treaties, duties on imports and exports, or other regulations.

Item No. 38: Report by the Secretary of State, required by legislative enactment of August 18, 1856 (11 Stat. 139), of a synopsis of certain information communicated to him by diplomatic and consular officers.

The State Department points out that the Department of Commerce has for many years been charged with the publication and dissemination of commercial information along the lines required under items 37 and 38 received from American Foreign Service officers abroad, and that the statutory provisions of these two items should be repealed.

Item No. 39: Report by the Secretary of State, required by legislative enactment of March 2, 1819 (3 Stat. 489), of the lists of passengers arriving in the United States from foreign places.

The State Department points out that this item involves information coming within the jurisdiction of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, and should either be eliminated or modified.

Item No. 40: Report by the Secretary of State, required by legislative enactment of March 2, 1799 (1 Stat. 731), abstracting returns made to him by collectors of ports, of the seamen registered by them.

The State Department points out that in recent years the amount collected in fees by Foreign Service officers has been included in the annual Budget messages of the President to Congress, and that the continuance of a separate report, as required by the above statutory provision, represents a duplication of information on the same subject.

Item No. 41: That part of the annual report to the Congress required of the Comptroller of the Currency to exhibit (18 Stat. 317).

Item No. 42: Statement to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, required to be included in the Comptroller of the Currency's annual report, of expenses incurred during each year in liquidation of each failed national bank separately (32 Stat. 138).

Item No. 43: Report of officers and administrative departments and offices of the Government delinquent in rendering or transmitting accounts to the proper offices in Washington (28 Stat. 209; 29 Stat. 179).

The Treasury Department, in recommending repeal of this item, pointed out that the Comptroller General, under existing law, annually reports to Congress any delinquency in the rendition of accounts by disbursing officers; that personnel ledger accounts of disbursing officers were transferred from the Treasury Department to the General Accounting Office by the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act of June 10, 1921.

Item No. 44: Submission of reports which may be made to the Secretary of the Treasury by the officers charged with the examination of the accounts of the Department of War and the Department of the Navy, respectively, showing the application of the money appropriated for those departments for the preceding year (sec. 260 of the Revised Statutes).

Item No. 45: Tabular statement required of the Secretary of the Treasury showing in detail the receipts and expenditures in the naval service under each appropriation (20 Stat. 167).

Item No. 46: Report required of the Secretary of the Treasury to be appended to the tabular statement mentioned above of accounts and balances in the hands of disbursing agents at the close of each fiscal year (20 Stat. 167).

The Treasury Department, in recommending the repeal of the provisions of law set forth in items 44, 45, and 46, pointed out that the requirements for these reports were affected by the Budget and Accounting Act of June 10, 1921, which transferred to the General Accounting Office the Office of the Comptroller of the Treasury and the six auditors, and that the Secretary of the Treasury is no longer in a position to make such reports to the Congress.

Item No. 47: Transmission of accounts kept by certain officials of the Treasury Department of amounts expended under the head of contingent expenses for the several bureaus of the Department (sec. 262 of the Revised Statutes).

The Treasury Department points out that it is of the opinion that the requirements of the above provision of law, although carried in the United States Code as prima facie law, were repealed by the act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 986), which discontinued reports and statements required by law to be made to Congress of "Statement of expenditures from contingent appropriations," and that such matters in addition are included in the Department's report to the Budget.

Item No. 48: Report required by the Secretary of the Treasury of administration of the functions with which he is charged under the Federal Alcohol Administration Act (49 Stat. 977).

The Treasury Department points out that the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1964), which repealed several provisions of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act of August 29, 1935, and established a new administration as an independent agency, was to be effected when the new administrators authorized thereby were appointed; and although such officers were never appointed, and the repeal did not become effected, many of the subsections of the act were omitted from the United States Code in view of the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 3, which abolished the Administration and transferred its functions to the Treasury to be administered through the Bureau of Internal Revenue; thus the information required by the above-mentioned statutes is included in the annual report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Item No. 49: Report of the number of persons employed, other than workmen and adjusters, and the compensation paid to each, at each mint and assay office (33 Stat. 657).

The Treasury Department, in recommending the repeal of this provision of law, pointed out that the information required is submitted to and included in the annual Budget in accordance with the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921.

Item No. 50: An abstract in tabular form of the separate accounts required to be kept of moneys received from internal duties or taxes in each of the respective States, Territories, and collection districts (18 Stat. 317).

The Treasury Department, in recommending repeal of this provision of law, indicated that any of such information which may be useful to the Congress is no doubt included in the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of finances, the combined statement of receipts and expenditures, and the annual report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Item No. 51: Report required of the Secretary of the Treasury relative to leases of unoccupied and unproductive property of the United States under his control, for the leasing of which there is no authority under existing law (20 Stat. 383).

The Treasury Department, in recommending repeal of this provision, states that it has had no occasion in many years to lease unoccupied or unproductive property of the United States.

Item No. 52: Annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency (32 Stat. 133).

The Treasury Department, in recommending that the reports required by items 41, 42, and 52, pointed out that such repeal would permit the Comptroller of the Currency to exercise discretion with respect to the date and contents of his annual report to the Congress; that this would be in accordance with existing statutory requirements respecting the annual reports of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Item No. 53: Report required of the Secretary of War by legislative enactment of April 20, 1874 (18 Stat. 33), relative to inspections made as to the necessity, economy, and propriety of all disbursements made by disbursing officers of the Army.

This report involves the expenditure of considerable time and attention in assembling and tabulating the details. Since practically all disbursements made by disbursing officers of the Army are supervised and audited by the General Accounting Office, it is believed that the report to the Congress may be discontinued without affecting the public interest or the efficiency and economy of expenditure of public funds. No estimate of the man-hours consumed in the preparation of this report is presently available, but such information will be furnished subsequently, if possible.

Item No. 54: Report by the Secretary of War, required by Appropriation Act of August 18, 1890 (26 Stat. 320), as to the cost of certain types and classes of guns manufactured by the Government.

Item No. 55: Report of the activities and expenditures of the Council of National Defense (39 Stat. 650).

This report relates to the activities and expenditures of the Council of National Defense created by the act of August 29, 1916. Most of the activities of the Council are now being carried out by the Office of Scientific Research and Development established in the Office for Emergency Management by Executive Order No. 8807 of June 28, 1941. Accordingly, it is believed that the requirement for a report may be dispensed with without depriving Congress of any needed or useful information.

Item No. 56: Report by the Secretary of War, required by appropriation act of August 18, 1890 (26 Stat. 320), of expenditures at certain arsenals, and of arms, etc., fabricated, repaired, etc., during the fiscal year.

The statutes requiring these reports (items 54 and 56) were enacted during the last century when practically all guns and other ordnance materials used by the United States were produced in Government-owned installations. These plants, however, now produce a very small percentage of all ordnance matériel used by the War Department, estimated to be less than 5 percent. Accordingly, the reports no longer reflect anything except a very small proportion of total ordnance production. These plants are considered somewhat the same as privately owned and operated ordnance plants when contracts for this matériel are in process of being awarded. Estimates are procured from the arsenals and production orders given accordingly. Elimination of the reports will not result in discontinuance of the keeping of accurate and complete cost-accounting records. Assembling the data and compiling the reports are extremely burdensome. The Rock Island Arsenal estimates that its an-

nual report for the past fiscal year required the consumption of 6,000 man-hours in its assembling and preparation. Figures from the other four arsenals and one armory are not available at the present time, but will be furnished later, if possible.

These reports are of no use to the War Department and are considered of very limited usefulness to the Congress, since complete reports on procurement are otherwise made to the Congress and the production in the arsenals represents such a small proportion of the total ordnance production. Elimination of the report, therefore, would not, in the opinion of the War Department, deprive the Congress of any information of value or usefulness to it.

Item No. 57: A detailed report of sales of any war supplies, material, lands, factories, or buildings, showing character of articles sold, price received, and purpose for which sold (40 Stat. 850).

This statute relates to a report of the sales of any war supplies, material, lands, factories, or buildings, showing the character of articles sold, prices, received, and the purpose for which sold. In view of the provisions of the Suplus Property Act of 1944, it is believed that this report properly should be discontinued.

Item No. 58: Hereafter the Secretary of War shall, within the limits of appropriations made from time to time by Congress, and in accordance with reasonable rules and regulations approved by him upon the recommendation of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, in connection with the promotion and encouragement of rifle practice, authorize and provide for: Construction work, equipment, maintenance and operation of rifle ranges; issues of ordnance; sales of arms, procurement of supplies; expenses of the National Board; transportation of certain officials; procurement of badges, prizes, etc.; and transportation of supplies, etc. Full report of all things done hereunder to be made annually to Congress (43 Stat. 510).

Paragraph 58 relates to the statutory requirement for a full report of all things done relating to the activities of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice. While the activities of this Board during wartime necessarily have been curtailed and limited and preparation of the report does not at present involve the expenditure of any considerable number of man-hours, any unnecessary use of manpower during present critical conditions seems to be unwarranted.

Item No. 59: Submission to the respective chairmen of the Committees on Military Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives of copies of each contract, order, or agreement (not later than 24 hours after made), covering the exchange or other disposition of military equipment, munitions, or supplies (54 Stat. 681).

In view of the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, and the fact that the method of disposing of property and supplies no longer needed by the War Department is regulated and governed thereunder, the usefulness of this report to the Congress seems extremely doubtful. Its discontinuance would not, in the opinion of this Department, deprive the Congress of any useful or needed information.

Item No. 60: Report to the Congress each month of the number of men in active training and service in the land forces under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (55 Stat. 628).

At the time of enactment of this requirement, the number of selectees to be inducted into the Army was limited to 900,000. It is believed, that submission of the report was required largely for the purpose of assuring Congress that the limitation was not exceeded. Wartime conditions have required expansion of this number many times. Since enactment of the measure, conditions have so changed that the report, without exhaustive and painstaking investigation, is not sufficiently accurate to be really informative concernng the strength of the armed forces. Following enactment of the act, many enlistments in the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard occurred. The War Department has no control over such matters, nor does it have accurate and detailed information concerning the selectees serving in the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard. Figures submitted in the report have been estimated for the past year or more and are subject to considerable inaccuracy and error. Determining each month the exact number of selectees in active training and service would involve a tremendous expenditure of time and energy and would be, in the opinion of this Department, unwarranted by the little practical use that could be made of those figures when obtained.

Item No. 61: Reports by the Superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital of receipts and expenditures in connection with operation of the hospital, required by appropriation act of June 4, 1880 (21 Stat. 156; 39 Stat. 309).

In view of the Federal accounting methods and controls now in use, there seems to be no purpose which the report can serve at the present time.

Item No. 62: Annual report of the affairs of Howard University (45 Stat. 1021).

Item No. 63: Report of all expenditures made by virtue of any appropriations by Congress to the Columbia Institution for the Deaf, including the amounts and rates paid to the superintendent and for teachers (R. S. 4867).

The Federal Security Agency, in recommending the repeal of the statutory provisions set forth in items 62 and 63, pointed out that the material in these reports is either included in other reports to the Congress made by the constituent units of the Federal Security Agency or is available in the printed Budget, and that the elimination of these statutory requirements would make the duplication of this material unnecessary.

Item No. 64: Annual report to the Public Printer by the Superintendent of Documents of all sales made by him (28 Stat. 610).

The Government Printing Office, in recommending the repeal of this statutory provision, points out that the report involves the compilation of the record of sales of more than 60,000 titles at an annual cost of approximately $20,000, and that other records provide all the other information necessary for the accounting of the proceeds of sales.

UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY LIBRARY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 48) designating the library of the United States Merchant Marine Academy as a public depository for Government publications.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the library at the United States Merchant Marine Academy, Kings Point, N. Y., is hereby designated a public depository for Government publications, and the Superintendent of Documents shall supply to such library one copy of each such publication, in the same form as supplied to other designated depositories.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the bills on the Consent Calendar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE (at the request of Mr. SPRINGER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and other documents.

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Business Week.

Mr. LEWIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. TAYLOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Saratoga County.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter relating to the seamen's rights bill.

DEFERMENT OF FARM LABOR

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 29, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in order that there may be no further misinterpretation of the will and the desire of the Congress in enacting subsection K, section 305, title 50, United States Code, commonly known as the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act, Congress reaffirms the necessity to our war effort of said subsection K and again expresses its will and desire that the local selective-service board, in classifying the registrant, observe subsection K, and concern itself solely with the registrant's essentiality to an agricultural occupation or endeavor, and to the question of whether or not a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be composed of three members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three members of the House Committee on Agriculture, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to determine who is responsible for the wholesale induction of essential farmers and farm workers where no replacements are available, in violation of the Tydings amendment, and to determine the effect of such induction upon agricultural production and upon the war effort, and to return its findings to the Congress at the earliest possible date.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, this is the Lemke resolution, which the Committee on Rules reported notwithstanding the fact that I felt, in view of the passage of House Joint Resolution 106, reported from the Committee on Agriculture by the House, there is no need for this investigation because I believe it will delay the aims of the gentleman from North Dakota.

At the time this resclution was reported I assigned it to the gentleman from Georgia. Unfortunately, he is extremely occupied on a very, very important matter, and believed this resolution would not be reached until he would be able to return to the House. I know he will be here shortly.

NO NEED FOR INVESTIGATION

As I said, I felt then that there was no need or justification for this resolution of investigation. This concurrent resolution provides for the creation of a joint committee to be composed of three members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and three members of the House Committee on Agriculture, the same committee of the House that reported and secured the passage of the Flannagan joint resolution through the House. However, the gentleman from North Dakota is very eager to have his resolution brought before the House, and, in accordance with the action of the Committee on Rules, I am calling it up in behalf of the gentleman from Georgia, although, as I stated, I myself feel that there is no need for it.

If this concurrent resolution had been introduced by a Member from a State where many boys had been taken from the farms, perhaps that Member would be justified in introducing such a resolution, but I hold here a report from the Selective Service System showing that throughout the United States the average number of farm boys exempted is 4 percent, whereas in the State of the gentleman from North Dakota the number of boys exempted between 18 and 25 years of age is 25.9 percent, the highest of any State. South Dakota comes next with 25.7 percent.

I do not wish to take the time to read the other States having large exemptions as against States like Texas, Massachusetts, North Carolina, Mississippi, and my own Illinois where there is only 4.5 percent exemption of men from 18 to 25 on the farms as against much larger exemptions in the two Dakotas. As I have many demands for time I cannot read the complete list and ask unanimous consent to insert it here:

Selective Service System classification of living registrants, by State, Jan. 1, 1945

Classes II–C and III–C (farm registrant deferments):

Alabama	2.1
Arizona	1.0
Arkansas	3.5
California	1.4
Colorado	5.2
Connecticut	1.8
Delaware	3.4
District of Columbia	0.1
Florida	0.8
Georgia	5.0
Idaho	5.3
Illinois	4.5
Indiana	4.7
Iowa	16.5
Kansas	9.0
Kentucky	3.5
Louisiana	2.6
Maine	2.6
Maryland	4.3
Massachusetts	0.9
Michigan	4.0
Minnesota	12.2
Mississippi	2.6
Missouri	2.6
Montana	9.6
Nebraska	14.1
Nevada	4.2
New Hampshire	3.0
New Jersey	1.3
New Mexico	2.9
New York City	0.0
New York (upstate)	5.0
North Carolina	1.0
North Dakota	25.9

Classes II–C and III–C (farm registrant deferments)—Continued

Ohio	1.9
Oklahoma	5.8
Oregon	2.6
Pennsylvania	2.9
Rhode Island	0.6
South Carolina	5.1
South Dakota	25.7
Tennessee	5.1
Texas	1.4
Utah	3.0
Vermont	12.9
Virginia	3.2
Washington	3.8
West Virginia	1.3
Wisconsin	16.6
Wyoming	5.9

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it not true that there are not very many people in North Dakota who are not farmers?

Mr. SABATH. There are quite a few towns in North Dakota, and there are many manufacturing and other businesses in North Dakota, although perhaps not to the extent as in the gentleman's State; but they are not all farmers.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that the gentleman from North Dakota is interested in getting agricultural production so that we may take care of our own boys who are in foreign countries, and is he not showing the proper spirit by trying to have men retained on the farms regardless of whether the men in North Dakota are left there or not?

Mr. SABATH. That is a rather long question, but I will try to remember it all.

BUMPER CROPS AND SURPLUSES

I presume that is one of the reasons, but if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will examine the record of the agricultural products that are being grown in North Dakota and throughout the rest of the country, he will find that we have great surpluses, and that we produced in 1944 a larger quantity of all these farm products than in any other year. All indications point to the production of a still larger crop in 1945.

They say there is a shortage of labor. There is a shortage of labor everywhere. But because of the tremendous progress that has been made in the improvement and development of machinery, and of farm machinery especially, including electric milkers, harvesters, tractors, mechanical cotton pickers, and other farm implements, 1 man, I am told, can do more work now with the aid of this machinery than was done by 10 men in past years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No, I am sorry, I cannot yield. I do not want to take too much time and I have four other resolutions to call up. I know the gentleman is a farmer. He knows all about the situation. He informs the House as to conditions every day, or nearly every day, so I feel he needs no further enlightenment except for some tables which I shall later insert which may prove informative to him and other Members of the House.

For that reason and because a question might be raised, I am going to ask unanimous consent that I may insert in my remarks the figures on production of grains and every other farm product which I may be able to secure between now and this evening to satisfy the gentlemen from Pennsylvania, North Dakota, Michigan, and other Members, that there is no real danger of any shortage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Crops for United States, 1940–44

	Wheat	Corn	Oats	Barley
	Bushels	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*
1940	813,305	2,462,320	1,245,388	308,944
1941	943,127	2,675,790	1,180,663	362,082
1942	974,176	3,131,518	1,349,547	429,167
1943	836,204	3,076,159	1,143,867	322,187
1944 [1]	1,078,648	3,228,361	1,166,382	284,426

[1] Estimated December 1944.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that time would permit a compilation of all the crops of grain, fruits, vegetables, poultry, milk, and dairy products for the years in question. The above figures from the Department of Agriculture indicate bumper crops for the 5 years in question, with the exception of barley, which is reflected in the farmers not raising that grain because they obtained higher prices for other grains. Surpluses carried over in each of these years and vast surpluses are on hand now in grain warehouses, in silos, and temporary granaries on the farms. I point to the danger of holding these vast surpluses on the fantasy of feeding the European countries after Germany's defeat. The demands on U. N. R. R. A. in furnishing food to the liberated countries has not come up to expectation, and even the overrun countries have raised some crops, and the indications are that with few exceptions all European countries will this year raise the principal crops to keep their people fed. Further, we hear no mention of the export of grains and foodstuffs from South American countries to European countries, and we have not been furnished with the vast amounts of canned goods held in reserve by U. N. R. R. A. for the relief of those in the battle-torn areas. These are figures which I should like to insert in the RECORD, but time will not permit their compilation now and at a later date I shall submit them. Yet in the face of these facts and the almost positive certainty that there is not an actual food shortage in this country, we are belabored with intimidating reports from so-called institutes as to a possible food shortage.

STIMULATE PRODUCTION

Mr. Speaker, as to the question of incentive payments, when the C. C. C. bill was under consideration many gentlemen arose and spoke on the provision for an additional $2,000,000,000 increase in borrowing power, stating that it was

necessary to continue paying a subsidy for the purpose of encouraging and stimulating the farmers to greater production. I stated then and I state now that the high prices that the farmer is receiving today and the tremendous subsidies that are being paid should be sufficient stimulation to increase farm production. I realize that the farmer does not get it all but the consumer is paying outrageously high prices for all foodstuffs. And from all reports and indications there will be a continued stimulation notwithstanding the complaint of shortage of farm labor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. No; I cannot. I myself appreciate that. I think the farmer should be congratulated upon his production.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I think the gentleman is delivering a wonderful talk here, and I think we ought to have a quorum. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withdraw his point of order if I yield to him?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That would be a question of intimidation.

The SPEAKER. All debate is out of order.

The Chair will count to determine whether a quorum is present.

Mr. HOFFMAN. At the urgent request of the minority leader, who is present, I withdraw it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws the point of order.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the gentleman from Michigan does not want to have the facts.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not talking in order now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed in order.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, I am speaking in order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not pass upon the question of whether or not the gentleman from Illinois was speaking in order. The Chair asked the gentleman to proceed in order.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am doing so. I think the House is entitled to the information that I can give. I have obtained it by careful searching and through diligent examination and investigation of the reports from the Department of Agriculture and of other departments. I think I could give the House, especially if I had the time, a great deal more information that Members do not possess on the great increase in production of farm products.

EXAGGERATED PREDICTIONS OF MEAT SHORTAGES

I admit that the newspapers carry many exaggerated predictions of a coming shortage of meat. It is apparent that the meat institute is trying to scare the country in claiming that there will be no meat forthcoming unless the ceilings are increased. In that connection, fortunately I have with me a chart from the O. P. A. showing that notwithstanding the scare and threats on the part of the meat institute we will have in 1945 72 percent—or 16,000,000,000 pounds—which is sufficient to provide for each man, woman, and child 127 pounds of meat a year. So the threats that we will have no meat are farfetched.

IMMEDIATE INVESTIGATION NECESSARY

I appreciate naturally that you gentlemen coming from agricultural districts are concerned in seeing that the farmers receive higher prices for their products, but I fear that you are overdoing it. I have heard it stated that some farmers are reluctant to demand higher prices in view of the prices they are now receiving. I realize that the demands come from the big farmers and ranchers whose acreages run into hundreds, yes, thousands of acres. It would be most interesting to know the size of their subsidy checks. In the near future the consumer will demand to know why no effort is being made to stop the ever-increasing cost of their living. The war profiteers and the war workers who are drawing good incomes and wages can afford these high prices, but the unorganized and white-collar workers are in a terrible plight and some day they will be heard from.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I feel that it is absolutely necessary to immediately begin an investigation in the publicized shortages of foodstuffs, the sources of the erroneous reports, and what is behind this scare. If we do not do it, I know the other body will undertake it.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman is aware of the fact that at the present time there is so much shortage.

Mr. SABATH. In what? There is no shortage in citrus fruits.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman is aware of the fact that at the present time when there is so much shortage in beef, poultry, eggs, and milk, there certainly must be a shortage of manpower on the farm as one of the big factors.

Mr. SABATH. I will tell you where the shortage is and why it exists.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The O. P. A. and the War Food need you.

Mr. SABATH. I am sorry I cannot yield any further to the gentleman. I know something about the crops and the manpower situation out in the gentleman's State. I know we have a greater crop of oranges, lemons, and fruit than ever before in the history of our country, and the gentleman will have to admit it.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yet we cannot get it back here.

Mr. SABATH. Oh, you have plenty of labor. None of that food has gone to waste heretofore and I hope it will not in the future.

I am in favor of giving the farmers all the labor they need, but we should not do it at the expense of the boys that need ammunition, guns and many other things that are essential for the conduct of the war.

I admit there is a great deal of publicity given to the shortage of meat. I believe that if the meat packers, those "unfortunate" men who have been down here demanding still greater ceiling prices, would allocate products to the usual channels, to the retail butcher shops and meat markets instead of giving it to the hotels, to the big restaurants and to the clubs, there would be enough meat available for the housewives, at least the cheaper cuts, if not the steaks. But unfortunately those packers in my city and a few other cities make sausage out of cheaper cuts because they can get 5 or 10 cents a pound more out of the sausage than they can get out of the housewife for the cheaper cuts of meat.

That applies also to butter. I do not want to dwell upon it, but I also have figures as to butter. We are paying $2.75 to $3.75 per hundredweight for milk where formerly the farmers received only 95 cents.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. No; I am sorry; I cannot yield right now. I am giving the House some information. The dairy people——

Mr. ELLIOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I cannot yield. Please.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Since the gentleman is going to give the House so much information and declines to yield, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. SABATH. That is all right. It will not hurt me. I will be here to give the information, anyway. I have yielded to the gentleman twice, and I am not going to yield any further.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 48]

Anderson, Calif.	Elsaesser	Larcade
Andrews, N. Y.	Feighan	LeCompte
Arends	Flood	Lesinski
Arnold	Fogarty	Luce
Auchincloss	Forand	McGehee
Barrett, Pa.	Fulton	McGlinchey
Barry	Gavin	Madden
Bates, Mass.	Geelan	Mansfield, Tex.
Boren	Gerlach	May
Bradley, Mich.	Gibson	Morgan
Bradley, Pa.	Gordon	Morrison
Brooks	Granahan	Mott
Brumbaugh	Green	Mundt
Buck	Hagen	Murphy
Buckley	Hand	O'Neal
Bunker	Hart	Patrick
Burgin	Hartley	Peterson, Ga.
Cannon, Fla.	Hébert	Pfeifer
Cannon, Mo.	Heffernan	Philbin
Celler	Heidinger	Phillips
Chiperfield	Hobbs	Powell
Clark	Izac	Powers
Combs	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Quinn, N. Y.
Crawford	Kearney	Ramey
Curley	Keogh	Rayfiel
Daughton, Va.	Kirwan	Reece, Tenn.
Dawson	Landis	Rivers
Dirksen	Lane	Robertson, Va.
Eaton		Robinson, Utah

Roe, N. Y.	Slaughter	White
Rogers, N. Y.	Smith, Maine	Wickersham
Rooney	Somers, N. Y.	Winter
Sheridan	Thomas, N. J.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Short	Thomason	Woodhouse
Sikes	Torrens	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 336 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEFERMENT OF FARM LABOR

Mr. SABATH. I am sorry to have this call of the House, but it was not my fault.

I was about to give the House and the country some information as to cheese. Only a few days ago my attention was called to the outrageous conduct of the cheese producers. I understand most of the present day cheese is water and some foreign substances, put up in all sorts of fancy packages and sold for about 5 times what it should be sold for. And that applies to many other things that I have not the time to mention—to many other commodities wherein the consumer is grossly imposed upon, yes, robbed.

It is of course to be regretted that some of the steak eaters will not be able to obtain their favorite steaks but three or four times a week. That must be as great a deprivation on their part as it is for the drivers of automobiles to be denied all the gasoline they want for pleasure riding; or for the poor girls to be denied all the cigarettes they crave.

I feel that the boys, our fighting men in the trenches, will greatly sympathize with these discontented people at home who do not seem to fully realize that we are at war. None of them is in danger of losing their lives because of being deprived of these luxuries.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understood the distinguished gentleman to say that he was going to ask unanimous consent to include in his speech a chart showing the surpluses. Is that correct?

Mr. SABATH. Yes. In fact, I can give you the information on some of the surpluses right now. We know we have over 500,000,000 bushels of wheat and a greater amount of corn. We have about 10,000,000 bales of cotton. I know the reports show a tremendous crop of vegetables and fruits starting to come in now. When I shall be able to get the official figures I shall be pleased to insert them.

Mr. McGREGOR. I will not object if the gentleman will also include a chart showing the shortages, along with the chart showing the surpluses.

Mr. SABATH. I was trying to make that clear, but I will have to forego that privilege.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman may revise and extend his own remarks.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. I reserve the balance of my time, and I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that we can proceed expeditiously with the consideration of this resolution and bring about its adoption at the earliest possible moment.

The very estimable chairman of the Rules Committee has just preceded me. Of course I know of his oft expressed solicitude for the farmers. I also know of his oft expressed solicitude for the interests of the country when it comes to the necessities of food and food production. I am just sorry that for some reason he finds himself today on the wrong side of this proposition. I am quite sure that if his observations had gone a little beyond the confines of the great city which he has the privilege to represent, he would have been with some of the rest of us on this occasion.

I want for myself, and I am sure for the author of this resolution and those who support it, to thank the majority leader for arranging to call it up today. When asked about it last week he said it would be called up at the earliest possible opportunity. On this occasion, as on others, the majority leader has done what he agreed to do.

This resolution has to do with farm or agricultural deferments and the induction of farmers into the armed services. This resolution came from the Rules Committee on February 26. Subsequent to that time there was reported from the Rules Committee the so-called Flannagan bill, which came from the Committee on Agriculture. It sought something in this direction. It was called up ahead of this resolution. It was adopted by this body, it went to the other body where it was incorporated in the so-called work-or-jail bill. I submit that no one can tell what finally is going to come of that legislation and what may be the fate of any part of that legislation. So it seems to me that whatever may have been done in the other body in any respect, it is highly important that we proceed to the consideration of this resolution and its adoption.

This is a concurrent resolution. It seeks to do two things, generally speaking. As I understand it, it seeks to clarify and restate the legislative intent which was originally expressed in the so-called Tydings amendment. The Tydings amendment, substantially, provided for the deferment of all essential agricultural workers, provided there were no replacements available. But this resolution goes further than clarifying legislative interest. It also provides for the setting up of a joint committee, three from this body and three from the other body, to determine the reason for the wholesale induction of farmers and farm workers in recent days.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman will remember that General Hershey appeared before our committee and stated that there was no evasion of the law, that they were proceeding in accordance with the mandate of the law that we passed.

Mr. HALLECK. General Hershey appeared before our committee, and without undertaking to restate what he said I submit that any clear understanding of what was done by Selective Service can lead to no conclusion other than that the clear intendment of the Tydings amendment has not been followed by Selective Service. In a moment I will point out why that is true.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Let me proceed just a moment; then I will yield.

It does seem a little strange after we put into the law something as clear as the Tydings amendment that we have to go to work again to say to the administrators: "This is our intent." But if that is what is necessary to be done I for one am ready to do it. I still say that it is a little peculiar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me now?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield briefly; then I wish to proceed.

Mr. DONDERO. I am wondering whether the Congress of the United States is doing anything by passing again the language on page 1 of this resolution? I am in hearty accord with the language on page 2, but I fail to see the necessity for our restating what we intended to do in a previous law.

Mr. HALLECK. Not so long ago I served on a committee whose hearings disclosed that an administrative agency was flying right straight in the face of a legislative mandate and, in effect, admitted they were. When they were asked what they were going to do about it they answered, "Nothing."

I do not know what more we can do. Some people have suggested that perhaps we need some impeachments, but that is a rather harsh remedy. Certainly this much can be said, that administrative agencies, once the legislative intent is made known, should follow that intent and there should be no question about action in that regard.

Reference has been made as to whether Selective Service was following the Tydings amendment. Let me read a paragraph that went out from the State director of selective service in my State of Indiana, having to do with this matter of the deferment of farmers. He refers to the number that should be inducted and then this paragraph is included:

> It is, of course, reasonable to suppose that in many cases drastic readjustments of farm production programs will become necessary in your area as a result of the induction of substantial numbers of the young farmers. However, we must be guided in the handling of these cases by the opinion of the President as expressed by Justice Byrnes in his communication to General Hershey to the effect that agriculture, like our other war industries, can with few exceptions be carried on by those in the older-age groups.

Does not that undertake to create a different standard and test, and do it by administrative order? Is it not definitely contrary to the law enacted by Congress? I say that it is. And because that is so, then certainly whatever else may have been done since that time, we

need to restate and clarify our intention today.

I do not know that it is necessary to include any extended argument as to the original advisability of putting the Tydings amendment into the law. The Congress believed when it adopted that amendment that it was necessary and desirable. I have seen nothing in the meantime to indicate to me that the congressional determination in that regard was wrong. Rather, as I read the papers, as I hear from my people as to what is happening on the farms, I notice in the press every day reports as to impending food shortages; yes, accurate reports as to shortages already here and then read of farm sales, as I read the papers from Indiana and from every other State showing what is happening on the farms, when I realize the extreme necessity of keeping production to the absolute maximum to feed our men at the front, to feed our civilians, to feed our allies, and the armies of our allies, and as I vision the people of the liberated countries looking to us for food, then I say clearly the Tydings amendment was justified. It is justified today and there is no authority anywhere that I know of that has at any time the right to override the congressional mandate as written in the Tydings amendment. No one of us wants any agricultural deferment except for a man who is really farming, is not replaceable, and who qualifies under the Tydings amendment.

For one, I will restate it. I for one want this committee set up to inquire into the whys and the wherefores about this departure from the mandate of the Congress as expressed in the Tydings amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask the gentleman if he will attempt to fix the responsibility on any particular person?

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to comment on that, but my time has expired.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, there is no Member of this body, in my opinion, who has adhered more strictly to the proposition of leaving the conduct of this war to those upon whom responsibility has been placed than I; but this is an instance where, regretfully, I am compelled to make an exception.

The Rules Committee of the House has had General Hershey before it and the general made a very impressive statement, a part of which was that he was adhering to the Tydings amendment; but under further examination it was disclosed that the statement is somewhat less than accurate. It appears that while the general has given instructions to local boards that they shall follow the Tydings amendment, people from other agencies have been sent in, presumably representing Selective Service, and have advised the boards to disregard the Tydings amendment. They are in my district today doing that very thing. They go to the appeals boards and issue orders to those boards to disregard the Tydings amendment. They are doing that in my district today. It is a case where the Selective Service has set itself above the Congress of the United States and as a result of what they are doing at the present time they are bringing terrible hardship upon agriculture by the very foolish, foolish things they are doing.

I know of an instance in my own district where an old gentleman, too old to carry on farming operations but yet under the necessities of the moment is doing so in spite of his age. He and his boy are tending 600 acres of land. Now in the midst of the planting season they come in and take the boy from him. In my district now when they are in the midst of the planting season, where local boards have given assurances that these boys would not be called and farmers have gone out to prepare the soil, put in the fertilizer and are now engaged in putting in the seed, these people come in from the outside, supposedly from outside the Selective Service, and are giving orders as to how these local boards shall perform.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. As I understand, the gentleman stated that the persons representing themselves as coming from Selective Service would actually come from some other agency.

Mr. COX. Yes; and with the knowledge of Selective Service. They condone it. They are a party to it. The testimony given by General Hershey will justify that statement.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. So far as the other agencies are concerned, they are going directly from the State directors notifying the local boards to disregard the Tydings amendment. That happened in my district.

Mr. COX. I hate to say it, but Selective Service is not being honest with the Congress, and something ought to be done.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. During the debate on the Flannagan bill I asked the question if anything could be done to help correct the situation now that these boys have been taken. Will the present resolution correct that situation?

Mr. COX. I do not know. The present resolution does not contemplate any expenditure of money. It simply directs that a joint committee made up of the Agricultural Committees of the two legislative bodies shall inquire into the reasons for the disregard of the Tydings amendment on the part of Selective Service. It will have a persuasive influence, in spite of the fact that General Hershey testified before the committee that the adoption of the Flannagan bill and the adoption of this resolution would have no influence on him in the interpretation he puts upon the Tydings amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] the chairman of the Rules Committee, injected politics into this debate. I wish to assure him that I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 29 at the request of the Committee of Eleven—LEMKE, North Dakota; HORAN, Washington; ANDERSEN, Minnesota; RAINS, Alabama; VURSELL, Illinois; ROGERS, Florida; REED, New York; LARCADE, Louisiana; PHILLIPS, California; O'HARA, Minnesota; WHITE, Idaho. This committee consists of about an equal number from both sides of the aisle.

This is no time to inject politics. As far as the committee of eleven is concerned, it is representing the people of the United States regardless of partisanship. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] presented some figures in regard to the number of deferments in North Dakota as compared with other States. Permit me to suggest to the gentleman that these are the juggled figures of General Hershey. Permit me to further inform him that they are inaccurate and untrue.

In the first place, 159,000, out of about 600,000, of our population left in the early stages of the war for war plants in other States. That certainly is as good a record as his own State. In the next place, there are no war industries at all in North Dakota, and in the next place, the farmers in North Dakota enlisted in the armed forces in far greater numbers than they should have, and for that reason the deferments were essential if agriculture was to continue.

Again, permit me to say to the sidewalk farmer from Chicago that he is being fed by little children and old men and women working in harvest fields in my State. If I am not mistaken, my State has led every other State in the Union in the production of wheat and flax, and especially in Durum wheat. Because of the shortage of help and the shortage of farm machinery 18,000,000 bushels of wheat were lost last fall because it was not harvested in time.

I am satisfied that if the gentleman had taken a little time, he would have discovered that North Dakota has furnished just as many men for the armed forces and industrial plants in proportion to the population as has the State of Illinois.

I wish to state further to the gentleman that North Dakota is first in the purchase of bonds, that the surrounding States of Montana, South Dakota, and Nebraska all are ahead of his State. That is no criticism but it does show the uncalled for remarks from the gentleman of Illinois regarding North Dakota.

So that we may have a clear understanding of what is before us, I shall first read House Concurrent Resolution 29:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in order that there may be no further misinterpretation of the will and desire of the Congress in enacting subsection K, commonly known as

the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Act, Congress reaffirms the necessity to our war effort of said subsection K and again expresses its will and desire that the local selective-service board, in classifying the registrant's essentiality to an agricultural occupation or endeavor, and to the question of whether or not a satisfactory replacement can be obtained.

That there is hereby created a joint congressional committee to be composed of three members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three members of the House Committee on Agriculture to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to determine who is responsible for the wholesale induction of essential farmers and farm workers where no replacements are available, in violation of the Tydings amendment, and to determine the effect of such induction upon agricultural production and upon the war effort, and to return its findings to the Congress at the earliest possible date.

This resolution shows clearly that the Tydings amendment is not intended to protect slackers—but to protect agriculture. Remember the Army needs men, but the Army and the Nation also need food. Congress intends that the farmers produce it if they are essential and irreplaceable.

There is a persistent misunderstanding, or should we say persistent false propaganda, to the effect that agricultural deferments are in excess of industrial deferments. The fact is that the male population on farms, between the ages of 18 and 26, has been decreased by over 40 percent from April 1940 to April 1944.

There has been a greater migration away from the farm—farm factories—than from any other industry. This because of the higher wages and higher income in industrial and war plants as compared with agricultural wages and income. Also because farmers and farm workers have been reluctant to ask for deferments. In many cases, they enlisted before they were drafted. Statistics show that agriculture has furnished more than its share of men for the armed forces and war industries.

It has been easy to spread this propaganda because the average person does not know that every farm is a factory. A factory which requires agricultural experience and skill. A war plant which manufactures food not only for our own armed forces and civilian population, but for the armed forces of the United Nations. A farmer cannot be expected to entrust a tractor or other expensive farm machinery to a person who never had any farm experience. He cannot trust the care of his dairy herd to someone who does not know a cow from a mule.

The truth is that old men and women and mere children on farms are working not only 40 hours a week, but 98 hours a week during planting and harvesting time. If parents living in a city worked their children the way they are worked on the farms, they would be prosecuted for violating the child labor laws.

Farmers and farm workers are not asking any special favors. Congress knows that there are 3,300,000 Government employees, many of them simply loafing on the job. It knows that many of these do not help the war effort but actually hinder it. They hamper and hamstring production. It also knows that there are still over 4,000,000 of the armed forces in the continental United States. It knows that these are willing and able to meet any necessary replacements. It knows that there are millions of men hoarded in the cost-plus factories. This because the bigger the cost the bigger the plus.

There is something wrong. With the President asking that we cut our own food consumption, that we pull in our belts in order to feed the hungry in other lands—with a scarcity of meat, poultry, butter, milk, cheese, and other food products, General Hershey, on January 3, sent out a directive. This directive many State boards interpreted as a Presidential order to ignore the Tydings amendment and to draft all of the farmers and farm workers physically fit between the ages of 18 and 26.

Someone is guilty of bad faith. General Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, attempts to wash his hands of this wholesale, illegal induction of farmers and farm workers. He says the Tydings amendment is binding on him and even on the President. He tries to place the blame on the local draft boards. He says it is up to them to decide whether a man between 18 and 26 years of age is an essential farm worker.

We agree with that, but we insist that he should have instructed these local boards that if they are essential they must be deferred. So far he has failed to do this. Only after 250 Members of Congress, and the House Committee on Agriculture insisted that he do something, did he consent to send a telegram to the State directors. In this telegram he clarified his previous ambiguous directive. He informed them that the Tydings amendment had not been modified or changed in any manner. He did not suggest that they observe it.

On the contrary, the general, after he sent his clarifying directive, sent out an editorial published in the Selective Service Bulletin in which he reiterates his former mischievous and erroneous directive of January 3, thus confusing the local draft boards still more as to what he really meant. The time has arrived for Congress, in no uncertain terms, to inform General Hershey and also the State directors that the Tydings amendment is still in full force and effect. Then, if the general cannot read English, it may be proper for us to employ a professor of English for him.

Congress knows that Army officers, under the control of General Hershey, called on local draft boards in the States of Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, and some other States, and suggested to them to ignore the Tydings amendment. The General says he has these officers on the beam, whatever that means, but just now Congress has him on the beam and wants to know why he is wrecking agriculture when there is already a shortage of many agricultural products, and when there will be millions more that we will have to feed besides our own Army and our own people.

Congress knows that the local draft boards have a difficult job. It sympathizes with them. It feels that they should not be blamed for the mistakes of General Hershey. No one—not even General Hershey or the President—has a right to ask the local draft boards to violate the law. The civilians are still governed by law and not by orders of generals. The generals' business is to win the war. The civilian population's business is to supply them and our armed forces with an abundance of clothes and food and war material.

The local draft board sits as a jury. It finds whether or not the registrant is an essential, irreplaceable farm owner, farm operator, or farm worker. If he is, he should be classified II–C and deferred. If he is not, then he should be classified I–A and not deferred. In arriving at its verdict, the local draft boards should be governed by facts. There is no room here for prejudice, for likes or dislikes, for favors or disfavors. There surely is no room here for getting even with someone. The sole and only question is, Is the registrant essential to agriculture and irreplaceable?

We have no quarrel with General Hershey but the success of our armed forces, the necessity of food, are of greater importance to us than the general. I have recently returned from a trip to my own State and have received first-hand information.

I was told by the chairman of the board of appeals that the local draft boards were confused and misled by General Hershey's directive of January 3; that they have not been given information that that directive was erroneously made by the general. That they have since been informed that they must judge the relative importance of the registrant as between the armed forces and agriculture.

The chairman of the board of appeals informed me that some of these local draft boards claimed that General Hershey has even taken away from them discretion as between the relativity. He informed them that with few exceptions no farmer or farm worker should be deferred. No wonder that a member of the Rules Committee told him that he had improved on Einstein's theory of relativity.

Congress knows that the Tydings amendment has nothing to do with that kind of relativity. The question under the Tydings amendment was and is, Is the registrant essential to an agricultural occupation and is he irreplaceable? It is absurd to assume that the local draft board is in a position to pass upon the relativity of the needs of the Army and the needs of agriculture. Congress decided that question in the Tydings amendment.

The chairman of the board of appeals also informed me that their board reversed 90 of the cases appealed to them and reclassified the registrant as II–C. He also informed me that the State director, in virtually every one of these cases, took a Presidential appeal. Of course, we know that the President has nothing to do with these appeals unless General Hershey is the President.

This chairman informed me that in every one of these so-called Presidential

appeals, General Hershey reversed the State board of appeals, and in violation of the Tydings amendment classified the registrant in I–A. The chairman of this board also informed me that unless prompt action was taken there would be a great reduction in agricultural products.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Is it not true in practically all branches of agriculture that you cannot replace the drafted farm labor with inexperienced people from the city without their ruining the implements which they try to handle?

Mr. LEMKE. The gentleman is correct. I repeat that old men and women and mere children on the farms are working not only 40 hours a week, as people do in the city of Chicago, but 98 hours a week during the planting and harvesting times. If parents in Chicago worked their children the same as they do on the farms they would be prosecuted for violating the Child Labor Act.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I am wondering if the gentleman can explain to the House how it happened that in the administration of the Selective Service Act 25 percent of the farm boys in the gentleman's State were deferred whereas only 1 percent were deferred in North Carolina and some of the other States.

Mr. LEMKE. As I said before, there are no industrial plants in my State. Every farm is a factory. The gentleman is comparing one class of people in his State with another class in another State. If the gentleman compares our farm deferments with his industrial deferments, I think he will find they are about the same. I doubt that the information the gentleman has is correct. I fear they are General Hershey's figures and I have long ago lost confidence in his figures.

Mr. COOLEY. No; I am talking about the record of the farm deferments.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Might it not be true that some of that difference might be attributable to the difference in physical disqualifications?

Mr. COOLEY. No; I am talking just about agricultural deferments.

Mr. LEMKE. I have no confidence in the figures submitted. I do know that our farms in North Dakota, as elsewhere, have been completely denuded of farmers and farm workers. I do know that not only farm workers, but farm owners, with a wife and dependent children, without any help are now being classified in I–A.

It should also be remembered that in my State and other midwestern States, there was no surplus labor to begin with. It is possible that there was more labor available for the farms in the South than in the North. I am not familiar with that situation. This simply goes to show how unreliable figures are and especially General Hershey's figures.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker a few days ago the House passed the Flannagan bill which reiterated the intention of the Congress when it enacted the Tydings amendment to the Selective Service Law. The Flannagan bill is clear and concise, and no one can misunderstand what it means. During the debate on that bill, I again spoke on the necessity of the Selective Service Director administering the selective-service law in accordance with the Tydings amendment. On numerous occasions within the last few weeks I have discussed this subject. My position and the position of the farmers of my district have been clearly explained. Therefore, nothing can be gained by further talk at this time. It is only action that counts. That action must come from the Director of Selective Service, General Hershey.

This Lemke resolution does two things:

First. The Flannagan bill reiterates the language of, and the intent of, Congress when it passed the Tydings amendment. This Lemke resolution reiterates the reiteration of the Flannagan bill. Simply more language along the same line but with less force and effect.

Second. The Lemke resolution sets up an investigating committee, the real purpose of which is be to ascertain why the Selective Service is not administering the law in the light of the Tydings amendment. Now, General Hershey has been called before an unofficial group composed of about 200 Members and there stated his views and his reasons for his method of administration. In addition to that, he was called before the Agriculture Committee, before the Military Affairs Committee and, I understand, before one or two Senate committees, where he made his position known. I wonder just what is to be gained by again interrogating General Hershey. It hardly seems possible that he will change his position, expressed in such unequivocal terms.

The Flannagan bill is still before the Senate committee and no action has been taken on it. The House will pass this Lemke resolution and it will go to the Senate and, unless the unusual happens, it will repose peacefully in a Senate committee until the necessity for its passage ceases to exist. If the Senate wants to help the situation, it should pass the Flannagan bill immediately. However, our action here today will give the Senate a choice as between the two measures.

Let us not forgot that General Hershey has made it clear that he bases his interpretation and his action upon a directive issued by James F. Byrnes, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, who speaks for the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy as well as the Chief Executive of the country. In short, is a law passed by the Congress, like the Tydings amendment, to be superseded by bureaucratic decree? That is the real question.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter from one of the farm census takers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, whether, if the present policy of General Hershey in disregarding the Tydings amendment is followed there will be a shortage of food, I do not know. I do know that of late there have been many statements in the press and over the radio to the effect that there will be. I do know that in the other body the past week there was so great an apprehension that food would be scarce, that one of the Members of that body threatened to introduce legislation which, as I understood it, would limit our shipments abroad of food.

I do know that notwithstanding the so-called corrective of the directive sent out by General Hershey some local boards were advised by Selective Service officials under General Hershey to disregard that corrective.

Because I do not know the ability of the farmers to produce during the coming year nor the number of acres under cultivation, my opinion as to whether there will be sufficient or insufficient food to feed the armed forces, our civilian population, and the civilians of other lands, to whom this administration has promised food, would be of little value. This I do know: that in my own section of the country productive farm after productive farm is being stripped of its agricultural labor. Many of the farm boys enlisted; some, heeding the call of the Government went to war industries, and others, notwithstanding the Tydings amendment, were drafted.

From a disinterested, unbiased observer, let me for a change put before you the views of one who in February was engaged in taking a farm census. The letter with the names deleted is as follows:

FEBRUARY 19, 1945.

DEAR SIR: I am writing in regard to these farm boys that they are drafting. I just wonder what they figure these and all the other boys are going to eat, and those in town included.

I am taking farm census right now and it certainly isn't the easiest job. You call at a home and ask how many acres they are going to farm and you get this answer: "Not an acre if they take my boy or boys. I will leave the ground idle, sell my cattle to butchers, get rid of my hogs and chickens."

Mr. HOFFMAN, do the people in Washington realize what this farm labor is coming to? I don't mean the boys from farms that just run around most of the time should be deferred. We have some around here that are in town more than farming, but there are some that worked good many hours a day all last year; and all winter milking cows and tending to stock and poultry.

For instance, A B has lots of hogs and cattle and he has passed and I suppose they will take him. Also, C D the same. There are E F, who has already been inducted, and his brother, who went for his examination. In this case the cattle will be sold and over 300 acres of land will lay idle.

We have a case on this farm where I live. It is G H. If he has to go, there will be around 300 acres laying idle. His brother is 14 and has heart trouble. His father isn't

well; he has a bad hernia. He helps Earl, but there are some things that are hard for him to do.

There are several boys I could name who farm a lot and who have lots of stock, and I think if some of these folks would stop and do a little figuring, they would realize that the boys are doing a lot more for the war effort than if they were carrying a gun.

I understand one of the draft boards in this county says the boys on the farm aren't any better than the town boys. That is true, but they should think of what he is going to do for milk, eggs, meat, and poultry by another year.

I could send you a whole page of boys' names that needs more consideration. And also I think it should be that half the draft board should be farmers and have them use a little judgment and also find out if they are really farming or keeping the road warm between their place and town.

In the farm census so far, there will be over 1,000 acres idle and I haven't covered half the township yet.

I think this needs a lot of consideration and it must be right away before all this stock and poultry are sold to the slaughter houses.

Thanking you very much for your time and trouble, and hope some of them will wake up to the fact that this is going to be a critical situation before it is done with.

Wish I had the money so I could come and really talk to some of them. I haven't any boys, so don't think this is just to try to get my boy out. I have two girls is all and they are only 10 and 6. And these other names are just a few of the boys that have lots of stock and poultry and farm lots of land.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this legislation emphasizes the need for the adoption of my resolution to investigate the food situation with respect to supplies, distribution, and shortages, especially meat.

Mr. Speaker, there are too many agencies attempting to control and regulate the meat business. The War Food Administration has issued a warning there is a great scarcity of meat. The American Meat Institute says the situation is serious. O. P. A. says the supply is dwindling and rationing must be cut drastically. Then the British become concerned because lend-lease shipments may be cut.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the armed forces must be supplied with all the meat they need, whether civilians get any or not. Our armed forces must come first all the time. The remainder ought to be allocated just as equitably as may be done. Those especially who are engaged in doing manual work ought to have their share.

Only a few weeks ago, when the O. P. A. and other groups were adjusting meat prices and adding more regulations, Government agencies called attention to the great number of cattle and other livestock on the farms and on the range. Livestock producers were given to understand prices were to be fixed so it would not pay to finish cattle and add an extra 200 or 300 pounds on each animal, but were induced to sell them on the slaughter market before they are fattened. Mr. Speaker, plenty of beef cattle can be supplied if the producer can have reasonable assurance he may have fair price for his livestock, and provided his product is handled in an orderly and businesslike manner.

Mr. Speaker, what we need as much as anything else is to have one over-all agency to handle the meat supply and distribution in this country. There are too many bureaus and agencies trying to deal with the problem. There are two or three agencies in the Department of Agriculture working on regulations. Then the O. P. A. works on prices; then a half dozen agencies deal with allocations. The Army, the Navy, the Lend Lease, the U. N. R. R. A., and some others. I am informed the black-market problem is growing worse every day.

Mr. Speaker, I insist there need not be a real scarcity of meat in this country. It is a problem of proper marketing, handling, and distribution. Put the control of meat in competent and experienced hands, under one agency with power to act unhampered by any other agency. The difficulty is that it is not being efficiently handled. Cut out a lot of red tape and bungling, take an account of the meat supply on hand, and where it is located. See that it moves promptly in proper channels. Then put a little confidence in the producer, make him feel he is a partner in the production of a very important material needed in the prosecution of the war, and we will have plenty of meat to take care of our needs.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, there have been some statements made with respect to farmers, this afternoon, that are wholly unjustified, and should never have been made. The farmers of this county have done a marvelous job. They have provided the biggest supply of food in history, during the past 3 years. They have done this by working long hours. The women and children have done much of the work while the brothers and sons are at the fighting fronts. You have not found them complaining about it either. They are glad to do it, even though they do not have the proper equipment in many instances with which to do it.

Mr. Speaker, this is no time to quibble or bicker. This is no time to blame the other fellow for errors. This is not the time to work at cross purposes. Put the administration of food under a single competent agency, then appeal to the patriotism of the producers, the processors, the retailers, and the consumers, and you will go a long way in solving this very serious dilemma. Action must not be delayed. We must not permit "too little and too late" to apply with respect to food. It is a serious matter. There is no justification for it. Now is the time to act.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the House to a few points. The issue, as I stated once before on the floor of the House, is something larger, much larger perhaps than the question of deferments, the production of food. The question is whether or not the other branches of the Government are going to recognize the laws made by Congress. There cannot be any question that the intention of Congress in adopting the Tydings amendment was to defer farm labor to insure the production of food. What other purpose could the Tydings amendment have in the law? If they did not want to defer people in order to protect the production of food, the Tydings amendment would never have appeared in the legislation. But it is there, and it is the law of the land. In my State, I do not hesitate to say, that through the influence of the director of selective service at Albany, the draft boards have been induced to ignore the law. The draft boards have been told by the Selective Service Director that the President's order or finding was superior to law which had to be obeyed. That was very deceptive and misleading to the draft boards. This deception by which the farms have been stripped of essential farm labor will cause a heavy loss in the dairy products and other foods.

I will give you one example here. I have this letter which comes from a reliable citizen whom I asked to investigate one situation:

RANDOLPH, N. Y., *March 12, 1945.*

DEAR MR. REED: Confirming my conversation with you over the phone this morning, in re: Classification of Howard Ernest Brace in this place, I further advise that Howard is the son of Ernest R. Brace of this place, that he is and has been the only assistant his father has had or been able to obtain to operate and conduct the farm operations on his farm of 266 acres, the farm stocked with 45 dairy cows, 12 head of young cattle, 4 horses, 60 sheep, also a large sugar bush to be operated at this season of the year.

The production from this particular farm in 1944 was as follows: 240,000 pounds of milk; 250 gallons of maple sirup; 350 pounds of wool; 2,000 pounds of mutton; and it will be repeated this season provided the son may remain to assist his father in the conduct of the business.

I also inform you that it is impossible to obtain farm labor, and therefore, unless the selective service board of our county grant favorable consideration to a deferment of Howard Brace, the father, Ernest R. Brace, will have no other recourse except to sell out and terminate his farm operations.

In the event I find that you may be in a position to assist in the deferment indicated, I will inform you further, and in the event Congress clears up the farm-labor problem, as you stated, I will appreciate having you inform me.

Yours very respectfully,

ORSON J. HELMS.

Do you think that the draft board deferred him? Not at all. They took him, and they took him under what they were informed was a Presidential order. That is in absolute violation of the law passed by this Congress representing the sovereign people of this country.

I have been asked by local granges to preserve the integrity of the Tydings amendment. I insert one from Ripley Grange, No. 65, as typical of those who have to supply the food for this war:

RIPLEY, N. Y., *January 23, 1945.*

Hon. DANIEL A. REED,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. REED: At the last meeting of Ripley Grange, No. 65, the members voted unanimously in favor of the Tydings amendment. We hope that you will also use your influence to help keep the amendment in effect.

Very truly yours,

A. JAMES COCHRANE, Jr.,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. Is it not true, in some cases at least, the draft board members were forced to take these boys or hand in their resignations?

Mr. REED of New York. I have been so informed; and what is more, when they appeal the appeal is turned down by a unanimous vote. They do not have a chance. I think the time has come for the Congress to assert itself. I think this is the worst example of militarism we have seen in this country at any time. It ought to be stopped.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, my opposition to this resolution is based on the fact that Congress has already set up two committees—one a select committee and another is a standing committee, with power to make the investigation provided for in this resolution. The chairman of the first of the committees is the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. What is his committee charged with doing? It is charged with investigating any act of the executive branch of the Government to determine whether or not they have gone beyond the law in administering the law. If that does not cover this question, then I do not understand the English language.

The second committee is the Committee on Military Affairs. Both of them have the power of subpena. Both of them have money to carry out the provisions of the resolutions that you passed. I cannot see why it is necessary to have a third committee when two committees of this House already have the jurisdiction to go ahead and make this investigation. If you want an investigation, why not let one of the committees which you have already set up make this investigation?

Then, again, I am informed when the Agriculture Committee considered the Fiannagan resolution it made an investigation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, we are interested as to how the Selective Service is circumventing the Tydings amendment. While in the State of North Dakota last week, I made a rather comprehensive investigation of the situation within that State, and the following I present here are the results of my investigation which I believe to be substantially correct.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

The difficulties with the administration of selective service may be grouped under the following heads:

First. The fact that registrants do not know their rights.

Second. The fact that the secretaries of the local boards, who for the most part have complete charge of the administration of the local offices either do not inform or misinform registrants as to their rights.

Third. The fact that local boards are unaware that they have complete control if they decide that a registrant is entitled to a farm deferment; or they are unaware that if they decide to let the State appeal board settle the matter the decision of the appeal board may be reviewed by the President, who, in this case, consists of a board of Army officers.

Fourth. The trend in cases other than those involving registrants who are engaged in farming, to take the power of final decision away from the selective-service boards.

First. Many registrants do not read the fine print on their classification card notifying them that they have only 10 days to appeal. Many of them do not know that there is an appeal agent in every county who will assist in preparing the appeal. As a result, some, thinking the decision of the local board is final, just go into the Army, others delay too long in perfecting their appeals and others prepare their appeals on time but do so without the help of the appeal agent and the appeals do not properly show the right to a deferred classification.

Second. Many registrants have been dissuaded from taking appeals until after preinduction physical examination upon the theory that they may fail to pass, in which case the appeal would become unnecessary. As a result many have been found to be physically fit and the 10 days within which the appeal might be taken has passed. In this connection, North Dakota Selective-Service headquarters has always been fair. Whenever it has come to the attention of The Adjutant General or his associates that delay in taking an appeal has been due to misinformation given by any person connected with selective service, the case has always been reopened and the appeal allowed. Many registrants have, however, abided by the decision of the local boards without referring the matter to State headquarters.

Third. The Tydings amendment provides that anyone "who in the judgment of a local board is regularly and necessarily engaged in agriculture" shall be entitled to a deferred classification. Thus, if a local board says the classification is II–C, that is what it is, and no member of the Selective Service Administration from General Hershey down can do anything about it. It is perhaps wrong to say that General Hershey is violating the Tyding's amendment, because before a farm boy can be put in the Army some local board must first give its judgment that the boy either is not regularly engaged in or is not necessary to agriculture. If, however, as is often the case, the local board has a close or a hot case and decides to leave the matter up to the State appeal board, the decision of the State board is not final. The State director has a right to appeal to the President. In February 1945 The Adjutant General appealed 95 such cases, and without exception the President rejected the appeal board's classification and in every instance placed the registrant back in class II–A. As a matter of fact, appeal boards have been practically shorn of their power. Their decisions have no weight whatever unless the State director agrees with them. Thus, in practice at least, the State director has supplanted the State appeal board, although the form of a decision by the appeal board must still be carried out.

Fourth. In June 1944 it was provided by a Selective Service directive that no one between the ages of 18 and 25, inclusive, should be entitled to a deferred classification other than in agriculture, unless he first had what was called a Special Form 42–A signed by the director of selective service of the State in which he was employed. This was a certificate to the effect that he was a necessary employee in a critical industry. Thus, as to these registrants, complete control was removed from the civilian boards and vested in the military. Furthermore, the State directors were circumscribed by rules which prohibited them from executing the certificate except in cases where the registrants were engaged in certain specified employments. As a result, two blacksmith welders, who were serving large communities keeping broken-down farm machinery in operation—which, by the way, is about all that is left—were sent into the Army over the protest of everyone, including the director of selective service of this State.

After April 1, 1945, the rule above mentioned will for all practical purposes be extended to all registrants from 18 to 29, inclusive.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. What we are after here is to restate the intent of this Congress and not get our water out of the branch. Let us go to the spring. General Hershey's attitude when he was before the committee of the House, composed of about a hundred Members, was that of a man who was in defiance of the will of Congress and was undertaking to place his own interpretation upon this law, and abrogate and violate the law. Let us go after him.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I was one of the members of the Committee of Eleven who worked on this matter for quite some time. We had General Hershey before our committee. About 200 Members of this House were so interested that they came to the hearing and we spent almost 3 hours going over this matter with General Hershey to see whether or not we could get him to carry out the will and the intent of Congress. Great interest was expressed in this matter at that time. We really marched up the hill in solid phalanx. I hope today we pass this resolution without having to disband without firing a shot and marching back down the hill.

Certainly, if ever there was a time when this country was faced with a shortage of food it is now. You can read the papers this morning about the report from the American Meat Institute. As the gentleman from California said, there is an apparent shortage all over the country. We are on the threshold of a food shortage that may even slow down the winning of the war. England, one of our allies, according to the press is greatly agitated because we may have to cut off some of our lend-lease supplies to her. Other countries may break out with a reign of chaos behind our lines after we have driven the enemy out and liberated the country, for lack of American food.

The purpose of this resolution is to try to get the food produced for the people of this country, for the armed forces, for those to whom we are extending lend-lease support, and food for the Army successfully to carry on the winning of the war. Its further purpose is to get those who administer the laws to quit bypassing the clear intent of Congress, and require them to give to Congress, the representatives of the people, the cooperation they should have in the interpretation and enforcement of the law. This is not a partisan question. The committee that formulated and helped write this legislation was almost equally drawn from both sides of this House. Let us pass this resolution and serve notice on General Hershey that the Congress is trying to take over in the discharge of its duties as the representative of the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, for almost 2 months now a Committee of Eleven, of which I have the honor to be a member, has fought against the bypassing of the Tydings amendment in an effort to prevent Selective Service from making a wholesale raid on farm help, which has already struck a dangerous blow to food production.

Our Committee of Eleven succeeded in causing the Director of Selective Service to issue a clarifying directive to the various State selective-service boards, but this was delayed until great damage has been done.

This resolution should be passed empowering the committee to get the facts and lay them before the Congress and the American people. Mr. Speaker, we are now on the very threshold of a dangerous food shortage, and it will get much worse before the close of this year. It is a food crisis which has been brought about by following the wrong policies of government. From the very outset, O. P. A. regulations penalized the small packers, driving hundreds of them out of business and slowing up food production.

Later regulations of the O. P. A. greatly reduced the feeding of cattle throughout the Nation by feeders who, for years past, made it the business of buying cattle and holding them in the feed lots until they had put an average of 200 pounds of meat on every beef. It is difficult to estimate the pounds of beef lost to the consuming public by reason of the O. P. A. and its regulations largely stopping this practice, which, in addition, furnished the public with the highest quality of American beef products.

Two years ago they asked the farmers to greatly increase their production of hogs. The farmers responded, and last year, when the Government froze corn, making it impossible to feed out these hogs, the protest of the farmers was met with the answer that they had produced too many hogs. The Government suggested that the farmers produce less hogs.

Now, today we have a dangerous and acute shortage of both beef and pork throughout the Nation. A southern Senator complains that they cannot get salt pork—one of the main meat ingredients for the working people of the South. It has been generally known throughout the Nation that not only salt pork but bacon and pork generally, especially in the big cities, has been scarce. Good beef throughout the Nation, for the past 2 months, becomes increasingly difficult to buy.

This food crisis is really beginning to become serious in the big cities. We read in the newspapers last week that over 7,000 retail butcher shops in the city of New York were about to close and go on strike, but were prevented from doing so by a threat of the Federal Government to prosecute them for the violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. The same situation is found in Chicago.

You read in the Washington papers that there will be little or no poultry available for Easter. Last year we had too much poultry and eggs, millions of cases spoiled in storage. This year there seems to be a shortage.

The American Meat Institute issued a statement that severe and growing shortages of all kinds of meat for the American public is so serious that we are "bordering on a meat famine in many parts of the country." The meat institute further stated that "for the first time since meat rationing began, many meat items now are reported for the country as a whole as being 100 percent in short supply in relation to the needs of the trade; most beef and pork cuts reported as being over 97 percent in short supply."

Mr. Speaker, in order to increase food production, the Government insisted last year that it be allowed to offer subsidies to increase the production of milk, butter, and other basic products. While over a billion of dollars has been expended by the Federal Government to increase the production of food through incentive subsidies, we now find that we are in much worse shape this year than we were 1 year ago.

This morning I received a letter from the Illinois Dairy Products Association, an organization which tries to chart the course and look after the dairy interests of the State of Illinois. They are crying out against Government regulations which have been diminishing their supply of butter. They claim that Washington officials do not follow sound policies suggested to them by the dairy interests, that butter is being held to about 6 cents a pound below what it should be selling for.

The Government has held, through the O. P. A., the price of dairy products to a point they admit is not profitable, yet instead of allowing the price to be set at such figures as would give the farmer a fair price the O. P. A. sets the price lower than it should be and then forces the farmers to take a subsidy check to equalize the loss in the price of his production that the O. P. A. has brought about. This regiments and controls the farmers and at the same time holds his price down lower than it should be as is illustrated at the present time in the price of butter.

Mr. Speaker, there are three fundamental reasons for the food shortage that has begun to rapidly overtake this country. First, the lack of farm machinery. Over a year ago I was one of a group of Congressmen who pointed out the acute need of more farm machinery if we were to finally avoid a food crisis in this country. We got them to increase farm-machinery production to a certain extent in 1944, and we have been insisting on an increase for 1945 to help make up the need for the older, worn-out machinery. The War Production Board has turned a deaf ear and the facts are that there will be less machinery produced in 1945 than there was in 1944. Let me cite a personal instance. For over a year now I have been waiting for my application to be filled for a gang plow and manure spreader for my own farm.

Mr. Speaker, secondly, the drafting of the farm help to a point lower than is necessary. Not only during 1944, but particularly during 1945, more than anything else will plunge us into a dangerous situation before the end of this year. That is the reason this resolution is before the Congress. That is the reason that, as one of the committee of 11, we called General Hershey before a committee of 200 Congressmen over a month ago in an effort to stop the raiding of the farmers of the very slim line of manpower that had been left them. The directive sent out by General Hershey at that time, and the statement of the President it contained, caused many draft boards to believe that it was a mandatory order on the part of the President to take all young men off of the farms of proper military age and qualifications. This committee of Congressmen helped, as I stated before, to get a clarifying directive issued by General Hershey, yet great damage had been done before the directive was issued and great damage is still being done to food production in this country.

Last week I received complaints, as I received every week, from my district, of young farm help being taken off of the farms, which is causing farmers to hold public sales and sell off their dairy stock and other stock to the great detriment of food production. This is going on all over the United States.

I have a letter from one man at Allendale, Ill., received yesterday in which he says:

> The office force of the local board which were giving 45 boys their physical examinations here, most of them farmers, told the boys if they passed their physical examinations there would be no deferments. Among this group I have a married son farming 250 acres with a lot of dairy cows, chickens, hogs, and all kinds of farm implements. In addition to running this rather large farm, he does custom work for other farmers who are short of help. He will have to sell the stock

and farm equipment if he is taken to the Army. Practically every farm boy called before the draft board is needed in farm production and should be kept on the farms in this county. If this is the condition in other counties it will certainly result in a food shortage affecting the entire country and all of us should be concerned about this.

I have letters from two leading businessmen in one of the cities of my district in which they tell me that this week 18 young farmers, every one of them essential to agriculture and who should be left on the farms of that county, are being taken into military service. Yes, General Hershey and those in charge say that the men have a right to appeal, yet, when they appeal, the appeal boards, seeking to carry out the will of the higher-ups, reject and disapprove their appeal.

Mr. Speaker, this food shortage is ex- the farms are depleted of farm help is because the Government, by the threat of induction, and because of the high wages in the war plants, millions of men have been lured and driven into the war plants of the Nation, many of them coming from the farms. In the war plants the hours have been shortened, and the pay increased. On the farms, by reason of the scarcity of labor, the hours of work for the day have been lengthened with slight increase, if any, in pay.

The War Manpower Commission recently made the statement which I have under the signature of a responsible official in my file, that if the men were properly utilized in the war plants of the Nation today it would be equivalent to adding 800,000 more men to production in the war plants. They mean by that that 800,000 men being paid in the war plants from six to eighteen dollars a day are not working. There has been expended over $300,000,000,000 in the war plants of this Nation to build our military machine, much of it with cost-plus contractors who the higher they run their costs the more money they make. This bad governmental policy has brought about the hoarding of labor. By that I mean a plant that would be able to fully employ 25,000 men would probably put on their employment rolls 35,000 men with the result that 10,000 would be loafing on the job. This has been done all over the Nation and is still being done. If we have spent $300,000,000,000, and we have spent more, in building our war machine, if 20 percent of that money has been wasted with such a labor policy that would amount to $60,000,000,000.

We tried to stop this waste in Congress the other day by offering what was known as the Barrett substitute to the May compulsory work bill. This bill, which I helped to prepare, would have stopped this hoarding of labor and would have put the 800,000 men to work whom the taxpayers are paying and who are loafing on these jobs. May I say here that most of these men are not loafing because they want to, but they are compelled to do so because the bad management does not keep them regularly assigned to work in the plants. The administration defeated this bill in the House.

Mr. Speaker, if the May bill is passed, which will force more men into these plants regardless of whether they are overstaffed or not, it will further raid the farms and all of the lines of essential civilian business of distribution, because, under the threat of fines and jail penalties, many of those men will be sent to the gulf coast, the west coast, and the east coast and to wherever there are war plants, with their transportation paid from home to these plants, and forced into these war plants where the War Manpower Commission says there are already 800,000 men and women who are employed by the plants who are not given sufficient work to do to keep them busy.

Mr. Speaker, this food shortage is expected to get worse. War Mobilization Director Byrnes recognizes this when he sets up a commitee to determine whether we are sending too much food to liberated countries through Lend-Lease, and whether we are exporting too much food to our allies in the war effort. The papers say England is worried for fear we will reduce lend-lease food to her.

The Congress has tried to meet this situation but their efforts have been largely blocked by the administration. No longer ago than a week the President said in substance that the American people can well afford to tighten their belts and continue to share their food with foreign countries to prevent suffering.

If the administration will give the farmers more machinery and leave enough young men on the farms to operate that machinery, the American people will not need to further tighten their belts. They will produce all of the food the people need, also for our armed forces and sufficient food that we may keep the President's commitments to help feed the starving people of the liberated countries as our armed forces drive the enemy out. The use of common sense in looking after the interests of our country first will put us in a position to not only take care of our own people but to have a greater portion to share for the other unfortunate peoples of the world. This food production shortage and food famine approaching this country will mean a food famine for the world and it cannot be jokingly laughed off in any nonchalant manner.

In conclusion let me say that the foremost cause of our manpower problem today, which is dangerously affecting the farms and food production, has been the lack of a sound labor policy which should have been laid down by the President of the United States. I say the President because he asked leaders of his party in the Senate not to press for such a labor policy over 2 years ago, and the matter has drifted and drifted ever since.

Secondly, the lack of sufficient farm machinery was also contributed to the lack of production and may I say at this point, had it not been for the unthinkable hours that the men and women and children on the farms had worked for the past 2 years, there would be a food shortage throughout this land at the present time that would slow down the war effort all over the world. The farmers and their families are entitled to the thanks and gratification of the Nation for the energy and patriotic devotion they have shown in the production of food to win the war.

Third. The recent draft directive affecting farm help that was sent out in January is the last and possibly the most dangerous blow that has been struck against food production, because it comes when the production line for food is already very thin and comes when we are on the very threshold of a food shortage in this country. Mr. Speaker, the Congress for 2 years has tried to prevent this danger. Whatever it can do from here on out should be done. The passage of this resolution and a searching inquiry at once will doubtless be helpful. For that reason, it should be done.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing well settled in the mind of virtually everyone in this Chamber it is the fact that the Tydings amendment has been and probably is now being nullified by Selective Service.

Coming from one of the great agricultural States of this Union I think I know something about agriculture and agricultural people. In the name of those boys I resent some of the smirking smiles that have greeted references to deferments granted agricultural workers. Let me say right here and now that the State of North Carolina and Texas, two of the greatest agricultural States of this country, ranked highest in volunteers in this man's war. The agricultural people of this country had a right to expect a fair and impartial administration of the selective-service law as between States and if what has been said here today is true and if the statistics furnished here are correct, then they have not received the treatment the agricultural people and the people who are dependent upon them for food had a right to expect and I challenge anyone to deny this statement. Imagine North Carolina showing 1 percent agricultural deferments and at the same time North Dakota, 25 9/10 percent; South Dakota, 25 7/10 percent; Nebraska, 14 1/10 percent; Iowa, 16 3/10 percent; Wisconsin, 16 5/10 percent. But the average in the United States is 4 percent.

If you will take the rural sections of this country and measure them mile by mile you will never find any area of land on this continent that possesses any higher degree of patriotism than those people who till the soil. I know of some terrible hardship cases in my district, but they can take it. I know one man with five sons, two sons-in-law, and one adopted son, all the labor he had, but they have gone. They can take it better than the gentleman from Illinois can take it because he comes from Chicago, and if he did not get some of my pork he would not have any bacon for breakfast, much less ham. The great urban population had better not forget the fact that their food comes from the farms of this country. If they do, they will soon

develop pains that will not be eased by sit-down strikes.

Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, I think the agricultural people are going to be able to take this better than the rest of the country because we are now approaching the time when food will be short and no one need stand up here and tell me that we are not going to have shortages, because we are.

I do not think this resolution is going to do any great big thing. The only possible good that may come from it is from the debate that is taking place here today on the resolution; however, I am willing to help.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WORLEY].

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Speaker, I gratefully acknowledge the very high compliment paid the State of Texas by the gentleman from North Carolina. I shall support this resolution, although I am not so sure it will do any especial good or harm, particularly in light of the Flannagan resolution which we passed a short time back.

I would like to ask the attention of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] and the other gentleman from North Dakota, both of whom spoke a few moments ago. I have in my hand a report from the National Selective Service System which shows that in Texas the men between the ages of 18 and 26 who are deferred for agricultural reasons is 1.4 in percentage while 25.9 percent in North Dakota are similarly deferred. In South Dakota nearly 26 such men are deferred for every 1 deferred in Texas.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, it will be a good thing to pass this resolution for the express purpose of thoroughly investigating the discrepancies which exist at the present time among the several States. Texas certainly does not mind, as the gentleman from North Carolina pointed out, to carry her full part of the load in volunteers, and we are going on down the line carrying our fair share of the tremendous war load, but we would like for some of the other States with high draft deferments to come along with us and help us get this war won, and get all our boys back home again.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on the 23d of January, in an extended speech on the floor, I set forth my ideas and the facts concerning the drafting of agricultural help and its relationship to the food supply of the country. I have had a tremendous reaction to that speech from all over the country, but notwithstanding what has been said and done, the farm boys are now headed for the Army.

Last week the draft in my county took 72. Saturday's paper stated that on Monday morning 56 more will report for induction. I have personal knowledge of 3 of the boys who are among these 56. One of them comes from the Musser farm that has received national recognition from the Department of Agriculture for doing a great job. I do not know how his dad is going to get along without him. He operated all of the equipment. Another one is a farmer operating 160 acres of land adjoining mine who raises apples, peaches, and cherries. The boy that operates the spraying equipment there and mixes the formulas goes into the Army today. Then there is a boy on the Bear farm, where they have about a hundred acres of fruits, apples, grapes, and peaches, as well as several acres of vegetables. The man that has charge of the spraying equipment and the mixing of formulas on that farm goes to the Army. If one of these sprays fails, that crop is no good. This is a serious thing.

The gentleman from Chicago says that we have surpluses of everything, but here is a Philadelphia headline of Sunday morning reading "Beef supply to be cut 12 percent." So it goes on down the line. The big farmer from Chicago apparently does not known that we are short of food everywhere; but we are. On Monday I was in a big Baltimore retail market. There was not a chicken on that market when there should have been 10,000. There was no beef on that market, and very little pork. There was no meat of any kind to speak of. There was nothing on that big market in Baltimore except bakery goods and vegetables and that kind of stuff. But it is just too bad that a great group of men in this country, in a position to know, are keeping on until we will all be hungry. The other day when the Sundstrom committee met down here to discuss this matter, the O. P. A. agent testified there was a great shortage of meat, but he admitted there was no shortage of livestock.

Last night I read the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, and I find he said the farmers produced more livestock in 1944 than any previous year. We have a greater number of livestock today than we have ever had, yet we cannot buy meat. Whether it is Government bungling, or whether it is O. P. A. interference, whether it is the Army or what it is, we ought to know and remedy this situation before we have food riots here. If you do not think we will have food riots you just keep kidding the people and taking the help off these farms. I know, and some of you do, too, that a man with a 160-acre farm cannot operate that farm single-handed and produce the crops.

Much is being said about our foreign commitments. I mean people are disturbed over the promises that the Government has made to our allies and the liberated countries that they will be fed. Someone has said that we now have 100,000,000 tons of food stored in England. The War Food Administration, however, is disputing this and contends that for military reasons they may not make known the amount of our stock piles in foods.

I am one of those who does not believe that it will aid our enemies or give them any comfort to know that we have an overabundance of food stored in various parts of the world. I rather think the War Food Administration, as well as the O. P. A., in refusing to give us the facts have something to hide. Either they do not want us to know how hog-wild they have been or how recklessly they have handled the food supply situation.

Nevertheless, if there is a hundred million tons of food stored in Britain, that food will not come back to the States, and production here must be continued at the 1944 high level to satisfy our own needs. The Lemke resolution should be passed, but frankly I am afraid it will not serve its purpose because the damage has been done. Acreage is being curtailed at this moment at a terrific rate because many thousands of these farm boys have recently gone into the armed forces and the rest are slated for induction.

So far as our meat shortage is concerned, the answer is simple with more livestock on hand than we have ever had. The answer is the O. P. A. and the W. F. A. simply need to give the slaughterers of livestock the greenlight. Then, too, the 18-cent ceiling on livestock is having its adverse effect. I am not saying that the ceiling should be raised, but the ceiling should be on a certain grade of cattle. The packer-buyer knows when he looks at cattle in the yard whether they will dress 60 or more pounds per hundredweight, and he places the 18-cent ceiling on that grade. Consequently, good cattle, that dress above 56 percent per hundredweight are penalized, in that they are bringing around 16½ cents a pound.

The order that the O. P. A. places upon the slaughterers compels them to buy a certain percentage of their slaughter as number 2 cattle, known in the trade as warmed-up cattle. So, the regulation places a premium on warmed-up cattle and discriminates against good fat cattle and in this manner severely curtails the supply of beef coming to market.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], but I wish to make this observation, in view of the statement that has been made. May I say that there are 4 percent more boys in the service coming from the cities than from the rural sections. Do not try to make it appear that the people from the cities are not serving in the Army.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is nothing more nor less than a bill of indictment, charging General Hershey, the Director of Selective Service, with having violated the letter and the spirit of the Tydings amendment. I do not agree with the allegations contained in the bill of indictment, nor do I agree with the violent assumptions which form the basis of the pending resolution. The resolution assumes that there has been a wholesale induction of essential farmers and farm workers. It further assumes that the Tydings amendment has been violated and the resolution has two objectives: First, to determine who is responsible for the alleged wholesale induction of essential farmers, and, second, to determine the effect of such induction upon agricultural production and upon the war effort. Certainly General Hershey is the responsible administrator and director in charge, but we all know that local selective-service boards

are charged by law with the responsibility of determining who should be deferred and who should not be deferred. Certainly we would not want that great authority exercised at any place other than in the local communities where registrants reside and where the local boards are in a position to obtain full information regarding every individual case. In all probability there has been some effort on the part of State directors and their associates to intimidate and to coerce local boards in the matter of farm deferments, but I frankly do not believe that General Hershey has been a party to any such transactions nor do I believe that he would countenance efforts on the part of his subordinates to influence unduly the decisions of local boards.

Under the law, each individual registrant's case should stand or fall on its own merits, and the local boards should feel free in the exercise of the great power which has been conferred upon them. I know of many hardship cases. The facts in no two cases are identical. In numerous hardship cases with which I am familiar the facts and circumstances indicated to me that the registrant was definitely entitled to a deferment under the Tydings amendment; and had I been a member of the local board I would have in all probability voted in favor of deferment. Merely because registrants living on the farm have not been deferred does not justify the accusation that local boards have acted in bad faith or have intentionally defied the plain provisions of the law. We all know that local boards have a very difficult task to perform, but I am sure that in most instances the boards are composed of conscientious and patriotic citizens. The record of deferments clearly indicates that local boards are actually functioning as by law they were intended to function. We find that in North Dakota in excess of 25 percent of the farm boys between 18 and 25 years of age have been deferred, whereas in North Carolina only 1 percent have been given deferments. It is easy to understand how there might be some slight lack of uniformity, since no two situations are identical, but it is difficult to understand why the difference should be so great. If anything about selective service needs to be investigated, it seems to me that it is this wide difference in the percentage of deferments in the different States, but even that might be charged to the human element involved. Some boards no doubt are liberal in applying the Tydings amendment and others are ordering the induction of every man who can possibly be spared.

Another objection to this resolution is that it does not conform to the language of the Tydings amendment, in that it omits the language "essential to the war effort" and attempts to restrict the board's considertion by concerning "itself solely with the registrant's essentiality to an agricultural occupation or endeavor and to the question of whether or not a satisfactory replacement can be obtained." The Tydings amendment deals with agriculture which is essential to the war effort. A registrant might be essential to a certain type of agriculture which is not in any way making a contribution to the war effort. If, for instance, a registrant engaged in agriculture is only producing a bare subsistence for himself and perhaps for his family and is not producing anything in excess of his own needs, he is certainly not contributing to the war effort in the manner contemplated by the Tydings amendment. Agriculture as such, of course, is essential to the war effort. While I am afraid that local boards have inducted many individuals who were actually making contributions to the war effort, I do not feel justified in indicting all of the officers of the Selective Service, and particularly General Hershey, whom I personally think has done an excellent job. He is forthright. He is honest and, above all else, patriotic, and certainly he would have no desire to ignore the plain language of the law. When our committee told him that one of his directives was ambiguous and had resulted in confusion, he immediately indicated a desire to clarify the situation and issued another directive, in which he referred specifically to the Tydings amendment, and emphasized that it was not his purpose to in any way modify, alter, or change the language of that provision of the law. I do not believe that even the author of the Tydings amendment would approve the interpretation which is now sought to be placed upon it.

If General Hershey or anyone else in Selective Service has been guilty of a wholesale violation of the law, I am under the impression that the Smith committee, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, can summons the offenders immediately and proceed with an investigation for the purpose of determining if and to what extent the law has been violated.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. May I say in response to the gentleman's statement that the reason why the Smith committee has not done so is that when that resolution was passed I made the promise on the floor of the House that the committee would not investigate either the Army or the Navy. Otherwise, the gentleman may be assured we would have done it long ago.

Mr. COOLEY. I was not criticizing the gentleman's committee.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know that.

Mr. COOLEY. I was merely pointing out the authority of the committee. Certainly the Committee on Military Affairs, headed by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] can call General Hershey before the bar of his committee tomorrow morning or even this afternoon and immediately proceed to make this investigation. Further, the House Committee on Agriculture, as I have indicated, recently conducted an investigation of this very matter and we had General Hershey and his associates there. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] was there and participated in those deliberations. As a result of that conference, General Hershey permitted us to write a clarifying directive which he immediately sent out to all of the State boards.

This investigation will be more or less a repetition of the investigation heretofore conducted by the House Committee on Agriculture, and I have no idea that it will result in a change in the interpretation heretofore placed upon the Tydings amendment, as I am sure that the Director of Selective Service believes that the interpretation is not only honest but in all respects accurate. I do not believe that General Hershey is a malfactor or that he is conscious of having in any way violated either the letter or the spirit of the law which he is administering. If a change in the law is desirable, that, of course, is a horse of a different color.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SABATH) there were—ayes 122, noes 33.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has not contacted the chairmen of any of the committees to see if they have any legislation to be considered, nor have they contacted him in that respect?

Mr. McCORMACK. None has contacted me.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Owing to the fact that we are going to get away from here before Easter, I will not object this time, but it is coming.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 62 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct an investigation of the progress of the defense housing program, with a view to determining whether such program is being carried forward efficiently, expeditiously, and economically, and with a view to determining whether the authorization of additional appropriations for defense housing purposes is necessary.

For the purposes of this resolution, the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned,

to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by supena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House of Representatives during the present Congress the results of their studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation, or otherwise, as the committee deems desirable.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a unanimous request for the continuation of this splendid committee.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I believe that if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], would take about 2 minutes to explain this resolution, there would be no objection and it would go through in a few minutes.

Mr. SABATH. That is what I started to say. I think everyone is for this resolution. Nevertheless, I feel the gentleman from Texas wishes to explain the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, this is not a resolution with reference to the appointment or continuation of any special committee. It relates exclusively to the standing committee on public buildings and grounds. I think that committee has some right to be proud of its record. In the first place, it was a pioneer in starting hearings with reference to post-war planning, beginning in November 1943. Very voluminous and extensive hearings, which are almost a textbook on the subject, have come from that committee without one solitary cent of expenditure authorized by the Congress.

It was, as I recall, in the Seventy-eighth Congress that there was a resolution similar to this one authorizing an investigation of the wartime housing, which has been very extensive throughout the country as a war emergency in making it possible to carry on our various defense plants. At that time, we received an appropriation of $10,000. Through the remainder of the Seventy-eighth Congress and through all of the Seventy-ninth Congress these investigations have been going on with very splendid results. We have gone from the Atlantic Coast to the Pacific Coast and from Canada to Mexico in these investigations. I marvel that we have accomplished as much as we have with the outlay of so little money. I do not believe there has been a more economical operation of any fund than there has been under this original appropriation of $10,000. In spite of all that we have done and all that we have accomplished, about $3,700 of that original $10,000 has not been spent.

It is our belief, in view of the increased housing which has recently been authorized from the appropriation angle through the deficiency bill which is now pending in the Senate, that some investigations are necessary to assure economy and to prevent any waste of the public money. Therefore, it is our purpose to ask for a slight increase over the $3,700 still unexpended of the original $10,000 which was appropriated.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I am hoping that the gentleman's committee will go into this situation very thoroughly and that it will call these witnesses who know about the situation in connection with the different departments of the Government. There have been witnesses called before committees within the last week whose testimony shows that the alleged need for housing in certain parts of our country that was presented by the housing authority before the Committee on Appropriations, absolutely does not exist.

Mr. LANHAM. I will say to the gentleman, I think our former investigations have been very helpful along the line he has indicated and we shall be glad to hear from any witnesses whom he will recommend and go into this matter of expenditures for housing to see that, insofar as it is possible to do so, war housing is not constructed where it is not necessary and not in overabundance. Necessarily these housing authorities have to follow very closely the recommendations of the War and Navy Departments in their demands. Sometimes vacancies do arise in that when the peak of production at a plant has been reached there is later a subsidence in the necessity for labor. The committee has certainly done a commendable job with very little money, and we hope to continue.

May I say in this connection, and I think this is important, that in the last Congress the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds inaugurated the policy of having the administrative officers of the Federal Works Agency and the National Housing Agency come before the committee in executive session once every month in order that they may have an opportunity to report the situation and in order that we may ask any questions we desire or make any criticisms that occur to us. I think it is a splendid precedent for every committee of importance in this body to follow, in seeking to get the proper collaboration and cooperation and understanding between the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio who is a member of the committee.

Mr. McGREGOR. As a member of that committee, I want to publicly compliment our chairman for originating that idea, which I think is bringing splendid results.

Mr. LANHAM. I thank the gentleman very much.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida to make a unanimous-consent request.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HENDRICKS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. HENDRICKS was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN].

STOP WORLD WAR NO. 3—LET SECURITY COUNCIL USE POLICE FORCE WITHOUT DELAY

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, the bill that I am introducing today deals with what I consider to be the most important problem facing not only us in the United States but men and women throughout the world. It deals with the peace which is to come after this war—a peace, pray God, that ends war for all time. We are coming to realize more and more that the achievement of this goal depends upon our having the actual means, mechanics, and methods for the prevention of war and the positive enforcement of peace. Peace is not something that just happens. It is something for which we must prepare and fight as vigorously as we prepare and fight for war.

Joint resolution to provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare of the United States by authorizing the American representative on the international security council to pledge the use of American armed forces for the purpose of the joint maintenance of a peaceful international society based on effective world organization

Whereas in view of the technological and political character of present-day welfare and international aggression, it is generally agreed that any international peace and security organization would surely fail unless backed by force which will be available promptly, in adequate measure and with certainty, to be used ultimately in case of the failure of all other means for the maintenance of peace; and

Whereas the creation of the institutional foundations for a just and enduring peace between nations must of necessity include arrangements for the peaceful settlement of international disputes and for the joint use of force, if necessary, to prevent or suppress threats to the peace or breaches of the peace: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the representative of the United States, if there be only one, or a majority of the representatives of the United States on the council of whatever international security organization is established during or after this war shall have authority, after such consultation with the President, the Secretary of State, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, as may be practicable under the circumstances, to pledge the use of the armed forces of the United States, or any part of such forces as shall be required, to enforce jointly the decisions of the international

security organization relative to the prevention or suppression of threats to the peace or breaches of the peace between nations.

SEC. 2. Any pledge of the use of the armed forces of the United States so given shall be binding upon the Government of the United States and shall be implemented immediately by the proper authorities who shall be responsible for taking all proper and necessary measures required for the carrying out of such a pledge.

SEC. 3. The Congress hereby declares that such pledge and the employment of the armed forces of the United States thereunder shall be regarded as being in the nature of international police activity for the prevention of warfare through the exercise of joint international responsibility for the definition and punishment of offenses against the law of nations, and not as a warlike act, or as constituting a declaration of war, or as creating a state of war, and that this joint resolution shall not be regarded as in any way abrogating or altering the constitutional right of the Congress of the United States to declare war.

It is in recognition of this very grave need that I submit this bill which, in substance, provides that the representative, or a majority of the representatives of the United States on the council of whatever international security organization is established during or after this war, shall have authority, after consultation with the President, the Secretary of State, and the chairmen of the Senate Foreign Relations and the House Foreign Affairs Committees, respectively, to pledge the use of specified numbers and types of military forces as agreed upon by the several nations. These forces shall be used quickly to enforce jointly the decisions of the international security organization as they relate to the prevention or suppression of threats to the peace or breaches of the peace between nations.

This means that our representative can proceed to cast our vote for immediate action to enforce peace and prevent war by the use of the armed forces of the international security organization.

Any pledge of the use of the armed forces of the United States so given shall be binding upon the Government of the United States and shall be implemented immediately by the proper authorities who shall be responsible for taking all proper and necessary measures required for the carrying out of such a pledge.

The employment of the armed forces of the United States under my bill will be regarded in law and in fact as international police activity for the prevention of warfare through the exercise of joint international responsibility for the definition and punishment of offenses against the law of nations, and shall not be regarded in law or in fact as a warlike act or as constituting a declaration of war or as creating a state of war; nor shall this act or any part of this act be regarded as in any way abrogating or altering the constitutional right of the Congress of the United States to declare war.

I am presenting this bill to you now, while World War No. 2 is still going on, because the only way we can avoid World War No. 3 is by building now the organization to prevent it. Our democratic liberties and institutions could not bear up against such a war. Civilization cannot survive another war. Up to now we have been able to save ourselves by calling upon our manpower and material resources after wars have overtaken us. We are at a threshold of a technological age which, if diverted to war purposes, will never again give us a chance to utilize our strength after being engaged in war. Planes that can go 800 miles an hour, or 14 miles a minute, have altered all our familiar concepts of space and time. World War No. 3, if it should come, would bring us all the horrors of large-scale rocket attack. Jet-propelled rockets that are only now really being developed will wipe out entire areas overnight. The 1,546,000 tons of bombs dropped on Europe by the Allies in 1944 would be as insignificant in World War No. 3 as the number of tons of bombs dropped in World War No. 1 is when compared to those dropped in this war. Gas and germ-carrying bombs would probably be employed by the next totalitarian leader in his attempt to wipe democracy off the face of the earth.

In addition to these most horrible threats which we all must consider inevitable should another World War take place, the cost of such a war would undoubtedly wreck not only our country's entire financial and credit structure along with all other nations. This past year of 1944 the United States spent $91,174,000,000 on war. In March of that year it was spending more than $312,000,000 per month, which amounts to more than $200,000 a minute. Our expenditures on the war for a single day are now almost three times as much as the cost of the War of 1812, while 2 days' expenditures equal the cost of the entire Mexican War. Fifty days of our expenditures for World War No. 2 equal our total outlay for the Civil War.

We can prevent World War No. 3 only if we set up machinery now to enable us to enforce peace. If we do not make any such provision we must resign ourselves to the fact that our civilization will soon receive another devastating blow—and one that will be fatal.

With the acceptance of my bill we will have authorized our Nation's participation in an international police force to prevent aggression or the threat of war. Such a force offers the world its only hope for peace. An international organization with a police force will be an organization with teeth in it. It will be able to stop war. It will avoid those delays that have always existed in the past. Its decisions are carried out promptly and will be something more than mere pious hopes. If we are not prepared to make provision for this police force with power to act quickly, then we might as well abandon all consideration of any type of international organization. The people of America believe in the United Nations and are proud of the success which the joint efforts of that association have brought during this war. But how can we let the people put their trust in an organization that lacks power to enforce its decisions? We have peace in our towns and hamlets today because policemen are able, when the occasion arises, to use force. We can be sure of peace only when the rules of international law and methods of settlement can be backed up by force sufficient to restrain, or to punish, the states which attempt to violate them. We must not deceive the people who have hopes for the future of international cooperation. We must make it clear from now on that international bodies not backed by force can bring us nothing but disillusionment and another lost peace. Once this point is made sufficiently clear to the people of the world, the need for an international police force which can be put into immediate action will gain widespread acceptance. It is with this idea in mind that I have introduced this bill. If we act now to provide the means for enforcing the peace we may be able to correct the mistakes that have plagued world history. The grim lessons of history must not be lost.

An examination of the period between World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 shows us that the Covenant of the League of Nations attempted to establish an organization that would further international peace and develop greater international understanding. Article II of the Covenant declared that any war or threat of war was a common concern of the whole League. Articles 12 and 13 provided that in any dispute likely to lead to war, members were to submit either to arbitration or inquiry by the League Council and were not to resort to war until 3 months after the arbitrator's decision or the report of the Council had been made. The fact that this article recognized war as being lawful and proper after a 3-month period was one of the greatest weaknesses of the Covenant. The recognition of war by the League was a serious mistake because, once such an international organization has allowed wars to spring up, it has lost its ability to maintain peace. The bill which I am presenting today does not, I am happy to state, have this same weakness.

The international organization of which the international police force would be a part under my bill, does not at any time recognize acts of aggression as lawful, but on the contrary, has specific procedures set down which it will follow to stop any acts or threats of aggression. The final measure to be taken, should others fail, is the prompt use of military force as police action to uphold the law that is being violated. An international organization with a police force such as this does not, as we have pointed out, recognize or permit the existence of war.

Article 16 of the League provided that if any member did go to war in violation of its obligations, it exposed itself to various economic penalties. We now know that sanctions such as these will not stop a state bent on aggression. The only attempt to go beyond these economic sanctions was a provision, also in article 16, which declared it to be the duty of the Council in such cases of violation, to recommend to the several governments what military forces they might use to protect the Covenant of the League.

This was, however, only a recommendation on the Council's part. The matter then had to be referred to each and every individual government and weighed, deliberated upon and debated endlessly. In the meantime the aggressor state made successful headway, and the League was powerless to require action. It could not even compel member states to consider the question of using force if they did not wish to. And then finally, if a group of the states on their own volition had decided to supply armed forces, there was no provision for any combined command or leadership by the League.

The year 1931 presents a clear-cut example of the League's failure to act quickly and effectively to put down a threat to peace. At that time the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact and the Nine Power Treaty were supposedly serving to prevent aggression. However, both these measures were negative in their approach to the problem. That is, the signatory nations, and some 60 governments signed the Kellogg-Briand Pact, declared that they were against war but they did not accept any positive obligations to act for peace. This was the situation when Japan invaded Manchuria in 1931.

Although the Lytton Commission, which investigated that invasion for the League, declared that Japan's actions could not be regarded as legitimate measures of self-defense by Japan, the League could do nothing effective about it. The rape of China had begun. Henry L. Stimson, then our Secretary of State, recognized the dangers involved in our failure to uphold the Kellogg Pact and the Nine Powers Treaty. In 1932 he wrote to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that, and I quote:

> Regardless of cause or responsibility, it is clear beyond peradventure that a situation has developed which cannot, under any circumstances, be reconciled with the obligations of the covenants of these two treaties, and that if the treaties had been faithfully observed such a situation could not have arisen.

There could hardly be a stronger endorsement of the necessity of force to assure peace. Few of us, however, were wise enough to see that because we lacked a small police force equipped to act quickly in 1931, we would be called upon to sacrifice the lives of our men just 10 years later. Because Jap war lords dressed in the guise of peace merchants lulled America to sleep, we were called upon to defend ourselves from the attack upon Pearl Harbor on a day that will go down in history as a day of infamy.

In 1935 prompt military action on the part of the League might have put down the world's second aggressor. However, we had grown no wiser by that time and Italy conquered Ethiopia without effective League opposition. The United States attempted to withdraw from this new threat to world security.

We hoped that trade embargoes and neutrality acts would keep the conflict from our shores. What happened in Europe, the Far East, or Africa, we said was no concern of ours. However, even at that time our own Ambassador in Italy recognized the futility of this attitude. In 1935 he wrote to Mr. Cordell Hull, our Secretary of State, concerning the conquest of Ethiopia that, and I quote:

> The inference I draw from it as to the future is that Italy must either be defeated now and prevented in the realization of her ambitions in east Africa, or the trouble will continue on through for a generation as an additional irritation to European politics and an additional menace to world peace.

Unfortunately for us the great truth of this prophecy was ignored. Aggression occurred next in the Spanish Civil War. Then came the greatest threat to peace, Nazi Germany, which dwarfed all others as it moved in its rapid pace to the most devastating war in all history.

This survey of past events can only reemphasize the need for prompt use of force to prevent aggression as provided for in my bill. When we have stopped the aggressor, we will have stopped the threat of war. Could there be any stronger cause for a well-organized international police force than this—the prevention of war? I do not think so. And I do not think that any of us here in Congress will be able to feel that we have kept faith with men who have died, their mothers, their wives, their children, their sweethearts, until we have seen to it that the threat of war has ended.

An outstanding precedent for the action proposed by my bill was our success at the time of the Boxer Rebellion in China in 1900. At that time, 231 foreigners were murdered. At the direction of President McKinley, we united immediately with Great Britain, Russia, France, and with Germany and Japan as well, and together provided 5,000 troops for the relief of the foreign legations under seige by the Boxers.

It has been suggested by some that the authorization of the American representative, or representatives, on the Security Council to call upon certain of our armed forces for the prevention of aggression would be inadvisable. They hold that the use of force would inevitably mean war and that, since Congress alone has the power to declare war, such a measure would involve an invasion of the rights of the Congress. Let me make it clear that police action is not war. Police action implies well organized force on the side of the law and the speedy subjection of any individual or group of individuals opposed to law. Not only would the use of force in this fashion not be war, but the mere existence of such a police force would discourage defiance of law. We all know how this works in our own several districts. I am sure you have all consulted, as I have, with officials responsible for law enforcement and have been told that compulsion is necessary to support all types of legislation. This is not due to the fact that all our citizens are lawbreakers, but rather because there is always a percentage of the population that will disobey regulations if it can. There is a similar percentage on the world level of government and we must have a means of dealing with it.

I have pointed out that the use of force to insure methods of peaceful settlement and to prevent aggression does not constitute war. It is therefore clear that the authority of Congress is in no way violated, since there is no attempt to assume the power to make war.

It has also been suggested that the American representative, or representatives if there are several, might hold authority that was broader than it should be. I wish to emphasize the fact that the representative would at all times have the benefit of a staff of expert American advisers and that he would also be in constant touch with the executive and legislative branches of Government. Our representative would not at any time be able to commit the American or the world police force to action by himself. That decision could only be made by all the members of the world security council. Furthermore, the American representative would only be calling to action a fairly small and a specifically agreed upon quota of our military forces. Our whole aim is to avoid having the entire resources of our Nation used in the prosecution of war again. We can accomplish this end by pledging a small military force to the international group. Finally, it is important to remember that this representative, or the representatives, will be selected in any manner Congress determines. Certainly Congress cannot object to such representation.

There is one other question that we must deal with, and that is the question of perfectionism. As this whole problem of establishing international security and defining the power of our American delegate comes up for general discussion, we will be confronted with the charge that none of these plans is perfect. I do not know of many plans, national or international, put into operation that have ever been perfect. The Constitution of the United States itself has been amended many times. This issue of perfectionism has been raised again and again and it may for this reason deserve a more deliberate answer.

It is interesting to note that many of the people who were once ardent isolationists are now perfectionists. They claim that they now believe in sharing the responsibility for world peace and well-being. In fact, they believe in it to such an extent that they will accept nothing except a perfect blueprint. This argument is neither new nor novel. This same perfectionist zeal was shown in 1919 by Henry Cabot Lodge and the others of his group when they succeeded in killing the Treaty of Versailles. Because Lodge knew that public opinion favored Senate acceptance of the treaty, he did not oppose it in an open and direct attack. Instead, he prolonged debate and added reservations until the treaty lost its force and was no longer acceptable to many who would have voted for it earlier. I wish to urge Members of this Congress to beware of similar perfectionist tactics after this peace. Let me point out again that no legislation is perfect. I have been a legislator since I was 22, and I have found through personal experience that legislation has always been the result of

conference. As you ladies and gentlemen know only too well, there must always be some compromise with opposition. Legislation, though at the outset not completely satisfactory, has been put into effect and then changed later. I have had many occasions to be thankful that such changes were made. The principle that I am striving for is the authorization of the use of force to preserve peace without delay. We must not sacrifice this principle. We would be completely foolhardy if we turn down plans that embody this principle in a sound fashion simply because minor details are not agreeable to us. We cannot afford to be so short-sighted in regard to an issue that involves the future of all our democratic institutions, of our way of life, and even of our existence.

The example of the Act of Chapultepec, the agreement of the American nations to protect peace, has given us hope that a sound agreement may be achieved by the United Nations of the world. The conference in Mexico authorized the use of armed force to prevent or repel aggression should other peaceful means of settling the dispute fail. With this example of hemispheric unity to inspire us, I ask that we go ahead with courage in our hearts to assure the people a similar immediate endorsement of peace for the entire world without delay. Such a force, empowered to act immediately to put down aggression, offers us our one possible assurance that representative governments, based on and working in the interests of all the people, will continue to exist.

Our discussion of the last war and of the present war has made it clear that the winning of the peace will require more than good intentions. Peaceful and democratic methods will not all of a sudden flourish unchallenged. And yet, just because this is so, we must not give up our faith in the ways of peace. If we give the lives of millions of young men to stop a war that has begun, then surely we should be willing to devote any amount of strength and energy necessary to see that this peace will last. It is not easy to work for peace. It has taken the people of the world a long time to realize that peace requires sacrifices and hard work too, and that the end of war does not permit a let-down of effort. But this time procedures have been worked out in advance. General opinion in this country favors our participation in international efforts to prevent another world war. This time we have recognized the fact that agreements and laws between nations must be backed up by force. All that we need to do now is incorporate the actual provisions for this international police force within the structure of an international organization. Let us of this House take the leadership to make certain that we will never be held responsible for a third world war. Let us make this provision now. As Abraham Lincoln, a man who led our country through an earlier wartime crisis, declared:

We cannot escape history.

We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation. We shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth. Other means may succeed; this could not fail. The way is plain, peaceful, generous, just—a way which, if followed, the world will forever applaud and God must forever bless.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder whether or not it is true that the gentleman actively supported the so-called Neutrality Act that was adopted I think about 1935 as a means of keeping this country out of war.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. At that time, in common with millions of others in America and throughout the world, I was endeavoring as God gave me the light to see to prevent a war.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I realize that this House is investigation-minded and that it is a waste of my time to oppose these resolutions but I want to restate the position I took at the opening of the present Congress. I stated then that I was going to oppose all resolutions for investigation until the so-called Monroney committee had made its report. I am still of the same opinion.

When the pending resolution is passed there will be 20 investigating committees in this House, and I will be required tomorrow morning to call a meeting of the Committee on Accounts to appropriate money with which to carry out the purpose of this and other resolutions of similar nature. Of course, the committee always follows the judgment of the House, but I still believe the House is making a mistake in setting up all of these investigating committees. Perhaps it would be a good idea if I did introduce a resolution to create an investigation committee to investigate the investigating committees.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 45 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee or subcommittees appointed by the chairman of said committee, is authorized and directed (1) to conduct thorough studies and investigation of the extent and character of aid now given by the Federal, State, and local governments and private agencies to the physically handicapped, (2) to study and investigate the diffusion within the United States of such aid to the physically handicapped, (3) employment opportunities for the physically handicaped, and all other questions in relation thereto which would aid the Congress in any necessary remedial legislation.

The said committee or any subcommittee is authorized to obtain and use for statistical purposes only, confidential information (1) from the record of the Selective Service System, (2) records from the War Manpower Commission, and (3) from the records of the Bureau of the Census subject to the restrictions of Forty-sixth Statutes at Large, page 25, section 11 (U. S. C. 13: 211).

For the purposes of this resolution, the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony and records as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or by any person designated by him, and shall be served by such person or persons as the chairman of the committee or subcommittee may designate. The chairman of the committee or subcommittee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses.

That the said committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) during the present Congress the results of their studies, inquiries, and investigations with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield half of the time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

I might just say a few words in reference to this resolution. It is a continuing resolution. The committee worked very hard in considering this matter, and did a very fine job under the able leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], a member of the Committee on Labor, is very much in favor of this resolution. He asked for time but has been called to a committee meeting for the moment. I just want to record his especial interest in the resolution.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that it has been my privilege to work under the splendid leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Kelley] on this program for the handicapped. I think he and his associates have done an excellent job. It is an important field for most careful study, and I trust that the House will continue the activities, so well begun, by that group.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I think this resolution should be passed and the committee continued. On the other hand may I call the attention of the House to a few things that are occurring. Senate Resolution 74 is a rather complete study of the physically

handicapped people in this country. We are here setting up another committee which may duplicate much of the work done under Senate Resolution 74.

I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] that we are having some duplications in the matter of committees. The Pepper Committee in the other body has made a very exhaustive and extensive study of the physically handicapped individuals, and I am wondering sometimes whether it is wise to duplicate too many of these efforts.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. I think you will find that the Pepper Committee investigated along different lines than the Committee on Labor in the House. The investigation, survey and study of the Committee on Labor of the House was quite extensive. It goes much further afield than the Pepper Committee. The purpose of the Committee on Labor was not to provide any pensions. I want to make that clear.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I realize that is true, yet there is overlapping. The Senate resolution is entitled, "A resolution authorizing an investigation of the educational and physical fitness of the cilivilian population as related to national defense." That was the title of their resolution.

It is true that physical examinations of the men of military age have indicated that several millions have been rejected because of physical defects. Some of these defects are correctable but the greater number of the defects indicated by a careful analysis are not correctable. Some of them could not have been prevented.

Quite a large percentage of the men were rejected because of missing eyes, twisted limbs, bad hearts, mental disorders and physical conditions, some of them minor, which the military authorities would not accept. There are a large group of men in the IV–F class with punctured eardrums, flat feet, missing teeth, a slight deafness, who are now very active in baseball, professional football, and other strenuous physical programs. The Army does not want this type of men. Perhaps the Army was at fault in not creating a special job in which they might be useful.

I would view with considerable alarm the tendency of the Federal Government to take over under political systems the direction of the development of the American youngster.

The American people have enjoyed the highest degree of health of any group in the world. The span of life has been markedly increased in the past two decades. Diseases of a preventable nature have been attacked and eliminated. Science and American medicine is moving forward. It will continue to move forward, relieving pain, disease and adding health activities wherever indicated.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is there a danger in these matters of legislation respecting the handicapped, treating them as a class, that you will actually hurt some of those who are making a valiant fight to take care of themselves? In other words, is it not true that some of them resent too much legislation?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes, I think that is true. There is a tendency to overdo those things. I view with alarm the tendency of the Federal Government to take over the educational and physical training of the physically handicapped of this Nation. They intend to start in the kindergarten. An educational program of physical fitness is proposed. Read the hearings of the Committee on Labor and you will find that most of the people appearing before that committee are Federal people who have a vested interest in keeping a new committee going and enlarging their activities.

I maintain that it is not possible to make people go to bed at night, notwithstanding Jimmy Byrnes' order that tries to shut them off at 12 o'clock, or make them eat right or keep them from drinking or doing some things that might cause them physical harm. More might be accomplished if wars were eliminated, because we send to war every 25 years the best people we have in the world and we kill them off. We leave the mentally handicapped and physically handicapped at home to propagate their kind.

I hope this committee will approach the problem of the physically handicapped investigation in a sensible manner.

Mr. JOHN J. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 154 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct thorough studies and investigations of the progress of the war effort insofar as it relates to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee, with a view to determining whether such effort is being carried forward efficiently, expeditiously, and economically.

The Committee on Naval Affairs shall report to the House during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems desirable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpena or otherwise, and to take testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman. The chairman or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

SEC. 2. The heads of the various executive departments and agencies are hereby requested to detail to such committee such number of legal and expert assistants and investigators as such committee may from time to time deem necessary, or, in case such detail is not authorized by law, to grant leave of absence without pay to personnel who may request such leave to serve with such committee, without prejudice to any rights or privileges to which such personnel would be entitled if such leave had not been granted.

Mr. SABATH. There being no requests for time to speak on this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of farm loans to veterans, in connection with the bill he introduced today on that subject.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 40 minutes.

TAXATION AS IT AFFECTS THE LOW-INCOME GROUP

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain tables and excerpts from letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I want to speak today in behalf of the millions of people in low-income groups who find themselves with pre-war or nearly pre-war incomes, with wartime deductions and increased costs of living, and who find it difficult under present conditions to keep body and soul together and to live decently. This is true despite the fact that we are living in the era of the greatest prosperity in the history of the world.

Instead of following a tax policy based upon the ability of the taxpayer to pay, we have followed a policy of increasing the tax rate, decreasing the individual and family tax exemption of the low-income group as living costs went up and then freezing their incomes at a level so low as to bring actual suffering to that group and their families. Lowering of individual and family tax exemption, increasing the tax rate, increased living costs, and the freezing of the wages of the lower-income group have lowered living standards of that group far below 1939 standards. This despite the fact that we are today enjoying the largest income payments and the greatest prosperity that any nation has enjoyed in the history of the world. Unless these people are given some relief, they will turn to socialism, communism, or some other "ism." This is going to be the real problem during the coming post-war years.

Before I proceed, I desire to lay down what I consider four fundamental principles:

First. Every man, woman, and child in America is entitled to a decent living. Many are not getting it.

Second. Paying an individual or the head of a family enough money whether in wages or other income to support himself or herself and family in common decency, is not and can never be inflationary. Money spent for the necessities of life to keep body and soul together will never bring about inflation. The anti-inflation policy of the Government has been to keep all wage increases to 15 percent under the Little Steel formula, regardless as to whether that wage brought a decent living or not. That policy is wrong.

Third. Taking money we call taxes from the low-income groups, which should be spent for bread, butter, milk, and food to fill the stomachs of hungry children will not avert inflation. Such a policy can only bring about suffering, crime, immorality, and poor citizenship. No policy of making everyone pay a tax to make people tax conscious can be justified when the tax dollar collected forces the living standards of the taxpayer below a decent level.

Fourth. Real, sound peacetime prosperity must be based upon increased purchasing power for this low-income group. Peacetime prosperity cannot be based upon starvation wages or income, either before or after taxation. Automobiles, radios, decent housing or living will not be bought with family incomes of $1,000 or even $2,000.

EVERY AMERICAN MAN, WOMAN, AND CHILD IS ENTITLED TO A DECENT LIVING

In 1933 when Mr. Roosevelt first took office he stated, and properly so, that one-third of the people in America were ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed. At that time the total income payments of the Nation reached a low point of $46,000,000,000 a year. By income payments I mean the total income of the Nation including wages and salaries, farm income, rents, dividends, and so forth. It is this income against which taxes are levied. Only recently Mr. Roosevelt in a message to Congress set forth what he called a second Bill of Rights in which he stated that every family had:

First. The right to earn enough to provide adequate food, clothing, and recreation.

Second. The right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a rate which would give him and his family a decent living.

Third. The right of every family to a decent home.

Fourth. The right to a good education.

Fifth. The right to adequate protection through old-age security, accident and unemployment insurance, and so forth.

He made the statement, "Necessitous men are not freemen."

Again, "People who are hungry and out of a job are the stuff out of which dictators are made."

To all this I readily agree. Hungry men and women brought about the French Revolution.

However, Mr. Roosevelt's definition as to who is entitled to a decent living is too narrow. He continues to talk about men and women without a job. He speaks of the farmers not having a decent income, to all of which we agree. He seems to have forgotten the millions of small investors who have invested their savings in stocks, bonds, mortgages, insurance policies, or who are receiving retirement pay and who are depending on that type of income for a decent living. The widow who has invested her life savings or perhaps the insurance of her husband in some business, stocks, bonds, or mortgages and is receiving a reduced income on those savings can be just as hungry if that investment is not producing enough to give her a decent living as if she were out of a job.

A railroad worker, postal, or other civil-service worker, or a worker who has retired from private industry, who depends upon his retirement pay, can be just as hungry if his dollar is not purchasing enough to give him that decent living as if he were in the relief line. People on old-age assistance and social-security benefits are in the same class. Many of these people are being paid retirement or insurance annuities in a dollar that today purchases as little as 50 percent in living costs compared to what the dollar purchased which they paid into the fund years ago. Many of these people find themselves in a position where their purchasing power has been reduced to a point where their income no longer pays for the necessities of life, not to speak of a decent standard of living. Interest rates on bonds they have purchased or the investment made by them either directly or through insurance companies have been drastically reduced. Dividends on the small amount of stock they may have purchased have been and are being eaten up by taxes until there is little, if anything, left. It is for this reason that I am speaking of low-income groups which include low wage and low farm income groups rather than low wage or low farm income groups only.

I shall confine my remarks to the discussion of the present cost of living, present incomes, including wages and the difficulties of the low-income group to live decently now. I shall not attempt to discuss the question of why we are where we are in this field. The important thing now is to try to bring relief to this low-income group.

II. WHAT CONSTITUTES A DECENT LIVING?

The question as to what constitutes a decent living for an individual or a family group depends upon the city or locality in which they reside. To compare the cost of living in different cities, a standard budget was established by the Works Progress Administration. The family budget was first devised by the Works Progress Administration in 1935 and was made up of goods and services which they estimated were needed by a 4-person family of an unskilled manual worker living at the "maintenance level." "Maintenance level" is described as above the "minimum of subsistence level" or "emergency level" of relief budgets, but below the standard of the skilled worker. It is stated that this budget does not "approach the content of what may be considered a satisfactory American standard of living."

This was the budget upon which the W. P. A. based its relief program in 1935 and subsequently. The Labor Department has simply taken this W. P. A. budget and brought it down to date by adding the percentage of increase in the cost of living since then. No one, of course, would contend that this sort of a budget constitutes a decent standard of living, certainly not as defined by the President.

Exhibit I of this budget gives the cost of living of a 4-person manual worker's family at maintenance level as defined by the W. P. A. in 33 large cities of the United States as of June 15, 1943.

Exhibit II gives the indexes of the cost of living for the same family group in the same cities as of June 15, 1943. This takes the living cost in the city of Washington, D. C., as a basic index number of 100. The hypothetical family for which the budget was prepared is made up according to W. P. A., of the active man who wears overalls at his work, his wife, a boy aged 13, and a girl aged 8. No household help is employed. The family live in a four- or five-room house or apartment with one indoor toilet and bath, has gas, electricity, and a small radio, uses ice for refrigeration and has no automobile. They read a daily newspaper and go to the movies once a week. Their food is an adequate diet at minimum cost. They pay for their own medical care. No savings other than life insurance is provided.

I asked F. A. Hinrichs, Acting Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, to bring these figures from June 15, 1943, down to date. On February 10 he wrote me a letter in which he gives percentage increases down to December 15, 1944. I am inserting the two tables into the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibits I and II.

Exhibit I is exceedingly interesting. For instance, this table fixes the budget for a typical family of four for the city of Washington at $1,809.17 with the following items:

Food, $668.25, or $2.30 per person per week.

Clothing, $226.88, or $56.72 per person per year.

Rent, $351.75, or $29.30 per month.

Fuel and light, $122.26, or $12.10 per month. This covers, of course, lighting, heating, and cooking.

Furniture, household equipment, and so forth, $45.11 per year.

Miscellaneous, $394.93 per year.

Mr. Hinrichs, in his letter of February 10, stated that the increase in cost from June 15, 1943, to December 15, 1944, for the average of the larger cities was 1.8 percent on all items. He stated the rental increase was 0.3 percent. I called him by telephone and asked where in the District of Columbia anyone could obtain a four- or five-room house or apartment with indoor toilet and bath, gas, and electricity—and, of course, water—for $29.30 per month. I stated, that I knew a lot of folks who would like that kind of apartment or dwelling. He replied that the price was, of course, low and

that they had taken the 1935 W. P. A. budget and simply figured the increases in the cost of each item of living since that time. In other words, that whole statement was based upon a so-called maintenance level for relief purposes or practically upon a subsistence level and is still on that basis.

On February 13, 1945, I received another letter from Mr. Hinrichs in which he wrote that they had done some recent work on rents in Washington, D. C., but that only preliminary results were available as yet. The letter reads in part as follows:

> The housing cost of a four-person annual worker's family at maintenance level at Washington, D. C., which is shown at $351.75 in June 1943 would be adjusted according to the revised figures to $426.22, or approximately $35.50 per month on the average.

The letter continues:

> In order to approximate the maintenance level presented in our releases on intercity differences, all rents for a four-or five-room dwelling with running water, private bath, electricity, and heating equipment were tabulated. The lowest 30 percent of these rents were then averaged, with the resultant 21 percent increase in the housing cost for Washington mentioned above. I should like to emphasize that this housing cost applies only to the maintenance level, that the rents are based on dwellings now occupied, not those available for rent to people moving to Washington. The rent does not necessarily include the monthly cost of running water, electricity, and heat. It only provides the necessary equipment for the tenant to be furnished with it.

I am still looking for that four- or five-room apartment or house in Washington with electricity, heating equipment, running water, inside toilet, and bath for $35.50 per month. Fact of the matter is, $35.50 per month represents, as Mr. Hinrichs states, the average cost of the dwellings of this type in the lower 30 percent rent bracket in the District of Columbia. This includes the Washington slums. It includes dwellings and so-called apartments which are unfit to live in. It includes dwellings or apartments which should be wrecked and replaced.

Surely no one will contend that this lower 30 percent of the housing facilities in the District of Columbia represents decent housing. If anyone has any doubts about the question, I would suggest that he or she spend a few days and look over that type of housing. I did.

Take the city of Detroit in my own State. Exhibit I gives the total budget for a four-person family at $1,798.05, itemizing it as follows:

Food, $675.24 or approximately $3.25 per person, per week.

Clothing, $214.40 or approximately $53 per person, per year.

Housing, $324.94 or $27 per month.

Fuel, heat, and light, $125.21 or $10.50 per month.

Household furniture and equipment, $38.86 per year.

Miscellaneous, $419.40 per year.

If we add the 1.8 percent increase, according to Mr. Hinrichs' letter of February 10, on all items, we find the total budget increased to $1,830.42. The rent remains practically the same. I know many people in the city of Detroit who would like to know where they can find a four- or five-room apartment or dwelling for a typical family of four including indoor toilet, bath, gas, heat, electricty, etc. for $27 per month. In fact they would like to find one like that for twice that sum. Again that $27 per month represents the average of the lowest 30 percent of all rented dwellings of this type in the city of Detroit. This includes slums and many dwellings that should be wrecked and replaced. Surely no one will contend that adequate, decent housing can be obtained in the city of Detroit or is being lived in at the present time as described by this table for $27 per month. Again I wish to state that Mr. Hinrichs simply took the relief budget of the W. P. A. of 1935 and brought it up to date.

To present all views, I asked both the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organization to furnish me their views on the question as to what constitutes a decent standard of living. Both of these organizations referred me to the figures of the Heller committee of the University of California which made up a standard budget for a familiy of four. The following is a statement of the American Federation of Labor on this matter:

COST OF MAINTAINING A FAMILY OF FOUR

I. Health and decency living standard: The Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics, University of California, Berkeley, Calif., collects prices each year for a budget of supplies needed to maintain a family of four in health and efficiency.

For December 1944, for the United States as a whole, the figures of the Heller committee show the following:

	A year
a. Consumption items only (food, housing, clothing, etc.)	$2,728
b. Consumption items plus taxes (Federal income and social-security taxes)	2,956

NOTE.—The Heller committee budget was priced in San Francisco in March 1941 and shows the following cost for the city of San Francisco (including Federal income and social-security taxes), $2,669.13. If purchase of War bonds up to 10 percent is included in this budget, it becomes $2,964.13.

Cost of living is higher in San Francisco than the average for the United States.

This is the Heller committee peacetime budget. (The Heller committee also has a wartime budget which reports wartime economies and accounts for durable goods which cannot be purchased. It is below the peacetime budget by about $400 yearly.)

II. Labor Department maintenance budget: This represents a bare subsistence living standard for a family of four. This standard does not allow enough income to permit savings against emergencies, nor does it allow adequate medical care or education. The standard is far below a so-called American standard of living.

A. Raised by Meany-Thomas report cost-of-living figures. This budget was priced in 1935 and has since been brought up to date by cost-of-living indexes. The budget, therefore, differs according to what cost-of-living index is used. The figures below show the budget brought up to date by the Meany-Thomas cost-of-living figures:

(Raised apparently refers to an upward revision of Labor Department figures.)

Labor Department maintenance budget adjusted to Meany-Thomas increase:	
Consumption items only	$2,113
Including social-security and Federal income taxes	2,179

B. Raised by Labor Department and Mitchell committee cost-of-living figures:

Labor Department maintenance budget:	
Consumption items only	$1,782
Including social-security and Federal income taxes	1,835

The Congress of Industrial Organizations report used the following language:

> The Heller committee, of the University of California, has done the most comprehensive work in this field. Their last report, as of March 1944, gives $2,964 as the minimum amount necessary for a wage-earner's family of four to maintain the fundamentals of healthful and decent living in accordance with community standards under wartime conditions. A white-collar worker's family would need $3,721. These figures include a 10-percent contribution for War bonds, and are based on conditions in San Francisco.
>
> A recent report, made by the New York Department of Labor, shows that the average woman worker living as a member of a family group requires $1,643.53 a year to maintain an adequate standard of living. This is an increase of almost 45 percent over the $1,130.93 necessary at the time of Pearl Harbor. Fourteen cities in New York State were covered in this study.

It is only fair to say, however, that, according to the Labor Department figures, there are only two cities in the 33 where living costs are higher than in San Francisco.

In 1937 the Minimum Wage Board of the District of Columbia set forth a minimum budget for a single woman and in 1943 the Labor Department brought that budget up to date. That budget is as follows:

Estimated November 1943 cost of a weekly budget for a single woman approved November 2, 1937, by the Minimum Wage Board of the District of Columbia

Item	November 1937 cost	Estimated November 1943 cost
Room and board	$10.00	$12.70
Clothing and upkeep	3.50	4.59
Sundries (priced)	2.52	2.81
Personal care	.57	.76
Health	.57	.63
Recreation	.32	.38
Transportation	1.05	1.04
All items priced	16.02	20.10
Other sundries included in this budget	.98	1.23
Total cost	17.00	21.33

Anyone who examines this budget knows that no single woman could live decently in the District of Columbia, in November 1943, for any $21.33 per week. Congress recognized that fact when it gave a flat $300 per year increase to the lower-bracket Government employees. The tragic part is that these figures have been and are being used in various cities as evidence upon which to base what is called a decent living standard wage scale.

Surely no one will contend that wage rates or incomes based upon these living costs would give the worker a decent living, certainly not as defined by the President in his message to Congres recently when he said that a man has "a right to earn enough money to provide adequate

food, clothing and recreation" for his family. That same family has a right to a decent home, good education, and adequate protection through old-age security. The fact of the matter is that the worker often finds this information used in determining his wage scale, forcing his living standard to a subsistence basis with just enough food to keep him and his family alive, with slum housing and enough clothing to keep the bodies of his family and himself covered.

Unless the Labor Department can give us cost-of-living figures based upon the right of every American to a decent living, including decent food, decent housing and decent clothing, it had better discontinue publishing information along this line entirely. The publication of figures on cost of living, based upon a subsistence level such as were used in the relief system of the thirties, should be discontinued. Such figures are misleading, place the Department in a false light, and merely help to bring the standard of living down to the lowest subsistence level.

The question of what constitutes a decent living in each locality at a definite time is a difficult one which will require much research to establish and maintain on a current basis. It certainly is beyond the capacity of one individual. It is not my purpose to attempt to do so. Our income-tax laws fixing family exemptions are not based upon living costs. The fact is that, as living costs went up, tax rates went up and tax exemptions came down to a point where those laws have helped to reduce the standard of living of the low income group far below even a subsistence level.

INCREASE IN LIVING COSTS

A great deal has been said as to the increased living costs during the past 4 or 5 years. Nearly every request by labor for increased wages was based upon the increased cost of living. I submit herewith the figures of three organizations which have done a great deal of work along this line.

(a) The Bureau of Labor Statistics of January 30 issued a report, which reads, in part, as follows:

On December 15, 1944, the Bureau of Labor Statistics index of the cost of living of moderate-income families stood at 1.27 percent of the 1935 to 1939 budget and 2.1 percent above the December 1943 level.

The President's committee revised this upward 4 percent, or to an index of 1.31 percent. According to the Labor Department estimate, as revised by the President's committee, it takes $1.31 today to buy in living costs what could be bought for $1 in 1939.

(b) American Federation of Labor report: The research and information service of the American Federation of Labor in answer to my inquiry, wrote me as follows:

The Meany-Thomas report shows that cost of living in the United States increased 43.5 percent from January 1941 to December 1943. From 1939 to December 1944 the increase was 46.4 percent. (Increases before January 1941 and after December 1943 are calculated on the basis of Labor Department figures, since we have no other information.)

According to the American Federation of Labor estimates, it takes $1.46 plus today to buy in living costs what $1 bought in 1939.

(c) Congress of Industrial Organization figures. The Congress of Industrial Organizations, in answer to my request, wrote me as follows.

In answer to your request, Living Costs in World War No. 2, by Philip Murray and R. J. Thomas, puts the rise in the cost of living between January 1941 and March 1944 at 45.3 percent. They make no estimate which dates back to 1939. The Bureau of Labor Statistics index, however, show a rise of 2 percent between March 1939 and January 1941. The total of 47.3 percent obtained by adding the two figures together corresponds closely to the 48-percent figure given by the Bureau of Agricultural Economists' Composite Cost of Living Indexes (farmers and workers) as the increase between March 1939 and March 1944.

According to the Congress of Industrial Organization estimates it takes $1.47 plus today to buy in living costs what $1 bought in 1939.

(d) The Bureau of Agricultural Economics. According to the Bureau of Agriculture Economics Composite Cost of Living Indexes—Farmers and Workers—as quoted by the letter from the C. I. O., the increase between March 1939 and March 1944, was 48 percent. According to these figures it takes $1.48 today to buy in living costs what $1 brought in 1939.

Thus the estimates of increase in living costs ince 1939 vary from 31 percent to 48 percent, and it takes from $1.31 to $1.48 today to buy what $1 bought in 1939. Any housewife will testify that the higher estimates come nearer giving the real increase in the cost of living.

HOW MANY INDIVIDUALS OF HEADS OF FAMILIES ARE THERE IN THE LOW INCOME GROUP IN THE UNITED STATES WITHOUT DECENT LIVING STANDARDS?

A little over a year ago I wrote Randolph Paul, then Chief Counselor and tax expert of the Treasury Department, for certain information regarding the distribution of income payments and tax burdens in the United States. I asked him to break this down as nearly as he could in such a way to show the income and tax burden of people with annual incomes of $1,000, $1,500, $2,000, $2.500, and $3,000. After some delay, I received that information. I was amazed at the facts. Had the statement not come from the Treasury Department over the signature of its then Chief Counselor and special tax expert, I would have doubted its authenticity and its reliability. I am including 2 tables containing this information at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibits III and IV.

The Treasury Department estimated at that time the total income payments for 1944 at $157,000,000,000. The estimate was very accurate and the tables were made up on that basis. An examination of this information shows the following distribution of that $157,000,000,000 in income payment during the year 1944:

First. Sixty-seven million, three hundred thousand income recipients will receive total incomes of $157,000,000,000 against which one places a personal tax liability—Federal and other personal taxes—of $22,000,000,000, leaving a net income of $135,100,000,000.

Second. Of this number 21,600,000 recipients received last year $19,200,000,000 in incomes of $1,000 or less and paid $500,000,000 in taxes. Their net income after taxes was $18,700,000,000 or an average of approximately $873 each for the year. Of this number 12,250,000 were single persons and 9,370,000 were married persons or heads of families.

Third. The table further shows that there were 24,400,000 income recipients last year with incomes from $1,000 to $2,000 who received $42,400,000,000 and paid $4,100,000,000 in taxes, leaving a net income after taxes of $38,300,000 000 or an average of approximately $1,500 a year after taxes. Of the 24,400,000 income recipients there were:

(a) Four million nine hundred and eighty thousand single persons and 7,450,000 married persons or heads of families with incomes from $1,000 to $1,500.

(b) Two million four hundred and ten thousand single persons and 9,580,000 married persons or heads of families with incomes of $1,500 to $2,000.

Fourth. This table further shows that there were last year 12,200,000 income recipients who received $34,600,000,000 in incomes of from $2,000 to $3,000 a year and paid $3,400,000,000 in taxes, leaving them $31,200,000,000 after taxes or an average of approximately $2,500 a year. Breaking this group down we find that included:

(a) Nine hundred and seventy thousand single persons and 6,590,000 married persons or heads of families with incomes of $2,000 to $2,500.

(b) Five hundred thousand single persons and 4,110,000 married persons or heads of families with incomes of $2,500 to $3,000.

The table can be broken down, of course, still further. But I am interested here primarily in the lower income groups.

I call attention to the definition of "personal taxes" as given by exhibit III:

Personal taxes consist of Federal, State, and local individual income taxes, estate, inheritance and gift taxes, property taxes (excluding taxes in business property and rented houses) taxes and licenses on motor vehicles not used in business, miscellaneous personal taxes and nontaxes payments to Government.

The complete tables or exhibits III and IV give a clear picture of the number of persons we have in the Nation in each income group.

WHAT HAS OUR TAX POLICY FOLLOWED DURING THE PAST 6 YEARS DONE TO THIS LOW-INCOME GROUP?

An examination of the cost of living index and all the changes in the laws providing for tax exemption under our income-tax policies shows definitely that as the cost of living went up, the income tax exemption of the low income groups came down. This has continued to a point where it is impossible for the low income groups to live decently. We are taking money we call taxes—in reality blood money—from that group, money that is absolutely required to give them a decent living. The tax

policy we have been following for low-income groups is taking bread, butter, and milk away from children and is taking the clothes off their back. I am placing in the RECORD as exhibits V and VI, two statements showing just how exemptions were lowered and how the 1944 law changed prior exemptions.

I want to discuss each income-tax group separately. But before I do so I wish to discuss the per capita system which was adopted last year and which has been bearing down hard on certain low-income groups. This system does away with the exemption we had for the head of a family and gives a straight $500 exemption for each person in the family. It has reduced the exemption for a man and wife as low as $500, as far as the normal tax is concerned.

Let us take a concrete example. I have a case in mind of a man who was in this low-income group. He had a wife and two children. Last year he received an exemption of $1,200 as head of a family, plus $350 for each child or a total exemption of $1,900. He died last June. His wife has no income and is compelled to work to support that little family. She has the same rent, heat, and light bills to pay. She is trying to maintain the same home. She is trying to do all of this in addition to taking care of her little family. Her income-tax exemption has been reduced from $1,900 to $1,500 by the per capita system. Let us suppose that the wife had died. Despite the fact that the husband would have the same household expenses, would have to employ someone to care for the children, his income-tax exemption would be reduced to $1,500.

This part of the law is absolutely unfair. The taxpayers' normal tax exemption has been reduced to $500 for a man and wife which means that a man and wife with $1,000 income has to pay an income tax. This applies to many old couples with small incomes. No tax of this kind can be justified on the ground that "every person should pay a direct tax." You are taking food out of these poor people's mouths, clothes off their back and forcing on them inadequate housing. Surely no one can contend that $1,000 a year will give a man and wife decent housing, food, and clothing anywhere today.

Since I am from Michigan, may I interject just one little phase of the Michigan tax policy which affects this group. The Treasury Department says that 80 percent of the living costs is subject to a sales tax. This means that this old couple in the $1,000 income group has to pay a 3-percent sales tax on 80 percent of their income or $24 a year additional.

THE EFFECT OF OUR PRESENT INCOME-TAX POLICY ON OUR LOW-INCOME GROUP

The following will show the effect of our income tax and anti-inflation policy on our low-income group:

I. HEAD OF A FAMILY WITHOUT DEPENDENTS AND WITH A $2,500 ANNUAL INCOME

A married man or head of a family without children had a $2,500 income-tax exemption in 1939. His exemption was reduced through the years until in 1944 he has a family exemption of only $500 for normal tax purposes and $1,000 for surtax purposes. In 1944 he paid, according to the Treasury Department schedules, $300 income tax and, if he was a worker, he paid $25 social-security tax, leaving $2,175 after the payment of these two taxes. Depending on whose living cost estimates we use, it takes from $1.31 to $1.48 today to buy what $1 bought in 1939; $1,470 to $1,660 bought the same living in 1939 that $2,175 buys today. So this man with a wife who had an income of $2,500 in 1944, through increased tax rates, increased living costs and decreased tax exemption is forced to a $1,470 to $1,660 a year living standard in terms of the 1939 dollar. We have increased his income tax 12½ percent, increased his living costs from 31 percent to 48 percent, and reduced his purchasing power to anywhere from $1,470 to $1,660 a year in terms of the 1939 dollar. This does not include the increase in excise and other taxes on hundreds of articles he is compelled to buy.

Now let us see just what a 15-percent increase in wages under the Little Steel formula will do for this man and to what extent it will help him to offset his increased living cost. Fifteen percent would increase his pay check by $375 a year. According to Treasury Department schedules his income tax would increase from $300 to $378. Thus far you have not increased his pay enough to give him back what you took away from him in income taxes, and he has nothing left to pay for increased living costs. The employer has given this man $375 in pay increases and the Treasury Department has taken $78 additional taxes out of him, leaving him a net increase of $297. So this 15-percent increase has in effect become a 11.88 percent increase or less than 12 percent. This $297 will buy anywhere from $200 to $227 on a 1939 basis. Thus, this 15-percent increase has actually restored only from 8 to 9 percent of his 1939 purchasing power. Adding this to his 1939 purchasing power, thus this $2,500 wage earner in 1944 will have a purchasing power of from $1,670 to $1,887 on a 1939 basis. It is evident that no increase of wages of 15 percent under the Little Steel formula or any other formula will place this man and others like him back upon a 1939 living-cost standard.

I want to emphasize that I am referring only to the low-income group and not the worker in the higher-wage bracket. Nevertheless we must bear in mind that it is the annual earnings and not the hourly wage rate which determines whether or not a worker is in the low-income group.

If this man lived in a sales-tax State, he would have to pay among other taxes a sales tax on 80 percent of his living costs. In Michigan this additional tax would have amounted to $52.20. In 1944 there were 6,590,000 married persons or heads of a family with incomes of from $2,000 or $2,500 a year.

II. HEAD OF A FAMILY WITHOUT DEPENDENTS WITH AN ANNUAL INCOME OF $2,000

A head of a family without dependents with an annual income of $2,000 was exempt from income taxation in 1939. In 1944, according to Treasury Department deduction schedules, he paid $202 income tax. If he was a wage earner, he paid $20 social-security tax, leaving a net balance after the payment of these two taxes of $1,778. Approximately from $1,200 to $1,357, depending on whose increased-living-cost estimates we take, would have purchased the same living in 1939 that this $1,778 purchased today. So this $2,000-a-year head of a family in 1944 is forced to a 1939 living standard of from $1,200 to $1,357. In 1944 there were 9,589,000 married persons or heads of a family with annual incomes from $1,500 to $2,000.

III. HEAD OF A FAMILY WITHOUT DEPENDENTS WITH A $1,500 ANNUAL INCOME

A head of a family without dependents with a $1,500 annual income was exempt from payment of income tax in 1939. In 1944 he paid, according to Treasury Department schedules, $98 income tax. If he was a worker, he paid $15 additional in social-security taxes, leaving him a net balance after the payment of these two taxes of $1,387. Depending upon whose living cost estimates we adopt, $937 to $1,060 would have purchased the same living in 1939 that $1,387 buys today. So this $1,500-a-year head of a family in 1944 is forced down to a 1939 living-cost standard of from $937 to $1,060. In 1944 there were 7,450,000 married persons or heads of a family with annual incomes of from $1,000 to $1,500.

IV. HEAD OF A FAMILY WITH NO DEPENDENTS WITH AN ANNUAL INCOME OF $1,000

The head of a family without dependents and with a $1,000 annual income paid no income tax in 1939. In 1944, according to Treasury Department schedules, he pays $12 income tax and if a worker he pays $10 social-security tax, leaving a net balance after the payment of these two taxes of $978. Depending on whose increased-living-costs estimates are used, $660 to $746 would have bought the same living cost in 1939 that $978 buys today. This head of a family with a $1,000 income is forced to a 1939 living-cost level of from $660 to $746. There were 9,370,000 heads of families in 1944 with incomes of $1,000 or under.

V. SINGLE PERSON WITH $1,000 INCOME

A single person with a $1,000 income was exempt from payment of income taxes in 1939. In 1944 he paid $39 tax and if he was a worker he paid $10 social-security tax, leaving him $901 net income after the payment of these two taxes. Depending upon whose increased-living-cost standards we use, $608 to $688 would have brought the same living in 1939 that $901 buys today. This single person with $1,000 income is forced to a 1939 living cost standard of from $608 to $688 a year. In 1944 there were 12,250,000 single persons with annual incomes of $1,000 or under.

REMEDY

It is, naturally, difficult to make a definite proposal as to what should be done to relieve this low-income group from unjust burdens. Increased pay would, of course, help. However, I believe that placing the income-tax exemptions upon a basis so that an individual or a family would be exempt from taxation on that portion of their income required to pay for a decent living, would go far toward bringing relief to the low-income groups.

From 1931 to 1939 a married man or head of a family had an exemption of $2,500, and a single or a person not the head of a family had an exemption of $1,000. In 1940 this exemption was reduced to $2,000 for a married person living with a spouse or the head of a family, and to $800 for a single person or married person not living with spouse or not the head of a family.

To give Congress an opportunity for direct consideration, I have introduced a bill today to place the income-tax exemption of individuals and heads of families back to a 1940 basis. This would give a married person living with a spouse and head of a family an exemption of $2,000, and a single or married person not living with a spouse and not head of a family an exemption of $800. Because of the increased cost of living, I am leaving the credit for each dependent at $500 where it is today.

WHAT WILL THIS POLICY COST?

I am frank to state that I do not know what this increase in family tax exemption will cost the Treasury Department. I am basing my bill to increase the tax exemption solely upon the principle that everyone is entitled to a decent living and, as stated in the beginning of my remarks, that taking money we call taxes from the low-income groups—money which should be spent for bread, butter, milk, food, decent housing, and decent living—cannot be justified even on the ground that everyone should pay an income tax to make people tax conscious.

HOW CAN WE REPLENISH THIS LOST REVENUE?

First. It is my candid opinion, from a study of both war and nonwar expenditures, that if we eliminate waste which can be reasonably eliminated in both our war and nonwar expenditures, the amount which will be eliminated will more than offset the amount of revenue lost to the Treasury Department by increasing the tax exemptions, under my bill. There is one chapter in this war for which this generation will be condemned in no uncertain terms by the coming generation which will pay taxes. That is the outrageous waste of the taxpayers' money both inside and outside the war effort. This is all the more true when we think of the millions of people in the low-income group from whom we have taken and are taking these taxes. I am satisfied and I say again that it is my honest opinion that every dollar lost to the Treasury Department by an increase of this tax exemption can be offset by elimination of waste. I believe I have shown that millions of these people are being deprived of a decent living, of bread and butter through this tax and and anti-inflation policy.

Second. However, assuming we cannot or will not eliminate this waste, how can this revenue be replaced? I refused to go along with a tax policy which would limit incomes to $25,000. I did so on the ground that this was not the American way. It was not the way of free enterprice. If Congress can limit incomes to $25,000 a year, it can limit incomes to $2,500 or even $1,500 or any other amount per year. A policy of this kind would have made impossible the success of men such as Ford, Edison, Knudsen, and many others who started life at the workbench and built up great industries through their genius. However, I did say at that time that I would go along with every reasonable policy of taxing down the higher incomes at least during the war period. Let us examine the record and the distribution of incomes according to the tables which I am inserting in the RECORD.

In the first group we find that 100,000 individuals received last year $7,400,000,000 in incomes of $25,000 or more and paid $4,400,000 in taxes. This left them, according to the table, a net amount after taxes of $3,000,000,000 or an average of $30,000 each per year. We find further that 500,000 individuals received last year total income payments of $8,100,000,000 in income of $10,000 to $25,000 and paid $2,400,000,000 in taxes. This left them a total income after taxes of $5,700,000,000 or an average of $11,400 a year after taxes. Surely these two groups could pay more taxes if necessary so that the low-income group could live decently. If we go still further we find that 1,800,000 individuals received last year $14,500,000,000 in incomes from $5,000 to $10,000 each and paid $2,800,000,000 in taxes. This left them $11,700,000,000 or an average of $6,500 a year after taxes. I am sure that these people could and would be willing to pay more taxes if necessary to relieve the low-income groups.

I want to call attention to the fact that since the tables in exhibits III and IV were compiled last January, the 1944 tax law was passed. This law repealed the victory tax adding that tax to the surtax. It increased the taxes somewhat on the higher income brackets and this increase will, of course, raise the total revenue of the Treasury Department.

I want especially to stress again the fact that the plight in which the low-income group finds itself, should bring home to everyone of use the absolute necessity of eliminating every dollar of waste and excess cost in government. This applies both to our war and nonwar expenditures.

EXHIBIT I.—*Estimated cost of living for a 4-person manual worker's family at maintenance level as defined by the Work Projects Administration in 33 large cities as of June 15, 1943*

City	Total	Food	Clothing	Housing	Fuel and light	Furniture, furnishings, household equipment	Miscellaneous
Atlanta	$1,641.23	$647.30	$201.95	$290.98	$98.01	$36.86	$339.13
Baltimore	1,641.32	680.46	209.21	254.93	109.38	45.06	342.28
Birmingham	1,590.17	658.23	216.78	246.40	76.43	39.02	353.31
Boston	1,716.69	651.52	207.75	271.79	154.32	39.71	391.60
Buffalo	1,633.30	656.03	213.44	259.74	114.92	40.65	348.52
Chicago	1,778.64	686.10	198.05	306.79	132.64	38.65	416.41
Cincinnati	1,666.95	664.21	226.68	276.02	99.41	44.61	356.02
Cleveland	1,763.96	691.33	226.94	304.77	117.27	40.91	382.74
Denver	1,594.06	645.37	203.17	243.05	114.86	39.22	348.39
Detroit	1,798.05	675.24	214.40	324.94	125.21	38.86	419.40
Houston	1,582.37	621.34	201.83	250.60	85.30	40.92	382.98
Indianapolis	1,620.71	646.07	200.12	254.57	106.49	41.78	371.68
Jacksonville	1,651.32	685.16	187.72	237.25	116.22	40.95	384.02
Kansas City	1,541.23	626.75	211.93	221.02	113.69	39.96	327.88
Los Angeles	1,622.21	629.07	212.96	250.33	71.07	41.42	417.36
Manchester	1,685.95	706.06	199.02	200.57	184.37	39.61	356.32
Memphis	1,634.69	646.31	230.55	287.37	89.80	42.93	337.73
Milwaukee	1,686.35	632.83	178.15	304.15	131.42	38.20	401.60
Minneapolis	1,703.53	650.62	205.98	311.27	144.65	39.31	351.70
Mobile	1,496.50	664.10	197.36	191.28	91.01	40.16	312.59
New Orleans	1,595.12	688.42	211.04	214.86	70.51	45.27	365.02
New York	1,816.12	721.87	209.90	311.34	130.11	41.46	401.44
Norfolk	1,695.86	684.35	219.91	261.69	113.52	43.64	372.75
Philadelphia	1,636.02	667.13	213.09	265.09	108.37	40.45	341.89
Pittsburgh	1,693.87	681.79	215.18	291.58	96.52	41.12	367.68
Portland, Maine	1,704.63	708.52	204.43	212.99	171.72	40.01	366.96
Portland, Oreg	1,686.58	689.54	201.92	206.27	161.46	41.50	385.89
Richmond	1,624.65	638.89	213.17	254.90	110.49	42.36	364.84
St. Louis	1,702.66	687.75	204.25	296.38	114.13	43.54	356.61
San Francisco	1,807.11	708.38	213.55	292.04	83.74	43.48	465.92
Scranton	1,671.40	695.94	203.27	263.35	102.60	39.94	366.30
Seattle	1,711.91	697.04	216.42	202.90	129.77	43.04	422.74
Washington, D. C	1,809.17	668.25	226.88	351.75	122.25	45.11	394.93
Weighted average	1,703.95	672.44	210.20	280.75	115.47	40.94	384.15

EXHIBIT II

U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics—indexes of the cost of goods purchased by wage earners and lower-salaried workers for large cities of the United States

[1935-39=100]

Date	All items	Food	Clothing	Rent	Fuel, electricity, and ice	Housefurnishings	Miscellaneous
1913—Average	70.7	79.9	69.3	92.2	61.9	59.1	50.9
1914—Dec	72.6	83.9	70.0	92.2	62.5	61.5	52.4
1915—Dec	74.0	83.9	72.5	93.6	62.5	65.4	54.6
1916—Dec	82.4	100.6	83.2	94.3	67.1	75.5	57.6
1917—Dec	97.8	125.4	103.3	92.3	76.8	89.0	71.5
1918—Dec	118.0	149.6	147.9	97.1	90.4	121.2	83.1

EXHIBIT II—Continued

Date	All items	Food	Clothing	Rent	Fuel, electricity, and ice	Housefurnishings	Miscellaneous
1919—June	121.0	148.5	160.1	101.0	89.3	128.8	85.5
Dec	135.3	160.0	198.4	109.6	94.8	152.3	94.3
1920—June	149.4	185.0	209.7	119.1	104.8	169.7	100.7
Dec	138.3	146.4	187.8	131.4	119.0	164.4	104.7
1921—May	126.6	121.8	161.5	139.2	112.9	141.6	104.7
Sept	125.3	129.2	139.5	140.0	112.7	127.8	104.0
Dec	123.6	126.1	133.4	142.3	113.8	124.4	103.5
1922—Mar	119.3	118.3	127.5	142.0	110.5	117.7	101.8
June	119.5	121.0	124.9	142.5	110.0	115.5	100.9
Sept	118.7	118.1	123.5	142.8	115.8	115.7	100.7
Dec	120.4	122.4	123.6	143.8	117.3	119.3	100.4
1923—Mar	120.2	119.7	125.4	144.5	116.5	124.7	100.5
June	121.6	123.7	125.7	143.6	113.2	127.4	100.5
Sept	123.1	126.6	126.7	147.4	114.5	127.5	101.1
Dec	123.5	126.0	126.7	149.6	116.0	127.4	101.5

EXHIBIT II—Continued

Date	All items	Food	Clothing	Rent	Fuel, electricity, and ice	Housefurnishings	Miscellaneous
1924—Mar.	122.0	121.3	126.3	150.4	114.7	126.5	101.2
June	121.8	121.5	125.1	152.0	112.0	123.1	101.3
Sept.	122.2	123.1	123.8	152.2	113.5	122.1	101.3
Dec.	123.2	125.9	123.0	152.6	114.2	122.7	101.7
1925—June	124.9	131.9	122.6	152.2	112.4	121.3	102.3
Dec.	128.2	140.6	121.8	152.0	121.3	121.1	102.6
1926—June	126.4	137.8	120.7	150.6	114.7	118.6	102.5
Dec.	126.1	136.8	119.6	150.0	118.6	117.3	102.8
1927—June	125.7	137.5	118.5	148.4	114.1	115.7	103.1
Dec.	123.8	132.5	116.9	146.9	115.4	115.2	103.6
1928—June	122.1	129.7	116.7	144.8	112.0	112.8	103.6
Dec.	122.4	130.6	116.0	143.3	114.3	112.1	104.3
1929—June	122.1	131.3	115.4	141.4	111.1	111.7	104.5
Dec.	122.8	133.8	114.7	139.9	113.6	111.3	104.9
1930—June	120.3	128.1	113.8	138.0	109.9	109.9	105.2
Dec.	115.3	116.5	109.4	135.1	112.4	105.4	104.9
1931—June	108.2	102.1	103.5	130.9	107.3	98.1	104.3
Dec.	104.2	96.5	96.3	125.8	109.1	92.6	103.3
1932—June	97.4	85.7	91.1	117.8	101.6	84.8	101.8
Dec.	93.5	82.0	86.2	109.0	102.5	81.3	100.2
1933—June	90.8	82.2	84.8	100.1	97.2	81.5	97.8
Dec.	93.9	88.1	94.4	95.8	102.9	91.1	98.1
1934—June	95.3	93.0	96.6	94.0	100.3	92.9	97.9
Nov.	96.2	95.4	96.5	93.9	101.8	93.6	97.8
1935—Mar. 15	97.8	99.7	96.8	93.8	102.1	94.2	98.1
July 15	97.6	99.4	96.7	94.1	99.0	94.5	98.2
Oct. 15	98.0	100.0	96.9	94.6	100.5	95.7	97.9
1936—Jan. 15	98.8	101.5	97.3	95.1	100.8	95.8	98.2
Apr. 15	97.8	98.4	97.4	95.5	100.8	95.7	98.4
July 15	99.4	102.6	97.2	96.5	99.1	95.9	98.7
Sept. 15	100.4	104.8	97.5	97.1	99.9	96.6	99.0
Dec. 15	99.8	101.6	99.0	98.1	100.5	97.9	99.1
1937—Mar. 15	101.8	105.0	100.9	98.9	100.8	102.6	100.2
June 15	102.8	106.0	102.5	101.0	99.2	104.3	100.9
Sept. 15	104.3	107.9	105.1	102.1	100.0	106.7	101.7
Dec. 15	103.0	102.7	104.8	103.7	100.7	107.0	102.0
1938—Mar. 15	100.9	97.5	102.9	103.9	101.2	104.7	101.6
June 15	100.9	98.2	102.2	104.2	98.6	103.1	101.8
Sept. 15	100.7	98.1	101.4	104.2	99.3	101.9	101.6
Dec. 15	100.2	97.2	100.9	104.3	100.0	101.7	101.0
1939—Mar. 15	99.1	94.6	100.4	104.3	100.1	100.9	100.5
June 15	98.6	93.6	100.3	104.3	97.5	100.6	100.4
Sept. 15	100.6	98.4	100.3	104.4	98.6	101.1	101.1
Dec. 15	99.6	94.9	101.3	104.4	99.9	102.7	100.9
1940—Mar. 15	99.8	95.6	102.0	104.5	100.6	100.5	100.8
June 15	100.5	98.3	101.7	104.6	98.6	100.1	100.6
Sept. 15	100.4	97.2	101.6	104.7	99.3	100.3	101.4
Oct. 15	100.2	96.2	101.6	104.7	99.9	100.4	101.6
Nov. 15	100.1	95.9	101.6	104.7	100.3	100.6	101.7
Dec. 15	100.7	97.3	101.6	104.9	100.7	100.4	101.8
1941—Jan. 15	100.8	97.8	100.7	105.0	100.8	100.1	101.9
Feb. 15	100.8	97.9	100.4	105.1	100.6	100.4	101.9
Mar. 15	101.2	98.4	102.1	105.1	000.7	101.6	101.9
Apr. 15	102.2	100.6	102.4	105.4	101.0	102.4	102.2
May 15	102.9	102.1	102.8	105.7	101.1	103.2	102.5
June 15	104.6	105.9	103.3	105.8	101.4	105.3	103.3
July 15	105.3	106.7	104.8	106.1	102.3	107.4	103.7
Aug. 15	106.2	108.0	106.9	106.3	103.2	108.9	104.0
Sept. 15	108.1	110.7	110.8	106.8	103.7	112.0	105.0
Oct. 15	109.3	111.6	112.6	107.5	104.0	114.4	106.9
Nov. 15	110.2	113.1	113.8	107.8	104.0	115.6	107.4
Dec. 15	110.5	113.1	114.8	108.2	104.1	116.8	107.7
1942—Jan. 15	112.0	116.2	116.1	108.4	104.3	118.2	108.5
Feb. 15	112.9	116.8	119.0	108.6	104.4	119.7	109.4
Mar. 15	114.3	118.6	123.6	108.9	104.5	121.2	110.1
Apr. 15	115.1	119.6	126.5	109.2	104.3	121.9	110.6
May 15	116.0	121.6	126.2	109.9	104.9	122.2	110.9
June 15	116.4	123.2	125.3	108.5	105.0	122.3	110.9
July 15	117.0	124.6	125.3	108.0	106.3	122.8	111.1
Aug. 15	117.5	126.1	125.2	108.0	106.2	123.0	111.1
Sept. 15	117.8	126.6	125.8	108.0	106.2	123.6	111.4
Oct. 15	119.0	129.6	125.9	108.9	106.2	123.6	111.8
Nov. 15	119.8	131.1	125.9	108.0	106.2	123.7	112.7
Dec. 15	120.4	132.7	125.9	108.0	106.3	123.7	112.8
1943—Jan. 15	120.7	133.0	126.0	108.0	107.3	123.8	113.2
Feb. 15	121.0	133.6	126.2	108.0	107.2	124.1	113.6
Mar. 15	122.8	137.4	127.6	108.0	107.4	124.5	114.5
Apr. 15	124.1	140.6	127.9	108.0	107.5	124.8	114.9
May 15	125.1	143.0	127.9	108.0	107.6	125.1	115.3
June 15	124.8	141.9	127.9	108.0	107.7	125.4	115.7
July 15	123.9	139.0	129.1	108.0	107.6	125.6	116.1
Aug. 15	123.4	137.2	129.6	108.0	107.6	125.9	116.5
Sept. 15	123.9	137.4	132.5	108.0	107.6	126.3	117.0
Oct. 15	124.4	138.2	133.3	108.0	107.8	126.7	117.6
Nov. 15	124.2	137.3	133.5	108.0	107.9	126.9	117.7
Dec. 15	124.4	137.1	134.6	108.1	109.4	127.9	118.1
1944—Jan. 15	124.2	136.1	134.7	108.1	109.5	128.3	118.4
Feb. 15	123.8	134.5	135.2	108.1	110.3	128.7	118.7
Mar. 15	123.8	134.1	136.7	108.1	109.9	129.0	119.1
Apr. 15	124.6	134.6	137.1	108.1	109.9	132.9	120.9
May 15	125.1	135.5	137.4	108.1	109.8	135.0	121.3
June 15	125.4	135.7	138.0	108.1	109.6	138.4	121.7
July 15	126.1	137.4	138.3	108.2	109.7	138.7	122.0
Aug. 15	126.4	137.7	139.4	108.2	109.8	139.3	122.3
Sept. 15	126.5	137.0	141.4	108.2	109.8	140.7	122.4
Oct. 15	126.5	136.4	141.9	108.2	109.8	141.4	122.8
Nov. 15	126.6	136.5	142.1	108.2	109.9	141.7	122.9
Dec. 15	127.0	137.4	142.8	108.3	109.4	143.0	123.1

EXHIBIT III.—*Estimated distribution, by net income classes, of income recipients, income payments, and personal taxes paid in the calendar year 1944*

[Number of income recipients in millions; dollar figures in billions]

	Total	Distribution by net income classes [1]						
		$0 to $1,000	$1,000 to $2,000	$2,000 to $3,000	$3,000 to $5,000	$5,000 to $10,000	$10,000 to $25,000	$25,000 and over
Number of income recipients [2]	67.3	21.6	24.4	12.2	6.7	1.8	0.5	0.1
Total income payments [3]	157.0	19.2	42.4	34.6	30.7	14.5	8.1	7.4
Less personal taxes [4]	22.0	.5	4.1	3.4	4.3	2.8	2.4	4.4
Total income payments after personal taxes	135.1	18.7	38.3	31.2	26.4	11.7	5.7	3.0

[1] The classification by net income brackets is in accordance with net income as determined by the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943.

[2] Includes only the income recipients who would be potential income-tax paying units if there were no exemptions and if the present advantage to filing separate returns were retained. The income of income recipients who are dependents for purpose of the Federal individual income tax is included, although the number of such income recipients is excluded.

[3] Income payments are as defined by the Department of Commerce.

[4] Refers to the personal taxes paid under present law in the calendar year rather than liability for personal taxes incurred in the calendar year. Personal taxes consist of Federal, State, and local individual income taxes, estate, inheritance, and gift taxes, property taxes (excluding taxes on business property and rented houses), taxes and licenses on motor vehicles not used in business, miscellaneous personal taxes, and nontax payments to Government. The portion of the Federal individual income tax withheld is considered paid by the individual when withheld rather than when received by the U. S. Treasury.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to totals.

Source: Treasury Department, Division of Research and Statistics, Oct. 19, 1943.

EXHIBIT IV.—*Estimated distribution by $500 net income classes under $5,000 of income recipients classified according to marital status, and of income payments in the calendar year 1944* [1]

[Number of income recipients in thousands; dollar amounts in millions]

Net income classes [2]	Single persons and married persons not living with spouse, who are not heads of families; and fiduciaries		Married persons and heads of families		All cases of income recipients	
	Number of income recipients [3]	Income payments [4]	Number of income recipients [3]	Income payments [4]	Number of income recipients [3]	Income payments [4]
0 to $1,000	12,250	10,990	9,370	8,250	21,620	19,240
$1,000 to $1,500	4,980	7,310	7,450	11,110	12,430	18,429
$1,500 to $2,000	2,410	4,710	9,580	19,300	11,990	24,010
$2,000 to $2,500	970	2,460	6,590	17,480	7,550	19,940
$2,500 to $3,000	500	1,550	4,110	13,160	4,610	14,700
$3,000 to $3,500	230	890	2,360	9,110	2,590	10,000
$3,500 to $4,000	130	560	1,790	8,000	1,920	8,620
$4,000 to $4,500	90	430	1,210	6,270	1,360	6,700
$4,500 to $5,000	80	430	860	5,000	940	5,420
Total under $5,000	21,630	29,340	43,300	97,720	64,930	127,060

[1] This table presents in greater refinement the same estimates contained as a part of the table appearing on p. 21 of the revised hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives on revenue revision of 1943, Oct. 4, 1943.

[2] The classification by net income brackets is in accordance with net income as determined by the Current Tax Payment Act of 1943.

[3] Includes only the income recipients who would be potential income-tax paying units if there were no exemptions and if the present advantage to filing separate returns were retained. The income of income recipients who are dependents for purposes of the Federal individual income tax is included, although the number of such income recipients is excluded.

[4] Income payments are as defined by the Department of Commerce.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to totals.

Source: Treasury Department, Division of Research and Statistics Jan. 17, 1944.

EXHIBIT VI

The operation of the 1944 law with respect to exemptions and credits for dependents may be seen in the following table:

Exemptions	Type of return	Taxpayer's personal exemption	Spouse's earnings [1]	Single		Total exemptions
				Child No. 1	Child No. 2	
Normal tax	Joint	$500	No income			$500
Do	do	500	$100 to $500 adjusted gross income			600
Do	do	500	$2,000 adjusted gross income			1,000
Surtax	do	500	$500 exemption regardless of income.	$500	$500	2,000
Normal tax	Separate	500	No income			500
Do	do	500	$100 adjusted gross income			500
Do	do	500	$2,000 adjusted gross income			500
Surtax	do	500	$500 if not dependent on another taxpayer.	500	500	2,000
Do	do	500	Adjusted gross income in any amount.	500	500	1,500

[1] Earnings here means adjusted gross income within the definition of that term in sec. 22 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code. It is also assumed in the above table that the children qualify as dependents as defined in sec. 25 (b) (3) of the code, who are not dependent upon another taxpayer.

EXHIBIT V

The following is a record of the changes that have been made in the personal exemptions and credits for dependent under the several revenue acts from 1913 to date for individual income-tax purposes:

Tax law, date of enactment	Income year	Married living with spouse; head of family	Single or married not living with spouse; not head of family; fiduciaries	Credit for each dependent
1913	May–Dec. 1913	$4,000	$3,000	-------
1916	1916	4,000	3,000	-------
1917	1917	2,000	1,000	$200
1918	1918	2,000	1,000	200
1918	1919	2,000	1,000	200
1918	1920	2,000	1,000	200
1921	1921–22–23	2,500	1,000	400
1924	1924	2,500	1,000	400
1926	1925–26–27	3,500	1,500	400
1928	1928–29–30 1931–32–33 1934–35–36 1937–38–39	2,500	1,000	400
1940	1940	2,000	800	400
1941	1941	1,500	700	400
1942	1942–43	1,200	500	350
1944	1944	[1] 1,000	[1] 500	[1] 500

[1] The Individual Income Tax Act of 1944 inaugurated a system of "per capita" exemptions and credits for dependents as a step toward simplification of the personal income tax system. For surtax purposes the "per capita" system calls for a uniform exemption of $500 per person, that is the taxpayer receives a $500 exemption, his wife $500 and there is a $500 allowance for each dependent. For normal tax purposes each taxpayer is given a normal tax exemption of $500 with no credits for dependents. In a joint return by a husband and wife the normal tax exemption amounts to $500 plus the lesser income of the 2 spouses, not exceeding in the aggregate for both taxpayers the sum of $1,000.

PROSPERITY AND PURCHASING POWER

Before I conclude I wish to make one more observation. Real, sound, peacetime prosperity can come only by increasing the purchasing power of the millions of people in the low-income group. Let us go over exhibit III again. A total of 21,600,000 income recipients, including 9,370,000 heads of families, received last year $19,200,000,000 in incomes of $1,000 or under. Suppose we could increase that average income to $1,500 a year. We would be adding $9,600,000,000 to our total income payments. Let us go further: 12,430,000 income recipients, including 7,310,000 heads of families, received last year $18,420,000,000 in income payments of $1,000 to $1,500. If we could bring that average up from $1,500 to $2,000, we would be adding $6,215,000,000 to our income payments. Then let us go still further and take the 11,990,000 recipients, including 9,580,000 heads of families, who received income payments of $1,500 to $2,000 and increase them from $2,000 to $2,500, or $500 a year. We would be adding nearly $6,000,000,000 more to the income payments. Let us stop there. Surely this could be done without bringing about inflation, since practically every dollar would be spent for decent living. If we could do this we would be adding nearly $23,000,000,000 to our income payments. While some of this money would undoubtedly go back in taxes under my proposed bill, the greater part would be added to the purchasing power of the Nation, providing jobs for service men and women and others doing much toward starting the wheels of peacetime prosperity rolling.

Previous to World War I there were 54,000,000 workers organized and unorganized in America. The reason we have enjoyed constitutional government for 150 years is because these millions of workers and millions of others like them have believed in constitutional government. If and when you shake their faith in constitutional government, all the rights we enjoy under the Constitution, including the right to own property, will be a thing of the past.

Unless this low-income group is given relief from this unjust burden of taxation, being permitted to earn and enjoy a decent living, they will turn to some ism for relief. They are in the majority and in the final analysis will say what kind of a government we will have.

CONTINUATION OF INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 187) authorizing the continuation of an investigation by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (Rept. No. 345), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is authorized, as a committee, by subcommittee, or otherwise, to continue during the present Congress the investigation begun under authority of H. Res. 290 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and continued by H. Res. 15, H. Res. 188, and H. Res. 383 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and by H. Res. 58 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and for such purposes such committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon such committee by H. Res. 290 of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

CREATION OF ACADEMY FOR FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, when we look at the world today, we cannot escape a feeling of sadness. The war has produced 824,676 casualties for the United States alone. Its total ravages through starvation and disease, as well as by the violence of war, run into untold millions. Little children, helpless old people, and all classes have been the victims of war. The problem of restoring a peaceful economy and providing food and other necessities for the world when the fighting stops will be enormous. There may be more hate in the world after the war than there was before or during the war.

We are winning a victory, but not without a price. Young men who were ambitious, capable, educated, and possessing a desire to live have given their all. Parents who dreamed of sending their sons to college have lost their sons. Thousands of young men will go through life, crippled, maimed, blind, and diseased. The country is filled with war orphans who will never know a father's smile, his playful arms, or his strong protection. When Sherman described war, he was talking about an old-fashioned war. Today, language fails us.

Will there be an end to wars? Will history repeat itself 25 years from now? Will the sons of our veterans today be compelled to fight in another world-wide war? Can there be any peace? The problem is so staggering, so complex, and so difficult that an answer of "No" seems irresistible. But the answer must not be "No." The brains, character, and genius of the world must be employed in an effort to maintain the peace. We must not run away from the problem because of its magnitude. If by our efforts we can eliminate some of the wars, our efforts will have been worth while.

I am inclined in the view that there is no easy foolproof formula or organization that will assure peace and prevent war. There is no virtue in mere cooperation. The underworld cooperates. Even men of good will but ignorant as to facts might cooperate for their own destruction. Cooperation to be of value must be intelligent and it must be cooperation for a good purpose.

With heavy hearts all mankind gropes for that which will bring order to a distressed and chaotic world. We can take a lesson from that which brings order in our several communities. Perhaps that which makes for order in a community on the prairies of Nebraska can be applied to our world community.

There are four institutions indispensable to order in any community. They are the courthouse, the home, the church, and the school.

The courthouse is a symbol of a government of law with limited and defined powers. It is a symbol of the settlement of disputes by reason. It is indispensable in the American community. But the courthouse alone is not self-sufficient. Whenever we fail to have good homes where individuals of good will reside, who receive knowledge from our schools and who receive character, idealism, and self-restraint from our churches, the courthouse is in jeopardy and cannot stand. So it is with a world governmental organization.

The home stands for character. The many problems that our Nation will face is a test of character for the American people. Our country can be no better than our citizens. The world can be no better than the citizens of the world. Peace on earth is in a measure an individual problem. We must be men of good will.

The church, as the third institution essential for order, has a tremendous task in bringing about world peace. These institutions are interdependent. Without the love of God proclaimed by the churches, government can become a symbol of tyranny instead of order. Without the message of the church, education can be for destruction. World peace has not a chance without a world-wide revival. The church today faces its greatest opportunity and its greatest responsibility of all time. Civilization's greatest calamity will be ours if the church fails. The church's task is not political. It is one of Evangelism and a world-wide missionary program. Love must supplant hate. Forgiveness must take the place of bitterness. The ideal of brotherhood must be resold in the world. The value of the individual must be again recognized everywhere.

If we believe that the power of God can heal a broken life, it follows that that same power can heal a community or a nation or the world. God forbid that the church becomes so political that it places all its faith in government and fails in that task which it alone can perform—the regeneration of human hearts.

The matter of education is vitally necessary for intelligent efforts at world peace. I wish to stress not so much the general field of education as specific education for training in our job of getting along in the world with others.

Our Military Academy was established in the year of 1802. Without a doubt we have through all the years had a much better Army because of that academy at West Point. In the year 1864 the Naval Academy was established. No one would argue that our Navy is not far better because of that institution, located at Annapolis. To this very day we do not have an institution whose job it is to train individuals to help our country get along in the world. We need a West Point of diplomacy. We need an academy for the Foreign Service that will provide the best training possible and that will develop and reflect a genuine American foreign policy. We need to educate some of our most capable youth in diplomacy. We need a system. We need a continuing and permanent foreign policy based upon justice. The fate of the world should never rest in the hands of three or four of the world's citizens and limited by their secret discussions. We need an open, forthright American foreign policy.

On the 7th day of July, 1943, I introduced in the Congress of the United States a bill for the creation of an Academy for Foreign Service. With slight changes, I reintroduced it in the Seventy-ninth Congress. It is H. R. 1100. I wish to mention some of its provisions.

My bill provides that in order to promote peace, greater understanding, and good will throughout the world and to provide a trained force for the foreign service, there shall be established a United States Academy of Foreign Service to be located at some point outside of the District of Columbia.

Admission to the academy shall be limited to men and women who are native-born citizens of the United States, who have reached their twentieth birthday and have not passed their twenty-fifth birthday and who have had at least 3 years' college or university education or the equivalent thereof. In addition to these requirements, the academy shall require an entrance examination of the applicant to ascertain his intellectual capacities and his aptitude for the foreign service. For a period, beginning with the cessation of hostilities of the present war and continuing for 3 years thereafter, individuals who have served in the armed services of the United States outside the continental limits of the United States for a period of at least 6 months shall be eligible for admission to the academy upon the passing of entrance examination only.

The return of the members of our armed forces to our civilian economy is going to have a wholesome political effect. These men and women will have the greatest right to take part in the government of our Republic. They have been in places where they could observe and they will have first-hand knowledge of the realities of the world. Their service outside of the United States will have given them a viewpoint that the rest of us do not have. I think that many of them are eminently fitted for diplomatic service and the provision to admit veterans under this more liberal arrangement will be for the best interests of our country.

The students at this Academy of Foreign Service shall be appointed as near as practicable by the same method as cadets are appointed to our Military Academy. By having these appointments made by the President, the Senators, and the Congressmen, we will attain a geographical spread in the student body. It will be a cross section of all America. These students will receive the same pay and allowances as is received by cadets in the Military Academy.

The Academy of Foreign Service shall provide for a 6-years' course of study. Four years of this shall consist of scholastic training within the academy and 2 years of apprentice training within the United States, under the the supervision of the academy in manufacturing, transportation, agriculture, marketing, finance, and other industries. Our objective will be a highly trained individual with practical experience and a thorough knowledge of the economy of America.

The course of study shall include, but shall not be limited to, Government of the United States, political and governmental theory, comparative religion, history, literature, science, composition, mathematics, economics, geography, foreign languages, agriculture, finance, international law, business and trade practices, and military and naval observation. The academy may arrange to temporarily assign students to the Military Academy and the Naval Academy of the United States for instruction in military observation.

This most difficult job of being a diplomat demands that the person be highly trained in all of these subjects. Their knowledge of government, religion, history, languages, and business and science are essential in order that they understand the rest of the world and that they understand their own country. It is possible to have a foreign service that advances the best interests of both the United States and the rest of the world at the same time.

In requiring training in military observation it is not expected that these diplomats shall be militarists. They should know enough about military and naval operations to be better than average observers. The Government of the United States and the people of the country should be informed at all times as to what is going on in the world in the way of armament programs. That has not always been the case.

This academy shall be governed by a board of trustees which shall have power to make rules and regulations and select the president and faculty of the academy. The board shall consist of the Secretary of State, three Members of the United States Senate, and three Representatives in Congress. Not more than two Senators and two Representatives shall be of the same political party. As one who believes that a permanent peace must be a just peace and a peoples' peace, I want this academy to be responsive to the people. The people have a direct control of the Congress. The Congress with the Secretary of State will control the academy. Out of the procedure it is hoped that a permanent, constructive, and just foreign policy will be evolved and maintained.

The bill also carries the provision whereby certain educators will be called upon to assist in the selection of the president and faculty of the academy for the first 2 years of its operation.

The bill provides that appropriate degrees shall be conferred upon the graduates of the academy and that upon graduation they may be required to serve the United States Government wherever assigned. Upon graduation they shall be available for assignment as follows:

First. To the State Department in said Department and in the foreign service of the United States.

Second. To the Department of Commerce for service in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce or other related duties.

Third. To the Department of Agriculture in connection with the Office of Foreign Agriculture Relations or other service relating to the production, distribution, and marketing of agricultural products.

Fourth. To the Department of the Treasury for service in connection with international finances and currency, tariffs, debt adjustments, and related activities.

The bill also provides that a graduate of the Academy of Foreign Service in any of the foregoing capacities, must be assigned to duty within the continental United States for a minimum of 1 year out of every 5. The purpose of this is obvious. This is our country. Those who represent us abroad should never grow away from it. America has in the past been a positive force for good. I pray that she may always be that. There is no danger of having too much Americanism in the world. There is a danger of having too much of the foreign ideologies in America.

In the days that follow this tragic war, America's sphere abroad will be far greater than it has been heretofore. Many countries of the world and countless islands of the sea, which up until now have been obscure, have become of world-wide importance. The United States has interests in all of those places. Justice has been defeated at times because the United States has been outmaneuvered in diplomatic circles. We owe it to ourselves and to all the world to prepare and train for leadership.

I am one who believes that the foreign commerce of the United States can be expanded; that it can be expanded to the benefit of ourselves as well as to the foreign nations. I further believe that commerce with the United States is a force for peace and not for war. The estab-

lishment of an academy to give training along this line will help us in winning the friendship and respect of the nations of the world.

The proposal that I have introduced is far from a perfect measure. No doubt a lengthy and thorough hearing on this bill by the Committee on Foreign Affairs would bring out the need for several modifications. I do not contend that every detail in this bill is the last word on the subject. I do contend that we should not delay the establishment of an academy for the Foreign Service any longer. There are those who say that it is not necessary because there are a handful of universities offering training in the diplomatic field. By the same token we might advocate that West Point be discontinued because the country is dotted with other military academies. If our diplomats and foreign representatives are all educated in private and endowed schools, either we will have no foreign policy or it will be the policy of some private individual or group of individuals. We need a forthright unified American system. We need a permanent and constructive foreign policy based upon justice. We need an institution where such a policy will be evolved and where the young men and young women will receive the practical and technical training necessary to carry out that policy.

This proposal to establish a West Point of diplomacy has received a great deal of favorable editorial comment. Many of the educators of the Nation have expressed themselves in its favor.

Dr. J. E. LeRossignol, chairman, executive committee, University of Nebraska Council on Post-War Reconstruction, wrote:

> I have read the bill with great interest and think it a most meritorious measure which, if passed, will fill a long-felt want. More than ever before this country needs highly trained men in the diplomatic and consular services, and I am sure that an academy such as you propose will supply the needed material.

Dr. Emil L. Jordan, chairman of the committee on foreign reconstruction training, New Jersey College for Women, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J., wrote:

> Your idea of an Academy of Foreign Service is excellent, entirely in tune with the times and with our post-war needs.

Dr. Frank L. Apperly, D. S. C., M. D., professor of pathology, Medical College of Virginia, wrote:

> Your recently reported advocacy of a "West Point of diplomacy" for training men for diplomatic posts must have the full support of all thinking men.

One of the leading clergymen of the Nation, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, said:

> I am much interested in the bill you have introduced. It seems to me high time that such an academy be established for the purposes you have in mind.

There are many other expressions along this line, but I shall not incumber the RECORD with them all.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this bill (H. R. 1100) may be duly considered and passed in the not too distant future.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is recognized for 1 hour.

MILITARY GOVERNMENT OF OCCUPIED GERMANY

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I arise to report to the Congress on military government of occupied Germany. This report is based upon experiences, observations, and study while serving with various military government detachments in Germany and upon an analysis of policies, plans, and objectives of military government.

Wisely or unwisely, it has been decided that our forces, along with British and Russian troops, will occupy Germany with, also, the probability of French participation. That part of Germany thus far occupied is serving as a testing ground for policies and procedures of military government and its operation is being studied carefully by observers both civilian and military.

Political chaos and severe physical destruction prevail in German towns and communities from which our conquering armies have newly driven the German Army. All semblances of law and order have vanished with the retreating Nazis.

In a few instances, the Germans have evacuated entire populations. But in most cases civilians have remained. Many have hidden themselves in the woods, in caves, in holes in order to escape evacuation and bombardment and to return to their cities and homes after combat has passed on. Recently, the Nazis have modified their policy of forced evacuation and as high as 98 percent have been found in farm villages where people are tied to the soil.

The physical destruction of German cities, homes, factories, schools, and facilities, is appalling. The degree of the destruction varies, ranging from small damage to isolated farm villages to utter devastation of towns and cities of strategic importance, such, for instance, as the town of Julich where 90 percent of the buildings were leveled to the ground. Where the principal buildings of Julich stood there are now but holes in the ground filled with shattered brick, powdered mortar, and splintered wood. Even the 10 percent of the buildings standing, mostly in the suburbs, are all damaged severely. Normally this was a thriving little industrial town of 10,000 people. When we entered Julich there were but two civilians there. Heinzberg, Geilenkirchen, and Duren have virtually the same story. In the larger cities such as Aachen and Cologne the devastation is less complete, but even more shocking in mass.

One cannot witness this destruction without being impressed with the calculated thoroughness and the awesome might of Allied warfare. Our soldiers really mean business. In attack, they are magnificent and terrifying.

Military government detachments have accompanied or followed tactical troops into all towns and villages of occupied Germany. Many detachments have established initial order and control of the civilian population under fire. For instance, detachments at both Geilenkirchen and Eubach endured prolonged artillery fire, suffering direct hits by 88 shells on the buildings in which they were located.

Conditions in a newly conquered town are usually desperate. If the town has been under bombardment, as is the usual case, the town is in a state of severe destruction. If it has suffered an air raid, the destruction is more complete. German dead, civilians and soldiers, decomposing horses, cows, dogs, stinking high to heaven, litter the streets and buildings.

Civilians circulating on the streets and among our troops constitute an insufferable hazard. They interfere with communication and present a danger of sabotage and espionage which tactical commanders will positively not tolerate, and especially so, since many German soldiers have been found in civilian clothing—some deserters and some spies.

The very first concern of military government detachments is the security of the tactical forces.

So the first job of military government upon entering a newly conquered town is to establish immediate and rigid control of the civilian population. All civilians are ordered immediately into their houses and cellars and required to stay there until given authority to come out. Burial parties and clean-up squads are then organized and closely supervised. Sanitary and health conditions must be improved for the safety of our troops.

In order to effect this initial control, a local government must be set up and, obviously, it must be set up immediately. The first effort, however, is always regarded as an emergency and temporary local government set-up, with improvements or changes in personnel to be made when time and circumstances permit.

It is the purpose of military government to direct and dictate German government rather than actually to govern. A handful of military government soldiers is not supposed to do the mass of work in local governmental administration. Our will is accomplished through use of local government officials selected and appointed by the M. G. O.—military government officer—as well as controlled and supervised by him.

So one of the first jobs of the M. G. O. is the selection of a bürgermeister. Usually before entering a town the M. G. O. has had a list of not only the leading Nazis who are not to be appointed, but also a list of people who have been removed from office or otherwise discriminated against by the Nazis. The M. G. O. seeks whatever local aid he can find in this selection, from such people as those with anti-Nazi records, people who have been discriminated against by the Nazi Party leaders and local church leaders, whose aid, with but rare exceptions, has been both trustworthy and helpful.

Some mistakes have been made in the selection of local government officials. Sometimes the M. G. O. of a spearhead detachment, going into a town under combat conditions and with urgent responsibilities affecting the security of tactical operations, simply does not have

the time to make thorough inquiry into the political background and antecedents of the men he uses temporarily. He has an emergency job to do and what he actually does is to grab the most likely man, not to honor him but to use him in getting a pressing job done, leaving to the military government detachment "pinpointed" for more permanent control of the particular town the job of more careful screening and appointment of local officials.

Fortunately, it is the firm policy of military government that under no circumstances shall Nazis or ardent sympathizers be retained in office for administrative convenience or expediency, and local military government officers have been ordered to remove local officials whose Nazi leanings or former affiliations have been discovered.

Mistakes made thus far are not important unless they are made so by repetition. Maybe we can profit by them.

When the bürgermeister is appointed it becomes his responsibility, under the M. G. O.'s direction always, to administer local government and control through and with the help of what other local officers and employees are needed, whose appointments are likewise screened and approved by the M. G. O. and the C. I. C.—Counter Intelligence Corps.

Civilian policemen and other local government personnel are appointed, given arm bands for identification, and given strict duties, too. If either the bürgermeister, his deputies or policemen fail in their duties, the responsibility for failure falls upon them, with appropriate punishment. If anyone fails to obey an order of a military government officer or in any way refuses to cooperate, he is punished, usually severely.

Strange as it may seem, many Germans are anxious to be appointed bürgermeister, policeman, civil servant, or to any position, it matters not what, under our supervision. In fact, the people are generally submissive and servile. The same people who perhaps only a few minutes before were shooting at our soldiers from behind barricades, once the town is captured, appear with hats in hand, the picture of humility and cooperative attitudes. Some people say this is a deep-laid Nazi plan. To some extent this may be true, undoubtedly so. But for the most part I think the explanation is more elementary; they fear punishment and they fear starvation, their life reduced to the bare essentials of living. Once conquered, they are at our feet, making no further claim to being the master race. This is the rule, but, of course, there are dangerous exceptions.

The difficulty in organizing local government, therefore, arises not in finding Germans who will serve but in selecting capable people without the taint of nazism. This is sometimes more difficult than one would imagine because the great majority of businessmen, worker leaders, professional people, and property owners have been members of the Nazi Party. Also, there is unmistakable evidence that before the Nazis abandoned the policy of forced evacuation certain individuals were approved or "drafted" to remain in specified towns. In the area of Aachen, for instance, the C. I. C. reports that more than 1,200 people were given certificates of selection which exempted them from German evacuation. True, some of these people remained on such essential jobs as preventing the flooding of mines, but in every case they remained obviously for reasons satisfactory to the local Nazi leadership. I prosecuted one of these so "drafted to remain" German civilians in military government court for the offense of harboring a German soldier and spy suspect in civilian clothing behind our lines.

The M. G. O. brings into each town with him a supply of circular notices, printed in both German and English, proclaiming the establishment of military government law and setting forth specific regulations or law as to circulation, curfew, looting, espionage, and so forth. These are quickly posted.

All civilians are required to present themselves at the bürgermeister's office and register. A registration or identification card is given them, establishing them as residents of that particular community. They are required to keep this identification on their persons at all times. This registration assists in apprehension of Nazi soldiers in civilian clothing, gives those charged with food responsibilities an accurate gage to their job and serves as a means of preventing circulation from one town to another.

Civilians are required to turn in to the bürgermeister's office all firearms and ammunition. A methodical search is made of all inhabited houses and if any person is found with firearms or ammunition the penalty is severe. American soldiers have been killed by German civilians, some by very young Germans. Other contrabands of war, such as radio transmission sets, carrier pigeons, and so forth, are confiscated. Strict curfew is established.

It is only after these initial steps necessary for the security and protection of the tactical forces are taken that the more complicated processes of military government are undertaken or permitted, such as establishment of military government courts, trial of war criminals, food procurement and distribution, repatriation of United Nations displaced persons, repair of public services, civilian health and welfare programs, and so forth.

Military government courts are set up for the trial of civilian offenders against military government law. The procedure in these courts is a combination of American and continental practices, adapted to exigencies of military government. If an American lawyer stepped into a military government court, he would at first be shocked by the seemingly summary procedure, the loose rules of evidence, and what, upon first impression, would appear to him as arbitrariness. Under the procedure no guilty party can escape punishment because of legal technicalities and red tape. A military government officer in Aachen said, "It is a rough sort of justice."

No matter what his offense, though, the German civilian is permitted to have counsel and to cross-examine the prosecuting witnesses. In the case of serious offenses, a military government officer is assigned as defending counsel for the accused. Instead of complaining at the lack of justice done in our military government courts, not a few German civilians have said that they provide a more even justice than Germans have been accustomed to. My own impression was that sentences for serious offenses may tend to be too light, while too much attention may be given to trivialities.

Later, German civilian courts under German civilian judges, subject to military government supervision, will be established.

As soon as the military situation permits, United Nations citizens are segregated from the German nationals, and, thereafter, separate treatment is given them. They are concentrated in areas where they can be given food, shelter, and medical care and from which their repatriation can proceed in cooperation with representatives from their native countries. One military government officer said, "There is too much social worker technique in the involved procedure of repatriation. It is more fitted to an uplifting program than to the exigencies of an emergency job." But be that as it may, the repatriation procedure is unquestionably slow, and, like many other problems of military government, has only just begun. At best, repatriation of the six to seven millions, or more, whom the Nazis have carried into Germany for forced labor will require many months. The job must not be underestimated, for to do would but lead to unfortunate disappointments.

The local German governments, created by military government and operating under military government direction, are required to administer a rigid food-rationing program and to prohibit hoarding. Procurement of sufficient food from German sources for equitable distribution to all civilians is the responsibility of the local government. American food is used only in the most desperate situation.

The mountainous region of Germany is not a heavy food-producing area. Western and southwestern Germany traditionally has a deficit in food production, and has imported food not only from eastern Germany but from other countries in large quantities. The urgent need for additional food in Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Russia, to whom we have been supplying food, leaves little hope for the importation of food into western and southern Germany from the east, even from eastern Germany.

The month of March is the planting season for potatoes and many other food crops, but the fertile fields of the Rhine and Roer valleys will lie largely unplanted for three reasons: First and most important, military operations prevent; second, scarcity of manpower; and third, the fields are sown with mines. Of course, all things must be secondary to the success and security of tactical operations, but I cannot recommend too strongly that, as soon as military operation will permit, every German civilian, male and female and regardless of previous occupation, be forced into the fields

to plant all available seed in this rich soil. The removal of mines is a hazardous business, of course, but we did not sow the mines and American soldiers certainly must not be used to remove mines in order that food can be produced for Germans to eat.

And eating is going to be a very acute problem for the German people. Already scarce even in the fertile Rhineland, food scarcity will surely become more urgent before another harvest and if the conflict is prolonged for several months, widespread starvation will be inevitable and beyond our power to prevent. The United States, what with her own shortages, the Pacific war still on her hands and the acute needs of her Allies, will have no choice but to require the Germans to fend for themselves as best they can, sending to Germany only enough bread, even if that is possible, for bare existence.

The German people could greatly lessen their own suffering during the desperate months ahead by thwarting their Nazi masters and surrendering now. If the conflict is prolonged and all Germany's resources are destroyed, it will be of no avail for the German people to say that because we have conquered them it is our responsibility to feed them. The United States is Christian and humane but there is a limit to what she can and will do. One thing sure, her own people come first and her friends next.

In prolonging the hopeless struggle, the Nazi leadership of Germany is not only uselessly sacrificing the lives of German soldiers and civilians but they are also increasing the misery and suffering which the German people must later endure and which it will be beyond the power of the Allied Nations to prevent.

In the approximately one-third of Germany which, by tentative agreement, the United States is to occupy, I believe we may find at least one-half of the entire German civilian population. My reasons for reaching this conclusion are as follows:

First. The Germans mortally fear the Russians and they are fleeing in untold thousands from that part of Germany which it has been announced Russia will occupy. News and rumors have spread through Germany of how German civilians in Rumania have been taken to Russia for work. The Germans also have in mind how their own leaders enslaved millions of Russians, French, Poles, and Czechs, and they fear retribution in the manner of "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth."

Second. Tactical operations encourage southward evacuations. It is obvious to all Germans that the Ruhr and the northern plains of Germany are the likely scenes of impending climactic battles and, of course, in every way possible they are fleeing the intolerable hazards of combat.

Third. The evacuation of German civilians as well as industries and slave labor from west of the Rhine has largely been to the central and southern regions of Germany. This has been true not only because there was more security by reason of physical barriers and remoteness but also because there was more living space.

And another important thing, the population to fall in our hands will be one largely of women and children and old men. In German towns west of the Rhine young German male civilians were indeed scarce.

This human problem is the key to our problems of military government. After all, there is not much that can be done with a pile of brick rubble except salvage. There is not much one can do with an exploded railroad locomotive; there is not much one can do even with a wrecked church except to hope that some day a rebuilt edifice will stand as a monument to the reconsecration of the German people to nobler ideals. Indeed, it is with the people we have to work in Germany and they constitute, as they have for more than a hundred years, the greatest problem of world civilization.

We will have on our hands not only an overconcentration of the German civilian population in "our part" of Germany but it is very likely we will find there, also, some 3,000,000 United Nations peoples taken into Germany by the Nazis for forced labor who will not only have to be fed but repatriated.

Of great importance, too, from the standpoint of allied problems in the occupation of Germany, is the fact that most basic elements of the entire German national economy will have been destroyed.

A financial crisis of the most serious proportions can only be avoided by the most rigid sort of controls. The people of not only Germany but of other countries as well will have but little confidence in the German Reichsmark with its history of instability. We must not attempt or permit an attempt to support the Reichsmark by orthodox financial methods, such as Great Britain's recent unsuccessful attempts to support the Greek currency. In my opinion, the German currency will be unsupportable by such methods which, in the main, rely for effectiveness upon confidence. An indication of how the Reichsmark may fall in value in international exchange can be found in its present value on the black market in Switzerland where a Reichsmark is now valued at approximately 1 cent. This probably means that no international exchange value of the Reichsmark can even be fixed, let alone supported. I was informed that the Reichsmark now has very small purchasing power on black-market operations within Nazi-held Germany. The Nazis maintain its value, or measure of exchange, by authoritarian controls. Within Germany it is unthinkable that there will not be a medium of exchange. Therefore, the value of German currency under military government will have to be fixed by fiat and maintained by rigid controls. That is, if complete economic chaos is to be averted.

We will find credit drastically curtailed or nonexistent. Forced extension of credit for the resumption of essential activity may have to be required of German citizens and institutions who may be in possession of means of credit. We must be prepared to find that even real property values will exist mostly in terms of the elementary essentials of life.

Experience has demonstrated that transportation facilities suffer less than many others. True, a lot of locomotives and railroad bridges will be blown up, but it must be remembered, also, that Germany has looted rolling stock from many countries and that damage inflicted by the Germans upon their own roadbeds, in contrast to what they did to the railroads in Greece, can be repaired comparatively quickly. Likewise, the highways and the intricate inland waterway systems will remain. But all these facilities will be used for our own purposes first. And we will have a tremendous transportation problem in movement of men, equipment, and supplies. Then, there is the very large transportation problem involved in the repatriation of displaced United Nations persons and prisoners of war. Their welfare comes ahead of German civilian needs. Stolen rolling stock will be returned, too, plus reparation equipment for that destroyed by Germans.

If the Germans prolong the war and have to be conquered down to the last town, production facilities and means of employment of the people will have been to a large extent annihilated. This would be their loss and would greatly add to their suffering. Munitions and war production facilities will, of course, be destroyed in any event. But the Germans will be permitted or required to use facilities for food production, food processing, textile production, medicine, building material, and such other production as is essential to the needs of the occupying powers and the minimum essential needs of the German people themselves.

Pending defeat or unconditional surrender, the United States and British forces will occupy under the command of the Supreme Allied Commander. During the period of the Supreme Commander's responsibility, military government of Germany will be strictly a military administration and representatives of Allied civilian agents will participate only to the extent approved by General Eisenhower.

General Eisenhower has established the following primary objectives of Allied Military Government:

First. Imposition of the will of the Allies upon occupied Germany.

Second. Restoration and maintenance of law and order, insofar as the military situation permits.

Third. Care, control, and repatriation of United Nations displaced persons and minimum care necessary to effect control of enemy refugees and displaced persons.

Fourth. Protection of United Nations property, control of certain properties, and conservation of German foreign exchange assets.

Fifth. Apprehension of war criminals.

Sixth. Elimination of nazi-ism, Fascism, German militarism, the Nazi hierarchy, and their collaborators.

Seventh. Preservation and establishment of suitable civil administration to the extent required to accomplish the foregoing objectives.

The size of the military government personnel of our occupying forces need not be as large as many people estimate.

As I have said, it is our purpose to dictate and direct the government of Germany rather than to perform the details of administration. In every town, in every county, and in every province, there will be military government officers and detachments to see to it that German government and enterprise are in strict accord with the American or Allied will. But the area we will have under our direct American control will be no larger than the State of Mississippi. True, we will have many more people under our control than inhabit the State of Mississippi, but, even at that, control of the people and their activities will be exercised through control of their government. In addition to these military government detachments, there will have to be investigators, technical experts, and highly trained intelligence officers.

The size of the police and garrisoned force is a matter without the scope of this report.

Like all other soldiers I saw in Europe our servicemen in military government are making great sacrifices and are suffering hardships, hazards, boredom, and homesickness in doing a dreary, dangerous, and seemingly thankless job. On the whole, our military government personnel is capable and qualified. Care has been exercised in the selection of both officers and enlisted men for service in military government. There is some evidence that some of the personnel of military government were transferred to this branch of the service because they were surplus or misfits in other branches, which, of course, is not a new occurrence in the Army. Some of them are misfits in military government, too. Though these are small in number, one is too many in a job so vital as the execution of policies of occupation of Germany. Fortunately, this fact is recognized by those in high command of the program and is being corrected.

The organization for military government is good. Fields of jurisdiction and command, as well as responsibility, seem definitely defined.

From the organizational point of view, the only sizable fault I found was in misuse and misassignment of manpower, which in some cases seemed profligate. For instance, I served with one detachment where 6 out of 9 enlisted men spoke good German, whereas in another detachment, to which I was also attached temporarily, only 2 of 17 enlisted men could do better than make an embarrassing attempt at a few common German phrases. This resulted in more use of German nationals as interpreters than would have been necessary if those proficient in use of the German language had been assigned with more regard to their fitness for service. And I got the very definite impression that German nationals should be used as military government employees only when it is positively unavoidable. In the case of both officers and men, there was evidence of haphazard assignment of duty. This is a matter, however, that can readily be corrected.

The Army's non-fraternization policy is designed, first, to have American soldiers bring home to the German people that they must share the guilt of the war makers, and that they cannot be taken into friendship by the civilized people of the world until they have proved as a nation that they are worthy of friendship; and, next, to prevent too much tender-heartedness in individual application of policy which it is thought might grow out of fraternization. Therefore, the American troops are ordered not to fraternize with the German people, not to visit with them nor shake hands, nor speak with them except on business, not even to say good morning, nor to smile. It is not a policy of hate, but rather one of cold and distant aloofness, which the Army wishes its men to show before the Germans. In this way, it is hoped, the Germans may come to realize their war guilt, and to realize that decent people of the world do not wish to associate with war makers as friends. To do otherwise, the Army holds, would be to play into the Nazis' hands, and to have the Germans feel they can pull the wool over our eyes until their next war-making program is ready.

In theory that sounds very good, but enforcement of the policy is very difficult, so difficult that it may have to be reconsidered after hostilities cease.

I find it very difficult to describe the attitude of an American soldier toward German civilians with whom he is thrown. Perhaps I can relate two incidents which happened in towns where I was located that will serve to give a better description than narrative and words of my own devising.

During the time that circulation restrictions on the German population were very rigid, the German women in Kohlscheid, Germany, were allowed on the streets only from 2 until 4. German males were not allowed on the streets at all except to go into the coal mines, attend the sick, or some other essential activity. An elderly German woman had been after a bottle of water. They use very large bottles for water over there. She was a few minutes late in returning home. A Belgian guard, in proper conformity with his duty, stopped the woman, gave her a good bawling out and demanded to see her registration certificate. The woman set her big water bottle on the street and produced her papers which the Belgian guard found in order. He returned her papers accompanied with more harsh words, and then kicked her water bottle over. An American soldier who had been watching the procedure walked over and kicked the Belgian guard soundly and gave him a thorough thrashing, then got into his jeep and drove off leaving neither name nor sign, except a distraught Belgian and a bewildered German.

Then, at Herzogenrath this incident happened. A German child, about 2½ or 3 years of age, was running on the sidewalk, stumped his toe and fell into the gutter, skinning his knee and getting mud on his face. An American soldier picked up the crying boy, took his handkerchief and wiped the mud from his face, carried him to his home, gave him a piece of candy, and went on his way—a nonfraternization policy violator.

I heard one soldier say, "I came to Germany hating everything German in a sort of abstract way, hating Germany in the mass. Before I was here very long, I saw her as a nation of people, men, women, and children, some shrewd and some simple. I saw her as a nation of factories, schools, churches, a nation with enormous capacity for good, badly misdirected. I still hate it all in the mass, but somehow I have no hate for the individuals I meet and particularly those who try to be friendly."

These examples of American servicemen's reactions to German civilians with whom they are thrown serves to indicate the difficulty the Army has in handling this troublesome problem of human relations which grows out of the elementary fact of life that human beings, instinctively gregarious, instinctively respond to each other, sometimes kindly.

The American soldier has traits and characteristics typically his own, and it will be as impossible to make the American soldier uncivil and unresponsive to human wants and acts of personal friendliness as it is to suddenly make a disciple of the Golden Rule out of a Nazi SS trooper.

It will avail us nothing to inveigh against these characteristics of free-born American men, berating them as weaknesses when in fact they are sources of national strength. We had best take stock of ourselves and formulate a program of action sufficiently in keeping with American character that it can be enforced and applied by American soldiers as well as be supported by public opinion at home.

As soon as hostilities cease, the men who cannot immediately be transported from the European theater must be given opportunities for reasonable outlets of normal social instincts. Plans are now under way for the Army to send a very large number of troops to school in the leading universities of Europe and to take many on educational tours because, sad to relate, it will be impossible, for several months after cessation of hostilities in Europe, to transport either to the United States or to the Pacific theater all the servicemen now in Europe who will then no longer be needed there.

For the troops of occupation there should be opportunities for something more of a normal life, perhaps a completely Americanized city in Germany, inhabited only by Americans where families of servicemen, stuck over there with a miserable but important job, could join them with homes, friends, neighbors, churches, schools, and the like available.

I think the problem of nonfraternization has taken on an importance in the minds of both the men in the field and those in high command to which it is not logically entitled. After all, the treatment meted out to Germany must be something more material, it seems to me, than the assumption of unnatural personal attitudes by our occupying forces.

Collectively, the German Nation has committed unspeakable crimes against the very principles upon which civilization is based. There must be punishment. Justice cannot be done without punishment. I subscribe to every logical argument for a just peace, am convinced that only a just peace based on Christian

principles can endure. But that does not mean we should be just sentimental. We must act in the light of the terrible fact that twice in the last 25 years Germany has brought immeasurable destruction and suffering to the world.

The war aims of the American people in conquering and occupying Germany have been expressed in actions and resolutions by the United States Congress and this determination to be secure in their freedom and free from German aggression has been articulated, also, perhaps even more definitely, by President Roosevelt. The decisions and agreements announced at Yalta indicate kindred sentiments and objectives on the part of our great allies.

Though these long-range objectives are unmistakable in broad character, they are yet to be defined in particular. For instance, "elimination of nazi-ism, fascism, German militarism" is written into the primary objectives established by General Eisenhower and in the agreements at Yalta. One of the first steps in attaining this goal is the extirpation of all nazi-ism from civic and government leadership in Germany. This is definite and I think attainable. The next step will be to arrest and bring to stern justice the Nazi and militaristic leadership which forced this holocaust upon the world. The pattern for bringing war criminals to stern justice is pretty well cut. This immediate job is one of intelligence, investigation, prosecution, execution, suppression, and rigid control. This goal, too, is definite and I believe it is attainable if accomplished within a period in which a militant American public opinion will support the degree of severity necessary to accomplish it.

But will these steps eliminate nazi-ism and German militarism? There were 7,000,000 members of the Nazi Party, and let us not forget that Hitler is a product of Germany rather than Germany being the product of Hitler.

Realistically considered, the only lasting elimination of these social antidotes is the building of counter political and social sentiments in the German national conscience strong enough to withstand the inevitable backwash following our withdrawal from Germany, whether that be early or late. An actual elimination, then, of these blacklisted Germanisms will require long-range social, educational, economic, and political programs. The length of time necessary will be so long, in my opinion, that I would not dare estimate it in terms of years. A flexible estimate in terms of generations would be a more fitting measure of time.

To illustrate something of what I have in mind, let me tell about a conversation I had with a young German. Technically he was not a German citizen because his parents were Russian nationals, though the young man himself was born and had lived all his life in Germany. This, however, only served my purpose because he felt freer to talk to me. He was my interpreter for a week and at odd times we talked of other things besides the war. I wanted to learn his attitude. At first he was cautious and I did not press, but one day he said to me, "It was a nice life under Hitler before the war." Instead of exclaiming, and to avoid disturbing him, I purposely made a meaningless remark like, "The war has surely ruined a lot of things for many people."

He continued in the same melancholy mood, "Boys and girls played, we marched, we danced, had picnics, shows."

I could not help saying, "But how about the German people?"

"Oh, they were happy," he said. "There was plenty of work, money to spend, plenty of food."

"But what about their government?" I inquired, "didn't they want to have some control over their own government?"

"They did not care about policy," he said. They had work, money, lots of beer, vacation trips, sometimes even to Italy or Switzerland. They did not bother about policy. That was something for the government."

This illustrates a point that I want to emphasize: To most Germans "it was a nice life under Hitler before the war."

They forget the vicious excesses, the racial hatreds, the mass murder of innocents committed by Nazi Germans. They will blame us—not themselves—for the havoc wrought on them by war, and unless we can uproot their militaristic spirit, unless we can instill in the German people not only a capacity for popular self-government—which I do not think they now have—but also a desire for it and a desire for peaceful living in the family of nations, then how can we be sure that we have eliminated the kind of political philosophy on which fascism and nazi-ism thrive, or that they will not again fall into evil political ways?

In approaching this difficult task, we must not forget that Germans, as a whole, hate America as a nation. Twice we have been the deciding factor in their defeat. Our soldiers are now invading their country. The mere fact that we may wish their sentiments to take a certain course, if they discern our desires, may be the most decisive factor in fixing their real prejudices and sentiments, instead of their professed ones, in the very opposite direction. Any attempt to mold German public opinion or sentiment, therefore, must for any foreseeable future be subtle and by indirection.

"Reeducate Germany" is a frequently used term. I have noticed some people speaking and writing as if they imagine this job can jolly well be done by hanging Hitler and his gang, rewriting German textbooks, and having the right kind of schoolteachers tell German children what a fine thing is democracy. True, this will be a vital part, but do not let us forget that much of a child's learning and even more of his attitudes and personal philosophies derive from his home environment. We will have to reach much deeper into the German social and political structure than the schools, and over more than one generation.

The first and most important lesson in the reeducation of Germany—utter defeat—is being administered now. But defeat of the German Army will not be enough, either. Time will produce the men for another army. Neither will disarmament alone suffice, unless permanent. One reason for the greatness of the Germany Army at the outbreak of this war was because it was new, modern, built from scratch. The unparalleled success of the United States in this war is proof enough that capacity to make war more truly lies in productive capacity rather than in armaments initially at hand, important though they are.

Plans of action to attain our long-range objectives cannot wisely be defined in every particular, of course, and we must of necessity "play by ear," so to speak, in many respects.

But there are certain fundamentals which must at all times be controlling factors in the formulation of policy and plans of action. Deviation from these for the sake of expediency must not be tolerated by the American people.

When we consider the problem of Germany in all its many phases, I think we may arrive at the over-all conclusion that the only permanent security against her aggression lies in either: First, permanent occupation of Germany; second, dissolution of the German nation as a unified political and military entity; or third, the building of a Germany desiring to live in peace with the other civilized nations of the world and willing to seek accomplishment of her aspirations only through peaceful means.

The latter is the most desired and at the same time the most difficult of attainment.

I think it is of utmost importance that our every move, not only from the hour of Germany's surrender, but in the making of plans right now, should be taken with these primary facts as our guide. There will be times when it will be easier, less costly, and more expedient to improvise.

For specific example, there is now under discussion a proposal for a centralized economic administration of the whole German nation. This proposal is contrary to all of our planning until recently, and arises, at least in part I believe, out of desires for reparations. Undeniably, the German railroad system can be operated more efficiently with a centralized administration at Berlin; the integrated German electrical generation and transmission system can be more efficiently administered by highly centralized methods; the internal waterways system can be more easily controlled by one central authority. After all, that is the way the Nazis have been doing it. There is no doubt but that Germany can produce more goods for reparation with a centralized economic administration of the nation as a whole. But what price reparations? By that one move we would eliminate any opportunity for the growth of a separatist movement.

If our aim is to rebuild a strong centralized Germany, as quite a few influential citizens of more than one country advocate, then a highly centralized economic administration of the whole German economy would appear to be a logical step in that direction. If our aim is to restore and rebuild German productive capacity, then it would seem logical to so manage her economics as to increase production of reparation goods or for any other purpose, the effect being

largely the same insofar as war potential is concerned.

But if, on the other hand, we want to provide fertile economic and political soil for the possible growth of separatist or partition sentiment within Germany, then this proposed step, though admittedly expedient for the moment, would defeat the purpose. Should this possibility be thrown overboard before we even get started? If so, for what? Another Germany as the economic pulsation of Europe?

It is contemplated that after hostilities cease, the Allied control council, sitting in Berlin and composed of representatives of occupying powers, will determine policies by which the forces of the three occupying powers will administer military government in their respective jurisdictions. The control council can only promulgate a policy by unanimous action. In the absence of unanimous action on policies, the forces of the respective occupying powers must of necessity proceed upon their own plan.

The process of reaching an international agreement is slow at best even between two nations. Unanimity between three or four nations may be even more difficult unless confined to broad and general policies.

Collaboration and joint action by the great powers is necessary, of course, and we have a right to hope for this result. But at the same time, the chances and dangers of disagreements should be recognized in every way possible. To say the least of it, the control council arrangement is not one that readily lends itself to a centralized economic administration of the details and complexities of the whole German economy.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the opportunity I have had to study and analyze this problem with full information from the bottom to the top. Every day I was in Germany I was impressed over and over with the enormity of this undertaking, the greatest political experiment in history—a metamorphosis of the political ideals, standards, practices, and aspirations of an entire nation of proud, industrious, smart, and remarkably homogeneous people. It will test not only the caliber of the United States statesmanship but also the very fiber of the United Nations accord. With determination as well as a spirit of justness and reverence to God in our hearts, let us proceed to victory.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. LESINSKI, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. ARENDS (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), indefinitely, on account of death in the family.

To Mr. LARCADE (at the request of Mr. RAMSPECK), for 1 week, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 197. An act to establish the grade of general in the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 242. An act for the relief of Ruben M. Herren;

H. R. 249. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper;

H. R. 256. An act for the relief of Dr. Luther J. Head;

H. R. 257. An act for the relief of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased;

H. R. 687. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions;

H. R. 946. An act for the relief of the estates of Robert C. Meals and Bessie Mae Morgret, Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, Donald Meals (a minor), and Betty Wrightstone (a minor);

H. R. 987. An act for the relief of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.;

H. R. 1149. An act for the relief of Dane D. Morgan;

H. R. 1429. An act to permit the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and the United States Maritime Commission, during the national emergency, to pay the tax imposed under section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code without regard to the $3,000 limitation in section 1426 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 1485. An act for the relief of Henry B. Tucker;

H. R. 1646. An act to establish the grade of admiral in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2506. An act to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 20, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Tuesday, March 20, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold executive hearings on Tuesday, March 20, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m. on the East Indian bills.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will hold hearings on Tuesday, March 20, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in room 247, House Office Building, on H. R. 128, a bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection so as to include active service with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will continue hearings on Wednesday, March 21, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in the committee room, room 247, House Office Building, on H. R. 128, a bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection for pensionable purposes for service rendered between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session at 10:30 o'clock a. m. on Thursday, March 22, 1945, in the committee room, room 356 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 or rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

332. A letter from the Director of Selective Service System, transmitting an estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

333. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in Quonset Hut occupied by the Eighty-third United States Naval Construction Battalion at Camp Rousseau, Port Hueneme, Calif., on December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

334. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report on the activities of the Department of Justice for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

335. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of the estimate of personnel requirements during the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 681. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 341). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 712. A bill relating to the status of certain natives and inhabitants of the Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 342). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House of the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 343. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 344. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 187. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to continue the investigation with respect to petroluem begun under House Resolution 290, Seventy-sixth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 345). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 2671. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (G. I. bill of rights) pertaining to loans for the purpose of purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property to provide more adequate and effective farm loan benefits; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ENGEL of Michigan:

H. R. 2672. A bill to fix the personal exemption and credit for dependents for purposes of income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 2673. A bill to provide for Federal assistance in the maintenance and operation of lunch programs in schools and child-care centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H. R. 2674. A bill to provide members of the armed forces upon their discharge or release from active duty with purchase certificates for civilian clothing; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARNESS of Indiana:

H. R. 2675. A bill relating to the granting of commissions or appointment as flight officers to men of the armed forces or men who have had training under the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service program as trainees, instructors, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 2676. A bill to provide for the free importation of synthetic rubber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANHAM (by request):

H. R. 2677. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to accept and dispose of real estate devised to the United States by the late Maggie Johnson of Polk County, Ark., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 2678. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in any and all claims which the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana, or any tribe or band thereof, may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 2679. A bill to extend certain benefits of the Canal Zone Retirement Act of March 2, 1931, as amended, to certain employees covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereto, approved May 29, 1930, be amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 2680. A bill to provide monetary benefit for certain enlisted men of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard discharged for service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 2681. A bill to restore the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to the Federal Loan Agency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States, and others, to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters with the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KOPPLEMANN:

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution to provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare of the United States by authorizing the American representative on the international security council to pledge the use of American armed forces for the purpose of the joint maintenance of a peaceful international society based on effective world organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. Res. 190. Resolution to investigate supplies of food, particularly meat; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. Res. 191. Resolution directing investigation of food supplies and commitments; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 192. Resolution to direct the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to investigate the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. Res. 193. Resolution providing for the investigation by the Committee on Agriculture concerning food supplies, distribution, and shortages, especially with respect to meat; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend to Puerto Rico the benefits of crop insurance, in conformity with laws enacted by the Congress of the United States of America; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to claim of ownership of lands by the sovereign State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States to take immediate favorable action on Senate Joint Resolution 8 establishing a procedure by which Federal spending and Federal income would be balanced except in specified emergencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States to oppose any constitutional limitation being placed on the taxing power of Congress under present conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting that the unallotted portion of the Colorado River Indian Reservation and improvements thereon be reserved and set aside for the benefit of war veterans; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaksa, memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States, urging that the Congress of the United States, by appropriate action, provide for the admission of the Territory of Alaska as the forty-ninth State of the Union, with full control of all natural resources; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting the Congress to enact legislation to prohibit or restrict the importation of scrap metal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States, requesting that the United States take appropriate measures to the end that Palestine should be opened for free immigration and unrestricted colonization so that the Jewish people may rebuild their ancestral homeland as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 2682. A bill for the relief of John Doshim; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2683. A bill for the relief of Bert T. McCoard; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2684. A bill for the relief of Ensign Elmer H. Beckmann; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2685. A bill to reimburse certain naval personnel and former naval personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in the bachelor officer's quarters known as Macqueripe Annex, located at the United States naval operating base, Trinidad, British West Indies, on June 11, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2686. A bill for the relief of Ben Greenwood and Dovie Greenwood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2687. A bill to grant the honorary rank of colonel to Edward J. Kelly, major and superintendent of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 2688. A bill to provide compensation to Honolulu Plantation Co., a California corporation, as compensation for damages sustained; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

212. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of sundry Americans of Polish descent at Lowell, Mass., on March 11, concerning the Yalta Conference and the Poland boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

213. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. A. N. Shepherd and 78 other citizens of Knoxville, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

214. By Mr. MURDOCK: Joint House Memorial 5 of the regular session of the Seventeenth Legislature requesting that the unallotted portion of the Colorado Indian Reservation and improvements thereon be reserved and set aside for the benefit of war veterans; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 1945

(Legislative day of Friday, March 16, 1945)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all mercy, these searching days our eyes are fixed upon a Strange Man on a cruel cross, who, when malice and hatred had done their worst, asked forgiveness for those who nailed Him there. Our gaze shows us how far we stand from Him, yet shames us by a tenderness that even physical torture could not embitter. We fain would utter the prayer He taught us: Forgive us as we forgive others. Forgive us our pettiness of spirit, the craven fears of our hearts, the uncleanness of our souls. Forgive us the careless word that went forth to wound, to poison, to defame. Forgive us the unheeded fading of bright ideals. Forgive us the things others can never forgive, the unfair judgments, the careless criticism, the rankling wrong. So cleanse our hearts and renew a right spirit within us that without sealing our own condemnation we may truly pray, "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us." We ask it in the name of the Master who reveals the power and the glory of the forgiving spirit. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. PEPPER, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, March 19, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 48. An act designating the library at United States Merchant Marine Academy as a public depository for Government publications;

H. R. 510. An act granting to Galveston County, a municipal corporation of the State of Texas, certain easements and rights-of-way over, under, and upon the San Jacinto Military Reservation in Galveston County, Tex.;

H. R. 1701. An act to amend section 2, Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress;

H. R. 2388. An act to provide for enlistments in the Regular Army during the period of the war, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2603. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and the Federal Loan Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution providing for the celebration in 1945 of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) to reaffirm the necessity of the Tydings amendment in our war effort and creating a congressional committee to investigate the necessity of agricultural deferments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. PEPPER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Myers
Austin	Hart	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Buck	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bushfield	La Follette	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capehart	Lucas	Taylor
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McFarland	Tobey
Cordon	McKellar	Tunnell
Donnell	McMahon	Tydings
Downey	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Eastland	Maybank	Walsh
Ellender	Mead	Wheeler
Ferguson	Millikin	Wherry
Fulbright	Mitchell	White
George	Moore	Wiley
Gerry	Morse	Willis
Green	Murdock	Wilson
Guffey	Murray	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent on an inspection tour for the United States Navy.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PROPOSED MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in order that all who may be interested in S. 555, commonly known as the Missouri Valley Authority bill, may have official and ample notice of the conduct of the hearings thereon, I wish to state that the subcommittee of the Commerce Committee of the Senate will proceed with the conduct of hearings on the bill on April 16.

On April 16, 17, 18, and 19 the committee will hear proponents of the bill. On April 20 the committee will hear the representatives of the War Department. On April 23, 24, 25, and 26 the committee will hear the opponents of the bill. On April 27 the committee will hear rebuttal testimony on behalf of the proponents and surrebuttal on behalf of the opponents.

Hearings before the Commerce Subcommittee will be confined to navigation and flood control, including dams and reservoirs. Consideration will also be given to power and irrigation and other incidental matters connected with flood-control and navigation projects.

It will be recalled that the Senate adopted the Bailey resolution, under which the Missouri Valley Authority bill was referred to three committees, first, the Committee on Commerce; second, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation; third, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Senate Committee on Commerce is to consider navigation and flood-control projects; the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation is to consider matters affecting irrigation; the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is to consider matters relating to agriculture. Necessarily, in considering navigation and flood-control projects, we will have to consider the dams and reservoirs which are to be constructed for those purposes, and in considering dams and reservoirs we have to consider the surplus water used for the generation of hydroelectric energy, and also for irrigation, because, as the law presently reads, wherever there is surplus water in the dams it can be utilized for those purposes.

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORT OF WAGE AND HOUR AND PUBLIC CONTRACTS DIVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

A letter from the Administrator of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, Department of Labor, submitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions of the United States Department of Labor for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Labor, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Director of the Selective Service System, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending June 30, 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

A letter from the assistant secretary-treasurer of the American Commission for the Protection and Salvage of Artistic and Historic Monuments in War Areas, transmitting, pursuant to law, a revised estimate of personnel requirements for the Commission for the quarter ending June 30, 1945 (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Whereas with the approach of military victory, there arises the greater question of establishing a just and lasting peace; and

"Whereas United Nations ha e been holding conferences relative to the setting up of a world-wide organization dedicated to the proposition that all free peoples are seeking a permanent peace; and

"Whereas the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has within its confines, the City of Brotherly Love, the metropolis of Philadelphia, known all over the world as the cradle of liberty, a symbol to all freedom loving peoples all over the world; and

"Whereas the selection of the city of Philadelphia as the capitol city of the world-wide peace organization would be appropriate and fitting: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Assembly of Commonwealth of Pennsylvania respectfully petition the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, to forward to the representatives of the United Nations the formal proposal that the birthplace of freedom, the city of Philadelphia, be selected as a permanent headquarters for the United Nations Peace Organization; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Congress of the United States, and the mayor of Philadelphia."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution to request that there be extended to Puerto Rico the benefits of crop insurance, in conformity with laws enacted by the Congress of the United States of America, and for other purposes

"Whereas the Island of Puerto Rico finds itself in a zone continuously menaced by the scourge of hurricanes;

"Whereas on diverse occasions Puerto Rico has suffered sudden reverses from atmospheric disturbances, being left in an acute economic crisis due to the effects on its principal crops, especially the coffee crop;

"Whereas insurance companies are not disposed to underwrite crops risks, except under conditions highly burdensome for the individual growers or the entities through which contracts are secured to indemnify the losses on crops; and

"Whereas it is of capital importance for the United States of America to maintain the maximum rhythm of production on the domestic front, lending every kind of protection to the producing sources or to the entities which safeguard them, with an eye to the highest level of the national economy: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate of Puerto Rico concurring)*:

"1. To request of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States of America, met in Congress, the extension to Puerto Rico of the benefits of crop insurance, in conformity with the laws enacted by the Congress of the United States of America.

"2. That a certified copy of this resolution be sent to His Excellency the President of the United States; to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; to the Secretary of the Interior; and to the honorable, the Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico in Washington, D. C."

By Mr. WILSON (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 13

"Whereas Congress annually for a long period has appropriated substantially more money than taxes levied; and

"Whereas the Federal Government debt and need for operating funds in the post-war period will strain the fiscal foundations of our Government; and

"Whereas fiscal stability under these conditions demands a constitutional directive which within definite limitations would compel the levying of taxes in at least an amount sufficient to equal expenditures: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Iowa (the House of Representatives concurring)*:

"1. That the Congress of the United States be memorialized and urged to take immediate favorable action on Senate Joint Resolution 8, establishing a procedure by which Federal spending and Federal income would be balanced except in specified emergencies.

"2. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Iowa Senator and Member of the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.)

By Mr. DOWNEY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution No. 15

"Joint resolution relating to claim of ownership of lands by the sovereign State of California

"Whereas the people of California presented a constitution and asked admission into the Union which constitution was submitted to Congress by the President of the United States by message dated February 13, 1850, and which, on due examination, was found to be republican in its form of government, thereupon by act of Congress approved September 9, 1850, California was 'admitted into the Union on equal footing with the Original States in all respect whatever' and in addition thereto it was provided in the said act of Congress 'that all the navigable waters within the said State shall be common highways, and forever free, as well to the inhabitants of said State as to the citizens of the United States without any tax, impost, or duty therefor' and further provided 'that nothing herein contained shall be construed as recognizing or rejecting the propositions tendered by the people of California as articles of compact in the ordinance adopted by the convention which formed the constitution of that State'; and

"Whereas the Constitution of the State of California referred to in the act of Congress, being the first constitution of this State, fixed the boundaries as follows:

"'The boundary of the State of California shall be as follows: Commencing at the point of intersection of the forty-second degree of north latitude with the one hundred and twentieth degree of longitude west from Greenwich, and running south on the line of said one hundred and twentieth degree of west longitude until it intersects the thirty-ninth degree of north latitude; thence running in a straight line in a southeasterly direction to the River Colorado, at a point where it intersects the thirty-fifth degree of north latitude; thence down the middle of the channel of said river, to the boundary line between the United States and Mexico, as established by the treaty of May 30, 1848; thence running west, along said boundary line, to the Pacific Ocean, and extending therein 3 English miles; thence running in a northwesterly direction and following the direction of the Pacific coast to the forty-second degree of north latitude; thence on the line of said forty-second degree of north latitude to the place of beginning. Also, all the islands, bays, and harbors, along and adjacent to the coast'; and

"Whereas in the articles of confederation referred to in the said congressional act admitting California into the Union hereinbefore mentioned it was provided in article 11 thereof as follows: 'Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right which is not by this confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled'; and

"Whereas the Original States formed the Union with all the rights they had asserted and maintained as colonies of England, and as successors to the English Crown; hence the Original Thirteen Colonies at the time of confederation of States owned and kept their tidelands; and

"Whereas such ownership has long been recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States of America and by other Federal departments and agencies, and has not been questioned until recently, with the result that the State of California and its grantees, both public and private, relying thereon, have expended vast sums of money in the development of such lands, including harbor facilities, reclamation and filling in, and the erection of costly structures; and

"Whereas in 1941 the legislature of this State adopted Senate Joint Resolution No. 24 asserting the title of the State and its grantees in such lands within this State, copies of which resolution were transmitted to the President of the United States, the Solicitor General, and the Senators and Representatives of the State of California in Congress; and

"Whereas it now appears that the Department of the Interior of the United States is contemplating action which would purport to vest in various individuals or corporations, rights in and to such tidelands and submerged lands, and particularly the right to extract and take oil and gas and other minerals therefrom; and

"Whereas such contemplated action appears to be intended principally, if not solely, to result in litigation against the State of California to assert a pretended Federal claim to such lands, either with or without the authorization of Congress; and

"Whereas any such litigation could only result in a decision in favor of this State or its grantees, would be unjust in view of the accompanying and attendant vexation and annoyance, and would seriously impair the further development of such lands and the financing thereof until the final decision; and

"Whereas it is appropriate at this time for California, through its legislature, to make a political decision by asserting in joint resolution and proclamation that California claims and asserts title to all such tidelands and submerged lands within the boundary lines of the State of California: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the sovereign State of California from the moment of the adoption of the Constitution of 1849 has, and does now, and forever shall, own in its sovereign capacity, the lands underlying the ebb and flow of its tides, and

under the Pacific Ocean to its outermost boundary; that all islands including, but not thereby excluding others, the island of Catalina and the belt of water around the said islands along and adjacent to the coast of California and the soil and subsoil thereunder; and all of the ports, harbors, bays, and inlets along the coast of California; and the lands lying under its lakes and navigable streams as they existed when said constitution was adopted, together with the fishes and other water fauna and kelp and other water flora and minerals in said waters and in and under said lands; subject only to its own lawful acts relating thereto since said time; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be, and he hereby is, directed to forward copies of this proclamation resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, to each Senator and each Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the attorney general of California."

By Mr. McFARLAND:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 4

"Joint memorial requesting the Congress to enact legislation to prohibit or restrict the importation of scrap metal

"*To the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"When the First World War came to an end the battlefields of France and Belgium were covered with huge quantities of scrap iron, steel, copper, lead, and zinc—the remains of implements of war, of lethal missiles with which devastation had been wrought, and the wrecks of all manner of conveyances for the transportation of men and supplies.

"The ravaged nations lay prostrate, their people impoverished, homeless, and hungry.

"The United States, which had contributed materially to the winning of the war, without hesitation assumed the task of succoring the helpless peoples of the war-torn lands. Thousands of shiploads of food and other necessary supplies were dispatched to Europe, and the people of this country are justly proud of their Nation's humanitarian achievement.

"One phase of the episode, however, was attended with unfortunate results. The presence in Europe's ports of the mercy ships, the vast quantities of scrap metals and wrecked vehicles littering the battlefields, and the cheap labor in unlimited quantities afforded by impoverished populations, presented an opportunity not to be ignored. The ships returned to the United States with cargoes of scrap metals, procured easily and cheaply, in such great quantities as to throw out of adjustment this Nation's raw-metal industries, and materially to affect its own unemployment problem.

"In the light of this experience the merest prudence suggests the wisdom of early steps to prevent a repetition on a many times multiplied scale.

"The war now being waged has long since dwarfed the First World War. Against the time when victory will perch on the Allied banners the total of expended war implements and materials containing essential metals will mount to fantastic heights. Daily announcements of the dropping of thousands of tons of bombs in a single area and the destruction of thousands of tanks, trucks, motor vehicles, locomotives, cars, and planes on and over the far-flung battlefields of both eastern and western Europe afford indisputable if bewildering evidence.

"There is every reason to assume that the conditions which will confront the countries directly concerned will not differ, except for their accentuation, after the conclusion of this war, from those which were confronted before. The ships of this great Nation in an endless stream will carry sustenance to the impoverished countries of Europe. War-expended scrap metal will be there in limitless quantities, to be had almost for the taking. The mistake should not again be made of importing it to this country to the detriment of this country's economy, and with little if any benefit to the people of the countries in which it lies.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, urgently requests:

"1. That the Congress give early and careful consideration to the subject presented.

"2. That the importation of critical scrap metals to the United States be prohibited, except by and for the use of the United States Government, and that, following the war emergency, no such importation be permitted unless for stock-piling purposes."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. McFARLAND:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial requesting that the unallotted portion of the Colorado River Indian Reservation and improvements thereon be reserved and set aside for the benefit of war veterans

"*To the Congress and the Secretary of the Interior of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"In excess of 60,000 citizens and residents of Arizona have entered the armed forces of the United States during the present world war.

"When the war is over these and thousands of veterans who entered the service from other States will make their homes in Arizona. Many of the latter, seeking rehabilitation and recuperation from the war's effects upon their health will be attracted by this State's salubrious and invigorating climate.

"Thus Arizona, to a greater degree than most States, will share with the Government of the United States the tremendous responsibility of promoting by all practical means the physical and economic rehabilitation of these men who counted not the cost.

"One of the most effective means of discharging this responsibility, with respect to veterans qualified by experience and inclination, will be to provide homes on the land under conditions favorable for profitable farming.

"On the Colorado River, in northern Yuma County, is the Colorado River Indian Reservation, containing approximately 100,000 acres of fertile farm land susceptible of irrigation. Allocation has been made of 8,330 acres of this land to 833 Indians, representing the entire Indian population of the reservation. Any further allocation would involve the bringing of Indians from other reservations, against the well-known disinclination of Indians to leave the homes to which they have been attached all of their lives.

"The United States Government has expended in the development of the Colorado River Indian Reservation some six and a half million dollars and a water supply adequate for the entire area is available. In addition the approximate sum of $9,000,000 has been expended in buildings and equipment for the three Japanese relocation centers of Poston No. 1, Poston No. 2, and Poston No. 3, which plants, with the conclusion of the war or earlier, will not be required for the purpose to which they are now being put.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, respectfully urges:

"1. That no further allotments be made of lands of the Colorado River Indian Reservation and that no Indians be transferred thereto from other reservations.

"2. That immediate steps be taken to prevent the sale or disposal, by the War Relocation Administration, of the property, equipment, and material of the Poston war relocation centers, and to insure the protection of the Government's investments in the area.

"3. That the available lands of the reservation and improvements thereon be set aside and reserved for farming and other uses by qualified veterans, on such equitable terms as may be determined by the appropriate governmental agency.

"4. That the Veterans' Administration be given authority to immediately prepare plans for carrying out the objectives outlined herein."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.)

NOMINATION OF AUBREY W. WILLIAMS—PROTESTS OF FARM ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred a joint letter from representatives of three national farm organizations, dated March 16, 1945, opposing confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Aubrey Williams to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration. This letter is signed by Mr. Fred L. Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange; Mr. W. R. Ogg, director of the Washington office of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and Mr. Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 16, 1945.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: When the nomination of Mr. Aubrey Williams, as Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, we addressed a letter to members of the committee, making it clear that we doubted the wisdom of confirming the nomination. We are still of the same opinion. Nothing that was presented during the hearings in this connection has caused us to change our minds.

In fact, we are more firmly convinced than ever that Mr. Williams is not qualified by training or experience to discharge the duties of the responsible position for which he has been named. It must be remembered that the R. E. A. as now constituted is made up of nearly 900 cooperatives, to which the Government has advanced hundreds of millions of dollars, all of which must be repaid with interest. During the post-war era vast additional outlays will be made for rural electrification.

Mr. Williams has had no experience in this field, and there is no reason to believe that he knows anything about the workings of cooperative organizations. The R. E. A. was established to bring electricity to the people of the rural areas at fair and reasonable rates; it was to be an independent, nonpartisan agency, conducted on sound business principles.

It is noteworthy that, in the main, Mr. Williams' most active and vocal organized support comes from nonfarm groups which have

no direct interest in the subject of rural electrification, and this support is strongly tinged with partisan bias. This would make it appear that he is already playing politics with the position he hopes to secure. In the event of his confirmation, how long will it be before he exhorts the R. E. A. cooperatives and their members to vote to "keep your friends in power," just as he exhorted the recipients of Federal relief funds when he was on the staff of the W. P. A.?

We believe that the cause of rural electrification will be served by the rejection of this nomination.

Sincerely yours,

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
By FRED BRENCKMAN,
Washington Representative.

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
By W. R. OGG,
Director of Washington Office.

NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS' FEDERATION,
By CHAS. W. HOLMAN, *Secretary.*

REPRESENTATION OF VETERANS AT PEACE TABLE—RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD under the rule Joint Resolution 302 of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, memorializing Congress concerning representation at the peace table of members of the armed forces.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and printed in the RECORD.

The resolution of the General Assembly of Connecticut is as follows:

Resolution memorializing Congress concerning representation at the peace table of members of the armed forces

Whereas the American soldiers have fought with unequaled courage, valor, and bravery, moving always forward from victory to victory, spilling their very lifeblood that our cherished American ideals might not perish: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress is petitioned to take suitable action to provide that the 12,000,000 men of the armed forces be represented at the Peace Conference; that there be selected one member from the personnel of the enlisted men of the Army, one from the Navy, one from the Air Force, one from the Marine Corps, and one from the merchant marine to have their part in the deliberations for the peace of the world; and be it further

Resolved, That the clerks of the house and senate are directed to forward a copy of this resolution to each of the Connecticut Members of Congress.

AMENDMENT TO PERMIT OLD-AGE PENSIONERS TO EARN WAGES WITHOUT PENALTY—JOINT RESOLUTION OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to permit old-age pensioners to earn wages without penalty.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 10

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to permit old-age pensioners to earn wages without penalty

Whereas the American people are engaged in a war which has utilized the services of younger men and women throughout the entire Nation; and

Whereas because of this condition an acute labor shortage has developed to such an extent that it has become the No. 1 problem of our Government; and

Whereas many old-age pensioners are able to perform many types of work that would relieve the labor situation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby, memorialized to amend the present restrictions in the Social Security Act to the end that any person who receives or is eligible to receive old-age assistance shall be permitted to do and perform odd jobs of labor, caretaking, and similar classes of casual work not in the general course of a trade or business, at such rates of pay commensurate with their abilities to perform the same, but in any event, in an amount not to exceed $25 in any one month without being penalized therefor; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this joint resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of Nevada to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to our congressional representatives in the Congress of the United States, and to the presiding officers of each State legislature now in session.

State of Nevada, executive department, approved February 28, 1945.

E. P. CARVILLE,
Governor.

ADMINISTRATION OF TAYLOR GRAZING ACT—JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF NEVADA LEGISLATURE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a joint resolution of the Legislature of Nevada requesting that unless the officials of the Department of the Interior and the Grazing Service speedily and forthwith show a proper disposition to conform with and carry out the said assurances and promises in connection with their administration of the Taylor Grazing Act, the said act should be repealed, at least insofar as its application to the public lands in Nevada is concerned, and so forth.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, as follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 8

Whereas the Taylor Grazing Act specifies that the grazing fees required to be paid under its provisions are to be reasonable; and

Whereas when the said act was before the Congress in 1934, the matter of the reasonableness of the said fees, as to their economic effect upon the enterprises of the stock-raising settlers and the business and tax structures of the local communities concerned, was brought up by members of the Senate Public Lands Committee with officials of the Interior Department and, to secure support of the Senate committee in enactment of the said act, assurances were given the said committee by the Interior Department officials that:

Their intention under the act was that of maintaining and upbuilding the public ranges for the benefit of the local interests consisting of the stock-raising settlers and States concerned.

They had no intention at all of depriving the settlers of rights derived either under State laws or by customary usage or of using the said act to exploit the grazing values of the ranges for revenue-producing purposes and, instead, intended only that the fees to be charged should pay for the costs of administering these values, and nothing more; and

Whereas in 1941 a grazing fee study made by the Grazing Service and contemplating an increase in the existing fees, of some 300 percent, was set aside after a series of hearings, at the request of the representatives of the stock-raising settlers, with a definite promise by the Grazing Service to defer any steps looking to increased fees pending the end of the war when opportunity could be had to determine what post-war economic readjustments might then have to be undergone by the range stock-raising industry; and

Whereas, despite both the said assurances by the Department of the Interior officials that only a cost of administration fee was intended and the promise of the Grazing Service officials that the matter of increased fees would be deferred for the duration, the Grazing Service recently has announced its intention of increasing the fees, effective for 1945, by approximately 300 percent, attempting to justify such increase, not on the cost of grazing administration but, instead, upon the value of the range, and without any consideration whatever of the economic effect upon either the enterprises of the stock-raising settlers or the business and tax structures of the local communities concerned: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That unless the officials of the Department of the Interior and the Grazing Service speedily and forthwith show a proper disposition to conform with and carry out the said assurances and promises in connection with their administration of the Taylor Grazing Act, the said act should be repealed, at least insofar as its application to the public lands in Nevada is concerned, and that until the question of how much the stock-raising settlers are to be required and how much they can afford to pay for range administration is decided, that no further increases in Grazing Service appropriations be granted, and we hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States and its committees concerned to take the steps necessary to these ends; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to each of the Members of the Nevada congressional delegation, to the governors of each public-land State, to the chairman of the Senate Public Lands Committee, to the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Director, United States Grazing Service.

State of Nevada executive department, approved February 28, 1945.

E. P. CARVILLE, *Governor.*

OPERATION AND PRODUCTION BY WALSH-KAISER CO. OF SHIPYARD AT FIELDS POINT, R. I.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Providence, R. I., relating to the operation and production of the shipyard at Fields Point, R. I., by the Walsh-Kaiser Co.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 183

Resolved, That—

Whereas the United States Senator from the State of Colorado, the Honorable EDWIN C. JOHNSON, recently introduced into the RECORD of proceedings of the United States Senate an anonymous letter criticizing the operation and production of the shipyard at Fields Point, R. I., operated by the Walsh-Kaiser Co.; and

Whereas the accusations in said letter constitute an unwarranted and unfounded vicious attack on the zealous and industrious efforts of both the management at the said shipyard and of the employees therein, many thousands of whom are citizens of the city of Providence; and

Whereas such an anonymous letter is an un-American and cowardly method of presenting such serious charges and can serve only to create disunity and distrust: Now, therefore

We the members of the City Council of the City of Providence, publicly express our resentment to this unfair and unwarranted attack on the management and employees of the Walsh-Kaiser Co.; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Senator JOHNSON and further copies be sent to each of the United States Senators from the State of Rhode Island with the request that the Senators from Rhode Island cause a copy of this resolution to be introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] presented a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Providence R. I., relating to the operation and production of the shipyard at Fields Point, R. I., by the Walsh-Kaiser Co. Recently, during debate on the so-called work-or-jail bill, I read into the RECORD a letter having to do with the same matter.

In this connection I desire to ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD following the resolution the Senator from Rhode Island presented, another letter which I have received on the same subject. I ask that the letter be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHEPACHET, R. I., *March 5, 1945.*

Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Washington, D. C.:

I am enclosing some clippings from the Providence Journal.

I read the article you claimed a friend wrote you of the conditions at the Rhiem's shipyard, and also of conditions of the Walsh-Kaiser Co., also. I also read Mr. McDonald's statement of reply to your letter.

Now to qualify myself to comment on either. I had charge of the maintenance carpenters under the Rhiems set-up and handled probably 400 or more men in my year of employment there as supervisor and boss carpenter in that section. I also handled a large number of men in shipwright work, to which my record will speak for itself, and resigned with the best of references, so I believe that qualifies myself to comment.

Whoever wrote you that letter had to work in that yard to know what he did. I must say he had everything as it was, regardless of Mr. McDonald's calling him a liar. I saw the same things, and many more. I could but class it as a glorified P. W. A. or W. P. A., or what have you. There were men there that didn't come there to work, and wouldn't work, either. They were there to get gas and tires and keep out of the draft and draw their pay for doing it, and selling lottery tickets. I have even had orders to build buildings to harbor two or three hundred of these men to keep them out of the weather, and they would burn up good first-quality stock in barrels to keep warm. Now, a man that really wanted to make a good job out of his job had to look out or he would get the props kicked out from under him. My particular crew had the reputation of being the best-working gang on the ground, and I was proud of the way I handled them. Result was, some of the higher-ups with a pull began to get scared that I was after their job and was afraid I could fill it, so the talk began I was building a castle around myself; so I got a transfer to shipwright leadman. I saw every part of that yard and had men working in every part of it at some time or other. I saw the conditions of waste of materials and man-hours, and plenty more. I kept sort of note records of my department and brought them home with me. Some of those notes are a disgrace to the shipbuilding trade, such as making fancy handles for ladies' purses and picture frames and such. At that time I had charge of the carpenter shop and every maintenance carpenter job on the whole yard. I had had a large number of men sent to my department because others couldn't get along with them, and others didn't want the responsibility of firing them. So I was the goat that had to tangle with the management and union, which kept me on the carpet quite often. I tried to see Senator JACK FOGARTY (who is a personal friend of mine) at the time he was there to inspect the yard. Things were pretty well covered up when he arrived, as we had wrecking crews working day and night tearing down buildings and burning them up. Most of these buildings were built by Brown & Matthews Co. and were solid and good, but the Walsh-Kaiser Co. was interested in building new ones on cost plus. Some of these buildings I had men working on them remodeling them over, just to be torn down after.

In my opinion, the Walsh-Kaiser Co. was far more interested in the construction work than shipbuilding. In that yard I have seen one after another good man get through because of conditions, because of the higher-ups not knowing half of what it was all about.

Now, as to Mr. McDonald's statements of being made up of barbers and such. It was these men that didn't quit because it was a racket for them, and some of the others that did know what they were doing were shoved around purposely and conditions were made plenty tough so they would get out, because some others that were higher up and couldn't even read a blueprint were a bit afraid of them. I saw so much waste of bond and tax money it made me sick to my stomach, as I come from a poor family and was taught not to waste.

So you see I can verify your friend's letter and could also find plenty others that had worked for me there that could verify it also. It kind of got under my skin to have Mr. McDonald call an honest man such a liar.

Now, I see in tonight's paper another article where JACK FOGARTY is demanding to have the man's name made public that wrote you, and he claims that the man who assailed the shipyard probably was after the general manager's job, and so on. So, in my opinion that is just another effort to cover up and try to belittle an honest man. Now, they can say I was after whatever they want to. It is immaterial to me. I resigned in September of 1943 and can't go any further than that date. I don't blame JACK FOGARTY for standing for his State. You know people in politics sometimes have to believe and see some things that they probably don't even like to.

I am not writing this to get myself in politics or looking for a better job, as I am self-employed and satisfied, and my reputation speaks for itself as to honesty. I am just trying to corroborate an honest man's statements. I don't know who he is, but he may know me.

I remain as ever,

Respectfully yours,

BILL TINKHAM.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 47)

Mr. MURRAY, from the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises, submitted, pursuant to Senate Resolution 28, Seventy-ninth Congress, extending Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, a report entitled "Two Years of Progress Under the Federal Reports Act," which was ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHEELER (by request):

S. 763. A bill to provide for the leasing of allotted lands on the Crow Indian Reservation; and

S. 764. A bill to provide for disposition of inherited interests in the estates of certain deceased Crow Indian allottees; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 48. An act designating the library at United States Merchant Marine Academy as a public depository for Government publications; to the Committee on Printing.

H. R. 510. An act granting to Galveston County, a municipal corporation of the State of Texas, certain easements and rights-of-way over, under, and upon the San Jacinto Military Reservation in Galveston County, Tex.;

H. R. 1701. An act to amend section 2, Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress; and

H. R. 2388. An act to provide for enlistments in the Regular Army during the period of the war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2603. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary, and the Federal Loan Agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution providing for the celebration in 1945 of the one-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.; to the Committee on the Library.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 29) to reaffirm the necessity of the Tydings amendment in our war effort, and creating a congressional committee to investigate the necessity of agricultural deferments, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a St. Patrick's Day address delivered by the Vice President before the Irish Fellowship Club, at the Stevens Hotel, Chicago, Ill., March 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID FOR AIRPORTS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN BEFORE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

[Mr. McCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement made by him before the Commerce Committee on March 16 in support of Senate bill 2 to provide a national airport program, which appears in the Appendix.]

CURFEW REGULATIONS—STATEMENT BY DIRECTOR OF WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION JAMES F. BYRNES, AND EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of a statement from the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, on the subject of curfew regulations, together with an article by Arthur Krock published in the New York Times of March 20, 1945, and an editorial from the New York Times of the same date, which appear in the Appendix.]

GIFT OF ORIGINAL OF BILL OF RIGHTS TO LIBRARY OF CONGRESS BY BARNEY BALABAN

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper release and remarks by Mr. Barney Balaban, president of Paramount Pictures, Inc., and by Mr. Luther H. Evans, Acting Librarian of Congress, on the occasion of the presentation to the Library of an enrolled copy of the original Bill of Rights, which appear in the Appendix.]

POLAND AND THE BIG THREE—LETTER BY THOMAS W. LAMONT

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by Thomas W. Lamont to the editor of the New York Times, and published in that newspaper on March 18, 1945, under the heading "Poland and the Big Three," which appears in the Appendix.]

DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, yesterday it was my privilege to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Mr. C. D. Hicks, of St. Louis, Mo., who had been a farmer but was forced to sell out because of the lack of manpower on his farm. I do not know how many Senators read the letter which appears in the RECORD, but the latter part of the letter refers to a matter to which my attention has been called in hundreds of letters I have received, namely, that the selective service boards are still taking men under the directive issued by General Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System. I quote the last part of the letter of Mr. Hicks:

> Unless something is done to clarify this situation with the local draft boards or unless the new manpower law is enacted with clarification of the meaning of the Tydings amendment prior to the middle of April, thousands of deferments expiring between now and that date will not be renewed and the farm situation thus further and seriously impaired.

I should like to suggest to the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, and to other members of that committee that it has come to my attention this afternoon that, at least in my section, there is to be an unusually heavy draft of boys. Last month the boys who left my home county numbered nearly twice as many, and I think two and a half times as many, as in any other month since the selective service board has been taking men in Nebraska. Boys are being taken right off the farm, and they are being taken according to the directive of General Hershey, which does not, in my opinion, conform to the provisions of the Tydings amendment.

I do not know whether any other Senators have had the information I have had, but I think the time has come, in view of the fact that an amendment designed to clarify the situation was adopted by the Senate to the work or fight bill, which is still in conference, when the Congress should assert itself and declare what the Selective Service System may do and may not do in taking boys off the farm. Particularly is it important now in the spring season, when the farmers must know whether they are to have manpower on the farms when they plant their crops. They should know whether the clarification of the Tydings amendment inserted by the Senate in the manpower bill is to prevail. As we know that bill has not been finally passed. It has been several days, nearly 2 weeks, since the Senate acted on it, but it is still under consideration in conference. I think the membership of the Senate should be advised, if the information can be furnished by the Military Affairs Committee, whether they expect the Tydings amendment to be clarified as proposed by the Senate so that we may know that these boys will be taken according to the will of Congress and not continue to be taken from the farms by circumventing the Tydings amendment.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator will recall that the manpower bill as passed by the Senate clarified that situation.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate that, and I want to tell the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that possibly the Senate has gone on record as far as it can go; but the conference report has not been adopted. The conferees are meeting, but we are letting this thing go day by day and day by day. If we continue along that line, by the middle of April the boys will have been taken off the farm. If action is not taken now, we will have a worse food shortage than we have today. We have simply got to have the men on the farm if crops are to be planted, and now is the time—there should not be another day's delay—to clarify this amendment so that the selective boards of the country may know under what provision they can take these boys off the farm.

I should like to have the Military Affairs Committee take up the matter with the Selective Service System and report to the Senate why it is that the numbers have increased so greatly, especially in my section of the country, and whether the Selective Service System expects to continue taking these boys, thus circumventing the Tydings amendment, or whether it expects to take them under the clarified amendment the Senate adopted several weeks ago.

ADMINISTRATOR, RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—AUBREY W. WILLIAMS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration?

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I rise today in opposition to the confirmation of Aubrey Williams for the post of Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Let me assure the Senate—and my voting record proves the truth of this assertion—that I rise as a friend and supporter of the R. E. A. I believe that the President has posed a dangerous threat against the R. E. A. by making this nomination.

The opposition to Mr. Williams, it should be made abundantly clear, is not partisan opposition. Republicans and Democrats oppose this confirmation, just as some Republicans and Democrats will vote for confirmation.

Mr. President, the R. E. A., in my judgment, is one of the outstanding domestic agencies of the Government today, and likely has proved more useful to the farmers of the Nation than any other permanent agency established in the past 15 or 20 years. Thus far, the R. E. A. has made loans totalling hundreds of millions of dollars, and has made possible the electrification of farm homes from one end of the Nation to the other. If legislation soon to be considered here were to be adopted—as I hope it will be—the R. E. A. will be in the billion dollar class.

I place the R. E. A. alongside the Rural Free Delivery System as one of the outstanding achievements of this century, for the farmers of my State and virtually every State. It is not an agency to be handed over to any Johnny-Come-Lately who has no qualifications other than the ability to speak beautiful words. It is not an agency to be regarded lightly and to be administered by just anybody to whom the President wishes to discharge a political debt.

In this connection, I pay tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD], who was one of the guiding lights in the creation of the R. E. A. No one can deny him his part in recognizing the need for such an agency, in working assiduously for its creation, and in personally carrying a petition to the President of the United States that such an agency be created.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] formed what was perhaps the first rural electrification cooperative in the United States up near Lake Irene,

Minn., even before the national agency was created by Executive order. He gave the benefit of his counsel and his wholehearted support to Morris L. Cooke, the first Administrator of R. E. A. Like many another Republican, he has spoken for the R. E. A. and defended it down to the present day.

No, Mr. President; this is not a fight on R. E. A. today or on the principles of R. E. A. It is a fight for R. E. A. and for the sound business principles that have distinguished the administration of that agency for the most part and should continue to distinguish its operations.

What manner of man would be the most ideally suited to fill this great present and post-war responsibility, and how do the qualifications of Aubrey Williams measure up to the yardstick of such standards?

RURAL BACKGROUND

The next Administrator of the R. E. A. should, preferably, be a man with a farm background. He should know from experience how electricity on the farm brightens the home, lightens the labor, and brings city convenience to the country home as does no other modern device.

Does Aubrey Williams have such a background? He does not. As a small child he moved with his family to the city of Birmingham and has had a wholly urban environment in youth and manhood. This is by his own statement.

But this handicap alone could not possibly disqualify an otherwise acceptable nominee.

BUSINESS TRAINING

The next Administrator of the R. E. A. will control the lending in the next 10 years of possibly a billion dollars to more than a million American farmers through their cooperatives. Such a man should have some business experience. He should have more than a theoretical knowledge of what it means to face a pay roll. He should have a sense of economy and frugality. He should have sound business judgment based on years of experience. In short, his record of competence should be unassailable.

Herein is probably the most serious flaw in the case of Aubrey Williams. Before he went off to school he did have a little business experience as a clerk in a men's furnishings store in Birmingham, all of it before he was 21 years old. By his own admission, this brief and minor youthful experience was the only time in his life when he was ever employed in the private-enterprise system. During the next 5 years, according to his story, he accepted, under the implied assurance of studying for the ministry, a scholarship which helped put him through college. Once his education was finished, however, he did not pursue the ministerial vocation. He then promptly abandoned the ministry, but, again by his own admission, he never made any attempt to repay the folks who contributed their mite to educate him in the belief that he would follow the Christian ministry. At least, had he repaid the money—as he well could have afforded—some other striving youngster answering to the call of divine service would have had the opportunity which Williams rejected.

It seems to me that this episode is a shabby chapter in the life of Aubrey Williams which does not speak well for his attitude toward the sanctity of moral obligations. It has been reflected in his later years in his careless regard for the sacredness of public funds.

Abandoning the ministry, Mr. Williams occupied the next 10 years of his life as a professional do-gooder, a social worker whose salary was supported by the earnest and good people of Wisconsin. There is much to be said on behalf of social work as a career of helpfulness to humanity. But the career of a social worker contributes little to the fitness of a man for the hard-boiled business job of running the Rural Electrification Administration. This era in Williams' life came to an end at about the same time as the present administration moved into Washington.

Then Aubrey Williams launched forth on a new career, that of a Federal spender, which he continued until about a year ago, in a succession of alphabetical agencies beginning with the F. E. R. A. and winding up with N. Y. A.

As National Youth Administrator it was shown that for every four and a half trainees Mr. Williams' N. Y. A. employed one salaried Federal official. This is according to the Byrd report, page 7. Williams' record in this connection is compared with that of the Office of Education doing the same and duplicating work at one-half the expense per trainee. See Byrd report, page 6.

The National Education Association repeatedly protested N. Y. A.'s duplication of existing training programs being furnished in the public schools by the Office of Education.

The protest may be found in the Byrd report, pages 11 and 12.

R. E. A. proceeds on the proposition that the Federal Government shall make self-liquidating loans to farmer groups who eventually will repay the Government.

Is it not probable that a man with a record of incompetence and extravagance in Government administration, as revealed in more than one congressional hearing, would recklessly and imprudently attempt to saddle farmers with ruinous debts, or is that the possible intent of those who initiated this nomination?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I was interested in the statement the Senator just made that the N. Y. A. had one administrative official for every four and one-half boys and girls who were trainees. Does the Senator mean that the N. Y. A. had more than a million administrative officials? As I recall, some 5,000,000 boys and girls were trainees under the N. Y. A.; therefore, according to the Senator's statement, the N. Y. A. would have had more than 1,000,000 administrative officials. It seems to me that is a little high.

Mr. WILLIS. The Senator from Vermont will find that statement on page 7 of the Byrd report covering the last years when Aubrey Williams was insisting on maintaining the N. Y. A. This statement in the report is that there was one Federal official for every four and one-half trainees in the N. Y. A.

Mr. AIKEN. Let us get the matter straight. The Senator speaks of the last years. The N. Y. A. was in existence 6 or 7 years. Was it not the last weeks instead of the last years at the time when the N. Y. A. was winding up its business? Was that not the period in which the N. Y. A. hade the percentage the Senator speaks of?

Mr. WILLIS. It was for more than the last weeks.

Mr. AIKEN. It might be for months.

Mr. WILLIS. It might be for years, as the Senator will find if he will refer to the Byrd report.

Mr. AIKEN. I doubt that it was for years. I do not think any Federal agency went quite so far in the matter of administrative officials.

Mr. WILLIS. It certainly was an era of wastefulness.

Mr. AIKEN. The organization would require a higher percentage of officials during the weeks when it was winding up its business than it required during the period when it had the most trainees.

Mr. WILLIS. I inform the Senator that that was before any effort was made to wind up the N. Y. A. It was still in operation, when Mr. Williams was endeavoring to demonstrate its usefulness.

Mr. President, bear in mind that, under the Rural Electrification Act, the Administrator must make a written certification that each and every loan extended to the cooperatives shall be self-liquidating. That is the Administrator's inescapable legal responsibility, sec. 4, R. E. A. Act, approved May 20, 1936.

In view of this provision there has naturally been a tendency among farmers to presume that if, out of his wisdom and experience, the Rural Electrification Administrator should make a finding of fact and certify that the project for which they are borrowing money is actually self-liquidating and that they will not have difficulty in repaying the loan, then they are safe in accepting the money.

The fact is that in accepting the judgment of R. E. A. administrators in the past some cooperatives have been unwisely plunged into debt. These farmers are not to blame. The fault lies with R. E. A., which assured them they would pay out.

I am proud to say the farmers of Indiana in their cooperative dealings with the R. E. A. have exhibited sound business judgment and all of them are in a healthy financial state.

But what would happen to the rural cooperatives of this country if a profligate spender who has as little regard as this man for the obligations of debt should be placed in the seductive position of money-lender to the Nation's farmers?

Winding up this discussion of Mr. Williams' business competence, we can add a footnote that for the past year he has been employed as special organizer of the National Educational Cooperative Farmers Union, an agricultural group organized in locals after the pattern of labor unions. It is an organization dedicated to political alliance between farmers and union labor. At no time in the past year has Mr. Williams' experience contributed to his knowledge or competence in the field it is proposed to assign him for which he was already so ill-prepared.

PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Mr. President, the next Administrator of R. E. A. naturally should know something about rural electrification. The latest Administrator of R. E. A., recently resigned, at one time addressed his employees with the statement: "You are looking at the biggest utility man in America." And he was probably right, unless David Lilienthal, of T. V. A., or Dr. Raver, of the Bonneville Administration, should care to challenge him. Both of these latter Federal appointees have spent most of their careers in some form of public utility management, regulation, or operation.

Whether you like them or not, they at least know the difference between a kilowatt and a kilowatt-hour and their approach to the problems of production and distribution of electricity is more realistic and more practical than that of a man who, at the age of 54, must now for the first time in his life begin to find out. By his own admission, the only contact Mr. Williams has ever had with the electric business in any way, shape, or form amounts to nothing more than paying his light bill and turning on the switch.

The electric light and power business is somewhat more complicated than the job of allocating funds to young people so that they can go to college. Half a century of scientific development has gone into this art. As the R. E. A. Administrator, Aubrey Williams could, and if I mistake not eventually would, make errors of judgment due to insufficient training and background in this intricate field which might plunge thousands of farmers into a mire of debt.

Aubrey Williams makes no pretension to engineering knowledge; he claims no skill in the science of electricity; he claims only the reward for faithful service at the expense of the American farmer and of the electrical cooperative movement.

DOES HE ENJOY THE CONFIDENCE OF THE FARMERS?

The next Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration must depend for success, in large measure, upon the cooperation and confidence extended him by the farmers themselves. America's farmers are not hat-in-hand relief clients of the type for whom Mr. Williams is wont to shed his crocodile tears of professional sympathy. The farmers are individualists who know what they want and who regard the Administrator of the R. E. A. as a servant and not as a master. Without their support the best intentioned Administrator must fail.

It is indeed pertinent and significant therefore that the organizations which mainly represent the American farmers' interests and which have all but a very small percentage of organized farm membership are opposed to this nomination.

The American Farm Bureau has written to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee protesting against Williams' nomination.

The National Grange has joined in that protest.

It is further significant that the National Milk Producers Federation, probably the largest single and most experienced of all the cooperative movements in this country, has added its name to the roll of those opposing this appointment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator from Indiana willing to correct that statement by saying that the Washington representatives of the Farm Bureau, the National Grange, and the Milk Producers' Federation protested the nomination of Aubrey Williams?

Mr. WILLIS. So far as I am informed——

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I am in position to state that that protest was made by direct authority of Mr. Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, who has on numerous occasions since that time confirmed it in person to me.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I agree that it was done under the direction of Ed O'Neal. But where did he get his authority? I am sorry to bring this point into discussion now, but I know that the executive committee was not aware of that letter of protest until after it had been written, because one member of the executive committee called me up and wanted to know what it was all about. The letter had then been written.

Mr. BROOKS, Mr. BANKHEAD, and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BROOKS. Let me inform the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Indiana that, so far as the Farm Bureau members of Illinois are concerned, the authority did not originate in Washington. The officers of the farm bureaus of the entire State have informed me of their position supporting that represented by the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I believe every word the Senator from Illinois says. I believe that Earl Smith would undoubtedly support Ed O'Neal in any position he might take, and that undoubtedly the Farm Bureau of the State of Illinois did support the position taken by the Washington representative. However, that is not the situation in all States by any means. I simply say that the letter was signed by Washington representatives of the three organizations, and was not sent as the result of action taken by a conference, or annual meeting, or even a meeting of the executive committee, so far as I can learn.

I wish to say further that I come from a section of the country where the Farm Bureau, the Grange, and the Milk Producers' Federation are all very active and very important. I have not had a single communication from New England or New York, from either the Farm Bureau, the Grange, or any of the milk associations, supporting the action of the Washington representatives. I believe that the Washington representatives made a mistake.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I should like to add to what the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Illinois have said, that I have received the most vigorous protest against the nomination from the officers and board of directors of the Indiana Farm Bureau.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not question that in the least.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that if the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation or any other similar organization takes a position before Congress, we are entitled, until that position is reversed by his board of directors, to assume that it is the position of his organization. I do not see how we can go behind the formal statement made by the president of such an organization. If the board of directors disagrees with him, it seems to me that it is up to them to arrange for a meeting. If a sufficient number of members are interested, a meeting can be called, and they can take action reversing the action of their president. But in speaking of the position of any national organization, I do not believe that the Senate can go behind the statement made to us by the accredited head of the national organization.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the statements of the Senator from Ohio are plain silly, in my opinion, because he knows that the executive committee cannot meet except by the call of the Washington representative, or the president, who signed the letter. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. Has the Ohio State Farm Bureau supported Ed O'Neal in his protest against Aubrey Williams, and has the Ohio State Grange taken action?

Mr. TAFT. I do not know. I am sorry to say to the Senator that I have not heard from them one way or the other. I do not know their position.

Mr. AIKEN. Then they did not go along with the national organization.

Mr. TAFT. I do not believe that that assumption is at all warranted. I do not know what their position is.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe that the letter I have before me should go into the

RECORD. I shall read two paragraphs from it, and ask unanimous consent to place the entire letter in the RECORD:

Mr. Williams has had no experience in this field, and there is no reason to believe that he knows anything about the workings of cooperative organizations. The R. E. A. was established to bring electricity to the people of the rural areas at fair and reasonable rates; it was to be an independent, nonpartisan agency, conducted on sound business principles.

It is noteworthy that, in the main, Mr. Williams' most active and vocal organized support came from nonfarm groups which have no direct interest in the subject of rural electrification, and this support is strongly tinged with partisan bias. This would make it appear that he is already playing politics with the position he hopes to secure. In the event of his confirmation, how long will it be before he exhorts the R. E. A. cooperatives and their members to vote to "keep your friends in power," just as he exhorted the recipients of Federal relief funds when he was on the staff of W. P. A.?

I ask unanimous consent, with the indulgence of the Senator from Indiana, that the entire letter be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIS. I shall be very glad to have it placed in the RECORD as a contribution to this discussion.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 16, 1945.*

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: When the nomination of Mr. Aubrey Williams as Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, we addressed a letter to members of the committee, making it clear that we doubted the wisdom of confirming the nomination. We are still of the same opinion. Nothing that was presented during the hearings in this connection has caused us to change our minds.

In fact, we are more firmly convinced than ever that Mr. Williams is not qualified by training or experience to discharge the duties of the responsible position for which he has been named. It must be remembered that the R. E. A. as now constituted is made up of nearly 900 cooperatives, to which the Government has advanced hundreds of millions of dollars, all of which must be repaid with interest. During the post-war era vast additional outlays will be made for rural electrification.

Mr. Williams has had no experience in this field, and there is no reason to believe that he knows anything about the workings of cooperative organizations. The R. E. A. was established to bring electricity to the people of the rural areas at fair and reasonable rates; it was to be an independent, nonpartisan agency, conducted on sound business principles.

It is noteworthy that, in the main, Mr. Williams' most active and vocal organized support comes from nonfarm groups which have no direct interest in the subject of rural electrification, and this support is strongly tinged with partisan bias. This would make it appear that he is already playing politics with the position he hopes to secure. In the event of his confirmation, how long will it be before he exhorts the R. E. A. cooperatives and their members to vote to "keep your friends in power", just as he exhorted the recipients of Federal relief funds when he was on the staff of the W. P. A.?

We believe that the cause of rural electrification will be served by the rejection of this nomination.

Sincerely yours,
THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
FRED BRENCKMAN,
Washington Representative.
AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
W. R. OGG,
Director of Washington Office.
NATIONAL COOPERATIVE MILK PRODUCERS' FEDERATION,
CHAS W. HOLMAN,
Secretary.

Mr. McKELLAR. If these gentlemen do not know what their organizations are in favor of, I doubt if we know.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In view of the challenge by the Senator from Vermont with regard to Mr. Ogg's authority, this action being personal, I wish to read from a letter sent by Mr. Ogg to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma] while the hearings were in progress. In the letter which is dated February 26, 1945, Mr. Ogg says:

The joint letter which I signed on behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation was not a personal statement in any sense of the word. This matter was given very careful consideration, and the text of this letter was specifically approved by President O'Neal, who authorized me to sign it on behalf of our organization. Furthermore, the executive committee of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which is composed of representatives of all areas of the country, gave consideration to this matter and agreed that the confirmation of Mr. Williams' appointment should be opposed by the federation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I wish to clarify the statement with respect to the authority of Mr. O'Neal. The president and the board of directors of the Farm Bureau of Illinois have informed me that they sustain the position taken by Mr. O'Neal.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not challenge that statement at all. As I have stated, Earl Smith and Ed O'Neal see things very much alike. However, I do say that the action of the Washington representative of these organizations has not been upheld by the State organizations generally throughout the country.

The Senator from Ohio says that he has not heard anything from the Ohio Farm Bureau, which is probably the most powerful of any of the State organizations, unless the Illinois Farm Bureau may exceed it in the amount of work done for the farmers. The Ohio State Grange has not communicated with him, and I doubt if the Ohio Milk Producers' Association has done so. I have received no communications from any of these organizations in the northeastern section of the United States with the exception, as I say, that one director of the American Farm Bureau Federation, after the letter was sent out, called me and said that he had been asked to endorse the stand taken, and he wanted to know what it was all about.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I should like to add to my earlier remarks that the most reliable and best documented evidence we can get from the representatives of the farm organizations is that the farmers of the country are not favorable to the nomination of Mr. Williams.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator tell me why the representatives of the various farm organizations did not appear before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for cross-examination, rather than using letters and telegrams with respect to Aubrey Williams?

Mr. WILLIS. I presume that they relied upon the reports which had been published of the hearings concerning Aubrey Williams when other matters were before the Congress, and thought that there was no need for any further evidence.

Mr. LUCAS. To me it seems rather strange that anyone should attempt to testify by telegram or letter, I care not whether he speaks as an individual, or as a representative of a farm organization or any other group. When he testifies by letter or telegram, the members of the committee are denied the opportunity of cross-examination. Such a communication is a self-serving statement, and I have always been opposed to that kind of evidence. It seems to me that the officers who speak for the Farm Bureau should make a personal appearance before the committee, rather than to send letters stating their positions. I am a member in Illinois, and what my colleague said a moment ago with respect to the Illinois Farm Bureau is correct. It seems to me that when the head of a great organization such as the Farm Bureau desires to protest against the confirmation of the nomination of any person, he should have the intestinal fortitude to appear before the committee, in order that the committee may at least ask him a few questions.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to say that I have just been informed that both the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation and the executive committee have approved Mr. Smith's action in opposing the confirmation of Mr. Williams' nomination.

Mr. WILLIS. That is the national organization, is it?

Mr. TAFT. The national board of directors and the executive committee. Later in the day I will have a letter, which I shall put in the RECORD, bearing out the statement I have just made.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator have a letter from Ohio?

Mr. TAFT. I have not sent for that information.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not believe the Senator can get one from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Vermont questioned Mr. O'Neal's authority to speak for the national board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the Senator said the board had not been called together. I wish to make the statement that they have been called together and have acted, and I shall later put into the RECORD a letter bearing out that statement.

Mr. AIKEN. But I should like to add that the board was called together after the letter was written.

Further, I should like to impose on the time of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] long enough to say that the Council of Farmer Cooperatives, which represents the great cooperatives of the country, such as the California Citrus Exchange, the Florida Citrus Exchange, the Rice Producers Cooperative, and similar organizations, declined to go along with the Washington representatives of the other groups in signing that letter.

We all know that the Farmers Union, which is not a small organization by any means, has also declined to go along with the other organizations. I am sorry they got mixed up in it at all; I think they have made a mistake. I know that the organizations in many States do not follow the national organization or the leaders of the national organization in this matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me ask the Senator from Vermont which State organization has not gone along with the national organization.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Ohio said he has not received communications from Ohio. I should like to know whether communications have been received from Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and many other States, which I might name.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator know that the organizations in the States he has mentioned have not approved the position taken by the national organization?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senators from those States would very likely have heard from them by now if they had.

Mr. McKELLAR. But the Senator is merely guessing at it.

Mr. AIKEN. I can almost tell what States have gone along, without even looking at the book.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I should like to inquire whether, when the Senator receives letters from William Green, Philip Murray, or other representatives of the American Federation of Labor or the C. I. O. or other labor organizations, he begins to inquire whether such representatives have the authority of the members of the local organizations, or otherwise, for the positions they take in their letters. Does not the Senator admit that such representatives have authority to send communications on behalf of the organization?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know at all.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Why does the Senator raise the question in connection with the farmers' organizations, when he does not raise a similar question in connection with the labor organizations?

Mr. AIKEN. I will say that, so far as I know, I have not received any telegrams from William Green or Philip Murray on the subject.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator has said that Mr. Williams has not had any experience. I wish to ask the Senator whether it is not true that Mr. Williams went from State to State aiding universities and city governments when he was Assistant Administrator of the W. P. A.?

Mr. WILLIS. I said he had no experience in the administration of electrical utilities of any kind.

Mr. LANGER. Did not the Senator say he had no experience as a businessman?

Mr. WILLIS. I said he had no experience as a businessman engaged in private enterprise and in meeting pay rolls and being responsible for the employment of people.

Mr. LANGER. I can only say that he came to North Dakota, when I was Governor, and erected several buildings which were very badly needed for the State university, and likewise he engaged in similar work in various sections of the State. My distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota, is from the town of LaMoure. Mr. Williams went there and erected a magnificent building; he did a fine job. I do not know how much money he spent; but in connection with the hundreds of thousands of dollars which were spent, there was not one scandal, so far as I know. I think Mr. Williams did a wonderful job in North Dakota in helping out the agricultural college and various towns and cities.

Mr. WILLIS. I do not presume Mr. Williams has any idea how much money he spent or whether it was economically spent.

I wish to say that the membership of the farm organizations which have expressed themselves through their duly accredited officials as being opposed to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Williams represent 90 percent of the organized farmers of America.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. The other day I received a letter from a labor leader in Louisville, Ky. Before the letter reached me I read its contents in the Louisville Courier Journal. The headline was "Weyler chides CHANDLER for refusing to vote for Aubrey Williams." The nomination of Aubrey Williams to be head of the Rural Electrification Administration may be one of the chief concerns of labor, but, for the life of me, I cannot imagine how it became one of their chief concerns. Of course, some labor leaders let many or most matters become of vital concern to them—including every nomination which is sent to the Senate for confirmation.

Let me say that the heads of 26 rural cooperatives in Kentucky personally came to my office and asked me not to vote for Aubrey Williams. The reason for their position was, they said, that the man who is now administering the R. E. A. is doing a very good job.

I admit the matter is of vital concern to the people who live on the rural electric lines in the country. They are vitally concerned about who will fill the job of Administrator of the R. E. A. But when we compare their interest with the interest of the labor leaders in some of the large cities, I think we are bound to agree that the average man living in the country on a rural electric line is sincerely interested in the welfare of the Rural Electrification Administration. Certainly his opinion should have more weight and influence with us than the opinion of a labor leader in one of the cities or towns should have.

Men who operate small cooperatives came personally to me and importuned and begged me not to vote for confirmation of Aubrey Williams' nomination. They said they knew his record; that they were getting along all right as they were; that they were doing well; and that they simply wished to be let alone. It seems to me their opinion is entitled to considerable weight.

Mr. WILLIS. I am sure the Senator is correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. President, does Aubrey Williams enjoy the confidence of Congress? The next Administrator of R. E. A. must enjoy the confidence of Congress if he is to prove a success in the R. E. A. program over the next 10 years.

This is especially true in view of the post-war rural electrification plans now being readied for the days to follow victory. The Senate now has pending before its Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a bill which authorizes rapid expansion of the rural electrification program in the first 3 years following the cessation of hostilities. The bill envisages a program involving more money in 3 years than the R. E. A. has been able to absorb in the past 10 years.

The members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who, by a decisive vote, adversely reported on Mr. Williams' nomination, would, if the Senate approved him, be faced with the problem of handing the purse strings to this enormous sum of money to a man on whom the committee has already passed a vote of no confidence.

At the present time there is before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a bill to remove the Rural Electrification Administration from the authority of the Department of Agriculture and to make it an independent agency. Such a matter should be decided wholly on its merits, and should not be prejudiced by the personality of an Administrator who has had a majority adverse

report on his qualifications by the same committee.

Furthermore, the House and Senate Appropriations Committees have had their fill of Aubrey Williams because of his record of incompetence, dubious activities and associations, and generally weak administration. The members of these committees are high-minded gentlemen, and they would not for one moment permit any bias or prejudice against a man personally to interfere with their judgment as legislators. But certain it is that with their own knowledge and experience of this man's past record they must vote him funds only with the greatest of reluctance and with every legal restriction possible.

We abolished the N. Y. A. in part, at least, to get rid of the incompetent management of Aubrey Williams. We certainly do not want to jeopardize the success of R. E. A. by fastening upon it the same blight.

Mr. Williams has publicly denounced Members of this body in most scathing and vicious terms. His utterances would tend, even if they are not intended to so do, to bring the Congress into ill favor with the public. They are a reflection on Congress as an institution. Congress must have an unprejudiced mind toward the Administrator of R. E. A. Why bring back into a position in the Government which requires the cooperation of Congress such a controversial character as Mr. Williams, when today we need unity in the country?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder if the Senator from Indiana can give us a few examples of the scathing denunciations of Congress which he states were made by Mr. Williams. If he can do so, perhaps he can convince me of the unworthiness of Mr. Williams to hold the position of Director of the R. E. A.

Mr. WILLIS. The denunciations were read before the committee. I have not a copy of them with me, but I can place them in the RECORD later.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not recall having heard them read before the committee. I know that I was not present in the committee for a day or two when I was ill. But the denunciations to which the Senator has referred have not been called to my attention. I was merely wondering what the statements were which the Senator has said slandered Congress.

Mr. WILLIS. I shall be glad to furnish them to the Senator from Vermont, but at the present moment I do not have them with me.

Mr. AIKEN. Very well.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, until now I have discussed Williams' capacity for the position to which he aspires solely on the basis of his qualifications for the job, insofar as his record shows them in relation to his past deeds and actions. It is apparent to any Senator that on this basis alone he should be swiftly rejected. But there is another factor which bears very strongly upon his qualifications for a responsible position. I refer not to his deeds and actions, but to the political, economic, and social ideologies which dominate his thought.

In his capacity as a private citizen, Aubrey Williams is entitled to any political philosophy he may choose. But under our system of government any man who does not believe in that system of government is and should be automatically disqualified for public office. As a matter of self-survival we must exclude from Federal office men who are out of sympathy and out of step with the American system.

I am aware that Mr. Williams has vehemently denied that he is or ever has been a member of the Communist Party. I am also aware that he has flatly denied having belonged to certain organizations which the Attorney General lists as subversive, Communist-front organizations.

Oddly enough, moreover, I rather believe that Aubrey Williams is too adroit, and too smart actually ever to have joined the Communist Party. The most effective Communists never join the party.

No; we are not dealing here with a rank and file picket-line Communist. We cannot apply the party label to such men. The absence of actual membership is meaningless.

If ever a man should be judged by the company he keeps, that judgment should be passed on Aubrey Williams.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Indiana used the expression "picket-line Communist." I do not believe the Senator would wish to have the RECORD show to the reading public—at least to those of the reading public who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—that every person who becomes or has been associated with a picket line is a picket-line Communist, would he?

Mr. WILLIS. No; I am not referring to these who legitimately participate in conducting a picket line.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator's statement would apparently imply that one who participated in the operation of a picket line is a Communist. However, he does not necessarily mean that.

Mr. WILLIS. No; not necessarily. I was not referring to a person engaged in maintaining a picket line in his ordinary and legitimate activity.

Mr. President, high praise of Herbert Benjamin, an avowed member of the Communist Party, as a real leader of the workers; laudatory support of David Lasser, leader of the Communist-front Workers' Alliance—those are straws in the wind if we seek to find the direction of this man's thinking.

Now that a rich appointive plum, amounting to $100,000 in salary over the next decade, is dangling before him, Williams hastily recants. Not until now does Williams state that his praise for Herbert Benjamin had been made in all innocence and without his knowledge that the man was generally known and had personally admitted his membership in the Communist Party. His protestations of innocence and ignorance add up to one of two conclusions: Either Aubrey Williams is too dangerously and witlessly deceitful to be entrusted with the high position to which he aspires or he is too childishly naive.

He is also a man of dangerously short memory. At times he had to be reminded of facts which he had earlier denied. In such cases he pleaded forgetfulness. He was a wonderful "Oh, now I remember" witness when prodded with the evidence.

I have cited the matter of Commonwealth College at Mena, Ark. Williams admitted that he had assisted in a fund-raising campaign for that school in the late twenties. He maintained that the college was not dominated by Communists until several years later, and stated that thereafter he had never had anything more to do with the school in any way, shape, or form. Later he was confronted with letters from the F. E. R. A. files showing that he personally had approved Federal funds for Commonwealth College at a time when it enjoyed national notoriety as a hotbed of "red" revolution, where agitators were educated in the technique of fomenting strife and civil discord, leading to the eventual revolution to which the school is dedicated—letter from C. F. Kleinfelter to W. R. Dyess, State F. E. R. A. administrator, October 24, 1934, p. 241, of Williams hearings.

Williams' only defense of his action was that the grant of Federal funds to Commonwealth College had been recommended by some school superintendent in Arkansas.

About the time Williams authorized those F. E. R. A. funds to Commonwealth College a special committee of the Arkansas State Legislature was appointed to investigate the school's radicalism. Hearings started in February 1935. One of the witnesses was Mr. Robert M. Berry, of Mena, Ark., who was serving as county administrator of F. E. R. A. Mr. Berry testified under oath as follows:

> My opinion is that * * * in recent years Commonwealth has ceased to be an educational institution and has become largely a school for agitation.
>
> You see, wherever there is a labor disturbance or trouble with labor and the employers Commonwealth sends a delegation to that point. In recent years they have sent representatives of their group to the coal strikers in Illinois and to the farm-holiday disturbances in Iowa, to the coal trouble in Kentucky. * * * More recently Commonwealth sent a delegation to eastern Arkansas to some sort of sharecropper trouble over there. About the same time they sent a delegation to Fort Smith, where there was a demonstration by the workers employed in F. E. R. A. relief projects. (Senate hearings, pp. 242–243.)

Those statements have been taken from the hearings of an Arkansas Senate committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. In the Senator's mind was there anything wrong in Commonwealth College sending representatives to observe farm-holiday disturbances in Iowa?

Mr. WILLIS. It was wrong for the young people of a college supported by Government funds to go out to foment trouble.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator know that trouble was fomented?

Mr. WILLIS. It was so stated in the report of the Arkansas State Senate committee.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator know that such conditions sprang up naturally, not only in Iowa but also all over the entire Northwest; and does he not know that in his own State some of the farmers committed suicide because they were starving to death and could not make a living?

Mr. WILLIS. No; I do not know that. I never heard of such a case.

Mr. LANGER. Before the debate shall have been concluded I shall be glad to present proof of what I state. I have it in my possession. The incident of which I speak happened when Mr. McNutt was Governor of the Senator's State.

Mr. WILLIS. I have no evidence of it. It is not of common report, even in the State of Indiana.

Mr. LANGER. I may say that it was reported in the newspapers of Indiana. I can produce a copy of the Senator's own newspaper containing such report.

Mr. WILLIS. I wish the Senator would do so.

Mr. LANGER. I will try to find the report in his own newspaper.

Mr. WILLIS. I am sure it would be convincing if it could be produced.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Indiana that students who are financed by Government funds should not go around the country stirring up trouble. However, can the Senator from Indiana tell us how much of N. Y. A. funds was allocated to Commonwealth College?

Mr. WILLIS. I do not have the exact figures, but I have a letter showing that the allocation was authorized.

Mr. AIKEN. It was authorized on the condition that the authorities of the State of Arkansas must first approve it. But I should like to know how much money Commonwealth College received from the N. Y. A.

Mr. WILLIS. It does not matter very much how much it received.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I think it does matter.

Mr. WILLIS. It is the principle involved that is important.

Mr. AIKEN. No evidence has been produced anywhere showing that Commonwealth College ever received a single dollar from the N. Y. A. If it did receive any money it was with the full approval of the State authorities of Arkansas.

Furthermore, let us consider that there was aid furnished to approximately 25,000 schools and colleges in the United States. All the opponents of Aubrey Williams can find is just one out of the 25,000 institutions that had a communistically inclined headmaster. It seems to me that that is a pretty good record, particularly so long as there is nothing in the evidence to show that the Commonwealth College ever got a dollar of N. Y. A. funds.

Mr. WILLIS. It really goes to show that the administration of Mr. Williams was not careful to screen out subversive institutions.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, the record shows plainly that the Commonwealth College got nothing; that the money which was contributed to State schools and colleges was distributed by State officials. They were the ones who directed to whom the money should go, and Mr. Aubrey Williams had nothing to do with it.

Mr. WILLIS. He did not recall the grant, did he?

Mr. ELLENDER. No grant was made.

Mr. WILLIS. He made an offer.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the same offer was made to perhaps 50 or 75 other schools and colleges in Arkansas, all contingent upon being approved by the State authorities.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt that many State colleges made requests for money, but it does not prove that they received any money. At all events, every dime that was contributed by N. Y. A. was distributed through the State officials.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, the money could not be spent there until the State education authorities had approved it and by resolution adopted the project. Is not that true?

Mr. WILLIS. My contention, I will say to the Senator from North Dakota, is that Mr. Williams authorized the grant of money to this school. If the State authorities felt it was unwisely placed, that is to their credit, but it is not to the credit of Mr. Williams that he ever permitted that grant.

Mr. President, in the light of this testimony by F. E. R. A.'s own county administrator, Mr. Williams still expects the Senate to believe that he was wholly unaware of Commonwealth's communistic doctrines at the time he extended Federal aid to them.

Let me repeat my earlier statement: Either Aubrey Williams is too dangerously and wittingly deceitful or he is too childishly naive to be entrusted with the high position to which he aspires.

In view of the testimony as to his subversive background, Williams, in the minds of many Members of Congress, is a dangerous man to place in a position of such vital control as the Rural Electrification Administration. Overnight be could discharge and replace the manager of every cooperative in the United States—Page 202, Williams' hearings. Of course, he would be too clever to do such a thing all at once, but within a few years, I daresay, the political strength that could be developed through the machinery of banker control over the millions of farm homes would be strongly entrenched in the hands of Aubrey Williams. The only logical conclusion that can be drawn for the purpose of this nomination is the vast political potentialities embraced therein.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to raise the point that this appointment involves issues that transcend personalities and partisan politics.

An old and respected friend of mine from Indiana called on me recently in behalf of Mr. Williams. I told this friend that Mr. Williams was wholly without any training in the business of rural electrification; that he had no qualifications whatever for the job. To this my friend reminded me that, after all, Mr. Williams had a "social consciousness," implying that this rare quality would overbalance all his shortcomings.

By the same reasoning, we should staff all our Government posts with people who have a social-minded record. Make Harry Hopkins Secretary of the Navy, for example. Of all the shop-worn and abused phrases, that expression stands next only to the word "liberalism." Generally speaking, most people admit that they themselves are both liberal and social-minded. On the other hand, most people contend that their opponents do not possess these priceless attributes. Beyond that these expressions run the whole gamut of political thinking. Certainly both Hitler and Mussolini founded their political thinking and their inhuman societies on the foundation stone of social-mindedness, and liberalism.

Stalin, under the cover of social-mindedness and liberalism, caused the death in the 1920's and 1930's of millions of Russians, who starved to death because of his policies. Social-mindedness, so-called, has run our national debt into astronomical proportions, it has increased the number of Federal employees to more than 3,000,000, and many of us fear it is bringing a peculiar type of American totalitarianism not unlike that against which our boys are fighting and dying today. Williams is one of these social-minded star gazers who chart the destiny of this Republic under their philosophy. To them debt is merely a scrap of paper—"we owe it to ourselves," they flippantly say; but, seriously they know, if they will be honest, that the end is communism and chaos.

Confirmation of this nomination means that the Senate of the United States at least condones, if it does not approve, the working philosophy that characterizes this man's life.

And what is that philosophy?

Aubrey Williams is a type of that large and, alas, growing group, too many of whom are entrenched in high places in Government, who are dedicated to the proposition that America is through; that the American system of free enterprise has failed. They believe that youth no longer has a chance in this country. Aubrey Williams has publicly stated that the only thing that many able and intelligent young people can look to in the future is made work or doles for the whole of their lives.

America is not perfect in a perfect world. We shall strive through the centuries for perfection and never wholly achieve it, but Mr. Williams betrays an

attitude toward America which would indicate that ours is an abyss of poverty from which no man can climb. He sees too much of the flaws and too little of the sterling virtues that have made America great.

And his social-worker solution for the tragic conditions he sees is that the Federal Government be converted to a vast eleemosynary institution in which the citizen, no longer free, becomes a faceless unit in a static, anthill society.

In this social-worker utopia, the Federal Government would simply become an enormous W. P. A., with 135,000,000 clients, whose lives would be guided, whose productive work would be controlled, whose status in life would be dictated by a self-perpetuating, an elite corps of super social workers designed after the pattern of Aubrey Williams. His difference from the Communist utopia is not in kind but in degree.

Follow the path of Aubrey Williams' thinking, and we will find at its end not freedom but totalitarianism. We will find the state all-embracing, all-powerful, all-controlling, taking the place of the freedom that he has promised and others have promised, for he is an American defeatist.

The only choice left to us, if we accept his attitude, is to prepare ourselves for a common level of poverty.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator was asked about Commonwealth College at Mena, Ark., a while ago. I wish to read from the record and from a statement by the Senator during the course of the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Senator WILLIS. I would like to read into the record the letter of October 25, 1934, written by C. F. Klinefelter and directed to Mr. W. R. Dyess, State relief administrator, Little Rock, Ark. He was State administrator of F. E. R. A.

This is the quotation from the letter:

Mr. Lucien Koch, president of Commonwealth College at Mena, Ark., has been here in the office presenting the claim of his institution as a special case for participation in the college-student-aid program. After consideration of the facts involved, Mr. Aubrey Williams agreed to approve this institution for participating in the program under the same conditions as set forth in Mr. Hopkins' letter of July 3, namely, that it will be entitled to an allotment of funds on the basis of 12 percent of the full-time enrollment as of October 15, 1934.

Mr. Koch will have an official affidavit executed by the acting director of the college and mailed to you at an early date. Upon receipt of the affidavit, you are, therefore, authorized by Mr. Williams to make an allotment of funds available to the institution, effective the 1st of November. After approval by you and the State superintendent, the affidavit should be sent in here for our file.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Superintendent Smith so that he will have a clear understanding of the situation.

Then the Senator from Indiana said:

That is signed C. F. Klinefelter, Assistant Director, Educational Division.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date of the letter?

Senator WILLIS. October 25, 1934.

Senator AIKEN. Do you recall how many schools you approved in all?

This is the important part of it:

Mr. WILLIAMS. Senator, this has to do with something besides funds for teachers. This has to do with work stipends for students prior to the establishment of N. Y. A.

I stand by the letter; it is all right. But the main thing to remember is that it states that the grant of funds was dependent upon approval by the State superintendent of public instruction, then it has to be done.

Senator WILLIS. Were you acquainted with Mr. Koch?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I knew him back in Wisconsin when he was a student in Mr. John R. Commons' class.

Senator WILLIS. And he was director of Commonwealth College in 1934 when this letter was written?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. President, I read that letter for the purpose of showing and clearing up the fact that Mr. Williams himself on the stand admitted that he had contributed funds to the Commonwealth College, which was, I believe, a well-known Communist college.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Indiana will yield, I should like to insert at this point, because it has to do with the Commonwealth College matter, a statement which Mr. Williams made before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry when he was asked if he had made any investigation of the college. He made this statement:

The F. E. R. A.—

Which was under Mr. Hopkins at that time.

The F. E. R. A. kept out of that. I felt that it was the State school authority's business. I would have been severely criticized if I had put myself up to say which of the colleges of America should receive that aid or which of the public schools should have it. I felt education was the State's business and that the Federal Government should, as far as possible, not infringe upon the State's responsibility and right in the matter of education.

And of course Mr. Williams made it clear throughout his testimony that every approval from Washington was made contingent on being approved by the State department of education in the State wherever the loan was made. That applied to Commonwealth College, which happens to be one out of a great many; I do not know how many schools were helped under the F. E. R. A. The number was about 25,000 under the N. Y. A.

Mr. WILLIS. The record still stands that Mr. Williams did not adequately protect the funds of the United States Government.

Williams denies that he stands for the so-called redistribution of wealth. He says he stands for "redistribution of opportunity." There comes to mind no other phrase that contains so much evil implication, so much weasel-worded deceit as will be found in that expression.

Redistribution of opportunity indeed, in a land that today boasts of its Higgins, its Henry Kaisers, its Henry Fords; in a land in which countless millions of American youth have climbed successfully from places of low estate to leadership in business and professions and usefulness in society. Opportunity is here for the young and the old; for all who would reach out for it. The greatest need today is fewer people selling America short and more leaders opening the eyes of youth to the opportunities that lie before them. This is the social-mindedness which we need in this day, a consciousness of the opportunities available to all who will open their eyes and lay hold upon them.

No; it is not social consciousness which motivates the philosophy of Aubrey Williams and his kind; rather it is class consciousness which they seek to develop. They seek to create hatred among the poor and those who by personal effort and striving have more than they have. They seek to create empty self-pity and hatred of success among those who seek to excuse their own lack of ambition and success. It is a great and evil weapon for dissension, disunity, and political propaganda. It is not a constructive instrument for good. Class consciousness is a thoroughly bad thing, born of demagoguery, and bred out of a mean and grasping striving for personal power.

We need social-mindedness, Mr. President, and I am for bushel barrels of social-mindedness, pressed down and running over. But I am for the kind that has a light in its eyes, a song on its lips, and some hope in its heart for this great, expanding America, not the kind that would pit class against class, and that urges us always to look at the clouds when we can see the sun.

Aubrey Williams has an intolerant spirit of self-righteousness that places all men who disagree with him in the class of Tories, "red" baiters, Fascists, witch burners.

He brings to politics all the fervid zeal of a crusading pastor fighting sin. But the doctrines he preaches are political cure-alls, which, if taken in large enough doses, would destroy the Nation. He would be a political preacher without a frock, and his collection plate would be the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. President, I refuse to accept Aubrey Williams because he is a self-professing liberal and has convinced a number of folks that he has a social consciousness. Something new must be added before I support him. That something must be a love for representative government, and competence to administer the trust he seeks, and I do not believe he will be able to achieve either one this late in his life.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ball	Bilbo
Austin	Bankhead	Brewster
Bailey	Barkley	Bridges

Briggs	Hill	Overton
Brooks	Hoey	Pepper
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Capehart	Kilgore	Robertson
Capper	La Follette	Russell
Chandler	Langer	Saltonstall
Connally	Lucas	Shipstead
Cordon	McCarran	Stewart
Donnell	McClellan	Taft
Downey	McFarland	Taylor
Eastland	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Magnuson	Tobey
Fulbright	Maybank	Tunnell
George	Mead	Tydings
Gerry	Millikin	Vandenberg
Green	Mitchell	Walsh
Guffey	Moore	Wheeler
Gurney	Morse	Wherry
Hart	Murdock	White
Hatch	Murray	Wiley
Hawkes	Myers	Willis
Hayden	O'Daniel	Wilson
Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum being present, the Senate will proceed with the pending business.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon we listened to a very able, complete, and at times impassioned, address by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. I myself was moved at times by the eloquence he displayed. I recall that one statement he made was in substance that what changed his mind about the Aubrey Williams nomination was his reading of a speech made by Representative KEEFE, of Wisconsin, from which the Senator from Illinois quoted rather fully.

This morning I received a telephone call from Representative KEEFE. A little later a letter was sent to me by him, from which I wish to read a paragraph in the hope that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois, may reverse his ideas about this case.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I asked the Senator to yield so I could make the point of no quorum. Will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I make the point of order that no business has been transacted since the last quorum call.

Mr. MURDOCK. Inasmuch as the Senator from South Dakota is making a very important speech we should have more Senators present to hear it.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his statement that the speech is an important one, but I stand by the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained. The Senator from South Dakota has the floor.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The paragraph I wish to read from the letter written this morning by Representative FRANK B. KEEFE, of the State of Wisconsin, is as follows:

> The Administrator of R. E. A. must be one who is fitted by education, background and experience to direct and manage a great business institution. R. E. A. has long since passed from the field of social experimentation and is firmly grounded upon the foundation of sound business practices.
>
> In the exercise of the same charity and tolerance which I exhibited in this speech quoted by you—
>
> This letter is addressed to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]—
>
> I have concluded that if I had a voice in this extremely important matter I could only say that in my humble judgment Mr. Williams does not meet the test of practical business experience which is so vital to the future welfare of R. E. A. I feel compelled to write this letter to you because I have been drawn into this situation as the result of the argument made by you yesterday. I want to assure you that the same motives which prompted me to make the speech from which you quoted compel me, in the spirit of utmost candor, to write this letter. I am furnishing a copy of this letter to Senator BUSHFIELD.

Mr. President, I should like to speak briefly about the business pending before the Senate, namely, the nomination of Mr. Williams to be Director of the Rural Electrification Administration.

I am a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The nomination of Mr. Williams was sent to our committee. The hearings lasted approximately 2 weeks. The chairman of the committee [Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma] conducted the hearings in a most able, efficient, and fair manner. So far as I personally know, everyone who desired to appear before the committee had an opportunity to do so. At any rate, the conduct of the hearings by the chairman was beyond criticism by anyone.

In the course of the hearings much testimony was taken. The printed record of the hearings comprises more than 300 pages. After the testimony was concluded the committee voted to have the testimony printed for the consideration of Members of the Senate. After the printed copy of the testimony came back to the committee and we had had an opportunity to give it full and careful study, the chairman called us together for the purpose of passing upon the nomination. The result of the vote was 12 against Mr. Williams and 8 for him. The committee made an adverse report to the Senate. I am asking that the Senate approve the majority report for the reasons which I shall state.

I never saw Mr. Williams prior to his appearance on the stand in the committee hearings. I know nothing about him except what appears in the record of his public life during the past several years. I had an opportunity to sit across the table from him for 2 weeks, study him, and ask him questions. I came definitely to the conclusion that Mr. Williams was not properly fitted by experience, training, or temperament to be the head of this vast lending agency of the Government of the United States. That is what it is. It is not a charitable institution; it is not a relief institution; it is not an agency to give away money. The Administrator of that organization must operate a great lending agency. At the present time its operations total more than half a billion dollars, and in my opinion they will soon pass the $1,000,000,000 mark. It is of definite, vital interest to every farm owner and every farm resident in the United States; and we want the best man we can find in America to operate that institution.

Mr. Williams' entire adult life has been spent either in college or as a social worker. He has never handled any lending agencies. He has never worked in a bank. He has never lived on a farm, or operated a farm. For many years, until the past year and a half, he has been engaged in Government work. I maintain that on the face of this record as it appears from the testimony in the case, Mr. Williams has not shown the qualifications which the director of a great institution such as the R. E. A. should have or the qualifications which the farmers of this country feel he should possess.

Immediately after the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry made its decision in this case a peculiar thing happened in this country. The wolves were turned loose, if I may use the expression, and they have been yapping and howling ever since.

The first one to raise the hue and cry was Senator JOSEPH FINCH GUFFEY, of the State of Pennsylvania; and I wish to direct my remarks for a moment to that gentleman. I have never crossed that man's path, and I have had no contact with him in any way, socially or otherwise. I know little or nothing about him, but he has seen fit to direct a vicious personal attack against me upon the floor of the United States Senate.

It is not necessary for me to say anything about this gentleman, Mr. President. I have only to refer to the record. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the personal attack which was made upon me. Twice during recent months a Member of this body, JOE GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania, has attacked me without cause, provocation, or justification I have never crossed his path in his legislative work, or in his personal activities. There is no contact of any kind between us, nor has there been. I have never spoken an ill word of him personally; yet in spite of that Mr. GUFFEY delivered a vicious personal attack upon me, one that was clearly in violation of the rules of the Senate. I have no desire to quarrel with any Member of the Senate, or to cast any aspersions upon him. I have studiously refrained from making any comment upon this unwarranted libel.

After his first attack, he followed me off the floor of this Chamber and insisted upon shaking my hand, and repeatedly assured me that he had no personal animosity or feeling of any kind toward me. I accepted his statement in good faith and let it pass. But now he has voluntarily and falsely repeated his statement, in which he attacked my personal integrity and the integrity of Members of the Republican State Committee of South Dakota, all of whom are known to me to be upright and honorable citizens. I cannot let this vicious, detestable action pass unnoticed this time, and I do not intend to do so.

The statements of Mr. GUFFEY are completely and utterly false insofar as they apply to me or to members of the Republican State committee of my State. The impression that he seeks to create by such statements is false. Not only

that, but the Senator knew that the statements were false when he made the accusation against me.

Mr. President, that is all I am going to say about that particular individual, unless by his own actions he invites a complete review of his own record.

The second individual to raise a personal attack in this case was an individual known as Drew Pearson, a noted Communist—columnist, I meant to say [laughter]—though I am not so sure that the first word is not correct.

I refer to what the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] had to say about this gentleman the other day. He stated it much better than I could:

> Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, it is not only generally known, but it is universally admitted, that Drew Pearson is the biggest and most notorious liar in America today. Not only is Pearson recognized as being the biggest liar, but he is also recognized as being the most perfect smear artist of the press and radio. He will go down in history as Drew Pearson the sponge [laughter], because he gathers slime, mud, and slander from all parts of the earth and lets them ooze out through his radio broadcasts, and through his daily contributions to a few newspapers which have not yet found him out.

Mr. President, on March 2 of this year, Mr. Pearson, whom I do not know and have never met, followed the pattern which I shall present to this body as I go along, with another personal attack upon me. I have never crossed Mr. Pearson's path. At one time he spoke rather kindly of me, to my surprise. But I think perhaps the Senate may be interested in hearing a few lines from the Merry-Go-Round published in the Philadelphia Record on April 9, 1944, in which Mr. Pearson had this to say:

> This column is happy to acknowledge that G. O. P. Senator HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD, of South Dakota, whom it described as a "bush-league politician" early this session, is shaping up as a most useful Member of Congress. BUSHFIELD is popular on both sides of the aisle, also usually keeps his mouth shut until he has something to say.

As a part of the smear campaign which is under way in connection with the business which is pending before the Senate, Pearson made a villainous, vicious, personal attack upon me, not in any connection whatsoever with Aubrey Williams' case, but obviously because of it. That is what inspired it. He is one of the wolves who were sent after me. I wish to call attention, Mr. President, to one or two of the things Mr. Pearson had to say.

On March 2, 1945, an attack upon me appeared in the column allegedly written by Drew Pearson. Obviously the attack was inspired by others, because it was based upon my opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Williams to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration. The method of the attack was not new, since Mr. Pearson has obtained a questionable notoriety by similar attacks upon many men in public service. A long list of distinguished Americans have been the victims of Mr. Pearson's peculiar type of "journalism." I use the word "journalism" with apologies to the honorable and splendid group of men and women in America who are engaged in the newspaper business, because most of them who have talked with me resent Pearson's kind of so-called "journalism."

Such distinguished citizens serving in the Senate as the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and other Senators have been thus crucified by this man Pearson. Our beloved and grand old man, the ex-Secretary of State of this country, Cordell Hull, took part in dissecting this gentleman Pearson in a truly noble style; and even our distinguished President of the United States of America was forced by Pearson's methods of attack to brand him as a chronic liar. Mr. President, I am happy to be classed in that distinguished company; and if I can consider myself to be merely on the lower edge of that group of American statesmen, I shall be exceedingly happy.

Libelous mud-slinging and scandalous untruths about public men are Pearson's stock in trade. By it, apparently, he has built his notoriety and has thus increased the sale of his column and his annual income. In his article of March 2 directed against me, he is guilty of a complete, unjustified, and unmitigated lie. He states that I am the author of last years' appropriation bill to compensate an Indian squaw. If I were able to aid one of the Indian citizens of my State, man or woman, by securing an appropriation or otherwise, I should be happy to do so. But Mr. Pearson is completely and wholly mistaken in his statement of this case. I have never asked for an appropriation, nor have I introduced a bill for one, for any Indian within or without my State. I have never attempted to secure such an appropriation or suggested it. Mr. Pearson, had he been interested in securing the truth about the matter, could easily have ascertained it by a very slight effort; but he was not interested in the truth. On the contrary, his only interest is in mud slinging, though why he should consider the securing of an appropriation for an American citizen reprehensible is beyond my comprehension. Apparently the securing of an appropriation for anything else under the sun is laudable and to be commended.

Second, Mr. Pearson pointed to me as the recipient of funds from more millionaires in America than any other Member of the Senate has been—a distinguished reference to me, Mr. President. Again, I wish to brand Pearson's statement as an unqualified, unjustified lie. I do not know the gentleman, but I would be tickled to death, Mr. President, to be able to meet him personally where my actions are not restrained by rules and regulations.

A third member of the wolf pack which started after me is a pusillanimous little nincompoop who is alleged to be a columnist on the Washington Star, a man by the name of Lowell Mellett. I shall not characterize him or dignify him with any description except to say that he lied when he wrote his column, and I would also be glad to meet that gentleman.

Mr. President, I wish to enter directly upon a discussion of the Aubrey Williams nomination; but, before doing so I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that along with these three personal attacks upon me because I had something to do with the cross-examination of Mr. Williams before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, there has been a steady stream of letters, telegrams, and postal cards from all over the country—not from any particular locality, although most of them have come from Michigan and New York—all of which follow along the same line of personal attack upon me. The surprising thing about it is, Mr. President, that many of the telegrams, letters, and postal cards are so identical, both in words and punctuation, that all of them could have been written by the same man. It all fits into a perfect pattern: Someone interested in Mr. Williams' case has seen fit to start the attack upon any Senator who does not agree that Aubrey Williams is a high-grade man whose nomination should be confirmed.

One Senator on this floor told me just the other day, Mr. President, that he had received two long-distance telephone calls that day, one from Denver, and one from Minneapolis, not requesting him to vote for Mr. Williams, but demanding that he vote for Williams. Other Senators have told me that they have heavy correspondence regarding this matter from all over the country. The pattern is perfect. It is thought by some that Senators who do not approve this nomination will be browbeaten, frightened, or scared away.

As a part of this pattern I refer to a copy of the Christian Science Monitor of February 6, 1945, bearing the following headline:

> Bitter Attacks on Williams Embarrass Senate G. O. P.

Mr. President, I participated in all but 2 days of the long hearings held by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in taking testimony upon this nomination. I have read and reread the printed copy of the hearings. I know of nothing which was said or done during the testimony given before that committee which could be characterized as a bitter attack upon Mr. Williams. The statement of the Christian Science Monitor is only a part of the pattern of the whole show.

I do not wish to take the time of the Senate needlessly, but I think it is necessary for me to refer as briefly as possible to some of the testimony which was taken by the committee. I hope Senators have read it, but in case they have not, I shall refer to it as briefly as possible.

On page 39 of the hearings there appears the following statement by Aubrey Williams, which was confirmed by him when he testified as a witness before the committee:

> I believe further that the logical sequitur of Federal relief to the destitute is a federally demanded rise in the standard of living. Individualism has failed to secure it. Business has failed to raise it. The States with varying financial climatic and political capacities, have done a very heterogeneous job of it.

On the same page of the hearings may be found another statement by Aubrey Williams, which he confirmed before the committee. The statement is as follows:

From the point of view of social justice and economic efficiency, the proper way to deal with the employed is for the Government to provide everyone with socially useful work at his regular occupation or as near as possible to it, and at his regular pay.

On page 43 of the hearings may be found a statement which Mr. Williams made at Pittsburgh, Pa., on June 4, 1938:

The heavy hand of monopoly is still upon our society, and it is increasingly apparent that we cannot have a free vigorous system unless that hand is removed.

On page 46 of the hearings appears a statement which was made by Mr. Williams on June 27, 1938, to the Workers Alliance. It reads as follows:

All my life I have believed in the organization of workers. All my life I have worked to do whatever I could to be a part of the group of organized workers, and I expect to continue that. I have said, on many occasions, that I hope that the Workers Alliance will grow, that it will expand. I hope that the organization of the unemployed people will include all of the unemployed people of America. I have a fundamental conviction that it is only through the organization of the wage earners that they can ever hope to cope with the organization of capital. I believe that the only thing that you can really trust is the fact that the people have organization; that they have it in such a manner that no one can take it away from them.

I have the feeling that you have made something here that nobody can ever destroy. I have the feeling that as long as you and I live, the Government is going to support symphonies. And the same thing goes for painting and writing. There may be lapses. But I have got a conviction that the American people have tasted the blood here. The men who stand for these sort of things are the men you are going to send to the elections.

We've got to stick together. We've got to keep our friends in power. I thought that speech Friday night was wonderful. I don't need to tell you. You know your friends very well. Just judge the folks who come and ask for your support by the crowd they run with.

Mr. Williams was speaking to a group of W. P. A. relief workers who had organized as the Workers Alliance. Of course, they had the right to organize. But, mind you, Mr. President, at the moment he made the speech from which I have quoted, Mr. Williams was Assistant Director of the W. P. A.

His testimony continues. I shall not take time to read it all. He said that the workers of the organization had called on him and asked him to help them get their wages raised. I have no objection to that, but it seems a little out of place for the man who was administering the W. P. A. to be promoting attempts on the part of W. P. A. workers to obtain an increase in wages.

I now quote from page 47 of the printed hearings. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] made the following statement:

As to the Workers Alliance, I do not know how it is in other places, but in places in Montana the Workers Alliance is absolutely controlled by the Communists, or it was.

Shortly thereafter I asked Mr. Williams the following question:

Referring further to Senator SHEPPARD'S committee report, I find this statement, describing you, Mr. Williams:

"He has been associated with radical groups and has served as a member of the Commonwealth Committee, an organization promoting the interests of Commonwealth College at Mena, Ark., a labor college with Communist leanings."

Is that correct?

Mr. Williams replied:

I assisted in the raising of funds for the Commonwealth College back in the days when I was in Wisconsin. It was at the behest and suggestion that I help them of Justice Brandeis, who wrote me a letter asking that I get in contact with Mr. Zeuch, who was the president of it.

I then said:

The Sheppard committee said this outfit had communistic leanings. Did you know that?

Mr. Williams replied:

Later on the Communists moved in and Zeuch was thrown out.

Senator BUSHFIELD. Because of being a Communist?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; he was never a Communist, but because he was not a Communist.

On page 48 of the testimony I said to Mr. Williams:

You are reported to have said in the New York Sun on October 26, 1935:

"Aubrey Williams Asks Newer Liberty—Tells Teachers Few Can Attain Success—Blames Economic System."

It is reported you said it at Charleston, W. Va., on that day:

"We know that a vast, overwhelming majority of the children born in the last 25 years will never rise above a hand-to-mouth existence, that all their steps from the cradle to the grave will be dogged by poverty, sickness, and insecurity. Yet, in spite of this, or because of it, we cling with desperate tenacity to this fond illusion of political freedom." Is that right?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is right. I said that.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, would the Senator be willing to put in the RECORD the remainder of Mr. Williams' statement on page 48 after he said "That is right; I said that." Will the Senator put in the remainder of the paragraph in which Mr. Williams says:

I believed many of the people, born in America, despite all the possibilities of our structure of life, were doomed to a very meager existence and would be dogged by poverty. I know even in wartime we have a considerable percentage of our people whose total income for their family life is under $500 a year and that there cannot be anything but poverty in their homes. I do not take back one word of that statement.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes; I am glad to have that incorporated in the RECORD.

Mr. AIKEN. I think in fairness to Mr. Williams, it ought to go in because at the present time some fifteen or twenty million people are in that class.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I have not the slightest desire in the world to misrepresent one single word about Mr. Williams.

Mr. AIKEN. I know that, and I thank the Senator for including the remainder of his statement.

As appears on page 49 of the testimony, Mr. Williams, on January 15, 1936, at Buffalo, N. Y., before the council of social agencies, made this statement:

I do not think you will accuse me of pessimism when I say that unemployment—or better, disemployment—is, like the airplane, the radio, the weather, and taxes, here to stay. Millions of those now out of jobs will never find jobs again. Thousands of young men and women leaving our schools each year are destined never to become self-supporting and independent in the sense that your and my generation were led to believe was our due.

The supply of workers exceeds the demand. Manpower is a drug on the market. The productive forces of this country are glutted with brawn and brain which they cannot use. And what can't be utilized is simply laid aside to molder and decay.

On page 50 of the testimony Mr. Williams testified as follows:

I do not have a defeatist attitude toward our future, but I do believe before we can correct many of these things we must face the music, and it is up to us to do it.

I asked, "What do you mean by that?" Mr. Williams' answer was:

I mean we ought not to go ahead with a condition that obtained in this country ever since I was born, where millions of people were not able to earn what was set forth by any community as a simple minimum standard of living.

I then asked him, on page 56:

Do you believe today that our American society should be made over?

Mr. Williams replied:

I think there are certain things in it that need to be corrected.

I inquired:

Just what do you mean by that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I mean by that that I think if farm people are receiving $200 a year or $300 a year, that ought to be corrected; some way ought to be found that those people can earn more than that.

I agree with him in that respect.

I then asked him this question:

Do you mean by that a redistribution of wealth in this country?

Mr. Williams answered:

I do not. I mean a redistribution of opportunity.

There was something said in the course of the debate yesterday about the Comptroller General's office and Mr. Williams' accounts. I know nothing about Mr. Williams' accounts. I only know what the record contains, and that is the reason I desire to quote briefly from it. After an audit of the N. Y. A. accounts of Mr. Williams, the Comptroller General filed with the Appropriations Committee a report.

I quote from a statement made by me at the hearings, on page 65:

In the report which covered more than 150 pages Warren charged numerous irregularities and questionable transactions which, if allowed to continue, would certainly prevent the youth of the country from receiving the full benefit of funds appropriated by Congress. Then, his report, which I have copied down, elicits the things which were irregular: Traveling expenses, intermingling of private and public business, private business transacted during official business time, accepting fees for participating in lectures, dual

compensation from State and Federal Government, filing of false claims, payment of per diem expenses while on annual leave, consultant expenses for attendance at Youth Citizenship Institute, Christmas cards printed at Government expense, and use of Government telephones for private business.

I want the Senate to understand that these charges were not directed against Mr. Williams personally, but were directed against his organization and were irregularities the Comptroller General found when he audited the accounts.

I shall refer to page 187 of the testimony where the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] asked some questions about this matter; before doing so let me say that Mr. Williams while on the stand made the statement—I can refer to the page in a moment if any Senator is doubtful about it—that the Comptroller General's office had "wiped the slate clean." Those were his words, "wiped the slate clean."

The Senator from Tennessee, at page 187 of the hearings, asked Mr. Warren:

Now, has that ever been disputed by Mr. Williams or anybody in his office?

That had reference to the charges filed before the Senate Appropriations Committee. Mr. Warren answered:

We have lifted some charges under it. We have collected some amounts under it. The N. Y. A. notified us they had made some collections, and I think we heard from time to time that they had taken remedial action in some of the matters we had pointed out.

Senator McKELLAR. So far as you know, they have never been settled?

Mr. WARREN. I would not say that.

Senator McKELLAR. Have you ever given Mr. Williams any clean bill of health on the charges contained in the Glass letter and report?

Mr. WARREN. Not that I have any recollection of. I might say that there are outstanding today against the N. Y. A. in the General Accounting Office exceptions raised by it amounting to $98,111.53.

Senator McKELLAR. How much has been paid in?

Mr. WARREN. Well, I see here that we have collected, on matters named in that report, $7,665.18. We reported to the Attorney General for collection $30,818.55.

On pages 75 and 76 of the hearings reference was made, in the examination of Mr. Williams, to a column which bears the title "Upstream," published in the Farmers' Union newspaper. I called his attention to the column, a part of which read as follows:

"Tory coalition in Congress for 2 years has tried to wage a soft war on the home front. When the President asked Congress for ten billion in taxes so that the youth now fighting the war would not be called upon to pay for it also, this Republican-Southern-Tory coalition brought out and passed a bill for two billion and later passed it again over the President's vigorously worded veto."

In fact, they have done many other discouraging things, such as making him quit.

Referring to Mr. Williams. The article written by Mr. Williams continues:

They have succeeded in running almost every decent man out of government, and those that are left live in constant fear of having their heads cut off.

They have wiped out the National Resources Planning Board.

They have apparently been able to sell the President—God forbid—the Baruch-Hancock demobilization scheme, which in the hands of Will Clayton, one of the most notorious cotton buyers of the South, will mean that the billions of dollars now invested in war-production plants and owned by the Government will go for 2 cents on the dollar, and none of it to any friend of the people.

By those and other destructive and obstructive acts done, always in the face of efforts of the President to fight a tough war on the home front as well as on the battle fronts, they have divided the people, arrayed farmer against labor, labor against management, and everyone against the Government.

The crowning act of the tory government is the enactment of a law that effectively denies soldiers the vote in the coming national election.

I asked Mr. Williams:

Did you write that?

His answer was:

Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIS. Will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. A while ago, when I was speaking on this subject, a Senator asked me to cite an instance of Mr. Williams having viciously upbraided the Members of Congress. I call attention to the statement the Senator has just read as typical.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I would call that viciousness.

Now, Mr. President, I read from page 77 of the testimony. I stated in a question to Mr. Williams:

I have here a reprint from the Birmingham News, published on November 22, 1938. This item apparently attempts to quote you, Mr. Williams.

"The South was declared by Aubrey Williams, Assistant Works Administration Administrator and Executive Director of the National Youth Administration, to be undergoing 'a constant process of impoverishment' because of an inefficient distribution system, at a session of labor relations and unemployment at the municipal auditorium last night."

Do you remember that speech?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I don't remember that.

Senator BUSHFIELD. You don't remember saying the South was continually growing poorer?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No.

I then read further from the Birmingham newspaper:

"He told the assembly it was imperative that some way be devised to 'spread the Nation's wealth equitably.'"

That sounds like redistribution of wealth to me.

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I have never used that term.

Senator BUSHFIELD. It is quoting you.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I never said that.

Senator BUSHFIELD. You simply deny it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is right.

Then I proceeded to question Mr. Williams—still reading from the same newspaper:

Senator BUSHFIELD (reading). "The National Youth Administration Chief defended the Government's huge program of spending and lending, declaring 'there need to be no fear about the national debt.'"

Are those your sentiments?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No. I said we had to go on with the program. I never made any statement about a national debt.

Senator BUSHFIELD (reading). "'It has been found,' he asserted, 'that Government spending definitely serves to raise the Nation's income level. And if the spending program is continued in sufficient degree it will itself take care of the debt because as the national income increases the source for further Government spending increases in an even larger proportion.'"

Do you believe that the Government debt can pay itself off if we spend freely enough?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that by means of judicious expenditure of funds you increase employment and thereby you increase the total national income and thereby make it possible for you to have a larger total income out of which to conduct everything, including government.

On page 82 I find this question by me:

I have before me a speech of yours, Mr. Williams. The title of it is "Government's Responsibility for Youth." It was published in the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1937. What are the injustices in that article that bother you?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, that is a pretty big order. I would refer you back to the monopolies, high concentration of wealth in the hands of very few beyond what they possibly could—to my mind at least—wisely use, and the lack of opportunity for a portion of the population to share in any sense in the blessings and opportunities of our country.

Senator BUSHFIELD. You said a moment ago that you thought some people in this country had more money than they could use.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Wisely use.

I now read some questions propounded by the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS]:

Senator WILLIS. In your book, Work, Wages, and Education, written about 1939 or 1940, you say:

"That any solution of the problem of jobs for all involves fundamental readjustments in relation of capital, labor, and government so the economy will function for the benefit of the entire population."

Now, will you describe what you mean by "readjustments in relation of capital, labor, and government"?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I mean such things as the S. E. C. with respect to controls that get established in our economy that bottle up and hold out segments of the population from participating in our economy and by proper methods of laws and procedures.

On page 97 of the record Mr. Williams testified that he was a member of the Political Action Committee, and had paid his dues.

Referring again to the column edited by Mr. Williams in the Farmers Union, the column called Upstream—A Column on Problems of Young People, by Aubrey Williams, I read a paragraph or two—this is Mr. Williams speaking:

I have just made a trip through the South. There is something happening down there—something more than the growing of a bumper crop of cotton, though they will have that, too.

There seems to be a bottom-deep awakening, a breaking up of the thick shell that has for decades covered the South; a stirring, or to use a good southern term of 50 years ago, a "refreshing." This is what they used to call what went on in religious revivals.

An unmistakable assertion of decency, and a turning on people who live by exploiting hatred, religious bigotry, by trading in people's prejudices and fears, is happening in the South today, more than anywhere else in the Nation.

Possibly it needs to happen there more than anywhere else—but it is happening, and that is the important thing.

A big part of this upsurge is taking place at the ballot box. Southern voters have done a magnificent job in retiring such bitter and dangerous men as Martin Dies, Joe Starnes, and "Cotton Ed" Smith.

These men are singularly similar in character and conduct. All three appealed to voters' lowest and ugliest selves—hatred of one's fellow man—denunciation of all men who sought to make a better world for all. All three got where they were through cheap and blatant demagogy of the crudest sort. And it was significant that voters saw this and repudiated it. The lines were clearly drawn, and decency won.

Those are Mr. Williams' words. He is expressing his own personal opinion.

Another quotation from the same column:

Still a third is the widespread repudiation of the Roosevelt-hating political clique who set themselves up as the self-appointed spokesmen of the voters of the South. If these self-styled leaders ever entertained any real expectations of carrying the rank and file of southern voters with them, they must know now that they have failed dismally. Even a southern press and radio, subservient always to these throw-backs to a feudal order, is now telling them that the people have not gone along with them.

These erstwhile leaders have labeled themselves for what they are. Nothing that has happened in the South's political life in a quarter of a century has so succeeded in making the people aware of the true character of their political leadership as has this action.

One further quotation from the same column:

This is the same crowd that has represented the South for the past 75 years in which the South has grown poorer and poorer, while every other section of the Nation has advanced in well-being and increased wealth and income.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am almost through, if the Senator from New Mexico will bear with me. If the Senator would prefer to make the suggestion of the absence of a quorum at this time I have no objection, but I would rather finish my statement.

Mr. HATCH. Very well.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I wish to call attension to the colloquy between the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] and Mr. Williams appearing on page 239 of the hearings, as follows:

Senator WILLIS. I recall you said you had some slight association in raising funds and you were perhaps a contributor to it at the request of Miss Brandeis.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me repeat it, then. I stated that Miss Elizabeth Brandeis was chairman of a little committee at Wisconsin. I made a contribution of $10 in 1928 or 1929.

I ask Senators to remember that date.

Then, I met with a small committee of two or three and they talked over raising funds. I didn't raise any; I didn't do any work with it.

That was my total connection with that institution, and that was 10 years before they were charged with being communistic, and the man that was there when I made my contribution had been ousted by this other element when this charge was made.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat the name of the organization to which Mr. Williams contributed $10?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Commonwealth College.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I continue to read from the hearings:

Senator WILLIS. And did you at any time in 1934 authorize an allotment of funds to be made available to Commonwealth College?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not recall. I know that I never authorized any direct allotment.

What you are referring to probably—and I am not sure they got any money, but what I think you are referring to is that there was a period in 1934 when F. E. R. A. made available funds to pay teachers where States were not able to keep the schools going for lack of funds to pay teachers, and that was set up under Dr. Alderman, who was in the office of education, and Dr. Alderman, on the recommendation of the State superintendent of public education of the various States, allocated certain funds to certain State institutions which were certified as being eligible to receive funds.

May I ask the Senator from Indiana if he quoted Mr. Williams' testimony respecting Lucien Koch?

Mr. WILLIS. No; I did not.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I shall quote further from the Senator from Indiana as appears in the hearings on page 241:

I would like to read into the record the letter of October 25, 1934, written by C. F. Klinefelter.

I think the Senator quoted that letter. Did he not?

Mr. WILLIS. I referred to it; but I do not think the letter is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Very well. I continue to read:

Mr. Lucien Koch, president of Commonwealth College at Mena, Ark., has been here in the office presenting the claim of his institution as a special case for participation in the college-student-aid program. After consideration of the facts involved, Mr. Aubrey Williams agreed to approve this institution for participating in the program under the same conditions as set forth in Mr. Hopkins' letter of July 3, namely that it will be entitled to an allotment of funds on the basis of 12 percent of the full-time enrollment as of October 15, 1934.

Mr. Koch will have an official affidavit executed by the acting director of the college and mailed to you at an early date. Upon receipt of the affidavit, you are therefore authorized by Mr. Williams to make an allotment of funds available to the institution, effective the 1st of November. After approval by you and the State superintendent, the affidavit should be sent in here for our file.

Let me say to the Senate that the very distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] will have something to say upon that subject when I finish, and I hope he will present the facts he has before him.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield for the purpose of the Senator presenting the matter he has in mind. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall make only a brief statement. I have not as yet determined definitely whether I shall make any remarks on the issue now before the Senate. Whether I do or not depends upon further developments. I had hoped that we could proceed with this matter to a conclusion without prolonged discussion, but if it takes such a course I shall be glad to comment upon what the Senator from South Dakota has said, and shall be very glad to make available to the Senate and place in the RECORD the letter to which the Senator refers or which I think he has in mind.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. May I inquire of the Senator whether he has any objection to my referring to the letter?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have none.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator. I wish to say in connection with the testimony to which I have just referred that the Senator from Arkansas has in his possession a letter from the prosecuting officer at Mena, Ark., who prosecuted the case against Commonwealth College, secured a conviction and closed the college.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask when did this happen, as this is something which did not come before the committee.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. It did not. The information was not secured until February 23.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator tell us when this prosecution occurred?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I find in this letter that it was in September 1939.

Mr. AIKEN. That was 5 years after the attempt was made to secure a loan from the Government, from the F. E. R. A.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think not only was an attempt made to secure a loan, but they succeeded in securing a loan. F. E. R. A. funds were furnished to this school, I think, notwithstanding the fact that the State superintendent of education and the State director of F. E. R. A. refused to recommend it; but the school did get the funds.

Mr. AIKEN. How could that be when the funds had to come through the State education department?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have not checked up, because I had no special interest in it; but it is my information that the State director of the F. E. R. A. refused to recommend it, and also the State superintendent of education refused to recommend it.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is in the prosecutor's letter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the statement of a man who lived there, and who prosecuted the case. He makes that statement in the letter.

Mr. AIKEN. That funds were received?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the statement say how much was received?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No.

Mr. AIKEN. As the Senator from South Dakota will recall, the committee did not have any evidence as to whether funds were received or not; but the condition on which they were approved by the F. E. R. A. was that they should be approved by the commissioner of education of the State of Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. That was very proper.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I had not thought of it from that aspect, particularly. I may say that the reason I happen to have this letter is that I attended one or two of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. While I was present at one of the hearings the question of Commonwealth College and Mr. Williams' connection with it arose and was discussed. After the reference was made I think possibly some news article was published about it. This citizen of Arkansas then got in contact with me by letter or telegram, and gave me some information about it, stating that he was the prosecuting officer who prosecuted the college and closed it. Then I requested him to give me full information about it, if he would, and this letter was written in response to my request, after the matter had been injected into the hearing. I was not quite clear as to what had happened. I remembered that there was such a college in Arkansas and that everyone regarded it as a Communist institution. I remembered that there had been court action, and that the college had been closed.

Mr. AIKEN. Is my understanding correct, that the management of the college changed between 1934 and 1939; that Dr. Koch was removed from office, and someone else of communistic inclinations installed?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator means Dr. Zeuch. Dr. Koch came later.

Mr. AIKEN. But there was a change in management, was there not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. There was a change in the president or superintendent of the college, but I do not believe there was any change in the general policies or program of the institution. I think it ended just as it had started. I do not believe there was any change in purpose of function.

Mr. AIKEN. Please understand that I am not trying to defend Commonwealth College, because I do not know the first thing about it. However, I do say that no evidence was offered before the committee to show that the college ever received any F. E. R. A. money. It is entirely possible that it did. Possibly political use could have been made of it, because we know what the W. P. A. and the F. E. R. A. were doing with the money in those days. They were making political use of a good deal of money.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator say they were making political use of the money?

Mr. AIKEN. They were; and they were doing so as long as there was any W. P. A. in my State.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator admits that, why is he willing to support those responsible for making political use of the money?

Mr. AIKEN. I am not supporting those responsible. In 1938 the N. Y. A. was set up; and in Vermont, after 1938, the W. P. A. continued to spend money for political purposes, even over the protests of the State administrator. However, the N. Y. A. was never accused of entering into politics in my State, so far as I know; but the W. P. A. was bad.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is the Senator able to speak for other States with respect to the N. Y. A.? I am not charging that the W. P. A. has spent money for political purposes. The Senator makes that charge.

Mr. AIKEN. I am simply judging from my own State. I realize that there were some States in the Union in which not a dollar of Federal money could be spent in those years without resulting political benefits, if the local politicians had their way; and in many places they did have their way.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If that is correct, was not Mr. Williams at that time Assistant Administrator of the W. P. A.?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not believe that any Administrator could have kept some of the money from being spent for political purposes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator believe that he tried to keep it from being so spent?

Mr. AIKEN. In my State it certainly was clean.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What was clean? Is the expenditure of money for political purposes clean? What was clean about it?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not believe that the expenditure of any Federal money for political purposes is clean. Will the Senator allow me time to read from this letter?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not wish to disrupt my discussion when I am about to conclude.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to read a paragraph from a letter which was written to me on March 1 by the commissioner of education of Vermont. I shall not read the entire letter, because only one paragraph of it refers to this matter. The letter is from Commissioner of Education Ralph E. Noble, who is not a new dealer. He is supposed to be a fairly conservative Republican. He says:

> I am naturally interested in seeing the directorship of the Rural Electrification Administration in competent hands.
>
> Although I do not know Mr. Aubrey Williams personally, and although I did not approve all of the national policies of the N. Y. A., I do believe, from the excellent service the N. Y. A. rendered in Vermont under the directorship of Mr. Allan Johnston, that Mr. Williams is a competent administrator and that he would have the best interests of the rural electrification service at heart.
>
> My interest in the Rural Electrification Administration is, of course, not in any way personal. I do see in it an opportunity for the improvement of rural standards in living, and therefore know that it has much significance to rural education.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is only one man's opinion; but that throws no light on the subject of the use of Federal funds for political purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. He is a pretty good man from a pretty good State.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to hurry through my remaining remarks. I thank both Senators for their contributions.

For the information of the Senator from Vermont, with the permission of the Senator from Arkansas I wish to refer to a statement in the prosecutor's letter, in which he says:

> Following his visit to the headquarters of F. E. R. A. a letter was written to W. R. Dyess, State relief administrator for Arkansas, by Mr. Kleinfelter, Assistant Director, Education Division, advising Mr. Dyess——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Is that the letter which has been placed in the RECORD? I assume it is.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thought it was. I heard Mr. Kleinfelter's name mentioned only once.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is a letter in the hearings, in which authorization was given for the contribution of money to this college. I do not remember the page, but it is in the record.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct. It was brought out during the questioning by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. McCLELLAN. The writer of this letter had never seen the record, but he knew about the letter.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. So I assume that he knows something about the transaction.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. He made a complete investigation, tried the case and obtained a conviction, and the college was disbanded, according to the prosecutor's statement.

Let me read the statement from the prosecutor's letter:

> Following his visit to the headquarters of F. E. R. A., a letter was written to W. R. Dyess, State relief administrator for Arkansas, by Mr. Kleinfelter, Assistant Director, Education Division, advising Mr. Dyess that Aubrey Williams had agreed to approve Commonwealth College for participation in the student-fund program. The letter contained this statement:
>
> "You are hereby authorized by Mr. Williams to make an allotment of funds available to the institution. After approval by you and the State superintendent of education, the affidavit should be sent here for our files."
>
> Neither Mr. Dyess nor Mr. Phipps, Arkansas superintendent of education, approved that grant, but the college received the money anyway under the directions of Mr. Williams.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. What is the date of that letter?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. February 23, 1945.

Mr. McCLELLAN. To which letter does the Senator refer? Is he referring to the letter from Mr. Williams?

Mr. LANGER. No; the original letter.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Will the Senator permit me to make a correction? The letter referred to by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] was dated October 25, 1944.

The prosecutor, Mr. Quinlan, says:

> The principal textbooks used in this school were Earl Browder's writings.

I leave the remainder of the letter for the distinguished Senator from Arkansas to refer to at the proper time if he sees fit to do so.

I quote further from the hearings when the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] was questioning the witness:

> Senator WILLIS. Were you acquainted with Mr. Koch?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I knew him back in Wisconsin when he was a student in Mr. John R. Commons' class.

Senator WILLIS. And he was director of Commonwealth College in 1934 when this letter was written?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Senator WILLIS. Do you consider him a responsible person whose character qualifies him to be head of a college?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think later on he caused a great deal of trouble, and I found he was mostly responsible for the trouble Dr. Zeuch had there, but at that time I would have said he was a striving and a good person.

On pages 233 and 234 of the testimony we find further examination by the Senator from Indiana, as follows:

Senator WILLIS. And the statement I have read you boasted about your familiarity with the leadership of the Workers Alliance. In that statement you claimed intimate relationship with them.

At the time you advised the Workers Alliance to keep their friends in power, would you state categorically that the Communists had no connection with the Workers Alliance?

Mr. WILLIAMS. To my knowledge, so far as I know.

The Senator from Indiana later made the following statement:

Before I ask any specific questions on this matter, I want the record to show that Earl Browder himself has admitted the Communist connection with the Workers Alliance, a connection which dates from its organization. Mr. Browder in his book, The Peoples Front, makes this statement:

"We Communists were the pioneers in this and in many other fields. The unemployed movement dates from the great Nation-wide demonstrations called by our party, for which we paid a heavy price. It was the Communists who raised the slogan of national unification and fought for it consistently and finally brought about the merger of all into the Workers Alliance."

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] subsequently asked the following question:

Senator ELLENDER. Who is David Lasser?

Senator WILLIS. President of the Workers Alliance.

Senator ELLENDER. Where is he now?

Mr. WILLIAMS. * * * he is now employed on the staff of the W. P. B.

I want to say this in respect to Mr. Lasser. I held him at high esteem then; I hold him at high esteem now.

I was mistaken in regard to Mr. Herbert Benjamin. I later found out that Mr. Benjamin was, by his own admission, a member of the Communist Party. At the time I made the statement concerning Mr. Benjamin I did not know that.

On June 27 Mr. Williams spoke at a meeting of the Workers Alliance. He said he did not know at that time that it was communistic.

The Workers Alliance publishes a Communist newspaper in New York City. The Workers Alliance had just held its national convention in Milwaukee, Wis., when the following statement appeared in the Sunday Worker of June 27, 1937, printing a message from William Z. Foster and Earl Browder to the Workers Alliance:

Warmest fraternal greetings on your united and progressive convention. Heartiest congratulations on your splendid fight against W. P. A. cuts. The Communist Party stands with you.

(Signed) William Z. Foster, chairman; Earl Browder, secretary.

That statement in that Communist newspaper was published on June 27, 1937, or a year prior to the time when Mr. Williams talked to the Workers Alliance, which he said he did not know was a Communist organization.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that Mr. Williams, as Administrator of the National Youth Administration, was in approximately the same position in regard to the Workers Alliance or any other group of unemployed as the Secretary of Labor would be in regard to the C. I. O. or the A. F. of L.? Does the Senator from South Dakota think that when representatives of those groups came before him or when he had occasion to speak to any considerable number of them it was his duty to determine whether there were any Communists in the group which came to consult with him on business?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Not at all. Do not misunderstand me. But the leaders of the Communist Party in America knew that that outfit was Communist, a year before Mr. Williams spoke to them.. A statement to that effect was published in the New York Communist newspaper. But Mr. Williams denied that he knew anything about it, a year later.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is probably safe to say that the Communists had designs on that organization, although Mr. Williams stated that he did not know anything about it.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Whatever the designs were, they succeeded.

Mr. AIKEN. The row between the Communists and the non-Communists in the Workers Alliance did not occur until after Mr. Williams spoke to them. Thereafter the Communists succeeded in throwing out the non-Communists, and the Communists took over the organization.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. They took over the Youth Organization, too.

Mr. AIKEN. Of course they take over all they can.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I referred to a contribution Mr. Williams made to Commonwealth College. The contribution is unimportant in size, and he had a perfect right to make it if he wanted to do so; but he said he made the contribution in 1927, years before he knew anything about the college. I have on my desk an original copy of the Commonwealth College Fortnightly, a student or college newspaper published on June 15, 1934. In that particular issue Mr. Williams is listed as a contributor to Commonwealth College.

Mr. AIKEN. During what period of time were the contributions made?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In this instance the contribution was made by Mr. Williams in the month of June.

Mr. AIKEN. Was the contribution described as an annual one?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; it was a contribution made in the month of June.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I recall the testimony, it was distinctly to the effect that Mr. Williams made but one contribution, and that was 11 years before he found out that Commonwealth College was communistic.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. But the record disproves that.

Mr. President, I am almost through. I find in the same issue of the Commonwealth College Fortnightly an advertisement of the summer session of that so-called college, in which the following statement is made:

Paul Mattick, a writer on Marxism, will be at Commonwealth from July 15 to 28. Some of his lecture topics are Theories of Accumulation and Collapse, by Marx, Otto Bauer, Rosa Luxemburg, Sternberg, Lenin, Bucharin, Grossman, and others; Different Interpretations of Marxian Dialectics; Production and Distribution in Communism; Is Russia Building Socialism? etc.

I call that to the attention of the Senate merely to show the kind of schooling which those attending that so-called college received.

In the issue of the Commonwealth College Fortnightly dated March 1, 1934, I find the following statement on page 2:

The nonfactional position of the school has been the source of internal difficulties in the past, but during 1933 the various factional organizations on the campus got along quite well with each other and with the management. Both the Communist and Socialist Parties have organized groups on the campus, the Communist groups having a larger membership.

On the first page of the issue of the same college newspaper of June 15, 1932, I find the following interesting contribution:

FRIENDS' COMMITTEE FORMED AT MADISON—ELIZABETH BRANDEIS AT HEAD OF GROUP ORGANIZED TO AID SCHOOL

Organization of a Commonwealth College committee at Madison, Wis., with Elizabeth Brandeis, daughter of Justice Brandeis, as chairman, was announced by Director Lucien Koch upon his return from his recent lecture trip.

The committee membership includes Genevieve Townsend, secretary; Aubrey Williams—

And so forth. Testimony was offered before the committee that Mr. Zeuch, the first president of the college, was dismissed because he was not a Communist. The May 1, 1931, issue of Commonwealth College Fortnightly contains the following statement:

For the first time in 8 years W. E. Zeuch is to have the opportunity of a change from his duties at Commonwealth. His appointment to a John Simon Guggenheim memorial fellowship, and the fact that the new director, Lucien Koch, and other commoners are prepared to carry on Commonwealth's administrative work have made possible a change of scene for Zeuch.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator would not consider Harvard University a Communist institution, would he?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. No; but it has on its staff several Communist professors.

Mr. AIKEN. A list of alleged Communist professors issued by the Dies committee included the names of some of

the professors at Harvard. Certainly, some of the very wealthy men of the country who make contributions to the Harvard endowment fund should not be accused of contributing to the Communist Party. The mere fact that Aubrey Williams gave $10 to a college about which he probably should have known more than he apparently knew, is no more reason for saying that he contributed to Communist support than would be the statement that wealthy men throughout the country who contribute to the endowment fund of Harvard University are thereby contributing to communistic support.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator for his contribution. I have called attention of the Senate to Mr. Williams' financial contributions to Commonwealth College, not because he contributed. That fact alone is wholly immaterial. I wished to point out that he was confused as to the dates when he made the contributions.

Mr. President, I have taken much more time of the Senate than I had intended to take. I am sorry if I have delayed the business of the Senate. I feel that the record of the hearings conducted by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is such that Mr. Williams, however estimable a gentleman he may be, should not be confirmed for one of the most important Government positions in America. His duties would be to preside over the activities of what may be termed strictly a loaning agency. It does not deal with relief workers or the poor people. It deals with a huge business which very shortly will be one of the largest of Government activities. I cannot possibly see how Mr. Williams is qualified by training, education, or belief to hold that important position.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. AIKEN subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to insert in the RECORD the up-to-date information which we have been seeking, both in the committee and on the floor of the Senate, with regard to whether Commonwealth College ever actually received any F. E. R. A. money.

I have learned from Dr. Kleinfelter, whose name has been mentioned on the floor, as well as in the committee, that there were eventually three work stipends of $15 a month granted to students of Commonwealth College; that these three grants of $15 a month were approved by W. E. Phipps, who was superintendent of education for the State of Arkansas. So $45 a month was granted to the students of this college, with the approval of the State superintendent of education in Arkansas.

I am also advised that in 1935 or 1936 charges were preferred against the college, or its head—I do not know which—which were investigated by a committee of the Arkansas State Legislature.

The committee reported "not proved." However, there was a change in the management of the college along about that time. Dr. Zeuch, who was the head of Commonwealth College in 1934, was replaced by Dr. Koch, who evidently got into trouble. Dr. Zeuch is now the head of a reputable school at Fairhope, Ala. The junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] probably knows more than any other Senator about whether the school at Fairhope is reputable or not.

Furthermore, I am advised that the $10 contribution which the Senator from South Dakota read from the Commonwealth College paper as having been made in 1934 by Aubrey Williams was not made in 1934 but in a previous year. Even he does not know why he was listed in the college paper of that year.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I dislike to repeat, but inasmuch as my good friend from Vermont seems to be somewhat intent upon challenging Mr. Williams' statement, I feel that I should read Mr. Williams' statement again, so that the Senate cannot misunderstand the facts.

On page 241 of the hearings, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] made the following statement:

Senator WILLIS. I would like to read into the record the letter of October 25, 1934, written by C. F. Klinefelter and directed to Mr. W. R. Dyess, State relief administrator, Little Rock, Ark. He was State administrator of F. E. R. A.

"Mr. Lucien Koch, president of Commonwealth College at Mena, Ark., has been here in the office presenting the claim of his institution as a special case for participation in the college-student-aid program. After consideration of the facts involved, Mr. Aubrey Williams agreed to approve this institution for participating in the program under the same conditions as set forth in Mr. Hopkins' letter of July 3, namely, that it will be entitled to an allotment of funds on the basis of 12 percent of the full-time enrollment as of October 15, 1934.

"Mr. Koch will have an official affidavit executed by the acting director of the college and mailed to you at an early date. Upon receipt of the affidavit, you are therefore authorized by Mr. Williams to make an allotment of funds available to the institution, effective the 1st of November. After approval by you and the State superintendent, the affidavit should be sent in here for our file.

"I am sending a copy of this letter to Superintendent Smith so that he will have a clear understanding of the situation."

That is signed by C. F. Klinefelter, assistant director, educational division.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the date of the letter?

Senator WILLIS. October 25, 1934.

Senator AIKEN. Do you recall how many schools you approved in all?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Senator, this has to do with something besides funds for teachers. This has to do with work stipends for students prior to the establishment of N. Y. A.

Listen to this. There cannot be any misunderstanding about it. This is the testimony of Mr. Williams himself:

I stand by the letter; it is all right. But the main thing to remember is that it states that the grant of funds was dependent upon approval by the State superintendent of public instruction, then it has to be done.

I cannot imagine what the purpose of the Senator from Vermont is in attempting to prove by the article which was inserted in the record that Mr. Klinefelter now says Mr. Williams did not authorize him to write that letter. It is perfectly plain on the face of it, and I call the Senator's attention to it because certainly he would not want to do Mr. Williams an injury by introducing proof by Mr. Klinefelter that Mr. Williams was not telling the truth.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not see anything inconsistent between the letter and the statement I have made. Mr. Williams said he would approve funds for the students of that college if the State superintendent of education would approve them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Well, it has been done.

Mr. AIKEN. And three stipends of $15 a month each were granted. It appears from the testimony that at one time Mr. Koch was president of Commonwealth College. At another place in the testimony it appears that at that time he was a director of Commonwealth College. If he then was president, I am mistaken; but if he was a director, and if Dr. Zeuch was president, I am not mistaken.

However, I do not see anything inconsistent between the statement and the letter. A total of $45 a month was granted to the students, with the approval of the department.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum. I think it would be entirely proper at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator from South Dakota finished his speech?

Mr. HATCH. Yes. He has yielded the floor. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Myers
Austin	Hart	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Buck	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bushfield	La Follette	Stewart
Byrd	Langer	Taft
Capehart	Lucas	Taylor
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Chandler	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McFarland	Tobey
Cordon	McKellar	Tunnell
Donnell	McMahon	Tydings
Downey	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Eastland	Maybank	Walsh
Ellender	Mead	Wheeler
Ferguson	Millikin	Wherry
Fulbright	Mitchell	White
George	Moore	Wiley
Gerry	Morse	Willis
Green	Murdock	Wilson
Guffey	Murray	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration?

(At this point Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have certain matters printed in the Appendix. Their requests appear under separate headings, earlier in today's RECORD.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, soon after Aubrey Williams was nominated by the President to serve as R. E. A. Administrator, I began to receive a few letters from various sections of the country sug-

gesting that I vote against his confirmation. I also received many letters and telegrams asking that I vote for him. In some of the letters divers charges were made against Mr. Williams. Among other things, he was charged with being a Communist, and as one who while he was Administrator of N. Y. A. had permitted the misappropriation of funds, the falsification of records, permitting dual programing employees and many other similar accusations. Because of these indictments, when I attended the first meeting of the Agricultural Committee of the Senate which conducted the hearings, I, of course, kept an open mind. I naturally expected that the committee would be furnished with such evidence as might be necessary in substantiation of the charges which were lodged against Mr. Williams, and from such testimony decide whether or not I would be for or against the nomination of Mr. Williams.

Mr. President, as I stated here yesterday, the Senate is sitting in the capacity of a jury, composed of the duly elected representatives of the people of this Republic. Mr. Williams stands indicted, among other things, as a Communist, a falsifier of records, while serving as N. Y. A. Administrator, a man who sabotaged the war effort and one who conducted N. Y. A. as a communistic organization.

It would seem to me, Mr. President, that every Senator owes to Mr. Williams a solemn duty to look into his record. It strikes me that before voting to confirm Mr. Williams, voting either for or against confirmation, I may say, it is the bounden duty of Senators to sift the testimony, and not depend on hearsay evidence. They should use their own judgment and not depend on the advice of others.

Soon after the hearings were started and in the light of so many charges against the nominee, I thought that many witnesses would come before our committee in order to substantiate the charges which had been made against Mr. Williams. The hearings proceeded, witnesses were invited to appear, but to my surprise only one witness asked to be heard in opposition to the confirmation of Mr. Williams. That witness was the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. I may say, in passing, that most of the testimony of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee was purely hearsay. Few facts were produced by him that rested on his own knowledge.

The testimony he gave was based on the hearings which were held before the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate, the Dies committee, and a few other committees of the Congress. That constituted virtually all the evidence furnished by him. He also read from many newspaper excerpts, as did the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD]. When asked to present proof in substantiation of his charges, he did not do so. He referred to the hearings upon which he depended and suggested that I read them. He evidently took the same position as the learned Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], who, when asked today, in the course of his remarks, why did not the farm organizations who oppose Williams testify, stated that the organization depended on the testimony already submitted before various committees of the Congress.

Mr. President, I repeat what I stated yesterday, that in the consideration of this nomination the honor and dignity of the United States Senate are at stake. Are Members of the Senate going to convict a nominee of the President purely and solely on hearsay evidence or may I say, merely charges, without adequate proof? Are they to be swayed by prejudiced ex parte evidence, or influenced by the record presented to this body by a standing committee of the Senate.

Why should a responsible committee of the Senate spend weeks in conducting hearings on a nomination if we are not to depend on the record in forming our conclusion as to whether or not the nominee is competent, as to whether or not the nominee is guilty of such charges as may have been preferred against him?

I repeat, Mr. President, we are today standing here as a jury. This man has been indicted in the eyes of the American people. If he is not confirmed by the Senate of the United States, this great body, composed of honorable men, will anyone doubt that the natural conclusion will be that he stands convicted of the charges that were preferred against him?

Mr. President, I had seen Aubrey Williams but once before he appeared before our committee. I did not know him very well, and, as a matter of fact, before he appeared before the committee, if I met him on the street, I would not have known him. Who is Aubrey Williams? Williams was born and reared in the midst of toil and poverty. His father was poor. But Williams was imbued with ambition. He was unable to attend school until he was 21 years old. He was compelled to work so as to help himself and his family. He entered Maryville High School, the eighth grade, at 21. From the age of 9 until he was 21, up to the eighth grade, he was self-educated. He had some good friends who coached him at night after he completed his daily work. Because of his burning ambition for an education, he finally achieved it, even though circumstances forced it via the hard way.

When he entered this little school in Tennessee, at Maryville—called the Maryville High School and College—he entered the eighth grade, as I have stated, a man 21 years old, and at the end of 3 years he graduated from high school there, and then took 2 years in the college department of the Maryville School. It was at that time, as I recall, that he studied for the ministry.

Mr. President, when World War No. 1 broke out Williams was still at school. He was attending his third college year at the University of Cincinnati. Did he remain at home, as did many young men of his age until the draft removed him from his school desk? No; as soon as war was declared he went to France with the Y. M. C. A., and worked for the Y. M. C. A. for a period of 6 months, thereafter joining the French Foreign Legion. He spent 6 months fighting as a member of the French Foreign Legion, and engaged in many battles.

As soon as our American forces went to France Williams resigned from the French Foreign Legion and joined the First Division, fought throughout the war, and was wounded. He entered as a buck private and came out a second lieutenant. While in France, after the armistice was signed, he pursued his school work at the University of Bordeaux, and there received a degree. Williams was almost 30 years old when he returned to this country, a soldier, a patriot, and a scholar, to further continue his college education. He completed his college work at the University of Cincinnati, and was awarded a B. A. degree, and then proceeded to do social work.

As has been stated, after Williams graduated from the University of Cincinnati, he spent 10 years doing social work in the State of Wisconsin with the American Public Welfare Association, and his duty there was to render administrative service for that organization in organizing and administering the work of the association. Because of his ability and of the training Williams had received by virtue of his connection with the American Public Welfare Association, soon after the R. F. C. was organized under the Hoover Administration for the purpose of administering relief, he was employed to organize and supervise relief work in various Southern States. He started out in Mississippi and was afterwards sent to Texas, and then was placed at the head of the southwestern division, which comprised eight Southern States. Because of his thorough grasp in the field of administering relief and organizing such work he was sent for and made assistant to the Administrator of W. P. A. here in Washington.

Mr. President, it is true that most of the work Williams did after graduation and until he became Administrator of N. Y. A. was social work, work to help the underprivileged. But in his capacity as administrator of relief he obtained most valuable experience. He had under his charge in W. P. A. more than 60,000 workers. He supervised the spending of billions of dollars of Government funds. It was necessary that he organize the personnel of W. P. A. into different groups so as to carry out the will of Congress. He was charged with the duty of supervising work in all of the States of the Union, so as to take care of the unemployed of this Nation.

When N. Y. A. was established by Executive order in 1935, in addition to his duty as assistant to Mr. Hopkins, W. P. A. Administrator, he was appointed executive director of N. Y. A., and for 2 years he handled the work of both offices. When Mr. Williams resigned as assistant to Mr. Hopkins and became Director of N Y. A. he supervised the work of 23,000 employees of that organization. He organized and administered all of the work done by N. Y. A.

Mr. President, I ask in all fairness: In view of the fact that Mr. Williams has managed and supervised as many as 60,000 employees when he was Assistant Administrator of W. P. A., and 23,000 employees when he was Director of N. Y. A.,

is it possible for anyone to conclude that he cannot organize and administer the work of 700 employees who constitute the entire working force in R. E. A.? Mr. Williams is a proven expert in management and I have no doubt that if confirmed he will be a credit to the R. E. A.

Mr. President, what is R. E. A.? R. E. A. is merely a lending association. I will read from the law itself:

> There is hereby created and established an agency of the United States to be known as the "Rural Electrification Administration", all of the powers of which shall be exercised by an Administrator, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 10 years, and who shall receive a salary of $10,000 per year. This act may be cited as the "Rural Electrification Act of 1936."
>
> SEC. 2. The Administrator is authorized and empowered to make loans in the several States and Territories of the United States for rural electrification and the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service, as hereinafter provided; to make, or cause to be made, studies, investigations, and reports concerning the condition and progress of the electrification of rural areas in the several States and Territories; and to publish and disseminate information with respect thereto.

In other words, Mr. President, Rural Electrification Administration was created by the Congress to function as a lending agency. What it needs is a good Administrator, and it is my firm belief that Mr. Williams is qualified by experience to fill that job. A man who has administered the affairs of an organization—W. P. A.—employing 60,000 persons and another organization—N. Y. A.—employing 23,000 employees can certainly administer the affairs of an organization employing only 700, as I pointed out a few minutes ago.

Mr. President, I will cite some of the work done by N. Y. A. I shall show it from the record. From that record Senators will note that in administering R. E. A. Mr. Williams will be confronted, if he shall be confirmed, with the same kind of work he did in N. Y. A. In N. Y. A. he organized thousands of groups to do different kinds of work, such as welding, auto repairs, radio connections, and the like. In R. E. A. groups or cooperatives are organized for the purpose of obtaining loans so that power lines can be built in certain parts of the country, so as to supply electricity to members of these cooperatives. The work is administrative. I will point out after a while more specifically how R. E. A. is presently organized and how it functions. Let me read the record:

> Mr. Williams directed N. Y. A. during its entire 8 years' span from 1935 to 1943. In that period N. Y. A. spent about $662,000,000, and gave employment to 4,800,000 youths. The average total cost per youth was only $138. Organized in every State, N. Y. A. at one time had about 23,000 paid employees, including project supervisors, representing every form of professional and technical experience. Administrative expenses averaged about 5 percent, supervisory costs about 22 percent, including instructors. The ratio of instructors to youth necessarily had to be high because of the technical nature of war production training and because actual production was combined with training. Honoring the ideas and desires of local committees, N. Y. A. had some 2,500 citizens' committees with a membership of about 25,000, who planned projects in cooperation with N. Y. A. These N. Y. A. committees were National, State, and local. In the peak year 19,000 separate projects were in operation.

Stop and think of that. Nineteen thousand projects were in operation. Those projects consisted of every conceivable subject that boys and girls could learn primarily in the latter 2 years, to help in the war effort. Many projects were organized wherein radio, automobile repairing, welding, and such things were taught. The principle of combining employment and training was followed, thus providing practical experience and cutting overhead costs.

The youths did much of their own work, built dormitories and other buildings, did their own cooking and housekeeping, made their own furniture, and repaired and salvaged automobiles.

In connection with the in-school programs in some 29,000 high schools and about 17,000 colleges, 2,134,000 youth were given work so that they could attend school.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has just finished speaking about the money which went to the various high schools throughout the United States. I am wondering whether or not the 29,000 high schools about which he spoke are connected in any way with the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] yesterday. He stated that approximately $165,000,000 of the money which had been appropriated by Congress had gone, under the management and direction of Aubrey Williams, to communistic organizations.

I have never been able to find from the record just where the $165,000,000 was spent. I have tried to trace it the best I could overnight through the record, to ascertain just what communistic organizations received the money. In breaking down the figures the best I could discover was that the money about which the Senator from Tennessee was speaking went to 1,600 colleges and universities and 29,000 high schools, to give work to needy students in order that they might receive an education. If that is the condition I wish to point out further to the Senator and to the Senate that every dollar of the $165,000,000 which went to the 29,000 high schools was under the control of the school boards. In other words, it was more or less of a grant to the particular high schools, and the money was spent under the supervision and direction of the school boards throughout the Nation.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is eminently correct. As I recall the testimony, the only so-called communistic college which made application was one in Arkansas, known as Commonwealth College. As I recall, the evidence shows that no money went to that school. It is true that application was made, but the money had to pass through the school authorities of the State of Arkansas; and the same thing which applied to Arkansas applied to all other States, namely, that no money was given to any school or college directly by the Administrator. It was all handled through the various local school boards, superintendents, or those in charge of the schools in the various States.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the point which the Senator has made. That is the point to which I referred a moment ago. With respect to the $165,000,000 which went to the high schools of this country, I should like to have the record show clearly and distinctly, without any question of doubt, that if that money was being spent to promote communism in this country, then every school board, every teacher, and every principal was involved in the communistic doctrine.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I made no such statement as that. I said nothing about schools. Of course I never made any statement about the money going to the schools. It was given to "pink" organizations. It was given to "fellow traveler" organizations, communistic organizations. That is where it went.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Tennessee now challenges the statement, which is perfectly all right. I am not attempting to prove anything with respect to the $165,000,000.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I know that the Senator does not wish to misrepresent me, or misquote any statements which I made. I certainly hope he does not. But what he is undertaking to do is to make it appear that I said that what was done was done through the public schools of the country. That is absolutely without the slightest foundation in fact.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not know what the distinguished Senator from Tennessee said in respect to schools, but the record shows, on page 171 of the hearings, what the Senator said about N. Y. A., if that is of any importance to this debate.

Mr. MCKELLAR. The Senator need not consider it of any importance.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe it is important. At the bottom of page 170 the Senator said:

> I am just wondering if we ever had any differences. I do not recall any differences. But when Mr. Williams began to run his activities in the National Youth Administration as a Communist front organization I had to part company with Mr. Williams, because I am not a Communist and could not go along with it.
>
> Senator ELLENDER. The Senator does not mean to say that N. Y. A. was run as a Communist organization?
>
> Senator MCKELLAR. Indeed it was; yes, sir.

Mr. President, according to the yardstick which has been laid down by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, every Member of the Senate who voted for N. Y. A. funds is a Communist.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is perfect rot.

Mr. ELLENDER. The distinguished Senator pointed out before the committee that Mr. Williams was a Communist because he happened to address the

Workers' Alliance, and because he made a contribution to Commonwealth College of Arkansas, both of which had communistic tendencies at some time or another. Because Mr. Williams did that, he is branded as a Communist. By the same token, and according to the yardstick laid down by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, I repeat that every Member of the Senate who voted for N. Y. A. is a Communist.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator can call him that if he wishes to do so; but I have not said any such thing, and any such argument is the veriest rot.

Mr. ELLENDER. The record speaks for itself. Look at page 171. It is there in black and white:

Senator ELLENDER. The Senator does not mean to say that N. Y. A. was run as a Communist organization?

Senator MCKELLAR. Indeed it was; yes, sir.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to disturb my very distinguished friend the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and I do not wish to misquote him at any time in connection with this debate. However, ever since he made the statement yesterday during the colloquy he had with me regarding $150,000,000, that was spent for Communist purposes through the N. Y. A., I have attempted to find the correct answer. The best answer I can obtain, in attempting to break down the figures which have been placed in the record of the hearings regarding that sum, is the amount of money which was spent in the schools and the colleges.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I denounce that as being absolutely untrue. Of course, the Senator can take his own view about it.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, I heard the Senator's statement about it.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator can repeat it if he wishes to do so.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not object to having the Senator correct the statement if it is in error; but I wish to have him point out to me before the debate ends what Communist group got the $150,000,000 that he talked about yesterday. That is what I should like to determine. Of course, yesterday the Senator said he did not know what a Communist was, and so forth; but perhaps he knows today.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am not going to suggest the absence of a quorum, without the consent of my friend the Senator from Tennessee; but I wish to call attention to the fact that after the Senate yesterday voted that the most important thing in the entire United States was the confirmation or nonconfirmation of the nomination of Aubrey Williams, probably not more than 15 Senators are now on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Louisiana, a member of the committee, is speaking, and he is speaking very learnedly and intelligently; but practically no Senators are in the Chamber to listen.

Mr. President, I think perhaps I will suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I make the point of order that no business has been transacted since the last roll call was taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is advised by the Parliamentarian, who has been present in the Chamber at all times during the session today, that business has been transacted since the last quorum call.

Mr. McKELLAR. I withdraw my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Therefore, the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana yielded to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Senator from New Mexico asked me to yield, I yielded for a question. I think the RECORD will so show.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the opinion of the Chair that the RECORD will show that when the Senator from New Mexico asked the Senator from Louisiana to yield, nothing was said about the purpose for which he asked the Senator to yield.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if I may say a word further. The Senator from Louisiana did say, "I yield for a question"; but the rules of the Senate provide that at any time a Senator observes the absence of a quorum, he may suggest it. It does not take too much observation to see that a quorum is absent. I insist on my point.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I make the point of order that unless the Senator from Louisiana yields for that purpose, the suggestion of the absence of a quorum is not in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not yield for the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if it would interfere with the Senator from Louisiana, and if he does not wish me to make the point——

Mr. ELLENDER. It would not interfere with me, but I do not see the necessity of having a roll call. I am sure that after a roll call no more Senators would be in the Chamber than are now present.

Mr. HATCH. Would the Senator prefer to proceed?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I would just as soon proceed.

Mr. HATCH. Would the Senator prefer to talk to empty seats? Very well; I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hope Senators will remain in the Chamber to hear the facts, since so many will not bore themselves to learn them from the record. What hurts me a great deal is to see at this time so few of my distinguished colleagues from across the aisle in their seats. Only three of them are now in attendance; that is all. I should like to have more Senators present. I should like to have them interrogate me so as to bring the truth about Williams to the surface. I think they owe it to the nominee to get to the bottom of this case and at least give him a square deal. That is what I have been pleading for. That is what I tried to emphasize before the Senate yesterday. Our duty demands that we study the written record, and upon the basis of the record itself to make our decision as to whether or not we should vote to confirm his nomination. That is what I am now demanding.

Mr. President, I do not know why it is that so many distinguished Senators declared they would vote against Mr. Williams no matter what evidence was adduced, no matter what facts were produced by any Senator. I do not know why they take that position; why they should be willing to prejudge his case. It may be that the crime which has been committed by Mr. Williams is that he has devoted his entire life to helping the underprivileged. That may be why a good many Senators would not like to see him selected for any position in the Government—not that he could do it in connection with the Rural Electrification Administration, because, as I pointed out a while ago, the Rural Electrification Administration is a loaning agency—they seem not to trust him because of his liberal views.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. A moment ago the Senator made a remark about there being practically no Senators on the other side of the aisle listening to his statement. I do not think the Senator should take offense at that. It is nothing unusual, if my authority is correct, in view of what has been occurring. In other words, after the nomination of Mr. Wallace for Secretary of Commerce was confirmed by the Senate, it is my understanding that the party leaders on the other side of the aisle immediately got together and said, "We have been defeated on the nomination of Mr. Wallace; but here is a great opportunity, with the nomination of Aubrey Williams, to square things." So all through this proceeding the Republican leaders have used the party whip and lash on certain recalcitrant Senators who they believe voted wrong on the nomination of Mr. Wallace. That is about the sum and substance of the present situation.

It is not a question of qualifications. It is not a question of anything but politics and prejudice, as I said yesterday, so far as Aubrey Williams is concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hate to see such a situation prevail in this great body as has been described by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. Certainly it is not very conducive to good government.

I continue to read from the N. Y. A. record:

IN-SCHOOL PROGRAM

In some 29,000 high schools and about 1,700 colleges, 2,134,000 youths were given work so they could attend school—about

1,400,000 in high schools and 700,000 in colleges. Their combined earnings totaled $169,500,000.

The high-school and college authorities selected the students, planned and supervised the work, determined the hours and wages, kept the work records, and submitted monthly pay rolls to N. Y. A., which then sent the checks to the students direct. The school authorities usually furnished supervision, space, and materials. The schools also helped by teaching the theory while N. Y. A. supervised the practice of work training.

Types of work done under the student-aid program included construction and repair of buildings and equipment, machine-shop and automotive repair, landscaping, hospital assistance, clerical work, library service, home economics, reforestation and soil conservation, research and statistical work, classroom and laboratory assistance, drafting, recreational leadership.

Pay was on an hourly basis for work performed. High-school students averaged $4 to $5 a month, college students $11 to $13, and graduate students $19 to $23.

Aid was limited to youth in families with total earnings less than $1,500 a year.

There were always two or three youths applying for every one for whom aid could be provided.

Minimum age for eligibles was 16.

A survey made during the year 1938–39 school year showed that N. Y. A. students made better grades than the average of the student body in 81 percent of the schools.

The value of N. Y. A. both for students and for the schools was attested by surveys in the high schools of California and in the Universities of Colorado, Florida, Missouri, and Ohio State.

OUT-OF-SCHOOL PROGRESS

During the life of N. Y. A., 2,677,000 youths were given work-training on out-of-school projects.

Their combined wages totaled $467,600,000. The monthly earnings varied from $15 to $22 until the final year when they rose to a peak of $25 a month for some of the work.

Local cosponsors planned and helped supervise N. Y. A. work-training projects—including such local public agencies as city councils, welfare departments, county agricultural agencies, school boards, and park boards.

The work-training took the form of learning by doing—actually making things for practical use.

At first N. Y. A. stressed construction work. It built 9,554 new buildings and improved or remodeled 25,626 more—including schools, vocational farm shops and other educational buildings, hospitals, recreational and community service buildings, and airplane facilities.

For girls, home economics was stressed—cooking, sewing, garment making, etc.

A good deal of clerical work-training was also done—for instance, filing and record-keeping for county officials.

CONVERSION TO DEFENSE AND WAR TRAINING

In the spring of 1940, more than 1½ years before Pearl Harbor, a machinery purchase program was started to prepare for the Nation's defense. After securing approval of the committees of Congress, N. Y. A. spent around $5,000,000 to buy old machinery which the youth then repaired, rebuilt and put to use. About 25,000 pieces of machinery were assembled and rebuilt under technical direction—equipment for machine shops, foundries and forges, woodworking, sheet metal, radio, aviation, and electric shops. This machinery had been junked by other Government agencies; it was bought at junk prices.

I ask all Senators to bear in mind that this took place just before Pearl Harbor. The Lord only knows what would have happened with our program to equip our Army had it not been for the work done by the N. Y. A. As I will show later, thousands of our boys and girls were actually already trained to do work in all the work shops of the Nation. The money which it cost was well spent. The entire program was thought out and carried into effect under the administration of Aubrey Williams.

I continue reading from the report:

By July 1, 1941—still nearly half a year before Pearl Harbor—when the N. Y. A. defense training program officially began, there were 2,500 mechanical shops in operation.

After Pearl Harbor, N. Y. A. went over entirely to a war production training program. By February 1942 in some 700 centers there were nearly 40,000 production units with almost 52,000 work stations—two-thirds being machine and metal working. They operated on 2 shifts of 8 hours each per day.

N. Y. A. projects under the war production training program consisted of machine shop, welding, aircraft and other sheet metal, industrial sewing, radio and electrical, automotive mechanics, aircraft engine mechanics, mechanical drafting, aircraft and other woodwork, forge, foundry, pattern-making, and clerical.

All of which was essential in order to make the wonderful progress which was made in this country in preparing for war.

I continue reading:

In the last year of N. Y. A., youth continued to enter N. Y. A. at a rate of 1,000 a day, even though the pay averaged less than $20 a month.

When N. Y. A. ended, it had a training plant worth $75,000,000.

SERVICE TO WAR INDUSTRIES AND THE ARMED FORCES

In the last year of its existence, N. Y. A. produced over 5,000,000 articles for public agencies participating in the war, such as the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission. For instance, at one time N. Y. A. was turning out around 30,000 items a month for the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

When N. Y. A. was abolished it was turning out an average of 1,000 trained youth per day for war plants and military service.

About half of the N. Y. A. work stations trained youth for specific industries.

War industries, as well as the military services, looked to N. Y. A. as a recruiting place, sometimes putting their people right in N. Y. A. offices to keep abreast of the work.

Some industrial concerns set up buildings on their own grounds and provided supervisors for N. Y. A. youth to be given their final stages of training—for instance, the Kaiser Shipbuilding plant, Consolidated Aircraft at Fort Worth, and airplane industries on the coast, Sperry Gyro in New Jersey, the Sun Shipbuilding Co. of Pennsylvania. Navy yards practically everywhere did the same thing.

Here is the record of the 198,887 youth who left N. Y. A. work training in the last 11 months of its existence (July 1942–May 1943): 19,831, or 10 percent, went into military service; of these, 11,805 volunteered, 8,026 were drafted; 179,056, or 90 percent, went into private or public employment; of these, 78,172 went into direct war industries, 18,103 went into indirect war industries, and 36,062 went into nonmanufacturing war industries.

In the group of whom there are actual records, 33,000 were boys of military age. Of these, 11,800 enlisted and 8,000 were drafted.

In other words, more than 60 percent of N. Y. A. eligibles went directly into the armed forces in 1943. In comparison, of all selective-service registrants in the entire country, 15 percent were inducted in 1943.

TESTIMONIALS

In the last year of N. Y. A., the Army and Navy and Maritime Commission testified before Congress that N. Y. A. was performing a useful service and requested that it be continued.

In addition, about 300 leading war production industries in 28 States sent letters or telegrams in behalf of N. Y. A. Here are a few sample quotations:

Carnegie Steel Corporation, Pittsburgh, Pa.:

"We have found that N. Y. A.-trained boys generally have an excellent background in work experience and in citizenship which permits their induction into our shops with a minimum disturbance to the unit and to us. They appear to adapt themselves very easily to our training activities, evidently because of their previous training."

Extracts of a telegram from the Independent Pneumatic Tool Co., of Chicago:

"We have had considerable experience with the work centers of the N. Y. A. and cannot be too enthusiastic in our praise of them."

Lockheed Aircraft Corporation, Burbank, Calif.:

"After observing our records, we find that your boys have without exception been above the average. * * * There is no doubt that Lockheed is indebted to you and your organization for the work you have done in aid of national defense."

CONCLUSION

In every country where dictatorships arose, unemployed youth formed the bulwark of their strength; and the dictators led these youth to war.

The United States, at the depth of the depression, had close to 5,000,000 unemployed youth, perhaps more than the rest of the world combined.

But this country had N. Y. A. and Aubrey Williams to help work out youth problems democratically. In the American way, our youth were aided, educated, and trained—many of them through the programs directed by Aubrey Williams—so that now they are prepared to fight for democracy against the dictator-led youth abroad.

Mr. President, I have further testimonials in respect to Mr. Williams from many other industries scattered throughout the country which praise N. Y. A. for its efforts in helping to win the war. Will anyone deny that in order to be able to organize the youth of the Nation into such a potent force, which so helped our war effort, a man with administrative ability was required? After all, in any undertaking such as R. E. A. that is what is necessary, a good administrator.

One of the charges made against Mr. Williams by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee in opposition to his confirmation was that he was not a farmer and that he was not an engineer, and therefore was incompetent to handle R. E. A.

Mr. President, that charge seems very funny to me. We have had before our committee many persons who testified as to the fine work of R. E. A. throughout the country, how well it had been managed since it was organized in 1935, how it had loaned to over 800 cooperatives money so that electricity could be spread in many of the farm areas of our Nation. Who administered R. E. A. prior to this time? The last Administrator was Mr. Slattery, who resigned sometime ago, as all of us recall; he was one of the administrators of R. E. A. He was a lawyer, and did social work under Mr.

Williams before he was selected to head R. E. A. He was neither a farmer nor an electrical engineer. The man who preceded Mr. Slattery was John Carmody. He was not a farmer, nor was he an engineer. He also did some social work under Mr. Aubrey Williams.

Those men were the ones who made R. E. A. what it is today. They were good administrators, good executives, and that is what I claim qualifies Mr. Williams, he is a good executive and a good administrator. I repeat, a man who could handle 60,000 men in W. P. A., and 23,000 in N. Y. A., certainly should be able to handle 700 in R. E. A.

To go back a little to the working of the R. E. A., there are in the R. E. A. four separate divisions. The Administrator is at the head of the whole agency. Then there is a division known as the Application and Loan Division. That division assists in the organization of cooperatives throughout the country.

There is an Engineering Division, which is staffed by good engineers, by men of experience, and they in turn investigate at any time when a cooperative asks for certain loans.

There is a Cooperatives Operations Division. This division helps the cooperatives in the country with their problems. In other words, it gives expert advice to them. Certainly if the Administrator had to be a farmer and an engineer, as was stated by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, it would be necessary, in order to carry on R. E. A. as it should be carried on, that the whole force would have to be farmers and engineers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I interrupt merely to keep the record straight. I made no such statement as that the Senator has attributed to me, and I challenge him to find it.

Mr. ELLENDER. What statement is that?

Mr. McKELLAR. The statement the Senator has just made, that I said it took a certain kind of man to hold this position, that he had to be an engineer or a businessman.

Mr. ELLENDER. Or a farmer?

Mr. McKELLAR. Or a farmer. I did not say anything of the kind, and have not said anything of the kind. The Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Illinois have been attributing many things to me I have not said, and there is not a scintilla of fact in most of the statements which have been made. Evidently they have been made for the purpose of killing time, or something.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean the statement by me?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; what the Senator just stated.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not see why I should want to kill time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Nor do I. It is remarkable, but time is being killed, just the same.

Mr. ELLENDER. The statement is here.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will ask the Senator to find it and put it in the RECORD.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not have the Senator's statement at hand. I do not expect to conclude my remarks this afternoon, and I shall look the statement up again and quote from the Senator's testimony tomorrow.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; I should be obliged to the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is in the record. Charges of incompetency and inexperience have been made, and it is stated that because Mr. Williams is not a farmer or an engineer he should not be confirmed. As a matter of fact, I believe that this very day several telegrams were read on the floor of the Senate from some of the organizations opposing Aubrey Williams, which said he knew nothing about farming and therefore was not competent. But I shall get from the record what the Senator from Tennessee said, and I shall have it tomorrow morning.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I repeat, Mr. President, none of the administrators of R. E. A. were farmers or engineers, or knew anything about either farming or engineering. Yet the evidence shows that R. E. A. has done a good job.

We hear talk about Members of this body wanting evidence of competency and experience on the part of a man in order to qualify him to handle the affairs of the Government. The chief argument made by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] today was that Mr. Williams should not be confirmed because he lacks experience, he lacks this and he lacks that; that he has done nothing but social work.

Mr. President, it was only 2 weeks ago that, without hearings being held, the Senate confirmed the nomination of Frederick Moore Vinson to be head of the R. F. C. I challenge anyone to show from Who's Who or from the record of Mr. Vinson that he has done anything to qualify him to handle R. F. C. loans, if the same yardstick should be applied to him as is proposed to be applied in the case of Mr. Williams. What does Who's Who say about Fred Vinson? I was not present when the Senate confirmed him. I was sick in bed at the time. I would have voted for him had I been present. But let us see who Fred Vinson is. Senators are so meticulous in the case of Aubrey Williams. They must know his family history from the day he was born up to the present time.

Mr. President, this is what Who's Who in America has to say about Frederick Moore Vinson:

Vinson, Frederick Moore, judge—

He is a lawyer—

Born at Louisa, Ky., January 22, 1890; son of James and Virginia (Ferguson) V.; graduated Kentucky Normal College, 1908; A. B., Centre College, Ky., 1909 (Ormond Beatty alumni prize); LL. B., 1911 (Jacobs Jr. law prize and Jacobs Sr., law prize)—

He evidently was a good law student—

LL. D., 1938; married Roberta Dixon, January 24, 1923; children: Frederick Moore, James Robert. Began law practice at Louisa, 1911; city attorney, Louisa, 1913; commonwealth attorney, thirty-second judicial district, Ky., 1921–24; member Sixty-eighth, Seventieth, and Seventy-second Congresses (1923–29, 1931–33), Ninth Kentucky District, Seventy-third Congress (1933–35), Kentucky at large, Seventy-fourth and Seventy-fifth Congresses (1935–39), Eighth Kentucky District; associate justice United States Court of Appeals for District of Columbia, 1937–43; appointed by Chief Justice of Supreme Court as chief judge United States Emergency Court of Appeals, March 2, 1942; resigned May 27, 1943; Director, Office Economic Stabilization since May 28, 1943. Member American Kentucky State, and Boyd County Bar Associations, Phi Delta Theta. Democrat, Methodist, Mason. Home: 2637 Central Parkway, Ashland, Ky. Address: United States Court of Appeals, Washington, D. C.

Senators, this is the record of my good friend, Frederick Moore Vinson, whose nomination to be head of the R. F. C. the Senate confirmed 2 weeks ago. There is nothing in his record to show that he has ever loaned a dollar or dime to anyone. He never ran a bank or anything of the kind and yet he was confirmed to run R. F. C., the largest and most stupendous lending agency ever established by a government.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply wish to say, Mr. President, that I wish Mr. Williams was such a man as Mr. Vinson is. Mr. Vinson is one of the ablest and most correct, one of the highest-minded, one of the finest, most level-headed men, not only in this country but in any other country in the world so far as I know and believe. I think he is one of the best equipped men we could find to be head of the R. F. C. He is equipped for the place by education; he is equipped for it by reason of being a manly, upright character, a man of the highest industry, of the most honorable dealings throughout a whole lifetime. There is no man in this country who was more fit for the place he now occupies than Mr. Vinson. He has had experience along a hundred different lines since he reached maturity.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not deny all that has been said by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Tennessee, respecting Mr. Vinson. But what I should like to know is this: What experience has Mr. Vinson had as a banker or otherwise to handle a $40,000,000,000 lending corporation? That, Mr. President, is what I want to know.

Mr. McKELLAR. He has been dealing with it here in Washington for many years.

Mr. ELLENDER. How?

Mr. McKELLAR. As a Congressman and as a judge on the Federal bench. He has had all kinds of experience. He is one of the best-equipped men in America for the place he now occupies. He has served many years in Washington. I believe the Senator from Louisiana will greatly regret even comparing a man like Judge Vinson with the nominee whose name is now before us.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the only reason on God's green earth why I mentioned Mr. Vinson's name was to show the manner and method by which

the Senate of the United States goes about trying to find out concerning the qualifications of individuals. Mr. Vinson's name was sent to the Senate and, I think, within 48 hours his nomination was confirmed. Hearings were not even held. My good friend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee is insisting, and the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] said that before voting for a man he insinuated——

Mr. McKELLAR. No, no.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am speaking of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], not the Senator from Tennessee. The Senator from Indiana said we ought to have a man of experience. If we should have applied the test of experience in banking, and the like, to Mr. Vinson, I doubt if Senators would have voted for him. Remember what I have said. I do not want the RECORD to show that I am in any wise against Mr. Vinson. I think he is a fine gentleman. As I stated, had I been present at the time his name was acted upon I would have voted for him. The point I am trying to make, however, is that the Senate of the United States does not seem to treat all nominations in the same way. The same investigation is not made in all cases. Senators do not always try to find out whether a man is experienced for the position to which he is nominated. The great difficulty with Aubrey Williams, as I said a moment ago, is that he has devoted his life to help the underprivileged, and because of that he has been accused of being a Communist.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am delighted that the Senator brought up the comparison. The Senate unanimously, without a word of hearings or examination, confirmed Judge Vinson because I have no doubt that each and every Senator knew him, as I did, to be an upstanding, honest, honorable American citizen who believes in the Constitution of the United States and who does not go off half-cocked on every ism and vagary that comes along. Mr. Vinson is a man whom everyone knows. His qualifications and his standing and his fitness for the office is known to everyone. I wish to say that I am very happy that the Senator brought up the comparison, because it shows not only how careful the Senate is in confirming nominations but also how far below the standard the present nominee falls.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Let me say to my good friend from Louisiana that I assume that if any Member of the Senate or any citizen of the country had asked for a hearing on the nomination of Judge Vinson, he would have obtained it. Judge Vinson's nomination for a position in the Judiciary had been confirmed by the Senate not long previously.

Mr. McKELLAR. And he served well.

Mr. CHANDLER. He served well. He served not only the people of my State, but the people of the United States. He was well known to almost every Member of the House and every Member of the Senate. As I say, his nomination to a position in the Judiciary had been confirmed within a few years.

The Senator admits that he did not ask for a hearing. No other Senator asked for a hearing. So far as I am advised, no citizen of the country asked for a hearing on Judge Vinson's nomination. What could the Senate do under the circumstances except to confirm his nomination forthwith, without a hearing? I wish to associate myself with the views expressed by the Senator from Tennessee with respect to the long and honorable service of Judge Vinson, both to the people of Kentucky and the people of the United States, in all the positions which he has held.

A different situation exists as to Aubrey Williams. When his nomination was submitted, forthwith there were complaints on the part of Senators and others, and demand was made for a hearing. The way for a nominee to have his nomination confirmed is through a vote by the Senate. We voted on Judge Vinson's nomination. If the Senator wishes to have the nomination of Aubrey Williams confirmed, I suggest that we vote on it. The way to have a nomination confirmed is to have a vote by the Senate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, like the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], my good friend the Senator from Kentucky has missed the point.

Mr. CHANDLER. My man has been confirmed. The Senator's man has not.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not complaining at all about Judge Vinson. To repeat, I would have voted for him had I been present. What I am talking about is the manner of procedure. There is nothing in the life history of Judge Vinson to show that he ever did any banking, and yet he was confirmed to handle the largest bank in the world. In the case of Aubrey Williams, Senators insist that he should be a farmer and an engineer in order to head a small loan agency of the Government, the R. E. A.

Mr. CHANDLER. How would the Senator have had the Senate proceed with respect to Judge Vinson, other than the way in which it actually proceeded? What would the Senator have had the Senate do?

Mr. ELLENDER. Senators say that Aubrey Williams' nomination should not be confirmed because he has not the necessary ability; because all he has done in his life has been social work; and because he is not a farmer or an engineer. Therefore, he is not competent to administer the R. E. A. If that same test were applied to Judge Vinson—as to whether or not he ever did any banking or anything of that kind—I doubt if he could pass the test and qualify to direct the R. F. C.

Mr. CHANDLER. Of course, the questions were not asked and the test was not made. But if the test had been made, I will say to the Senator that I believe he could have qualified.

Mr. ELLENDER. His record certainly does not show it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I suppose, under that same criterion, only former Members of Congress and former governors could qualify for membership in the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will not make that suggestion too loud, because it might interfere with some of our plans. [Laughter.]

Mr. AIKEN. I will even withdraw the suggestion if it is going to interfere with any of the Senator's plans. [Laughter.]

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield to me merely for the purpose of having something printed in the RECORD, I assure the Senator from Tennessee that I will not take advantage of the situation involved in the transaction of such business to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from New Mexico is not seeking to prolong this debate. There is no filibuster. He wants to get through with this nomination as quickly as possible. Therefore I shall not object to his having the matter to which he refers printed in the RECORD.

(Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain statements and editorial comments on the subject of curfew regulations, which appear under a separate heading.)

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, while I am on my feet I am not going to suggest the absence of a quorum, but I make the observation that at this hour there are probably not more than 10 or 11 Senators in the Chamber.

It is apparent that the Senator from Louisiana will not be able to conclude his remarks this afternoon. I notice that on the Executive Calendar there are several nominations of postmasters, which it is desired to have confirmed today, if possible. I ask the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Tennessee if they have any objection to having the Senate proceed at this time to the consideration of the postmaster nominations.

Mr. McKELLAR. I simply wish to say that I hope I will not be charged with engaging in a filibuster if I agree to the suggestion that the Senate adjourn or take a recess at this hour, 4:35 p. m.

However, before that is done, since I observe that the Senator from Illinois has returned to the Chamber, I wish to point out that I have examined the evidence, which will be found beginning in the record at a page which I will later specify. The $155,000,000 was spent by the National Youth Administration, as I recall, through the Workers' Alliance and also through the National Youth Congress. Both those organizations were declared by the Attorney General of the United States to be Communist—no, not Communist organizations, but Communist-turned organizations——

Mr. LUCAS. Subversive organizations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Subversive or Communist organizations. That is where the money was spent, as I remember the figures. The figures were given by me at the time of my testimony. I have not been able to find the exact figures in the record. I may be wrong as to the $155,000,000; but if the Senator will examine the

record of the House hearings—not the Dies committee hearings—he will find it is approximately $155,000,000. I never referred in the slightest way to schools or school children.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me inquire whether the Senator from Illinois wishes to ask me a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I merely wish to read into the RECORD a statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. The testimony is as clear as a bell that Mr. Williams, so far as the record before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is concerned, is not a Communist. He had nothing to do with the organization or the carrying on of the Workers' Alliance or the Youth Congress or any other subversive organizations in this country.

When the Senator from Indiana was questioning Mr. Williams before the committee—the testimony can be found on pages 237 and 238 of the hearings—I asked Mr. Williams this question:

Senator LUCAS. Let me ask one question. The Senator from Indiana has assumed in his question that you temporized with these subversive groups in these workers' organizations.

I would like to elaborate a little upon that.

He left the assumption with me that you, as Assistant Director of W. P. A. or N. Y. A. have constantly temporized with subversive groups in these organizations.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Senator, there is nothing to show that in the record, and I defy anybody to produce one single iota of evidence that I ever had one single thing to do with anything connected with the Communist Party, that I have ever been connected with it or even favorable regarding it.

I was anathema to the communistic element from the very beginning of my stay in Washington for the simple reason that apparently they didn't like the way I thought or the way I acted or the way I spoke.

As for promoting the thing, when Mr. Lasser was in this terrific fight with them and they threw him out, as the testimony brings out there—I am not sure it is there, but I know it happened—one of the things they charged against him at the time was that he had connived and worked with me, and that he was too easy, too pliable, too easily persuaded by me to do this, that, or the other thing.

I don't say that is true, but that is what they charged.

And as was brought out in a report made about me when some of the Communists were questioned here a couple of years ago, the statement was that the Communists hold Williams in contempt.

As far as I know—I have never read that—I was never even brought in as having anything to do with the promotion of it.

I stand completely behind that letter that I wrote saying that we recognize the right of the workers to organize and to present their claims in a group and to act collectively.

Mr. President, the evidence further shows that when Aubrey Williams made an address to the Youth Congress of America in Washington, D. C., that part of the organization controlled by the Communists hissed Aubrey Williams when he rose to speak. That is the testimony which was given before the hearings. I contend—and no Senator can show me anything different from the record made before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—that there is not a single line of competent or reliable evidence which would convince any reasonable, sound, and prudent mind that Aubrey Williams is not a good, patriotic American.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, during the debate this afternoon the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] questioned my statement that during the committee hearings he had contended that Mr. Williams should know something about electricity, and something about country life and farming. He replied that he had never made any such statements. I respectfully refer him to page 135 of the printed hearings whereat he is shown to have made the following statement:

As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, the Rural Electrification Administration requires a man at the head of it who has had experience, especially with people who live in the country; also experience and knowledge of some sort of electricity and its production, its control and management, and thirdly, the Administrator should have some experience in business.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I thank the Senator. That is exactly what I said. I stick by it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thought the Senator denied what I stated he had said before the committee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. No; the Senator is wrong. He should look at the RECORD tomorrow.

Mr. ELLENDER. The point which I was discussing was that the Senator from Tennessee asserted before the committee that in order for Mr. Williams to qualify as the R. E. A. administrator he should know something about electricity, about farming, and about other matters as well. That is what I said the Senator from Tennessee had stated. The Senator said that he had not made such a statement. I have quoted from the RECORD. I quote further from the RECORD. Another statement made by the Senator from Tennessee will be found on page 138 of the printed hearings as follows:

In my opinion, Mr. Williams may qualify as a social-work expert, but how in the name of heaven even Mr. Williams himself, as delightful and as ingratiating and as seductive a man as he is, could think he could run successfully the rural electrification business is something beyond me. So far as his record indicates he knows nothing about rural matters, and certainly he knows nothing about electricity.

His life's work has been as a social worker for the whole time of his grown-up life.

I am just one of those old-fashioned men who believe that a man ought to know something about the business that he is employed to take charge of.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I still agree with that statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator continued:

I will make this illustration: I happen to be a member of the Presbyterian Church, but let us suppose that the Catholic Church should elect me Pope of Rome? [Laughter.] In the name of God, what could I do with one of the most important and one of the most splendid offices in the world? I would be as much out of place in that case as Mr. Williams will find himself out of place in the R. E. A., if he should get it—just as much, because I have never studied religion to that extent. I believe in religion, but I have never studied it as I should.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I agree with every word that the Senator has read. I reaffirm it and reiterate it. However, the Senator from Louisiana did not state today that I had made such a statement. If he will read in the RECORD tomorrow showing what he said he will see that I am correct in my statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then possibly I was under a misapprehension of what the Senator objected to a while ago.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, without taking the Senator from Louisiana off the floor, and without displacing the pending nomination, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the other nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will state the other nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, does that complete the Executive Calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the nominations on the Executive Calendar with the exception of the nomination of Aubrey Williams.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

RECESS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 21, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, March 20 (legislative day of March 16), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

R. Hunter Browning, Madison.

ILLINOIS

Adam P. Eaton, Allerton.
Daulton L. Rohde, Jr., Oakdale.
Margaret M. DeCoste, River Grove.
Helen Elaine Varlas, Schiller Park.

INDIANA

Bynum L. Shepard, Elizabethtown.

MICHIGAN

Dell Merry, Clarklake.
George J. Cobb, Saranac.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ann K. Hunt, Darlington.
Olive Ruth Keeney, Dickerson Run.
Edla N. Huffman, Marshalls Creek.
Orvilla H. Hardican, Secane.
Goldie H. Wright, Wind Ridge.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 20, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of the ages, in the name of Thy Son whose sacrifice was written in the reddest blood of all time, we beseech Thee to stir in us the deepest convictions. While patriotism is filling the air may we be mindful to heed the call that does not shrink before life, with its peril of hunger, its persistent darkness, and its dull weight upon the breast of the world. How tragic it is that truth is upon the scaffold and wrong upon the throne, yet how unshaken the fact that our God standeth within the shadows, keeping watch above His own. In our unspeakable sorrow for our defenders who are holding their breasts against biting steel by day and night, grant that we may never be submerged by our own self-interest, nor put the scepter of rulership in the hands of defeat. As human lives are made desolate and wrecked by the blasts of war, O God, lest the shadows engulf them, keep us strong to comfort them and bear them upward on wings of faith. In the name of Him who is our companion on life's weary way. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the bill (H. R. 2200) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 18 of the United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," together with the accompanying report thereon; and

H. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution authorizing the special committee of the Committee on Agriculture, designated by the chairman to study post-war plans for agriculture, particularly as relate to cotton, to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. EREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Justice.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of War.
5. Foreign Economic Administration.
6. National Archives.
7. United States Maritime Commission.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 681) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman from Kentucky would withdraw his request for a few minutes. It happens that this legislation should go also to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I would like to have the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] present if that is so.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. SPENCE. We have stricken out the amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the bill is sent to conference, the conferees would probably come from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, would they not?

Mr. SPENCE. No; I think not. That was a rider that was put on in the Senate. We did not report that amendment. We did not report the Senate amendment. We reported the bill without the Senate amendment. So far as the bill is concerned, it is a matter exclusively in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I have taken the matter up with the chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], and I have told him we were going to try to protect his jurisdiction.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But the ranking minority Member has not had a chance to consider the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Would this legislation go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

The SPEAKER. Not the housing part of it, but the matter amending the Securities and Exchange Act would certainly be sent to that committee by the present occupant of the chair.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Would the conferees be appointed from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

The SPEAKER. On this bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Oh, no; they would be from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wonder if the gentleman from Kentucky would not wait a few minutes. I have telephoned the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SPENCE. I will withdraw my request for the present, Mr. Speaker.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an interesting article by John Griffin, of the Boston Sunday Post.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order today to address the House for 15 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended 10 minutes, making 25 minutes altogether.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therewith the text of a bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LEAVE IT TO TEXAS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LOWERING THE VOTING AGE FROM 21 TO 18 YEARS OF AGE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain statements and extracts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PATMAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMISSION

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein two short articles by Hon. Earl P. Kelsey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAVENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short editorial.

Mr. CARLSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include letters and a copy of a petition.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by former Congressman Binderup.

THE BYRNES CURFEW ORDER

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Byrnes issued an edict some time ago requesting that all night clubs and barrooms be closed at the hour of midnight for conservation purposes, with the idea that the war effort would be helped. He did that with the idea of trying to aid and assist in the war effort and the aid to prosecution of the war, and I think he tried to do it because he believed it was the best thing for America. It was sound and sensible to conserve manpower, fuel, and the health of our citizens. But we have one mayor, the mayor of the city of New York, Mr. LaGuardia, who is defying that order. Putting New York City above the national welfare. Now the order is going to be very difficult to enforce by Mr. Byrnes, just because one mayor in a great city will not obey the order and enforce it by his local police force. It seems to me we have reached a pretty bad condition in America. Other mayors throughout the country want to know what they are to do now. Why is an order good for all cities except New York City. Why are New York City night clubs any better than night clubs in Philadelphia, Chicago, or Kansas City, or any other American city. If people of America want to help the war effort they do not have to stay up all night; let them go to bed at midnight and get their rest so they can work the next day. Let the dancing girls get a job that will help win the war.

THE FOOD SHORTAGE

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged to see that the House is interested in the food shortage. For some months I have been interested in the meat industry and the distribution and slaughtering of meat here in the East.

Only last week we held a meeting of Congressmen and Senators here on the Hill with members of Government agencies, the O. P. A. and the War Food Administration. The members of the meat industry at that time made certain suggestions as to how this meat shortage could be taken care of and supplies increased. That committee is going to hold a second meeting at 10 o'clock on Thursday, March 22, in the caucus room of the Old House Office Building, room 360. All Members are invited to be present. The O. P. A. and the War Food Administration have promised that representatives of these agencies will be there at that time to explain what they are going to do to assist.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

THE BYRNES CURFEW ORDER

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the patriotic people of these United States were dumfounded at the action taken by Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, in challenging and defying the United States Government with reference to the midnight curfew on night clubs and hot spots.

There may be those who doubt the wisdom of the order in the first instance which was issued by Mr. Justice Byrnes, the unofficial assistant President of the United States. But there can be no doubt in the minds of any patriotic Americans about the duty of all State, county, and municipal officials and proprietors of the institutions affected to cooperate with and abide by this regulation. It is to be hoped that now that the mighty little man of New York has set himself up above War Mobilization Chief Byrnes the patriotic people of New York will cooperate with their Government, the Little Flower to the contrary notwithstanding.

If this challenge continues, Congress should take immediate action, and to that end I am prepared to offer the necessary legislation to make the order mandatory and legal.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RUSSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted by the American Legion.

F. L. GAUSE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1360), for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors, with Senate amendment thereto and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,120.65."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW YORK AND THE CURFEW

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not quite agree with my colleagues the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] as to Mayor LaGuardia's action. I am not a member of his party, but I think he has done a great deal for the safety of New York. With a population of seven and one-half million people, with hundreds of thousands of service men and women visiting the city every day, it is pretty dangerous to strain our communication system by forcing everyone to hurry to the subways about 12 o'clock. Why, some of the people working in the theater district are not even able to get something to eat after they finish their work. To quote part of an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

New York is a special case any way you look at it. It is the big amusement center of the United States. Between 300,000 and 400,000 transients visit New York every 24 hours, and plenty of them want some fun of one kind or another while they are in New York. Currently, a lot of these visitors are service men and women, whose chief reaction to the curfew's workings in New York has been one of disgust.

It is ridiculous to assume, as Byrnes did when he issued his Nation-wide midnight curfew request, that a blanket amusement regulation can work equally well in New York as in Charleston, S. C., where Byrnes was born, or in Spartanburg, S. C., where he once practiced law.

What the midnight curfew did in New York was to breed a lot of low-type and dangerous speakeasies; put a terrific strain on taxis, busses, and subways when the customers of legitimate places were thrown out at midnight; give the police and magistrates a brand-new set of headaches as if they didn't have enough of those already; expose visiting service people to all manner of clip-joint steerers after midnight; and push the occurrence of drunken street brawls toward new highs.

Mr. Speaker, New York has to face different problems than Mississippi or Virginia or any other part of the country and I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] that the New York people are just as patriotic as the people of Mississippi or Pennsylvania

and that they will abide by the regulations of Mr. Byrnes as strictly as possible under the circumstances.

Mr. RICH. The mayor of New York is making his own regulations.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

COMMUNICATION FROM LT. GEN. MARK CLARK

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication; which was read:

MARCH 20, 1945.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Lt. Gen. Mark Clark, commanding general, Fifteenth Army Group, has asked the War Department to convey to you and to the Members of the House his grateful thanks for your thoughtful communication of encouragement to him and the members of his command.

General Clark wishes you to know that your message has been brought to the attention of all officers and men of the Fifteenth Army Group and that, in the future as in the past, they will exert every effort to warrant the confidence you have expressed in them. He hopes that you will inform the House that the aim of the Fifteenth Army Group is the achievement of a victorious conclusion of the war followed by a peace that will be enduring.

It is a pleasure for me to transmit to you this message from General Clark.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. ULIO,
Major General,
The Adjutant General.

AMENDING NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 681) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], to explain the bill briefly?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this bill continues the Federal Housing Administration from June 30, 1945, to June 30, 1946, and authorizes an increase in insurance of $100,000,000.

It has the approval generally, I think, of everybody interested in war housing construction. It is not an authorization for an appropriation. It is merely an authorization for an increase in the issuance of insurance which will stimulate private enterprise, private lending institutions, to lend the money to builders to construct these houses that are so necessary for the continuation of the war effort. The last time the Commissioner, Mr. Ferguson, was here for authorization of additional insurance he said that would be all that would be required. However, the prolongation of the war has made it necessary for this additional $100,000,000 of insurance.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. It only has to do with title 6 of the Housing Act; is that not correct?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes; which relates to war housing. These houses are only being built in defense areas where the President by proclamation has said there is an acute housing shortage.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Why is it not possible for stock companies and other private insurance companies to insure these housing projects?

Mr. SPENCE. They do not issue that kind of insurance. The act authorizes the Federal Housing Administration to charge from one-half to one and one-half percent premium. They have never charged more than one-half of 1 percent. They started out with a million dollars capital and the proceeds from the premiums has left that sum unimpaired. They still have about $10,000,000 capital.

Mr. RICH. Do they have the amount now that they originally started out with?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes. Of course, there may be some losses in the future. They have insured 375,000 houses, and they now have recovered about 3,000 houses which were in default.

Mr. RICH. That is better than the crop insurance. They had $40,000,000 and they lost $37,500,000.

Mr. SPENCE. This is good insurance. That is the reason I am urging the bill to be considered by unanimous consent.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, as far as I know, this bill has the unanimous approval of the committee. It should be emphasized that this is for the insurance of war housing building and has nothing whatsoever to do with the so-called Lanham construction. I call the attention of the House to the fact that the committee took up Senate 618, struck out all after the enacting clause, and substituted the House bill. Section 3 of the Senate bill which will go to conference is a matter over which the Committee on Banking and Currency had no jurisdiction, did not seek jurisdiction, and did not take jurisdiction. It has to do with amendments to the Securities and Exchange Act.

I understand from the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], and the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce [Mr. LEA], that that committee has informally discussed this amendment, and it has the approval of a majority of the members. I wish to have that confirmed by the gentleman from California or the gentleman from New Jersey, if either is here.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. I have discussed the matter with the gentleman from California, Chairman LEA, of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I told him we had no disposition to invade the jurisdiction of his committee. For that reason, we struck out the Senate amendment in reporting the bill.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. The subject matter of the section which has been eliminated from the Senate bill by the House Committee on Banking and Currency is clearly a matter over which the Banking and Currency Committee of the House did not have original jurisdiction. The jurisdiction of such matter is within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Furthermore, I am of the opinion that the committee that reported the original housing bill in the Senate had no jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in the Senate amendment. It was one of those happenings which so often occur in the Senate where at the last moment, when a bill is under consideration on the floor of the Senate, an amendment is offered and adopted that has no relationship whatsoever to the bill to which it is attached. The Senate amendment eliminated by the House committee from this bill does not have any relationship to the subject matter of the bill.

The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] has introduced in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses a bill which seeks to do what the Senate amendment contemplates. That measure, H. R. 280, is now before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is contemplated to holding hearings on such bill at an early date. In view of the above facts I think the House committee has acted properly and justifiably in the action it has taken.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by (1) striking out "$1,700,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,800,000,000"; and (2) striking out of the third proviso "1945" in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1946."

SEC. 2. Section 608 (g) of such act, as amended, is amended by adding before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "and to insure under this title any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by him of any property acquired under this title without regard to any limit as to time or aggregate amount contained in this title."

SEC. 3. Subsection (b) of section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by striking out "$100,000" where it appears in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "$300,000."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by (1) striking out '$1,700,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$1,800,000,000'; and (2) striking out of the third proviso '1945' in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '1946.'

"SEC. 2. Section 608 (g) of such act, as amended, is amended by adding before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: 'and to insure under this title any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by him of any property acquired under

this title without regard to any limit as to time or aggregate amount contained in this title.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems that the T. V. A. has prevented another disastrous overflow on the lower Mississippi River.

Again the T. V. A. has probably saved hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of property as well as hundreds of human lives by protecting the people of the lower Mississippi from the disasters that have been experienced along the Ohio, the Missouri, and other streams emptying into the Mississippi.

Not only have those dams held back the floodwaters in the Tennessee and prevented such disasters as we had along the lower Mississippi in 1927, but the T. V. A. has also given us a navigation channel all the way up to Knoxville, Tenn.; and has provided approximately 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year that is now being used for war purposes, preparing the implements of war with which to carry on this conflict, and at the same time it has made that great T. V. A. area the coming section of the world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Accounting Review by E. L. Kohler on the control of expenditures in the United States Government.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on five different subjects and include certain letters.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a petition from the Nebraska State Legislature to the Nebraska delegation in Congress and their reply thereto.

NEW YORK AND THE CURFEW

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is quite right in his statement that some of us from the Middle West do not understand the people of New York nor the conditions that exist in New York. If the gentleman is right in saying that at night the subways and all the systems of transportation are crowded and the people cannot get home, I can understand very well why they need have some place where they can go and be sheltered from the storms and wind and rain or whatever may come in the way of weather, because some of the folks up there probably need protection from the elements. I say further to the gentleman that nobody doubts the patriotism of the people of New York. If you are going to be without employment, as some of the hearings that were held before the Smith committee disclosed, if Government workers are going to be out of jobs, up in the country out on the farm where the air is clean and pure and the people are fine and friendly and you will not find any gasoline smells to bother you, no soot in the air, where everything is lovely, where it is now springtime, where you can see the sun come up every morning and go down at night over the lake, I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] have your folks come out and help us do a little farming.

There is plenty of room and you can help grow food for your neighbors back in the city.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, May 3, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 2 hours.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. TARVER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 2689), making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 347), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Union Calendar and ordered printed.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN reserved all points of order on the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that there may be published in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Dr. C. W. Warburton, deputy governor, Farm Credit Administration, regarding the statements of Mr. A. C. Utterback, a supervising examiner of Farm Credit Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

H. W. PARISIUS

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the hearings on the Agriculture appropriation bill there was furnished to our Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations a statement by Mr. H. W. Parisius, Director of the Office of Food Programs, Foreign Economic Administration, relative to the shipment of farm machinery to certain other countries in the world. The information was furnished us with the request that it be considered confidential. We did not accept it with any agreement on our part to so consider it. We did not include it in our hearings, but submitted to the full Committee on Appropriations today the question of whether or not the information should be publicized.

By the direction of the full Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent that this information—the letter of Mr. Parisius and statistical information accompanying it—may be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the individual bills on the Private Calendar.

GEORGE A. CARDEN AND ANDERSON T. HERD

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar (H. R. 1270) to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, is there any way that this bill might be passed over without prejudice rather than be objected to? The Rules Committee is to consider it at 2:15 p. m. this afternoon for a rule.

The SPEAKER. That does not prevent the Committee on Rules from considering the bill.

Mr. CRAVENS. As I understand it, this bill will now have to go back to the committee and then come back to the House; is that correct?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas may ask unanimous consent, if the gentlemen will withdraw their objections, that the bill be passed over without prejudice in view of this situation.

Mr. CRAVENS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlemen who objected will withhold

their objections, in view of the fact that if the objections stand this bill will have to go back to committee, while, as a matter of fact, a rule is to be considered in connection with this bill by the Rules Committee with the idea of bringing it up under a rule and avoid the delay of sending it back to the Committee on the Judiciary for further consideration, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of that situation, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to explain what this bill is. This bill involves millions of dollars. It was considered in this House under a rule and was defeated on a roll-call vote. It is the only private bill that I know of that the Committee on Rules has ever voted out a rule on. If the House wants to consider it again, it is all right with me, but I hope the House will look into this bill, so when it comes up under a rule the Members will understand it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

FILIP NICOLA LAZAREVICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 268), for the relief of Filip Nicola Lazarevich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

MORRIS BURSTEIN AND JENNIE BURSTEIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 816, for the relief of Morris Burstein and Jennie Burstein.

Mr. McGREGOR and Mr. DOLLIVER objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

ELEANOR McCLOSKEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 271), for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the warrant of arrest and the order of deportation against Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas, heretofore issued on the ground that admission to the United States had been fraudulently gained, and that she shall hereafter be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of entry.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOBY LENA ROSENBERG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 840), for the relief of Toby Lena Rosenberg, alias Maria Louisa Nasco, alias Alejandrinio Nasco Echegaray.

Mr. BARDEN and Mr. TRIMBLE objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

MICHAEL SOLDO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 846) for the relief of the alien, Michael Soldo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien, Michael Soldo, of West Palm Beach, Fla., whose wife and minor child are citizens and residents of the United States, shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted, at Detroit, Mich., on February 11, 1942, to the United States for permanent residence. The Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith the bond filed by the said Michael Soldo at the time of his admission to the United States on a temporary basis, and conditioned upon his return to the Dominion of Canada.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "February 11, 1942", and insert "October 15, 1936."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the balance of the page, down to and including the period on line 12.

The committeee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN BASQUE ALIENS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1402) for the relief of certain Basque aliens.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Only one objection is heard. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings in the cases of Cirilo Olavarri, Theodoro Asia, Antonio Urteaga, and Joe Buera, all of Salt Lake City, Utah, and Vidal Mezo, Marcial Aguirregoitia, Geronimo Bilbao, Juan Tomas Mendiola, and Alejo Yraguen, all of eastern Nevada, legally admitted as seamen, but who have remained in the United States longer than permitted by law and regulations, and that these aliens shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of their actual entry on the payment of the visa fees of $10 and head taxes of $8 per person.

Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct nine numbers from the Spanish quota for the first year that the said Spanish quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES MOLNAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 269) for the relief of Charles Molnar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the warrant of arrest and the order of deportation against Charles Molnar heretofore issued on the ground that admission to the United States had been fraudulently gained, and that he shall hereafter be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of April 12, 1936.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTONIO RUIZ

The Clerk called the bill (S. 72) for the relief of Antonio Ruiz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Antonio Ruiz, of Phoenix, Ariz., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the death of his two minor children, the late Samuel Ruiz and the late Rosalie Ruiz, who died as a result of personal injuries sustained by them when a United States Army airplane crashed into their home in Phoenix, Ariz., on April 2?, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after "Ruiz", insert "and Paz Ruiz."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "his claim" and insert "all claims."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "his" and insert "their."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Antonio Ruiz and Paz Ruiz."

LINDON A. LONG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 77) for the relief of Lindon A. Long.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lindon A. Long, of Dothan, Ala., the sum of $3,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the death of his minor son, Emile Long, who died as the result of injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a United States Army truck in Dotham, Ala., on June 3, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEMPSEY INDUSTRIAL FURNACE CORPORATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 201) for the relief of the Dempsey Industrial Furnace Corporation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Dempsey Industrial Furnace Corporation, Springfield, Mass., the sum of $1,035. Such sum represents the cost to such corporation of furnishing salt as part of the equipment of a gas-fired salt bath type furnace supplied to the United States naval air station, Pensacola, Fla., pursuant to a contract dated May 13, 1943. Through a misinterpretation of the specifications issued with the request for bids, arising out of the fact that such corporation had never supplied the salt for furnaces of this type, the cost of furnishing the salt was not included in the price quoted by such corporation in submitting its bid.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after the word "bid", insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANGELINA BOURBEAU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 202) for the relief of Angelina Bourbeau.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to Angelina Bourbeau, of Springfield, Hampden County, Mass., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,629.60, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States arising from personal injuries suffered when the car in which she was a passenger was struck by a Government motor vehicle operated in connection with the United States Army at Westover Field, Chicopee Falls, Mass., at Lyman and Chestnut Streets, Springfield, Mass., on January 16, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the figures "$3,629.60" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$1,681.95."

Line 7, strike out the words "satisfaction of her claim" and insert in lieu thereof the words "settlement of all claims."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ST. VINCENT'S INFIRMARY AND DR. ALVIN W. STRAUSS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 206) for the relief of St. Vincent's Infirmary and Dr. Alvin W. Strauss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to St. Vincent's Infirmary, of Little Rock, Ark., the sum of $86.49 and to Dr. Alvin W. Strauss, of Little Rock, Ark., the sum of $100, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for services rendered Jesse L. Becker, Jr., private, first class, United States Marine Corps, from March 26, 1941, to April 3, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID B. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 209) for the relief of David B. Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to David B. Smith, of Edgewater, Fla., the sum of $5,859.10, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by David B. Smith when he was struck by a United States Navy truck No. 42445, on February 18, 1944, on the highway, Edgewater, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$5,859.10" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "$3,267.10."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "injuries", insert ", hospital and medical expenses, loss of earnings, and other expenses."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAMP NO. 1, ALASKA NATIVE BROTHERHOOD, SITKA, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 802) for the relief of Camp No. 1, Alaska Native Brotherhood, Sitka, Alaska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Camp No. 1, Alaska Native Brotherhood, of Sitka, Alaska, the sum of $6,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for compensation for damages sustained by said organization on account of the destruction of the Alaska Native Brotherhood Hall by fire on January 13, 1943, occasioned by the negligence of agents of the United States Army who were in possession of the hall: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGARET GUDZIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 933) for the relief of Margaret Gudzin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Margaret Scholastica Gudzin (also known as Margaret G. Potts; also known as Mrs. George Potts as of July 31, 1944), of 503 South Holmes Street, Scotia 2, N. Y., the sum of $46.08, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of travel from Schenectady, N. Y., to Sweetwater, Tex., while under official orders to report for Women's Airforce Service pilot training, which training was terminated while the claimant was en route to Sweetwater, Tex., as a result of administrative action based on recommendations by Members of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Margaret Scholastica Gudzin (also known as Margaret G. Potts; also known as Mrs. George Potts as of July 31, 1944)" and insert in lieu thereof "Margaret G. Potts."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Margaret G. Potts."

MRS. ELLEN C. BURNETT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 993) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen C. Burnett.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Ellen C. Burnett, 2122 California Street NW., Washington, D. C., the sum of $393.60, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for loss of certain personal property owned by her husband, Lt. Col. Frank C. Burnett, United States Army, now deceased, which disappeared from an Army warehouse at the Presidio of San Francisco, Calif., where it was stored for the convenience of the Government and while Colonel Burnett was on duty with the United States Army in France: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MAE E. SUTTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1009) for the relief of Mrs. Mae E. Sutton.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 411) be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Mae E. Sutton, San Francisco, Calif., the sum of $7,570.89, in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Mae E. Sutton against the United States for injuries sustained when the automobile which she was driving was struck by an Army truck near Ord Village, Calif., on November 15, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER: Page 1, line 6, strike out "$11,570.89" and insert "$6,570.89."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill was laid on the table.

RAY L. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1079) for the relief of Ray L. Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Ray L. Smith, who allegedly was disabled as the result of an injury received during April 1937, while employed by the United States mint at San Francisco as a guard, and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the United States Employeees' Compensation Commission not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits hereunder shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the figure "17" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "15."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the words "an injury received" and insert in lieu thereof the words "a head injury received as the result of a fall."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GUS A. VANCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1135) for the relief of Gus A. Vance.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gus A. Vance, Elizabethtown, Ky., the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for injury received while working for the Civilian Conservation Corps in California and being injured while on duty, in 1933: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, after the enactment clause, strike out the remainder of the bill, and insert in lieu thereof "That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes,' approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Gus A. Vance, of Elizabethtown, Ky., who allegedly was injured while working for the Civilian Conservation Corps in California during 1933, and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits hereunder shall accrue prior to the approval of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATES OF JOHN C. AND ANN K. KEEGAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1668) for the relief of the estates of John C. and Ann K. Keegan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estates of John C. and Ann K. Keegan, of Woosung Township, Ogle County, Ill., the sum of $10,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of John C. Keegan, and the death of his daughter, Ann K. Keegan, as a result of being struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck under supervision of the Forest Service, on December 17, 1938, near Oregon, Ill.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to", strike out "the estate of John C. and Ann K. Keegan, of Woosung Township, Ogle County, Ill., the sum of $10,000," and insert in lieu thereof "Mrs. Mary Ellen Keegan Herzog the sum of $2,500; to pay Francis James Keegan the sum of $2,500; to pay Sgt. John Keegan the sum of $2,500, all of Savannah, Ill."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Keegan Herzog, Francis James Keegan, and Sgt. John Keegan."

JAMES H. HILER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1846) for the relief of James H. Hiler.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the bill (S. 321) for the relief of James H. Hiler, an identical bill to the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is here au-

thorized and directed to allow credit in the account of James M. Hiler, an employee of the Federal Public Housing Authority employed as housing manager of the Marine View Terrace housing project (project No. CAL-4745), Eureka, Humboldt County, Calif., in the sum of $162.70, together with interest thereon, public funds for which he is accountable and which were stolen, without his fault, from a vault in the project office in the community building in said project sometime between the close of business at 5:15 o'clock postmeridian on July 22, 1944, and 9 o'clock antemeridian on July 23, 1944: *Provided*, That the said James M. Hiler is hereby relieved of pecuniary responsibility for the loss of said public funds.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1846) was laid on the table.

EDWARD LAWRENCE KUNZE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2129) for the relief of Edward Lawrence Kunze.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, to Edward Lawrence Kunze, of Leonardville, Kans., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for permanent injury received in an accident on Highway 77 between Junction City and Riley, Kans., when the gasoline trailer-truck which he was driving was struck by a Government vehicle driven by a WAC, said vehicle having pulled from a long convoy of Army vehicles directly in front of vehicle which claimant was driving, resulting in his permanent personal injury: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "Kansas", insert "on July 16, 1943."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISTOFFER HANNEVIG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2320) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Christoffer Hannevig, through his trustee in bankruptcy, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I object.

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That with a view to effectuating the purposes of the convention entered into on the 28th day of March 1940, between the Kingdom of Norway and the United States of America, that jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear and determine, in accordance with the principles of international law, the claim against the United States of Christoffer Hannevig, a citizen of Norway, through his trustee in bankruptcy, for damages alleged to have been sustained as a result of the commandeering or requisitioning of certain ships and ship contracts and the taking over of certain shipyards, owned by Christoffer Hannevig or corporations owned or controlled by him, and to render judgment therefor.

SEC. 2. That the jurisdiction herein conferred is conditioned upon the acceptance by said trustee in bankruptcy of the following procedure and reservations for the purpose of establishing the claim, if any exists.

(a) Within a period of time not to exceed 6 months the trustee shall present to the Attorney General of the United States of America a statement of claim in which shall be set forth in a clear, categorical, and full manner—

1. The precise items of alleged loss or damage composing the claim on behalf of Christoffer Hannevig, indicating definitely the amount of each separate item thereof;

2. The facts alleged in support of each such item of the claim; and

3. The principles of law upon which each item of the claim is alleged to rest.

Such statement of claim shall be accompanied by all the evidence upon which all items of the claim are made to rest, it being clearly understood that no further evidence may be submitted in support of the claim, either during the stage hereinafter provided for settlement negotiations or during its possible adjudication, except such rebuttal evidence as is referred to hereinafter.

(b) Within a period of time not exceeding 1 year from the date of the receipt by the Attorney General of the said statement of claim of the said trustee, the Attorney General shall present to the trustee an answer to the statement of claim, in which shall be set out, in a similarly clear, categorical, and full manner—

1. the defenses of the Government of the United States of America to each item of the claim;

2. the facts upon which such defenses rest; and

3. the principles of law relied upon in each instance.

To such answer there shall be attached all of the evidence upon which the defense of the case shall be made to rest and no further evidence shall be submitted in defense, either during the stage for settlement negotiations or during a possible adjudication of the claim, except such rebuttal evidence as is referred to hereinafter.

(c) Within a period of time not exceeding 6 months from the date of the receipt of the answer of the Government of the United States of America, the trustee may, if he so desires, submit a reply to such answer. In such reply the said trustee, without being allowed to augment or change any of the bases of the claim as stated in his statement of claim may explain such alleged bases in the light of the evidence submitted with the answer.

There may be submitted with the reply only such evidence as is strictly in rebuttal to evidence submitted with the answer and as does not present any new bases of claim. Any such evidence submitted which is not strictly in rebuttal to the evidence submitted with the answer shall be entirely disregarded in deciding the case.

(d) Within a period of time not exceeding 6 months from the date of the receipt of the reply of the said trustee, the Attorney General may, if he so desires, submit a counterreply, which counterreply shall be strictly limited to answering contentions advanced in the reply.

There may be submitted with the counterreply only such evidence as is strictly in rebuttal to evidence submitted with the reply. Any such evidence submitted which is not strictly in rebuttal to the evidence submitted with the reply shall be entirely disregarded in deciding the case. It is understood that no evidence may thereafter be submitted in support of or in defense of the claim, either during the period of settlement negotiations or during its possible adjudication.

(e) Within a period of time not exceeding 6 months from the date of the receipt of the last pleading of the Attorney General, the trustee shall serve on the Attorney General a legal brief in which the trustee shall set forth with clarity and fullness all his contentions with respect to the factual bases of the claim as already developed and the law applicable thereto.

(f) Within a period of time not exceeding 6 months from the date of the receipt of the brief of the trustee, the Attorney General shall serve on the trustee a reply brief, in which the Attorney General shall set forth with clarity and fullness all his contentions with respect to the factual defenses of the claim and the law applicable thereto.

It is declared to be the purpose of paragraphs (a) to (f), inclusive, to require a full, systematic, and fair development of all the facts and law of the case for consideration by the Attorney General and the trustee, and, if necessary, by the tribunal or tribunals.

(g) In the event that the Attorney General and trustee shall be unable to agree upon a disposition of the claim, or any portions thereof, within a period not exceeding 6 months next succeeding the submitting of the reply brief by the Attorney General or within a period not exceeding 1 year from the date of the receipt by the Attorney General of the brief of the trustee, the pleadings thus exchanged shall be referred to the Court of Claims for a decision on the claim or any such unsettled portions thereof, it being clearly understood, however, that in no event shall the issues of the case, either factual or legal, or the contentions of either party, as submitted to settlement negotiations, be changed in character, or the written record above described augmented in any manner in the event that the claim shall be so referred to the Court of Claims for adjudication.

(h) The issues to be decided by the Court of Claims shall be those formulated by the pleadings exchanged pursuant to paragraphs (a) to (f), inclusive, of this act, or such of those issues as shall not have been previously settled by agreement of the Attorney General and the trustee.

(i) The Court of Claims in rendering its decision shall state fully its reasons therefor.

(j) The decision of the Court of Claims shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States, to which court an appeal may be taken by either the Attorney General or the said trustee.

SEC. 3. Should a judgment against the United States be rendered in the premises, the amount thereof shall be paid to the trustee for distribution as follows and in the order named:

1. Payment of such fees and expenses as are or may have been approved in the bankruptcy proceedings against Christoffer Hannevig now pending in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York.

2. Irrespective of any statute of limitations, payment to the United States of any income and profits taxes properly found to be due, with interest.

3. A sum equal in amount to the claim of George R. Jones, Inc., against the Kingdom or Norway, with interest, shall be placed in escrow subject to payment of any amount found to be due said George R. Jones, Inc., under an arbitration to be carried out between the Kingdom of Norway and the United States of America as in said convention of the 28th day of March 1940 provided.

4. Payment of balances due creditors in the bankruptcy proceedings of Christoffer Hannevig and his various American corporations, with interest; also payment to the Insurance Department of the State of New York as liquidator of the Liberty Marine Insurance Co. and North Atlantic Insurance Co. and the insurance commissioner of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as liquidator of the Jefferson Insurance Co. of the amounts on deposit with Christoffer Hannevig, with interest; also payment to the Kingdom of Norway, through its Ambassador to the United States, of amounts with interest, of those claims as to which creditors' agreements were concluded in the town court of Oslo, Norway (Oslo Byrett), on or about June 22, 1934, and on or about November 15, 1934: *Provided, however,* That as to any of such claims as were included in said creditors' agreements and were also filed and allowed in the bankruptcy proceedings in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, payment shall be made in the amounts, with interest, agreed upon in such creditors' agreements: *And provided further,* That if the amount remaining for the payments provided for in this paragraph 4, be insufficient to satisfy such payments in full, then and in that event, the payments so to be made shall be according to the proportions which the total of all the payments provided for in this paragraph 4, shall bear to the amount so remaining.

5. Any balance shall be turned over to the Kingdom of Norway through its Ambassador to the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING PUBLIC LAW 537, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS, APPROVED MAY 2, 1942

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2378) to amend Public Law 537, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 2, 1942.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the matter involved in this measure, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be referred back to the Committee on Claims for further study and consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ELIAS BAUMGARTEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1356) for the relief of Elias Baumgarten.

Messrs. TRIMBLE and BARDEN objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

JOSE M. ARRAIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2305) for the relief of Jose M. Arrais.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to cancel forthwith the outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of the alien Jose M. Arrais, also known as Joseph P. Arrais, of San Francisco, Calif., and is directed not to issue any further such warrants or orders in the case of such alien, insofar as such further warrants are based on any unlawful entry of such alien into the United States prior to the enactment of this act. Hereafter, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, such alien shall be considered to have legally entered the United States on the date of his entry in September 1927 and to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the Portuguese quota for the first year said quota is available.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, my attention was diverted when the bill was first called. I wanted to object to it. I ask unanimous consent that we return to the original reading of the bill, H. R. 2305, so that I may enter an objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2305) for the relief of Jose M. Arrais, also known as Joseph P. Arrais.

Messrs. McGREGOR and DOLLIVER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

DANIEL B. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1038) for the relief of Daniel B. Johnson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Daniel B. Johnson, of Toledo, Ohio, the sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him when he was struck by a car operated by one William Grote, an employee of the Post Office Department of the United States Government, while on business of the Post Office Department, on Monroe Street, near the intersection of Grasser Street, Toledo, Ohio, on December 24, 1943: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN PROPERTY OWNERS ADJACENT TO FORT KNOX, KY.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1134) for the relief of J. L. Horton, and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That J. L. Horton, owner of a certain farm consisting of 100 acres of land, more or less, near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox) in Hardin County, Ky.; James Horton, owner of a certain farm of 76 acres, more or less, in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); Fred Bird, owner of a certain farm of 100 acres, more or less, in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); John Dowdell, owner of a certain farm of 100 acres, more or less, in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); Martin Dowdell, owner of a certain farm of 65 acres, more or less, in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); Harrison Trent, owner of a certain farm of 45 acres, more or less, in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); Charles Clark, owner of a certain farm of 335 acres, more or less, in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); Obed Crutcher, owner of a certain farm of 100 acres, more or less, in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); Nannie Horton and Virgil Funk, owners of a certain farm of 100 acres, more or less, in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); Lubie Bailey, owner of a farm of 60 acres, more or less, in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); Cowley Heiss, owner of a farm of 100 acres near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox) in Hardin County, Ky.; Arthur Carr, owner of a farm near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox) in Hardin County, Ky.; number of acres unknown; Lonnie Wise, owner of a certain farm of 100 acres in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); Leo Wise, owner of a certain farm of 135 acres in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); E. B. Meyers and Nellie Meyers, owners of a certain farm of 200 acres in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); Clyde A. Meyers, owner of a certain farm of 150 acres in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); W. C. Masters, owner of a certain farm in Hardin County, Ky., consisting of 40 acres, more or less, near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); Gertie Stone, owner of a certain farm of 17 acres, more or less, in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); Caskmears Atcher, owner of a certain farm of 77 acres, more or less, in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); Josephine Clark, owner of a certain farm of 96 acres, more or less, in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); Alexander Higdon, owner of a certain farm of 31 acres, more or less, in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); Mrs. J. T. Eubanks, owner of a certain farm of 40 acres, more or less, in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); Mrs. Harrison Basham, owner of a certain farm of 208 acres, more or less, in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); Harry Yates, owner of a certain farm of 80 acres, more or less, in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); G. S. Stone, owner of a certain farm of 223 acres, more or less, in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); Della Stone, owner of a certain farm of 50 acres, more or less, in Hardin County, Ky., near Camp Knox (now Fort Knox); are, as such owners or owner, hereby authorized to bring suit or suits as they may respectively desire to do so against the United States of America to recover damages, if any, for loss or losses which they may have sustained or suffered as respective owners, by reason of establishment, construction, or maintenance of Camp Knox (now Fort Knox) in the State of Kentucky. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky, to hear, consider, determine, and render judgments for the respective amounts of such damages, if any, as may be found to have been sustained or suffered by the said owners of said farms with the same right of appeal as in other cases, and notwithstanding any lapse of time or statute of limitation; *Provided,* That such action or actions will be brought within 1 year from the date that this act shall become effective.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky, to hear, determine, and

render judgment for the respective amounts of such damages as may be found to have been sustained or suffered by landowners who owned land in the vicinity of Fort Knox, Ky., prior to the time the Government acquired that site: *Provided*, That no claims shall be considered by the court of any landowner who acquired the property after the acquisition by the Government of this military reservation: *Provided further*, That such action or actions will be brought within 1 year from the date that this act shall become effective."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain property owners adjacent to Fort Knox, Ky."

JAMES LEMUEL MUZZALL AND JAMES M. MUZZALL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1151) for the relief of James Lemuel Muzzall and James M. Muzzall.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, to James Lemuel Muzzall, a minor, 11 years of age, in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for personal injuries inflicted on him on July 24, 1943, by reason of his being struck and injured by an Army staff car operated by an enlisted man on official business, while said Army staff car was proceeding south on Highway No. 76, in Henry County, Tenn., at a high, dangerous, unlawful, negligent rate of speed, said physical injuries thus inflicted on the said James Lemuel Muzzall being a fracture of the right tibia, severe wounds on the left side of his face and head, resulting in a brain slosh, and in other severe injuries to his entire head, body, legs, and arms, and the serious impairment of his mental faculties; and the sum of $2,500, to James M. Muzzall, the father of said minor, James Lemuel Muzzall, to reimburse him for moneys spent by him for doctor bills, hospital bills, medicine, and otherwise spent by him in the effort on his part to have his said minor son treated for and, insofar as possible, cured of his aforesaid injuries and for the loss of services of said minor son: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000: *Provided further*, That the amount authorized and directed to be paid to James Lemuel Muzzall shall be paid to his legal guardian to be used for his sole use and benefit.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, insert "the legal guardian of" and strike out the words "eleven years of age."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "Tennessee", strike out the balance of line 1 and all of lines 2 to 13 and the words "of said minor son" in line 14.

Page 2, line 22, after "$1,000", strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 23, 24 and 25.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF OTTO FREDERICK GNOSPELIUS, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1357) for the relief of Otto Frederick Gnospelius, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Arthur Gnospelius, administrator of the estate of Otto Frederick Gnospelius, late of Boston, Mass., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death on September 11, 1943, of the said Otto Frederick Gnospelius as a result of injuries sustained by him when, as a pedestrian, he was struck, on September 10, 1943, at the intersection of Old Colony Avenue and Redfield Street, Boston, Mass., by a vehicle in the service of the Army of the United States.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Arthur Gnospelius, administrator of."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,700."

Page 2, after line 4, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAM D. MOAK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1486) for the relief of Sam D. Moak.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

JOHN C. TUTTLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1568) for the relief of John C. Tuttle.

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. DOLLIVER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

BLANCHE H. KARSCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1711) for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Blanche H. Karsch, of Memphis, Tenn., as administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton, the sum of $7,025.60, together with interest on such sum at the rate of 6 percent per annum from December 1, 1931, until the date of payment by the Secretary under the provisions of this act, in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for refund of the taxes erroneously paid upon a portion of such estate which was not subject to tax.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "from" strike out "December 1, 1931", and insert in lieu thereof "November 23, 1939."

At the end of bill add: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERKINS GINS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 167) for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the statutes of limitation, so far as they bar the cotton-linter claim of Perkins Gins, a corporation of Memphis, Tenn., formerly the claim of Perkins Oil Co., also a corporation of Memphis, Tenn., arising out of purchase contract No. 3418, entered into by the said Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn., predecessor of said Perkins Gins, of Memphis, Tenn., on September 16, 1918, with the United States of America, be, and the same are hereby, waived and revoked.

SEC. 2. That the said claimant is hereby authorized to file within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act its said claim and have the same adjudicated by the Court of Claims of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN BURL TOWNSEND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 807) for the relief of John Burl Townsend.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Burl Townsend, Gilmer, Tex., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by the said John Burl Townsend and by his wife and minor child when the automobile in which they were riding was struck on March 6, 1943, in Jasper, Tex., by a United States Army truck.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "John Burl Townsend" and insert "Mrs. Wilma Louise Townsend."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$500" and insert "$300."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "John Burl Townsend and by his wife" and insert "Wilma Louise Townsend."

Page 2, line 3, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1 000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wilma Louise Townsend."

WILLIAM H. SHULTZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 912) for the relief of William H. Shultz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William H. Shultz, of 240 First Street SE., Washington, D. C., the sum of $783, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for money alleged to have been erroneously paid him by the Veterans' Administration on adjusted-service certificate No. 20975, issued to him under the provisions of the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, 1924, as amended: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REALTY BOND & MORTGAGE CO. AND ROBERT W. KEITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1055) for the relief of the Realty Bond & Mortgage Co. and Robert W. Keith.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

LEONARD D. JACKSON AND ELSIE FOWKES JACKSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1059) for the relief of Leonard D. Jackson and Elsie Fowkes Jackson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Leonard D. Jackson, Alexandria, Va., the sum of $2,500, and to Elsie Fowkes Jackson, Alexandria, Va., the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Leonard D. Jackson and Elsie Fowkes Jackson against the United States for damages for personal injuries sustained by them on January 14, 1944, when the vehicle in which they were riding was struck, at the intersection of Fourteenth Street and Constitution Avenue, Washington D. C., by a vehicle in the service of the United States Navy.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figures "$2,500" insert in lieu thereof the figures "$750."

Line 7, strike out the figures "$10,000" insert in lieu thereof the figures "$6,350."

At the end of bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary nothwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOSES TENNENBAUM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2485) for the relief of Moses Tennenbaum.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Moses Tennenbaum, of Poland, now residing at 552 Neptuno, Habana, Cuba, shall be admitted to the United States of America for permanent residence here nothwithstanding any provision of the immigration laws of the United States now in effect. That upon the enactment of this act into law the Secretary of State is directed to authorize the proper consul to issue proper visa to Moses Tennenbaum without compliance with the usual requirements.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VONNIE JONES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 780) for the relief of Vonnie Jones, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Asa Jones, father of Vonnie Jones, a minor, the sum of $2,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries received by the minor, Vonnie Jones, in an accident caused by a United States Army vehicle, near the town of Hornbeck, in the parish of Sabine, State of Louisiana, on February 5, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claims. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Asa Jones, father", and insert "the legal guardian."

Page 1, line 6, after the word "Jones", insert "of Hornbeck, La."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Vonnie Jones, a minor."

MARINE ENGINE WORKS & SHIPBUILDING CORPORATION, TARPON SPRINGS, FLA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1322) for the relief of the Marine Engine Works & Shipbuilding Corporation, of Tarpon Springs, Fla.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Claims for further study and consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

AUSTIN BRUCE BOWAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1488) for the relief of Austin Bruce Bowan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Austin Bruce Bowan the sum of $6,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Austin Bruce Bowan against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on September 22, 1942, on Highway No. 41 (Tamiami Trail), when the truck which he was driving was struck by a Government vehicle in convoy en route to Venice Army Air Base, Venice, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Bowan" and insert "Bowen, of Sarasota, Fla."

Line 6, strike out "$6,000" and insert "$2,000."

Line 8, strike out "Bowan" and insert "Bowen."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Austin Bruce Bowen."

DR. DAVID R. BARGLOW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1539) for the relief of Dr. David R. Barglow.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to Dr. David R. Barglow, of Trinidad, Colo., the sum of $32. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims which the said Dr. David R. Barglow has against the United States for and on account of professional services rendered during the month of October 1942 in making physical examinations of Government employees engaged in the construction of the Trinidad Prisoner of War Camp at Trinidad, Colo., which examinations were made under the orders and direction of the United States Army engineers who were in charge of said project: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and that the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. SUE B. BOWEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1716) for the relief of Mrs. Sue B. Bowen, as administratrix of the estate of Clyde Bowen, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $78.65 to Mrs. Sue B. Bowen, as administratrix of the estate of Clyde Bowen, deceased, of Pocatello, Idaho, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for services rendered by Clyde Bowen as United States commissioner for the United States District Court for the District of Idaho, for the period ended May 31, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF THE LATE DEMETRIO CAQUÍAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1756) for the relief of the late Demetrio Caquías.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to the administrator of the estate of the late Demetrio Caquías who was fatally injured on March 15, 1944, when struck in Ponce, P. R., by a United States jeep. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of such accident.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "administrator of the."

At the end of the bill, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BENJAMIN D. LEWIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1983) for the relief of Benjamin D. Lewis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 and 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770) are hereby waived in favor of Benjamin D. Lewis, who contracted tuberculosis while employed at the Normoyle Quartermaster Motor Base, San Antonio, Tex., prior to 1942, and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. The monthly compensation which the said Benjamin D. Lewis may be entitled to receive by reason of the enactment of this act shall commence on the first day of the month during which this act is enacted.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "15 and 20" and insert "15 to 20, inclusive."

Page 2, line 6, after "Act" insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no benefits hereunder shall accrue prior to the approval of this act."

Page 2, line 8, strike out all of section 2.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HATTIE BOWERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2007) for the relief of Hattie Bowers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hattie Bowers, of Modesto, Calif., the sum of $15,485.13. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Hattie Bowers for damages to her automobile and for personal injuries, sustained by her, as the result of an accident on April 5, 1943, when the automobile she was driving on United States Highway No. 99, approximately 6 miles north of Bakersfield, Calif., was struck by a United States Army truck.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$15,485.13" and insert "$5,000."

Line 8, strike out "damages to her automobile and for" and insert "property damage."

Line 9, after "injuries" insert ", medical and hospital expenses."

At the end of the bill add the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VILLAGE OF COLD SPRING, MINN.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2003) for the relief of the village of Cold Spring, Minn.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

WALLACE ROBERTSON, HENRY BOWKER, AND EDWARD PARISIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2164) for the relief of Wallace Robertson, Henry Bowker, and Edward Parisian, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an identical Senate bill, S. 515, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, for the months of August and September 1942, in the sum of $95, representing payments made by him to Wallace Robertson in full settlement for overtime services rendered prior to July 13, 1942.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of funds applicable for road-construction activities on Indian reservations, the sum of $188 to Henry Bowker and the sum of $53.33 to Edward Parisian, in full settlement of claims for compensation covering overtime services rendered during July, August, and September 1942.

SEC. 3. No charge shall be made against the certifying officer, nor shall any claim be made against Wallace Robertson, for the amount of any payments for which credit is allowed under section 1 of this act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2164) was laid on the table.

REIMBURSING CERTAIN NAVY PERSONNEL FOR PERSONAL PROPERTY LOSS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2224) to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval training center, Farragut, Idaho, on July 10, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 525, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed $6,763.55, as may be required by the Secretary of the Navy to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval training center, Farragut, Idaho, on July 10, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 2224) was laid on the table.

OSBORNE E. McKAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2336) for the relief of Osborne E. McKay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Osborne E. McKay, lieutenant commander, United States Naval Reserve, Sagamore, Mass., the sum of $2,480.74. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Osborne E. McKay against the United States on account of property damage sustained on November 10, 1942, when certain personal effects owned by him were destroyed by fire and water in the hold of the United States Army transport *James Parker* at pier 60, Cristobal, C. Z.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$2,480.74" and insert "$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. RUTH COX

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2427) for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cox.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice, if the gentleman will withdraw his objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

HUGH M. GREGORY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1617) for the relief of Hugh M. Gregory.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the status of Hugh M. Gregory, as a retired commissioned officer of the United States Army, his appointment on August 25, 1941, to the position of associate field representative in the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services, be, and it is hereby, validated; and he shall be entitled to the whole amount of salary at the rate of $3,200 per annum for such services performed by him during the period from August 25, 1941, to June 30, 1942, inclusive, but shall not be entitled to any retired pay for that period; that payments heretofore made to him as salary or traveling expenses for the period from August 25, 1941, to June 30, 1942, inclusive, are hereby validated.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to Hugh M. Gregory, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum equal to the total amount of any salary withheld during the period of his employment as an associate field representative in the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services at the rate of $3,200 per annum and validated by section 1 of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "$3,200" and insert "$3,000."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "$3,200" and insert "$3,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of Texas (at the request of Mr. BECKWORTH) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Admiral Moreell at Houston, Tex.

Mr. SHEPPARD (at the request of Mr. ELLIOTT) was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the San Bernardino Daily Sun.

ELIAS BAUMGARTEN

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, H. R. 1356, Calendar No. 140, be restored to the Private Calendar at the next call of that calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONKMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

RESTORING H. R. 952 TO PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 952, Private Calendar No. 42, be restored to the Private Calendar. It was objected to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 96 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Public Lands is authorized to continue the study of the problems in connection with the public lands of the United States begun under authority of House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and for such purposes said committee shall have the same

power and authority as that conferred upon it by said House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and such authority shall continue through the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution authorizes continuance of study by the Committee on the Public Lands of certain public land problems and the use of public lands in the rehabilitation of veterans, as authorized under House Resolution No. 281 of the Seventy-eighth Congress. I think the committee has done splendid work and is entitled to be granted additional time to conclude its investigation.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few observations as to our lands and farms that are being investigated by this committee.

I find that unfortunately some Members from time to time seem to believe that I am opposed to the farmers. I certainly am not opposed to the farmers, and I have said so many times. What I do object to is for Members to get up and by their remarks aid the speculators, profiteers, and black-market racketeers in obtaining unconscionable prices by exaggerating the rumors of the shortage of food.

I have authentic figures to show that there was as much available food, supplies for civilian consumption in 1944, as there was during the years 1935 to 1939 and 1940, and from all indications 1945 will be a record-breaking year, weather permitting, notwithstanding lend-lease shipments and supplies for our armed forces.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I do not want to take up too much time, please.

Mr. LEWIS. I just wanted to ask a question. I would like to ask what the President meant the other day when he said we will all have to tighten up our belts? Was he talking about food or not?

Mr. SABATH. That has been explained. It was because he feels we are eating and consuming too much, and I think the President was right, as many of you are apparently misled by these false rumors and unjustifiable releases as to the alleged shortages.

The report shows that we have consumed more food this last year than we did during the years 1935 to 1939 and 1940. The gentleman must remember these are not my figures or statistics. I will give you and the country authentic figures proving my contention, and only do so because unfortunately false rumors are being given out through the press by various institutes and avaricious people for the purpose of creating a scarcity and obtaining higher prices for their products, and bring about still greater profits. So, Mr. Speaker, in the interest and for the benefit of the membership and the country, I shall later give you a résumé of agricultural production and consumption that I have just received from the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of the Department of Commerce of the latest information taken from the Survey of Current Business of the Bureau which I hope the gentlemen will carefully read and study. I am sure this résumé will prove most informative and enlightening.

Some Members think I am sometimes overstating things. Only a few days ago the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] called my attention to a package that is being made up by the cheese manufacturers that contains only about 25 percent of the butterfat it should contain, or one-half the amount of cheese, notwithstanding that cheese manufacturers and dairy dealers are charging four times its value. I ask my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] whether that is right.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is not exactly the proportions, I will say to my colleague. As I remember the package, it showed 20 percent fat. It was selling at 55 cents a pound. The ceiling on the whole article was 40 cents in Washington, and that contained 32 percent fat. So the consumer was paying between two and three times as much for the butterfat that was in the concoction. It was not cheese, it was some kind of concoction.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman very much for giving the exact figures and substantiating my contention. In addition to that, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] showed me a price book giving present-day milk prices. I said that milk was bringing 16 and 17 cents a quart, while formerly it was 8 cents, and a question was raised when I said that some few years ago we were paying 95 cents a hundredweight for milk, but now the dairy people receive $2.75. The prices for milk are even higher than that, as I stated on yesterday. The gentleman from Pennsylvania showed me from his own books that he was receiving up to $3.75 and $3.85 for 100 pounds of milk. Now, those are the conditions.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I do not want to object to the statement the gentleman has made, but we will all have to agree that there is a shortage of certain agricultural products, namely, dairy products, beef, pork, lard. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that in my own State many bakers have closed down in the past few weeks because there was no lard available to make bread. So there is a shortage of numerous agricultural products; although we have produced a large quantity, still there is a shortage.

Mr. SABATH. I know, but the record shows——

Mr. ELLIOTT. I do not care what the books show; I am talking about the real facts of shortage.

Mr. SABATH. This report shows there is as much food for the American people today, notwithstanding the shipments we have made under lend-lease and to our armed forces, as they consumed in the years 1935 to 1939.

As to the shortages, I agree with the gentleman that there are some shortages, and I again direct attention to the conditions which have given rise to these growing fears on the part of the consumer that shortages really exist. We are aware that a great deal of publicity has been given to these rumored scarcities of foodstuffs, but I charge the shortage is created by the hoarders, speculators, and black-market operators. If the farmers and producers would stop selling to the black markets, there would be no shortage. But if they can get from 25 to 50 percent more for their chickens or whatever they have to sell by going to the black market, human nature is human nature; there is a certain amount of selfishness in all of us, and naturally they take advantages of it, disregarding the general conditions of the country.

What I am trying to bring home is that we must do something to stop the black markets, stop unnecessary rumors of shortages so as to deprive the speculators and profiteers of the opportunity to rob the American people. I am sorry every Member was not here to listen to the extended speech made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] on yesterday because he pointed out some facts to which I have been calling attention for the past 3 years as to the conditions of the white-collar people of this country. I am pleased that the gentleman has borne me out as to the unfortunate conditions that I have alluded to so often. We have 20,000,000 white-collar workers who are earning below $1,300 a year. Such people cannot afford to pay the high prices they are charged. For years the agriculture bloc has been clamoring and asking for parity prices. Do you gentlemen know that prices now are 116 percent of parity instead of parity? Still you come in and demand an increase in prices. Tomorrow we will consider the agriculture bill. I want you to be here when the bill is being considered and see how much money we will appropriate again for the farmers.

That bill appropriates nearly $900,000,000 and it is only a small part of what we are appropriating in aid of the farmers of the country. It has been stated that they have been deprived of machinery, but here again I have the figures to show how much machinery they have obtained in the last few years which enabled them to increase the production of foodstuffs, crops, and so forth; however, with the aid of favorable weather that God Almighty provided.

Mr. STARKEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STARKEY. Is it not a fact that the agricultural products that are sold in the black market are eventually sold to the consumer, therefore the best friends of the farmer are the industrial workers who have steady employment at high wages which enable them to consume the proper amount of food?

Mr. SABATH. I agree that the industrial worker who is now engaged in war work is receiving perhaps fair enough compensation, although the millionaire profiteers contend it is too high. However, I think the industrial worker is justly deserving of what he receives. Mr. Speaker, I am interested, though, in the predicament of unorganized labor. I am interested in the men who are living on small pensions, the widow who is living on a small income; I am interested in the clerks and teachers who are getting

$50, $60, or $75 a month, I am interested in those people who cannot afford to pay these high and ever-increasing prices and that is the reason I am pleading for action. We must do something to hold the prices down so that these people can live decently, otherwise we will be guilty of gross neglect.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. From my own observations, one of the reasons for the shortage of the meat supply today is on account of the regulations promulgated by the Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration. There are many cattle that could be slaughtered today, but they cannot get to the market because of the feeding proposition and the regulations over the feeding bins in the western part of this country.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is right to some extent, but there is another reason for the shortage of meat. The packers are refusing to sell to the regular meat markets or butcher shops. They are giving preference to restaurants, to the clubs, and to the hotels. By doing so they withhold from regular channels a great deal of meat and are responsible for unfair distribution. Then they are not permitting the cheaper cuts to go to the butcher shops so that the housewife can get some of that cheaper meat for stew, goulash, or soup purposes. The packers are making these cheaper cuts into sausage because they obtain from 5 to 10 cents more a pound for it when made into sausage. Those are the abuses and that is the reason there is a so-called shortage. However, Mr. Speaker, we have today, and we had during 1944, an average of 127 pounds of meat available for every man, woman, and child in the United States and with that amount of meat available no shortage should exist.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement. I agree that the white-collar workers should have a better salary and, as I recall, not long ago we tried to bring that about. I think probably the gentleman voted with us, but it was beaten down on the floor of this House.

Mr. SABATH. What is the question, please?

Mr. VURSELL. The question I desire to ask is this: Why are these powerful interests throttling the poor people in this country when the gentleman's party is in power? If we Republicans were in power, some would rather expect it, but I cannot understand how it can be done with the gentleman's party in power.

Mr. SABATH. I am glad the gentleman admits that much—that it might be expected if the Republican Party were in power. Unfortunately, your side, the Republicans, helped to defeat the proposition. However, we are at war. We need the big people as well as the little people, and we need the rich as well as the poor. That is the reason, I presume, that the administration has not gone after the big boys that have been making millions during this war. When the time comes I will be with the gentleman, and I hope he will have his party go along with me to get after these profiteers and bring about an adjustment in conditions.

May I say that I have a meeting of the Committee on Rules at 2 o'clock. In addition to that I have two other very important matters, and I am obliged to conclude my remarks, regretting very much that I cannot give the House more information. I know you regret it also.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield. I cannot refuse the smiling gentleman.

Mr. BREHM. In speaking of the black market, does the gentleman realize that the Russian Government operates its own black market and is making millions by doing so? Does the gentleman feel that maybe in America the Government should start operating its own black market, thereby siphoning off some of this excess money as an aid in keeping down inflation? Some people in America seem to want to pattern after Russia, maybe we should pattern after them in regard to the black market and apply the profits toward a reduction of our national debt. Its worth considering and at least it would be one operation of Government that would show a profit.

Mr. SABATH. I do not know whether they have a black market, but if they do make money, they make it for the people and the government. Here, unfortunately, it is made by private business, private industry and private individuals—the few—and at the expense of the many; that is the difference.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert this valuable information in the RECORD, with the hope that the Members will study it.

I am sorry I cannot put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain charts mentioned in the Survey of Current Business, especially one showing the allocation of total food production, which shows that the level in 1939 is equal to the level of production in 1944. I maintain that if civilian or home consumption is fully as great today as in the years between 1935 and 1939, and in view of the fact that there is nearly 10,000,000 members of our armed forces out of the country, I repeat these figures flatly prove and substantiate all that I have stated on this floor in an effort to bring home the true facts that a shortage does not exist. The excerpts from the Survey of Current Business are as follows:

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

The flow of commodities from the Nation's farms in 1944 was large enough to allow the highest civilian per capita food consumption in the Nation's history, and at the same time to devote almost a quarter of available supplies to the needs of our armed forces and allies. It was thus even more true in agriculture than elsewhere in the economy that in general productive facilities adequately met the requirements of the Nation at war.

Civilian per capita consumption of food in 1944 was 9 percent above the 1935–39 average. Moreover, the wartime increases have been accompanied by a general improvement in the nutritive content of the national average diet and, apparently, by some reduction in the disparity among the diets of various segments of the population.

The physical volume of farm output in 1944 exceeded the 1943 total by 3 percent, continuing the upward production trend which has featured each year since 1939. The 25-percent rise in total farm output during this 6-year period was achieved notwithstanding a net decline in farm employment and an increase in crop acreage limited to only 6 percent.

Stimulating all-out production and directing agricultural effort into products most urgently needed were Government actions reflected in the setting of national production goals, broken down on a State and county basis, and in price policies permitting advances and guaranteeing minima for major farm products. The index of prices received by farmers more than doubled between 1939 and 1944 and averaged 15 percent above parity last year.

FACTORS INCREASING PRODUCTION

Perhaps the most important single factor responsible for the wartime expansion in agricultural output has been the unusually favorable weather. There were other important contributing factors, not the least important of which was the increased allocation of resources to the production of farm equipment.

* * * * *

Rapid strides have been made in farm mechanization during the war years as indicated, for example, by the one-third increase in the number of tractors on farms since January 1, 1940. Not only did these additional machines enable farmers to handle larger crop acreages per worker, but the accompanying decline in number of work animals released cropland previously used for feed purposes. Mechanization was also furthered by substantial additions to the number of such key equipment as milking machines, combine harvesters, and corn pickers. In order to keep farm equipment operating, production of spare parts has been boosted substantially.

Finally, a part of the increased output can be attributed to such technological advances as improved varieties of crops, better rotations, and more balanced livestock feeding, to the greater use of fertilizers, and to earlier soil-conservation programs.

The net effect of these developments has been a 34-percent increase in output per worker since 1939 and a 16-percent increase in average crop yields per acre harvested.

* * * * *

Annual food production, together with the amounts purchased for the armed forces, lend-lease, and other exports, is shown in the chart here. As was to be expected, most of the increase in production between 1939 and 1944, has been absorbed by the greatly expanded takings of the military and export agencies. Military purchases aggregated over 14 percent of 1944 food output; lend-lease shipments and other exports 7 percent.

Despite the larger diversion from domestic civilian channels, 1944 production was sufficient to raise per capita civilian food consumption to the highest on record—9 percent in excess of the 1935–39 average. Another chart here contrasts wartime changes in production and civilian consumption of all foods and of major food groups. The divergencies between the changes in production and consumption are chiefly due to the military and export requirements.

Consumption of such important foods as meats, eggs, fluid milk, and chickens showed considerably larger increases relative to prewar amounts than did the over-all food consumption index. The major exceptions to the general pattern were canned fruits, sugar (not shown in the chart), and dairy products other than fluid milk and cream. Butter production in 1944 was the lowest since 1921, largely because other dairy products have afforded more profitable outlets for milk production in recent years.

Mr. Speaker, with that I conclude, and I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include the information above referred to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I know that we all enjoyed the wonderful agricultural advice by the gentleman from the pavements of Chicago. It seems that several times each week the city gentleman, who lives on the pavements in Chicago, comes in and says how easily the farmers are getting along. He claims there is not much of a food shortage in this country, that farmers are having an easy time. Nevertheless, when we hear about the abundance of food in Canada with unjustifiable night life and gayety, when, according to the press, the same thing is true in Paris, that the night clubs seem to have plenty of unwarranted light, food, and heat over there, and when at the same time the United States is furnishing at least 80 percent of the fighting men on the western battlefields of Europe with food and equipment, when we are also furnishing perhaps 90 percent of all the fighting men in the Pacific with the necessary food and equipment, when we are taking care of the requirements of U. N. R. R. A. and other agencies to feed the people of Italy, France, England, Russia, and practically everybody in the world, I am just beginning to wonder whether we fully appreciate the patriotic, hard work, and unselfishness of our farmers and people generally throughout the United States. I think it is high time that some other countries do a little more sacrificing.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. Does the gentleman believe we are winning the war?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. We are winning the war in spite of it. But I still contend that perhaps it would be well for some of our allies to do some of this fighting in western Europe, as well as in the Pacific; also to do a little raising of crops, and show a little cooperation along those lines. I do not believe any of us, after the United States has been doing all those things, after we have liberated those countries and are feeding the people in them, approves of the fact that General De Gaulle refused to see the President of the United States when the President asked to see him. I know I felt it to be repulsive to every sense of appreciation.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think the gentleman said the United States is furnishing 80 percent of the men who are fighting in Europe on the Allied side.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. On the western front, I said.

Getting back to this bill, this is a resolution to extend the Lands Committee under the excellent guidance of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON]. We all know that at the beginning of this war it was necessary for the United States Government to take over and purchase many hundreds of thousands of acres of land. That left many problems for the local people, because when the Federal Government takes over land from local people that local government loses the tax revenues from those hundreds of thousands of acres. In my own district the Government came into a certain county and purchased about 65,000 acres of the best tillable land in the county. Consequently, the schools were put to a very hard task to keep running. The particular school section involved lost approximately $6,000 in taxes, and that has been a great problem for it.

I do not believe anyone objects to the continuation of this committee. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] has done an excellent job, like the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], who are chairmen of other special committees. He has been most economical. He has gone throughout the country holding hearings with the purpose of presenting his findings to the Congress in the near future in order that we may better deal with the problem of these public lands.

Mr. Speaker, this was a unanimous report of the committee, and I hope the resolution will pass the House unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order, and to revise and extend the remarks I have already made and those I expect to make now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks about the food situation. I have been close enough to it for enough years so that I am not going to stand here and try to take any one phase of it and try to relate all the factors, because that is something that one should be rather careful about doing. For example, I was at a dairy meeting one day this week and a man from the United States Department of Agriculture said they were allocating 200,000,000 pounds of cheese to lend-lease, largely British, and 200,000,000 pounds to other set-aside orders, leaving the consumers of the United States 400,000,000 pounds.

Later one of my colleagues came to my office. He said, "What do you think of that? They are giving the British 5 pounds of cheese per capita." he said, "We have over 135,000,000 people in this country and only 400,000,000 pounds of cheese, so we are going to get only 3 pounds per capita." Well, I said, "That sounds all right, but let us analyze it from all points of view." I continued, "We had better get all of the story." He wanted to know what all of the story was. I said, "I cannot answer; with too much assurance as I do not know all the facts. We do have in addition about 200,000,000 pounds of foreign-type cheese made in the United States to consume. But I do not know this, from correspondence from many young men in the Southwest Pacific, I find they get their dairy products from New Zealand and Australia. The amount of cheese and butter we obtain from Australia and New Zealand for use in the Pacific most assuredly must be deducted from the 200,000,000 pounds allocated to lend-lease, before we would really have a true picture of the situation. Incidentally there would be considerable saving in transportation and refrigeration which are added factors. I just use that as an example. It is a very ticklish question. When one is making a statement that is all-inclusive, one must be sure to temper his words and see that they are in close harmony with the facts. But there is one thing that does bother me, and it has been bothering me for months. I would not say anything about it here on the floor if it had not been for my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. I picked up this wrapper right here in the Capitol. It does not even say cheese on it. It does say "20 percent fat" and it does say "45 percent moisture." It does say it came from the great State of Ohio, which I am sorry to have to say also. This 5-pound package sold wholesale in a chain store within a few blocks of the Capitol for 55 cents a pound. It has 20 percent butterfat. That means there is a pound of butterfat in the 5 pounds and it sold for $2.75. Remember that it has more moisture than normal cheese because normal cheese has only 38 percent moisture. Normal cheese also has 32 percent fat. Normal cheese has a fixed price of 23¼ cents per pound at Plymouth, Wis. We call the Plymouth plus price the Wisconsin minus price because all the other States get from six-tenths to 2 cents a pound more for cheese than does the State of Wisconsin. This price as I said is fixed at 23¼ cents, meaning the farmer gets around 21 cents per pound on that basis. The consumer is supposed to buy cheese on the basis of the Plymouth price. In other words, the butterfat that is in this package at Plymouth fixed price was 14.53 cents per pound or 72.65 cents for the butterfat in the 5-pound package. If we never had an O. P. A. or had never heard of the War Food Administration, I think that the business people of this country would give the people of this country butterfat in the form of cheese surely at a better advantage than they will get in the form of this concoction.

What I cannot understand is how they get so much power under the First or Second War Powers Act to take some little fellow and do just exactly what they want to do with him. That is what we had the cheese meeting about last Thursday. It was the question of these farmers out in Wisconsin who have been producing certain kinds of cheese. If their cows gave more milk in 1945 than they did in 1942, the farmer cannot make that into cheese,

but has to put it into a can and haul it off somewhere 10 miles away to some other factory. And they make him do it. But some big shot who can be up in the city of New York can defy the administration and run his night club until 1 o'clock. And if he says he is going to run it until 1 o'clock, he can run it until 4 o'clock. I just wonder during wartime, if you are going to apply these things to the little fellow who is in the picture or whether you had not better be applying it some of the big shots that are in the picture.

Further about cheese concoctions: I called the attention of the O. P. A., 2 months ago to another kind of cheese concoction which had 28 percent fat and 45 percent moisture and sold for 70 cents a pound. Well, I took it up with the O. P. A. The O. P. A. said they were going to straighten out all that cheese business pretty soon. But I see now they are branching out into other fields. They are going to tell you how much to pay to go to a movie. People can do as they wish about going to the movies. But people must eat. They have frozen their incomes. I think the time has come when we should stop these substitutes that are going into the food business just the same as they have gone into many other businesses. Only this morning one of my colleagues called me up and wanted to know who the vegetable-protein man was in the Agriculture Department. He said he had a constituent that wanted to sell vegetable protein. I wish I knew the number of tons of vegetable protein that have been put into the sausages and hamburgers of this country during the last 3 or 4 years. Sure, my colleague from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] says they do it because they can buy those proteins for nearly nothing and sell them along with the animal protein in the form of meat and get 30 or 40 cents a pound for them. So this whole food question, brought up by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is a very serious question. It goes back to the fact that 1942 is the first year in 30 years that we have ever furnished our own beef in this country. People do not realize that we have been on a beef-import basis for 30 years. We have been on an import basis as far as dairy products are concerned for over a quarter of a century. We have imported from 20 to 60 millions of pounds of cheese each year.

The stock piles of food as shown in cold storage in pre-war years may have looked large in the aggregate. When one considers the amounts of food in cold storage or other stock piles and thinks of them in connection with the demand for the armed forces, the allocation for lease-lend and other agencies, and the 135,000,000 people to be fed in our country, these cold storage stocks are really pretty small after all. We may have 135,000,000 pounds of butter in storage at a certain time but that does not mean much when the domestic demands, and the allocations are taken into consideration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to continue the study by the Public Lands Committee of the House with reference to various public-land problems.

The resolution was first asked by direction of the Public Lands Committee, and I understand it was unanimously reported by the Rules Committee, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] said a few moments ago.

We have had quite a few problems that have been brought to the attention of the committee by reason of the war and by reason of the Transportation Act of 1940. Eight million acres of land came back to the Federal Government under the Transportation Act of 1940. However, no provision was made in the act for the disposition of that particular land. We have 14 bills now before the committee with reference to problems brought about by the acquisition by the United States of large tracts of land. We are trying to work out the question of veterans' preference on public lands also.

We have compiled a complete compilation of the public lands owned in the United States. Until we began our study no one agency had a complete compilation of these lands. Twenty-four percent of the land area in continental United States is owned by the Federal Government. If we take in the various Territories and possessions, 36 percent of all of the United States, its Territories, and possessions is in Federal ownership. Of course, there are many problems. We are trying conscientiously to work out a Federal land program. We have tried to conserve our funds. We have only used two-thirds of the money which was allotted to us heretofore. I believe the House is friendly to us and I will not take any further time. I hope you will pass this resolution unanimously.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I, too, hope it will be adopted unanimously. I congratulate my chairman on good work well done. I want to thank the gentleman for bringing to my committee, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, a bill which pertains to establishing veterans' preference on the public domain under the Boulder Dam Project Act. I hold in my hand a memorial from the State Legislature of Arizona, and also just today I submitted a resolution from the city council of Tucson, Ariz., both of which pertain to these land problems, which our committee is investigating. There is much more work to be done.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The gentleman from Arizona has been very helpful and diligent on this problem.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have asked the gentleman to yield simply to call the attention of the House to the fact that the hearing on this resolution before the Rules Committee developed the fact that this committee had done exceptionally good work at exceptionally low cost. The Rules Committee was rather surprised at some of the testimony and material that was submitted to our committee as to the work of your special investigating committee, and especially that you were able to accomplish that work at the low cost which you reported.

I, therefore, am very anxious to see this resolution adopted, because I believe your committee should be permitted to continue its work to its full completion.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. We are grateful for that fine statement. I consider the committee a creature of the House and I appreciate the commendation of the Rules Committee that made possible the study.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the committee bring in some recommendation relative to the taxes to local subdivisions, like school districts, that have been lost through the acquisition by the Government of certain lands?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes; we made a factual report just prior to the close of the last Congress which set up the situation as it existed. We did not make a recommendation as to the type of law because that is one of the next phases of study.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No bill has been presented.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. There are 14 bills pending. We have analyzed the bills and have asked the views of the Council of State Governments, the American Municipal Association, the American Finance Association officers, and several other organizations to give us their views, and reports are coming in on these bills.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and also to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to commend the chairman of our Committee on the Public Lands, my distinguished colleague from Florida, for the splendid service he has rendered this country in his untiring efforts in the troublesome problem of expansion of Federal ownership of lands. I hope this resolution extending the work of that committee will receive favorable consideration from this body. The report issued by the committee during the last Congress pointed out that the Government now owns one-fifth of the entire land area of the United States. It shows that the United States Government owns outright 51 percent of the entire area of Wyoming, and in addition to that, the United States owns the

mineral rights over an additional 30 percent of the lands of Wyoming in which the citizens of my State own only the surface.

Now the implications of this situation are staggering. For nearly a century and a half of our history the trend was from public ownership to private ownership. During the past decade that trend has been reversed. Unless the Congress attacks this problem vigorously and finds a proper solution, a large part of our population may ultimately be reduced to a condition of tenancy with Uncle Sam as the greatest landlord in the history of the world.

In my opinion, the Congress must abandon the policy of public acquisition of lands and return to that historic policy of divesting itself from ownership of lands wherever possible, consistent with the public interest.

I was very much interested in the remarks made a few minutes ago by the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee on the food situation in this country.

The great State of Wyoming, which I have the honor to represent, runs over 1,000,000 head of cattle and over 3,000,000 head of sheep. There has been a drastic reduction in the number of sheep during each year of the war. You wonder why that condition prevails.

In 1941 the Office of Price Administration fixed a ceiling price on domestic wool which today does not pay the cost of production. The United States Tariff Commission, in a report issued during January last, estimates that, with interest included in cost of wool, there is a loss of over 10 cents for every pound of wool produced by the wool growers of our country in 1944.

Now, since 1941 the cost of production has skyrocketed but the Office of Price Administration has refused to raise the ceiling price on wool, in spite of the fact that Congress provided that ceiling prices should be revised to meet the rising cost of production.

Recently the War Food Administration asked the wool growers of my State to increase the number of sheep. What does that amount to? It means they are asked to produce more at a loss.

Because of the many difficulties besetting the wool growers of the country, and by reason of the fact that the Office of Price Administration has refused to raise the ceiling price on wool to a point where the wool growers can show a little profit, there has been a distinct reduction in the sheep population of Wyoming and the Nation. As a matter of fact, so many of our wool growers have been forced to liquidate their herds that, in spite of the terrific demand for wool and for mutton, we find our sheep population in the country today the lowest since 1928.

It seems to me that the Office of Price Administration should follow the clear mandate of the Congress and adjust the ceiling price on wool to meet the increasing costs of production so that the wool growers of this Nation will be justified in attempting to meet the request of the War Food Administration to produce more mutton and wool.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of commenting briefly upon the tremendously important work of this committee in two respects, and I hope what I say will not be repetitious. It does, however, reinforce what the gentleman from Wyoming has just said.

First, there is this problem of dwindling revenues of the county and State governments because of the retirement of land, and the work of this committee should result in some of these lands getting back on the tax books and, secondly, it will help the returning farm youth, the veterans who are entitled to stay on the farm and who must find opportunities on the land. We all know that wealth is not produced from the land by itself. It takes land plus human cultivation. So we have these millions of acres that might become an important source of land for the returning veterans whom we want to favor.

If this country can take pride in anything, it seems to me it is the homestead policy that was inaugurated by President Lincoln, a matter I commented on in an extension of remarks on Lincoln's birthday. But the homestead policy of this country must be brought down to date. This excellent committee is studying and is classifying our public lands and, in my opinion, that study will help us with these two things which I know the House wants to do, namely, provide revenues for county governments and also to provide farming opportunities for our returning veterans.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Coming as I do from a public-land State, I know that the committee has done good work and will do more by this extension. I want to approve what the gentleman has said. And now that time is short, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks further at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on the Public Lands, I agree with my chairman that this committee should be extended in its power of investigation because much remains yet to be done and because it has accomplished a great deal with the money heretofore furnished it. The public-land States of the West have many complicated problems, and it is often necessary to hold hearings out West in arriving at sane conclusions where the Members of Congress may see with their own eyes the situations involved and hear the testimony of residents in the area being studied in order to get an evaluation of all the facts. We will need to do more of this instead of relying solely upon departmental testimony or upon departmental testimony or upon a few interested witnesses to present the case.

The gentleman from Arkansas who has just preceded me points out the significance of our homestead laws, and he also made mention of the immediate need of making suitable provisions for our returning veterans. That is a matter in which I have been greatly interested, both in connection with the Public Lands Committee work and also in connection with irrigation and reclamation. Only a few weeks ago I sponsored a bill before Chairman PETERSON'S Committee on the Public Lands which extended the privileges of homestead entry to the veterans of the Second World War just as such had been extended to the veterans of the First World War. This legislation was general, but it did not cover the reclamation projects watered from the Colorado River through Boulder Dam. This omission has been taken care of by a subsequent bill favored by the American Legion, sponsored by Congressman PETERSON, of Florida, and reported out by the committee of which I am chairman, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. By this legislation we extend preference to all veterans on any lands in Arizona or California irrigated from the Colorado River under the Boulder project.

Let me say to the gentleman from Arkansas that not only is the Committee on the Public Lands looking to favor the returning veterans, but hand in hand the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation is also sponsoring legislation which will confer great benefits upon veterans throughout the 17 Western States, and in all of that part of our country lying west of the ninety-seventh meridian. In all of this effort it is highly important that Members of Congress supplement the evidence presented by Government departments by a first-hand knowledge of the western conditions gained often by a personal investigation. The extension of the powers of this committee will aid toward that end.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the pending resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 187 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is authorized, as a committee, by subcommittee, or otherwise, to continue during the present Congress the investigation begun under authority of House Resolution 290 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 15, House Resolution 188, and House Resolution 383 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and by House Resolution 58 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and for such purposes such committee shall have the same power and authority as that conferred upon such committee by House Resolution 290 of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is very fortunate in having as its members two oustanding members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House who have devoted a great deal of time to this subject. They are very familiar with the matter, consequently I yield such time as he may desire on this resolution to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] who is a member of the Rules Committee as well as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and he will explain the need for the resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 187 provides for continuance of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This special subcommittee was created originally in 1934, and, while it dealt with the subject of oil, it was, rather peculiarly, long known as the Cole committee because of the service of its distinguished chairman, the Honorable William C. Cole of Maryland, who served so long and ably in this House.

Originally this committee dealt with the problems of oil production and the making of contracts and compacts between the States for the conservation of our natural oil resources. Since the war came in the last few years this subcommittee has been especially active in obtaining oil and gasoline needed for the war effort and in dealing with the problems of the distribution and rationing of oil and gasoline which has been in short supply.

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has general jurisdiction over this subject. The Subcommittee on Petroleum could function, in most instances, without the special authority conferred by this resolution. However, because of the many problems which confront the Petroleum Committee, it has been thought best, throughout the years, to give the committee the authority and power to subpena to summon witnesses, when necessary, and to require the furnishing all books, records, and other information which might be of aid to the committee and to the Congress in passing on the many problems surrounding the production and distribution of petroleum and its products. The Committee has not been a spending committee. As I remember, the total amount or money appropriated for this subcommittee was something like $12,000 4 years ago, and it still has about $6,000 left from that original amount, so a financial problem does not enter into the consideration of this resolution.

I think that the House generally is well acquainted with the work of this committee and undoubtedly wants it to continue its service.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think a great many Members of this House realize that I am not so obsessed with these special investigations. I think a great many of the standing committees could probably do a better job than some of these special committees. But I want to make this remark about this so-called Oil Committee. It has been a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for many years. I had the honor of appointing the first chairman and the first members of that committee. I appointed as chairman the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Cole.

May I say one thing about the so-called Oil Committee and its work? It is one investigating committee of the House as to which I can say that I have never heard anybody in industry or out of industry criticize any of its actions, any of its procedures, or anything about it. All have said that its members have done one of the greatest jobs done by any subcommittee ever appointed under any committee of the House. I shall be glad to see this resolution adopted and the life of this committee extended.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, your remarks are very complimentary, and are deeply appreciated by the membership of the Petroleum Committee as well as the membership of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which you so long headed as chairman.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. In view of what the Speaker has said in reference to this committee and the work of this committee, which he has followed over a period of years, does the gentleman from Ohio feel that this committee is capable of handling the oil situation and that it should not be necessary for other special committees of the House to investigate matters affecting oil?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is my opinion, if I may answer the gentleman from Missouri, the Special Committee on Petroleum has done a very outstanding job in the field of petroleum and oil and can continue to do so. I think the results of the committee's efforts speak for themselves.

Mr. COCHRAN. I know the Committee on Small Business and also the Committee on Naval Affairs in the last year made investigations. There might be some grounds for the Committee on Naval Affairs doing so, because it was investigating the naval oil leases; but I do not feel there was any justification for the Committee on Small Business investigating the oil situation when we had this subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The chairman of the Small Business Committee does not agree with me.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman certainly does not want me, as a member of the Subcommittee on Petroleum or as a member of the Committee on Rules, which is presenting this measure to the House in the hope that it will be adopted unanimously, to find fault with the work of any other committee. However, may I point out, as to the Elk Hills project, to which the gentleman refers, the Committee on Naval Affairs did have jurisdiction because Elk Hills is a naval oil reserve. Over the activities of the other special committee our committee had no control. Its activities were entirely up to the chairman of that committee and the leadership of the House, and not our committee. We had no jurisdiction over it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I think the committee should protect its jurisdiction once it is given it by the House.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We shall endeavor to do so in the future.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Is it within the province of the committee to investigate the amount of oil that is being contributed by this country in the war effort as compared to that furnished by other nations?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In the past we have gone very thoroughly into the oil reserves, not only of this Nation but of other nations, and into the war usage of oil. The latest investigation we have made on this subject revealed we are furnishing between 75 and 80 percent of all the oil and gasoline consumed in this war, while the rest of the United Nations are furnishing the balance.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. In answer to the question the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] has just asked, may I say that if he will refer to House Report No. 2096, which this committee filed with the Congress on January 2, he will find that that question was thoroughly discussed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes. I recommend that the Members of the House read that report.

May I add for the benefit of the gentleman from Ohio and other Members who may not be as fully conversant with the problem as some of us who have served on the committee are, or hope we are, that we have called the attention of the various responsible officials of the Government to what some of us believe is the drain which has been placed on our natural resources in fighting this war, and that we have been supplying at least our full share of oil, and perhaps more.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. May I add my commendation of the work of this committee? Our State is in the midcontinent field. I have known of the work of this committee since the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Cole, was chairman of it. This committee not only thoroughly studied the oil problem, but brought in recommendations that obtained results. We are pleased with its past service, and I sincerely hope the life of the committee will be extended.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We appreciate your comment very much.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, who has long served as a member of the committee.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. It is not my intention to make any extended remarks with respect to this resolution inasmuch as the gentleman from Ohio has covered the subject so well.

Furthermore, in view of the commendation that has been expressed by the Speaker of the House with respect to the worth-while service rendered in the past by this committee there would seem to be no necessity for any extended discussion of the subject. I may say, however, that it has been my privilege to be a member of this committee from the time it was first appointed. Words cannot fully express the fine service that was rendered by the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Cole, a distinguished Member of this body for many years, as the original chairman of this committee. The fine work done by the committee under his leadership has been continued under the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], who succeeded him as chairman.

May I say to some of the new Members of the House, who may not be familiar with the work of the committee in the past, that the study that was made by this committee in the first instance, during the chairmanship of the gentleman from Maryland, Mr. Cole, was so extensive and so worth while that the industry has referred to it as the finest and most complete study that has ever been made of the oil industry in this country. It consisted of eight volumes of approximately 500 pages each, and covered every detail of the oil industry.

In the years that have intervened, the work of that committee has continued along the same broad and constructive lines that characterized the work of this committee in the beginning. Today, as a result of the war, we find new questions have arisen which make it particularly important to continue this committee. Some of these problems are: The question of whether there has been a serious depletion of our domestic oil reserves; the question as to what policy should be adopted to encourage new discoveries of oil fields within our own domain in order that there might be increased production; the question of what should be our foreign policy with respect to the use of oil produced in foreign fields and the extent to which our domestic oil can, with safety to our own needs, be exported for foreign use. Then, there are also important studies that should be made on the question of prevention of waste of natural gas, and the policy to be pursued with reference to pipe lines as a means of transportation. For these and many other reasons that might be given, I hope that the House will see the importance of continuing this committee.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the present chairman of the Petroleum Subcommittee, the able gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] and the ranking Republican member, the capable gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] have rendered outstanding service in directing the committee functions on this great subject and problem of petroleum, and in preparing the committee report which was referred to a few moments ago, and which, by the way, is being now used as an authoritative source and document on the oil reserves and supplies of this country by many of the universities and industries of America. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope this resolution will be adopted unanimously.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar resolution (H. Res. 155) was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an Iowa poll.

TO SAFEGUARD THE ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 182 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 43) to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same back to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill H. R. 43, a bill similar to that which was passed at the last session of the Congress. The Rules Committee reported this bill out by unanimous vote and I believe the Committee on the Judiciary has reported it unanimously. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is present and desires to have the same called up.

I shall reserve the balance of my time and I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House at the last session, I believe, unanimously. It has the unanimous report of the Committee on the Judiciary supporting it. I think there is no controversy about the rule. I do not believe it will be beneficial for me to take any further time of the House with reference to this rule.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee is about to have a session and I will have to leave in a few minutes. The gentleman from Texas will handle this matter, if that is agreeable.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection to this rule. If we adopt the rule, then the Committee on the Judiciary can handle this thing this afternoon. There is no objection to the adoption of the rule.

Mr. PITTENGER. Well, I am not so sure. I would like to know a little something about the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I would like to make this observation. I understood the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] to say he was going to the Rules Committee. It has just come to my attention a few moments ago that the Rules Committee is going to consider this afternoon the matter that any legislation contained in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill will not be eliminated and that he intends to bring in a rule for that purpose. I simply want to say this to you, Mr. Chairman of the Rules Committee, if you bring in a rule like that permitting the subcommittee on agriculture to write legislation, then you are going pretty far afield from what should be done.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield any further.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that procedure has been followed by the Rules Committee many, many times.

Mr. RICH. Can it be arranged that the chairman of the Rules Committee——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois can move the previous question on the rule at any time he desires.

COMMITTEE ON RULES—PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, before that is done I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file any rule that might be reported out by the Committee on Rules this afternoon.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let me say to the chairman of the Committee on Rules that if the Committee on Rules in defiance of this House of Representatives brings in a rule permitting the Committee on Agriculture to write legislation on the appropriation bill, then it is pretty near time that we got a new Rules Committee.

Mr. SABATH. The Rules Committee always submits its rules to the House for action.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois that the Rules Committee may have until midnight tonight to file a report?

There was no objection.

TO SAFEGUARD ADMISSION OF EVIDENCE IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as

in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the failure to observe the requirement of law as to the time within which a person under arrest must be brought before a magistrate, commissioner, or court, shall not render inadmissible any evidence that is otherwise admissible.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the act of August 18, 1894 (ch. 301, sec. 1, 28 Stat. 416), as amended (U. S. C., title 18, sec. 595), is amended to read as follows:

" 'It shall be the duty of the marshal, his deputy, or other officer, who may arrest a person charged with any crime or offense, to take the defendant within a reasonable time before the nearest United States commissioner or other nearby judicial officer having jurisdiction under existing laws for a hearing, commitment, or taking bail for trial, and the officer or magistrate issuing the warrant shall attach thereto a certified copy of the complaint, and upon the arrest of the accused, the return of the warrant, with a copy of the complaint attached, shall confer jurisdiction upon such officer as fully as if the complaint had originally been made before him, and no mileage shall be allowed any officer violating the provisions hereof.'

"SEC. 2. The act of March 1, 1879 (ch. 125, sec. 9, 20 Stat. 341; U. S. C., title 18, sec. 593), is amended to read as follows:

" 'Where any marshal or deputy marshal of the United States within the district for which he shall be appointed shall find any person or persons in the act of operating an illicit distillery, it shall be unlawful for such marshal or deputy marshal to arrest such person or persons, and take him or them within a reasonable time before some judicial officer named in section 591 of this title, who may reside in the county of arrest or if none, in that nearest to the place of arrest, to be dealt with according to the provisions of sections 591, 596, and 597 of this title.'

"SEC. 3. The act of June 18, 1934, chapter 595, as amended by the act of March 22, 1935, chapter 39, title 2 (49 Stat. 77; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 300 (A)), is amended to read as follows:

" 'The Director, Assistant Directors, agents, and inspectors of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice are empowered to serve warrants and subpenas issued under the authority of the United States; to make seizures under warrant for violation of the laws of the United States; to make arrests without warrant for felonies which have been committed and which are cognizable under the laws of the United States, in cases where the person making the arrest has reasonable grounds to believe that the person may escape before a warrant can be obtained for his arrest, but the person arrested shall be within a reasonable time taken before a committing officer. Such members of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice are authorized and empowered to carry firearms.'

"SEC. 4. Section 397 of the Revised Statutes of the District of Columbia (D. C. Code, title 4, sec. 4–140) is amended to read as follows:

" 'The several members of the police force shall have power and authority to immediately arrest, without warrant, and to take into custody any person who shall commit, or threaten or attempt to commit, in the presence of such member, or within his view, any breach of the peace or offense directly prohibited by act of Congress, or by any law or ordinance in force in the District, but such member of the police shall, within a reasonable time, upon such arrest, convey in person such offender before the proper court, that he may be dealt with according to law.'

"SEC. 5. Failure to observe the requirement of law as to the time within which a person under arrest must be brought before a committing officer shall not render inadmissible any evidence that is otherwise admissible; but if it be found by the trial court that any person under arrest was not brought before a committing officer within a reasonable time this shall be prima facie evidence that any admission or confession made by him during the time of such unreasonable detention was made under duress."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. What is the parliamentary status at the moment?

The SPEAKER. The parliamentary status is this: The Chair was under the impression from information he got from a member of the Committee on the Judiciary that the Committee was not ready to proceed with the consideration of this bill. The Chair therefore asked the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] not to call up the rule. Then four members of the Committee on the Judiciary appeared on the floor and said the Chair had been a little mistaken about it. The rule was considered and adopted. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] thereupon asked unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. The bill and amendment have just been read, and the bill is now open for debate under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes. By the procedure of having the bill considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole, the general debate provided for in the rule has been eliminated.

The SPEAKER. Debate on the bill under this procedure is all under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; the net result is that the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule, but without any general debate.

The SPEAKER. And the Chair thinks that is what the Committee wanted.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation was before the House during the latter part of the preceding Congress.

About two and a half years ago the Supreme Court, in the case of *McNabb* v. *United States* (318 U. S. 332), held that if a defendant were not arraigned his confession could not be introduced in evidence, even though there might not have been any compulsion.

There was a strong dissenting opinion in that case. In other words, the Supreme Court departed from the old, established rule. The rule has always been that if an arraignment is within a reasonable time the confession may be admitted in evidence provided there was no compulsion or duress.

A bill was introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which provided that failure to observe the requirements of law as to the time within which a person under arrest must be brought before a magistrate, commissioner, or court shall not render inadmissible any evidence that is otherwise admissible. That bill was reported during the last session, and when it came before the House for consideration I offered an amendment providing that failure to arraign shall not render a confession inadmissible if the arraignment were within a reasonable time. To that amendment the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] offered a further amendment which I accepted, to the effect that if it be found by the trial court that any person under arrest was not brought before a committing officer within a reasonable time then this shall be prima facie evidence that any admission or confession made by him during the time of such unreasonable detention was made under duress. That amendment, together with an amendment to make all of the arraignment statutes uniform, was adopted unanimously by the House. The bill did not pass the Senate, however, due to the lateness of the time when it was considered by the House.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. This bill was rather fully discussed last December; was it not?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It was fully discussed.

Mr. HANCOCK. There was no opposition to the bill, but, as I recall it, the committee bill was amended by an amendment offered by the gentleman, and his amendment was modified by a further amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa. Then the bill was passed without opposition?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct.

Mr. HANCOCK. That bill as amended in the last session is the bill we are now considering?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. The bill that passed the House, with the amendments offered in the last session, is the bill we are now considering.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. It may be true this bill passed the House, but some of us may not have been on the floor last December when it was passed. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that, in my opinion, this bill seeks to circumvent constitutional safeguards for defendants that have been in existence ever since the Constitution of the United States was adopted. So far as I am concerned, I am opposed to that type of legislation.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I may say to the gentleman that I had the same opinion about the original Hobbs bill, but what this bill does now, aside from making the four arraignment statutes uniform, is to restate what the law was before the McNabb decision. It says that a person must be arraigned within a reasonable time, and if he is not arraigned within a reasonable time that shall be prima facie evidence that any admission he makes or confession he makes is made under duress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is really very simple. It is substantially the same bill that was passed by this House last December. It was reported out of the Committee on the Judiciary unanimously. The situation is simply this: No constitutional safeguards are being interfered with; on the contrary they are being recognized. Of course, at common law and under our Constitution no defendant may be required to give evidence against himself. Therefore, a confession, if introduced by the Government, must be shown to be voluntary. We have in every State as well as in the Federal Government certain statutes which regulate the procedure after a defendant has been arrested without a warrant. In the Federal Government we have four such statutes. One provides that the defendant arrested without a warrant must be taken forthwith before some magistrate. Another statute says "immediately" and so on.

Prior to the McNabb decision the courts had uniformly held that the failure to comply with these statutes about taking a prisoner for arraignment before the magistrate, was no evidence one way or the other as to whether or not the confession was obtained voluntarily. When the McNabb case came before the Supreme Court, it reversed that rule of long standing and held, in substance, that the mere failure to comply with the statute, in other words, if the statute required the officer immediately to take the prisoner before the committing magistrate, and that were not done, that would be conclusive evidence that the confession obtained while he was thus held was obtained involuntarily and was inadmissible.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Did not the McNabb decision go so far as to render inadmissible a statement even though the inability of the officer to have the arraignment made immediately was unavoidable?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That is entirely correct. The Supreme Court decided that failure to comply with the arraignment statute created a conclusive presumption, if I may put it that way, that the confession was obtained under duress.

The purpose of the bill as finally reported out by the Committee on the Judiciary is this: First, it amends all four statutes governing arraignment and puts in uniform language. It says that the officer must take the prisoner before the committing magistrate within a reasonable time. Then it says that the failure to comply with these arraignment statutes will not render any confession inadmissible but that the failure to take the prisoner within a reasonable time before a magistrate is prima facie evidence that the confession obtained during that time was obtained under duress.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. What is a reasonable time and who is to determine what is a reasonable time?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. That would be for the trial court to determine. We have a similar statute in at least half of the States of the Union, and it is for the court to determine.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. I am just wondering whether this is a bill to correct a judicial error.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. The purpose of this bill is to overcome the decision in the McNabb case which, may I say, required a dismissal of many cases where, for one reason or another, a confession had been obtained, and in cases in which for some reason or another the prisoner had not been promptly arraigned.

Mr. LEMKE. Then I sincerely hope the gentleman's committee will bring in some other bills correcting other judicial errors also.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. May I call attention to this fact that many times a prisoner is arrested, and maybe at his own request, maybe because of some circumstance such as related by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, it is impossible to arraign him immediately. I think the bill as finally worked out by the Committee on the Judiciary protects the Government and will also give the prisoner some protection, because any officer who neglects to take his prisoner before the magistrate in accordance with the statute will be called upon in court to explain why he did not do it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice in the last paragraph of the minority report these words:

> The legislation proposed is not needed. It may, if adopted, be but the beginning of a course which will ultimately lead to the elimination of all protections, built up through years of struggle and designed to safeguard personal rights and liberties under law.

That was signed by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. CRAVENS]. Does the gentleman agree with that, or has there been some change?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. May I say to the gentleman I think the statement of the gentleman from Arkansas had more application to the original bill as reported out, rather than to the amended bill now under consideration.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is brought here to bring about a remedy for the new and novel rule of procedure which was adopted in the McNabb case, relating to the admissibility of evidence or to the admission of confessions which are made by defendants in criminal cases. The holding in the McNabb case has completely changed the rule of evidence in criminal cases. And this decision has caused great confusion among our courts in this country.

The former rule relating to confessions, that which has been provided by the Constitution, and which has been followed by the decisions of our higher courts, has been to the effect that the matter is determined solely and entirely upon the question of whether or not the confession is made "freely, voluntarily, and without compulsion or inducement of any sort." That rule has been maintained in this country throughout the years, until the decision in the McNabb case.

In that case the Supreme Court by its decision simply reversed that rule of practice which had been followed and that rule which had been adopted in this country in all procedures of this kind.

The question of whether or not the accused person had or had not been arraigned was never before taken into consideration in determining the admissibility of a confession. That question was determined solely and entirely upon the question of whether or not the confession had been made "freely, voluntarily, and without compulsion," and without any regard whatsoever as to whether or not an arraignment had, or had not, been effected prior to that time, or immediately after arrest. In many cases an immediate arraignment is impossible. Courts are not in session, usually, at night. In sparsely settled communities courts are not available for an immediate arraignment because of distance.

In the McNabb case—and many are familiar with the decision in that case and with the facts involved—one of our Federal revenue officers was found shot and killed in a cemetery in the State of Tennessee. These McNabbs were arrested that same night. One of them wanted to talk and he told, voluntarily, what had happened. He told the officers who had fired the shots and where the man had been shot and killed. It was a complete confession. Another one of the McNabbs confessed and pleaded guilty almost immediately afterward. This confession came sometime early the next morning after the arrest had occurred on the previous night. The arraignment of the accused was held the day following the murder.

The Supreme Court in that decision, without regard to how the confession was obtained, or the circumstances under which it was obtained, only considered the fact that arraignment was not had immediately after arrest and held that the confession was not admissible in evidence. This holding permitted the McNabbs, who were confessed murderers, to go completely free in that case.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That holding by this Court here was made after all the courts in Tennessee had held it was admissible.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is precisely correct. All the courts of the State of Tennessee has previously held that the confession was admissible in evidence, but when the case came up to the Supreme Court of the United States,

that court upset all the precedents upon that question and held that such confession was not admissible and that operated as an acquittal of the defendants. The defendants went entirely free. Since the McNabb decision, our courts all over the country have been following that rule. If a defendant is not arraigned immediately, regardless of any confession which he makes "freely, voluntarily, and without any compulsion of any kind," they cannot use it against him, under the McNabb decision. They have simply let down the bars in such matters. By this most peculiar decision, it now operates to release and discharge many guilty criminals.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. By what logic did the Supreme Court reach that decision?

Mr. SPRINGER. I cannot understand it. I cannot under the philosophy of such a decision as was rendered in the McNabb case. To say the least, that decision was an anomalous decision. It has upset every precedent which had been decided throughout the years on that same question. This resolution merely places the law as it was before the McNabb case was decided, and makes uniform our law respecting when arraignments are to be made—"within a reasonable time."

I hope this resolution is adopted by the House by a unanimous vote.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill was originally offered last year, known as the Hobbs bill, one section was in it on the first page, lines 2 to 6. Those who have copies of the bill before them will notice that those lines are now eliminated. At that time the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] offered the four succeeding sections, and later on the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE], on page 4, offered that section beginning on line 10. Therefore, the bill as it is before us today is no longer the so-called Hobbs bill, but it is a bill made up of the amendments to which I have referred.

The next angle is this: It is to bring about uniformity in four different statutes that now are on the statute books. In one the language provides that the defendant should be brought immediately before the committing magistrate; second, he should be brought immediately and without unnecessary delay; third, that he should be brought forthwith; and fourth, that he should be brought immediately and without delay.

In this bill it is proposed that the defendant shall be brought to the committing magistrate, the United States commissioner, within a reasonable time. There is your bill with all it contains in its entirety. As has been explained by preceding speakers, it was intended to rectify what it is alleged was the damage done by the McNabb decision, reported in 318 United States Reports, page 332, which completely upset the law of evidence which had existed up to that time, that a confession must be freely and voluntarily made, without any coercion or compulsion, without regard to the time elapsing between the arrest and the taking of the prisoner before the committing magistrate. All of us who have been engaged in prosecuting offices, in whatever capacity, whether county, State, or Federal, realize the difficulties of bringing prisoners at once before the committing magistrate. As a matter of fact, the United States Commissioner is not a paid officer. He is paid by fees, and frequently there are men learned in law who must make their living by practicing law in courts. I referred, when this bill was here before us the other time, to a very fine United States Commissioner for whom we were frequently compelled to wait until he could return from court to arraign a prisoner and to take the preliminary steps in committing him to trial. I think if the public generally realized the character of men who are in the Federal service, first of all, the men in the old lines of the service, such as the post-office inspectors; immigration service; secret service; F. B. I., and even of the newer groups which have been organized within the complexity and modernity of our life, they could find that these men are men of exemplary character. Federal judges have the highest confidence in their character, ability, and honesty.

When those men come in they do not seek a record for convictions at all. They are seeking to see that justice is done. They arrest the prisoner. They accord him every right. They inform him who they are and what his rights are. Then if he freely and voluntarily wishes to make a statement, they take it. The fact that they have taken a statement after he has been sufficiently warned of his rights and every safeguard taken, proves there should be no question as to the time elapsing before he can be arraigned, because that is a matter of the convenience of the United States attorney, the commissioner, or the defendant's counsel. All those factors enter into it. Consequently, when the McNabb opinion was handed down it reversed this. We are simply seeking to restore the rule of evidence which existed before that time, with the result that no man arrested now can be held beyond a reasonable time. That is what the Gwynne amendment provides for. He must be brought in within a reasonable time.

It is our contention that if these steps are taken, every safeguard that is afforded a prisoner will be retained and the law will be restored to its original status, and all will know just where they stand.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEA (at the request of Mr. HARRIS) was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects, and in one to include a letter addressed to the War Production Board.

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution adopted by the Order of the Sons of Italy.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address by Hon. Maury Maverick.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2126) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Seattle Times.

BILLS ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR FROM THE COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on the Consent Calendar yesterday there were seven or eight bills from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization which were called up for consideration. All of the bills had been introduced upon specific recommendations by, and in some cases, even request of, the Department of Justice. They were fully considered by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and reported by that committee unanimously. Some Members in this House have developed a very peculiar voting habit, without realizing, it seems, that they are destroying the very basis of congressional legislative procedure. One particular gentleman—the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and if he is here I will be glad to yield to him on any question he wants to ask—wraps himself in the American flag the minute anyone whom he dislikes dares to utter anything with which he disagrees. Well, the poor flag has been almost worn out lately because there are a great many people in this great country of ours with whom this lone, self-appointed guardian of our Nation disagrees and he has had to use the flag quite often lately in his efforts to justify some of his remarks on the floor of this House.

Now we will take a quotation from the gentleman's "unbiased" remarks appearing on page 2417 of yesterday's RECORD:

These bills—

And I quote—

should not be passed by unanimous consent. In my opinion they should not be passed at

all. The old-line Americans who send me to Congress do not expect me to transfer the right somewhere else to say who is to become citizens of the United States.

Continuing the quotation:

They do not want us to permit the unloading upon this country of the riffraff of the Old World, while our young men are fighting to save America for Americans.

As the bills in question were mostly naturalization matters which in no way affected our basic immigration policy—the gentleman clearly showed that he did not even bother to read the bills or the reports thereon. He was not interested in the merits of the bills—he just objected to them—to all of them—without even bothering to wait until they were actually called up for consideration. How can anybody call that just and fair consideration of legislation?

Mr. Speaker, at this point I am going to insert a short explanation of the eight bills in question so that the membership of the House can judge for itself what the problems involved are:

MEMORANDUM IN BRIEF EXPLANATION OF THE EIGHT IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION BILLS THAT WERE OBJECTED TO ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR YESTERDAY AND REASONS WHY THEY SHOULD NOT BE PUT INTO ONE OMNIBUS BILL

H. R. 513

This is a bill designed, in a slight way, to reward persons who have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence and who have gone abroad for the purpose of serving in the military or naval forces of any of our allied countries, or who have gone abroad for the purpose of taking employment in war work of any such country.

Under our law, a person in the usual naturalization case is presumed to have lost his residence in the United States for naturalization purposes if he is absent for more than 6 months and actually loses his naturalization residence if he is absent for more than a period of 1 year. This means that upon his return he must again start his residence anew, generally a 5-year period, although his absence for the purposes mentioned does not break up his residence here for immigration purposes. Likewise, he is required to pay $3 for the issuance of an immigration return permit, which is valid for only a period of 1 year, and is subject to a $3 fee for each 6-month extension.

All this bill does is to hold that such a person, if he returns to the United States for permanent residence within 1 year after the United States shall cease to be in a state of war, shall not lose his residence for naturalization purposes, and exempts him from the payment of the fees referred to.

It is well known that in some cases persons recently arrived in our country can more efficiently serve the Allied effort by returning to the country from whence they came and serve either in the military service of such country or engage in war work of that country. The committee was of the opinion that no good reason exists why we should handicap those persons who are putting forth their best effort by proceeding abroad for the purpose specified in the bill.

H. R. 578

This is strictly a veteran measure. It is not new legislation at all. Legislation of the exact type has been placed in the statutes from time to time It merely rewrites a law that has been on the books on different occasions and merely expedites the naturalization of a few remaining veterans of previous wars who have not as yet become naturalized citizens of the United States. The expedition is by way of eliminating some of the steps in the naturalization process. It does not waive at all the applicant's loyalty or willingness to defend the United States.

The last act expired on December 6, 1943. This bill passed the House in the last Congress.

H. R. 669

All this bill does is to permit the naturalization proceedings to be had at places other than in the office of the clerk of court or in open court where it is established that the individuals are too ill or physically unable to appear. Appearance in the office of the clerk of the court or in the court is waived only when the court itself is satisfied that the illness or disability is sufficiently serious to prevent appearance in the office of the clerk of the court or the court and is of a permanent nature, or of a nature which so incapacitates the person as to prevent him from appearing in the office of the clerk of the court or the court for a period of at least 1 year.

Very few cases would be involved, but a few very meritorious cases are occasionally found in which it would be a very humanitarian thing indeed, to permit the judge to naturalize the person in the person's place of confinement.

This bill passed the House in the last Congress.

H. R. 434

Under existing law, a person, whether a native-born or naturalized citizen, loses his citizenship by voting in a political election in a foreign state or participating in an election or plebiscite to determine the sovereignty over foreign territory. All this bill does is add the proviso that citizenship shall not be lost if the voting in the political election or participation in an election or plebiscite was or hereafter is done under legal compulsion. Some countries have laws making it a criminal offense for refusing to vote in public elections. There is no reason why an American citizen who is compelled to vote in a foreign election at the risk of being penalized for a crime should lose his citizenship.

This bill passed the House in the last Congress.

H. R. 776

All this bill does is to make eligible for naturalization persons of the Filipino race. The Filipinos have been our own nationals (though not citizens) since the acquisition of the Philippine Islands. Under the Philippine Independence Act of 1934, they were made aliens for the purpose of immigration and naturalization. At present they have an annual quota of 50 and, if made racially eligible to naturalization, this quota of 50 per annum will continue after the independence of the Philippine Islands becomes final. Those Filipinos presently in the United States, as well as the few to come, will be made racially eligible for naturalization subject to the same conditions as pertain to all other aliens aspiring to citizenship, except that as to those Filipinos who entered prior to May 1, 1934, and have since continuously resided in the United States, they shall not be required to prove lawful entry because prior to that time, they being nationals and not aliens, were not required to make compliance with any immigration laws in order to enter the United States. The description of Filipinos limiting the term found in the latter part of section 2 of the bill was deliberately placed therein so that other orientals of races ineligible to citizenship could not enter by claiming to be Filipinos.

On December 17, 1943, an act of Congress was approved making Chinese persons racially eligible to naturalization and granting such persons a small annual quota of 105 per annum. It would seem we owe just as great an obligation to the Filipinos, who are and have been our nationals for upward of 50 years and who have made a glorious contribution to the war effort, as we do to persons of the Chinese race.

This bill was reported by our committee in the last Congress and the committee in the present Congress is likewise of the opinion that it represents a meritorious measure and should be enacted into law. (Through error it is indicated in the report that it passed the House.)

H. R. 387

This bill has but one objective. Under the Nationality Act of 1940, a citizen, either native-born or naturalized, shall lose his citizenship by obtaining naturalization in a foreign state, either upon his own application or through the naturalization of a parent having legal custody of the person involved. There is a proviso, however, that nationality shall not be lost as the result of the naturalization of a parent unless and until the child shall have attained the age of 23 years without acquiring permanent residence in the United States, and there is also a proviso that a person who has acquired foreign nationality through the naturalization of his parent and who at the same time is a citizen of the United States shall, if abroad and he has not heretofore expatriated himself as an American citizen by his own voluntary act, be permitted within 2 years from the effective date of the act (this 2-year period expired on January 13, 1943) to return to the United States and take up residence therein, and it shall be thereafter deemed that he has elected to be an American citizen. Failure on the part of such person to so return and take up permanent residence in the United States during such period shall be deemed to be a determination on the part of such person to discontinue his status as an American citizen, and such person shall be forever estopped by such failure from thereafter claiming such American citizenship.

The sole purpose of this bill is to extend the 2-year period, which has already expired, to January 13, 1947, in order to allow these people to return to the United States. Bear in mind that these people have not taken any affirmative act of expatriation on their own account but have lost their citizenship through an act of their parent and have been unable to return to the United States because of lack of transportation resulting from present war conditions. It is hoped that by 1947 they will have been able to return to the United States. The extension of this period has been more or less of an oversight on the part of the Congress as the Congress has extended the time limitations in other parts of the nationality laws so that American citizens stranded abroad will not lose their citizenship because of circumstances over which they have no control.

This bill passed the House in the last Congress.

H. R. 511

This bill is designed to amend the naturalization laws in the interest of unity in citizenship. There are a number of elderly aliens in the country who are most anxious to become citizens of the United States, but because of lack of educational qualifications in their early days it is impossible for them now to pass the so-called educational qualifications for admission to citizenship.

The first section of the bill provides, in substance, that a person if racially eligible to naturalization, is 50 years of age or over, has resided in the United States continuously since prior to July 1, 1924, and who has made a declaration of intention to become a citizen, which declaration is not more than 7 years old, or who within 2 years after the effective date of the act makes such declaration, may be admitted to citizenship upon full and complete compliance with all of the requirements of the naturalization laws except that he shall not be required to speak the English language, sign his declaration or petition in his own handwriting, or meet

other educational requirements. He must take advantage of this provision within 4 years after the date of the act. Particular note should be made of the fact that the loyalty requirements are in no manner whatsoever interfered with.

The second section of the bill merely provides that persons whose citizen children have served in the military forces of the United States during the present war under honorable conditions shall not be required to get the so-called Presidential exception in order to be naturalized. Section 326 of the Nationality Act of 1940 provides that certain classes of so-called alien enemies must secure a Presidential exception before they can proceed to naturalization. Due to the amount of work before the Naturalization Service, it often requires a long period of time before the exhaustive investigation which is made in section 326 cases can be completed. It is believed an exception should be made in favor of the parents of citizen children serving honorably in our forces. Again, note should be made of the fact that the loyalty of the applicant is completely investigated prior to the time he is naturalized.

The third and last section of the bill merely provides for a waiver of the declaration of intention to become a citizen on the part of parents whose children are or have served honorably in the armed forces of the United States. This waiver is designed to expedite the naturalization of parents of citizen service people. As you know, the law requires a 2-year period between the declaration of intention to become a citizen and the final naturalization. The waiving of a declaration is no novelty. The present law grants waivers of the declaration in many classes of cases, principally in the cases of spouses of American citizens.

Through greatly increased naturalizations and decreased immigration, plus a high mortality rate because of their advanced average age, the alien population in the United States is rapidly declining. As an example, there were 7,300,000 aliens in the United States in 1920; 6,200,000 in 1930; and only about three and a half million as of today. There must be at least a million aliens in the United States today who are over 50 years of age, many of whom greatly desire to become citizens but because of circumstances beyond their control know that they cannot pass the high educational standards. We believe that in the interest of a unified citizenship this bill should be enacted into law.

This bill passed the House in the last Congress.

H. R. 388

This is another bill in behalf of our soldiers and other persons serving honorably in the armed forces. It is designed to grant citizenship to the foreign-born children born to our service people abroad.

Under existing law, where one person is a citizen and the other is an alien, citizenship cannot pass to the foreign-born child at birth unless the citizen parent has resided for a total of 10 years in the United States, 5 of which must be after his sixteenth birthday. You will, therefore, see that none of our citizen service people can pass citizenship to their foreign-born children, the other parent being a noncitizen, unless the citizen parent is at least 21 years of age, because they could not have enjoyed 5 years' residence in the United States subsequent to their sixteenth birthday.

The committee recognizes the fact that we are drafting thousands of boys 18 years of age and the Navy is enlisting other thousands of boys at 17 years of age, and it is but natural that a certain number of these persons will marry abroad and have children born to them. They have a right to demand that these children shall be born citizens of the United States.

All this bill does is provide that citizenship shall pass to the child if the citizen parent has resided in the United States or its outlying possessions for a period or periods totaling 5 years subsequent to his twelfth birthday. The bill is drafted to apply generally to all persons. If the House thinks this goes too far, I would see no objection to limiting the bill solely to service people. This could be done very easily by inserting a proviso in the present bill as a first proviso to the bill, which would follow the colon on line 1 of page 2 and reading, *"Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection concerning residence shall not apply in the case of a citizen parent who has served or hereafter serves honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States during the present war, which war, for the purposes of this subsection, shall be deemed to have commenced on December 8, 1941, and shall continue until the United States shall cease to be in a state of war;".

This bill passed the House in the last Congress.

OMNIBUS BILL

It has been suggested that these various measures be put into an omnibus bill and brought out as one bill. I think my brief explanation of these bills has demonstrated to the most skeptical that they are, to a large degree, in favor of our soldiers and sailors of the present war and of our veterans of the past war. They attempt to amend various sections of both the immigration and naturalization laws and are totally unrelated one to the other. They have been presented to the committee from time to time as the experience of the Immigration Service of the Department of Justice has discovered the need therefor. I sincerely hope that when these bills again come up on the Consent Calendar they will pass.

Mr. BENDER Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Is the bill reported unanimously by the committee?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Unanimously.

Mr. BENDER. Will the gentleman explain who the members of the committee are and who voted for this bill?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Everyone voted for it. Everyone voted for the six bills that were objected to by the gentleman from Mississippi regardless of the merits of the bills. If it is a question of something personal with him I would like to know it. Is the gentleman trying to take it out on these poor veterans who need relief, he who always talks about his great love for the veterans, or is he trying to pick on somebody whom he doesn't like and who he thinks, is personally interested in these bills? I do not know. Whatever the motives of the gentleman may be, I want him to know that I have no personal interest in any of the bills—except in wanting fair and just treatment for people who deserve it. I am doing my duty as any other chairman of a congressional committee is doing it, by seeking speedy action on legislation reported by my committee. All the members of our committee have all the time they want to speak on any legislation we are considering, whether it is in opposition or in favor of the bill, it does not make a particle of difference to me how the members vote in committee.

Mr. BENDER. Was there any opposition to any of these bills?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. None. There was no opposition. I may say furthermore that in offering the seven or eight bills we were trying to help some of our service men and women and their parents, and may I say, too, that some of these bills were passed by the House in the last session, but were tied up in the Senate on account of the filibuster there over the confirmation of the six Assistant Secretaries of State.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a constituency of close to 350,000 people, all of whom had a chance to vote either for or against me, which is more than some other people can say about their districts, and I do not propose to be hoodwinked by objections to legislation coming out of my committee, objections made not on the merits of the bills but based simply on the fact that they come out of a particular committee which certain people do not like. I want to assure the gentleman from Mississippi that the constituency of my district, as well as the districts of the other members of the Immigration and Naturalization Committee, have just as much right to let their legally elected representatives make a few decisions concerning the best interests of their country as has the constituency of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Among the bills objected to is a bill to permit naturalization of Filipinos. I wonder how the many brave Filipinos fighting side by side with our soldiers will feel about this slap to their national and racial pride at the moment when they are risking their very lives to fight our common enemy? And how about the Filipinos in this country? They have been here for years and we cannot deport them. They are married to American women, they have American-born children, and their children are serving in this war. What objection can there be to letting them become racially eligible for naturalization, if they are morally and otherwise qualified for citizenship? Why, we talk about assimilation in this country. What are we doing to assimilate the alien population within our own borders, for the benefit of our own country? This particular bill would simply allow naturalization of a number of fine Filipinos who have been here for 18 or 20 years, who have raised four or five children, some of whom are in the service. We cannot deport them, so why keep on classifying them as aliens—setting them apart from their neighbors? They are anxious to become citizens of the United States and the evidence clearly shows they have gone out and they have done everything they could to help this war and to make themselves an integral part of their respective communities.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DE LACY. Is it not a fact that the Filipinos as a whole, and especially those on the west coast where they are more numerous than anywhere else, are indispensable to our food operations and to our canneries and in the fields as farm hands and in other respects they are a very important part of our economic life?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is true and the evidence clearly shows that.

There was some talk by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] a very able gentleman, and other Members on both sides of the aisle, to the effect that they

want all the provisions contained in the various bills put into one bill. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, this is simply impossible. The various bills deal with different, unrelated sections of both the immigration and naturalization laws and we have to amend them whenever the necessity for such amendments arises. The committee has discussed this problem on numerous occasions and we have come to the conclusion that it is humanly impossible to lump it all in one bill. I fully agree with my colleague from New York that it would be a good idea to have it all in one bill but, unfortunately, it cannot be done.

We must follow, at least to some degree, the rulings of the Attorney General and the views of the Department of State who supported all of this legislation in order to intelligently legislate and amend the laws where we find that it is needed. When we passed the Nationality Act of 1940 we did not know we were going to be in the war, or we would have made certain additional provisions which had to be added after the war started as the necessity for them arose.

We have thousands of our boys in the fox holes. We have drafted aliens. Some of them had died, but when they died, they died as men without a country, although wearing an American uniform. Generals MacArthur and Marshall, the War and Navy Departments have been pleading for some legislation in order that the man who wears a uniform shall be permitted to take on the cloak of citizenship, irrespective of the day when he came to this country. We have drafted him and he is called upon to make the supreme sacrifice. The least we can do is to give him the citizenship of the country he is defending with his life.

Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, I had a hard time for about 3 months to pass that legislation through this House. It was opposed by the same elements who are habitually opposing any legislation which comes out of our committee. I cannot run to the Committee on Rules every minute and ask for a rule. I want to save that committee's time and the time of the House. Somehow I felt that the House would be willing to consider legislation recommended by a number of important Government departments and reported unanimously by a standing committee of the House composed of members from all parts of the country, as my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi said, he is objecting to all legislation, practically, coming from the Committee on Immigration. He said so in so many words when he said, "In my opinion these bills should not be passed by unanimous consent. In my opinion they should not be passed at all." Is he against the veterans? Is he against the wives and families of veterans? I do not think so.

Here is another problem. Up until about 2 months ago we had sixteen or twenty thousand marriages of American soldiers in Australia alone. The soldiers have been away from home for 3 or 4 years. If the young man is under 21 and marries and a child is born to him, that child is an alien under our present law. If the soldier is over 21 years of age and a child is born to him, citizenship automatically attaches to that child. My colleagues, what do you think about that? Do you think that the children born of these marriages, whether the soldier is 18 or 19 years of age—and most of them are 18 and 19 at the front today—should not be given citizenship? Our committee has to deal with such problems. We are not an appropriations committee. We do not dish out any money. We are a human clearinghouse to help alleviate the hardships of our soldiers and our sailors in regard to their citizenship, in regard to their naturalization. All of these bills had to do with naturalization and had nothing to do with immigration.

On the next page of yesterday's RECORD you will find that my distinguished colleague again gets busy, and this is what he says, and I quote.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I think if the gentleman is going to talk about a Member, and that Member is not here, there ought to be a quorum present to hear it. I do not think it is proper for a Member of the House to discuss another Member without him being on the floor.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman let me give him some information?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the gentleman is going to continue along this line, I shall insist on my point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman withhold the point of order for a moment? I want to inform him——

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Not if the gentleman is going to continue with the type of speech he is making without the gentleman being present.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think I told the gentleman that I am referring to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But the gentleman from Mississippi is not on the floor, and the gentleman has referred to him in a manner that I do not think is suitable.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman wait a minute until I get through with the point I am trying to bring home?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No; I am going to insist on the point of order.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have something to say, and the gentleman will not let me say it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is the gentleman going to continue with the same line of conversation?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Under the rules of the House, a Member may discuss another Member provided the discussion is kept within the rules, in the absence of the other Member, may he not? He may discuss another Member's vote or another Member's objections or another Member's speech without the necessity of having the other Member present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York knows the rules of the House, and he will proceed in order.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am just quoting from the RECORD, Mr. Speaker. I have no grudge or personal feeling against any Member of this House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield,

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman think there is anything irregular about the gentleman objecting to these bills coming up on the Consent Calendar?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; that is my point.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is there any reason why the gentleman cannot go before the Rules Committee and bring the bills in in the regular way?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There are a lot of reasons.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman thinks there is something irregular about the gentleman objecting to those bills coming up?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think I stated my position on that point quite clearly.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that a quorum is not present.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I want to save time and I want to save a roll call.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I insist on my point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I suggest to the gentleman that special orders are granted so that Members, without regard to which side of the aisle they are on, may have the opportunity of speaking. May I call the attention of my friend to the situation with which we are confronted. I know that on reflection he will——

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is the gentleman lecturing me?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; far be it from me to do that. I have too much respect for my friend to do that, even if I had it in mind.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The majority leader was not on the floor of the House to hear the discussion just now. He was absent.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true. I am talking about the basic proposition involved.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I will desist from making any further comments about the gentleman from Mississippi if the gentleman will let me finish, and I will dispose of it in 5 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Nebraska has made a point of order.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I will withdraw my point of order, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from New York will cease to refer to the Member in the manner he has been doing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think it is a sad commentary when a person's freedom of speech is practically destroyed by a point of no quorum, when a gentleman is speaking under a special order. That kind of activity can work both ways.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not proceeding in order. If we are going to be lectured here, I will make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That works both ways. Wait until the gentleman has a special order and a quorum is not present. I serve notice I am going to ask for a quorum. The gentleman asked for it and he is going to get it.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I suggest that the gentleman from New York not yield further but make his speech.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It is not my intention to try to bring about confusion in any way because of certain remarks I have made.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In fairness, may I say that just before I left the hall earlier this afternoon for a few moments I learned that the gentleman from New York was going to speak. I stepped over and asked him if he was going to make any remarks that would cause any commotion or anything. He said "No." I asked him if he was going to refer to me and he said "No," but he was going to refer to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. Thereupon, with the gentleman's consent, I attempted to call the office of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] so he could be here, and I could not get him. I do not know where he was.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is the point. That is exactly what I wanted to tell my colleague over there. I do not come up here and make a speech referring to someone without giving him an opportunity to be present.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understand that the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, has the kindest feeling toward everyone on the minority side. There is no question about that.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I want you to include me.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But sometimes his spirit gets the best of him, and his enthusiasm does, just as mine does, and he attempts to lecture us over on this side. I do not have any objection to that, but I do think if the motives of a Member are to be questioned, we ought to have a quorum to hear it. I have no disposition to cause any inconvenience or to take the gentleman off the floor.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I told the gentleman the facts when he asked me. I did not withhold anything or hide anything. I want the House to know it. I have in some measure done what you would do or everybody else would do, although many times it was not done on my side when someone spoke referring to me without giving me notice of a speech that was to be made.

However, Mr. Speaker, all I am asking on these measures, and not because of any personal interest involved, is equity and justice to a lot of persons who are involved in and who would be helped by this legislation. I say again that a number of these bills affect veterans and their families, and they are essential to our war effort. I have no intention to start a feud with any Member of the House. All I wanted to do is to call the attention of this House to the problems involved in these bills. I appeal to you, Members of Congress, to please read the explanation of the various bills. I feel sure that after reading it you will agree that there is nothing in the charge that they will flood our country with new immigrants. You will find, as I have stated before, that they do not affect immigrants coming here or going out. They deal mostly with naturalization and citizenship problems which arose because of war conditions—problems which we could not possibly have anticipated when we passed the Nationality Act of 1940.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield gladly.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman, since this is so important, and I think it is important, from the manner in which the gentleman is stating it, to the welfare of many veterans, why should not the bill then proceed through the regular course and come up under a rule and be discussed with a larger membership than there is at the present time? I still cannot understand why the gentleman does not seem to be favorable to giving all of this information to more Members of the House than are present here at this time.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The answer to that is, most of these bills were passed in the last Congress just before we adjourned. We passed them and they went over to the Senate. They were caught in the Senate because of some conditions over there. In view of the fact that the departments dealing with these problems have requested Congress to get some legislation through, at the earliest possible moment, I simply tried in my own way to bring this about as quickly as I could. If I cannot, then I have no alternative other than to go to the Committee on Rules and ask them to give me a rule.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Certainly.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Under the Private Calendar, there is no rule for discussion of bills.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No; these are not private bills.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Why are the bills concerning this particular subject taken in one category and passed off with the thought indicated, as you have said, that they are all of similar characteristics and affecting veterans who are now in foreign countries or married to foreigners?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. What I am trying to do is to show that most of these bills affect veterans and their families.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Right, and they should be protected.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It has nothing to do with immigration or bringing in immigrants. That is what I am trying to convey to this House.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman is talking to too few Members here.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. This will not destroy the quota law of 1924 or affect any of its provisions.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, were these bills discussed in a regular meeting by the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization which had these bills before them?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BENDER. And was there any objection whatsoever?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No, sir; I think I made that statement before.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman earlier in his remarks referred to a statement by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is true.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. As having some ulterior motive.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I said if any gentleman in this House or the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], had any motive in objecting to these bills because of my bringing these bills up I would like to know it. I do not want to be picked on by anybody. I do not want to be standing on the flooor taking up the time of the Congress, taking up the time of 21 Members of Congress sitting in committee, mornings and afternoons, to consider legislation and then come here on the floor and be knocked off. I simply refuse to take it any longer.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The gentleman feels that anyone who objects to his bills on the floor is not proceeding in order?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No. I do not. That is his privilege. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did not say that. I said that was his prerogative. You have a right to object to any bill you want but the gentleman from Mississippi categorically objects to all bills from our committee—even before they are called up. The point I made was that in view of the fact that these bills had been considered by a committee of 21 members, in view of the fact that the Department of Justice and the Department of State had given approval to these bills, in view of the fact that the matters are urgent because they affect the families of veterans of this war and the last war, I simply thought that they should be considered on their merits. The committee members thought it would save time to put them on the Consent Calendar. That is the reason they asked me to put a number of our important bills on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman feel that he cannot bring them in in the regular way and get a rule?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thought I had made it clear as to why we put these bills on the Consent Calendar. If it becomes necessary, I feel confident that we can get a rule on most of the bills.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the gentleman has been interrupted a great deal, I ask unanimous consent that he may have 10 additional minutes, if he wishes it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have nothing further to add unless someone desires to ask some more questions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman announces he does not desire any further time.

Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

HAS "UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER" BECOME HITLER'S MOST DEADLY WEAPON?

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, in late years great nations have been stricken with disaster largely because they have neglected to face realistically the facts confronting them. Certainly this was true in England and other European countries during the thirties. For example, in November 1934, Winston Churchill declared in the House of Commons:

> What is the great new fact which has broken upon us in the last 18 months? Germany is rearming. That is the great new fact which rivets the attention of every country in Europe—indeed, in the world—and which throws almost all other issues into the background.

His warning fell on the deaf ears of the existing British leadership.

I believe that America may be currently the victim of a similar tragic neglect of reality. I refer to the failure, and the destructive consequences, of the military slogan "unconditional surrender" now being used as a substitute for the statement of peace terms.

This Congress has a solemn responsibility to the American people in respect to our political methods. It is to insist that the Administration use political methods that will bring about the defeat of our enemies in the shortest possible time and with a minimum number of casualties. In our military operations, Congress and the American people generally believe this objective is being effectively pursued. In the field of political warfare, however, evidence is piling up that the tactics in use have failed. We should face that fact honestly.

A short time ago, on the floor of this House, the President practically acknowledged that the term "unconditional surrender" was being effectively used by our enemies to prolong the war. If so, then Congress has a duty to call on the President and the State Department to revise and improve their methods, just as the War Department changes their plans to meet new battle conditions.

Consider this question: What conditions will keep a fight going the longest possible time? Obviously, one or the other of two conditions. The first would be if the stronger contestant would relax his efforts. The second situation that would keep a fight going the longest possible time would be for the losing contestant to be so fearful of the consequences of defeat that he would fight to the death. Under those circumstances the stronger contestant would be stupid indeed if he prolonged the fight by threatening his opponent with death unless he meant it, because the longer the fight lasted the more punishment he, the stronger opponent, would inevitably suffer.

The President, in his last speech to the House, seemed to admit the slogan "unconditional surrender" has given the Nazis and Japanese a deadly propaganda weapon for resistance to the last man. They tell their people that those terms mean death or slavery. Goebbels is reported as saying that "We are in the same boat. Better to die together than to live together in chains." In the absence of stated conditions of peace, the Goebbels propaganda line has produced fanatical resistance.

The boomeranging effect of "unconditional surrender" is seen in the dragging on of this war compared with the quick surrender in the last war. In that war the surrender terms, the original fourteen points, were issued January 8, 1918. On September 27, 1918, five more points were added. Eleven months from the date of the original terms, the armistice was signed. But the "unconditional surrender" phrase made public by the President January 26, 1943, seems to produce the opposite effect in this war.

Perhaps when the Axis was near the height of its conquests, this bombastic slogan had merit for morale purposes in the United Nations. If so, that psychological purpose has long since been achieved.

There is no longer any doubt about our ultimate victory in the military phase of this war. Therefore, these questions should be answered:

First. Is it right to keep secret our peace terms when their nonstatement prolongs resistance and results in the death of thousands of American boys and the blasting of thousands of American homes?

Second. Moreover, are not the words "unconditional surrender" acting as a vengeance threat that make the poorest possible framework for lasting peace in the world?

Third. Is not the continued failure to formulate conditions for peace evidence of a bankrupt statesmanship?

Fourth. Do these words give groups seeking peace in the land of our enemies any possible framework on which to enlarge their ranks and sue for peace?

This last question seems particularly significant. Picture the position of the groups who may be seeking peace in Germany or Japan. They are anxious to capitulate, to acknowledge defeat and are trying to rally support for that position. The immediate hurdle that would frustrate their efforts is this question: What are the peace terms? Until the terms are dictated, there seems to be no possible ground on which a body of opinion can be built up in enemy countries to effectively work for peace.

Our military effort is forcing about 25,000,000 young Americans to live abnormal and unnatural lives. These young people are our seed corn. Each death or mangled life among them weakens America. Each week the war is prolonged adds to the moral deterioration taking place among our own people. The fact that most of this moral destruction has been hidden by war censorship does not lessen its ravages. Our enemies are not going to pay the price of this dissipation of our human resources, no matter how completely we defeat them. That price will be paid by our children, and our children's children.

Every week of war sees the political controls over American life become more firmly locked in place. Read How Nazi Germany Has Controlled Business by L. Hamburger of the Brookings Institution. From it, you will learn that our Government has already adopted many of the economic methods of nazi-ism. Each week that goes by makes it more difficult to prevent these totalitarian methods from becoming the permanent way of life in America. More important perhaps is the steady disappearance of individual liberty. The labor-draft bill and the conscription of nurses are testimony to this trend. No penalties against our foes will enable us to evade the consequences of our own steps away from liberty.

From boys on the battle fronts and from the lips of many trained observers has come the declaration that "unconditional surrender" unaccompanied by stated peace terms has multiplied the cost of victory in terms of American lives. Will we learn too late that the phrase "unconditional surrender" was the Achilles heel of our whole war effort?

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. May I ask the gentleman what is it he refers to that we have adopted which is Nazi control of our people?

Mr. BUFFETT. I did not say Nazi control of our people. My words were: "From it you will learn our Government has already adopted many of the economic methods of fascism." If the gentleman questions that, I suggest he read the book which has been written by a member of the Brookings Institution staff on the subject; then if he still disagrees with me he may take the time to explain his views or tell them to me, because I would like to have them.

Mr. SAVAGE. The gentleman made some comparisons with the surrender made in the last war. Is it the gentleman's desire that we now negotiate a peace so that in a few years hence Germany can bring about another war?

Mr. BUFFETT. I made no such statement.

Mr. SAVAGE. The gentleman made a comparison with the surrender last time. I do not think the last surrender was an example of what we want this time. We do not want to do this all over again. We do not want anyone negotiating a peace and saying to Hitler: "We will let you surrender," and permit him to have a bomb back of him that he is going to throw into our world affairs shortly.

Mr. BUFFETT. I have no control over the gentleman's inferences. Here is what I believe. This failure in our political warfare should be replaced by a constructive policy. The cost of this failure is measured not in dollars, but in human lives.

Mr. Speaker, even the barbarians of historic fame tried to safeguard the lives of their fighting men by sending the conditions for peace to their enemies.

Alaric the Vandal with all his ruthless ferocity submitted peace terms to those against whom he was fighting.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. May I say to the gentleman that I received a letter this morning from an officer now stationed in Burma, and he asked me in his letter if I would raise my voice, as a Member of this body, for him and his buddies over there. They have talked this over and they have talked it over constantly. They do not want to see anything less than unconditional surrender. They know, because they are going through great hardships. This particular man is a lawyer and his practice has all gone to pieces as a result of his service. There are bad living conditions over there, which he described to me. He said, "Above all, let us not give way to anything less than complete surrender so that we will not have to do this job all over again." I appreciate the opportunity given me to make that statement, because in doing this I am carrying out the wishes of this officer who is in the service in Burma.

Mr. BUFFETT. I am glad to have the gentleman's contribution, because it illustrates the confusion caused by the lack of a clear statement of conditions for peace. No suggestion has come to my attention requesting a lessening in the demand for unconditional military surrender. There is a general failure to distinguish between military unconditional surrender and the statement of peace terms. The political announcement of peace conditions would supplement and hasten full military capitulation.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. May I say that I agree with the gentleman. The enemies should be told emphatically that the term "unconditional surrender" refers to the Army and not the civilian population.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman is correct.

Some people far from the battlefront, and apparently motivated by the desire for vengeance, have claimed that the abandonment of the phrase "unconditional surrender" represents the demand for a negotiated peace. That claim is absurd. The statement of peace terms does in no way soften the rightful insistence on complete military capitulation. The lives of American boys are more important than vengeance. The statement by America now of the terms Germany and Japan must accept for a cessation of hostilities represents a dictated peace. Hard, extra-hard, or whatever the conditions are, they should be formulated now and our enemies advised of them.

When our people and our enemies are told the conditions of peace, that statement becomes the terms of a dictated peace. It tells the enemies the cost of their defeat and nothing more. On December 28, 1933, President Roosevelt said:

> The blame for the danger to world peace lies not in the world population but in the political leaders of that population.

On that same day he said:

> It is but an extension of the challenge of Woodrow Wilson for us to propose in this newer generation that from now on war by governments shall be changed to peace by peoples.

The people want victory and peace in the shortest possible time. Obviously, the people cannot construct peace terms to replace the vacuum caused by the swashbuckling phrase "unconditional surrender." Their Members in Congress must have the courage to forthrightly demand a constructive solution for this grave mistake.

There is no question that with the new scientific methods of destruction available to us, we can be successful in destroying the German and Japanese peoples. Perhaps some people can reconcile such an aim with the President's words about Christian decency. However, if this policy is followed it will be consummated only at the price of destroying the heritage of our children and western civilization as well. The people are aware of that fact even if our leaders, apparently blinded by the questionable thrills of unparalleled military destruction, are unable to see that truth.

For it was Hitler who boasted that regardless of what happened to Germany, the Nazi concepts of militarism and ruthless might would be victorious throughout the world. The consequences of the lack of a peace formula and continued use of the purely military phrase "unconditional surrender" may fulfill Hitler's boast. Unless America's political leadership has the courage to turn away from this error we may be yet mocked by the Roman victory, described by St. Augustine, wherein the conquerors became more and more like those they had conquered.

Mr. Speaker, this ghastly vacuum must be replaced immediately by a straightforward statement of peace terms. Unless this constructive move is made, this war can become in the eyes of the common people everywhere simply a brutal competition in casualties between political leaders.

In that event history will record this period not as the century of the common man, but as the century of the betrayal of the common man.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. When the President talked to the Congress and the country a short time ago I recollect that he made the statement that the Members of the House should be very careful about any remarks made on this floor that would affect the trend of the war. I should like to ask the gentleman whether the statements made by Mr. Morgenthau, the Secretary of the Treasury, that in his opinion Germany should be made purely an agricultural country after this war, was along the lines indicated by the Commander in Chief.

Mr. BUFFETT. I think it was diametrically opposed to the later statement that the President made to the Congress.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. If the gentleman will yield further, as I understand the gentleman's contention it is this: The Allies should state definitely and precisely what they propose to do with Germany when unconditional surrender is accepted, so the German people then will know that they are not going to be destroyed entirely, but that the objective will be to destroy the war machine of Germany and its leaders.

Mr. BUFFETT. I make no effort in this discussion to even hint at the kind of terms that should be issued to the German people as well as the Japanese people. Whatever they are they should be announced. Let us tell the Germans and the Japs what is to follow unconditional surrender. Perhaps they would choose that fate immediately. It is my belief that the use of a purely military phrase as a stopgap for peace terms is prolonging the war. I believe that deeply, and I believe the events of the war and the logic of the situation demonstrate it.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GOSSETT. In line with the question just asked by the other gentleman, some of the boys back from the front have told me that after Mr. Morgenthau's statement, an unfortunate one, as I view it, about what he thought should be done with Germany, you could just feel the front line stiffen; that it was certainly fine propaganda material for Mr. Goebbels. It seems to me the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury really talked out of order in that case.

Mr. BUFFETT. To my mind there is no question about it. Many of our military leaders thought the war would be over in 1944. The Germans were in headlong retreat. Suddenly they stiffened and fanatical resistance followed immediately after the so-called Morgenthau plan became public knowledge.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DE LACY. Does the gentleman believe that the true views of the Secretary, which were that the industrial capacity of Germany to make war again should not be permitted to her after the war, are not essential to keeping war out of the world? In other words, does the gentleman believe we should simply win the war and give Germany the power to make another one?

Mr. BUFFETT. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. In my own opinion, a very obvious and sensible way of stopping war coming out of Germany, if that continues to be a future danger, is to remove from the German people the specific industrial capacity by which they make war. But that does not involve reducing them entirely to a state of serfdom.

Mr. DE LACY. That was our honorable Secretary's position, too.

Mr. BUFFETT. The Morgenthau plan reported in the press proposed the reduction of Germany to a completely agri-

cultural land. Unless that scheme was an official plan, and it was not, its release served no helpful purpose to our side.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. SAVAGE. Is it the gentleman's opinion that if we were to make some other kind of peace rather than the type he mentions the German people would rise up against Hitler and surrender, in spite of Hitler and the troops that surround him, who kill those people who even attempt to surrender? Does the gentleman believe the people could overcome that and surrender in spite of Hitler?

Mr. BUFFETT. I have attempted to point out the probabilities of this situation. The absence of military surrender under the conditions that have prevailed indicates the strong probability that our insistence on the military phrase "unconditional surrender" in place of peace terms has effectively sabotaged any possibility of a peace movement inside the lines of our enemies.

Mr. SAVAGE. It seems to me that Hitler prevents any peace movement in Germany.

Mr. BUFFETT. Certainly he does to the extent of his ability.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I think in all fairness to our President and to those who have been carrying on this war and who have been insisting on unconditional surrender, which I think is backed up by 99 percent of the American people, we should keep in mind what the President did say, that we have no intention of destroying the German people or destroying Germany as a nation, but we are demanding that the forces that now control the German people lay down their arms and surrender unconditionally. Then we will give these people a chance to earn their place among the nations of the world. That is what the President said about it, and not the inference the gentleman from Nebraska has drawn in his remarks today.

Mr. BUFFETT. I have made no inference. If the gentleman makes inferences, they are his own.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman's speech speaks for itself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PEACE TERMS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN] who put the last query to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT] show the criticism that anyone who talks about a negotiated peace incurs. I recall very, very vividly speaking before a New York forum in August 2 years ago. Someone from the audience asked whether I thought we should have a negotiated peace to end the war.

My reply in substance was that I knew of very few wars which were not ended through negotiation. From that day on right down until the present week, I have been accused of being a Hitlerite because I suggested that when the war ended there would be negotiations. Already, before the victory, there is almost constant talk about the terms on which the victors can get together and agree upon the terms of a peace which they hope will be so satisfactory, not only to the vanquished but to the Allies and all others, that future wars will not occur. So the gentleman from Nebraska, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] who agreed with his views, and others on the floor who have endorsed those views, may expect shortly that through PM and some other publications of that nature, they will be accused of disloyalty. But that is one of the burdens which go with the office we hold. That is one of the disagreeable things. We just have to take it as part of the job. One who is never criticized usually is a nonentity.

Going through life I have noticed that whether it was a dog fight on a corner or whether it was what the Washington papers refer to as a wrestling match; whether it was a prize fight—and I have never been to a real prize fight, although I have been to some boxing contests among the students in academies—whether it was a football game or whatever it was, the fellows who wanted gore, the fellows who wanted blood, the fellows who shouted "kill him" were the fellows on the sidelines who were in no danger of shedding even one drop of sweat. So, I find in this war, and before we got into the war, the people who were the most anxious that we should protect ourselves by establishing a frontier on the Rhine, the people who had so little faith in America, who had so little confidence in our form of government, who were so fearful that our people—the young men—lacked courage and fighting ability, were the people who felt that we must hurry and repeal the Neutrality Acts and do the things which we knew would ultimately involve us in war. They were the people—you might call some of them intellectuals, and by that I mean sincere, honest folk, who had been educated in a college or university, had little, if any, experience in earning their livelihood—who had never felt the necessity of following the pronouncement in the Bible where it is written "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, until thou return unto the ground." I have never found one of them who had a callous on his hand or on his foot. There were also people who were engaged in business and who, if war came on, would make a profit. Now, I do not charge those people with being disloyal. The only inference I think that can be drawn from what I am saying is that they have no great, overwhelming desire to do any of the fighting themselves.

When we get to the end of this war, so far as the military end is involved, I think most of us agree that our enemies—the Japs and the Germans—should lay down their arms; that the war should not end until Germany and Japan are both helpless so far as waging a war in the immediate future is concerned. But when you talk about destroying a people—and I am talking now about the Germans, not about the Japs—some people have found a great deal of fault, and justly so, because Hitler wanted to destroy and did destroy a large part of a whole race. That aroused the indignation and horror of all the world, and we, too, would be subject likewise to criticism and worse if we adopted and carried out a similar policy, and insisted that every German who is alive at the end of the war be shot or executed. I do say this: That when the victory has been won over Germany, then we should say to Russia, to Great Britain, and to France, "Now, for the second time, at the cost of the lives of millions of American youth, the victory has been won. Germany lies prostrate at your feet. She has no power to wage war. She has no industrial plants capable of manufacturing the instruments of war. But now, from this day on, you being here on the ground, you police her; you keep her where she cannot make future wars. Do not ask us who live so far away to police your neighbor. Do not again because of your carelessness, because of your indifference, or your desire for trade permit her to grow strong."

That is what I would say to them. I would say further to them, "If your men who are interested in financial gain do as you did after the last war—sell her the things out of which she can make her bombers, submarines, her ammunition—if you do that, expecting to profit by it, then do not again call upon America to send her young men across the seas to die on foreign soil."

What is unreasonable about that? When you are talking about unconditional surrender, there is something to be said on that side, of course. I will not quote what the young men in the service write to me or what they say to me, because there are something like 11,000,000 in the service. To quote from this or that one or the other one as typical of what they all believe would certainly be misleading. I do recall that at Appomattox General Grant said, "Unconditional surrender." Lee was an American and so was Grant. So when, due to force of circumstances, surrender was made, you recall what Grant said when Lee asked about the horses. "Take them home; you will need them." Had Grant and Lee made the terms which followed the end of the war, there would not for years have been the ill feeling which kept open breach between our people. But the politicians who had nothing to do with the fighting or the winning of the war, then, as now others seek to do, insisted upon their so-called reform, upon their opportunity to make a profit, and the seeds of discord were sown. Now, most assuredly we are going to leave the German people with the means of feeding, clothing, and sheltering themselves. Are we not? We have enough burden on us now with the Hottentots, the people of India, of China, and a half dozen other lands on our hands, if we are going to feed them. I do not know whether we are or not, but I do know the President said decent people would be willing to share with them. If under U. N. R. R. A. we are going to feed all people, it is not within my province to say there is going to be a shortage of food here. But I do

read the press, and I read last week where a Member of the majority over in the other body said that if his people down in Mississippi did not get salt pork, the farmers could not work. Perhaps he was stretching it a little. I am inclined to think he was, because I think they will get salt pork and I think they will work. They will work either with salt pork or without, for that is the kind of people they are—determined, resourceful, and patriotic. I hope it is not quite as bad as was pictured. But, nevertheless, the situation was so bad and food was so short that he said unless some of these administrative agencies—and you will understand, coming from Mississippi, that he does not belong to the minority party, nor was he a chronic critic—he said that unless some of these agencies mix a little common sense with their doings there would be legislation which would restrict them—deprive them of some of their authority. That gentleman took a chance with some of the spreaders of disunity when he expressed the thought that we should first feed America.

Now, after all, we know that even a cornered rat will fight, and there is ground for the belief that if we keep on telling, as the Secretary of the Treasury did tell—and if I am wrong someone on the majority side can correct me—that we are going to continue to fight until Germany and her people were made an agricultural nation and farmers all, stripped of industrial production—if that is so, there is ground for the belief that such a policy will cost American lives. And the additional lives lost will not be those of politicians or policy makers. I want to leave this thought with you, that the lives it is going to cost will not be our lives—your life nor mine; it will be the lives of those fine young men who either enlist because of their patriotism or who are taken by Uncle Sam and put into the service. I do not like to lecture. I get enough of that from the gentlemen on the other side, and I welcome it. I want to take this occasion to thank you on the right for the good words of advice you have given me, even though sometimes it comes in unpleasant form. From the bottom of my heart I thank you, and I hope to profit by it. However, I do want to suggest that it might be well for some of us who are all the time saying, "Let's lick 'em; let's kill 'em," until we do some of the fighting, we speak in softer terms and not be so insistent upon bloodshed. Some folks have acquired the habit of spending other people's earnings—let us not let them get the habit of wasting other people's lives.

EXPLANATION

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEALY. Mr. Speaker, when H. R. 32, an act to provide trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation, was called on the Consent Calendar, its consideration was objected to. My name was not included as one of those who objected. I am speaking now so that the RECORD will show that I was one of the many who did rise to object to the consideration of H. R. 32.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 197. An act to establish the grade of general in the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 242. An act for the relief of Ruben M. Herren;

H. R. 249. An act for the relief of Charles R. Hooper;

H. R. 256. An act for the relief of Dr. Luther J. Head;

H. R. 257. An act for the relief of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased;

H. R. 687. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions;

H. R. 946. An act for the relief of the estates of Robert C. Meals and Bessie Mae Morgret, Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, Donald Meals (a minor), and Betty Wrightstone (a minor);

H. R. 987. An act for the relief of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.;

H. R. 1149. An act for the relief of Dane D. Morgan;

H. R. 1429. An act to permit the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and the United States Maritime Commission, during the national emergency, to pay the tax imposed under section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code without regard to the $3,000 limitation in section 1426 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 1485. An act for the relief of Henry B. Tucker;

H. R. 1646. An act to establish the grade of admiral in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2506. An act to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 21, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Wednesday, March 21, 1945, to resume hearings on H. R. 1362, railroad retirement bill.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will continue hearings on Thursday, March 22, at 10: 30 o'clock a. m., in the committee room, room 247 House Office Building, on H. R. 128, a bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection for pensionable purposes for service rendered between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session at 10:30 o'clock a. m. on Thursday, March 22, 1945, in the committee room, room 356, House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

336. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380); to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

337. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the Solid Fuels Administration for War for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount $3,730,000 (H. Doc. No. 117); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

338. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of $4,480,000 for the Department of the Interior, in the form of amendments to the Budget for the said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 118); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

339. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget for the War Manpower Commission of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1945, containing estimates of appropriations amounting to $93,872,900, and proposed provisions effecting said estimates (H. Doc. No. 119); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 390. A bill to amend section 28 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924; without amendment (Rept. No. 346). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TARVER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2689. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 533. A bill authorizing the State of Minnesota Department of Highways to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Hastings, Minn.; with amendment (Rept. No. 348). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1184. A bill to authorize Slater Branch Bridge and Road Club to construct, maintain, and operate a free suspension bridge across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River at or near Williamson, W. Va.; with amendment (Rept. No. 349). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATRICK: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1652. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State of Louisiana to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Mis-

sissippi River at or near New Orleans, La.; without amendment (Rept. No. 350). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 1659. A bill authorizing the Department of Highways of the State of Minnesota to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Pigeon River; without amendment (Rept. No. 351). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2690. A bill to amend the Bonneville Project Act; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 2691. A bill to provide for the administration of all public lands in the Jackson Hole National Monument by the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ERVIN:

H. R. 2692. A bill to assist veterans to establish small business enterprises by providing for reasonable exemptions from priorities, allocations, and rationing restrictions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 2693. A bill to amend the Bonneville Project Act; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H R. 2694. A bill to provide for the retirement of certain officers and former officers of the National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 2695. A bill to amend section 3 of the act approved August 12, 1935, entitled "An act to safeguard the estates of veterans derived from payments of pension, compensation, emergency officers' retirement pay and insurance, and for other purposes," as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. R. 2696. A bill to establish the methods of advancement for post-office employees in the field service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. J. Res. 132. Joint resolution to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution creating a commission to investigate ways and means of improving post-war economic conditions in the bituminous-coal-producing industry of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TARVER:

H. Res. 194. Resolution waiving points of order against the bill (H. R. 2689) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2697. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Ida Londinsky; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 2698. A bill for the relief of Lucas H. Roark; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2699. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jabez Fenton Jackson and Mrs. Narcissa Wilmans Jackson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 2700. A bill for the relief of Alice Walker; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2701. A bill for the relief of Margaret J. Pow; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 2702. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn K. Chelf; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

215. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. James E. Work and 42 other citizens of Fort Morgan, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

216. By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of the mayor and Council of the City of Tucson, Ariz., in their Resolution 1995 of March 12, 1945, requesting the United States of America to limit and control the location of mining claims on certain lands in the Coronado National Forest; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

217. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the War Parents of America, Lexington, Mass., asking for united action and effort in winning the war; that we all show the same quality of courage as our sons who are fighting and dying on the battle fronts; to the Committee on Rules.

218. By Mr. WELCH: California Senate Joint Resolution No. 15, relating to claim of ownership of lands by the sovereign State of California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

219. By Mr. WALTER: Petition of the Pennsylvania Federation of Historical Societies, memorializing Congress, the Honorable Jesse H. Jones and the Honorable James C. Caft to the end that publication may be made of the various censuses of the United States from 1800 to 1860, inclusive, and that publication be made first of the 1850 census, because of its evident importance; to the Committee on Printing.

220. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Thomas A. Laproth, president; Paul Voelzke, secretary; and the members of the board of directors, Rosebud Farmers Union Cooperative, Gregory, S. Dak., urging that each Member of Congress oppose and vote against any and all proposed legislation to subject cooperative associations to additional income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

221. Also, petition of James Valley Cooperative Union, Huron, S. Dak., urging Members of Congress to oppose and vote against any and all proposed legislation to subject cooperative associations to additional income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and means.

222. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of 30 signatures of citizens of New York State in opposition to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

223. By Mr. SADOWSKI: Petition of the Common Council of the City of Hamtramck, Mich.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

224. By Mr. MOTT: Petition of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, petitioning and requesting the Congress of the United States of America to consider favorably and adopt Senate Joint Resolution 8; to the Committee on Appropriations.

225. Also, petition of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, petitioning the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the Peterson bill, H. R. 5477, known as the seamen's bill of rights; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 1945

(Legislative day of Friday, March 16, 1945)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hath set thoughts of Thyself in our yearning hearts, it is past noontide and for some of us the twilight gathers as swiftly ebbs out our little day; not yielding to the weights of dismal failures but casting aside the ashes of past regrets, we would redeem the hours of labor that remain for us ere the night falls. As we spend our years like a tale that is told, may we so number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.

Teach us so to live and so to toil and so to play our part in this age on ages telling that we may face with clear conscience the gaze of our contemporaries and the judgment of posterity. And when we have finished our course, grant that we may look without fear upon the flaming of eternal dawn. We ask it in the name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, March 20, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Myers
Austin	Hart	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hawkes	Overton
Bankhead	Hayden	Pepper
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hill	Reed
Brewster	Hoey	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Kilgore	Shipstead
Byrd	La Follette	Stewart
Capehart	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Taylor
Chandler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McFarland	Tobey
Cordon	McKellar	Tydings
Donnell	McMahon	Vandenberg
Downey	Magnuson	Wagner
Eastland	Maybank	Wheeler
Ellender	Mead	Wherry
Ferguson	Millikin	White
Fulbright	Mitchell	Wiley
George	Moore	Willis
Gerry	Morse	Wilson
Green	Murdock	Young
Guffey	Murray	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent on an inspection tour for the United States Navy.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 77. An act for the relief of Lindon A. Long;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.;

S. 321. An act for the relief of James M. Hiler;

S. 515. An act for the relief of Wallace Robertson, Henry Bowker, and Edward Pairisian, and for other purposes; and

S. 525. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval training center, Farragut, Idaho, on July 10, 1944.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 411. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mae E. Sutton; and

S. 681. An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 72) for the relief of Antonio Ruiz, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1360) for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 43. An act to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases;

H. R. 201. An act for the relief of the Dempsey Industrial Furnace Corporation;

H. R. 202. An act for the relief of Angelina Bourbeau;

H. R. 206. An act for the relief of St. Vincent's Infirmary and Dr. Alvin W. Strauss;

H. R. 209. An act for the relief of David B. Smith;

H. R. 269. An act for the relief of Charles Molnar;

H. R. 271. An act for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas;

H. R. 780. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Vonnie Jones, a minor;

H. R. 802. An act for the relief of camp No. 1, Alaska Native Brotherhood, Sitka, Alaska;

H. R. 807. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wilma Louise Townsend;

H. R. 846. An act for the relief of the alien Michael Soldo;

H. R. 912. An act for the relief of William H. Schultz;

H. R. 933. An act for the relief of Margaret G. Potts;

H. R. 993. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen C. Burnett;

H. R. 1038. An act for the relief of Daniel B. Johnson;

H. R. 1059. An act for the relief of Leonard D. Jackson and Elsie Fowkes Jackson;

H. R. 1079. An act for the relief of Ray L. Smith;

H. R. 1134. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain property owners adjacent to Fort Knox, Ky.;

H. R. 1135. An act for the relief of Gus A. Vance;

H. R. 1151. An act for the relief of James Lemuel Muzzall and James M. Muzzall;

H. R. 1357. An act for the relief of the estate of Otto Frederick Gnospelius, deceased;

H. R. 1402. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

H. R. 1488. An act for the relief of Austin Bruce Bowen;

H. R. 1539. An act for the relief of Dr. David R. Barglow;

H. R. 1617. An act for the relief of Hugh M. Gregory;

H. R. 1668. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Ellen Keegan Herzog, Francis James Keegan, and Sgt. John Keegan;

H. R. 1711. An act for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton;

H. R. 1716. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sue B. Bowen, as administratrix of the estate of Clyde Bowen, deceased;

H. R. 1756. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Demetrio Caquias;

H. R. 1983. An act for the relief of Benjamin D. Lewis;

H. R. 2007. An act for the relief of Hattie Bowers;

H. R. 2129. An act for the relief of Edward Lawrence Kunze;

H. R. 2320. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Christoffer Hannevig, through his trutee in bankruptcy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2336. An act for the relief of Osborne E. McKay; and

H. R. 2485. An act for the relief of Moses Tennenbaum.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 1360) for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following business was transacted:

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate letters from the Director of the Budget (Executive Office of the President), Director of the Office of Strategic Services, and the officer in charge, the American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending June 30, 1945, which, with the accompanying papers, were referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a report for the month of February 1945, from the chairman of the subcommittee on War Mobilization of the Military Affairs Committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON WAR MOBILIZATION

MARCH 19, 1945.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the names of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of February 1945, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Virginia W. Boyce	3810 W St. SE., Washington, D. C.	Department of Interior, Washington, D. C.	$1,800
Ann S. Gertler	3721 39th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	do.	2,000
Hope C. Heslep	2 East Maple St., Alexandria, Va.	War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C.	2,000
Joan P. Karasik	1919 19th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	3,800
Charles Kramer	4621 South 34th St., Arlington, Va.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	6,500
C. Theodore Larson	3917 North 5th St., Arlington, Va.	National Housing Agency, Washington, D. C.	5,600
Fritzie P. Manuel	1621 T St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Manpower Commission, Washington, D. C.	3,800
Darel McConkey	Lanham, Md.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Cora L. Moen	5327 16th St. NW., Washington, D. C.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	2,000
Elizabeth H. Oleksy	1620 Fuller St. NW., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	2,600
Francis C. Rosenberger	5814 64th Ave., East Riverdale, Md.	Office of Price Administration, Washington, D. C.	4,600
Herbert Schimmel	3604 Minnesota Ave SE., Washington, D. C.	War Production Board, Washington, D. C.	8,000
Marjorie J. Tillis	211 Delaware Ave SW., Washington, D. C.	Foreign Economic Administration, Washington, D. C.	3,200

H. M. KILGORE, *Chairman.*

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 8

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States Senate Joint Resolution 8, proposing an amendment to the Federal Constitution providing that the President shall transmit to Congress his estimates of receipts of the Government during the ensuing fiscal year, together with his recommendations as to the purposes for which such receipts shall be expended, and, except in time of war or during the period ending on the date of the expiration of 1 full fiscal year after the termination thereof, the Congress shall not appropriate money for expenditure during such fiscal year in excess of such estimated receipts, except by a vote of three-fifths of each House, unless additional revenues have been previously provided therefor, or unless such appropriation be for expenses and contingencies of the Congress or the courts, or for payment of claims against the United States; and

"Whereas the house of representatives (the senate concurring) recognizes, in the interest of good government, the urgent need for and the inestimable benefits to be derived from such a yearly control of the Nation's revenues and expenditures: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That we, your memorialists, the Forty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, do hereby most respectfully petition and request the Congress of the United States of America to favorably consider and adopt Senate Joint Resolution 8; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to United States Senators GUY L. CORDON and WAYNE L. MORSE and to Congressmen JAMES W. MOTT, HOMER D. ANGELL, LOWELL STOCKMAN, and HARRIS ELLSWORTH, and that they be, and hereby are, urged to use their best efforts and influence to make this memorial effective, and the secretary of state hereby is instructed to transmit the same to them.

"The secretary of state hereby is instructed to forward a certified copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate and to the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 5

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the forty-third legislative assembly of the State of Oregon, convened in regular session, respectfully represent that—

"Whereas despite a hard and uncertain calling, the merchant seamen of the United States do not enjoy the protection of unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, group life insurance, pensions or retirement plans; and

"Whereas although they are civilians, serving voluntarily on the merchant ships of this Nation, they work side by side with the military and carry troops, ammunition, and supplies as an integral part of invasion fleets; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has under consideration legislation which will, if enacted into law, make certain guaranties to American seamen similar to the rights granted members of the armed forces in the G. I. bill of rights: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring), That the forty-third regular assembly of the Oregon Legislature petition the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the Peterson bill (H. R. 5477) known as the seamen's bill of rights; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to both branches of the Congress of the United States, to Admiral Emory Land, Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 7

"To the President of the United States, to the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate from Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in regular session assembled, respectfully represents that—

"Whereas article III of the treaty with Russia, dated March 30, 1867, guarantees that all persons in the Territory shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of the citizens of the United States; and

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska was expressly incorporated into the Union of States by the Congress of the United States under section 3 of the organic act, act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512); and

"Whereas a long line of judicial decisions recognized that the Territory of Alaska is part and parcel of the United States and is bound to the United States, as is each of the other States of the Union (*Rasmussen* v. *United States* (197 U. S. 516)); and

"Whereas the incorporation of a Territory into the United States has on each previous occasion since the founding of the Government of the United States been a step directly preceding statehood; and

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska has demonstrated its ability beyond any question of doubt over the many years, in caring after its own affairs, by providing sufficient facilities for education, health, and by providing for the general welfare of its people; and

"Whereas the people of the Territory, since its incorporation into the Union, have conducted themselves in orderly manner, without riot, bloodshed, civil disturbances, or disobedience at the polls or in the general conduct of its affairs; and

"Whereas the people of the Territory have contributed more than its proportionate share, through voluntary enlistment and through the selective service, to the armed forces of the United States in the present conflict, as well as in the great war of a generation ago; and

"Whereas the principle of self-determination has been recognized by the Government of the United States since its inception; and

"Whereas it has been the policy of the Government of the United States to extend local autonomy to every possible degree to the peoples of its Territories and possessions; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States has continually advocated and taken the leadership in the family of nations to put into practice the principle of self-government and the extension of home rule; and

"Whereas the people of the Territory have, on each occasion, through meetings, editorials, memorials, and demonstrations, expressed themselves as being overwhelmingly in favor of statehood; and

"Whereas the Territory of Alaska has fulfilled all of its obligations admirably and complies with all prerequisites for statehood:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges that the Congress of the United States, by appropriate action, provide for the admission of the Territory of Alaska as the forty-ninth State of the Union, with full control of all natural resources.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Approved by the Governor, March 8, 1945.

"ERNEST GRUENING,
"Governor of Alaska."

A resolution adopted by the Fish and Game Commission of the State of California, protesting against the plan of the Army engineers of the United States to divert all water from the Klamath River that rises above Spencer Creek into the Sacramento drainage through the Pit River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. WALSH):

Resolutions of the General Court of the State of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take official cognizance of the inherent right of the people of Poland, as well as the people of other small nations, to determine the form and kind of their own government

"Whereas the circumstances surrounding the disposition and placement of the territorial boundary lines of the Republic of Poland, and of other small European nations, as well as the manner in which the people of these small nations shall be permitted to determine the kind and form of their own government, give rise to serious concern as to whether the inherent rights of these peoples shall be safeguarded; and

"Whereas all peoples throughout the entire world are fundamentally entitled to self-determination of the manner in which they shall be governed; and

"Whereas the cardinal principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter do in fact guarantee these rights to all peoples: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts looks with concern upon conditions in Europe which presently are determining the location of the territorial boundary lines of the Republic of Poland, as well as those of other small nations, and, therefore, respectfully urges and petitions the Congress of the United States to take official cognizance of the fact that the matter of territorial boundary lines is of universal concern and a proper subject for determination as a result of conferences between the United Nations as a whole rather than as the result of the decision of a single member thereof and further, that the matter of the form and kind of government to be enjoyed by any group of people is a matter for self-determination rather than by arbitrary decision of another government; and be it further

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges and petitions the Congress of the United States to take whatever action it shall deem necessary in its deliberations to insure unto the people of all small nations all of the rights and privileges enunciated in the Atlantic Charter; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 765. A bill concerning the establishment of meteorological observation stations in the Arctic region of the Western Hemisphere, for the purpose of improving the weather-forecasting service within the

United States and on the international air transport routes from the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 766. A bill to provide for disposition of the lands comprising the Fort Reno Military Reservation, in Canadian County, Okla.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 43. An act to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 201. An act for the relief of the Dempsey Industrial Furnace Corporation;

H. R. 202. An act for the relief of Angelina Bourbeau;

H. R. 206. An act for the relief of St. Vincent's Infirmary and Dr. Alvin W. Strauss;

H. R. 209. An act for the relief of David B. Smith;

H. R. 780. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Vonnie Jones, a minor;

H. R. 802. An act for the relief of camp No. 1, Alaska Native Brotherhood, Sitka, Alaska;

H. R. 807. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wilma Louise Townsend;

H. R. 912. An act for the relief of William H. Shultz;

H. R. 933. An act for the relief of Margaret G. Potts;

H. R. 993. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen C. Burnett;

H. R. 1038. An act for the relief of Daniel B. Johnson;

H. R. 1059. An act for the relief of Leonard D. Jackson and Elsie Fowkes Jackson;

H. R. 1079. An act for the relief of Ray L. Smith;

H. R. 1134. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain property owners adjacent to Fort Knox, Ky.;

H. R. 1135. An act for the relief of Gus A. Vance;

H. R. 1151. An act for the relief of James Lemuel Muzzall and James M. Muzzall;

H. R. 1357. An act for the relief of the estate of Otto Frederick Gnospelius, deceased;

H. R. 1488. An act for the relief of Austin Bruce Bowen;

H. R. 1539. An act for the relief of Dr. David R. Barglow;

H. R. 1617. An act for the relief of Hugh M. Gregory;

H. R. 1668. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mary Ellen Keegan Herzog, Francis James Keegan, and Sgt. John Keegan;

H. R. 1711. An act for the relief of Blanche H. Karsch, administratrix of the estate of Kate E. Hamilton;

H. R. 1716. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sue B. Bowen, as administratrix of the estate of Clyde Bowen, deceased;

H. R. 1756. An act for the relief of the estate of the late Demetrio Caquias;

H. R. 1983. An act for the relief of Benjamin D. Lewis;

H. R. 2007. An act for the relief of Hattie Bowers;

H. R. 2129. An act for the relief of Edward Lawrence Kunze;

H. R. 2320. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Christoffer Hannevig through his trustee in bankruptcy, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2336. An act for the relief of Osborne E. McKay; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 269. An act for the relief of Charles Molnar;

H. R. 271. An act for the relief of Eleanor McCloskey, also known as Evelyn Mary Mikalauskas;

H. R. 846. An act for the relief of the alien Michael Soldo;

H. R. 1402. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens; and

H. R. 2485. An act for the relief of Moses Tennenbaum; to the Committee on Immigration.

AMENDMENT TO THE SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT: COMMERCIAL FISHING—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 37) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing for the extension of liability, which I ask may be printed and appropriately referred. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanation of the amendment.

There being no objection, the amendment was received, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

The explanation of the amendment presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

REASONS FOR THE NEW READING

The old reading "in commercial fishing" is not unrestricted as it appears if one considers Senate Joint Resolution 37 in connection with the Tydings amendment. Already the Tydings amendment restricts farm deferments to men "to be necessary and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation." The insertion "in commercial fishing" would not alter the qualifications that the men have to be necessary to and regularly engaged in commercial fishing.

The new reading determines the types of fishermen to be considered, namely, "fishermen, captains, and engineers."

It is estimated that about 11,000 fishermen, captains, and engineers are in draft age, 18 through 38. Out of this number, about 950 are captains and engineers, while the rest are fishermen. The following table shows the average production per fisherman on the basis of 1940 total production per area and with consideration of the fact that at present only about 45,500 fishermen are left in commercial fishing.

Of the approximately 84,500 fishermen, captains, and engineers engaged in fishing on January 1, 1942, about 10,000 have migrated to other war industries and about 29,000 have been drafted to the armed forces or have voluntarily joined the merchant marine.

Total area production per fisherman left

Area	Total production (millions of pounds)	Fishermen left	Production per fisherman (thousands of pounds)
I. Washington, Oregon, and Alaska	730,714	13,600	53,700
II. California	1,290,929	4,900	263,455
III. Western Gulf of Mexico, Mexican border, and Alabama	219,214	4,500	48,714
IV. West coast of Florida	93,369	4,200	49,294
V. East coast of Florida and South Carolina	113,667		
VI. Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina	491,202	7,700	63,792
VII. Delaware, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, and Rhode Island	373,476	3,300	113,175
VIII. Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Maine	612,988	5,300	115,658
IX. Great Lakes States	89,310	2,000	44,655
X. Mississippi Valley, inclusive	36,536	(1)	(1)
Total	4,051,405	45,500	

[1] Negligible.

From this table it can be seen that those fisheries that are especially important for military supply, namely, the salmon fisheries of Alaska, Oregon, and Washington, the pilchard, mackerel, and tuna fisheries of California, and the mackerel and sardine fisheries of New England, are especially protected if the production limit of 50,000 pounds is established. In addition, the menhaden fisheries, which are important for fish-oil production, needed in part for ammunition and other war material, will be fully protected. The lesser important fisheries naturally will suffer, but it has to be considered that this amendment is a war measure intended to exempt from the draft comparatively few fishermen left in draft age who are necessary to prevent a critical shortage of fish food.

By adherence to this table, fishermen still will be far from an equal level with the farmer as far as draft deferment is considered. The average farmer produces annually about 34,500 pounds of food, and such an average farmer has been protected by the Tydings amendment since November 13, 1942. In the past the fishermen did not enjoy such protection. A protective measure adopted by Congress will, at any rate, come late and will reach only a limited number of those who have been left over. Establishing for this limited number a deferment qualification of 50,000 pounds annual production, is certainly a modest request of the fishery industries toward the registrants to be considered.

RELATION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Fundamental Remedy," published in the Washington Star of March 16, 1945, and an editorial entitled "Not Onerous—If Tried," published in the Washington Evening Star of March 20, 1945, on the subject of the relation of the District of Columbia to the National Government, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE SECRETARY OF STATE—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Stettinius Called Brave or Innocent," by David Lawrence, published in a recent issue of the Washington Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

EUROPEAN CONFEDERATION—ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the subject of a European confederation, written by Dorothy Thompson and published in a recent issue of the Washington Star, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADMINISTRATOR, RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—AUBREY W. WILLIAMS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, yesterday while I was debating the subject matter before the Senate the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] challenged a statement which I attributed to him, and I desire today to keep to my promise of referring to the printed record so as to show him that I did not misquote his testi-

mony. On page 2483 of yesterday's RECORD, I made the following statement in the course of my remarks, and thereafter a colloquy took place between me and Senator McKELLAR:

There is a Cooperative Operations Division. This Division helps the cooperatives in the country with their problems. In other words, it gives expert advice to them. Certainly if the Administrator had to be a farmer and an engineer, as was stated by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, it would be necessary, in order to carry on R. E. A. as it should be carried on, that the whole force would have to be farmers and engineers.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. I interrupt merely to keep the record straight. I made no such statement as that the Senator has attributed to me, and I challenge him to find it.

Mr. ELLENDER. What statement is that?

Mr. McKELLAR. The statement the Senator has just made, that I said it took a certain kind of man to hold this position, that he had to be an engineer or a businessman.

Mr. ELLENDER. Or a farmer?

Mr. McKELLAR. Or a farmer. I did not say anything of the kind, and have not said anything of the kind. The Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Illinois have been attributing many things to me I have not said, and there is not a scintilla of fact in most of the statements which have been made. Evidently they have been made for the purpose of killing time, or something.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean the statement by me?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; what the Senator just stated.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not see why I should want to kill time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Nor do I. It is remarkable, but time is being killed, just the same.

Mr. ELLENDER. The statement is here.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will ask the Senator to find it and put it in the RECORD.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not have the Senator's statement at hand. I do not expect to conclude my remarks this afternoon, and I shall look the statement up again and quote from the Senator's testimony tomorrow.

So, Mr. President, in compliance with that suggestion made by me, I shall quote from the hearings on the nomination of Aubrey Williams, conducted by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I refer to page 135:

Senator McKELLAR. As I understand it, Mr. Chairman, the Rural Electrification Administration requires a man at the head of it who has had experience, especially with people who live in the country; also experience and knowledge of some sort of electricity and its production, its control and management, and, thirdly, the Administrator should have some experience in business.

I want to give you my reasons for making this statement. I voted for that law; I supported it vigorously. It is doing a wonderful work for the people of this country, and especially for the country people of this Nation. I was born and reared in the country; I know all about country people and farm and country life, and nothing ever gave me more pleasure than to vote for the Rural Electrification measure, which has done tremendous good for the country people of America.

Again, on page 137, the Senator from Tennessee further testified:

It is quite a large corporation. Its proper management, its skillful management, or its careless management, its management without any experience, is a matter of the greatest importance not only to the American people, and especially the country people whom it is intended to serve, but it is or ought to be of the greatest importance to the Members of the Congress, and for that reason I am presenting, in the most serious way I know how, this matter to you.

If you wanted to select a president of a bank you would select a man with banking experience.

Senator WHEELER. Like Wallace.

Senator McKELLAR. If you want to select a Senator, he ought to be a man that knows something about the Constitution and the laws and the American people.

Senator TOBEY. How about the Secretary of the Navy?

Senator McKELLAR. I will be with you on that; yes, sir. I think there ought to be a man put in charge of this great corporation who has some knowledge about the matters about which he is going to act.

I will now give you my good friend Mr. Williams' record to show whether or not he has had such experience in life. I believe Mr. Williams is about 50 years old, or 48 years old, something like that. I read Who's Who—and Mr. Williams must have furnished that material to Who's Who—and let us now see what he has done that would justify him employment for one of the most technical jobs in our Government.

"Aubrey Williams, University of Bordeaux"—

It has been a long time since I studied geography, but as I remember, that is in France—

"University of Bordeaux, 1919.

"University of Cincinnati, 1920.

"Community Service, Cincinnati, 1920–22."

* * * * *

Now, that is the history as it is given in Who's Who.

From that history is there a suggestion that Mr. Williams has ever had any experience in the kind of business that he is being called upon to look after here?

Senator WHEELER. More experience than Stettinius had for Secretary of State.

Senator McKELLAR. I am not comparing persons or officials at present, I am just talking about Mr. Williams. Mr. Stettinius has already been before this Senate and that is past. But here is a man now who has never had the slightest experience with anything pertaining to the country except, as I will show you, in social-service work.

He was never in business, he does not claim to have ever been in business, and yet he is to be put in charge of a half-billion dollars of American money, in one of the most technical set-ups that we have in our Government.

In my opinion, Mr. Williams may qualify as a social-work expert, but how in the name of heaven even Mr. Williams, himself, as delightful and as ingratiating and as seductive a man as he is, could think he could run successfully the rural electrification business is something beyond me. So far as his record indicates, he knows nothing about rural matters, and certainly he knows nothing about electricity.

His life's work has been as a social worker for the whole time of his grown-up life.

I am just one of those old-fashioned men who believe that a man ought to know something about the business that he is employed to take charge of. I will make this illustration: I happen to be a member of the Presbyterian Church, but let us suppose that the Catholic Church should elect me Pope of Rome? In the name of God what could I do with one of the most important and one of the most splendid offices in the world? I would be as much out of place in that case as Mr. Williams will find himself out of place in the R. E. A. if he should get it—just as much, because I have never studied religion to that extent. I believe in religion, but I have never studied it as I should.

Now, if Mr. Williams has not had any experience in rural matters or electricity—he never mentioned that the other day—or am I mistaken about it? Did he mention it? Did anybody ask him about what his experience was?

Well, I will pass that on.

Mr. President, I think the Senator's testimony as I have just read it justifies the statement I made yesterday, and I believe I have met the challenge of my distinguished friend the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McMAHON in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Louisiana has read from the record of the hearings what I said, and it carries out my views entirely; but I do not think his construction of it was correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I did not hear the Senator's statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I said that what the Senator first said about my statement was not correct, but what he has just read is correct, and I stand by it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what I stated yesterday and the Senator's immediate challenge of my statement, and in answer to that challenge I have now read from the hearings. Is the Senator not now satisfied that I have proved he was mistaken?

Mr. McKELLAR. No. I am entirely satisfied that the Senator has placed an accurate statement in the RECORD today. So that ought to be satisfactory to the Senator.

I see the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] present. I should like to tell both the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Louisiana, confidentially of course, that I am not a candidate for this office. I do not desire it. They have been defending Mr. Williams. They have been attacking me for some reason. I do not understand why. Honestly, I never was more astonished in my life than I was at the attack made on me day before yesterday by the Senator from Illinois. It was almost impossible for me to comprehend it. I would not have made such an attack on the Senator from Illinois for anything in the world, and I simply cannot imagine why he should have attacked me as he did. I cannot understand why the Senator from Louisiana does not devote his time to telling about what kind of a man Williams is. Why do the two Senators single me out? I happen to differ with them about Mr. Williams. They may be right and I may be wrong; I do not know; but I am honest in my views, and I hope the Senators are honest in their views. But why should they attack me? I am not a candidate for this office. I would not have the office if an attempt were made to bestow it on me a thousand times. I am not a candidate for the position. I assure both Senators that their attacks on me in this debate are beside the point. The question is, Is

Williams fitted for the office? It is not a question of whether I am fitted for the office or not. I simply cannot understand that kind of attack, except that the Senators are undertaking to filibuster and to postpone a vote for some reason. I can understand the attack only on that basis.

Mr. LUCAS rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana has yielded to me. I hope the Chair will be good enough to permit me to continue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has yielded to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Chair. I do not know of any two more delightful or lovable men in the Senate than the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Louisiana, and I simply cannot understand why they should undertake, in their supposed defense of Mr. Williams, to denounce me and characterize me in the way they have done and attribute to me statements I never made. I hope both Senators will think better of it. I do not think I deserve it. I believe they were incorrect in the appraisal of the testimony I gave, and I am extremely sorry they take the view they do, but I cannot help it. I think it would be very much better, and I believe the Senators would win more votes, if they would tell, if they can, the good qualities of Mr. Williams, and not attack me, because I want to assure them that if the nomination of Mr. Williams is rejected, as I hope it will be, they could not get me to take the office if it were handed to me on a silver platter, or on a dozen silver platters.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, far be it from me to desire in any way to impugn the excellent character of my good friend the Senator from Tennessee; but when the distinguished Senator challenges a statement I make—and the RECORD shows what I said in answer thereto—and when I promise him that I will cite the record and show him that I am correct, I do not see anything wrong in doing so, and I cannot conceive how it affects his character. I have not in any manner attacked the Senator. On the other hand, as I pointed out in my discussion yesterday and in my discussion of the day before, the only witness who appeared against Mr. Williams was the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. That is the reason why I deem it necessary to refer to some of the statements he made before the committee. I am not attacking the Senator from Tennessee; but since the Senator has seen fit to appear before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as a witness in opposition to Mr. Williams, I am going to treat him as a witness. I am going to take his testimony and pick it apart as much as I can. I desire to further add that I highly respect the Senator. I entertain the kindliest feeling for him, and I would not in any manner purposely offend him.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I too regret that my distinguished friend the able senior Senator from Tennessee, thinks I have made any personal attack upon him in connection with these debates. If I have done so, and he feels that way about it, I certainly want to offer a humble apology to the Senator, for whom I have great affection. He has been very kind to me since I have been in the Senate, and I want to continue to enjoy a cordial and friendly relationship with him as long as I am here.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, certainly I feel the same way about the Senator from Illinois, and I was very much astonished when day before yesterday he attributed to me reasons for the position I took which were entirely outside the facts in the case. If Mr. Williams is the man the two Senators think he is it seems to me they should bring out his good qualities. Whether I am a man of bad character, whether I tell the truth or not, I was simply presenting the record. The reason I appeared before the committee, as everyone knows, was that I had made the same sort of fight on Mr. Williams before. Mr. Williams was the head of the N. Y. A., and I sought to get Mr. Williams out of office by abolishing the N. Y. A., and finally succeeded. Then when Mr. Williams' nomination was sent to the Senate I again brought before the Senate the facts which were developed before. That is all there was to it. Of course, the Senator is at liberty to pick my testimony to pieces; but I shall be glad, before he attempts to do so, if he will first read what I said. The Senator from Louisiana has made good by reading the testimony itself. Let every Senator form his own opinion as to what is right from what I said. I stand by every word I said. I do not take back a thing. I believe that what I said is exactly right. I thought it was the truth then, and I think it is the truth now. I have no apology to make for it.

Of course, Senators may want to kill time. Yesterday afternoon the Senator said virtually the same thing, and read a part of what I said. He made the same sort of statement yesterday.

Mr. ELLENDER. In reading the RECORD this morning I noted where the distinguished Senator challenged me to point out from the record the statement which he made. My point is that before the committee the Senator from Tennessee specifically stated that in order to be qualified to direct the Rural Electrification Administration a man should be an engineer and a farmer, and should know something about country life.

Mr. McKELLAR. I still say so. Of course, a man ought not to be appointed as the head of the Rural Electrification Administration unless he knows something about it. Mr. Williams' principal business in life has been charity work.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator further stated, as I pointed out, that in order to be qualified to be the president of a bank a man should know something about banking. Yesterday I pointed out to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and other Senators who were present that Mr. Vinson was appointed as the head of the largest banking institution ever created by the Government; and yet the Senate confirmed his nomination without going into his qualifications. As a matter of fact, Who's Who shows that Mr. Vinson is a lawyer. He has been a judge and a Member of Congress. His record does not show that he is a banker. What I am pleading for is that the same yardstick which was applied to Mr. Vinson be applied to Mr. Williams. The Senator says that in order to be qualified to head the R. E. A., which is nothing but a lending institution, a man must know farming, he must be an electrical engineer, and he must know something about country life; but when it comes to Mr. Vinson, who will manage a $40,000,000,000 banking corporation, it is not necessary that he know a thing about banking.

Mr. McKELLAR. I did not say that; but I will let it pass.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. My statement will be very brief. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will not interrupt me.

I started a moment ago to reply to what the distinguished Senator from Tennessee said were attacks on him. Mr. President, all my life I have known only one way to present anything factually and logically, and that is on the basis of the record itself. I have had some experience in the trial of lawsuits in Illinois. If anyone will examine the argument which I made in behalf of Aubrey Williams the other day, he will find that that argument and my conclusions are based upon the data which appear in the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. As the Senator from Louisiana has said, the record made before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in opposition to Mr. Williams was made primarily by the senior Senator from Tennessee, who volunteered and requested that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry hear him in opposition to the confirmation of Mr. Williams' nomination.

Mr. President, I could not do what the Senator from Tennessee did to Aubrey Williams, irrespective of any ill will or hatred and irrespective of any political philosophy he may espouse. As one Member of the United States Senate, I could not do that to anyone, especially when we examine, as I did, the sources of the information upon which the distinguished Senator from Tennessee sought to block this appointment. That is the argument which I have made all the way through. I have never cast any reflection upon the Senator from Tennessee other than to say that he knows, as a lawyer and as one who is vitally concerned about everyone having his constitutional rights, that there was not a single thing that he put in that record that would stand the test before a court of competent jurisdiction.

In my section of the country, if a person trespasses upon another man's land, he is subject to a fine; but the accused has his constitutional rights and his defense, the same as has a man who has committed murder. That is the way it should be.

In my 10 years in Congress I have seen numerous inquisitions which seem to me to impair and reflect upon the dignity and integrity of the United States Senate. That statement is not confined to this particular committee. I sometimes wonder how witnesses stand up under the gruelling cross-examination to which they must submit from every conceivable angle before a committee of able and prepared Senators. I am also at a loss to understand some of the ex parte testimony that is introduced and considered by committees. Anything is relevant, everything is germane. I suppose it has always been that way; and perhaps there is nothing we can do about it. Nevertheless, it seems to me that when the President of the United States sends a nomination to the Senate, carrying with it the weight and dignity of the Executive Office, there ought to be some well-defined procedure in the committee considering the nomination, and the nominee should be given a fair and impartial hearing. He should not be subjected to an examination upon questions wholly irrelevant and immaterial. Other testimony should be submitted upon the same high basis. Aubrey Williams should be confirmed on the basis of this record. No jury in the United States, after taking an oath to hear the evidence fairly and impartially, would fail to give Aubrey Williams the confirmation to which he is entitled, based upon the record. The record is what I am talking about.

Mr. President, this sort of thing has worried me. I once sat as a member of a committee in the House of Representatives. On one side were three members who had a certain political philosophy and theory. They already had their minds made up as to what they would do before they began consideration of any question. On the other side were three members with exactly the opposite philosophy. They, too, had closed minds. I attempted as best I could to give the witnesses and the cause the best that was in me. The reports from both sides were filled with political bias and prejudice. I happened to be in the center, and practically rewrote the report, based upon facts, common decency, and justice.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. McCLELLAN addressed the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I shall be through in just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois to complete his statement. Following that, I promised to yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LUCAS. So, Mr. President, when I consider the record as I see it in this case and when I examine it carefully and closely, I can do nothing except reach the conclusion which I did reach. If the Senator from Tennessee charges me with being unfair and with doing an injustice to him—which certainly I did not intend to do—I should think he would think just a little about the injustices he did to Williams through his testimony as a witness before the committee. Obviously that is a horn at the other end of the dilemma.

Mr. President, the only point I made yesterday when the Senator from Tennessee and I disagreed was with respect to a statement he made regarding how $150,000,000 or $160,000,000 was spent by Aubrey Williams through Communist organizations. I have not been able to find just where that money went, from the viewpoint of the Senator from Tennessee. The only thing I could discover which might relate to it was in my breakdown of the facts and figures where an item of that amount was considered in respect to schools. I did make that statement, and the Senator from Tennessee challenged it. If it does not belong there, it should be corrected. I certainly do not want the Senator from Tennessee to think for one moment that I am charging him with saying that he is responsible for the implication or innuendo that school boards and teachers were teaching communism in the schools. I certainly wish to rectify that statement for the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Because I do not want to do him an injustice at all. I do not want anyone to think for one moment in connection with this case that I have not adhered strictly to the record or based my arguments and my conclusions on the record that has been made. That is the only way I can proceed, so far as hearings are concerned. I simply cannot do a lot of speculating about a nominee outside of the record. I simply cannot do that, Mr. President, and I am not going to do it.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to ask the able Senator from Illinois a question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understood from the remarks of the Senator from Illinois that he has taken the position that in this proceeding we are more or less trying Aubrey Williams as a criminal in a court would be tried. If that is the Senator's view, certainly it is not mine. I am not going to take that position, and by my vote I will not be placing myself in that position.

Mr. LUCAS. I did not say that at all, let me say to the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator said he would not convict Aubrey Williams on this evidence. I do not regard this proceeding as a proceeding whereby a man is being convicted or acquitted.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that. All I said was that the ordinary person charged with trespass would receive a fair trial, out in my part of the country. He would have a trial in accordance with his constitutional rights.

But th procedure before Senate committees is that witnesses appearing before them may be asked any conceivable questions which Senators may choose to ask. A witness before a committee may be asked whether he has stopped beating his wife, and he will have to answer either "Yes" or "No"; otherwise he is in contempt. I am complaining about that procedure, and I have complained about it for 10 years, ever since I have been in the Senate. I think that when a nomination is sent by the President of the United States to the Senate, for confirmation for a Cabinet position or for a judicial position or any other, there should be a rule dealing with the matter and requiring the observance of some propriety in connection with the handling of such cases. I think the nominees deserve such treatment. I think the executive branch of the Government deserves it. I do not know whether that has ever been tried or whether it has ever been thought of. Probably it has, because in the last 150 years practically everything has been thought of by someone.

However, the more I see how it is possible to handle witnesses before congressional committees, the more I am constrained to continue to complain about it; because if there is a desire to prosecute a witness before a committee, there is nothing he can do except stand there and "take it" because he is a witness. That is what I am complaining about. I submit he is entitled to some protection.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator in that complaint.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, with the views just expressed by the able senior Senator from Illinois, I am in full accord. I wholly agree with him. Possibly I misunderstood him. I wish to say for the RECORD that when a presidential nomination to which the Senate must advise and consent comes to the Senate, in considering my duty and in determining what I shall do regarding my vote on the nomination, I do not have to regard my nominee as a criminal or regard him as being on trial as one charged with a crime. I think I have a right, as a Senator, to weigh whatever information I may have, and to vote my convictions, regardless of whether I wish to announce the reason for my vote. I have observed in the Senate, in the brief time I have been here, that in voting on such nominations Senators often vote for or against confirmation—and I have seen it occur on this side of the aisle—without any apparently sufficient reason being given. I think a nomination of this character simply addresses itself to the judgment, wisdom, and consent of the Senate, based upon whatever information the Senate may have—whether it is gained at a public hearing or from other sources, and irrespective of whether it is such information as Senators wish to announce publicly for the RECORD.

There is no legal obligation on the part of any Senator in the performance of his duty to consent to the confirmation of any nomination. I have a right to weigh the evidence and consider the nominee in the light of my own judgment and in the light of any information I may have, and to vote on the nomination on that basis. I do not have to explain to my colleagues or to the President of the United States or to anyone else, if I am satisfied that I am doing

my duty to my country on the issue which is presented.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may make one reply to the statement of the Senator from Arkansas, in the time of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will yield, but I hope the Senator will not make a long speech. I should like to proceed with my argument.

Mr. LUCAS. I will not make a long speech; but I think the Senator from Louisiana knew that he and I had to make some reply to our good friend the venerable Senator from Tennessee. So perhaps I took a little longer than I should have taken.

Let me make one other statement in reply to my good friend the senior Senator from Arkansas. The point I made a while ago regarding Aubrey Williams—and I say this with all the sincerity I possess—there are not 12 men in America who, after taking an oath to give Mr. Williams fair and impartial consideration, would fail to confirm him, based upon the evidence which was presented before the Agriculture Committee. If these records made are useless and of no service to Senators, we ought to discontinue them and save the taxpayers of America money. If Senators' minds are fixed and determined, if no evidence will change them, then the hearings are a useless and futile thing. They are a waste of time and a waste of money.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Did the Senator say that such men would decide that the nomination ought not be confirmed?

Mr. LUCAS. I said they would decide that the nomination ought to be confirmed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to yield to me first, if he will, so that I may comment upon the statement just made by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well; with the consent of the Senator from Vermont, I will yield first to the Senator from Arkansas. Then I will yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I simply wish to say in reply to the statement of the able Senator from Illinois that it is not a question of whether 12 men would convict or confirm on the basis of the record. I can speak for one United States Senator. There is one who will not vote to confirm the nomination, on the record; and I think I can do that and be fair and impartial.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. Gladly.

Mr. AIKEN. Getting back to the question of whether Aubrey Williams is qualified for the position to which he has been nominated, I think the best answer to those who claim that the Administrator of the R. E. A. should be an electrical engineer and a farmer is to be found in the record relative to the three persons who up to this time have served as Administrators of the R. E. A. I believe the Senator from Louisiana put their biographies in the RECORD yesterday.

Briefly reviewing them, we find that the first Administrator of the R. E. A. was Morris Llewellyn Cooke. He studied mechanical engineering. Subsequently he became a reporter on the Philadelphia Press, and later on the Denver News and the New York Evening Telegram. Later he became a journeyman machinist. Subsequently he made a study for the Carnegie Foundation of administrative methods in the United States and Canada. Thereafter he became a technical consultant of the Labor Division of the Office of Production Management. After that he became an author; he wrote several books. Not at any time was he engaged in farming or electrical engineering.

The next Administrator was John Michael Carmody, whom everyone knows was one of the best Administrators the Government has had in recent years. He attended the Elmira Business College at Elmira, N. Y. He studied at the Lewis Institute, Chicago, Ill., and then became a clerk and bookkeeper for various structural steel manufacturers. He then became associated with a manufacturer of ladies' garments. Later he became editor of Coal Age, and also Factory and Industrial Management, both published by the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. He later became a member of the National Mediation Board and a member of the National Labor Relations Board. At no time was he a farmer. He never had engaged in farming or electrical engineering.

Then we come to the last Administrator, Harry Slattery. He was trained to be a lawyer. He became a well-known investigator. At no time was he engaged in farming or electrical engineering.

Mr. President, I ask that the biographies of Harry Slattery, John Michael Carmody, and Morris Llewellyn Cooke, beginning on page 171 of the hearings, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the biographies were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Who's Who in America, vol. 22, 1942–43]

HARRY SLATTERY

Lawyer; born in Greenville, S. C., June 13, 1887; son of John and Mary (Grace) Slattery; educated at Mount St. Mary's College (Maryland), Georgetown University, and George Washington University; unmarried. Secretary to Gifford Pinchot, 1909–12; secretary to National Conservation Association, 1912–17; counsel same, 1919–23; special assistant to Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of Interior, 1917–18; executive and counsel of National Boulder Dam Association, 1925–29; counsel of National Conservation Commission, 1929–32; Washington representative of New York Power Authority, 1931–33; practice of law, Washington, D. C., concurrently, 1923–33; personal assistant to Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, 1933–38; assistant to Administrator of Federal Emergency Administration of Public Works, 1933–38; Under Secretary of the Interior, 1938–39; Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration since 1939; member of National Power Policy Commission; member of Energy Resources and Land Commissions of the National Resources Committee; consultant to power subcommittee of advisory commission, Council of National Defense, since 1940. Took active part in passage of Federal coal- and oil-leasing measure, Federal water-power legislation, Alaska Coal and Home Rule Acts, forestry legislation, investigation of naval oil reserves, etc. Member of Society of American Foresters, Delta Theta Phi Club; National Press. Contributor on conservation. Author: Rural America Lights Up. Home: Broadmoor Apartments. Office: Longfellow Building, Washington, D. C.

[From Who's Who in America, vol. 22, 1942–43]

JOHN MICHAEL CARMODY

Industrial executive; born Bradford County, Pa.; son of Michael John and Catherine (Collins) Carmody; graduated Elmira (N. Y.) Free Academy, 1899, Elmira Business College, 1900; student Lewis Institute, Chicago, 1908, Columbia, 1926; married Margaret Cross, Oct. 4, 1913; one daughter, Catherine Cross. Began as clerk and bookkeeper, 1900; with various structural steel manufacturers, 1900–1914, and with manufacturer of ladies' garments, 1914–23; made special study of labor relations in bituminous coal industry for United States Coal Commission, 1922; vice president in charge of industrial relations, Davis Coal & Coke Co., and vice president and general manager of its merchandising subsidiaries, 1923–26; editor, Coal Age, also Factory and Industrial Management, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., New York, 1927–33; made survey for McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. of industrial development in Russia, 1931; Chairman of Bituminous Coal Labor Board, 1933; chief engineer of Civil Works Administration, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, and member of National Mediation Board, November 1933–September 1935; member National Labor Relations Board; Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration, 1936–39; Federal Works Agency, 1939–41; member of Maritime Commission since 1941. Member of Power Policy Commission, Society for Advancement of Management, American Society for Public Administration. Clubs: National Press, Cosmos. Home: 2102 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.

[From Who's Who in America, vol. 22, 1942–43]

MORRIS LLEWELLYN COOKE

Consulting engineer in management; born in Carlisle, Pa., May 11, 1872; son of William Harvey (M. D.) and Elizabeth Richmond (Marsden) Cooke; mechanical engineering, Lehigh University, 1895, Sc. D., 1922; married Eleanor Bushnell Davis, June 16, 1900. Reporter on Philadelphia Press, Denver News, and Evening Telegram (New York), 1890–94; served apprenticeship in Cramp's Shipyard, Philadelphia, later journeyman machinist at Southwark Foundry; engineer for Acetylene Co., Washington, D. C., 1896–97; assistant engineer in United States Navy during Spanish-American War; engaged in commercial organization work, 1899–1905; consulting engineer, 1905–11; director of department of public works, Philadelphia, 1911–15; chairman of Storage Section of War Industries Board of Council of National Defense and member of Depot Board, United States Army, 1917; executive assistant to Chairman of United States Shipping Board, 1918. Made study of collegiate administrative methods in United States and Canada for Carnegie Foundation, 1910; director of giant power survey of Pennsylvania, 1923; chairman of Mississippi Valley Commission of Public Works Administration, 1933; director of Water Resources Section of National Resources Board and Chairman of Water Planning Commission, 1934; Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, 1935–37; Chairman of Great Plains Commission, 1936–37; technical consultant of Labor Divison, Office of Production Management, 1940–41. Trustee of the Power Authority of State of New York, 1931. Fellow American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Society

Mechanical Engineers (council 1915); member of Society for Promotion Engineering Education, Taylor Society (president 1927), Franklin Institute, Delta Phi, Sigma Xi; honorary member of Masaryk Academy (Prague), Czechoslovak Order of the White Lion. Democrat. Episcopalian. Clubs: University (Philadelphia); Engineers (Philadelphia, New York); Cosmos (Washington, D. C.). Author: Academic and Industrial Efficiency, 1910; Snapping Cords, 1915; Our Cities Awake, 1918; (with Philip Murray) Organized Labor and Production, 1940. Editor: Public Utility Regulation, 1922; What Electricity Costs, 1933. Homes: St. Georges Road, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia, Pa., and New Hope, Pa.

Mr. AIKEN. The 3 Administrators to whom I have referred, none of whom were farmers or electrical engineers, developed the R. E. A. to such an extent that more than 1,000,000 farmers are now being served by it. At the present time there are between 900 and 1,000 rural-electric cooperatives in the United States. At the hearings last year it developed that only 6 cooperatives out of approximately 1,000 were in arrears in their prepayments. I know one of them was in arrears because of war conditions, which caught them at an inopportune time. I should like to know whether 1,000 other borrowers from the Government can show such a record over a 10-year period of time. Of a thousand borrowers from the R. F. C., can only six be found to be in arrears in their prepayments? It will be found that probably several times that number have completely defaulted in their prepayments. So the argument that the Administrator of the R. E. A. should be a farmer, an electrical engineer, or both, simply does not hold water in the light of the work of the three previous Administrators to whom I have referred. I, too, should like to see farmers occupying positions as heads of the R. E. A., but I do not think a farmer is likely to become the Administrator of the R. E. A.

Mr. President, we may as well realize that much of the opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Williams comes from persons throughout the country who are not in favor of the R. E. A. They hope to see an Administrator appointed who will administer the R. E. A. in the way that they would like to have it operated. They know that Mr. Williams is 100 percent loyal to the objectives of the R. E. A. If they cannot get their own man in as Administrator, their next objective will be to increase confusion, which, unfortunately, already exists, to some extent, in the R. E. A. and let the R. E. A. drift along until it goes from bad to worse. But the ultimate objective of some opponents—not all, because most of them are very loyal—is complete destruction of the R. E. A.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask one question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question, but not for a speech.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator from Vermont made a very serious charge against the agricultural personnel of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by stating that many persons who are opposed to Aubrey Williams are opposed to the R. E. A. program. The public has no way of knowing whom the Senator has in mind. I ask him if he has in mind any member of the committee who voted against Aubrey Williams. If he has, let him state whom he has in mind.

Mr. AIKEN. I said that much of the opposition came from around the country. I did not say that it came from the committee.

Mr. BILBO. Does the Senator mean to imply that any member of the committee is opposed to the R. E. A.?

Mr. AIKEN. I was not implying that the Senator from Mississippi, or any other member of the committee, was opposed to the R. E. A. I think the Senator from Mississippi made clear his reasons for opposing Mr. Williams, but I do not think they were sound.

Mr. BILBO. I do not want the Senator from Vermont to think that any member of the committee is opposed to the R. E. A.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator merely puts into the RECORD words which I never used. Any one reading the RECORD will realize that I have not said what the Senator has inferred that I said.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I am very glad to yield to any Senators who desire to propound questions, but I will ask them to make no speeches in my time from now on.

I may state to my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], that there is no Member of the Senate for whom I have greater respect or love than I have for him. I hope that he will not for a moment think that I am in any way attacking him personally when I mention his name in the course of my remarks. As I indicated a moment ago, the only reason why it is necessary to refer to the distinguished Senator is that he was the only witness who appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in opposition to Mr. Williams, and he, of course, was the one who made the various charges against Mr. Williams which I have been discussing. I propose to discuss them further during this debate.

Mr. President, when I was addressing the Senate yesterday afternoon, and before I was interrupted, I was attempting to explain to the Senate how the R. E. A. operates. As I pointed out, the R. E. A. is a loaning agency of the Government. It is administered by an Administrator who has been selected by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Whenever a community desires to obtain a loan from the R. E. A. for the purpose of supplying electric current, a cooperative is organized in that community by those who desire to obtain funds. As I was attempting to show yesterday when I was interrupted, the R. E. A. has four distinct and separate divisions within itself. The first is the Applications and Loans Division, which helps to organize cooperatives in communities that desire electricity. After the cooperative is organized, then the Engineering Division takes hold of the application and passes upon the engineering feasibility of the cooperative. After careful study, a report is made by both those Divisions to the Administrator, who in turn passes judgment. Then, there is a third division, known as the Cooperatives Operations Division. This Division helps local cooperatives in their operations and assists them in solving their problems. Fourth, there is the Finance Division, which takes care of the fiscal aspects and accounting of the various cooperatives and audits the loans which are made to them.

It will be readily seen from that, Mr. President, that the Administrator of R. E. A. need only be an executive, one who can administer the making of loans to the cooperatives, supervise their organization, and form judgment after investigations, and so forth, have been made by the divisions that are within the R. E. A. For that reason I have contended all along that it was not necessary that the Administrator be a farmer or an engineer, any more than it is necessary that the head of the R. F. C. be a farmer or a mechanical engineer or an electrical engineer, because, as all of us know, the R. F. C. has made loans to farmers; it has made loans to bankers, and it has made loans to many industries throughout the country which are engaged in the manufacture of many war materials.

So the head of the R. E. A., which is a loaning agency, as well as the R. F. C., need be a man of executive ability, of administrative ability, and I am confident that the record which has been produced to the Senate showing the administrative positions which Aubrey Williams has held under the W. P. A., where he had under his control, as I said yesterday, 60,000 employees, and under N. Y. A., where he had as many as 23,000 employees, demonstrates the executive ability of this nominee.

Let me at this point call the attention of the Senate to some of the work that has been done by the N. Y. A. as reflected in a speech delivered in the House of Representatives by Representative TARVER, of Georgia. I quote from his speech as follows:

A WAR PRODUCTION TRAINING PROGRAM

From July 1, 1942, to March 1, 1943, the National Youth Administration gave war-production training to 303,000 previously unemployed boys and girls. It is conservatively estimated that over 400,000 will have been given training in the 12-month period of fiscal year 1943.

Over a thousand youths a day leave the program and a thousand other youths, mostly without any work experience, take their places. Of those who leave, between 650 and 700 a day enter employment, the majority of them in war industries. While it is not practical to follow through on every youth who leaves the program, there is ample reason for assuming that many of the remainder likewise find employment in essential industry. Some enter the armed services, greatly advantaged by their training in mechanics.

The National Youth Administration war production training program utilizes approximately 39,000 work stations (a machine or equivalent training facility for 1 person per shift) concentrated in 640 shops located in 510 communities and in every State of the Nation. How closely these work stations are related to war production is apparent from the following list, which gives the number of work stations for each type of training

activity carried on by the National Youth Administration:

Machine	9,739
Sheet metal	5,666
Welding	6,858
Patternmaking and foundry	1,005
Forge	208
Radio and electrical	3,543
Auto mechanics	1,105
Aircraft and aircraft engine mechanics	1,079
Joinery	207
Aircraft woodwork	748
General woodwork	1,400
Industrial sewing	2,570
Mechanical drafting	638
Other shop activities	40
Clerical	2,162
Other activities	253

In 225 of the above 510 communities, and in 11 additional places, residence centers for the housing of youth are provided. This makes it possible to bring in youth from sparsely settled areas where it would be impractical to set up training facilities and to give them training which enables them to make the maximum contribution to the war effort of which they are capable. These residence centers have a second important function, for they are the basis of the youth transfer system whereby the demands of one area for semiskilled labor may be met by transferring youth having the specific skills needed from an area that has a relative surplus. By the end of this month over 31,000 National Youth Administration trained youth will have been transferred to critical labor shortage areas. Shipyards alone have been provided with 14,000 National Youth Administration trained youth.

The average cost per month, for each youth, including subsistence of those in residence centers, the wages paid to youth, and all training and administrative cost is $66.91. The average cost for each different trainee for the entire period of time spent in training is $108.44.

Actual production work of material, principally for the armed forces, is the basis of National Youth Administration training. The Army, Navy, Maritime Commission, and other agencies provide the materials; National Youth Administration processes them at no charge. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are thus saved the Government, and the youth profit by the best kind of training it is possible to give. In many cases parts that must be had by the Navy shore establishments or Army arsenals without a moment's delay in order to break a production bottleneck can be and are sped through National Youth Administration shops, the saving of time in such cases being far more important than the saving in cost. Some idea of the extent of this production may be had by citing the number of parts or articles made for a few Government establishments in the past 10 months.

Listen to this:

Portsmouth Navy Yard, Portsmouth, N. H.	1,214,318
Brooklyn Navy Yard, Brooklyn N. Y.	406,047
Norfolk Navy Yard, Norfolk, Va.	102,731
United States Naval Coast Guard, New England	20,884
United States Submarine Base, Connecticut	1,384
United States Maritime Commission, various shipyards	13,795
Rock Island Arsenal, Rock Island, Ill.	1,282,747
Watervliet Arsenal, Watervliet, N. Y.	8,129

One-half of all National Youth Administration trainees are females. Youth of draft age now represent approximately one-third of the males. Many in this group, while acceptable to industry, are not up to the physical standards of the armed services.

In the past year National Youth Administration moved 10,500, or more than 25 percent of its work stations to new locations, as the urgency of training needs developed in various parts of the country. It has proved to be the only training agency that is capable of rapidly moving and setting up its facilities to meet immediate needs.

STUDENT WORK PROGRAM

By keeping 40,000 youth in college National Youth Administration has this year assured the training of 3,106 additional engineers, 2,084 chemists, 410 physicists, 1,129 mathematicians, 277 pharmacists, 68 metallurgists, 1,613 doctors, 270 dentists, 1,033 biologists and bacteriological specialists, 361 nurses, 2,624 dietitians and home economists, 1,256 agricultural specialists, 6,276 teachers, 1,233 physical education directors, 5,073 business and commerce technicians, 2,593 social scientists, and 9,952 other technical personnel, all of whom would have been unable to continue their college education without National Youth Administration assistance.

Mr. President, the point I desire to make at this time is that all this work which has been so necessary, which has been so important, to put us in such a position that we could help our soldiers in getting ammunition and implements of war, was made possible through this training program which N. Y. A. carried out, and all of it was organized and administered by and through the efforts of Aubrey Williams. I think he did a great work, and I am confident that he would make an equally fine record in continuing the work of R. E. A., if the Senate should confirm him.

Mr. President, I shall now discuss another charge that was made against Mr. Aubrey Williams, the charge being that he is a Communist. I take the charge seriously, since it was made by a very reputable person, and the charge was also made by way of telegrams, letters, and so forth, from people who did not appear and testify.

It is now my purpose to show that Mr. Williams is not a Communist. As I pointed out yesterday, the only crime Aubrey Williams has committed during his lifetime is that he has been aiding the underprivileged. He was placed in position where he could do that. As I also pointed out yesterday, as Assistant Administrator of W. P. A. he was instrumental in directing the work of helping millions of our unemployed, and as Administrator of N. Y. A. he again helped millions of underprivileged boys and girls of our Nation. Mr. Williams' activities in that direction no doubt furnish the reason why some accuse him of being a Communist.

Mr. President, imagine a great statesman of the stature of George Norris being accused of being a Communist by the same committee which accused Aubrey Williams. Why was Norris accused of being a Communist? I am confident it was because of his liberal views. I know that he did not believe in communism, and I know that he was as great an American as ever adorned a seat in the United States Senate. Yet there are some who charge him with being a Communist.

Mr. President, let me read to the Senate Mr. Aubrey Williams' views on communism. When asked by the committee why he had at times been accused of communistic ideas, Mr. Williams said:

So far as I know, the general term "Communist" certainly in my case must have grown out of the fact that I have seemed to be very much interested in the unemployed, and worked for them, and in their behalf. I conceived it to be my duty, employed under the acts of Congress to work in behalf of the interest of those people for whom the act was created, which was to provide them with assistance. I suppose people must have gotten the idea somewhere that anyone who works diligently in terms of trying to create a better situation for those people have got some curious kind of communistic philosophy. That is the only thing I can ever account for it.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] commented:

You are not the only one that has been called a Communist.

Mr. Williams' views on communism are summed up in the following quotations from his sworn testimony:

I have never been a member of the Communist Party. I have never attended a meeting of any Communist group, or party, or affiliates of a Communist group. I have never employed, knowingly, a Communist.

Mr. President, that is the direct testimony of Mr. Williams, and when his accuser appeared before our committee I asked for proof, and none was forthcoming. I was referred to the hearings held before the Dies committee, and the only proof submitted to that committee was from one of its staff, a Mr. Matthews, whose background I propose to place in the RECORD in a few moments.

I continue reading from the summary of Mr. Williams' views:

I have great admiration for what the Russian people have been able to do, especially in this war. If they wish to develop communism as their way of life, that is their business. I have always held, and I so hold now, that we are trying to develop in this country a democracy, which is an entirely different form of government, and that they ought to leave us alone.

You will find that those people who work hardest for democracy are most frequently held up, even by the Communists themselves, to ridicule and to charges. I could cite you illustrations of people who were nominated for the presidency of some of our great universities, who were genuinely thoroughgoing liberals working for democracy, where the charges were going around that they were Communists, and it could be traced around to the Communists themselves, that they had started these charges on these same people.

As an illustration of the wide cleavage between myself and the Communists, there was a break that came back there when Russia joined with Germany, joined with Hitler, and the Army asked us for lists of our people. In January of that year, I gave them (the Army) lists so that they could come in and talk to the young people. The Communist element of the Youth Congress hissed me down in the Labor Auditorium here in the Department of Labor, because of my stand at that time.

Later on (1940), in Boston, when I made an address up there, the papers carried it, in which I took issue at that time with that element in the Youth Congress, which was communistic, that they were destroying the youth organization that would be useful in America if it had not gotten into the control of the Communist element among the youth, and I did all in my power to eradicate that element, and I became an anathema

to them and have been an anathema to them ever since.

We are attempting to establish a form of government which is the most difficult thing there is, where we shall have freedom of all the people and yet, by a joint effort, shall achieve for ourselves, a good life, and have freedom as a part of that good life, freedom of the individual, a representative form of government, elected and responsive to the people. To me that is the most wonderful and desirable thing there is in life.

Mr. President, as I stated a while ago, I made an earnest effort before the committee to get the accusers of Mr. Williams to furnish us with proof to back up their charges, but none was established. They contented themselves with saying that because Mr. Aubrey Williams had contributed $10 to Commonwealth College in Arkansas 11 years before that college turned out to be communistic, therefore he, Mr. Williams, is a Communist. It was shown by the record that at the time Mr. Williams made his contribution, the wife of Mr. Justice Brandeis was at the head of the committee which made collections for that college, and on that committee were many other prominent Americans who sought to collect money in order to help the college. But, because Mr. Williams had contributed along with numerous others socially and officially prominent, the sum of $10 to that college, Mr. Matthews before the Dies committee pinned the label "Communist" on the shoulder of Mr. Aubrey Williams.

Mr. President, another method of attack and another way to connect Mr. Williams' name with communism was to refer to the fact that he made speeches before certain organizations. I have here the charge that was made against him because he, in his capacity as assistant W. P. A. Administrator, talked to a group which had come to him in order, I believe, to secure higher wages. Mr. Williams made a talk to the group. The press got some of it. I do admit, Mr. President, that Mr. Williams may have talked out of line on many occasions, as many of us do. I do not suppose there is a Senator who now holds a seat in this body who has not made statements years ago which today he regrets having made. That is just a normal thing in the lives of all public men. I do believe Mr. Williams may have written a little too much at times and may have talked a little too much at times, and many of the statements made by him in the past are now flying back in his face.

Mr. Williams was charged with praising the leadership of the Workers Alliance in 1938, specifically its president, David Lasser, and its secretary-treasurer, Herbert Benjamin. Mr. President, the fact that Mr. Williams spoke to the Workers Alliance, or that he praised some of its leaders would seem to be sufficient to justify the action on the part of some to brand him as a Communist. The record shows that David Lasser was president of the Workers Alliance at one time, and when that organization became Communistic it kicked Mr. Lasser out as president because he was not a Communist. The record shows that.

Mr. Williams said he held in high esteem David Lasser, now employed by the War Production Board. At one time Congress prohibited the use of funds for the employment of Mr. Lasser—in W. P. A.—but later this provision was eliminated by action of both Houses of Congress. Mr. Lasser was opposed by the Communists when he was president of the Workers Alliance, and in 1939 he was thrown out of office by the Communists who then took control, as I previously stated.

As to Mr. Benjamin, Mr. Williams stated that he was mistaken when he spoke favorably about him in 1938. While he did not know it at the time, Mr. Benjamin later on, in 1939, admitted membership in the Communist Party. Mr. Benjamin also claimed that the Communist Party helped form the Workers Alliance originally, but Mr. Williams said that so far as he knew the Communists did not have any control over the Workers Alliance until after they defeated Mr. Lasser in 1939.

As I previously said, the statement was made by Mr. Williams in 1938. Yet, because he made a statement to the members of this organization, which afterward turned communistic, but which was not communistic at the time he made the statement, he is branded as a Communist.

Having failed to show that Mr. Williams knowingly condoned Communists in the Workers Alliance, the charge was made that Mr. Williams was lax in failing to investigate all the elements in the Workers Alliance.

Mr. Williams pointed out that he never had any official connection with the Workers Alliance. He was never a member of it—being in fact ineligible since it was an organization of unemployed people. Mr. Williams pointed out that he had no more connection with the Workers Alliance than, for example, the Secretary of Labor has with a labor union. Likewise, he had no reason to attempt to control its leadership anymore than the Secretary of Labor would have to control the leadership of a labor union.

Since his job involved dealing with the unemployed, however, Mr. Williams was obliged to deal with the Workers Alliance, since it was an organization of the unemployed. Since Mr. Williams had to deal with many organizations and individuals, it would have been impossible to investigate the possibility of Communist tendencies in each and every one of them. In fact, Mr. Williams felt it was entirely improper for him to question the politics of any of the unemployed people, since he was directed by Congress to administer programs for the unemployed entirely on a nonpolitical basis. Incidentally, by the time the Communist element gained control of the Workers Alliance in 1939 Mr. Williams had already left W. P. A.

A letter from Mr. Williams to the Workers Alliance in September 1936 recognized it as a collective bargaining organization, but the letter also stated:

We recognize the workers' right to organize in such form as they wish to organize. Organization is their own affair. We do not recognize you as the only organization for the workers, inasmuch as such action might be construed as promotion by the administration of company unionism. We affirm the workers' right to organize and choose their own representatives, together with the corresponding obligation of administration officials to deal with such representatives in the adjustment of grievances and consideration of recommendations.

Mr. President, I have before me other statements in respect to other organizations which were communistic, and of which Mr. Williams was accused of being a member. Remember, no membership card was ever presented to the committee; but, I repeat, an earnest effort was made by me and other members of the committee to obtain evidence that Mr. Williams belonged to any of these organizations at the time they were communistic. As I stated a while ago, he was not only not a member when the organizations were communistic but he was never a member of any of them.

The Dies committee, in volume 17, charges that Mr. Williams has been a member of three organizations found subversive by the Attorney General and four organizations which the committee found subversive. The three organizations listed as subversive by the Attorney General are American Youth Congress, Washington Committee for Democratic Action, and the Workers Alliance.

Mr. Williams said, "I was not a member of any one of those organizations."

When asked what organizations he did belong to, Mr. Williams replied that the only ones he had ever belonged to were the Presbyterian Church, the American Legion, and the National Citizens' Political Action Committee. In addition, while he was not a member of it, he approved the use of his name to raise funds for a committee on Jewish refugees. The American Youth Congress was one of the organizations to which he was supposed to have belonged. It started as a fine organization, but afterward became communistic.

The Dies committee called the American Youth Congress a front organization controlled by Communists—naming Joseph P. Lash and Clarence Hathaway.

Mr. Williams commented:

I have this comment to make, Senator, that there was a struggle from the day that the Youth Congress showed its head; that the Communists made inroads upon it. It was predominantly the other way along that line. I, frankly, was among those that deplored the efforts of the Communists to get in there, and I did all I could to get them out, but it was a democratic organization; and if they asked a fellow like that to speak, I had nothing to do with it. I had nothing to do with the Youth Congress. I had no responsibility for it and no connection with it. It was a private youth-citizen group.

I addressed the Youth Congress in New York. I forget the year, but it was the year they had their world conference there. The president of Vassar College, Mrs. Roosevelt, and myself were the speakers at that time.

Is it possible that anyone will charge that Mrs. Roosevelt is a Communist merely because she addressed the National Youth Congress? Yet one would have as much right to say that she was a Communist because she addressed the National Youth Congress as to make the same charge against Mr. Williams.

A year later I attempted to speak in support of my position with respect to this recruiting, but was practically hissed off the

stage by the Youth Congress group, the audience.

When asked if he was in sympathy with the objectives of the organization, Mr. Williams replied:

In the initial stages, where I felt they were doing constructive work, I was. I later became very unhappy about them and felt they were rendering a great disservice to all American youth. The whole thing of my being a member of the thing is really ridiculous, because of the fact I don't suppose there is anybody they denounced more or hated more than they did me.

Mr. Williams added:

When the Youth Congress started it was made up of typical American youth who had but one idea, and that was to find some way to get something to do, instead of walking the streets in idleness. Later, I became convinced that the Communists had taken over—at the time that Stalin and Hitler had agreed upon a pact—and the Youth Congress later turned against the war effort.

This change occurred over a period of 4 or 5 years.

Mr. President, soon after the Youth Congress was organized Mr. Aubrey Williams was not the only distinguished American who addressed them. There were many others. It was but natural that he was asked to speak to them, because he administered N. Y. A., a Government organization that was created to help the underprivileged youth of the Nation. Many prominent Senators and Representatives sponsored meetings of Youth Congress. Would anyone have the temerity to accuse those Senators and Representatives of being Communists because, forsooth, they sponsored gatherings of the National Youth Congress? I contend that one would be as much justified in saying that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who is now presiding, and whose name appears in this record as a sponsor, is a Communist because he fostered some of the meetings, as he would be in accusing Aubrey Williams of being a Communist because he addressed the Youth Congress. Yet in the case of the Senators and Representatives no such accusation was lodged against them. As for Aubrey Williams, he did not foster any of the meetings. He was merely invited to address them in his official capacity. Nevertheless, it is charged that because he addressed them he is a Communist. It is also charged that he was lax in failing to investigate the American Youth Congress, even though the only connection which could be shown between him and the American Youth Congress was that he addressed its meetings twice and that he dealt with it officially, as he was obliged to do, inasmuch as he was in charge of a youth program and the American Youth Congress was an organized group of youth.

Mr. Williams placed in the record the names of 13 Senators and 40 Members of the House of Representatives who sponsored the 1937 convention of the American Youth Congress. I am not making this reference in an attempt to be critical of any of my colleagues. I merely make this point in order to show the manner and method by which some persons are attempting to pin the label of communism on the back of Mr. Williams because he did the same things which many prominent persons did. The record shows that at the time when Mr. Williams addressed the American Youth Congress it was not a communistic organization. It became communistic afterward.

Let me read the list of Senators who sponsored the 1937 convention of the American Youth Congress; ARTHUR CAPPER, of Kansas. Would anyone say he is a Communist? But we would have as much right to say that ARTHUR CAPPER is a Communist, because he fostered a meeting of the American Youth Congress.

DENNIS CHAVEZ, of New Mexico; EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado, my good friend who is my next-door neighbor in the Senate. Would anyone accuse him of being a Communist? He is as fine a type of American as I have ever met. He is genuine, honest, and honorable, and I know he loves his country.

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr., of Wisconsin. I have just spoken about him.

Marvel M. Logan, of Kentucky, who used to sit here; Ernest Lundeen, of Minnesota; Gerald P. Nye, of North Dakota; James P. Pope; Harry H. Schwartz; Elbert D. Thomas.

As I have indicated, 40 Members of the House of Representatives sponsored the 1937 convention of the American Youth Congress. Their names are as follows: Robert G. Allen, Herbert S. Bigelow, Gerald J. Boileau, John M. Coffee, Matthew A. Dunn, Charles R. Eckert, Frank W. Fries, Harry L. Haines, Ed. V. Izac, Paul Kvale, Louis Ludlow, Sam Massingale, John R. Murdock, John M. Robinson, Paul W. Shafer, Compton I. White, John T. Bernard, Charles G. Binderup, D. Worth Clark, Joseph A. Dickson, Herman P. Eberharter, Thomas F. Ford, D. J. Gehrmann, Santiago Iglesias, Dewey W. Johnson, Charles H. Leary, John McSweeney, Matthew J. Merritt, James C. Oliver, Byron N. Scott, Henry J. Teigan, and Will M. Whittington.

That list of Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives who sponsored the convention was obtained from the official printed program of the American Youth Congress issued at the time of the convention at Milwaukee, Wis. Mr. Williams pointed out that no person whose name appeared on the list had ever denied sponsoring the meeting. He stated:

I do not wish it to be understood that I am critical of these gentlemen. As a matter of fact, I feel they were showing the proper interest in the plight of young people at that time in what they did when they sponsored the meeting.

He also said:

I want to say this for the record: While I do not find fault with these gentlemen, it ought to be noted I never sponsored its holding a meeting in the entire time I had my relationships with them.

Mr. President, it is on such flimsy, flimflam evidence that some persons have had the temerity to accuse a good American of being a Communist. As I pointed out yesterday, if the same yardstick is to be used, I can prove, according to the man who made the accusation, that every Member of this body and every Member of the House of Representatives who voted for any funds for the N. Y. A. is a Communist. In other words, the yardstick used by the Senator from Tennessee is that anyone who fostered a meeting of an organization which later became communistic or anyone who supports an organization with a communistic front is a Communist. That is the yardstick used by the Senator from Tennessee. As I mentioned previously, we find testimony in that connection on page 170 of the record. I now read it. The Senator from Tennessee said:

But when Mr. Williams began to run his activities in the National Youth Administration as Communist front organization I had to part company with Mr. Williams, because I am not a Communist and could not go along with it.

Senator ELLENDER. The Senator does not mean to say that N. Y. A. was run as a Communist organization?

Senator MCKELLAR. Indeed it was; yes, sir.

Senator ELLENDER. I am surprised and disappointed in the Senator.

Senator MCKELLAR. The Senator may be surprised. He has been surprised and disappointed in me a number of times. I forgive him for it; I cannot hate him; I love him just the same.

Senator ELLENDER. The feeling is mutual, Senator.

Mr. President, if we are to follow the line of argument that the accusers of Aubrey Williams have pursued, I contend that insofar as the statement made by the Senator from Tennessee that N. Y. A. is communistic is concerned—and the thought stands in the mind of the Senator that it is—according to his yardstick the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who voted for N. Y. A., is a Communist, and so am I. If that is communism, I am for it.

Everyone knows that the Dies committee held long hearings and blasted at many of the prominent men in this Nation. In most cases the only evidence which was produced was along the line of that I have just indicated. There was no direct proof; no membership cards were produced to show that such persons belong to the organizations which the Attorney General declared to be subversive. Merely some remote connection in some way or other was shown.

Who is the great man upon whose testimony many of our prominent citizens have been indicted as Communists? As the record shows, the name of that gentleman is Mr. J. P. Matthews. Let me read some of the record of Mr. Matthews.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] furnished the following statement about him:

That is the testimony of one Mr. Matthews and Mr. Matthews alone, who was employed by the Committee on Un-American Propaganda Activities, to find all of these things. I have searched the records, and the committee, as a whole, finds no one guilty of un-American propaganda activities. This record is based upon the testimony of Mr. Matthews, and for the benefit of this committee I want to read into the record the background of Mr. Matthews at this point.

He was instructor at Scarritt College, Nashville, Tenn. He was forced to resign

from Scarritt for violence in preaching against child labor and Jim Crowism.

He was instructor at two Negro universities—Fisk, at Nashville; and Howard, in Washington, D. C.

1929: Executive secretary of Fellowship of Reconciliation, American branch of pacifist international; joined Socialist Party.

He became a vehement Marxist and turned his back on his religious teaching, time and again advocating the necessity and inevitability of class conflict, making no "bones" of his hostility to the established order, laughing and pouring scorn upon what he termed the so-called democracy of America.

1933: Fired by Fellowship of Reconciliation and expelled from Socialist Party for the violence of his extreme views. "Fascism," said Matthews at this time, "is nothing but capitalism gone nude."

At Pittsburgh, 1934: "Even if Japan attacks America, I am not fighting for America."

Matthews then moved over to Consumers' Research and in 1935 published a book entitled "Partners in Plunder," a vicious attack on the business community as a gang of cheats and swindlers.

Senators, it is upon the testimony of this degraded misfit that some good people think that the charges against Aubrey Williams are true.

I continue to read from the statement:

In 1935 the underpaid employees of Consumers' Research, organized in an A. F. of L. local, struck for better hours and higher pay, and Matthews struck back with clubs and tear gas. The case went to the N. L. R. B., who ordered the strikers reinstated, and this was the end of Matthews with Consumers' Research.

In 1936 he published another book, entitled "Guinea Pigs No More," urging consumers to rise up against manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, and knock them spinning, advocating a reorganization of society with the consumers in control, to be achieved by violence if necessary.

Has worked with Gannett's League for Constitutional Government in circulating forged protocols of Zion and Elizabeth Dilling's Red Network.

But pickings were rather slim until Matthews appeared as a voluntary witness before the Dies committee and told such a horrendous tale of his own past exploits that he was immediately hired as director of research of the committee at $3,600 a year. Matthews modestly confessed to having been a member of 94 left-wing organizations, representing himself as a combination Lenin-Trotsky-Stalin who knew practically everything that was going on in the world, for he was the chief engineer of most of it. The record does not bear him out—but let that pass.

I need not go into the history of the late but unlamented Dies committee, which this professional slanderer more or less directed. In his jaundiced eye anyone who spoke for the Roosevelt administration and denounced Hitler was ipso facto a Communist. And anyone who spoke disparingly of Dr. Matthews and the smear techniques of the committee was obviously a "red" of the deepest hue.

And out of this mass of innuendo, deliberate misrepresentations, gross errors, and plain unvarnished lies, what finally emerged?

The committee, following its usual method of research with the garbage it collected, listed 1,121 Federal employees whom it charged with being "reds." The F. B. I. carefully investigated every one, each was examined by a committee of high officials in his or her agency, and of all the persons listed, just two were found to be subversive within any sensible interpretation of that term. And among the public at large, the doctor turned up and listed such prominent Communists as Shirley Temple, William Allen White (peace be on his gentle soul), Mayor LaGuardia, and the late Senator George Norris.

I challenge anybody to defend such reprehensible and un-American practices.

The mess finally become so foul that the Committee on Un-American Activities had to be reorganized, without J. B. Matthews as director of research.

His career exhibits a clear record of general untrustworthiness, of wild and almost fanatical ideas.

Mr. President, after many of the persons to whom reference has been made were charged with being Communists by the Dies committee, the Seventy-seventh Congress saw fit to enact Public Law 135. It ordered the Department of Justice, through the F. B. I., to make an investigation of various organizations and of the membership thereof. Pursuant to that law, the F. B. I. made a thorough investigation. Because they are of a confidential nature, I am sorry that I cannot give to the Senate all the findings of the F. B. I. The names of many persons investigated in conjunction with Mr. Aubrey Williams were contained in one single report. It seems that the report was made as a whole, and it includes the names of many persons besides that of Aubrey Williams. Hence, I was not permitted to read the entire report to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. President, in a moment I shall read an excerpt from the findings of the F. B. I. But before doing so I should like to quote a few excerpts from the testimony of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] in connection with this subject. In his testimony before the committee the Senator said:

Mr. Williams was noted in that report of the Attorney General as being a member of either four or five of the Communist front organizations.

The facts are exactly the opposite. This accusation was made against Mr. Williams and many other reputable persons by the Dies committee, and was based solely on the unsupported testimony of its former staff member, J. B. Matthews.

Pursuant to Public Law 135, the F. B. I. in the Department of Justice made a thorough investigation into the charges, and completely cleared Mr. Williams and practically all the others who had been falsely accused.

Here is the report from the Attorney General referring specifically to a list of employees which included Mr. Williams. I ask the four Senators who are now present to listen to me.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. ELLENDER. Five Senators are now in the Chamber, besides the present occupant of the chair and myself.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HATCH. Would the Senator from Louisiana like to have me suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana declines to yield for that purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not think it would bring into the Chamber any more Senators than are now present.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield in order that I may suggest a correction of his statement?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Eleven Senators are now present.

Mr. ELLENDER. Some Senators have come into the Chamber since I made my statement. [Laughter.]

(At this point Mr. MAGNUSON obtained consent to have printed in the RECORD an explanation of an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 37 which appears elsewhere in today's RECORD under an appropriate heading.)

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I indicated a moment ago, under Public Law 135 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, a thorough investigation was made by the F. B. I. regarding all charges which had been made against Aubrey Williams and others. It strikes me that surely the results of that investigation should be a decisive answer to the charges which have been made against Williams. I read it as follows:

Re Aubrey Williams:

Inasmuch as we find nothing in these reports showing the above employees—

As I said a while ago, there were other employees besides Aubrey Williams—

have engaged in any activities which might properly be characterized subversive or disloyal to our Government, they have been exonerated and we are filing the reports without further action.

That is how the F. B. I. disposed of all the vicious charges about which I have been talking. As I have already said, insofar as Aubrey Williams is concerned, the report which I have read should dispose of the charges made against him. But my guess is that as long as Aubrey Williams maintains an attitude of desiring to help the underprivileged of the country he, as well as many others who entertain such views, will be branded as Communists.

Mr. President, I for one never raised the religious issue in this case, nor do I believe the committee or any member of it raised that issue; and, with due regard to my good friend from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], I know that he at no time raised the religious issue in respect to Mr. Williams. The whole matter came about from a telegram which was introduced into the RECORD by the Senator from Tennessee for the purpose of showing how Aubrey Williams obtained his education; and there were included in the telegram that came from Dr. Broady some remarks to the effect that Mr. Williams had "denied the divinity of Christ after the church educated him for the ministry." At no time did any member of the committee

discuss the religious issue as such. It was only mentioned in the manner I indicated above.

Mr. President, I placed in the RECORD on Monday last two telegrams which I presented in order to clear the charge against Williams that he had obtained his education under false pretenses. I ask unanimous consent to place them in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Without objection, the telegrams may be printed in the RECORD.

The telegrams are as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 2, 1945.*

CAMERON HALL,
Social Education and Action Division,
Presbyterian Church,
Philadelphia, Pa.:

Re Aubrey Williams. Evidence produced that you gave scholarship to Williams so he could pursue education for ministry. Please wire Government collect concerning value scholarship and whether or not demand was made by you for return of funds advanced when Williams failed to follow the ministry. What is your policy in that regard? Would appreciate your immediate reply.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senator.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *March 5, 1945.*

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Senate Office Building:

Aubrey Williams was granted $480 from Presbyterian National Agency 1912–17 in preparation for ministry but no demand was made for return of the amount because such repayment procedure was not initiated until 1919. Thus he is not now indebted to the church.

JOHN OLIVER NELSON,
Director, Presbyterian Service Loan Funds.

Mr. ELLENDER. It will be noted that the Presbyterian Church never demanded repayment and has acknowledged that Mr. Williams is not now indebted to it.

Now, Mr. President, I move on to another indictment which was made by my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Tennessee. It involves certain charges which were attributed to Mr. Williams while he was N. Y. A. Administrator.

On June 4, 1941, Hon. Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General, sent a letter to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and to the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, accompanied by a report concerning the 1940 All-American Youth Orchestra organized by Mr. Leopold Stokowski. The charge was that organization costs of the orchestra had previously been estimated at $3,556, when later on the costs apparently were $14,580. Concerning this matter, Mr. Warren said:

During my absence in North Carolina on July 16, 1943, with Mr. Frank L. Yates acting as Acting Comptroller General, the case finally reached our office for decision, and he signed a memorandum to our Claims Division, and also notified Mr. Williams that the charges against Mr. Stokowski only were being released.

It is proper and fair for me to say, gentlemen, that had I been present, had I acted upon the case, that I, of course, would have likewise released the charges against Mr. Stokowski.

Mr. Warren continued:

Looking back now, after a period of 4 years, and based upon a thorough study, I would have still sent the report to the Congress, or to the Appropriations Committee, about the orchestra, based on the theory that Mr. Williams had told the Appropriations Committee he was going to spend one amount, when, in fact, it went higher, but I would not have raised the charges, in the first place.

On September 26, 1941, Mr. Warren transmitted to the Senator from Virginia and others a report prepared by the Investigations Section of the General Accounting Office. It is this report from which the Senator from Tennessee read the topical index, involving a whole series of charges. These charges were later answered, item for item, in a report by N. Y. A.

At this point I should like to read from the topical index presented in the testimony of my distinguished colleague from Tennessee. These are the charges which were preferred by my good friend against Mr. Williams, and they were based on the Glass letter to which I have just referred:

1. Travel expenses: Mingling of private and public business.
2. Intermingling of private and official business.
3. Accepting fees for participation in lectures at meetings.
4. Dual compensation.
5. Filing of false claims.
6. Aiding and assisting in the filing of false or fraudulent claims against the United States.
7. Appointment in contravention of Executive Order 7070 dated June 12, 1935.
8. Payment of per diem while on annual leave.
9. Designation of headquarters for convenience of employee.
10. Consultant expenses for attendance at Youth Citizenship Institute.
11. Employment of personnel for use of another agency.
12. Additional compensation paid husband for services performed by wife.
13. Aviation school for Negroes.
14. Supplementing State employment service funds with Government funds.
15. Christmas cards.
16. Use of Government telephones:
(a) Calls to the same person on the same day.
(b) Calls illustrating charges for additional minutes.
(c) Calls which might be questioned as to whether they are official.
(d) Calls illustrating conference connections.
(e) Personal interzone telephone calls made by Karl Borders, executive assistant, National Youth Administration.
(f) Personal interzone telephone calls made by D. B. Lassiter, Deputy Administrator, National Youth Administration.

As the record shows, these charges were preferred by Mr. Warren in the usual course of his duties as Comptroller General of the United States. Soon after the charges were preferred N. Y. A. made a report and answered the charges categorically, and many were cleared and some are still pending. I should like Senators to listen to what Mr. Warren had to say about these charges. Concerning the G. A. O. report—that is the report which was made to the Senator from Virginia and to which I referred a moment ago—Lindsay Warren said:

We have lifted some charges under it. We have collected some amounts under it. The N. Y. A. notified us they had made some collections, and I think we heard from time to time that they had taken remedial action in some of the matters we had pointed out.

Mr. Warren testified that total exceptions raised by the General Accounting Office against N. Y. A. during its entire 8 years still outstanding in G. A. O. amount to $98,111, including all of the charges made in the G. A. O. report. Mr. Warren said:

When I say there is $98,000-and-some-odd amount of exceptions outstanding, that means against the N. Y. A. from its inception to its close.

Of the $91,111, Mr. Warren said that $7,665 had been collected by G. A. O., $30,818 had been reported to the Attorney General for collection.

Referring to the exceptions raised by G. A. O., I said:

Is there anything unusual in that, Mr. Warren?

That was the question I directed to Mr. Warren.

Mr. WARREN. No; there is not. There is a widespread misconception about exceptions raised by the General Accounting Office. When we raise an exception there, that does not mean of itself that there is anything wrong or illegal. That is our great weapon for requiring the disbursing officers to come in and give us sufficient information about an item that we question, so we can then decide whether to hold that disbursing officer or to release him.

Senator ELLENDER. Did any of the charges made by you reflect on the personal character or integrity of Mr. Williams?

Senators, that is the important thing, not that charges were made by Mr. Warren in the usual course of his employment, but how they affected the character and integrity of Mr. Williams. Mr. Warren answered:

I see no reflection upon the personal character or integrity of Mr. Williams whatever in any report that I have sent up to Congress.

Later Mr. Warren stated again:

I repeat, there is nothing in the report reflecting upon the character or integrity of Mr. Williams.

Yet in the minds of some of the accusers of Mr. Williams he still stands charged; the records were falsified and he had something to do about it, he is guilty of something.

Referring to the $30,818 that G. A. O. turned over to the Attorney General for collection, I asked:

And you have done the same with respect to other departments of the Government?

Mr. WARREN. We are doing that every day.

But because it happened in the case of Mr. Aubrey Williams, it is a crime in the eyes of some of his opponents. As the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] pointed out yesterday, the railroads of this country can overcharge the Government from twenty-five to forty million dollars a year, in freight charges,

that is all right, nothing will be said about it, but because it has happened in an organization with which Mr. Williams was connected, it is a crime, and he should be indicted for it, he should be crucified for it.

Senator ELLENDER. There is nothing unusual about that?

Mr. WARREN. No, sir.

Later the chairman of the committee said:

Mr. Warren, have you referred claims to the Department of Justice with respect to other departments than N. Y. A.?

Mr. WARREN. Oh, yes; we are constantly doing that, Senator, every day.

The CHAIRMAN. That is nothing unusual, then, in your work?

Mr. WARREN. No.

Referring to the charges in the G. A. O. report, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] said:

I assume these charges are against the employees of N. Y. A. rather than against Mr. Williams; is that right?

Mr. WARREN. There has never been any charges raised against Mr. Williams. These charges are raised against the disbursing officers, and, of course, against individuals in some cases.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to state that I am chairman of the Committee on Claims of the Senate. As the records will show, our committee handles hundreds of cases during the life of every Congress, and I know of dozens of cases which have come before our committee from the Treasury Department, and a request from the State Department last week, asking that claims such as that to which Mr. Warren is referring be forgiven because of inability of collection. I say to my colleagues that charges of this kind against Mr. Williams are just putrid. As I have indicated, they have been made by every Comptroller General, not only Mr. Warren but many others, ever since that Office has been in existence. Because Aubrey Williams was head of the N. Y. A., and some of his disbursing officers paid off someone perhaps 25 cents too much here or a dollar yonder, or failed to charge 4 minutes of telephoning when three was the order, this charge is preferred against Mr. Williams.

I quote further from Mr. Warren's testimony.

Senator AIKEN. I was wondering whether these charges you raised were not for the protection of the departments themselves.

Mr. WARREN. Of course that is one of the reasons.

Senator AIKEN. Otherwise the head of the department might not, and in many instances probably does not, have any idea of these questionable expenditures until you raise them, does he?

Mr. WARREN. Well, Senator, they do in some cases, and in others they do not. For instance, there is no administrative audit made of a single freight or passenger bill today in the Government. The entire audit is made solely by the General Accounting Office, and we are collecting back on overcharges between twenty-five and thirty million dollars a year on that alone.

Later Mr. Warren said:

Our collections in the field from illegal payments cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts for the last fiscal year amounted to $48,000,000 alone.

Senator ELLENDER. This point is, as you brought out, whatever happened in N. Y. A. over the period of 8 years has not been unusual, but, as a matter of fact, it has occurred in practically every department of the Government.

Mr. WARREN. That, of course, is correct.

Senator AIKEN. You have reported over matters involving millions of dollars in single cases to Congress, have you not?

Mr. WARREN. That is correct, Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I gladly yield.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, it is true, is it not, that the General Accounting Office does not even audit a bill of less than $500, so that someone could come along 2 or 3 years from now and raise the identical questions that are raised here against Mr. Williams. Is not that true?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is absolutely true. It seems not to be a crime for these things to be done in any department of the Government except the one headed by Mr. Williams. As I pointed out, Mr. President, Mr. Warren has admitted it has happened in every department of the Government. Yet the only man who is being accused of doing wrong, or who is being found fault with, is Mr. Williams, and that charge was one of the charges made by my distinguished friend the Senator from Tennessee. The other one, as I have stated, was the charge of Mr. Williams being a Communist.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I have read the hearings in this matter and I wish to know whether the Senator agrees with my conclusion, that there is not one word of testimony here showing that Mr. Williams was ever guilty of a single dishonest act in connection with the Government service.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is eminently correct. The evidence of the Comptroller General himself, which I have just read, shows it. His department audited all the accounts of the N. Y. A., which was headed by Mr. Aubrey Williams. I may say further that the record shows that Mr. Williams was Assistant Administrator of W. P. A., and W. P. A. handled billions of dollars yearly, but not a single solitary thing occurred in W. P. A. which reflected against the character or integrity of Aubrey Williams.

Yet in spite of all that, as I have just indicated, and simply because Mr. Aubrey Williams headed the organization, based on things which happened in the ordinary and usual course of events, the charge is made that he is dishonest, and so forth and so on, and that is why he should not be confirmed. The same thing applies to the charge against Williams of being communistic. Mr. President, it is simply ridiculous.

I read further:

Senator AIKEN. Which are pretty large in comparison with this comparatively small amount.

The total exceptions outstanding at G. A. O. against N. Y. A. during its 8 years amount to $98,111 out of total expenditures amounting to $662,000,000. In simple arithmetic that means only $1.48 out of every $10,000 spent.

Mr. President, I believe that what I have read from the testimony of Mr. Warren should be a complete answer and ought to be conclusive proof that the charges made against Williams in that respect are not well-founded.

Mr. President, another charge was made against Mr. Williams. I read from the record at page 142 of the hearings. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] testified:

Now, let us see about another phase of that very thing.

He was discussing N. Y. A.

I wonder how many people are here who are fathers? I happen to be a bachelor and I have no boys to go into the Army, and maybe I ought not to even mention it, but I have 10 nephews and nephews-in-law in the Army, but I wonder how many mothers and fathers in this audience approve of what I am going to say now.

Of the number of young men that went out of the N. Y. A. how many do you suppose went into the Army? I asked that question, and I will answer it myself; 37,000 went into private employment and 1,500 into the armed services, and 4,500 went into the public service, civil service, public employment, and they became what? Yours boys were not treated exactly that way.

Senator LUCAS. Was that not the responsibility of the draft boards?

Senator MCKELLAR. I do not know whose responsibility it was. If you have got boys in the Army——

Senator ELLENDER. I have.

Senator MCKELLAR. Your boys were not treated that way. They either volunteered themselves, went into the Army to fight for their country, or they were forced to go in by proper law.

Why should we take the boys under Mr. Williams—kindly, ingratiating, splendid gentleman, well educated—he did not graduate, I do not believe, from any college as far as the record shows—but he is a well-educated man, a nice gentleman, one of the nicest gentlemen I ever saw. Why should the people in that public service, I think 410,000 at one time, I think that was his largest number, selected by him or, rather, brought in by his agents, why should they have such large advantages over your boys?

That question, I think, answers itself.

In other words, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee was charging Mr. Williams, in a measure, with sabotaging the war effort in respect to these boys who were in N. Y. A. In other words he said in effect: Why should N. Y. A. be in existence? Why should it take the young men of our country to do N. Y. A. work when they were needed in the Army? That charge, Mr. President, is unjust and not at all well-founded. Let me read from the record. The report of the Comptroller General dated November 1, 1940, was quoted as follows:

The National Youth Administration has requested Army recruiting officers to refrain from contacting National Youth Administration youth in order to keep them on N. Y. A. rolls and maintain a program which would justify congressional appropriations.

Mr. Williams replied:

Both charges are made in complete disregard of the clear record of the N. Y. A. policy. In 1940, nearly 8 months before this charge

was made, a special memorandum was sent to all State N. Y. A. administrators, directing them to cooperate fully with the Army's recruiting drive. * * * This is the letter I sent out January 18, 1940, which was several months before this report was ever made or any charges were made:

"To: All State youth administrators.

"Subject: Army recruiting.

"Questions have come up in several States regarding recruiting among National Youth Administration youth by Army recruiting officers I had a conference recently with representatives of the Army and we agreed upon the following arrangements:

"1. That National Youth Administration State administrators would furnish complete lists of young men employed on National Youth Administration projects to Army recruiting authorities whenever requested.

"2. That meetings, when so desired by the Army, would be arranged by the National Youth Administration so that Army representatives could come and explain to National Youth Administration workers who wish to attend such meetings the opportunities offered by the Army to young people.

"3. That there would be no recruiting on the project site or elsewhere during work hours. In other words, all activities would be limited to the two above provisions."

Then later, March 22, Mr. Woodring—

He was then Secretary of War—

stated that it was not necessary any longer to have us furnish lists or to hold meetings, but that they would handle their recruiting work as the Army handled it everywhere else.

Then finally, on July 30, 1941, Mr. Lasseter, Deputy Administrator of the National Youth Administration sent word out to Mr Frank Welch, acting State administrator of Maine, and this letter went to every State youth administrator in the country, in which he said:

"Mr. Williams has just had a conference with Capt. F. E. M. Whiting who is in charge of recruiting for the Navy relative to the assistance which the National Youth Administration might render in furthering the enlistment of young men in the Navy.

"Mr. Williams would like to have as many as possible of the young men on National Youth Administration projects know of the opportunity for service with the Navy and hopes that a good percentage of enlistments will result therefrom.

* * * * *

"Mr. Williams is very anxious that the National Youth Administration offer every assistance that it can to the Navy and knows he can count on your full cooperation."

A charge was made that N. Y. A., under Mr. Williams, kept youth out of the armed services by its recruitment and training policies.

Concerning this accusation, Mr. Williams stated:

A slander has been applied here to the hundreds of thousands of finest American youth that we have, and that is that they tried to stay out of the Army and use the N. Y. A. as a refuge by which they could do it. * * * During the year of 1943, 15 out of every 100 young people in America went in the Army through the draft. * * * I cannot give you the percentage of young people that were volunteers during that year, but the 15 out of every 100 was the figure of those who were inducted through the draft. Now, during that same year, in 1943, of the 33,000 male youth of military age on N. Y. A., 8,026 were inducted into the armed forces through the draft, and 11,805 enlisted voluntarily in the Army that year. * * *

So that out of the 33,000 there were 19,831 that went into the Army, or 60 percent of those of military age went from the N. Y. A. into the Army that year. That is the only thing in which I have any very strong feeling in this whole business, to slander these boys when they are there dying today, which, to me, is unforgivable.

To summarize, 33,000, or 31.8 percent, of the male youth on N. Y. A. in 1943 were 18 years and over. Of these, 8,026 were drafted and 11,805 enlisted, as shown by actual records. So 60 percent of the N. Y. A. males of military age entered the armed services in 1943. In comparison, 15 percent of all eligibles in the country were inducted through selective service that same year.

Mr. President, there is much more that I could say to the Senate on the issue involved in this nomination; but I understand that several other Senators desire to address the Senate this afternoon. I propose, if the occasion presents itself, to conclude my remarks at some future time. I could continue all afternoon, and probably for some time tomorrow before finishing what I have to say.

As I have indicated in the course of my remarks, the only thing that is hurtful to me is to note that so few Senators have been present during the consideration of this nomination, which I deem most important. I sincerely believe that if Senators will read the record, particularly the charges which were made against Aubrey Williams, and follow them through, they will unquestionably come to the same conclusion that I have reached.

When I attended the hearings before the committee I was skeptical about the qualifications of Mr. Williams because of the many conflicting letters and telegrams which I had received both for and against him, some of them containing charges against him, which I have discussed during the course of my remarks. As a United States Senator, I felt that it was my bounden duty to listen to the testimony and to elicit as much information as I could gather before reaching a conclusion.

As I stated on the floor of the Senate 2 or 3 days ago, this good man is fighting for his reputation. In World War No. 1 he risked his life in order that our Government might survive. Today his four sons are fighting to preserve our democracy—to preserve the Senate. I do not want to believe that Senators will not take the time to study the record and give their fellow American a fair and square deal.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2126) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, yesterday the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], in the course of his remarks, made several references to me. Today, I shall follow the precedent set by the late great Governor of New York, Gov. Alfred E. Smith, and read from the record. I am satisfied to rest my case upon what appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday and of June 12, 1943. Let me read in part what the Senator from South Dakota said yesterday:

Twice during recent months a Member of this body, JOE GUFFEY, of Pennsylvania, has attacked me without cause, provocation, or justification. I have never crossed his path in his legislative work, or in his personal activities. There is no contact of any kind between us, nor has there been. I have never spoken an ill word of him personally; yet in spite of that Mr. GUFFEY delivered a vicious personal attack upon me, one that was clearly in violation of the rules of the Senate. I have no desire to quarrel with any Member of the Senate, or to cast any aspersions upon him. I have studiously refrained from making any comment upon this unwarranted libel.

Later in his remarks the Senator said:

The statements of Mr. GUFFEY are completely and utterly false insofar as they apply to me or to members of the Republican State committee of my State. The impression that he seeks to create by such statements is false. Not only that, but the Senator knew that the statements were false when he made the accusation against me.

Mr. President, that is all I am going to say about that particular individual, unless by his own actions he invites a complete review of his own record.

I should like to say to the Senator from South Dakota that he can examine my record from my day back to 1738, when the paternal side of my family came to this country from the north of Ireland, and he can go back to the days of William Penn, when the maternal side of my family arrived here with the Quakers, from England, and he is welcome to find in the record anything he cares to report about any ancestor of mine or about me.

Last week, in the statement I made about the corruption fund in Pennsylvania, I said:

They plan to spend this money in an unblushing attempt to buy the next election and do not intend to report its use to the public or to the appropriate committees of the Congress.

They dare try to do this because they got away with murder in South Dakota in 1942, when they let Senator BUSHFIELD use the $18,000 of Republican money left over from the 1940 campaign.

* * * * *

Senator BUSHFIELD, by the way, was financed in his own campaign by Joe Pew and the other oily fat cats of Republican politics, as well as the du Ponts, Alfred Sloan, and Colonel McCormick, of the Chicago Tribune.

On June 12, 1943, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as will be found beginning at page 5758 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 12, 1943, in volume 89, part 4, the full, complete account of those who gave money to the compaign in South Dakota, as was reported by the treasurer of the South Dakota Republican Campaign Committee. The figures regarding South Dakota campaign contributions were taken from the office of the secretary of the State of South Dakota, filed there by Walter H. Burke, of Pierre, treasurer of the Republican State committee. The first public notice of those amounts of money was given in a small newspaper entitled "South Dakota To-day," a Democratic monthly published by the Democratic State committee, at Mit-

chell. The editor is Mr. E. H. Bremer, who was secretary to Senator Berry when Mr. Berry was Governor. Former Governor Berry lives in Belvidere. After I placed the figures in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 12, 1943, the Senator from South Dakota said:

I have been very greatly interested in the so-called disclosures of the junior Senator from the great State of Pennsylvania. We in South Dakota were very happy, I will say to the Senator, to have friends in his wonderful State who were able to assist us in the campaign for the preservation of the American Government. I am not so much concerned with the amount of money which friends in Pennsylvania contributed to the Republican Party in South Dakota, but we are tremendously inspired that we have a government in this country which permits individual Americans to accumulate and make enough money so that they can give this sort of contribution to their friends throughout the country, because we do not have anyone in our party who has such a distinguished signature that we can sell autographed campaign books for $250 apiece to deserving Democrats.

Then I said the following:

I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota if he will inform me, through the treasurer of the State committee, at an early date, what happened to the $17,000 carried over at the end of the 1940 campaign. Was that expended in his behalf in the election of 1942? In the expense account of the Senator from South Dakota, as filed for 1942, it appears he received the total sum of $4,000, including $1,000 from Mabel Pew Perim and $1,000 from J. N. Pew, Jr. He expended $3,187.29, leaving a balance to his account of $812.71. I presume he is saving that for the election 6 years from now. I should like to know about the $17,000, what happened to it, who kept it, and when it was expended?

I cannot guarantee these reports. They were filed by the Republican State treasurer and certified to by the secretary of the Commonwealth, and countersigned by the treasurer of the State.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I am glad to answer the question of the Senator from Pennsylvania, but I want to call attention at this time to the fact that he has not disclosed the names of the contributors to the Democratic campaign fund in South Dakota for either of those years, or how much money they had. We have not a Federal Treasury to carry on our campaigns in that section. We have to raise the money from successful Pennsylvanians.

Mr. GUFFEY. I will say to the Senator from South Dakota that the same information is available to him in South Dakota with respect to Democratic campaign contributions and expenses, which was available to me with respect to the Republican campaign contributions and expenses. I am sure the Senator will find that there was carried over no balance of $17,000. I doubt if the Senator's opponent in that campaign had a total contribution of $17,000 to run his whole campaign.

Mr. President, that is the record in the case, so far as what I have said is concerned. If that violates the rules of the Senate, I am sorry; but I do not think it does, as I understand them. I leave it to the Senate to determine who gave the correct facts about the contributions. I rest my case there.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

As in legislative session,

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2126) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 and agree to the same.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CLYDE M. REED,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
JOE HENDRICKS,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

ADMINISTRATOR, RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—AUBREY W. WILLIAMS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, for the purpose of the RECORD, I wish to make a few remarks. I know that Senators desire to arrive at a vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Williams. I shall discuss a subject which I think is pertinent to the issue, but which has been very lightly discussed, if at all, namely, the subject of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Approximately a year ago a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was appointed to investigate complaints which had been made with regard to the administration of the Rural Electrification Administration. The subcommittee was entirely a bipartisan one, and approximately 2,000 pages of testimony and exhibits were presented before the subcommittee.

The subcommittee consisted of the late Senator Smith, of South Carolina, former Senator Gillette, of Iowa, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and myself. All testimony was given under oath. The subcommittee made a unanimous report signed by all members present. The Senator from Mississippi was ill most of the time and had to go to Rochester, Minn. He was not present when the report was signed. The unanimous report recommended that the administration of Rural Electrification be taken out of the Department of Agriculture and restored to its independence as it existed under the act of Congress approved May 20, 1936.

After the nomination of Mr. Williams was sent to the committee I took the position that it should be held up, because, in view of the testimony showing the conditions throughout the country as they pertained to the R. E. A., no man could administer the agency as it had been administered at the beginning, and as it was intended to be administered by the Congress.

Mr. President, the Rural Electrification Administration was established on May 11, 1935, by Executive Order No. 7037. On May 20, 1936, by an act sponsored by the late Senator Norris, and Representative RANKIN, the R. E. A. was made an independent agency. By law it was intended that more specific rules and regulations, and directives, should be given to the Administrator than had been given under the Executive order.

I read paragraph 9 of the act:

This act shall be administered entirely on a nonpartisan basis, and in the employment of officials, the selection of employees, and in the promotion of any such officials or employees, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency. If the Administrator herein provided for is found by the President of the United States to be guilty of a violation of this section, he shall be removed from office by the President, and any appointee or selection of officials or employees made by the Administrator who is found guilty of a violation of this act shall be removed by the Administrator.

Section 10 reads:

The Administrator shall present annually to the Congress not later than the 20th day of January in each year a full report of his activities under this act.

So much for the legislative history of the origin of the R. E. A.

Under the reorganization plan of July 1, 1939, the R. E. A. was transferred to the Department of Agriculture by an Executive order.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the statement which I made to the Committee on Agriculture in objection to the appointment of an Administrator of the R. E. A. at this time.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This committee has been appointed in order to pass upon the qualifications of Mr. Aubrey Williams to be the next Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, or the R. E. A., as it is popularly called. This nomination by the President presents a very difficult and unusual problem.

Ordinarily, we merely have to pass upon the qualifications of a Presidential nominee. This, in itself, is a difficult enough task. But in the present nomination, we not only have to pass upon the qualifications of the candidate, but also, the kind of a job he has to fill. In this case, we cannot divorce the two.

Let me refresh the members of this committee with a few pertinent facts. On July 1, 1943, I duly introduced a resolution to investigate the functioning of R. E. A. since it

was transferred to the Department of Agriculture, among other things.

Under that resolution, after nearly a year's work, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has made its report. It occupies 5 parts and consists of 2,179 pages of sworn testimony and exhibits. The subcommittee, with no dissenting votes, has also made an interim report on June 23, 1944.

I will not labor you with details, but there are a few simple facts in that report that should prove conclusively to this committee and this Congress that it is a waste of our time to pass upon the qualifications of this or any other candidate until the committee's recommendations are acted upon. Now, what did this committee investigating R. E. A. find?

In the first place, we found that when R. E. A. was independent it was a fine public agency that did a splendid public job and won the confidence of all:

"So long as this policy of independence prevailed, the record of the R. E. A. was outstanding and fulfilled the highest expectations of the President, the Congress, and the people of the United States. All employees were directly responsible to the Administrator. The Administrator was responsible to the Congress." (Interim report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry pursuant to Senate Resolution 197, Investigation of the Administration of the Rural Electrification Act, June 23, 1944, p. 1.)

When the R. E. A. was transferred to the Department of Agriculture under the Reorganization Act of 1939 it was the unanimous opinion of all who were responsible for establishing this fine agency that it was to continue as a separate administration in the Department of Agriculture.

Likewise, if you examine the language of the Reorganization Act, you will note it is to the same effect. Section 5 of the Reorganization Act says:

"The Rural Electrification Administration and its functions and activities are hereby transferred to the Department of Agriculture and shall be administered in that Department by the Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture."

The pertinent language that concerns us relates to the following words:

"Shall be administered * * * by the Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture."

If the Congress wanted R. E. A. "gobbled up," it would not have used the language, "administered * * * by the Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration."

The fact is, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, proceeded to take over and dominate R. E. A. completely.

As the subcommittee concluded, the authority of the Administrator was dissolved in various agencies of the Department of Agriculture:

"Centralization of authority and responsibility placed by the Congress in the person of the Administrator became dissipated among the various agencies of the Agricultural Department." (Interim report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, pursuant to S. Res. 197, June 23, 1944, p. 1.)

We do not have to go into details as to who caused it. The fact of the matter is that the authority placed by Congress in the office and person of the Administrator was "undermined," to use the exact language of the interim report. (Ibid, pp. 1 and 2, interim report.)

I also call your attention to the fact that this committee concluded that the Administrator was no longer Administrator in fact:

"There can be no doubt that the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, appointed by the President and confirmed in that appointment by the United States Senate, is no longer the Administrator of the R. E. A. in fact." (Ibid, interim report, p. 2.)

What particularly concerned the committee was that, as a result of all this undermining, dissension arose in the administration of the R. E. A., resulting in "growing discord and distrust and disorganization within the R. E. A." (Ibid, interim report, p. 2.)

When R. E. A. was an independent agency things went along in fine shape. The conclusion of the committee makes this abundantly clear:

"During the early years of the Administration it was administered in accord with the spirit of the act and as an agency responsible to the Congress, or what is generally described as an independent agency. Throughout those years the Rural Electrification Administration gained the respect and the commendation of the Congress, as well as the people of the United States. It is fair to say that the Administration gained general approval and was singularly free from adverse criticism." (Ibid., interim report, p. 2.)

The opposite condition prevailed once R. E. A. was transferred to the Department of Agriculture. Here are the exact words of the report of the Senate committee investigating R. E. A.:

"The disintegration and demoralization of personnel in the R. E. A. since its integration into the Department of Agriculture is an outstanding contrast to the harmony and excellency of morale that appears to have existed prior thereto, and is an indictment of the Administration under the Agricultural Department." (Ibid., interim report, June 23, 1944, p. 4.)

In other words, we have a picture of orderly administration when R. E. A. was an independent branch of the Government, in accordance with the standards prescribed by the Congress.

The committee investigating the R. E. A. had a complete opportunity to examine the administration of R. E. A. under its former Administrator, Mr. Harry Slattery. We did not concern ourselves with personalities and the broad charges that are hurled at people when they disagree with one another. Rather, we confined ourselves to the facts. An examination of the background of Mr. Slattery shows that he was well qualified to undertake this job. I refer the committee to the summary of his record in part 4, on pages 1466 and 1467, which discloses his activities in the power field from 1907 to date, a period of nearly 37 years. Likewise, the committee had before it the record of his accomplishments and the work of R. E. A. during the 5 or more years he was Administrator. It is a splendid record, whether we judge the increase in allotments, the miles of line that were electrified, the number of systems, and particularly cooperatives that have been organized, the 1,300,000 or more farms that are receiving service, and related administrative accomplishments.

The policies that led to the successful administration of R. E. A. were evolved before the Department of Agriculture took over. They continued with many improvements under the former Administrator, Mr. Slattery, despite the continuous and needless obstruction of the Department of Agriculture.

I quote from the testimony of the former Administrator, Mr. Slattery:

"In the light of their continuous obstruction, bureaucracy, and red tape, this accomplishment is all the more remarkable." (Pt. 4, p. 1449 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.)

When a man of this caliber voluntarily resigns it means that the situation has become intolerable.

Today we are confronted with the problem of selecting a new Administrator for the R. E. A. Note it is still to be continued in the same Department of Agriculture, despite the fact that the Senate committee investigating R. E. A. recommended that R. E. A. be made an independent agency "at the earliest possible date." (Ibid, interim report, p. 2.)

The record shows that there is a scandalous condition in R. E. A. that exists today and has existed ever since Mr. Wickard placed Mr. Neal out there in St. Louis. In my opinion, he has been placed out there illegally to take over the lawful powers of the Administrator. (See pt. 2 of the hearings, p. 200 and following; also p. 496 and following.)

Certain divisions, like the Applications and Loans Division, are vastly overstaffed. Why do you need a hundred or more people to make loans when major construction and loans have practically stopped?

Other technical divisions, like the Technical Standards Division, are punished and their staff is taken away because they won't play Mr. Wickard's and Mr. Neal's political game. The same is true of the Finance Division, the policing division of R. E. A. that really needs help to safeguard the bookkeeping and accounting records of nearly $500,000,000 in R. E. A. funds.

In addition, all of the principal powers of the Administrator have been taken away from him and are either exercised by Mr. Wickard or someone else whom he designates. To illustrate, budget, the hiring and firing of personnel, the establishment of policy, in fact every major function has been taken over by Mr. Wickard or his agents. How can any Administrator run the R. E. A. under such political control?

If you look at the R. E. A. Act you will note that Congress intended to make it free from political domination. Mr. Wickard has ignored this plain language of the act of Congress. Mr. Neal, the man whom he has made actual administrator, was the defeated candidate for the governorship of New Hampshire.

No, the appointment of a new Administrator is no solution. Neither Mr. Williams nor any other man can clean up this political mess until R. E. A. is taken away from Mr. Wickard and made an independent branch of the Government once more.

If a man of Mr. Slattery's competence and background, with the full backing of this Senate Investigating Committee, could not administer the R. E. A. when the bureaucrats in the Department of Agriculture moved in, I believe this committee should defer the question of the appointment of any Administrator until this basic matter is cleared. This is not to be taken as any reflection upon the present candidate, as I am not discussing his merits or lack of merits. The record merely shows that it is impossible for anyone to do a good job until this agency is made an independent branch of the Government, responsible directly to the Congress and the President. I express the hope that the joint bill, "To reestablish the Rural Electrification Administration as an independent agency of the Government," as introduced by Senators WHEELER, AIKEN, and myself on January 15, 1945, will be given early consideration, after which we can turn to the question of a suitable Administrator for the R. E. A.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, in my opinion it is as impossible now as it was before the subcommittee reported to consider the nomination of Aubrey Williams to be Administrator of the R. E. A. without examining in detail the administration of the R. E. A. since it was transferred to the Department of Agriculture.

In my remarks today I want to summarize quickly the high lights of the investigation of the R. E. A. I do so out of justice to the members of the Senate subcommittee who worked very earnestly and hard. Senator Smith has since died, and Senator Gillette is no longer a Member of the Senate. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is present, as well as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and myself.

As a result of the resolution which I submitted, and the investigation which was conducted, the subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry made a unanimous report.

If I were to use one word to characterize the administration of R. E. A. under Secretary Wickard, as disclosed by the sworn testimony and documentary exhibits in the subcommittee hearings, I would use the word "maladministration."

An examination of the testimony discloses indisputable proof that Secretary Wickard looked upon R. E. A. as his own private hunting ground. The evidence is conclusive that practically from the time he assumed office, he tried to wreck this once fine agency. Let me refer to part 4 page 1436, of the Senate investigation of R. E. A. There we learn from such indisputable sources as the late Honorable George W. Norris, and the former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wallace, that Mr. Wickard was out to destroy the independence of the R. E. A. back in 1941. So the recent charges by Mr. Wickard of maladministration are really another way of saying that he wanted to take over R. E. A. bag and baggage, and dominate it completely. Let me read the sworn testimony:

Mr. Wallace stated that Senator Pope was called to Washington and Wickard tentatively offered him the administratorship of the Rural Electrification Administration—"if the consent of the President could be secured." His proposal then was to have Mr. Krug of the Tennessee Valley Authority succeed Mr. Falkenwald of the Rural Electrification Administration; Mr. Parker to succeed Rural Electrification Administration's Mr. Winder; and a Mr. Blaisdell succeed Mr. Thaxton of Rural Electrification Administration in engineering.

He stated that Mr. Pope declined the offer for three reasons. He did not want to leave the Tennessee Valley Authority. He did not know anything about rural electrification, and he did not want to put himself in the position of pushing out Harry Slattery, who seems to have innumerable friends through the South and here in Washington.

"So," the then Vice President, Mr. Wallace, said, "that plan fell through." He then said:

Mr. Wickard's assistant concocted the idea of a general "blitzkrieg" to have the Secretary demand the resignation of the following Rural Electrification Administration key officials: Dr. Person, Mr. Winder, Mr. Thaxton, Mr. Falkenwald, and Mr. Nicholson, and simultaneously to request the President to move me into some other department or to ask for my resignation.

The Vice President, Mr. Wallace said:

I understand that a feeler at the White House on this got nowhere. (Pt. 4, pp. 1436 and 1437.)

As another illustration of the maladministration of R. E. A. under Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the committee's findings on Mr. Robert B. Craig, former Deputy Administrator of R. E. A. and Acting Administrator of R. E. A. He was a former school teacher. By a strange and happy coincidence he recently left his small-salaried job at R. E. A. and went for a big-salaried job with the Copperweld-Steel Co., the very concern which the Senate records disclose was favored greatly in R. E. A. bids on construction materials.

This is the man whom Secretary Wickard reprimanded, as follows:

SIR: There is before me for consideration a report of an investigation which was conducted by the Division of Investigations of this office to determine whether you gave testimony in good faith before the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, with respect to promotions in the Rural Electrification Administration during the fiscal year 1939, or whether you willfully deceived the committee and the Congress. Although the evidence obtained during the investigation will not substantiate a charge that you testified in bad faith or willfully deceived the committee and the Congress, it does reveal that an intolerable situation existed in the Rural Electrification Administration during the latter part of 1939 and the early part of 1940, as a result of which inaccurate and incomplete promotion figures were deliberately furnished the Committee on Appropriations, the Bureau of the Budget, and this office.

At the time of these pernicious activities you were serving as Assistant Administrator, in which position you should have exerted every effort to see that complete and accurate information regarding promotions in the fiscal year 1939 was submitted in response to clear and specific requests. The evidence indicates, however, that notwithstanding the extreme importance of these requests you adopted a more or less complacent attitude and did little to assure the submission of complete and accurate information. In view of your official position at the time and the information submitted by certain witnesses whose sworn testimony was obtained during the investigation, it is inconceivable that your subordinate employees evolved the scheme which was followed to mislead and deceive the Committee on Appropriations, the Bureau of the Budget, and this office without at least some knowledge thereof on your part. (Pt. 2, p. 353.)

This Mr. Craig is the same man who approved, aided, and abetted in the issuance of false vouchers. In a letter to the Attorney General, under the falsely approved vouchers of one R. E. A. employee, we note that a violation of criminal law is alleged. (Pt. 2, p. 279, exhibit 32.)

This is the same Craig who was hired by the above Copperweld-Steel Co. upon the express condition that he "was to have nothing to do with R. E. A."—part 2, page 217. However, this same Mr. Craig edited the "block buster" letter which was designed to have the President dismiss Mr. Harry Slattery, former Administrator of R. E. A. For his own confession in this matter, I refer Senators to part 2 of the above testimony, page 360, in which Mr. Craig admits that his job in this connection was to "edit" it.

This is the same Mr. Craig who attended the recent session of the National Association of R. E. A. cooperatives in San Antonio, Tex., and stood outside of the door where a committee was voting on an independent R. E. A. Despite the fact that this was a "packed" session, a vote for independence was nearly put through. Inadvertently Mr. Craig grabbed the hands of one of the delegates and thanked him for voting against the R. E. A. independence bill. It happened that the particular gentleman voted for independence.

As shown by the testimony, Mr. Craig is reported to have admitted that he was the father of the organization which held the convention at San Antonio. The sworn testimony shows that he had told a responsible citizen of Wisconsin that he was going to organize this association for the purpose of controlling R. E. A.; that he said he was born in Ohio in the State of Harry Daugherty, that he learned his politics from Harry Daugherty, and he said, "I am going to run this organization either from the inside or the outside." On another occasion he called attention to the fact that there were 4,000,000 votes in this organization.

I cite all the above facts to show that, notwithstanding Mr. Craig's bad administration and association with those attempting to subvert the valid purposes of R. E. A., he was highly commended by Mr. Wickard when he resigned. For Mr. Wickard's letter of commendation, I refer the Senate to part 2 of the above testimony, page 307.

As another indication of the maladministration of Secretary Wickard in his handling of the R. E. A., I refer Senators to the report his investigators made of copper. It related to alleged favoritism of R. E. A. officials to copper interests. The first thing we note is that the Administrator of R. E. A. never saw this report until it was forced out by the Senate Committee investigating R. E. A.—part 2, page 200. That investigation was made about 1940 when Mr. Wallace was still Secretary of Agriculture. It came about as a result of practices which were being pursued in the R. E. A. even as far back as that, and Mr. Craig at that time was deputy administrator. Some of the engineers came to me and told me of some of these practices. I went to Mr. Wallace and asked him to investigate. Mr. Wallace appointed Mr. Appleby to investigate those practices, and the investigation consumed a year or 18 months. However, in the meantime Mr. Wickard became Secretary of Agriculture and the sworn testimony shows that the report of the investigation was submerged and hidden from the Administrator, Mr. Slattery, who went into office as administrator at the time R. E. A. was transferred to the Agricultural Department. He says that he had never seen it, that it had been submerged and hidden until the committee of the Senate asked for all the papers and documents that had anything to do with R. E. A. It is a large volume of sworn testimony, but the practices which had prevailed continued.

While this report was started under Secretary of Agriculture Wallace, it was consummated under Secretary Wickard—part 2, page 201.

Under oath Mr. Slattery stated that he would have preferred charges against Mr. Thaxton and Mr. O'Shaughnessy, who are still employed in R. E. A. However, under the agricultural set-up he could not hire or fire anyone—part 2, page 201.

I next desire to cover briefly the attack on the administration of the former Administrator, Mr. Harry Slattery, by Secretary of Agriculture Wickard. As Senators know, a few individuals formed a National Association of R. E. A. Cooperatives. Mr. Craig testified before the committee that he was proud to accept the paternity of that organization. They were going to take control. I referred to a convention they had at San Antonio, Tex., last fall. The question of removing the R. E. A. from the control of the Department of Agriculture, and making it an independent agency came before the convention. Mr. Craig was there; he had organized the organization, and he had to a large extent, with other outsiders, controlled it, in connivance and in cooperation with personnel in the Department of Agriculture. At this convention the committee on resolutions was presented with a resolution proposing to transfer the R. E. A. from the Agricultural Department and to give it an independent status, which it had originally. That resolution in this convention of the organization which was organized under and by Craig to control the R. E. A., was defeated by two votes.

A man from a State nearby Washington came to my office and said he was a member of the committee on resolutions, and stated that Craig was there lobbying all the time to keep R. E. A. in the Agricultural Department. He said, "I voted to make it independent. We lost by two votes, nine to seven. When I came out in front of the committee room there stood Mr. Craig, and he took my hand and thanked me for having kept it in Agriculture, which I had voted for an independent status."

As I have said, a few individuals formed a National Association of R. E. A. Cooperatives. A scheming few were very anxious to establish some private insurance companies of their own, and they were going to use membership and surplus funds of the R. E. A. systems to do so. This was a matter of direct concern to the Government. Quite properly Administrator Slattery addressed a communication to the Secretary of Agriculture, and asked him for an opinion on the legal validity of such a proposal. Mr. Wickard personally went over this proposal, as did his general counsel. Mr. Wickard likewise later testified on the stand that he approved the position of Administrator Slattery on this matter.

After waiting for some time for a reply from Mr. Wickard, which he did not get, the situation developed to such an extent that Administrator Slattery had to send a letter to the R. E. A. systems. This letter embodied all the principles which Mr. Wickard and his staff had approved—part 2, pages 438, 549, 550. In effect, Mr. Slattery said to the cooperatives who were asked to contribute to outside organizations money to be used for purposes other than for rural electrification, "Stop, look, and listen before you dip into R. E. A. funds."

Prior to the time when he sent this letter, the various officials of the National Association of R. E. A. systems generally addressed Administrator Slattery as "Dear Harry"—part 4, pages 1124 and 1145.

The officials of the national association wanted to borrow from the funds of the R. E. A. cooperatives; they wanted to start some insurance companies and pay themselves salaries. They had to put up some money with each State insurance commissioner in order to do business, and they had no money themselves, so they were going to borrow it from the various cooperatives. When Mr. Slattery wrote to the cooperatives and told them to "stop, look, and listen," he at once became very incompetent in the eyes of the Department of Agriculture, the officials and organizers of the N. R. E. C. A.

What I particularly want to call to the Senate's attention is the poor administration of Secretary Wickard. Even though he approved the letter of Administrator Slattery in substance, when all the wild charges of incompetence were hurled against him because he would not go along with these private insurance schemes, Mr. Wickard did not raise one finger in his defense.

At this point, I should like to pay my tribute to the former Administrator of R. E. A., Mr. John M. Carmody. He did an outstanding construction job when he was in charge of that Administration. He refused to continue when R. E. A. was placed in the Department of Agriculture because he did not want to have layers of clerks, who knew nothing about R. E. A., tell him what to do. Mr. Carmody was subpenaed to testify before the committee. In his sworn testimony, he said, "That was a mistake. It was an afterthought," when R. E. A. was transferred to the Department of Agriculture—part 2, page 340.

In response to a direct question, Mr. Carmody says:

> I would put it back where it was before, make it an independent agency (pt. 2, p. 336).

When Mr. Carmody took charge of R. E. A. it was practically dead. He revivified it and put it on its feet, and he is entitled to the greatest credit. His foresight and knowledge of administrative affairs are borne out by his statement that he did not want to attempt to administer it under the Department of Agriculture.

What kind of man was Mr. Slattery, and what were his qualifications for heading the Rural Electrification Administration, which he did for over 5 years? I refer to part 4, page 466. He was recognized as a very efficient Administrator until he would not tolerate outside influence taking charge of the conduct of R. E. A. or borrowing money from the funds of various farm cooperatives. What were his qualifications?

Beginning in 1907 and continuing for a period of nearly 37 years, Mr. Slattery was intimately associated with every important bit of national power and conservation legislation. As the Members of this body know, he has been closely associated with all the important legislation having to do with power and related matters.

He was counsel of the National Conservation Association. He assisted the Governor of Pennsylvania in dealing with utilities. He was the Washington representative of the New York State Power Authority, and he occupied numerous related positions that made him one of the best qualified men in this country to head the Rural Electrification Administration.

As a matter of fact, he did not seek the job. He tried to avoid it. He only consented when he was drafted for it by the President, and he had to leave a position where he was satisfied, as Under Secretary of the Interior.

Now, what sort of a record did Mr. Slattery make during the period he was Administrator of R. E. A.? I refer to part 4, page 1450, of the Senate subcommittee investigation of the R. E. A. Senators will note the following:

Allotments of funds to build R. E. A. systems increased nearly $213,000,000, or 83 percent, during his administration.

Funds advanced during his administration increased over $211,000,000, or 133 percent.

The miles of rural electrified lines increased over 245,000 miles, or 180 percent, during his administration.

The number of rural electrification systems jumped 348 during his administration, or 76 percent.

The number of farmers connected during his administration increased 731,000, or 236 percent.

The amount of electricity purchased during his administration increased nearly 1,500,000,000 kilowatt hours, or 962 percent.

I will not give any further details, but will refer my colleagues to the documentary record. I challenge Mr. Wickard or any other person to point to a single branch of the Government that has as fine a record of administration as the R. E. A. under its former Administrators, Mr. Slattery and Mr. Carmody.

Equally important in his accomplishment was the financial record during his regime. About $34,000,000 was due on R. E. A. loans, and payments made on this indebtedness totaled nearly $47,000,000.

With an outstanding allotment of approximately $500,000,000, delinquencies under his administration were only $97,000. Offset against this, other borrowers had made advance payments in excess of $12,000,000.

I say it is an indictment of Secretary Wickard when a man with such a fine public background and with such a remarkable record of accomplishment has to quit in the middle of a 10-year appointment because the political domination of R. E. A. by Secretary Wickard had become intolerable.

I now desire to refer to another type of maladministration by Secretary Wickard that makes a joke and a farce out of our so-called civil-service law. The Norris Act states specifically that every employee shall be under civil service and protected under civil service.

When Mr. Slattery, the former Administrator, would not play Mr. Wickard's political game, what did Mr. Wickard do? The first thing he did was to strip the Administrator of all of his professional staff. Not one professional assistant was made available to the Administrator after Mr. Wickard got through.

How did Mr. Wickard do this? Very simply. He merely abolished the jobs. Testimony concerning that will be found in part 4, page 1461. I am sure this body will be interested to know that when a Cabinet member abolishes a job, the Civil Service does not question it. This makes a mockery and a farce of civil service.

Some of the jobs abolished were held by veterans who were honorably discharged from the last World War. They had worked for more than 9 years in the R. E. A. and had a rating of "excellent" in their work, which is the highest rating obtainable under civil service. Nevertheless, all such jobs in the Administrator's office were abolished.

We have been hearing much of the necessity for establishing desirable and lasting world peace. I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that one of the positions abolished by Mr. Wickard related to the most successful experiment in inter-American relations that has been established in this country. This is the R. E. A. Latin-American engineering program. Engineers from 14 Latin-American republics took part in this splendid program until Mr. Wickward killed it. Engineers from Latin America came here to study how rural electrification was established and how it was managed: but Mr. Wickard killed that very fine effort.

All the time that Mr. Wickard was abolishing these jobs of tried and trusted veterans in the office of the Administrator, other politicians or incompetents were taking over. I intend to go into this matter quite fully at some future date. I call it to the attention of the Senate now only to disclose the gross maladministration of R. E. A. under Secretary Wickard.

For the past few weeks we have heard much discussion about the nomination of Aubrey Williams to be the Administrator of R. E. A. We have covered practically every subject under the sun. We have gone into his views on educational matters, political matters, religious matters, and volumes of other things. However, a very small amount of attention was paid to the main issue, namely, How can Mr. Williams, or any other person nominated to be Administrator, function under the present set-up of R. E. A. in the Department of Agriculture under Secretary Wickard?

When Secretary Wickard recently appeared before the Senate committee investigating Mr. Williams, he said:

> The R. E. A. occupies the same position in the Department of Agriculture as all other bureaus. R. E. A. would function according to the law and that the law provides for the same sort of direction and supervision that has been accorded to all the other bureaus in the Department of Agriculture. * * * If appointed, Mr. Williams would be given the same administrative authority as all other heads of bureaus are given. * * * That is no different from the situation with regard to any other bureau in the entire Department of Agriculture. It is exactly the same thing, and this language just merely was making it clear that there is the same supervision. We * * * would regard the Administrator's authority in this particular matter, his recommendations, his actions the same as with regard to that of any other head of any bureau in the Department.

This testimony of Secretary Wickard occurs in the Williams hearings, pages 247, 248, 251, and 252.

In other words, Mr. Wickard is telling us that under congressional law the R. E. A. is just the same as any other bureau in the Department of Agriculture. I wonder if Mr. Wickard has read the law passed by Congress, and if he has, does he understand its plain language?

It is quite apparent that he has not read the law, but if he has read it, he either does not understand the clear mandate of Congress or he has been given some very bad legal advice.

Let us read the law. I shall not take the time of the Senate to go into detail, but we will consider the high lights under which the R. E. A. Administrator was to administer R. E. A.

First. R. E. A. law:

(a) Section 1 of the R. E. A. Act of May 20, 1936, which is the original act of Congress, states:

> All of the powers * * * shall be exercised by an Administrator.

(b) Section 11 of the R. E. A. Act above states:

> The Administrator may * * * appoint and fix the compensation of attorneys, engineers, and experts, and he may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such other officers and employees as he may find necessary and prescribe their duties.

It will thus be seen that under sections 1 and 11 of the R. E. A. Act the Administrator is in complete charge of the administration of R. E. A., and specifically has control over its personnel.

Second. The Reorganization Act:

Under Reorganization Plan No. II R. E. A. was transferred to the Department of Agriculture to be administered by the Administrator, under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The following is from the Executive order:

> SEC. 5. Department of Agriculture: Rural Electrification Administration transferred—the Rural Electrification Administration and its functions and activities are hereby transferred to the Department of Agriculture and shall be administered in that department by the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture. (U. S. Statutes at Large, 76th Cong., 1st sess., 1939, vol. 53, pt. 2, p. 1434.)

Note particularly that R. E. A. is to be administered in that department by the Administrator. If Senators examine the other transfers under the Reorganization Act, they will note this is a specific exception for which Congress has provided. The only reference to the Secretary is, "general direction and supervision."

Thus, if we turn to section 401 of the Reorganization Act (ibid. p. 1429) all doubt is removed. Here other lending agencies similar to R. E. A.—Farm Credit Administration, Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, Commodity Credit Corporation—were also transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture. Each of these agencies formerly had a head who corresponded to the Administrator, such as a president, governor, and so forth. But no mention is made of them in the reorganization. It does not provide that the organization shall continue to be administered by the prior Administrator. Congress transferred all their authority to the Secretary of Agriculture and only used the same general language, "and shall be administered under the general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture." Note that no provision is made that the specific former administrators shall administer these agencies as was done by Congress in renaming the Administrator of R. E. A.

In other words, the congressional mandate in the case of R. E. A. has affirmatively and specifically provided for the administration of the R. E. A. by the Administrator.

Third. The specific governs the general.

It is a well established principle of statutory interpretation that the specific always prevails over the general. In this case, Congress is very specific. It states that R. E. A. shall be administered "by the Administrator." This is specific. This is a specific mandate. The general mandate is the language "general direction and supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture." In other words, there is a specific mandate vesting authority in the Administrator, and a general mandate vesting general direction in the Secretary of Agriculture.

Fourth. No repeals by implication.

Another well established principle of statutory interpretation is that there are no repeals by implication. Nowhere in the Reorganization Act has Congress stated that the R. E. A. Act of 1936 has been repealed. On the contrary, the Congress has stated that the act shall be "administered by the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration."

If there are no repeals by implication, this means that the Congress did not intend to repeal the R. E. A. Act of 1936.

Fifth. Subsequent amendments to R. E. A. Act of 1936.

An examination of all subsequent amendments to the R. E. A. Act of 1936 discloses that Congress plainly intended that that act should remain in full force and effect, except as specifically modified. Consider, for example, the changes embodied in the 1944 law concerning loans to the Administrator of R. E. A.:

> The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator upon the request and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. (Public Law No. 425, 78th Cong., approved September 21, 1944, title V, sec. 501 (a), subsection (a) of sec. 3 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended.)

This changes section 3 of the R. E. A. Act of 1936, which reads: "to make loans

to the Administrator, upon his request approved by the President."

The original act provided that the Administrator could make loans, and that the R. F. C. would make loans to the Administrator upon the request of the Administrator, approved by the President. Under the reorganization order the R. F. C. still lends money to the Administrator, upon the request, not of the President, but of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Under the Reorganization Act, as R. E. A. lost its independence, it was essential that the direct contact that the Administrator had with the President be changed and vested in the Secretary of Agriculture. Note, however, that the R. F. C. is still authorized and directed to make loans to the Administrator. Note also that each time Congress wants a change in a specific part of the R. E. A. Act of 1936 it does so by express language. It follows that all of the remaining parts of the R. E. A. Act of 1936 not so changed are still in full force and effect.

Any further doubt that the R. E. A. is to continue to function under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, is disclosed in Public Law No. 563, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 23, 1944. In section 502 it amends section 4 of the 1936 R. E. A. Act. Note that the Congress reaffirms the specific power of the R. E. A. Administrator:

> Loans under this section and section 5 shall not be made unless the Administrator finds and certifies that in his judgment the security therefor is reasonably adequate and such loan will be repaid within the time agreed.

Under the same act, section 709:

> The Secretary of Agriculture may delegate to such officers as he shall designate the authority to employ personnel in the departmental service wherever located.

This is merely a continuation of the general authority which has been granted to the Secretary of Agriculture under United States Statutes at Large, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, 1939, volume 52, part 2, page 1436, section 404. This section related to personnel transferred to the Department that were not otherwise provided for. The Rural Electrification Administration is the only exception to that rule.

In view of the fact that the Administrator's powers were not specifically curtailed in administering the R. E. A.—see above R. E. A. law—and that section 11 of the R. E. A. Act specifically gives him control of R. E. A. personnel, it is apparent that this language related only to those bureaus that were completely merged in the Department of Agriculture and whose personnel handling was not provided for otherwise. Accordingly, only in such agencies could the Secretary delegate to others power over personnel which the reorganization act granted to him. It obviously does not include a delegation of powers over personnel where Congress has not given such power to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Accordingly, the R. E. A. Act of 1936 is still in full force and effect. Under that law, the Administrator has full control of the R. E. A. He also has full control over personnel under that act. The only change that was made was with respect to general direction and supervision by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Subsequent legislation which has amended the R. E. A. Act of 1936 has not changed the essential authority of the Administrator in any important administrative respect. This includes allotments, the handling of personnel, and the day-to-day matters that constitute the administration of the R. E. A.

It is submitted accordingly that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard, acted without sanction of law and contrary to the express language and clearly stated intent of Congress to have the R. E. A. administered by the Administrator, as provided in the original R. E. A. Act of 1936 and all subsequent modifications to date.

The Secretary of Agriculture acted without authority of law when he proceeded to take over and administer minutely personnel and other day-to-day problems of the administration of R. E. A.

In other words, Mr. Wickard has come before a committee of the United States Senate and clearly misrepresented the plain law, if he ever read it or understood it; or else he has been misinformed.

What does this have to do with the nomination of Mr. Williams to be Administrator of R. E. A.?

For nearly a year a bipartisan committee of the United States Senate investigated the functions of the Rural Electrification Administration under Mr. Wickard in the Department of Agriculture. I have before me a copy of the interim report. It is only a few brief pages. I wish to read a few extracts from that report, which is signed by both Republicans and Democrats.

First of all, let me point out that harmony prevailed in the R. E. A. as long as it was independent:

> So long as this policy of independence prevailed, the record of the R. E. A. was outstanding and fulfilled the highest expectations of the President, the Congress, and the people of the United States. All employees were directly responsible to the Administrator. The Administrator was responsible to the Congress. (Interim report, p. 1.)

We next observe that the authority of the Administrator was undermined. Here are the exact words of the Senate subcommittee report:

> There is evidence that subordinates in the Department of Agriculture cooperated with subordinates in the R. E. A. and persons not employed by the Agricultural Department or the R. E. A., to undermine the authority placed by the Congress in the office and person of the Administrator. (Interim report, pp. 1 and 2.)

I particularly wish to call attention to the fact that Mr. Wickard had usurped the powers that the Congress had placed in the Administrator; so for all practical purposes the Administrator of the R. E. A. was a rubber stamp:

> There can be no doubt that the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, appointed by the President and confirmed in that appointment by the United States Senate, is no longer the Administrator of the R. E. A. in fact. (Interim report, p. 2.)

What kind of morale prevailed among the employees of R. E. A. once it became a part of the Department of Agriculture? It will be observed that the morale of the R. E. A. was very bad, according to the committee:

> There can be no doubt that there is dissension among those in highest authority in the administration of R. E. A., that there is divided authorty and therefore credence can be given to the reports—

And also to the evidence, let me say—

> which came to the committee of growing discord and distrust and disorganization within the R. E. A. (Interim report, p. 2.)

All these things, during the regime of R. E. A. in the Department of Agriculture, are in sharp contrast to the fine agency that existed when R. E. A. was independent. Here are the exact words of the subcommittee:

> The disintegration and demoralization of personnel in the R. E. A. since its integration into the Department of Agriculture, is an outstanding contrast to the harmony and excellency of morale that appears to have existed prior thereto, and is an indictment of the administration under the Agricultural Department. (Interim report, p. 4.)

In its conclusion, to which there was not one dissenting vote, the bipartisan committee recommended that R. E. A. be made independent "at the earliest possible date."

Why do I say that R. E. A. should be made independent before we consider the nomination of an Administrator of that agency? I do so simply because it is completely impossible for any person to administer that agency under the present political regime of Mr. Wickard.

It is shocking to hear a Cabinet member, Mr. Wickard, come before a committee of Congress and misrepresent the clear law. It may be that he may be excused because he did not know the law or he may have been misadvised. In this he has been aided and abetted by the general counsel of R. E. A., Mr. Vincent D. Nicholson.

After reading his recent testimony before the Williams committee, I am wondering whether Mr. Nicholson is familiar with R. E. A. procedure or whether he is making up his testimony to suit his convenience at the time.

Exactly what has Mr. Wickard done in the R. E. A.? At a time when there was a lawful Administrator, Mr. Harry Slattery, nominated by the President and approved by the Senate of the United States, he sent out another man, Mr. William J. Neal, to take over. His title was Deputy Administrator. Actually he assumed control of the R. E. A.

Here is how Mr. Wickard did it. On June 23, 1943, while the lawfully appointed Administrator was still in full charge, he issued the following memorandum to the R. E. A. staff. I read from part 2 of the Senate subcommittee investigation of R. E. A., page 386. This came after Mr. Slattery became "incompetent" because he would not go along with the national rural electrification cooperatives organized by Mr. Craig. I now read the memorandum issued to the

R. E. A. staff on June 23, 1943; this was Mr. Wickard's order to all the employees:

Memorandum to all Rural Electrification Administration section and division heads and the members of the administrative staff

William J. Neal has been appointed Deputy Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Effective immediately, Mr. Neal will exercise coordinating and administrative authority for the operation of the Rural Electrification Administration. All section and division heads and the members of the administrative staff will report to the Administrator through Mr. Neal.

All previous memoranda are superseded to the extent that they conflict, or are inconsistent with, the provisions of this memorandum.

What effect did that order have upon the powers of the existing Administrator? Let me read from the sworn testimony of the former Administrator, Mr. Harry Slattery. Mr. Beedy, who was counsel of the committee, asked the following question:

And you have largely been shorn of your power since Mr. Neal was appointed as the Deputy Administrator, have you not?

Mr. SLATTERY. The order of June 23 makes Mr. Neal Coordinating Deputy.

Mr. BEEDY. Which gives him full charge of personnel?

Mr. SLATTERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BEEDY. As Coordinating Deputy?

Mr. SLATTERY. Coordinating Administrator, in a sense.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. And he is instructed to take orders from the Department of Agriculture, and not from you?

Mr. SLATTERY. Yes, sir.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. You have no authority over Mr. Neal?

Mr. SLATTERY. I have no authority over Mr. Neal. (Pt. 2, Senate subcommittee investigation of R. E. A., p. 213.)

In other words, Mr. Wickard, through his so-called deputy, Mr. Neal, took over complete control of the R. E. A., bypassed the lawful Administrator, and gave complete authority to a stranger in R. E. A., Mr. Neal.

Who was Mr. Neal? If Senators will turn to the testimony and documentary exhibits of the Senate investigation, part 4, pages 1400 to 1428, inclusive, they will find that his was the worst-managed of all the R. E. A. cooperatives. I understand he was president of the board of directors from the beginning. It is quite apparent that Mr. Wickard has never read this testimony and is not familiar with the facts, or he would not have repeated recently in the Williams hearings that:

I thought Mr. Neal was a good choice. (Pt. 7, p. 563.)

Nor would Mr. Wickard have issued the following misleading statement concerning Mr. Neal's system, New Hampshire 4, Merrimack:

They were having the same kind of troubles * * * that practically * * * all other cooperatives were having who had their construction stopped by a shortage of material. (Pt. 7, p. 564.)

The exhibits of the Senate investigation disclosed that this system, where Mr. Neal was president and leader, was having the same kind of difficulty long before the war started. I refer to exhibit 216, dated August 26, 1940. Let me read just one sentence from that R. E. A. report of one of its field engineers:

In my opinion, this can only be accomplished by the appointment of a Rural Electrification Administration supervisor. (Pt. 4, p. 1400.)

That is to say, in 1940 it was recommended that a receiver be appointed for the system of which Mr. Neal was president.

The Williams hearings have the evidence to show that a recent audit of Mr. Neal's system shows that it has one of the worst records of all the R. E. A. systems. Its superintendent, a close collaborator of Mr. Neal's, engaged in defalcations totaling $15,000. The system is in the red in its operations to the extent of nearly $180,000. It owed the Government nearly $40,000 on back payments on its Government loan. This is the Mr. Neal whom Mr. Wickard said "was a good choice." He is also the man who is Acting Administrator in the R. E. A. today.

I do not see what all this concern is about appointing an Administrator immediately. The R. E. A. construction program has practically stopped. All they are doing today is constructing some extensions. The important matter is to see that R. E. A. is made independent, so that when an Administrator is appointed he can do a real job.

How do the R. E. A. systems feel about making R. E. A. independent? I hold in my hand a few of the many letters and telegrams which I have received from over half the States in the Union that have come in, in the last few days. They are unanimous in stating that R. E. A. should be made independent. Naturally, many R. E. A. systems that favor independence are afraid to write. The reasons are obvious. They have to go to Agriculture and R. E. A. each day for various types of favors, including loans and extensions. It puts them on the spot to put down their real sentiments in writing. Nevertheless, these representative letters and telegrams amply prove that R. E. A. independence is the overwhelming desire of the great mass of R. E. A. systems.

I intend to go into some detail further when the R. E. A. independence bill comes before the Senate. This will show the negligence or the connivance, or both, of the Department of Agriculture in many vital matters that affect the daily administration of R. E. A. At this time I merely want to state that R. E. A. should be made independent before we vote on any candidate to be Administrator of R. E. A.

Based upon the records of the sworn testimony in the hearings of the subcommittee investigating R. E. A., it is my firm conviction that no one can satisfactorily administer R. E. A. under the political domination and maladministration of Mr. Wickard. Both in the recent hearings and on this floor I have not cast any reflections on Mr. Williams. For all these reasons which I have called to your attention, I cannot acquiesce in the confirmation of Mr. Williams.

When the consideration of the name of Mr. Williams came up in this body on Monday, there was much discussion as to the significance of the R. E. A. problem compared to the pending treaty. This body resolved its opinion in favor of the importance of the R. E. A.

Permit me to call these important facts to your attention: Today the R. E. A. functions in 46 States. It serves over 1,300,000 farm families. At an average of some 5 to the family, this means that around 7,000,000 citizens in all parts of the Union are vitally affected by this debate.

While the nomination of an Administrator as long as R. E. A. is in the Department of Agriculture is not important, there is another matter that is.

A real crisis exists in the R. E. A. today. I am sorry to disagree with the remarks of my distinguished friend, the good Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] when he stated that R. E. A. was now being operated in a satisfactory manner. I think the facts will prove conclusively that the opposite is the fact.

I hold in my hand a letter entitled "Jefferson Day Committee of the District of Columbia, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C." It is signed by Robert E. Hannegan, chairman. I notice in the upper left-hand corner, printed conspicuously, is the executive committee. I also notice that Mr. Claude R. Wickard is listed as co-chairman. This is the same Mr. Claude R. Wickard who is Secretary of Agriculture. This is the same Mr. Wickard who appointed the defeated politician, Mr. Neal, to be the Deputy, actually the Administrator of R. E. A. This is the same Mr. Wickard who has been playing politics with R. E. A. practically from the day he took over this once fine agency.

As the Members of this body know, the R. E. A. Act of 1936 is still in full force and effect. Section 9 of that act specifically prohibits politics in the administration of the R. E. A. Let me read you just one sentence:

SEC. 9. This act shall be administered entirely on a nonpartisan basis, and in the appointment of officials, the selection of employees, and in the promotion of any such officials or employees, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency.

The question I would like to ask this body is, how can the cochairman of the Democratic Committee that is in politics up to its ears, and in this particular case is selling $100 dinners, administer a nonpolitical agency like the R. E. A.?

The answer is, he cannot. The fact is, he has not. The man he appointed, Mr. Neal, was a defeated Democratic politician for the Governorship of New Hampshire. That is how the politicians pay off the "lame ducks."

Now, let us go one step further and prove to this body why R. E. A. should be made independent at the earliest possible date.

First of all, I am reliably advised that Mr. Wickard and Mr. Neal believe that Mr. Williams will be defeated. They are making their plans accordingly. Mr. Neal has been in this city and has consulted prominent Members of this body

in order to "line himself up" when Williams is defeated. If this is not playing politics and contrary to all the laws that we have passed prohibiting it, I do not know what is.

Equally important, many members of the R. E. A. staff, including some who are in this body at the present time, while they are being paid Government funds to perform R. E. A. duties, are watching every move of this debate.

Specifically the Applications and Loans Division of R. E. A. is having its field representatives scour the country, and when the Williams nomination is set aside I predict that this chamber will be flooded with wires and letters asking for the endorsement of Mr. Neal as the next Administrator of R. E. A.

I say this is an affront to the dignity and the intelligence of this body. It is politics of a very low order.

Meanwhile Mr. Neal is bullying the R. E. A. staff, telling them all over the lot that he is to be the next Administrator.

If I know the sentiments of this body and the manner in which we proceed, I can assure Mr. Neal this is very far from the fact.

That may not be so much a reflection on Mr. Neal as it is on Mr. Wickard for appointing a Deputy Administrator whom he made actually the active Administrator. He selected a man who had been the head of an R. E. A. cooperative whose financial condition was the worst of all the cooperatives in the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I simply wish to make the same explanation which I made in the committee in regard to the New Hampshire cooperative. Without excusing the mismanagement of that particular electric cooperative, which is at the foot of the list, according to the testimony, in the matter of being in arrears, I wish to say that the rural electric cooperative in New Hampshire will pay out as soon as the war is over. Unfortunately, it spread itself too thin at the start. It took on approximately 1,000 summer homes which have been closed since soon after the war started. Naturally, it has gone into the red, and it was one of the six cooperatives in the United States which we were told were behind in their payments to the Federal Government.

I wish to say, however, for the State of New Hampshire that it is a fertile field for rural-electric cooperatives; and with good management and with the conditions which will exist when the war is over, that cooperative can be placed on a paying basis. In fact, the new president, Mr. George Duncan, of Jaffrey, is a very capable man. I am sure he will put it on its feet. It has been placed at a serious disadvantage by having actually had to pay almost 3 cents a kilowatt hour for its electricity at wholesale, due to the nature of the contract which was made. I think the base rate was 1.32 cents a kilowatt hour, but Mr. Duncan informed me that actually it has had to pay 2.8 cents for what it used.

So, without excusing the management of the cooperative in any way, I wish to say that the New Hampshire R. E. A. cooperative will, in my opinion, make a complete recovery after the war and when the thousand persons who discontinued their service can become paying members.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I hope the statement of the Senator from Vermont is correct. I am sure that in time that cooperative will get on its feet. However, I have read the report of the examiner which shows that the cooperative of which the Senator speaks has been very sloppily administered. The first suprintendent of that co-op was Mr. Huntress. He was found to have been guilty of defalcations of approximately $15,000. The co-op was $158,000 in the red. Mr. Messer is now the administrator. The report of the examiner shows that he paid approximately $150 a mile for the right-of-way. After Mr. Huntress was compelled to quit because of his defalcations Mr. Messer was put in charge. As I have already said, he is the man who paid approximately $150 a mile for the right-of-way when, in the neighboring State of Vermont less than $12 a mile was paid. That would indicate a lack of proper management.

I also understand that approximately 1,000 people in New Hampshire who owned summer cottages were given a rate of $18 for the season. The report also shows that their service was not disconnected for the other 9 months of the year.

Mr. AIKEN. I think service is disconnected for most of the year. I do not question the mismanagement involved. Mistakes were made in obtaining the right-of-way. Along some of the lines only 15 feet of the area on each side of the line was cleared, and every time an ice storm or a snow storm occurs, branches from the trees fall and smash the line. The line then has to be rebuilt at great expense. My statement was that under proper management New Hampshire would be a fertile ground for R. E. A. cooperatives.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have no doubt that they will be given proper management in time. It is remarkable to me that any New England State should be confronted with conditions of the kind to which reference has been made. I have referred to the subject not in any way to cast reflection on the board of directors. I know something about "easy come, easy go." The management is generally left to some "good" fellow. But that is no excuse for Mr. Wickard's picking a deputy administrator, and making him an administrator of the national R. E. A. in fact.

Many persons live in the rural sections, and during the wintertime it is necessary for them to hold a meeting of the board of directors in order to determine what should be done. It is amazing how quickly they respond. Not one cooperative out of nearly 300 has indicated that it wished to remain under the Department, and they are coming every day. In my correspondence with them I did not mention the nomination of Mr. Williams. I did not think it would be fair to Mr. Williams to mention his nomination. I did not think those people would know anything about him, so there was no reason why I should ask them how they felt about it.

Mr. President, so far the cooperatives are unanimous in the belief that the R. E. A. should be made independent. Many R. E. A. cooperative systems feel that if they go on public record that R. E. A. be made an independent agency retaliation will be visited upon them. Many men have come to my office and said that they were in favor of independence for the R. E. A. but were afraid of retaliation by the Department of Agriculture if they state their desire publicly. Mr. President, think of the taxpayers who are borrowing for R. E. A. projects, money which has been provided by Congress being afraid that the Department in Washington will retaliate if they say that they want to return to a status of independence and get away from the Agricultural Department.

I have received many letters and telegrams which have come from more than 30 States. I did not bring them all with me. The interesting thing is that the writers of many of the letters say they have read the testimony of the investigation and have made up their minds. They say, "We have had a meeting of the board of directors and we have discussed the matter."

Here is a telegram from California:

Resolved, That this board is in favor of R. E. A. being an independent agency.

Here is one from Georgia:

Our cooperative wishes an independent R. E. A. by all means, and will on our next meeting pass a resolution to this effect and forward to you a copy.

Here is a letter from Idaho:

The board of directors of this association are in agreement with you that the Rural Electrification Administration seemed to operate more efficiently when it was an independent agency, and they wish to extend their wholehearted cooperation in securing it in a like status.

That was the status the agency had before being placed under the Department of Agriculture.

Here is a telegram from Illinois:

The board of directors are on record as voicing approval of your Senate bill 309 to make R. E. A. an independent agency, and desire it passed.

Here is a telegram from Indiana:

Directors have read subcommittee report. Our contacts with R. E. A., plus the report, convince board independent R. E. A. essential. Board willing to cooperate fully to achieve necessary independence. Only nonpolitical organization can give greater service to rural America.

This is from Iowa:

The confusion and disorganization in the R. E. A. of recent years has caused considerable alarm on our part, and we firmly believe that much of this has come from that agency being under the Department of Agri-

culture. It is our hope that it will prove possible to make R. E. A. an independent agency once more, and that a strong, capable leader will be placed at its head. The problem facing rural electrification today and in the post-war period cannot be met by divided authority and responsibility. To accomplish the work that must be done will require an agency that is alert and aggressive with its mind on rural electrification rather than on departmental strife.

Here is a communication from Kansas—I read merely an excerpt:

I think every person in the Board or in connection in any way with our cooperative is enthusiastically in favor of terminating the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and restoring the R. E. A. to its original status of an independent agency.

Here is one from Kentucky:

The manager and board of directors are unanimously in favor of establishing R. E. A. as an independent agency.

I read one now from Louisiana:

The board of directors and manager are unanimous in their opinion that the R. E. A. should be divorced from the Department of Agriculture and established as a separate and independent agency. We sincerely trust that this can and will be done.

Now one from Maryland:

This cooperative feels most emphatic R. E. A. should be independent agency.

Here is a resolution adopted by a board of directors in Minnesota:

Whereas since the integration of the Rural Electrification Administration with the Department of Agriculture there has been a shifting of responsibility by its employees resulting in the disintegration and demoralization of personnel; and

Whereas the board of directors believe that the Rural Electrification Administration is a project of such size, involving so much money, that it should constitute a separate department of the Government: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That R. E. A. be set up as a separate department.

Here, Mr. President, is a long letter from another cooperative in Minnesota. It is an excellent letter, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD without reading, because I desire to save the time of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA, *March 16, 1945.*

Senator HENRIK M. SHIPSTEAD,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SHIPSTEAD: Since it is unlikely that I will find time to accept your kind invitation to appear before the Senate Agricultural Committee to testify in behalf of Senate bill 309, commonly referred to as the R. E. A. Independence bill, I should like to furnish you with this letter outlining my views concerning this question. Kindly consider yourself authorized to use it in any manner you deem fit.

For the purpose of introducing myself I should like to say that I consider myself just an average farmer. I own and operate a 400-acre farm located 2½ miles north of Alvarado, Minn., in the Red River Valley where I grow grain and livestock and maintain a small dairy herd. My family and I have lived in this community for more than 30 years during which time I have always been active in community affairs. As a result I genuinely feel that I can and do carry and command the respect of my fellow and neighboring citizens. At the present time I serve as president of the P. K. M. Electric Cooperative, Inc., and president of the Minnkota Power Cooperative, Inc., both of which are R. E. A. financed projects and ones which I have been president of since their inception several years ago. In addition to these two community enterprises, I am president of the Alvarado Cooperative Creamery, chairman of the Marshall County Draft Board, chairman of the Township A. A. A. and adjutant of Minnesota Legion Post, No. 35.

Under the circumstances, I believe I am entitled to offer my views concerning the question at hand for consideration by the members of your committee.

The conditions under which the R. E. A. is operating at the present time are no secret. It is a national disgrace of the first order and forward-thinking people everywhere in all walks of life cannot understand why Congress and the President sit idly by for months on end and allow one of the finest Government Bureaus ever created to help rural America, degenerate into a breeding place for corruption, graft, and political manipulations. That it has been allowed to degenerate into such, there can be no question. The more than 2,000 pages of sworn testimony taken by your subcommittee investigating the administration of the R. E. A. under the Department of Agriculture is sufficient evidence in itself to underwrite immediate action for its removal from the Department of Agriculture and the influence of the Secretary of Agriculture. Until Congress and the President take cognizance of this decadent state of affairs and halt it, existing rural electrification projects and the movement must continue to suffer. Unless it is corrected quickly irreparable harm will be done which can threaten the security of existing loans. I say this in all sincerity for it is no secret that honest farm men and women do not care to continue their alinement with a movement that is being riddled with politicians who are malignant toward anyone bent on conducting themselves and the business affairs of the cooperative on an unbiased business basis instead of on a basis of doing what is necessary to feel sure of an allotment for their project. Honest farm men and women have in the past devoted hours on end without pay along with employees who have worked long and hard and in many instances at rates of pay below standard to further and build this rural electrification program of ours. They did it willingly and honestly. They were proud of their connection with the movement and proud to be referred to as R. E. A. leaders of their community. That condition is fast disappearing.

Unless R. E. A. is liberated soon and again restored as an independent agency under a strong Administrator there can be little question but what honest, unselfish people interested in and proud of the cause cannot be induced to remain in posts responsible for the direction of the program. If that condition is permitted then the final stage of decay before death has set in and for all practical purposes the program can be written off as a failure.

Unfortunately, the very nature of the R. E. A. movement is tailor made for full exploitation by those men engaged in the task. They know it and are making capital stock of their opportunity. They realize only too well that most projects are anxious above all to bring everyone in their community the benefits of the program. Therefore, they crack the whip and the average board member will dance and smile because he does not want to jeopardize the chance for his cooperative to expand its service. Likewise, with the average project manager. In many instances he has a better job now than he ever had before and in many instances has a better job that he could command elsewhere, should he lose his present job. Consequently, he is not prone to fight his masters and, therefore, is easily made subservient to those in power and bent on employing the program to further their own ends.

Next, there is what you can probably call the average member. For all practical purposes, to him, the program has served its course since he has the benefit of the line and can be expected to remain quiescent so long as the power stays on and his lights do not blink.

Lastly, we have the unelectrified farmer who is anxious to do nothing that will disturb his delicate chances of getting the power to his farm. These conditions are only natural ones and can only serve to excite any political-minded administrator who is greedy for power and anxious to wield a potent political whip for his chief.

Until R. E. A. is made independent and free under the guidance of a powerful administrator capable of commanding the respect of his staff and stiff-arming the powerful business interests and professional politicians which he must face daily, R. E. A. can only be expected to continue to operate in its present state of chaos. As long as it does, rural America and the Nation will continue to suffer.

Realizing this, I have exerted my influence and spent such small amounts of my money as I have been able to afford in an effort to derail this political machine that is gaining momentum daily. That I have been partially successful is attested to by the results of the San Antonio convention of the N. R. E. C. A. held on January 16 and 17. While I failed to rally sufficient strength to explode the machine responsible for the political manipulations within R. E. A., I am satisfied my efforts constituted a major obstacle for those who were preparing to place the convention on record as opposed to R. E. A. independence and favoring the appointment of William J. Neal for the vacant post of Administrator.

That I did not succeed more fully can only be attributed to a well-oiled political machine having the resources of the Department of Agriculture and the officials of the N. R. E. C. A. as its assets.

However, the record of sworn testimony is clear cut and the recommendations of the subcommittee of which you were a member along with those of former Administrator, the Honorable John M. Carmody, and can hardly fail to command the respect of Congress and the President. Therefore, I am confident that if you can be successful in bringing your bill to the floor, Congress will confirm your stand and hastily approve your recommendations. I, therefore, urge you make haste in an effort to save the greatest agency ever created for the farm people of America from the political vultures who are unable to conceive of the harm they are doing.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I have here a communication from Mississippi, reading as follows:

Our board of directors agree unreservedly that R. E. A. should be reestablished as an independent agency. Our Representatives in Congress are being advised accordingly. We are also unalterably opposed to the confirmation of Aubrey Williams as Administrator of R. E. A.

I will say about the correspondence that I think about four letters mentioned Aubrey Williams' nomination. I am not sure whether two were against him and two or three for him or not.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator permit me to add, regarding the communications I have had in the matter, that I

have heard from two R. E. A. cooperatives? They both favor the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Williams. One was a Maryland cooperative, the other covers Minnesota, Wisconsin, and northeastern Iowa. They were in favor of Mr. Williams' nomination being confirmed. I also have a communication to the effect that the Ohio cooperative have requested the confirmation of Mr. Williams.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. All of them?

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure it will be found to be a fact that the State-wide organization in Ohio does. The two to which I have referred are the only R. E. A. cooperatives which have expressed any sentiment for or against Mr. Williams, so far as I know. They are more concerned with the office than the man.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is no reflection on Mr. Williams.

Mr. AIKEN. I think we spend altogether too much time discussing personalities, and too little time in correcting the faults or evils of offices which men are to occupy.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I agree entirely. I have not, either in the committee or on the floor of the Senate, indulged in personalities, except from the record. It is not pleasant to bring out things as I have here this afternoon about Wickard; but he had plenty of warning.

Here is a resolution from Missouri:

We do hereby respectfully request the legislative authorities of the United States to remove the Rural Electrication Administration from the Department of Agriculture and make it an independent agency with a single Administrator with power to act as it was originally authorized by Congress. This action was brought about by the apparent and increasing difficulty the Administration is experiencing under the Department of Agriculture of which we are sure you are quite well informed.

Here is a letter from the president of a concern in Montana:

I have felt for some time that the R. E. A. could cooperate much better and fulfill the original intention of the R. E. A. if it could be operated as an independent agency rather than as it is now as a part of the Department of Agriculture, and I hope that the fight to bring about the return of R. E. A. to an independent agency will be successful.

Here is one from Nebraska:

The board of directors at last meeting voted unanimously in favor of returning R. E. A. to its independent status. We will help in any way possible to accomplish this.

From North Carolina:

Our board of directors, representing over 1,600 farm families in our section, has gone on record favoring the R. E. A. as an independent agency. We believe that the R. E. A. program is entirely too big to be administered by the Department of Agriculture or any Government department where it could be used for political purposes. The cooperatives and the R. E. A. have a tremendous job ahead of us to electrify rural America and in our minds this job can best be accomplished with the R. E. A. as an independent agency.

Here is a communication from Ohio:

We may trust you and your colleagues to restore R. E. A. to what it originally was, and now should be—an organization for the sole purpose of extending electricity to our rural homes. We find nothing in the act that permits the use of the facilities of the administration for the purpose of promoting personal, class, or group political ambitions.

We regret that since R. E. A. has been in the Department of Agriculture much effort has been spent that did not further the original purpose of R. E. A.

We regret that many of our project directors, managers, and members have been misled and now think it necessary to devote their time, energy, and money to the purpose of protecting our interests against exploitation. The idea that our Congress should be guided, directed, and influenced by the R. E. A., and R. E. A. should be guided, directed, and influenced by N. R. E. C., and N. R. E. C should be guided, directed, and influenced by district organizations, and district organizations should be directed and influenced by State organizations, constitutes a chain of control that involves too many possibilities for the promotion of personal interest to be practicable If R. E. A. is responsible only to Congress, we have a majority in Congress that will protect our interest against exploitation and will constitute an efficient, direct, and adequate control.

We have not found time to attend many of the State, district, and national promotional meetings and contribute our ideas to the confusion that already exists.

We have reviewed the testimony of the Senate investigations. We have tiresomely eliminated the personal prejudice, opinions, and political ambitions of much of the testimony. After 8 years of contact with these men we should know about what to expect. We marvel at the accuracy of the findings of the committee and believe that they are, as set forth by the committee, sound and constructive.

Here is a communication from the president of a co-op in Oklahoma:

I personally went on record in a State-wide organization by introducing a resolution to make R. E. A. an independent agency, which was unanimously adopted.

Here is a communication from Oregon—many of these States have what they call State-wide cooperatives; I have not time to untangle them.

A resolution was unanimously passed asking that R. E. A. be again made an independent organization as in 1936. I have read most of the hearings that were published by Congress on the investigation.

These men read the hearings, which fact is very illuminating. I think that if more people read the hearings, there would be better understanding of the problem.

I have read the hearings on the investigation, as have other members of our legislative committee, so we have not arrived at our conclusions through prejudice.

I read a communication from South Carolina:

The Congress of the United States should at the earliest possible moment enact legislation making R. E. A. a free and independent agency of the Federal Government.

I read one from Tennessee, as follows:

It is our sincere belief that the public interest would best be served by restoring Rural Electrification Administration to its former status as an independent governmental agency.

One from Texas:

We all think the two departments should never have been thrown together. Each one is large enough to look after its own affairs. The more you have mixed up in any business the more trouble you will have. I am sure your ideas are right in trying to get R. E. A. out of the Agricultural Department and I hope you will be able to do it.

I also have communications from the States of Washington and Wisconsin in favor of independence of the R. E. A. I understand that all cooperatives in Oregon, Tennessee, Oklahoma and Iowa are in favor of R. E. A. independence.

I read a communication from Wyoming:

It is the desire of the board of directors of our cooperative to make R. E. A. an independent and nonpolitical agency. You may solicit our support.

Mr. President, I have approximately a hundred letters altogether, but I shall not take the time of the Senate to read them. The ones I have read are typical of the rest.

Mr. President, it was provided that the R. E. A. should be a nonpolitical agency in all its divisions. I may say that I have received letters sent to me confidentially bearing the signature of Mr. Hannegan, secretary of the Democratic National Committee in the last campaign. The signatures look as though some girl had written them. The letters ask for funds from the employees of the Rural Electrification Administration. That, of course, was a violation of the original act. Someone gave the names to Mr. Hannegan. I do not think he intended to violate the law; I am not sure that he did; but I am sure that someone in the Rural Electrification Administration gave him the names.

The letter came from the Jefferson Day Committee, having to do with the Jefferson Day dinner at $100 a plate. It was signed "Robert E. Hannegan, chairman, executive committee. Claude E. Wickard, cochairman."

Mr. Wickard claims to be the Administrator of R. E. A., with full power to hire and discharge and make loans. We expect a Cabinet secretary to be in politics; we cannot find fault with that; but when the office is used to assist or to have a subordinate assist in giving names of employees from whom to collect funds for a political campaign, he knows that it is an encouragement to violate the provisions of the R. E. A. Act and of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to remark that the telegrams and letters which the Senator from Minnesota has read, as well as the hundred or so which he has but which he has not read, constitute a remarkable tribute to the high character of the men who are managing the local R. E. A. cooperatives today. The fact that they have courage to write in and state their positions on this subject, even while they are under a Cabinet officer, is to me a remarkable tribute to the entire group of individuals who have organized and are operating the R. E. A. cooperatives throughout the country today.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I think it is very encouraging to find such letters coming from men who till the soil. Such men

always have independence and courage, and many of them have studied the problem and have read the testimony and the hearings. Farmers are short of help, but they have attended meetings of their cooperatives in the wintertime on very short notice. It shows a profound interest in the matter. They want no politics in R. E. A. They have to do business with all kinds of administrators. They do not want anyone to come around and talk much of their dependence on favors or charity. They want to be as independent as they were under Mr. Carmody and under Mr. Slattery, until outsiders came in and took charge and control of R. E. A.

I have already quoted the act dealing with political activities. Of course the question might arise, How can the cochairman of the Democratic National Committee, who is in politics up to his ears, and in this particular case is selling $100 dinners, administer a nonpolitical agency such as the R. E. A.? As a matter of fact that is another instance which makes it plain that the Secretary of Agriculture, a political appointee, who has the right to make political speeches, should not be in charge of the administration of a nonpolitical organization, with a present investment of $500,000,000, which will soon be nearly $1,000,000,000. The organization should be operated as a business institution. That is the way the farmers want it to be conducted.

I have been a member of a farmers' cooperative rural electrification project since 1935, and I know we do not ask any favors. We pay our bills. We want to be left alone and do as we like. We want to vote as we please. We do not want anyone to come around and claim he is doing us a favor when we make our application to R. E. A., and allotments are made, and we pay our dues. The farmers are more independent than most individuals in the cities give them credit for being.

I am informed that the Department of Agriculture anticipates that the nomination of Mr. Williams will not be confirmed so they are plugging hard now for the nomination of Mr. Neal to be Administrator. Members of the staff and employees throughout the country in the last campaign were drumming up attendance at meetings to be addressed by Mr. Wickard, who spoke to State cooperatives and told them that he had already arranged to give them so many thousands of dollars after the war is over. I hold that that should not have been done. That certainly cannot be called anything but political activity. The Secretary had employees of the R. E. A. go out and drum up attendance at meetings which he addressed.

Mr. President, we spent nearly a year on these hearings. The evidence is complete; it is conclusive. I can do no more than say as I already has said, that a bipartisan committee concluded this investigation of R. E. A. and Mr. Wickard by stating that R. E. A. should be made independent at the earliest possible date. I have made this statement out of loyalty to the cooperative farm organizations. I have done it as a matter of loyalty to the committee, which under very uncomfortable and very strange and difficult circumstances had to conduct the investigation. I have never seen men labor more earnestly for long hours and under terrific pressure than did former Senator Gillette, the late Senator Smith, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I felt that it was my duty not only to the cooperatives, to the committee, and to the late Senator Smith, but also to the entire population of the United States.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ADMINISTRATOR, RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—AUBREY W. WILLIAMS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks in connection with the matter under debate. In order to conclude my remarks as quickly as possible, I shall decline to yield.

I believe that it is timely in this debate to read two or three sentences from the Constitution of the United States. The first sentence I want to read is:

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

The second sentence is:

> The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America.

The Constitution does not say "in a President and a Cabinet and various appointed officials." It says "in a President of the United States of America." Later it says that the President shall appoint certain officials of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate.

One reading the record made before the committee in this case might gain the impression that he was back in the days when it was a triable offense, if one happened to be a Baptist, to try to land at the port of Boston, and when in many of the towns and colonies one's right to become a citizen depended upon his religion.

I hope we have passed that day of bigotry; but it appears that we have not when we discuss and take evidence on the religious beliefs of an American citizen in connection with his right to hold office under appointment by the President. I fear that if such a course were long continued the clashing of personalities would eventually wreck the executive department of this Government.

It has always been my concept of this Government that the President of the United States was charged with carrying out the duties of the executive department of government, with the execution of the laws of the country, and the mandates of the Congress through the agents who operate under him. It has been my feeling also that, regardless of politics, the President has the right to select his agents, that the provision in the Constitution giving to the Senate the right of confirmation was a safeguard to prevent the appointment of improper persons, and that, in determining the fitness of appointees, we should look only to the question of whether or not they are competent and honest.

We should not ask whether they are Presbyterians, Baptists, or Catholics, or from what particular college they may have graduated. In passing upon this question, I think we should confine ourselves to the single inquiry as to whether or not the appointee is competent and honest.

There is another respect, Mr. President, in which we have gone far afield. Yesterday, I listened with great interest to the remarks made by able Members of this body on the question of whether or not the head of the R. E. A. should be a banker. I have read articles on the question of whether or not he should be an electrical engineer. It seems to me passing strange that those questions should be raised at this particular time. My mind went back to Judge Patterson, the able Under Secretary of War. No one could successfully contend that Judge Patterson is in the merchandising business; yet he heads the largest procurement agency in the United States and does the biggest job of buying. Before he became Under Secretary of War he was a judge; before that, he was a lawyer. Similar observations could be made in the case of Mr. Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy, and the present Under Secretary, Mr. Bard. The question is, Is the Administrator a man who can successfully administer a department?

I remember much discussion in the past about "brain trusters." I agreed with the criticism of some who were classed as "brain trusters." I believe that what the Government needs in any department is an able administrator. Technical skill can be procured in the form of assistants.

What rule should we apply in the case of the Office of Secretary of the Interior? If we were to follow the argument which has been made, the Secretary would have to be a geological engineer, informed with respect to oil and coal, an expert forester, a chemist, and many other things besides. I wonder where objections to the qualifications of any one man would end if we were to follow that line of reasoning.

I maintain that the head of a Government department should have one qualification, and that is that he be an able administrator. The only other question should be, Is he honest? If he is honest and an American citizen—and I have not yet heard any challenge of Mr. Williams on those grounds—the only question which should arise is, Is he an able administrator? Can he operate a department of Government?

In this case I shall not attempt to cover the national record of this man. I shall speak only of the things about which I know at first hand. I was very happy over the accomplishments in my State of an organization known as the National Youth Administration, which

was administered by a man named Aubrey Williams, a gentleman who has been cussed and discussed on this floor for the past 2 or 3 days, and whose religion has been inquired into.

I should like to place in the RECORD a few of the accomplishments of that organization under his administration, in the State from which I come, accomplishments to which I point with pride. I maintain that they are proof that the department was headed by an able administrator. Otherwise the work could not have been so well done.

In my State there was an old, unused portion of the United States naval ordnance plant. The plant had been closed and efforts had been made to sell it—or rather to give it away. It cost $50,000,000. At one time efforts were made to sell it for $80,000. A survey was made by the National Youth Administration. A great quantity of junked machinery, ready to be sold as scrap, was piled up. That machinery was sorted, cleaned, and repaired. What was called a resident-work project was started. I believe that was the first such project in the United States. It really amounted to a trade-training school. In that project the N. Y. A. sought to train young men and young women of my State, without reference to race, creed, or color, in at least the fundamentals of becoming skilled workers. Such training was badly needed in my State. The N. Y. A. cooperated with the educational institutions of the State and with the State government. Among some of the accomplishments there, before the war, was the making of 12,000 steel cots. In making them they were teaching the young men how to weld. Those were made for the Army Quartermaster Corps, for the cost of the material. They made 1,500 ship ladders for the merchant marine. They made over 100,000 pieces of equipment for boards of education, at a time when it was very difficult to obtain such equipment. They made very delicate torpedo-testing stands for the torpedo plant across the river in Virginia. Incidentally, it had previously been impossible to obtain those stands by means of commercial contracts. Yet the stands which the Navy had been unable to contract for were manufactured by those young men under the instruction of elderly mechanics.

Those schools turned out trained young men and young women. The greater portion of the young men are now mechanics in the Army or Navy, doing mechanical work on the battle fronts, in the islands, and elsewhere in the armed forces. They even trained tool and die makers who are now working successfully in plants. The average production training given those young persons was at the beginning for a period of approximately 24 weeks. Due to efficient management and due to the pressure because of the war, the training program was reduced to a period of 12 weeks.

In 1943 the project was furnishing to the Martin bomber plants and the shipyards the young people and later the older people needed in the plants.

The following is a partial list of plants for which young workers were trained in that project: the aircraft industries in the entire Chesapeake Bay area—I have talked to all their managements, and they said they were glad to get them, and they said they were the best employees they could get their hands on; the Norfolk Navy Yard, at Norfolk, Va.; Patterson Field, at Fairfield, Ohio; the Glenn L. Martin plant at Baltimore, and, later, the Bethlehem steel yards at Baltimore.

Those are some of the things accomplished by that school, which is now charged with wasting money. The workers who made the cots and the ship ladders were receiving $40 a week, of which $28 was spent for their board and laundry. That resident center, which was the first in the United States, also served the parent project for local units in all the surrounding neighborhood.

The South Charleston project served 12,000 youths from West Virginia, Maryland, North Carolina, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia. They built the entire plant with the exception of 1 building that was used for a shop. They built plumbing and heating units and the electrical work. They built intercommunicating loud speakers for Government offices in Washington, when they were impossible of procurement elsewhere. They built dormitories. They built their own dining hall. Yet it is now said that the center was not well managed and that money was wasted.

The maximum monthly earnings there were in excess of the national schedule of $30 a month. The national Administrator, Mr. Williams, approved the payment of $40 a month there. Twenty-eight dollars of that money had to be paid back for board and laundry. The students were put through courses in welding, both arc and gas, drafting, electricity, foundry work, auto mechanics, machine shop, radio, and clerical courses; and the center even trained 167 Air Corps Cadets for the Fifth Corps Area in their preflight mechanical training.

In the early months of the project the students were busy building their own project. Was that bad management? They were being taught in that process. In May 1940, for instance, the Army ordered 6,000 steel cots from them, when such cots could not be purchased on the market. That order was later increased to 13,000, after the first shipment was received and passed the rigid Army inspection. The building of those cots was used as a means of instruction. They made cartridge containers for 200-millimeter guns for the Philadelphia Ordnance Depot. They made machine-gun mounts for the naval ordnance plant at South Charleston. They made gages, dies, gigs, and fixtures for the Army and Navy.

The supervision of all the units was found to be excellent. The value of the project can be measured by observing the efficiency and ability of the students in any of the plants where they went.

I have described somewhat the program in one State. It covered, all told, seven of these schools. For instance, they took over a cut-over tract of forest land, and secured from it, when we badly needed it, over 3,000,000 feet of lumber, and turned it out as finished lumber for use by the Government.

I wish to add two other things. We have been discussing manpower and training programs. It may be interesting to note that approximately 95 percent of all the youths who went into industry from the South Charleston plant in my State remained on their war jobs until, in the case of the young men, they were called to the colors. Practically all the young women are still working in their war jobs. I understand, from a study of the situation, that that figure is typical with regard to the situation throughout the United States. I saw that project in operation on numerous occasions, as did one or two other Members of the Senate. We were struck with the efficiency, with the careful method of planning, and programing devised by the national headquarters, and with the method of getting the worker to the place.

After observing all that, I cannot refrain from giving to the Senate for the record the benefit of my observations of the administrative work of the man whose nomination is under discussion, the man who organized those jobs all over the United States.

In the State of West Virginia, at the time when the N. Y. A. began, there were, on the average, 5,000 boys in school each month, in the out-of-school work projects and program; and there were approximately 6,000 boys in the school-work projects. That meant that 6,000 children who were unable to obtain an education except for the help they received in that way were earning money while working around school plants, and 5,000 others were working out of school, earning a chance to receive an education while making a living. Over the 8 years of the operation of those programs in my State, their administration nationally was handled so carefully by the staff which was chosen by this Administrator—and the measure of a real administrator is the staff he chooses and puts on a job—that not a single uneconomical act was found in the audit which was made, and all the expenditures were regularly and properly accounted for.

I wish to add that at no time was any distinction made among religious or racial groups or between parochial schools and public schools.

The work program of the National Youth Administration was operated in all the counties of my State, and brought to completion during the period of its operation more than 2,000 units or work projects. They included so many projects of local and State importance that I cannot enumerate them. There is not a part of the State that does not reflect the civic improvements wrought by the National Youth Administration. The work was entirely apart from the aid given to national defense, which was highly commendable, and was also of material assistance in training young men and women to work in war factories, not only in West Virginia but in the neighboring States of Virginia, Maryland, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. The N. Y. A. administration in my State built school

buildings, community centers, and recreational centers, rehabilitated old school buildings, established playgrounds and athletic fields, and improved the sanitary and health conditions of countless communities. It also added immeasurably to industrial school facilities. All those contributions were made to the health and well-being of the people of my State. I am proud of them. My State is proud of the work done by the N. Y. A. We regretted very much the necessity of its discontinuance.

Mr. President, I feel, and have felt from the outset, that the success of an organization is based upon the ability of the administrator at its head. It is not based on his ability as a banker, or his ability as an electrical engineer, but is based upon his ability to choose a staff, ably direct them, and formulate necessary plans, programs, and regulations under which the staff shall work. I believe that any person who has studied the operations of the N. Y. A. will find that the N. Y. A. was well administered. In my opinion that is the measure of an administrator.

For the reasons which I have stated I feel impelled to support and vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Aubrey Williams, who so ably administered the N. Y. A. during the 8 years in which it was in operation in my State.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CONFIRMATION OF POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the nominations on the Executive Calendar following that of Mr. Williams.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The clerk will state the nominations on the calendar following that of Mr. Williams.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the nominations to which there is no objection.

RECESS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 22, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 21 (legislative day of March 16), 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Fletcher Warren, of Texas, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nicaragua.

Frederick B. Lyon, of Michigan, to be a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, and a consul general of the United States of America.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 21 (legislative day of March 16), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

KANSAS

Lorraine C. Mills, Bunkerhill.

KENTUCKY

Violette G. Thomas, Owingsville.
Katheryn E. Short, Van Lear.

RHODE ISLAND

Alexander P. Bates, Oak Lawn.

TEXAS

Hubert John Risinger, Bandera.
Granville M. Knox, Bertram.

WISCONSIN

George W. Rickeman, Helenville.
Gene F. Guay, Peshtigo.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, who hast given us life and the promise of spring, holy, holy is Thy name. Today we see Thy love in the beauty and prospect of nature, in the budding tree and flowering field, and in the numberless delights of Thy providence. Open our hearts to this inflow of divine order, for everything breathes the promise of new life. Thy prevailing goodness lays its hand upon us and calls us to manifold service. Our cup is so full that we know not where to begin to praise Thy holy name. May life be so sacred with us that we may bear a conscience void of offense and be earnest to every call of duty. O Voice of God, bless every silent advance, every defense of the truth, every combat with sin, and every triumph over wrong. Stimulate us with that faith that always greets the dawn rather than the setting sun—faith in Thee as our Father and in our fellowmen as our brothers and in the ultimate triumph of all things right. We ask it in our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1946

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2126) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2126) "making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, and agree to the same.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
JOE HENDRICKS,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

ELMER THOMAS,
CARL HAYDEN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
ELBERT D. THOMAS,
JOSIAH W. BAILEY,
CHAN GURNEY,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
CLYDE M. REED,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2126) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendments Nos. 1, 3, 5, and 7, provides that "used" automobiles shall be purchased from funds provided in the bill as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2, inserts the word "effected" instead of the word "affected".

Amendment No. 4, appropriates "$44,508,000", as proposed by the Senate, instead of "$41,358,000", as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 6, appropriates "$24,172,000", as proposed by the Senate, instead of "$14,037,000", as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8, inserts the word "be" as proposed by the Senate.

J. BUELL SNYDER,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
W. F. NORRELL,
JOE HENDRICKS,
D. LANE POWERS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTILYNCHING BILL

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy the House has unanimously adopted the conference report of the civil functions War Department appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I place on the desk discharge petition No. 3 to discharge the Judiciary Committee from further consideration of H. R. 1698, a bill to assure persons within the jurisdiction of every State due process of law and equal protection of the laws, and to prevent the crime of lynching. This measure is popularly known as the antilynching bill. In our legislative program for the post-war period, the antilynching bill deserves high priority.

At this time I, therefore, wish to outline some of the more cogent reasons why the Seventy-ninth Congress should outlaw this heinous crime as speedily as possible. Five thousand one hundred and forty-four persons in the United States met death at the hands of the lynch mobs from 1889 through 1944. I do not need to point out that under mob law an individual needs only to be suspected or accused of an offense, not necessarily punishable by law, and without anything remotely resembling an opportunity to defend himself, is snatched up and put to death. Nor do I feel that it is necessary to go into all of the gory details of flogging, hanging, shooting, burning, and the other fiendish tortures by which the lynch sentence is executed. It is sufficient to say that these acts of unrestrained barbarism are committed in the greatest democracy in the world and, in the overwhelming majority of cases, by native white Americans.

Three thousand six hundred and eighty-eight victims of lynch mobs in the United States have been Negroes. Today every person who has made anything like a careful study of this problem agrees that as the yearly number of lynchings decline, more and more of its victims tend to be confined to members of the colored race. I, therefore, feel that it is incumbent to examine some of the facts known about lynching.

Mob violence is inconsistent with our laws of government and is indefensible regardless of the nature and gravity of the offense. It should be said that, however, that relatively few of the lynchings of Negroes resulted from accusations, well founded or not, that the lynched committed a felony like murder, robbery, rape, or arson.

My mind goes back to our experience with lynching immediately following World War No. 1. In 1917, according to the best available figures, 52 Negroes were murdered by the lynch mob; in 1918, the number increased to 63; and in 1919, lynching spiraled to 79. Ten of the lynchees in 1918 were soldiers or ex-soldiers and there is little question but that these men were slain simply because they had tasted a little freedom, a little travel, and had a little pride in the part they played in the Army that fought for democracy.

If 10 Negro soldiers or ex-soldiers were lynched in the first year they returned to this country after World War No. 1, what can we expect will be the fate of almost a million Negro soldiers and sailors who have had several years of service and have seen duty in many foreign countries after World War No. 2? Hundreds of thousands of these Negroes are from the South and will return there after the war.

We have some experience to guide us here. On April 3, 1941, Pvt. Felix Hall, a volunteer, was found hanging from a tree at Fort Benning, Ga. He was clad in the uniform of the United States Army. I have here a clipping from the Plaindealer, published in Kansas City, Kans., dated March 16, 1945, which states that on Tuesday, March 13, a group of civilian police in Jackson, Miss., severely beat with blackjacks a group of Negro overseas veterans because they were fraternizing with some white soldiers whom they met in the railroad station at Jackson. These men had fought together overseas and had congregated in the lobby of the station between the Negro and white waiting room. "The police, seeking to preserve southern custom," the article stated, "informed the men that they could not mingle together in Mississippi." When they did not immediately break up the conversation, the story continued, civilian police, armed with sawed-off shotguns and tommy guns, beat the Negro soldiers about the head with blackjacks and forced them to immediately board their train en route to Camp Shelby. I do not wish to be pessimistic, but if this sort of thing can happen here in the midst of a war, it is only reasonable to assume that this is but a foretaste of what will come afterward. In connection with this general problem of civilian brutality against Negro members of the armed forces during the war, I think that it is significant that the War Department has been so moved by the gravity of the situation that, at its request, a bill, H. R. 1528, was introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress to make unlawful an assault by a civilian on a member of the armed forces a Federal offense.

I am concerned about the violence that has been, and is being, perpetrated upon the Negro soldier and the Negro veteran. I am equally concerned about the wide-scale violence that we may reasonably expect after cessation of hostilities. There is no room in America for lynchings; there is no room in America for race riots. This must apply particularly to the post-war period. We, as a Nation, are preparing to take our rightful place of leadership in world democracy. That democracy for which men fought and died is not, and must not be a democracy labeled "for white Europeans and white North Americans—only." It must be a democracy for all of the nations and all of the peoples of the world. We will assume world leadership in the post-war era because we have won it. I ask this House then to make this democracy a real and meaningful thing to the millions of Negro servicemen and their families who have helped to make victory and leadership possible. I ask that this House take immediate steps to outlaw lynching by adopting H. R. 1698 so that when these boys come home, black and white alike, they will know that they have truly fought for—and won—a better America and a better world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. FELLOWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by the Honorable James B. Perkins, of Maine, on the work-or-jail bill.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from an article by Leonard Lyons.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include in one an editorial from the Manchester Union entitled "Less Coal," and in the other an article written by Ernest Lindley on Dumbarton Oaks.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Clarence Budington Kelland.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the services of Mr. Joseph F. Kelly, of the War Shipping Administration.

FARM MACHINERY

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, on page A1317 of the Appendix of the RECORD appears a table showing the exports of farm machinery from the United States, which I think all the Members would find very interesting. You will note that 21,349 farm tractors were exported to Canada last year, that a total of 41,037 farm tractors needed for domestic production were exported last year from the United States, and that many of these tractors were sent to South American countries, which, as far as I know, have had no direct effect on the winning of this war.

REJECTIONS FROM THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. REES of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until midnight tonight to file such rules as it may report today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LITHUANIA

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KELLY of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Assistant Secretary of State William L. Clayton, recently made before the Women's National Press Club in Washington.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and to include an address by Hon. Charles P. Taft.

Mr. WHITTINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein the membership rolls of the Democratic steering committee from its inauguration and a list of the chairmen of the Democratic caucus.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me under special order for this afternoon may be put over until Friday and that the time be extended from 20 minutes to 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

MIDNIGHT CURFEW

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, War Mobilizer Byrnes displayed both wisdom and courage in the issuance of the order closing night clubs, bars, and like places at midnight.

There can be no doubt but that great pressure was used to stay the issuance of the curfew order. No act could be more timely in view of the acknowledged scarcity of food, manpower, and other essentials of war.

We of the Fourth South Carolina Congressional District, the home of Mr. Byrnes, are proud of his unwavering determination to do only that which will further the causes of this global war and hasten the coming of a victorious and permanent peace.

It will be observed that the objectors to the enforcement of the midnight closing order are not from the millions of homes whose sons and daughters so courageously and unrelentingly are now forcing our enemies to terms of unconditional surrender.

The good people of this country would do well to let Mr. Justice Byrnes know that they stand shoulder to shoulder with him during these trying hours.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances—one, on the coming San Francisco Conference; two, on war criminals; and, three, on the East India Exclusion Act.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, to include therein a speech he made before the Polish Relief Committee in the city of Lawrence, and secondly, to include a very fine editorial which appeared on St. Patrick's Day in the Lynn Telegram News of Lynn, Mass.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and include therein an overseas broadcast made by him.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include therein a resolution concerning the free press.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therewith a radio address made by Mr. Herbert Bratter.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the fact that we are now $235,000,000,000 in the red, according to the Treasury Department, and in order to save some money we must do something here in the Congress in order to economize. I call your attention to the fact that the Bureau of the Budget has 576 employees, and it costs them $2,189,800 a year to maintain that Budget. The Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate have 23 employees, and the salaries and wages paid are $98,480.

The Bureau of the Budget is recommending too many things for us to appropriate money for. Whenever the House says, "We are within the Budget," then you think that is all right. I say it is not right. What you have got to do is to get below the Budget estimates. We must budge the Budget. Budge it downward. The House should take from the Budget Bureau the thought that they can recommend any amount to be spent and that you will give the money from a Treasury that is empty. More than empty. It is bare. It is like Old Mother Hubbard's cupboard. So I say to you, go below the Budget or you will bust. Bust the financial stability of our Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

STATISTICAL SUMMARY, BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a statistical summary for March, issued by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PACE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXEMPTING ANNUITY PAYMENTS FROM TAXATION

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 577, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation, be recommitted to the Committee on the Civil Service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1946

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2689, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes. Pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may proceed for not to exceed 5 hours, to be concluded today, and the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] and myself. I have conferred with the gentleman with reference to this request and have been advised it meets with his approval.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not understand the time allowed.

Mr. TARVER. Not to exceed 5 hours.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would not reserve that objection for the moment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin reserve the right to object or withdraw his objection?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I withdraw the objection for the time being.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am wondering if 5 hours will not take care of all the demands for time?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I have requests now for only 1½ hours.

Mr. TABER. How much time does the gentleman from Wisconsin want?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not care for more than 15 minutes, but I do not want to be cut off with 2 minutes like I had on the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I will give the gentleman 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2699, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee on agricultural appropriations which brings this bill to you today has acted with more unanimity in the preparation of this bill than has been the case in connection with any agricultural appropriation bill during the period of my service as chairman of this subcommittee. There has been very little difference of opinion, and such difference of opinion as has come about has related to minor matters contained in the bill and not to any of the major items of appropriation. I feel that that situation has been brought about by the fact that in the preparation of the bill there has been an entire absence of any spirit of partisanship and the 7 men who have worked on the subcommittee have sought to keep in mind only the interests of agriculture as they might best be promoted by the provisions contained in this bill with justice to the citizenry of the United States as a whole as to the amounts of the appropriations which should be provided.

We have had, of course, the continued and able service of the Members who have during the previous congresses served on this subcommittee: the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the gentleman from California, [Mr. SHEPPARD], the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], in addition we have had three exceedingly able Representatives recently assigned to this subcommittee, men deeply interested in agriculture, men who have found it possible to attend the hearings almost continuously for a period of several weeks with the remainder of the subcommittee, and who studied them in detail. I refer, of course, to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]. On account of his absence on a mission of public importance we have not been able to avail ourselves this time of the able assistance of our colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who has formerly aided in the preparation of the Agriculture appropriation bill.

We have had as always the able counsel and assistance of our genial and capable executive secretary, Arthur Orr.

We have brought to you a bill which, if you have examined the report of the committee, you will find is approximately $141,500,000 below Budget estimates when appropriations, reappropriations, transfers, and loan authorizations are all taken into account. The total of these items in the bill is approximately $833,000,000. The total of the Budget estimates was something slightly in excess of $975,000,000. In addition to pointing out that fact I wish to call your attention to this situation, that in the fiscal year 1942 there was made available for agriculture through the medium of this bill in excess of $1,400,000,000, whereas, as I have stated, the total amounts made available in the pending bill aggregate only slightly in excess of $833,000,000, a reduction in this brief period of time of approximately 36 percent. I think I am correct when I say that no other department of the Government has sustained a similar percentage of reduction in the amount of funds made available for its use during that period of time.

I do not wish to discuss in detail all of the items contained in the bill. I do wish to address myself to those which I think are of outstanding interest to the membership of the Committee of the Whole and of outstanding importance, and if after I have concluded this discussion, which I hope to have reasonably brief in character, there are other items in the bill not mentioned by me about which Members desire information, I shall do the best I can to supply the information which may be requested. I wish to point out first that we have taken the same action with regard to penalty mail that has been taken by other subcommittees, following the leadership of the Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations in appropriation bills which have heretofore been presented to the House since the passage of Public Law 364, Seventy-eighth Congress, dealing with that subject matter. In other words, we have reduced the Budget estimate for penalty mail by 10 percent. Personally, I do not feel that that is a wise or logical way in which to deal with this particular problem, but in view of the fact that the precedent has been established and has on several occasions been approved by the House in the passage of other bills making this blanket reduction, our subcommittee has felt bound to follow that precedent in the case of the pending bill. The natural result of that sort of procedure, however, will ultimately be, in my opinion, if it has not already been, to have the department estimate at least 10 percent in excess of what it reasonably anticipates will be required, in the expectation that the subcommittee handling the bill will reduce it by 10 percent and it will then have the amount which it actually requires.

We have a substantial reduction in the appropriation for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. In the matter of economic investigations we have cut the Budget figures $100,000 because of our feeling that the information developed by the pending farm census will render unnecessary the collection of many types of statistics which have heretofore been collected by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics in its economics-investigation work and that the work of the Bureau in this particular field will not suffer by reason of the proposed reduction in the amount.

We have proposed a reduction in the estimates for the Crop and Livestock Division of this Bureau. We have disallowed a supplemental Budget estimate of $150,000 for the study of farm wages. The original budget as submitted to the Congress contained an item of $119,000 for this purpose and that item is carried in the bill. The $150,000 which we have disallowed was requested of the Budget by the Department at the time that it passed upon the item in the original budget, but was disallowed at that time by the Budget, and if you will examine the hearings you will find that it was developed therein that no additional evidence was submitted to the Budget between the time of its original disallowance of the item and the time when for some unknown reason it approved the extra $150,000 and transmitted the supplemenetal estimate to the Congress. We have, for these and other reasons which will be apparent from an examination of the hearings, disallowed the supplemental estimate of $150,000.

OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

The estimates for this office have been approved without change, as recommended by the Budget. In the present state of disturbed international relations and of uncertainty as to world commerce in agricultural products after the war, this office is, in the judgment of the committee, performing exceedingly useful service to American agriculture, and it has provided the full amount of funds thought necessary to continue its activities unimpaired.

EXTENSION SERVICE

The duties of your subcommittee in connection with appropriations for the Extension Service are more or less routine. The amount of payments to the States being fixed by law, the full estimate for administrative expenses has also been approved. There have been frequent complaints from administrative personnel, particularly field personnel, concerning the level of salaries paid such employees when compared with the salaries paid to employees of other organizations of the Government of similar grade. While we have taken some evidence on this subject, it is, of course, one which cannot be dealt with in an appropriation bill, especially since the work carried on in the field is done in cooperation with State governments.

The items in the estimate for the Agricultural Research Administration and the Special Research Fund have been approved as submitted.

In connection with the Office of Experiment Stations we have made one very substantial reduction below the Budget estimate, and that is in the fund proposed for availability for allocation to States for the State experiment stations under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Act. We carried last year for this item $2,463,708. However, the Bureau of the Budget proposed that we increase that item to the full limit of the authorization contained in the Bankhead-Jones Act, $3,000,000. While the committee realizes the importance of the work which is being done with these funds, we do not feel under war conditions existing at the present time, with the financial resources of the Government being strained in an effort to meet our war needs, that there is justification for largely increasing this particular item of appropriation which has no direct connection with the war effort. We have therefore disallowed the amount of $536,000-plus, the increase proposed by the

Bureau of the Budget, and have provided in the bill for the appropriation of the identical sum carried in the bill for the present fiscal year.

In the matter of the Federal experiment station in Puerto Rico, we have disallowed the Budget increase of $60,000-plus, intended principally for use in the reconstruction of buildings at that project which, from the evidence adduced before us, we feel can be properly postponed until after the war; certainly until after the expiration of the next fiscal year.

No substantial change has been made in the estimate for the Bureau of Animal Industry, nor in the estimates for the Bureau of Dairy Industry. These are carried in the bill in substantially the same figures proposed by the Budget, with one or two minor exceptions.

In the estimates submitted for the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils and Agricultural Engineering, there was included $170,000 in addition to some $47,000 which has heretofore been carried in the bill for designing farm structures, a work which has been carried on by the Bureau for many, many years. Additional money was sought to be appropriated upon the idea that the farmers of the country need a great many more buildings, that there will be a great farm building program after the war, and that it is essential that designs for farm buildings be improved and perfected for use in connection with that anticipated building program. It is the opinion of our subcommittee that while a great deal of building on farms in the country is justified at this time, or is needed at this time, it is impossible for the farmers to carry out the building projects which are desired by them, because they are unable to obtain the necessary materials. What they need now is not to be furnished with additional plans for farm structures but to be accorded the materials that are necessary for use in building farm structures which they desire and which, in many thousands of cases, are so badly needed. We could conceive of no particular reason for appropriating $170,000 additional for that type of study.

We also eliminated a Budget proposal to add $25,000 for funds to be used in the study of electrical appliances for use on the farm. The Rural Electrification Administration is doing and is presently capable of continuing to do all work of that character which may be desired by the farmers of the United States.

There have been no material changes in the estimates for the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. The item for the control of emergency outbreaks of insects and plant diseases is carried in the bill as proposed by the Budget. Of course, it cannot be definitely predicted now how much money will be needed for that purpose during the next fiscal year.

The appropriations for the Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry have been provided as proposed in the budget, with one slight addition of $15,000.

No change has been made in the estimates for the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics.

An appropriation of $850,000 for this important Bureau has been approved as recommended by the Budget, representing an increase over the amount available for the present fiscal year of $43,370. Last year the committee provided $200,000 in excess of Budget estimates for this Bureau, which is sufficient evidence of the fact that we regard its work as being of very great value and importance. An appeal has been made to us this year to again add funds above Budget recommendations, but, notwithstanding the desirability of the work to finance which this request has been made, the committee does not feel that under present financial conditions it is justified in further increasing this appropriation above Budget estimates.

In the white pine blister rust control item the committee has made a very substantial reduction below Budget estimates but at the same time it has provided for the use of $1,000,000 more in this work than was available during the present fiscal year. We realize fully the importance of the white pine blister rust control work. At the same time, we know that with the shortage of manpower existing in this country and the necessity for the utilization of additional manpower in our war industries, it is not going to be possible for the work of white pine blister rust control to attract new workers to the extent proposed by the Budget without seriously interfering with the manpower needs both of war industries and of agriculture.

The work had for its use this year $1,923,000. The Budget proposed $4,250,000, more than double the amount available for the present fiscal year. We thought that that increase is not justified under existing conditions and, while we have allowed it to the extent of $1,000,000, we have disallowed $1,326,000 of the Budget estimate for this work.

We have made three substantial changes in the items of estimates submitted for the Forest Service. The first of these and the most important is the disallowance of the $1,000,000 item proposed for the aerial mapping of forests. We realize the desirability of this work, but we feel that it has not direct connection with our war effort and that it is something which might well be postponed until a post-war period. We have therefore disallowed the $1,000,000 in the Budget which was proposed for the purpose of carrying out that particular work.

We were impressed by the statements made to us by some of our colleagues who appeared before our subcommittee and by the statements made by members of our subcommittee from the Northwest—the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]—as to the importance of the work in the study of the reseeding of depleted forest ranges. We felt that the Budget did not adequately provide for that work, so we have added the amount of $75,000 for the purpose of making adequate provision for it—a sum which we think upon reading the hearings you will find is amply justified.

We have reduced the amount proposed for the forest-products laboratory at Madison, Wis., to the amount which was made available for the present fiscal year. In doing that we have not intended to discount the importance of that work, but we wish to point out that the Army and Navy during the present year are transferring to that laboratory approximately $1,500,000 for the study of problems in woods that are of particular interest to the armed services.

It is anticipated that similar transfers will be made in the future. So that apparently there is no lack of sufficient funds to carry on all reasonable investigations that could be projected.

In that same connection, I wish to point out that some 40 or 50 of our colleagues appeared before us urging the establishment of 20 experimental forests or additions to existing forest stations in the South. Some of our colleagues urged the establishment of an experimental forest in Pennsylvania, and others, too, urged the establishment of a similar activity in the State of Ohio. We were also advised that similar research work in forestry is desired in the northwestern part of the United States and in New England.

I believe our subcommittee is fully and deeply impressed with the wisdom of decentralizing to some extent this work at Madison, Wis., and having studies made in the different areas of the country where different types of forestry problems exist, of the particular problems in those areas. We think it might be wise to set up a Nation-wide system of these experimental forests and laboratories for the purpose of carrying on that work. But it was proposed to have us exceed the budget by providing for such stations according to particular plans which were called to our attention. We did not feel that it would be fair to other sections of the country to set up the projected system of experimental forests in the South at a cost of $927,000 above the budget, and at the same time we could not allow similar items for Pennsylvania and Ohio for the same reason, that is, that these are problems which interest all portions of the country almost alike, problems which ought to have the attention of Congress, but which ought to have that attenton on the basis of consideration of Nation-wide needs and not consideration of the needs of any particular section or area in the United States.

So, we have suggested in our report that the Department accord study to this problem and, if possible, submit to us next year a Nation-wide plan for experimentation in forestry along the lines which have been advocated by our colleagues who have appeared before our subcommittee. If that is done, it is possible that the Budget will approve the plan which may be suggested.

Now, we have also made a substantial reduction in the appropriation for forest roads and trails as proposed by the Budget. The Budget proposed a program for the construction of new forest highways at a cost of about $45,000 per mile,

amounting to $4,200,000. You know, of course, that the Congress has provided a road program for the country which does not become effective until after the war. It is to be carried out in the 3 post-war years. We have not felt that the construction of new highways in national forests is a matter of any more importance than the construction of new highways throughout the country generally. Therefore, we have eliminated that part of the Budget estimate, but we have approved that part $500,000, which was proposed for the purpose of providing for the repair of existing national-forest highways.

Many of our colleagues have been interested in what is known as the emergency rubber project, the guayule project in California. I trust the members will read the hearings before the committee. This subcommittee last year recommended the elimination of the emergency rubber project, feeling that the benefits which might reasonably be anticipated from the operations of that project were not sufficient to justify the large expenditure of funds which had been had and was being proposed. We therefore provided for the liquidation of the project. However, the House in its good judgment, by an overwhelming majority, disagreed with the conclusions of our subcommittee and eliminated the proposal for the liquidation of the project. Notwithstanding that fact, the Budget, in its estimates submitted this year, provided for gradual liquidation, providing for the destruction of 10,000 acres of the guayule shrub during the coming fiscal year, although that destruction and reconditioning of the land for return to the owners would cost $183,000 more than it would cost to retain that 10,000 acres of the guayule shrub. We felt the Budget was disregarding the expressed will of Congress. It was in accord with the expressed views of our committee, but not with those which you expressed upon consideration of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill last year. So we have reduced the appropriation by $183,000 and have directed in the report that the 10,000 acres of guayule proposed for plowing up be not destroyed, but that the project be continued upon the basis which was last year approved by the Congress.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. It is simply my intention to call to the attention of the House the fact that the chairman of the subcommittee who is now addressing the House, the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, was very scrupulous with respect to the rights of the House relative to the guayule project. As the gentleman has mentioned, in spite of the fact that he himself opposed it, yet he saw to it in the subcommittee that the wishes of Congress as expressed last year by a direct vote, were upheld. I wish to sincerely compliment the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, on that fine demonstration of upholding what the House really wishes done in this particular instance.

Mr. TARVER. I thank the gentleman.

The War Food Administration appropriation for the present fiscal year was $30,000,000, or $28,000,000 plus, leaving out the overtime which was carried in the appropriation. The estimate submitted by the War Food Administration for its administrative expenses for the next fiscal year was submitted in three forms, as is customary with all of the departments, I understand, the minimum form carrying something in excess of $22,000,000. The Budget cut these administrative expenses to $10,000,000, the most drastic cut made in connection with any organization coming under the jurisdiction of this committee. When the War Food Administrator and his assistants were before our committee we sought to elicit facts which would justify us in approving that proposed cut, but we were unable to do so. All the witnesses who were in a position to have knowledge of the program and its needs insisted that the program would be substantially wrecked if funds in excess of $10,000,000 were not provided for administrative expenses. So we sent down to the Budget and we asked that they send up the officials of the Budget who had passed on this subject matter, thinking that perhaps they had sources of information that we did not have, which would indicate the possibility of this organization being able to function during the next fiscal year on $10,000,000 when it wanted $22,000,000. After examining the representatives of the Budget, we came to the conclusion that some of their cuts were justified, but that some of them were entirely without justification, and we took steps in the pending bill to restore cuts to the amount of $3,636,000, giving the War Food Administration $13,636,000 for the next fiscal year as against over $28,000,000 which it had for the present fiscal year. I may say that $2,708,000 of that increase is for transfer to the Extension Service to afford aid to the county agents in assisting farmers in connection with their problems which have grown out of this war. The Farm Bureau recommended that the amount of $4,000,000 should be appropriated for this purpose. Since the War Food Administration itself has only asked for $2,708,000 we provided only that amount in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I desire to take this opportunity, if I may, to compliment the committee on the new form of setting up the committee's action on Budget increases and decreases. This is a most helpful thing and I hope it will be carried out by the other subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TARVER. I thank the gentleman. Perhaps the most important item in the bill, or at least one of those of outstanding importance, is that having to do with the conservation and use of agricultural land resources. The Budget, as you know, submitted to us a proposal by which it undertook to do several things. One was to decrease by $10,000,000 the amount of $300,000,000 which you had fixed last year as the over-all figure for the regular land use program. The departmental authorities had projected a program on the basis of $300,000,000, as you had directed and publicity had gone out to the farmers over the country relative to the apportionment of funds aggregating an amount of $300,000,000; and the Budget, as far as we know, without any justification therefor arbitrarily cut $10,000,000 from the amount. That we have restored in this bill. There was also the seed program, the program of $12,500,000 for stimulating the production of clover and other legume and grass seeds, a program which, although not carried out in my section of the country, according to the evidence before us has been very effective and has been of vast benefit to agriculture. All of the evidence we have indicates that the continuance of this program for the next fiscal year is more necessary than it has been for the present fiscal year; so we restored that program.

The major change proposed by the Budget, however, was that we should appropriate section 32 moneys in the amount of $133,000,000, $100,700,000 of which should be from unexpended balances of 1943–44 section 32 moneys; and $32,300,000 of which should be taken from section 32 moneys for the next fiscal year and divert it to this program. To begin with, that is not legislatively authorized, and while we have three or four major legislative items in the bill they are items which have been heretofore approved by the Congress.

This is a direct legislative item which has never received the approval of Congress, which had provided by section 32 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act that 30 percent of the tariff receipts should be segregated and set aside for certain designated uses, including the disposition of surplus agricultural commodities. So our committee did not feel justified in including the legislation, irrespective of whether we felt that section 32 moneys ought to be so diverted or not. So far as the 1943–44 moneys are concerned they have already reverted to the Treasury and there is not anything involved in appropriating the unexpended balance of section 32 funds for those years except the matter of language. The money is in the Treasury; it is not available for use for section 32 purposes; and to appropriate it directly or refer to it as a reappropriation of section 32 moneys is a distinction without a difference. So we have undertaken to write this appropriation in accordance with the law. We are not undertaking to change the law. We have made the appropriation as projected from the general funds of the Treasury of the United States as authorized by law, and we have also eliminated from the proposed language of the bill the limitation of $200,000,000 on the program that might be carried on in the calendar year 1946. That sort of provision is a limitation not on funds carried in this bill but on funds which are expected to be carried in a bill for the 1947 fiscal year. It is therefore legislative. The Congress has authorized $500,000,000 by statute and we have been asked to provide in an appropriation bill a legislative limitation changing the

fundamental statute, so that the limit will be $200,000,000. Besides that, the evidence before our subcommittee does not justify the decrease of this very important and useful program at this time in the manner which was proposed by the Budget, even if we had the authority in an Appropriations Committee bill to legislate.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I must admit that I do not know what the items of expenditure are in connection with this $300,000,000 for soil conservation. What does it go for? Probably some other Members of the House would like to have that information too.

Mr. TARVER. Each State through its State committee of farmers works out a program for itself of those soil-conserving practices which are felt by the farmers of that State to be most important for that State. That program when worked out by the States is approved by the authorities in Washington. Each State, having its own particular problems, works out its own necessary program.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I merely want to state my great satisfaction at the action of the gentleman's committee in refusing to reduce the soil-conservation fund and in refusing to permit this diversion of section 32 money which is so important for new uses and the removal of surpluses.

Mr. TARVER. I thank the gentleman. I may point out in this connection that the Farm Bureau in appearing before our committee urged the carrying on of this program for the next fiscal year in the same volume and to the same extent and in the same amount of money as that made available for the present fiscal year which would be, according to the departmental authorities $368,000,000 or approximately that amount, although the Farm Bureau in testifying before us asked for an appropriation of $350,000,000. We have not gone to that limit, but we have provided in the bill altogether for $342,250,000, which is $22,500,000 above the Budget proposal, and we have provided for changing the language of the bill as indicated.

We have also refused to approve another change suggested by the Budget and that is the language which proposes to bar the so-called seed-lime-fertilizer operations after the calendar year 1946. The basic law enacted by the Congress authorized that program. We felt it has been one of very great usefulness to agriculture and we know of no reason why we in an appropriation bill should undertake to limit the authority heretofore provided by statute enacted by the Congress.

Mr. PACE. Did the hearings before the gentleman's committee disclose what influences are at work in the Budget to cause it to submit recommendations of this character on a program so important to the farmers of this Nation?

Mr. TARVER. No. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that the reasoning of the Budget in arriving at these conclusions was not disclosed to our committee.

We have provided for the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation in the amount recommended by the Budget, $7,984,900. You know, of course, that our subcommittee has in past years recommended the elimination of this program and the Congress agreed with us a couple of times. We thought the program was on the way out. We felt that it has been conducted without substantial benefit to the farmers of the United States and that the expense to the Government is so tremendous that its further operation would not be justified.

As I have said we have provided in preceding bills for its liquidation, but the Congress in December passed a bill proposing to reinstate the program for a period of 5 years, not only to reinstate but to expand it to include flax and certain crops where the work should be conducted experimentally. I hope that the program will be successful. I think there will be nothing more interesting to the farmers of this country than to have a sound crop-insurance program worked out. I wish I were able to think it will be successful. I do not. I think that we are simply going to waste a great deal more of the people's money in undertaking to find a solution for this particular problem in the way in which we have tackled it. But the Congress has made it mandatory upon us by the enactment of this law passed in December to provide the funds necessary to administer the program, and we have provided them in this bill in the exact amount recommended by the Budget.

Soil Conservation Service: We have made no increase over the Budget estimate, but we have made a substantial increase as recommended by the Budget of $4,261,500 for soil-conservation operations, that being the item under which technical assistance is furnished to soil-conservation districts. That increase is occasioned by the great increase in the number of soil-conservation districts from 1,114 on June 15, 1944, to an expected number of 1,492 on June 15, 1946. That increase in the number of districts requires an increase in money for the furnishing of adequate technical services to those districts. And, of course, the Government cannot afford to discriminate between the districts and afford that type of service to some and not to others, so we have approved the Budget estimate in that particular.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. In reference to the aid furnished the districts, does that consist solely in sending experts to assist them?

Mr. TARVER. Not solely that, but that is the main item of expense; that is, the technical service to aid them in mapping plans for their districts, the methods which should be used in endeavoring to restore the fertility of the eroded land, to conserve the fertility of land not eroded, the working out of sound farm practices, are all subject matters concerning which advice is furnished by the technical experts provided under the provisions of this appropriation.

Mr. THOM. Does the district contribute any money?

Mr. TARVER. The district contributes far more than the Government. I cannot yield any further. I am taking more time than I should, and there are other important items that I would like to refer to.

The school-lunch program is carried in the bill in the same amount as that provided for the present fiscal year, $50,000,000.

The Sugar Act administration expense fund has been approved without change.

In the Market News Service there is no change in the Budget estimate of a material nature, except in a reduction by $100,000 of the funds estimated for the enforcement of the Commodity Exchange Act. Dealing in agricultural commodities on exchanges has diminished to such an extent that additional money for the administration of the Commodity Exchange Act is not, in the opinion of our subcommittee, justified.

Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation under the Farm Security Administration: The committee, I think I may say for all of them, has been very greatly impressed with the type of work which has been done by our former colleague, Frank Hancock, of North Carolina, now Administrator of the Farm Security Administration. He is really putting into effect things which Congress has been directing the Administrator to do over a period of years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

He is liquidating these large cooperative projects concerning which Congress has complained. He is eliminating these experimentations involving the construction of hosiery mills and other activities of that type. He has sold already more than 700,000 acres of the 1,800,000-plus acres which have been acquired by the Government in the course of this program, and he has assured us that he is proceeding to dispose of the remainder of that acreage as rapidly as it can be done.

We think that he is doing a good job, yet we find upon examination of the estimates that the number of beneficiaries of this program has decreased from July 1, 1944, to December 31 by approximately 50,000. The evidence in the hearings showed that there were 475,000 beneficiaries as of July 1, 1944, and only about 425,000 as of December 31 of the same year. That is evidence of the fact that there is a decreasing need for the type of assistance carried on in this program.

The condition of agriculture in this country, while of course not by any means satisfactory to those of us who represent agricultural areas, has yet improved over the conditions which existed several years ago, and the necessity for the extension of this type of loans to low-income farmers has diminished rather than increased. Notwithstanding that, the Budget proposed to set

aside $125,000,000 for this program instead of $67,500,000, which was the amount that was authorized for the present fiscal year. We could not understand why such an increase is justified. It was sought to be justified in part by saying that our returning soldiers are going to become beneficiaries of this program. We do not believe that ought to be true. We do not think the American soldier returning from the battlefield ought to be required to enter into a rehabilitation program conducted by the Farm Security Administration in order to get the type of assistance he needs. We think he ought to have that assistance, but he ought to have it under the provisions of the G. I. bill of rights. If that act is not sufficiently broad to provide adequately for his needs, it ought to be amplified by Congress, but we ought not to seek to incorporate him into this rehabilitation program which we have carried on for several years for the benefit of low-income farmers. So we have reduced the amount proposed for loans to the amount available for the present fiscal year and have reduced the administrative expenses of the agency accordingly.

We have also reduced the budget estimate for the farm tenancy program. That is a program with which I am very deeply concerned, as I think every Member of Congress representing areas where a large percentage of the farmers are tenant farmers should be. However, the $15,000,000 which they have had for the regular program for the present fiscal year has been enough. They are not able to buy farms at normal values for use in this program except in certain restricted areas of the country. Of course, I do not believe any of us want to buy lands at highly inflated values and saddle these tenants with a 40-year loan upon the basis of those inflated values, loans which it is probable that in the years after the war the tenants would be unable to pay, so that the granting of that type of loan to them would be an injury to them rather than a help. We cut down the budget estimate of $25,000,000 for the regular program to $15,000,000, the amount available for the present fiscal year.

The Budget, however, proposed $25,000,000 for use in this program for returning veterans of the present war. They did that under the provisions of the G. I. bill of rights, which has a clause expressly authorizing the utilization of this program for the benefit of these returning veterans. While we do not think the amount of $25,000,000 provided for that purpose will be a drop in the bucket compared to the need which will exist, because it will provide for only about 5,000 loans, yet in view of the action of Congress in authorizing veterans' eligibility for this program we did not feel justified in reducing that estimate of the Budget by any amount whatsoever, so that the amount carried in the bill is $40,000,000 instead of $50,000,000 for the over-all program, a reduction of $10,000,000 below the figures suggested by the Budget.

WATER FACILITIES, ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS

The estimate of $1,000,000 for this purpose has been approved without change.

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECT

This appropriation has not heretofore been carried in this bill. We have approved the budget estimate except that portion of it which provides $307,824 for the construction of farm buildings on these projects, and $27,110 for the construction of roads thereon. These proposed expenditures we do not think are authorized by law, and we have eliminated from the bill the funds estimated therefor, leaving in the bill for all purposes under this heading, $1,165,066.

In the Rural Electrification Administration item, we have made a substantial reduction which will probably attract adverse criticism by some supporters of the R. E. A. program. I am one of those supporters. I believe in the Rural Electrification program, and I think that it has accomplished a great deal of good and that those who have been in charge of it and who are now in charge of it are doing a jam-up job. They have electrified about 40 percent of the farms in the United States. They have loaned over $400,000,000. Delinquencies amount to approximately one-half of 1 percent of the amounts that have become due. They have had repayments above maturities of 4½ percent of the funds loaned.

I want to see that program enlarged until it will finally reach all of rural America. But we ought not to neglect to examine other facts. They are not able to expend even the amount of money which we have been heretofore providing for this program under present conditions. Under W. P. B. regulations relative to the use of materials for extensions of existing lines, in most areas of the country it is impossible to obtain extensions. That is evidenced by the fact that they have $111,000,000 that has been allocated from authorizations made during this and previous years which they have been unable to expend. This year they will have made by the end of the year allocations covering the $26,000,000 which they have available, but they have only been able to expend slightly in excess of $2,000,000 of that amount. They had $25,000,000 for this year plus an unexpended balance of approximately $1,000,000. The budget proposed $150,000,000. Any Member who will read the hearings on the subject will know that they could not possibly expend that amount. We have provided in the bill $60,000,000 instead of $150,000,000, which is more than twice as much as they had for the present fiscal year, and which is more money than they can use. It is our judgment that those who vote for more money than that are really doing an injustice to the Rural Electrification program rather than helping it, because they are creating the impression in the minds of the people of the country that the farmers are getting $150,000,000 for the R. E. A. program, when, as a matter of fact, they will not be able to use more than a fraction of it.

We have also reduced the administrative expenses of the Rural Electrification Administration in conformity with the reduction in the amount of funds available for it.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Estimates for F. C. A. including farmers' crop-production and harvesting and provisions for the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation have been approved as submitted.

Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the Committee, I have used more time than I should have used in my effort to explain the important provisions of this bill. Let me say in conclusion that this subcommittee has no pride of personal opinion with regard to the subject matters provided for in this bill. If, in your judgment, there ought to be amendments made, if you want to reduce the amounts of appropriations which we have provided, or increase the amounts of others, you will certainly not be offending any member of the subcommittee if you offer and urge your amendments; and, if, in the judgment of the House, changes should be made, that, of course, is perfectly satisfactory with us because we are merely the servants of the House; we are merely trying to do a good job for American agriculture, keeping in mind the financial condition of the Government at the present time. If we have not done the kind of a job that you want, we invite your efforts to have our mistakes corrected.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has so comprehensively and with such particularity discussed the bill that there is not much I can add to the information he has given you.

As you have learned the bill undertakes to appropriate $833,801,932, which is $141,499,350 less than the Budget recommended.

If we had not been obliged to include some sixty millions to cover the G. I. bill we would have brought in a bill somewhat smaller in amount than that for fiscal '45. Incidentally, we realize that with farm values boosted from 25 to 63 percent it is no time for any veteran to purchase a farm without and unless he has the most careful advice of those able to advise him.

In my opinion as expressed in committee hearings, the total amount might well have been still further reduced to the advantage of the taxpayer, and to nobody's disadvantage for the duration. Some things which might well be done in normal times cannot and should not be attempted while we are at war.

The bill was carefully scrutinized and considered item by item by my colleagues in the committee, and all of us had a chance to say our say, and finally the bill was reported unanimously, as is, and I am for it.

I am sure that there can be no justification for seeking to increase the total amount covered for appropriation, as well as that there also can be but little tenable ground for controversy or amendment, if the real purpose and intent of the bill, which is to implement the war effort, be allowed to prevail.

Under the diplomatic and very able direction of the chairman, the gentleman from Georgia, the members of the subcommittee have worked long and hard and harmoniously and as a unit for

weeks, without the slightest evidence of partisanship or sectionalism, each and all of us determined to appropriate every cent of money for agriculture essential to the winning of the war, equally as determined not to spend a cent of the taxpayers' money in support of any project at this time which cannot be justified and the war-winning necessity for which cannot be established as emergent or essential.

ARTHUR ORR

Right here I wish to pay my respects and a tribute to Arthur Orr, the experienced and extremely capable, long-time efficient executive secretary of the committee, who has rendered the committee such valuable service while the bill was under consideration by it. It is not to be overlooked that during and while the hearings were in progress he observed the twenty-fifth anniversary of his service with the Appropriations Committee. The committee and the Congress and the clerk are each and all to be congratulated.

Now, Mr. Chairman, nobody realizes any more or better than the subcommittee reporting the bill the responsibility which rests upon it as it undertakes to handle what is known as the farm problem from the standpoint of appropriations for the support of the farm and the farmer through the Department of Agriculture and directly for the agricultural population. This responsibility is heavier now than ever, for we are engaged in and at the critical stage of a war such as we have never experienced heretofore.

You have before you the very comprehensive report. The hearings have been available since Saturday last. I see no occasion for my discussing the bill at any length.

I do want to talk briefly about the farm problem in general.

THE FARM PROBLEM

It is true that no man can forecast the future of or for the American farmer. Despite the fact he has been made the victim of propaganda, false hopes, soaring prices, speculative land values, and covered with mortgages he does not recognize as existent, and always the goat, because as an aggregation he will not cooperate, nevertheless, what he is expected to do does not involve diverting his efforts from the supplying of peace needs to war needs. "Nothing," as someone has said, "that he learns to do now will come amiss when the world is again at peace." The defeat of Hitler—and the Japs—and the restoration of tolerable living in Europe will deliver the American farmer from the disastrous accumulation of staples produced by his past mistakes and place him in a position to create, for the first time in American history, and in due time, a healthy and permanent agriculture.

It is not easy to know what to do to make that dream come true. Appropriations and doles and subsidies will not accomplish it. We have an enormous national problem to solve. A problem of proteins and vitamins, which now coincides with our international problem. It involves not only land, but human beings and about everything else under the sun.

Our attention has been drawn to the War Food Administration's discharge of its duties. Certain evidence which was presented to us made us suspicious that there were people in that outfit who were not an asset to it, to put it mildly. That is all I care to say with respect to that matter now.

WAR FOOD

The War Food Administration has supplied the nations of the world with a tremendous amount of food.

An indication of the magnitude of relief shipments may be seen in the fact that during the 18 months ended last November 30, 2,250,000,000 pounds of meat and 175,780,000 pounds of butter were exported for relief and other than military requirements.

I notice that James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion has named a new agency headed by Leo T. Crowley, Foreign Economic Administrator, to determine how much food and other relief materials the United States can supply to the rest of the world without endangering the war effort and its own civilian economy. This move, intended to avert a serious clash between domestic and foreign demands for scarce American supplies, comes none too soon.

The War Food Administration has been trying since December to dispose of 400,000 cases, or 9,600,000 No. 2 cans, of string beans of the 1942 and 1943 pack, it was learned yesterday. So far 215,000 cases have been inspected for quality, and of these, 89,000 cases are in the process of being inspected.

The original processor, who has first option to buy the commodity back, and the processors in similar lines who get second choice, have turned the offer down, the procurement and price support division of W. F. A. said yesterday.

The 89,000 cases were sold on February 16; 126,638 cases were offered to wholesale dealers and institutional and State purchasing agents at a fixed ceiling price but with a 1½ percent discount if paid for in cash. This is the normal trade discount.

On March 12, 120,036 cases were offered to the latter two groups on a different basis. They were invited to submit their own bids, the W. F. A. reserving the right to reject the offer if it was not high enough. March 29 is the closing date for these bids, which will be passed on by the Procurement and Price Support Branch of the W. F. A. Office of Supply in Washington.

Meanwhile a No. 2 can of string beans is still rationed at 10 blue points a can.

We are told by the President that we must tighten our belts, and that we will do for our boys and girls over seas, but there are some things about the whole situation which deserve and will compel a most thorough investigation. There are some things which smell worse than spoiled tomatoes, rancid lard, and carloads of rotten potatoes.

We will take a 12-percent cut in our meat ration for the benefit of our military personnel and for our fighting Allies, but we have a right to know where all the stocks of food have gone, and where they are, and that is and should be no military secret.

I think an editorial writer for the Washington Post hit the nail on the head when he wrote last Sunday respecting food sharing, as follows:

FOOD SHARING

The President was stating a simple truth when he pointed out that people who oppose cutting our food consumption for the sake of feeding the starving of other countries are not decent. We share the President's belief that the vast majority of Americans are the decent sort who are prepared to make sacrifices to alleviate the sufferings of others. However, the agitated debate over food shortages and export demands has taken an acrimonious turn that threatens to obscure and distort the real issues and to give a wrong impression of the temper of the civilian population.

Faced by the simple question whether we are willing to share our comparative abundance with the starving people of liberated areas the answer is unequivocally, "yes." Moreover, we could, and probably we shall be forced to, get along with less food than is now available without impairment of health and efficiency. Starting from that premise, the discussion of our food problem becomes motivated by a desire to utilize our resources to the best advantage and to give the most aid with the means at our disposal.

Attacks on the Administration for the loose, uncoordinated character of its food relief program are warranted, and constructive critics will not be turned aside by presidential rebukes addressed to a selfish minority.

SEES "HORN" RUNNING OUT

J. A. Krug, chairman of the War Production Board, warned the United States and her allies the other day that this Nation's "inexhaustible" horn of plenty is running out.

Chairman Krug stepped into the charged controversy over American food and resources and declared that "we must explore all the factors that will reduce to a minimum the net drain on American goods, including food, textiles, and such basic materials as steel and lead."

Agreeing in principle with President Roosevelt's admonition that we must do our best to help feed the starving peoples of Europe, Krug, nonetheless, bluntly warned the allies and the liberated areas of Europe and the Pacific that:

"We can stretch to the limit all our resources—and they are tremendous—and we will still fall short in our efforts to avoid desperate suffering abroad. We are not an inexhaustible arsenal of food and materials. This fact seems to be as much of a surprise to millions of Americans as it is to our allies.

"There has been too much talk the world around about the inexhaustible wealth and resources of America. There is a limit to everything and America is reaching that limit. I hope we can get this idea over to the other nations of the world. For we have scraped the bottom of the barrel in several respects."

This is taking the bull by the horns, an act long deferred, but one that should have salutary repercussions.

FARM MACHINERY

Mr. Chairman, in this connection, I cannot omit to say a word or two on the question of farm machinery, the domestic scarcity of which is hampering the efforts of American agriculture to an extent which may have disastrous repercussions on the battle front. The Members are aware, of course, that a Member of the House, in a recent speech from the

floor, advised this body of the existence of extensive inventories of farm machinery and equipment in the reservoirs of many of the countries allied with us, and perhaps, some friendly neutrals as well. The committee, sharing the general concern on this question, went into the matter very fully at the hearings in an endeavor to obtain information concerning such foreign inventories for this House which is directly responsible to the people through whose industry and generosity these supplies are lend-leased to others.

I feel that it is my solemn obligation to advise the House and the country that the committee's efforts to obtain such information were not entirely successful. Although officials of the executive branch were in full possession of the information, it was given to them, they alleged, by foreign governments under the seal of confidence, and only under that seal transmitted to the committee. The reasons assigned, of course, are those of military security, but it is my understanding that the officials of this Government have no determining voice in deciding whether any such information does or does not affect military security. And so the committee found itself silenced in a matter important to this country by the unreviewed dictum of an official of a foreign government. I need not tell the House that I, for one, did not like it, and only after action of the Appropriations Committee as a whole so directing, was the subcommittee, through its chairman, authorized to publish the information which you will find before you in the record.

LEND-LEASE MEAT

I understand that there will be a substantial reduction in lend-lease shipment of meat. Britain will get only 25,000,000 pounds of lend-leased meat next quarter, or about 12½ percent of present shipments. This evidently was based on the theory that British reserves are large enough to sustain England without great American assistance.

If we can manage to produce to feed the world, we ought first to be able to feed ourselves. Is that not so? Charity begins at home. To live on American standards it is estimated that we need the product of a billion acres. When the war is over the American farmer on these acres will be in a position to establish a solid future for himself. As I see it, a starved world will eagerly carry off his grain stocks; a naked world will carry off the stocks of cotton and wool and other products. The law of supply and demand will once more operate normally to save the day and civilization.

Then the day will have arrived when we will no longer have to pay the farmer to stay out of production because, as sure as the sun rises and sets, with a proper distribution of farm production, with systematic development of markets at home and abroad, good farming will pay.

The need for subsidies for agriculture will cease to exist. The economic postwar future for the American farmer promises either a new and better day, or the end of economic stability the world around.

THE FARMER AND PEACE

The future welfare of the farmer is involved in the kind of peace we are able to make and keep. He cannot disassociate himself from any single problem, for he is touched and touches the question at almost every angle as the feeder of the world.

William Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, was talking about agriculture as much as about any other economic issue when he said that the Bretton Woods pacts would stabilize the markets and maintain job levels. The international bank and monetary funds must be adopted to insure the stable post-war markets needed to maintain full production and employment in the United States.

In a Nation-wide broadcast Mr. Clayton warned that, without such international institutions to curb a return to the economic warfare of the last two decades, the most elaborate political and military arrangements for the preservation of physical peace will soon disintegrate in an atmosphere of bitterness.

He declared:

Our foreign economic policy revolves around an expansion in world economy—free and equal access for all nations to the trade and raw materials of the world, increased production, much greater exchange of goods and services between nations, and higher levels of living for all peoples everywhere.

Now, there is not one single element of the Santa Claus philosophy in this policy. On the contrary, quite aside from the question of future peace, the United States will be one of its principal beneficiaries.

FOREIGN MARKETS

Noting that there are almost unlimited foreign markets ready to absorb the expanding output of the United States, he asserted that the real problem will arise from difficulties in making payments. The International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development present a solution to this problem without superseding private lending or disrupting normal business practices, he explained.

The whole basis of the Bretton Woods proposals is the conception of an expanding economy and collective security through common action—

Mr. Clayton said, adding that unless this goal is achieved—

the solution of the vast problems before all nations may well be rendered impossible.

After the war, agricultural resources, human and soil—

Says Arthur Moore—

must be restored, preserved and expended all over the world, in new farming areas and old. The underfed must be fed. But, if the world is to obtain freedom from want, people must not be fed at the expense of food production or farm standards, nor of the farmer, as such.

The farm problem varies from region to region, from crop to crop, from farm to farm. The true problem is, as has been said, to grasp the wonderful range and diversity of American agriculture and the delicate, complex interrelationships that keep it dynamic.

SIX MILLION FARMS

We have a total of 6,000,000 farms. None is typical. One-third of them—the top 2,000,000—produce nearly four-fifths of all farm crops.

They include a few big "factory farms" and great ranches and plantations, but the vast majority are just good prosperous farms. The bottom 2,000,000 farmers account for only one-twentieth of total agricultural production—and consume most of that themselves. The middle third farm for profit, but most of them are short of capital or short of land. These groups produce the Nation's food and industrial crops; they produce a disproportionately high share of the Nation's children; and perhaps more importantly they are the Nation's greatest reservoir of independence and self-reliance. In that fundamental struggle of our times between the state and the individual, the farmer will never surrender.

TRAMPING OUT THE VINTAGE

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of all those interested in the farm problem, to a recent book written by Joseph A. Cocannoner, entitled "Tramping Out the Vintage," in which he defines a program for agriculture. Among other things which interested me, and evidently have interested others, he definitely makes and stresses three important points, viz:

Rural education must cease weaning able boys and girls from the farms; we need teachers who understand farm life; we must handle our greatest resource—soil—more intelligently.

He fails, however, to emphasize the fact that unless farm income is adequate, it is futile to expect ambitious youths to stay on the farms.

If this point were stressed—

Says Haydon S. Pearson in his review thereof—

the book would be better balanced. Economics being what they are, up and coming youths will always insist on a vocation that provides some of the good things of this modern age.

Mr. Cocannoner sees the dangers to American society unless our farm population overcomes its indifference to soil erosion, poor animal husbandry, and "cotton minds."

Without the vineyard to produce them—

He says—

there can be no grapes of wrath. Tending the vineyard properly is the task for America today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

MISSOURI RIVER FLOOD CONTROL WILL HELP AGRICULTURE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the committee on the comprehensive way in which they have approached the problems in the annual agriculture appropriation bill. On the whole, it is one of the best-balanced bills on the subject that has come before the House in my membership.

I rise at this time, however, Mr. Chairman, to mention the importance to the agricultural interests in the great basin of the Missouri River, and thereby to the Nation, of an action taken here earlier

today. That was the adoption by the House of the conference report on the appropriation bill for the civil functions of the War Department.

That action placed into law the initial appropriations for drawing the plans on the huge multiple-purpose dams authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944, passed by the House last May, and finally enacted into law last December.

This action has immense significance to agriculture. In the first place, Mr. Chairman, when those dams are constructed it means the end of the floods which in 2 successive years, 1943 and 1944, covered from two to three million acres of the Nation's best and richest farm lands between Sioux City, Iowa, and St. Louis, Mo., not only knocking them out of production in this important war period but damaging hundreds of thousands of acres for many years to come. Such ruin will stop when the dams are built for which the House today voted funds.

In the second place, Mr. Chairman, these dams will open a new era for agriculture upstream from Sioux City, in the Dakotas, Montana, and Wyoming. They will mean water for livestock and irrigation in dry years; they will mean an abundance of power for towns, cities, and country, and revolutionize the life on the farms and ranches of those States.

And these things can be done under the projects now authorized and for which initial design funds have now been voted. There is no need for any Missouri Valley Authority to do the job.

The funds voted today will start the Army engineers on their part of the work—the big structures on the main stem of the river. The Budget message sent up from the White House yesterday, if approved by the Congress, will provide similar funds for the Department of the Interior to plan its part of the authorized work.

The funds now approved by Congress for the Army engineers in 1945 and 1946 include these items for the work on the authorized Missouri River program:

Garrison Dam	$700,000
Oahe Dam	450,000
Fort Randall Dam	200,000

The funds recommended in the special budget message for the Department of the Interior include:

Bureau of Reclamation	$2,150,000
Geological Survey	1,400,000
Fish and Wildlife Service	375,000
Office of Indian Affairs	56,500
National Park Service	40,000
General Land Office	48,500
Grazing Service	10,000

In his message transmitting this estimate, the President said:

> This estimate includes funds only for the work preliminary to actual construction and must be performed irrespective of whether construction of the projects in the basin is accomplished by a valley authority or other agencies.

He also said:

> In my judgment, the proposed work will not interfere with the conduct of the war.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, it should be pointed out that the President did not send up a budget message on the Missouri program for the Army engineers until after the civil-functions bill had passed the House of Representatives.

At the conclusion of our hearings on the civil-functions bill, I asked the Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, for tables showing the estimates they had made for funds to begin plans and designs on projects authorized by the 1944 Flood Control Act, and asked particularly about the Missouri River items. General Reybold gave us the tables, but the committee decided they should not be acted upon until the Budget Bureau had completed its consideration.

When the estimates later did come to the Congress, they were minus the amounts the engineers had requested for the Missouri River and the Central Valley of California. It was understood that they were deferred for consideration of the valley authority proposals. The other body, however, placed in the bill the full amount requested. That action, in which the distinguished Senator from my State, Senator GURNEY, was most helpful, the action of the House conferees yesterday in concurring, and the action of the House today in adopting the conference report, can only be interpreted as meaning that the Congress does not see any necessity for a Missouri Valley Authority.

The great program can be undertaken by the regularly established agencies of the Government—and, indeed, is now under way.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I believe that in the discussion of an appropriation bill it is in order to speak of taxation. I wish, if I may, to comment on the action of the legislature in my own State of Pennsylvania, and the legislatures of other States in connection with the memorialization of Congress to call a constitutional convention for the purpose of considering and adopting an amendment placing a 25-percent limitation on inheritance, gift, and income taxes.

The State Legislature of Pennsylvania last year, without any general knowledge on the part of the people of Pennsylvania, followed an action already taken in 17 other States and adopted a resolution petitioning Congress to call such a convention for that purpose. This resolution and its objective, I understand, has been sponsored primarily by Frank Gannett's notorious league for so-called constitutional government. It has for its purpose the lifting of the income-tax burden from those individuals who have huge incomes and are able to pay, and the saddling of that burden on the wage earners and those receiving small salaries who already find it difficult to meet tax obligations, and also upon industrial corporations, as it undoubtedly would occasion an increase in the corporate tax rate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman know of any other effect such limitation would have other than the transfer of the tax burden from those with large incomes to those of small incomes?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. There are many other effects, but to me that is the most important one.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seems to me that is correct. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Seventeen States, without the citizens of those States knowing what was taking place, have already passed the resolution. If two-thirds of the States of the Union adopt such a resolution the Congress will have no recourse except to call a constitutional convention. If this amendment is finally adopted, we will lose, I am informed by the Treasury Department, $6,000,000,000 worth of revenue instantly. In addition to this loss everyone knows that in the post-war period we are not going to have the benefit of all the revenue we now receive from excess-profits taxes. It is going to be difficult for the Government to meet its obligations without the loss, which would thus occur. Congress would be compelled to enact legislation providing for a sales tax and various excise taxes and practically all of this burden would fall upon individuals who today are paying taxes on incomes above $500 if single and $1,000 if married. These people will see their tax burdens doubled and trebled if this nefarious proposition is allowed to be consummated.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman know that out of the 17 States that have adopted it 3 of them, Arkansas, Iowa, and Wisconsin through their legislatures, have recently rescinded their action?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I understand that is so. When the people of those States became aware of what had taken place the legislatures immediately saw that they better rescind their actions. In the State of Pennsylvania, Representative James Lovett, from Westmoreland County, has introduced a resolution calling upon the Pennsylvania Legislature to rescind its previous action. I hope my colleagues from Pennsylvania, Republicans and Democrats alike, will direct the attention of their constituencies in Pennsylvania to the resolution of Representative Lovett and urge them to petition the members of the general assembly and the State senators to take favorable action upon his resolution before the rank and file of the people of this country are saddled with a tax burden that will be unbearable.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I call attention to the fact also that the Government expects to take in about $42,000,000,000 in revenue in the coming year. If the 25-percent limitation were in effect we would probably not be able to take in one-half of that unless we at least

doubled or trebled the taxation on the lower income earning people.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. What the gentleman says confirms the information I have already received from the Treasury Department. In my own city of Philadelphia it is difficult enough at present to take care of tax obligations, because in addition to income tax we must all pay a city wage tax which was forced upon us. We do not wish to contemplate any new burdens.

I hope that every Member of this House will direct the attention of their constituencies to what is taking place, so that the people of the several States in the Union can watch the action of their legislatures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand here a book compiled by the Committee on Agriculture showing a list of payments made to farmers who received $1,000 or more under the 1943 agricultural conservation program and the 1942 crop parity payment program. This book contains information showing that 26,578 farmers in this country are receiving over $1,000 apiece under these programs, and that the amount of money we are handing out in gratuities now amounts to over 50,000,000 a year. You know, when we talk about the individual worker in the country today toiling hard and trying to earn and save a dollar, in order that he can buy food and clothing, that is one thing; but when you have a list here of thousands of people who are getting $1,000 or more a year, and some of them very fabulous sums, it seems to me that the Congress ought to wake up, because if you do not, you will find the farmers of this country waking up and they are going to tell you what to do; and that, very shortly.

Let me read you a partial list of States. Alabama had 373 people who received $698,539.86; Arkansas had 796 people who received $1,709,708.58; California had 1,418 people who received $3,571,368.95; Georgia had 595 people who received $1,169,771.66; Illinois had 1,477 people who received $2,432,630.77; Kansas had 2,948,- people who received $4,830,621.44; Louisiana had 264 people who received $535,208.56; Mississippi had 1,231 people who received $2,778,048.49; Nevada had 32 people who received $68,292.05; North Carolina had 136 people who received $275,275.56; Oregon had 974 people who received $2,150,700.65; Pennsylvania had 59 people who received $143,928.54; South Carolina had 172 people who received $269,791.40; Texas had 2,668 people who received $5,142,039.76, Washington had 2,385 people who received $4,884,784.16; and Wyoming had 272 people who received $514,591.26.

If any of you Members are interested in knowing the figures of other States, I will be glad to give them to you.

Now let us take some of the insurance companies. In Wisconsin, the Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., of Milwaukee, received a check for $48,086.67. The Old Life Insurance Co. of America, also of Milwaukee, received $7,244.69.

Let us take the State of New York. The Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., 1 Madison Avenue, New York City, received $95,756.95.

These are the hand-outs that I am talking about that this munificent Government of ours gives to these great corporations.

The New York Life Insurance Co. received $8,485.45.

The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, of New York City, received $73,903.31.

Let us take Massachusetts. The John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., of Boston, received $65,242.24. Out of a total amount of $72,570.42 for the entire State of Massachusetts, the John Hancock Life Insurance Co. received over $65,000.

Missouri: The Kansas City Life Insurance Co., of Kansas City, received $14,169.57. The National Fidelity Life Insurance Co., of Kansas City, received $9,252.72. The Mutual Life Insurance Co., of St. Joseph, Mo., received $10,379.67.

Now, let us step over to another State and take little Connecticut. The Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., of Hartford, received $1,181.93.

The Aetna Life Insurance Co., of Hartford, received $39,095.08.

I have a policy in the Aetna, and maybe they are making that policy good; I do not know.

Connecticut General Life Insurance Co., of Hartford, $23,894.88. Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Co., of Hartford, $16,550.29. Travelers Insurance Co., $43,839.82.

Minnesota: Federal Land Bank of St. Paul, $48,473.41. Northwestern Life Insurance Co. of Minnesota, $6,837.45. Winona National & Savings Bank, of Winona, Minn., $4,280.18.

And so it goes on down the line. What are the taxpayers of this country going to say after awhile when they learn what is in this book? I am going to show the people of this country just what the Congress has been doing in frittering away the money of the taxpayers—the people who have to work and pay taxes. I want them to see where this 20 percent goes that is taken out of their salaries for taxes, which money is used to pay these fabulous sums.

But I just want to say this: After you learn what is in this book and find out how munificent this New Deal has been to these great corporations and to these farmers who are getting over $1,000, it will be time for the American people to wake up.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to read into the RECORD at this point a release from the War Food Administrator, Judge Marvin Jones. Overnight, so to speak, another wave of food-shortage hysteria seems to have immersed us in a sense of fear. Most of us have heard from time to time dire predictions as to our food situation. These predictions have been made for several years now, yet no one in America so far has gone hungry, and I do not believe anyone is going hungry this year. I know we all have faith and confidence in our former colleague, Judge Marvin Jones. He is doing a good job in feeding our Army and Navy and civilian population and in supplying our allies with food. The worst criticism I have to offer against our war-food program is that Judge Jones has not been given more authority. It is reassuring to hear him state today that no one in this country is going hungry. He has just issued the following release:

I hope no one will be misled about the food situation. No one has gone hungry in this country. No one is going hungry. We have heard these things before. This storm will pass and certain facts will stand out:

1. In 1943 the American farmers produced 32 percent more food than this or any other nation ever produced before the war.

2. In 1944 they upped this 5 percent making a record increase of 37 percent above pre-war production.

3. This record was made in spite of the handicaps of war.

4. This year the farmers themselves set goals that call for an even greater crop acreage.

5. We have the best fed Army and Navy in the world. They have first call on our food.

6. Russian officials have told us that but for American food they could not have gone forward as they did in turning back the Germans. The same is true of England. All our allies are fighting in a common cause.

7. Our civilians during the war have eaten more food per capita than they did pre-war.

Our armed forces will continue to be well fed. We will continue to help our fighting allies. Our own people will continue to have plenty of good, wholesome food, and we will contribute our share to the relief of starving people, even if it means a new hitch in our belts. This is a practical matter and a part of the war itself.

The primary object of the War Food Administration is to aid in securing production of food. We are proud of the all-time production in each of the war years. Credit for this goes primarily to the American producer. Anyone who sells the American farmer short makes a mistake.

In addition we have been buying $5,000,000 worth of food per day for lend-lease, and to supplement the needs of our armed forces. This food must be processed, stored, loaded, transported and delivered to shipside. Much of it is perishable.

The handling of this food is a gigantic task. It must be handled with speed. It must go forward every day. It must be kept flowing to the war fronts.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

FOOD SHORTAGES

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I believe we can all agree with the statement made by our chairman of the Committee on Agriculture as to the splendid job the American farmers have done in producing food. Their outstanding achievement in food production is a miracle when you consider the handicaps under which they have operated, the shortages of machinery, the shortages of labor, plus unnecessary and unwise restrictions placed upon their production by the O. P. A. and other administrative agencies. Food production by American agriculture for the past 3 years cannot be used by the adminis-

tration as an alibi for the food shortage which now threatens our country. The fault is not with the farmers nor with the processors. The fault, as I see it, lies in the unnecessary and unwise administrative orders from Washington and the lack of coordination on the part of those agencies in securing proper and adequate distribution of the food. There is no question but what we are going into a serious shortage of certain vital foods.

In the case of beef, that is one situation which can be remedied. If the administration would change its policy, we could have more beef. But as long as policies are in operation which will stop the farmers of this country from putting 300 or 400 pounds more meat on feeder cattle there will be that much less beef produced in the United States in 1945.

I introduced a resolution yesterday calling for an investigation of the food situation by the House Committee on Agriculture. I appeared before the Committee on Rules this morning and asked them to report a rule ordering our Committee on Agriculture to make the investigation. I felt that the Committee on Agriculture was charged with the responsibility to see that we had abundant and ample food for the American people, for the armed forces, and to keep our commitments. My colleague the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], introduced another resolution which called for the creation of a special committee to investigate the entire food matter.

I do not know what the Committee on Rules will do, but it is my hope we can get to the bottom of this entire food problem to find out as to our supplies and what the commitments have been made by the administration and what the needs of the country are to maintain a decent civilian economy. Our first duty is to assure the men and women in the armed forces that they will have an abundance of all vital foods.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think the gentleman is right about that resolution. The Smith committee has authority to investigate that situation. I am one of the members of the Smith committee. But the members of that committee do not have any special knowledge of agriculture, and this question of food production, supply and transportation should come before your Committee on Agriculture, and be investigated by that committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that. I definitely feel that the investigation should be made by a committee of the House, whether it be a standing committee or a special committee.

Let me refer for the moment to what the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], said. He quoted Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, and I am satisfied he quoted him correctly. The proposition is not one of production, because the farmers have been doing a good job; but the question is one of distribution. The matter has become so serious that our War Food Administrator, Mr. Jones, went to Mr. Byrnes and asked him to set up a special committee to see that there would be a check on the commitments made by U. N. R. R. A., by the F. E. A., by Lend-Lease, and these other agencies. Mr. Jones feared that these agencies would promise away most of our food.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. After the Hot Springs food conference I heard one of the American delegates say that he expected that in the next year while we would have enough food, we would not be able to have the luxury of having the grain after it had been transferred into beef and meat, but we would have to go on something like peasant diet, eating cereals ourselves, and forego what he called the luxury of eating meat. In the statement made by War Food Administrator Jones that we will have plenty of food, I wonder if the gentleman knows whether he means we will not starve, but we will get enough cereals, or whether he means that we will have the type of balanced diet to which we are accustomed?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I may say to the gentleman that we do have a certain school of thought in some of these agencies, which maintains that instead of feeding corn, hay, wheat, barley, and oats to livestock so that we can eat beef, poultry, and dairy products, that they should feed this corn, hay, wheat, and barley directly to the people, and in that way we will save a lot of money and a lot of time and work. It sounds fantastic.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is that the plan?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think that is the way some of them are planning, but with many others I prefer to eat my meat red, I prefer to eat butter, and I like to have fluid milk, instead of eating corn and hay.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If these so-called internationalists, these one-worlders who want to raise the standard of living of people all over the world, including those who eat rice and things like that and no meat, if they advocate giving our meat to people in other parts of the world, is there any reason why we should not send meat over there and eat a little rice ourselves? That will bring about the balance a little quicker.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Perhaps we would have to send the gentleman from Michigan over to teach them how to eat this red meat.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have not had any for a couple of years. It does not make any difference to me. I can eat fish.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will say this to the gentleman, that he will have less meat and less beef and less pork and less poultry in the next 5 months than he has ever had before.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How can that be if I have not had any? I am not complaining. I do not care for meat. I like rice and oats and oatmeal. Up at Battle Creek we make a fine grade of oatmeal, you know.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I know the gentleman does not complain.

But let me point out an additional reason why this situation will be more aggravated. In New York at the present time 90 percent of the beef goes into the black market and people are not getting it who want to live up to the laws and regulations.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. We talk about our G. I.'s. Is it not about time to think about the mothers and wives of our G. I.'s, who are forced to go into the black markets to get their meat and other foods at this time?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is true and I am glad the gentleman called that to our attention.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would it not seem much better if the O. P. A. would issue one set of stamps for butter and another for meat? We hear about butter turning rancid because people do not have enough coupons to buy it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Even if you had one set of stamps for butter and another for meat, I doubt if in the next few months you will get very much of either one of them. You must have production first.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I have worked closely with the gentleman from Minnesota in the last 6 years. I think the point the gentleman from Minnesota has always made is that ample food can only be attained by a maximum food program. I think a very good example is a product such as eggs which we have seen increased very materially. The increases could have happened in other things if there had been a maximum food production program.

I wish to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if that is not where he still stands?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman who is one of the outstanding agricultural leaders in the United States. I have not changed my views. If we produce an abundance we shall be amply able to take care of all the people to whom commitments are made and we would not need many O. P. A. regulations.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. I have just been wondering whether the investigation contemplated by the gentleman would be broad enough to cover inquiries concerning the allocation of farm machinery or steel for the manufacture of farm machinery.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If my resolution is passed it will be broad enough, because I raise the question in it as to the reasons for the shortages.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman that if the investigation is to be made it should be made by the gentleman's committee.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I hope the Committee on Agriculture will play

an important part in it. I do not know whether we are going to get it or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota in order that he may answer some questions of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I did not quite understand the gentleman's statement with reference to the percentage of meats in New York that went to the black market.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have it from official sources that more than 90 percent of the beef and poultry in New York City goes into the black market.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. And what is being done to stop that?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We have provided ample funds for the O. P. A., and they have a large enforcement staff. Some cases have been begun against black-market operators, some of the small ones; but, by and large, the black market is flourishing and increasing in its operations and is getting worse and worse every day.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. One other question on the same point. The gentleman is a very able member of the Committee on Agriculture and I observe that he is familiar with the operations of agriculture and its products. What is the estimate as to what part of the beef and pork of the United States go into the black market? What percentage the country over?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is pretty hard to answer that question. It depends on whether one lives in an area where the supply is produced. There is less in the black market in those areas. But when it comes to the larger consuming areas like New York and Boston and some of these other places where they have to ship in most of the food, the gentleman will find that the black market is flourishing to a large extent, and very little is being done about it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Is the black market growing?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The black market is growing by leaps and bounds. Right here in Washington about 30 percent of the beef is sold on the black market at from 10 to 12 cents above the ceiling price.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I wish to compliment my colleague from Minnesota as the author of this resolution. It is high time we had a check-up on some of these rules which are depreciating our food supply, and also to control some of these agencies that are recklessly sending what we have all over the world. I wish to compliment the gentleman for introducing it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me say to my colleague from Minnesota—and I thank him for what he has said—his district is one of the finest in the country. I know that because I had the honor of serving a large part of it for 8 years. In his district they produce dairy products, hogs, cattle, corn, and sugar beets. Sugar-beet production has been cut 50 percent in the last 2 years, from 1,200,000 acres down to about 600,000 acres. It is not too late for the administration to change its policy on sugar so we can secure a return of the old acreage which will permit us to get the sugar we need here in the United States and also to meet our commitments.

Here is the issue for Congress to promptly settle. Shall we encourage the production of an abundance of food with proper distribution to take care of the needs of our armed forces, civilian requirements, and other commitments, or shall we permit the continuation of policies that now threatens serious food shortages and a break down of both production and distribution machinery? I say, the time has come for a change in policies, and it is up to the House to investigate and take quick action to force needed changes in food policies as a part of our effort to win the war, maintain civilian economy, and meet our commitments.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill provides less money for agriculture than has been provided by any annual agricultural appropriation bill for many years. It is the ultimate in a continuous and progressive reduction in agricultural appropriations and expenditures in the United States. In 1940 we appropriated in round figures one and a fifth billion dollars in the annual bill. In this bill we provide for the coming fiscal year less than half of that amount.

From a reading of the report on this bill you may get the impression that a slightly larger amount is recommended for appropriation this year than last. But when you take into consideration the fact that there is included in this bill $25,000,000 for G. I. loans, which is not strictly an agricultural expenditure but an expenditure for all American citizens, without regard to section or industry, it will be noted there is provided in this bill the lowest amount for agricultural purposes that has been provided by any annual bill for many years.

Likewise there is a marked decline in the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture during the last year. The total number of employees in the Department of Agriculture on June 30, 1943, was 108,000, while the number on January 31, 1945, was 72,000, a decline in the number of employees in the Department of Agriculture in time of war of approximately 36,000.

But as the expenditures of the Federal Government for the Department of Agriculture decreased, production on American farm steadily increased, with the result that we have broken each year the farm production record of the preceding year, and have produced in the year 1944, just tabulated, the greatest volume of food and fiber ever grown at any time in any land in the history of the world. For example, the following table indicates the progressive increase in volume of production since 1909:

Volume of agricultural production in the United States, 1909 to 1944

[Index 1935–39=100]

Year	Total food products	Total agricultural products [1]
1909	76	79
1910	75	79
1911	78	83
1912	80	85
1913	78	81
1914	81	86
1915	84	86
1916	81	83
1917	82	86
1918	90	90
1919	90	91
1920	87	92
1921	84	83
1922	92	91
1923	95	94
1924	97	98
1925	93	97
1926	97	103
1927	97	98
1928	100	102
1929	97	99
1930	98	98
1931	100	102
1932	96	96
1933	97	96
1934	100	93
1935	93	91
1936	97	94
1937	101	103
1938	103	103
1939	106	103
1940	111	110
1941	115	113
1942	125	121
1943	132	129
1944 [2]	137	133

[1] Includes in addition other feed grains, hay, cotton, tobacco, hops, soybeans, flaxseed, wool, and mohair.
[2] Preliminary.

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, The National Food Situation, October 1942 and January 1945.

It will be observed that production increased from an index number of 79 in 1909 to 133 in 1944—the record farm production of all time.

We have not only exceeded our record in the production of all agricultural products and the production of food, but we have fed the American people better than they or any other people have ever been fed before—both in quantity and variety of diet.

And some people who have been feeling sorry for themselves when they could not get just what they wanted at the store or butcher shop may be surprised to learn that we have fed the American people more generously and adequately throughout every year of the war than in any year of peace and prosperity. Here is the table submitted by the Department of Agriculture and found on page 82 of the hearings:

Estimated per capita civilian supplies for the major food groups for specified periods

[Pounds per capita, by calendar year, retail weight]

	Calendar years				
	1935–39	1941	1942	1943	1944 [1]
Dairy products [2]	437	468	491	516	522
Dry beans, peas, and nuts	14.1	14.4	16.7	17.6	17.9
Tomatoes and citrus fruit	84	97	98	101	103
Leafy green and yellow vegetables	90	92	104	105	109
Other vegetables and fruits	212	226	207	185	207
Eggs	36.1	37.7	37.7	41.2	41.7
Meat, poultry, and fish [3]	132	147	146	150	151
Grains	200	197	202	207	209

[1] Preliminary.
[2] Milk-solids-non-fat equivalent basis; excludes butter.
[3] Excludes bacon and salt pork.

Preliminary estimates for 1945, based on assumption that the war will continue, give: dairy products, 528; dry beans, peas, and nuts, 17.4; tomatoes and citrus fruits, 101; leafy, green, and yellow vegetables, 104; other vegetables and fruits, 211; eggs, 43; meat, poultry, and fish, 133; and grains, 205. Of course, if the German war ends during the year these estimates will be greatly increased. So it is evident that those who complain about the war diet of the American people are complaining about a diet vastly better in quantity and quality than any which the American people have ever enjoyed in time of peace.

For example, the highest average consumption of meat, widely discussed in the press this morning, the highest average consumption of meat by the American people in any year prior to the war was 132 pounds per person per year. In 1944 the amount was 151 pounds per person. Even if both wars continue through 1945, which no one anticipates, the yearly ration per person will still be higher than it was before the war. During the past year, when every other participating nation has been rationed to a substandard diet, the American farmer has been delivering to the people of the United States, through legitimate channels, not taking into consideration any additional amount which may have been channeled through black markets, 151 pounds of meat per capita, the greatest amount ever consumed by the American people in any year of their history.

As far as our soldiers are concerned, of course we provide the best and the most of everything for our fighting men. In time of peace he was consuming an average of 132 pounds of meat per year. He is now consuming in the American Army an average of 292 pounds of meat per year, the very best quality of meat that is to be obtained.

When the history of this war is written and the contribution by the farmers of America to victory is evaluated, they will have contributed, by any standard—hours of work per day, days on the job, volume of production per farm, per acre, or per man—as much as any other industry, either by class or by individuals, not only to win the war but throughout the war to preserve at home our normal standard of living. And he has sold the products of his toil to the consumer at the lowest comparable price. In that respect he has rendered a far greater service than the middleman. Here are some of the figures:

Hogs and pork products

	1918	*1943*
Market price for live hogs	$17.30	$13.50
Retail prices:		
Pork roast	.22	.35
Pork tenderloin	.25	.45
Pork chops	.35	.41
Picnic hams	.25	.31
Sugar-cured hams	.30	.35

Sheep, veal calves, and lambs

Market price for live sheep, veal calves, and lambs (average at least 2 cents lower in 1943 than in 1918).

Retail prices:	*1918*	*1943*
Shoulder of mutton	$0.18	$0.30
Leg of lamb	.22	.38
Lamb chops	.20	.45
Breast of veal	.12½	.20

Sheep, veal calves, and lambs—Continued

Retail prices—Continued	*1918*	*1943*
Veal chops	$0.20	$0.40
Leg of veal	.22	.38
Veal cutlets	.15	.45

Wheat and bakery products

Market price for No. 1 dark northern wheat	*1918* $2.25	*1943* $1.53¾
Retail prices:		
Bread (large loaf)	.07	.12–.14
Raised doughnuts (dozen)	.14	.25

The Government is now paying a subsidy on wheat in order to prevent the price of a loaf of bread from going up 1 cent per loaf. The extend of the imposition on the consumer and the United States Treasury which must take this subsidy out of the taxpayer, is evident when you remember that the total cost of the flour in a pound loaf of bread is only a little over 2 cents.

In view of the fact that the farmer has provided so bountifully for the table of the American people and their allies and so adequately for the diet of our armed forces, and at the lowest wage and lowest price of any worker or industry in the Nation, it would be presumed that his record-breaking achievements would meet with the warm appreciation of the people and the Nation he has so faithfully served. But too frequently the contrary has been true. Tables have been published to leave the impression that the farmer is reaping vast profits and in effect profiteering on his customers. Here is a typical excerpt:

A comparison of commodity prices

Wheat:		
December 1932	per bushel	$0.42
December 1944	do	1.63
Cotton:		
December 1932	per pound	.0572
December 1944	do	.2138
Hogs:		
December 1932	per 100 pounds	3.04
December 1944	do	14.14

A more inequitable and unscientific system of comparison could not be devised. Rather than go back to the depth of the depression and pick out the lowest price the farmer ever received why not go back to 1919 when everybody was prosperous and everybody was receiving the highest wage for his labor and the highest price for his products ever paid up to that time. For the 1932 figures let us substitute the 1919 figures. And that is comparable because it was a year of peak industrial prices and wages as well as agricultural prices and wages.

In 1920, wheat was $2.40 a bushel. Today it is $1.63. The price of everything else has gone up 200 percent. Wheat has gone down.

In 1919, cotton was selling at 35 cents a pound. Today it is selling for 21 cents.

Hogs in 1919, sold as high as $24.50. Today, they are selling at $14.70.

In short, farm prices today are just about half what they were in 1919 while industrial wages and prices are more than twice what they were at that time. The year 1919 may have been an inflation year. But if it was, industrial wages and prices stayed at inflation and are today more than twice above. Only farm prices were deflated. And the farmer is today working longer hours and delivering at a higher rate of production per capita without adequate machinery than any other businessman in America.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to complete my statement, and then I will be glad to yield.

But in this world conflict we have not had to wait until the close of the war to witness the decline of farm prices. Already agricultural products are dropping. The price of cattle has fallen. The price of hogs has dropped. The price of corn is lower. The total value of all livestock, including poultry, declined 27 percent in 1944 alone, while the price of every other commodity has increased.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. While the price of every service and commodity in the United States has increased during this war, farm prices alone have declined during the war.

Now, the farmer is not complaining. He accepts with equanimity the disproportionate share of the national income remaining after the other industries have taken the lion's share. But he is confronted today by a situation which challenges the closest attention. Notwithstanding the scareheads in the morning newspapers on the scarcity of food, there is on hand today the greatest supply of foodstuffs in the history of the world. If we did not produce a single grain of wheat we have enough wheat on hand to last 2 years, and the report received just yesterday is to the effect that we have another huge crop of wheat coming on this season. Present indications that it will be a banner crop and we have no place to put it.

There is so much corn that the price in my home community has dropped from $1.08 last fall to 87 cents this week. There are between eleven and twelve million bales of cotton hanging over the market right now, with the prospect of the keenest competition in the post-war market, with rayon, nylon, plastics, and other synthetic fabrics.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I shall be glad to yield a little later.

Mr. GRANGER. I just want to say there are 12,000,000 cattle that the gentleman should speak about.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. On January 1, 1945, there were 81,760,000 cattle in the United States. That breaks every record for cattle on hand except for 2 years, 1942 and 1943, and it is only 2 percent behind 1942. We have cattle, and to spare. And, incidentally, there is on hand today in reserve six times the amount of wool normally in storage.

To complicate the situation, the armed forces have on hand enough staple foods to last them practically a year. And they are still buying today more feverishly than ever before. The morning paper reports that Canada is seeking a market for a huge supply of surplus meat. And its graneries are bulging with wheat for which transportation can not be secured. We have it from an

authoritative source that England has enough food stock-piled to last until January 1, 1946, even at the reduced lend-lease quotas now in contemplation. Every warehouse is filled. All pipe lines are loaded to capacity and all cars and ships are full. The corn stored by Joseph in Egypt pales into insignificance when compared to the amount of foodstuffs that are stored today ready for immediate consumption.

Now, the Army, of course, is justified in maintaining these huge stores because it is a fundamental axiom of military science that always you must proceed as if the war being waged would last indefinitely.

But we know, and everyone knows, that the end of the European war is rapidly approaching; that it cannot under any circumstances last longer than approximately 3 months. While we as good soldiers must continue to pile up these vast stores both on this side and on the other side with the view of the war's continuing through 1946 and 1947 we know that when the German war ends there will be an immediate drop in the purchase of agricultural products.

We are told that we must provide surplus food in order to feed not only our own armies and the armies of our allies, but also the destitute people in liberated countries. It now develops that the need for support of destitute peoples in Europe has been greatly overestimated. The Army, the Navy, the lend-lease authorities and U. N. R. R. A., all acting independently have submitted overlapping estimates. Russia has redeemed all of her agricultural lands. The Ukraine, the breadbasket of the Soviet Republic, with its great communal farms will be under cultivation this season and will be operated by labor forces supplemented by German prisoners of war now in Russian concentration camps.

France has suffered no great agricultural devastation; practically all French farms are intact. The Germans kept them so because they were consuming the major share of their products themselves. There is in many parts of France today actual surpluses of foods. The shortage in portions of France is due not to lack of food in France as a whole but to difficulties of transportation. In no country in Europe will it be necessary to provide food beyond the first crop year. That means that when this war is over we will have on hand such a surplus of food as never seen before.

Experience is a great teacher. After the last war when we had a small amount of surplus food on hand, but insignificant as compared with the amount of supplies which are now in reserve. We had no alternative than to throw it on the market. You will remember how depots were established in every city in which the Government sold food. Billy Sunday had just completed a series of meetings down here in a tabernacle built near Union Station. In that building the Government set up a retail store and sold food to everybody. The effect upon prices was catastrophic. When you have so much more on hand this time, what is going to be the effect when that vast amount of food is turned loose upon the market?

Mr. Chairman, it must be remembered if we furnish food abroad, it is a case of giving it away.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, never has there been such devastation as exists today in Europe. Hardly a city left standing, one out of every five houses in England destroyed; the destruction in Germany is even greater. All exchange is gone, all wealth has been burned up in the holocaust of war. They have nothing with which to pay for anything that we send them. Any exportation of food to Europe in the post-war period will be purely on a free, gratis basis. In other words, we are going to give it to them. So here is the proposition, Mr. Chairman: When we give our food and cotton to the destitute people of Europe, who is going to give it? Is the American farmer going to be forced to give it through curtailment of his prices, as after the last war, or is the Government to give it away and pay the producer a fair price? Is the laborer worthy of his hire?

That is a fallacy. In 1920 wages instead of going down went higher and agricultural products went to the bottom of the well. On the other hand, remember that the rest of this country is dependent upon the buying power of the farmer just as much as he is dependent upon the buying power of the rest of the country.

We made that mistake in 1920. Everybody stayed up except the farmer, and he went to perdition. Then in contravention of this idea that all you have to do is to keep up the rest of the country, the rest of country followed him to the very depths. They went along. So you really are not taking care of the farmer alone in this post-war period if you maintain his buying power; you are maintaining the prosperity of the entire country. We are all in the same boat. We have to sink or swim together.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] such time as he may desire.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, as this committee came to the consideration of this bill making agricultural appropriations for the next fiscal year of necessity we had to have before us a twofold problem. First, in view of the financial condition of the Nation, with a national debt which will reach the staggering total of $300,000,000,000 sometime soon, the vast expenditures to meet the necessities of war, it was incumbent on us as Members of Congress to keep conscious of the fact that reductions should be made where possible, but not where such reductions would jeopardize the operations of the Department and its program of production. We had the further duty of protecting so far as we could our great agricultural resources which have contributed so much toward the winning of this war and the maintenance of our high standard of living in peacetime.

While this bill does not reflect my own views in many particulars, one has only to read the hearings to realize that this committee has taken its duty seriously and has given many hours of study and work in an effort to report a bill which would have the support of all members of the committee and of the country. It is hard to realize the great contributions to the welfare of the Nation which have been made by the Department of Agriculture under programs initiated by this Congress. Frequently we accept the benefits of these programs without realizing that back of such benefits is the vision of men in the Department and Members of Congress who have put through legislation providing for such programs.

In the field of research the Department has released during the last year 43 new varieties of crop plants, bred for improved resistance to disease, heat, drought, or cold. Tests with DDT have shown wonderful possibilities in the control of injurious insects. The Cotton Ginning Laboratory at Stoneville, Miss., has designed a press for gin use that presses cotton to the same density as produced by the big compresses making it possible to load 130 bales in a freight car which formerly carried only 80, and are continuing their test of cotton fiber which in my judgment show it to be better than substitutes now being used in many fields. There have been tremendous improvements in corn hybrids, greatly increasing production. These are merely samples of the great advances made possible by research of the Department of Agriculture. In my own area of Mississippi through the last 10 or 15 years due to the use of improved cotton seed of an early maturing type we have been able to produce a crop early enough to largely miss the ravages of the boll weevil. Many of our farmers accept this as a natural occurrence and I am afraid without full appreciation of the fact that back of such development there was continuous experimentation on the part of the Department of Agriculture which has brought about this improvement and saved to my section alone many millions of dollars. This Department has done wonderful work in the control of diseases of animals and of plant life and in the prevention of diseases in those fields. Time does not permit me to go into the many phases of this program.

Most Members of Congress send out bulletin lists with many hundreds of bulletins which are available to farmers. These bulletins if studied and the information contained therein put to use will result in great benefit to our Nation. Back of each of these pamphlets is the experimentation, research, and practical experience of the Department of Agriculture which has proved the correctness of the information contained in such bulletin. I feel that these bulletins are not fully appreciated by the farmers of America and have urged the Department of Agriculture to devote further time and study in conveying to the people the knowledge that this source of information is available and if used will result in tremendous advances in agriculture. In my judgment it is better to have one development actually put to practice and

use than to have 10 discoveries, none of which are put into practice because of the failure to sell the farmers on such improvement. I realize this is a difficult problem. There may be those in the Department who think that when they make such information available to the farmers they have done their part and if the farmer does not make use of it that is his fault. This is the wrong attitude in my judgment because with the tremendous labor shortage, the number of hours which the average farmer must put into his work, he has little time to think along the lines of improvement and in trying out new practices during the present emergency. This is a great field for study on the part of the Department in an effort to see that the information which they have obtained and the new practices which they have proven to be of value are fully utilized by farmers.

The American farmers have certainly contributed their part to winning the war. They have been faced with a shortage of labor, a shortage of machinery, with greatly increased demands for production. Not only did the farmers of the Nation have these problems with which to contend but was forced to accept subsidies in order to meet production costs in many instances. They believed as I do, that they were entitled to a fair price in the market place for their products. Instead of this they have had price ceilings so low as to force them to accept subsidies.

The dairy industry particularly in my area has been tied down by price ceilings, based on prices established when this industry was a side line incident to farming. With a subsidy, they have found the going tough. I am hopeful that some relief may be obtained for these producers.

Not only have our farmers taken these problems and handicaps in stride but they have worked, without limit on hours put in to sustain this Nation in the time of its need. They have contributed untold quantities of foodstuff to our allies and thereby have made added contributions. In 1943 our farmers produced 32 percent more foodstuffs than ever before in history; in 1944 an additional 5 percent. Our farmers have answered the challenge. It is the attitude of this committee that much of this ability to show production is to a large extent a direct result of the soil-conservation practices and programs which have been in effect for a number of years. This gave us many thousands of acres of rich soil in the beginning of the war. With wartime demands so great much of this soil has been used to a greater extent than is consistent with good and long-time conservation practices. It is my personal belief that wartime demands have resulted in "cashing in" much of our great natural resources of this kind. Of course that is true also in other fields. We have greatly depleted our oil supply. This is irreplaceable. At the same time we have greatly depleted our rich soils and our forests. These last two can be replaced under a sympathetic and constructive program. We have made an effort in this bill to carry on the soil conservation service and program, believing that by so doing we are keeping at a minimum the depletion of this great natural resource under wartime needs. This is the capital of our farmers and of our Nation. If the war forces the liquidation of a part of this, we should restore such fertility in fairness both to the farmers and to the Nation.

This committee has given much attention to forestry and the urgent need of our Nation to conserve our great forests. This natural resource has suffered greatly during this emergency. Many of us in the committee believe, in line with many of our colleagues who appeared before the committee, that this resource should be restored, and that much attention should be given to the growth of new trees and of new forests so as to fully utilize many lands in the Nation which have not heretofore been fully productive. In my own section there are many thousands of acres which could easily be turned to the growth of trees. I believe that the expansion of the experimental forests and further experimentation with forest products is a step that should be taken by this Nation. Private landowners and companies handling forest products recognizing that timber is becoming scarce, are spending millions of dollars in this field. Most of the States of our Nation are now on a sound financial basis and they, too, are vitally interested in forestry, in the conservation of our present forests, and in the further expansion of work in that field so as to restore this great natural resource, the depletion of which has been so necessary during the war. Unfortunately the request on the part of the persons interested in the expansion of this program in the Southeastern States came too late to have such request considered by the Department and was not presented on a national basis.

It is my belief that it would have been wise to have gone ahead with such experimentation in those areas prior to the setting up of a program on a national basis. I certainly know that in those areas we have the urgent need for such expansion. While this committee did not take appropriate action to expand this work in that area we have requested the Department of Agriculture to make a study of this problem on a national basis so as to include the problems of the various sections of the country and to have it ready for presentation at the next meeting of this committee. I feel that members of this committee who could not see the propriety of this expansion in view of its limited scope and the method of preparation are sold on the necessity for such enlarged program on a Nation-wide basis and I believe the Members of Congress will fully appreciate the need to restore so far as we can these millions of acres of forest lands to full production, appreciating fully the contributions which foresty has made to the great advancement of our Nation. In so doing we are contributing to the whole Nation. In my own section there are many, many acres of thin land which cannot be operated successfully in the usual farm crops. They are ideal, however, for timber growing. Here again the farmer has not realized that the best way for him to be successful is to realize from every acre of his ground such production as it will produce. In some sections of my State the farmers are having to buy coal because they do not have trees and firewood. Most of such farms have numbers of acres which could be adapted to the growing of trees and at least make such farm self-supporting with regard to timber needs. Experimental forests in that area so that the farmers of the section could see what could be done by planting and harvesting trees as a crop would mean much on selling the people, and once they were sold they would carry this program on for their own benefit and for the benefit of the whole country.

This committee has recognized the needs of other agencies connected with the welfare, well-being, and progress of our farm population. With regard to the Rural Electrification Administration, which has meant much toward keeping our farmers satisfied to stay on the farm, which has resulted in greater conveniences, and has enabled them to keep up the great production in wartime with less labor than heretofore, the committee did not see fit to grant all the increase requested by this agency because it was advised that material and equipment were not available for such expansion. I know it is the attitude of the committee, however, that at any time the R. E. A. can fully utilize the funds which are here appropriated, that upon another request being made the committee will certainly be sympathetic with such request, having full confidence in the value of such expansion and great hopes that it will reach the vast majority of the farmers of the country.

In this bill we have appropriated many dollars toward agriculture and toward this agency which has done so much to improve agriculture and those engaged therein. In so doing we have tried to keep conscious of the demands on the Federal Treasury and of the financial condition of the Nation. We do believe, however, that the high standard of living which this Nation has enjoyed can be largely attributed to the great natural resources with which we have been blessed. We feel that the demands of war, however, have seriously depleted these resources and that the Nation owes it to itself to do everything within reason to keep such drain on our natural resources at a minimum, and insofar as possible to restore and maintain for future generations rich soil, fine forests as well as excellent livestock, and a contented and happy farming population, believing that by so doing we are better enabling the Nation to continue to enjoy the high standard of living with which it has been blessed throughout its history. By leaving these great resources intact for coming generations we aid them in meeting the great financial problems which must follow from our huge expenditures in fighting this war on all the fronts of the world.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the chairman of our committee has covered the matters contained in this bill item by item, I have not attempted to do so. I have tried to relate the needs for supporting this Department together with the benefits which flow to our people and Nation from its programs.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset that it was certainly a pleasure to work on this particular subcommittee under the chairmanship of such a fine chairman as we have in the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, and in collaboration with the other five gentlemen of that committee. I believe, everything considered, that we have done as good a job as the average subcommittee could do. The ramifications of the structure of our Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration are immense. But there are certain points that I would like to bring out and discuss rather frankly, and with that in view I intend to take about 15 minutes of your time. Before doing so, may I commend the work of Mr. Arthur Orr, our subcommittee clerk, who was a very helpful assistant in the big job of preparing this bill for action here today.

It was my thought in demanding of certain officials of the Government that they release to us figures concerning the exportation of farm machinery—it was my thought, I repeat, that Congress should be entitled to such information, in view of the fact that we hear on every hand that there is a food shortage. The particular gentleman who appeared before us from the Foreign Economics Administration was a little hesitant about giving us this information but the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, told him, and rightly so, that it would be up to the subcommittee, and eventually up to the full Committee on Appropriations, to say whether or not the release of this information should be considered confidential and whether or not the Congress should make available unto itself that particular information concerning the exportation of farm machinery. The full committee yesterday morning decided that it could not harm the war effort in any possible way by making this information public and agreed to my motion that such should be done. As a result of this decision of the Appropriations Committee you will find that particular information in the Appendix of the RECORD at page A1317.

May I speak more or less from the viewpoint of a man who has farmed practically his entire life? It is from the viewpoint of a man who urged a liberal appropriation for A. A. A. in this bill. The records of the subcommittee will show that I personally moved to raise the appropriation for A. A. A. up to $300,000,000 and that I moved to reinstate the seed program in this bill. The record will show my approval of $60,000,000 in loaning power for R. E. A. and my support of the great number of useful bureaus in our Department of Agriculture, especially the great fundamental research divisions.

From the viewpoint of one of the few Members of the Congress who have come direct from the farm to Congress, I am searching this exportation of farm machinery report, trying to determine just why our Uncle Sam should give to neighboring nations, not engaged in war, tractors and farm implements by the thousands, when our own farmers need them so badly. From that viewpoint, I want to look into this problem of the exportation of farm machinery, not as it affects our fighting allies, the Russians and the British and others, but I cannot understand when examining this report just why Congress should countenance the sending out of this country, when we need farm machinery as badly as we do, farm machinery to the South American republics and Mexico. I perhaps can stretch my point of view when it comes to Brazil. Brazil actually has men fighting over there in Italy alongside the Thirty-fourth Division, many of whom are men from my own district and who have been on that front line for over 400 days without intermission. But let us look into this report and may I quote from it to you Members of Congress?

We find, for instance, that out of the 41,037 farm tractors exported to other countries of the world in 1944, and that represents quite a tidy little chunk of our production, 16.6 percent in fact, 1,840 went to Mexico, 193 to Chile, 265 to Colombia, 363 to Venezuela, 169 to Peru, 111 to Uruguay, and so on.

Personally, from the viewpoint of a man representing what is perhaps the most exclusively agricultural district in America, I protest against sending any of those precious farm tractors out of this Nation at a time like this to noncombatant nations of which it certainly cannot be said that this must be done because of furthering the war effort; and I shall continue to protest as long as this procedure is followed. Might I inquire why should Canada, whose food situation is not grave, receive 21,349 farm tractors in 1944?

For the last 2 years I have been trying to get a disk-harrow for my farm, just an ordinary tractor disk. When I went to my dealer again this last fall and asked him what was the possibility of getting that particular disk for this coming spring, that implement I needed this past 2 years and could not get, he said to me, "Well, Carl, I do not know how many requests for disks I have had this year, something like 35. I got 1 last year, and you are still fifth on the list."

In other words, at the rate my home dealer was able to obtain that particular type of farm machinery that I need so badly to farm that land, it will be 5 years before my turn comes to secure that particular disk. Now, let us quote again from this report as to the number of these machines sent to some of our neighboring countries.

When I see in this report that our kind and beneficent Government through the bureaucrats operating certain divisions has seen fit to send 1,299 harrows, for instance, to Brazil, 662 to the Dominican Republic, 5,510 to Mexico, 294 to Chile, 309 to Venezuela, 250 to Colombia, and ad infinitum, I begin to see why my dealer does not have that piece of machinery available for sale to farmers here in the old United States of America. Also, I begin to wonder if we are not far too generous with our substance in that line and many others. When I think of the farmers back home who are working long hours today to try to produce as much food as they possibly can produce; when I see these farmers writing me as they have protesting against the taking away from them of the only help they have on the farm; when I see a man 79 years of age on a farm in my particular congressional district from whom the draft has threatened to take his only help on his nearly 400 acres of land; when I see the necessary farm labor stripped from our farms in violation of the expressed law of the land which we had just this week to reexpress for the benefit of selective-service officials, I think it is time for Congress to get up on its hind legs and assert itself and really find out whether our laws are to be made by Congress or whether the bureaucrats in this teeming bureaucracy shall supersede us in that duty.

Seven thousand eight hundred and sixty-five grain drills were exported last year, 17,520 cultivators, 4,112 combines, 2,254 binders, 13,543 harrows, and 39,041 plows. This will perhaps explain to a good many farmers just why they cannot secure the implements they need. Why should not the farmers in the United States obtain much of this farm machinery instead of the South American nations being the recipients? The only answer that can be made to this question now is that irresponsible persons in our Government are too lavish with our substance and know not what they do.

We hear much talk about a food shortage. On September 23, 1943, I spoke to this House and predicted a coming food shortage if the labor was drained from our farms and if farm machinery was not made more plentiful. This food shortage is a fact today simply because the men and machinery are not there to work the farms and simply because there are not enough men of practical experience in agriculture, who actually know agriculture, taking part in this great Government of ours and making decisions which affect food production throughout America.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], one of the best-versed men in agriculture in the House.

Mr. JENKINS. In the study made by the gentleman, has he discovered, or has any evidence been brought to his attention, as to whether or not there is favoritism in the distribution of farm implements in this country? I will cite an instance in my own district. I have never been able to run it down. I do not want to accuse anybody unjustly. But that was to me a very glaring instance of favoritism if I have the facts right. I would like to know if the gentleman is acquainted with any such facts.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Frankly, none such have come to my knowledge, I am glad to say. I have much confidence in these boards, but they simply have not been able to allocate machinery when such was not available to the dealers.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I would like to say to the gentleman from Minnesota, as well as to the gentleman from Ohio, that last year it was necessary for this House to vote in an amendment to the agriculture appropriation bill deducting the per diem allowance for certain Agriculture employees who are denying to the farmers their necessary equipment because they refused to join in a certain program of the Agriculture Department.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to close this part of my address by simply reiterating, that while I am perfectly willing to see the exportation of anything we have to any of our allies where our products will do some good in winning the war, I object to sending our substance, by lend-lease, U. N. R. R. A., or in any manner to those non-combatant countries that really have done nothing definite to aid us in winning this war. I refer to the bulk of South American countries. I object to sending farm machinery down there that could far better be utilized in your district and my district for the further production of food which we know we must have to win this war and secure a lasting peace. Uncle Sam's resources are not unlimited, as some star-gazers would have us believe.

Now, let me go into another subject, please. There came to my attention during the hearings that $25,000,000 was placed in this particular bill in the farm tenancy section for the purpose of giving G. I. veterans the opportunity to make loans under the Bankhead-Jones Act. Here we have the curious situation where, under our basic G. I. bill as you all know we have authorized loans which are to be made to veterans for 20 years at 4 percent. I believe we are doing something here, however, that will mess up the whole works by putting into this appropriation bill an entirely different provision, which is available to only a limited number of veterans, those who can be covered by this $25,000,000, 40-year money at 3 percent. I do not believe Congress had in mind that that should be done. I fear there will be a lot of hard feeling. In line with that thinking, I agreed to have my name included as one of the sponsors of the Cunningham bill which was dropped into the House hopper the other day, which simply amends the G. I. bill so that each and every one of these veterans shall have the right to have this 40-year money at 3 percent rather than just giving a few of them under this particular appropriation bill that right.

I have investigated certain farms over which the Farm Security has had administrative supervision and which they have aided farmers in reestablishing themselves. I know that five out of those six particular farms that were personally investigated were coming along fine and making wonderful progress for their owners. The other was a failure. But to me this is a very good percentage and very worth while.

Under the new Farm Security Administrative there is a very evident improvement in this great help to farmers who have been forced to seek this aid, as their credit was no good at the local banks.

With that part of the work of Farm Security I am in wholehearted sympathy. Let us keep Farm Security in that field, and recognize that the problems in that field are in no way similar to the problems facing the G. I. veteran who wants his own home and farm. Let us divide these and not mix them up by forcing the G. I.'s to accept the necessarily strict provisions of the farm-tenancy program. Congress did not intend that the G. I. loans and the farm-tenancy program should become intermingled. Today it has, and I fear that both programs—both worthy—will become unmanageable as a result. Frankly, I think the Farm Security today is doing a good in their particular field of helping farmers who cannot get commercial credit elsewhere. But, Mr. Chairman, I am fearful of what is being done today. I do not like it. I expressed myself openly in the committee. I do not like to see the veterans of this Nation put in the same category as Farm Security clients, and under the same regulations as Farm Security clients, in order to get these farm loans that you and I in Congress decreed the veterans should have the right to get. When we think about Farm Security and farm tenancy we think about farmers who have been unable, perhaps from no fault of their own, to carry their own financial burden. Personally, I am glad to vote for the money necessary to help them, and their record of repayment the past few years has been a splendid one. When, however, I think of the G. I. veterans—these boys coming home—I am afraid that the psychology of those whose job it is to select and supervise the farmers under the Jones-Bankhead Act and the farms they purchase is not the sort of psychology that you and I want applied to the G. I. veterans coming home. Remember that perhaps $10,000,000,000 in loans and 2,000,000 borrowers for homes and farms may be the size of the veteran loan business before this law is fully utilized. I call your particular attention to the fact that the $25,000,000 here is allocated specifically for veterans. This is the opening wedge for great sums to follow, and I cannot, in justice to either the Farm Security, farm tenancy, or our veterans, see the wisdom of this course of action. When we come to that portion of the bill I intend to move to strike it out of the bill, with the viewpoint in mind that we must pass better legislation for the veterans—with the viewpoint in mind that we cannot permit the handling of these loans by people who are not trained for that work and by people who do not have the proper perspective to which our veterans are entitled. Clearly, the Veterans' Administration should place the control of this great farm-buying program in the hands of elected, not appointive, officials in every county in our land. Veterans' organizations should give their counsel to these nonpartisan boards.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to my neighbor from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I am very much interested in what the gentleman has had to say about the operation of the Farm Security Administration in connection with the veterans. In South Dakota the Farm Security Administration has done a rather commendable job in its work. As a Republican, I can say they have been free from the political criticisms which I have heard in some of the other States. They have attempted to do a good, business-like piece of work in a public spirited manner; but I agree with the gentleman that when it comes to making this money available to the veterans, that might more properly fall within the purview of the Veterans' Administration than the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Of course the gentleman knows that the Veterans' Administration does have the right to allocate the Farm Security and the Farm Tenancy this particular provision of the G. I. bill. The thing is entirely according to law but I feel that Congress should at once see to it that the proper organization is in charge of it. The Veterans' Administration has dodged its responsibility.

Mr. MUNDT. I think everything is perfectly legal, but I agree with the gentleman about the psychology of the Farm Security Administration, which is to deal with a relief program, in connection with farmers who need the helping hand of Government to set them on their feet.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am glad to hear that the gentleman agrees with me as to just how far we should permit Farm Security and Farm Tenancy to proceed. I am friendly to both.

Mr. MUNDT. That is the reason I joined with the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], in sponsoring this new bill to treat the veteran as he should be, under the G. I. bill of rights, to give him equity rather than relief.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Give him the right to have 40-year money, if he needs it, at 3-percent interest, the same right accorded others under the Bankhead-Jones bill. That is the least we can do for these men who are fighting for this Nation.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. And he should be a mighty good risk because he is at the proper age to assume a long-term indebtedness.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has consumed 16 minutes.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to talk about our national forests. I realize that this subject is something like the weather and the national debt—everyone talks about them but few really try to do anything about them.

There is no question but what our national forests are being depleted at a dangerous rate. This fact is definitely of national interest.

Of the total landed area of this great Nation of ours, one-third is said to be best suited for the growing of trees; 49 percent is best suited for farming and livestock; while the remaining 18 percent consists of mountains and deserts.

In the bill before you this afternoon we feel that adequate provisions have been made for the current year and that our remaining forests will be protected to the limit of presently available men and materials. They will be protected from the ravages of fire. The pest invasions will be controlled and the part that research in forest products has been playing in our military efforts will be continued.

However, many on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations felt that the time was here to take a full and factual look at the entire situation as it affects our national forests and to present some of our reactions.

We feel that a complete and adequate program can no longer be avoided, and many of us hope that next year will see the beginning of a Nation-wide program that will meet the true seriousness of the situation as it affects our national forests.

To anyone who has seen recent pictures of our invasions on either front must come the realization of the tremendous part that American forests are playing in this global war.

Practically every piece of supply that goes to the front is boxed, crated, or cased in wood. In this modern warfare it does indeed take lumber also to win.

We are now arriving at a national awakening of what this inroad on our existing forests means in terms of our national economy and our future security. Within this Union there are 32 forest States and the lumber which is helping to win this war is drawn from each of these 32 States.

Something of an appreciation of what we are taking from our forests can be gathered from the following record of the total lumber produced from our forests in the last 7 years. In 1938 we produced 21,600,000,000 board feet of lumber; in 1939, 24,900,000,000 board feet; in 1940, 38,900,000,000 board feet; in 1941, 33,400,000,000 board feet; in 1942 our production rose to 36,300,000,000 board feet; in 1943 we produced 34,300,000,000 board feet; and for the year just passed, 1944, it is estimated that our production was approximately 32,000,000,000 board feet.

This is for lumber only. Other products, such as pulpwood, cordwood, poles, piles, and so forth, taken from the forests of this Nation amounted to better than 40,000,000,000 board feet. It is, I think, most important to call attention to this factor, for lumber is not the only draining upon the forest resources of this Nation.

I think it would be informative if we were to consider 1 year's production—say, that of 1943—in terms of building a board fence around the 17,936 miles of the circumference of this Nation of ours. The lumber produced in 1943, if used to build a solid board wall around this Nation, would have given us a board fence 362 feet high, running along the 3,072 miles that compose the Mexican border, up the Pacific coast, in and out of peninsulas and isthmuses, for a distance of 2,730 miles, across the northern boundary for a distance of 3,987 miles, down the Atlantic coast for 5,565 miles, and around the Gulf of Mexico, a distance of 3,641 miles. The 40,000,000,000 board feet of poles, piles, and pulpwood would supply plenty of posts to nail the boards to.

It is the war, of course, that has brought us face to face with the fact that we are nearing the end of our virgin stands of timber. We are also nearing an end of an era when we permitted, even encouraged, prodigal cuttings of the Nation's forests.

A nation's resources consist of two types: Those which are exhaustible, which when once exploited cannot be replaced. Our oils and our minerals are prominent in this type. When we utilize such resources, we say we are "mining" them. The forest industry itself admits that for 300 years we have "mined" our forests. By that the industry means that they have depleted the land of all trees and have given all too little thought to the fact that wood is part of plant life and that it is a natural resource that can be renewed. This is the second type of resource.

It grows and takes from the soil only 2 percent of the volume of the wood produced, and that 2 percent can, by wise management, be replaced.

Today our Forest Service and our lumber industry are thinking in terms of this great natural resource in terms of "cropping." For years now, more foresight in the Forest Service and in the lumber industry has been used, and this complex problem given much thought. They realize that it takes from 40 to 200 years to renew this national asset. They realize that the problem of growing a 40- to 200-year "crop" involves long-range financing of a special type, and they realize also that old and obsolete methods of forest-land taxation will have to be modified and modernized if a workable program of reforestation is brought about.

Roughly speaking, the forest lands of the Nation are about 600,000,000 acres. Of this number, 178,000,000 acres—about 10 percent of our total landed area—is given over to the national forests, and these national forests contain one-third of the Nation's remaining timber.

But the war has seen a progressive inroad even into this reserve. In 1939 we cut 1,290,000,000 board feet from the national forests, while in 1944 this figure had more than doubled until we cut three and one-third billion board feet from the national forests.

To put it another way: In 1938 it was estimated that we had 519,000,000,000 cubic feet of standing timber. It has also been estimated that we should have had 653,000,000,000 cubic feet to sustain the cut that occurred in 1941, but that for the long-range view if we are to maintain the national resources of this Nation's forests, the standing timber on one-third of our landed area should never be allowed to drop below 788,000,000,000 cubic feet of standing timber.

Briefly, the problem before the Nation is to develop a program that will progressively, through the years to come, restore approximately 300,000,000,000 cubic feet of standing timber. This program should include everyone who can make a contribution.

This problem and this challenge is generally recognized. Already this Congress has taken steps. In 1941 Congress appointed a Joint Committee on Forestry made up of five members of the Senate and House to study and make investigations of the present and prospective situation with respect to the forest land of the United States, its condition, ownership, and management, as it affects a balanced timber budget, watershed protection, flood control, and other commodities and social economic benefits which may be derived from such land.

It should be said, however, that our position has altered in the 3 years since this study was made. Today, perhaps we can profit by another look. During the hearings on this bill which we have before us today, individuals and delegations came to us from all parts of the Nation and were given complete hearings. Without exception they made good presentations.

Your subcommittee realizes the gravity of the present situation and feels the need for a sound and nationally comprehensive program of restoration of an asset that belongs to and concerns every individual of this great Nation.

Briefly, the Forest Service suggests a program along four broad lines:

First. They ask for a further public cooperation aid to the industry and aid to private owners. This public cooperation includes (a) research, (b) forest management and fire and pest control, and (c) greater utilization of the wood from the Nation's forests. At this point, it should be noted that for years only 20 percent to 25 percent of the standing tree was put to useful purposes. Today through research and better management, we are using up to as high as 33⅓ percent; in the hearings instances were mentioned as high as 40 percent of the standing tree. This in itself is a great saving to the Nation.

Second. The Forest Service suggests that all submarginal forest lands too poor for profitable private ownership be included in Federal reserves.

Third. They suggest the establishment of definite standards for all forest management, cutting, logging, reforestation, and other proper uses of the Nation's forest lands. This is the most troublesome of all of the problems involved in the rebuilding of our forests, since it entails the changes in financing, in taxes, and to some extent—even yet—changes in attitudes on the part of those who hold stewardship over portions of the Nation's timber. However, great progress has been made in this phase in the last 10 to 20 years. Timber owners no longer defend the "mining" of our declining forest stands. Increasingly they realize that wood is a crop.

The fourth broad phase, itself a type of research suggested by the Federal Forest Service, entails the development of methods of salvage for large burns and the slashings which are a part of every lumbering operation. In this regard, one of the most interesting experiments now being conducted by the For-

est Service is that on the Tillamook burn area in Oregon. In this burn there are estimated to be 8,000,000,000 board feet of lumber, and ways and means of avoiding this huge waste are at present being studied.

But, of course, in the broader sense, while the outline of the program may come from the Federal Forest Service, the dismal business of making both ends meet in this country must be the responsibility of you and me. Some way must be found to get the very maximum of return, in the shape of more and better timber, for every dollar appropriated.

A couple of weeks ago this House by its action raised the Federal debt to the world-record dimensions of $300,000,000,000. It is not my purpose in this discussion to argue as to just who owes whom what, but rather to quote from an editorial in the Evening Star of a week ago in which they said:

> For a national liability of $300,000,000,000, whether we owe it to ourselves or not, is bound to have a profoundly important effect on the economic future of all of us.

Debt tends to weaken credit. The credit of the Federal Government is especially important since only the Federal Government can coin money. The States cannot coin money. Therefore, the national debt affects us as individuals, our local and county governments; it will affect us in our State governments; it will affect our Federal union.

Anything that we do to weaken the financial stability of the Federal Government must necessarily affect those who depend upon a stable medium of currency with which to do business any place in the United States, and inferentially today apparently any place in the world.

And so the members of your Appropriations Committee have somewhat of a conflict of duty here. One is to assist in every way we can to develop and provide for the maximum of Federal participation in a program that will rebuild one of our greatest national assets—the forests of this Nation; and secondly, do all in our power to see that this Nation once again lives within its means, which in the long run is the only way possible for us to maintain our national stability.

There was a time when the bulk of our individuals, the bulk of our county and municipal governments, and practically every one of our State governments was deeply in debt. Today even as we raise the Federal debt limit to $300,000,000,000, this situation has changed. Just what the proportionate responsibilities are do not concern us. Today practically all individuals, all institutions, all corporations, municipalities, county governments, and State governments, are close to or completely out of debt. Many have surpluses. At this point I insert recent comments on the condition of States' finances, mostly from governors' messages to State legislatures in 1945:

RECENT COMMENTS ON THE CONDITION OF STATE FINANCES—MOSTLY FROM GOVERNORS' MESSAGES TO STATE LEGISLATURES 1945

CALIFORNIA

"During these war years, State revenues have soared to unprecedented amounts. We have frozen many millions for post-war construction to take care of a 10-year backlog of building needs and to cushion employment conditions during the period of reconversion. There will be millions left in our treasury after these sums have been set apart." (Source: Biennial message of Earl Warren, Governor of the State of California, January 8, 1945, p. 14.)

CONNECTICUT

"During these past 2 years we have followed a policy of wise and careful spending. We have lived well within our means, paid off or laid aside enough money to retire the general fund debt and accumulated a substantial surplus." (Source: Inaugural address of His Excellency Raymond E. Baldwin, Governor of the State of Connecticut, to the General Assembly, January 3, 1945, p. 11.)

DELAWARE

"The financial condition of our State Government is presently strong, with a favorable cash balance in reserve to meet contingencies which may be expected in our post-war readjustments. This strength can be maintained only by continuing to conserve and economize." (Source: Message of Hon. Walter W. Bacon, Governor of Delaware, to the One Hundred and Tenth General Assembly of the State of Delaware, January 2, 1945, p. 4.)

GEORGIA

"Two years ago, when I took office, the State owed $35,961,630.38. On January 1, 1945, the State's net indebtedness stood at $6,924,000. The floating debt that existed on January 1, 1943, has been entirely paid. * * * If we are permitted to continue our present fiscal policies, we shall be able to fulfill the pledge made 2 years ago that, when my term of office ends in January 1947, the State of Georgia not only will not owe a single dollar that is not covered by money in its treasury, but it is hoped that the State will have a comfortable reserve to assist in financing the transition from war to peace. Then Georgia, for the first time in its history, will be free of debt." (Source: Message of Gov. Ellis Arnall to the General Assembly of Georgia upon the condition of the Commonwealth and the State budget, January 9, 1945, p. 11.)

ILLINOIS

"The fact that Illinois has been able to build up a substantial reserve in the general revenue fund of the State treasury during the last two bienniums, has raised the question of whether taxes can be reduced. We all agree that State income should not permanently exceed expenditures. It is always difficult to forecast accurately our total State revenues because of the fluctuations, resulting from general business conditions, in the receipts from the retailers occupational tax, which is the source of such a large share of our general revenue.

"The best estimates are that total general revenue receipts for the next 2 years will be approximately the same as in the biennium which will end June 30 next, and now estimated at $320,000,000. Appropriations from these funds amounted to approximately $284,000,000. It is now indicated, however, that not more than $260,000,000 of these appropriations will be expended. Thus, approximately $60,000,000 will have been added during the biennium to the reserve in the general revenue fund." (Source: Inaugural address of Dwight H. Green, Governor of Illinois, January 8, 1945, p. 7.)

"By 'surplus' is meant the excess of collections over disbursements during the fiscal year. This excess in the general and reserved funds totaled $38,450,152 for the 1944 fiscal year, being 14.54 percent of the total revenue. For the preceding fiscal year the year's surplus was $30,876,580. It must be emphasized that neither surplus mentioned represents the total accumulated State surplus, the accumulated surplus, or balance available in the general revenue fund alone was $115,798,756.80 on December 31, 1944." (Source: The Illinois Taxpayer, January 1945, p. 1.)

IOWA

"A great deal has been said during the last few months about the balances in our State treasury. Fortunately the State of Iowa as a unit of government is in a sound, prosperous condition. This is the result of careful budgeting by legislatures, economical administration of funds by officials, and increased receipts in certain funds as a result of the war. This has given rise in some instances to an unwarranted feeling of great wealth. Iowa is not a wealthy State. Before the war our per capita income was neither the greatest nor the smallest. Iowa financially is a middle-class State.

"A substantial part of the funds accumulated is pledged under our constitution and laws to specific purposes. * * * Part of the surplus must be used to replace worn-out equipment which cannot now be replaced because of the war. * * *

"The surpluses now on hand, together with revenues in funds increased by the war, should be sufficient to meet all of the needs of Iowa government during the next biennium." (Source: Inaugural address of Robert D. Blue, Governor of Iowa, to the fifty-first general assembly in joint session, January 11, 1945, pp. 12–13.)

KANSAS

"Our State, generally speaking, is in excellent financial condition. For the past 2 years there has been no State levy on general property except to pay the principal and interest on soldiers' bonus bonds for World War No. 1, and the one-fourth mill levy for a building fund for institutions under the control of the board of regents. It is my hope to eliminate any general State levy during the fiscal years of 1946 and 1947.

"On December 30, 1944, there was a cash balance in the State general revenue fund of $9,592,479.88. In addition there were general fund taxes covering the year 1943 in the amount of $230,268.60. As of December 30, 1944, these taxes had not yet been drawn from the counties by the auditor of state. Thus we have available cash in the amount of $9,822,748.48. Against this balance there are appropriations available for expenditure in the amount of $7,819,555.71. We have available in the State general fund at this time a net cash balance of $2,003,192.77, even if all appropriation commitments were liquidated.

"This net cash balance will be augmented during the next 6 months by such collections as income tax, and which, I am reliably informed, will total slightly in excess of $7,000,000." (Source: Message of Gov. Andrew F. Schoeppel to the Kansas Legislature, January 10, 1945, p. 4.)

MAINE

"When the laws passed by this legislature take effect, there will be a substantial surplus in the State treasury. In the eyes of many groups of people this surplus represents the solution of their particular problem. No matter how large this surplus may turn out to be it cannot solve all these problems and this legislature, through appropriation measures, will judge which problems it will attempt to solve by recourse to this surplus. Meanwhile I suggest that we all bear in mind how this surplus came about.

"State revenues increased 12.2 percent in 1942 over 1941 and have since continued to climb. The per-capita income of individuals in Maine went from $600 in 1941 to over $1,000 in 1943. This was a 68 percent increase and the highest increase in per-capita income of any New England State. At the same time there was a corresponding drop in our relief loads. Thus you can see how this surplus came into existence. It is not a normal operating surplus at all. It is the result of a war-inflated economy on the one

hand and abnormally restricted government functions on the other hand. The same situation exists in all State governments." (Source: Inaugural address of Horace Hildreth, Governor of Maine, to the Ninety-second Legislature, January 4, 1945, pp. 4–5.)

MICHIGAN

"The sixty-second regular session of the legislature created a post-war reserve fund for the purpose of liquidating Michigan's obligations after the termination of the war, to its returning servicemen, their widows and dependents, and any other post-war obligation of Michigan.

"The latest transfer to this post-war reserve fund was made on December 19, 1944, bringing the amount up to the statutory limit of $50,000,000 The funds in this reserve are, or will be, invested in short-term United States Government securities, and the earnings thereon when received will be added to the balance in the fund. * * *

"The State is entirely out of debt. On November 15, 1944, there was retired $2,433,000 in highway improvement bonds which was part of fifty million issued between 1921 and 1925.

"For the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, it is estimated that revenues will amount to approximately $158,000,000 as against appropriations of $138,000,000. This latter figure includes the $132,800,000 actually appropriated by the legislature from current revenues plus $2,500,000 for school aid, which was appropriated from the previous year's surplus, and approximately $3,000,000 in carry-over balances this year, most of which were in the welfare items for old-age assistance and aid to dependent children. There will be unexpended balances as of June 30, 1945, and the best estimates now point toward a surplus of approximately $25,000,000." (Source: Message of Harry F. Kelly, Governor of Michigan, the sixty-third Michigan Legislature, January 4, 1945, p. 10.)

MARYLAND

"It is highly gratifying to report to you that as a result of the combined efforts and cooperation of the general assembly and the State's fiscal officers with this administration, the State's financial condition was never more sound than at present. Maryland's credit today ranks with the highest among the States of the country. * * *

"Total expenditures have been less than the amount appropriated, and total revenues received have exceeded all reasonable expectations, with the result that on June 30, 1944, we had a general-fund surplus of $8,961,000, and it has been estimated that at the close of the present fiscal year we will have on hand a general-fund surplus of $9,272,531." (Source: Address of Gov. Herbert D. O'Conor to the General Assembly of Maryland, January 3, 1945, pp. 8–9.)

MINNESOTA

"Our State debt has been reduced $11,048,106 in the last 12 months. This is a reduction of fully $50,493,266 since January 1939.

"I am glad to report that at the opening of the present fiscal year on July 1 we had a free balance of $3,100,000 in the general revenue fund, $15,700,000 in the trunk-highway fund, and $21,700,000 in the income-tax school fund, This makes a total of almost $41,000,000 in these major funds. By the end of the present year on June 30, the general revenue fund should have a free balance of $5,500,000; the income-tax school fund fully $25,000,000, and the trunk-highway fund probably around $18,000,000. We thus should be able to enter the post-war period with some good reserves to help meet the demands that may be expected." (Source: Inaugural message of Gov. Edward J. Thye to the Legislature of Minnesota, January 3, 1945, p. 5.)

MISSOURI

"It is estimated that a surplus of approximately $18,000,000 will remain in the general revenue fund after all current obligations of the past biennium have been paid. I recommend that this surplus and any accumulated surplus as the result of economical spending be safeguarded as a backlog for post-war projects and post-war employment. Since the war and business incident thereto have been responsible for this surplus, it would seem not only the part of good business but a moral obligation that it be set aside to take care of some of the damage this war will inflict on Missouri. It is going to require hard-headed resistance to pressure groups by both the general assembly and the Governor in order that this surplus be judiciously spent, and I earnestly recommend to you that you regard this surplus as a sacred fund." (Source: Inaugural address of Gov. Phil M. Donnelly to the Sixty-third General Assembly of Missouri, January 8, 1945, p. 4.)

MONTANA

"The State government is in the best financial condition in its history. Our general fund balance is around $5,000,000. The University millage fund has a balance of about $1,000,000. We are well ahead on all our bond principal and interest requirements. Our surpluses are more or less typical of the States generally at this time.

"We should, however, keep in mind that these are not normal times. We cannot safely assume that the State government's income will remain at the current figure, nor can local units of government safely assume that their financial condition will continue as prosperous as it is now." (Source: Message of Gov. Sam C. Ford to the Twenty-ninth Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana, 1945, p. 13.)

NEVADA

"The records of the State treasurer show the cash balance of State funds in the State treasury as of December 31, 1944, to be $3,447,955.34. There is no outstanding bonded indebtedness.

"On June 30, 1944, the bank value of bonds owned by the State was $4,713,620. On December 31, 1944, the bank value of bonds owned by the State was $5,564,915.37. Income from interest on bonds from July 1, 1942, to June 30, 1944, was $226,596.14. On December 31, 1944, the sum of $31,927.60 was available for investment." (Source: Message of Gov. E. P. Carville to the Nevada Legislature of 1945, p. 7.)

NEW YORK

"The financial position of the State continues to be most fortunate. To avoid the slightest interference with the national war effort in the use of manpower and materials the State has deferred many normal purchases, repairs, replacements, and new undertakings. At the same time revenues have continued at a high rate, while the careful management of State funds has been intensively maintained. As a result, I am happy to advise you that our surplus this year will approximate $150,000,000.

"Last year, upon my recommendation, your honorable bodies created the post-war reconstruction fund. The purpose of this fund was to husband the war time savings of the State in order that they might be available at the proper time to meet the State's deferred reconstruction needs and to aid in the stimulation of job opportunities after the war for the men returning from our armed forces and for our war workers.

"This fund now amounts to more than $160,000,000. I recommend that this year's surplus be transferred to the reconstruction fund, thereby increasing that fund to approximately $310,000,000." (Source: Message of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey to the legislature, January 3, 1945, p. 4.)

OHIO

"Our aim should be to operate the Government in the ensuing 2 years out of the current revenues and to leave untouched, except for the moneys that can be used for new capital investments, the $92,000,000 unexpended at the end of 1944.

"This surplus should be used for emergency purposes and capital investments only. We must not forget that many things that should have been but were not done during the war will require finances for performance after the war." (Source: Address of Gov. Frank J. Lausche before the ninety-sixth general assembly on January 15, 1945, pp. 1–2.)

OKLAHOMA

"The income to the general revenue fund from the present tax structure, according to the estimate heretofore made by the State Equalization Board, is approximately $11,000,000 (aside from the amount required for debt service, which will no longer be required) in excess of the amount appropriated from the general revenue fund for the current fiscal year." (Source: Message of Gov. Robert S. Kerr, January 2, 1945, pp. 2–3)

OREGON

"I am happy and proud to report that the State of Oregon is in the best financial position in which it has been in a long, long number of years. * * *

"The total bonded indebtedness from original issues of over $87,000,000 has been reduced to around $20,000,000. * * *

"The State has invested in War bonds, notes, certificates, and Treasury bills a total of $37,000,000." (Source: Legislative message of Earl Snell, Governor of Oregon, to the forty-third biennial legislative assembly, January 8, 1945, pp. 2–3.)

PENNSYLVANIA

"Budget—It shows a surplus of $110,735,000 in the general fund and estimated revenue of $369,000,000." (Source: Message to the General Assembly of Pennsylvania by Maj. Gen. Edward Martin, Governor of Pennsylvania, January 2, 1945, p. 5.)

SOUTH CAROLINA

"Our financial condition is one of prosperity unequaled in the history of our State * * *. Even though a big surplus is in our State treasury, we are living in abnormal times. Our income tax has increased over 350 percent, but at the close of the war, this will necessarily fall off: We must, in our legislative program, keep before us the post-war days when our income will not be near as great as it is today." (Source: Annual message of Ransome J. Williams, Governor, to the General Assembly of South Carolina, January 10, 1945, p. 3.)

SOUTH DAKOTA

"In general, it may be stated conservatively that South Dakota's financial condition today is good." (Source: Message of Gov. M. Q. Sharpe, to the Legislature of South Dakota, at commencement of the twenty-ninth regular session, 1945, p. 14.)

TEXAS

"This program will require approximately $86,250,000 in State highway funds to match the Federal grants. We have made a careful study of our financial position and find that with our $30,000,000 nest egg we will be able to start this program promptly at the expiration of the emergency, and over a 3-year period with a normal return from our gasoline tax and license fee revenues, we should be able to raise the remaining $56,250,000 in the 3-year period, although it will be necessary that we hold pure State fund construction to the minimum. A careful analysis indicates that if this is done we should execute our 3-year program with funds that will be available to us, leaving a balance at the end of the third year of only $400,000, which is a rather close margin on which we must attempt to operate but we feel that by careful administration this can be accomplished." (Source: Message of Gov. Coke

R. Stevenson, to the members of the forty-ninth legislature, 1945, p. 3–4.)

VERMONT

"The State's finances are in excellent condition.

"According to the present program of debt reduction our bonded debt at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, will have been reduced to $393,000, excluding the perpetual debt which consists of certificates of indebtedness, held by the permanent school fund, and the agricultural college bonds, which total $568,031.90.

"On July 1, 1944, the unappropriated surplus in the treasury was $1,006,626.44 and this will probably be increased by the end of the present fiscal year, June 30, 1945." (Source: Inaugural message of Mortimer R. Proctor, Governor of the State of Vermont, to the general assembly, January 4, 1945, p. 24.)

WASHINGTON

"Our own State has a surplus of more than $60,000,000. We must conserve this surplus and use it wisely." (Source: Inaugural message of Mon C. Wallgren, Governor of Washington, to the twenty-nin'h legislature, January 10, 1945, p. 10.)

WEST VIRGINIA

"Every citizen is proud of the financial stability of our State. Such can be matched by only a few and exceeded by none of the States of the Union. Since 1933 West Virginia has steadily climbed to its present high position of sound fiscal policy and management." (Source: Inaugural address by Clarence W. Meadows, Governor, January 15, 1945, p. 4.)

WISCONSIN

"The State is in an enviable position financially. The prosperity which has come to it, largely because of war activities and enterprises during the last 4 years, places it in the best financial status in its history." (Source: Governor Goodland's message to the 1945 legislature, January 6, 1945, p. 5.)

WYOMING

"The financial condition of your State is excellent, and, likewise, the financial condition of political subdivisions has improved. State bonded indebtedness stands at $3,464,000, slightly over two and one-half million of which are outstanding highway bonds which the attorney general rules cannot be paid until due date. Your State treasurer is charged in all the various funds with approximately $41,000,000, three and one-quarter million of which is in the general fund." (Source: Legislative message of Gov. Lester C. Hunt to the Twenty-eigth session, Wyoming Legislature, January 11, 1945, p. 8.)

I am sorry that this is not complete, but it is of sufficient breadth to give us some appreciation of the fiscal status of our States. It seems apparent to me that if we are to rebuild our forests that we must utilize every facility which experience and the fortunes of the times make available to us. I say that with no feeling whatever that the Federal Government can withdraw from its position of dominance in this program. I merely say that the program needed is so important that every factor should be considered.

Let me repeat. I have the feeling that the Federal responsibility in this matter of rebuilding our forests cannot be dodged. I have a suspicion that if we set up an adequate program that will achieve those things which are broadly recognized as necessary to restore and preserve this great national asset, we may have to consider even an increase in Federal expenditures. However, I do feel that some consideration to what is being done by the individuals in the industry, the States, and our schools of forestry and silviculture could be profitably reviewed by us at this time.

We should explore them fully. Those which have promise should be recognized and fitted into a national program. I believe that every step should be taken to coordinate and to achieve not only full public cooperation in this business of rebuilding our forests by giving aid to industry and private ownership. I believe that every step should be taken to make the fullest possible advantage of the work being done in State institutions and in private industry. Even if we do this the Federal participation must remain dominant.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, under consent received in the House, I include a list of forest schools known to have conducted research in forest management:

FOREST SCHOOLS KNOWN TO HAVE CONDUCTED RESEARCH IN FOREST MANAGEMENT

Pennsylvania State College, Duke University, University of California, Iowa State College, Purdue University, University of Idaho, Utah State Agricultural College, Michigan State College, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, Cornell University, Harvard University, New York State College, University of New Hampshire, University of Vermont, Yale University, University of Montana, Oregon State College, University of Wyoming, Louisiana State University, University of Georgia, Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Mississippi State College, University of Arkansas, University of Florida.

Most of the research done by forest schools is an adjunct of teaching. Research in forest management by its very nature is a long-time process. Few of the schools are equipped with personnel adequate to follow through on such long-time experimentation. On the other hand, the field of forest management is broad enough to include a variety of studies in different forest types, varieties of climate, soils, and tree species. Simple but well planned cultural operations if painstakingly done, followed even with student assistants for a long period of years, may produce valuable results. Actually most of the research underway is largely of an empirical character including planting, thinning, pruning, weeding, and improvement cuttings. Well-planned long-time projects are exceptions. Sound basic research in forest management cannot be made a part-time job.

STATES, OTHER THAN UNIVERSITIES, KNOWN TO HAVE CONDUCTED RESEARCH IN FOREST MANAGEMENT

New Jersey Department of Conservation, Ohio Agricultural Experiment Station, Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station, Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station, Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, Connecticut State Forest and Park Commission, New Hampshire Forestry and Recreation Department, New York State Conservation Department, Florida Forest Service.

PRIVATE OWNERS KNOWN TO HAVE CONDUCTED RESEARCH IN FOREST MANAGEMENT

Great Northern Paper Co.

However this list is obviously incomplete, for many firms and owners are doing some work in this direction today.

Another phase dealing with this business of rebuilding our forests is that connected with experimental forests. Many members of the subcommittee feel that every one of the 32 forest States should have from 1 to 4 experimental forests. Just how extensive these individual forests should be in area and just what the element of State and Federal responsibility should be in such a 32-State program, should be clearly defined.

Personally, I feel that this phase of the business of rebuilding our forests should be fully explored and at this point, Mr. Chairman, I include a list of States known to have experimental forests and also a list of States known to have operated State forest nurseries.

EXPERIMENTAL FORESTS

As indicated by the research conducted by forest schools, the experimental forests are used as tools or as demonstration and practice areas in connection with teaching. The main objective is teaching. These forests vary in size from minor plantations and wood lots to larger demonstration and practice forests in which students are given the opportunity to become acquainted with actual forest conditions.

STATES KNOWN TO HAVE EXPERIMENTAL FORESTS USUALLY AVAILABLE TO FORESTRY SCHOOLS ESPECIALLY FOR TEACHING BUT FOR SOME RESEARCH

New Jersey, Ohio, Michigan, Wisconsin, Connecticut, New Hampshire, New York, Florida, Texas, Pennsylvania, California, Iowa, Indiana, Idaho, Utah, Minnesota, Vermont, Montana, Oregon, Wyoming, Louisiana, Georgia, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Alabama.

STATES KNOWN TO HAVE OPERATED STATE FOREST NURSERIES

Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

Now we come to the field of research. This is one of the most encouraging phases of the conservation of our national forests. If you will turn to the record, you will find on pages 710 through 714 the story of the conquest of wood waste beginning with 1915 to date. Much headway has been made. Much yet remains to be done. In addition to using more of the wood of the standing tree, in addition to finding new uses for what used to be scrap lumber or the wasteful byproducts of logging and milling, in addition to conducting research to overcome the two ancient enemies of wood—rot and fire—research

has also been successful in speeding up the growth of trees, and, in addition, the same experiments have enabled researchers to produce clearer lumber.

But the over-all and outstanding work of research has been in the utilization of a higher percentage of the wood in the standing tree.

When one saw a tree in the forest 30 years ago he would have seen one of nature's products from which only some 20 percent was put to useful purpose. Today, in many operations, this same tree would yield up to 33 percent, in specific instances, perhaps even as high as 40 percent. Much work is being done in this regard, and because of the very nature of this work much of it must be done by Federal laboratories.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to include a list of the States, schools, associations, and firms doing research in forest products.

I would like to call attention to the comments included with this insertion, for they will serve to bring out, I believe, the difference between individual and even State interests in the whole field of research.

This, I believe, has been particularly true in the military work which the Madison Laboratory has so ably contributed to the war effort during the last several years.

While this might have come from private and local laboratories, the facilities are readily available to the Federal needs and have responded with great credit to our national wood-products laboratory at Madison, Wis.

STATES, SCHOOLS, ASSOCIATIONS, AND FIRMS DOING RESEARCH IN FOREST PRODUCTS

It must be borne in mind that of the attached lists some do relatively little work in this field. The amount of money spent by the schools, for example, varies widely—some may have but one research worker engaged only part time on forest products research to fill in between teaching. Other schools may have two or three workers engaged full time.

Industrial research is mostly confined to lowering costs of the products manufactured or improving them and what work is done on new products generally starts where the Forest Products Laboratory leaves off. The break-down of industrial research, speaking of American industry as a whole, according to Barron's Financial Weekly, is about as follows:

Thirty-one percent reducing production costs.

Thirty-four percent improving the quality of the product manufactured.

Twenty percent developing new fields of application for the product normally manufactured.

Fifteen percent developing new products.

It will be observed that on the whole industrial research only spends about 15 percent of its total research money to develop new products out of the raw material they customarily work with.

Speaking specifically of State institutions, it will not, as a general rule, be profitable for small State laboratories or school laboratories to go deeply into basic forest products research. There may be exceptions to this where members of the staff are especially suited by experience and personal interest and have the physical and financial facilities and freedom for such work. In contrast, problems at the Forest Products Laboratory have been approached by groups of workers each with his own specialized training in the solution of problems requiring very professional skills. In most cases the full time of the available staff at State or endowed institutions will be needed to meet the pressure for quick results of a so-called practical nature.

On the other hand, comprehensive research is necessary at the Forest Products Laboratory on a large scale to establish the facts about the fundamental properties and reactions of wood and wood products to provide a stable foundation for applied research and development. State forest products research should assist on this where possible but will generally have to depend upon the basic work done elsewhere. Their programs will generally be developed on the basis of experience and contact with local needs and the appreciation of local industries for the services rendered.

There are no figures available as to number of workers or sums provided for research by State institutions and private concerns listed.

STATE FOREST PRODUCTS LABORATORIES

Division of Forest Products Research, Texas Forest Service, Lufkin, Tex.

Forest Products Laboratory, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

Forest Products Laboratory, Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oreg.

Forest Products Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.—proposed.

UNIVERSITIES, COLLEGES, AND EXPERIMENT STATIONS KNOWN TO HAVE CONDUCTED RESEARCH IN FOREST PRODUCTS

Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg, Va.

Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Ark.

New York State College of Forestry, Syracuse, N. Y.

Purdue University, LaFayette, Ind.

Yale University, School of Forestry, New Haven, Conn.

University of Michigan, Forest School, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Duke University, Durham, N. C.

University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

University of Maine, Orono, Maine.

Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich.

George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky.

Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa.

Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif.

Clemson Agricultural College, Clemson College, S. C.

Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.

Alabama Polytechnic Institute, Auburn, Ala.

Rhode Island College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, Kingston, R. I.

University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.

Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

North Carolina State College, Raleigh, N. C.

University of New Hampshire, Durham, N. H.

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.

Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pa.

Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa.

University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.

Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station, New Haven, Conn.

FOREST PRODUCTS PRODUCING INDUSTRIES AND BUSINESS FIRMS KNOWN TO HAVE CONDUCTED RESEARCH IN FOREST PRODUCTS

American Cellulose Co.; Blandin Paper Co.; Brown Co.; Weyerhaeuser Sales Co.; Brunswick Pulp & Paper Co.; Bryant Paper Co.; Champion Paper & Fiber Co.; Combined Locks Paper Co.; Crown Zellerbach Corporation; Crystal Tissue Co.; J. Neils Lumber Co.; Detroit Sulphite Pulp & Paper Co.; Eureka Fibre Co.; Hammermill Paper Co.; Diamond Match Co.; Fitchburg Paper Co.; Weyerhaeuser Timber Co.; Minnesota and Ontario Paper Co.; Flambeau Paper Co.; Fraser Paper, Ltd.; Gardner-Richardson Co.; Gaylord Container Corporation; Great Northern Paper Co.; Hammond Redwood Co.; Hawley Pulp & Paper Co.; Hinde & Dauch Paper Co.; Hoberg Paper Mills, Inc.; Hollingsworth & Vose Co.; Industrial Rayon Corporation; International Paper Co.; Kimberly-Clark Corporation; John A. Manning Paper Co., Inc.; Marathon Paper Mills Co.; Masonite Corporation; Brooks-Scanlon Corporation; Mohawk Paper Mills, Inc.; Mosinee Paper Mills Co.; Neenah Paper Co.; Nekoosa-Edwards Paper Co.; Northern Paper Mills; Northwest Paper Co.; Oxford Paper Co.; Port Huron Sulphite & Paper Co.; J. & J. Rogers Co.; Rogers Paper Manufacturing Co.; Scott Paper Co.; Soundview Pulp Co.; Southern Kraft Corporation, York Haven Division; Stimson Lumber Co.; Strathmore Paper Co.; Tennesse Eastman Corporation; Tomahawk Kraft Paper Co.; Union Bag & Paper Corporation; Union Mills Paper Manufacturing Co.; Whiting Paper Co.; Whiting-Plover Paper Co.; Woonsocket Rayon Co.; Burgess Cellulose Co.; American Viscose Corporation; Wood Conversion Co.; Burton Swartz; Red River Lumber Co.; May Bros.; Wood-Mosaic Co., Inc.; W. M. Ritter Lumber Co.; Crossett Lumber Co.; Gamble Bros., Inc.; The Mengel Co.; Bradley Lumber Co. of Arkansas; Hillyer-Deutsch-Edwards, Inc.; E. L. Bruce Co.; Chicago Mill & Lumber Co.; Frost Lumber Industries; Hardwood Lumber Co. of Louisiana, Inc.; Holly Hill Lumber Co.; George D. Emery Co.; C. H. Pearson & Son Hardwood Co., Inc.; Ichabod T. Williams & Sons; Pacific Lumber Co.; Green Lumber Co.; Wisconsin Land & Lumber Co.; Anchor Lumber Co.; Pardee & Curtin Lumber Co.; Bringardner Lumber Co.; Griffith Lumber Co., Inc.; Roddis Lumber & Veneer Co.; Louisiana Central Lumber Co.; Temple Lumber Co.; Crosby Lumber & Manufacturing Co.; Fordyce-Crossett Sales Co.; Con-

solidated Water Power & Paper Co.; Riegel Paper Co.; McPherson Lumber Co.; Pope & Talbot, Inc., Oregon; Tyee Lumber & Manufacturing Co.; Twin Harbors Lumber Co.; Wauna Lumber Co.; West Coast Wood Preserving Co.; Westfir Lumber Co.; White River Lumber Co.; Snellstrom Lumber Co.; Atlanta Oak Flooring Co.; Bristol Door & Lumber Co.; Meadow River Lumber Co.; Morgan Manufacturing Co.; Jerome H. Sheip Co.; Pekin Wood Products Co.; Poinsett Lumber & Manufacturing Co.; Temple Lumber Co.; Denkmann Lumber Co.; DeSoto Hardwood Flooring Co.; Delphos Bending Co.; Hillerich & Bradsby Co.; Kahler Co.; Anderson-Tully Co.; Chickasaw Wood Products Co.; American Fork & Hoe Co.; Nickey Bros., Inc.; C. F. Works & Sons; National Casket Co., Inc.; Fisher Body, General Motors Corporation; Pope & Talbot, Inc., California.

FOREST PRODUCTS CONSUMING OR PROCESSING INDUSTRIES AND BUSINESS FIRMS KNOWN TO HAVE CONDUCTED RESEARCH IN FOREST PRODUCTS

Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Cos.; Bakelite Corporation; Resinous Products & Chemical Co., Inc.; Casein Co. of America; Catalin Corporation of America; I. F. Laucks, Inc.; E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc.; Dow Chemical Co.; Timm Aircraft Corporation; Plaskon Glue Co.; Perkins Glue Co.; Engineering Research Corporation; Ault & Wiborg Corporation; Boston Manufacturers Mutual Fire Insurance Co. of Boston; Riverbank Laboratories; Elmendorf Corporation; General Finishes, Inc.; Industrial Laboratories, Inc.; Oshkosh Industrial Laboratory; Reilly Tar & Chemical Corporation; Sealright Co., Inc.; Southwestern Laboratories; Valcan Corporation; Western Cartridge Co.; Western Union Telegraph Co.; Netherlands Indies Laboratory; Sutherland Refinery Corporation; General Electric X-Ray Corporation; Arthur D. Little, Inc.; Timber Engineering Co.; Aircraft Veneer Committee; Wood Preserving Corporation; Protexol Corporation; Vidal Research Corporation; Girdler Corporation; Northwest Syndicate, Inc.; Structural Specialties, Inc.; American Lumber & Treating Co.; Curtis Cos. Inc.; International Creosoting & Construction Co.; Southern Wood Preserving Co.; American Wood Sugar Co.; Central States Aircraft Veneer Committee; Taylor-Colquitt Co.; American Box Board Co.; American Dyewood Co.; American Gum Importers Association, Inc.; American Seating Co.; Bartlett Tree Export Co., F. A.; Becker, Moore & Co., Inc.; Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc.; Berry Bros., Inc.; Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co.; Congoleum-Nairn, Inc.; Albert L. Clapp Laboratories; Container Testing Laboratories, Inc.; Crocker-McElwain Co.; Cliffs Dow Chemical Co.; Dietzgen Co., Eugene; Armstrong Cork Co.; Thred-Dit; Fibre Conduit Co.; Forest Products Chemical Co.; Formica Insulation Co.; Robert Gair Co., Inc.; Marvil Package Co.; General Box Co.; Glidden Co.; Columbia Naval Stores Co.; Globe-Wernicke Co.; Grand Rapids Wood Finishing Co.; Haskelite Manufacturing Corporation; Hercules Powder Co.; Herty Foundation Laboratory; Homasote Co.; Hutchinson & Son, Inc., W. H.; American Cyanamid & Chemical Corporation; Joseph E. Seagram Co.; Western Electric Co.; James Gibbons Co.; Johns-Manville Corporation; S. Karpen & Bros.; Kobbe Laboratories, Inc.; Harold A. Levey; J. P. Lewis & Co.; Lord & Burnham Co.; Mead Corporation; Motor Wheel Corporation; National Folding Box Co.; New England Box Co.; North American Aviation, Inc.; North American Rayon Corporation; Thomas Keery Co., Inc.; Package Research Laboratory; Rafton Laboratories, Inc.; Scoville Manufacturing Co.; Miner Laboratories; Singer Manufacturing Co.; Pennsylvania Railroad Co.; A. G. Spalding & Bros., Inc.; Standard Tank & Seat Co.; Stanley Works; Upson Co.; Gebhart Laboratory; Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corporation; Anderson Corporation; Unit Structures, Inc.; Klomparens Lock Joint Manufacturing Co.; E. R. Reed & Co.; Armco Drainage Products Association; United States Plywood Corporation; Van Stee Corporation; Heywood Wakefield Co.; Beachley-Reichard Furniture Co., Inc.; Wellswood Spring Co.; Shearman Bros.; Parlor Furniture Co.; Strand Ski Co.; Seng. Co.; Northwood Chemical Co.; Jennison Wright Co.; Certified Builders, Inc.; Carbozite Corporation; Southern Ry Co.; Osmose Wood Preserving Co.; United States Stoneware Co.; Parkwood Corporation; Koppers Co.; Atlas Mineral Products Co.; Moore Dry Kiln Co.; S. Di Giorgio; Franklin Glue Co.; Plymold Corporation; A. D. Chapman & Co., Inc.; Monsanto Chemical Co.; W. & J. Sloane Co.; Inner-Ease Co.; Holgate Bros. Co.; Timber Structures, Inc.; Weaver Piano Co., Inc.; R. C. A. Laboratory; Simpson's Walker Woods, Inc.; Pluswood, Inc.; Louis de Ladurantaye; American Pipe & Construction Co.; Pullman Standard Car Manufacturing Co.; Sensenich Bros.; Higgins Industries; Henry J. Kaiser Co.; F. W. Megow; Nissen Wagon Co., Inc.; Harry R. Powell; Lignum-Vitae Products Corporation; G. B. Lewis Co., Inc.; Covered Wagon Co.; Taylor Lowenstein & Co.; Fluor Corporation; Marley Co.; Lilie-Hoffman Cooling Towers, Inc.; Foster Wheeler Corporation; C. H. Wheeler Manufacturing Co.; Hauser-Stander Tank Co.

TRADE ASSOCIATIONS KNOWN TO HAVE CONDUCTED RESEARCH IN FOREST PRODUCTS

National Lumber Manufacturers Association; American Society for Testing Materials; American Society of Heating and Ventilating Engineers; National Board of Fire Underwriters; Institute of Paper Chemistry; Highway Research Board; Mellon Institute; American Society of Civil Engineers; Seismological Society of America; Pacific Boast Building Officials Conference; American Society of Agricultural Engineers; American Chemical Society; Institute of Aeronautical Sciences; John B. Pierce Foundation; American Institute of Architects; American Institute of Chemical Engineers; American Institute of Chemists; American Institute of Electrical Engineers; American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers; American Institute of Science; American Society of Arborists; Battelle Memorial Institute; Charles Lathrop Pack Forestry Foundation; Boyce Thompson Institute for Plant Research; Carnegie Institution of Washington; Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania; New England Botanical Club, Inc.; Society of American Foresters; Torrey Botanical Club; American Institute of Electrical Engineers; U. S. Testing Co., Inc.; New York Botanical Garden; Field Museum; Los Angeles Testing Laboratory; Chicago School of Design; American Joint Committee on Horticultural Nomenclature.

I trust that all those interested in our national forests will study this material when it appears in the RECORD tomorrow. In no sense am I trying to have the Federal Government avoid its full responsibility in leading this Nation to a safe position with regard to our national forests. My whole intent in placing this material before the Committee of the Whole House is to point out, first, the gravity of the situation of our forests today; second, the need for getting a complete program started at the earliest opportunity; and, third, the necessity for enlisting in this effort all those who have some contribution to make in this direction, every individual, every firm, every local and State facility, and, of course, the Federal Forest Service. Many of us hope that technological advance and the use of airplanes in the expensive business of fighting forest fires in the future will enable us to use for research and reforesting funds now expended for preventive measures.

Since our national forests cover portions of 32 of our States, and since one-third of our total landed area is best suited to the production of trees, it must be apparent to all of us that in addition to the great work in soil conservation that is going on at this time, we must give adequate and intelligent attention to the development of a program that will restore our national forests. This done, this Nation of ours will not need to want for anything that Nature can grow through all of the centuries to come.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to follow the distinguished gentleman from Washington who has just left the well of the House. Evidently he has found his place, to fit into this great body. He speaks the voice and the convictions of a true conservationist. I am sure he is going to add a great deal to the prestige of the committee, in calling to the attention of the country the necessity of preserving the soil and forests of our country. I might say I am thoroughly in accord with the provisions of this bill, although many of us thought that we made a pretty good record for appropriations which we considered were necessary for the Forest Service. Yet, I might say we are grateful that some consideration was given to our efforts before the committee. At this point I should like to call to the attention of the Members who are interested

in veterans' legislation the great necessity of having an overhauling of all the lending agencies under the Farm Credit Administration. Our Committee on Agriculture will probably report a bill which provides that the veteran will pay 4 percent interest for Federal farm loans. He will probably pay 4 percent interest for farm Land Bank Commissioner loans; under the provisions of this appropriation bill he will pay 3 percent on a farm tenancy loan; another rate of interest for a production credit association loan; and other rates of interest for farm security loans.

I might say in this connection that our Committee on Agriculture is making a study of this whole program with a view of building up a sound system of credit for the farmers of this country.

I especially want to call attention to a paragraph in the committee report on page 13. It has to do with grazing fees on national-forest lands. I want to quote the last paragraph, after the committee had discussed appropriations for the Forest Service:

> One of the matters falling within the province of the work under this appropriation is the regulation of grazing on national-forest ranges and the fixing of grazing fees therefor. The committee, from evidence presented, was impressed with the need for revising grazing fees upward in view of the increased value to stock raisers of the grazing privilege. Such an upward revision would be more in keeping with the present price levels of livestock and livestock products.

Of course, the committee is restating a position that I think is sound and is the present practice of the Forest Service in fixing grazing fees, in that they are raised and kept in line with the price of livestock. I did not want the record to be incomplete and leave the thought that it is in order to raise the grazing fees. It is true, on the surface, it looks as if the livestock prices are reasonably high. I shall insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a study made by the Tariff Commission, at my direction as chairman of a Subcommittee on Agriculture.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GRANGER. This report, prepared by the Tariff Commission, will actually show that, rather than a profit being made in the operation of the sheep industry, there has actually been a loss of somewhere in the neighborhood of $1.22 per head during the year 1944. So if that yardstick were used this time, rather than increasing grazing fees, it would mean there should be a reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Utah has again expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, in this bill today we are appropriating something over $800,000,000 for the advancement of agriculture, and to increase agricultural products.

I was interested in listening to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. He gave a wonderful, voluminous lot of statistics showing just how much meat every one of us was to get. Everything was prepared, the farmer was told how much to produce, and he overproduced; the O. P. A. set the price; the meat is supposed to be in the butcher's box. About the only thing that did not click in the program and something that we are up against now, is that they have not been able to connect the purchaser with the meat. The purchaser cannot catch up with the meat unless he sneaks into the black market at inflation prices. There is an abundance of New Deal statistical meat being furnished the people, but real meat is hard for the housewife or the restaurant owner to obtain. There should be more real meat and fewer statistics. The people cannot eat ration stamps.

Canada seems to be thriving. People are going across to Canada from the United States in droves to buy meat. Food is not rationed in Canada. It is plentiful. Through lend-lease or otherwise Canada has been furnished some 4,000 or more plows, and something like 39,000 plows have been exported through lend-lease, and also some 20,000 tractors. I should like to know when I am going to get my plow. I have been trying to operate a pretty big farm and have been on the list for over a year but I have not yet got it. At the same time, however, we can export 4,000 plows a year to Canada. There is something wrong with the distribution of this meat supply to the country. There is no question but that the farmers produced it. While the farmer has been cut short on agricultural implements, instead of working 8 hours a day he has doubled his day; if he needed 2 tractors but had only 1, he operated the one 16 hours rather than 8 hours. Yes, the farmer has been fairly prosperous during the past 2 years. I do not believe it has all been because of New Deal planning; it has been because of Government buying to support the military effort. Unfortunately, the prosperity that has been brought to the farmers through his own efforts, for which we give him credit, is based fundamentally upon the maiming and killing of men in the military service—American soldiers all over the world. Yes, the farmer has been fairly prosperous. He has done a remarkable job because he has not been afraid to work day and night to produce the food for victory and in order to feed the civilian people of the country and incidentally make a few dimes to put down in his jeans or to credit to his bank account which has not been any too fat during the past number of years.

I think after we pass this bill for something like $800,000,000 in order to encourage agriculture the committee of the House should go over to the O. P. A., that is helping to wreck agriculture in this country, call upon Chester Bowles, Marvin Jones, and others to cooperate with the Congress in order to carry out the law as written by the Congress. Then we would do agriculture and the people of the Nation a real service. The foolish, unsound policies they are forcing on meat processors and stock raisers is wrecking the meat supply of this country.

We who have not had the opportunity of meeting some of these gentlemen who formerly served in the House listen with considerable awe to the great compliments that are paid these leaders in Government today. I have heard and you have heard on the floor of this House the virtues of the great Jesse Jones extolled day after day, we have heard the Commander in Chief extolled from one day to the other, and now for a steady diet we hear the great Marvin Jones, head of the War Food Administration, extolled day after day. It seems to me it is almost a fetish building certain individuals up in the minds of the general public and following the idea of personal government. We have had too much personal government. I would like to see the Congress extolled for having the courage to go to the O. P. A. and the War Food Administration and stop them from wrecking the farmers' livestock market in this country.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] pays great tribute to the farmers and to the administration. I happened to sit last night with some of the leading businessmen in the packing business of the State of Missouri and if ever I listened to men who know something about meat production and the processing of meat it was the gentlemen that I listened to last night. They told us that they were losing 85 cents on every hog killed since last August, that they had been losing on every beef killed for over a year and being purchased by the Federal Government. They said that the slaughtering of hogs on the market today is from 28 to 58 percent in decline from the same time last year. They claim that the market for these farmers whose virtues we seek to extol is going to ultimately vanish, that they cannot indefinitely keep this market open to them and continue to process meat at a loss. They have the figures to prove a constant loss to the packers and have furnished these figures to the O. P. A. They spent 48,000 man-hours getting the figures. They say that unless something is done to correct this situation the farmer will lose his market because the packers will be forced out of business.

The O. P. A. and those who are managing agriculture and regimenting agriculture in this country have forced more men into the bootlegging of meat than was ever known in a given area in the United States or probably in the world. It is far worse than the old bootleg days of the eighteenth amendment. There is more meat processed through the local slaughterers and through the black market than there is federally inspected meat that is processed through the big legitimate markets. Look at the tremendous loss. Twenty-two thousand little slaughterers have been licensed in the past year.

The merchant has the restaurant man, the hotel operator at his mercy. He can favor them with meat or he can withhold a part of it and break them. He can, and I am told does, in many instances demand tribute from them. In turn the merchant who is cheating is shook down for graft by some Federal inspectors. Businessmen are corrupted, morale is lowered, the black market flourishes, and the honest legitimate meat packers are being penalized and driven out of business. Bad policies enforced by the O. P.

A. are largely responsible for this vicious cycle that gains momentum every day.

Look at the waste there is. It has been said that the packers save everything but the squeal. Yes; not half of the meat, for the first time in the history of this Government, is being processed through the regular channels where they have the facilities to work up and save everything incident to the slaughtering of the animal. We have bootlegging of meat in the black markets throughout the land. That is the result of the O. P. A. as well as other Government officials refusing to allow the regular, legitimate, and efficient packers of this country to have a sufficient price in order that the meat may be federally processed and inspected, and in order that they may send it through the regular channels. This is the first time in the history of this Nation that one of the great industries of this country has been forced not only to process the meat, but forced to sell it at a loss month after month until losses are running into millions of dollars, which will ultimately, in my judgment, destroy the market for the farmers of this country.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Is it not a fact that the fixing of a price to the extent that the processor of meat cannot make a profit is in direct violation of law, in that the law prescribes that a reasonable profit be provided for?

Mr. VURSELL. Absolutely. The law that we passed prescribes that a reasonable profit shall be provided, and that the price of living shall be controlled. They have not done either one. The black markets are robbing the people of this country, and the Government, by edict, has brought that about by grinding down private industry, the packers, of this Nation.

To show you how federally inspected slaughtering has fallen off, may I quote these figures? Whereas they were killing 10 a year ago, in February 1944, they only killed 4 this February 1945. What I am trying to explain is that of the millions of hogs killed last year compared with this year so far it is a ratio showing a drop from 10 to 4 or 40 percent less than last year. There has never been a time in the past 20 years when there has been such a decline in hogs, such decline in beef, such a decline in mutton, in poultry, and all of those things that the farmer produces, as there has been in the last year.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VURSELL. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The records in the Department of Agriculture also show that the weight of the federally inspected cattle that have been slaughtered since the controls went into effect has fallen 44 pounds per animal. Last year they butchered about 20,000,000 head of cattle. That means that about 880,000,000 pounds of meat have been lost to this country; that is, good meat that should have been available to our people if the feeder of livestock had been permitted to feed in the normal course of his operations.

Mr. VURSELL. The gentleman is quite right. The trouble lies with the policies which have been put into effect by Chester Bowles of the O. P. A. and the War Food Administrator, Marvin Jones. It is personal government in action in defiance of the letter and spirit of the Price Control Act written by the Congress. It is the by-pass again of representative government. If the Congress will exert its independence, stand together and demand these policies be changed it can and will do a great service to the Nation. It should be done without delay.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

FULL EMPLOYMENT AND THE FARMER

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, today I shou'd like to emphasize the very great importance to farmers of H. R. 2202, which I introduced on February 16, known as the full-employment bill. This is the measure which would make it a responsibility of the Congress to assure the existence at all times of sufficient employment opportunities to enable all Americans to exercise the right to useful, remunerative, regular, and full-time employment. Senator MURRAY of Montana introduced a similar measure in the Senate.

It is my belief that if we pass such legislation, we can in an orderly fashion shift from war- to peace-time levels of productivity and national income even higher than they are now. Within such a framework for directing and coordinating Federal activities, we can achieve an economy of continuously expanding markets and employment opportunities for all who are able and willing to work.

To the farmers this would mean that they would not again experience the shrinking markets and disastrous declines of price and land values which bankrupted so many of their fathers after the last war. They would, on the contrary, continue to earn the high net incomes of recent years—which, by the way, were more than twice the record peacetime farm net incomes of 1925.

I hardly need to point out to you that the demand for post-war full employment is not a partisan issue. Not one but both candidates in the last Presidential campaign explicitly recognized the responsibility of the Federal Government in this connection. Mr. Dewey in his San Francisco speech, for example, stated:

> If at any time there are not sufficient jobs in private employment to go around, then Government can and must create additional job opportunities. There must be jobs for all.

Leaders of industry, leaders of organized labor, and representatives of various consumer and welfare groups have likewise taken a clear stand in favor of governmental measures to assure full employment. This consensus as to the chief objective of Government economic policy is not surprising, since full employment, and the high level of production associated with it, is the one and only pathway to the maximum welfare of all groups in society. On this broad issue there can be no conflict of interests.

What I am particularly interested in today is the fundamental agreement among the major farm groups of the Nation as to the importance of this full employment objective.

Albert Goss, master of the National Grange, has this to say:

> No group has a greater interest in seeing full employment maintained after the war than agriculture. Without it, our whole economy breaks down.

Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, points out that:

> The type of economic security we all want is jobs and opportunity for all those who are willing to produce.

The president of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, Homer L. Brinkley, asks:

> What about measures to assure full employment and attendant requirements for optimum quantities of farm products? We are vitally interested in measures affecting full business operations of all kinds.

The stand of the Farmers Union is well known, and was reiterated by James G. Patton when he wrote in a recent article:

> In our highly industrialized economy, full employment is the farm-relief measure of our time * * * nearly all our problems start with the possibility of mass unemployment; nearly all our solutions must start with full employment as the premise. Hence, a full-employment bill, while it will not in and of itself insure Utopia, is an indispensable preliminary to the organization of a truly good society.

The position of Secretary Wickard and the Department of Agriculture has been stated in these words:

> First and most important is full industrial production and employment. American farmers sell, and will continue to sell, most of what they produce on the domestic market; they need plenty of customers able to pay fair prices.

The attitude of the land-grant colleges, presented in a statement of the Committee on Post-war Agricultural Policy of the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, is that:

> High-level employment in nonagricultural industry means very much more to farmers than any farm program the Government may attempt. Manipulations of agricultural production and prices are no substitute for good consumer markets.

Individual farmers, too, through Nation-wide polls, have expressed their overwhelming appreciation of the extent to which farm prosperity depends on national prosperity.

After hostilities cease, and when temporary demands for relief feeding have tapered off, farmers will again depend on domestic consumers for their markets.

Few realize what a huge farm market we can have right here at home if we maintain full employment and the national income that goes along with it. War experience has shown that with increased incomes consumers eat much better—better quality food and more of it. Careful estimates made by the Department of Agriculture indicate that, if we had full employment, our domestic consumption of most farm products would be 15 percent to 50 percent higher than before the war. I have here a supporting table entitled "Table 1, United

States Per Capita Consumption of Selected Farm Products, Pre-war and at Full Employment Post-war" that I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point. This, and the other tables I shall use, are derived from United States Department of Agriculture data.

TABLE 1.—*United States per capita consumption of selected farm products, pre-war and at full employment post-war*

Item	Pre-war	1943, civilian only	Post-war	Percentage increase over pre-war
	Pounds	*Pounds*	*Pounds*	*Percent*
Foods:				
Beef and veal, dressed weight	62.8	57.7	71.0	13
Pork and lard, dressed weight	67.1	87.1	96.0	43
Chickens, dressed weight	17.9	28.1	25.0	40
Eggs	37.3	42.9	43.5	17
Dairy products (fluid milk equivalent)	801.3	767.2	895.0	12
Citrus fruit	48.8	59.7	75.0	54
Other fresh fruit	89.4	61.3	90.0	1
Commercial truck	95.0	88.7	109.0	15
Canned vegetables (processed weight)	31.1	36.1	43.0	38
Wheat	221.4	225.9	212.0	−4
Sugar	96.5	80.3	115.0	19
Peanuts	4.3	7.5	6.0	40
Nonfoods:				
Wool	4.5	7.7	6.0	107
Cotton	25.3	39.8	30.0	19
Tobacco products	6.5	8.6	10.0	59

And these are per capita figures. To them must be added the further increase from a probable 7-percent growth in population from 1940 to 1950. The net result would be a materially larger civilian consumption for most products than we have had even during the war.

But we need not rely for a farm market solely on domestic demands. Full employment and high levels of production at home generate economic activity in other countries, and this automatically increases the demand for our exports. Hence we could and should count upon an export demand for agricultural products substantially above the post-war level. I have here a table estimating such increases for selected products—Table 2, "Past and prospective farm prices at full employment"—which I should like to have inserted in the RECORD at this point:

TABLE 2.—*Past and prospective exports, at full employment*

Product	Pre-war, 1935–39	1950, at full employment
Wheat, million bushels	54	About 100.
Lard, million pounds	192	About 600.
Pork products, million pounds, dressed weight	143	About 340.
Dairy products (in equivalent million pounds of fluid milk)	352	About 500.
Canned vegetables (million pounds of fresh vegetables equivalent)	93	About 250.
Citrus fruits (million pounds fresh)	562	About 800.
Other fruits (million pounds, fresh)	2,550	About 3,000.
Cotton (million bales)	5.6	4.5.
Tobacco (million pounds farm weight)	457	525.

With these domestic and export demands, there would be markets for nearly as much as our farmers are now producing. The numbers of livestock and acreages of crops needed at full employment post-war are compared with present and prospective levels in table 3.

The demand for some products like potatoes, wheat, and peanuts might decrease below war levels, since they have been pushed to abnormal amounts to offset war shortages. But, when added together, these full-employment domestic and foreign demands for farm products as a whole would require even larger acreage than farmers are now growing under greatly inflated war requirements. Of course, if farm efficiency continues to increase; that is, if we keep on improving stocks, hybrid seeds, fertilization, and machinery, it is probable that this increased demand could be met with no more acreage than is now under cultivation. This would mean increased value and income per acre and per farmer.

Consumption and production figures tell the full employment story even more forcefully when applied to specific commodities. What would full employment mean to cattlemen, for example, or to cotton and tobacco growers, to cattle growers, to hog producers, or to the dairying industry?

BEEF CATTLE

Everyone knows today that when people have good jobs they want to eat more steak and roasts. The market for beef is almost a barometer of prosperity and depression.

If we maintain post-war full employment, cattlemen could market nearly 30,000,000 cattle and calves a year, at good prices. This would mean they would take in about two and one-third billions of dollars a year—not much less than today, and just about double their average pre-war sales.

But if we allow severe depression to develop, beef producers will be really hard hit. Production would decline to about 27,000,000 head, beef prices to about $4, and farm income would be down to two-thirds below present levels and one-third below the pre-war average. I have here illustrative figures—Table 3, beef cattle, pre-war, war, and post-war prospects, under various conditions—to be included in the RECORD at this point:

TABLE 3.—*Beef cattle, pre-war, war, and post-war prospects, under various conditions*

Item	Unit	Pre-war, 1935–39	War, 1943	Post-war [1]		
				Full employment	Moderate depression	Severe depression
Cattle and calves slaughtered	Million head	24.8	27.6	29.6	28.4	26.7
United States beef production	Million pounds, dressed weight	7,974	9,670	9,975	9,600	9,000
Farm prices, beef cattle	Dollars per hundredweight	6.51	11.80	10.50	8.00	4.00
Farm prices, veal calves	Dollars per hundredweight	7.75	13.50	12.25	9.75	5.00
Farm income from cattle marketings	Million dollars	1,173	2,560	2,322	1,717	810

[1] Data for full employment and moderate depression from U. S. Department of Agriculture estimates; severe depression, rough estimates by the author.

COTTON

The cotton farmer has a double stake in full employment—both his domestic and his very important foreign market depend upon domestic prosperity; the former for obvious reasons, the latter because foreign nations can be prosperous only if the United States is prosperous.

The chief problem facing cotton growers after the war is that of competition—from synthetics and from foreign growers. Despite this threat, full employment would permit cotton to hold its own. It would create a market for about 14,000,000 bales and an approximate 40 percent increase of cash income over pre-war years, provided prices were kept at a level low enough to meet competition. I should like to have a supporting table—Table 4, "Cotton, pre-war, and war, and prospects under various post-war conditions"—inserted in the RECORD at this point.

TABLE 4.—*Cotton pre-war and war, and prospects under various post-war conditions*

Item	Unit	Pre-war, 1935–39	War, 1943	Post-war [1]		
				Full employment	Moderate depression	Severe depression
Cotton consumption, American cotton: [2]						
United States	Million bales	6.8	9.8	9.0	8.0	6.0
Foreign countries	Million bales	5.3	1.3	4.5	3.3	2.0
Total consumption	Million bales	12.1	11.1	13.5	11.3	8.0
United States production	Million bales	12.9	11.1			
Cotton acreage	Million acres	28.5	21.9	25.9	21.7	15.3
Cotton farm price	Cents per pound	0.10	0.20	0.13	0.12	0.09
Cash income from cotton lint	Million dollars	645	1,110	900	702	360

[1] Estimates for full employment and moderate depression by U. S. Department of Agriculture; for severe depressions rough estimates by the speaker.
[2] Data for cotton years, beginning Aug. 1 of year stated.

If a serious depression is allowed to develop, on the other hand, prices and production would plunge downward, and acreage might have to be cut to less than 60 percent of the full employment market, and farm income from cotton would fall to half its pre-war level.

The heavily populated cotton South has problems enough even at best. One of the most difficult of these is the rapid introduction of mechanical cotton pickers, tractor plowing, cultivators, etc. Under depression conditions, this mechanization would only add to the already large number of sub-marginal farmers. But with a full employment market and with the removal of discriminatory freight rates, the industrialization of the South can go swiftly forward, and open up good-paying jobs for farm people who may wish to leave the farm, as well as new markets for truck, dairy and other diversified farm products.

TOBACCO

Tobacco farmers, too, have a fundamental interest in full employment. Nobody today has to be told that increased incomes have a heavy impact upon the demand for cigarettes.

With full employment, farmers could grow one-third more tobacco than they grow today and sell it at prices nearly as high. The value of these crops would be nearly two and one-half times the pre-war level.

Severe depression, on the contrary, would cut consumption sharply, and prices would fall from 40 cents a pound to 18 cents or less. Farm income would be less than half what it is at present. I should like to have a supporting table—table 5, "Tobacco, pre-war, war, and prospects under various post-war conditions"—included in the RECORD at this point:

TABLE 5.—*Tobacco, pre-war, war, and prospects under various post-war conditions*

Item	Unit	Pre-war, 1935-39	War, 1943	Post-war		
				Full employment	Moderate depression	Severe depression
Domestic consumption	Million pounds, farm weight	899	943	1,360	1,240	1,000
Exports	Million pounds, farm weight	601	457	525	400	250
Total disappearance	Million pounds, farm weight	1,500	1,400	1,885	1,640	1,250
Total production	Million pounds, farm weight	1,500	1,400	1,885	1,640	1,250
Acreage	1,000 acres	1,647	1,449	1,938	1,685	1,285
Farm price	Dollars per pound	0.19	0.40	0.35	0.26	0.18
Farm income from sales	Million dollars	279	560	660	426	225

HOGS

Hog producers, because of their great wartime expansion for overseas markets, are even more dependent than cattlemen on high levels of domestic activity in the post-war. If we can maintain full employment, expanding domestic consumption will offset much of the shrinkage in export shipments, and maintain high incomes for hog producers.

But severe depression would be catastrophic for hog farmers. If production were cut only one-third—from present marketings of 95,000,000 head a year to 61,000,000—prices would fall to $7 or lower, and cash income from hogs to under $600,000,000—or less than a third of what hog producers' income would run at full employment. I should like to have table 6, "Hogs, pre-war, war, and post-war prospects under various conditions," inserted in the RECORD at this point:

TABLE 6.—*Hogs, pre-war, war, and post-war prospects under various conditions*

Item	Unit	Pre-war, 1935-39	War, 1943	Post-war		
				Full employment	Moderate depression	Severe depression
Hogs slaughtered	Millions	86.8	95.3	92.6	78.2	61.0
Pork production, dressed weight	Million pounds	7,337	13,371	12,135	10,250	8,000
Farm prices	Dollars per hundredweight	8.30	13.70	11.75	9.10	7.00
Farm cash income from hogs marketed	Million dollars	838	2,953	2,139	1,456	560

DAIRYING

With full employment after the war, the market would take over a fifth more than all the dairy products now being sold from farms. As a result, farm income from dairy products, which is already running twice pre-war, would be further increased to one-sixth more than it now is. Under severe depression, however, both marketings and prices would fall drastically, and farm income from dairying would be near the low prewar levels. I should like to have table 7, "Dairy products, pre-war, war, and post-war prospects under various conditions," inserted in the RECORD at this point.

TABLE 7.—*Dairy products, pre-war, war, and post-war prospects under various conditions*

Item	Unit	Pre-war, 1935-39	War, 1943	Post-war		
				Full employment	Moderate depression	Severe depression
United States production (fluid milk equivalent)	Billion pounds	103.7	117.7	128.4	121.3	110
Farm sales of milk and dairy products (fluid milk equivalent)	Billion pounds	80.8	90.8	110.7	105	100
Milk cows	Million head	28.5	25.7	27.9	26.4	23.9
Average farm receipts from sales of milk, butterfat, and butter (fluid milk equivalent)	Dollars per hundredweight	1.81	3.12	2.90	2.25	1.60
Farm cash income from dairy products	Million dollars	1,409	2,804	3,222	2,363	1,600

Cotton, tobacco, beef cattle, hogs, dairy products, all show a close and consistent relation between the level of national prosperity and farm prices and income. Sales of these five products account for over half of all farm cash income. And there are many other farm products—poultry products, fruits and vegetables, flaxseed, wool and lambs—that are equally sensitive to changes in domestic and foreign buying power.

Putting these separate farm pictures together, we find that if we can maintain full employment after the war, as H. R. 2202 is intended to make possible, farmers can enjoy markets and incomes almost as large as the record highs reached during the war.

Under full employment and a national income continuing at a $150,000,000,000 level, per capita consumption of all food would rise to a new level about 18 percent above pre-war. Assuming that farm prices decline to parity level, net income of farm operators would remain more than twice as high as pre-war. Cash income from farm marketings per person engaged in agriculture would be about $2,125, or two and one-half times as large as before the war. I should like to have table 8, "Employment, prices, and income in the United States, farm and total, pre-war, war, and post-war, under full employment," inserted in the RECORD at this point:

TABLE 8.—*Employment, prices, and income in the United States, farm and total, pre-war, war, and post-war under full employment*

Item	Unit or base	Pre-war (1935–39)	War (1943)	Post-war (estimated at full employment)
ALL UNITED STATES ACTIVITY				
Employed (civilian plus military)	Millions	43.6	61.5	58.0
Unemployed	Millions	10.2	1.1	2.0
Gross national product	Billion dollars	81.9	186.5	188.0
National income	Billion dollars	65.4	147.9	150.0
Food consumption per capita, index	1935–39=100	100.0	106.0	118.0
AGRICULTURE				
Workers in agriculture	Millions	9.3	8.8	8.0
Volume of agricultural output, index	1935–39=100	100.0	129.0	[1] 135.0
Cash income from farm marketings	Billion dollars	8.0	19.2	17.0
Net income of farm operators	Billion dollars	4.2	11.4	9.3
Prices received by farmers, index	1910–14=100	107.0	193.0	165.0
Parity ratio	1910–14=100	64.0	119.0	100.0
Cash income from marketings, per person employed in agriculture	Dollars	860	2,182	2,125

[1] Production consumers would buy at the estimated prices and incomes.

But suppose we experience severe depression such as that we suffered in the early 1930's, with 17,000,000 unemployed and national income falling below $60,000,000,000? Such a catastrophe for the industries of the Nation would be a double catastrophe for farmers. Sons and daughters would flock back home from the cities, while farm products would go begging. Farm prices would drop to less than half of present levels. Prices of things farmers buy would decline, but less rapidly, so that the farm price ratio would fall to two-thirds of parity or less. These estimates are shown in table 9, "Post-war employment, prices, and income in the United States, farm and total, with full employment, moderate depression, and severe depression," which I should like to have included in the RECORD at this point:

TABLE 9.—*Post-war employment, prices, and income in the United States, farm and total, with full employment, moderate depression, and severe depression*

Item	Unit or base	Full employment	Moderate depression	Severe depression
ALL UNITED STATES ACTIVITY				
Employed (civilian plus military)	Millions	58.0	53.0	43.0
Unemployed	Millions	2.0	7.0	17.0
Gross national product	Billion dollars	188.0	130.0	76.5
National income	Billion dollars	150.0	105.0	57.5
Food consumption per capita, index	1935–39=100	118.0	110.0	100.0
AGRICULTURE				
Workers in agriculture	Millions	8.0	8.5	9.0
Volume of agricultural output, index	1935–39=100	[1] 135.0	[1] 125.0	[1] 115.0
Cash income from farm marketings	Billion dollars	17.0	12.5	6.5
Net income of farm operators	Billion dollars	9.3	6.5	3.0
Prices received by farmers, index	1910–14=100	165.0	125.0	75.0
Parity ratio	1910–14=100	100.0	89.0	62.0
Cash income from marketings per person employed in agriculture	Dollars	2,125	1,471	722

[1] Production consumers would buy at the estimated prices and incomes.

Net income of farm operators would decline to one-third of the levels that would prevail with full employment. Even with low depression prices, the markets would take one-sixth less than they would with full employment, and great unsalable surpluses would pile up in many farm products. The Government would have to undertake expensive measures to support prices and markets for farm products; but despite these efforts, farmers and city people alike would suffer great hardships. Meanwhile, banks and insurance companies would be closing their doors, and farmers who bought land at recent higher prices would be forced into bankruptcy by the thousands.

These facts all emphasize one basic relation; farmers cannot prosper unless the Nation prospers.

National prosperity, in turn, is what the full employment bill is designed to accomplish. Its enactment would constitute a congressional promise to cooperate with the economic groups of the Nation in making sure that there is sufficient spending in the economy to take off the market all the products—from farm and factory—that the people of this country can produce.

Congress has influenced the spending of various groups with almost every measure that it has passed. Tax laws, social security, public works, tariffs, wage legislation, banking and currency programs—all have affected the expenditure decisions of business, consumers, States, and cities as well as the Federal Government.

But we have not always been able to appraise the over-all picture in our debates on particular measures. Under the full-employment bill, however, congressional proposals would no longer be debated as isolated items. A joint committee composed of members of standing committees in both Houses would be charged with the responsibility of coordinating all proposals within the framework of a national full-employment budget.

H. R. 2202 does not prescribe what this National Budget should contain. Specific proposals would continue to be thrashed out in Congress as they now are. The only commitment of the legislation is that the effects of all the actions we take should add up to a full employment level of demand—demand for goods and services, and demand for labor to produce these goods and services.

If business, labor, farmers, consumers, and State and local governments cooperate with the Federal Government in shaping an expansionary program, full employment can be achieved, and private enterprise and initiative will hold full sway. Without such cooperation, employment and national income will fall, business will contract, and economic insecurity will breed a new crop of Federal regulatory and support programs.

For these many reasons I strongly urge that serious study and consideration be given to H. R. 2202 by all who are concerned with the future of American agriculture.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, my attention has been called to an item in one of the gossip columns that appeared in a Washington paper yesterday morning, purporting to report one of the weekly off-the-record meetings held by the new Republican Members of the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses. Mr. Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O., talked to us on that occasion and we asked him a good many questions. I do not know how or where the column got this garbled report of some of the discussion in the meeting. I called Mr. Murray's office and was assured promptly that he had not talked with the columnist or any of his agents, that he did not do business that way, and I am glad to say I believe him completely. But, however it happened, the story puts me in the position of saying things I did not say and I cannot let it pass unchallenged. I should like to read this paragraph:

> Representative WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, asked why it is that labor doesn't bring its own bills to Congress on important issues affecting labor.
>
> "We Congressmen are really put on the spot whenever there is a need for legislation," JUDD explained, "and when you people, instead of bringing in your own bill, wait for labor-baiters like HOWARD SMITH to introduce legislation. If legislation is needed, we've got to do something about it—even if it means voting for something proposed by a labor-hater."

Mr. Chairman, I dislike taking notice of this sort of misrepresentation to which we are all constantly being subjected. If you do not deny it, your silence is interpreted as meaning it is true, and if you do deny it you merely draw attention to and in some degree dignify a scurrilous attack upon one of our colleagues. In this case, however, I feel under obligation out of fairness to both the dis-

tinguished gentleman from Virginia and to myself to deny categorically that I made any such statement or accusation regarding him or any other of our colleagues, and I invite any of the 75 Members who were present to state so publicly if they heard me make the alleged statement or mention the name of any of our colleagues.

What I did say was this, and I can quote it verbatim because on a good many occasions during the last 2 years I have asked exactly the same question of friends in the labor movement in my own district in Minneapolis. What I said was this: "Almost always in our country's history whenever one group in our population developed a great deal of power it tended to abuse that power. The railroads at one time thought they were stronger than the country but they were not, and they had to be regulated. The banks and Wall Street at one time thought they were stronger than the country and abused their power, and they had to be regulated. Now, labor has great power in this country and there are some of its leaders who, it seems to me, are tending to abuse that power. If they continue, it will inevitably lead to regulation. Therefore, Mr. Murray," I asked, "why don't you leaders of labor work out and propose legislation—and I will help sponsor it—that will merely bring the practices of all the unions up to the level of the practices that the best-managed unions long ago voluntarily adopted? Then labor will not need to worry for a moment about any of the people that it calls labor-baiters introducing or voting for legislation which would be restrictive of labor's legitimate rights."

That is almost word for word the language of the question I asked. I submit it is very different from that reported in the column, and I resent intensely any attempt to put into my mouth words or accusations or insinuations which were not there. There is no need to discuss the matter any further. It is enough to be responsible for the things I do say without gratuitously being made responsible for a lot of things I did not say or think.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would not take this time, but evidently the committee has been engaged in the consideration of rather important matters, and it might be well by way of diversion to make some comment about the gentleman to whom the last speaker referred. I did not all hear the remarks, but I gathered that the substance of it was that the gentleman to whom reference was made does not always tell the truth. That probably is not news to Members of this House. It is reprehensible for Pearson to so distort his comments about Congressman, but it is outrageous for him to place the gentleman who just left the floor in so false a position for no one is more kindly, more considerate of his colleagues than our fellow Member, the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD. As well might Pearson throw mud at the flag for our colleague gives offense to no one.

In the March 20 Washington Post, referring to debate on the floor, the gentleman, Mr. Drew Pearson, among other things said this:

> Although the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shows a vicious speech by HOFFMAN, it does not show one statement by HOFFMAN that, although most judges stay out of politics, "if Justice Frankfurter wants to descend into the political arena that is a matter between him and his God." This statement is not shown because before HOFFMAN could say another word Representative WILBUR MILLS of Arkansas, presiding over the House at the time, ordered it expunged from the RECORD."

Now, you would think that even so notorious a liar as Pearson would use a little discretion in his lying. Why the man should put into the Washington Post, which at least a few Members of the House read, a statement which every Member of the House who knows anything at all about House procedure knows is false, is beyond me. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] was in the chair all right, but he did not strike anything I said from the RECORD. He did not have any authority to strike anything from the RECORD. Not only that, but no objection was made to what I said. Pearson had to tell two lies in one sentence, both of which those who were present here and who are familiar with the procedure of the House, know are false. They know his statements are falsehoods.

Moreover had the statement attributed to me been made it did not violate the House rules nor would it have been improper. Some say this gentleman, Mr. Pearson, is a smart man; that he is a good reporter. He may be smart, low, and cunning but he is a disgrace to the profession which numbers so many honest and conscientious reporters and columnists.

Why this House permits him or his stooge the privilege of the Press Gallery when he is not a reporter—just an ordinary falsifier—why the House permits him the privilege of the House Press Gallery is beyond me. The gentlemen here in the Press Gallery are gentlemen of integrity. They know how to narrate the facts. While they make a few mistakes now and then, by and large we can depend on what we find in the papers from the Press Gallery reporters. But here is this bird who comes along and day after day tells the most barefaced lies that anyone could think of. And he is not even skillful. Some folks have admiration for a skillful, cunning liar, but for a liar who is also foolish I just cannot understand why the House permits him to use its hospitality to attack its Members.

Now, I am not afraid of being charged with suppressing free speech in suggesting that he be segregated from decent, conscientious reporters. That is not the issue involved. We furnish special facilities at the taxpayers' expense for those in the Press Gallery and these reporters come in here because the public is interested in what transpires on the floor and we talk freely in their presence never regarding them as eavesdroppers—tittle-tattle talebearers, keyhole peepers, or scandalmongers—but Pearson is all that. I would send him over into the gallery and while that might be a hardship for decent people to associate with him, I would put him in a special pen as you would do with an unruly or a fence-jumping critter. He does not abide by any of the rules which apply to decent people, to the ordinary, average citizen. He just goes off and writes that rot because he knows somebody will be looking to see what new lie he has thought up since his last appearance. Why do we not just say to the gentlemen upstairs, "If you are controlling the Press Gallery, why do not you get that skunk out of there? If you do not, we will have to do it for you and set him apart"; because if they associate with him, so help me John Rogers, their clothes must stink when they go home at night and their wives will want to know where they have been.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, on page 13 of the committee's report on H. R. 2689 appears this statement:

> One of the matters falling within the province of the work under this appropriation is the regulation of grazing on national-forest ranges and the fixing of grazing fees therefor. The committee, from evidence presented, was impressed with the need for revising grazing fees upward in view of the increased value to stock raisers of the grazing privilege. Such an upward revision would be more in keeping with the present price levels of livestock and livestock products.

I wish to direct my remarks to the suggestion that the national forest should raise their grazing fees upward. It may be that there should be some adjustment of the grazing fees on the national forest, but certainly not upward.

I also note the testimony given by Mr. Granger and others of the Forest Service, on pages 686 to 693 of the committee hearings. Among other things, it was shown that the rates now charged on the national forest for grazing, are three times what they were in 1918. Also I find from the records of the Forest Service that grazing fees as the result of the Rachford appraisal and formula were increased from 7.5 cents per head in 1934 to 26 cents per month per head in 1944. There were 3,750,000 head of cattle on the national forest in 1918, and only 2,000,000 in 1943. This cut in numbers was made necessary because of overgrazing during and following the last World War.

There was much better feed on the ranges in those days than there is today. Just cutting in half the amount of stock to be grazed is not sufficient. There must go with it a program of re-seeding and poison and weed eradication. The amount this will cost will be repaid to the United States Treasury many times over in the way of increased revenues, without increasing the cost per head to the user. Right now the Forest Service is working along the line of charging more

for a much poorer quality of range forage.

Mr. Loveridge, before the Agricultural Committee, stated that if there had been the same number of stock on the Forest Ranges in 1944 that there was in 1918, the grazing fees would have amounted to $5,700,000 instead of the $2,400,000 that were collected, as a result of the present decreased cattle and sheep populations.

Putting it another way, in 1918, the Stockmen paid into the United States Treasury for grazing fees, $1,725,821.91 for 3,750,000 animals. In 1943, the stockmen paid $2,400,000 in grazing fees for just about half that number of stock on the ranges—or 2,000,000,000 head.

It seems to me that the Forest Grazing Service and the Agricultural Appropriations Committee could well look into the matter of re-seeding and otherwise increasing the feed value of these ranges, so they would care for more cattle and sheep, rather than to carry out their past and present policy of cutting down the number of stock permitted on these ranges to the decreased forage and increasing the fees.

Even from an investment standpoint, it would seem logical to spend a few hundred thousand dollars for re-seeding and eradication of poisons and weeds, when we know that the returned income in the way of grass and feed would repay it in a very few years, as well as helping out the economy of the West.

In most of the Western States, the industry that ranks first in economic importance is livestock. In my district of western Colorado, where 65 percent of the area is owned by the Federal Government and lies within the national forest or the Taylor Grazing Act, this is most important.

The forest reserves were created by the act of March 3, 1891, section 24, which reads:

> The President of the United States may, from time to time, set apart and reserve, in any State or Territory having public land bearing forests, in any part of the public lands wholly or in part covered with timber or undergrowth, whether of commercial value or not, as national forests, and the President shall, by public proclamation, declare the establishment of such forests and the limits thereof.

On February 1, 1905, the forest reserves were transferred from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture. The first recognition of the use of the old forest reserves for grazing dates back to April 12, 1902, when the Secretary of the Interior issued a manual, part of which was devoted to the subject of grazing on the forest reserves. Then on July 1, 1905, 5 months after the old reserves were transferred to the Department of Agriculture, a regulation was issued which read:

> The Secretary of Agriculture has authority to permit, regulate, or prohibit grazing on the forest reserves. Under his direction the Forest Service will allow the use of the forage crop of the reserves as fully as proper care and protection of the forests and the water supply permits.

Neither Congress nor any responsible executive officer has ever formally declared that national-forest grazing fees should return to the Treasury the full commercial value of the pasturage furnished. The general plan of the Forest Administration has always contemplated that users of the forage, like users of the timber, are to pay into the Treasury the reasonable value of the products used, due consideration being given to supply and demand, quality, accessibility, regulations, market conditions, and other factors.

In 1906 grazing fees were established at 1 cent per head per month. This was gradually increased until in 1922, C. E. Rachford, Assistant Chief under W. C. Barnes, then Chief of Grazing, made a study covering a period of about 2 years. Mr. Rachford made an appraisal and recommendations which were completed in 1924, and the report was turned over to Secretary Wallace. Afterward, Dan Casement was selected to review this report.

In 1927, the Secretary, after meeting with representatives of the National Livestock Association, reached an announced settlement of the grazing fee issue as follows:

First. That no increases in fees be made during 1927.

Second. That the schedule of fees determined through the Casement study be approved, subject to further reductions as found equitable to adjust fees fairly between forests and regions.

Third. That the increases in fees arising from the new schedule be applied in installments of 25 percent each during 1928, 1929, 1930, and 1931, the full measure to be applied during 1931 to 1934, inclusive.

Fourth. That in view of the social and economic purposes of the Forest Service and the general public benefits derived from the national forests, this schedule of fees be accepted as representing fair compensation for grazing on the forests under present conditions.

Fifth. That no changes in this schedule of fees be made during the 10-year permit period beginning in 1935 unless material change occurred in conditions which enter into an equitable determination of fair compensation.

To carry out the Casement recommendation for further reductions under No. 2 foregoing, the Forest Service further critically examined the individual forest fees, and the final average fees established were:

	Cents per month
Cattle and horses	14.5
Sheep and goats	4.5

The spring of 1933 found the livestock industry in the throes of the worst depression in history, and a demand again arose for lower grazing fees. After consideration, the Secretary of Agriculture approved the following plan:

First. That the average national forest grazing fees of 14.5 cents per head per month for cattle and horses and 4.5 cents per head per month for sheep and goats, in effect during 1931, be used as the basic fees, subject to adjustment each year in accord with fluctuations in livestock prices.

Second. That the adjusted fees each year shall have the same ratio to the basic fees that the average price received by producers in the 11 Western States during the immediately preceding year had to the corresponding average price during the period 1921–30, inclusive, in the case of cattle, and during the period 1920–32, inclusive, in the case of sheep.

Third. That the cattle prices used in adjusting the fees shall be the prices received for beef cattle as compiled by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and the sheep prices shall be the prices received for lambs as likewise compiled by the Bureau of Agricultudal Economics.

This plan was made effective in 1933. It is still operative.

As a result of the Rachford and Casement studies a formula was worked up for grazing fees on the basis of the market price of all cattle and sheep sold on the central markets from the 11 Western States. This formula has been followed ever since with the following results:

	Average national forest grazing fee (cents per head per month)		Average price per 100 pounds received by farmers in 11 Western States	
	Cattle	Sheep	Beef cattle	Lambs
1933	9.05	2.05	$4.13	$4.18
1934	7.51	2.385	3.43	4.85
1935	8.04	2.71	3.67	5.51
1936	13.05	3.36	5.96	6.84
1937	12.55	3.66	5.73	7.45
1938	14.98	4.24	6.84	8.62
1939	13.4	3.3	6.11	6.74
1940	14.89	3.68	6.80	7.49
1941	15.97	3.85	7.29	7.82
1942	18.9	4.6	8.64	9.39
1943	23	5.5	10.50	11.30
1944	26	6.25	11.70	12.60
1945	25	6	11.30	12.30

When the new fees were put into effect in 1931 the charge for cattle was 14½ cents and for sheep 4½ cents.

May I recall to you that the original grazing fee that was established when the ranges were comparatively new and in much better condition than now was 1 cent? We are today paying for grazing cattle 25 times what we did in those early days.

I wish I had time to review with you the differences between grazing livestock on the national forests and in privately controlled pastures. For 38 years I have operated a stock ranch close to one of the national forests and have used the privileges of the range. These areas are generally high and very mountainous, often extending in elevation to well over 10,000 feet. The terrain is very rough and rugged and the grazing is in mountain peaks surrounded by timber. Many different permittees use the same range and the stock is all run together under the watchful eye of the cowboys in charge. Because of the deep canyons, high mountains, and rough terrain as well as the poison and predatory animals the losses average from 5 percent to 20 percent a year.

When the Forest Service first started to regulate and control grazing in 1905 they stated that the charges to users of the range would not exceed the costs of administration. There is no written evidence of this fact, but many men have

told me that that was the promise that was given them for their cooperation in the establishment of the act. Let me give you the figures as given me by Mr. Dutton, of the Forest Service, this morning:

Grazing fees—receipts 1944	$2,458,945.77
Expenses for salaries of foresters, rangers, guards, supervisors, travel, etc	1,213,941.00
Incidental expenses, experiments, reseeding, special meetings, etc	469,000.00
Total	1,682,941.00
Net balance of	770,004.77

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROCKWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. A net of how much?

Mr. ROCKWELL. Seven hundred and seventy thousand dollars.

Mr. HORAN. What became of that?

Mr. ROCKWELL. That goes into the Treasury.

Mr. HORAN. None of it was used for improving the range?

Mr. ROCKWELL. There is no record to show what happened to that. As I understand it, the research work done by this organization comes under the head of "incidental expenses" and includes reseeding, experiments, and that sort of work.

Mr. HORAN. The reason I asked the question is because it is apparent that our range has become less efficient during the years. I was interested in seeing the figure quoted by the gentleman from Colorado because I feel that it might be a good place for us to inquire as to whether or not we could not use more of those funds, which apparently are covered into the Treasury, for the purpose of rebuilding the range, which would enable us to graze more stock and thereby increase the Government's income.

Mr. ROCKWELL. I think the gentleman is absolutely right.

In conclusion may I summarize what I am trying to say to you. The stockmen of the 11 Western States believe that the present fees charged by the National Forest are sufficiently high to more than care for the necessary administration of grazing on the forest. They have no objection to a study and revision of these fees for the purpose of equality but not with the idea of an increase in these fees. In 1943, the total income from these fees per animal unit was 1.09 and the total expenditure amounted to 75 cents per animal unit, including $277,500 for range improvement. Surely this is a sufficient margin. This agency was never set up as a revenue producer for the Treasury but to safeguard and protect our great national resources such as water, minerals, and timber stored in our great mountains of the West.

I, therefore, feel compelled to object to the request of the Agricultural Appropriations Committee that any study be made for the purpose of increasing the grazing fees on the national forests. These fees are based on the prices received by the stockman for his stock at the central markets and last year they were at their highest point which is three times what was charged in the early 1930's and more than enough to care for necessary administration and incidental expenses. Also, we recommend that a study be made of a program of reseeding of the range and the elimination of poisonous weeds. This in turn will vastly increase the revenues by allowing increasing numbers of livestock on the forest-grazing land.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with considerable interest to the story of the marvels of farm production as told by the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations of the House and truly they are marvelous, but I want to remind all of you it has been done in an 8-hour day on the farm—8 hours before dinner and 8 hours after dinner.

I have also listened on several occasions to the venerable Member from Chicago when he referred to the days of the 95-cent milk. I want to take you on a little journey of imagination.

I want you to picture Adolph with a lantern on his left arm and five big pails nested on his right arm, making his way before breakfast down to the barn to milk the cows for his 95-cent milk. We will make no reference to what it costs to feed the animals or to produce the milk. After breakfast, after he has had a good big slice of ham and four or five buckwheat cakes, we see Adolph in gum boots standing half-boot deep in the lot beginning to load up the spreader with the winter's accumulation of fertilizer that makes the corn grow. Such an easy way to make 95 cents. Then we will have the gentleman decide after one morning's experience like that whether 95 cents a hundred is any price for milk or not. I would say to this distinguished Member, the patriarch of the House, that if he were to be given liquid milk in his city of Chicago, he still would not have cheap milk when it was delivered to the people of Chicago, because there are some milk drivers in that city who make almost as much money as a Congressman makes. I hope the committee of which I am a member will make a study and once and for all show us the spread in the cost of distribution and production of these raw materials until they reach the breakfast and dinner tables of America.

There are some other thoughts coming to me, something immediate, and a little later I shall speak of a subsequent problem that is facing agriculture in this country. In my district in northwestern Ohio is a small town called Archbold. It has 1,200 population. Last year it purchased almost $11,000,000 of livestock. But in every letter coming to my desk from that district and the surrounding counties they say, "Where are the tractors? Why can we not get tractors?" I have attended meetings, and so have you, when we have heard of allocations and promises made of production of farm implements, and I say to you that sooner or later this Congress, which has voted without question every Army and Navy bill that has come along, must scrutinize the appropriations for some of these great warships that are being laid down for delivery 3 years from now, when our Navy at the present time is destroying the remnants of the Japanese Navy, and decide which is most essential, the production of the No. 1 munitions—food—or the building of ships long after the emergency or the enemy navy exists. That does not mean that I want to let up one little bit on hammering Japan, and Japan will be destroyed with the ships already in existence. I think before 90 days the Japanese fishing smack will have to go out at night, if it wants fish around the Japanese islands.

I was intrigued also by the story of the fine cuts of meat that my friend from Missouri pictured the Army and the Navy eating. On this letter I made a few notes from a paratrooper soldier, a Wisconsin boy from Mr. MURRAY's district, who is somewhere in New Guinea. He writes:

> We are in the land where the sun shines hot and the soldiers eat bully beef and dehydrated potatoes.

But I want to show you how it affects his morale. On the next page he writes:

> We are a high-spirited bunch, and I like it.

They are not getting rare roast beef over there. They are fighting on their canned bully beef and their dehydrated eggs and their dehydrated potatoes, and the boy says they are not bad if the cook knows how to prepare them.

I am wondering now whether we are going to have this supply of meat coming along when I see farm after farm depleted of labor, with the last operator taken away. There was one farm in my district consisting of 615 acres, and they took the last able-bodied man last week. There are other farms of two and three hundred acres, and one after another they are going out of production. I am wondering whether these boys are going to have all the bully beef they need. Yes, they can throw stones at the Japs; they can kill the Japs with their bare hands and carve them up with a trench knife, but you cannot go far without something under your belt, and I propose, for one, to see that he gets it if I can.

I have been one of those who has in the past criticized the farm administration of the New Deal, and I did so remembering a trip that I made as a member of the committee down into the Southeast in 1940. We were in the city of Charlotte, N. C., where witness after witness came into that room and testified that 6 cents an hour, 60 cents a day, was the prevailing rate of wages in that area. I remember one farmer from Florida who came into that room to listen to the committee of the Congress. He came down there to see if there was not something we could really do to make him an economic, independent, upstanding producer of agriculture. About 2 o'clock in the afternoon he said, "Will the gentlemen of the committee please rise?" Every man in that room rose to his feet. The sincerity of this man was moving. You could not resist coming to your feet. Down on his knees in that ballroom in the Charlotte Hotel that farmer knelt and gave thanks to Almighty God that a

committee of Congressmen had seen fit to come down into his area, the first one he had ever seen in his life that was interested in him, so he said. He had thought Republicans had cloven hoofs and spiked tails and horns, and here was a committee of Republican Congressmen coming to see what we could do to help him.

We came back to Washington, and a Member from Mr. TARVER's own State, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], before my committee told us that peanuts were $40 a ton. He said, "If we could get $60, we might have a new crop to grow there instead of cotton." Well, we have 1,000,000 tons of peanuts this year at $160 a ton. I did not think that was too much. Sixty dollars was like 90-cent milk; it just kept you from starving to death.

I wish there were more of you here, because in 2 or 3 weeks you are going to vote like a bunch of sheep for the extension of the reciprocal-trade treaties that are going to take that million tons of peanuts from Mr. TARVER's State, with its oil now worth about 14 cents, and put it into direct competition with coconut and palm oil that was brought into this country in the spring of 1940 for $4.40 a hundred f. o. b. Cincinnati, and 2 cents a pound duty was paid on it. That duty is now off.

It is true that Mr. Rainey, of Illinois, when asked, "Why not repeal this infamous tariff act you have heard so much about," said, "The Republicans will not do it and we do not dare." But you have cut it 50 percent, and now you come with a bill from the Committee on Ways and Means to permit another 50-percent cut, that would cut it to 25 percent, yet on your oils there is none there.

I say to you, if you want the American people to eat, if you want the American people to have a standard of diet higher than any others in the world, if you want a farmer something different than a clod or a serf, you have to stand up here and be counted when these men floating around on a pink cloud come in here in this House to put the American farmer, who is compelled by law to wear clothing and overalls, in competition with a native skinning up a palm tree with a G-string around his middle. That will be the acid test of whether you are the farmer's friend or not.

I want to tell you one of the reasons why I am not in favor of going back to this economic situation we had here prior to 1940. No one here has given the Lord God Almighty credit for the wonderful growing years and bountiful crops. I think they come as a direct reward for America because she is great, because she aims to be honest and solid and charitable to all in the world. I think it is just a benediction of the Almighty that these crops have been bestowed upon us during these war years when we have had to gather them with short labor. But if somebody challenges the remark I made, I want to give you the hottest one of all of them, the little pigs. You have heard a lot of them. I want to tell you something, that on March 3, 1940, 7 years after the lights of civilization went out, little pigs, 75 pounds to 130 pounds in weight, sold in the Chicago market for $1 a hundred less than they did when the fourth-term President was inaugurated for the first term—March 4, 1933.

If you think your proposition will preserve agriculture, a rude awakening is coming, because the thing that the chairman hinted at, this debacle, this collapse, this sliding of agricultural prices will take down agriculture first, then the country towns, then transportation, then the cities and the manufacturing, all tied together. This country cannot live on a free-trade basis with all the world. It will raise each one just a little and it will bring us down to the level of the world.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is talking about this little-pig business. Does the gentleman recall that last week over in the other body a gentleman who represents the State of Mississippi rose there and said that his farmers were not going to be able to work because they could not get salt pork, and they could not get salt pork because of the manipulations of the fellows down at the other end of the Avenue?

Mr. CLEVENGER. They cannot get salt pork because he has taken all of the farmers out of the Corn Belt where they put fat back on the pork.

You cannot feed them on blue sky and get good thick fatback.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How about their working on orders, directives, and regulations? How about that keeping up their strength?

Mr. CLEVENGER. Well, I will say something about the black market. For 45 years I have been a constant visitor to the city of New York. It amuses me sometimes to hear them talk about the black market. I have never been there when there was a first-run at the theater but sooner or later somebody would come to me and say, "Mr. CLEVENGER, have you seen the latest so-and-so sensation at such-and-such a theater?" And I would say, "Why, yes. I saw it last night." I will say to the gentleman sitting before me that he is going to enjoy this as he has been there with me many times. And then they would ask, "How did you get the tickets to that show?" And I said, "I got them at the box office." That is the last place they thought of to go for a theater ticket. I am wondering if they know where to go to get steaks.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

OFF ON HIGH—ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN PROPAGANDA SHEET—LINING UP THE VOTES FOR BRETTON WOODS WITH FEDERAL MONEY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, dated March 17, 1945, from the Treasury Department of the United States came the following letter:

Secretary Morgenthau recently addressed the Detroit Economic Club on the Bretton Woods agreements for an international monetary fund and an international bank for reconstruction and development.

The Secretary thought you might be interested in the enclosed material from the Detroit papers and some selected clippings from other newspapers throughout the country dealing with the Detroit meeting and the Bretton Woods agreements.

I am also taking the liberty of enclosing a copy of the text of the Secretary's address for your reference.

EDWIN B. FUSSELL,
Assistant to the Secretary.

With it were five full-page electroplates of Detroit newspapers and two of equal size containing assorted propaganda from Detroit and other papers.

Doubtless similar material went to the desk of every other Congressman.

The propaganda is in line with this administration's idea that, come low or high water, the interests, the welfare and the well-being of other people, other nations, should be considered first—before the interests of our own people of America.

The one great, vital question which confronts us here in the United States of America is the early winning of this war with a minimum of loss of life.

American youth throughout the world are dying by the thousands and the principal beneficiaries from the sacrifices which they have made, which they will be required to make, are the people of other lands.

If that is to be the fate of American youth, then the least that we here at home can do is to devote our every thought, our every word, our every act, to giving them the greatest possible support in every field.

The future welfare of other nations might well wait until the victory has been won; until the enemy has ceased shooting, bombing, killing, America's young men. The one thing which should concern every administration official is the giving of every possible aid to those who have either enlisted or who have been drafted to fight this war.

The administration here in Washington has at last discovered that there is a possible shortage of food. Yesterday, the President stated that he was going to give the matter some consideration. Perhaps General Hershey and those who have been "shanghaiing" agricultural labor at last realize that possibly some of their political friends will not be able to get all the butter, the meat, and the other things which they enjoy.

It is aso possible that the White House—even the Executive Mansion—although the First Lady announces that she has not noticed any shortage of food—may in time discover that milk does not originate in a can; that the materials which go into the bread has a prior existence, and that, somewhere in the United States, someone has sweated and toiled to produce.

Krug, head of the War Production Board, according to the press, a few days ago made the momentous discovery that there was a limit to America's capacity to produce and to feed the world.

Perhaps it is too bad that some of the higher-ups in the administration either never heard of or failed to remember the old nursery jingle, which goes something like this:

Humpty-Dumpty sat on a wall;
Humpty-Dumpty had a great fall—
And all the king's horses and all the king's men
Could not put Humpty-Dumpty together again.

Perhaps they have forgotten that the answer to the riddle was that Humpty-Dumpty was an egg; that an egg once broken, the milk once spilled, cannot be conjured back into its original form by an administrative directive.

So up into Detroit, where there has been a slow-down of production, where the Army and the Navy officials have warned that men on the fighting lines will die because of slow-downs, work stoppages, and strikes; because of a lack of material, goes the great Henry Morgenthau, who announced, in substance, that the German nation should be deindustrialized, that its people should become agriculturalists, and attempts to line up the industrialists and the workers of Detroit in support of Bretton Woods, a program which will require American taxpayers to contribute, at its inception, more than five and one-half billion dollars.

The principal purpose of Bretton Woods is to make the American taxpayer pay for benefits which will be enjoyed by foreign nations and the people of foreign nations.

To corral the votes of the Detroit industrialists and of hundreds of thousands of workers in Detroit, Henry baits his hook with the juicy promise that Detroit, if Bretton Woods is adopted, will get an order for a million automobiles in the immediate post-war period and that hundreds of thousands of jobs will be created. All this on the theory that if we give or loan now five and one-half billion—later, more if necessary—to foreign nations, the people of those nations will, in turn, spend that money buying automobiles, and, naturally, someone must build them.

For myself, I prefer to have the American tax dollar spent here in America with the American people and that they—not someone across the sea—buy the automobile. The automobile will be sold, but it will be sold to an American. It will be paid for by American dollars, no part of which has been shaved off by some intermediary for administrative expenses. The automobile will be built by American labor and the American worker will have a job.

The theory of giving foreigners American dollars so that they, in turn, can spend those dollars with us and so create prosperity, savors too much of lifting ourselves by our own bootstraps.

Henry, instead of advocating the adoption of Bretton Woods, might far better have been appealing for a return to work, for the production of war materials. But his mind apparently was not on the main, the vital issue; he was thinking of the future welfare of those who are not Americans.

Bretton Woods should stand or fall on its merits, and there is no excuse for a member of the President's Cabinet traveling around the country spending tax money in propaganda.

There is no excuse for a Cabinet officer attempting to buy the support of automobile manufacturers, of automobile workers, by offering them post-war sales, post-war jobs.

One thing the automobile manufacturers, and the automobile workers should remember is this: That if this administration continues to increase the tax burden of the American citizen, of the American farmer who has been the motor manufacturers' best customer, he will not have the money to buy on the home market, and the worker will not have the food to eat which the farmer would otherwise produce if properly equipped with motor transportation and farm machinery.

Henry should learn what Krug and some other high administrative officials are learning and today acknowledge, that it is necessary to keep a sound, secure foundation under the American people, under American industry, and that cannot be done if the material for that foundation is shipped abroad, given away.

Excerpts from these Detroit papers, which show Henry's bait, are attached hereto and marked exhibit A.

EXHIBIT A

Detroit Times of February 23, 1945: A picture of Secretary Morgenthau and Walter McLucas, chairman of the board of the National Bank of Detroit, with the information that Mr. Morgenthau addressed the Economic Club on the Bretton Woods conference.

Same page—first—headline, two-thirds across the page, "Strike May Hit 100,000 Jobs," and at the right, the headline on the news article reads, "Dodge fight seen halting B–29 output," and, down below, the statement:

The Army and Navy today flatly told representatives of 13,000 striking U. A. W.-C. I. O. Dodge main plant employees that they are impeding the war effort and jeopardizing recent United States gains.

Appearing at a W. L. B. hearing after the strikers refused to heed a W. L. B. order to return to work, the service officers said unless the strike is called off immediately production of certain B–29 bomber parts will be stopped completely.

In addition, production of trucks, tanks, robot bombs, and Bofors guns has been affected seriously.

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND MAY BE IDLE

A company spokesman estimated that, if the strike continued, more than 100,000 workers from 13 other Detroit and Chicago Chrysler Corporation plants may be made idle by the end of the week.

Detroit News, February 26, 1945, headline across top of page, "Strike perils jobs of 100,000."

Then, in the news column, is reprinted Morgenthau's address under the caption, "Million-car export due for Detroit—Morgenthau looks to Bretton Woods."

On another full-page reproduction, there is an article captioned, "In terms of jobs in Detroit factories."

Then the news story begins with the paragraph:

Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau, speaking here in behalf of the Bretton Woods agreement, made a persuasive case for it by relating its purpose to Detroit's needs as an exporting center.

The substance of his argument was that, if we would finance other peoples and other nations, they would buy some automobiles and the workers of Detroit would have jobs.

Detroit Free Press, February 27, 1945, headline running across first page, "Dodge strikers get new W. L. B. ultimatum."

Down below, the subheading, "15,800 idle as unit still defies order—14 more plants may be forced to close."

Over at the left of the same page, "Strike at Dodge snowballs into national crisis.".

Then, down in the middle of the page, Morgenthau's plug for Bretton Woods, captioned, "World auto trade boom predicted by Morgenthau economic pact would open market, Detroit business leaders told."

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, many Members of the House are receiving complaints from all over the United States on the unworkability of title 3 of the G. I. bill of rights, namely, the title dealing with loans to veterans. I am receiving complaints from all over the country that this portion of the G. I. bill is not functioning in the best interests of the veterans. I believe that to be true primarily because the Veterans' Administration has surrounded title 3 with so many regulations, rules, and interpretations, that it is impossible to make a loan under it to the best interests of the veterans. I have information from bankers that they are only considering the making of loans to veterans because of the patriotic desire on their part to help them; otherwise, they would not be interested in these loans or interested in making them because the Veterans' Administration has surrounded title 3 with such unworkable regulations and interpretations that they cannot figure it out and make the loan and know what they are doing. I am perfectly aware also in the drafting of the G. I. bill of rights we placed therein a provision that if the veteran could not get a guaranteed loan under the provisions of the bill, the Veterans' Administration may permit him to get a loan from any other agency of the Government. In the bill before you, which is now under discussion. I find a provision authorizing $25,000,000 to make loans to veterans under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Act. That is well and good. But that, again, will only add confusion to the chaotic condition that already exists in the interpretation and administration of title 3 of the G. I. bill of rights. I am for the veterans getting those loans under the terms of the Bankhead-Jones Act, but not to have them administered by the Secretary of Agriculture and subject the veterans to the detriments of the Bankhead-Jones Act. If we could make it so that the veteran would get the benefit of the Bankhead-Jones Act without the detriments and make it as an amendment to the G. I. bill of rights instead of placing the veteran under the Department of Agriculture, then in my opinion we would be doing something for the veterans. In connection with that, I quote from the Bankhead-Jones Act the following as to the powers and duties of the Secretary of Agriculture, which he would have over the veteran if this

$25,000,000 provision is retained in the present bill:

And that such proper farm practices as the Secretary shall prescribe will be carried out.

In other words, under this provision in this bill the Secretary of Agriculture would be able to tell the veteran who secures one of those loans what to farm, where to farm, how to farm, what to plant, what not to plant, and have complete control over him. That is not what the veteran is fighting for. That is not what the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House was endeavoring to do in enacting the G. I. bill of rights.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, we want the veteran to have the benefit of the loan without a lot of red tape and control over him. Let him be a freeman in the free country he is fighting for. Following out this thought, some 20 Members of the House, including myself, on Saturday of last week, met and discussed the possibility of an amendment to title 3 of the G. I. bill.

On Monday of this week I introduced such a measure, which is known as H. R. 2671, which will give the veterans all of the benefits of the Bankhead-Jones Act, without any of its detriments. In other words, he will be a free farmer or a freeman; will be able to come under the provisions of this bill, H. R. 2671, which is offered as an amendment to the G. I. bill of rights, and get everything that he can get under the Bankhead-Jones Act, with the same rate of interest, the same length of time to pay it off. I have no pride of authorship in the bill I have introduced, known as H. R. 2671, but I do say if we want to aid the veteran we should not do it in the manner proposed by the bill under consideration, but rather it should be by direct amendment in a separate bill to title III of the G. I. bill of rights, and prevent adding more confusion to the present chaotic condition.

Therefore, I submit to you the proper way to aid the veteran is to consider H. R. 2671.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I was deeply interested in the address of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] wherein he discussed the great amounts of food on hand in this country. Among other things he called attention to the 82,000,000 head of cattle in this country as well as the number of hogs and other livestock. I come from a cattle-feeding section of the country where thousands of cattle are grazed and fed every year. The gentleman from Missouri says 82,000,000 is more cattle than we have ever had before, and that we have a surplus of livestock.

On the other hand, Government agencies tell us of the great scarcity of meat, including beef. The War Food Administrator, Mr. Jones, says there may be some doubt about it. Some Government agencies say the meat supply is fast fading away and very soon there will be little left for anyone. Officials in high places even tell us we may be short of meat for our armed forces. Even the British Government is concerned about a meat supply they expect from this country. Housewives say they cannot buy meat in the butcher shops and the butchers say they cannot buy it from the wholesalers.

What I am trying to bring out is this—the whole problem ought to be unscrambled. It appears to be a matter of maldistribution, bad handling and bungling. There are too many agencies dealing with the problem, many at cross-purposes.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I submitted a resolution that the Committee on Agriculture look into the food supply problem, especially meat. We should find out about our supply, what the demands are on the part of the armed forces, about our promises to the Allies, how much we are to give to U. N. R. R. A. and other foreign groups, and how much for ourselves. A policy should be formulated with respect to the distribution of food for the present and in the post-war era. The authority for the handling and distribution should be placed in one agency and not a half dozen as is being done now. It looks as though the left hand does not know what the right hand is doing in dealing with the meat question.

I know the problem can be worked out if we have experienced men to deal with it and who are given authority to do it. One thing that would give the country more meat is to offer inducement to the feeder by paying a little higher price for the finished product. Because livestock are slaughtered before finished we have a poorer quality of meat at a higher cost, and we have a less supply of good meat. It is estimated about 20,000,000 cattle were slaughtered last year at an average of 50 pounds less weight than the year before. This is a decrease of 10,000,000 pounds. We should have had an increase of two or three hundred pounds on each animal.

In any event we have confusion with respect to producing, processing and distribution that could be straightened out if we put it in the hands of one agency with authority to act. We have lots of statistics about meat. People cannot eat statistics—they want meat.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I agree fully with the remarks just made by the gentleman from Kansas. The testimony presented this afternoon on the floor of the House on the food situation in the United States has been most confusing. More than anything else, it emphasizes one thing, the need now of a prompt and searching investigation on the part of the people's Representatives.

I have gathered at random some statements made by Members of the House during the debate today. Let me repeat them to you:

First. Farm production in the United States is getting worse and worse.

Second. We have more food today than at any time in our history.

Third. We must be ready to take another hitch in our belts.

Fourth. Liberated lands will be able to produce record crops.

Fifth. We must export great quantities of food.

Obviously, we are in great disagreement. On one propostion, however, we do agree and that is the American black market flourishes and little is being done about it. It is not a healthy picture for morale on the home front, and most certainly it is not a healthy picture for our G. I.'s on the battle front.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, there is something of more importance involved than this agriculture bill that we have up for consideration today—period. Little did I think 6 years ago, when I became a member of the Committee on Agriculture, that I would gradually see it washed out as far as being a committee of any great importance. In 1939 and 1940, the Agriculture Committee considered only the legislation O. K.'d by the Department. Now we see the committee's functions turned over to the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, evidently with the support of the chairman. These are facts no one can dispute. Little did I realize that the Committee on Appropirations or any other committee of this House would ever have the temerity to take over the functions of a legislative committee of the House of Representative like the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations has done. This Agriculture Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has set itself up above the law; rules, I will say instead of law, because I am not a lawyer, and I do not want to get into any legal argument. It distresses me to see the great Rules Committee become a partner to such a program. I do know when groups play fair, I know when they bite in the clinches, and I know when they hit below the belt, because I come from a country that is not too far removed from the lumberjack days.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Do I understand that the Committee on Appropriations is bringing in legislation on this appropriation bill not authorzed by the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Kansas. Yes; I regret to say that the Rules Committee is going to bring in a rule that provides that no points of order can be made. The Appropriations Committee voted to ask for this kind of a rule. The Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations has taken upon itself to write the legislation that ought to go through the Committee on Agriculture. I am not irritated or jealous about it as far as it affects the Agriculture Committee. I do resent the attitude,

however, and I do question a program whereby the chairman of the Agriculture Committee gives it his blessing by appearing for a rule wherein points of order cannot be made without authorization from the Agriculture Committee.

It saddens me to see our country gradually going down the road to totalitarianism. Oh, it is the power certain people like to grab for some reason or other. I do not care who the Member is, he cannot help from being irritated, he should be depressed to see these things happen. I am not jealous about anything that the Agricultural Committee might have up for consideration, but in this bill the way it is brought in you will find legislation that could and should have been referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

Let me give you one example. In the Agricultural Committee that is supposed to have charge of farm loans, they here vote out the Flannagan farm credit bill. I voted against it. After July 1 a person who is able to make a 50-percent down payment on his farm gets a mortgage for 4 percent for the remaining 50 percent. If he is fairly thrifty and he has 25 percent to pay down on the farm, the Flannagan bill requires the borrower to pay 5-percent interest. But, lo and behold, if he can go to the Appropriations Committee and get in good with that Bankhead-Jones committee, he can buy a farm without a red cent. He can sign a statement that he cannot get the money from anyone and he can get the loan for 3 percent for 40 years. In addition, he can get the Bankhead-Jones committee to provide a loan wherein they spend $300 to go out and find a farm, or 5 percent on the average farm they will buy. The fellow who is the worse off has to go to the Bankhead-Jones committee. The fellow who is fairly well off and tries to get started has to get a loan from legislation that passes the Agricultural Committee and pay as much as 66⅔ percent more interest than he would if he could get a loan through the Bankhead-Jones committee set-up.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It appears then it is about time that the Appropriations Committee of the House handling these appropriations for the Department of Agriculture get together with the House Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not want to make a personal matter out of this.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I was not being personal.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable H. CARL ANDERSEN, a member of this subcommittee, went before the Rules Committee yesterday and protested. My colleague on the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin the Honorable FRANK B. KEEFE, protested also. These gentlemen realize that this committee is in a field which it did not have any business to be in. I want it to appear in the RECORD at this point that as a Member of Congress I will not support nor will I vote to provide one group of people 100-percent loans at 3 percent and provide another group 75-percent loans for 66⅔ more interest, or 5-percent interest.

We are going down the road to totalitarianism because when they get those loans they will be under the domination of the administration that provides the soft loan at 3 percent. The average or common man's loan will pay 5 percent and the hard-loan borrower will pay 4-percent interest. I wish someone sometime would explain this kind of legislation.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] may have permission to revise and extend his remarks and to insert certain tables and other extraneous matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is given permission to revise and extend his remarks, but he will have to get permission to include extraneous matters in the House.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me when we are considering an appropriation bill for agriculture it is important to bring up the matter of the leather shortage and to make a suggestion as to how we can secure more leather.

Just a few days ago, on March 15, the War Production Board announced "a deep slash in the supply of leather for civilian shoes in April, May, and June." I am reliably informed that only 10 or 15 percent of the leather recently available for upper leather for shoes would be available for those 3 months. In practical effect this means that only fabric shoes will be made during this period. Much of the material now going into shoe construction is not worth the effort and energy required for the manufacture of the shoes produced. The quality of much of this fabric material is so low that, as many housewives tell me, shoes, particularly those for children, will not stand up and frequently fall apart shortly after they are put into use. As a result of the continued reduction in quality due to the lack of leather, the number of shoes produced in this country has continued to decline so that, in spite of a fairly strict rationing system, O. P. A. authorities now admit that the number of shoes available is fewer than the total number of tickets outstanding. In 1942 this country produced approximately 450,000,000 pairs of shoes. In 1944, 314,000,000 pairs of shoes were produced for civilians in this country. The cut announced this last week will probably result in a drop in production, even of the fabric shoes, to less than 300,000,000 pairs for the year 1945.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, there is increasing realization of the need for American production of footwear to provide for at least the minimum needs of the liberated countries. Some estimates set this requirement to a figure of 200,000,000 pairs. Present supplies cannot possibly fill even the minimum requirements for our needs here at home, much less the decent and humane thing of supplying some footwear to the peoples just freed from the Nazi yoke.

This need requires the resourcefulness of the American people. This problem, I am convinced, has a comparatively simple solution. This solution is so simple and so obvious that I am sure many will ask, Why did not I think of that one? And yet I am convinced that only inertia and lethargy and failure to realize the importance of increasing the supply of leather have brought about the failure to use the potential supply of leather that is available through the skinning and tanning of the large number of hogs that are slaughtered in this country. According to the Department of Agriculture, 46,520,000 hogs were slaughtered in federally inspected wholesale slaughterhouses in 1941. Yet in that year, approximately 200,000 skins were tanned to make valuable pigskin which is used to manufacture many beautiful articles that are sold in this country. According to the Department of Agriculture, this morning 74,804,827 hogs were slaughtered in federally inspected slaughterhouses last year. Yet only 550,000 skins were tanned to make pigskin. If only one-half of the hogs slaughtered in these slaughterhouses were skinned and the skins were tanned, the leather supply available in this country would be doubled. It might be possible then to produce a good quality leather shoe whose durability would be such that the present rationing program would fulfill the footwear needs of the people of this country; a new product will have been developed and we may be in position then, as good neighbors, to aid in filling the footwear needs of our allies abroad.

I was interested last evening while glancing through one of the better texts on shoe manufacturing, a volume entitled "Boot and Shoe Manufacture," by Frank Plucknett, to read that a British delegation visiting Russia in 1929 reported in regard to pigskin:

> Care is being taken in that country in regard to the collection of raw materials, especially pigskins, of which it is hoped to export considerable quantities in the near future.

Apparently our Russian allies have learned to gather pigskin. According to one of the British trade journals of the leather industry, the Leather Trades Review, September 15, 1943, the Germans have also learned to use pigskin. R. E. Muirhead, in a letter to the editor in the issue of September 15, 1943, states that—

> In districts of Germany where before the war pigs were not skinned, on the outbreak of the war the government made it compulsory to skin pigs and even took the trouble to have men trained to do the skinning in order to use the skin for leather production.

It seems to me that much leather that should be used in shoe manufacturing is going into the production of leather novelties. This is a comparative waste and all available leather should be kept for more desirable use in shoe production. On April 20 of last year, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL], called the attention of this House to the serious shortage of leather resulting in the curtailment of shoe manufacturing. He stated:

> I take the floor today to point out a situation in my district which presents a most deplorable condition which bids fair to threaten the very future of the community in which I live.

I refer to the fact that there are available no hides from which to make shoes.

He later stated:

You may be interested to know, from my observations taken on the tour I made in the Endicott-Johnson plants last summer, that the tanneries have not enough hides so they can operate and produce the leather to fill the full quota they have been called upon by the Government to manufacture. I speak of military and civilian needs they have been ordered to fill.

At that time the question was raised as to whether the problem was not really one of a labor shortage in the tanneries and the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] replied:

I will ask the gentleman to join me, if it is at all possible for him to do so, to take a tour through the Endicott-Johnson tanneries and shoe factories. He will change his mind after he has gone through the shoe factories and will conclude that there is enough labor, particularly in the tanneries, to tan and cure a great many more times the number of hides than have been made available. I assure the gentleman that sufficient labor is available. The only problem is to get the hides.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, I am informed that the O. W. I. announced on June 19, 1943, the formation of a test group "to investigate the possibility of increasing supplies through greater utilization of domestic pigskins." The full statement by the O. W. I. reads as follows:

A task group has been appointed to investigate the possibility of increasing leather supplies through greater utilization of domestic pigskins, Harold Connett, Chief of the Leather and Shoe Branch, W. P. B., announced today.

The slaughter of hogs averages approximately 80,000,000 head annually. However, only small amounts of leather are now produced from this kill, because the skin is usually left on the cuts of meat in the form of rind. It is hoped that substantial additions to the leather supply may result from this investigation, despite the fact that there are serious obstacles to be overcome.

The task group has been requested to investigate the suitability of pigskin leather for upper leather, sole leather, glove leather, and other uses, and the steps necessary to accomplish the maximum leather production from the hog slaughter.

The task group which consists of representatives of the various industries involved in utilizing pigskin leather, follows:

Packers: Henry McCaw, Swift & Co., Chicago, Ill.; Joseph P. Russell, Abrogast & Bastion, Allentown, Pa.

Hide and skin dealers and collectors: Thomas Trainer, Owatonna Hide & Fur Co., Owatonna, Minn.; Sig Adler, Sig Adler & Co., 3918-30 South Wallace Street, Chicago, Ill.

Tanners: E. E. Grayson, S. M. Gusdorf Co., 302 South Harding Street, Indianapolis, Ind.; Herman Roser, Herman Rose & Sons, Inc., Glastonbury, Conn.; F. Sturgis Stout, John R. Evans & Co., Camden, N. J.

Shoe manufacturer: Charles F. Johnson, Jr., Endicott-Johnson Corporation, Johnson City, N. Y.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand the transcript of a conference held on March 27, 1941, exactly 4 years ago. This conference was called by Harriet Eliot, attended by the leading figures of the shoe industry and all Government agencies involved, and met for the purpose of "talking with shoe manufacturers to get a more complete view of the situation running from the shoe manufacturers toward the consumer from the consumer back to the leather supplies." It seems to me that someone has bungled this problem. On the one hand, we have the terrific need not only of our own population but also of our allies. On the other hand, we have the tremendous potential source available and apparently all that has been done about it is to have conferences, unending conferences, involved complicated regulations, but no one seems to have taken any action to resolve this problem.

Mr. Chairman, steps could be taken immediately to bring and end to the leather shortage. I hope this House will take steps to force some action in this field.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the membership of the House has had opportunity to reflect on the disastrous results from a departmental administrative standpoint of the deletions on points of order made in this body a couple of days ago during its consideration of appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary.

I have no quarrel with the rights of any Member of this body to raise points of order on the two or three definite legislative provisions that were carried in that bill. I refer specifically to the item of Cultural Relations with China and the Near East and the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education in London. I will state, however, in my opinion the provisions were warranted, first for the reason that the work being conducted by the Department of State, under these two items, has been considered of sufficient importance by the President during the past 2 or 3 years to justify their being financed out of the President's emergency fund. There is no question in my mind but that the elimination of these two items, if sustained by the Senate, will have considerable effect on the morale of the nations wherein this work is conducted, in addition to placing this country at certain disadvantages in its foreign relationship during this crucial period.

I do, however, resent and I believe that every fair-minded Member of this body will resent, the seemingly obstructionist tactics adopted with respect to the smaller and more insignificant legislative provisions that have been carried in this bill over a period of years, some of which came into being as a result of the need for more expedient action on the part of the departments in carrying on their war programs.

There has been considerable discussion in this House, and in the press, as well, about placing government on a business basis. Nearly all of the provisions eliminated on points of order were intended to do just this. The so-called red tape in our Government has been publicized for the past many years. Several of the provisions were intended to circumvent this red tape.

Take, for instance, the authority to transfer between appropriation items in amounts not to exceed 10 percent of any appropriation under the caption "Foreign Service"; the primary purpose of which was to provide some flexibility in the administration of these appropriations. It is impossible for any agency of the Government to predict with any degree of accuracy its exact requirements under any one appropriation item for a period of approximately 1 year in advance. The real effect of this provision, as experience will show, has been to obviate the necessity of the department coming up for a deficiency appropriation in the event that it runs a few dollars short in one appropriation item, whereas it may have a considerable amount over in some other appropriation item. With an annual appropriation of approximately $25,000,000 for the Foreign Service, only $15,000 was so transferred during the fiscal year 1944.

With respect to the elimination of the entire item of foreign service buildings, it may be stated that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House was apprized of the legislative provision exempting this activity from the provisions of the act of March 25, 1938. This committee, however, realizing the importance of moving with dispatch in the acquisition of sites and buildings during this abnormal period, saw fit to allow the exemption to remain. If we wait until the war is over and then follow the usual procedure of requesting funds to purchase individual properties, there is no question but that the cost to the taxpayers of this Nation will be increased by many thousands of dollars.

The elimination of the wording, "Printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919" under the item International Conferences, will also result not only in inconveniencing the department in the carrying out of its work, but also in increased cost to the department. Many conferences are, of course, held outside of the District of Columbia and it is inconceivable how this statute could be made to apply to small amounts of printing and binding in other points of the United States and beyond the continental limits of the United States. Likewise, expenses of entertainment and representation allowances are considered a basic necessity in the conduct of any international conference. Similar allowances are made by other governments to their representatives, and this authority was included to place our representatives on an equal basis in order that they may avoid embarrassment and being placed in disadvantageous positions in their dealings.

Coming now to the Department of Justice, the membership will recall that there was eliminated from this department a provision authorizing the use of not to exceed 5 percent of the appropriations under Legal Activities and General Administration interchangeably. This provision as in the case with the Department of State, was inserted for greater flexibility in administering the various items of appropriation and obviating the necessity of coming to the Deficiency Committee for supplementals. To give you an idea of the extent to which this provision has been applied in the past years, it may be stated that in 1938 the amount of $29,500 was so transferred. In 1940, $3,928; in 1941, $4,425; in 1942, $2,400; in 1943, $4,700; and in 1944, $8,903.

It can be readily seen that the department has not taken advantage of this provision and that there has been no abuse of the authority heretofore allowed.

Under the item "Salaries and expenses of marshals" there was deleted a provision authorizing the payment of not to exceed 4 cents per mile for the use of privately owned automobiles when traveling on official business within the limits of their official station. The United States marshals and their deputies almost without exception use their privately owned automobiles in the discharge of their duties and in the transportation of prisoners. It is the responsibility of the Government to furnish transportation in these instances and obviously it is cheaper to authorize payment at the rate of 4 cents a mile than it is for the Government to purchase the necessary automobiles, principally because depreciation costs are not charged to the Government when privately owned automobiles are used.

In connection with the Federal prison system there was eliminated a proviso exempting an appropriation item from section 3709 of the Revised Statutes when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $500. Mr. Bennett, Director of the Bureau of Prisons, has indicated to the committee on numerous occasions that, rather than an added cost to the Government, this provision has resulted in considerable savings to the Government. The procurement of supplies and material for the maintenance and operation of the institutions is exceedingly difficult under the present sellers' market created by the war. In many cases vendors do not desire to take on additional business and are unwilling to comply with the requirements of the provisions cited. The deletion of this provision from the bill will prohibit the Federal Prison System from making advantageous purchases on the open market and will greatly increase the procurement problems of this organization.

Coming to the Department of Commerce, there was eliminated a general provision authorizing the Secretary to delegate to an officer of the Department authority to sign minor routine official papers and documents during the temporary absence of the Secretary, the Under Secretary, and the Assistant Secretary of the Department. I do not believe that there is a business establishment in this country that has not in effect a working arrangement similar to the one provided for in this provision. It seems to me no more than just a matter of common sense.

As in the case of the marshals under the Department of Justice appropriation, there was eliminated from the Census Bureau an item authorizing reimbursement to employees for the use of their privately owned automobiles. The censuses that are taken by this Bureau under authorization of law are taken by temporary enumerators employed for this specific purpose. It is, of course, not economical to purchase automobiles for the execution of these responsibilities, and it certainly is unfair to the employees to impose upon them the use of privately owned automobiles without just compensation for gasoline, tires, and so forth.

In the Civil Aeronautics Administration there was eliminated on a point of order the item "Of not to exceed the amount of $5,000 for the entertainment of officials in the field of aviation in other countries when specifically authorized and approved by the Administrator." When one contemplates the future of this country in the aviation field and the many problems dealing with aviation that must still be solved it becomes exceedingly difficult to comprehend the reasonableness of eliminating this item. Our officials are entertained abroad and each country expects that their representatives will be extended similar courtesies on their visits to this country. Obviously the expenses of such entertainment cannot be defrayed by officials of the administration from their personal funds.

In two instances under the Commerce Department there were eliminated the words "without warrant action." I am just wondering if the term was thoroughly understood at the time the points of order were raised. The provision has no effect whatsoever on the continuation of previously appropriated funds during 1946. The provision was merely intended to eliminate the processing of many documents by the Treasury Department, the General Accounting Office, and the Department of Commerce.

Again under an appropriation item of the Civil Aeronautics Administration there was eliminated authority to reimburse employees for the use of their privately owned automobiles when traveling on official business. This item was needed in connection with the maintenance and operation of the air navigation facilities, many of which were located at otherwise inaccessible points.

In connection with the Civil Aeronautics Board under the Department of Commerce, there was eliminated the provision "without regard to section 3709 of the revised statutes." This provision, as the preceding text of the bill will indicate, was for the employment of consultants, experts, and guards on a contract fee basis. The purpose of the language was to permit the immediate employment of these types of employees for the investigation of aircraft accidents. The guards were necessary to prevent souvenir hunters and others from removing items which may be vital to the investigation and thus preserve evidence which may be of value in determining the cause of the accident. All of these employees were, of course, hired on a temporary basis only.

These are only a few of the 37 points of order conceded or sustained during the action on this bill. I could cite numerous others of a similar nature and equally insignificant and equally detrimental to the efficient operation of the departments involved. But time does not permit. I merely took advantage of what time was allotted me to call to the attention of the House the result of these points of order in the hope that the individual Members will more fully consider the import of their actions when contemplating the raising of points of order against similar provisions in appropriation bills in the future.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time, 3 minutes, to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to direct attention to the possible violation of existing law covering loans made by the Rural Electrification Administration, with the thought that consideration should be given to the reduction of the $60,000,000 appropriation in the pending bill for loans from moneys borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Section 904 of chapter 31 of the United States Code—covering rural electrification—provides:

> The Administrator is authorized and empowered from the sums herein authorized to make loans * * * for the purpose of financing the construction and operation of generating plants, electric transmission and distribution lines or systems for the furnishing of electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central-station service.

Section 903 provides:

> That no such loan (by R. E. A.) shall be in an amount exceeding 85 percent of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor.

Information has just been received by me in a letter from a constituent indicating that regardless of these limitations, loans are being made by the R. E. A. for purposes not authorized by the act, and in excess of the amount prescribed.

To substantiate this charge and fact, I quote from my constituent's letter, as follows:

> I have just received from the Western Pine Association a notice about the taking advantage by a Government bureau of a law of Congress in a manner which Congress quite obviously did not intend. I quote from the Western Pine Association Bulletin:
>
> "A case in point is a recent certification to the W. P. B. by the R. E. A. of the Department of Agriculture. The Rural Electrification Act authorizes the Administrator to make loans that will be self-liquidating within a period of not to exceed 35 years at the rate of 2 percent per annum. Such low-interest-rate loans were restricted by Congress to the financing only of generating plants, transmission, and distribution lines or systems. The obvious intent of such restriction was recognition that otherwise banks and industry would be destroyed or severely curtailed.
>
> "The present case involves R. E. A. authorization of a 100-percent loan for the purchase and rehabilitation of a creosoting plant and for working capital. The claim is made that a creosoting plant comes under the authority to promote rural electrification. If such assumption is established, these low-rate, long-time loans could apparently be made for the purchase and operation of timber and sawmills, copper mines, smelters, refineries, wire mills, as well as for the manufacture of electrical transformers and for purchase of raw materials."
>
> I can only hope that Congress will amend the Rural Electrification Act so that there will be no possibility in the future of Government agency lawyers getting away with this sort of thing. Obviously, if you give these Government agencies an inch they will take a mile, and this sort of thing should be stopped, not only in this case, but in the future.

If the $60,000,000 appropriation above referred to and provided for in H. R. 2689 is used ultra vires, and for the purpose of financing creosoting plants, and these at 100-percent loans, then it is probable that an amendment to make a very substantial cut in this appropriation is not only justified, but highly necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Clerk read down to and including line 7 on page 1.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have addressed the Committee of the Whole today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2689) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CHELF (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), indefinitely, on account of death in the family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include certain tables and other extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks and include a copyrighted article by Maj. George Fielding Eliot entitled "Prediscbarge Leave Favored To Ease Return to Civilian Life."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a document by the Tariff Commission. The Public Printer estimates that it will cost $130, as it exceeds the limit fixed by the Joint Committee on Printing. Notwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that it may be extended.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LINK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Honorable M. S. Szymczak, member, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, entitled "Monetary and Credit Agreements Entered Into at Bretton Woods," delivered before the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, at Chicago, Ill., on March 20, 1945.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks on four different subjects and to include therein newspaper clippings and a resolution.

Mr. NEELY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include with them two editorials from the Philadelphia Record.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein certain statements, excerpts, and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the tables referred to in my remarks this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1360. An act for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 77. An act for the relief of Lindon A. Long;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.;

S. 321. An act for the relief of James M. Hiler;

S. 515. An act for the relief of Wallace Robertson, Henry Bowker, and Edward Parisian, and for other purposes; and

S. 525. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval training center, Farragut, Idaho, on July 10, 1944.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 22, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

The Committee on Invalid Pensions will continue hearings on Thursday, March 22, at 10:30 a. m., in the committee room, room 247, House Office Building, on H. R. 128, a bill to extend the period of the Philippine Insurrection for pensionable purposes for service rendered between July 5, 1902, and December 31, 1913.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in executive session at 10:30 a. m. on Thursday, March 22, 1945, in the committee room, room 356, House Office Building.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 194. Resolution waiving points of order against the bill (H. R. 2689) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 353). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 1656. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify the provisions of a contract for the purchase of a power plant for use in connection with the San Carlos irrigation project; without amendment (Rept. No. 354). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 199. Resolution for the consideration of H R. 689, a bill to enable the Department of State, pursuant to its responsibilities under the Constitution and Statutes of the United States, more effectively to carry out its prescribed and traditional responsibilities in the foreign field; to strengthen the Foreign Service, permitting fullest utilization of available personnel and facilities of other departments and agencies and coordination of activities abroad of the United States under a Foreign Service for the United States unified under the guidance of the Department of State; without amendment (Rept. No. 355). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BATES of Kentucky: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 195. Resolution to investigate supplies and shortages of food, particularly meat; without amendment (Rept. No. 356). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 52. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to study the basic problems affecting post-war immigration and naturalization; without amendment (Rept. No. 357). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1074) for the relief of Mary G. Person, and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2703. A bill to improve salary and wage administration in the Federal service; to provide pay for overtime and for night and holiday work; to amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2704. A bill to authorize municipalities and public-utility districts in the Terri-

tory of Alaska to issue revenue bonds for public-works purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 2705. A bill granting travel pay and allowance for subsistence to certain soldiers of the Regular Army who served in the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 2706. A bill to make census data available without charge to applicants for benefits under the Social Security Act and to those seeking employment in defense industries; to the Committee on the Census.

H. R. 2707. A bill to terminate the use tax on motor vehicles and boats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 2708. A bill to prohibit race segregation in the armed forces of the United States after the termination of hostilities in the present war and the beginning of demobilization; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 2709. A bill to amend the Criminal Code so as to punish anyone injuring a party, witness, or juror on account of his having acted as such; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2710. A bill to provide for the detention, care, and treatment of persons of unsound mind in certain Federal reservations in Virginia and Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2711. A bill to insure further the military security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information secured through official sources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2712. A bill to amend Public Law 36, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 2713. A bill to provide veterans' benefits based upon service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 2714. A bill to increase from 1 to 2 years the time within which to file claim for disability pension or death compensation or pension in order to receive benefits from date of discharge or release from active service or date of death; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2715. A bill amending title 11 of the Social Security Act to provide insurance benefits for any wife, irrespective of her age, who was married to and living with an insured individual for 10 years or more prior to the date he attained the age of 65; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2716. A bill to provide for health programs for Government employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2717. A bill to eliminate the requirement of an oath in connection with applications for benefits under all laws and regulations administered by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2718. A bill to amend section 1 of an act entitled "An act to effect needed changes in the Navy ration," approved March 2, 1933 (Public, No. 411, 72d Cong.); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 2719. A bill to amend the act of June 21, 1940 (Public Law No. 647, 76th Cong.), so as to make such act applicable in the case of highway bridges owned by municipalities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2720. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tide waters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution requesting the President to establish friendly diplomatic relations with Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings on a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties, held before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary during the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of House Document No. 394, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, entitled "Handbook for Servicemen and Servicewomen of World War No. 2 and Their Dependents, Including Rights and Benefits of Veterans of World War No. 1 and Their Dependents," as a public document, and providing for additional copies thereof; to the Committee on Printing.

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the historical statement of the laws enacted and the regulations promulgated relating to veterans and their dependents, with a complete statement regarding expenditures for hospital and domiciliary construction, as a House document, and providing for additional copies thereof; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. Res. 195. Resolution to investigate supplies and shortages of food, particularly meat; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SLAUGHTER:

H. Res. 196. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the calling up of any bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations until its report has been on file and available to Members of the House for 10 days; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 197. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit the exclusion of Members of the House from committee hearings; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 198. Resolution authorizing the printing of the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States No. 63, delivered during the October term, 1944, in the case of the *Northwestern Bands of Shoshone Indians, petitioners, v. The United States*, on writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims, as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GIFFORD:

H. R. 2721. A bill for the relief of the Tobey Hospital; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 2722. A bill for the relief of the Farmers Mutual Fire Insurance Co., of Sumner County, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2723. A bill for the relief of I. H. Beasley; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2724. A bill for the relief of Charlie Powell; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2725. A bill for the relief of the estate of Joe Manier; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2726. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annie D. Ford; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2727. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lillian Adams and Pleas Baker; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2728. A bill for the relief of R. H Sindle; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2729. A bill for the relief of Donald George; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 2730. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jane Strang; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 2731. A bill for the relief of Joseph Kenney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 2732. A bill granting an increase of pension to Matthew Henson; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2733. A bill for the relief of Charles Larkin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICH:

H. R. 2734. A bill for the relief of J. C. Decker, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2735. A bill for the relief of Frank L. Howard; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2736. A bill for the relief of Norman Abbott; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2737. A bill for the relief of Clara Black; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

226. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Christian Frederick Danielsen, of New York, praying that the words "without revealing the nature or source of its evidence" be countermanded from the War and Navy Department's restrictive circular entitled "Discharge of Subversives From Private Plants and War Department Plants Privately Operated of Importance to Army Procurement," dated February 5, 1942, in that the clause results in an unconstitutional denial of a fair trial; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

227. By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico: Petition of the Seventeenth Legislature of New Mexico urging that the Congress consider such legislation as necessary to make the prevailing wage scales in New Mexico conform to those now being paid in the States of Arizona and Colorado; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

228. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of the Forty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning the Congress of the United States to consider favorably Senate Joint Resolution 8, proposing an amendment to the Federal Constitution providing that the President shall transmit to Congress his estimates of receipts of the Government during the ensuing fiscal year, together with his recommendations as to the purposes for which such receipts shall be expended, and, except in time of war or during the period ending on the date of the expiration of 1 full fiscal year after the termination thereof, the Congress shall not appropriate money for expenditure during such fiscal year in excess of such estimated receipts, except by a vote of three-fifths of each House, unless additional revenues have been previously provided therefor, or unless such appropriation be for expenses and contingencies of the Congress or the courts, or for payment of claims against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

229. Also, petition of the Forty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the Peterson bill (H. R. 5477) known as the seamen's bill of rights; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

230. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of the New Moscow Woman's Christian Temperance Union, with 72 signers, requesting the President and the Congress in the interest of the war effort to cancel the April holiday for the manufacture of liquor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

231. By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Petition of Mrs. E. D. Speer, president, Sunbeam Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Aledo, Ill., et al., urging the Congress to limit the activities of the alcoholic beverage industry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

232. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Mrs. L. E. Austin, and other citizens of South China, Maine, deploring the shipping of malt beverages and other liquors with higher alcoholic content into our fighting areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

233. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 24 residents of Butler County, Pa., favoring the passage of the Lemke bill, an act prohibiting the vivisection of dogs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

234. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take official cognizance of the inherent right of the people of Poland, as well as the people of other small nations, to determine the form and kind of their own government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

235. By Mr. GEELAN: Resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut, memorializing Congress concerning representation at the peace table of members of the armed forces, by providing that the 12,000,000 men of the armed forces be represented at the peace conference; that there be selected one member from the personnel of the enlisted men of the Army, one from the Navy, one from the Air Forces, one from the Marine Corps, and one from the merchant marine, to have their part in the deliberations for the peace of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 1945

(Legislative day of Friday, March 16, 1945)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and beauty, we thank Thee for eyes to see and for hearts to thrill at every sacrament of loveliness as again earth clothes itself in the blooming garb of spring. We thank Thee for the purity of dawn which calls to holy dedication, for the zenith splendor of midday which summons us to challenging tasks, and for the peace of the evening which speaks of life everlasting. From dawn to dark give us courage in the midst of fear, faith amid the mists of doubt, love even in the strife of hatred, and hope like a beacon amid the encircling gloom of despair. Build Thou our inner strength. Grant that we may be among those who stand in the evil day, and having done all still stand. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, March 21, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 77. An act for the relief of Lindon A. Long;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.;

S. 321. An act for the relief of James M. Hiler;

S. 515. An act for the relief of Wallace Robertson, Henry Bowker, and Edward Parisian, and for other purposes; and

S. 525. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval training center, Farragut, Idaho, on July 10, 1944.

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following business was transacted:

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the Vice President and referred as indicated:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to ascertaining the sense of the people of the State on United States membership in a general system of international cooperation having police power to maintain the peace of the world

"*Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in general court convened*, That the Governor, with the advice and consent of the council, is hereby authorized and directed to request selectmen of towns to insert an article in the warrant of the town meetings holden under date of March 13, 1945, to read as follows: 'To see if the town will vote to support United States membership in a general system of international cooperation, such as that proposed at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, having police power to maintain the peace of the world. Each town clerk is directed to forward to the secretary of the state the result of the vote, in his town, if any, on this question. The secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to canvass the vote on this article as returned to him and transmit his findings to the clerk of the United States Senate.'

"Approved February 14, 1945."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Concurrent resolution relating to legislation affecting aeronautics now before the Congress of the United States

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has under consideration certain bills identified as S. 2, S. 34, S. 1, H. R. 4, H. R. 287, H. R. 674, and other similar bills affecting aviation, air commerce, and providing for certain Federal aids in the construction and development of airports; and

"Whereas it is the intent and import of these measures to vest in the Government of the United States full authority and power to regulate and supervise all air commerce and related activities, whether they be of an interstate or intrastate nature, and further to make substantial grants of Federal funds to municipalities for airport construction, without adequate planning and without giving full consideration to the economic responsibilities of the States and their political subdivisions; and

"Whereas it is the import of these measures to impose upon the States and their political subdivisions obligations, requirements, restrictions, and limitations of an indefinite nature, for an indeterminate period of time, without due regard to the extent to which the public interest may be served; and

"Whereas the effect of said measures would be to supersede and unsurp the rights of the States to regulate and control air commerce within their borders and to infringe upon, jeopardize, and deny the constitutional rights of the States to exercise their police powers in the public interest; and

"Whereas the provisions of these acts would place municipalities in competition with each other and with the States for Federal airport aids in such a manner as to force the wasteful expenditure of public funds and to make impossible the orderly and well-planned development of aeronautics facilities into a system based on actual need and utility; and

"Whereas the several States are now engaged in preparing legislation which will create in an orderly manner aeronautics programs designed to provide such aviation facilities as may be needed, under the direction of State authorities familiar with local requirements and conditions; and, further, since these State programs provide for continuing financial assistance to be accomplished by means of taxes on aviation gasoline and aircraft, general taxation, and bond issues for the purpose of cooperating with the municipalities and with the Federal Government in developing an economically sound airport and air-commerce system which will best serve the Nation, the States, and the municipalities: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the Legislature of the State of Minnesota records its opposition to any of the above-mentioned or similar bills which do not have deleted from them all language which is designed to deprive the States of their inherent and constitutional rights to govern themselves and which destroy the sound principle of intergovernmental cooperation between municipalities, States, and the Federal Government in such matters where each level of Government has a substantial interest; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the clerk of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the clerk of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives, the clerk of the Commerce Committee of the Senate, and each of the Minnesota Senators and Representatives in Congress.

"Approved March 17, 1945.

"EDWARD J. THYE.

"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

A letter in the nature of a petition from Luigi Balletta, of Long Island, N. Y., praying that Italy be recognized as a full ally of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from a citizen of Hempstead, N. Y., remonstrating against drafting women nurses unless all other groups of women are included; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPRESENTATION OF VETERANS AT SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE — RESOLUTION OF TEXAS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Texas favoring the plan to send a representative of veterans of World War No. 2 to the peace conference at San Francisco. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 128

Whereas a resolution has been presented to the House of Representatives at Washington, voicing a plea that veterans of World War No. 1 be represented at the World Peace Conference; and

Whereas the American veterans of World War No. 2 are interested in, and have asked for, this same representation at the peace conference; and

Whereas the men who do the fighting should be the men who make the peace, as they know the situation vastly better than someone who has not been at the front or even in uniform; and

Whereas Texas now has almost 800,000 men in the service, many of them fully qualified, both by experience and ability, to sit at this conference table for peace: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives, That we do ask our Congressmen in Washington to support this measure and use every effort in their power to see that representatives of veterans of World War No. 2, as well as World War No. 1, be at the conference for world peace which meets in San Francisco; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to our Congressmen in Washington, and that a certified copy, signed by the chief clerk of the house of representatives, be sent to the secretary of the American Veterans of World War No. 2, and it is so resolved.

RESOLUTIONS BY NEW MEXICO CATTLE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a number of resolutions adopted by the New Mexico Cattle Growers' Association at Albuquerque, N. Mex., on March 9, 1945.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolutions presented by the Senator from New Mexico will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolution 10

Whereas the quota limitation on the importation of cattle into this country has not been effective due to failure to pro rate the numbers uniformly over the 12-month period: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge that the regulation be modified to pro rate the number of cattle imported to monthly quotas; and further urge that all importations of all processed beef be reduced to terms of live animals, this number to be recognized as a part of the live animal quota.

Resolution 12

Whereas economic and political conditions in the post-war period may be conducive to renewed attempts to secure modification of this country's sanitary embargo, which prohibits the importation of meat and meat products into this country from foreign countries wherein foot-and-mouth disease is known to exist; and

Whereas the embargo does not discriminate against any country but simply operates to protect the American livestock industry and the public from the ruinous effects of foot-and-mouth-disease outbreaks such as have occurred here in the past and frequently occur in those countries such as England which must import their meat supplies from infected countries: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the continued vigilance and efforts of Congress and all responsible Federal officials to maintain the sanitary embargo in its present form.

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Resolution 3

Resolution on the life of Office of Price Administration

Resolved, That we favor the passage of the Wagner-Spence resolution extending the emergency price control and stabilization act to December 31, 1946, which in its present form provides that the subsidy on the purchase of livestock be discontinued and in lieu thereof, and to avoid a disastrous break in the livestock market, a critical time in the feeding period, we urge that the conditions of the original act be complied with, which provides for an adjustment of ceiling prices to offset increased cost of production.

Resolution 2

Whereas the control of meat and meat prices is now in charge of two or more bureaus of Government; and

Whereas this duplication of control is confusing and harmful to the industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge upon the Congress that it put such control as is necessary in one agency only, and that this agency be headed by someone who has a first-hand knowledge of range and farm problems.

Resolution 4

Whereas the revised Vinson cattle stabilization order, issued last month establishes a ceiling price on live cattle; and

Whereas the livestock industry of New Mexico and the entire Nation have been unalterably opposed to such a program since it was first proposed over a year ago; and

Whereas there is a threat that this policy will be extended and will bring more confusion into the livestock trading circles and marketing organizations and through such confusion tend to reduce the meat supply of our Nation at a time when meat is vitally needed by our military forces and civilian population: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we strongly urge the removal of the ceiling price on live cattle and protest the announced policy of rolling the price back on July 2 of this year.

To the Committee on Finance:

Resolution 11

Where as the Reciprocal Trade Act expires June 12, 1945; and

Whereas press releases indicate a broad policy is contemplated in affecting an exchange of agricultural commodities for machinery and other products of our manufacturing industry which if not safeguarded would react to the disadvantage of the American agricultural producer: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we recommend in the event the Reciprocal Trade Act is extended, it be limited to the period of 1 year, and that all such treaties negotiated receive Senate approval before becoming effective.

Resolution 9

Whereas post-war rehabilitation of war-torn nations will greatly encourage the international exchange of goods, and the United States will be required to take an active part in rebuilding much of the world's economy; and

Whereas bankrupt nations can only trade on an exchange of goods, and imports to the United States may, therefore, work to the disadvantage of American producers; and

Whereas the high standards of living in the United States cannot be maintained in competition with the lower standards in some other countries, unless a protective tariff is maintained; and

Whereas such a tariff is not a subsidy; it simply requires foreign importers to balance their low-cost imports to our domestic costs: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we recommend that protective tariffs be maintained fully to protect our domestic American economy.

To the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Resolution 7

Whereas there are some 250,000 acres of land in grazing district No. 7, which was relinquished to the United States by the A. T. & S. F. Railroad, which is public domain, but has been withdrawn by Executive order, for use by the Navajo Indians pending legislation and selection of lieu allotments by the Navajos: Be it

Resolved, That the New Mexico Cattle Growers' Association go on record as having this Executive order withdrawn and this land restored to the public domain and administered by the Grazing Service, for the reason that most all lieu allotments have been selected, and no reason for the withdrawal now exists.

To the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolution 1

Whereas livestock producers of New Mexico have already lost to the armed forces great numbers of their skilled labor, which drain on our ranch and farm labor has placed New Mexico in the critical farm-labor status; and

Whereas the State selective-service headquarters, following recommendations of the National Selective Service headquarters, are now threatening by further inroads by the draft of ranch labor, apparently regardless of the Tydings amendment to the present selective-service law; and

Whereas the Tydings amendment was passed by Congress and became law for the single purpose of retaining a sufficient number of experienced farm and ranch laborers to produce sufficient food for our armed forces and civilian population; and

Whereas recent action of the New Mexico selective-service boards and the State selective-service headquarters in reclassifying into I–A all II–C ranch and farm labor, even over the protest of county war boards, is in violation to the Tydings amendment to the selective-service law, and is not to the interest nor welfare of the Nation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we appeal to the Governor of New Mexico to direct our selective-service headquarters to defer all remaining ranch and farm labor within the State, which is essential and needed, and which would qualify under provisions of the Tydings amendment on grounds of agricultural production. And that insofar as possible the recommendation of the U. S. D. A. War Board, whose proper duty it is to investigate all II–C

deferments, be followed by the local boards. We submit to draft officials of the State that there are no substitutes available for this ranch and farm labor, and if further inroads are made on the available supply, it will result in greatly decreased production of meat; be it further

Resolved, That the legislative committee of the New Mexico Cattle Growers Association be instructed to present this resolution to Gov. J. J. Dempsey with the urgent request that he take immediate action to relieve this situation.

To the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Resolution 5

Public lands

Be it resolved, That the executive committee of the New Mexico Cattle Growers' Association, assembled at Albuquerque, N. Mex., March 9, 1945, reaffirm our stand that there be no raise in the present grazing fees for the duration, and 6 months thereafter, as promised by the Grazing Service at the outset of the war.

Resolution 6

Public lands

Be it resolved by the executive committee of New Mexico Cattle Growers' Association assembled in Albuquerque, N. Mex., March 9, 1945, That the life of the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands and Surveys as provided in the Seventy-sixth Congress Senate Resolution 241, be recommended by this association to be continued until all uses of public lands are fully covered.

We feel that such hearings will lay foundation for legislation to promote more equitable and fuller uses of all the resources of our public lands, and in particular will stabilize the livestock industry in the use of grazing rights.

Resolution 8

National forests

Whereas stability of use is vitally important to livestock operators holding grazing permits on national forests; and

Whereas cuts for distribution and so-called transfer cuts in grazing permits disrupt the well-balanced ranch operation, depreciate the value of all other land holdings and other commensurate property of the permittee; and

Whereas other Federal bureaus recognize a limited amount of local self-government in the use of Federal lands, thus encouraging better care and improvements: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we again request our Senators and Representatives in the Congress to strive for legislation giving a legal status to local advisory boards and eliminating cuts in grazing preferences except for purposes of conservation and that transfer of grazing rights on national forests be made with the sale of commensurate base property and not with the sale of livestock.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 701. A bill to provide a method for the wartime reduction of temporary grades held by general officers of the Army of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 111).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 685. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the acquisition of buildings and grounds in foreign countries for use of the Government of the United States of America," approved May 7, 1926, as amended, to permit of the sale of buildings and grounds and the utilization of proceeds of such sale in the Government interest; without amendment (Rept. No. 112); and

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution relative to determination and payment of certain claims against the Government of Mexico; without amendment (Rept. No. 113).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY (REPT. NO. 110)

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program has been studying the disposal of surplus property for almost 2 years. We deem it appropriate at this time to report to the Senate. In particular, we believe that a most useful function will be served by comment on this subject, while the Surplus Property Board is still in the period of organization and still in the process of crystallizing its policies.

We hope that our report will aid those charged with the burden of administration in the disposal of surplus property, which, indeed, is no light task.

Our report points out many defects. We do not, however, desire to be critical in the sense of disparaging those who have labored over the task of administering surplus property disposal. We fully appreciate the problems which they have faced and the difficulties of their undertaking. But the task lies before us. It must be done now and it must be well done.

We cannot afford to repeat the mistakes of World War No. 1, when the armistice found the United States without any surplus disposal organization, but with warehouses filled. We have not yet disposed of all of the surpluses which accumulated during the last war. Some of the 25,000,000 pairs of hobnailed shoes which were never used in that war were offered for sale by the Treasury Department's Procurement Division as recently as last December.

In that war the scandals and the investigations came after the harm had been done.

In this war it has been the purpose of our committee to anticipate the pitfalls which lie ahead. By investigating abuses and mistakes whenever and wherever we could find them, we have learned most of the dangers to be avoided.

Before effective action can be taken for proper disposal of surpluses an efficient directing organization must be set up. This organization must have competent personnel and an adequate budget. It must have the full cooperation of the Government agencies with which it is to deal.

The Surplus Property Act of 1944 will work, even though it may not be perfect. Of course, Mr. President, it is not perfect and will require amendment and correction. The act sets forth a number of policies to be pursued in the disposal of surpluses. Of course, these policies are not all consistent with each other. There is no reason why they should be. For instance, the act requires in section 2A that surpluses be disposed of to assure their most efficient use for war purposes, whereas section 2G requires that disposal be regulated for the purpose of encouraging and fostering post-war employment opportunities. Each of these policies has its proper application in a proper situation at the proper time.

The drafting of regulations fixing the proper policies to be applied in various situations is a principal function of the Surplus Property Board.

The Board must also simplify the complex and overlapping array of disposal agencies which now confound not only the buying public but the selling agencies themselves. The Board must set up uniform rules for all disposal agencies and a single information center so that all persons seeking to learn about surpluses of any kind will be able to get the information in one place.

The Board and a special commission which has been set up for the purpose soon must arrive at proper policies for the disposal of surplus properties abroad. We must avoid a period of confusion at the end of the war. To do this it is necessary to plan now. Decisions must be made as to the items which will be declared surplus when the war in Europe ends and those which will be utilized against Japan. Arrangements must be made to dispose of matériel which will be declared surplus.

Our surpluses can be a great national asset to relieve shortages which have plagued the civilian population and have hindered war production. They will prime the pump for the return to a peacetime economy. Properly handled they are a potent force for good.

But, first of all, surpluses must be declared promptly. The Surplus Property Board has no authority to require the various Government agencies to declare matériel surplus. These agencies, themselves, must fully discharge their obligation of searching carefully among their inventories for those items which are in excess. In this way our surpluses can be made useful now, while we are suffering many shortages, whereas, if declared later, they may only serve to glut post-war markets.

Before I close, I desire to say a word about the abuses which the committee has investigated. Some of these are discussed at length in the report. They were chosen because they serve as excellent examples of what could happen if our surpluses were not properly administered. They illustrate the dangers of a system which permits persons to get inside information or special favors. They illustrate the dangers which follow from lack of constant vigilance by the surplus disposal agencies. They il-

lustrate in some cases what will happen when unscrupulous or unsavory elements of the population attempt to make quick, easy profits out of surpluses. We know, from our discussions with the surplus disposal agencies, that they are determined to exert every effort to prevent such occurrences in the future.

An organization and a system designed to give the widest publicity to every action taken and to give full and easy access to all information, so that anyone can learn with ease what surpluses are for sale and where, will go far to accomplish this end.

The Surplus Property Board can develop such an organization. The Board has been in operation only 2 months. It has found many obstacles in its path. Its task is not simple.

But time is of the essence. The Board must act at once to avoid serious consequences from the long delays which may hamper the entire disposal program. I wish to emphasize this point, Mr. President. It is easy to criticize others. The procrastination cannot be laid at the door of the Board alone. Were we seeking to find scapegoats, we would easily find many, including the Congress itself, which passed the Surplus Property Act of 1944 only after long delays.

The committee, however, is focusing on future action rather than upon failures of the past. We desire to aid and not to hamper the Surplus Property Board in its difficult task. And we have been assured that the Board intends to put forth every effort to expedite the completion of its organization and the drafting of its regulations.

Mr. President, I submit the report to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

Mr. MEAD subsequently said: Mr. President, I happened to be out of the Chamber earlier in the session when the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], from the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program, submitted a report on the disposal of surplus property. I desire now, Mr. President, to comment briefly on his report. I think it was a very valuable and a very scholarly report, and I recommend its reading to every Member of the Senate. In my opinion, each and every Member of this body will find the report not only interesting but instructive, and it will supply the detailed information on the basis of which the committee has reached its conclusions.

The committee has not completed its study of this subject. We shall continue to follow the disposal of surplus, both in this country and abroad, for the purpose of assuring the American people that this important function is efficiently performed. We also intend to complete our study of the disposal of surplus plants. Senators will recall that the report submitted today is the second in a series of three. The first dealt with the accumulation of surplus. The one submitted by the Senator from New Mexico deals with disposal of surplus other than industrial plants. We are continuing our investigations into the disposal of plants, and when they have been completed we will report to the Senate.

I believe it appropriate also to mention that progress is being made both by the Surplus Property Board and by the individual disposal agencies in solving the problems discussed in the committee's report. The Surplus Property Board is expediting the completion of its regulations, and are hopeful that they will be published in the very near future, for they are essential as guideposts for the several agencies interested in the disposal of surplus property.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has followed in the footsteps of the Treasury's Procurement Division in instituting the practice of widely advertising its sales and setting up an investigative division. The primary need is for integration of these activities among all the disposal agencies under the supervision of the Board.

It is also appropriate for me to state at this time, in view of the extended hearings which were held on the auctioneering method of surplus disposal, that the committee is not opposed to auctions as such, but insists that they be used with great caution and with all proper safeguards.

We hope that the report submitted today will serve as a warning to anyone seeking to speculate in surplus properties. Our committee intends to continue its close scrutiny of the disposal program. We shall continue to inform the Senate and the American people whenever we find abuses.

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—ECONOMY PROGRESS REPORT OF 1945 (S. DOC. NO. 31)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from Mr. BYRD, chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting an additional report of the joint committee on the subject of economy progress of 1945, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, on the question of economy progress of 1945, be printed in the body of the RECORD and also as a Senate document.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed as a Senate document and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES,
March 22, 1945.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: In accordance with title 6 of the Revenue Act of 1941, Public Law No. 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, it gives me pleasure to present to you an additional report of this committee, which I ask that you lay before the Senate of the United States, with a view to its being printed as a Senate document.

Respectfully submitted.

HARRY F. BYRD, *Chairman.*

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL EXPENDITURES—THE ECONOMY PROGRESS REPORT OF 1945

To: The PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.
The VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.
The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

ECONOMY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS HAVE RESULTED IN OVER $3,000,000,000 IN SAVINGS

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures since its inception on September 20, 1941, under title VI of Public Law No. 250, Seventy-seventh Congress (55 Stat. 726), has operated in 1941, 1942, 1943, and 1944, and during this period of a little over 3 years has expended, to January 1, 1945, a total of $45,913.08 for all purposes. Thus far the committee has made recommendations which have resulted in direct savings of $2,457,623,568. A comparison of these figures spell out an expenditure of less than $20 for each million dollars saved, an apparently insignificant item in the background of billion-dollar spending.

In addition to these savings the committee has caused many indirect economies to result. A conservative figure for indirect savings caused by the committee's vigilance and recommendations would more nearly approximate $600,000,000. Taken together, direct and indirect savings exceed $3,000,000,000.

The committee desires to emphasize that it does not claim sole credit for all of these reductions in nonessential Federal expenditures. Some of the agencies themselves have cooperated in bringing them about. The Budget Bureau has worked diligently in reducing excessive Federal personnel in overstaffed agencies and in curtailing Federal expenditures. Many Members of Congress, particularly those sitting on the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House, have made invaluable contributions in the cause of economy. And, last but not least, the Congress itself has been the final authority as to the savings of public funds.

Recommendations by the committee to reduce nonessential Federal expenditures are made only after investigations and hearings at which responsible representatives of Government agencies submit evidence and testimony relative to the functions, expenditures, and necessity of their respective agencies. In each of its reports the committee has the benefit of factual information compiled by the Bureau of the Budget and the Treasury Department and the views, advice, and deliberations of the Secretary of the Treasury and those of the Director of the Budget Bureau.

EARLY PLANS FOR SAVINGS

Immediately upon its creation, the committee promptly marked out for elimination and for pruning the proposed Federal expenditures incident to the continued activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps, the National Youth Administration, the Work Projects Administration, and the Farm Security Administration. It began a study of the administrative costs of all civil departments and agencies of the Federal Government, including the varied and far-reaching functions of the Department of Agriculture and a study of the budgetary and audit control of all Government corporations. These studies embraced a review of all governmental research and publicity programs, land purchases, borrowing power, contract authorizations, Federal highway and public-works costs and the necessity for continued Federal spending in these activities. The committee made an early recommendation that all funds impounded by

the Budget Bureau from previous appropriations, and held in reserve, be covered back into the general fund of the Treasury.

Due to the studies and accomplishments outlined in the committee's preliminary report of December 24, 1941 (S. Doc. 152, pt. 1, 77th Cong.), and its supplemental report of July 25, 1942 (S. Doc. 152, pt. 2, 77th Cong.), firm ground was laid for a thorough war on waste and elimination of nonessential Federal spending. By December 1943 economies in public funds earmarked for Federal expenditure in unnecessary governmental activities reached $2,000,000,000.

URGENT NEED FOR ECONOMIES

Before the war the necessity for economy in nonessential spending was important. In total war it has become vital. Substantial reduction of it is a material aid in holding down inflationary price increases. During the war the Federal Government, particularly nonwar agencies, must of necessity marshal their money and manpower in an efficient and orderly manner. Every dollar now added to the public debt makes it more difficult for the Nation to meet post-war problems in domestic and foreign trade. To preserve a democratic system of government calls for a preservation of a solvent government. National solvency should be the greatest concern of each citizen. The national income for the depression year ending December 31, 1930, amounted to $68,900,000,000. For the year ending December 31, 1944, it more than doubled and reached the sum of $160,700,000,000. Consequently, expenditures of the "relief" and "subsidy" type made directly or indirectly to individuals should have been promptly eliminated. Continuing them during the war requires a diversion of vital manpower and materials from war production. The Federal Government exclusively must pay the cost of national defense. Therefore, it should concentrate on this task alone and carefully refrain from undertaking financial plans to carry, in addition, the burdens and responsibilities historically belonging to State and local governments. The committee recommended in its first report to the Congress and the President on December 24, 1941, that no new adventures or commitments in public works or costly Government programs should be undertaken by the Federal Government during the present war, except those imperatively necessary to national defense (S. Doc. 152, 78th Cong.), and advised the various agencies in the executive branch as to the urgency of retrenchment in the appropriations of their existing nonessential activities.

INITIAL ECONOMIES

In the committee's progress report of December 21, 1943 (S. Doc. 140, 78th Cong.), the total economies amounted to $2,117,543,231. This sum included savings of $238,960,000 effected when Congress, following the committee's recommendations, abolished the Civilian Conservation Corps; savings of $646,168,499 when the Work Projects Administration was drastically reduced and placed in liquidation; savings of $140,511,000 when the National Youth Administration was eliminated; and savings of $18,022,142 when Congress, accepting the committee's recommendations, reduced the operating expenses of the Farm Security Administration.

SUMMARY OF DIRECT SAVINGS AS A RESULT OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE JOINT ECONOMY COMMITTEE

A summary of the direct savings attributed to the committee's reports and recommendations during the fiscal years 1943, 1944, and 1945 is listed below:

Fiscal year 1943

1. Congress followed the committee's recommendation that the Civilian Conservation Corps be abolished. Savings----- $238,960,000

2. The committee recommended the abolition of all nondefense activities of the National Youth Administration. Congress eliminated a major portion of the National Youth Administration's nondefense program. Savings----- $83,767,000

3. The committee recommended drastic reduction of the Work Projects Administration's activities, which Congress accepted. Savings ----- 540,000,000

4. The committee recommended deferment of land purchases, reduction of overhead costs, and curtailment of nondefense activities in the Department of Agriculture. Congress reduced the appropriation of the Department of Agriculture. Savings----- 195,731,208

5. The committee recommended that the farm-tenant program be curtailed. Congress reduced this appropriation. Savings ----- 2,270,000

6. The committee recommended that the Farm Security Administration be liquidated. Congress reduced the administrative expenses for the Farm Security Administration. Savings----- 23,183,000

7. The committee recommended a 50-percent deferment of expenditures for Federal highway projects. Congress reduced appropriations for this function by about one-third. Savings----- 50,300,000

8. Congress followed the committee's recommendation that nondefense public building construction be deferred. Savings----- 23,148,000

9. Congress limited appropriations to the Interior Department for nonessential public work projects to projects already under construction. This followed committee recommendations. Savings----- 56,985,000

10. The committee recommended reduction of loan authorizations for farm-tenant program. Congress reduced the amount authorized to be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for this program. Savings----- 17,500,000

11. The committee recommended cancelation of loan authorizations of Farm Security Administration. Congress reduced the authorization for the Farm Security Administration to borrow from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Savings----- 22,500,000

12. The committee recommended that the nondefense Rural Electrification expansion program be deferred. Congress reduced the loan authorization of the Rural Electrification Administration to borrow from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Savings----- $90,000,000

13. The committee recommended the elimination of unnecessary forms and questionnaires required of the general public. The Budget Bureau curtailed the number of forms and questionnaires issued by Federal agencies to the general public. Savings to the Federal Government----- 1,790,000

14. The committee recommended a mileage reduction for Governernment vehicles. The Office of Price Administration reduced the mileage of official cars. Savings (computed on 12,772,280 miles, at 3 cents per mile)----- 383,168

15. The committee urged that Government agencies lease, instead of purchase, land needed for war and recommended maximum utilization of Government landholdings. The War Department "outleased" safety zones surrounding ordnance plants for agricultural purposes and "outleased" its industrial facilities. Savings.. 2,800,000

Fiscal year 1944

16. The committee recommended maximum utilization of Government landholdings and prompt cancelation of leasehold interests. The Navy Department canceled leases on 59,840 acres of land and those for 47,310 square feet of building space during the period Nov. 1 to Dec. 31, 1943. Savings----- 47,907

17. The committee recommended the abolition of the National Youth Administration. Congress accepted this recommendation. Savings--- 56,744,000

18. The committee urged the complete liquidation of the Work Projects Administration's activities which recommendation was accepted by Congress and the unexpended appropriation was returned to the Treasury. Savings----- 106,168,499

19. The committee recommended that publicity in the Federal Government be curtailed. Congress reduced the appropriation of the Domestic Operations Branch of the Office of War Information. Savings----- 5,811,199

20. The committee recommended that overlapping and duplicating functions of the Federal

Government be eliminated. Congress reduced the appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board. Savings ---------- $937,922

21. The committee continued to recommend that reclamation projects not connected with the war program be deferred. Congress reduced appropriations for these reclamation projects. Savings ---------- 52,719,470

22. The committee continued to recommend that work on rivers and harbors be deferred. Congress further reduced appropriations for these projects. Savings ---------- 181,894,100

23. The committee recommended that the Farm Security Administration be liquidated. Congress reduced appropriations for administrative expenses. Savings ---------- 18,022,142

24. The committee recommended that the farm-tenant program be curtailed. Congress reduced appropriations for administrative expenses. Savings ---------- 298,930

25. The committee recommended the immediate liquidation of resettlement projects. Congress reduced the appropriation for administrative expenses. Savings ---------- 78,961

26. The committee recommended cancelation of loan authorization of the Farm Security Administration from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Congress reduced the amount available for loan authorization from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Savings -- 87,500,000

27. The committee recommended reduction of loan authorization for farm-tenant programs. Congress reduced the amount available for loan authorizations from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Savings ---------- 2,500,000

28. The committee continued to recommend over-all reductions in Federal personnel. Reductions, totaling 134,395, have been accomplished by act of Congress, through the application of the Byrd-Langer amendment to the overtime-pay law, and through voluntary action of various agencies. Savings.. [1] 295,669,000

29. The committee recommended suspension of the competitive lending activities of the regional agricultural credit corporations and a curtailing of their administrative expenses. Congress restricted use of appropriations to these corporations. Savings ---------- $171,700,000

30. The committee recommended a reduction in the administrative expenses of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Congress reduced the appropriations of this Corporation. Savings ---------- 4,171,506

31. The committee recommended the elimination of unnecessary forms and questionnaires required of the general public. The Budget Bureau curtailed the number of forms and questionnaires issued by Federal agencies to the general public. Savings to the Federal Government ---------- 5,370,000

32. The committee recommended a prompt termination of military leases: Release by the using services, War Department, of 1,885 military real-estate properties caused a reduction in the Government's rent bill. Savings ---------- 3,080,523

33. The committee recommended a prompt termination of military leases: The War Department's cancelation of 9,448 leases caused a further reduction in the Government's rent bill. Savings ---------- 25,919,477

34. The committee urged that Government agencies lease instead of purchase land needed for war and recommended maximum utilization of Government landholdings. The War Department "outleased" safety zones surrounding ordnance plans for agricultural purposes and "outleased" its industrial facilities. Savings ---------- 2,800,000

35. The committee recommended cancelation and renewal of waste-paper contracts. The Government Printing Office and the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department canceled and renewed certain of these contracts. Savings ---------- 173,065

36. The committee recommended a mileage reduction for Government vehicles. The Office of Price Administration reduced the mileage of official cars. Savings (computed on 115,554,214 miles, at 3 cents per mile) ---------- 3,466,626

37. The committee recommended maximum utilization of Government land holdings and prompt cancelation of leasehold interests. The Navy Department canceled leases on 7,548 acres of land and those for 968,275 square feet of building space. Savings ---------- $1,254,194

Fiscal year 1945

38. The committee recommended that administrative expenses of the regional agricultural credit corporations be curtailed. Congress reduced appropriations to these corporations. Savings ---------- $790,007

39. The committee recommended a reduction in the administrative expenses of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. Congress reduced the appropriations of this Corporation. Savings ---------- 1,883,682

40. The committee recommended a reduction in the travel and communication costs of agencies of the Federal Government. Congress reduced agency appropriations accordingly. Savings ---------- 89,833,310

41. The committee recommended a reduction in personnel expenses of all Federal agencies. Congress reduced appropriations for personal services in 9 Federal agencies. Savings ---------- 21,912,020

42. The committee recommended cancelation and renewal of waste-paper contracts. The Government Printing Office and the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department canceled and renewed certain of these contracts. Savings ---- 519,195

43. The committee urged that Government agencies lease instead of purchase land needed for war and recommended maximum utilization of Government land holdings. The War Department "outleased" safety zones surrounding ordnance plants for agricultural purposes and "outleased" its industrial facilities. Savings ---------- 2,800,000

44. The committee recommended maximum utilization of Government land holdings and prompt cancelation of leases and sale of land and improvements not needed for war. The War Department sold improvements constructed on its land holdings. Savings realized to Mar. 8, 1945 ---- 1,082,115

45. The committee recommended maximum utilization of Government land holdings and prompt cancelation of leasehold interests. The Navy Department canceled leases on 2,215 acres of land and those for 114,302 square feet of building space. Savings to Feb. 28, 1945 --- 161,352

Total savings ---------- 2,457,623,563

[1] Excludes estimated salaries of employees reduced from agencies cited for fiscal year 1943.

COMMITTEE REPORTS REVEAL WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Authorized to make a full and complete study and investigation of all expenditures of the Federal Government with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of such expenditures deemed to be nonessential, the committee has diligently ferreted out and exposed waste and extravagant spending of public funds wherever found. It has done so through the media of 28 comprehensive reports issued to the President and to the Congress and made public periodically since December 24, 1941, the date of the committee's first report (S. Doc. 152, pt. 1, 77th Cong.). A complete listing of and citation to these reports follows:

1. Preliminary (S. Doc. 152, pt. 1, 77th Cong.).
2. Supplemental (S. Doc. 152, pt. 2, 77th Cong.).
3. Government Questionnaires (S. Doc. 4, 78th Cong.).
4. Government Automobiles (S. Doc. 5, 78th Cong.).
5. Regional Agricultural Credit Corporations (S. Doc. 20, 78th Cong.).
6. Home Owners' Loan Corporation (S. Doc. 48, 78th Cong.).
7. National Youth Administration (S. Doc. 54, 78th Cong.).
8. Travel and Communications in the Federal Government (S. Doc. 57, 78th Cong.).
9. Federal Personnel (S. Doc. 66, 78th Cong.).
10. Federal Ownership of Real Estate (S. Doc. 130, 78th Cong.).
11. Additional Report on Federal Personnel (S. Doc. 131, 78th Cong.).
12. Civilian Employment of Executive Branch of Federal Government for September and October 1943 (Senate Committee Print No. 1, 78th Cong.).
13. Civilian Employment of Executive Branch of Federal Government for November and December 1943 (Senate Committee Print No. 2, 78th Cong.).
14. Progress Report (S. Doc. 140, 78th Cong.).
15. Civilian Employment of Executive Branch of Federal Government for December 1943 and January 1944 (Senate Committee Print No. 3, 78th Cong.).
16. Penalty Mail (S. Doc. 147, 78th Cong.).
17. Civilian Employment of Executive Branch of Federal Government for February and March 1944 (Senate Committee Print No. 4, 78th Cong.).
18. Civilian Employment of Executive Branch of Federal Government for March and April 1944 (Senate Committee Print No. 5, 78th Cong.).
19. Nonmilitary Government Automobiles (S. Doc. 198, 78th Cong.).
20. Civilian Employment of Executive Branch of Federal Government for April, May, June, and July, 1944 (Senate Committee Print No. 6, 78th Cong.).
21. Civilian Employment of Executive Branch of Federal Government for July and August 1944 (Senate Committee Print No. 7, 78th Cong.).
22. Government Corporations (S. Doc. 227, 78th Cong.).
23. Civilian Employment of Executive Branch of Federal Government for August and September 1944 (Senate Committee Print No. 8, 78th Cong.).
24. Civilian Employment of Executive Branch of Federal Government for September and October 1944 (Senate Committee Print No. 9, 78th Cong.).
25. Unexpended Balances (S. Doc. 241, 78th Cong.).
26. Civilian Employment of Executive Branch of Federal Government for October and November 1944 (Senate Committee Print No. 10, 79th Cong.).
27. Civilian Employment of Executive Branch of Federal Government for November and December 1944 (Senate Committee Print No. 11, 79th Cong.).
28. Quarterly Report on Civilian Employment of Executive Branch of Federal Government (Senate Committee Print No. 12, 79th Cong.).

In these reports recommendations were made to the President and to the Congress, which, when carried out, effected substantial economies. While concentrating on the reduction and elimination of nonessential expenditures in the spending agencies of the executive branch of the Federal Government, the committee at the same time has made every effort to accomplish savings in such a way as not to interfere with the war effort.

INDIRECT ECONOMY

As previously shown, results have been gratifying in instances where both direct and indirect economies were effected. The latter type of economy can best be illustrated by a description of the committee's activities in reducing Federal personnel; for example, the keeping by the committee, periodically, of an exact record on the total number of civilian employees engaged in Government service has caused curtailed recruiting of unnecessary Federal personnel and has been a complement to the Byrd-Langer amendment to the Overtime Pay Act of 1943 (57 Stat. 78), which required the Budget Bureau to prescribe personnel ceilings for Government departments and agencies. The accuracy of this data compiled by the committee each month and promptly presented to the Congress has reflected a reduction in the amounts requested by the various agencies to be appropriated to them for expenditure under their approximate and estimated personnel budget needs for each fiscal year.

During the period July 1, 1944, to June 30, 1945, the committee, working in conjunction with the Bureau of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees of the Congress, has been instrumental in paring savings from the anticipated personal-services expenditures of the various agencies of the Federal Government. Tangible savings, thus far, from nine agencies total $21,912,020.

JOINT COMMITTEE COMPOSED OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE BRANCHES OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Section 601 (a) of the act specifically provides for the composition of the committee by designating 14 members made up as follows: (1) 3 members of the Senate Committee on Finance and 3 members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to be appointed by the President of the Senate; (2) 3 members of the House Committee on Ways and Means and 3 members of the House Committee on Appropriations to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and (3) the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The committee, therefore, is a cross-section of the most important financial committees of both the House and the Senate, and also has representatives from the 2 most important financial agencies of the Federal Government, namely, the United States Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget. Thus, both legislative and executive branches have a voice in its investigations and recommendations for a more efficient conduct of governmental affairs.

STRICT ECONOMY GOAL

Steps toward strict economy have been taken by the committee with each of its reports. As pointed out in the preliminary report of December 24, 1941, there is no excuse for nonessential spending in a government at war. In an era of great sacrifices and burdensome taxes, the Government should provide economy guideposts for its citizens to follow, and decrease rather than increase the difficulties of the United States Treasury in financing the war (S. Doc. 152, pt. 1, 77th Cong.).

QUIZ MANIA QUELLED

On February 11, 1943, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 38, Seventy-seventh Congress, the committee issued its report on Government questionnaires required of the general public (S. Doc. 4, 78th Cong.) and concluded that the cost to private business of preparing Government forms was far greater in comparison than the benefits derived by the Government. It found that the "quiz mania," with its accompanying paper work, involved an intolerable waste of time and resources not only for the victims of these needless inquisitions but also for the Government itself. The committee recommended that the amount of appropriations made available to each agency of the Federal Government for forms or questionnaires be limited and that full information as to the number of forms issued and their character and purposes be made a part of the records of the respective Appropriations Committees of the Congress so that information as to the number of questionnaires printed and distributed and the cost thereof to each Federal agency would be readily available.

This investigation of the committee resulted in the issuance of regulations by the Bureau of the Budget for the simplification and elimination of numerous forms and questionnaires required of the public by the various Government agencies. The cost to the Government of preparing, analyzing, tabulating, and keeping unnecessary forms was greatly reduced. Business enterprises, particularly those engaged in war production, were relieved of a continuous expense of unnecessary accounting to several Government agencies, many requesting substantially the same information. Savings resulting from this report amounted to $7,160,000. (Hearings on independent offices appropriation bill for 1936, at pp. 1306–1307.)

ABUSE OF OFFICIAL CAR PRIVILEGE DISCLOSED

In its report on Government automobiles (S. Doc. 5, 78th Cong.) economies were effected by the elimination of nonessential and duplicated travel by Government representatives in official cars owned or rented by the Federal Government. The committee urged that the same standard of strictly essential driving logically applies to Government employees as well as to individual citizens, particularly at a time when the reduction in the consumption of gasoline and the conservation of rubber is so vital to the war effort. The committee further recommended that an official passenger car pooling arrangement be established by the various agencies and that severe penalties be imposed upon Government employees who use or authorize the use of any Government-owned or leased vehicle for other than official purposes. Congress carried some committee views into effect by enacting section 202 (b) of Public Law 358, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved June 27, 1944.

Similar recommendations were reemphasized in a subsequent report on the subject of ownership and operation of nonmilitary Government automobiles (S. Doc. 198, 78th Cong.) and legislation was introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress (S. 820, 78th Cong.) and reintroduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress (S. 56, 79th Cong.) to carry committee recommendations into effect. As a result of committee investigations and activity in this field of economy, the Office of Price Administration reported a mileage reduction of 128,326,494 miles for Government vehicles in the fiscal years 1943 and 1944. Computed at the cost of 3 cents per mile, this saving totaled $3,849,794.

DUPLICATION OF AGRICULTURAL CREDIT AGENCIES

In accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, Seventy-eighth Congress, the committee was requested to investigate the need for the regional agricultural credit corporations and their reestablishment and to determine whether the making available of $225,-

000,000 of public moneys for lending purposes by these corporations would result in essential or nonessential expenditures in the field of agriculture. After a thorough study and investigation of the statutory authority and present need for regional agricultural credit corporations, the committee found that their reestablishment and their loan program duplicated wholly or partially the lending activities of 19 other Federal agricultural lending agencies performing identically similar or related functions, and by soliciting credit in a limited field of credit deprived private lending institution and country banks of their normal loan business, thereby weakening the structure of over 11,000 of such banks already carrying the burden of credit for the food-for-freedom program and the direction of and collection from War bond sales in their respective communities throughout the United States. The committee was convinced that the more than 3,000 employees required to solicit and administer the loans of these corporations in every county of the United States could be put to better use in the war program, particularly, when many of them were formerly loan solicitors of the Farm Security Administration who, quite logically, would continue their easy lending habits by dispensing credit on terms so advantageous to the borrower that the Government would be left without security and suffer heavy financial losses by reason of default. As a remedy for any credit needs, if any were shown to exist, the committee recommended, through S. 715, Seventy-eighth Congress, that the statutory authority of the emergency crop and feed loan program be enlarged (S. Doc. 20, 78th Cong.).

RESTRICTION OF COMPETITIVE LENDING ACTIVITIES IN AGRICULTURE

The committee's recommendations in its report on regional agricultural credit corporations (S. Doc. 20, 78th Cong.) prompted Congress to restrict, on June 30, 1943 (57 Stat. 428), the competitive lending activities of these corporations from an available fund of $225,000,000, thereby effecting savings in the amount of $171,700,000 out of this fund with accompanying elimination of $790,007 in the administrative expenses of them for the fiscal year 1945, resulting in a total savings of $172,490,007 (Budget of the United States for 1945, at p. 822; and Budget of the United States for 1946, at p. 782). This saving is a conservative figure based upon potential lending powers, not actual dollar expenditures. Through existing financial methods of Government corporations, this available fund could have been pyramided to an amount much higher than $225,000,000.

BELATED LIQUIDATION OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

The act of June 13, 1933 (48 Stat. 129; 12 U. S. C. 1463), creating the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, provides in subsection (k) that—

"The Board (the Federal Home Loan Bank Board) shall proceed to liquidate the Corporation when its purposes have been accomplished and shall pay any surplus or accumulated funds into the Treasury of the United States."

The act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1647; 15 U. S. C. 712a), provides in subsection (a) that "notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the establishments or agencies named in subsection (b) of this section [the Home Owners' Loan Corporation is expressly named therein] shall, after June 30, 1937, incur any obligations for administrative expenses, except pursuant to an annual appropriation specifically therefor, nor shall any such establishment or agency continue to function after said date unless established by or pursuant to law: *Provided*, That nothing contained therein shall be construed to extend the period during which any such establishment or agency heretofore has been authorized by law to function."

The committee sought to liquidate the Home Owners' Loan Corporation in accordance with the direction of these two statutes and recommended to the Congress, after hearings and investigations, that all holdings of the Corporation be liquidated by the end of the fiscal year 1945 (S. Doc. No. 48, 78th Cong.)

Though not entirely followed by the Congress, recommendations of the committee aided in causing a reduction of $6,155,188 in the operating expenses and obligations of this Corporation during the 2-year period July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1945 (Budget of United States for 1945, at p. 197; and Budget of the United States for 1946, at p. 197). The Secretary of the Treasury did not participate in the recommendations of this report.

ONE PAID TEACHER FOR FIVE STUDENT TRAINEES

Following an earlier recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury that the National Youth Administration be terminated, the committee, in its comprehensive report to the President and Congress on May 24, 1943 (S. Doc. 54, 78th Cong.), concluded, after extensive investigation and hearings, that because of duplication of purpose, excessive costs, and wasteful management practices, the National Youth Administration should be abolished by June 30, 1943, and that its idle equipment and widespread facilities be made available to essential war agencies. Testimony disclosed that this Administration employed on an average of one paid teacher to instruct five student trainees. The Congress carried the committee recommendations into effect by promptly eliminating all appropriations to this agency of the Federal Government except $3,000,000 for purposes of liquidation by January 1, 1944 (57 Stat. 518). Total savings in the sum of $140,511,000 were thus effected.

UNNECESSARY TRAVEL AND EXCESSIVE LONG-DISTANCE CALLS

In its Travel and Communications Report (S. Doc. 57, 78th Cong.), the committee disclosed exorbitant expenditures in these two items by employees of nearly all agencies of the executive branch of the Government and recommended that the Bureau of the Budget take measures necessary to reduce such excessive costs to the Public Treasury. As a result of the vigilance and efforts of the Bureau of the Budget and the committee before, during, and following the issuance of this report, an estimated savings of $89,833,310 in the travel and communication activities of the Federal Government was made during the period July 1, 1944, to June 30, 1945, including $9,983,955 savings in travel expense and $150,499 savings in communication expense on the part of nonmilitary agencies of the Federal Government, and an estimated savings in travel expenditures for the War Department during this period of $79,698,856.

OVER 3,000,000 ON FEDERAL PAY ROLL—PERSONNEL MALPRACTICES

On June 18, 1943, the committee released its report on Federal personnel (S. Doc. 66, 78th Cong.), and for the first time the Nation learned the shocking facts concerning its civilian manpower, including the excess of Government employees, 55 percent of whom are not engaged in direct mechanical war production, unusual pay raises, skip-grade promotions, top-heavy pay rolls, the breakdown in the personnel record system, faulty execution of the Classification Act, overlapping personnel functions and activities, and general waste and ineptitude. In this detailed report the committee recommended that an immediate reduction of over 300,000 be made in the 3,000,000 or more Federal civilian employees by all departments and agencies of the Government and that the Civil Service Commission immediately cease recruiting employees from sources outside of the Government service until a more effective utilization of Federal civilian employees was made. The committee's additional report on Federal personnel emphasized this report with later statistics (S. Doc. 131, 78th Cong.).

ONE-FIFTH OF NATION'S LAND AREA CONTROLLED BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

In the Federal Ownership of Real Estate report of the committee, it was revealed that one-fifth of the entire land area of the United States was held by the Federal Government. This total land control of 383,600,523 acres in all States has been a growing concern to county and municipal governments as the corresponding tax load on local taxpayers increases, with its complications expressed in fears that the dumping of large tracts and parcels in the post-war era will produce chaos in local real-estate values. The committee recommended that all land-holding Government agencies begin immediately to liquidate surplus holdings not needed for Federal activities and that consideration be given to establishing a central unit in an already existing Government agency to perform the operational functions of appraising, acquiring, abstracting, recording, and disposing of all Government-owned real estate, thereby reducing inequities, lack of uniformity, duplication and waste of funds in connection with Government acquisition and disposition of real property by various Federal agencies (S. Doc. 130, 78th Cong.). Committee investigations prior to and following this report prompted annual savings by the War Department in "outleases," lease terminations, and sales of improvements to land in the sum of $38,462,115.

ABUSE OF OFFICIAL MAIL PRIVILEGES

Section 204 of the Treasury-Post Office Department Appropriation Act, 1944, approved June 30, 1943 (57 Stat. 270), directed the committee to make a study of the problem of penalty mail in all the departments and branches of the Government with a view to eliminating unnecessary volume and reducing costs. Accordingly the committee, after hearings and investigation, issued its report on penalty mail (S. Doc. 147, 78th Cong.) in January 1944 and in it disclosed grave abuses in the use of the penalty (official) mail privilege by the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government. It found an illogical weight distinction between penalty mail originating in Washington, D. C., and that originating elsewhere. This weight distinction resulted in large shipments of penalty mail being sent to the National Capital from the field offices of various agencies in order that advantage could be taken by reshipment from Washington, D. C., where a 70-pound instead of a 4-pound limit was in effect for official mail matter. The committee found that since no record of the number of circular publications, posters, and other matter mailed by Government agencies was kept, that penalty mail in great quantities was flooding the Post Office Department. The committee recommended that the penalty mail privileges of Government agencies be abolished and that in lieu thereof legislation be enacted directing such agencies to reimburse the Post Office Department at regular postage rates or upon a cost-ascertainment basis, from their regular appropriations, for their use of the mail channels. Congress promptly followed this recommendation on June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364, 78th Cong.).

SAVINGS RESULTING FROM CANCELATION AND RENEWAL OF WASTEPAPER CONTRACTS

In addition to the several reports issued the committee has made numerous investigations which have not resulted in official reports but nevertheless were responsible for savings of Federal funds or increase in revenue.

An example is the investigation, made in the early part of 1944, of contracts for the removal of waste paper from Government

office buildings. This investigation revealed numerous discrepancies and much malpractice in the advertising, bidding, and letting of contracts and in the handling, weighing, and hauling of waste paper.

As a result of the investigation the committee recommended the cancelation and renewal of contracts. This recommendation was followed and effected an increase in revenue to the Federal Government of $692,260.

FEDERAL CORPORATIONS—A FOURTH BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

In order to effect both direct and indirect savings of public money, it has been necessary for the members of the committee and its staff to make a thorough analysis of all types of Federal financing. A report issued by the committee on August 1, 1944, dealing with Government corporations (S. Doc. 227, 78th Cong.) disclosed the manner in which the executive branch of the Government uses the corporate form to set up huge reservoirs of capital borrowed from the United States Treasury and, by means of a perpetual charter and a revolving fund, maintain a constant source of cash and credit for transactions far beyond the restraints of Congress and the public audit of the General Accounting Office. The magnitude of Government corporations, particularly the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Commodity Credit Corporation, is now so great as to rival the Government proper. The committee revealed that to a great degree nearly all Government corporations do business directly in competition with private enterprise. Their number and their interrelations and intertransactions are a puzzling spectacle in the realm of Government finance. Taken together, the 44 corporations of the Federal Government and the 11 corporations in which the Government has a proprietary interest or a contractual relation constitute a financing unit of huge dimensions with virtually unlimited powers and a vast network of operations—in actuality, a fourth branch of the Government. In order to remedy this situation, the committee recommended, and the Senate recently considered the Byrd-Butler bill, providing legislation for an immediate over-all control of these corporate bodies by the General Accounting Office (S. 469, 79th Cong.).

SURPLUS IN UNEXPENDED BALANCES

The committee, since its creation, has been studying and compiling statistics on the unexpended balances, contract authorizations, obligations, commitments, and appropriations of the Federal Government for each fiscal year in an attempt to have the various agencies adopt procedure which will reveal the condition of their appropriation and contract authorization balances so that Congress may consider current unexpended balances and promptly provide legislation to lapse or cancel out all surpluses that are found to be nonessential. It was pointed out in the committee's recent report to the Congress and the President (S. Doc. 241, 78th Cong.) that unnecessarily large balances are dangerous to the economy of our Nation. This report disclosed that as of October 1, 1944, there was a total of $151,233,000,000 in public funds available for expenditure in the category of unexpended balances. As of January 31, 1945, there was $118,819,475,000 available for expenditure.

COMMITTEE REPORTS AND SERVICES WIDELY UTILIZED

In addition to its investigative and statistical accomplishment on the side of economy, the committee has serviced legislative and executive groups with information and advice pertaining to the reduction and elimination of nonessential expenditures. Many individual Members of Congress have availed themselves of the facts of the committee's investigations, its statistics, and personnel. For the first time in history a stable beginning has been made toward strict economy by reducing nonessential Federal spending. The committee considers it a privilege to be cloaked with the responsibility to study the financial problems of government and point out reduction in cost possibilities to the public, the Congress, and the executive branch of the Federal Government.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE JOINT ECONOMY COMMITTEE

A summarized financial statement showing the expenditures of the Joint Economy Committee for all purposes up to January 1, 1945, follows:

Financial statement

Year	Office personnel	Traveling expenses	Hearings	Supplies	Total	Balance	
						$10,000.00	Appropriation, Nov. 1, 1941.
1941	$180.00		$592.50	$78.01	$850.51	9,149.49	
						10,000.00	Appropriation, Oct. 26, 1942.
						19,149.49	
1942	7,595.26	$74.50	1,145.79	55.05	8,870.60	10,278.89	
						20,000.00	Appropriation, July 12, 1943.
						30,278.89	
1943	15,807.09	9.90	953.48	120.13	16,891.50	13,387.39	
						10,000.00	Appropriation, June 28, 1944.
						23,387.39	
1944	19,164.22			136.25	19,300.47	4,086.92	
	42,747.47	84.40	2,691.77	389.44	45,913.08	4,086.92	Jan. 1, 1945.

ECONOMY OBSERVATIONS IN THE FUTURE AND THEIR RELATION TO THE PUBLIC DEBT

Common sense dictates that fiscal planning for normal peacetime requires a balanced national budget. The public debt outstanding at the end of the fiscal year 1918 amounted to a total gross of $12,243,628,719, or a per capita gross debt of $115 (Annual Report of Secretary of Treasury, fiscal year 1943). The rapid upward trend of the public debt in the last 15 years is indicated in the following table: [1]

Date	Total gross debt	Gross debt per capita
June 30, 1930	$16,185,309,831	$131.49
June 30, 1931	16,801,281,492	135.37
June 30, 1932	19,487,002,444	155.93
June 30, 1933	22,538,672,560	179.21
June 30, 1934	27,053,141,414	213.65
June 30, 1935	28,700,892,625	225.07
June 30, 1936	33,778,543,494	263.01
June 30, 1937	36,424,613,732	281.80
June 30, 1938	37,164,740,315	285.49
June 30, 1939	40,439,532,411	308.21
June 30, 1940	42,967,531,038	325.63
June 30, 1941	48,961,443,536	367.54
June 30, 1942	72,422,445,116	537.25
June 30, 1943	136,696,090,330	1,001.24
June 30, 1944 [1]	201,003,387,221	1,456.54
Feb. 28, 1945 [2]	233,707,487,406	1,680.35

[1] P. 9, Daily Statement of U. S. Treasury, July 1, 1944.
[2] P. 9, Daily Statement of U. S. Treasury, Mar. 1, 1945.

The committee admits that the sum of its efforts toward strict economy are insignificant compared to $100,000,000,000 budgets. Even though there are few commendations for the thrifty, the committee is convinced that its service is purposeful. It has full sympathy for the Nation's taxpaying citizens, who must be taxed to the degree that the Government fails to restrict its expenditures. The committee has revealed that at last Government spending is being recognized for what it is—taxation.

At the present rate of Government spending, the public debt will reach $292,000,000,000 by June 30, 1946. Reduction in the present debt—orderly, steady, or otherwise—should not be precluded. Since taxes have increased, it is evident that additional tax burdens will tend to interfere with private expansion and expenditure and thereby cause an exodus from private industry to the public pay roll.

What has been accomplished in savings so far is considerable but not enough. The Federal debt, which stood at $48,961,443,536 on June 30, 1941, just prior to the present war, has reached the unprecedented height of $235,123,061,109 on tax day, March 15, 1945, including guaranteed obligations not owned by the Treasury. The Congress of the United States must continue to exercise strict control over Federal expenditures, obtain tax relief for the Nation's citizens, and reduce this Federal debt.

The value of each employee, each bureau, and each dollar expended must be conscientiously weighed in its relation to the welfare of the people. Spending practices which waste the financial resources of the Nation must be eliminated. The committee is confident that more nonessential expenditures can be cut out of the National Budget each year and that Government spending can be reduced to a minimum, thereby making way for an economically sound post-war era. That the people will hold the Congress strictly accountable for all extravagant appropriations is self-evident. Consequently, it is hoped that Congress will continue to participate actively in all endeavors to restrain wasteful spending wherever it appears. During wartime it is the patriotic duty of all citizens to reduce their spending to a minimum. It is even more the patriotic duty of the Congress of the United States to curtail all nonessential expenditures.

[1] Table 23, Annual Report of Secretary of the Treasury, fiscal year 1944, at p. 627.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. 767. A bill for the relief of Iva I. F. Hoekman; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 768. A bill for the relief of Charles R. Laucomer;

S. 769. A bill for the relief of H. H. Ashbrook;

S. 770. A bill for the relief of Kilpatrick Bros. Co.;

S. 771. A bill for the relief of Jens C. Petersen;

S. 772. A bill for the relief of George Laucomer;

S. 773. A bill for the relief of Walker M. Lee;

S. 774. A bill for the relief of E. C. Douglass;

S. 775. A bill for the relief of C. R. Watson;

S. 776. A bill for the relief of Arlon E. Springer; and

S. 777. A bill for the relief of William Ledingham, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAWKES:

S. 778. A bill to assure to persons within the jurisdiction of every State due process of law and equal protection of the laws, and to prevent the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED:

S. 779. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alan Sells and the estate of Alan Sells; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BREWSTER (for himself, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 780. A bill to provide for the establishment of forest products laboratories in the northeastern, northwestern, and southern regions of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 781. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), with respect to payments to educational or training institutions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 782. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render judgment in any and all claims which the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of Indians of the Flathead Reservation in Montana, or any tribe or band thereof, may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

INVESTIGATION OF GOVERNMENT LOANS TO PRODUCERS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS ON IRRIGATED LANDS

Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MCFARLAND, and Mr. HAYDEN) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 106), which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

Resolved, That the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a study and investigation for the purpose of ascertaining whether, in the administration of the Lend-Lease Act or of any act of Congress providing for loans or other benefits to producers of agricultural products, there is any discrimination against agricultural products grown on irrigated lands, or against the producers thereof, and to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT NO. 101, RELATING TO INVESTIGATION OF PRESIDENTIAL, VICE PRESIDENTIAL, AND SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES DURING 1944

Mr. GREEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 107), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That 1,000 additional copies of Senate Report No. 101, current session, submitted pursuant to Senate Resolution 363, Seventy-eighth Congress, by the special committee authorized and directed to make a complete study and investigation of Presidential, Vice Presidential, and senatorial campaign expenditures during the year 1944, be printed for the use of said committee.

RENEGOTIATION OF CONTRACTS—STATEMENT BY WAR CONTRACT PRICE ADJUSTMENT BOARD AND LETTER BY SENATOR McKELLAR

[Mr. McKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the War Contract Price Adjustment Board, and the letter of transmission, together with the reply thereto, which appear in the Appendix.]

BROADCASTING OF TOMORROW—ADDRESS BY HON. PAUL A. PORTER

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Broadcasting of Tomorrow," delivered by Paul A. Porter, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, at a meeting of the National Association of Broadcasters in Washington, D. C., on March 12, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. PATRICK'S DAY ADDRESS BY PAUL E. FITZPATRICK

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a St. Patrick's Day address delivered at the National Democratic Forum, National Democratic Club, New York City, Saturday, March 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOMINATION OF AUBREY W. WILLIAMS—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Test for the Senate," relating to the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams, published in the Washington Post of March 22, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN AID TO RUSSIA—ARTICLE BY ERNEST K. LINDLEY

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "We Gave the Red Army Its Speed," by Ernest K. Lindley, from Newsweek of February 12, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE KEY TO PROSPERITY—ARTICLE BY E. H. TAYLOR

[Mr. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Key to Prosperity," written by E. H. Taylor and published in the Country Gentleman, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MEAT SHORTAGE

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, that the meat shortage has been brought about by the bungling of the bureaucrats is now apparent.

The farmers of our country are willing to go all out for victory, but they cannot produce enough to feed the world with some bright young fellow of the New Deal, entirely unfamiliar with the basic principles, writing the formula.

As a part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Chicago Daily Drovers Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDUCTION BEYOND COMPREHENSION

The decline in production of pork and lard this year is almost beyond comprehension, it is so great. In the first 2 months of 1945 packers under Federal inspection alone produced 1,263,961,000 pounds less of these products than in January and February of last year. This was equal to the pork and lard that more than 18,000,000 Americans ate in a whole year prior to the war, and enough to furnish the pork requirements of an army of more than 30,000,000 men a full 2 months.

Inspected packers in the 2 months butchered 6,653,000 fewer hogs than in the first 2 months of 1944, a reduction of 43 percent. The January kill was down 32 percent, and the February kill was down 55 percent, indicating that the situation became worse as the weeks passed. On Monday of this week the 20 leading markets received 71 percent fewer hogs than on the same day a year ago.

If you can visualize a fence around more than 6,500,000 hogs you can get an idea of how great the production slump has been from last year. It would take about 50,000 double-deck railroad cars to haul that many hogs to market, and if the job was done at one time the string of cars would be more than 375 miles long. Standing two abreast in one long line that many hogs would extend a distance of more than 1,800 miles.

Such a break-down of the production data gives us a better idea of what a tremendously successful task American farmers accomplished before the unfortunate appearance of the bright young fellows from O. P. A. headquarters to include the hog raisers in their regimentation plan. Farmers producing hogs were not getting abnormally high prices. Whatever other reasons they might have had to take over the management of the hog, danger to the Government's battle against the forces of inflation could not have been one of them. In fact, hog markets all along have been well below the high-water mark calling for action from Washington. Enforcement of meat ceiling prices in the packing industry, in wholesale meat channels, and at retail, while not entirely foolproof, still was strong enough to hold off inflation pressure in the markets for live animals.

On September 13, 1943, the O. P. A. made public its hog edict regarding the ceiling, an unlucky day for the hog raisers, packers, pork eaters, and people of the liberated countries depending on America for pork and fats. During very few periods had the cost of hogs been much above the existing level, and there was always sufficient production to balance costs above the $14.75 level, Chicago basis, with costs below that level in other seasons, before O. P. A. interference. On the day the ceiling was announced costs averaged only 15 cents above the current level.

The production slump was brought about by bungling of O. P. A. "experts" in an industry they knew little about and where they were not needed. Since the start of the war only 4 monthly average costs to packers have been above the current costs. One month was 90 cents over the cost now O. K.'d by those in charge of price control. Another month showed a plus sign of 65 cents, another 45 cents, and one 30 cents.

In view of the results, no one can justify O. P. A. action in placing a ceiling on the live animal, either in hogs or in cattle. The cattle catastrophe is in the making.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, sometime ago I received a letter from Mr. James Norris, of the Norris Grain Co., a very successful member of the Chicago Board of Trade, I am told. In this letter Mr. Norris raises some points of objection to the completion of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. As the points which Mr. Norris raises are common to most of the opposition to the seaway, I ask leave to have Mr. Norris' letter and a copy of my reply to him inserted in the RECORD, as well as a letter written by me to Mr. E. S. Crosby, which deals with the same subject.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORRIS GRAIN CO.,
Chicago, December 19, 1944.

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Care of Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIR: I have been following with no little interest the proceedings with reference to the St. Lawrence deep seaway. As a grain merchant who has used the St. Lawrence waterway in the export of grain for the past 40 years, and whose father and grandfather used it in the export of grain and flour 50 and 70 years ago, I trust you will excuse me for feeling that I have some practical knowledge of this waterway.

Our company owns grain elevators with large water-front properties at Duluth, Chicago, Manitowoc, and Toledo. We are also largely interested, through Canadian subsidiary companies, in Canadian grain elevators, so that if the projected new seaway proves a success, we would benefit. I must say, however, that I do not think there is any necessity for an enlarged seaway. The cost, as I understand it, has been estimated from $400,000,000 to $750,000,000. It is my belief that it cannot be built with a direct expenditure of $1,000,000,000 and if it should be built, it will necessitate an additional huge expenditure by every port on the Great Lakes in the way of necessary deepening of harbors and improvements, so that I wouldn't be surprised if the direct and indirect cost might run to a fanciful sum. As I read the arguments of the proponents, I hear more of "power" than I do of "seaway," and I can quite see the reason for this. I believe that there is a great urge on the part of the proponents to develop power, but under our laws, our Government is not allowed to spend money on power development unless it is in connection with a waterway, and I am convinced that if it were a question of the new St. Lawrence waterway alone, that no serious attempt would be made to put the project over. In other words, it really is only being urged to get the power development, but we must have the seaway or the Government is not authorized to expend the money. The cost of the new Welland Canal, which was completed during or shortly after the last World War, was estimated to be about $60,000,000, but the final cost was something like $120,000,000. This was simply an enlargement and deepening of the previous canal and enables the largest steamers on the Lakes to proceed to the foot of Lake Ontario or even farther, as the channel has now been widened in the St. Lawrence River to permit large boats to go all the way to Prescott, Ontario (within 90 miles of Montreal), where the Canadian Government has built a very large grain elevator for the transfer of grain from the lake steamers into river tonnage. This improvement in the Welland Canal also permits large steamers to proceed to Oswego, N. Y., where at times a fair amount of grain has been transferred to barges for transshipment over the Erie Canal. However, at no time have any of the really large American steamers used the new Welland Canal for grain to Oswego or Prescott. The reason is a simple one. When they go to Lake Ontario, a large steamer cannot get return cargo. As you probably know, the bulk of our larger lake tonnage is used for the transport of ore from Lake Superior to Lake Erie ports. When they discharge their ore cargoes, they return with cargoes of coal to the Northwest. If they go to Lake Ontario with grain, they only get a small premium in the cargo rate, something less than 1 cent a bushel premium, so that the time they lose going down on Lake Ontario and returning light to Lake Erie is not compensated by this small premium in the freight, and as stated above the volume of business ex-American lake tonnage through Oswego and Prescott has been extremely small. It has also been found that barges from Buffalo are often willing to haul the grain from Buffalo to the seaboard via the Erie Canal for as low or lower differential than the 1-cent-a-bushel premium paid the lake steamers to Oswego.

It is my opinion that the belief generally entertained that if this deep seaway is built we will see ocean steamers on the Great Lakes is mostly mythical. An ocean steamer has to be constructed of much heavier steel and motive power than a lake steamer, and for that reason costs a great deal more. Now, the only large cargoes that could possibly come up our lakes to inland waters would be package freight, not bulk freight, and to construct a package freight ocean liner rather than just a bulk carrier is an extremely expensive proposition, and I feel confident that the cost of freight from, say Montreal, on goods of this sort could be made much cheaper by river steamers or rail than to warrant the larger ocean steamers proceeding to our Middle West. Also, I don't believe that vessel owners would be very keen to allow expensive tonnage of this sort to use the canal system, as the wear and tear and pumping, etc., might cause considerable damage.

At the present time it is possible for moderate-sized steamers, say 3,000 tons, to come across the ocean and bring goods into our Middle West. Before the present war we saw the occasional foreign steamer of such size come on our Great Lakes, but it was almost a rarity and the only cargo I ever heard of their transporting to Chicago was one cargo of barbed wire from Belgium or some pulp for paper making. This has been a most irregular trade, and I think in the past 10 years that there may possibly have been 5 or 6 shipments of this sort into Chicago.

As regards the export of grain, the cheapest method of transportation is to ship by water to Port Colborne or Prescott where the grain is transferred into river craft, which are of much cheaper construction and with much less overhead than a larger steamer. The cost of transfer of grain runs from ½ to 1 cent a bushel, and this cost of transfer is much less than the cost of operating a larger and more expensive steamer. Certainly if there was a demand for the deep waterway, at the present time our large lake steamers would be using the waterway now to the fullest extent, because at times we have seen a very heavy movement of grain for export on this waterway. Now, I don't know, outside of grain, of any bulk traffic that can be secured for east-bound movement over this proposed waterway, and on the movement of bulk cargoes from Europe, the only cargo of any consequence has been Welsh coal into ports like Montreal and Quebec, which comes forward on British cargo ships and is then distributed for local consumption in Canada, a great deal of it moving as far west as Toronto in small river craft. I don't believe there has been any sound or careful analysis ever made by the proponents of this deep seaway as to the business that would move on the seaway. It has always just been taken for granted that it would be a great thing for the country and a great development, whereas the writer doesn't think it would be used to any great extent at any time by ocean tonnage.

If I am wrong and the proponents are correct, we should see a large movement inward-bound up the waterway to midwestern cities. Every bit of this freight will be carried by foreign bottoms, and none of these foreign bottoms pay a living wage. When the few Scandinavian boats came over here carrying pulpwood and other products named above, it was a matter of comment by American seamen that the poor devils working on these boats didn't get a living wage and the food wouldn't even be consumed by an American seaman, it was so poor. Under the present proposal, if you are right, we will see a flood of larger foreign boats operating on the lakes, paying starvation wages, and I presume you know that every one of them will operate and use all our facilities without paying a dime. In other words, we will spend $1,000,000,000 or $1,500,000,000 and give away the advantages and make ruinous competition for our present lake tonnage. Certainly no one of our lake steamers can operate on the ocean, but if you are right, we will see a lot of foreign ocean tonnage operating on our lakes and taking away this business from the American worker. At present under the La Follette seamen's bill, it isn't possible for an American ship, unless heavily subsidized, to compete against foreign boats, but on our lakes we at present have an exclusivity which permits all of this lake tonnage to operate and pay fair and attractive wages to American seamen. By this proposal you would ruin the greater part of this business, and for what? Grain today can be transported on the St. Lawrence seaway at very low rates. I have seen grain carried repeatedly from Chicago to Montreal at 4 cents per bushel. Probably the lowest rate in existence anywhere, and there isn't any ocean steamer today that could compete on those kinds of rates.

The new Welland Canal was constructed at a cost of $120,000,000. I suppose the terminals at Port Colborne cost several million more, but let's omit that cost and just figure $120,000,000. Two percent on this investment would mean $2,400,000 a year. In addition to that, we must figure some depreciation and damage by accident, as well as the physical maintenance and upkeep of this canal. I would say offhand that the canal probably is costing Canada, figuring the above rate of interest, say $3,000,000 per year. The average cost of shipping grain from Port Colborne to Montreal over the past 10 years, I don't think, would amount to 4 cents per bushel. I think it would be closer to 3½ cents, but am willing to say 4 cents. That would mean, figuring the $3,000,000 cost per annum of the canal that 75,000,000 bushels of grain per year could be handled through Montreal from Lake Erie for nothing. In other words, $3,000,000 figures 4 cents per bushel on 75,000,000 bushels, and I don't think Montreal has ever in 1 year exported 100,000,000 bushels, and let me tell you 100,000,000 bushels is a lot of grain to be exported in a few months. Certainly Montreal won't average it over a period of 10 years. Now, if you figure $1,000,000,000 for the deep St. Lawrence waterway, which estimate I believe is under what it eventually will cost, and figure 2 percent plus the upkeep, this will mean a cost of $25,000,000 per annum, which is probably an understatement, so that you could carry, figuring the average rate from the West to the seaboard at 5 cents per bushel, 500,000,000 bushels of grain free of charge with the present facilities, which I think shows you how ridiculous economically the proposition is if one just figures grain, and as stated above, I know of no other bulk cargo available for export. Frankly, I think if it weren't for the power development we would never hear of the deep St. Lawrence waterway, but let me get on record that I do greatly favor the development of public works in these United States if they are carefully thought out and properly considered. It is my belief if we spend money on a waterway, it should be in our own country, say, with a great improvement of the Erie Canal or, better still, an enlargement of the Illinois waterway, or for the Missouri Valley (irrigation and waterway) which is already being talked of. Why spend a great part of our money in Canada? Let us at least, when we are proposing public works, plan to spend in these United States for the benefit of the United States and not for a lot of foreign-vessel owners who operate on starvation wages.

Apologizing for writing to such length, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES NORRIS.

MARCH 15, 1945.

Mr. JAMES NORRIS,
Norris Grain Co., Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. NORRIS: Thank you for your letter of December 19, 1944, in which you raise many interesting questions concerning the usefulness of the St. Lawrence seaway. I know you to be a thoughtful and fair person, and, therefore, I have given a great deal of thought to the contents of your letter. I have inquired from several Government agencies for answers to the questions of fact which you raise in your letter, and am glad to answer the various points which you raise at considerable length, because they are important and I know you want the facts:

1. You assert that the cost of the St. Lawrence project would be excessive, mentioning the figure $1,000,000,000 and one and a half billion dollars in this connection; you estimate the annual overhead and operating outlay at $25,000,000. By some coincidence, the same point was raised some time ago in a letter from Mr. E. S. Crosby, of Buffalo, whom you probably know, as he is an operator of lake and canal vessels. My reply to him contains extensive analysis of the cost of the St. Lawrence project. I am attaching a copy of this letter for your attention instead of repeating the same arguments here.

2. You state that if it were not for the power project, we would not hear of the St. Lawrence Seaway, since "Under our laws, our Government is not allowed to spend money on power development unless it is in connection with a waterway." Your interpretation of our national laws is not quite accurate, since the Government has built large and small dams on our rivers for one reason or another. Just to name two prominent ones, President Wilson started Muscle Shoals by Executive order in order to manufacture nitrogen for explosives; and President Roosevelt started the largest dam of all, the Grand Coulee, as a part of our recovery program in 1934, as a public-works project. Both of these, of course, have since had legislative sanction. The Supreme Court has unequivocally upheld Federal jurisdiction over navigable rivers and their tributaries.

Even more significant is the fact that the St. Lawrence waterway has been in the consciousness of both Canadian and American traders and seafarers for many centuries, and the interest in the present proposal for a deep navigation channel for oceangoing vessels was first seriously initiated in 1895 at a time when utilization of water power was only in its infancy and the first contracts for hydroelectric stations at Niagara Falls were being let. Until 1920 the proposals for developing water power on the St. Lawrence River were not related to a waterway but involved merely the diversion of water for power generation through side canals. It was after the last war, mainly as a result of the difficult transportation experiences, that the seaway became of major national interest. The joint development of the seaway and power project was a logical engineering proposition, first advanced by private companies (the Aluminum Co. of America, General Electric Co., and the du Pont Co.) and later promoted by the two Governments as a joint public undertaking.

3. You point out that the Welland Canal has cost twice its original estimate, that it isn't fully utilized, and that its annual charges are in excess of what it would cost to transship cargo at Port Colborne or Buffalo by other means. First, as to the cost of the Welland Canal: This canal was started in 1914, but, on account of the war, work had to be suspended on it until almost 10 years later and it was not completed until 1932. The difference in original estimate and final cost, therefore, is due to unforeseeable circumstances, namely, World War No. 1 and the higher wage and cost levels during the decade after the war.

I dare say that if you were to construct any other long-range project, whether it be a railroad or a battleship or a generating station, a public or a private undertaking, under similar conditions, the final costs would not agree with original estimates made years earlier. It is a simple economic principle that if the general price level rises, and with it costs increase, due to a fall in the purchasing power of the dollar, by that same token the price of services rises. As you recall, rail rates were increased after the last war and hence, comparatively, waterway transportation would still remain at an advantage.

Whether or not the Welland Canal is being fully utilized, and whether it can justify its total cost and annual expenses, cannot now be answered definitely. It must be remembered that the canal was constructed as a link in the ultimate Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway, and therefore it will not see its fullest utilization until the waterway is completed from Montreal to Lake Ontario. However, even under present limited conditions of utilization, the Welland Canal carried up-and down-bound tonnage of 10,663,000 in 1939, which, even taking your figure of $3,000,000 per year of annual expenses, including overhead, would give a total cost of less than 30 cents per ton of traffic; as applied to grain, this would be a little less than 1 cent a bushel, about the same as the transfer charge, either at Port Colborne or Buffalo.

With the construction of the St. Lawrence project the traffic in the Welland Canal will probably be multiplied very materially, so that the annual cost per ton of traffic will be much less and its economic justification thereby much enhanced.

You state that vessels do not utilize the Welland Canal because they cannot obtain return cargo from Prescott or other Lake Ontario points. You imply, therefore, that even with the Welland Canal vessels prefer to return from Lake Erie ports with coal as return cargo. A glance at the official statistics of the Dominion of Canada indicates that in the same year, 1939, there was an unbalanced cargo on the Welland Canal—down-bound, 8,997,000 tons, and up-bound, 1,665,000 tons. You note that many vessels and their owners did not follow your reasoning, but found it profitable to send their ships down-bound with cargoes six times the available cargo on the return trip up-bound.

4. You generally question the availability of outgoing cargo besides grain. Again the facts are at variance with this general assumption. In 1939, through traffic in the St. Lawrence canals was 7,414,000 tons. Of this amount 4,511,000 tons were down-bound and 2,903,000 tons up-bound. Down-bound traffic consisted of wheat, 2,147,000 tons, and other agricultural products, 733,000 tons. In addition, there was shipped out via the St. Lawrence 271,000 tons of manufactured products, including such items as gasoline, petroleum, agricultural implements, cement, bricks, iron and steel products, sugar, autos and parts, and 1,045,000 tons of products of the mine—mostly soft coal. It is true that the coal shipped down-bound is for destination to eastern Canada, but it is not unlikely that when the St. Lawrence seaway is constructed coal will be shipped for export to South America, for instance, via the canal.

The principal items of up-bound traffic—2,903,000 tons—were gasoline, petroleum products, sugar, paper and pulp, hard and soft coal, copper, and iron ore. These are 1939 figures. In other years there was imported kaolin, coming from England, and corn, imported in years of drought, from Argentina.

With regard to the small Dutch and Swedish ships which were giving direct service from the Great Lakes to Europe, you state, "Before the present war we saw the occasional foreign steamer of such size come on our Great Lakes, but it was almost a rarity, and the only cargo I ever heard of their transporting to Chicago was one cargo of barbed wire from Belgium or some pulp for paper making. This has been a most irregular trade, and I think in the past 10 years that there may possibly have been five or six shipments of this sort into Chicago." In part II of the St. Lawrence survey reports, pages 10 and 11, you will find certain statistics of movement of traffic between Great Lakes ports and European points:

Movement of traffic through the St. Lawrence canals to and from European points, 1937–39

[Tons of 2,000 pounds]

Year	To Great Lakes ports		From Great Lakes ports	
	Number of trips	Tons carried	Number of trips	Tons carried
1937	52	70,056	35	50,800
1938	60	81,463	59	99,100
1939	103	159,296	88	130,388
Total	215	310,815	182	280,288

Source: Special tabulation furnished by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Transportation and Public Utilities Branch, Ottawa, Ontario.

Again there was traffic between Great Lakes ports and Atlantic coast points, via the St. Lawrence canals:

Movement of traffic through the St. Lawrence canals to and from Atlantic coast points, 1937–39 [1]

[Tons of 2,000 pounds]

Year	To Great Lakes ports		From Great Lakes ports	
	Number of trips	Tons carried	Number of trips	Tons carried
1937	126	291,725	31	45,836
1938	70	135,323	40	52,080
1939	64	137,508	56	97,627
Total	260	564,956	127	195,543

[1] Principally between maritime Provinces of Canada and Newfoundland, and Great Lakes ports.

Source: Special tabulation furnished by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Transportation and Public Utilities Branch, Ottawa, Ontario.

Among the exports you will find many varieties of products, grains, grain products, wheat, fodder, naval stores, coal, coke, petroleum products, iron and steel, metal scrap and machinery, and vehicles, as well as chemicals, pigs and pigments, fertilizers, etc.

Among the incoming traffic there was equally a large variety of products, the most important being wood pulp; animal, fish, and vegetable oils; dairy products; grain products; sugar; molasses; beverages; fibers and products; paper; clay; chalk; stone; sand and cement; nonmetallic minerals; iron and steel; machinery; glass; porcelain and earthenware; manufactured goods of all kinds.

The total tonnage, of course, was small because there were not enough ships that could give the service. You are aware, perhaps, that plans are now afoot to expand this service after the present war.

The point is that the traffic is there, and there are enterprising people who are even willing to build special ships to fit the limitations of the channels in order to turn an honest dollar by giving cheaper transportation services. In spite of limitation of size and consequently higher cost of operation, the operators of these ships find it profitable to make the arduous trip to Great Lakes ports. I say arduous because they have to go through 22 locks on the St. Lawrence River, besides 7 on the Welland Canal, in order to get into Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, and Lake Michigan.

Under the plan proposed in the St. Lawrence project, there would be only 7 locks on the whole St. Lawrence River from Montreal to Lake Ontario and 7 in the Welland Canal between Lake Ontario and Lake Erie. And service by larger vessels would be faster, more frequent, and considerably cheaper.

The traffic is there, without a doubt, in abundance. In addition to grain, there would be outgoing cargoes from the Great Lakes consisting of iron and steel products, automobiles, trucks and parts, machinery of all types, agricultural implements, packing-house products—particularly lard and dairy products.

You state also that there would be but little incoming cargo, principally consisting of Welsh coal. An extensive study made by the Department of Commerce indicates there would be incoming traffic in green coffee, fresh and canned citrus fruits, bananas, wines and liquors, crude rubber, tin, sulfur, vegetable oil and seeds, wood pulp and newsprint, burlap and jute and, over a period of decades, most important of all, iron ore, which this country is going to need in order to maintain its supremacy in the industrial world and to secure the stability of the great iron and steel industry in the Great Lakes area.

5. You appear to have adopted the traditional arguments of opponents of the seaway which run something like this: If the St. Lawrence is built it will not be used because ocean ships could not come into the Lakes and operate profitably in view of the great economy of existing lake carriers; but, on the other hand, if they did come into the Great Lakes, they would take away jobs of American seamen. These are actually contradictory assertions and cancel each other out.

I have just pointed out that the traffic is available and ships would come to pick it up or to deliver it. As for the fate of the American seamen, it is well to observe that coastwise shipping is prohibited to foreign flagships and much of the trade of the Great Lakes is coastwise, and therefore would be under American jurisdiction with American standards.

As for the foreign traffic, I question the argument that in order to preserve American seamen's standards we should trade less and have less to sell and less to buy from abroad by making transportation costs excessive; that we should route traffic the longer way around whereby the price of the product is increased without increasing work for seamen. Doing business the harder, the longer, and the more expensive way does not help our merchant seamen, for the very disabilities you describe for the Great Lakes are present for shipping out of New York just as much, where foreign ships do come, and we welcome them.

We certainly can't hurt American seamen by giving more work to seamen of all nations, nor can we help by having less work for all seamen. The problem of cost of operation of our merchant marine cannot be solved by restricting the amount of work available for all shipping; it must be faced and settled as a national problem involving the future of our merchant fleet so that our ships can serve this Nation on all the seas, including our inland seas.

Your final paragraph comes as a surprise. After all of the arguments you have raised against the St. Lawrence on the score of high cost and lack of traffic, you are proposing to spend large amounts of money on the Erie Canal, the Illinois Waterway, and the Mississippi River, amounts which will far exceed the cost of the St. Lawrence. You hold that public works expenditures should not be undertaken in a foreign country—meaning Canada.

The money appropriated by the United States for the St. Lawrence project will be spent in major portion in the United States, since the principal works to be financed by this Government are located in the International Rapids between New York and Ontario and a major portion of that work is on the American side of the boundary.

I am having sent to you a set of the St. Lawrence Survey Reports of the Department of Commerce. I call attention to part I, History of the St. Lawrence Project; part II, which gives the necessary data on the usability of the waterway; part III, which describes the available cargoes; and part VII, which summarizes the bases upon which the St. Lawrence is justified.

I am placing your letter and this reply in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because the points you raise are common to all opposition arguments and there are doubtless many who would wish to have the other side of the picture.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE D. AIKEN.

AUGUST 17, 1944.

Mr. E. S. CROSBY,
Marine Trust Building, Buffalo, N. Y.

DEAR MR. CROSBY: I have studied your letters of June 12 and July 5 with reference to the cost of the St. Lawrence seaway project very carefully. I have also had the benefit of the advice of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, who have made the most exhaustive cost studies of this project and who also are in charge of the maintenance of Great Lakes harbors and, therefore, know what additional expenses would be incurred in improving these harbors along with the St. Lawrence seaway.

I have, on the basis of this careful review of the facts, come to the following conclusions:

1. Your figure of $1,000,000,000 for the cost of the St. Lawrence waterway is an exaggerated figure which has been used ever since 1929, when it first appeared in a book by Harold G. Moulton. This figure, though without foundation, has plagued discussions of the St. Lawrence project ever since, in the 1933 hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as well as in the 1941 hearings before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee. Those who have advanced that $1,000,000,000 figure have included in that the cost of improving the St. Lawrence River itself, the cost of improving the interconnecting lake channels, the costs of improving lake harbor and port facilities, and the cost of the Welland Ship Canal. Much of the improvements assumed to be necessary for the St. Lawrence project in 1929 or even in 1943, have already been made by the Corps of Engineers for the benefit of lake shipping. In this class the dredging of the St. Clair and Detroit Rivers, as well as the MacArthur lock at Sault Ste. Marie, must be included. The Welland Ship Canal, which has cost the Canadian Government about $130,000,000, is also completed. You must see from these facts that you can't take the 1929 or 1934 figures and present them as the future cost of the seaway.

2. The much-quoted figure that you recite also includes an item for harbor improvements and port facilities of $250,000,000. As I recall, this was arrived at by the assumption of a cost of $25,000,000 per harbor for 10 harbors. This also is an exaggeration. The Corps of Engineers estimate that the improvement of 10 Great Lakes harbors to a depth sufficient for oceangoing cargo ships would cost little over $10,000,000 to the Federal Treasury. Of course, there would be other improvements in loading and unloading facilities, piers, wharves, etc., but these would be undertaken by the local communities or economic interests only if they estimate the advantages to be greater than the costs.

3. Your annual charge of $55,000,000, based on a total cost of $1,000,000,000 for the project, is also exaggerated because, first, it is based on too big a cost figure, and, second, your amortization, interest, and maintenance charge of 5½ percent a year is too large, particularly where your interest is assumed at 4 percent. The Federal Government is able to borrow on long term at 3 percent or less.

4. You do not make any allowance for the division of costs between Canada and the United States. You assume that the total cost of the seaway is going to be paid for by the Federal Government, and that is not a fact.

5. You fail to make allowance for the self-liquidating power project for which New York State offers to pay a substantial sum including all of the costs of the power works and 50 percent of the United States share of the joint works at the International Rapids.

6. The estimate prepared by Maj. Gen. Thomas M. Robbins, Deputy Chief, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and presented before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in 1941 was $579,000,000. If we subtract from this the amount that Canada has paid for the Welland Canal and the amount that Canada will spend in the wholly Canadian sections of the seaway, and if we deduct also the amount already spent since 1941 in building the new lock at Sault Ste. Marie, the cost of the additional works which the Federal Government must provide will be in the neighborhood of $276,000,000. From this must be deducted also the amount that New York State will pay for the power project, which is set in the proposed legislation at $93,000,000. If we add the interest during construction and the cost of improvement of channels in 10 harbors, we get an estimate of about $200,000,000 for the Federal liability in constructing this project, including the improvements in connecting channels.

On the basis of the cost estimates of the Army engineers, the annual charges for interest, amortization, and maintenance are estimated at little over $10,500,000, at which rate 16,000,000 tons of traffic would cost about 65 cents a ton, and not $3.50 a ton as you state.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE D. AIKEN.

BASEBALL AS A MORALE FACTOR

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I believe that all the people of the country realize the importance of baseball as a sport, not only to the American people, but to the millions of soldiers who are serving overseas.

There is published at St. Louis a newspaper called the Sporting News; the Baseball Paper of the World. It is published by John G. Taylor Spink. I know that my colleagues will be interested to learn that many thousand copies of this newspaper have been sent to the soldiers overseas. As a result of visits to those soldiers, I am able to say that, because they were able to obtain this newspaper and keep up with baseball in the country, their morale has had a tremendous boost. As a boy I read this newspaper. Many of our soldiers read it when they were youngsters; and I know how much it means to them to get it overseas.

I wish to commend Mr. Spink and his associates for publishing this very fine newspaper, with complete coverage of baseball wherever it is played in the country. I commend them for having furnished large numbers of copies of the newspaper to our soldiers. The soldiers have greatly enjoyed reading it, and it has contributed in large measure to their morale.

ADMINISTRATOR, RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—AUBREY W. WILLIAMS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

Mr. GUFFEY obtained the floor.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I wish to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for that purpose?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Daniel
Austin	Hart	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hatch	Overton
Ball	Hawkes	Pepper
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Kilgore	Smith
Byrd	La Follette	Stewart
Capehart	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Taylor
Chandler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McFarland	Tobey
Cordon	McKellar	Tunnell
Donnell	McMahon	Tydings
Downey	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Eastland	Mead	Wagner
Ellender	Millikin	Wheeler
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wherry
Fulbright	Moore	White
George	Morse	Wiley
Gerry	Murdock	Willis
Green	Murray	Wilson
Guffey	Myers	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent attending the funeral of a friend.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent on an inspection tour for the United States Navy.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] are unavoidably detained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GUFFEY. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. I regret very much the necessity of referring from time to time to an unpleasant matter, but I note in the Washington Post of yesterday, under the heading "The Washington Merry-Go-Round," that Drew Pearson makes this statement:

An indication of what is behind some Senators in opposing Aubrey Williams as R. E. A. Administrator is the admission of Senator BILBO, of Mississippi, that he had to oppose Williams to satisfy Mississippi friends who bawled him out because he voted for Henry Wallace. Among these friends was Lumber King Robert Newton, Wiggins, Miss.

Mr. President, every word of that statement is a lie except "Senator BILBO, of Mississippi," as I am from Mississippi, and "Robert Newton, Wiggins, Miss."

No Senator is obliged to oppose Aubrey Williams, and certainly I am not opposing Aubrey Williams to satisfy my Mississippi friends, because I have been bawled out for voting for Henry Wallace. In fact, the majority of the people of my State approve my action in supporting Mr. Wallace under the circumstances.

I have received very few—I will say less than one-half dozen—messages from the people of my State throughout the entire controversy concerning Wallace, objecting to my support of Mr. Wallace. Mr. Newton himself was for Wallace.

Drew Pearson says I "had to oppose Williams." As long as I am a Member of the Senate I do not "have" to do anything. I am not a "rubber stamp." I do not always follow certain lines. I try to be independent in thought and in action.

But the biggest lie of this statement is that Mr. Robert Newton is a lumber king. Mr. Newton is not in the lumber business. He never owned a sawmill in his life. He is in the naval-stores business, and is president of my home bank.

I do not understand how this miserable creature, Drew Pearson, can concoct so many different kinds of lies. I do not know what are his mental processes which make it possible for him to be such a damnable artistic liar.

I merely want to say in conclusion that Drew Pearson is a multiple, multitudinous, multiplied, ball-bearing, continental, damnable liar. [Laughter.] He is a notorious and inexcusable disgrace to the radio and journalistic world, and should be ostracized, kicked out, and suppressed by both press and the radio.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I urge the confirmation of the nomination of Aubrey Williams to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

During the years the National Youth Administration was in existence it was administered by Aubrey Williams, and the Nation owes him a debt of gratitude for his 8 years of leadership in administering that great youth agency.

At a time when our youths faced their greatest need, the National Youth Administration under the leadership of Aubrey Williams gave gainful employment to over 4,800,000 idle boys and girls, in tasks for the public welfare of the communities in which they lived. The increased morale and deeper patriotism engendered by this program is reflected in the many thousands in our armed services who are better soldiers and workers for the Nation by reason of this experience.

When N. Y. A. was instituted there were over 5,000,000 boys and girls out of work and out of school. Each youth was assigned a job through the democratic method of having a local committee of leading citizens select the work project on the basis of the needs of the community—one which would give valuable work experience to the workers. This was supplemented in most cases by training related to the work performed. It led to the employment of over 340,000 of the youth in private industries.

Over 2,000,000 young men and women received pay for work performed so that they could continue in school or college—a great contribution to the democracy of education which is the foundation of our Republic.

During his administration Mr. Williams supervised the spending of $662,000,000 with capable control and wise direction. One of the greatest services this man rendered to the Nation was his contribution to the defense and war-work programs. When the Nation initiated the first defense programs he had the foresight to increase the vocational-training facilities by approximately one-third, erecting over 4,000 training shops, with 54,000 work stations, for the preparation of young trainees for jobs in defense industries, leaving the vocational schools for older people. During the last year of the agency over 1,000,000 young men and women received this training. Thousands of them were employed in our Government airplane shops and arsenals. Over 425,000 found employment in our war industries, and many more thousands went into our Army and Navy because of their having at once fitted into the shops of our mechanized forces, and many thousands also acted as radio operators.

When the N. Y. A. was terminated about a thousand of these youth a day were being employed in war industries at a most critical time in our war production. Almost every major war industry endorsed the program. At that time there were 131,000 men and women being given preemployment training throughout the Nation. After the training centers were closed the number dropped to approximately 61,000, a loss of 70,000 trainees to the Nation. In one section of my State, the hard-coal region, the N. Y. A. had 3,000 in training, running 3 shifts a day. After these shops were closed there were in preemployment training in the schools in that area only 577 youths, most of whom did not become available to industry till graduation. Private industry was forced to set up training courses at great expense and paid the workers from $60 to $90 per month, as compared with $25.80 paid N. Y. A. trainees for production for the Government. The trainees in industry did not produce in any way comparable to the N. Y. A. youth and the increased expense was enormous, and Uncle Sam paid the bill. While being trained the N. Y. A. workers made over 10,000,000 metal articles for the armed forces or for agencies related to the war effort. In addition, several million articles were made by girls in the power sewing-machine shops for the Quartermaster Department.

When the hue and cry was raised against the N. Y. A. in 1943 I predicted that "any change in the present set-up, in my opinion, is bound to retard the training of war production workers at a time of the Nation's greatest need of producing implements of war." My prediction was verified, and the so-called economy reason for liquidating the

N. Y. A. proved to be a very costly move, for it not only slowed up the proper training of young men and women for war-production jobs, but it resulted in a terrific increase in cost and thus a far greater bill had to be paid by the taxpayers.

The present objections to Mr. Williams are not made on the ground that he was a poor administrator, but are due to prejudice and partisanship, or perhaps even ignorance regarding the fine work the N. Y. A. accomplished.

Within a week after N. Y. A. was closed, Secretary Stimson made a statement to the country that a serious crisis had arisen because of the shortage of implements of war needed by the Army and the Navy. At that time the weekly news magazine Time published as its leading article a statement of the serious conditions by reason of this shortage. I quote a single sentence, "When production falls below goals 2 months in a row, as seems to have happened, the Army loses not only equipment but time—and if enough time is lost an all-out assault on Europe may be delayed too long." Shortly after this a similar appeal for more production of war implements was made by General Somervell and shortly after by Donald Nelson, and in August of that year by our Commander in Chief.

In spite of the national crisis, many thousands of trainees were deprived of the opportunity to obtain training for war industries and the industries were deprived of a very important source of trained labor. The statement was made at the time N. Y. A. was abolished that the schools could do the same work as had been done under Mr. Williams' wise leadership. This was an impossibility, as there were few schools equipped for this purpose.

At the time the N. Y. A. was terminated a great many erroneous statements were made regarding its cost. It was erroneously stated that the N. Y. A. was costing about a thousand dollars per trainee. This same erroneous statement was sent out by the secretary of the National Educational Association. Actually, the cost was approximately $133 per trainee.

When N. Y. A. was terminated the War Department also was forced to train young men and women for war-production jobs, and in Portland, Maine, they offered $15 to $45 a week for this purpose. Senators can readily see the great difference in cost between Mr. Williams' management and the War Department program. Mr. Williams proved himself an excellent Administrator of the N. Y. A., and he would make an equally good record if he were in charge of R. E. A. The work that he did in N. Y. A. brought him in contact with people all over the Nation, particularly those of the less-fortunate groups in country districts. He therefore thoroughly understands the needs of those people for electricity.

The American Farm Bureau Federation is opposed to Aubrey Williams. Why? In the first place, of course, because he has been in the employ of the National Farmers' Union, a rival organization. But it goes much deeper than that. The conflict is not between Aubrey Williams and the great body of farmers who make up the bulk of the membership of the farm bureaus. He is their friend. It is the little group of "big shots" at the head of the Farm Bureau Federation who hate and fear Williams. They know that he wants to help the small farmer come up in the world. That does not suit the big landlords and the big farm corporations who look on the small farmers only as a source of cheap labor supply. The men at the head of the American Farm Bureau Federation want electricity on the big farms, but not on the small farms. Aubrey Williams, as head of R. E. A., would see to it that the small farmer gets a break. Some people try to call that communism. I call it Americanism, the kind of Americanism that will make communism impossible. There can be no political stability in America without science-born conveniences and reasonable comforts among the whole people. The most dangerous course the Senate can follow is to reject a man for office because he wants the Government to do its share in giving all the people a decent living.

If the Senate rejects Mr. Williams, it will be rejecting our great constitutional idea that the Government should "promote the general welfare" of our people. His record is one of which this administration can well be proud. When Germany, Italy, and Russia were training their idle youth for war with propaganda, this Nation was fitting our young men and women to be workers in our great democracy under the wise leadership of this great patriot and leader, Aubrey Williams. He will serve the Nation wisely in this new capacity.

I should like to read a letter which was sent to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma]:

FEBRUARY 21, 1945.

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Agriculture and Forestry Committee, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Had I not been absent from Washington during the hearings regarding the appointment of Mr. Aubrey Williams as Director of the R. E. A., I would have protested earlier against what I consider the unjust and unfounded charges made against him.

During the time the N. Y. A. was in existence I was chairman of the advisory board in Pennsylvania (an unpaid position), and during those years worked in close contact with Mr. Williams and, therefore, speak with knowledge both of his ability and character.

The work he did as head of the N. Y. A. was outstanding in efficiency and scope and the detractors of that agency made as many misstatements regarding it as the enemies of Mr. Williams are making against him.

In respect to his character, I can only wish that more people might lead as truly a Christian life as he has. Whatever religious beliefs Mr. Williams follows, his actions have always shown him to be a thoroughly Christian gentleman.

Further, isn't it a new and dangerous idea in our Government to make religious qualifications for holding a position? Have some American citizens forgotten article I of the Bill of Rights? May I request that you read this letter to the members of your committee.

With many thanks,
Sincerely yours,
MRS. CARROLL MILLER.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there has been injected into the matter under consideration some question about Commonwealth College, an institution formerly located in my State before the authorities took the necessary court proceedings to close it because it was an un-American communistic institution. During the course of the hearings some question arose as to whether F. E. R. A. funds or relief funds under the direction of Aubrey Williams were ever granted to that institution. On page 241 of the printed hearings a part of a letter was inserted in the record. In that letter, dated October 25, 1934, Mr. C. F. Klinefelter wrote to W. R. Dyess, State relief administrator, Little Rock, Ark., and directed him to approve those funds for that institution. I shall not take time to read the letter; but it has also been stated, and the letter likewise states, that approval should also be given by the State Superintendent of Education or State Commissioner of Education. Some discussion was had about this matter on the floor of the Senate day before yesterday, at which time the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] referred to a letter which had been written to me by Mr. J. F. Quillin, attorney of Mena, Ark., who was deputy prosecuting attorney for that county in 1938 and 1939, and particularly at the time when proceedings were taken against that institution, causing it to be closed by order of court.

Mr. Quillin, in his letter to me dated February 23, 1945, stated:

While Aubrey Williams was connected with F. E. R. A., Lucien Koch, who was then president of Commonwealth College, went to Washington for the purpose of obtaining a grant from the F. E. R. A. for the aid of students attending his school. His visit to Washington and the results thereof were matters of public knowledge here. Following his visit to the headquarters of F. E. R. A. a letter was written to W. R. Dyess, State Relief Administrator for Arkansas, by C. F. Klinefelter, assistant director, Education Division, advising Mr. Dyess that Aubrey Williams had agreed to approve Commonwealth College for participation in the student fund program. The letter contained this statement: "You are hereby authorized by Mr. Williams to make an allotment of funds available to the institution. After approval by you and the State superintendent of education, the affidavit should be sent in here for our files."

After reference was made to this matter last Tuesday, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] later requested permission that his remarks be inserted in the RECORD immediately following that discussion. In his remarks he said, and I now read from page 2478 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Tuesday, March 20:

I have learned from Dr. Kleinfelter, whose name has been mentioned on the floor, as well as in the committee, that there were eventually three work stipends of $15 a month granted to students of Commonwealth College; that these three grants of $15 a month were approved by W. E. Phipps, who was superintendent of education for the State of Arkansas. So $45 a month was granted to the students of this college, with the approval of the State superintendent of education in Arkansas.

Mr. President, I know Mr. Phipps, and when that statement was made on the floor of the Senate, in view of my acquaintance with him and my knowledge of his qualities of citizenship and Americanism, I seriously doubted that he had

ever given approval to a grant of any sort to what he knew and to what was generally known to be a communistic institution. Therefore, I telegraphed Mr. Phipps and asked him the direct question whether he ever approved it during his tenure of office. I have the following telegram in reply. It is dated at Russellville, Ark., March 20, 1945, and is addressed to Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

RUSSELLVILLE, ARK., *March 20, 1945.*
Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I served as State commissioner of education for Arkansas from November 9, 1933, to April 15, 1938. During that time I did not recommend or approve in my official capacity any application for or grant of F. E. R. A. funds for Commonwealth College at Mena. After conferring with Attorney General Carl Bailey as to my right to refuse to sign application, and being advised it was a matter of my discretion, I refused to sign. That was investigated before I left office, and it was found that my name was not on the application, but application was approved and aid granted without my signature. If my name is on application now, it is a forgery. The investigation showed, I believe, that Mr. Andrews, deceased, signed as F. E. R. A. educational director. He was strictly a Federal employee. Mr. Williams, no doubt, accepted Mr. Andrews' (of Wynne) approval and granted aid.

Best regards.

W. E. PHIPPS.

Mr. President, my purpose in reading that telegram to the Senate is that, as the record stood, I would regard the statement which was made on the floor of the Senate as a reflection upon my good friend and fellow citizen, Mr. Phipps, if the record were allowed to continue to show that he approved the granting of funds to that communistic institution. Mr. Phipps is as fine an American as there is, and he is a conscientious official who knew conditions there. I rose for the purpose of inserting in the RECORD the telegram I have read, in order that those who read the RECORD may know that any statement to the effect that the commissioner of education of Arkansas approved a grant of funds to a communistic institution is not true.

Mr. President Mr. Dyess, who was then head of the F. E. R. A. in Arkansas, has since died. I am unable, of course, to place in the RECORD positive proof or denial as to whether he approved the application for funds for the institution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. My information, however, which comes from persons who are in position to know, is that he refused to approve any allocation of funds or any grant of money from F. E. R. A. funds to Commonwealth College.

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I do not have my finger on the page, but somewhere in the record a statement was made that Mr. Williams himself said that he approved the letter which purportedly had been signed by—the Senator named the person, but I do not recall who he was.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand, there is no question that the letter was written. Mr. Williams admitted it.

Mr. President, in view of the turn which the discussion has taken, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following the close of my remarks a copy of a letter from Mr. J. F. Quillin, attorney at law of Mena, Ark., addressed to me on February 23, 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. Quillin was deputy prosecuting attorney, and, acting in his official capacity, he filed an information against the Commonwealth College in 1939. He prosecuted the college on three counts: First, failure to display the United States flag during class hours—in Arkansas we have a State law requiring all public schools and institutions to display the flag; second, promoting doctrines and theories which had for their purpose the overthrow by force of the Government of the United States and the State of Arkansas; third, displaying an unlawful emblem, to wit, the Russian hammer and sickle.

Mr. President, I had not intended to speak on the subject now before the Senate. Last Tuesday, when the letter to which I have referred was adverted to by the junior Senator from South Dakota, I had not intended to consume any time of the Senate in discussing the real issue before the Senate; namely, whether the nomination of Mr. Williams should be confirmed or rejected. However, I had hoped, as I then stated, that the debate would not be prolonged. So far as I can see, no purpose will be served by prolonging the debate. My mind is made up as to my duty and the action which I shall take. Judging by the empty seats which we have seen in this Chamber during the course of the debate, I doubt if there is a Senator who does not now know how and why he will vote on the pending question. I think it would be a waste of time and an unnecessary prolongation of the debate to continue it further. I stated yesterday that I was ready to vote against confirmation on the basis of the record although there are many other reasons I could give if necessary. I shall only mention one other now, and that is if I should vote for his confirmation I honestly believe I would be doing a real disservice to the future program of the R. E. A. Therefore I do not wish to impose upon the Senate a long statement or argument in substantiating my position. I think that the question before the Senate should be hastened to a conclusion. If it were a matter involving an important legislative issue, such as the Mexican Water Treaty, for example, which was laid aside to take this up, or a complicated legislative proposal about which we were not satisfied, debate would be helpful. We might acquire some enlightenment, and proceed more wisely. But since this debate will not, in my judgment, change the mind of any Senator, we should hasten it to a conclusion, and proceed with business which the supporters of this confirmation contend is of greater importance to the country.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator, because I want to know the facts of the case as much as any other Senator does, what was the outcome of the prosecution of Mr. Lucien Koch? Is he the person who was prosecuted?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No; the Commonwealth College was prosecuted.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know the nature of the charges upon which the prosecution was based?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I read from the letter the charges as reported to me by the official who prosecuted the case.

Mr. AIKEN. What was the outcome of the prosecution?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Beginning with where I left off when quoting from the letter a few minutes ago, I will continue reading:

Each of these charges was based upon an applicable criminal statute of the State of Arkansas. The maximum finding for conviction of charge No. 1 is $500, each of the other charges carrying a maximum fine of $1,000.

The corporation made no defense in the justice court where the maximum fine was assessed in each case. An appeal was then taken to the Circuit Court of Polk County and, after a great deal of procedural maneuvering the case was tried before a jury of Polk County citizens in January 1940. The college was represented by Attorney C. A. Stanfield of Hot Springs, Ark., a very able lawyer who defended Communist Joe Stecher in the numerous attempts of the Government to deport him.

More than 2 days time was consumed in the trial of this case. At the conclusion of the testimony the defendant, of course, moved for a directed verdict on each count. Judge Minor W. Millwee, who is now an associate justice of the Arkansas Supreme Court, presided at the trial. The motion in each instance was overruled and the case went to the jury. Without hurry but after due deliberation the college was convicted on each count and again the maximum fine was imposed.

No appeal was taken from these convictions, although several dilatory motions were appealed in the Supreme Court. Upon executions of the Polk County Circuit Court all their properties were sold and the life of the institution was ended.

Mr. AIKEN. If the college was engaged in subversive teaching, it should have been prosecuted and convicted. I do not question the statement of the Senator from Arkansas. All I rose to say is that the information given to me, which I understood to be reliable, was that the State superintendent of education, Mr. Phipps, had approved three scholarships for the school in 1934. There is no way of knowing whether Mr. Phipps signed his name to the approval, or who signed it. He said that he did not sign it. I am told that the approval was signed at least in the name of Mr. Phipps. Only the official records would show whether his purported signature as placed on the approval was genuine or not genuine.

Mr. McCLELLAN. My remarks are in no way intended to reflect on the motives

and purposes of the Senator from Vermont. I believe that the Senator was misled in the information which he received. He thought that the statement was fully justified.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it is possible that Mr. Phipps' name was signed to the approval without his knowing of it, because we are aware that such things are done in connection with other matters.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In ordinary matters it might be so assumed, but in this particular case Mr. Phipps in his telegram has said that he not only did not sign the approval but that he conferred with the attorney general of Arkansas with regard to the matter to ascertain that he had the legal right to refuse. From his statement I assume that he felt more or less directed to consent to it so far as Washington authorities were concerned. Certainly, with that precaution being taken and that interest in it at the time, I am sure Mr. Phipps could not be mistaken in remembering that he did not sign the approval requested of him.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the three stipends of $15 each a month must have had the approval of the State relief administrator, or else the money could not have been paid.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I stated to the Senator a moment ago that the then State relief administrator, Mr. Dyess, is now dead. A short time after that, in 1935 or 1936, Mr. Dyess was killed in an airplane accident; and so I have no way; of course, of getting positive proof that he did not sign and did not approve. I am advised, however, that he did not, and, according to the telegram which I have read from Mr. Phipps, someone else—not Mr. Dyess, but someone occupying possibly a position under the educational director—took the responsibility of signing. Mr. Dyess, however, did not sign, and neither did the commissioner of education.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to say that I do not think the $45-a-month contribution is so all-important. I have not had opportunity to verify the figures, and I assume they are correct; but I do not think that is a matter of great importance. I know, however, how I would feel, acting in an official position, if I were called upon to approve funds for an institution that was communistic and inimical to everything that America stands for. I would not want to do it; and the well-qualified citizens of my State who filled the offices at that time refused to do it. I did not want to leave the record as it was after the statement was made that this grant to Commonwealth College was made with the approval of the commissioner of education, and thus leave a cloud upon him, as I would regard it if the same record were made against me.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that if Mr. Phipps did not sign the approval, then the Senator from Arkansas has done exactly right in making his statement to the Senate. However, I think we should remember, regardless of what Commonwealth College was, that in the course of his public career Mr. Aubrey Williams has lent assistance to the students of approximately 25,000 schools and colleges in the United States; and I should be very much surprised if there were not other institutions besides Commonwealth College that had a headmaster or professors teaching things they ought not to have taught. If this college of all the 25,000 receiving assistance from N. Y. A. and F. E. R. A. is the only one of this type that can be pointed out—and, in view of what the Senator from Arkansas has said, we still do not know whether they actually got any money—I think the record is very good. Of course, if Mr. Koch was teaching this stuff and went to jail he got just what was coming to him.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is the way I feel about it, and I thank the Senator for his statement.

Mr. President, I asked unanimous consent a while ago to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks a letter from J. F. Quillin, attorney, of Mena, Ark., addressed to me under date of February 23, 1945.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

MENA, ARK., *February 23, 1945.*

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I am pleased to respond to your telegraphic request for a statement containing such information as I may have regarding Commonwealth College and any connection therewith of Aubrey Williams. You have my permission to use this statement in any way you see fit and to use or omit the use of my name, according to your own judgment.

This school was organized in 1923 by Kate Richards O'Hare, William E. Zeuch, and W. C. Benton. O'Hare needs no introduction, as she is well known to have been active in all radical movements and even to have been associated with anarchistic groups. She was an avowed Communist.

Zeuch is a doctor of philosophy from some northern university. He is a sort of crackpot, but to the average person he presents evidence of being both sincere and able. He advocates the Russian communal system and has often made the statement that he would like to tell the people of the United States the good things about the Russian form of government and the bad things about our own. He made that statement here many times. My information is that he traveled some in Russia.

W. C. Benton is the scholarly, impractical type who is thoroughly American and honest. As soon as he discovered the direction in which this school was traveling he severed his connection from it and was very useful to the authorities in obtaining evidence upon which to close the institution.

In September 1939 while I was serving as deputy prosecuting attorney for Polk County I filed three separate informations against this corporation charging them as follows:

1. Failure to display the United States flag during class hours.

2. Promulgating doctrines and theories which had for their purpose the overthrow by force of the Governments of the United States and the State of Arkansas.

3. Displaying an unlawful emblem, to wit, the Russian hammer and sickle.

Each of these charges was based upon an applicable criminal statute of the State of Arkansas, the maximum fine for conviction of charge No. 1 is $500, each of the other charges carrying a maximum fine of $1,000.

The corporation made no defense in the justice court, where the maximum fine was assessed in each case. An appeal was then taken to the circuit court of Polk County and, after a great deal of procedural maneuvering, the case was tried before a jury of Polk County citizens in January 1940. The college was represented by Attorney G. A. Stanfield, of Hot Springs, Ark., a very able lawyer, who defended Communist Joe Stecher in the numerous attempts of the Government to deport him.

More than 2 days' time was consumed in the trial of this case. At the conclusion of the testimony the defendant, of course, moved for a directed verdict on each count. Judge Minor W. Millwee, who is now an associate justice of the Arkansas Supreme Court, presided at the trial. The motion in each instance was overruled and the case went to the jury. Without hurry, but after due deliberation, the college was convicted on each count and again the maximum fine was imposed.

No appeal was taken from these convictions, although several dilatory motions were filed in the Supreme Court. Upon executions of the Polk County Circuit Court all their properties were sold and the life of the institution was ended.

Upon the filing of the informations in the justice court a search warrant was obtained. I had charge of the execution of these search warrants and assisted in making the search. Although classes were being held, the flag was not being displayed. One of the officers climbed into the attic of a small building, where he found a beautiful silk flag pushed back into the attic, covered with dirt, dust, and debris. No Russian flag was being flown, but several large photographs of the Russian flag were displayed in various buildings. In their library, which was separately housed and which contained some 9,000 volumes, the only photograph on the wall was that of Joseph Stalin. Some 2 or 3 days were spent in searching this institution for evidence of subversiveness. A large number of documents, including textbooks and lesson outlines were found and used in evidence. Incidentally, after this search was made I was asked to assist the attorney general in defending Secretary of State C. G. Hall in a mandamus action brought by one of the members of the faculty of Commonwealth College who had been nominated for governor by the Communist Party. The documents taken from his quarters at the school under this search warrant formed a large part of the testimony in the Hall case. The Circuit Court at Little Rock refused to grant the writ of mandamus, whereupon an appeal was taken to the Supreme Court. The judgment was affirmed as given by the trial court, the case being styled *Field* v. *Hall* and reported in 201 Arkansas at page 77.

The principal textbooks used in this school were Earl Browder's writings. We were able to establish at the trial of the case, from documentary evidence obtained at the school, that the school was advocating open revolution by the Negroes in the South, and in one lecture prepared for delivery and distribution the Negroes were advised to seize the black-belt territory and establish their own independent government.

In the most frequented room on the whole campus, with the exception of the library, a Russian hammer and sickle, made of metal, was imbedded in concrete. Photographs were made of it and I have some of those photographs in my possession.

The principal witness offered by the defendant at the trial in the circuit court was Nathan Oser, the acting director of the institution. He admitted the teaching of communism, and offered no defense other than a 20-minute dissertation on the merits of that theory of political economy. He used

the Russian Government as his illustration, and when I asked him on cross-examination to compare various phases of the Russian experiment, respectively, with comparable parts of our governmental set-up his answer was that he was not sufficiently acquainted with the American form of government to be able to make an intelligent comparison.

When I was making my investigation of this institution, I called him before me with a subpena. I required him to testify, as he was not personally concerned with the investigation. He stated that Harry Bridges, John L. Lewis, and Aubrey Williams, in the eyes of his institution, were the greatest of all the American citizens and were doing more for the American people than any others inside the borders of our country. When I asked him to illustrate what he meant, he testified that they more nearly advocated the doctrines of Karl Marx than even Earl Browder was doing.

While Aubrey Williams was connected with F. E. R. A., Lucien Koch, who was then president of Commonwealth College, went to Washington for the purpose of obtaining a grant from the F. E. R. A. for the aid of students attending his school. His visit to Washington and the results thereof were matters of public knowledge here. Following his visit to the headquarters of F. E. R. A., a letter was written to W R. Dyess, State relief administrator for Arkansas, by C. F. Klinefelter, Assistant Director, Education Division, advising Mr. Dyess that Aubrey Williams had agreed to approve Commonwealth College for participation in the student-fund program. The letter contained this statement: "You are hereby authorized by Mr. Williams to make an allotment of funds available to the institution. After approval by you and the State superintendent of education, the affidavit should be sent in here for our files."

Neither Dyess nor Mr. Phipps, Arkansas Superintendent of Education, approved the grant, but the college received the money anyway under the directions of Mr. Williams.

It is well known that while Aubrey Williams was Deputy W. P. A. Administrator he was a prominent and active member of the Commonwealth committee, which solicited funds for Commonwealth College. I was told by officers of the school here that not only did he assist in obtaining funds for the school by the use of his office and by private subscription but that he personally contributed.

Williams also worked with and encouraged the Communist-front organization, Workers' Alliance.

While Williams was connected with relief work in Washington he saw to it that Highland Folk School, a Tennessee institution which was classed as a sister institution of Commonwealth College, receiveld help from W. P. A. and N. Y. A. funds.

While Williams was holding his position in the relief organization, a number of members of the faculty and student body of Commonwealth College obtained important and responsible positions in his department. The following is a partial list:

Clay Fulks, local Communist, editor in chief, Arkansas Guidebook.

Cunningham, W. P. A. project director in Oklahoma.

Ward Rogers, supervisor Workers' Education schools in Arkansas and Texas.

William Butrick, N. Y. A. staff.

Harold Coy, editor in chief, Federal Writers' Project.

William E. Zeuch—do not remember his position.

Lucien Koch, liaison officer, N. L. R. B.

Aubrey Williams has made the public statement that his association with Communists in Washington was one of the high spots of his entire life. He is a member of the Civil Liberties League, which, according to proof which I have in my files, did everything possible to hamstring the prosecution of Commonwealth College. In my humble opinion, the President has made a serious mistake in offering Williams for the important place of Administrator of Rural Electrification. He would staff that organization with radicals, unless he has changed his politics. In view of his record, the burden is squarely upon him to prove that he has made that change. The people of Arkansas are glad to be rid of Mr. Williams' pet, Commonwealth College, and they warn the entire Nation against the placing of men who were in anywise connected with that school in positions of trust or importance.

Very cordially yours,

J. F. QUILLIN.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as I have said during the course of my remarks, my purpose in addressing the Senate at this time was merely to clarify the RECORD and to place in the RECORD the statement of Mr. Phipps, who was charged with having approved this grant or allocation of funds to Commonwealth College. I do not know how much importance or significance or consideration the whole thing merits; that is a matter for each individual Senator to determine for himself; but I did want the RECORD to be correct. In conclusion, Mr. President, may I express the hope this debate may be concluded today and a vote had on this confirmation issue.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Aubrey Williams nomination has stirred emotions that have no particular value in the determination of the issue. I want to speak for the next 10 mintues upon the factual situation regarding the Rural Electrification Administration and why Mr. Williams is not a competent man to head it, without any respect to his religious or lack of religious belief or any other issue except the Rural Electrification Administration.

I have been interested in the question of providing electricity for farms for 25 years or more. Twenty-five years ago I was chairman of the public utilities of Kansas and at that time and during that service I discussed rather extensively with the private public utility companies plans for energizing public lines for farm purposes. It was rather difficult. Public utilities privately owned are private institutions, and of course extending lines into farming communities where customers are not very numerous was a task involving more or less of a hazard from the private standpoint, although, Mr. President, it is fair to say that today with 2,500,000 farms supplied with electricity, 1,500,000 of them obtain it from private public utility companies, whereas the consumers of the Rural Electrification Administration lines number about 1,100,000. So, after all, the public utility companies have done a very good job in some States. The Rural Electrification Administration does not operate at all in Rhode Island or Connecticut or Massachusetts. Electrification of farms in California, New York, and other States is very largely done by the public utility companies, and yet the Rural Electrification Administration is so important in carrying on the business of providing electricity for the farms that it is entitled to the very best Administrator it is possible to put at the head of it.

It ought to appear at some place in the RECORD that $498,000,000 of public money has been allocated to the R. E. A. for the purpose of building lines to farms. That amount has not all been spent, but will be spent as fast as materials are available.

The whole philosophy, Mr. President, of the Rural Electrification Administration is that it should be a self-liquidating project, financed with public money, which is to be repaid by collections from the various cooperative organizations formed to build and handle the public electric lines. There are nearly 900 cooperatives financed with public money handling this work for the R. E. A.

Mr. President, the job of keeping this agency solvent—and it is solvent now—is an important one.

It should be stated for the RECORD that the way this job is done is that the farmers form cooperative associations which then make application to be financed by the R. E. A. An examination is made, and, if their project looks as if it will justify the expenditure, the money is furnished, and that has been done in approximately 900 cases.

A few years back those of us who followed this matter closely were a little concerned as to whether the idea of self-liquidation would be successful. Today, I am happy to say, the R. E. A. is solvent, and the idea of self-liquidation is being carried out fully. On the 30th of June last the payments in default upon principal and interest were only a fraction of 1 percent of the total amount loaned, and as against that small delay in payment some $18,000,000 had been paid in advance of the due dates of the loans. So that in the R. E. A. we have an institution performing a fine public service, which has been fortunate up to this time in realizing the central idea that it should be self-liquidating.

Mr. President, to continue the record the R. E. A. has made up to this date requires the exercise of sound judgment and of wise discretion on the part of a good Administrator. The only reason I shall cast a vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Williams is that I do not believe he measures up to the qualifications which I think are necessary for the head of such an institution as the R. E. A., and that is all. What I fear is that the appointment of a man with the ideas of expenditure of public money indicated by Williams' public career in the F. E. R. A., the W. P. A., and the N. Y. A. may easily waterlog the Rural Electrification Administration in 3 or 4 years.

If any administrator should attempt to handle the R. E. A. on the basis of Mr. Williams' past record of expenditure of public money, the idea of self-liquidation, of operating it upon a sound business basis, of making it pay out, would be destroyed. That, and that alone, Mr. President, is the reason why I shall vote against the confirmation of the nomination. I think this is a wholly improper kind of an appointment from the standpoint of a business administration.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am sorry to have to take issue with some of my colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and also some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle; but when we see things differently, I think there is no serious wrong in disagreeing openly.

The R. E. A. is one of the most important of all Government agencies. It has already carried light and power to over a million American farms, thereby making possible the enormous increase in food production which has served us so well during the wartime crisis.

We hear talk of food shortages now, but without the electric energy which R. E. A. has carried to the farms of America, it is entirely possible that we might today be talking of famine rather than shortage.

As time goes on, this great agency will play an increasing part in the development of America.

There are still over 4,000,000 farms which do not have electric service. When they are served the productive capacity of American agriculture will be so great that our ability to produce food and other farm products, either for peace of war, will never again be questioned.

Further than this, the extension of electric lines to all parts of rural America will make it possible to decentralize the population so that if war again does come to America, our national security will be greatly enhanced.

The R. E. A. was originally set up as an independent agency, being transferred to the Department of Agriculture in 1938 by an act of Congress.

After the hearings before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last year, I came to the conclusion that Congress had made a mistake and that the R. E. A. could serve the Nation more efficiently if restored to its original independent status. To effect this restoration will unquestionably take weeks—possibly months—and perhaps it may not be done at all.

In the meantime, I feel it is most essential that this agency, whether in or out of the Department of Agriculture, should have a head responsible to the Congress.

We cannot afford to let it drift. We cannot afford to leave the division chiefs and other employees of this great department in any uncertainty as to their own future. To do so is simply to play into the hands of the enemies of the R. E. A. Unfortunately, this great agency does have enemies even now.

There are those who would like nothing better than to see it fail. It must never fail, but must go on expanding its work until the final goal is reached.

The question is, Who should be Administrator of the R. E. A.?

The appointment is for 10 years. That period may be too long, but this agency has had three Administrators in a period of less than 10 years. All have been loyal to the cause of rural electrification. They have been devoted to the objectives we have sought. They have been successful, or we would not today have a million farms enjoying the benefits of electric energy.

All 3 men have been sound in their business judgment, or there would be more of the nearly 1,000 cooperatives in arrears on their repayments of loans today. As I stated yesterday, of nearly a thousand cooperatives, only 6 were in arrears on their payments, as was testified before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last year.

The President has nominated Aubrey Williams to be Administrator of R. E. A.

There is no question of Mr. Williams' devotion to this cause. His lifework has been devoted to helping others. He knows what it is to be poor, and most of the farmers who look forward eagerly to the extension of the blessings of electricity to them and their families are poor themselves. Mr. Williams has learned life the hard way and has an understanding of others in similar circumstances.

Farm people are comparatively poor, and for generations there have been those who have exploited them, telling them what they must pay for the things they buy and what they may get for the things they sell.

Through organization American farmers are now lifting themselves out of poverty, distress, and dependency.

Farm cooperatives, of which rural electric cooperatives are not the least important, are bringing a new day to American agriculture.

It is no longer possible for unscrupulous dealers to force goods of inferior quality on farm purchasers at exorbitant prices. It is no longer possible for a buying cartel to tell farmers what they may get for the products of their labors.

Selfish interests are powerfully organized for the purpose of destroying farm cooperatives. Their methods know no gounds. They plant their spies in farmers' meetings—even the meetings of R. E. A. cooperatives. They are determined to destroy farm cooperatives at any cost and they are equally determined to prevent, if they can, Government offices being held by men favorable to farm organization.

Aubrey Williams believes in cooperation. He believes in farm credit at interest rates comparable to the rates paid by other groups.

Sitting before me is the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who participated in a terrific fight in his State which resulted in reducing the interest rate from 12 percent to 6 percent. Think of an interest rate of 12 percent to farmers, yet there are people in this country who would like to go back to 12 percent interest to farmers.

Aubrey Williams believes in better rural homes and rural living. He believes in better rural health. He believes in better rural education and he believes in the R. E. A.

He has made those beliefs plain time and time again. For that reason his enemies have decided that he must not occupy any position in government which will enable him to put his beliefs into practice.

There is no greater hypocrisy practiced today than that which impels a man loudly and publicly to announce himself in favor of meritorious objectives and then devote his time to improvising methods to prevent those objectives ever being realized.

The enemies of farm cooperatives and farm credit and better farm homes, better farm health, and better rural education never show their hand openly. They work in devious manners and are frequently supported by other men who are actually devoted to the cause which they are unwittingly helping to defeat.

Make no mistake about it. The fight which is now going on here in the Senate to determine whether Aubrey Williams shall be confirmed to be R. E. A. Administrator is just another battle between the advocates of scarcity, high prices, and monopoly, and the advocates of plenty and full employment, and in the years to come the influence of the outcome of this fight may be felt all through rural America.

The charge that Aubrey Williams is a Communist is absurd. It has become common practice to call all who believe in farm cooperatives Communists.

Remember that the list of alleged Communists issued by the Dies committee contained the name of George Norris as well as the name of Aubrey Williams.

What a wretched, absurd, cruel thing it was to issue a list like that. Yet, the song that Aubrey Williams is a Communist is being sung over and over and over again in this battle to destroy the reputation of an honest American citizen.

He did not wait for America to get into the First World War. He joined the Foreign Legion of France 4 months before America entered that war. He has four children—all boys—all now in the armed services of the United States. It seems to me that is a pretty good record for a Communist.

I shall not go into any of the other charges made against Mr. Williams because he needs no defense.

Not a single one of the charges made against him was substantiated in the least degree. In fact, not one of his accusers, except one member of the Senate, had the courage of his convictions to come before the committee and back up the charges made.

All through the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Aubrey Williams made a good appearance and gave an excellent account of himself. Not once did he fail to meet every charge which had been leveled against him.

He kept his head in spite of the greatest provocation which I have ever seen a witness forced to endure.

The point has frequently been made that he would not be a good administrator of the R. E. A. because he is neither a farmer nor an electrical engineer. Neither were any of his three predecessors, yet they all gave good accounts of themselves.

What we are asked to confirm, as the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] said yesterday, is the nomination of an administrator, not of a farmer or an electrical engineer.

Aubrey Williams is honest. The Comptroller General stated emphatically twice that never once during all the time that Mr. Williams was entrusted with the spending of $652,000,000 was there any occasion to question his integrity or honesty.

I do not know whether Mr. Williams will be a good Administrator of R. E. A. or not. If the nomination of Mr. Williams is not confirmed, I do not know whether the man whose nomination eventually will be confirmed will be a good Administrator or not. I think Mr. Williams will be a good Administrator, and I base my judgment on my experience with him while he was Director of the National Youth Administration.

As Governor of my State, I had to deal with Mr. Williams from the time he became Administrator of the N. Y. A. in 1938 until 1941.

I had to deal with a good many other Federal agencies during that time, also. I got along with some and I did not get along with others, but I want to say that up in Vermont we considered the N. Y. A. one of the best of the Government agencies that was set up during the decade of the thirties.

We had an excellent State administrator in Vermont in the person of Mr. Allan Johnston. As Federal Administrator, Aubrey Williams never undertook to dictate to him in any way on how local matters should be handled so far as I could see.

There was never any evidence that that agency engaged in politics in the State of Vermont, or that the money spent was not well spent and spent where it would do the most good. In fact, of all the Government agencies, the N. Y. A. was conspicuous because it did not engage in politics during that 3-year period.

There was a great deal of good done by the N. Y. A. during this time in helping particularly young people and young mothers who had no way of taking care of their children during this period.

I could spend some time in describing the work done by the National Youth Administration in my State, but the strongest testimony to this effect is the fact that to the best of my knowledge I have not had one single protest from the State of Vermont against the appointment of Aubrey Williams as Rural Electrification Administrator.

In fact, to the best of my knowledge, the only protest I have had against confirming Mr. Williams' nomination is one received yesterday from the Mahoning County Republican Women's Club of Youngstown, Ohio. There may have been one or two others. I recall an unsigned letter which came to me this morning.

In contrast to this I have received a letter from Mr. Ralph Noble, commissioner of education for the State of Vermont, in which Mr. Noble says, among other things—and I read merely the part which refers to Mr. Williams:

> I am naturally interested in seeing the directorship of the Rural Electrification Administration in competent hands.
>
> Although I do not know Mr. Aubrey Williams personally, and although I did not approve all of the national policies of the N. Y. A., I do believe from the excellent service the N. Y. A. rendered in Vermont, under the directorship of Mr. Allan Johnston, that Mr. Williams is a competent administrator and that he would have the best interests of the rural electrification service at heart.
>
> My interest in the Rural Electrification Administration is, of course, not in any way personal. I do see in it an opportunity for the improvement of rural standards in living, and therefore know that it has much significance to rural education.

I have received a communication from Mr. Witold J. Mkelk, a member of the advisory board of the Massachusetts Department of Agriculture, endorsing the appointment of Aubrey Williams.

I have received a copy of a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Dairyland Power Cooperative at Chippewa Falls, Wis., also endorsing Mr. Williams.

I have received a telegram from rural electric cooperative people in Ohio, endorsing Mr. Williams.

I have not received any communication from any State or local grange, any State farm bureau, or any local milk producers organization in opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Williams.

Other than the communications which I have mentioned, I have not received over two dozen, in all, on the subject. To the best of my recollection, all the others, with the possible exception of one or two—and I do not recall that there have been any such letters added—are from people favoring the approval of Aubrey Williams. I have not heard from William Green or Philip Murray on the subject, or from any of the labor interests, so far as I know.

In summarizing the case of Aubrey Williams, I have been forced to the conclusion that the greatest issue before us is not whether Aubrey Williams should be confirmed as Administrator of R. E. A. It is not whether the R. E. A. should remain under the Department of Agriculture or be reestablished as an independent agency. It is not even whether R. E. A. should be continued and expanded, although there is no doubt in my own mind as to this.

The main issue involved in the vote which we are soon to take is whether a man can come before this Senate for approval and have that approval granted or refused on the basis of the evidence presented or whether such judgment will be influenced by politics, prejudice, racial and religious discrimination, and all the other evils which Members of the United States Senate should rise above.

I have heard much criticism to the effect that the judicial branch of our Government prejudges cases brought before it for decision, that it is influenced by the social philosophy of the administration, and that matters brought before the courts for decision are not always decided upon the evidence and their merits.

Whether such charges against the judiciary are generally true or not is beyond my knowledge. This is not the place to discuss that subject anyway, but, this is the fitting place and the only place to determine whether the United States Senate is rendering itself vulnerable to the same charges that have been made against the courts.

Are we going to surrender to an appeal to prejudice, or are we going to pass judgment according to the evidence presented to us, none of which substantiates the charges made against Mr. Williams?

It may be said by some that this is Aubrey Williams' day in court. Here is a man who offered his own life in the First World War; who now has four sons serving their country in this war; who has been completely exonerated of every single charge made against him and whose only crime consists, according to the views of some, of being sympathetic to poor and needy people and having a desire to help them rise above the unfortunate social status in which circumstances placed them.

Is he on trial today before this body? In my judgment, it is not Aubrey Williams, but the 96 Members of the Senate who are on trial.

All that I ask is that each Member of this body weigh the evidence that has been presented, ignore all appeals to prejudice, hate, and other lower instincts and then vote according to the dictates of his conscience.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I am advised that several Senators desire to make very brief remarks with respect to this issue. In order that they may have notice that the vote will come very shortly, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Daniel
Austin	Hart	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hatch	Overton
Ball	Hawkes	Pepper
Bankhead	Hayden	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bilbo	Hill	Revercomb
Brewster	Hoey	Robertson
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Bushfield	Kilgore	Smith
Byrd	La Follette	Stewart
Capehart	Langer	Taft
Capper	Lucas	Taylor
Chandler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McFarland	Tobey
Cordon	McKellar	Tunnell
Donnell	McMahon	Tydings
Downey	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Eastland	Mead	Wagner
Ellender	Millikin	Wheeler
Ferguson	Mitchell	Wherry
Fulbright	Moore	White
George	Morse	Wiley
Gerry	Murdock	Willis
Green	Murray	Wilson
Guffey	Myers	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate for any length

of time in discussing the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams to be at the head of the Rural Electrification Administration. I think my record in the Senate will demonstrate that there is no Senator now serving who has been a stancher advocate and defender of rural electrification than I have been. I believe I can justly claim for myself as keen an interest in and as fervent a determination to advance the welfare of the rural electrification work in this country as any Member of this body can. I realize that the votes have been gathered in, and that the rejection of this nomination is already a foregone conclusion. I can already hear the rumble of the wheels of the tumbrel as it approaches.

I have known Mr. Williams for a number of years. I have not always agreed with him; in fact, I have disagreed with him on numerous occasions, and I presume that in the future I shall disagree with him again but I did not want this record to be closed without briefly expressing my feeling of disappointment as to the nature and character of the attack which has been made upon this nomination submitted by the President of the United States. I digress long enough to compliment the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] for the remarks he made earlier today. I have come to conclusions entirely different from those he reached, but at least he confined himself to the question of Mr. Williams' qualifications.

Mr. President, the charges which have been made against Mr. Williams, I think, have been completely and fully answered by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. Convicting individuals for their economic or political beliefs by the process of association is a very dangerous practice to be indulged by the Members of this body, representing the respective States in a representative form of government. I venture the assertion that no man in this country with a wide acquaintance could successfully defend himself, under the procedure of conviction by association, against a charge of being an accessory before or after the fact to any crime in the Decalogue.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not wish to suggest any reflection upon the position of the Senator from Wisconsin; but in the view of many Senators on the other side of the aisle, as the Senator from Wisconsin will recall, it was an entirely ideological attack which was made upon the nominees for the State Department, and conviction by association was intended to be controlling. I do not address my remarks as an argument against the Senator from Wisconsin, but they certainly apply with great force to Senators who are so zealous in asserting that ideologies should not now be considered, but who were very anxious that they should be considered in connection with the other nominations to which I have referred.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maine sees no distinction between the remarks made by the Senator from Kansas, and some of the statements which appear in the record before the committee, as well as in the debate which has taken place in the Senate on Aubrey Williams, I personally cannot hope to enlighten him on the subject.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not wish to leave the matter with such an interpretation placed upon it. It was my suggestion that some of the Senators on the other side of the aisle who had objected most strenuously to any consideration of Mr. Williams' ideology had urged most strenuously the same arguments, and I think with equal injustice, against the State Department nominees. That was the point which I sought to make. I think it is an entirely valid one.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I cannot agree with the junior Senator from Maine. It seems that the effort to pin the label of communism on Mr. Williams falls into an entirely different category than the efforts which were made with regard to the nominees for the State Department, or the efforts which the Senator from Kansas now makes in regard to the present nomination by contending that Mr. Williams is not qualified because of his previous record.

Likewise, Mr. President, much of the opposition to Mr. Williams springs from an ex post facto attitude of condemnation of his part in the administration of acts of Congress which were enacted during the economic crisis, and which were designed to afford some measure of relief to those who were unemployed through no fault of their own.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, the position taken by some Senators, namely, that of attacking Mr. Williams because of past association, is exactly the same position which is being taken by some of the sponsors of Mr. Williams, who would condemn everyone who does not agree with their views as to pacifism. However, I agree with the Senator that both are equally wrong in taking such a position.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, let us remember that so far as the F. E. R. A., the W. P. A., and the N. Y. A. are concerned, they were all, pursuant to acts of Congress, furnished with vast sums of money, and were designed to relieve distress and human suffering which were widespread in character, and caused by a grave economic crisis. I do not believe that any evidence worthy of consideration by the Senate has been produced which reflects upon Mr. Williams' character. On the contrary, the evidence proves him to be a man of integrity, zeal, and administrative ability. I submit that the evidence is sufficient to prove that he discharged the heavy responsibilities which were placed upon him in a very difficult situation in a manner which should receive the commendation rather than the condemnation of this body.

Mr. President, in the consideration of nominations presented to the Senate by the Chief Executive we should confine ourselves to a consideration of the qualifications of the nominees for the offices to which they are appointed and their attitude toward the objectives which the position is designed to attain. We should not indulge in a consideration of alleged evidence or testimony which would not, in my opinion, be admitted by a justice of the peace in any State of which I am aware. I have confidence that if Mr. Williams were confirmed he would accept the responsibilities of this important office, and would discharge them with great ability, with exceptional personal integrity, and in conformity with the statute under which the Rural Electrification Administration was established. I regret that his confirmation will be rejected by the Senate upon what seems to me to be entirely flimsy evidence. I hope that when his four boys return—and I trust they will return—their faith in the fairness of this body will not be shaken when they read the testimony and the RECORD.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am ready to yield the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. I have only one statement to make. It does not concern the merits of the issue before the Senate, but is with reference to what happened in the hearing room of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It was a matter of deep regret to me, and I wish to refer to it on the floor of the Senate. I have in mind the statements which were made in the committee with reference to the late Honorable George W. Norris, of Nebraska.

One morning I went into the committee room merely to get the atmosphere of the place and to hear what was going on. Within 10 minutes I heard a Senator read the name of the last Honorable George W. Norris as having been a Communist. Subsequently I, as well as other Senators, spoke about it. I said that if George W. Norris was a Communist, we needed more of them in the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I think it is an outrage for any Member of the Senate to assert that George W. Norris was a Communist. He represented some of the best things in our American life, and attained a national reputation for his liberal and unselfish policies. He has gone, and cannot speak for himself. I should be derelict in my duty if I did not defend him now against any charge that he was a Communist. I keenly regret that any associate of mine should defame the memory of George W. Norris or stigmatize it in any way.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator from New Hampshire has said. I think it is as ridiculous to classify the late George W. Norris as a Communist as it is to classify Aubrey Williams as one under the evidence which has been adduced in connection with this nomination.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the word "Communist" is a word which has been loosely used on many occasions. It has been asserted against many of us from time to time over a period of a great

many years. I wish to read into the RECORD a definition of "communism." I have previously read it on the floor of the Senate and on other occasions. The definition is as follows:

Communism is a hateful thing, and a menace to peace and organized government. But the communism of combined wealth and capital, the outgrowth of overweening cupidity and selfishness, which insidiously undermines the justice and integrity of free institutions, is not less dangerous than the communism of oppressed poverty and toil which, exasperated by injustice and discontent, attacks with wild disorder the citadel of rule.

That is how communism was defined by that great radical and Democrat, Grover Cleveland.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, to that definition I want to say, "Amen."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of Hon. James V. Heidinger, late a Representative from the State of Illinois, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE HEIDINGER, OF ILLINOIS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, the announcement of the death of Representative JAMES V. HEIDINGER, of Illinois, should be received with more than formal notice. Representative HEIDINGER came to the Seventy-seventh Congress and served continuously until declining health forced him to leave Washington and go to Arizona. He was about 63 years of age.

With deep emotion I express my regret at his passing because I have personally been associated in a neighborly way with Representative HEIDINGER since I came to Washington. I know that he was truly one of God's noblemen. Before he came to Congress he was for many years a judge in the judicial circuit in which he lived. He was an outstanding citizen of southern Illinois. His life touched the lives of many of the people in that area and was a wonderful blessing to thousands. Representative HEIDINGER had profound faith in the American philosophy of government and the American way of life. He loved his country with a devotion rarely seen, and he dedicated the hours of his life in Washington completely to loyal and able service to his country.

The Nation has suffered a great loss. It will be a long time before the place of Representative HEIDINGER, in his several capacities, can be filled by a man who is his equal. Personally I have lost that most priceless possession—a real friend.

HE WAS A FRIEND

He made his friends by being one,
  And on his friendship men relied,
In every deed that need be done,
  He made the Golden Rule his guide.
His friendly presence brought a cheer
  That made the day seem wondrous fair;
His daily living so sincere,
  Made others love him everywhere.
He was a friend.

No task too great for him to do,
  And in the doing was a smile
That aided as he carried through
  The deeds that were so well worth while.
The brightness of his day is gone,
  We see the setting of the sun;
If only we could carry on,
  And live a life like he has done.
He was a friend.

Just yonder on the star-kissed shore,
  He carries on in nobler way;
Though we can see his face no more,
  Thanks for his friendship for a day.
If on his tomb I could indite,
  The epitaph I have in mind,
One phrase is all that I would write,
  The truest words that I could find—
He was a friend.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I merely wish to add a word to what the Senator from Indiana has said regarding Representative HEIDINGER and to endorse all that he said concerning this great American Representative who has just died.

I first became acquainted with Representative HEIDINGER in his home State some 6 or 7 years ago. He instantly struck me as being one of the highest type of American citizenry. He was the leading man of his community. He had no desire to come to Congress, but was literally drafted for service as a Member of Congress from his district, and was reelected without any effort on his part.

I wish to say, as the Senator from Indiana did, that in the death of Judge HEIDINGER we have lost one of the finest statesmen of this Congress.

ADMINISTRATOR, RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—AUBREY W. WILLIAMS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] are both members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which held hearings on the pending nomination. They both heard the testimony before the committee, and in strong and able speeches on this floor they have reviewed the testimony and the charges made against the nominee, Mr. Aubrey Williams, and, to my mind, have completely answered the charges. I simply rise, Mr. President, to associate myself with them in their advocacy of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Williams.

Mr. Williams was born in my State of Alabama. He was born in adversity and raised in adversity. When he was only 7 years of age he went to work in a laundry, and from the time he was 9 years of age he made his own living. From 9 years of age until 20 years of age Mr. Williams was not able to attend altogether 1 whole year of school. Studying at night, taking every opportunity he could to read and improve himself, helped by his neighbors and friends, teaching him as best they could, Mr. Williams finally prepared himself sufficiently to enter Maryville College at Maryville, Tenn.

Not long after he had been admitted to that college World War No. 1 broke out in Europe. Foreseeing the danger to our country, recognizing with that vision and foresight that has so characterized him that the interest of America was at stake in that war, Mr. Williams, before the United States had entered the war, left this country, traveled to France, and enlisted as a member of the French Foreign Legion. I do not have to tell this body of the French Foreign Legion. The world has perhaps never seen a tougher, more daring, more reckless, and more gallant outfit of fighting men than the French Foreign Legion. As a member of that organization, Mr. Williams acquitted himself with fine distinction.

When the United States finally became a party to the war he transferred from the Foreign Legion to the American Expeditionary Forces. He fought on the Chemin des Dames, at Compiegne, at Cantigny, at Soissons, at Chateau-Thierry, in many of the bloodiest battles of the war. He received a wound in battle. His whole conduct as a soldier of the Foreign Legion and as a soldier of the Army of the United States reflected great credit upon him and upon his courage, his devotion, and his patriotism.

After the war he did what many other members of the American Expeditionary Forces did, and entered the Bordeaux University in France, from which he graduated. He returned home and worked his way through the University of Cincinnati, and then engaged in social service work. For 10 or 12 years, he served as director of the Social Welfare Conference of the State of Wisconsin, a private organization, and as such his record was one of faithful, constructive, and splendid service.

In 1929 and 1930 when terrible floods occurred in Texas and Mississippi he went to that area and joined in the relief work in those States. In that work he made such a reputation that when the old F. E. R. A. was established in Washington to give relief to the unemployed Mr. Williams was summoned to the staff of the F. E. R. A. and became Deputy Administrator of that organizatcn. As such he employed thousands of people; he passed on and approved thousands of projects; he handled millions of dollars of money appropriated by the Congress. His record there was so creditable and so outstanding that when the National Youth Administration was established in 1935 he was appointed Director of that agency, and during the 8 years of the life of the N. Y. A. Mr. Williams served as its Director. Under his directorship, the N. Y. A. helped 4,800,000 boys and girls, young men and young women, to receive an education and training. Under his responsibility it expended some $662,000,000. It employed as many as 23,000 people at a given time.

The directorship of the N. Y. A. was a position which required administrative ability of the first order. The cooperation given that agency of the Government, the work it did, the support it received from the various States and the people in the States, the support it received from the Congress of the United

States when year after year Congress made appropriations for the agency, show how well it was operated, show the confidence in which it was held both in the Congress and in the country generally.

Mr. President, all kinds of charges have been made against Mr. Williams; charges to the effect that the N. Y. A. was used as a Communist-front organization. As Senators who were members of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor in 1942 will well recall, at that time the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] introduced a bill to abolish the N. Y. A., and the Senate Committee on Education and Labor held exhaustive hearings on the bill. Many witnesses appeared before the committee. Witnesses came from all over the United States to testify to the work of N. Y. A., to the purpose it was serving, as to what the students it had helped were doing, what contribution they were making to the welfare of the country, how well they had been trained, and how well they had been educated through the help of the N. Y. A.

Mr. President, the hearings constitute some 644 pages. The same charges were made in 1942 by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] against N. Y. A. and Mr. Williams that are now being made against it and Mr. Williams. The Senator from Tennessee came before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, made his charges, and hurled his thunderbolts against Mr. Williams and the N. Y. A.

As Senators know, after these thorough and complete hearings the Senate Committee on Education and Labor refused to report the bill of the Senator from Tennessee to abolish the N. Y. A. because he had not been able to substantiate his charges; he had not been able to make out his case against Mr. Williams and the N. Y. A. On the contrary, the committee felt, after taking all the testimony, that the N. Y. A., under Mr. Williams, was being operated in an able and capable manner, and that the N. Y. A. was serving the purposes for which Congress had been making its appropriations to the agency and was doing a splendid job.

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate to refer to all the many witnesses who appeared in 1942 testifying to the administrative ability of Mr. Williams and as to the effective work of the N. Y. A., but I do wish to call attention to a few of the witnesses so that the Senate may know who the witnesses were, their character, the type of the witnesses who refuted so definitely and so positively the charges which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] had made against Mr. Williams and the N. Y. A.

One of the first names on the list is that of Mr. Owen D. Young. No comment is needed by me to inform the Senate who Mr. Young is.

Witnesses appeared representing the Alabama Drydock & Shipbuilding Co.; the American Locomotive Co.; the Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, of Fort Worth; the Crucible Steel Co. of America; the Culver Aircraft Corporation; the Fansteel Metallurgical Corporation; the Ford Instrument Co.; the General Electric X-ray Corporation; the Gilbert & Barker Manufacturing Co.; the Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation; the Houston Shipbuilding Corporation; the International Harvester Co.

I shall not read the names of all the companies who testified, through their representatives, in behalf of Mr. Williams and the N. Y. A., but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of the witnesses as set out in the hearings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

N. Y. A. RECORD—INDUSTRIAL CONCERNS WHICH WIRED OR WROTE IN FAVOR OF CONTINUING N. Y. A.

Aetna Steel Products, Pottsville, Pa.; Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., Mobile, Ala.; American Locomotive Co., Auburn, N. Y.; Barnes-Duluth Shipbuilding Co., Duluth, Minn.; Brandt Warner Manufacturing Co., York, Pa.; Courier Corporation, Syracuse, N. Y.; C. G. Conn., Ltd., Elkhart, Ind.; Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, Fort Worth, Tex.; Consolidated Aircraft Corporation, Elizabeth City, N. J.; Crucible Steel Co. of America, Harrison, N. J.; Culver Aircraft Corporation, Wichita, Kans.; Curtiss-Wright Corporation, St. Louis, Mo.; Dravo Corporation, Wilmington, Del.; Fansteel Metallurgical Corporation, North Chicago, Ill.; Fellows Gear Shaper Co., Springfield, Vt.; Ford Instrument Co., Long Island, N. Y.; General Electric X-ray Corporation; Gilbert & Barker Manufacturing Co., West Springfield, Mass.; Gulf Shipbuilding Corporation, Mobile, Ala.; Higgins Industries, Inc., New Orleans, La.; Houston Shipbuilding Corporation, Houston, Tex.; International Harvester Co., St. Paul, Minn.; J. A. Jones Construction Co., Inc., Panama City, Fla.; Jones & Lamson Machine Co., Springfield, Vt.; Richmond Shipyard No. 1, Richmond, Calif.; Keuffel & Esser Co., Hoboken, N. J.; Libert Aircraft Products Corporation, Farmingdale, N. Y.; Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., St. Paul, Minn.; North American Aviation, Inc., Dallas, Tex.; Parachute Co. of Utah, Manti, Utah; Pioneer Parachute Co., Inc., Manchester, Conn.; Piper Aircraft Corporation, Lock Haven, Pa.; Pitney-Bowes Postage Meter Co., Stamford, Conn.

Precision Engineering Co., Duluth, Minn.; Precision Tool & Manufacturing Co., Syracuse, N. Y.; Schneider Machine & Tool Co., Syracuse, N. Y.; Southeastern Shipbuilding Corporation, Savannah, Ga.; Standard Heater & Oil Equipment Co., Jersey City, N. J.; St. Paul Foundry Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Studebaker Corporation, South Bend, Ind.; Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Chester, Pa.; United States Air Conditioning Corporation, Minneapolis, Minn.; U. S. Hoffman Machinery Corporation, Syracuse, N. Y.; Walsh Holyoke Steam Boiler Works, Inc., Holyoke, Mass.; Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; William Bros. Boiler & Manufacturing Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; Worthington Pump & Machinery Co., Holyoke, Mass.; York Corrugating Co., York, Pa.; Air Kind Products, Brooklyn, N. Y.; A. B. Equipment Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill.; Ardco Manufacturing Co., North Bergen, N. J.; Associated Manufacturers, Inc., Waterloo, Iowa; B. & C. Machine Shops, Worcester, Mass.; Barclay Manufacturing Co., Inc., West New York, N. J.; Banthin Engineering & Manufacturing, Inc., Bridgeport, Conn.; R. H. Bouligny, Inc., Charlotte, N. C.; Brown Shipbuilding Co., Houston, Tex.; Walter Butler Shipbuilders, Inc., Superior, Wis.; Century Electric Co., St. Louis, Mo.; Cessna Aircraft Co., Wichita, Kans.; Chicago Electric Manufacturing Co., Chicago, Ill.; Charles F. Clark, Chicago, Ill.; Clinton Square Auto Supply Co., Newark, N. J.; C. A. Coffey, York, Pa.; Cone Automatic Machine Co., Inc., Windsor, Vt.; Columbia Aircraft Corporation, Valley Stream, N. Y.; Daikin Co., Chicago, Ill.; the David Bell Co., Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.; Louis F. Dow Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Ford Bros., Inc., Buffalo, N. Y.; Gardiner-Warring Co., Inc., Florence, Ala.

Albert Given Manufacturing Co., East Chicago, Ill.; David Goldberg, Uniontown, Pa.; D. Grandinetti Manufacturing Co., Syracuse, N. Y.; M. J. Grass Screw Machine Products Co., Buffalo, N. Y.; Charles Harris Plumbing & Heating Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Herzog Iron Works, Inc., St. Paul, Minn.; Alfred Hoffman & Co., West New York, N. J.; Jerald Silky Co., Waterloo, Iowa; A. A. Johnson Machine Tool Co., Syracuse, N. Y.; K-H Machine Works, Union City, N. H.; Kieley & Mueller, Inc., North Bergen, N. J.; James A. Kiley Co., Somerville, Mass.; Knapp Bros. Manufacturing Co., Joliet, Ill.; L. O. Koven & Bro., Inc.; Jersey City, N J.; Laister-Kauffmann Aircraft Corporation, St. Louis, Mo.; Jacques Kersler Manufacturing Corporation, North Bergen, N. J.; M & L Motor Supply Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Mall Tool Co., Chicago, Ill.; Midwestern Tool Co., Chicago, Ill.; Miele Iron Works, Union, N. J.; Models, Inc., North Bergen, N. J.; New Monarch Machine & Stamping Co., Des Moines, Iowa; Moore Dry Dock Co., Oakland, Calif.; Pneumatic Scale Corporation, Ltd., North Quincy, Mass.; Rankin's Tent & Awning Co., Waterloo, Iowa; Research & Engineering Co., carburetors, Agawan, Mass.; Rockford Bolt & Steel Co., Rockford, Ill.; Savannah Machine & Foundry Co., Savannah, Ga.; Robert L. Stedman, Oyster Bay, N. Y.; Tirrell Silk Co., Phillipsburg, N. J.; West Duluth Business Men's Club, Duluth, Minn.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, can we imagine that such companies as those I have named, who sent their representatives to tell of the work of the N. Y. A. and of what it and Mr. Williams were doing, would have appeared in behalf of Mr. Williams and the N. Y. A. if there had been any question of the good Americanism of the N. Y. A., if there had been one single thing about the work or the administration or the operation of the N. Y. A. which the witnesses felt was in any way subversive or in any way even tinged with communism?

In my State of Alabama, Mr. President, the N. Y. A. had as its State director Dr. John E. Bryan, who at the time of his appointment was the county superintendent of education of Jefferson County, the county in which Birmingham, Ala., is located, the largest county in the State, a county so large that it constitutes in itself the largest congressional district in Alabama. There never has been in Alabama a finer American, a more loyal, devoted, patriotic American, a more outstanding American citizen, than Dr. John E. Bryan. His father before him, beloved by the people of Birmingham and of Alabama, called "Brother" Bryan because of their love and affection for him personally, a Presbyterian minister of the city of Birmingham, the most popular and most beloved man in Birmingham and in Jefferson County, was a veritable saint come from heaven. Any man who had gone to Birmingham, Ala., and said that the son of "Brother" Bryan was connected with any organization that was in any way subversive or any kind of a front for a subversive activity or communism, would have met with such wrathful scorn that he would have felt that Birmingham and Jefferson

County were indeed unhealthy places for him. Dr. Bryan is like unto his father, that noble Presbyterian preacher, "Brother" Bryan.

Mr. President, to insinuate for one moment that N. Y. A. was any kind of a communistic organization or a front for any kind of communism is to reflect upon the fine, splendid, sterling Americans like Dr. Bryan, who operated the N. Y. A. in my State of Alabama. If we were to search the State of Alabama to find the most loyal and patriotic people in the community, surely at the top of the list there could be placed no more fitting or appropriate citizen than Dr. John E. Bryan.

Communism! Ridiculous. It is absurd to use such a term in connection with an organization composed of the men who composed the N. Y. A. and who did the work of the N. Y. A.

Mr. President, when a man's record cannot successfully be attacked, when his services, his ability, or his integrity cannot successfully be attacked, it seems to have become popular to smear him with the word "Communist." In Jefferson's day they did not have the word "Communist," but it will be recalled how freely his opponents used the word "Jacobin" in respect to him. Doubtless if Mr. Jefferson were living today and driving through his mighty reforms to make America democratic there would be some who from one end of the country to the other would denounce him as a Communist.

Mr. President, when a case cannot be made out against a man, when the facts will not sustain the charges made against a man's ability or his capacity to do a job, his opponents seek to arouse prejudice against him, seek to tear him down in the minds and hearts of men, by hurling at him the epithet of Communist. There is no more basis for charging Aubrey Williams with operating the N. Y. A. as a Communist organization than there was in the olden times for charging Thomas Jefferson with being a Jacobin or a heretic and a "red" because of the mighty democratic reforms which he proclaimed and which he fathered.

In the hearings before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry there is one brief bit of testimony which I want to take a moment at this time to read to the Senate. It is found on page 179 of the hearings. It is the testimony of a man named Walter C. Chapman. His is not a great name in American annals. So far as I know Mr. Chapman's name has never appeared in large headlines as having done some very exciting or unusual or extraordinary thing, but I think when Senators read the testimony of Mr. Chapman they will find that he is one of the splendid, honest-to-goodness, every-day Americans, who make up the strength and the character of our Nation. The truth is, Mr. President, as I read this testimony of Mr. Chapman, I recognized that he has been so busy trying to do something for the other fellow, he has been so busy trying to give some help, to provide some relief for crippled people and handicapped people, that he has had no time to seek to build up himself or create an aura of fame around his own name. Let me read Mr. Chapman's testimony. He resides in Salem, Va. He says:

I am a livestock raiser in Virginia in a small way.

He is merely one of the men living on a dirt farm trying to make a little bit in raising a small number of livestock. He says he is "executive secretary of the Virginia Society for Crippled Children and Physically Handicapped Adults, a private organization." He further says:

I have no Federal Government, State, or county position—just a private citizen—but I am interested in the approval of Mr. Williams and in his favor, because I was associated with him during 5 years on the N. Y. A. in Virginia, and I therefore know how the program was operated in Virginia, and also to a large extent in the Nation.

* * * * *

I was born on a farm, raised on a farm. I came here Tuesday and did not plan to testify, but after hearing so many statements, I thought the committee might want to hear just a brief statement of someone who knew about the N. Y. A. intimately and personally.

I might say I was field representative for the N. Y. A., and that is the only Government position I ever held. I held it from the day the N. Y. A. started until 1 year before it ceased, when, by reason of becoming executive secretary of the National Rehabilitation Association, I resigned

While I was a N. Y. A. supervisor for 46 counties in West Virginia I was at the same time the Department of Virginia Americanization chairman.

That is, of course, a department of the American Legion.

I gave innumerable addresses, and I do now, on Americanism, and I want to say that these charges against Mr. Williams being a Communist, to me, a person who really knows his record professionally, seem ludicrous. I am now promoting for the American Legion in Virginia an oratorical contest, and the subject is Our Constitution.

The N. Y. A., gentlemen, in Virginia, had a very proud record. Most of you people who knew about our program were in favor of it. We had all of the N. Y. A. people, both supervisors and youth, on the program take the oath of allegiance to the Constitution. A very large majority of these N. Y. A. boys all over the country are now fighting the war, and our program, from its very inception, was to train the youth of this land along the lines of democracy and Americanism, and what this Government stands for.

Now, as far as Mr. Williams is concerned, I only know him professionally. When I came in here Tuesday and spoke to Aubrey Williams he did not know my name. I only bring that out to show you that there is no personal matter in this proposition. I only feel you gentlemen want to hear something about this program.

Now, the N. Y. A. in our State was certainly a most economical program. A comparison of costs of the N. Y. A. and the C. C. C. will show that the C. C. C. was far in excess of the cost of the N. Y. A. All of the directives coming from the national office, Mr. Williams' office, while he operated the N. Y. A. stressed economy. All directives stressed cooperation with other agencies, and we made a definite attempt to cooperate with all of the agencies—local, State, and Federal. The public schools of Virginia and the public schools of this Nation learned a great deal about vocational education from the N. Y. A. and they are now practicing what they learned.

Now, I do not want to make a long statement about this proposition, but I would like to stress again that this N. Y. A. program as operated, thought out, and directed by Mr. Williams was a sound business program.

Mr. President, if we were to call to Washington all the State supervisors and directors of the N. Y. A., judging from the testimony which our committee heard in 1942 on the McKellar bill, I do not doubt that each and every one of those supervisors and directors would substantiate the testimony of Mr. Chapman which I have read. Mr. Chapman spoke about the fact that such a large number of N. Y. A.-trained boys had gone into the armed forces. We know that the figures given in the hearings show that 60 percent of the boys of military age went directly from the N. Y. A. into the Army. Most of the others went into war plants, using the skill, training, and knowledge which they had obtained with the help of the N. Y. A. to make the guns, shells, airplanes, and munitions we had to have for the fighting and winning of this war.

A year and a half before the infamous attack came at Pearl Harbor, Aubrey Williams, as the Director of N. Y. A., foresaw the danger which confronted our country. He correctly read the ominous signs on the horizon, and he turned the N. Y. A. to the task of preparing its trainees for war production. As a result of the foresight and wisdom of Aubrey Williams, trainees of the N. Y. A. during the first year of the war produced approximately 5,000,000 articles for the Army, the Navy, and other war agencies. During the first year of the war the N. Y. A. turned out each day 1,000 young men and women who went directly into the Army or into war plants.

Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] says that the head of the R. E. A. ought to be a man who is close to the rural life of the Nation and that he ought to be some kind of an engineer. I am glad that such rigid and narrow requirements are not imposed upon candidates for the office of United States Senator. If they were, I fear that at least some of us who are here would never be able to qualify. We should never be able to get here. The truth is in Mr. Williams' case, that he has far more qualifications for this job than many appointees whose nominations have been confirmed by the Senate have had for the jobs to which they were appointed. I notice the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce [Mr. WHEELER] smiling when I make that statement. He has been here a long time. No Member of Congress has a better knowledge and understanding of what has happened in the Congress during the past quarter of a century. He knows how truly I speak when I make that statement.

For the past 2 years Aubrey Williams has been connected with one of the three great farm organizations of the Nation; namely, the Farmers Union, with a membership of 400,000 members in 26 States of the Union, a farm organization operating with 3,500 cooperatives. During the past 2 years Aubrey Williams' business has been to go out and live with the farmers, go into their

homes, go into their fields with them, talk over with them their problems, understand their problems, see them at first hand, and endeavor to help them in solving them. For the past 2 years Aubrey Williams has been living with the farmer. He has been living with agriculture. He has been living with mother earth. He is not an engineer, but Mr. John Carmody, who so successfully filled the position of R. E. A. Administrator, was not an engineer. Mr. Harry Slattery, who did the job of Administrator well, was not an engineer. He was a lawyer.

The biggest job that has been done in the United States, almost in its entire history, so far as the administration of a vast project of the Federal Government is concerned, is the job of operating the T. V. A. What a magnificent job the board of the T. V. A., under the chairmanship of Mr. Lilienthal, has done. Mr. Lilienthal, when he took over that job, was not a farmer. He was not an engineer. He was not an electrical expert. He was only a lawyer. But he had the same kind of administrative ability that Aubrey Williams demonstrated that he possessed when he administered N. Y. A. With that ability Mr. Lilienthal went down to the Tennessee Valley, and has done a stupendous job in magnificent fashion.

Sitting on his right as one of the administrators of the T. V. A. has been Dr. Harcourt Morgan. He is not a farmer, an engineer, or an electrical expert. He is a former university president. He was formerly president of the University of Tennessee.

The third member of that board, with whom many of us served in this body, former Senator James Pope, is not a farmer. He is not an engineer. He is not an electrical expert. He is a lawyer, a legislator, and a former Member of the United States Senate.

The man who did so much to support that board of three managers of the T. V. A. was none other than Mr. J. A. Krug. Mr. Krug is not an engineer. He is not an electrical expert. He is not even a manufacturer; and yet where is he today? He is the driving power, the head and successful leader of the War Production Board, which is responsible for the production of the mighty instruments for the waging and winning of this war.

Mr. President, if we were to examine the records of the Senate, I venture the prediction that few of the nominees whose names have come before it for confirmation to high and important positions would be found to have small or technical qualifications. But they had administrative ability, they had courage, they had character, they had capacity to get things done, just as Aubrey Williams demonstrated that he had the capacity to get things done, when he was operating the N. Y. A.

Whence comes this nomination? It comes from the President of the United States. Who is he? First let me ask who brought the R. E. A. into being; who gave it birth; who fathered it? The present President of the United States—not the Congress. After the President brought the R. E. A. into being, the Congress some months afterward passed a statute giving it statutory status; but the R. E. A. was the product of the mind and heart and pen of the President of the United States when he signed the Executive order which brought the R. E. A. into being. Can it be that Senators have more concern about the R. E. A. than has the father of the R. E. A.? Certainly they will admit they have no such responsibility in the matter of this appointment and in the matter of the effective and efficient administration of the R. E. A. as has the President, who is the Chief Executive of this Nation. If the appointment should prove disappointing, if it should fail, whose responsibility would it be? Where would the responsibility be placed? Every Member of the Senate knows, without my stating it, that the responsibility would be put squarely on the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt. On every stump in the land, from Maine to California, the candidates for office and the party speakers would proclaim how the Roosevelt Administration had failed in the administration of the R. E. A. The responsibility rests on the Chief Executive. He was elected President of the United States for the fourth time, last November. He smashed a great American precedent in being elected for the fourth time. By that election the people of the United States said, "We want him for our Chief Executive. He is the man we want to make the appointments, the one in whom we put the power to make the appointments, and the one whom we will hold responsible."

I say to the Senate that the President, as the Chief Executive of this Nation, with the responsibility upon him for the executive branch of the Government, with the responsibility upon him for the administration of the R. E. A., has the right to name as his lieutenant to administer and operate the R. E. A. the man he wants, unless we find his nominee to be incapable or unfit for the job. There is not one iota of testimony in the record which shows that Aubrey Williams is not fully fit and qualified to operate the R. E. A.

Mr. President, this question is bigger in many ways than Aubrey Williams; it is bigger even than the present President of the United States. The question is whether, when a man is chosen by the people of the United States to be the Chief Executive of the Nation, he shall be allowed to name his own lieutenants to carry forward his program and to help him meet his responsibility in the administration of the executive branch of the Government. We know that in the 150 years of our history it has been very seldom that the Senate of the United States has denied to the Chief Executive, whether he were a Whig or a Democrat or a Republican, the right to name his lieutenants to carry on for him the administration of the executive branch of the Government. We have had one notable exception in our history, a case which the present one readily brings to mind, namely, the refusal of the Senate of the United States to confirm the nomination of the great Roger B. Taney to be Secretary of the Treasury under President Andrew Jackson. We know the hatred which existed at the time on the part of certain great and powerful interests against President Jackson and his administration. We know the politics involved in the action of the Senate at that time. We know the prejudice which played its part in the rejection of that nomination. I see too much evidence of the same sort of politics, the same opposition to the administration in office, the same prejudice and the same animosities and desire to rebuff someone and to get someone's head, in the opposition in the Senate to confirmation of the nomination of Aubrey Williams.

I recall the struggle in the early days when the R. E. A. was first established. I know how the great and powerful power interests of this country did everything which the ingenuity of man could contrive to defeat the R. E. A. and to prevent it from serving the purposes for which it was created. One of the most sordid stories in the history of my State of Alabama is that of the efforts of the power company in my State to keep the R. E. A. from furnishing electric power to the farmers in Alabama. They not only went into court with all kinds of injunctions and court actions in an effort to thwart and defeat the R. E. A., they not only bought what they considered to be local community leaders, in an effort to get them to use their influence with their fellow members of their communities against the establishment of the R. E. A., but they spread all kinds of false and malicious propaganda against the R. E. A., telling a farmer that if he were to get on a R. E. A. power line and if a mule happened to be killed by an R. E. A. power line 50 miles away, he would be personally and individually responsible to pay for the value of the mule.

I see much evidence today of the same powerful forces, in the opposition to Aubrey Williams. They do not want Aubrey Williams because they know the character, the heart, the conscience, and the purpose of the man are such that he would operate the R. E. A. with one purpose, namely, to serve the farmers of the Nation, and that he would stand adamant in his opposition to selfish ends and selfish desires. Powerful forces here today are opposing the confirmation of the nomination of Aubrey Williams, just as the great powerful forces against Roger B. Taney waged their campaign against him, hurled their powerful opposition against him, and encompassed his defeat in the United States Senate. It seems trite to say that history repeats itself. But today we witness a repetition of history. We see politics, prejudice, animosity, and the might of powerful vested interests combined to defeat Aubrey Williams' nomination.

Mr. President, as Aubrey Williams contemplates the action of the Senate I can imagine that he is not thinking of himself; he is not thinking of the job of R. E. A. Administrator. He does not need a job. He already has a good job

with a great farm organization. I can imagine that he is thinking of his four fine, stalwart sons, one of whom has been in the Pacific fighting for our country for more than 2½ years; two of whom are today on the Rhine under Generals Eisenhower, Bradley, Patton, and Hodges.

The last of the four, the youngest, is today wearing his country's uniform in a military camp, training, preparing, and making ready to go overseas to help carry the war to the enemy. I imagine that Aubrey Williams is thinking of those boys today. What will those boys, out on the battle fronts, facing dangers, risking their lives and bodies, think if the Senate rejects the nomination of their father? Whatever the Senate does or does not do, it cannot take away from Aubrey Williams, the father of those four splendid, stalwart soldier sons, the certificate of honor which his Government gave him for his service in World War No. 1. It cannot take away from Aubrey Williams the distinction which he bears as having stood on the Chemin des Dames, at Compeigne, at Soissons, at Chateau-Thierry, baring his breast to the enemy, facing danger, and, ready if need be, to give his life for his country. With all its power the Senate cannot take that record or that glory away from Aubrey Williams. Whatever the decision may be in this matter, the record will stand, because Aubrey Williams' entire life, and all his service, testifies that he is and has been all of his life a humanitarian, that he was a valiant and a brave soldier, that he has served well his Government in peace as well as in war, and that he is an American.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I feel that I must say a word or two for Aubrey Williams, because we both have something in common. We are both ignorant men. I went to school for only 5 years. I had 5 years of formal education. I completed 8 grades in 5 years, and could not continue because the necessary funds were not available. Without going to school, Aubrey Williams learned as much as I know. Then he started attending school. He lifted himself by his own boot straps. For that reason I feel that I should come to his defense. But it will do no good; it will make no difference. Those who oppose him are not here to listen to me. They care not what will be said. Nevertheless, the record will have been made. When historians pore through the record they will say, "This ignorant man at least saw the light, and knew in which direction history was moving."

Mr. President, it is said by some that Aubrey Williams is not qualified to be the Director of the R. E. A. because he is not an electrician. How absurd. If Abraham Lincoln were here would the same persons say that he would not be qualified to administer the R. E. A.? Yet electricity was not well known in Abraham Lincoln's time. The question before the Senate is not whether the nominee is an electrician or an engineer. What is needed is an administrator, and Aubrey Williams has proved his ability as an administrator.

We have had examples of the practice of sending men abroad to be administrators merely because they happen to be familiar with the technical aspects of the work to be performed. We sent railroad engineers to France merely because they were engineers. We sent them there to command hundreds of other men in the operation of trains, and in keeping war materials moving forward. A number of those men failed miserably. They were excellent engineers. They knew how to operate trains, but they did not know how to command men. They found themselves in sorry circumstances. Some of them were tried and convicted of negligence. It was not primarily negligence. They did the best they could, but it was not good enough.

Mr. President, a tide in history is moving, and we cannot stand against it. The peoples of the world have seen that there is plenty for everyone. In this country we have produced a great abundance of war materials for the purpose of killing people abroad, and at the same time we have fed our own people at home better than they have ever been fed before. Some of us have had to go short merely because those who had not previously had enough now have sufficient money, and can compete in the market and buy some of the food which others among us had been fortunate to have heretofore. But we have a higher standard of living than we have ever had before, and have produced a great abundance of war materials. The people know that to be true. They will not permit another time to arrive such as that through which we passed in the recent past, when factories were closed and people were thrown out of work. We all know that abundance is now on every hand.

Yet, Mr. President, there are Members of the United States Senate who would attempt to dam the tide and hold it back. It cannot be done. If we form a solid phalanx and attempt to hold back the tide we shall be overwhelmed. England, at least, has had more sense than to try to do that. She is sending to the San Francisco Conference Clement Attlee, a Socialist. The English go along with the tide. In England even the reactionaries have sense enough to know that it is impossible to stop the tide, that the thing to do is to climb aboard and try to steer the boat down a middle course so that it will not be wrecked either on the right or on the left. The course which we are urged to follow is one which leads to dictatorship.

Mr. President, the people of America elected Franklin D. Roosevelt their President for a fourth term. It has always been understood that a President should have the privilege of selecting officers to administer the affairs of the various Government agencies, unless, as the distinguished Senator from Alabama said, it is proved beyond all doubt that the appointee is absolutely incapable or unfit to perform the duties of the office. No such circumstance has been proved in the case of Aubrey Williams.

I would not say that this is an attempt to stab the President in the back—in order to stab a man in the back the stabber has to be somewhere near the stature of the man attacked—I would say that this is simply a matter of pushing pins under the toe nails of the President, trying to irritate him at a time when the fate of the world is resting in large part upon his capable shoulders.

The President has been very fair. He would have had a great opportunity, if he had been so minded, to deal in petty things. He did not have to designate prominent men of the opposite party to go to the San Francisco Confrence. He could have ignored them completely; but he rose above partisan politics, and designated the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and former Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, a Republican, and two men from the Democratic side in the Congress to attend at the Conference at San Francisco. I wish that in this situation the Senate would try to rise above petty things and be as fair as our great President.

It has been said that Aubrey Williams received his education with the understanding that he would follow the ministry, and that he reneged on his promise. Possibly that is a crime. If it is, I have a brother who should be classed with him. My father, who was a minister, sent my brother—I shall not say which one nor where he lives—to a theological school to become a minister. He was expelled because he loved the ladies more than he loved his studies. [Laughter.] Regardless of that, however, he turned out to be a fine man, a fine husband, and a fine father, and I am proud of him. Aubrey Williams probably realized that he was not cut out to be a minister. I judge that from what he said the other day.

It will be remembered that when Maj. Gen. Anthony McAuliffe was surrounded at Bastogne and was called upon by the Germans to surrender his reply was "Nuts." The other day when Aubrey Williams was asked if he was going to give up the fight to be R. E. A. Administrator he said, "Hell, no." That probably would not sound very well coming from a minister; but that is the kind of man he is. I think he would make a pretty good Administrator for the R. E. A. If someone came to him and said, "We want an electric line out here in the country," and Aubrey Williams, after looking it over, thought the line should not be constructed he would say, "Hell, no; that is no good." I think he would do a good job.

I have been greatly distressed by the proceedings in the Senate during the last few days. The opposition has called for a show-down on the nomination of Aubrey Williams under the pretense that it is very important, and yet at any given time if I could have turned a machine gun on the other side of the aisle very few Republican casualties would have resulted.

I repeat, Mr. President, it is not a matter of trying to get at the truth; it is a small affair of trying to stick pins under the toenails of the President.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I wish to take a few moments to discuss the pending nomination, though I appreciate that anything I might say in connection with Aubrey Williams would have little influence upon the Members

of the Senate. I am sorry that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] referred to Mr. Williams as an ignorant man, because I must contradict him. I have known Aubrey Williams for a long time, and he is far from being ignorant. I am also sorry the Senator from Idaho stated that he was an ignorant man like the Senator, because from the speeches the Senator has made in the Senate I am sure he is not an ignorant man. So far as I am concerned, I never would admit I was ignorant; people have tried to prove that I was, but I never admitted it, and I am afraid the statement might come back to plague the Senator at some time.

Mr. President, if I were to vote my prejudices based on the support Mr. Williams is receiving from some persons outside the Senate, I am afraid I should vote against him, because many of the organizations and many of the people outside the Senate who are strongly supporting him have been those who for one reason or another have condemned me because I did not always agree with their views.

Today it seems to be a common purpose, if one does not agree with another, either to call him a Fascist or to call him a Communist. I think that is a very unfortunate trend.

Recently I made a speech at Haverford College, and quoted Max Eastman. I said:

> Max Eastman makes plain that the liberal will have difficulty finding any place or function whatever in this conflict.

He was speaking of the conflict between labor and capital, and the conflict that is going on throughout the world.

> For, he insists, the depth and the force of the conflict compel all men to abandon themselves to one side or the other completely. They can, he adds, no longer exercise judgment between two parties because the underlying standards of judgment are in question. He sees the present as "a revolutionary age, a gathering conflict between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the temporary twilight of liberalism."

I want my colleagues to note that phrase, "Temporary twilight of liberalism." Then I said:

> Incisively he makes clear that the honest radical regards the world upheaval as a great conflict between two opposing forces that in such a fight, the spirit, the theory, the essence of liberalism is of very necessity buried beneath the opposing intolerances of the parties.

Let me say here that those who call themselves liberals and then show their intolerance by denouncing anyone who does not agree with them as a Fascist or a Communist, cannot be classified in any sense of the word as liberals, because intolerance, whether it is economic, racial, or religious, is the very antithesis of liberalism as I have known it, and as it has been taught down through the ages.

Mr. President, when I rise to speak of Mr. Aubrey Williams I wish to do so without any intolerance or prejudice. But we see ever creeping into our society here in the United States of America the same intolerance of various groups that was seen in Europe immediately following the war in Italy, in Germany, in France, and in Russia. We see the same intolerance spreading throughout Europe today, and when we see it growing we know that ultimately it will cause an upheaval in this country.

Those who are spreading that kind of intolerance in this country are doing this Government the greatest disservice that could possibly be done it, whether the intolerance comes from the radical, on the one side, or from the ultraconservative, on the other. In my judgment, both are doing a disservice.

I have known Aubrey Williams for a considerable period of time. I had occasion to come in close contact with him when he was with the W. P. A., and he and the administration were accused of using the W. P. A. for political purposes. I know that Aubrey Williams was one of those who was definitely opposed to using the W. P. A. for political purposes in a campaign. I know that he was opposed to having it so used in my State, and I know he was opposed to having it used in that way throughout the country.

So far as his connection with the N. Y. A. was concerned, I never heard anyone in my State speak of him who did not compliment the N. Y. A., except one individual who wrote me a few days ago. Previous to that time everyone who had any contacts with him complimented the way he handled the N. Y. A. in my section of the country. What he did in other sections I do not know.

I have not always agreed with the statements of Mr. Aubrey Williams. In fact, I think he has made some very foolish statements, particularly when he said, as he has been quoted in the RECORD, that all the people—or words to that effect—should support the President of the United States. But I can understand that a person who owed so much to the President might make such a statement without thinking about it. I can also understand how he might have made some speeches in which he perhaps made statements with which I would not agree. But I wonder what member of the United States Senate, when engaged in a political campaign, has not made some statements for which, on further reflection, he was sorry.

When statements of Mr. Williams were introduced into the record, it was seen that most of them were excerpts from speeches, and the complete speeches were not given, but some particular line or some particular sentence was picked out. No one can judge a man by merely selecting one sentence of a speech he has made. When a Member of the Senate makes a speech upon this floor or in a campaign, if a smart newspaperman picks out an isolated sentence without giving the full context of the speech, the Senator may be completely misunderstood by the people who read only the one excerpt.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. In line with what the Senator from Montana is saying, I am wondering, if a foolish statement made in a speech should deprive a man of the right to hold office, how many Members of Congress would be in office today.

Mr. WHEELER. There would not be many. I have not examined the record of all the speeches made by every Senator and every Representative, but there would not be many, under such a test, who would remain in office.

Mr. HATCH. I make no exception; I would even include the Senator from Montana. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator should do so. Probably I can be blamed much more for some things I have said in the past than some other Senators.

Mr. HATCH. I hope the Senator will not take offense.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly not.

Mr. HATCH. Because he and I have disagreed many times, and from my standpoint the Senator from Montana has made many foolish statements, and certainly I have made many foolish statements from the standpoint of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course; and I have heard the Senator from New Mexico make some very recently. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I was about to say that a man should not be branded as being this or that merely because he happens to be associated with a particular individual who has certain leanings. I have recently been criticized because when I made speeches there were some Communists in the hall where I spoke. Others have criticized me because there were some Fascists present in the hall when I spoke. Probably everyone who makes a political speech in a campaign could find burglars and pickpockets and other undesirable characters in the audience. The fact that such individuals are present does not make the speaker of their ilk.

The question before the Senate is not whether at some time or other Mr. Aubrey Williams has made a foolish statement; the question is, Is he competent to handle the job? Rather than say that Mr. Aubrey Williams is an ignorant man, I would say that he is far from being an ignorant man. He is to some extent a self-educated man. He has a very brilliant mind, and he is very able. I would say that in intellect he compares favorably with most of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. What I meant was that Aubrey Williams was ignorant in the sense that Abraham Lincoln and Al Smith were ignorant. Neither of those men had a great deal of education.

Mr. WHEELER. Aubrey Williams has had some education. He is a self-educated man. Abraham Lincoln was a self-educated man. Abraham Lincoln certainly was not an ignorant man. Neither was Al Smith an ignorant man. Al Smith was a very able man, and I was glad to give him my support when he ran for the Presidency.

As I have said, Aubrey Williams is a very able man. No one came before the committee and questioned his honesty or integrity. He has handled millions upon millions of dollars. The Comptroller General came before the committee and absolutely absolved Mr. Williams of any guilt of any kind whatso-

ever with respect to the handling of Government money.

Mr. President, I shall vote to confirm the nomination of Aubrey Williams because I think he is honest and capable. I think he will make a first-class Administrator of R. E. A. He knows something about the cooperative movement, and he is interested in the cooperative movement. The work he is going to do will be with people who are interested in the cooperative movement.

I am satisfied in my own mind that if the nomination is confirmed and Aubrey Williams becomes Administrator of the R. E. A. he will not permit his position to be used in the slightest degree for political purposes. I would not for a moment think of voting for him if I thought he would use his position for such purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows that the evidence before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry failed to disclose that Aubrey Williams either used the N. Y. A. or the W. P. A. for strictly political purposes.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. No one before our committee made such a charge. The charges against him were along an entirely different line. They were to the effect that he was a Communist, that he was incompetent, and another charge was made against him respecting religion.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes. Many persons seem willing to accuse another of being a Communist provided he does not agree completely with their theories on every issue that comes before the Congress of the United States. Likewise, there are many crazy individuals and nitwits who call anyone that does not agree with their political philosophy, a Fascist. That is one of the very worst things that are happening in this country at this time. As Max Eastman has said, what such individuals are doing is to divide the country. Many in this country who today call themselves great liberals are the worst offenders along that line.

Mr. President, as I said at the outset, I appreciate that anything I may say on the floor of the Senate respecting Aubrey Williams is not going to change a single vote. I repeat, however, that I believe him to be honest; I believe him to be intelligent. I know he is not a Communist. In my judgment, there is not a word in the evidence to indicate that he ever was a Communist. He testified that he was not a Communist; that he was opposed to communism. In my judgment, no one has ever accused him of misstating facts affecting his own personal reputation.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator from Montana made the statement a while ago that he is going to vote to confirm the nomination of Aubrey Williams, and that is all right. The Senator stated that he was going to vote to confirm the nomination because he did not believe that Mr. Williams would prostitute the position as Administrator of R. E. A. for political purposes.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. BILBO. I ask the Senator from Montana if he has read the Sheppard report made after Aubrey Williams had been investigated while he was Deputy Administrator of W. P. A. and had charge of handling the political end of it?

Mr. WHEELER. I have read the report and am familiar with it. Let me say a word with reference to that report. Mr. Aubrey Williams was not in charge of policy making in W. P. A. The man in charge of W. P. A. was Harry Hopkins. Harry Hopkins was the responsible head of W. P. A. He was the one who dictated its policies. Any one who says that a subordinate working under Mr. Hopkins can define policy does not know Mr. Hopkins.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator let me read to him what Mr. Williams testified before the committee respecting the handling of W. P. A.?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; I will be happy to have the Senator do so.

Mr. BILBO. I read from page 5 of the hearings:

> The following January I was appointed as Deputy Administrator of F. E. R. A., and at that time there had been created the C. W. A., the Civil Works Administration, and I was appointed Deputy Administrator of Civil Works. In that capacity I had the responsibility for the entire operation under Mr. Hopkins of the organization, and putting to work some 4,000,000 people during that winter of 1933–34.
>
> As you gentlemen will recall, the C. W. A. was terminated in the spring of 1934, and we went back to direct relief of F. E. R. A. I was continued as Deputy Administrator under that, and in 1935, with the passage of the $4,800,000,000 bill, I was made Deputy Administrator of the Works Progress Administration.
>
> I continued in that capacity until the first of the year 1939.

That is when he went to the National Youth Administration.

> During that period I continued to have charge of operations of W. P. A. under Mr. Hopkins and all the duties that were germane to it toward carrying out the purposes of that act.

Mr. WHEELER. There is nothing in that statement that contradicts a word I have said. Mr. Williams said he had charge of putting men to work, but as to the number of men he put to work, that was dictated by the policy laid down by Mr. Hopkins, who dominated the W. P. A. Mr. Williams was simply an understudy of Mr. Hopkins. As I said a moment ago, anyone who knows Harry Hopkins knows that Mr. Aubrey Williams would not for one second be permitted to put a great number of people to work and play politics with them unless that policy were first authorized by Mr. Hopkins. When we refer to the W. P. A., after all, let us remember that Mr. Hopkins was head of the organization under appointment by the President of the United States. The Senator from Mississippi has been an ardent supporter of the President of the United States. If politics was played with W. P. A., the responsibility does not rest upon a subordinate. If the charge which the Senator is making is true, he should not make it against a subordinate in a department. He should make it against the responsible head, who is the political head of the Democratic Party as well as President of the United States.

What the Senator is really doing is taking a kick at the head of the political party; but he does not want to do that, so he takes a kick at the man below, who has no responsibility with reference to the subject.

Mr. BILBO. If we are to place all the blame on Harry Hopkins, I am afraid that Mr. Williams would not be a safe man now, because of contamination.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the Senator believe that the man who is the closest adviser of the President of the United States, and one of his most intimate friends, cannot be trusted, and that he would contaminate anyone associating with him?

Mr. BILBO. The Senator from Montana made the statement; I did not.

Mr. WHEELER. That is the only inference that can be drawn from the statement of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. I take the position that Mr. Williams was particeps criminus in all the things which were done with the W. P. A. for political purposes. When the Sheppard committee was making its investigations, it dealt with Mr. Williams, and not Mr. Hopkins.

Mr. WHEELER. When the Senator——

Mr. BILBO. Wait a minute.

Mr. WHEELER. Who has the floor?

Mr. BILBO. I have it now, with the Senator's permission.

Mr. WHEELER. Would the Senator wish to be held responsible for the policies of the Secretary of Agriculture while the Senator was working in the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. BILBO. No; but if I winked at them and became a party to them, I should be just as much to blame as the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Sheppard committee, in its dealings with Mr. Williams, had correspondence with him, and he made statements to the committee. The Sheppard committee investigated conditions in one State in which dozens of charges were made as to the prostitution of W. P. A. for political purposes. Mr. Aubrey Williams wrote Senator Sheppard a letter in which he said:

> I have received these charges, and I have made a thorough investigation in that State. I do not find one scintilla of evidence to show any misuse of the funds.

Whereupon the Sheppard committee itself made an investigation, and it found the worst condition in the history of the country. Mr. Williams is blind to anything that is wrong.

Mr. WHEELER. Sometimes Senate investigating committees also make mistakes. We are not always correct. We usually are, but not always.

Mr. BILBO. I should like to give the Senator a statement with respect to my State.

Mr. WHEELER. I shall be glad to have it.

Mr. BILBO. Conditions were bad in my State. An investigation was ordered; and under the direction of Aubrey Williams nine or ten investigators were sent into the State. They made a thorough investigation. They found conditions to be as reported. The report was brought back to Washington and was concealed. It has been kept in hiding until this very day. For a year I tried to get it from Mr. Williams, but was unsuccessful. I know that he will not do.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. He had an opportunity to cross-examine Mr. Williams, and did cross-examine him; but during the time I was in attendance at the meetings of the committee the Senator did not ask him anything about what happened in Mississippi. That was the time and place for the Senator to have brought the charge. I should have liked to have heard Mr. Williams give his answer to the Senator in public at that hearing.

Mr. BILBO. The matters to which I am referring are matters of public record, and did not have to be brought into this record.

Mr. WHEELER. But the Senator brings them out on the floor of the Senate, and makes a charge which he did not bring before the committee, notwithstanding the fact that the Senator sat there during the time Mr. Williams was on the stand, and cross-examined him. He did not give Mr. Williams an opportunity to answer him at that time, so that we might have the benefit of both sides of the story, both from the Senator and from Mr. Williams.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the fact that the Senator from Mississippi takes the position that Aubrey Williams at that time was playing politics in his State with W. P. A., it might be interesting to know just who was getting the patronage down there at that time, assuming that there was any patronage coming through the W. P. A. Apparently it was not the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WHEELER. I certainly received none of the patronage in my State from W. P. A.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The best and most conclusive evidence that Aubrey Williams does not approve the use of Government agencies for political purposes will be found in the fact that after he left the W. P. A. and became Administrator of the N. Y. A. in 1938, the N. Y. A. was singularly free from politics all over the country, except for local spots here and there, whereas the W. P. A. continued along its political path, just as it had been doing before. We all know that the W. P. A. was used politically by the local bosses, and that the administrators probably could not have stopped it if they had wanted to. I know that in my State the administrator, who was a good, clean administrator, resigned his position. I have always felt that he resigned because of the insistence of local politicians that he put the organization into politics. It was in politics. The State administrator did not put the organization in politics, nor did Aubrey Williams. N. Y. A., under the leadership of Aubrey Williams, was never engaged in politics in my State.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly the N. Y. A. was never used for political purposes in my State.

Mr. AIKEN. Perhaps the fact that the N. Y. A. under Aubrey Williams refused to go into politics may account for some of the opposition to him today.

Mr. WHEELER. In connection with the W. P. A., I must say, in justice to Mr. Hopkins, that he appointed a man in my State who was a Republican. Then the local politicians complained so much about it that the appointee finally resigned. So far as Mr. Hopkins was concerned, he was opposed to playing politics with W. P. A. in my State, but, as I say, the local bosses and politicians complained so much that in many instances Mr. Hopkins was probably forced to change administrators.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I do not like to go into this subject, but since the question has been raised we might as well admit the situation as it actually existed. The Senator from Mississippi has pointed to the campaign of 1938. I hope he will not leave the Chamber. Before that campaign, I stood on the floor of the United States Senate advocating the insertion in the appropriation bill of one little sentence which would have prohibited the use of W. P. A. funds for political purposes, and I saw the Senate of the United States vote down that amendment.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator will remember that I supported him in his effort to secure the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator certainly did. After the campaign of 1938, a bill was passed which had teeth in it, among other features. It was called the Hatch bill. It prohibited the use of W. P. A. for political purposes. Last week I heard the Senator from Mississippi say on the floor of the Senate that that law ouht to be repealed, and that in effect it had been repealed in Mississippi because it had not been observed. He may quarrel with Aubrey Williams, if he desires, because Aubrey Williams made one foolish statement. Let the Senator from Mississippi explain his own statements.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I hope the nomination of Mr. Williams will not be rejected simply because of the charge that he is a Communist, because there is not a scintilla of evidence in the record that he is a Communist. If he were a Communist I would vote against his nomination, but there is no evidence that he is. The fact that he wrote some letters or did something with some organization which is branded as Communist does not mean very much, for I know a number of fine people in this country who have supported some organizations which afterward turned out to be, according to the Attorney General of the United States, "front" organizations for the Communist Party. Today a person can join almost any organization, and he may find some Communists in it, whether he knows it or not. They are very clever in obtaining control of organizations which frequently start out with honest and patriotic objectives; but Communists work themselves in and obtain control. Thereafter, because of that fact, sometimes a person will be accused of having Communist affiliations. I think that is all there is to the charge that Aubrey Williams is a Communist. Not a scintilla of evidence that he is a Communist has been produced against him. Not a scintilla of evidence that he is not honest has been produced against him. Not a scintilla of evidence that he does not have ability has been produced against him. Certainly he is not an ignorant man.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a few days ago I asked Aubrey Williams to give me a brief résumé of his own background and life story, because I had heard so many things said in discredit and in intended disparagement of him that I wondered if my impression were incorrect, namely, that he came from old and good American stock and that he was that kind of a fellow himself.

So, Mr. Williams has given a little sketch about his own life story. I think it is at least worth putting into the RECORD.

Mr. Williams says:

My father's people moved from North Carolina in the year 1819 and settled in southwestern Alabama in a community which later became known as Akron, Ala., about 125 miles north of Mobile. They became cotton planters and later had rather extensive holdings with a large number of slaves. On my father's side, in addition to the Williamses, there were the Harrises, my grandmother being a Harris. Both of these families freed their slaves at the outbreak of the war.

I interpolate that it is evident, therefore, that liberalism is not new in the Williams family.

My mother's people came from Virginia and were of Scotch-Irish stock. They moved to north Alabama, locating some 16 miles north of what later became Birmingham. Both of my grandfathers served in the Civil War. With the devastation which came as a result of the war, my grandparents on both sides were in the condition that everyone else in the South was in—in ruin—and my father moved to Birmingham when I was some 6 years old, and established a blacksmith's shop. This was in 1890, and I grew up in Birmingham. I have always been very proud of my father.

I interpolate again that I honor a man who says "I am proud of my father—who was a blacksmith."

"Honor thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

I continue to read from the sketch prepared by Mr. Williams:

I regarded him as a good example of the adjustments which southerners had to make following the war.

Again I interpolate that evidently it is not new in the Williams family for a man to see external conditions which demand internal adjustments.

As a wagon and carriage builder he won first awards at Paris, France, and St. Louis for vehicles which he built with his own hands.

I interpolate again that the Williams family seems to have come from rather close to the fundamentals of America.

With regard to myself, the following is a rather detailed delineation of what is probably an ordinary American's growing up during this period.

I was born in Springfield, Ala., August 23, 1890. My father—

He repeats—

was a blacksmith.

Mr. President, I have seen men who evidently, after they got up a little in the world, tried to conceal their humble origins.

We early moved to Birmingham, where I grew up. I went to school about a year and one-half from the time I was about five and one-half until I was 7 years old. Then I went to work on a laundry wagon and worked for a year. I then reentered school for 1 year, but I had to leave when I was 9 to assist in the support of my family. At that age I went to work at Lovemun, Joseph and Loeb, a department store, where I began as a cashboy. I was thus employed for 4 years; at the conclusion of which I was in charge of wrappers of the entire department store.

Mr. President, I interpolate again that Lovemun, Joseph and Loeb seemed to think the Williams boy was all right, and I guess he worked his way up from cashboy to store wrapper without any political help.

From then on until I was 21, I worked at 3 other establishments, and at that time I was assistant manager of men's furnishings of Somers Tailoring Co.

Evidently Somers Tailoring Co. thought the Williams boy was all right. Again I suggest Mr. President, that he probably got his promotion without political aid.

During that whole period, I had not been able to attend school, but had been able to take advantage of commercial night schools and had had the assistance of a very wonderful friend, a principal of a Birmingham public school, who was kind enough to give me a portion of his lunch hour each day for instructional purposes.

I interpolate—Aubrey did not add it—that I suspect the good principal was not the only one who sacrificed a part of his lunch hour; and I interpolate again that this story is not a strange one to me, because I happen to know fairly well another American boy who walked the bottoms out of his shoes on the streets of Birmingham looking for a job, a boy who later worked in a steel mill near Birmingham.

Aubrey continues:

When I was 21—

And I should like to interpolate once more that a man who showed sufficient promise at 21 years of age to make a high school or public school principal give up part of his lunch hour to help him get an education must have had something in him.

He continues:

When I was 21, I decided to try to get an education, and went away to a mountain school in Tennessee called Maryville College. This has a preparatory department, or high school. By stretching their standards a bit, they permitted me to enter the first year of high school, though I had not had sufficient preparation.

Again I interpolate that the Williams boy must have made a good impression on the faculty of the Maryville mountain school, so much so that they stretched the standards a little in order to let him enter.

I finished the course in 3 years, it being a 4-year course—

I interpolate that if the boy finished a 4-year course in 3 years—as did the able and distinguished Senator who spoke so movingly of him this afternoon—he must have had the kind of ignorance which Abraham Lincoln made world famous.

I continue reading—

and then entered the Maryville College proper. I remained there through my sophomore year. I went to Cincinnati in the fall of 1916 and entered the University of Cincinnati. I remained there until the spring of 1917, at which time I went to France with the Y. M. C. A.

I interpolate again, Mr. President, that Aubrey Williams was not content with being an assistant sales manager of a tailoring company. He wanted an education, and he quit what must have been a pretty good job in order to enter a humble educational institution. The boy has now grown up. He has become a man. He further stated:

I remained there until the spring of 1917, at which time I went to France with the Y. M. C. A.

Mr. President, there are many persons who feel that a man who exhibits a humane or Christian attitude is a sort of a sissy. There may have been some scurrilous remarks to the effect that he was trying to avoid military service. Someone said that he tried to keep the boys out of the Army when he was administering the N. Y. A.

I remained with the Y. M. C. A. for a period of some 4 months—

Then what did he do?—

and then entered the Foreign Legion.

That was the Foreign Legion of France. If my knowledge of the history of the fighting qualities of the Foreign Legion is correct, I would not call it a crowd of sissies. He entered the Foreign Legion from the Y. M. C. A.

I saw some 3 months' service in the Legion. I took part in the Battle of Campiegne and the Battle of Chemin des Dames—

I am not as good in my French pronunciation as is the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]—

and through to February 1918, at which time I entered the American First Division.

Aubrey Williams—the Y. M. C. A., the Foreign Legion, in combat. I did not say "Communist." I said "in combat"—against the Huns who were trying to enslave Europe under the Kaiser, the Hitler of a generation ago.

"Which time I entered the American First Division." He put on the uniform of an American soldier.

He continues:

I was in all of the engagements of this division through to Soissons. I was then sent to the Saumur Artillery School, after which I was made a second lieutenant and made an instructor in artillery.

Mr. President, it might have been Aubrey Williams who was in the Foreign Legion; it might have been the Aubrey Williams who was in the First Division; it might have been the fighting Aubrey Williams who said "Hell, no" when he was asked if he was going to quit before his opponents in the American Senate. This is not the first tough battle Aubrey Williams has ever had. I suspect that he has come closer to cold steel than have most of the Members of the Senate who are his enemies. I rather like a fellow who does not run when the shooting starts. That seems to have been a characteristic of Aubrey Williams during his entire life. The Army must have thought he was all right, too. This Williams boy seems to have a way of making a good impression upon persons for whom he works.

Aubrey Williams states:

I was then sent to the Saumur Artillery School after which I was made a second lieutenant and made an instructor in artillery.

I assume he received that appointment without any political aid.

He continues:

Later I went to the University of Bordeaux, was given a degree, came back to this country, entered the University of Cincinnati, took a degree there, then went to Wisconsin and was executive director of the Wisconsin Conference of Social Work, and on the faculty of the University of Wisconsin.

I see the laundry truck driver, the wrapper in the department store, the assistant manager of a tailoring company, the boy who got the standard stretched in order to enter Maryville Military School, who eventually got through college and served with the Y. M. C. A., the Foreign Legion, the American First Division, who was given one bar as the insigna of a first lieutenant of artillery. I am not speaking of the kind of artillery which we shoot here in the Senate; I am speaking of the kind of artillery which is used when men gamble every day and night with their lives in the face of deadly enemies.

The boy now comes back; still wanting to learn more, not seeking a job in business or, perhaps, in the Army, but leaning toward something which will give him a chance to do something for humanity.

As was said by the able Senator from Idaho, who has proved to be such a great addition to the Senate, whose voice has commanded our admiration, and for whose sentiments we have come to respect highly in the short time in which he has been a Member of the Senate—as he pointed out, Aubrey Williams may not have remained in the ministry because whether one feels it proper to respond to the call of the ministry is one

of those questions which he settles in his closet, or in the quietness of the nights and darkness, and not in the public arena. But the boy—the gentleman—who did not enter the ministry now has a record of humanitarian service which no Senator in this Chamber can excel. Aubrey Williams has favorably touched the lives of more boys and girls than most any one of us Senators can claim. He made it possible for boys and girls, who could not otherwise have received an education, to acquire one. The fire of service has never left Aubrey Williams' heart.

Mr. President, Aubrey Williams was appointed to the faculty of the University of Wisconsin. Evidently the officials of that great university did not think he was a Communist, or something else which is nauseating to some persons.

Williams adds parenthetically:

It was in connection with the Wisconsin Conference of Social Work that I began the developing of experience in the field of public administration which later was to be of such valuable assistance to me in the Federal Government. This organization was devoted to the improvement of public service in the whole field of public assistance, and correctional and penal institutions.

Mr. President, I know there are some who say that a social worker is a subject of ridicule and scorn. There are some who think that ministers are deluded. They think that the only rightful place for a man is within the isolation of the high towers of what they call big business. But, Mr. President, I remember the story of the humble man of Galilee who was taken upon the mountain top, shown the world, and turned it down to become the Great Teacher and the Saviour of men.

Mr. Williams continues:

I spent 10 years as director of this organization. Following that I was employed by the American Public Welfare Association, an organization with similar purposes to the Wisconsin Conference of Social Work, but operating on a national basis, and it was while I was with the American Public Welfare Association that I was sent to Mississippi and Texas for the purpose of establishing an organization for the distribution of relief in 1932.

Mr. President, I am not so sure that all raised their voices against the condition that led to that distress as loudly as they have against Aubrey Williams, who was sent to Texas and Mississippi to relieve the distress.

In Mississippi I started from scratch with nothing but the loan of money sent down by the R. F. C., a million dollars.

A million dollars was entrusted to Aubrey Williams.

In the period from the middle of October until the 1st of December I organized the Administration of Relief in the 82 counties in Mississippi, employed the personnel, directed them, and established all the forms and procedures for the expenditure of the money and the organization of the work. In this undertaking, I established the principle that unemployment relief should be in the nature of work and not in doles or grocery orders. That meant that in addition to giving persons assistance, that work had to be organized and supervised and executed. That meant that work directors had to be employed, projects had to be organized. (It might be of some interest that this was the first place in America where unemployment relief was organized in the form of work.)

The laborer's sweat being the consideration of his food. That is what Aubrey Williams installed as a precedent in Mississippi.

I later was called to Texas, where I organized the work in 254 counties of the State.

I wonder if my able friend from Mississippi, the distinguished senior Senator, as Aubrey Williams came down with a million dollars to help the distressed people of Mississippi, then turned upon him his scorn.

Following that I was called to Washington by Mr. Hopkins and placed in charge of the Southwestern States—Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama.

Again Aubrey Williams won his spurs, to be the director of the Southwestern States, by what he had done in Mississippi and Texas. He had a way of working himself up.

That was in June of 1933. In August of that year I made a proposal to Mr. Hopkins which was later to become the basis for the Civil Works Administration program.

Hopkins did not pick him for politics, Hopkins heard of a fellow named Williams who was doing a good job in Mississippi and Texas. Someone put him in charge of the Southwestern States, and then he made a proposal about the civil-works program which led Hopkins to bring him to Washington. He says:

Mr. Hopkins brought me to Washington to organize that program and put it into effect. During the months of November, December, and January, 4,118,000 unemployed people were put to work on Civil Works Administration projects.

Well, we laugh at the W. P. A., some look with contempt upon the W. P. A. and we hear certain expressions about the W. P. A. worker. Sometimes we think he was a failure. Yet, Mr. President, there were some mighty good men and women who were failures back in those dark days in being able to provide for themselves. I am not so sure whether it was their failure or the Government's failure that produced their pitiable plight.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. One of the most amazing things to me in connection with this debate, and from what I hear of the opposition to Aubrey Williams, especially on the Republican side of the aisle, is that it is claimed he is not qualified, that he has had no organization experience, that he has not any ability to run an organization like the Rural Electrification Administration. I can think of no worse time in the history of America to place a man in charge of anything than when Aubrey Williams took charge, first of Mississippi and then of Texas, and then of the Southwestern States. It took a man with vision and courage and organization ability to do what he did in those dark days, and continue to have the confidence of those who were in power at that time.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator. He is eminently correct. Mr. Williams further says:

This work was organized in practically every county in the United States—

Is that any lesser job than running the R. E. A., organized in every county in the United States?—

and involved the putting together of an administrative staff of 65,000 people and the organization of upward of 40,000 projects of every character and kind, fitted to, and in terms of the background and skills of the unemployed. In addition to that, during winter of 1933–34—

And we know that winter left a scar, irremovable, upon many a community and heart—

at the suggestion of some 12 college presidents—

As I stated, Mr. President, this Williams boy seems to keep on attracting the favorable attention and confidence of people all along the line of his life—

at the suggestion of some 12 college presidents, I was placed in charge of the organization of a student work program which included the 1,680 colleges and universities of America.

Again Aubrey Williams was helping boys and girls to get an education.

This program gave opportunities to continue their education through working on projects in these colleges to around 96,000 youth who otherwise would not have been able to have attended college.

Mr. President, there are many of us upon the floor of the Senate who know how some boys got through college because the college gave them an opportunity to roll coal, or roll ashes, or wait on the table, or do some other kind of work, without which they would not have been able themselves to have gotten an education. I honor Aubrey Williams for never having forgotten the struggle he had to get an education and make an American out of himself.

I continued in this capacity until the C. W. A. was discontinued and W. P. A. was established, at which time I was made Deputy Administrator of the organization, and was in charge of the administrative structure under the direction of Mr. Hopkins.

Mr. President, I again interpolate; Mr. Hopkins has not been without his enemies. I know few men in our time who have been more scurrilously and scandalously assaulted than Harry Hopkins, but somehow or other he has seemed to retain the confidence of a man who has had the affection and the confidence of the people of America, and, I may add, of the world—President Franklin D. Roosevelt. And through the years, beside that man who has been one of the leaders of the earth has been Harry Hopkins. When history is written, that which will be remembered will not be the scandalmongers who assaulted Harry Hopkins, but the great work he helped to do. I may add that close to Harry Hopkins and the President through that time has been Aubrey Williams, and he, too, will be remembered much longer than many of his attackers.

So Harry Hopkins, who has been good enough to be in charge of the munitions

program of the Allied cause, of the United Nations, but Aubrey Williams as Deputy Administrator under the W. P. A. administration, with the approval, I am sure, personally given, of the President of the United States, who still has confidence in Aubrey Williams.

In the same year of '35 the National Youth Administration was established by the President through Executive order. I was placed in charge of the organization and establishment of the N. Y. A. from its inception.

Mr. President, who do you suppose designated Aubrey Williams to be head of the N. Y. A. but the President of the United States?

State organizations were set up in all of the States of the Union, and Alaska, and Hawaii—19,000 projects, employing 250,000 young people, were organized. In addition to this, projects were organized in the 29,000 high schools giving work to thousands of high-school students and the work in 1,680 colleges continued. I had the responsibility of carrying on the work of Deputy Administrator of W. P. A. as well as the administration of N. Y. A. from July 1935, until December 1938, at which time I was made Administrator of the National Youth Administration and relieved of any further duties in the W. P. A. I continued as Administrator of N. Y. A. until it was abolished in 1943.

Mr. President, the N. Y. A. was abolished by the American Congress. The American Senators and Representatives said to the boys and girls of this country who could not otherwise obtain an education in high school or college, who were getting it from the N. Y. A., "We will not any longer give you or others like you that opportunity." Great, rich America, needing fighting men in a little while, needing technicians, and skilled workers soon, needing intelligent citizens always; yet the Congress of the United States said, "We are done with N. Y. A." They did not consider its record of accomplishment, marvelous as it was. They hated the idea of that kind of help.

Mr. President, I cannot refrain from calling attention to the fact that I have here in my hand the vote in the United States Senate by which in this body the N. Y. A. was abolished, and I must say that the RECORD reveals that perhaps the most earnest advocate against the N. Y. A. has been the leading opponent of Aubrey Williams in this fight—I regret that he is not on the floor, the able and distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator kindly state how the Senator from Mississippi voted on that question?

Mr. PEPPER. I would be inclined to believe, because I am an optimist always, that the able Senator from Mississippi probably voted against the abolition of N. Y. A.

Mr. BILBO. Read the record. The Senator has the record.

Mr. PEPPER. In the Senate there were two votes taken. When former Senator TRUMAN proposed to the Senate—mark you, a Senator named TRUMAN, whom the people of the United States have honored with the Vice Presidency of the United States, thought enough of the N. Y. A. and its continuation to propose to the Senate the elimination of the House provision which cut out the N. Y. A., and the insertion of a substitute which would preserve it. Not only therefore the present President but the Vice President apparently had confidence in Aubrey Williams and in his work. There were two votes upon that question. On the first vote there were 41 yeas and 37 nays. Eighteen Senators did not vote. Those who voted "yea" at that time, in favor of continuation of N. Y. A., were Aiken, Andrews, Bankhead, Barkley, Bilbo, Bone, Capper, Caraway, Davis, Downey, George, Green, Guffey, Hatch, Hayden, Hill, Johnson of Colorado, Kilgore, La Follette, Langer, Lodge, Lucas, McFarland, Maybank, Mead, Murdock, Murray, O'Mahoney, Overton, Pepper, Russell, Scrugham, Shipstead, Thomas of Oklahoma, Thomas of Utah, Truman, Tunnell, Van Nuys, Wagner, Wallgren, and White.

Those who voted "nay" were Ball, Bridges, Brooks, Buck, Butler, Byrd, Chandler, Chavez, Clark of Missouri, Danaher, Eastland, Ferguson, Gerry, Gurney, Hawkes, Holman, McCarran, McClellan, McKellar, Maloney, Millikin, Moore, Nye, O'Daniel, Radcliffe, Reed, Revercomb, Reynolds, Robertson, Smith, Stewart, Taft, Vandenberg, Wheeler, Wherry, Willis, and Wilson.

Later on the matter came back before the Senate on the conference report, after the matter had been to conference. At that time the yeas were 39, and the nays were 33. That is, there were 39 against the N. Y. A. and 33 for it. At that time I believe the able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] was not able to be present and so is not recorded, but I am sure if he had been present he would have continued the liberal attitude he usually exhibits here and voted for the boys and girls of Mississippi.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. The point I was making is this: The Senator was rather strong in his statement that those who are opposed to Williams having this billion dollar R. E. A. job are those who voted to abolish the N. Y. A. I simply wanted to prove to the Senator that that statement is subject to criticism, because I voted to retain the N. Y. A., and I am very much opposed to Mr. Williams taking charge of this billion-dollar organization, the R. E. A.

Mr. PEPPER. That was in August and September of 1943, and I do not know of anything that Mr. Williams has done since 1943 to make him any worse than he was in 1943, and if he was good enough to run the N. Y. A. in the opinion of the able Senator from Mississippi, I am at a loss to understand why he is not good enough to run the R. E. A. now. If he was good enough to have had, to a considerable degree, the lives of boys and girls in his hands, he is good enough to have charge over some lines of wire that are conveying electric current to the farmers of America, Mr. President. If it were a matter of integrity or patriotism upon which I should be solicitous, I would be more concerned about the man educating my children than I would the man building an electric line.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to my able friend.

Mr. BILBO. I will say to the Senator from Florida that my vote to retain the N. Y. A. was not indicative of my utmost confidence in Mr. Williams at the time. I do not legislate that way. I was willing to take Williams with all his faults and shortcomings, since there was no way to get rid of him, rather than to abolish the agency in order to get rid of him. Some of my colleagues were willing to abolish whatever good there was in N. Y. A. in order to get rid of its head; but I was not willing to go that far.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad the Senator contributes that much testimony.

Mr. BILBO. The Senator speaks about Mr. Williams having had such a terrible time in his struggle to obtain an education. I do not believe he struggled very much personally, because he testified that he obtained the money from the Presbyterian Church. That did not require any effort on his part, except that he told them he intended to be a preacher, and he got $750.

The Senator makes great capital of the fact that Mr. Williams went to my State. In January 1932 I had just left the office of Governor. A new Governor had been inaugurated. Williams was sent there by whom? He was then an employee of the American Public Welfare Association, and was brought to Mississippi as a salaried worker of that organization, by the Governor of the State who succeeded me, to organize F. E. R. A., C. W. A., or whatever it was at that time. It was a relief program.

I am sure that my friend from Florida had no occasion to go down to Mississippi to investigate what was done under the administration of Mr. Williams. However, it was at that time his first entry into Mississippi that I made up my mind that Aubrey Williams would not do for a job of this kind, because under the leadership of the then Governor and with Government relief money he organized the most complete political machine we had had in a number of years in Mississippi; and he has been at it ever since.

Mr. PEPPER. I have heard it said, when the question was asked by one lawyer of another, that a technicality is a good law point which one's opponent overlooks. By analogy, when I see a man venting his spleen against a political organization, and speaking of its vices, I usually infer that the organization is on the other side. So I suspect that my able friend from Mississippi has lapsed into the fault of which all of us are guilty at times, of saying, when a political organization is against him, that it is a bad organization.

Mr. BILBO. For the information of the Senator, I am not questioning what Mr. Williams did in Texas with Governor Ferguson or Mrs. Ferguson. I am speaking only of my own State. I had gone out of office. I was not a candidate for

any office, but I was on the scene, and I know what he did in organizing relief work in Mississippi, his very first work in that campaign. Harry Hopkins was advised as to the type of man he was. He was the kind of man he wanted.

The Senator says that some day the history of Harry Hopkins will be written, and that it will be a glorious history. Let me tell the Senator that part of his history has already been written. It was written by the venerable and saintly Morris Sheppard, or under his leadership. There are Senators now in the Chamber who were members of that committee. That history was written while Harry Hopkins was operating the W. P. A. In 18 States the committee found a prostitution of W. P. A. that was more corrupt than anything else in the history of American politics.

Mr. PEPPER. The United States Senate confirmed the nomination of the same Harry Hopkins to be Secretary of Commerce and a Cabinet officer of the Government of the United States.

Mr. BILBO. As a member of the Commerce Committee, I made the motion to confirm his nomination as Secretary of Commerce because I wanted to put him where he could not do so much harm. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. Again I infer that any political influence which Mr. Hopkins exercised was not on the side of the able Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BILBO. I was right, and he was wrong.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not believe the Senator from Florida ought to be too hard on the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. The Senator from Mississippi has been talking about organizations. He has certainly organized this fight against Mr. Williams to such an extent that the Senator from Mississippi has most of our Republican brethren following his leadership. He has done that which most of us on this side have never been able to do. The senior Senator from Mississippi has been able to herd together, to shepherd, and bring under his leadership, most of the Republican Members of this body, to support and sustain him in his fight against Mr. Aubrey Williams. In view of this feat on the part of the Senator from Mississippi in assuming leadership and having most of our Republican brethren in this Chamber follow his leadership, I do not think the Senator from Florida ought to be too hard on the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BILBO. Speaking about associating with Republicans, I would much rather be associated with Senators on the other side than with some of the crowd which is supporting Aubrey Williams.

Mr. HILL. The Senator may be right. I was simply congratulating the Senator on his capacity to furnish leadership and bring the Republicans under his leadership so that they would follow him in this fight.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I believe that the Senator from Alabama is speaking in terms of which he has little understanding. I do not know that in the State of Alabama, or in the district from which the Senator formerly came, there are enough Republicans to inform him to any great extent as to the purposes and principles of the Republican Party. I think I may say with assurance that we are not following Mississippi in our Republicanism, or in the attitude we take upon any question. At this time I have no knowledge as to how individual Republicans will vote. I believe I know the general sentiment. However, if it is any comfort to the Senator, let me assure him that we are not following a Democrat from either Mississippi or Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished minority leader says that he does not know how his Republicans are going to vote. I believe the Senator from Maine, the distinguished minority leader, will find, when the vote is tabulated, that they will have done as I have stated. They will have been shepherded by my distinguished friend from Mississippi, and they will go down the line following his leadership in this matter.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. If by chance the Republican Members of the Senate find themselves associated with the Senator from Mississippi, it will be all to the credit of the Senator from Mississippi, and there will be no offense on our part in voting as we think we ought to vote.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I do not like to have my distinguished friend the minority leader try to keep secret the fact that most of the Republican Members of the Senate are following the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I do not like the idea of the distinguished minority leader seeking to repudiate their leadership in this fight. When the roll is called and the vote is announced on this nomination, it will out. The Republicans will be tabulated as following the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The remark I made does not have any bearing at all upon the question, except I notice the Senator from Maine said that all the credit would belong to the Senator from Mississippi because the Republicans had joined with him. Would not the Republicans give him just a little credit for coming over and joining them?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if the inquiry is addressed to me, let me say that at the moment I am not disposed to give much credit to anyone on this side of the aisle for any views which are expressed or for any votes which may hereafter be cast.

I had assumed and I had given assurance that the majority of the Republicans in the Senate will vote as I believe they should vote on this nomination. How that will be will be disclosed when the roll call comes. If it will be any satisfaction to the Senator, I am perfectly willing to state how I will vote. I usually keep that to myself until the roll call comes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have not asked the Senator how he is going to vote, and I have no desire to do so. However, I think he should not take all the credit. He should be willing to give the Senator from Mississippi just a little credit, also.

Mr. WHITE. I think any Democratic Senator who joins with the Senators on the Republican side is entitled to some credit for that act on his part. There always is the chance for repentance, and we are "holding out the hand" at all times. [Laughter.]

Mr. HATCH. That is fine.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BILBO. I wish to give the Senator from Alabama a little piece of information to take back to Alabama. The publishers and editors of all the Republican Negro newspapers in Philadelphia, at a meeting the other day, endorsed Aubrey Williams.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, that may be true; but that shows that the Senator from Mississippi has more influence with most of the Republicans in this body than those Republican editors have, because most of the Republicans in this body follow the leadership of the Senator from Mississippi, rather than the leadership of the Republican editors who have been mentioned.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to ask what it has to do with the nomination of Aubrey Williams whether the colored newspaper editors of Philadelphia are endorsing him. They are Americans. This is simply an attempt to set them apart from other Americans. My father was a Southerner, but I certainly object to having brought up on the floor of the Senate the question whether a man is red, black, or white.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to answer the Senator?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I will.

Mr. BILBO. In order that the Senator from Idaho may understand me, let me say that I gave the information to the Senator from Alabama because he had just charged me with lining up with the Republicans on the other side of the aisle, as a good Democrat.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is a question of politics, not a question of race.

Mr. BILBO. It is a question of politics on the part of the Senator from Alabama, as against me, and I wished to give the Senator from Alabama something to take back home with him.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say I did not accuse the Senator from Mississippi at all of lining up with the Republicans. I congratulated him; I commended him.

I told him that he had been able to do what most of us have never been able to do, namely, he had gotten most of the Republicans in this body to line up with him, to follow his leadership.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama knows he is drawing on his imagination.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the able Senator from Mississippi, evidently with an inference against Aubrey Williams, has said that he has been supported by a resolution of the Negro newspaper publishers of Philadelphia. I think I recall reading in the newspapers a few days ago that on the Rhine battle front some Negro soldiers were fighting side by side with white soldiers, following the Stars and Stripes. It does not make the flag of our country less honorable, Mr. President, because the whites happen to be joined by Negro soldiers in following that flag, nor does the approval of Aubrey Williams by those Negro editors make him unfit or disqualified to be Administrator of the R. E. A.

What I said, Mr. President, about the significance of these votes was that as a general rule, and that is a generalization; and, like all generalizations, its accuracy is subject to exceptions—as a general rule, a great many Senators who actively and aggressively fought the N. Y. A. and the W. P. A. appropriations today are fighting the R. E. A., ofttimes, and Aubrey Williams, in the present fight on the floor of the Senate.

So, Mr. President, Aubrey Williams says:

> I continued as Administrator of N. Y. A. until it was abolished in 1943.

However, when the able Senator from Maine was addressing the Senate a moment ago, I anticipated that probably he would say he would vote for Aubrey Williams to be Administrator of the R. E. A. I hope he will do so, because on the 28th of June 1943, as shown at page 6595 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, during the consideration by the Senate of the Truman amendment to keep the N. Y. A. in existence, the able Senator from Maine said:

> I had expected that other Senators would precede me in the discussion of the pending amendment. But I am unwilling that a vote be had without taking the opportunity to give to the amendment my unqualified support. I confess without any hesitation, Mr. President, that my interest in N. Y. A. springs from some knowledge of the character of its work which has been done within my own State.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I hope that is not a complaint against my action at that time. I did vote for continuance of the N. Y. A.; but I think the Senator will recognize that there is a vast difference between the conditions then and the conditions today.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator mean a different situation politically?

Mr. WHITE. Then we were not voting upon Aubrey Williams. The vote then cast was neither a vote for the rejection of Aubrey Williams nor a vote for his confirmation. The question then was simply and solely whether an existing organization which had been built through the expenditure of millions of dollars, which had its ramifications in every State of the Union, which was training the youth of the Nation, which was pouring them into the industrial life of the Nation, should be continued or should be cut off absolutely and immediately. That was what I voted against.

Today I will be voting on Aubrey Williams. That is quite a different proposition.

Mr. PEPPER. The man who organized N. Y. A., the man who was the inception of it, the man who selected its personnel, the one who laid down its program, who formulated its policies, was Aubrey Williams—no one else. I dare say the able Senator from Maine cannot name a person who was in the N. Y. A. office in Washington save Aubrey Williams. When we thought of the N. Y. A. we thought of Aubrey Williams as symbolizing that organization.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I will yield in just a moment. I ask the Senator to permit me to continue for a minute just now.

Here is what the able Senator from Maine gave as his testimony about what Aubrey Williams had done:

> In Maine N. Y. A. has had a dual program. There has been a program for local youths in local plants, and there has been a program carried on at resident centers, so-called. From these local plants and from these resident centers of Maine within less than a year's time there have gone into the industrial life of this Nation more than 1,000 trainees qualified in some branch of craftsmanship. There have gone from a single resident center, located in the home town of my distinguished colleague [Mr. BREWSTER], 1,200 trainees as welders, as machine operators, and as foundry workers of one kind or another. From them all, local plants and resident centers, Maine's branch of the N. Y. A. has contributed to the industrial life of the Nation more than 7,200 trainees, skilled, as I said a moment ago, in some useful work in the field of production.
>
> Mr. President, there have gone from the N. Y. A. training plants of Maine sufficient numbers of aircraft workers to produce, so I am told, 18 attack bombers for every week.

That is the testimony the able Senator from Maine gave to Aubrey Williams.

Mr. WHITE. Oh, no, Mr. President.

Mr. PEPPER. Eighteen attack bombers a week, so the Senator from Maine then said, were being produced by N. Y. A. centers in Maine—N. Y. A. centers headed by Aubrey Williams, I repeat.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I hope the Senator will concede that the speech I made at that time was a good one.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; it was.

Mr. WHITE. I certainly approve all I said; but if my recollection serves me right, the Senator will not find, from the first word I spoke to my concluding word, a reference to Aubrey Williams as such. I was speaking of a great organization. Aubrey Williams played his part in that organization, and I am ready to give him credit for whatever contribution he made; but it was a great organization made up of hundreds of thousands of persons, and Aubrey Williams was but one spoke in the wheel.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, that statement would be like having the able Senator from Maine rise on the floor of the Senate to pay tribute to the American Army on the Rhine today, and saying to us that he did not mean to give his approval to General Eisenhower.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not think my colleague from Maine needs any defense or explanation, but I wish to add this much as another one of those who, as Senators know, supported N. Y. A., but did not necessarily conclude that they were endorsing all the personnel.

It so happened that out of the N. Y. A. group we thought sufficiently well of one of its members to select him as commissioner of education of the State of Maine, and today he is rendering distinguished service.

I may say further that in the case of the N. Y. A. there was very widespread recognition of the service which it had rendered in Maine. On the other hand, I regret to say that, so far as the R. E. A. is concerned, the only organizations in Maine concerned with the matter, and which have communicated with me, have protested against the confirmation of Mr. Williams' nomination. Whether or not that is justified, I do not now discuss. I merely point out that there apparently is a different approach to the problem on the part of some of those who are immediately concerned with the matter before us than there was in the case of the N. Y. A.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there have been many protests which have come from over the country. But, of course, unless we know the source of the protests, we shall not know the motives which impelled them.

Mr. BREWSTER. I thought I made it clear that it is the companies furnishing rural electrification in Maine who are protesting. I realize that there are other foes of Mr. Williams, to the protests of some of whom I attach no importance whatsoever.

Mr. PEPPER. It may be that the authors of some of the telegrams which have been sent to Senators have succumbed to some of the propaganda which has affected even Senators in this matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely wish to congratulate the Senator from Florida on the effectiveness of his argument, which has brought over to this side of the Chamber nearly all the Republicans from the other side of the aisle. [Laughter.]

Mr. PEPPER. They came over in order to be closer to my friend from Mississippi. He is the attraction, Mr. President. He is the magnetic pull. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to say, in commenting on what the distinguished majority leader has said, that our presence on this side of the aisle will not harm any Senators over here, and may do much good. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Maine that some of the Senators from the other side of the aisle look much better on this side than they do on the other side.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I regret to point out that there are vacancies on this side of the aisle into which Republicans are able to move.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Republicans have moved in, but they do not necessarily fill the vacancies. [Laughter.]

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may make a serious statement?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I was interested in what the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] said. The Senator stated that Maine had selected a commissioner—of what?

Mr. BREWSTER. We selected a commissioner of education from the N. Y. A. organization here in Washington.

Mr. HATCH. I wonder if the Senator has received any protests from him against the Williams nomination?

Mr. BREWSTER. I have receive from him a very strong endorsement of Mr. Williams.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator please put it in the RECORD.

Mr. BREWSTER. I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER subsequently said: Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD the telegram from the commissioner of education of Maine, to which I referred earlier in the debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUSTA, MAINE, *March 13, 1945.*

Senator OWEN BREWSTER,

United States Senate Office Building:

My association with Aubrey Williams convinces me that he is innocent of charges made that he is un-Christian and communistic. Speaking as a private citizen it is my sincere hope that approval of his appointment as Administrator of R. E. A. may be considered solely on a basis of his qualifications for position. I have complete confidence in your ability to so judge the man.

HARRY V. GILSON.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the very able Senator from Florida has claimed about everything for Mr. Williams. I am wondering now if he will claim that Mr. Williams furnished all the millions of dollars which were spent by the N. Y. A., as well as the other agencies which he has represented during the past 10 or 12 years.

Mr. PEPPER. No; Mr. Williams' good work was made possible by the support of the American people, the taxpayers of this country, through appropriations of the American Congress, up until 1943, when the N. Y. A. was abolished by the Congress.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. In order to keep the RECORD entirely straight, I may say that I voted to the very last to continue the N. Y. A. in existence. At that time the ablest man in the organization was a gentleman from my State, who did excellent work in that State. I voted for the continuation of the work of the N. Y. A. because I had complete confidence in the man to whom I have referred. I merely want to have that appear in the RECORD.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the able Senator from Georgia, who always makes a very fine statement, if it is not a fact that the able administrator from his State, to whom he has referred with proper credit, was chosen by Mr. Williams and supported by Mr. Williams.

Mr. GEORGE. No; he was not. I am very pleased to make that statement. I did not want to do so, but the Senator has asked me the direct question. The man to whom I have referred was not chosen by Mr. Williams. I do not say that Mr. Williams did not assent or consent to his final selection, but the man was really chosen because he would be a balance wheel in this important organization which had to do with the youth of the country, and because his services were needed in that particular organization. He is still in Government service.

Mr. PEPPER. Was he recommended by the able Senator from Georgia?

Mr. GEORGE. If I was called upon to recommend him, I did so, because he happened to be a man from my own town. Nearly all the credit for the work of the N. Y. A. in the Southeast is due entirely to his foresight and capacity to handle the N. Y. A. Georgia has an enviable record in connection with the work of the N. Y. A. there.

Mr. PEPPER. Was the man to whom the Senator has referred the administrator in Georgia?

Mr. GEORGE. I think he was the head of the organization in Georgia, but was finally brought into the Washington office.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad that an able citizen of the Senator's home town and of the Senator's State was brought into the organization, and that he rendered such splendid service. But, Mr. President, the fact cannot be escaped that Aubrey Williams put together an organization which had in its personnel such able men as the man from Georgia to whom the Senator from Georgia has referred, as well as the man who was later chosen by the people of Maine to be commissioner of education of that State. While, of course, no one would claim that Aubrey Williams should be given exclusive credit for that organization—and I have not intended to make any such implication—by the same token he would not be responsible entirely for the complete personnel of the R. E. A. But Aubrey Williams has proved, by having done so, that he can establish and direct a good organization. That is the only point I wish to make.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to add one observation with regard to what took place in Illinois in connection with the N. Y. A. I had nothing to do with it in the way of sponsoring the appointee to whom I shall refer. Recently the appointee to the N. Y. A. in Illinois was William Campbell.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois please speak a little louder so that Senators over on this side of the aisle can hear what he has to say?

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Otherwise, all of us good-looking Republicans will have to move over on the other side of the Chamber into seats which are not now occupied by good Democratic Senators. [Laughter.]

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the entire Republican side of the Chamber is vacant with the exception of five Senators.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I think we should have the clerk count the Republicans and the Democrats now on the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Illinois. I know he must be encouraged by the fact that those from far away are beginning to listen to the voice of the missionary.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope that I may be allowed to continue my observation without interruption. It will not be very long, but I wish to express the thought I have in mind.

As I was about to explain, I had nothing to do with the appointment made in Illinois to the N. Y. A. The name of the person who was appointed was William J. Campbell. He later became United States district attorney for the Northern district of Illinois, and today he is a Federal judge. So the people of Illinois did not do so bad.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will say something else if I may. The senior Senator from Illinois has spoken of his State, and the able Senator from Georgia has also spoken of his State. A few days ago the man who had been N. Y. A. Administrator for my State was on his way back from the Pacific and stopped for a while in my office. With due modesty, but with some pride, he showed me a certificate of the distinguished service which he had rendered in the Navy in the Pacific in connection with some of the amphibious landings which had been made on some of the islands in the Pacific.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say to the Senator from Florida that I have already inserted in the RECORD an endorsement of Mr. Williams from the Commissioner of Education of Vermont, who gave his endorsement on the strength of the good work done by the N. Y. A. in

Vermont during the time Mr. Williams was in charge.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. While we are going about from State to State, I should like to say that I have had here on my desk for several days a letter from a citizen of my State of unimpeachable integrity, the controller of the State university, who was associated with Aubrey Williams for 5 or 6 years in the N. Y. A. No one in the Southwest will question either the honor or ability or integrity of Tom Popejoy. May I have his letter read at this time?

Mr. PEPPER. I wish the Senator would.

Mr. HATCH. I ask that the clerk read the letter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO,
Albuquerque, February 5, 1945.

Dear Senator HATCH: I have noticed in the press that the President has sent Aubrey Williams' name to the Senate for confirmation as Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

As you know, I worked with Mr. Williams for 5 or 6 years and was closely associated with him in Washington as his deputy administrator. As a result of these contacts, I believe that I am in a position to state objectively the qualifications which I think he possesses. He is a man of great ability, high integrity, and it was my observation that he always had at heart the interests of the organization which he represented. As you know, he was in the last war and he now has three sons in this war. He truly believes in the American way of life and, while he has been labeled by some as being on the radical side, I am convinced that he always is sincerely interested in the welfare of all of the people. I am confident that he will do a great job for the Rural Electrification Administration. It is also my opinion that the majority of the people in this State would favor his confirmation.

This letter goes to you unsolicited, Senator HATCH, and it is sent on the basis that it is wise for citizens to react in favor of individuals as much as they do in opposition to them.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

TOM L. POPEJOY,
Comptroller.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I merely wish to call attention to the fact that Mr. Popejoy, who wrote this letter, wrote it entirely unsolicited. He has no connection with the Federal Government, and no connection with Mr. Williams. He is connected with the university of my State and is an outstanding American citizen.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator. Of course, his attention has already been called to the fact that instead of three sons, as was mentioned by the writer of the letter, Mr. Williams' youngest son, an 18-year-old boy, has just gone into the service.

Let me hasten through this statement from Mr. Williams. I quote again:

There is only one further fact that might need to be noted, and that is that in 1940, when it became evident that we as a Nation would not be able to stay out of the war, I asked permission of the President to go out and buy machinery that was in the backyards of private industry and not being used, and for an Executive order giving the Youth Administration surplus machinery not being used in the various departments of the Government, including the Army and Navy. With these two permissions and directives—

The President of the United States trusted Mr. Williams to help get this country ready to meet the attack of the enemy.

With these 2 permissions and directives, I assembled and organized some 3,500 mechanical shops in 718 different communities in the Nation and manned them with technical supervisors in the fields of tooling, dieing, riveting, welding, electrical work, and in fact every conceivable mechanical and technical type of training.

Mr. President, is that man qualified to run the R. E. A.? He initiated the suggestion that he take boys and girls without skill and give them skill to prepare their country, that we take idle machinery and shops and put them to work at defending America. Just as he suggested to Harry Hopkins a better plan for the W. P. A., and got to be Deputy Administrator, just as he was chosen by 12 college presidents to head up an educational program, just as he was made head of the N. Y. A., he suggested mobilizing idle machines and shops and training boys and girls who were unskilled to prepare America. Yet Senators say Aubrey Williams is not qualified to be Administrator of the R. E. A.

His statement continues:

By means of this effort some 1,400,000 young people were trained in technical work during the years of 1941, 1942, and 1943.

Mr. President, I have never heard any critic of Aubrey Williams say he did not have patriotism and did not have vision. He saw clouds of danger upon the Nation's horizon, and set about getting America ready. I think it would not be an exaggeration to say that our scars upon the enemy, some of them, at least, many of them, can be traced to the patriotism and the farsightedness and competence of Aubrey Williams.

And at the time the N. Y. A. was abolished, it was turning out over a thousand trained youth a day—

That was in 1943—

in the technical and mechanical skills needed in war production and in the armed forces. In recognition of the character of the work, the N. Y. A. was transferred to the War Manpower Commission in 1941 by an act of Congress, with specific instructions to devote its efforts to the preparations of youth for participation one way or the other in the war effort.

Mr. President, that concludes the statement I asked Mr. Williams to prepare for me. I do not know of any error in the facts stated in the statement.

What it reveals is that a boy, son of a southern family, the Harrises of the South, I imagine of Georgia and Alabama, settled in Alabama. His grandparents were in the Civil War. His father was a blacksmith, and he is proud of it. The story is of that boy fighting his way up until he got to be the head of the greatest youth-training organization this Nation has ever had, and he helped America to prepare itself for the onslaught of the enemy. He gave boys and girls skills that will last all their lives.

Yet, Mr. President, for some reason it is taken to be a fact that the Senate of the United States is not going to confirm Aubrey Williams to be the head of the R. E. A.

The question of competence is made the ground of opposition, because I know this body would not wish to let enter into its vote and determination anything less important respecting his qualifications than the competence of the man to do the job.

All these slurs and insinuations, these scurrilous charges which have been made against Aubrey Williams, Mr. President, many of us believe have not been made because the authors of them thought Aubrey Williams was not competent. They do not like what Aubrey Williams believes in about democracy. Mr. President, the record of Aubrey Williams is filled with evidence of the kind of democracy he fought for and his sons are fighting for.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with what the Senator says, and what I cannot understand is why the opponents do not unmask and give to the American people the real reason why they are opposed to Williams.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. The able Senator from Mississippi a moment ago mentioned on this floor the fact that Aubrey Williams was endorsed by some Negro newspaper publishers. If anyone is voting against Aubrey Williams on that account then let that fact be the subject of disclosure in the Senate of the United States, and it may be determined for the people of America in our own great democratic way whether that action is justified. If one is opposed to Williams because he really believes in protecting the special interests of America and opposing the ancient democratic principle of "the greatest good for the greatest number," then let that mask also be torn away. Let people indicate whether they believe in the Rooseveltian kind of democracy, the Jacksonian kind of democracy, the Jeffersonian kind of democracy, or whether they believe the contrary.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. PEPPER. I wanted to conclude my statement, but will yield to the Senator if he wishes to ask a question.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wanted to make a brief statement. The reason I wanted to make it is because of the statement just made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

I always hate to vote against confirming one of the President's appointees. I never derive any pleasure from doing so because I think generally under the circumstances the President has the right to make the appointment. But where advice and consent of the Senate is required and asked for, then it becomes the duty of a Senator to advise and consent

or refuse to advise and consent. I know Aubrey Williams and I have known of his activities in the Government service for a number of years. I want to disavow any intention to vote against him because of religion or because of philosophy or for any reason except that the people who live on the rural electric lines in my part of the country do not want Aubrey Williams to be in charge of their affairs.

I have not been impressed with his service as Deputy W. P. A. Administrator, and I know something about it. I have not been impressed with his service as Administrator of the N. Y. A. I want to answer the statement made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] that a vote against him would reflect on his sons, and assert now that if the President will withdraw Mr. Aubrey Williams' name or if Mr. Williams will consent to withdraw his name, I will vote for any one of his four sons, but I do not intend to vote for Mr. Williams.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the argument has been made, and this is the last thing I propose to say, that Mr. Williams is not skilled in electrical matters. We voted unanimously the other day to confirm Mr. Fred Vinson, as was pointed out by the able junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], to be the greatest banker in the world. Yet he is not a banker. No, Mr. President, we do not insist upon such technical skills upon the part of those who are to administer agencies of the Government.

In conclusion, I believe, Mr. President, that history and time will bear me out, that taking the long view, the Senate of the United States will do itself more honor if it agrees with the President by confirming Aubrey Williams, than it will if it repudiates the nomination of the President and condemns Aubrey Williams before his sons and his country as being unworthy to hold this place of public trust.

AMENDMENT OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair), as in legislative session, laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 681) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. BANKHEAD, and Mr. TOBEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADMINISTRATOR, RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—AUBREY W. WILLIAMS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I rise to observe that it had been my fervent hope that the Senate might vote on the nomination today. At one time during the day's proceedings it looked as though we might have a vote on the question, but the debate has now gone until after 5 o'clock. Due to that fact, a number of Senators have left the Chamber with the assurance of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and also with the assurance from me, or with the express opinion that a vote would not be reached this afternoon. Under those circumstances I hesitate to keep the Senate in session long enough to vote this afternoon. I certainly hope, however, we can conclude the matter tomorrow.

I am willing to enter into any reasonable arrangement that will give some assurance that the matter will be concluded tomorrow. I do not know what other Senators intend to address the Senate on the pending nomination. I have felt and feel now that before the vote is taken perhaps I should make a brief statement. I say that because I want to speak, and because I think it is my duty to do so. I do not wish to take much time of the Senate, simply sufficient to make a brief statement as to my position and the vote I intend to cast. There may be other Senators who are in the same situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the only names on the list of speakers remaining are those of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. BARKLEY. If that be all we will conclude the matter very promptly; but in view of the fact that Senators have left the Chamber with the understanding on both sides that there would not be a vote this afternoon, I do not feel like attempting now to force a vote this afternoon. I want to make that statement, Mr. President.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, I yield; if I have the floor.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am greatly disappointed that a vote is not going to be had this afternoon. Is the Senator from Kentucky, or the Senate, willing to agree to fix a time tomorrow at which a vote may be taken, say 1 o'clock or 2 o'clock? I do not know how long the Senator from Kentucky desires to speak, and I am certainly willing that he, the Senator from Oklahoma, and all other Senators who may want to speak shall have an opportunity to do so. I hope, though, we can agree on an hour to vote. We have gone along all week, and it seems to me that practically everything has been said that could be said on the subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a vote be had on the nomination of Aubrey Williams at 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. LUCAS. I object.

Mr. ELLENDER. I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection, Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Tennessee that I have no doubt that the vote will be obtained tomorrow, and inasmuch as the Senate apparently will have to meet tomorrow, it does not make very much difference whether the vote comes at 2 o'clock or at 4 o'clock. I would be willing to agree to a limitation of debate which will bring the matter to a conclusion and a vote. Therefore, I now ask unanimous consent that during the further proceedings on this nomination no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 20 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Make it 30 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well. I will make the request 30 minutes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall not object to that, although the debate can be prolonged for a long time with a 30-minute limitation.

Mr. BARKLEY. That all depends on how many "prolongers" there may be.

Mr. McKELLAR. We do not know.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. CHANDLER. I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then, Mr. President, we will make no headway this afternoon.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I wanted to say, Mr. President, that the situation as I understand it is precisely as it has been stated by the majority leader. There was a general understanding that there would be no vote this afternoon. Many Senators on both sides of the Chamber have left the Chamber. Under the circumstances, I think we should let the matter go over until tomorrow. I also agree with the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Tennessee that we ought to have a vote and finally dispose of this matter tomorrow, if it is possible to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I know of no human reason why this matter ought to be prolonged longer than tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. I am in complete agreement with the Senator in that respect.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am so anxious to conclude the matter that during the time I shall occupy tomorrow I may even request not to be interrupted so as not to prolong the discussion.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree not to interrupt the Senator.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the appropriate committee.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of several postmasters.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE HEIDINGER, OF ILLINOIS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in legislative session, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolution (H. Res. 200) was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
March 22, 1945.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JAMES V. HEIDINGER, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I wish to join in what has been said earlier today about Representative HEIDINGER, who comes from the State which I have the honor to represent. The Nation has lost a truly great citizen and an able legislator; Illinois has lost an illustrious son; and I personally have lost a very dear and close friend. He being much older than I, through the years I have always sought the advice and counsel of this distinguished lawyer, this man who was elevated to the honored position of judge, and finally chosen to represent his district in the Congress. I speak for the people of Illinois when I say that the people of my State send their regrets and their sympathy to his loved ones as they mourn his passing.

Now, Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 108) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JAMES V. HEIDINGER, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Under the second resolving clause, the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BROOKS as the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate take a recess, in executive session, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, March 23, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 22 (legislative day of March 16), 1945:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for promotion in the Foreign Service of the United States, effective as of March 1, 1945:

FROM FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, UNCLASSIFIED, TO FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 8

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Ohio.
H. Gardner Ainsworth, of Louisiana.
Donald B. Calder, of New York.
Robert J. Cavanaugh, of Illinois.
Leonard J. Cromie, of Connecticut.
C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., of New York.
Lewis E. Gleeck, Jr., of Illinois.
Richard E. Gnade, of Pennsylvania.
Bartley P. Gordon, of Massachusetts.
Richard A. Johnson, of Illinois.
M. Gordon Knox, of Maryland.
Alfred H. Lovell, Jr., of Michigan.
John M. McSweeney, of Massachusetts.
Bromley K. Smith, of California.
Henry T. Smith, of Georgia.
William L. Smyser, of Pennsylvania.
John L. Topping, of New York.
James S. Triolo, of California.
John W. Tuthill, of Massachusetts.
William W. Walker, of North Carolina.
Fred E. Waller, of Michigan.
Fraser Wilkins, of Nebraska.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 22, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Fred V. Poag, pastor, Second Presbyterian Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

Grant, O Eternal God, to these Thy servants that while they are beseeching Thee for foresight, courage, comfort, and strength they may remember that they are means through which the myriad prayers of Thy people may be answered.

Grant this day, we humbly ask, that they may find balance between the courage of their convictions and the sweet reasonableness of tolerance for the ideas of others. May no one feel that truth is confined to his own point of view, but instead may he discover through the wisdom of deliberation the whole truth which shall make men free.

Grant to these Thy servants, and those whom they represent, a deep respect for the sacred. May the goodness which they seek be not alone that which can be touched but that also which is worthy to be lived. Grant to them so large measure of integrity that they may be courageous publicly because they are courageous privately. May the deliberations of this day be carried on with vision of such high ideals and great cause that even the human mistakes and frailties may not impede Thy purpose for Thy people.

This is our dearest petition: Give us peace, not simply a peace which is the cessation of conflict but a peace which is symbolic of justice and right throughout the wide world. Return the men and women who war for this peace from the far places of the earth so that they may take their places in completing the ultimate purposes for which Thou hast created our Nation. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2126) entitled "An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of War.
4. Office of Defense Transportation.
5. Tennessee Valley Authority.
6. Veterans' Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Mr. John Victory, secretary of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, before the Press Club.

Mr. O'TOOLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by the National Catholic Welfare Conference on school attendance and child labor.

SISTER KENNY

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced into the House a resolution calling for an investigation of the opposition to Sister Kenny.

Sister Kenny before coming to the United States was preeminently successful in the treatment of the dreaded malady of infantile paralysis. Since her arrival in the States about a year ago, the public press on many occasions has lauded the splendid work that this noble Australian woman has accomplished. Time after time we have read that she has restored life and use to the limbs of adults and children who had been afflicted with this dreadful scourge and who had been deemed hopeless cases.

Yet, throughout her entire visit to the States she seemed to have been surrounded by controversy. To the layman it appears that on many occasions the members of the medical profession have

gone greatly out of their way to criticize and hinder Sister Kenny's work.

Infantile paralysis in most cases affects children, and as a result it is the deep concern of every adult who is interested in the future of this country. If Sister Kenny can alleviate the sufferings of the unfortunate victims of polio and restore them to normal life, no individual or group of individuals no matter how powerful should be allowed to interfere with her work. This is a matter of national concern. Medicine cannot afford to be reactionary. It must be progressive and must try new methods even when those methods are originated and conceived by individuals outside the profession. I believe it is the duty of this Congress to ascertain definitely the progress that this woman has made and I further believe that this body should get to the bottom of the question as to whether or not she has received the full cooperation which she deserves.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Peabody Lodge of Elks, Peabody, Mass.

Mr. LINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Honorable M. S. Szymczak, member, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, entitled "Monetary and Credit Agreements Entered Into at Bretton Woods," delivered before the Illinois Manufacturers Association, at Chicago, Ill., on March 20, 1945.

I have been informed by the Public Printer that this will take two and a half pages at a cost of $130. I ask that this address be printed in the RECORD notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Honorable M. S. Szymczak, member, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, entitled "Federal Reserve and the Bretton Woods Proposals," delivered before the Chicago chapters of the American Statistical Association and the American Marketing Association, at Chicago, Ill., on March 21, 1945.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and include in one a story on Bill Mauldin, one of the greatest cartoonists of World War No. 1, and in the other a letter from ex-Senator Robert L. Owen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one certain correspondence with the President of the Civil Service Commission with respect to the handling of retirement-fund deductions, and in the other a statement by Col. Maurice Hirsch, Chairman of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board.

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

THE CURFEW ORDER

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUNKER. Mr. Speaker, I repeat that the curfew order, even as recently allegedly modified to permit some restaurants to stay open after midnight, is a brazen violation of the Constitution of the United States.

And I repeat that that decree has all of the unwholesome characteristics of a mandate designed to condition the people for further regimentation.

Unless my statements are refuted by the production of the facts that I have asked for in H. R. 162, which apparently even the House Rules Committee was forbidden to touch, there are millions of patriotic American people who will draw the same conclusions that I have drawn—and their resentment will not easily be appeased.

In my resolution, which was introduced on March 5, I asked that the Government produce the simple fact—regarding saving in manpower, coal, and electricity—which prompted this decree.

If we still have representative government in this country, then the investigation I have requested will get under way promptly, unless unseen forces—fearful of the case against the curfew decree—intervene.

If the Government has no facts upon which to stand, which seems to be the case, then my compensation will have to come with the thought that I have faithfully observed my oath to defend the Constitution and in doing so I have voiced the abiding sentiments of millions of American people whose reassuring expressions on this subject have come to me from every walk of life and from every part of America.

DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH ITALY

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CURLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to House Resolution 194, to be considered today, which will stifle the Congress by putting in the hands of the Committee on Rules the opportunity to prohibit any item from being taken out of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill on a point of order. You have stifled the press of this country and you have stifled the radios of this country. You have regulated all industry and agriculture and you are regulating everybody. Now you want to regulate the Congress. I say it is time, and high time, for you to wake up, before you find yourselves in such a position that you cannot say anything. This New Deal is and will be found out to be the rawest deal that has ever come to America. I am, I have been, and always will be against the stifling of religion, of liberty, and of independence in America. I am against communism and all "isms," except the good old rugged Americanism.

REJECTIONS FROM THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, mention has been made on the floor recently of the percentage of men rejected physically upon being examined for induction into the armed forces. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] yesterday listed for the information of the House the States showing the percentage of rejection in each of the States. I note with considerable pride that my own State, Oregon, is at the top of that list. Only 24.4 percent of those examined in Oregon were rejected. This figure is far better than the national average, which is 39.2 percent.

Those of us who live on the Pacific coast have known for some time that the Pacific coast, and particularly the State of Oregon, is just about the healthiest place in the world in which to live, and that our young men are unusually physically fit. Such a belief is often hard to prove, so I am grateful to the Selective Service System for compiling this information, and to the gentleman from Kansas for making it public.

I am also reliably informed that 51.3 percent of Oregon men registered under Selective Service are now in the armed forces. This is somewhat higher than the national average, which is 49.1 percent. I am proud of the record of my State's participation in this war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WASIELEWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. HOOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial on the Bretton Woods Conference.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address delivered by Lt. Comdr. Paul

A. Dever, United States Naval Reserve, on March 17 at the annual banquet of the Ancient Order of Hibernians at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, D. C.

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein a letter from Governor Eccles, of the Federal Reserve Board, and the statement of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in regard to the Bretton Woods proposals.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered on March 19 by John J. Reilly, a prominent citizen of Philadelphia, and to extend his remarks and include a speech in the RECORD by Mr. Loyal D. Odhne, on vocational training for handicapped veterans.

TO PITCH WAS HIS JOB

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GATHINGS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION, NEW BEDFORD, MASS.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks by inserting a newspaper article and an informative address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GIFFORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

O. P. A. SAYS "IT ISN'T NECESSARY TO GO TO CHURCH"

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WEICHEL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

OIL SUBSIDIES HAVE FAILED—OILMEN ASK PRICE INCREASE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VURSELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EARTHMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news item.

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news item.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Mr. Guy Thaxton, an engineer for the Rural Electrification Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL—POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 194 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2689) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, this is the resolution to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] referred as tying the hands of the House in the consideration of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. The resolution ties the hands of no one, but, on the other hand, serves just the contrary purpose.

There is nothing extraordinary in what the Rules Committee has done. The Committee on Agriculture, in an endeavor to insure the House consideration of all of the provisions of the pending bill, came before the Rules Committee for a rule waiving points of order against the bill. That is the question now before the House.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Has a rule like this ever been brought to the floor before?

Mr. COX. Yes; on some of the agriculture appropriation bills.

Mr. RICH. When?

Mr. COX. It happened last year, I believe; and maybe once or twice previous to that.

Mr. RICH. I never heard of it myself. This is the first time I have seen such a thing.

Mr. COX. If the rule is adopted, the membership will have an opportunity to offer and have considered amendments to every item in the bill. If the rule should not be adopted, several provisions of the bill would probably be stricken out under points of order.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COX. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If any item should be stricken out by vote of the House and the House wanted it, it could be put back in, could it not?

Mr. COX. No; an item would go out if it were subject to a point of order and the point of order were made against it. If the pending resolution is adopted the House will have full opportunity to consider these provisions.

Mr. RICH. One further question; then the gentleman is going to permit the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations to write legislation, is he not?

Mr. COX. The House will permit the Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations to submit to the House all proposals it thinks as evidenced by the pending bill should be considered. If they were stricken out then the House would as a result of that procedure be denied full consideration of the entire bill; that is all.

The pending resolution is not restrictive; it ties nobody's hands. It simply is intended to make possible full and fair consideration of every provision in the bill. If there is any provision in the bill that the gentleman or any other Member of the House does not like, he or she would have opportunity to debate it and offer amendments which would cure what might be thought to be a defect.

Mr. RICH. Then instead of obeying the rules of the House and conducting business as formally provided for and done ever since I have been a Member of this body, a rule now is brought in to permit the Rules Committee to tell the House how it has got to act.

Mr. COX. The Rules Committee is making no demand of the House. The Rules Committee is the servant of the House and simply makes proposals. That is all the committee has done in the instant case.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Let me make this observation, if the gentleman will indulge me just a moment: The gentleman from the Committee on Appropriations handling this bill, in anticipation that the point might be made that the committee was encroaching on the prerogatives of the Committee on Agriculture, brought along with him to the Rules Committee the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, who made a statement in which he fully and satisfactorily set forth why his committee had not had opportunity to enact legislation which would have obviated the necessity of requesting this rule. He joined in the request that the rule be granted.

I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct in that there would be no opportunity for debate and consideration on the merits of any item stricken out on a point of order. Unless this rule is adopted, the only other way to include the items in the bill would be to have the Senate restore some of them. They would then come back to the House. The debate would not be very satisfactory, because there would be not more than 1 hour on each such amendment, and it would be controlled by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. COX. There would not be free opportunity of debate.

Mr. McCORMACK. There would not be that opportunity which this rule permits to debate the matter?

Mr. COX. The pending resolution will make possible liberal debate and free consideration of the entire matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is not an unusual procedure?

Mr. COX. Not at all.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Pennsylvania stated that the idea of the Rules Committee is to stifle consideration. The gentleman used that language, I am sure, without appreciating just what the interpretation or significance might be outside the Chamber

because the House has the power to express its will. It can accept or not by majority vote the rule recommended by the Rules Committee. I interpret what my friend said in the right light, but I think unconsciously he used a word that reflects, unintentionally, upon the Rules Committee.

Mr. RICH. I am not reflecting upon the Rules Committee and the individual members of that committee. I am reflecting on the things you do here and the dialogues that take place on the floor of this House to salve the people of the country into believing you are doing the right and honorable thing. I do not think you are.

Mr. COX. Of course, I take no exception to the gentleman's observation. There was some disinclination on the part of the Rules Committee to propose this rule. However, the action taken by that committee is not final. It is simply a proposition which the House itself must pass upon. The complete control of the whole question is in the House. If the House wants to consider the provisions of the bill against which points of order might lie, then it will adopt the pending resolution. If it does not want to do that it will vote down the rule and then take the bill as it will be stripped as a result of points of order which unquestionably will be made.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. In order to clarify the atmosphere and get a perspective of what we are doing when we consider the rule, over a long period of time the Congress has found in its wisdom that it is best not to insert in appropriation bills legislative matters. The Congress, having discovered that, has adopted a rule which says that must not be done or a point of order will lie against that legislative provision. Now, this resolution asks that we waive that general rule of the House and accept in this particular bill legislative matters so that they can be debated on the floor of the House.

Mr. COX. The gentleman states the question accurately.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The other day from what the majority side had to say, including the majority leader and some of the speakers on the other side of the aisle, I was almost persuaded that we ought to follow precedents—I say I was almost persuaded that we ought to follow precedents. Then it occurred to me that the President and his party have broken so many precedents that maybe I was wrong. Then I came back again and read the RECORD the next day, and I thought: "Well, we ought to follow precedent." Now, you come along this morning, you on the majority side, and say, "Let us junk all of these precedents."

Mr. COX. No. The gentleman should not take too much of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. I want to ask a question. Does the gentleman think it is good policy to do away with this rule which says we should have legislative committees consider and report legislation?

Mr. COX. I think it is something that should be followed as nearly as is possible.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But honored by the exception?

Mr. COX. This should be used sparingly. In the instant case I think there is abundance of justification for the House bringing to bear upon the question its present-day opinion as to what ought to be done.

Mr. HOFFMAN. When the New Deal wants the money, to heck with the rule; is that it?

Mr. COX. No. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, there is plenty of precedent for this rule. But all precedents are not good precedents. A good precedent should always be followed. A bad precedent should never be followed. In these war days some unfortunate parliamentary practices have crept into our parliamentary proceedings, and rather than continue this evil practice we should mend our ways and return to sound procedure.

The rules of the House definitely prohibit the Committee on Appropriations from reporting legislation to the House. That committee can only recommend that the House provide money for purposes previously authorized by law. At times emergencies arise when it is advisable to include in appropriation bills items not previously authorized by law, which are emergency matters. This tolerance has always been recognized.

The emergency feature, however, does not enter into the rule now before us. As we all know, there are numerous items in this appropriation bill which had their genesis in Executive and bureau orders, directives, or decrees. Years have passed since those directives or orders were issued. Each year the Agriculture Subcommittee on Appropriations appears before the Rules Committee asking that a special rule be granted waiving all points of order against these items. That is not new. Year after year the Rules Committee has protested this action on the part of the Appropriations Committee. My understanding is that members of that committee have secured these rules in the past on the theory that they would not ask for repetition in the next year's appropriation bill, unless the Congress had proceeded according to the rules and secured affirmative legislation by the proper legislative processes. Indeed, I think the record will bear me out in the statement that members of the Rules Committee in previous years have advised the Congress that they "would not do it again" and would not grant rules waiving points of order covering these recurring annual estimates.

As one member of the Rules Committee, I have made it clear in previous years, both in the Rules Committee hearings and in debate on the rule, that I would not continue this procedure. This is a rule of expediency. Yes, the Rules Committee has the power to recommend abandoning the rules of the House in these specific cases, and at times has followed this course of expediency. The reasons for such action do not apply at the moment, however.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman intend to adhere to that policy in the future?

Mr. MICHENER. If the distinguished majority leader will be patient, I will answer his question. I have a lingering suspicion that down in his heart the majority leader agrees with the policy and the philosophy which I am suggesting. I do not believe he will urge that I am wrong. Those in positions of leadership in the Congress are ofttimes placed in embarrassing situations. I quite agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts that there are times when good legislation and necessary emergencies require the waiving of points of order. That is not the present case, however. The exact contrary is true. The integrity of the Appropriations Committee is at stake. It was never intended that this should be a super, all-powerful, over-all, dominating committee. Its functions are most important. Its accomplishments are necessary to the carrying on of the Government and the protection of the taxpayers. There should always be enough money provided by the Congress to do the essential things. There should never be money appropriated that is not needed.

Mr. Speaker, for several years there has been complaint and much back-stage protest because the Appropriations Committee is taking unto itself powers it does not really possess. The time is approaching when there will be a general revolt among the Members that will possibly go too far and take away from the Rules Committee any discretion when it comes to recommending the waiving of points of order on appropriation bills. In these circumstances, the Appropriations Committee itself should read the handwriting on the wall and put its own house in order. If the committee is headstrong, is it not the duty of those who believe in the Appropriations Committee, as now constituted, to vote against this rule and save this committee from itself?

This bill was reported out on 1 day. The contents of the bill were confidential to the committee up to the moment of report, as were also hearings, constituting 2,200 pages. The next day the Rules Committee was asked to bring in this rule. I think all the Members know that it refused to report the rule, and then on the next day the committee was called together again and reconsideration was had. And so here we are, with this annual occurrence.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman then in favor of the old hymn which says, "Yield not to temptation, for yielding is sin"?

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Michigan always has a pert remark. I

might recall some other old sayings. For instance, there is "virtue in persistency."

The chairman of this subcommittee persists each year in reporting out a bill containing legislation without any authority of law. He then persists in coming before the Rules Committee and asking for the waiver. The Rules Committee then persists in maintaining its integrity and in doing that which it has threatened to do in bygone years, but finally yields to the superpersistency of the chairman of the subcommittee and those aiding and abetting him.

Another old saying in which I believe much is: "If at first you don't succeed, try, try again." The first day the Rules Committee voted on reporting this rule, I thought we had succeeded in settling the matter. However, the proponents tried again and after the second meeting, when I returned to the floor and was asked about the result of the second contest, I truthfully remarked: "We have met the enemy and we are theirs."

Of course, this rule will be adopted, but I shall not be a party to this desecration, and I shall continue to persist and try again in the belief that the time is not far distant when the general rules of the House will prevail as to appropriation bills, or the course of the Appropriations Committee will be further circumscribed by rule.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the ranking Republican member on the Subcommittee on Appropriations, the able gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], who speaks for his committee.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, the old adage "Fools rush in where angels fear to tread" is perfectly exemplified by me in this instance. As Calvin Coolidge once said: "I have noticed that nothing I never said ever did me any harm."

But, Mr. Speaker, I cannot resist the impulse to emphasize that after all the tumult and the shouting dies, after the foam and froth have evaporated and the false fury has subsided, the real issue will stand out: Whether or not this House proposes to do its own legislating or will humiliate itself to take orders from the Senate with respect to what legislation shall be enacted.

The fact that the Rules Committee has granted the rule is the evidence that it has the authority to waive other rules. The power of the House to make its own rules is unquestioned. Those who oppose the adoption of this rule because it waives other rules find themselves insisting that because some legislative committee has failed, as they allege, to bring in certain legislation, the House therefore should not legislate; should strike from the bill on a point of order all attempts to legislate; should permit another body to legislate for it, to put back in the bill the matter stricken therefrom on a point of order; and to compel the House under the rules governing action on a conference report to eventually legislate at its bidding.

The right of the House to initiate legislation is the principle involved—a right assured to it if the present rule be adopted.

I care more for the substance and preservation of that right than for the shadow of the contention relating to the exercise of the right to raise a point of order.

To legislate or not to legislate is the issue; let the chips fall where they may.

It is about time some of those legislative committees that are talking about getting together with the Appropriations Committee should get together with themselves, stop talking, and bring out some of the legislation they have had under consideration for 4 years, to my knowledge. Without pulling any punches, I will say, just as I have said, they cannot be heard to complain concerning the situation for which they themselves are principally responsible.

I am for the adoption of the rule. I am for the preservation of the right by the House to pass such bill as it sees fit to advance free from any possible humiliation incident to eventually having to adopt a conference report covering the same matter as would be stricken from it under the technical right to make a point of order against the subject matter because it is legislation.

Reduced to an absurdity, the argument against the rule would preclude all legislative action not based on a specific measure introduced by some legislative committee. Legislative committees have no right to bark like dogs from the manger of their own failure to provide the essential opportunity for consideration of necessary legislation; which opportunity is provided by this rule.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. While the gentleman is arraigning the other committees of the House, will he tell us what provisions of this bill are subject to points of order?

Mr. PLUMLEY. I know what provisions are subject to points of order.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman tell us what they are? We want to know.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] will take care of that.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has no right to arraign other committees of the House for not reporting legislation which the Appropriations Committee now attempts to write without authority of law, and then not point out the provisions of this bill that are in violation of law and subject to points of order.

Mr. PLUMLEY. If the gentleman had been here yesterday he would have heard every one of them enumerated. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], the chairman of the committee, will answer the gentleman's question. Let the record speak. This is no arraignment; it is an answer to one. I do not propose to answer the gentleman's questions out of my time.

The answer to the situation is found in action by the legislative committees, and until they act the House has a right to take advantage of its rights to get such matters and things before it.

What are we here for if not to legislate?

We take ourselves too seriously when we quibble over a technicality and attempt to deprive the Members of the House of their opportunity for full, free, and frank discussion of the merits of the measure; an opportunity they are denied and do not have on a conference report, practically, since the committee members usually take all the hour allotted.

Talk about getting together—the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture, before it took action in the premises, contacted the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, with regard to whether or not we should ask for a rule. He signified his approval of such procedure and appeared before the Rules Committee to support the application of the full Committee on Appropriations for this rule.

And lastly, Mr. Speaker, and so very important it is not to be overlooked by any Member, I wish to reiterate that, if the rule is not adopted, the Members of the House will be deprived of their opportunity for full, free, and frank discussion of the merits of the measure; and I wish in closing to emphasize the fact realized by altogether too few Members that, if this rule is not adopted, then instead of a majority of 435 Members of this House legislating, one man by an objection in the nature of a point of order can and may legislate for the entire body, by the elimination, through the use of a point of order, of an item or many items which a majority of this House wish to have an opportunity to consider. Do not forget that. Vote for the rule.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the majority leader when he figures we are going to have this vacation we talked about on the 24th? Will it be answered this week?

Mr. McCORMACK. If my friend will refrain from asking that question, he can rest assured that the leadership on his side has discussed the matter with me. The leadership is thoroughly acquainted with the situation.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman think I can get the information from my leader?

Mr. McCORMACK. The House will be advised. I can assure my friend that the leadership is thoroughly acquainted with the situation and the House will be advised tomorrow.

Mr. RICH. I hope the membership will soon be advised of it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure the gentleman will be satisfied.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported

that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1360. An act for the relief of F. L. Gause and the legal guardian of Rosalind and Helen Gause, minors.

THE LATE HONORABLE JAMES V. HEIDINGER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart today that I announce to the membership of the House the death this morning in Phoenix, Ariz., of our friend and colleague, JAMES V. HEIDINGER, of Illinois. Judge HEIDINGER, as you well know, was in ill health for several months. At the beginning of this Seventy-ninth Congress he was at the Naval Hospital at Bethesda. It was my privilege to visit him, and at his request I introduced a resolution in the House requesting that the oath of office be administered to him at the hospital.

This was done by the Speaker in person. On the day following, I again visited him and was pleased to observe the elation and satisfaction that he exhibited because of the privilege that had been accorded him to qualify as a Member of this Congress. He was extremely enthusiastic in his expressions of gratitude both to this House and our Speaker for promptly taking the necessary steps whereby his legislative status would be unimpaired.

Judge HEIDINGER had been a farmer, a school teacher, a practicing attorney, and a judge. Several times he and the late Claude V. Parsons contested for the privilege of representing the Twenty-fourth Congressional District of Illinois in Congress. Once the judge was defeated by less than 100 votes, but he gracefully acquiesced in the verdict of the voters and tried again. In 1940 he was successful. He served continuously in the Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, and Seventy-ninth Congresses. Shortly after taking his seat in this body his predecessor passed away. Both of these men had had a high regard for the other. Each of these men informed me that in all these campaigns he had never heard of an unkind remarks made by his opponent.

Judge HEIDINGER was a kind man. He was a man of principle. He said what he thought. He weighed carefully the problems that came before him for consideration. He brought with him in his legislative career the principles that had made him a just and honorable judge in the courts of his own county.

He will be missed in this House, and in the great Committee on Naval Affairs of which he was a member.

In Judge HEIDINGER, Illinois had an able, keen, and unselfish Representative. We of his State who perhaps had more opportunity of knowing him intimately, feel deeply the loss of this faithful colleague who commanded our admiration and respect. We shall always cherish the privilege that was ours to have known him and to have worked with him.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if any man in Congress knew Judge HEIDINGER better than I did. His office is next door to mine. He and I lived in the same building ever since he came to Congress, and I have been with him almost every day during that time—up to the day he went to the hospital. I have never met a finer man, a more consecrated American, or a more splendid gentleman, in or out of Congress, than JAMES V. HEIDINGER, our departed colleague from Illinois.

Two days ago I received a letter from Mrs. Heidinger, telling me that he was in a very critical condition. His son, who is now in the Navy, came by to see me on yesterday, and I showed him his mother's letter. He seemed to feel that the end was near, and I am sure this announcement has not come as a very great surprise to him.

We sometimes refer to those friendships that grow up between Members on different sides of the aisle as the flowers that overhang the walls of party politics.

JIM HEIDINGER was a Republican, a real Abraham Lincoln Republican, from Lincoln's home State of Illinois, while I am a Democrat, a Jeffersonian Democrat, from Mississippi, the home State of Jefferson Davis, the Great White Chieftain of the Confederacy.

But we were both Americans who believed in America and American institutions, and as far as our friendship was concerned all the political differences we ever had—and we had many—never had the slightest effect, so far as I could tell, on his friendship for me, and it never had any effect whatsoever on my friendship for him.

Someone has said:

I wrote my name upon the sand
And trusted it would stand for aye;
But soon, alas, the refluent sea
Had washed my feeble lines away.

I carved my name upon the wood,
And, after years, returned again;
I missed the shadow of the tree
That stretched of old upon the plain.

To solid marble, next, my name
I gave as a perpetual trust;
An earthquake rent it to its base;
And now it lies, o'erlaid with dust.

All these had failed, I was perplexed,
I turned and asked myself, "What then?"
If I would have my name endure,
I'll write it on the hearts of men.

The name of JAMES V. HEIDINGER will endure, because he wrote it on the hearts of his fellow men.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, again the Death Angel has beckoned; again our ranks have been invaded. In the midst of a busy day in the consideration of important legislation, we are suddenly informed that our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, Judge HEIDINGER, has answered the last call.

Judge HEIDINGER's passing was not unexpected. Nevertheless, the suddenness is a shock. A splendid man, conscientious, serious, and appreciating the responsibilities of his office, he was beloved by his constituents, and was admired and respected by all who knew him. It will not be possible for anyone to fill Judge HEIDINGER's particular place in the affection and in the hearts of those with whom he has served so well. We shall miss him. The Nation has lost another splendid man.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished leader of the majority, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, no matter how long a period of time the death of a friend may be expected, when the actual passing on happens the impact is sudden and the results are forcibly conveyed to the minds of the friends of the dear one who has taken the journey into the Great Beyond.

I join with the Illinois delegation on both sides of the aisle and my other colleagues of the House in the deep sympathy they feel in the death of our dear friend, JIM HEIDINGER.

It is difficult for one to express his feelings under circumstances of this kind and what I shall do is to refer to some of the outstanding characteristics of the friend who has passed on.

The light of the candle of JIM HEIDINGER will continue on as long as any of his friends live. In life he personified everything that was fine, sweet, kind, and noble. The light from his candle will constitute an example for all who knew him to follow. His was a light of nobility of character, of warmth of feeling for his fellow men, of sincerity of purpose in the performance of his duties. His was a light of an honorable and trustworthy life; his was the life of a gentleman.

My personal contacts with our late friend were close and most friendly. I benefited greatly from those contacts. In moments of emotion and when I was perhaps under undue strain, I met JIM HEIDINGER and his sweet character and sincere personality had a tendency to calm me down. When I met him I met a man with a broadness of vision and of tolerance, and he tended to curb any unrestrained feelings I might have had at that moment.

The passing of JIM HEIDINGER is a tragic blow to this House and a great loss to the people of the State of Illinois and the people of his district. I shall always remember him during the remainder of my journey through life for the fine, noble, human characteristics of sincerity of purpose, honorableness of thought, and warmth of feeling that he so nobly and outstandingly exemplified during his useful life.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Illinois delegation, naturally I am shocked and feel deeply the loss of my friend, Judge HEIDINGER, with whom I became acquainted when he first came to the Congress. That was the first time I ever met him. I learned to know him quite well. As has been stated, he was

gentle, kindly, courteous, a real gentleman in every sense of the word.

I learned during the first year he was a Member of Congress that he was born in the same week, as a matter of fact, 1 day ahead of myself. We learned that Stephen Day and Charlie Dewey were born in the same week. So we called ourselves the congressional quadruplets.

Each year, on 1 day during that week, up until this year, the four of us held a reunion, either at luncheon or at dinner, and had a friendly, congenial, pleasant time together. I cannot think at the moment of proper words to express my feelings on this occasion. However, an unknown poet has placed words at my disposal. The title is "There Is No Death." The unknown poet expresses my feelings at this time in these words:

There is no death! The stars go down
To rise upon some other shore,
And bright in heaven's jeweled crown
They shine forevermore.

There is no death! The dust we tread
Shall change beneath the summer showers
To golden grain or mellow fruit
Or rainbow-tinted flowers.

There is no death! Although we grieve
When beautiful, familiar forms
That we have learned to love
Are torn from our embracing arms.

Although with bowed and breaking heart,
With sable garb and silent tread
We bear their senseless dust to earth
And say that they are dead;

They are not dead. They have but passed
Beyond the mists that blind us here,
Into the new and larger life
Of that serener sphere.

Though disenthralled and glorified,
They still are here and love us yet.
The dear ones they have left behind
They never can forget.

I am sure the dear ones that have been left behind by the death of Judge HEIDINGER will not and never can forget the kindly, lovable man who would not knowingly hurt anyone's feelings.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago when one of my colleagues from Illinois rushed into the cloak room where Congressmen were gathered to tell us that the Member from Illinois, our Judge HEIDINGER, had passed away, it was a shock. It was a shock not only to the Members from Illinois, but to everybody there. The Members began telling what a great loss it was. It is particularly a loss these days to have any good American leave this Congress. As the news came, several Members said, "That man was a good American. We cannot afford to lose a man like that." They began thinking then about Judge HEIDINGER. One said he was such an unusually kind man. Another remarked how good natured he was. The words "gentle" and "sweet" were used repeatedly. One Member said, "I often came to him and asked him about little things. He was, I suppose, as busy as any Member of this House, but he always had time to sit down and explain matters. He never seemed to be in a hurry if somebody needed anything from him."

Mr. Speaker, the loss of this Member lies heavily on the hearts of all of us, and none of us can quite express the way we feel. We feel too deeply about the loss to be able to say how deeply we feel. Visitors sitting in the gallery may wonder if it is proper that the Congress should stop like this in the consideration of important legislation to think of a Member who has passed away and eulogize him in this way. Some of us thought so, too, when we first came here. But as you stay here, you begin to see that perhaps the consideration of one good Member for a few moments is more important than any legislation we could pass. As we sit here commemorating the fine qualities that made this particular Member a beloved friend, a patriot, and a statesman who as one man said in the cloakroom, never stopped to think of the consequences to his political future but voted for what he thought was right. We, at the same time are resolving we shall try to imitate his good qualities. In a way that, I think, is what eternity means. It means that the good qualities for which one stands in one's life shall be considered by those who surround us and go on and on, and thus create, if enough good people live that way, what may some day be a real heaven upon this earth.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak the sentiments of all the Members of the House when I make the statement that the Congress and the Nation have suffered a distinct loss in the passing of our colleague, Judge HEIDINGER. This knowledge will cause sorrow in many homes in southern Illinois and it will be a shock to a great many people throughout the length and breadth of our State of Illinois.

Judge HEIDINGER was trusted first by the small circle of friends who knew him. He was trusted for his fine character and his ability. As that trust by his public acts was justified, his circle of influence widened and he was called to service by his county as a county judge. He held other offices through the confidence and trust of the people who knew him for his fine Christian character and his sterling honesty. His circle of influence widened until it encompassed his entire congressional district.

His services were such here in the House that the confidence in him of his people increased. He was reelected by increasing majorities, and this time, when his health was so bad that he was unable to make a campaign, his people reelected him by a greater majority than ever before.

He loved southern Illinois. His memory was rich in the history of the growth and development politically, industrially, and spiritually of that section of the State. He was a man who realized that all of us who come into the world owe a debt to society, a debt to the memory of the pioneers, out of whose efforts, thoughts, and toil were wrought the opportunities we were to enjoy, a debt to the statesmen who shaped the destinies of that section of Illinois and who helped to guide the destinies of this Nation. He talked with me often about the late Senator Borah, and his great qualities of leadership and statesmanship. He was proud of the fact that Senator Borah came originally from Fairfield, Ill. He was a man who wanted to pay the debt he owed to society. He wanted to liquidate that debt in the interest of the people and in the interest of the State and of the Nation. He wanted to make his contribution for a better America. He constantly strove to do that. While he was man who was modest and kind, he was a man who possessed the courage of a lion when to stand for the right was the course his conscience dictated. As has been remarked by a former speaker, it never occurred to him in considering legislation that his vote should be tempered, directed, or cast for the purpose of reelecting him to the Congress to the detriment of the people and the cause of the Nation he was serving at the time such vote had to be cast.

He discharged his duty as a Representative of the people, as Washington, Jefferson, and Franklin, and those men who wrote the Constitution of this country thought a Representative should after he had been honored by being elected to this great body, the greatest legislative body in the world.

It is unfortunate that a man of such courage and sterling character, a man of such fine ideals of American citizenship, a man who was always ready to support unfailingly representative constitutional government in this country; it is unfortunate in these troublous times that he should be called to his reward.

It has been my pleasure to have known him intimately for some 25 years. It is difficult to try to portray the fine character of this man as a neighbor, a friend, a legislator; and it is difficult to speak under the stress that comes to me and the Members of this House who knew and respected him as all of us do who were privileged to have known him. It is a serious blow to his family. I know that they have the sympathy of all the Members of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, there has fallen on the ears of one of our colleagues the beckoning music of eternity. A mighty oak has fallen. Some there are who may see fit to question the wisdom of Congress in time of war pausing in its deliberations, in its consideration of important and weighty matters of state and of international consequence, to pay tribute to the memory, character, and statesmanship of one among us. But Judge HEIDINGER is typical of many of the self-effacing, quietly modest men who work in the vineyards of this body. Too often their accomplishments are unheralded and unsung. Judge HEIDINGER accomplished more by his sincerity, his geniality, his personality, and his warmth than perhaps some others may accomplish by their eloquence and their conspicuous activities on the floor. Certainly in the hearts of the people whom

he so well represented in southern Illinois there will be left pain and suffering. It will be hard to repair the damage which his passing will create, because it will be difficult to fill his shoes.

Judge HEIDINGER has a brother who is a resident of my home city of Tacoma, Wash., one of our most distinguished and erudite lawyers in the State of Washington. He is general counsel for the Weyerhaeuser Timber Co. Through his brother I came to know Judge HEIDINGER very well. Never was there a finer man than our deceased colleague. Never was there a man who was more amenable to approach by his colleagues. Never was there a Congressman who graced these Halls more willing to lend advice and counsel. A scholarly and compassionate judge, an ideal, an impeccably upright citizen of a great State has gone, but he has carved his memory indelibly in the hearts of those who follow him.

I think these condign tributes that have been paid today to Judge HEIDINGER are most fitting. I know that his family will derive immeasurable consolation and comfort from reading the remarks made by his colleagues from his State of Illinois and elsewhere, who have spoken so feelingly on the floor. It is very important that we who belong to different political parties and ipso facto entertain divergent political beliefs should ignore those political differences in the consideration of the character and accomplishments of our fellows in this body when they are called by their Maker. One of the finest things which characterizes the House of Representatives is the fact that when any of us open the doors and march into our eternal abode, forgotten are the political differences which may have marked our activities in life, because in the great democracy of death there are no political differences. There is only brotherhood; there is only memory.

William Jennings Bryan once said death is but a narrow starlit strip between the memories of yesterday and the hopes of tomorrow. We are here in this mortal life but a few short years, and, after all, about all we can hope to accomplish is that in the hearts of those who survive us there may be a few pleasant memories, the knowledge that we have tried in our humble way to ease the lot of our fellow man. If there is one characteristic that may be said to be common to the Members of the House of Representatives, regardless of party, it is that they glory in the service, not because of any compensation, because God knows that is relatively small in these times of high taxes and inflated cost of living, but they revel in the opportunity to serve their fellow man and to heed the admonition in the Bible of doing unto others as we would have them do unto us. About the most effective thing any of us could strive to do is to ease the burden of our fellows, provide uplift and inspiration wherever we can. Appraised by that criterion, Judge HEIDINGER stood as a tower of strength among us and as a shining beacon of light.

I am grieved that Judge HEIDINGER no longer will be in this body. We will all miss him, but we want to tell his family that he left behind him hundreds of colleagues who mourn his passing.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House it is my sad duty to join with those who have already paid such highly deserved tribute to our departed colleague. During his latter years of service in the House Judge HEIDINGER was a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I doubt if there was a member of the committee more loyal, more interested in the work of that committee than Judge HEIDINGER. He attended all of the meetings. My impression of him was that he was not so much interested in the number of ships that were built, or their size, or the number of airplanes; his interest was in the welfare of the people who ran the ships and the airplanes. This was symbolic of the man's character. It indicated his complete humaneness, his love of mankind rather than matter. So even though he was a member of that committee for comparatively few years, during that period of time he contributed in a large way to the building of the Navy of this country which is our great pride and which is the awe of the world. Every member of the committee came to love Judge HEIDINGER because of that human interest that he constantly displayed.

I think one of the finest compensations we who serve in this House have is the opportunity that is given us in working here to become associated with grand, lovable characters, and in that way perhaps to enrich our own lives and our own character. The feeling of the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs toward Judge HEIDINGER in that regard is shared by every Member of this House who knew that fine gentleman, that lovable man, Judge HEIDINGER. Because of his service here each one of us has been enriched. The country has benefited immeasurably by his service. His loss will be deeply felt by the committee which he served with such distinction.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, the shock that came to us a few minutes ago with the announcement of the passing of our colleague, JIM HEIDINGER, has been somewhat softened by these beautiful and well-deserved tributes from his colleagues.

I visited Judge HEIDINGER at the hospital the day he was leaving for the West to regain his health. I believe there was in him at that time a real determination and courageous feeling that he would overcome his illness and be back with us in a few weeks. When I talked with him that day he was a sick man but courageous. He was kind, cheerful, quiet, and sincere as always.

Mr. Speaker, I join the Members of the House in extending sympathy to Mrs. Heidinger and to his son, who is serving in the armed forces. Illinois and the Nation have lost a fine man with a distinguished career. His colleagues, his large host of friends will miss JIM HEIDINGER.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, it was with a heavy heart that I learned within the hour of the passing of our good friend, the Honorable JAMES V. HEIDINGER. He came to the House the same year I did and we went through the same experiences in becoming acquainted with the routine and work we had to do as Members of the House of Representatives.

I formed a great attachment for Mr. HEIDINGER, his wife, and family. All of us I am sure feel badly this afternoon at his passing.

Last summer Judge HEIDINGER spent nearly a month in my home town trying as best he could to overcome the disease that affected him. I visited him daily while he was there. He visited in my home several times.

Judge HEIDINGER was always a gentleman, he was a man we all loved. I know if he were here this afternoon, and he is here in spirit, he would join in the words I shall now quote from that famous poem of Tennyson's:

Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me!
And may there be no moaning of the bar
When I put out to sea.

But such a tide as moving seems asleep,
Too full for sound or foam,
When that which drew from out the boundless deep
Turns again home.

Twilight and evening bell,
And after that the dark,
And may there be no sadness of farewell
When I embark.

For tho' from out our bourne of time and place,
The flood may bear me far
I hope to see my Pilot face to face
When I have crossed the bar.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, as a neighbor of Mr. HEIDINGER, whose office adjoined mine for some years, I feel it would be entirely out of order for me to use an abundance of superlatives to describe him. Folks do not try to gild lilies or perfume violets. Lilies and violets are beautiful as they are.

Mr. Speaker, JIM HEIDINGER was a Christian gentleman, a good neighbor, a devoted husband, a loving father, and a fine friend. JIM HEIDINGER was just an average citizen transplanted to Washington; a man who loved folks. We will miss him.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly shocked when I learned of the passing of our colleague, Judge HEIDINGER, while on my way to the session today. I knew he had been critically ill, so his death was not altogether unexpected. However, we are never ready to see our friends go.

Several days ago I wrote a letter to Judge HEIDINGER in Arizona and just this week received a reply from Mrs. Heidinger. She said he was greatly pleased to hear from his fellow Members in Congress. I had intended to write

him another letter today and am reminded of the following verse:

Leaves have their time to fall
And flowers to wither at the north wind's breath;
And stars to set, but all,
Thou hath all seasons for thine own, O Death!

Judge HEIDINGER was a kindly and gracious soul. I became very closely attached to him. We came to the House together. He always had a word of encouragement and good cheer, and I shall greatly miss him on this floor. I feel that our country has lost a most valuable Member of Congress, the State of Illinois has lost a most faithful public servant, and I have lost a dear friend. I join with my colleagues in expressing my deep and sincere personal sympathy to Mrs. Heidinger and the other members of the family.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues from the Illinois delegation and the other Members of the House in mourning the loss of our good friend, the Honorable JAMES HEIDINGER, of Fairfield, Ill. Judge HEIDINGER and I, along with several other Members of the Illinois delegation, came into the House of Representatives in the Seventy-seventh Congress. Our offices adjoined one another in the Old House Office Building. It had never been my pleasure before that time to have known the judge very well, but during those 2 years when we were quartered so closly together, I came to know him for the real man that he was. Some mention has been made today of the opportunity afforded here in Congress of meeting substantial citizens from the 435 congressional districts all over America. Certainly, of all the Members of Congress, Judge HEIDINGER personified the true ideal of our representative republican form of government. Judge HEIDINGER was a pioneer citizen of the section of Illinois from which he was elected. He was active and interested in everything that went to make up the life of that community. As a lawyer he practiced, of course, in the courts of law a .d served for a number of years as county judge. In his campaigns throughout his county he met and came to know almost every voter personally and they knew him as well. But his interests extended over and beyond his chosen profession, because he became identified with those things that mean so much in the life of every community—the building industries, the service industries, the churches, and the schools.

When the southern portion of the State of Illinois became identified with the great petroleum industry, Judge HEIDINGER was known to everyone identified with that industry as a conscientious, capable judge in that community, the people in it, the land, and the land values. So I say that Judge HEIDINGER personified the ideals of our republican form of government, because truly, indeed, he represented that section of Illinois from which he was elected.

Those of us from the Illinois delegation had, of course, some notice that his health was not the very best. I visited him several times in the hospital before he left Washington, and only the day before he left I called on him. Then, as always, he demonstrated the kind of a man he was, always thinking of the welfare and interest of others, because even at that late date he demonstrated his personal friendship to me and certainly his personal thoughts of every Member of the Illinois delegation. His appreciation for the substantial family life was demonstrated by his fondness for and interest in all children, and particularly for his own son and wife and their children.

Of all the fine friends that we have had since our stay in Washington, certainly the Judge and Mrs. HEIDINGER were the very best of all of those we knew. I and the members of my family join in extending our sincere sympathies and condolences to Mrs. Heidinger and the judge's fine son now in the country's service, Lt. James S. Heidinger, his daughter-in-law, and grandchildren.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I attempt to say a few words relative to the untimely death of my very good friend and colleague, Judge JIM HEIDINGER.

Some months ago I was in the Naval Hospital. Among my first callers was JIM HEIDINGER. I learned to know him during my illness. At that time he seemingly was in perfect health, and when he entered my room he brought sunshine and joy and a real human spirit that was exemplified only in JIM HEIDINGER.

Mr. Speaker, the people of his district have lost a very capable Representative, the people of the Nation have lost a true American citizen, and I have lost a loyal friend. I am sure that I, too, want to join in extending my sympathy to his splendid wife and fine son.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD].

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of our friend and colleague, JAMES V. HEIDINGER, of Fairfield, Ill., the Congress has sustained a grievous loss.

It has been a rare privilege to have known and been associated with such a kindly, modest, unassuming, and true friend.

Judge, as he was so familiarly known, loved his State and his country. He displayed his devotion by his many worthy achievements, and his name will be long remembered as one who wrought much and well for the district in which he lived and the State and Nation to which he devoted his life.

Judge HEIDINGER was an able lawyer and was elected county judge in 1914, which office he held for 18 years.

To me, Mr. Speaker, our late colleague typified the real America—a contemporary of the school that produced our sturdy forefathers. His passing will not only be a great loss to his colleagues here in Congress but to his host of friends. His lifetime of good deeds will be an everlasting tribute to his memory.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD with reference to our late colleague.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we Members, particularly of Illinois, mourn the passing of our good friend, Judge HEIDINGER. We shall all miss his wise and kindly counsel, that he was so generous in giving whenever asked, which was often, by his colleagues. Judge HEIDINGER was perhaps one of the most highly regarded men in the House of Representatives. His most noted qualities were his most lovable character, his kindness, his gentlemanly character, and, above all, his intense love of his country. On a few occasions, I have heard matters of legislation discussed in the cloak room, and if any one brought up the subject of a man's attitude and his vote on a certain piece of legislation that it might affect him politically, Judge HEIDINGER always stated he did not care what the political effect would be that he was going to vote his convictions, and I might say I am sure Judge HEIDINGER never wavered from that position. Judge HEIDINGER was of the old school of Americanism, and could not tolerate any wavering of loyalty to the Constitution. He was a firm believer in free enterprise and our republican form of Government.

Judge HEIDINGER's sweetness of character, even in times of heated debate among his colleagues, always stood out, and by that fine poise that dominated Judge HEIDINGER at all times often had a tendency to temper the emotional outbursts of his colleagues.

We have all profited by the great privilege of having associated daily with Judge HEIDINGER these past few years. Not only his home district, the Twenty-fourth District of Illinois, not only the State of Illinois, but the House of Representatives, has suffered a loss in his passing from our midst.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, one of the saddest features of one's service in this great legislative body is the time when a colleague, by the stroke of inscrutable destiny, is removed from our midst. The handclasp which once gladdened our day is no more—yet the memory of the fellowship and of the statesmanship will linger with us throughout the years. Born on a farm near Mount Erie, Wayne County, Ill., JAMES VANDAVEER HEIDINGER loved his fine people of the Twenty-fourth Congressional District who made possible his serving in Congress. He has served and served well. A lover of the soil, he wanted to be known at all times as a dirt farmer and endeavored to farm his land which today is producing oil. Having been a farmer boy, a school teacher, a lawyer, a judge, and Congressman, a Mason, a Shriner, and an active member in the Methodist Church, "the Judge" was known to a large circle of friends who cherished his excellent counsel and advice. He labored among many nationalities, of many creeds, and many faiths. He labored in the office and in the mart, in the sick

ward, in the temples, and in the halls of justice; but his labors were all united in one great cause, the betterment of humanity. A wonderful family man, he loved very dearly his son, James S., a lieutenant in the United States Navy, his grandchildren, Sharon Elizabeth and James V., and their charming mother, and the beautiful association which he and his fine wife enjoyed will ever be an inspiration and example to us all. As a statesman, he was a great lover of the Constitution, having the best interests of his country at heart always. For the 4 years that I have known the Judge and his fine family, they became our very closest friends. We cherished the companionship and our visits together. During my last visit with him in Phoenix he realized that his stay on earth was short, but had every confidence in the future, appreciating the comradeship and association with his friends and colleagues in the House of Representatives. I know that my life has been made richer because of intimate contacts and genial fellowship with this great and grand friend and fellow worker. We recall here his zeal and unselfish interest, and we glory in his accomplishments. These shall remain with us—our heritage forever.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 200), as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JAMES V. HEIDINGER, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That a committee of four Members of the House, with such Members of the Senate as may be joined, be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the funeral committee the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON].

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the further resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 23, 1945, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in open session at 10:30 a. m. on Friday, March 23, 1945, in the Committee Room, 356 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

340. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budgets for a group of war agencies for the fiscal year 1946 containing estimates of appropriation in the amount of $1,120,453,300 (H. Doc. No. 120); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

341. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946, in the amount of $550,000 (H. Doc. No. 121); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2113. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 358). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 359. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 360. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. H. R. 44. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the United States Government"; with amendment (Rept. No. 361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2738. A bill to authorize acceptance of a site for a national cemetery in South Dakota to be designated as the Verendrye National Memorial Cemetery, for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service, of former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable, and certain other persons as provided for in United States Code, title 24, section 281, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 2739. A bill to create in the Veterans' Administration a board to be known as the Federal Board of Psychiatrists; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 2740. A bill to increase wartime service-connected death compensation or pension to widows and children of persons who shall have died as the direct result of combat service in World War No. 1 or World War No. 2; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota:

H. R. 2741. A bill to provide for the donation by the United States of the site of the original Fort Buford, N. Dak., to the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2742. A bill to amend section 9 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act, approved December 21, 1928; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 2743. A bill to protect Klamath Indian livestock; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 2744. A bill to provide for the general welfare and advancement of the Klamath Indians in Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2745. A bill to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1921; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. Res. 201. Resolution to investigate the achievements of Sister Elizabeth Kenny in the treatment of infantile paralysis; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2746. A bill for the relief of Annarae Weiss; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS of New York:

H. R. 2747. A bill for the relief of George A. West; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 2748. A bill for the relief of the Dubuque & Wisconsin Bridge Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2749. A bill for the relief of the parents of Robert Francis O'Toole; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 2750. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Marlin, Andrew J. Perlik, and Albert N. James; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

236. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of John J. Scher and 30 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

237. Also, petition of George Hyatt and 30 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

238. Also, petition of J. A. Pons and 29 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

239. Also, petition of J. W. Trimble and 32 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

240. By Mr. PLOESER: Petition of 12 signers requesting the Congress of the United States to permit the use of live decoys for the 1945 fall duck hunting season; to the Committee on Agriculture.

241. By Mr. STEFAN: Petition of the Nebraska State Legislature, memorializing the

Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to permit old-age pensioners to earn wages without penalty; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

242. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging official recognition by the United States of the right of the people of Poland and other small nations to determine the form and kind of their own government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 23, 1945

(Legislative day of Friday, March 16, 1945)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, beyond the circle of whose all-embracing love we cannot drift, unworthy we come to stand in Thy presence; yet with contrite hearts we pray that by Thy grace we may cast away the works of darkness and put upon us the armor of light in these testing days of Thy judgment in the earth when men are reaping the awful harvest they have sown. As Thy revealing light falls upon our lives and shows in them the shadows of shame that keep us from our best, save us from mean excuses and evasions. For our trifling with candor, for loving darkness better than light, for contentment with low living, for bitter tempers, for selfish pride, for unbridled tongues, for hardened hearts, chasten us with sincere repentance. Grant us forgiveness and the determination to worthily serve Thee and our fellows in newness of life. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, March 22, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Connally	Hoey
Austin	Cordon	Johnson, Calif.
Bailey	Donnell	Johnson, Colo.
Ball	Downey	Johnston, S. C.
Bankhead	Eastland	Kilgore
Barkley	Ellender	La Follette
Bilbo	Ferguson	Langer
Brewster	Fulbright	Lucas
Bridges	George	McCarran
Briggs	Gerry	McClellan
Brooks	Green	McFarland
Buck	Guffey	McKellar
Burton	Gurney	McMahon
Bushfield	Hart	Magnuson
Byrd	Hatch	Maybank
Capehart	Hawkes	Mead
Capper	Hayden	Millikin
Chandler	Hickenlooper	Mitchell
Chavez	Hill	Moore
Morse	Russell	Tydings
Murdock	Saltonstall	Vandenberg
Murray	Shipstead	Wagner
O'Daniel	Smith	Wheeler
O'Mahoney	Stewart	Wherry
Overton	Taft	White
Pepper	Taylor	Wiley
Radcliffe	Thomas, Okla.	Willis
Reed	Thomas, Utah	Wilson
Revercomb	Tobey	Young
Robertson	Tunnell	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent on an inspection tour for the United States Navy.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following business was transacted:

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on March 22, 1945, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 77. An act for the relief of Lindon A. Long;

S. 167. An act for the relief of Perkins Gins, formerly Perkins Oil Co., of Memphis, Tenn.;

S. 321. An act for the relief of James M. Hiler;

S. 515. An act for the relief of Wallace Robertson, Henry Bowker, and Edward Parisian, and for other purposes; and

S. 525. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval training center, Farragut, Idaho, on July 10, 1944.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Director of the Office of War Information and the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission (Office for Emergency Management), transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending June 30, 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a revised estimate of personnel requirements for the Board for the quarter ended June 30, 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Legislative Resolution 11

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to immediately make adequate appropriation so that the coordinated plan for the control and use of the waters of the Missouri River Basin can be executed as expeditiously as is consistent with the public economy

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation providing for additional flood control and also for a further development of navigation on the Missouri River; and

"Whereas plans are being made for an even greater development of the Missouri River including a great development of irrigation; and

"Whereas said improvements should be made at the earliest possible time in view of the destruction of life and property and the loss to industry, agriculture, and commerce caused by recent floods and the continuous waste of valuable water resources within this basin; and

"Whereas improvements of the type contemplated have been carried on in the past by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, and the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior; and

"Whereas the said Government agencies have had charge of such developments for many years and have planned and are prepared to execute the said works of improvement with no delay at the conclusion of the war; and

"Whereas it has been suggested that in order to further the progress of this development, a Missouri Valley Authority should be formed with broad powers similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska:*

"1. That we endorse the aforementioned improvement program and recommend and urge upon the Congress of the United States of America that the coordinated plan for the control and use of the waters of the Missouri River Basin, as now authorized by law, be given immediate adequate appropriation so that the plan can be executed as expeditiously as is consistent with the public economy.

"2. That we commend the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for their action in effecting coordination of their activities within the Missouri River Basin.

"3. That while it may be necessary to create some permanent administrative coordinating agency to regulate the use of the water resources when development has been further advanced along the Missouri River and there is no objection to calling it a Missouri Valley Authority, we object, however, to granting to such administrative agency unchecked authority to engage in private business, operate farms, remove hundreds of thousands of acres of land from the tax rolls, take over the administration of education and of local and State laws, and in general to do the economic planning for the entire area.

"4. That a copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the legislature of each State bordering or through which the Missouri River flows."

Petitions of several citizens of New York City, N. Y., praying that Italy be recognized as a full ally of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Eula A. Stitt, Hobart, Okla., relative to the

treatment by the Veterans' Bureau of Tony L. Axtell, a veteran of World War No. 1, and praying for an investigation of his case; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina; ordered to lie on the table:

"House resolution urging the observance by all citizens and sections of South Carolina of the midnight closing or curfew promulgated by War Mobilizer James F. Byrnes, and pledging the backing and support of this State to War Mobilizer Byrnes in his efforts to further the successful prosecution of the war

"Whereas War Mobilizer James F. Byrnes has called upon the Nation to observe the midnight closing or curfew of certain businesses and establishments, which closing or curfew is regarded by him as necessary and appropriate for the successful prosecution of the war; and

"Whereas all sections of the Nation immediately took steps to cooperate in the war effort by the observance of said midnight closing or curfew; and

"Whereas it was sought thereby to conserve the Nation's power and fuel resources, to minimize absenteeism in war work, to reduce the strain on overloaded transportation facilities, and to give to the men and women of our fighting forces concrete evidence that our people are wholeheartedly supporting them and are prepared to make any sacrifice which we may be called upon to make to hasten the day of final victory; and

"Whereas we feel that, compared to the sacrifices being made by our men and women hourly on the battlefields of the world, the observance of the midnight closing or curfew is little enough to ask of the American people, and that all citizens and sections of the Nation should readily respond to the Nation's call: Be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives, That we call upon every citizen and section of the State of South Carolina to respond wholeheartedly and without reservation to the request of War Mobilizer James F. Byrnes for the midnight closing or curfew and we commend him for his action in calling upon the people to make this contribution to the war effort, and pledge him the loyalty and support of the State of South Carolina in this, and all other matters, in which he asks for the aid of the American people; be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house forthwith transmit copies of this resolution to the Senators and Congressmen from South Carolina."

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions of sundry citizens of Cambridge and Hurlock, Md., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 599) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A petition of sundry citizens of Pittsburgh, Pa., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 623) to prohibit the paid advertising of alcoholic beverages by radio in certain circumstances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

LIQUOR DURING THE WAR EFFORT—PETITION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference a petition of sundry citizens of Bath, Maine, dealing with the question of liquor during the war effort.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petition presented by the Senator from Maine will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF GEORGIA—FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a joint resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Georgia endorsing Federal aid to education.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Resolution 87

Whereas the members of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia believe that the education of the children and youth of the United States is essential to the perpetuity of American democracy and a high level of income and productivity of the people of the Nation; and

Whereas we are fully informed of the great differences in educational opportunity, not only within the States, especially within the State of Georgia, but among the several States of the Union; and

Whereas we believe that the Federal Government, together with the States and the local communities of the Nation, has an obligation to furnish the financial resources to guarantee an American standard of educational opportunity to all of the children of the Nation; and

Whereas we believe that the Federal Government should grant financial assistance to the States for education, leaving the control of education to the States and local communities; and

Whereas we believe that the history of Federal aid to education fully demonstrates that this can be done: Be it

Resolved, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to enact, at the earliest possible date, Senate bill 181, introduced by Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah; and House bill 1296, introduced by the Honorable ROBERT RAMSPECK, Representative in the Congress, Fifth District, Georgia; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States Senate and to the Speaker of the House of the Congress; to the President of the United States; to the authors of the Senate and House bills; to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor; to the Honorable GRAHAM A. BARDEN, chairman of the House Committee on Education; to the 2 Senators of the State of Georgia, and to each of the 10 Representatives of the State of Georgia in the House of the Congress.

In house: read and adopted February 15, 1945.

In senate: read and adopted March 2, 1945.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the General Assembly of Georgia identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.)

RESOLUTIONS OF COLUMBUS DAY CITIZENS, INC., REQUESTING RECOGNITION OF ITALY AS AN ALLY OF UNITED NATIONS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a resolution adopted on March 20, 1945, by the Columbus Day Citizens, Inc., at a meeting held in New York City. The executives of this organization represent more than 500,000 Americans of Italian ancestry in the city of New York.

The resolution pays tribute to the actions of the Italian people in overthrowing Mussolini and the forces of fascism, and likewise commends them for their cooperation with the Allied forces in the struggle against a common foe. The resolution gives voice to the plea of the Italian people that Italy be declared an ally of the United States, and that an invitation be accorded to Italy to participate in the forthcoming San Francisco Conference.

The diplomatic and political relations between Italy and the United Nations have been steadily progressing since President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill addressed the Italian people prior to the landing of the liberation forces in Italy. In that first message to the Italian people they were asked to overthrow the forces of Hitler and Mussolini. Later President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill promised that self-government would be restored to Italy as speedily as possible, and those pledges have been kept. The latest step in this program was the appointment just a short time ago of an Italian Ambassador to the United States.

It would be in keeping with the principles set forth in the "four freedoms" and the Atlantic Charter to invite Italy to the San Francisco Conference. Italy is cooperating with us in the defense of democracy. Italy has contributed much to the civilization of the world. We should make provision for her people to be represented at the council table at San Francisco.

I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference the resolutions adopted by the Columbus Day Citizens, Inc., held on March 20, 1945, New York City, and also a list of the officers and members of the organizations.

There being no objection, the resolutions and list of officers and members were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution requesting the United States Government and other Allied Nations to recognize Italy as an ally and invite Italy to the San Francisco Conference

Whereas it has been amply proved that the role of Italy in this war, prior to its invasion by the United Nations, was forced upon its people by their Fascist and Nazi dictators; and

Whereas history has demonstrated that the Italian people, prior to their enslavement by Mussolini, were imbued with a democratic spirit and tradition; and

Whereas with the military aid made possible by the United Nations, the Italian people have been quick to overthrow and repudiate the Fascist-Nazi forces by which they had been dominated; and

Whereas immediately upon the landing of our troops upon Italian soil, the people of Italy gave spontaneous and fervent expression of welcome to the soldiers of the Allied forces, and have since spiritedly taken up arms and courageously fought side by side with them for the cause of democracy; and

Whereas the people of Italy, by their unstinting sacrifice of blood and treasure have given conclusive proof of the sincerity of their desire and determination to give their utmost cooperation to the United Nations in the common purpose of destroying the Nazi-Fascist power; and

Whereas these sacrifices have been publicly recognized and praised by the President of the United States and by other leaders of the United Nations; and

Whereas the ravages of war and of misrule under the Fascist regime have created political and economic conditions which are causing appalling suffering and despair among the 45,000,000 people of Italy; and

Whereas the continuance of these conditions may result in their spiritual and social demoralization to an extent that would require generations for recovery therefrom, and thereby lessen the contributions which the Italian people, by reason of their culture and industry, would otherwise be enabled to make to the advancement of civilization, and to the promotion of international good will; and

Whereas it is believed that recognition of Italy as an ally by the United Nations would give a powerful uplift to the spirit of its people, and strengthen them with renewed faith in the principles of democracy; and

Whereas on April 25, 1945 at San Francisco a conference of representatives of the United Nations will commence, for the preliminary discussion of the problems of world peace and security: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this committee hereby respectfully urge that the United Nations extend their formal recognition to Italy as an ally and that an invitation be accorded to Italy to participate in the San Francisco Conference; and it is further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Members of both Houses of Congress and to the Secretary of State.

OFFICERS OF COLUMBUS DAY CITIZENS COMMITTEE, INC.

Officers: Generoso Pope, president; Dr. Peter Amoroso, Hon. Anthony Campagna, John De Martino, Hon. Paul P. Rao, vice presidents; Joseph Pirozzi, treasurer; Hon. S. Samuel Di Falco, secretary; Joseph Biandi, counsel; Miss Carlotta N. V. Schiapelli, executive secretary.

Board of directors: Hon. Ferdinand Pecora, chairman; Charles Rao, vice chairman; Dr. Peter Amoroso, Hon. Anthony Campagna, Michael Castaldi, John De Martino, Hon. S. Samuel Di Falco, Hon. Anthony Di Giovanna, Michael Del Balso, Roy Garofano, Joseph Pirozzi, Generoso Pope, Hon. Paul P. Rao, Vincent Russo, Daniel Scocozza, Michael Scuatorchio.

Executive council: Columbia Association of department of correction, fire department, police department, post office (New York), post office (Brooklyn), sanitation department, transportation department.

LIST OF OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE COLUMBUS DAY CITIZENS COMMITTEE, INC., REPRESENTING MEMBERSHIP OF ORGANIZATIONS TOTALING 665,500

Generoso Pope, publisher of Il Progresso Italo-Americano.

Hon. Ferdinand Pecora, justice, supreme court.

Dr. Peter F. Amoroso, commissioner of correction.

Hon. Anthony Campagna, commissioner, board of education.

Hon. Paul P. Rao, Assistant Attorney General, United States Department of Justice, representing organizations with a membership of 100,000.

John J. De Martino, assistant chief inspector, police department.

Joseph Pirozzi, Chief, Alien Division, Treasury Department, Internal Revenue Bureau.

Joseph Biandi, attorney, law firm, Alvord & Alvord, Washington, D. C.

Hon. S. Samuel Di Falco, councilman, city of New York, representing organizations with a membership of 125,000.

Hon. Anthony Di Giovanna, councilman, city of New York, representing organizations with a membership of 140,000.

Michael Scuatorchio, representing American Democratic Organizations in New Jersey with a membership of 250,000.

Michael Castaldi, attorney, representing organizations in Long Island with a membership of 30,000.

Daniel Scocozza, president, Consolidated Carting Co., representing organizations in the Bronx with a membership of 1,000.

Vincent Russo, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, representing organizations in Staten Island with a membership of 10,000.

Charles Rao, president, Arc Electric Construction Co.

Michael Del Balso, president, Del Balso Construction Co.

Roy Garofano, president, Garofano Construction Co.

Miss Carlotta N. V. Schiapelli, executive secretary, immigration, social service and naturalization.

Lt. Samuel V. Terranova, president, Columbia Association, police department with a membership of 1,000.

Thomas Di Candia, president, Columbia Association, department of correction, with a membership of 100.

Salvatore J. Lucchese, president of Columbia Association, New York Post Office, with a membership of 2,000.

Frank Volpe, president, Columbia Association, Brooklyn Post Office, with a membership of 800.

Nicholas Lo Buglio, president, sanitation department, with a membership of 5,000.

Capt. Salvatore Rogers, president, Columbia Association, fire department, with a membership of 400.

Joseph Morena, president, Columbia Association, transportation department, with a membership of 200.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 783. A bill to authorize the making of advances of accrued pay owing to certain disabled members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TUNNELL:

S. 784. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. John T. Webb, Sr., to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BILBO:

S. 785. A bill to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the superintendent of weights, measures, and markets of and for the District of Columbia; and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1921; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ENTERTAINMENT OF DISTINGUISHED VISITORS BY FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. CONNALLY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 109), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the unexpended balance of amounts made available under Senate Resolution 163, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, agreed to July 1, 1943, shall remain available for expenditure during the remainder of the Seventy-ninth Congress for the purposes stated in said resolution.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO SUBMIT REPORT AND FILE MOTIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment or recess of the Senate following today's session authority be given the Committee on Appropriations to report House bill 2374, the first deficiency bill, 1945, and to file motions in writing to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI in connection with certain amendments to that bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT AT TESTIMONIAL DINNER FOR DR. ABBA HILLEL SILVER

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a testimonial dinner given for Dr. Abba Hillel Silver, March 21, 1945, at the Hotel Commodore, New York, which appears in the Appendix.]

ACADEMIC FREEDOM—ARTICLE FROM PM

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Academic Freedom" from PM for March 22, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BROTHERHOOD OF MAN—RADIO BROADCAST BY REV. H. B. RICKETTS

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio broadcast by Rev. H. B. Ricketts, on February 18, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DUMBARTON OAKS PLAN—ARTICLE BY DOROTHY THOMPSON

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to the Dumbarton Oaks plan, written by Dorothy Thompson, and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 19, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADMINISTRATOR, RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION—AUBREY W. WILLIAMS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration has been before the Senate since about February 2. During most of the time the nomination being under consideration by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The nomination was reported back to the Senate, and has had the active consideration of the Senate proper during the past week, beginning Monday. I see no reason why a vote cannot be had upon it very shortly.

The senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has signified a desire to submit some comments upon the nomination before the final vote is taken. On a former occasion I suggested to the Senate that before the vote was taken I desired to present for the record some data which have been placed in my hands. I now ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a portion of the statement made by Mr. Aubrey W. Williams during the hearings before the committee. The statement is in the nature of questions and answers, and sets forth, in the main, the background and record of Mr. Williams. I ask that the portions I send to the desk as indicated by pencil marks be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. For the record, state your full name.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Aubrey W. Williams.

The CHAIRMAN. Where do you reside?

Mr. WILLIAMS. 5107 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Va.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you resided in Virginia?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have resided there since 1936.

The CHAIRMAN. You claim to be a resident of Washington at the present time and residing in Virginia as a matter of convenience?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You are a native of what State?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. In what year were you born?

Mr. WILLIAMS. 1890.

The CHAIRMAN. What month and what day?

Mr. WILLIAMS. August 23, 1890.

The CHAIRMAN. Before you are subjected to questions by the committee, you may proceed to make a statement of your background, leading up to the time you were a boy, giving information about your educational qualifications, and, after you got through school, tell the committee what work you have been engaged in.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, as I have just stated, I was born in Alabama—Springville—in 1890.

Senator WHEELER. We will not hold that against you, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My parents moved from Springville shortly after I was born, and my father opened a blacksmith shop in Birmingham. I grew up in Birmingham, Ala.

I began work rather early in life. My first permanent job was when I was 9 years old, in a department store in Birmingham, and I continued in that type of work until I was 21, at which time I had a position as assistant manager of a department in a men's furnishing store. I had not had the privilege of going to school in my youth, and I set out at that time to get an education.

I was able to enter school up in the mountains of Tennessee, and was there at Maryville College for 5 years.

From there I went to Cincinnati for a year, and went abroad at that time, in 1917, with the Y. M. C. A. After I was in France about 6 months I entered the Foreign Legion in the war and served with the legion until the American Army reached France, and then I entered the First Division of the American Army and saw service until the war was over.

The CHAIRMAN. What branch of the service were you in?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was in the Fifth Field Artillery. I then entered the University of Bordeaux in France, together with thousands of other American soldiers that took that privilege, and took a degree over there.

I came back to this country and reentered the University of Cincinnati in order to get my degree there.

Following that, I went to Wisconsin and was there employed for 10 years in work having to do with public administration of all forms of public assistance. That was a citizens' organization, the purpose of which was to improve administrative procedures and to work for better administration in all forms of public assistance.

Senator BILBO. Was that a private or public job?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That was a private citizens' organization, but its work had to do with public agencies that expended money in behalf of all forms of public assistance.

Senator CORDON. What was the name of it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Wisconsin Conference of Social Work.

I taught some at the university while I was there.

Following that, I was employed by the American Public Welfare Association, which in 1931 was engaged in cooperation with the R. F. C. that had been established at that time to loan funds to States for relief purposes, and in that capacity I was sent to the State of Mississippi, where I was put in charge of organizing the work there for the expenditure of a loan of $1,000,000.

For a period of months I engaged in the organization of relief in that State, and, incidentally, we established the work principle with respect to unemployment relief in the State of Mississippi at that time.

Following that, I was sent to Texas, where I organized the same type of work under Governor Ferguson in connection with the R. F. C. in the spring of 1933; the R. F. C. was still operating prior to March 4 in 1933.

Following 5 months in Texas, I was called to Washington by Mr. Hopkins and employed as regional representative for the seven Southwestern States for F. E. R. A. That was in June 1933.

Senator BANKHEAD. What is the F. E. R. A.?

Mr. WILLIAMS. F. E. R. A. was the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. It was the beginning appropriation for the relief of the unemployed by this administration—W. P. A., $500,000,000, that was appropriated by Congress at that time. That was in May when I was employed by Mr. Hopkins, and then in August I was called to Washington and made his assistant.

The following January I was appointed as Deputy Administrator of F. E. R. A., and at that time there had been created the C. W. A.—the Civil Works Administration—and I was appointed Deputy Administrator of Civil Works. In that capacity I had the responsibility for the entire operation under Mr. Hopkins, of the organization, and putting to work some 4,000,000 people during that winter of 1933–34.

As you gentlemen will recall, the C. W. A. was terminated in the spring of 1934, and we went back to direct relief of F. E. R. A. I was continued as Deputy Administrator under that, and in 1935, with the passage of the $4,800,000,000 bill, I was made Deputy Administrator of the Works Progress Administration.

I continued in that capacity until the first of the year 1939. During that period, I continued to have charge of operations of W. P. A. under Mr. Hopkins and all the first of the year 1939. During that period, carry out the purposes of that act.

In the year of 1935, July 1935, there was established, by the President through Executive order, the National Youth Administration, and in addition to being the Deputy Administrator of W. P. A., I was also appointed Executive Director of the National Youth Administration, and organized that work in the several States, and directed it from its beginning.

In 1939, when I was relieved of the Deputy Administratorship of the W. P. A., I was made Administrator of the National Youth Administration, and it was separated from the W. P. A. and placed outside upon its own, and I gave my full time from then on to N. Y. A.

Inasmuch as I was entirely responsible for that particular job, it is probably more germane to the question of competence for me to discuss that in greater detail than in the case of the other, although there were a great many times when I was completely responsible and in charge of W. P. A.

In N. Y. A. we expended a total of something like $662,000,000 through a period of 8 years, from 1935 to 1943. The highest expenditure in any one year was something like $155,000,000.

During that period, we gave employment on out-of-school projects, and on in-school projects, at the high-school and college levels of 4,800,000 separate individual youths. We had organizations in each of the States of the Union. We had at one time something like 23,000 paid employees other than project employees, and these people represented every form of professional and technical background.

In that work, we had to do with some 29,000 high schools, where we had organized the work in high schools in cooperation with the respective administrative officers.

In providing work for young people, we sought as much as we could to work projects out in terms of the ideas and desires of the local communities, and in order to do that we established local committees of citizens who were interested in young people. This continued over a period of years. At one time we had some 2,500 citizens' committees who, in connection with our administrative personnel, worked out the type of project that we were to carry on.

In one year, particularly, the highest year, where we had the largest number employed, we were operating at one time something above 19,000 separate projects for young people. These projects were of all character and variety, as you gentlemen are fully aware, I think. It was a part of the philosophy of the thing, as some of us conceived it, that these young people should do much of the work in connection with building of shops and dormitories, and so forth. They built their dormitories. They built their buildings. They did their own cooking. They did their own housekeeping. They made a great part of their own clothing. They made the furniture. They repaired automobiles. They salvaged thousands of automobiles which were used on projects.

In other words, it was a training project for them, and we used the opportunity, in the building of a plant, to give them work. So that it did two things: It provided them with practical work experience, and it cut down the total overhead cost that would be required to carry it on.

Senator WHEELER. In Montana, you set them to work repairing airplanes and they repaired and rebuilt airplanes out there.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir. We had a project like that at Helena.

Senator WHEELER. At Helena, Mont.?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Senator WHEELER. I know. In other words, many of the young men that worked on that project in Helena were given very high positions over in the Boeing factory, and other factories on the coast. They became expert mechanics in that way.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

At the beginning of the war, we began changing completely over to a mechanical program, where all the youth were put into mechanical and metal type of work training. In order to do that we had to build plants. We had to build shops. The youth themselves repaired and modernized old machinery. We went around to the back of the machine shops of America and assembled something like 25,000 pieces of machinery, and the youth, under technical direction, rebuilt those machines for use in training. They also built well over 400 shops which were used for work-training purposes.

When the N. Y. A. was abolished, there were 718 mechanical shops in operation, giving work training to around 60,000 young people, and turning out on an average of 1,000 of the young people a day that were either going into the war plants or were going into the various branches of the services. The average cost of this work over the 8 years, was $138 per youth per year.

Senator WILLIS. You mean those that were training in these 718 shops?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is a total figure, Senator. That is the total cost—administrative, supervisory, and everything—was around $138 per youth per year.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the N. Y. A. program operate in every State?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; it operated in every State.

The CHAIRMAN. And in each State it was similar to the other States?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; practically the same. There was a great variety, due to the local conditions and desires of the local citizens, but the administrative set-up was identical throughout the whole country.

Senator WILLIS. How did you coordinate it with the technical training of schools and industry?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We coordinated it with the schools in this way, that we did no teaching of theory. We only did the actual supervision on the machine, and if there was theory to be taught, we made arrangements with the schools whereby they established classes to teach, for instance, like the mathematics of metals, blueprints, and all of that.

Senator BANKHEAD. What was done in the way of keeping the boys and girls in schools, providing schooling opportunities for them?

Mr. WILLIAMS. There was a total, Senator, of 2,100,000 young people during the 8 years that were given work in schools in order that they might have the means whereby to attend schools.

The division is about 700,000 who were able to go to college and the remainder were at the high-school level.

Senator ELLENDER. How were they paid, Mr. Williams?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the colleges?

Senator ELLENDER. Yes; and in the high schools?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the colleges we set a top limit of $15 a month for the individual students, and they were paid on an hourly basis.

Senator ELLENDER. Who selected the students?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The college authorities selected them. They supervised the work and kept the work records, and then submitted to us each month a pay roll, and we sent the check direct to the individual youth.

Senator ELLENDER. These boys who were selected by these colleges actually performed work for the colleges?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Senator ELLENDER. And the same for the elementary schools?

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the high schools.

Senator WILLIS. What was the minimum age?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Sixteen.

The CHAIRMAN. For the record, state the class of youngsters that were appealed to to enter this N. Y. A. activity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They were the needy youth who were in the families, the total earnings of which were less than $1,500 for the year. There were always two or three youth applying for each one that could be given a work stipend.

The CHAIRMAN. What percent were boys?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Senator, I do not know that I could answer that.

The CHAIRMAN. Was it something like 65 percent boys and 35 percent girls? The preponderance were boys?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the preponderance were boys, but I could not give you an exact figure on that.

The CHAIRMAN. State very briefly the major activities that were engaged in. In my State, you had different kinds of shops.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You had strictly vocational shops where the boys were taught automobile mechanics, and then you had electrical shops. I would like for you to state for the record the different branches of activity that were stressed under the N. Y. A. program.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the beginning we stressed road building, bridge building, construction work, the building of schoolhouses, of which we built something like 6,000 of various character. I think the most expensive one that we built was something over $250,000. They had an average value of something like $6,000 per school.

For the girls in the early days we had home demonstration work; cooking, sewing, garment making, and that type of work, and clerical work. We organized a great many clerical work projects in connection with the various branches and subdivisions of the Government, where we had a pool of them being trained, and they got their practice work in connection with the county tax assessor, the county clerk, and so on.

Senator WHEELER. I don't know what you did in other States, but as far as my State is concerned, I feel it was the most constructive program of any of the relief programs that were administered during that whole time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, when the war came, we went into a strictly mechanical program, as such.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, this record shows that Mr. Williams has been in Washington between 9 and 10 years. He entered the N. Y. A. organization on July 26, 1935. That was when the organization had its existence by virtue of an Executive order. The order creating the agency of course was made by the President, and Mr. Williams had charge of it from that date.

The record further shows that on July 13, 1939, Mr. Williams was confirmed by the Senate as the head of the National Youth Administration, and I exhibit to the Senate the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 84, part 8, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session. On page 9032 of the RECORD I find the following notation:

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams to be National Youth Administrator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That is the record of the confirmation of Mr. Williams to be the Administrator of the National Youth Administration. He was confirmed unanimously.

Mr. President, Mr. Williams served until the agency was terminated on September 10, 1943. So he was the head of the National Youth Administration for about 8 years. The record which he made in that capacity is the basis upon which he secured his present appointment. It likewise is the basis for the opposition to Mr. Williams.

If a man serves the public, and thereafter is appointed to a major position and his nomination comes before the Senate for confirmation, the record of his service is scrutinized very carefully, and if any sort of objections can be found, they are urged against confirmation. From my point of view, while the record made by Mr. Williams as National Youth Administrator could not be said to be a perfect one, because perfection does not exist in administrative positions, certainly it stands very high. During the time of his service he so organized the agency, covering every State spending $650,000,000, and embracing more than 20,000 employees, that it trained upward of 5,000,000 boys and girls who did not have the opportunity of attending the common schools, the high schools, and the colleges of the Nation.

Mr. President, as a result of this training program these youngsters, taken in the main from underprivileged homes, were given the advantage of instruction, which they could not obtain elsewhere, and the instructions were of such nature that when the war came on the training which had been given to them enabled them to step out and do something worth while. As I view the situation, the N. Y. A. was an organization training boys and girls for the war effort. They were of such an age at the time they were being trained that they could receive instruction in vocational training along lines which made them valuable when the war came on.

I think that if Mr. Williams had known the war was coming, which he could not have known in 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, or even to September 1939, he could not have done more to help the country prepare than he did in training these youngsters. In my opinion, the activities of the N. Y. A. resulted in the production of what might be called a stock pile of young men and young women ready for the war effort.

Speaking from the standpoint of my own State, I can say the N. Y. A. was very popular in Oklahoma. Every boy and every girl who could gain admission to the organization sought it, and to the extent that money was available, they entered the training. When it became necessary to enlist men for industry every boy in my State who could be induced to enter industry was sought after, and literally carloads of boys trained in the N. Y. A. were recruited and sent to the Northeast and the West to enter industrial pursuits. Youngsters from my State were sought after in New England. They went to industrial plants in the North, as well as on the west coast, to make war goods. So I wish to approve the record made by the National Youth Administration under the leadership of the National Director, Aubrey W. Williams.

I desire to submit this inquiry: Who is there among us who has done as much Nation-wide to provide a stock pile for any activity furthering the war effort as did the N. Y. A. in the early days of its organization? I know of no one who did more than did Williams, and I can think of no one who has done as much.

There were only a very few stock piles accumulated prior to the war, and one of those consisted of the boys and girls educated and trained directly for the war effort in the National Youth Administration. I might suggest that another stock pile had to do with cotton. Only one consisted of men and women. The Army certainly had no stock pile developed when the war broke out in the way of an Army. The personnel of the Army fell to as low as 120,000 men. With the complement of officers it consisted of about 127,000 shortly prior to the time the war broke out in Europe. That is the only Army we had, save the National Guard. So the Army did not prepare and have on hand a stock pile of soldiers when the war broke out in Europe. Neither did the Navy Department have a

stock pile of Navy equipment and naval personnel. Aubrey Williams had upward of 5,000,000 youngsters trained and ready to enter the factories for the making of war materials.

Mr. President, I am not criticizing the Army, but the Army did not have any stock pile of modern rifles when the war began. It did have two and one-half million of the old Army rifles used in World War No. 1, the single-shot Enfield and the Springfield rifles. The Army had scarcely a single modern repeating rifle. After the war broke out in 1939, a joint committee of the Senate and House made a tour of the Army plants and camps throughout the Nation. This committee traveled 10,000 miles before it found a single repeating rifle. That rifle was found at a cavalry camp at Leavenworth, Kans.

Mr. President, the Army did not have at that time a stock pile of rifles, a stock pile of planes, a stock pile of munitions, or a stock pile of powder. Yet Williams did have upward of 5,000,000 youngsters in a so-called stock pile of young men and women, ready for the war, not only for enlistment in the Army and the Navy and the Air Corps but youngsters ready, sought after, to enter the defense plants.

Mr. President, in addition to this great stock pile of youngsters, we did have a stock pile of cotton which at one time was thought to be very embarrassing, but it has not proved to be embarrassing, because it has served the needs of the Nation during the period of this war. We likewise had a stock pile of wheat which has served the needs of the Nation during the period of this war. If this administration had been as far-sighted in every particular as was Aubrey Williams, we certainly would have had a stock pile of rubber laid up when the war broke out on the 7th day of December 1941. We did not have a stock pile of rubber; we did not have a stock pile of copper; we did not have a stock pile of aluminum; we did not have a stock pile of ammunition; but we did have a stock pile of upward of 5,000,000 youngsters, both boys and girls, ready to enter the active military service of the Republic.

When the vote is had, I shall vote for the confirmation of Aubrey W. Williams to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. President, I do not care to take more time, because everything has been said on the subject that could be said, so far as I know, but I do not want to place in the RECORD in connection with what I have said letters from some of those who are favorable to the confirmation of Mr. Williams.

I first ask permission to incorporate in the RECORD at this point an editorial appearing in the Washington Post of date February 8. The editorial is entitled "R. E. A. Director."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Oklahoma will be complied with.

The editorial is as follows:

R. E. A. DIRECTOR

Aubrey Williams gave a very good account of himself before the Senate Committee on Agriculture. Like many a militant fighter for the disadvantaged, he has been called a Communist by those who employ this term to denote a political actionist at the people's level whom they don't like. He has had a stormy career in the Government. As Deputy Chief of the Works Progress Administration and later as head of the National Youth Administration, he tackled tough assignments and discharged them with ability and integrity. The very nature of these assignments brought him the enmity of interests opposed to Federal assistance for the jobless and the young.

There is every reason to expect, from Mr. Williams' background, that he would press vigorously to bring the benefits of electricity to rural areas. Thus he has, it seems to us, the prime qualification for the office which the President has designated him to fill. In addition, he has knowledge of the urgent needs of family farms from his service during the past year with the National Farmers Union. With realization of the President's proposals for development of the country's great river valleys on the T. V. A. pattern, rural electrification will assume great importance. It can contribute much to the modernization of rural homes and the stimulation of economic opportunity among small farms. Mr. Williams, we believe, is well suited to the task of redeeming R. E. A. from the torpor into which it has fallen and making it an effective instrument of postwar regeneration.

Mr. THOMAS. of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in the early days of Mr. Williams' public service he worked in the southwestern section of the United States. Mr. Malcolm J. Miller worked with Mr. Williams out of the New Orleans office. I have received a telegram from Mr. Miller who served as regional director of the W. P. A. in the southwestern area of the United States. I ask permission that the telegram be read at the desk. It contains a statement with reference to Mr. Williams' efficiency and competency for the position for which he is now being considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the telegram will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 19, 1945.*

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Washington, D. C.:

Today's press reports say that your committee will question Aubrey Williams today on his religious beliefs. For many years during the great depression I was closely associated with Mr. Williams in the W. P. A. and other Federal work programs and had the opportunity to observe his constant efforts in behalf of the unemployed and underprivileged. If there is any better way to judge a man's religion than to observe his treatment of those who under circumstances over which they have no control have been forced to seek aid of those in authority I have never heard of it. The underprivileged and needy have never had a more sincere and resourceful advocate than Aubrey Williams and that Mr. Chairman, I submit, is a religion of deed in its most effective form.

MALCOLM J. MILLER.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in my State, as I have stated, the National Youth Administration was considered to be a success. The gentleman who had charge of the State of Oklahoma under Mr. Williams was Bruce G. Carter. Mr. Carter is now president of the Northeastern A. & M. College, located at Miami, Okla. I have a letter from Mr. Carter, which I ask permission to have read at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be read:

The legislative clerk read as follows:

NORTHEASTERN A. & M. COLLEGE,
Miami, Okla., January 24, 1945.

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: I have just read in the paper where my old friend and former boss, the Honorable Aubrey Williams, has been nominated by President Roosevelt to head the Rural Electrification Administration.

Having worked with Mr. Williams for a number of years, I think I got to know him very well. I know him to be a very able administrator and a very loyal, dependable American. I certainly recommend him most highly for the job that the President has nominated him for. I am sure he will be a genuine asset to all of rural America, and he will do a very effective job in securing electrical service for our rural people.

This letter is entirely unsolicited and is just written because I felt like writing it. You certainly are under no obligation to me, but I do know that you are genuinely interested in knowing what people think of our leaders, and I am certainly happy to offer this work in regard to America's great and fine man—the Honorable Aubrey Williams. I shall be personally indebted for your aid and assistance in seeing that he is confirmed by the Senate.

With warmest personal regards,

BRUCE G. CARTER.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, during the time the committee had this nomination under consideration a very large number of letters and telegrams were received by me as a Member of the Senate and as chairman of the committee. I have gone through the file and selected a number of telegrams and letters which in my opinion set forth arguments in favor of Mr. Williams. The letters which contain no such arguments I did not see fit to bring to the Senate. I now ask permission to have printed at this point as a part of my remarks a number of letters and telegrams received, as stated, from persons throughout the entire United States, recommending and advocating the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Williams.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Oklahoma will be complied with.

The letters and telegrams are as follows:

JOHN EDDLEMAN CO.,
Oklahoma City, Okla., February 19, 1945.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I appreciate very much the support you are giving Aubrey Williams.

When Mr. Williams was Assistant Administrator of the Emergency Relief Administration, I was appointed State administrator over his protest, which meant that he could have caused me a great deal of trouble had he not been a real executive and one who placed duty above personalities. He was always fair, and during the trying days of the thirties had a much larger job than he is up for now.

I just wonder what a minister and Sunday school teacher of a boy growing up would know about what his ability would be as an executive 35 or 40 years later. I can say to you, that he is a man with ability to do the job and in an able and efficient manner.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN EDDLEMAN.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF YARDS AND DOCKS,
CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT REPAIR DEPOT,
McAlester, Okla., March 3, 1945.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: You remember that I was district director of N. Y. A. in the third district, Oklahoma. I know that the Honorable Aubrey Williams stands for the underprivileged. I believe that Aubrey Williams will see that the good people on the farms of this country will have the opportunity of taking advantage of cheap electricity if appointed.

Please do what you can to help him.

Mr. Williams had so many district directors that he probably would not remember me, but since I had the pleasure of working for him I cannot help but ask that you do what you can for him.

Sincerely,

EARL A. HAMILTON.

GENERAL WELFARE REPORTER,
Oklahoma City, Okla., February 5, 1945.

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: In our meeting of February 4, 1945, by motion and second it was ordered by unanimous vote, that as secretary of G. W. A. Center 7, I should write you immediately that our organization went on record in that act to express that it is the desire of our people that you vote to confirm the appointment of both Henry A. Wallace and Aubrey Williams to the positions to which they were appointed by the President.

We know that Henry Wallace can be of untold assistance to the entire population, especially of the common people, of our Nation and indirectly at least, to all the world, and in the name of the masses of that common people whom you have so championed there we bring the request that you will do all in your power to have him confirmed as Secretary of Commerce and retain all the duties and powers that have been delegated to Jesse Jones in the past.

We are as confident of the ability and usefulness of Aubrey Williams as Rural Electrification Director as we are of Mr. Wallace in the other position, and we thank you kindly for the cooperation we know you will give our President in these appointments which will mean so much in winning the peace after the war will have been won.

Very sincerely yours,

Mrs. JOE P. HORTON,
Secretary.

HOMINY, OKLA., *March 11, 1945.*

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You were just right on the matter of the Wallace nomination and I have no doubt you will be right on the Aubrey Williams nomination, but I want to give you my views anyway. From what Drew Pearson says it is being urged against Williams that he studied for a preacher and then changed his mind and never became a minister. That seems to be some religious bigotry. Then I understand some of his enemies say he is a Negro lover. That, of course, is racial prejudice. I have an idea that the real facts are that his strongest opposition to him comes from special interests who know that his heart is with the common, average people. When Roosevelt appoints a man to office I would want something besides religious bigotry or racial intolerance before I would vote to reject the nomination.

Sincerely your friend,

FRANK E. RANSDELL.

BROTHERHOOD OF MAINTENANCE
OF WAY EMPLOYES,
Detroit, Mich., February 7, 1945.

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been out of my office for several days covering a large part of the railroads in Oklahoma in my work as general chairman of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, and I find a very large part of the railroad employees, as well as the common people of this State, very much disturbed over news reports that the Senate may vote against the confirmation of Mr. Henry Wallace for Secretary of Commerce and Mr. Aubrey Williams over the R. E. A.

The Senate has confirmed a large bloc of reactionary, or Wall Street idols, for the Department of State, and then if this same body should turn down the nomination of such men as Henry Wallace and Aubrey Williams I am sure you know that this means a complete let down of the liberal forces of this country.

I am sure you know the railroad employees have had the very utmost confidence in you and your judgment and we have not thought it necessary to request that you support our President by helping to confirm these two men, who are looked upon as great progressive leaders by the common people of our great State and Nation.

With best and sincere wishes, we are,

Sincerely yours,

GEO. SUDDERTH,
General Chairman.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., *February 2, 1945.*

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our organization is giving full support to Aubrey Williams as Director of R. E. A. We urge your help on his confirmation.

TOM W. CREEK,
President, Oklahoma Farmers Union.

CLAREMORE, OKLA., *March 10, 1945.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Justus Farmer's Union local, with a voting strength of 165, instructed the officers to wire each of you, urging you to support the appointment of Aubrey Williams as Director of the R. E. A., or inform us as to why you cannot.

B. BLEVERICH,
President,
E. DICKERSON,
Secretary.

ROXTON, TEX.

SENATE AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.:

Farmers will be pleased to have Aubrey Williams head R. E. A.

J. P. MAXWELL,
Director, Texas Farm Bureau.

GATESVILLE, TEX., *February 4, 1945.*

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Chamber, Washington D. C.:

Urge that you confirm Aubrey Williams as R. E. A. Administrator. Agricultural producers in this section have faith in his ability to serve R. E. A. Those of us who are members of R. E. A. believe he has the initiative and ability to fully administer the R. E. A.

N. FOOTE,
President, Texas Agricultural Mobilization Committee.

AMARILLO, TEX., *February 3, 1945.*

Hon. ELMER THOMAS:

I strongly urge you to use all your influence for Aubrey Williams as national R. E. A. Administrator.

J. J. BERG,
President, Texas Farmers Union.

READING, PA., *February 8, 1945.*

The Honorable ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We support Aubrey Williams for R. E. A. appointment. Your help appreciated.

THE FARMERS UNION, LOCAL NO. 70,
Centreport, Pa.

HANOVER, PA., *February 10, 1945.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS:

Urge you confirm Aubrey Williams for R. E. A. post.

MEMBERS MARBURG LOCAL NO. 38,
FARMERS UNION.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 20, 1945.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: During the hearings before your Senate Committee on Agriculture on the fitness of Mr. Aubrey Williams for the position of head of the Rural Electrification Administration, to which he was nominated by President Roosevelt, Mr. Williams' religious beliefs have been made a point at issue. We should like at this time to raise our voices in protest at this injection of the religious question in a matter which is of exclusively governmental concern.

Freedom of religious belief is one of the great freedoms for which this Nation is now engaged in total war, recognized and acknowledged by all American citizens except those few subversive individuals who are seeking to foster in this country doctrines of racial and religious bigotry which have undermined democratic principles and practices in other nations. We have no way of knowing the particular religious beliefs of Mr. Williams, but we respectfully submit that, whatever they may be, they are in no sense germane to the question of his fitness for the position to which the President has seen fit to nominate him. We would therefore urge that all discussion of the religious question be declared out of order in the present hearings and that all previous testimony on the subject be stricken from the record.

We should be unjust to our own social convictions if we did not add to this request our own opinion that Mr. Williams is eminently qualified for the position as Administrator of the R. E. A. His great administrative experience, his knowledge of government, and his devotion to democratic purposes are assets which our Government sorely needs as we approach military victory in this global war against the forces of darkness. We therefore urge your committee's strongest approval of President Roosevelt's nomination of Mr. Williams.

Respectfully,

Dr. REINHOLD NIEBUHR,
Chairman, Union for Democratic Action.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 23, 1945.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: To one who looks upon his Representatives in Congress with the greatest respect, the activities of you and your committee in considering the nomination of Aubrey Williams as R. E. A. Administrator are extremely disappointing and leave much to be desired.

In bringing the religious issue into the examination, you are openly refuting the Constitution, which you solemnly swore to preserve, protect, and defend. I feel, as do many others, that it is a great pity for a layman to have to bring this to your attention.

Mr. Williams' record as an administrator is clearly before you. It is an excellent record, to which only an affirmative vote can be

recorded. If some men in Washington would stop disputing the authority of the President and get out of their picayune rut, a great deal of necessary legislative progress might be attained.

Hoping that you will see your way clear to examining Mr. Williams in the correct procedure and seconding his nomination, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL M. TAYLOR.

FLUSHING CLUB OF THE LIBERAL PARTY,
Flushing, N. Y., February 22, 1945.

The Honorable ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agriculture Committee,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The Flushing Liberal Club, at its regular meeting, voted unanimously to urge the confirmation of Mr. Aubrey Williams as chairman of the Rural Electrification Administration.

In his service as head of the National Youth Administration, Mr. Williams showed his ability as an administrator and his viewpoint of service to the general welfare.

The principal issue of our times, as so well stated in a recent editorial, is: "Shall we have more for the many by democratic means, or more for the few by privileged means?" By those who oppose his confirmation (as well as that of Mr. Henry A. Wallace as Secretary of Commerce), anything or anyone that is truly democratic or liberal is called radical and communistic. Such name-calling reveals much more concerning those who use it than of the ones so named.

We urge you to continue to support the confirmation of Aubrey Williams.

Respectfully yours,

MELVIN E. OAKES,
ELEANOR M. SICKELS,
Cochairmen.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 5, 1945.*

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building:

The American Labor Party of the State of New York urges senatorial confirmation of Aubrey Williams for Rural Electrification Administrator. Mr. Williams' previous outstanding record as head of the National Youth Administration indicates his ability to carry on the important responsibilities of his new post. Mr. Williams' appointment means that the benefits of electricity will be extended to small farmers. Mr. Williams' appointment, too, is particularly important now because many of our returning veterans have indicated their interest in undertaking farming. The American Labor Party urges his confirmation.

HYMAN BLUMBERG,
State Secretary, American Labor Party.

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *March 6, 1945.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Washington, D. C.:

Sixty members urge approval of Aubrey Williams as Rural Electrification Administrator.

NEIGHBORHOOD VICTORY GROUP.
MATILDA BRESLAW.

WOODSTOCK, N. Y., *February 6, 1945.*

CHAIRMAN, SENATE AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C:

Following farmers of town of Woodstock, Ulster County, N. Y., urge confirmation of Aubrey Williams as head of Rural Electrification Administration.

Mrs. David France, Floyd Wilson, Eugene Hoyt, Edmund Gilligan, Merlin Wilbur, Benson Harrison, Lapo Martin MacDaniel, Conrad Cramer, Fred Reynolds, Herbert Keef, Howard France.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 9, 1945.*

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge you to confirm the nomination of Aubrey Williams.

WHOLESALE CLOTHING CLERKS UNION.

MADISON, WIS., *March 13, 1945.*

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Committee on Agriculture,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: I have been directed, as attorney for Dairyland Power Cooperative, by its board of directors, to transmit to you resolution of the board urging the confirmation of the appointment of Aubrey Williams as Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration. Copy of this resolution is enclosed herewith.

Very truly yours,

FLOYD E. WHEELER.

Resolution adopted by board of directors of Dairyland Power Cooperative at Chippewa Falls, Wis., March 10, 1945

Whereas President Roosevelt has submitted to the United States Senate as his nominee for the important position of Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration the name of Aubrey Williams; and

Whereas opposition has developed to the confirmation of the appointment of said Aubrey Williams and it appears that at least a substantial portion of this opposition stems from sources inimicable to a strong and vigorous development of rural electrification on a cooperative basis, and from those who would seek to make the administration of Rural Electrification Administration subservient to the wishes of large privately owned power interests; and

Whereas Aubrey Williams, by reason of training, experience, courage, and a vigorous interest in social and agricultural welfare, appears to possess those qualities which would enable him to administer the office of Rural Electrification Administration in accordance with the basic purposes of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 so as to bring to American agriculture and rural peoples throughout the country the benefits of cheap electric energy, thereby promoting the general welfare of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors of Dairyland Power Cooperative in meeting assembled at Chippewa Falls, this 10th day of March 1945:

1. That the United States Senate is hereby urged to vote in favor of the confirmation of the appointment by President Roosevelt of Aubrey Williams as Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration;

2. That copies of this resolution be sent to the United States Senators from the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois, in which States are located the 24 member R. E. A. distribution cooperatives of Dairyland Power Cooperative and which presently serve approximately 42,000 farms and rural homes in said States with electric energy on a cooperative basis, and that copies of this resolution be further sent to the United States Senate Commmittee on Agriculture.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *February 17, 1945.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman Senate Agricultural Committee, Washington, D. C.:

Referring to Aubrey Williams' beliefs, the word "religion" is not synonymous with the word "Christian." The Constitution guarantees freedom of religious, not Christian, beliefs.

M. G. BELLAH.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, *February 26, 1945.*

CHAIRMAN OF SENATE AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Since Mr. Aubrey Williams has headed the R. E. A. and has done a wonderful job we feel that his experience, his reappointment would be a help to that Department and to the people in general. Therefore, we are asking if you will be so kind as to give him your support.

EDWARD H. MCREYNOLDS.

YORK, PA., *February 10, 1945.*

ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Agricultural Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge confirmation Aubrey Williams R. E. A. Administrator.

I. C. Rumsey, president, York County Farmers Union; Clarke E. Elwenhart, county secretary; George M. Wehler, president, F. E. C. U., York Local No. 62; George A. Strine, secretary, F. E. C. U., York Local No. 62; C. Wilmer Krall, president, Kralltown Local No. 108; Edward I. Livingston, Jr., secretary, Kralltown Local No. 108.

OMAHA, NEBR., *February 9, 1945.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Washington, D. C.:

We, the majority members of Farmers Union State Board of Nebraska, wish to confirm the appointment of Aubrey Williams.

H. C. Hansen, John Henthorn, Henry Pedersen, Albert Schoeurock.

CLANTON, ALA., *February 5, 1945.*

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Washington, D. C.:

The farmers of my community request the committee to confirm the appointment of Aubrey Williams as head of the R. E. A.

J. A. JACKSON.

CLANTON, ALA., *February 5, 1945.*

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Washington, D. C.:

Members of the Farmers Union of Alabama request the committee to confirm the President's appointment of Aubrey Williams as head of the R. E. A.

W. L. SANDERS, *State President.*

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY,
Evanston, Ill.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Having followed Aubrey Williams' career as an upright administrator of relief and W. P. A. funds, I trust his loyalty to democratic principles and his integrity and efficiency. I think he's opposed by selfish special interests.

I hope you and others will endorse his appointment to R. E. A.

Very sincerely,

THOMAS DAWES ELIOT.
Professor of Sociology.

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 27, 1945.*

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, United States Senate Agriculture Committee:

It is imperative that men of Aubrey Williams' character be in key positions in order that the United States of America should forge ahead.

BEN SCOTT,
Secretary, Progressive Citizens League, 5044 Washington Park Court.

KANSAS CITY, MO., *February 8, 1945.*
CHAIRMAN OF THE SENATE AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE,
Senate Office Building[1]

We think Williams' appointment excellent choice for farmers.

RAY H. MORROW,
Ex-President, Cass County Farm Bureau, Pleasant Hill, Mo.

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 5, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
The Senate Office, Washington, D. C.:

I see a very great danger to our Government and our whole country in the possibility that a man of Aubrey Williams' intense honor and integrity could be as reported in the press confronted by a Senate committee with such terms as are quoted, namely, "a Godless Communist," etc.

I know his qualities from personal experience in transactions in which he is concerned.

I am sending this serious message more broadly than only to the committee members who have applied these terms hoping it might help to evoke strong opposition to such an irresponsible element in the Government of the United States.

ANITA MCCORMICK BLAINE
(Mrs. Emmons Blaine).

CONGRESSIONAL PARISH IN NORTON,
February 21, 1945.

Senator THOMAS,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Please pardon the address which I have given you at the heading of this letter, but I do not know your full name. I do not know anything of the qualifications of Mr. Aubrey Williams for Rural Electrification Administrator, but some of us who are Unitarians would like to correct the ignorant attitude which Dr. Broady has shown regarding one element of the Unitarian belief. Though a minister does not subscribe to our theological beliefs, we expect him to have some knowledge of them.

Unitarians do not, and never have denied the divinity of Christ. They do deny the deity of Christ. They believe that all men have divinity within them, but that some develop that divinity to a greater degree than others. Jesus was one who did this.

I am enclosing a pamphlet regarding the Unitarians which I very much wish you would examine. Perhaps you will find that you are one—many people are and do not realize it. The list of Unitarians in history is a noble one, and I could ask no greater honor than to be a humble follower of their great religion, and I think you will feel the same on reading this pamphlet.

Most sincerely,

HAZEL ROGERS GREDLER.

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Hardwick, Mass., February 8, 1945.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Millions of American farmers and rural dwellers without electricity would, if they were in a position to act on Presidential nominations, vote enthusiastically to confirm Aubrey Williams to the post of Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Men like President Roosevelt and Aubrey Williams are known to be moved by a deep concern for these overlong-neglected millions without electricity and to be strongly devoted to the responsibility of maintaining the integrity of the R. E. A.

R. E. A. has succeeded in a province where business not only failed to live up to its public responsibility but where it also felt unequal to the service needs of millions of America's rural dwellers. What the R. E. A. program needs is not a businessman with sabotaging intent but a man like Aubrey Williams, who believes in its principles. R. E. A. has proven its soundness and has served hundreds of thousands through self-reliance—through cooperatives.

Senators and Congressmen owe our American future a strict adherence to the rule of noninterference with the R. E. A. program. Every Senator is the agent of millions of unserved families seeking electricity. No Senator can, in view of recent planks of platforms of both parties, say that he or she is mandated to vote to scuttle R. E. A. What is more, those Senators with records of hostility to R. E. A. are the ones crying for a businessman to run the program.

Aubrey Williams brings singular qualifications to the job of R. E. A. Administrator. As an N. Y. A. Administrator, he salvaged much wholesome good among the youth of America—so much so that it has been noticeable in our fight on all fronts. He believed in the essential good of his mission then as he does in the R. E. A. mission today.

People who shall decide whether they will use R. E. A. assistance or not can be counted on to show in what measure they may place confidence in Mr. Williams. These neglected millions do not need a dog-in-the-manger businessman but an opportunity to form cooperatives and go into the business of serving themselves. Hence a Senator's vote against Williams is no less than a vote to cripple the R. E. A.

You are urged to give your full support to the confirmation of the Williams nomination and to make unmistakably clear your sympathetic concern for those to whom electricity means the lightening of the burden on the farm and in the home. After all, this program is for our own American people.

Sincerely yours,

WITOLD J. MIKELK,
Member, Advisory Board.

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., February 21, 1945.

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Agriculture and Forestry Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Had I not been absent from Washington during the hearings regarding the appointment of Mr. Aubrey Williams as Director of the R. E. A., I would have protested earlier against what I consider the unjust and unfounded charges made against him.

During the time the N. Y. A. was in existence I was chairman of the advisory board in Pennsylvania (an unpaid position), and during those years worked in close contact with Mr. Williams, and therefore speak with knowledge both of his ability and character.

The work he did as head of the N. Y. A. was outstanding in efficiency and scope and the detractors of that agency made as many misstatements regarding it as the enemies of Mr. Williams are making against him.

In respect to his character, I can only wish that more people might lead as truly a Christian life as he has. Whatever religious beliefs Mr. Williams follows his actions have always shown him to be a thoroughly Christian gentleman.

Further, isn't it a new and dangerous idea in our Government to make religious qualifications for holding a position? Have some American citizens forgotten article I of the Bill of Rights? May I request that you read this letter to the members of your committee.

With many thanks,

Sincerely yours,

EMMA GUFFEY MILLER
(Mrs. Carroll Miller).

THE BOARD OF HOME MISSIONS OF THE CONGREGATIONAL AND CHRISTIAN CHURCHES,
Memphis, Tenn., February 11, 1945.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Senator from Oklahoma,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: As an ordained Christian minister I write to protest against the un-Christian and un-American attack leveled against Aubrey Williams, candidate for head of the Rural Electrification Administration, by Dr. Joseph M. Broady, 30 years pastor of the Sixth Avenue Presbyterian Church in Birmingham, Ala. In a telegram to Senator MCKELLAR, this minister charges that Williams "denied the divinity of Christ, after the church educated him for the ministry," and is therefore unfit for a Government position.

The charge is un-Christian because the implication behind it is plain: since the church paid for Williams' education, he should believe in the divinity of Christ and should have entered the ministry. Thereby Dr. Broady makes belief in the divinity of Christ a bargain-counter affair to be adhered to by Williams because the church helped to finance his college education. This conclusion is, in my opinion, utterly false and unjustified. A man cannot be made to believe even the most basic tenet of the Christian faith—the Inquisition notwithstanding. Furthermore, no man should become a Christian minister unless he feels himself irresistibly called by God. Evidently, Aubrey Williams, who in good faith accepted the aid of the church in getting his education, decided against entering the ministry. Instead he chose other types of work, other callings. These callings—in fact all callings whether they be ditch digging, truck driving, banking, farming, and so on, are equally divine, according to sound Protestant doctrine as handed down by Jesus Christ, the church fathers, and John Calvin, and especially stressed by Martin Luther. Hence the ministry may be a special calling, but it is no higher before the Lord than any other worthy calling.

Finally, the accusing Dr. Broady not only forgets his Christian doctrine. He also forgets that he is an American believing in the constitutional right of freedom of worship, when he concludes that because Williams does not believe in the divinity of Christ "he is utterly unworthy of any position in Government." Since when, I ask, is belief in the divinity of Christ a prerequisite to holding a Government position? This prerequisite would bar all Jews, nonbelievers, and a good percentage of Protestants from State and Federal appointments; and if it had been applied in the past, it would have eliminated many of the signers of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution from participation in national affairs.

I, therefore, conclude that Dr. Broady has made false accusations which square neither with sound religion nor with good government.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID S. BURGESS.

MEMPHIS, TENN., *February 19, 1945.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: I wish to take this opportunity to call upon you to do everything possible to promote the appointment of Aubrey Williams as the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, and to state that Senator MCKELLAR and Rev. Joseph Broady do not represent the progressive southerner when they attack Mr. Williams.

If Mr. Williams is not appointed because of the fact that some believe he does not believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ it is an attack upon all the people of our country because this is a process always followed, first to attack the nonbeliever, and next a particular believer or race, by antisocial forces. Second, nonbelief of itself does not affect a person's ability to do a job and Mr. Williams has definitely proven to the less fortunate people of our country and its youth that he is not only an intelligent worker but a successful one in his former work, as well as a sincere and earnest person.

Next Senator MCKELLAR represents the views of southern reactionaries who maintain their strength with a poll-tax system that disfranchises one-half of his constituents; therefore, I feel that he does not represent the people and as a result others who do must overrule him.

Sincerely,

ALFA HULSEY.

WILLMAR, MINN., *February 8, 1945.*
Senate Agricultural Committee,
Washington, D. C.:

Resolution adopted at annual meeting February 5, 1945, by unanimous vote as:

"Be it resolved by the membership and stockholders of the Kandiyohi Cooperative Electric Power Association known more familiarly as Kandiyohi County R. E. A. of Minnesota this 5th day of February 1945, in annual meeting assembled, That the members of this association endorse the appointment by the President of the United States of Aubrey Williams to act henceforth as Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration and urge the confirmation of the said appointment by the Senate of the United States; that this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting; and that copies hereof be sent to Minnesota Senators HENRIK SHIPSTEAD and JOSEPH BALL and otherwise transmitted in such manner that those committees of said Senate considering said confirmation be advised of the action taken at this meeting."

KANDIYOHI COOPERATIVE ELECTRIC POWER ASSOCIATION,
O. N. GRAVGAARD, *President.*

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *February 5, 1945.*
Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

The present attempt to discredit Aubrey Williams by accusation that he is not a loyal citizen and that he does not believe in the American way of life, democracy, and free enterprise is grossly unfair in view of Mr. Williams' decade of service as a loyal public official. Mr. Williams ably administered a program which gave almost 5,000,000 unemployed American youth an opportunity to continue their education and obtain work experience in accordance with established American educational and industrial practices. We urge favorable action on his nomination as R. E. A. Administrator.

Mr. and Mrs. EUGENE W. BURGESS.

TAOS, N. MEX, *February 9, 1945.*
Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

We are all rooting for the appointment of Aubrey Williams, National Administrator of R. E. A.

TAOS COUNTY COOPERATIVE HEALTH ASSOCIATION.

ESTANCIA, N. MEX., *February 7, 1945.*
Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge appointment Aubrey Williams, R. E. A. Administrator, by 40 members.

ORTIZ COOPERATIVE LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION,
VOIL A. LARSON, *Secretary.*

SANTA FE, N. MEX., *February 8, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Committee Chairman, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Strongly urge favorable committee action on Aubrey Williams' nomination for Rural Electrification Director. His experience and broad humanitarianism eminently fit him to advance this deserving program.

DANIEL K. SADLER.

FAIRFAX, VA., *February 10, 1945.*
The Honorable ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The long wrangling in the committee, and the spectacle of a minister of a Christian church on so un-Christian an errand, has prompted me to write you and add my voice to those who want the confirmation of Aubrey Williams. I had supposed that the President was expected to appoint his own Cabinet.

Very truly yours,

ELIZABETH CHILTON MURRAY.
(Mrs. Douglas Murray).

BREMERTON, WASH., *February 28, 1945.*
SENATE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIRS: As a citizen interested in preserving and perfecting the democracy that my forefathers helped to found, I feel it my duty to vigorously protest your treatment of Mr. Aubrey Williams.

I feel that article VI of the Constitution was violated when Mr. Williams was questioned about his religious beliefs. They are his private concern and have nothing to do with his ability as a public official. Freedom of religion is one of the basic principles of our democracy.

It seems that Mr. Williams' lack of prejudice toward Negroes was also attacked. Communistic leanings cannot be proved by freedom from prejudice. There are many of us white people in this country who believe strongly in racial justice who are not Communists and have no connection with Communists. Racial equality, or the brotherhood of man, was a Christian doctrine long before communism was ever heard of. I respectfully refer you to the teachings of Jesus as recorded in the Bible as proof of this.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. FRANCES A. GRAVES.

WOODACRES, MD., *February 23, 1945.*
The Honorable ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: We want to add our words of commendation to the many that you have received in favor of Aubrey Williams. We feel he is ably qualified to be head of R. E. A. and trust you will lead the way toward his confirmation.

Truly yours,

Mr. and Mrs. H. E. SNYDER.

THE PENNSYLVANIA FIRE INSURANCE CO.,
Brentwood, Md., February 20, 1945.
SENATE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The papers state that you have called Messrs. Broady and Hodges to testify concerning the religious beliefs of Aubrey Williams. It is to be hoped that you asked the honorable gentlemen whether they believe all they are told.

You should have asked them if they believe Noah kept thousands of animals shut up in a boat 300 by 50 by 30 cubits for almost a year. Remember the ark had only one door, which was shut, and one small window. Someone has said that if Noah had a hobby it was ventilation.

Ask them if they believe Jonah spent 3 days in the belly of a whale, without even a Coca-Cola. Or if they believe the sun stood still while Joshua mopped up his enemies. What happened? Did the earth cease rotating?

Ask them if they think the fish all drowned at the time of the flood. At the Scopes trial, Bryan asserted that he believed it. If the great commoner had known his Bible, he would not have pulled that boner.

Since when have we required religious beliefs as a qualification for public office? Have you ever read our Constitution?

Must a man believe that some patriarch held a conversation with a jackass—perhaps it was a jackass' mother—in order to qualify as Rural Electrification Administrator?

Do you know that the Jewish religion rejects this all-important doctrine? Are you going to throw out all the Unitarians? We had a President of that faith one time, did we not?

This is not a plea for the ratification of Aubrey Williams. It is a plea for decency, common sense, and civilization. Shades of Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, and Abraham Lincoln—freethinkers, all. Are we to be turned over to the witch hunters in this the twentieth century?

Very truly yours,

ELMER C. HELM.

CORINTH, MISS., *February 6, 1945.*
Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Washington, D. C.:

I am urging your support of Aubrey Williams for Director of R. E. A.

AMOS J. BRADLEY,
Farm and R. E. A. Member.

TYLERTOWN, MISS., *February 10, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Washington, D. C.:

Urge support of Aubrey Williams for R. E. A. Director.

WALTHAL COUNTY,
P. AND M. ASSOCIATION,
By GRAVES.

HOUSTON, MISS., *February 6, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agriculture Committee, Washington, D. C.:

Urging you to support Aubrey Williams for Director of R. E. A. This association has 375 members.

CHICKASAW COUNTY
P. AND M. ASSOCIATION,
M. M. MCGUARY, *President.*

CORINTH, MISS., *February 6, 1945.*
Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Washington, D. C.:

We, the Alcorn County P. and M. Association, solicit your support of Aubrey Williams for the Director of R. E. A.

ALCORN COUNTY P. & M. ASSOCIATION.
JOE E. WELLS, *President.*

NATCHEZ, MISS., *February 6, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Washington, D. C.:

Urge you to support Aubrey Williams for Director of R. E. A.

GROVER C. COLEMAN,
F. S. A. Supervisor.

PHILADELPHIA, MISS., *February 6, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee:

The Neshoba County P. and M. Association, with a membership of 1,000 farmers, en-

dorses and urges the appointment of Aubrey Williams for Director of Rural Electrification Administration.

J. B. DUNN,
Secretary and Treasurer.

FOREST, MISS., *February 6, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee:
The Scott County Purchasing and Marketing Association, A. A. L., representing 372 Scott County farm families, urge you to support Aubrey Williams for Director of R. E. A.

R. L. ALFORD,
Secretary, Scott County P. and M. Association, A. A. L.

DEKALB, MISS., *February 6, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee:
Urging your support of Aubrey Williams for Director of R. E. A.

WILLIAM U. BANKS,
F. S. A. Supervisor.

LUCEDALE, MISS., *February 6, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Agricultural Committee, Washington, D. C.:
Please support Aubrey Williams as Director of R. E. A.

F. G. SNELL,
Pascagoula, Miss.

HAZLEHURST, MISS., *February 6, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Washington, D. C.:
Aubrey Williams friendly to all farmers; will protect our interests in rural electrification. Urge nomination Director, R. E. A.

COPIAH COUNTY P. AND M. ASSOCIATION.

CORINTH, MISS., *February 6, 1945.*
Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee:
I would like to urge you to support Aubrey Williams for the Director of R. E. A.

W. K. FORSYTHE.

WOODVILLE, MISS., *February 6, 1495.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Agricultural Committee, United States Senate:
Please support Aubrey Williams for Director, Rural Electrification Administration. He is interested in small farmer receiving this service.

HUBERT J. ROGERS,
President, Wilkinson County Purchasing and Marketing Association.

TAYLORSVILLE, MISS., *February 5, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agriculture Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
I urgently solicit your cooperation in securing Senate approval of Mr. Aubrey Williams as Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

E. V. GIBSON,
President, Southern Pine Electric Power Association.

TAYLORSVILLE, MISS., *February 5, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
I have served as chairman of Mississippi Rural Electrification Authority since it was created by State legislature in 1936. Our State agency has cooperated with Cooke, Carmody, and Slattery in developing R. E. A. program for Mississippi. I am convinced that Aubrey Williams is well qualified to serve as an Administrator of R. E. A. and I earnestly urge favorable action by your committee on his appointment.

EVON A. FORD,
Chairman, Mississippi State Authority.

ANGUILLA, MISS., *February 8, 1945.*
Hon. Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Washington, D. C.:
Urging you give support of Aubrey Williams for Director of R. E. A.

JOHN W. BURTON,
Director, Sharkey County Purchasing and Marketing Association.

POPLARVILLE, MISS., *February 7, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senate, Senate Office Building:
We recommend you support Aubrey Williams for Director, R. E. A.

WILMER SPIERS,
President, Pearl River Hancock.

LITTLEFIELD, TEX., *February 5, 1945.*
Hon. ELMER THOMAS:
We recommend Aubrey Williams for Rural Electrification Administrator.

R. L. Tisdale, member R. E. A. Lamb County Electric Co-op.; J. R. Kuykendall, president, Plainview Production Credit Association; C. W. Smiley, President.

HEARNE, TEX., *February 8, 1945.*
Chairman THOMAS,
Senate Agricultural Committee, Washington, D. C.:
Urge confirmation of Aubrey Williams, head of R. E. A.

CHARLES DESTEFANO,
President, Mumford Robertson County Farm Bureau.

AUSTIN, TEX., *February 9, 1945.*
Senator THOMAS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, United States Senate:
As farmers we respectfully urge confirmation of appointment Aubrey Williams.

CASUAL ELLIS.

NEW WAVERLY, TEX., *February 20, 1945.*
Senator THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture, Senate Office Building:
Papers featuring violation of religious freedom by religious attack on Aubrey Williams. His great ability as Administrator testified to by millions of young people saved from despair by N. Y. A. now giving priceless war service. Hope you soon report favorable on his R. E. A. appointment.

MINNIE FISHER CUNNINGHAM.

AMARILLO, TEX., *February 3, 1945*
Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building:
I most seriously ask you to support Aubrey Williams as national R. E. A. Administrator.

FRANK OVERTURF,
Secretary, Texas Farmers Union.

AUSTIN, TEX., *February 5, 1945.*
Senator THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Senate Office Building:
Urge confirmation of Aubrey Williams to head R. E. A.

MARGARET READING,
Secretary, Texas Agricultural Mobilization.

GATESVILLE, TEX., *February 3, 1945.*
Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:
The Coryell County Farm Bureau fully supports Aubrey Williams as R. E. A. Administrator and has complete faith in his ability to properly handle the program and therefore urges his confirmation. All persons who are now members of R. E. A. in this section and the many who hope to have service after war are deeply interested in his confirmation.

J. FRANK BLAIR,
Secretary, Coryell County Farm Bureau.

NASHUA, MONT., *February 9, 1945.*
Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agriculture Committee, United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
The Northern Electric Cooperative, Inc., Opheim, Mont., with 450 members, urges you to support the confirmation of Aubrey Williams as National Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration.

MRS. JOHN ROGENES,
Secretary-Treasurer, Montana Rural Electrification Administration.

RICHLAND, MONT., *February 12, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agriculture Committee, Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Urge approval Aubrey Williams' appointment R. E. A. Administrator.

FARMERS UNION LOCAL NO. 337,
Larslan, Mont.

GLASGOW, MONT., *February 8, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Washington, D. C.:
We urge you to support the appointment of Aubrey Williams as National Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration.

VALLEY COUNTY ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
A. O. NELSON, *President,*
FRED H. RUSHER, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *February 8, 1945.*
ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Agricultural Committee, Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
Sincerely trust your approval of Aubrey Williams as R. E. A. Administrator.

Mr. and Mrs. HAROLD L. SHANE.

GLASGOW, MONT., *February 9, 1945.*
Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Washington, D. C.:
Strongly urge support of confirmation of Aubrey Williams for National Administrator of the R. E. A.

JASPER DEDOBBELEER,
President, Farmers Union Oil Co.

CIRCLE, MONT., *February 8, 1945.*
ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Washington, D. C.:
We urge you to support the confirmation of Aubrey Williams as National Administrator of R. E. A.

E. R. MERRIMAN,
Secretary-Treasurer, McCone County Electric Co-op, Inc.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *February 6, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Confirm appointment of Aubrey Williams as National R. E. A. Administrator.

Mr. and Mrs. RONALD W. HOLTZ,
Portage, Mont.

GLASGOW, MONT., *February 9, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Washington, D. C.:
Strongly urge the confirmation of the nomination of Aubrey Williams for National Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration.
THOMAS DIGNAN.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *February 6, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agricultural Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Respectfully urge that you exert every effort to have Aubrey Williams appointment confirmed as R. E. A. Administrator.
D. W. CHAPMAN,
President, Montana Farmers Union.

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *February 6, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Confirm appointment of Aubrey Williams, National R. E. A. Director.
Mr. and Mrs. MELVIN GOOD.

GLASGOW, MONT., *February 10, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Agriculture Committee, Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:
We urge your support of Aubrey Williams for R. E. A. National Administrator.
NORTHERN MONTANA SEED GROWERS ASSOCIATION,
N. C. BRIGGS, *Secretary.*

GLASGOW, MONT., *February 10, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Agriculture Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:
Strongly urge your support of Aubrey Williams for National Administrator of R. E. A. National Administration.
ROYCE BIDDLE.

GLASGOW, MONT., *February 10, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Agricultural Committee:
We urge the appointment of Aubrey Williams as National Administrator R. E. A.
VALLEY COUNTY DEMOCRATIC CENTRAL COMMITTEE,
STEPHEN WEBER, *Chairman.*

GLASGOW, MONT., *February 10, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Agriculture Committee, Washington, D. C.:
The members of Farmers' Union local urge you to give your support to the appointment of Aubrey Williams for R. E. A. Administrator.
CHERRY CREEK LOCAL,
By BEN RICE, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

RICHLAND, MONT., *February 9, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agriculture Committee, Washington, D. C.:
Urge approval Aubrey Williams appointment R. E. A. Administrator.
NORTH VALLEY COUNTY FARMERS' UNION.

GLASGOW, MONT., *February 10, 1945.*
Senator ELMER THOMAS,
Chairman, Senate Agriculture Committee, Washington, D. C.:
I strongly urge the confirmation of the nomination of Aubrey Williams for the National Administrator, Rural Electrification.
E. T. GALLAGHER.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] desires to be recognized.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have sat here and listened to the debate on the question whether or not the Senate should confirm the nomination of Aubrey Williams. I have read the testimony adduced at the hearings. Being a lawyer, naturally, when anyone is accused, I am inclined to demand that the accuser prove his case. I believe that if Senators will turn over carefully in their minds all the evidence in this particular case, and consider the history of Aubrey Williams from the day he was born until the present day, they will conclude that there is no proof that he is connected in any way with communism.

It has been brought out that in 1939 the Senate—though not exactly the same membership as now comprises the Senate—confirmed the nomination of Mr. Williams to be head of the N. Y. A. What has happened since then? Read the record and find out what has happened so far as Aubrey Williams' life is concerned.

My heart goes out to him. My sympathy goes out to anyone who is being tried, so to speak. I may feel a little closer to him than do other Senators. When I read his record, I find that at a tender age he began to make a living for himself. I know what that means. Having gone to work in the cotton mills at the age of 11, and remaining out of school until I was 18 years of age, I can feel kindly toward Aubrey Williams.

I was on the battlefield with him. He was in the First Division. The Forty-second, or Rainbow Division, of which I was a member, was alongside the First Division. I can remember what the people back here in the United States said when the boys were over there in 1917 and 1918. At that time they said, "When you come back to the United States, we will give you anything you ask." Is that true today?

Today Aubrey Williams has four sons in the service. I can imagine what I would say if I were one of his boys and the United States Senate refused to confirm the nomination of my father, who fought in the First World War and furnished four sons for his country's service in this war.

Let us see whether or not he is qualified by reason of what he has done in the past. For 4 years I was Governor of South Carolina while he was Deputy Administrator of the F. E. R. A. He was not the head, but the deputy. On numerous occasions Aubrey Williams helped me, and helped the poor people of South Carolina. I well recall one time when our schools were about to close. It was in April. I came to Washington and asked for approximately $400,000. His auditors went over our request and reduced the amount by $1, as I recall, and the schools in South Carolina remained open.

If it had not been for the interest of Aubrey Williams in rural electrification, South Carolina would now be 2 years behind where it stands today. Aubrey Williams and the F. E. R. A. helped to start South Carolina toward the front in rural electrification. This fact has not been brought out. He furnished South Carolina the funds necessary to make surveys all over the State for lines which would pay. That money was used to furnish employment and help the people in the rural districts of my State. If those surveys had not been made, and the rural electrification authorities of my State had started from scratch, without the funds with which to move forward, South Carolina would now be 2 years behind.

South Carolina is interested in rural electrification. My State was the first State in the United States to establish a rural electrification authority. In the fall of 1934 the matter was discussed with Aubrey Williams in Washington. Even before that time he had started to make surveys throughout my State. Aubrey Williams is interested in rural electrification.

I have listened attentively to the arguments which have been made on the floor of the Senate. We should not hold that a man must be an engineer to be qualified to be the head of the Rural Electrification Authority. I feel that I am talking upstream, so to speak; but at the same time I feel that I should be derelict in my duty if I did not urge the Senate to confirm the nomination of Aubrey Williams, which has been submitted to the Senate by the President of the United States.

We may not agree with everything that any man has done in the past. I do not agree with everything that Aubrey Williams has said or done in the past; but in my opinion what he has said and done does not disqualify him to be the head of the Rural Electrification Administration. He will not be the boss. The Secretary of Agriculture will have supervision over him; and if he goes wrong he can be checked up and brought to taw, if it should become necessary; but I do not believe that it will ever be necessary to call Aubrey Williams to taw, because he has been tried and has not been found wanting. If the nomination of Mr. Williams is not confirmed, someone who has not been tried and tested may be nominated for the position.

Aubrey Williams rose from the bottom. He is a self-educated man. He has tried to do his duty to the underdog, and to all his fellow men. I have had dealings with him for 4 years, and I speak with authority.

I hope the Senate will vote what they believe will be for the best interests of the United States in this matter, and will not take into consideration whether the nominee is a Democrat, whether he is a Republican, or whether he is anything else, except whether he is qualified for the position. This matter is a serious one for us to face at this time. Again I call to the attention of the Senate the question: What would you say and what would you do if you were one of the nominee's boys in the service at this time

and if your father's nomination was not confirmed by the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hesitate to share with my good friend the junior Senator from South Carolina, who has just made such an admirable speech, the experience of attempting to swim upstream. Whether that is the situation we confront, we will not know until the vote is cast. I would feel recreant to my duty as a Senator and as a man if I were to remain altogether silent and if I did not express my views in regard to the pending nomination before the vote is taken. What I say I wish to be a part of the RECORD, on my own behalf.

I am under no obligation of any sort to Aubrey Williams. I do not remember that I ever asked a favor of him. I know I never asked one personally, and I do not recall ever asking a favor of him officially. I never made a recommendation to him, either when he was Deputy Administrator of the F. E. R. A. or the W. P. A., or of the C. W. A., or Director of the N. Y. A., to appoint anyone to any office under his jurisdiction. I have not talked with him or seen him since the pending nomination, upon which we are shortly to vote, came to the Senate. The only instance I recall when I ever asked Mr. Williams to do anything in regard to the N. Y. A. was in connection with one of the projects in my State, in western Kentucky—I think it was at Mayfield—where some additional machinery was being sought in order that a larger number of young men might be employed. Machinery was gathered up from everywhere from the backyards of machine shops and plants of various kinds, and was refurbished and installed in the machine shops operated under the auspices of the N. Y. A. throughout the country. I remember that I went to Mr. Williams to see whether there was any way by which more machinery could be obtained for the project in one of the towns and county seats in my State. By the way, I do not recall what was the result of the interview in regard to the machinery. I do not recall whether the machinery was available or whether it could be obtained.

So, Mr. President, my vote and my attitude on the pending nomination are not induced by any obligation, personal or otherwise, under which I labor, toward Mr. Williams.

I have admired the courage and fortitude which accompanied his early life, information about all of which I have obtained from the record. I never talked with him about it; but I have read the hearings from beginning to end—every page of them—since they were printed. I have admired the fortitude and courage which accompanied Mr. Williams' early efforts to equip himself for a successful career as a man. Probably the considerable sympathy, appreciation, and admiration I have is because my own early life followed similar efforts and a similar course.

I have read the record, as I said, from beginning to end. I have read the charges which have been made directly, and those which have been insinuated. I would be unable from the record alone, if I had no other knowledge of him, to reach the conclusion that I would be justified in voting against the confirmation of his nomination to be head of the Rural Electrification Administration.

I realize that something about Mr. Williams' religious beliefs has been injected into the record and into the discussion. I do not believe, and I would hate to believe, that any Senator would be actuated by any prejudice against a man because of his religious beliefs or his lack of them, in determining his qualifications for public office. The Constitution of the United States says that the "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." I have a right, just as every other Senator has and as every other American has, to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of my own conscience or not at all, if in our consciences we do not feel disposed to do so. The Constitution also stipulates that no religious test shall ever be established or required as a qualification for holding any office of trust or honor under the United States. I do not know the eminent divine who injected that issue into the nomination by sending to the committee a telegram in which he made the announcement that neither Mr. Williams nor anyone else entertaining any views which were not in accord with his was worthy of any honor or any office in the United States, thereby intimating that, so far as he was concerned, it would be all right for us to violate the spirit as well as the letter of the Constitution by taking that matter into consideration in determining our votes. I do not believe any Senator will be influenced by any such idea when he votes on the nomination.

Effort was made during the hearings to create the impression that Mr. Williams was, first, a Communist, that he was a member of the Communist Party, or that he harbored communism. I do not believe the record shows that he was ever connected in any way with any communistic organization; but I think the record proves, beyond the slightest shadow of doubt, that the fact is that he combatted communism. He never, he says, knowingly employed anyone who was entertaining communistic views. I know how easy it is to charge a man with entertaining views which are inimical to our form of government and our traditional theories, if he takes up the cudgels for the underdog. I know how easy it is for us to be accused of trying in some way to undermine the traditional foundations of our Government if we make a step forward in behalf of the great masses of the people.

I recall my first race for Congress, which took place in 1912 in the First District of Kentucky. I had three opponents, one of whom had previously served in the House of Representatives. I adopted a platform upon which I ran in the Democratic primary and made speeches all over my district. One of the planks in the platform was that I favored Federal aid to the States and counties in the United States in connection with the construction of highways. One of my opponents, who had previously been a Member of Congress, said that plank was socialistic, that I wanted to tear down State lines, that I desired the Federal Government to engage in road building, and that even with the cooperation of the States, the whole idea was socialistic. All over the State we held a joint debate. My opponent condemned my views in favor of Federal aid for the construction of highways. He said that my views were socialistic. The word "communistic" had not at that time become common.

While we were campaigning—the primary was held on the first Saturday in August of that year—the Baltimore Convention, at which Woodrow Wilson was nominated for President of the United States, adopted a platform, one plank of which was an unequivocal declaration in favor of Federal aid to the States and counties in connection with the building of highways. My opponent, who had criticized me for the view which I had taken, was compelled to accept it as a part of the Democratic platform, and I ceased to be a Socialist. The platform was adopted, and from that day until now the policy of Federal aid in the construction of highways has been the accepted policy of the Federal Government. It has resulted in the building of highways all over this Nation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have asked not to be interrupted. I will yield to the Senator from Illinois, but not as a precedent.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. In view of the statement of the Senator from Kentucky I wish to make an observation.

I have had occasion to read the records of the Congress when the first bill for rural electrification was introduced. Charges similar to those to which the Senator from Kentucky has referred as having been made against the Senator's position with regard to Federal aid in connection with the construction of public roads were made by very prominent Members of the Congress against the proposed Rural Electrification Act. It was said that it was socialistic, and that if enacted it would gradually cause our Government to become a socialistic state.

Mr. BARKLEY. I recall what the Senator from Illinois has stated. I was very active during the consideration of the legislation which resulted in the creation of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Later, while I was a Member of the House of Representatives, and a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, under whose jurisdiction came legislative matters pertaining to the United States Public Health Service, I sponsored and aided in the enactment of legislation providing for maternity and infant care among those who were unable, because of their financial condition, to purchase necessary medical and

other care during childbirth. I did so on the theory—and so stated in arguing on behalf of the legislation—that every child born under the American flag had a right to be born under conditions which would make it possible for him to have a strong body and a strong mind, and that every mother who went down into the valley of Gethsemane to bring forth a human being had a right to expect organized society to help make that miracle possible, and bring forth a human being under conditions favorable to his development. But because I took such a position I was charged with wanting to socialize medicine in the United States. It was said that I desired to have the Government of the United States become an obstetrician, and take charge of all births. Yet Mr. President, while I was a Member of the House, and before I came to the Senate, the policy which I have advocated was adopted and made a part of the work of the Children's Bureau of the Department of Labor. Not a year has since passed when Congress has not appropriated money to carry out the program inaugurated in that legislation. The program is now a part of the settled policy of the country. But I, as well as others, were accused of trying to socialize medicine, and to have the Government take over the control of family life in the United States. The program was said to be socialistic; nevertheless it was adopted.

I could recite many other instances of men being unjustly accused because they were a little forward in their thinking, because they did not necessarily believe in the status quo, and because they were unwilling to have their Government remain hitched to a post and unable to move, although everything else in human life moved on.

During the course of the hearings held by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry there was apparently brought into question the good faith of a great woman of the United States, a woman who was the wife of a great man and a great jurist. By insinuation, or by direct charge, Mr. Williams was accused because, while he was in charge of the social welfare department of the State of Wisconsin, he had made a $10 contribution to a college in Arkansas at the request of Mrs. Louis D. Brandeis, whose husband was an Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court under appointment of Woodrow Wilson. When Justice Brandeis' nomination came before the United States Senate he was accused of even worse things than Aubrey Williams has been accused of here. Yet, he lived to make one of the greatest contributions to the jurisprudence of this country. Because Mr. Williams contributed $10 to a college in Arkansas, which later came under the influence of Communists, or some sort of Communist organization, an effort was made to bring that circumstance into this case as a disqualification of Williams. An effort was also made to question the good faith and moral attitude of Mrs. Louis D. Brandeis in order that Mr. Williams' qualifications might be brought into question.

Mr. President, I realize that opposition has been expressed to Mr. Williams by some of the leaders of the Farm Bureau Federation. I am a member of the Farm Bureau Federation. I have often stated publicly that it was one of the best organizations among the farmers in the United States. It is one of the most effective of farm organizations. In my State it has perhaps done more effective work in behalf of the welfare of the farmers than has any other organization. Prior to its organization in my State the Farmers' Union, with which Mr. Williams is now connected, was very strong. We were seeking to organize the farmers of Kentucky, especially the tobacco growers, in order that by cooperative effort they might hold their tobacco from the market instead of being compelled to place it upon the market at a time when only four purchasers were dividing geographically the area in which the tobacco was grown so that there might be but little competition in the purchase of tobacco. I made speeches in my State in behalf of the farmer's cooperative organization. I made speeches in behalf of the Farmers' Union and in behalf of the Farm Bureau.

I received a letter from the head of the Farm Bureau Federation in Kentucky asking me to vote against Mr. Williams. He did not state why he was opposed to Mr. Williams, and I do not now understand why; but I felt that, in all frankness, I should be honest with him, and I wrote him immediately in reply that I would support Mr. Williams for this appointment. I admire the Farm Bureau Federation, and, as I have said, I am a member of it. I have not always agreed with it. I did not agree with it when it opposed the Farm Security Administration which was set up in Washington and throughout the country in order to help tenant farmers own land. I cannot understand for the life of me how any farmer can oppose any program that will make it possible for tenant farmers not to be tenants all their lives but to hold out to them the hope that they may own their farms. I did not agree with the Farm Bureau Federation on that issue.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I had a communication from the Farm Bureau Federation in my State, a communication similar to that the Senator had from the federation in his State, and I think I know something of how it came about. In my opinion, Ed O'Neal, the head of the Farm Bureau Federation, passed out the word to the State organization, and it followed his instructions. That is typical of what happens. Here in Washington time after time we are informed that this organization and that organization is against this or against that. What does it mean? The members of these organizations know nothing about it; the question has not been referred to them at all; but they act in accordance with the instructions of the parent organization. It is our part, using common sense and judgment, to determine for ourselves whether such communications are representative of the organization.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know anything about Mr. O'Neal's activity in this matter. I do not know whether the head of the Farm Bureau Federation in my State received any communication from Mr. O'Neal. I know Mr. O'Neal; I have known him for many years and regard him as a very able farm leader. I do not always agree with him, and when I do not agree with him I try to be as honest with him as he is with me by telling him I do not. I do not agree with him in this matter if he has been responsible.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator and I have had some experience as most of the other Senators have had with these organizations, and we know that often the action they take is not representative of the sentiment of agriculture or any other group but is a dictum from above, passed out and asked to be complied with. Is not that true?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think, perhaps, that is true——

Mr. TOBEY. Then we should discount it, if in our judgment it is not truly representative of the membership.

Mr. BARKLEY. No matter what the legislation is and what organization has asked for it. So much for that.

Recently I was called upon by a delegation from my State, consisting of the heads of the Rural Electrification Cooperatives' Association of Kentucky. We have in that State 26 rural electrification cooperatives, embracing forty-seven or forty-eight thousand farmers. If we multiply that by the average number in a family, we can see how many persons living on farms are affected directly by the program of rural electrification. Those who called upon me were eminent gentlemen, fair gentlemen, honest gentlemen, and friends of mine personally and politically. They came to Washington to ask me to vote against Williams. I said, "What have you got against Mr. Williams?" They said, "We have not anything against Mr. Williams, but we want Mr. Neal." I said to them, "Suppose Mr. Williams could be defeated, there is no assurance that Mr. Neal would be appointed. The President had the choice. He had an opportunity to appoint Mr. Neal when he sent the name of Mr. Williams to the Senate, but he did not do it. I have no way of knowing, if Aubrey Williams' nomination is rejected, that Mr. Neal will be appointed, and I do not know whether he ought to be. He is now Acting Director of the R. E. A., having been designated by the Secretary of Agriculture, as I recall, when Mr. Slattery resigned."

I said to these friends of mine, "I cannot vote against Mr. Williams. I think he is qualified; I think his record shows he is a man who has great ability in organization. He has had some experience with R. E. A.; he is sympathetic with it." They said, "When the war is over we want to inaugurate a far-reaching program of extending the R. E. A. in the country and we want a man who will be in sympathy with it." I said to these gentlemen that, from my knowledge and experience and observation, Mr. Williams not only was in sympathy with the program but that he would be a very effective Administrator in the effort to advance and extend it.

So much for that.

Now, Mr. President, we are told that the scales are all set for the rejection of

the nomination of Mr. Williams. Maybe that is true. The Senator from Alabama the other day gave out a statement to the newspapers in which he said that the nomination would be defeated by anywhere from 8 to 10 votes. Perhaps that is true; I do not know. I have not asked any Senator how he is going to vote. I have assumed and now assume—and I think I have a right to assume, and if I did not have a right to assume it, I would not have the respect of the Senate that I have. I assume that every Member of this body will vote his honest convictions, and I assume that if I had undertaken to make a personal canvass of every Senator I would not have been able to change a single vote. I am not egotistical enough to think that I can change any votes by what I am saying now, but, so far as I am concerned, I want my record clear on this nomination.

We are supposed to be fighting all over the world to preserve some of our freedoms. The freedom of religion is one of them, and others are the freedom of the press, the freedom of speech, and the freedom of thought. All over this round earth on every island, in every sky, on every continent, and on every sea ten or twelve million of your young men are fighting in order that we may preserve the right to think and the right to express our thoughts in public.

Mr. Williams, 25 years ago, fought in not less than half a dozen battles in World War No. 1 to preserve our democracy and to preserve our Nation. Fortunately, he came out of that war unscathed, but, like about 2,000,000 other of our young men at that time, he laid his life upon the altar of his country. He was not drafted; he volunteered; he went into the Army and fought at Soissons, at Chateau Thierry, at Chemin des Dames, and on other battlefields, and came back home. Up to that time he had scarcely any education. At the age of 21 years he started out to educate himself. It takes a man of courage, fortitude, and vision to do that. Many young fellows when they arrive at the age of 21 think it is too late to try to obtain education; they do not want to enter classes with younger men. Mr. Williams was not of that fainthearted type. He laid his life on the altar of his country a quarter of a century ago, and now his own boys, out of his own loins, are fighting again all over the world in order to preserve our right to think and our right to speak. Because their father may have thought some thoughts and spoken some words that may not meet our entire approval, are we to say here in the United States Senate that those 4 boys can be expected to give their limbs and their lives in order that here back in America we may think and speak, but their father is to be denied the right to hold an office of honor and trust in the United States because he is exercising and has exercised the rights for which they are today fighting?

Mr. President, I am not willing by my vote to render such a verdict. I am not willing by any votes of mine to say to those boys, and to 12,000,000 other boys who may have fathers who have acted in a way not altogether to our approval, "It is all right to send you all over the world to fight for us to have the right to think and the right to speak; but that is a 'phony' right, it is an illusion. You may surrender your lives in Germany or Japan in order that we in America on the home front may think and speak, but when you get back to America you are going to find an America that does not believe in the thing for which you have been fighting." I do not intend by any vote of mine or any word of mine to contribute to such an intellectual, moral, spiritual, or political debacle on the shores of the United States.

Mr. President, the rejection of the nomination of Aubrey Williams will cast no reflection on his 4 sons. Let no one be disturbed by that thought. It will not in the long run even cast a reflection upon Aubrey Williams himself. But when these 12,000,000 men of ours return to the United States and find what it is we have done and have been doing and saying here, the result of this vote may be a reflection upon the Senate of the United States, because they are coming back, and they are coming back to a Nation for which they have been fighting all over the world. They are coming back to a philosophy which they have been led to believe guarantees our right to be free Americans, and when they get back we may find that in their migrations all over the world, with packs upon their backs and guns upon their shoulders, they themselves have entertained some ideals about our own domestic situation and the world situation which are not altogether in conformity with traditions.

They may have some new ideas about things in this country. I hope they will. I believe they will. Not that they will come back with any notion of undermining the foundations of our Nation or society, or to make unstable the institutions which have grown up in America in a hundred and fifty years under the Constitution of the United States, but, in my judgment, they will come back more impressed than ever with the fact that our Government is an instrument and an agency of the people and a servant of the people, and that under our Constitution, framed by our forefathers, we can make our Government and our institutions sufficiently strong to solve the problems which arise from time to time, without hitching them to a post and making it impossible for them to move forward in the development of organized society, whose only effective agent and spokesman is the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, I shall cast my vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Aubrey Williams in the belief that he is an honest man, that he is a sincere man, that he is a Christian man in the highest sense of that term, being an advocate of applied Christianity. I shall vote for his confirmation in the belief that he will make an able administrator, considering the problems of all the communities in the Nation which seek to harness electric energy, this great miracle of nature, in order that drudgery may be lifted from the backs of millions of our people who have never enjoyed this boon of science.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall make a short statement of my reasons for voting against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Williams, not for the purpose of persuading any Senator, but in order that the RECORD may be clear.

I have not examined the so-called charges against Mr. Williams, nor have I given any weight to them, nor have I made any decision on the basis of the charges. I myself know that Mr. Williams has been closely associated with extremely left-wing groups, such as the American Youth Congress, but I have not studied his position on such questions, and I have not formed my conclusion on his position, because it has seemed to me immaterial because of his lack of other qualifications.

The question we have to consider is not whether the charges made are true or not true. When a nomination is submitted to the Senate the question we have to consider is whether the nominee is qualified for the particular position for which he is nominated.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator does not mind, I should like to conclude my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio declines to yield.

Mr. TAFT. Qualifications are always intangible, difficult to determine, and not satisfactory subjects for evidence or debate. I have found the best way to ascertain a man's qualifications is to ask people who have come in contact with his work. I have talked with many who have had such contact with Mr. Williams, and I have never found any who have not been extremely critical or apologetic about Mr. Williams' activities as an official of the Government.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Williams because, in the opinion of those who have best reason from experience to know, he is an incompetent and wasteful administrator, he has no judgment or reliability, he has always been inclined to disregard the limitations of law and authority imposed upon him by Congress.

The Rural Electrification Administration is a business organization, supposed to make business loans to farm cooperatives on a reasonably sound basis. Mr. Williams' qualifications certainly do not cover this type of activity, and his faults completely disqualify him.

I might add that the leading farm organizations, vitally interested in the welfare of the Rural Electrification Administration, are against Mr. Williams, including the National Grange and the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. President, in view of the discussion on the floor of the Senate some days ago by the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], I ask that there be inserted at this point in my remarks a letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., March 20, 1945.

Hon. ROBERT A. TAFT,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TAFT: In response to your inquiry relative to the position of the American Farm Bureau Federation concerning the appointment of Mr. Aubrey Williams as Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, I wish to advise that, after conferring with several of our Farm Bureau leaders, I authorized the sending of a joint letter with the National Grange and the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, which was sent to every member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on January 31, 1945. This letter opposed the confirmation of Mr. Williams' appointment.

This action was subsequently reviewed by the executive committee of the federation, which represents all regions of the United States, and the committee unanimously supported my action. This action was submitted to the board of directors and there was no objection to the action that was taken by the executive committee; during a 3-day session not a single member of the board registered an objection. The action of the executive committee stands as the action of the federation unless it is reversed or modified by the board.

I also approved the sending of another joint letter with the National Grange and the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation to every Member of the Senate on March 16, 1945, again opposing the confirmation of Mr. Williams' appointment.

Trusting this will give you the information you desire, I am,

Sincerely yours,
EDW. A. O'NEAL, *President.*

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I prefer to conclude.

Mr. AIKEN. I was merely going to state——

Mr. TAFT. It has been urged upon me that I should vote for Mr. Williams because he is friendly to the cause of our Negro citizens, and has made enemies for that reason. I rather resent the fact that Mr. Williams' friends have apparently gone all over the country accusing Senators who are opposing Mr. Williams because they do not think he is qualified of being against the colored people. I agree that Mr. Williams' friendship for the colored people is a strong point in his favor, but it has no relation whatever that I can see to his qualifications to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration. I do not understand why I should vote for a man who has no qualifications, merely because he is also opposed by some southern Democrat.

The argument that because Mr. Williams has four sons fighting abroad for the United States he is qualified to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration seems to me so ridiculous as to require no answer. There are many hundreds of men in this country who have exactly the same qualifications, if that is an argument for appointment to an important and responsible position in the United States.

Mr. President, my decision is based solely on my conviction that Mr. Williams is wholly and completely unqualified for the position of Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator tell us how the Ohio farm organizations stand on the appointment?

Mr. TAFT. I have not heard from them, so I do not know how they stand.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator say he has not heard from Ohio rural electric cooperatives?

Mr. TAFT. I have three letters from rural cooperatives in Ohio. Two of them are opposed to Mr. Williams, and one is for him.

Mr. AIKEN. Did not the State-wide cooperatives say they were for him?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think I have any letter from the State-wide Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives. At least, I did not find any in my file, and I looked through it this morning. I have two letters from cooperatives in Ohio which are opposed to Mr. Williams, and one letter from a cooperative which is for Mr. Williams.

Mr. AIKEN. In Ohio?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I have received communications from Ohio cooperatives also endorsing Mr. Williams, signed by William Griffith, of the South Central Cooperative organization.

Mr. TAFT. I may suggest that Mr. Aubrey Wiliams has propagandized throughout the country to have telegrams favoring him sent to Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. He has caused all the telegrams he could to be sent to Senators for the purpose of persuading them to favor his nomination. Obviously rural electrification cooperatives lose nothing by endorsing Mr. Williams. His nomination might be confirmed. If his nomination is not confirmed they will lose nothing, because they can be for the next man who may be appointed.

Mr. AIKEN. Are we to understand that because the Ohio State Farm Bureau and the Ohio State Grange have not followed the leadership of the Washington representative and telegraphed to the Senator from Ohio, that they are opposed to Mr. Williams?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a question is asked.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I have received an official letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation asking me to oppose Mr. Williams. That has been published in the newspapers over and over again. If the American Farm Bureau Federation of Ohio dissents from that action, they should let me know. Otherwise, I assume that the National Farm Bureau Federation speaks for the various organizations which are constituent parts of it.

Mr. AIKEN. I shall have to repeat the statement I made the other day, that a very large number of State farm bureaus have not followed the leadership of the Washington representatives in opposing the nomination of Mr. Williams.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. I may state that the other day the Senator from Vermont stated unqualifiedly that this had been done by the Washington representatives; that it was not endorsed by the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation; that it was not endorsed by the executive committee. Yet at that time it had been endorsed both by the board and by the executive committee of the American Farm Bureau Federation, as shown by the letter I have just placed in the RECORD.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sorry the Senator from Ohio does not remember very well what I said. I said that the letter was written to Senators opposing the nomination of Mr. Williams before the letter was submitted to the directors, or the State branches asking for their support, because one of them called me up and said he had received this letter and wanted to know what it was all about. I do not say that the board of directors, finding it out, naturally did not try to pull the Washington representative out of the hole. If I had been one of them I would probably have done so. I say the action was taken without previous notice having been given to the board of directors.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator first made the other statement that the letter had not been endorsed, and subsequently when I got the actual facts on the telephone, the Senator made the later statement which he has just repeated.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am not going to bicker with the Senator from Ohio on this matter, but I do want to take a little time now to go into something which has not been brought out and which may explain in part some of the intense opposition to the confirmation of the nomination of Aubrey Williams. The Senate might perhaps understand the intense opposition to the confirmation of Mr. Williams a little better if I were to review the circumstances which eventually led up to his nomination, which we are now considering.

When Congress placed the R. E. A. under the Department of Agriculture, Mr. John Carmody, the Administrator of R. E. A., quickly came to the conclusion that the arrangement would not prove workable, and resigned his position. Mr. Harry Slattery was appointed to succeed him, and Mr. Robert Craig, who has been with the Department a long time, remained as Deputy Administrator under Mr. Slattery, which position might be considered to be that of an executive officer of the organization. Mr. Slattery's work took him around the country a great deal addressing meetings here and there.

Mr. Craig, extremely able and likewise ambitious, seemed to have done a great deal of the work of actually directing the R. E. A. I give him credit for much that was done in reducing the cost of construction and making other improvements in the work generally.

Mr. Craig readily admitted sponsoring the organization now known as the National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association. This association was organized principally by Mr. Craig, Mr. Clyde Ellis, ex-Representative from Arkansas, and Mr. Steve Tate, who I take to be a rather ambitious—I do not know whether "playboy" is the word or not—from the State of Georgia.

One of the primary purposes of this organization was to form insurance companies which would insure, not only the lines of the cooperatives, but would ultimately expand into all the branches of the insurance business.

Personally I believe that an organization of the R. E. A. cooperatives is a good thing, and I believe that mutual insurance of their lines would be very helpful all around. It is a type of insurance which regular insurance companies do not care for anyway.

I do not believe that it was Mr. Craig's business as a Government employee, however, to sponsor the N. R. E. C. A., as it is commonly called, and I do not believe that this organization should go outside its own field of insurance; but I do think that a national organization is a good thing for the 1,000 rural electric cooperatives which we have in this country today. In the absence of a strong organization the cooperatives may be picked off one by one, and may be attacked singly by the utility companies which are so strongly opposed to the existence of any R. E. A. at all.

The N. R. E. C. A. having decided to organize two insurance companies, the question came up as to where the capital would be obtained, and the men in the oragnization decided the capital could be obtained easiest by getting the R. E. A. cooperatives to invest their funds in these insurance companies. They were to organize under the laws of the State of Maryland, and, as I recall, they had to have $300,000 in order to make a start. Inasmuch as the funds of the cooperatives were supposed to be kept for the purpose of repaying their loans as these payments became due, such a method of financing was undoubtedly improper, if not actually illegal.

Up until the spring of 1943, the N. R. E. C. A. had been very friendly with Mr. Slattery. They had eulogized him, they had praised him, and had been very friendly with him, at least on the surface, but in April of 1943, when Mr. Slattery warned the cooperatives not to put their funds into the insurance business, the N. R. E. C. A. turned on Mr. Slattery with a vengeance and demanded his removal. They wrote to several Members of Congress and wanted them to ask the President to remove him. Steve Tate called him on the phone and told him that if he did not come around to their way of thinking they would drive him out of his office. I think the words used were that they would have a "cat thrashing" if Mr. Slattery did not come to terms. But Mr. Slattery did not come to terms.

In the meantime Mr. Wickard had decided that something must be done about the R. E. A.

Among other things, it was found, as was testified in hearings before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last year, that when bids for wire were called for by local cooperatives, whenever the aluminum interests were the low bidders the engineers under Mr. Craig required specifications to be changed so as to get another bid from the copper interests and permit them to underbid aluminum and so obtain the order.

It was testified before the committee that in many cases the practice of refusing the low bid of the aluminum company and rewriting the specifications so as to give the bid to the copper interests cost the local cooperatives several thousand dollars.

I have not learned to this day whether aluminum or copper is the better material to use for the wire of rural electrification lines, but it appears from the testimony, which ran all through the hearings last year, that the copper interests definitely were favored in the letting of contracts and particularly a corporation known as the Copperweld Co. was securing the lion's share of the orders.

Although there is no evidence that Mr. Craig ever profited financially from turning orders over to the copper interests while he was employed by the Government, it seems that Mr. Wickard felt that the best way to handle the situation was to get rid of both Mr. Craig and Mr. Slattery. Mr. Craig was under investigation at the time, but was permitted to resign, which he did. Mr. Slattery refused to resign. He came to the Congress and told of the treatment to which he was being subjected, and asked for a hearing, which was accorded him. There were rather extended hearings. The printed testimony in the hearings comprises five good-sized volumes.

After leaving the R. E. A., Mr. Craig went to work almost immediately for the Copperweld Co., which was the company which had been getting most of the orders from the R. E. A., and he is now employed by the Copperweld Co. It seems that those interests had heard that Mr. Williams was to be nominated to be Administrator of the R. E. A.

It appears that late in January, just a few days before Mr. Williams actually was nominated, Mr. Ross Collins, a former Member of the House of Representatives, who was acquainted with Mr. Williams, invited him to lunch. When Mr. Williams arrived at the appointed place he found there not only Mr. Collins, but also Mr. Craig of the Copperweld Co.; Mr. Gray, who also represented the Copperweld Co.; and Mr. Clyde Ellis, a former Member of the House of Representatives from Arkansas, who, as I have said, was one of the organizers and keymen of the National Rural Electrification Cooperatives Association.

I heard about this luncheon meeting very soon after it occurred, and I would have interrogated Mr. Williams about it when he was before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last month. However, the subject was brought up by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] and was voluntarily discussed by Mr. Williams. I should like to read the testimony which was given at that time. It is found on page 208 of the printed hearings:

Senator SHIPSTEAD. Do you know Mr. Gray?
Mr. WILLIAMS. I met him once; yes, sir.

As I have said, Mr. Gray represents the copper interests.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. Do you know who he is?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, I know very little about him. I met him one time.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. How did you happen to meet him?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I met him in this manner: Some weeks ago Mr. Ross Collins invited me to lunch. I am very glad to have that question brought up here. I went to lunch with Mr. Collins, and at this lunch there was Mr. Gray and Mr. Craig and Mr. Ellis.

Mr. Ellis told me at the luncheon, "I get it in the wind that you are going to be nominated by the President for the R. E. A." "Well," I said, "I don't know. I heard some rumors about it." Then later I talked to Mr. Judson King and he said to me, "Have you read these records?" I had heard something about Craig, so forth and so on, and he said, "Have you read the records?" I said, "No." He said, "I wish you would come out here and read them.' So I got the records and read through the first two volumes.

It became perfectly evident to me on reading the two volumes that I wanted little help from Mr. Craig.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. You came to that conclusion?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes. I called up my friend, Mr. Collins, and told him I wanted to make it very clear to him that I did not want any support or help from Mr. Craig or anybody connected with him.

This man Gray was there. I saw him for a moment later in company with Mr. Ellis.

Mind you, Mr. Craig is employed by the Copperweld Co., which had been getting the lion's share of the orders for R. E. A. construction material.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. What is Mr. Collins doing now?

Mr. WILLIAMS He is here in Washington.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. You don't know what he is doing?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, sir; I do not.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. But he invited you to meet these people?

Mr. WILLIAMS. He did. He had been of great help to me in the N. Y. A. work in the House—in Congress.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. Do you know Mr. Carlin Gray's business?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No, sir; I do not.

Senator SHIPSTEAD. You don't know that he is a lobbyist for the Copperweld Co.?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I do not know anything about him. That is the only occasion I think I ever met him.

I understand, too, although it does not appear in the testimony, that these representatives of the Copperweld Co. told Mr. Williams at this luncheon meeting what a great help they could be to him in the work which he would be doing. However, it appears to me that the Copperweld Co. felt that Mr. Williams could be of great help to it if he became Administrator of the R. E. A.

After he gave his testimony before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on February 14, which I have just read, it was apparent that the opposition to him was intensified from that date. When the representatives of the Copperweld Co. found that they could not handle him, it would appear that they then

turned on all the heat they could everywhere in the United States to prevent his becoming Administrator of the R. E. A.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the Senator indicate to the Senate what kind of heat, pressure, or influence they might exert on this body?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator knows the kind of influence these big corporations use. They do not usually exert it directly. They find some other way. They bring up the color question in certain States where the people feel keenly about it. They bring up something else, such as communism in another State. They incite the people to opposition by indirect means. The Senator knows that they do not come out in the open and work directly.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. It has been very unfortunate that in this debate the friends of Aubrey Williams have brought up so many issues to hurl either directly or by insinuation against those who do not consider Mr. Williams adequately qualified to administer so great and important a function in the national life and future of America. We have had the color question, the religious intolerance question, the nationality prejudice question, and now comes the suggestion that some copper interest used its influence, and, therefore, might influence the vote in the Senate.

Let me say to the Senate that among my acquaintances of Jewish extraction there are many of the finest people in the world. I have an undying gratitude toward the colored people, for it was a colored boy, a Senegalese in the Army of France, who helped to carry me, wounded, off the battlefield. My father was a Protestant minister. My chaplain, as I faced death, was a Catholic priest. Since birth I have had none of the influences which would cause me to be affected by such charges so as to cause me to vote against Aubrey Williams for any such reason. I dare say that no Member of the Senate has been influenced by anyone with a copper interest in mind; and I resent such implications being hurled. In these trying days, when nerves are jagged and men are laying their lives on the altar of death to preserve a Nation of tolerance, in my judgment the less such questions are brought forward, no matter what political advantage one may think he can derive in the future by hurling such charges, the better off our country will be, and the better our cause, for which our boys are dying, will be served.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have the floor. I am not yielding for a speech. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that if he does not like the conclusions which I draw, all he has to do is to read the testimony which was given before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last year. If he can draw any other conclusion than that the copper interests of the country had the inside track in obtaining R. E. A. orders, and that they intended to run the R. E. A. so far as it was possible for them to do so, then he is drawing a different conclusion from that which I was able to draw.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely wish to ask the Senator from Illinois whether I am correct in understanding that he said the friends of Aubrey Williams have raised the question of color and the question of religion?

Mr. BROOKS. I am not sure who raised them first; but I will say to the Senator that the friends of Aubrey Williams have been bandying them around here and have been charging that that was the influence which might draw a vote against him, and I wished to disclaim any part in it or any intimation of it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I do not blame the Senator from Illinois for wishing to disclaim any part or interest of that sort; but I ask him to read the record before the committee and see who raised the question.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield briefly.

Mr. BROOKS. In reply to the Senator, I will state that what I had to say applies to every Member of this body. It would be better that such questions not be raised in this country today, no matter who is involved; and once they are raised, it would be better to let them lie, rather than to bandy them constantly around on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. I agree that such questions should not be raised; but once they are raised, I think they should be met.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico told the Senator from Illinois what I intended to tell him, namely, that if he would read the record before he spoke he would find out that it was not the friends of Aubrey Williams who raised these questions at all.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to say that I do not know whether copper or aluminum is the best and cheapest conductor for R. E. A. lines to use; but I am satisfied that if Mr. Aubrey Williams is appointed to the office, neither the copper interests nor any other interests will dictate to him and tell him how to conduct the R. E. A. I am sorry the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association or its personnel has ever become connected in any way with the Copperweld Steel Co. I am sorry that in the bulletin of the N. R. E. C. A. which I have before me we find only three full pages of advertising, one by the Wagner Electric Corporation, of St. Louis, about which I know nothing, another full page by the Copperweld Steel Co., and a third full page by the Anaconda Wire & Cable Co. I have hoped that the rural electric cooperatives in this country might have an organization to work for the good of all, to reduce the insurance costs on their lines; but I am reluctantly forced to the conclusion and opinion that that organization cannot stand, that it is headed for trouble, that it has become too closely allied with the interests which make too much money from the R. E. A. cooperatives' line construction.

I repeat that these people cannot handle Aubrey Williams, and I repeat that the intense activity against him dates from the time when he came before our committee, last month, and told of the subterfuge which was used to get him to meet with the representatives of the Copperweld interests just before he was appointed.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I had not intended to say anything during the discussion of the pending nomination. However, there have been indications of an intense hatred being engendered throughout the country over this particular nomination. I was astonished when the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] made the statement that the friends of Aubrey Williams had raised the question of prejudice or hatred. I do not think the Senator has read the record or has listened to the reading of the record. On page 168 of the record, which was read the other day, I noticed one of the first injections of prejudice. I have heard of anti-Semitic injections into discussions, but I do not know where I have heard before of an attempt to use a person's beliefs against him, when it is said that he denied the divinity of Christ after the church educated him for the ministry. That is a matter which was injected into the situation by the Senator from Tennessee. If he is one of the friends of Aubrey Williams, I mistake the situation. He is the one who suggested to the Nation that the nominee does not believe in the divinity of Christ. I wish to remind him and some others that today there are millions of people in this country who do not believe in the divinity of Christ, and that, according to our Constitution, they are citizens of the United States and are entitled to hold office. I have known of people holding high office in the Government of the United States who were not supposed to believe in the divinity of Christ, and so have other Senators. I do not know why that question should be injected into the record unless we are going further than a consideration of anti-Semetic activities, and are reaching the point of antagonism against some of the beliefs of the Jewish people. I do not know any other reason for injecting such questions into the pending issue.

We are told that the friends of Aubrey Williams are the ones who have brought these issues forward, but the record contradicts that statement. It shows that they came from the opponents of the nominee—the bitter haters of Aubrey Williams.

I do not know whether it is a mere coincidence that the Senator from Tennessee who has used that argument has also been a bitter opponent of Lilienthal. I do not know whether that is a coincidence, or what is the purpose of such an attack and suggestion to the Nation.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] told us it was to the credit of Aubrey Williams that he has been a friend to the Negro. I do not know whether that sort

of credit is entitled to consideration in this debate. I do not know whether it is the intention to consider a man's beliefs and actions, or whether we are simply to use such pet hatreds for the purpose of poisoning the minds of first one person and then another, and then turning around and saying it is the friends of Aubrey Williams who inject hatreds into this debate.

When it is said that the Negro has a friend in Aubrey Williams I should think that would at least arouse some sympathetic consideration in the minds of those who have been benefited as much as some of our friends in this Chamber have been by the votes of the Negroes. I think there are many of us who have been. I do not deny that I have; I think many of those on the opposite side of the aisle have, I am sure that many Senators on this side of the aisle have. But the sad part is that these issues are injected into the discussion for the purpose of affecting the determination of who shall occupy the position of administrator of a great Government agency.

It has been said that Williams is not qualified; but, Mr. President, some of the Senators making that contention voted for Williams when his nomination for another important public office was before the Senate for confirmation on a previous occasion. They admitted his qualifications then. It is apparent that at the present time, by reason of numbers, their courage has increased, or their opinions have changed. I do not know which it is. I do not know whether their opinions have changed because more persons are now prejudiced, and because more persons have been reached by prejudice, or whether it is because they did not know on the previous occasion to which I have referred what they think they now know. Were they derelict before when they did not learn of his lack of qualifications, or are they now manifesting an exceeding amount of interest because there are many persons who are joining with them in this anti-Semitic and anti-Negro move?

Mr. President, I do not believe there are many persons who believe that Williams is not qualified to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration. I have listened to the discussion which has taken place in the Chamber, and I have heard no statements made which would indicate a lack of ability on the part of Williams. I have heard conclusions stated by Senators who will vote against Williams, and who know how they will vote. They say, "No, he is not fit; he is not qualified." We have not been told what it is that Mr. Williams cannot do. The Senator from Ohio said that Williams has gone far to the left; but the Senator also argued just as strongly against President Roosevelt. President Roosevelt has been too far to the left for the Senator from Ohio; but he has been about right for the American people; he has been right for the American Army; he has been right for the boys who are fighting in this great war. Aubrey Williams' boys are also fighting in this war. Aubrey Williams has been good enough to raise boys to fight in the war for you, Mr. President, and for me.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator misunderstood me. I said that I would not vote for or against Aubrey Williams merely because he had pursued a course to the left. I said that I happened to know that he had been closely associated with the American Youth Congress, which was repudiated by President Roosevelt on the occasion when they called upor him and he told them that their position with regard to Finland was utterly unreasonable. That is all I have said about Aubrey Williams. But, so far as his being to the left or to the right is concerned, I think I made it clear that that has nothing to do with my particular views as to his qualifications for being Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. TUNNELL. I understood the Senator quite clearly, and I think every other Senator understood him. We know that the Senator from Ohio has been opposed to Williams on the ground, as stated, that he was too far to the left. He stated that he would be as much opposed to Roosevelt as he would be to Aubrey Williams. That is my belief as to the Senator's position.

Mr. President, we have been told that the National Grange is opposed to Aubrey Williams. I do not believe it. I do not think that many persons believe that the Grange is opposed to Aubrey Williams. Certain officials of the Grange usually appear on occasions of this nature and add their voice to any expression which they think is anti-administration.

Not long ago I received a letter from a man by the name of Brenckman. So far as I know, there never was a partisan contest held in this body when he was not antiadministration. Brenckman wrote me regarding his position with respect to Aubrey Williams. If I did not know anything else about Aubrey Williams except that he was opposed by Brenckman, I should say that the presumption should be in favor of Aubrey Williams. Considering the experience which I have had with Brenckman I would take a position consistent with the views of Aubrey Williams sooner than I would take one consistent with the views of Brenckman.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am not here to defend Mr. Brenckman, because the Senator may know very much more about him than I do. Is the Brenckman to whom the Senator refers the Washington representative of the National Grange?

Mr. TUNNELL. I presume he is a member of the organization, but I do not believe he represents the full membership of the organization.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am not speaking of whether he represents it or not. I am asking the Senator if the Fred Brenckman to whom the Senator has referred is the Brenckman who represents the National Grange.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, what does the Senator want to know from me?

Mr. BREWSTER. I wish to know whether the Brenckman to whom the Senator has referred is the Fred Brenckman who represents in Washington the National Grange?

Mr. TUNNELL. I assume that he is. What else does the Senator wants to know?

Mr. BREWSTER. I merely wish to say that, as a lifelong member of the Grange——

Mr. TUNNELL. If the Senator wants to ask me a question, let him ask it. If he wants to make a speech, let him make it later. I decline to yield further to him.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. Brenckman is a representative of the Grange. I like him very much. I think he is a citizen of high standing. Nevertheless, I disagree with his opinions in this matter. I do not wish anything I have said during this debate to be regarded as any reflection on any of the representatives of the farm organizations who signed the letter opposing the nomination of Aubrey Williams.

I do, however, reserve the right to disagree with them at any time and this is one of the times I disagree with them.

Mr. TUNNELL. His opinions are very similar to other opinions which have been expressed to me. I do not know whether the Senator has reference to other ideas which Mr. Brenckman has expressed. I do not know whether Brenckman has any other ideas or not. I never hear from him except when he wants to strike at some person whom he classes as "Administration."

Mr. President, so far as I have heard prior to or during this debate, the farmers of this country have no particular reason to be afraid of Aubrey Williams, and I do not believe they are afraid of him. I believe that the effort to arouse the farmers against a person who has been nominated for office should be condemned. I do not refer to anyone who has been nominated by a party; I refer to someone who has been nominated by the President of the United States. The effort which we have seen to arouse opponents to the nomination now before the Senate, is highly reprehensible. Such efforts are based upon prejudice. I do not believe the Senator from Ohio, or other Senators whom I have heard speak, should be identified with the kind of prejudice which we have all seen manifested during this debate. I know that it is well to separate one's self from the spirit of prejudice, and I think we should separate ourselves as a Senate and as a Nation from such a spirit. Unless there is some evidence other than the conclusions of some of those who have exhibited the spirit of prejudice not only now but in the past, so far as I am concerned, I shall think that the prejudice has something to do with the vote which is to be taken today.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I desire to speak for only a few moments, and I shall appreciate that amount of consideration.

Mr. McKELLAR. I withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President I have not entered into this unfortunate, it seems to me, and distinctly personal controversy. I have had no quarrel with Mr. Aubrey Williams; my relations with him have been most cordial. I regret that this situation has arisen, but I do not care to enter into the discussion, because I think the subject has been pretty well exhausted on both sides. Yet, as a lifelong member of the National Grange, which is representative, I believe, of the very finest citizenship and which, we earnestly hope, may be one of the chief factors through its constituent members in the rural areas in saving us from the great perils which we may face in the post-war era, I cannot, as one Member of this body, remain silent when its Washington representative, Mr. Fred Brenckman is attacked in what seems to me to be an utterly unwarranted manner by the suggestion that if he has expressed an opinion upon a subject of such vast national import to the rural regions of the country, then that is sufficient reason for taking the other course. It is not merely Mr. Fred Brenckman who is involved, but it is the great national organization which he represents. I shall not choose to advise any other Member of this body, but I, at any rate, do not desire to see such a message as this go out to the great organization which for 75 years has contributed so greatly to the progress of this country and which was organized here in the city of Washington that many years ago.

I appreciate the indulgence of the Senate in permitting me to place at least this brief statement in the RECORD. I know Mr. Fred Brenckman, and I regard him as a man of character and capacity and one whose opinion is entitled to respectful consideration by this or any other body.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Eastland	McCarran
Austin	Ellender	McClellan
Bailey	Ferguson	McFarland
Ball	Fulbright	McKellar
Bankhead	George	McMahon
Barkley	Gerry	Magnuson
Bilbo	Green	Maybank
Brewster	Guffey	Mead
Bridges	Gurney	Millikin
Briggs	Hart	Mitchell
Brooks	Hatch	Moore
Buck	Hawkes	Morse
Burton	Hayden	Murdock
Bushfield	Hickenlooper	Murray
Byrd	Hill	O'Daniel
Capehart	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Overton
Chandler	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Radcliffe
Connally	Kilgore	Reed
Cordon	La Follette	Revercomb
Donnell	Langer	Robertson
Downey	Lucas	Russell
Saltonstall	Thomas, Utah	Wherry
Shipstead	Tobey	White
Smith	Tunnell	Wiley
Stewart	Tydings	Willis
Taft	Vandenberg	Wilson
Taylor	Wagner	Young
Thomas, Okla.	Wheeler	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams, of Alabama, to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration?

Mr. McKELLAR. On that question I ask for yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to take not more than 1 minute. A moment ago the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] rightly expressed his indignation against raising the religious issue, the issue of race, and other issues which spring from intolerance. I agree with him perfectly. Such questions should never be raised on the floor of the United States Senate, but, Mr. President, since they have been raised Senators have a very effective and decisive way of meeting them. That way, Mr. President, is by the votes they cast.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Aubrey W. Williams to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GUFFEY (when Mr. MYERS' name was called). My colleague, the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], is absent on public business. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. TOBEY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. If he were present he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent on an inspection tour for the United States Navy.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS]. If present and voting the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] would vote "yea"; and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. My colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is necessarily absent. If present he would vote "nay" on this question. His pair has been announced heretofore.

I announce the necessary absence of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] who if present would vote "nay." He is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] who I am advised would if present vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—36

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Barkley	Johnston, S.C.	Murdock
Briggs	Kilgore	Murray
Chavez	La Follette	O'Mahoney
Downey	Langer	Pepper
Ellender	Lucas	Taylor
Green	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Guffey	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hatch	Magnuson	Tunnell
Hayden	Maybank	Wagner
Hill	Mead	Wheeler
Hoey	Mitchell	Young

NAYS—52

Austin	Eastland	Reed
Bailey	Ferguson	Revercomb
Ball	Fulbright	Robertson
Bankhead	George	Russell
Bilbo	Gerry	Saltonstall
Brewster	Gurney	Shipstead
Bridges	Hart	Smith
Brooks	Hawkes	Stewart
Buck	Hickenlooper	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Calif.	Tydings
Bushfield	McCarran	Vandenberg
Byrd	McClellan	Wherry
Capehart	McKellar	White
Capper	Millikin	Wiley
Chandler	Moore	Willis
Connally	O'Daniel	Wilson
Cordon	Overton	
Donnell	Radcliffe	

NOT VOTING—8

Andrews	Myers	Tobey
Butler	Scrugham	Walsh
Glass	Thomas, Idaho	

So the nomination was rejected.

TREATY WITH MEXICO RELATING TO THE UTILIZATION OF THE WATERS OF CERTAIN RIVERS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, automatically the Senate will return to the consideration of the Mexican treaty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was displaced by a vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand, but the motion to displace it was that it be temporarily laid aside. Does that not mean that it will automatically come up without an additional motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed by the parliamentarian that a motion temporarily to lay aside is not in order.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I resolve the difficult parliamentary problem by moving that the Senate resume the consideration of the Mexican water treaty.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty (Executive A, 78th Cong., 2d sess.) between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, relating to the utilization of the waters of certain rivers, and (Executive H, 78th Cong., 2d sess.) a protocol supplementary to the treaty.

Mr. HAWKES obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to make a brief statement. I merely wish to urge Senators to remain in the Chamber. The treaty with Mexico is now before the Senate and will remain before the Senate, subject to any temporary exigencies that may arise, until it is disposed of. It is a very important matter, and I hope Senators will not absent themselves on the theory that the treaty is

going to take a long time to be considered by the Senate. I hope we may keep the treaty before the Senate in executive session until it has been finally disposed of.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to ask for unanimous consent for consideration of the debt-limitation bill. I am not advised as to what the Senator from New Jersey has in mind to discuss, and I do not wish to ask his consent until he has finished.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I did not hear clearly what the Senator from Georgia said.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I expected to ask unanimous consent that the Senate lay aside the treaty with Mexico temporarily, and proceed to the consideration of the debt-limitation bill.

Mr. HAWKES. May I ask the Senator how long he thinks that will take, because I should like very much to make my statement now, if I may.

Mr. GEORGE. I think it would take only a few minutes, but I do not wish to displace the Senator, and will wait until he has finished.

Mr. HAWKES. I shall not take very long.

Mr. President, I am just as vitally interested in our coming to an agreement and ratifying a treaty with Mexico which will define the equitable rights of the two nations to the Colorado River water and the Rio Grande water, as is any other Senator. I am very deeply interested in being a good neighbor, but I am also interested in being a sound neighbor, and looking after the interests and welfare of our own people in the United States. I am one who believes that in making a treaty which we hope will bring peace, we should make it wisely and in such form that those who follow us will find it possible to carry it along in such a way as will preserve and maintain peace.

Mr. President, knowing that our distinguished ex-President Mr. Herbert Hoover had a great deal to do with the Colorado River compact between the seven States, realizing that he probably knows as much about the water requirements and the water conditions of that great river and its basins as any other man in the United States, I wrote to him and asked if he would enlighten me in regard to those conditions and with reference to the treaty. I have in my hand a letter which Mr. Hoover wrote to me under date of March 17.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document this letter from Mr. Herbert Hoover, so that every Member of the Senate may have a copy of it and study it and may have the enlightenment which will come from Mr. Hoover's experience as chairman of that compact commission.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed as a Senate document (No. 32).

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I wish to read from the letter in part. I do not wish to take the time of the Senate now by reading the entire letter:

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter asking my views about the pending treaty with Mexico allocating the waters of the Colorado River and its relation to the Colorado River compact. I have gone back over the records, I have studied the treaty, and I visited the locality again a year ago to bring myself up to date.

Certainly we should deal with Mexico as a friend, and not at arm's length. But when we make a treaty about water, we are dealing with the lifeblood of the West, and shaping its whole destiny.

As you know, I had the honor to be Chairman of the Colorado River Commission which settled the Colorado River compact in 1922 and other matters relating to the development of the river. And during the following year I had many duties involving these questions.

Mr. President, I should like to remind Senators that Mr. Hoover not only was chairman of the Commission to settle the Colorado River Compact, but he was the Secretary of Commerce of the United States at the time, and therefore was the Government's representative in that matter.

I read further from the letter:

6. The compact's references to a treaty: At the time the compact was negotiated, the possibility that a treaty might be made with Mexico some day was recognized, and that under it Mexico might become entitled to the use of some water. In that event, the compact divides the burden between the upper and lower basins, but it cannot be said that the compact "foreshadows" such a treaty as that now proposed.

I omit a part of the letter, and come to this:

Now, by means of American works, we have controlled the flood water and silt, which is of tremendous value to Mexico. No one would want to deny these benefits to Mexico. But had it been suggested in 1922 that the United States was to be penalized in the future by having to furnish free to Mexico a volume of water, made available by works constructed in the United States, to supply lands made possible of development only because of those works, I know it would have met with the opposition of the compact framers. Moreover, had the compact negotiators considered such a treaty possible as the present one, I am not sure that agreement on a compact could have been reached. Certainly, the compact that was concluded would have been different.

* * * * *

As to the allocation of water: The treaty guarantees at least 1,500,000 acre-feet per year to Mexico, but contains no specific allocation or reservation of water to the United States.

Mr. President, I think that is an important point to mark. We guarantee certain water to Mexico, but there is nothing said about guaranteeing anything to the United States in the event of a very low flow of water, or in the event of a drought.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from New Jersey has been quoting Mr. Hoover with reference to the compact entered into between the Colorado River Basin States.

Mr. HAWKES. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The irony of the matter, so far as the Senator from New Mexico is concerned, is that that compact was brought about at Santa Fe, N. Mex., and Mr. Hoover was the chairman of the Commission. The Senator from New Jersey is now speaking of the allocation of water which might be made under the treaty, but Mr. Hoover and those who took part in the compact conference at Santa Fe, N. Mex., were not at the time considering also American States, so far as New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming were concerned. Of course, California got it all. Whenever Mr. Hoover is quoted, so far as that compact is concerned, naturally I know that he is not discussing the interests of New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, or Wyoming.

Mr. HAWKES. I recognize what the Senator has said. I am reading from Mr. Hoover's letter, which he has sent to me in explanation of this matter. I cannot quite agree with the Senator that Mr. Hoover is not just as much interested in New Mexico as in any other State.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no question in my mind of his deep interest, but I know that the fact is that New Mexico got nothing, Colorado got nothing, Wyoming got nothing, and Utah got nothing.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator realizes, does he not, that California had agreed to pay the bill for Boulder Dam?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I realize that California got the water, electricity, and everything else.

Mr. HAWKES. Why did she get it?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly Mr. Hoover is the answer.

Mr. HAWKES. That may be so; but the fact of the matter is that Boulder Dam never would have been built if contracts had not been made to take the power and water and pay for them, under which contracts California assumed the whole burden of the investment in Boulder Dam, with interest on the investment.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. Let me finish. So far as I know, that was the first case in the United States of a community guaranteeing to return to the United States Government every dollar advanced for a great project.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I ask the distinguished Senator who has the floor if it is not true that the compact divided the water, 7,500,000 acre-feet to the upper basin States and 8,500,000 acre-feet to the lower basin States? Is not that correct?

Mr. HAWKES. That is my understanding.

Mr. DOWNEY. Consequently, is not the insinuation made by the Senator from New Mexico, that California got it all, and the upper basin States got nothing, far out of line with an accurate statement of the facts?

Mr. HAWKES. If the representatives of the State of New Mexico who attended the meeting were as able as the Senator from New Mexico, I am sure that New Mexico's interests were not neglected.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator possibly has more faith than I in that particular

respect; but let me tell the Senator from California——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. On paper, the upper basin States are supposed to get 7,500,000 acre-feet. But what was the law which was enacted by Congress? California would get the water; California would get the power; Arizona would get 17 percent of the revenue; Nevada would get the rest; and we signed the compact. Those are the facts.

Mr. HAWKES. Was not the State of New Mexico a free agent? Did it have to sign the compact?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course we did not have to sign the compact; but I am telling the Senator the facts.

Mr. HAWKES. Would this treaty correct the errors to which the Senator is referring?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It would correct the errors to some extent. What little water California has left for us would be protected.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I regret to interrupt while the distinguished Senator is making his argument, but I must answer the statement made by the Senator from New Mexico.

At the time the compact was made, the upper and lower basin States were using only about 7,000,000 acre-feet of water, and that is all they ever could have used. By the construction of Boulder Dam the availability of water was more than doubled; and under the compact New Mexico now has safely guarded twice as much water as she was using, or twice as much water as she could have used without Boulder Dam.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is only common sense to recognize that water runs down the river. It never runs up the river. I do not care about the technicalities; but water runs down the river. More water goes into Boulder Dam from New Mexico than that State will ever get out of it, even under the best of conditions.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator is not criticising California because of the fact that water runs down the river, is he?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; but I am criticizing California for wanting to grab it all. We should like to have at least a gallon.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I should like to obtain some information from the able Senator, who has made a study of the pending treaty. Will the treaty, if put into execution, deprive the territory above Boulder Dam of the use of any water which it is presently using or may use in the future?

Mr. HAWKES. I do not think so.

Mr. OVERTON. Is there any dispute about that?

Mr. HAWKES. Is there any difference of opinion?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes, Mr. President; most certainly. Under the provisions of the treaty, representatives of the Republic of Mexico will have control of all the tributary streams which are a part of the Colorado River stream system.

Mr. HAWKES. If I may interrupt for a moment let me say that perhaps I misunderstood the question. I thought the Senator asked whether the States above Boulder Dam would be deprived of water.

Mr. McCARRAN. The treaty could be so operated as to deprive the States above Boulder Dam of water to which they are entitled. It depends upon the management of the treaty; and the management of the treaty would be in the hands of two men, namely, the Boundary Commission, consisting of a citizen of the Republic of Mexico and a citizen of the United States.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will indulge me for another observation, the reason I made the inquiry was that in the consideration of the last flood control and river and harbor bill what is called the arid and semiarid West, comprising a number of States in the Missouri Valley Basin, was very anxious not to be deprived of a single drop of water. Finally an agreement was entered into which was satisfactory to the committee and satisfactory to the Senators from the States in the Missouri Valley, and generally in what is called the arid and semiarid West. After that prolonged fight and satisfactory agreement, I expressed the hope that this treaty will not deprive that territory of any of the water provisions for the conservation and preservation of which have been made. If the Senator will pardon me, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is thoroughly conversant with the question, and I am sure he could answer it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that whether or not anyone in the United States is deprived of any water is more or less of a long-range question. At the present time we are wasting probably 10,000,00 acre-feet of water into Mexico every year. As we increase our uses in the United States, there will be less wastage of water into Mexico. It is conceivable, although I do not regard it as probable, that the time might come, in some period of extreme shortage—and the treaty makes provision for that kind of a situation—when both the upper and lower basins might have to make good whatever deficiency there might be in the one and a half million acre-feet of water guaranteed to Mexico. The treaty provides that in that event each of the two areas shall make it good on a 50–50 basis. Fifty percent of the deficiency would be made good by the upper basin, and 50 percent by the lower basin. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that from the standpoint of the proponents of the treaty, we do not want to lose any water. We regard this as a way to save water. For example, at the present time Mexico is using 20 percent of all the water from the Colorado River Basin which is being used. Under the operation of the treaty she will ultimately be reduced to using approximately 8 percent. In our own interest and to save our own water, those of us who favor the treaty are for it because of that reason.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I will yield for a minute. I should like to continue my remarks; because days or weeks will be spent in considering the treaty, and I should like to proceed to present consecutively some of the thoughts Mr. Hoover has expressed in his letter.

Mr. OVERTON. I shall take only a moment. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado a further question. During the excessively dry years when the upper basin States will have to make the same contribution that the lower basin States will have to make, will that contribution affect Colorado?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. OVERTON. What other States will it affect?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It will affect every State in the Colorado River Basin, namely, Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, California, Arizona, Nevada, and New Mexico.

Mr. OVERTON. In view of the strong fight which was made by Senators representing the Western States to conserve every drop of water the good Lord might vouchsafe to them, and considering the fight which was made last year, it is passing strange that the Senator would now favor giving up some of the water.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I wish to say that I shall not intrude any further on the time of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey who has the floor and is anxious to proceed with his remarks. I simply wish to serve notice at this time that I think some of the last statements inadvertently made by the Senator from Colorado are highly erroneous, and in my own time I shall answer them. However, I do not think we should intrude further on the time of the Senator who has the floor.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further observation?

Mr. HAWKES. How long will it take, let me inquire.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It will not take more than a moment.

Mr. HAWKES. Very well, I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I simply repeat to the Senator from Louisiana that those of us who favor the treaty do so because we think it will save us water, rather than lose us water; and that will be the subject of considerable debate.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like to say, following the remarks of my distinguished friend the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], that I

am interested in a treaty and I do not wish to be put in the class of those who are opposed to one. I am interested in a treaty which is founded on justice and which protects the rights of the citizens of the United States, a treaty which will have a chance of enduring and a chance of producing the kind of peace about which all of us are talking.

One of the complaints I have to make about the treaty now pending is that, in my opinion, it does not clearly define how the existence of a drought shall be declared. Inasmuch as the United States has spent hundreds of millions of dollars for the construction of the dams and has made it possible to have the water available at all, I very definitely believe that the United States should have the undisputed right to declare when a drought which endangers its citizens exists.

Now, Mr. President, to resume with Mr. Hoover's letter, I read further from it:

This guaranty—

That is the guaranty to Mexico of a million and a half acre-feet of water a year, as suggested in the treaty—

takes precedence over older American users who are paying for the storage works which alone will make possible Mexico's increase of use above the quantity of approximately 750,000 acre-feet which she used before construction of the Boulder Canyon project. Each country ought to be allocated a pro rata of the flow of the river so that Mexico will share the hazards of the American water supply if she is to share the benefits of the American storage. The so-called escape clause entitling the United States to diminish deliveries only if her own consumptive use is curtailed by extraordinary drought is so uncertain in operation as to invite acrimonious dispute.

I repeat that, Mr. President—invite acrimonious dispute. That is what we are attempting to avoid.

I read further from the letter:

(b) The impairment of existing American rights: The Boulder Canyon Project Act stipulated that the waters stored by that project should be used exclusively within the United States. Congress appropriated $165,000,000 on that representation to the taxpayer. Communities in the lower basin entered into contracts with the United States reciting that pledge, and in reliance upon it have incurred over $500,000,000 of debt to repay the Government's whole investment and to construct aqueducts, canals, transmission lines, etc., to use the water so stored and paid for. Figures used by the Reclamation Bureau show that in a decade like 1931–40, if 1,500,000 acre-feet were guaranteed to Mexico each year, some 15,000,000 acre-feet of Boulder Canyon storage would have to be drawn down for that purpose, exhausting substantially the whole active storage of the reservoir, after making deductions for flood control and dead storage. Our pledge ought to be kept. If it is to be broken, Mexico ought to be admitted no further than to a basis of parity with, not precedence over, the American users who assumed the obligation to pay for these works on the promise that the benefit would be theirs.

* * * * *

2. Diversion works: These are the key to the treaty. Until the upper basin is fully developed, several million acre-feet per year will flow to the sea, as has always been the case. The Boulder Canyon project power operations convert this into a smooth flow, instead of spring floods, but the greater part of the water discharged for power generation will nevertheless reach Mexico during the winter season, when she does not want it for irrigation. Mexico lacks sites for diversion works; these are located on American soil. The treaty (i) obligates the United States to build Davis Dam to make the Boulder Canyon winter power discharges available for Mexican summer irrigation; (ii) requires Mexico to build a diversion dam, which may be partly on American soil, within 5 years; (iii) authorizes her to use American power for pumping; (iv) gives her part of the power proceeds from Pilot Knob power plant, built at American expense, to help Mexico pay for some of these investments; and (v) offers her the use of the All-American Canal. The combined effect is to make possible the use of several million acre-feet per year, not merely 1,500,000 acre-feet, of the waters conserved by the Boulder Canyon project. That is to say, the treaty alone makes possible the increased Mexican use of the temporary American surplus, the fear of which is the impelling reason for making any treaty at all.

* * * * *

3. Administrative provisions: This treaty foreshadows the more important post-war treaties to come, and is an ominous precedent. It delegates excessive power to a commission of two individuals, one American and one Mexican.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. Certainly, I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Permit me to say about the treaty that while its proponents do not think the objections about the administrative powers of the United States section of the Commission give ground for any fears along the line expressed by the Senator, I wish to say that I am prepared to offer, and we are having drawn now, a reservation which would place in the resolution of ratifications language making it entirely clear that the powers of the International Commissioner representing the United States as to appropriations shall in no case be binding until the Congress shall authorize the appropriations, and also making it clear—which I think the treaty already does—that the American Commissioner shall not have any power or jurisdiction in any wise to interfere with State laws or with the operations within the United States or any of our Federal or State agencies, such as the Reclamation Service or any of the State agencies.

It seems to me that if that sort of a reservation is adopted, it will remove any complaint or any fear whatever as to the powers of the International Boundary Commission.

I suggest that early in the debate, because there is no disposition on the part of those who favor the treaty to put anything over on the Congress or to do anything which is violative of the spirit of the intent to have Congress control.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Texas that I am sure no one wishes to put anything over on the Congress or on the American people, because whenever they do it they put it over on themselves.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. We are all a part of America.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. May we not have a copy of the draft of the reservation to which the Senator from Texas referred?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am having it prepared, but I do not have it at the present time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. May we have it during the afternoon?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think it will be available this afternoon, but certainly it will be by next week. I want to be fair with the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Who is preparing it?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am having some experts and some lawyers drawing it up. I will submit it to the Senator from California. He will see it before it is offered.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We may get into trouble with lawyers and experts. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. At times we have to deal with all kinds of people.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I wish to compliment my good friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] with respect to his statement concerning the reservations. I think the power to be given the Commissioners is altogether too broad, and I think it is unprecedented. I think it is a good thing that we will have an opportunity to consider the reservations later on. I think that we should also consider the type of treaty which has worked well between the United States and Canada. There is no Senator here who would not want to deal fairly with Mexico, but our first obligation is, of course, to make sure that the American States that are opposing the treaty, such as California, Nevada, and other States that have entered complaints, are assured that, so far as possible, their objections shall be removed. It may be that when their objections are removed the treaty may be in such form that there can be general agreement on it. If the Senator from Texas will allow Senators who represent States in opposition to the treaty, such as the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and others, to consider the reservations, I think that much time can be saved.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If a time could be fixed when we could have possession of the draft and make a study of it, I think we could do something of consequence. But the Senator from Texas does not allow us any leeway. From the beginning to the end of the work involving the drafting of this treaty the work was conducted by a few people from "upstairs." They, together with the representative of Mexico, but not a representative of any of the States that are opposed to the treaty, framed the document. That is one of the situations with respect to the treaty about which I complain.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey further yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I yield for a moment, but I should like to continue my remarks so that there may be some continuity to them.

Mr. CONNALLY. I apologize to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator from Texas does not need to apologize to me. He has been extremely courteous.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

All I wish to say is that the Senator from California will be given opportunity to inspect the draft before it is offered. If the Senators with whom we shall confer wish to offer suggestions with reference to the draft, we shall give them every consideration. I initiated the matter only yesterday, and I have not had much time to work on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It was initiated day after day in the hearings. I can forgive the Senator for not counting that time. However, there seems to have been time in which to go to Mexico and present to the officials there the particular questions involved. Please let us know when we can secure a copy of the draft.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I see the force of the argument of the Senator from California. I think that the amendments should be in the hands of Senators at the earliest possible moment. I may say to the Senator from California that if this great body is to take any amendment which has been prepared in some special room, or in some special way, and act upon it without first giving it due consideration and proper deliberation, and without recognizing our obligations to the people of the United States, the Senate is not what I believe it to be.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I should hate to debate that question.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not want to debate it at the present moment.

I continue to read from the letter:

> The significant innovation of this treaty is that the power delegated here, even as to domestic functions of the Commission or its officers, cannot be reclaimed without the consent of Mexico. The treaty endures until Mexico agrees to another one. If the Senate fails to retain, by reservation, the power of Congress over the Commissioners created by this treaty, and the large funds they will control, it will be setting a precedent for the all-important post-war settlements.
>
> 4. Conclusions as to the treaty: A treaty with Mexico on the Colorado River is desirable, as a matter of principle, but is by no means indispensable.

I may interpolate that we have gone for 50 years without a treaty of this nature, and I should rather have none at all than one which was brought about by precipitant and ill-advised action for which we would repent at leisure.

> The present treaty contains many good features, particularly as to the Rio Grande, but its three cardinal defects as to the Colorado ought to be remedied by Senate reservations. Otherwise, the treaty will cause, not cure, endless discord with Mexico and contention among the seven States of the Colorado River Basin.
>
> If Mexico declines to accept such reservations, it would be better to have no treaty at all than to perpetuate the interpretations which would be disclosed by such refusal.

Mr. President, I have prepared a few remarks which have come to my mind in connection with my study of this treaty, and the proposals which have so far been made.

The Colorado River compact, the Boulder Dam Act, the contracts made between the Government and California agencies and citizens, and the construction of the Boulder Dam as a consequence of these sequential events, have made it possible for Mexico to rely upon the receipt of water in excess of 200,000 acre-feet a year in dry years, at times and in places where water is required.

It is one thing to say that 200,000 acre-feet a year flow down through Mexico and into the ocean, and it is another thing to talk about 1,500,000 acre-feet a year flowing down at times and to places where it is wanted and needed.

To be sure, Mexico used 750,000 acre-feet as a maximum prior to Boulder Dam, but that was not a regular yearly use, nor delivered exactly at the right time and at the right place on a basis of reliability.

It is claimed that California is asking too much, in seeking its full rights for future use, and development of its great arid regions, because of the fact that none of the Colorado River water originates in California.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is it not equally true that Mexico contributes absolutely nothing to the flow of the stream?

Mr. HAWKES. It is positively true, and I think I will bring that out in my next statement.

Mr. MURDOCK. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. HAWKES. If the basis of reasoning to which I have referred is sound, Mexico would have no rights at all, because none of the Colorado River water originates in Mexico.

All this was known when the Colorado River compact was agreed upon. All this was known when the Boulder Dam Act was enacted by the Congress of the United States in 1928. All this was known when the contracts were entered into between the United States Government and the people of California.

Let us not forget that the only reason that the water is available in reliable quantities for either California or Mexico is that California agreed to reimburse the Federal Government over a period of years, not only for the full cost of Boulder Dam, but with interest on the investment which the United States made in Boulder Dam.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LA FOLLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How did that operate? Did California reimburse the Government for the cost of Boulder Dam?

Mr. HAWKES. California entered into a contract that guaranteed the return of the funds invested in Boulder Dam, with interest at 3 percent, if I remember correctly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did California in that way pay for the dam?

Mr. HAWKES. No; the Government invested the money, and California entered into a signed, sealed, and delivered contract to repay the Government every cent it invested in Boulder Dam, with interest at 3 percent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What does California receive?

Mr. HAWKES. If the Senator makes a contract with me to pay me a certain amount of money, then certainly he is going to receive something for it. He would not be foolish enough to agree to pay $160,000,000 and interest unless he got something in return.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What did California receive?

Mr. HAWKES. California received water according to the Colorado River compact.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. And power.

Mr. HAWKES. And I think any excess water that may have been made available.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does not California receive electric power cheaply?

Mr. HAWKES. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is no detriment. We pay in Arkansas a much higher rate and get nothing at all for it. That is a good guarantee in itself.

Mr. HAWKES. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Arkansas that, because of this contract California paid the United States $4,000,000 for power they could not use and did not need simply because they agreed to do this thing. I am certain if the Senator from Arkansas agreed to pay large sums of money in any venture he would expect some benefits, otherwise he might find himself in the poorhouse.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understood that California got cheap enough rates, and that in itself was a great boon.

Mr. HAWKES. Of course, it was a boon. Did the Senator ever go into a deal in his life without expecting to get some benefit?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no reason to complain, if it was a good deal.

Mr. HAWKES. Is my speech a complaint?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. California, I understood, is complaining.

Mr. HAWKES. I am not complaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, just what has the Senator from Arkansas against California?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Nothing.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. What is the umbrage the Senator takes against California?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has the floor.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I should like very much to proceed with my remarks if I may.

California certainly has the right to expect that the seven-State Colorado River compact and the Federal Government will keep faith with it and its citizens in accord with the provisions of the Boulder Dam Act, which was amended in the Senate, and contains the provision

that the water conserved by Boulder Dam shall be for the exclusive use of the citizens of the United States. To me that is pretty plain language.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is wrong; it should not be that.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator means it is American language.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes, that is American language, and we ought to repudiate it.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not believe in breaking faith on any contract to which I am a party, and I certainly do not believe in helping the Government to break faith with its citizens on a sacred act such as the Boulder Dam Act.

California and its citizens relied upon the Colorado River compact and the Boulder Dam Act when it entered into its contracts and put several hundred millions of dollars of venture capital—I repeat, "venture capital"—into the erection of dams, aqueducts, waterways, and the system of water conveyance, a part of which consists of 80 miles of expensive tunneling through mountains.

California did not make these investments on the theory that its entire territory could be developed in 10, 15, or 20 years. It recognized the fact that it might take 50 or even a hundred years, and that is what made the investments venture capital.

It has always been venture capital that has pioneered the way and built up the United States of America. If every improvement and development in the United States had been compelled to rely upon immediate profit and utilization of all of its powers within a short period of a few years, there would have been no development, and venture capital would have been forthcoming, but would have remained in the bank or been put in Government bonds or other safe investment.

There are a number of points in the treaty which I feel should be amended before it is adopted, but two points are vital, and if they are accepted by this branch of the Congress, it will mean a new era in government and our foreign relationship.

No. 1 is the question of giving Mexico 750,000 acre-feet of water in addition to what was used in the maximum year prior to the building of Boulder Dam. It is argued that during the last year, 1944, while the treaty was a matter of discussion—and mark you, Mr. President, those words in the treaty were a matter of discussion in the Senate—Mexico used 1,800,000 acre-feet of water, but no one says much about the fact that this 1,800,000 acre-feet of water would not have been available, nor would it have been usable at the right time and at the right place, except because of the improvements along the river which were in the United States and which were paid for by the money of our citizens for the purpose of conserving water for the exclusive use of our citizens in the United States.

I should like to say that while it is repeatedly stated Mexico used 1,800,000 acre-feet of water in 1944, there is no conclusive evidence to that effect. If there is, I should like to have it pointed out to me. I do not question it, because I know nothing about it; but, so far as I am concerned, up to date no definite information has been furnished me to prove that 1,800,000 acre-feet of water went to Mexico last year.

I believe we should be the highest type of good neighbors which it is possible to be, without sacrificing the rights and natural resources of the country which belongs to our own citizens. It is my firm conviction that in making it possible for Mexico to have and use at the right time and right place 750,000 acre-feet of water each year, subject only to unusual drought in this country which deprives us of some of our own water, we are being good neighbors and we are giving Mexico something she never could have had without our investments and improvements and engineering skill, exercised within the confines of the United States.

No. 2: I am unalterably opposed to the making of a treaty which permits an American water commissioner to enter into agreements with Mexico to do things involving the expenditure of perhaps hundred of millions of dollars, subject only to the approval of our State Department, or the so-called Government of the United States.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has very kindly explained that an effort is being made to draft amendments which will cure that defect, which I mentioned the first day the treaty came before the Senate for discussion.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. Perhaps I misunderstood the distinguished Senator from Texas, but I understood him to say that it was his intention to present reservations rather than amendments.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. DOWNEY. I might say to the distinguished Senator who has the floor that I understand reservations have no effect upon the power of the other party to a treaty. A reservation merely explains in effect what we believe the treaty to mean, or it may limit our own action, but in no way affect the rights or obligations of the opposite party to the treaty. That can only be done by an amendment.

Mr. HAWKES. In other words, the Senator's point is that a reservation only partially reduces the moral obligation.

Mr. DOWNEY. If the Senator will yield further, it does not at all affect the obligation to the other contracting country to the treay.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. When a reservation is accepted by the other party to a treaty, of course, it is just as binding as any portion of the treaty. That is the object. If, let us say, we say to the other country that by use of the word "government" we mean thus and so, and they accept it, as they will no doubt accept a reservation if they accept the treaty, it is just as binding as anything in the treaty.

Mr. HAWKES. Does the Senator contemplate in the reservations he is preparing to include provision that they must be accepted by the other country?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is implicit.

Mr. HAWKES. I do not believe in leaving things implicit. I think there are too many "implicit" things, and I think when we have the English language, everything should be made plain. Experience throughout my whole life has taught me that when we leave something indefinite, although we may think it all right, we often get into trouble, whereas when we define a thing clearly, we save ourselves much trouble. I had an old friend who used to say, "God deliver me from honest misunderstanding; I do not care anything about dishonest misunderstandings."

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield, but I should like to conclude.

Mr. DOWNEY. Never mind; I shall make some remarks in a moment, after the Senator concludes.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I believe the approval of these important developments and expenditures of the money of the taxpayers, citizens of the United States, should be up to the Congress of the United States. It is not satisfactory to me to have anyone say we are protected because under the treaty the Congress must appropriate the money. If the Government is bound morally, and I believe legally as well, to proceed under this treaty with a foreign power, then I am not willing to have the Congress refuse the appropriation and in turn have the foreign power make a claim which must go to arbitration under the Pan American Treaty of 1934, providing two-thirds of the Senate agree it should, and I do not see how they could refuse.

If we really expect and want peace in the world, let us clearly define our rights and obligations in our relationship under each specific treaty with each and every foreign power with whom we enter into treaties and thus avoid misunderstandings.

The fact that a vast number of organizations in the United States are opposed to this delegation of power and to this treaty is sufficient reason to cause every Senator to pause and consider carefully the effect of the treaty, which is not revocable, and can only be altered, changed, or canceled by the consent of both governments.

I call the attention of the Senate to a green book which has just been issued and which I think is available to every Senator, showing the various persons and organizations in the United States—important organizations which are on record by resolutions duly adopted—that are opposing the treaty as it is proposed. The organizations include the Wyoming Stock Growers' Association, the Wyoming Wool Growers' Association, the Wyoming Agricultural Council, the Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation, the American Bar Association, the American Federation of Labor, the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, the

Western Regional Farm Bureau Conference, the Intermountain Section, American Society of Civil Engineers, and so on. I shall not take time further to read the list. I have mentioned these only to show that everyone in the five States mentioned is not in favor of the treaty. I think a false impression was left a few days ago, not intentionally, of course, but it was indicated that five States out of the seven in the Colorado River compact were in favor of the ratification of the treaty. Surely it may be possible at almost any time to get five governors, it may be possible to get the engineers of a State, and United States Senators, who, for one reason or another, will be for or against something, but this great body owes it to the people of these States to pay attention to what the people themselves want done. Because the two Senators from New Jersey and the Governor, and perhaps the chief engineer, are in favor of something, it does not follow, according to my way of thinking, that necessarily the people of New Jersey are in favor of it. I merely call attention to that because I think it is very important.

The pending treaty is a new pattern of treaty with a foreign power, and if it is ratified in its present form it can mean little less than that the Congress of the United States is abandoning its supervision of the affairs of the people of the United States and turning those affairs over to the administrative branch of the Government, with power to obligate the Nation, leaving to Congress only the duty of automatically appropriating the money needed to complete the work and plans agreed upon by the administrative branch.

To this I am unalterably opposed, because I believe in constitutional government, and I believe that the elected representatives of the people have a greater responsibility to the people than the appointed representatives, department heads, or agencies of the administrative branch of the Government.

Mr. President, the debate will undoubtedly cover an extended period, if we do our duty. I am learning every day how little I know about the treaty, and I have spent many hours and many days on it. I have studied it for no other reason in the world except that I am a Member of the Senate. I have no interest which directly or indirectly is affected by the treaty we are discussing, but I am very deeply interested in preserving the natural resources of the United States, and in not agreeing to do things which we cannot afford to do. I am not in favor of acting in haste and repenting at leisure. We are trustees for the younger generation which is now living, and we have to look at 50 years as a very short time.

From what I heard in a meeting of 6 or 8 of the distinguished Members of this body this morning, I came to the conclusion that this matter was thoroughly misunderstood. The question was asked, "Suppose a shortage of water occurs, and the dams are full and the quantity of water provided for is guaranteed to Mexico; will we have to deliver it?" The answer was that we would unless there should be an unusual drought. "Why should we not?" said one Senator. "The water is in the lake back of Boulder Dam, and in the reservoirs which we have built, and what we deliver will not hurt us."

Mr. President, I wish to leave a very important thought in the minds of my colleagues in this connection. God does not send the rain evenly distributed to suit you and me, and the snow does not fall and does not melt to suit us. If we exhaust the reservoirs because the water is there, when we have a year of drought—and we cannot say when there will be such a year—it is conceivable to anyone who has ever been in the West what will happen. I have been going to the West for 43 years. I have seen Los Angeles County grow from 145,000 to 4,350,000, in a period of time which is as but the wink of an eye.

Senators have said to me, "What are you disturbed about? California cannot use this water in the next 40 or 50 years." That makes me smile, Mr. President. What is the period of 40 or 50 years in the life of a nation? Do we owe the youth following the present generation the duty of conserving and preserving fairly and justly the natural resources of our country? I merely leave that thought with the Senate. I wish I could make it as clear as it is to me, because I have seen the reservoirs, and I have been through a drought period. I have seen the effects of drought, and I say to my colleagues that if we do not properly protect our natural resources, if we let them get away, and permit the people of California to go broke and suffer famine because the water is not there, due to our action in putting ourselves under obligation in perpetuity to a foreign nation, then I do not want it recorded that I was responsible for it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. I rise at this time merely for the purpose of keeping the record straight respecting the extraordinary drought provision in the treaty. Not only must there be an extraordinary drought in the Colorado River Basin, but two other things must happen before we can deny one drop of water to Mexico under the guarantee. We could experience the most violent drought that has ever afflicted this country, and still under the guarantee, we could not deny a drop of water to Mexico. Under the treaty not only must there be an extraordinary drought, but after the drought comes, then before we can decrease by one drop the water to Mexico we must first decrease consumptive use in the United States. Then there is still another provision that precedes decreasing use of water to Mexico, and the third condition is that we must find it difficult to make deliveries to Mexico before we can deny Mexico a drop of water. So we have the three conditions——

Mr. HAWKES. May I interrupt the Senator there?

Mr. MURDOCK. Certainly.

Mr. HAWKES. We may not only find it difficult to deliver the water to Mexico, but we must prove to Mexico that we have had a drought, and that it is difficult to deliver the water. We must prove that to Mexico's satisfaction.

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes. In my opinion the Mexican section of the Commission would have something to say on the question. But we must have the three condition: First, extraordinary drought; second, a decrease of consumptive use in our own territory, and, third, difficulty in delivering water to Mexico.

If the Senator will be patient with me I should like to make a comment. The very reason that we spend hundreds of millions of dollars up and down the Colorado River is to tide our users over periods of drought. We fill up our reservoirs during the flood season in order to enable us to continue deliveries during a dry season or during a drought. But under the provisions of this treaty, regardless of what the taxpayers of the Colorado River States spend for their own benefit, we must first decrease the use of stored water to the users in the United States before we can deny a drop of water to Mexico.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Utah for his very clear statement on that subject, because it is most important that it be understood.

First, Summing up briefly, I wish to be a good and fair neighbor to Mexico, but I likewise want to be a fair and honorable representative of the people of the United States and not sell them down the river through playing Santa Claus with the natural resources which were presumably to be conserved by the Boulder Dam and other dams for the future use and development of properties vital to the welfare of the next and succeeding generations.

I do not believe we can buy friendship, and if for a time we buy what seems to be friendship, such presumed friendship will vanish just as soon as we are compelled to refuse to make further gifts of things which are desired by a foreign nation but badly needed by our own citizens.

I am unalterably opposed to this new pattern of treaty which gives the administering branch of Government the power to obligate our citizens morally, if not legally, in sums which will run into hundreds of millions of dollars without the approval of Congress first being obtained, so that it gives its consent to any and all projects of importance, prior to the time it undertakes the appropriation of the money with which to carry them through.

Second. It is my firm conviction that this treaty should clearly define the right of the American Commissioner or the Government of the United States to declare when there is a drought that puts its citizens in jeopardy of losing the necessary water required to maintain satisfactorily the property, farms, and agricultural interests of the people.

On Tuesday, February 13, 1945, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, when Mr. Tipton was testifying in regard to the meaning of the last paragraph of article 10 on the treaty, which deals with the question of drought or serious damage to the irrigation system of the United States, which would make it difficult for

the United States to deliver the guaranteed quantity of a million and a half acre-feet a year, he stated as follows:

The interpretation of the word "difficult" is in the hands of the United States Commissioner. He can determine that it is difficult if the upstream reservoirs are threatened with depletion by reduction in run-off in the Upper Basin. It is within his discretion to make the determination of what constitutes extraordinary drought and as to what constitutes difficulty in making deliveries.

I requested and was granted permission to ask Mr. Tipton a question. I again acknowledge the courtesy with which the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee always treated me before the committee. I asked Mr. Tipton this question:

Is there anything in the treaty that says what you have just said, and that is, That our Commissioner can decide whether it is difficult? I have understood that there is not. I have understood that the Commissioners have to agree on that.

Mr. Tipton replied:

No. I do not think, an extraordinary drought, sir.

Senator HAWKES. Can you refer to the thing that says that our Commissioner can decide it alone?

Mr. TIPTON. I think the lack of saying anything—

Remember this, Senators—

I think the lack of saying anything would indicate that it is at the discretion of our Commissioner. As a matter of fact, it is assumed that at the present time that actual determination would be made by the United States Bureau of Reclamation.

Senator HAWKES. It may be assumed, but I do not agree with you where there are two parties to the treaty that without anything being said one can assume that he has a right to determine when there is an extraordinary drought. I think that is one of the weak points in the treaty, and I have thought so all along.

Mr. TIPTON. That again, I think, sir, is a legal question, and I think the Six States Committee would be very happy if that were propounded to the attorneys at the time.

Senator HAWKES. You do see my point?

Mr. TIPTON. Yes; I see your point.

Senator HAWKES. Why leave something uncertain, when you believe a certain thing is meant?

Mr. TIPTON. Well, I see your point.

Senator HAWKES. Well, why leave it uncertain when it is easy enough to fix it up by the use of the proper language?

Third. With reference to the quantity of water we guarantee to Mexico, to be delivered yearly at the times it is needed for use, it is my firm conviction that we will be fine neighbors and can never be criticized by anyone in the world if we, through the use of hundreds of millions of dollars of our money, have constructed dams which make it possible to deliver a regulated flow of water to Mexico at the boundary line, year after year, subject only to extreme droughts, and in the amount of a guaranteed 750,000 acre-feet of water, which was the maximum amount of water Mexico used prior to the construction of the Boulder Dam.

I used the word "maximum" advisedly, because Mexico had no reliable source of supply until we did these things and spent our money. Some years she received as little as 200,000 acre-feet of water.

Then, if on top of guaranteeing her 750,000 acre-feet of water, such as we have at the Imperial Dam, we give her the entire return flow, which the State Department engineers have estimated to be as high as a million acre-feet a year of water of usable quality but not equal to the fresh water at Imperial Dam, it is my feeling we will have complied, not only with the terms of equity, but with the requirement for sane generosity.

I urge the Senate to weigh well this new pattern of treaty which sets a new standard for the United States in its international dealings.

I hope we may devise a treaty which will be so fair and so well defined and so satisfactory that when it is ratified we will have accomplished some of the things which are necessary for peaceful understanding and cooperation, and which will build for continuing peace between these two great nations which God ordained should be close and fixed neighbors for all times.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the distinguished Senator from New Jersey believe that Mexico is entitled to any water at all?

Mr. HAWKES. I believe that Mexico could probably prove a claim, in any court which tried to dispense equity and justice, to a few hundred thousand acre-feet of water. By that I mean not more than 500,000 acre-feet.

Mr. LUCAS. How does Mexico obtain that right?

Mr. HAWKES. She obtained it by prior use, before we ever built Boulder Dam and spent $579,000,000 to conserve water.

Does the Senator believe for one moment that the representatives of Mexico in Washington do not know that when the Boulder Dam bill was passed it was amended in the Senate so as to provide that the water conserved by that dam should be for exclusive use in the United States by its citizens? I do not know whether the Senator was in the Chamber when I made the statement that the record shows that Mexico had used as much as three or four hundred thousand acre-feet a year. However, that was not a regulated flow, delivered at the times and places where the water was desired.

Mr. LUCAS. I know what is said in the Colorado Basin Pact about a treaty. I also know what the evidence shows as to the number of millions of acre-feet which are going into Mexico at the present time. In attempting to answer halfway the argument which the Senator has made, my point is that if Mexico can acquire a right, by prior use, to a certain amount of water—the Senator now admits that she has a prior right to 500,000 acre-feet, and even California agrees that she is entitled to 750,000 acre-feet—if Mexico has been able to establish such a right in the past under the doctrine of prior appropriaion or prior use, it seems to me that under the same doctrine, whether Boulder Dam or any other dam be built, if the water continues to flow into her territory, and she continues to use the water, she might at some time be able to use 3,000,000 acre-feet of the 10,000,000 acre-feet which is going down there now. It seems to me that in the same court of justice and equity to which the distinguished Senator has referred, at some time in the 50-year period which the Senator has mentioned, someone might ultimately say that Mexico, instead of being entitled to 750,000 acre-feet a year, would be entitled to 2,500,000 acre-feet a year. That is the thing which has been worrying me, so far as the interests of the people of this country are concerned. I believe that it is a legitimate argument.

Last week in the debate the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] stated that he wanted a treaty so that the interests of his State could be definitely settled once and for all, in order that the people of his State might go forward with their plans and programs, and know exactly where they stood. To me that argument is extremely appealing, from the standpoint of substantiality, from the standpoint of future planning, and from the standpoint of a good-neighbor policy with respect to the country south of the border.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator has opened a very interesting subject.

The increased use or demand from the time prior to the construction of Boulder Dam up to the present time could only be based upon the improvements which have been made in the United States. The Senator is thoroughly familiar with that subject. If we are to go into the question of whether Mexico can use a certain amount of water, let me say that with a normal water fall, and with the reservoirs kept full, we shall be allowing many million acre-feet of water to flow into Mexico for a long period of time. Do not forget that if Mexico should take some of that excess water, over and above one and a half million acre-feet, and build towns, villages, homes, and farms, even with this treaty she might say, "You did not use this water for 20 years, and we have made many developments. We have built many towns. What are you going to do?"

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot follow the Senator at all.

Mr. HAWKES. From the humanitarian standpoint of which the Senator speaks, I believe that charity begins at home, except for the charity we can do abroad without denying those at home their rights.

Mr. LUCAS. That is beside the point. I am attempting to argue a question which seems to me to be very substantial in connection with this treaty. The Senator definitely admits, as everyone else admits, that Mexico is entitled to so many acre-feet a year from the Colorado River. She is entitled to that water under a doctrine of law, the doctrine of prior usage. If she is entitled to so much now—and everyone admits that she is entitled to a certain amount—and if she uses more as the years go by, the question is whether or not the doctrine would still apply. Suppose that 25 or 30 years from now Mexico might be using 2,000,000 acre-feet of water. Would she not be entitled to it at that time, under the same doctrine under

which she is entitled to a certain amount now?

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator has a very able legal mind. Let me ask him a question——

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for the compliment.

Mr. HAWKES. I mean it. Does the Senator believe that without this treaty, and with full knowledge of the Boulder Dam Act, including the reservations made in it at the time we spent the money, Mexico could continually convert water to her use, and then make a claim to natural resources which originate in the United States, are confined to the United States, and preserved by the United States?

Mr. LUCAS. I am not sure that I know about that point. I raise the question. I notice that two good lawyers are on their feet—one from California and one from Colorado.

Mr. HAWKES. We have a very good one from Colorado.

Mr. LUCAS. The question is of considerable importance to me. The answer might go a long way toward helping me make up my mind on the question whether we are doing equity between this Nation and Mexico, and at the same time doing equity among our own citizens.

Mr. HAWKES. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I am always open to conviction, up to the time I sign anything; and very frequently after I sign it. However, I should like to be fully informed before signing anything.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very glad to hear that statement by the Senator from New Jersey, because from now on I shall confer with him. I am glad that he has an open mind, and that it will remain open until the last bit of evidence is in.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I am very happy that the very logical mind of the senior Senator from Illinois has gone directly to the heart of this whole question. I am very glad that he has referred to the doctrine of prior appropriation, by virtue of which Mexico might have an equitable title to the amount of water she had been using prior to the construction of Boulder Dam.

I am likewise very happy that there is present a distinguished lawyer from Colorado. I wish to assert categorically that it is the universal rule, both in the United States and Mexico, that the doctrine of prior appropriation does not apply to the stored waters of a reservoir created by the talent and labor of another people.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Colorado that there are many cases in the Supreme Court reports, and in the reports of appellate courts in the West; but I challenge any Senator who knows irrigation law to produce a single textbook statement or a single case from any appellate or Supreme Court decision holding that there is any right to acquire, by appropriation and beneficial use, the right to stored waters in a reservoir built by a private proprietor.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the distinguished Senator for his elucidation of that subject.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I should like to ask a question of any of the distinguished lawyers who are scattered about on the floor of the Senate, and let me say in that connection that the Senator from Colorado need not take his seat. I know nothing about the water laws of the West, but we have been talking about the appropriation and prior use of water. I should like to ask how long such appropriation and prior use must continue before it ripens into either a legal or an equitable right. Can any Senator tell me that?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President——

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There is no fixed time. It is judged entirely by all the circumstances of the case. There is an enormous range of time within which rights may be perfected.

Mr. WHITE. So the question as to the time is wholly in the air; is it?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is wholly in the air, and it is always wholly in the air, until there has been a judicial determination of it.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado a question. While it is wholly in the air—it may be 5, 10, 15, or 20 years—from my limited knowledge of the right which comes from prior use, it is seldom, if ever, determined or perfected in 1 or 2 or 3 years.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to finish what I started to say, if the Senator will further yield to me.

Mr. HAWKES. I should like to have the Senator from Colorado complete his statement; therefore, I yield first to him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think we are a little off the course which we should consider in connection with the problem. Until there is an arbitration or a treaty, obviously by sheer strength of our might we can do as we please with the waters of the Colorado River, to the extent we are able to control them. So our problem is whether to make a treaty and settle the respective allocations as between the two countries, or whether we should let the problem ride, and at some future day face the question in an arbitration court. So far as the treaty is concerned, we are now in process of making the treaty; so we can pass that for the moment.

Our jeopardy, I suggest, is in connection with what might happen to us in an arbitration court. In that connection I would remind the Senate that Colorado probably originates more great national streams than does any other State of the Union. We originate part of the Colorado River; we originate the Arkansas River; we originate the Rio Grande. We have had long experience with water problems, and we have tried all sorts of theories in connection with our water problems and to protect our water interests.

At one time we held the theory that because we originated the water we could do as we pleased with it, that we could use all we wanted of it, that those below us, in Kansas, for instance, could not use it unless it pleased us that they should do something with it.

We went to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court of the United States has said that in a contest of that kind between two sovereignties the doctrine of equitable adjustment shall prevail. Mr. President, what is the doctrine of equitable adjustment? It considers every relevant factor which may be involved. I have no doubt that it would consider how much water Mexico had used prior to the building of Boulder Dam. I have no doubt that it would consider how much Mexico is using now or how much she would be using as of the date when the arbitration comes before the tribunal. I have no doubt that it would consider our expenditures on the stream for the purpose of making a stabilized flow of water. Every relevant factor which could have weight as a matter of equity would be considered at an arbitration.

In that connection, Mexico is using 1,800,000 acre-feet of water.

Mr. HAWKES. No one can prove that, can he?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall undertake to do so.

This treaty stabilizes and freezes the use of water by Mexico at 1,500,000 acre-feet. The pending treaty will have the effect of progressively reducing the percentage of water which Mexico may use, from the 20 percent of water which she is presently using, to an ultimate 8 percent, approximately. That would be an equity to be considered, and that is a very valuable consideration for this treaty.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. HAWKES. Would the Senator mind if I said just a word first?

Mr. DOWNEY. No, indeed.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator from Colorado has said we would freeze the use of water by Mexico at a million and a half acre-feet. Mr. President, under the treaty Mexico would be guaranteed a million and a half acre-feet of water.

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes.

Mr. HAWKES. There is nothing in the world to stop her from converting water to her use if it flows into her territory and we do not use it, but that does not necessarily establish a prior right.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Colorado, as always, has most ably and persuasively entirely diverted from the point. Again I say categorically that all the decisions are uniform that there is no right which can be gained by beneficial use and appropriation of the stored waters of a reservoir. Manifestly, that is not only a rule of honesty and decency—namely, that a man is entitled to the fruits of his own toil—but if that rule did not prevail in the West, including in Colorado, who would build a reservoir? If Mexico has the right to grab 0,000,000 acre-feet of this water, as is the implication of the argument which has been made, would

we ever have built a reservoir? The universal decisions in the West are as I have indicated.

I wish to say to the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Maine, that the New England cases very succinctly state that same principle of law. New England modified the strict rule of riparian rights, and allowed the building of reservoirs for their mill power. I will cite to the distinguished Senator from Maine a Maine case on the basis of which it can be shown, under facts identical with those existing in connection with the Mexican situation, that Mexico could have acquired nothing more than a right to the waters of the unregulated stream, and could not acquire any right in the stored waters of the reservoir.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I think the Senator has stated the law of New England correctly. When I was a young lawyer I thought I knew something about the water law of Maine and of New England generally.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will further yield to me, let me say that the Senator from Colorado has referred to one of the most important irrigation cases ever decided by the Supreme Court of the United States, namely, the Wyoming-Colorado case. That case is on all fours with the situation now before us, and it squarely upholds the position of California. What does that case hold? It holds that equitable considerations will decide the rights between Wyoming and Colorado. Then it holds that since both States follow the rule of beneficial appropriation, the Supreme Court will apply that rule. Then it proceeds to apply it. The law of irrigation came to Spain from the Moors. Spain brought the law to Mexico. Mexico inaugurated that law throughout the Southwest. Lower California has, or did have it before the nationalization of its waters, the same doctrine which we have in California.

Consequently, under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, in both Lower California and Upper California—the United States having the same rule of law—the rule of law prevailing in the United States and in Mexico would be applied. That rule is clearly and unequivocably, I say again—and I challenge anyone to show any dissenting authority—that there is no right in any proprietor or in any State to gain a beneficial use in waters stored in a reservoir built by another person.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAWKES. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The question here, I respectfully suggest, is not one of gaining a right in water which is stored. The right which is gained is in water which is being released from storage and is crossing the boundary into Mexico.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President——

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I shall be through in a moment, and will yield the floor.

I wish to refer to the statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] which he made on the opening day of the debate. I think that he and I feel very much alike on this subject. He said that he hoped this great Nation would never use its might or power to force its will upon Mexico or upon any other country. I hope that we will never use our might or power to force our will unjustly upon any foreign nation or upon any people on earth. On the other hand, I hope we will use our power to preserve the rights, interests, and equities of the citizens of the United States. That is why I want to see this treaty given proper deliberation by the Senate. I want the Senate to analyze it and not arrive at hasty action merely because of a meeting soon to be held at San Francisco or any other place. I want to be sure that when we ratify this treaty we know what we are doing. We can then look the people of each one of the 48 States of the Union in the eye and feel that we have done justice to them, and at the same time have been a good neighbor of Mexico.

Mr. DOWNEY obtained the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that there has not been a second reading of the treaty. The Chair suggests that, if it is agreeable to both the proponents and opponents of the treaty, the treaty may be read a second time by its title.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the suggestion of the Chair is followed, and the treaty is read the second time by title only, will it be read at a later time for amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would not have to be read at a later time for amendment, but the treaty would be open to amendment in the Committee of the Whole. Likewise, amendments may be offered in the Senate after the Committee of the Whole reports the treaty to the Senate.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MURDOCK. When the treaty is open to amendment, must it be amended article by article or may amendments be offered to any part of the treaty at any time before final action?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands the precedents, the treaty would be open first to amendment, article by article. Amendments may be proposed in the Committee of the Whole, however, to an article after it has been passed in its regular order, in the same manner as when considering a bill in legislative session.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. May the Senate amend a treaty which has been entered into?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rules of the Senate, the Senate has the same right to amend a treaty as it has to amend a joint resolution or a bill either of the Senate or the House

Mr. AIKEN. Reservations would be in order before the treaty had been ratified?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Reservations, as distinguished from amendments, are, of course, in order at the appropriate time. Reservations are not offered to the text of the treaty but to the resolution of ratification. They cannot be offered under the rule until the resolution of ratification has been presented, which cannot be done until the treaty has passed the stage of amendment.

Is there objection to the second reading of the treaty by its title?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, prior to final disposal of the treaty, either while we are considering it in the Committee of the Whole or when we go back to our regular form, is there any stage of the proceedings when amendments or interpretative reservations may not be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments may be proposed up to the time of the submittal of the resolution of ratification. Reservations cannot be offered until the resolution of ratification has been presented.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. Can the treaty be read the second time without prejudice to the rights of either the proponents or the opponents of the treaty?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Chair may be permitted to state the situation, the treaty would not have to be read at the desk at length. If there is no objection, the second reading of the treaty by its title will now be had.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Executive A, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session—A treaty between the United States of American and the United Mexican States, signed at Washington on February 3, 1944, relating to the utilization of the waters of the Colorado and Tijuana Rivers and of the Rio Grande from Fort Quitman, Tex., to the Gulf of Mexico, and a protocol—Executive H, seventy-eighth Congress, second session—signed in Washington on November 14, 1944, supplementary to the treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty is now under consideration in the Committee of the Whole, and article I is open to amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I merely wish to make a brief statement. When the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] took the floor and delivered his interesting address, I stated that I would ask unanimous consent that the pending business before the Senate be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed, as in legislative session, to consider the debt limitation bill. Since making that statement, certain Senators have spoken to me and asked that the matter go over until Monday. I merely wish to make the statement that it will go over until Monday, or to some other appropriate time when I shall renew my request.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 681) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, Mr. PATMAN, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. CRAWFORD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

TREATY WITH MEXICO RELATING TO THE UTILIZATION OF THE WATERS OF CERTAIN RIVERS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty (Executive A, 78th Cong., 2d sess.) between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, relating to the utilization of the waters of certain rivers, and (Executive H, 78th Cong., 2d sess.) a protocol supplementary to the treaty.

(Mr. DOWNEY addressed the Senate. After having spoken for about 20 minutes, he yielded the floor for the day. His speech will be published entire after it shall have been concluded.)

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator will yield for that purpose, I will make the point of no quorum. I wish to do so because I think we are considering a most important treaty, and in my opinion one of the most important addresses on the treaty will be made by the junior Senator from California. So I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

During the calling of the roll.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my point of order of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not press that motion until the majority leader can be consulted.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. We have been waiting for a considerable period of time in the hope that the majority leader would be present. I looked around and could not find him. It is now half past 4. I renew the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" appear to have it.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, what was the announcement of the Chair?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have no disposition to keep the Senate in session if it does not wish to remain in session; but I am so much interested in obtaining action on the treaty that I am very hopeful that Senators will remain in the Chamber and hear the debate. I wish both sides to have a fair opportunity to present their arguments. I have no disposition to cut off any Senator, but I am very anxious that the Senate proceed with the utmost expedition.

The treaty was laid aside, and a week was spent on the nomination of Mr. Aubrey Williams. So far as I know, not a single vote was changed after a week of debate. On next Monday I shall endeavor to induce the Senate to proceed with the consideration of the treaty with the utmost expedition.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I can appreciate the force of all the Senator has said. However, we have been through a hard week. There has been long debate, and there has been a difficult decision for many Members of the Senate to make. As the Senator from California has said, it is now half past 4. I hope the Senator from Texas will acquiesce in the motion made by the Senator from California that the Senate now take a recess.

Mr. CONNALLY. In view of the circumstances, I am not disposed to resist the motion; but I hope that next week we may be able to reach some understanding.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, we may be able to reach one; but it is rather unusual to ask that an agreement be reached as to when the debate shall end, on the first day of renewed consideration.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not proposing that that be done now. I assured the Senator I would not do so. I said I hoped it might be done next week.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I make the point of order that the Chair has not announced the vote on the motion of the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas obtained permission to proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield the floor.

POSTMASTERS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there are some postmaster nominations on the Executive Calendar. I ask permission that they be considered and disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the postmaster nominations.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

George A. Cook, of Illinois, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1948 (reappointment);

Charles R. Denny, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1944, vice T. A. M. Craven; and

Julius G. Luhrsen, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 29, 1949, vice Lee M. Eddy.

RECESS TO MONDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think we should try to devote a little more time, next week, to consideration of the pending treaty, by meeting a little earlier. I had discussed with the Senator from Texas and other Senators the possibility and desirability of having the Senate meet at 11 o'clock a. m. The committees usually are not in session on Monday. Except for the work of the Appropriations Committee, I do not think there is now much committee work which is urgent. I hope it will be possible for the Senate to meet at an earlier hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, let us try it just this once; let us meet at 12 o'clock.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will not insist on moving that the Senate meet at 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday, but I desire to give notice that we shall attempt to have the Senate meet earlier each day following Monday.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until Monday, March 26, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 23 (legislative day of March 16), 1945:

POSTMASTERS

IDAHO

Charles L. Burdett, McCall.

MAINE

Sarah A. Gillis, Pembroke.
Frank Lee Whitney, Surry.

PENNSYLVANIA

May N. Schultz, West Pittsburg.

REJECTION

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate March 23 (legislative day of March 16), 1945:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Aubrey W. Williams to be Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration for a term of 10 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 23, 1945

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord Jesus, to whom we look for guidance and seek to serve, the world is straining to hear Thy voice in the solemn hush of nature newly born; we are glad, for this is the day which the Lord hath made. We pray for that day when this gray world shall be changed into morning light; when the mighty shall be put down and overwhelmed as their sins cry out against God.

Read our hearts, Heavenly Father. We express the deepest gratitude to Thee for the safe return of the 68 nurses from the hardship and darkness of their internment in Santo Tomas prison camp in Manila.

We praise Thee that hidden from this world of tumult and strife, in the human breast is the altar of prayer. Whatever form fate or sorrow may take, frowning look or angry tone, there we find rest. There we would stay our minds, knowing the eternal law that for every loss there is a gain; quicken our patience in faith that Thy will be done. Dear Lord, we pause before the mystery of death and give tribute to one whose career dictated a blessed destiny. Gentility was the aroma of his conduct; always constant in his devotion to duty, ever adorning his position as a public servant and private citizen, he climbed heroically toward the perfect day. Give peace and comfort to all those bowed in grief. In Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 108):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JAMES V. HEIDINGER, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess in executive session until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The message also announced that, pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution, the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BROOKS members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 681) entitled "An act to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RADCLIFFE, Mr. BANKHEAD, and Mr. TOBEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 202) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

The Post Office and Post Roads: VAUGHAN GARY, Virginia.

Claims: JAMES H. MORRISON, Louisiana.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KIRWAN (at the request of Mr. PRICE of Illinois) was granted permission to extend his remarks and include therein a letter.

Mr. OUTLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter on Bretton Woods.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter which he had sent to Senators and Representatives of the Intermountain and Central State regions covering the proposed international sunshine air route from Great Falls to Alaska and the Orient.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper item in regard to one of the pages who has secured a license to fly.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, being a symposium on pertinent present-day problems.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therewith an editorial from the Indianapolis Star.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include therein an editorial from the New York Times entitled "The Food Inquiry."

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a memorial from the General Court of Massachusetts.

LT. JAY HILARY KELLEY

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to announce to the House of Representatives of this Congress that a distinguished Member of this House, my colleague from the State of Pennsylvania, Hon. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY, through the Associated Press, has this news of his hero son, Lt. Jay Hilary Kelley:

Lt. Jay Hilary Kelley, 24, Greensburg, Pa., has been cited for soldierly conduct in the battle of the Belgian bulge last December. His father, Representative KELLEY (Democrat, Pennsylvania) has just been informed of the citation.

The lieutenant, a 1942 graduate of Penn State College, is one of five sons of the Congressman in the armed services.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

RETURNING NURSES FROM THE PHILIPPINES

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it has just been my privilege to spend half an hour with Maj. Maude Davidson, who commanded the 68 nurses who have recently been safely returned from internment in Manila.

Major Davidson is an exquisite little woman, vividly alive, even though she is thin and worn from illness and privation and the responsibilities that have been hers since June 1941, when she and the other American nurses were sent to Santo Tomas.

She told me a very moving story of quiet heroism and gallant courage as great as any this world has seen.

So many rumors have been brought me of molestation of our nurses by the Japanese that I was glad of the opportunity to ask her for the facts. You will be as relieved as I am to know her categorical denial of anything of the sort. Quite the contrary, she said, the nurses were treated with complete respect from the very beginning, when the Japanese commanding officer was a physician who held them to be a part of his own profession, to the very end.

Major Davidson has a wonderful pair of eyes; eyes that saw Germany with the Army of Occupation in the First World War; eyes that watched over the Seventh and Eighth Cavalry for 10 years on the border; eyes that have seen more than any woman's eyes should ever have to see of suffering of body, mind, and soul. Once seen no one will forget the tragic beauty of those eyes, nor the gentle sweetness of her fleeting smile.

Let us be grateful indeed that 2 dietitians, 1 physiotherapist, 1 Red Cross

worker, and 68 American nurses are back in this their country unmolested and safe.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

RESIGNATION OF BOWLES DEMANDED

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLER of Nebraska addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a long letter from General Hines, of the Veterans' Administration, in reply to an editorial that appeared in a newspaper in my congressional district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one, to include a speech by the Reverend E. A. Conway, S. J., and in the other, to include a speech of my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana.

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a soldier.

THE NATION'S MEAT SUPPLY

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GARDNER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CHESTER BOWLES

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to sit here and not reply to the attack that was just made on Mr. Bowles. No one has been more critical at times of the O. P. A. than I, not only here but in my district and generally.

I feel that Mr. Bowles has done an outstanding job. He took over the most thankless agency in the Government. With all due respect to the gentlemen who preceded him, in my judgment, the O. P. A. had not been administered half so well as it has been since he took it over.

Whether you like the O. P. A. or do not like the O. P. A., the fact remains that if we had not had this agency and if it had not been as well administered as it has been the dollars in your pocket would be worth precious little today.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the majority leader what information he can give us in reference to the program before recess?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, after next Wednesday there will be no program until April 10 and the Members may reasonably assume that I shall arrange a program then so that there will be nothing for a day or two even after that date.

We have pending the agricultural appropriation bill and there are a couple of resolutions that have been reported by the Rules Committee with reference to investigations which I think should be disposed of. We also have the extension of the Selective Service Act for 1 year which I note from the newspapers was reported unanimously and I would naturally want to have that acted upon immediately. I hope that may be done by tomorrow at the latest. If the bill has been reported unanimously by the committee I hope it might be agreed to unanimously by the House, but if that is not satisfactory we will bring it up tomorrow, if we dispose of the pending bill.

There is also possible a conference report on the so-called manpower bill. The chairman of the committee having charge of that matter is present and I hope he will enlighten us to some extent. If that can be disposed of we will do so this week. If we can accomplish all this, there will be no program for Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday.

Mr. MICHENER. Then, boiled down, the suggestion of the majority leader is that there will be no business transacted in the House after Wednesday next and before April 10. Further, it is the purpose of the majority leader not to have controversial matters come up the remainder of the week after the 10th of April so that, as a matter of fact, the real business of the House will be resumed about the 16th of April?

Mr. McCORMACK. I would prefer not to place myself definitely on record to that extent. I should prefer to let my statement stand that the Members may with confidence rely on the proposition that for a day or two after we meet on April 10 there will be nothing controversial come up. Looking ahead I do not know just exactly what the situation will be and, therefore, I do not want to make a definite statement as to the remainder of that week because if I should make a definite statement I would keep to it no matter how uncomfortable it might be later. In making the statement, I have gone as far as I can go at this particular time.

In other words, from next Wednesday on there will be no legislative program until April 10 and for a day or two after that date there will be nothing controversial come before the House and probably not for the rest of the week. It is hoped that perhaps we can dispose of the legislative matters in hand today and tomorrow. If not, we will have to go over until Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of H. R. 2625, to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the members of the Committee on Military Affairs are present, and I now yield to any minority member of that committee to state his position on the unanimous consent request of the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object on my own account, the manner as to how this resolution should be brought up was not put before the committee, and for that reason I am not sure that all of the members on the minority side are in favor of bringing it up in this way. I would like to have the chairman of the committee explain to the House, if he will, the situation with reference to the conference on the so-called work-or-jail bill at this time, because that would be in order as an amendment, as I understand, to this bill, for which unanimous consent has been asked.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any explanation that I could make that would be of any degree of satisfaction to the House with respect to the conference that we are now engaged in. I will say this, however. The House surely understands that we have a very difficult problem. We have two bills, one from the Senate, and one from the House, that are directly adverse to each other. There seems to be quite a bit of determination on the part of the Senate conferees to stand for their measure. The House conferees, of course, are standing for the House measure. But we did make some progress yesterday, and we have tentative proposals that will be made again today, and I hope that we may be able to get a little further along with it. We might, though it is a remote possibility, reach some kind of an agreement.

Mr. CLASON. In other words, the gentleman thinks that that may be disposed of without any regard to the present resolution he is bringing up?

Mr. MAY. It might do it, but I cannot give any assurance of it.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding, and I think the chairman will agree with me in this, that the Committee on Military Affairs reported out this bill yesterday unanimously.

Mr. MAY. That is right.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Further, I think that almost every member of the committee, although I am speaking for myself, was very well satisfied with the testimony given to us by General Edwards on this legislation. In addition to that, we made no decision in regard to it, and that we might bring the bill up in just the manner in which the gentleman now states.

Mr. MAY. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. So I want to tell the chairman that I am very much in favor of having the bill brought up in this way in order that we may send it over to the Senate as quickly as possible.

Mr. MAY. May I say for the benefit of the House that, in addition to extending it, we preserved the right of the House and the Senate to discontinue it at any time by concurrent resolution of both Houses if and when we decided it ought to be done.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. May I say that I am in favor of bringing it up at this time and passing it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understood the majority leader he stated that there would be a session tomorrow. This bill, as I understand it, now leaves the Tydings amendment just as it is.

Mr. MAY. Oh, yes. It does not affect the Tydings amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What about the Flannagan resolution and House Concurrent Resolution 29 that we adopted here?

Mr. MAY. That is already written into the bill that is in conference, and everybody on both sides agrees to it. We have really strengthened it by making it impossible to transfer a man from the farm. When he is once placed on the farm, he cannot be again reclassified.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If this bill is considered now, as the gentleman has requested, and goes through, will it be possible for General Hershey, for example, to ignore the Tydings amendment?

Mr. MAY. I do not think so, unless he wants just deliberately to violate the law, and I do not think he wants to do that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by deleting "May 15, 1945," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the date of the termination of hostilities in the present war, or on such earlier date as may be specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress for that purpose. As used in this section the term 'date of the termination of hostilities in the present war' means the date proclaimed by the President as the date of such termination or the date specified in a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress as the date of such termination, whichever is the earlier."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, after the quotation mark following the colon, insert "May 15, 1946, or."

In line 8, after "purpose", delete the period and insert a comma and a quotation mark and the following: "and by adding at the end of section 16 (b) the following new sentence:"

In line 8, before "As", insert a quotation mark.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from a servicemen's paper.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the grounds on which he claims the floor on a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Flint Weekly Review of March 9 of this year Irving Richter, national legislative representative, U. A. W.-C. I. O., among other things wrote this:

I told, if you remember, how CLARE HOFFMAN'S staff greeted a C. I. O. delegation with copies of Join the C. I. O. and Help Build a Soviet America, a Fascist pamphlet by Joseph P. Kamp. I questioned the use of a Congressman's office as a distribution center for such material.

The SPEAKER. What the gentleman has read so far is hardly sufficient to entitle the gentleman to recognition on a question of personal privilege. The Chair suggests that the gentleman read the quotation he called to the attention of the Chair yesterday as entitling him to the floor on a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. He also wrote this:

The C. I. O. requires no defense against a Congressman who would cover up for a gang of conspirators against our Nation.

Is that enough?

The SPEAKER. That is the paragraph the Chair read yesterday when he talked to the gentleman about this matter. The Chair thinks the gentleman has stated a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I might add that there is plenty more along the same line.

The gentleman also wrote this:

HOFFMAN took the floor on a point of personal privilege and proceeded to attack me, the C. I. O., the New Deal, and finally back to C. I. O. and P. A. C. again.

* * * * * *

HOFFMAN made a great point of having paid for the pamphlets out of his own pocket. He did not deny that his office and staff are financed by the taxpayers or that he uses them to distribute the pamphlet.

What Mr. Richter in his previous release charged and intended to charge was that I had misused Government funds to distribute a pamphlet published by the Constitutional Education League of New Haven, Conn., and New York, N. Y. The inference to be drawn from his article was that I had used Government funds to purchase the pamphlets and to pay the postage on whatever may have been distributed by me.

Nailed in that falsehood, he comes back with the argument that because some of the C. I. O. lobbyists, when here in Washington, went to my office and there asked for and were given a pamphlet published by the league, that was a misuse of Federal funds.

In passing, it might be said that the gentleman is completely mistaken; that none of the delegates was given a copy of Join the C. I. O. and Help Build a Soviet America.

When I addressed the House on February 22, 1945—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 1368—I had assumed that the C. I. O. circular had reference to another league pamphlet which was, at the request of one or two of the delegates, given to them.

I cite this only to show that, in his last article, from which I have just quoted, the legislative representative of the U. A. W.-C. I. O. is completely mistaken as to what was given out.

However, that mistake is immaterial, for, broadly, the charge is that, because a Congressman's clerks—that is the legal definition; really they are secretaries—are paid by the Government, therefore everything they do is being paid for by the taxpayer's money, and a Congressman is misusing Federal funds if he so much as asks one of them to bring him a cup of coffee and a sandwich from the House cafeteria.

The gentleman from New York, Mr. Winchell, makes the same charge in his broadcast and in his article printed in the Daily Mirror, and I will put that in the RECORD.

Then this Mr. Richter makes another statement, and I will get them both together and then separate them afterward in the statement which I wish to make. He states that—

HOFFMAN tried to laugh off the sedition indictment by insulting William Power Maloney, the Government's prosecuting attorney in the case. He asserted the Supreme Court had called Maloney a "pettifogging shyster." That is a lie.

The Supreme Court naturally did not use the language "pettifogging shyster," and I did not so intend to state. All the Supreme Court did was to define Maloney's actions, which brings him within the definition of being a pettifogging shyster. More about that later.

Now to get back to this first charge, and this is by way of warning to Congressmen, not from me but from Mr. Winchell and from this legislative representative of the C. I. O. You get his point? I tried to explain it before.

There was a delegation here, part of it from Michigan, of C. I. O.-U. A. W. representatives.

On two occasions members of that delegation came to my office, and I happened to be out. On one occasion, one of them, perhaps two of them, asked for a pamphlet. One of the young ladies gave either one of them or both of them a pamphlet. It was not the pamphlet

entitled "Join the C. I. O. and Help Build a Soviet America," but let that pass. Suffice it to say on this point that the pamphlet was an argument against the Communists, the use of the method and the procedure of the Communists by certain C. I. O. unions.

On the foundation that a congressional secretary gave a representative of the C. I. O., when he called at the office, a copy of a pamphlet setting forth the activities of the Communists and the infiltration of the Communists into some C. I. O. unions, Richter rests the charge that I misused Government money for my own personal benefit.

As unlike as is darkness from light was another C. I. O. representative who came to my office shortly after the first visitors. The second visitor was Walter T. Casebier, an official of a local union, president of U. E. R. & M. W. of A., Local No. 931, of Benton Harbor, Mich., a pleasant, kindly, courteous gentleman, who expressed his views in a common-sense way; who patiently listened to my replies to his questions and who created the conviction that he, like the average American citizen, believed in the doctrine of living and letting live; that he loved this country first above all others and that, so far as he and the members of his union could do so, their first idea, their first thought, their whole effort, would be devoted to production, and that they neither asked for nor expected any undue or special consideration from either their Representative in Congress or from the Federal Government.

If all representatives of the U. A. W.-C. I. O. used equal good judgment and good sense, practically all of the controversy and disagreement between union representatives and those sent here as Congressmen would be obviated.

Now, please hear my warning. And I hope the Members of Congress will pardon me for being so presumptuous as to issue a warning. But years ago I used to try cases in justice court, little cases, $5 cases, petty thieving, and things like that. And I learned to be cautious and accurate as to small matters.

I am not a good lawyer like William Power Maloney, he of grand jury fame. I do not pretend to be a great lawyer acting for the New Deal. But, having been brought up with the people on these little things, knowing the importance of little things—and our lives are really made up of little things—I want to plead with the Members of Congress to please, oh please, do not misuse money appropriated by the Federal Government to employ secretaries by having your secretary venture to call up someone here, for example, your wife, and tell her you will not be home to dinner until perhaps 7 o'clock because the House is in session—because, remember, the secretary is paid by the Federal Government, and you must be very, very careful about it because someone like Brother Maloney or Mr. Winchell will be after you.

Now, that is all free. I quit practicing law when I came down here and I have not been interested in lawsuits since. This advice will not cost anyone one single red cent, but just take it home and watch your activities in your offices.

Be careful. Do not call another Congressman and ask him if he will go to church with you on Sunday morning. I mean, do not have your secretary do it. No, on second thought, do not do it yourself because the Government pays for the telephone service. There are other occasions where you might ask him which I will not mention or refer to, or places where you might desire to meet your colleague; you might even want to ask a colleague to have lunch with you—but be careful—Winchell will get you. But do not venture to have your secretary call another Congressman or a Senator and see if you cannot make arrangements to attend divine services, because that would be a misuse of Federal money.

Now, enough of that—and I would not venture to speak this morning, but there will be a session tomorrow anyway. And I do not want any Congressman to go home for the Easter recess and be confronted by a constituent's charge relayed from Winchell that he was misusing Federal money.

This reference to Mr. Maloney is to help Mr. Winchell. I always like to help Walter Winchell. It would be an extremely difficult task to induce him to peddle real news, to be accurate. But for fear that he may forget and next Sunday night not give all the news, the worth-while news, to the public, I am just calling his attention to a bulletin which appeared in the Washington Star, I think day before yesterday.

Now, Winchell has had a great deal to say in times gone by about this indictment of the so-called seditionists. He has tried to link good, loyal citizens in with those who have been arrested but never convicted. Do not forget there are six or seven of those men down there who have been convicted, and by joining them in with the others he sort of tries to smear the whole group and, as well, anyone who is anti-New Deal.

Now, William Power Maloney was a man who apparently acted with a gentleman named Stokes, a reporter, and in behalf of the Washington Post procured the indictment of all these people. And to Mr. Winchell, William Power Maloney has been a sort of saint. But, as subsequent events have proved, he is something of a plaster saint with feet of clay. He had a great deal to say about Congressmen who ventured to express their opinions on the floor. He felt so deeply about it that he had me down there at least four times, and I probably would have continued on indefinitely on his call if I had not adopted the course of telling the reporters in the Gallery in the morning what I was going to say when he called me down in the afternoon. So it was no longer a news scoop for Stokes, and right away Maloney forgot me as soon as he learned he could not get any new stories, exclusive ones, for Stokes. That is all there was to that.

Mr. Richter, the U. A. W.-C. I. O. pamphleteer, questioning my integrity, refers to Kamp's writings—presumably the pamphlet, Join the C. I. O. and Help Build a Soviet America—by stating that—

"It was a part of the aforesaid conspiracy that the said defendants * * * would print, publish, distribute, and circulate widely * * * newspapers, magazines, books, leaflets, circulars, pamphlets, * * *" including Kamp's.

And further:

And about Kamp's Constitutional Educational League:

"And it was further a part of the aforesaid conspiracy that the said defendants * * * would organize, support, use, control, contribute to financially, and cause so to be done and otherwise aid * * * committees, groups, and organizations" (including the league).

The Members will recall that it was a special United States prosecuting attorney who engineered the first indictment against the so-called seditionists. For a long time and until his true record became known, Maloney had charge of that investigation and of the grand jury proceedings.

It is true that an indictment was procured. Three indictments were procured against most of the defendants indicted in the first instance. The first indictment has been pending for almost 3 years. The second indictment alleged practically the same state of facts, as did the third, naming, however, fewer defendants.

The most remarkable thing about the whole performance is that, while the indictment named perhaps six or seven individuals who had previously been convicted, neither Maloney nor his successors, with all the power of the F. B. I., the Department of Justice—yes, the United States Government—behind them, has ever to this date convicted anyone of the charge named in any one of the three indictments.

As an example of the New Deal's inefficiency, may it be said that it has not yet after almost 3 years—for the investigations were pending in April of 1942—been able to even conclude the trial of those indicted.

In fact, last fall the Washington Post, which was at the bottom of the indictments, editorially acknowledged and confessed that the whole proceeding was a farce.

Mr. Richter attributes undue influence to me when he states that "the C. I. O. requires no defense against a Congressman who would cover up for a gang of conspirators against our Nation."

I never covered up anyone and certainly, if there is a gang which has been conspiring against our Nation, the P. A. C., Walter Winchell, the F. B. I., and the Department of Justice should be able in 3 years' time to uncover anything that I might try to cover.

The gentleman's statement, if there was any truth in it, is a charge of incompetency against the national law-enforcing officials. It is a confession of his own lack of diligence, for, if he knows of any conspiracy, with two million and more dollars which the P. A. C. has in its treasury, with the several million which the C. I. O. has, it would seem as though they might be able to rip off the cover which he alleges I have put on.

The Flint paper says that I insulted William Power Maloney. This is what

I am calling Walter's attention to. It is a late bulletin, right on the front page of the Star:

MALONEY FOUND GUILTY

William Power Maloney, special assistant to the Attorney General, was found guilty of being disorderly and fighting in the street, and fined $10 today by Municipal Judge John McMahon. The case grew out of a fight originating in a local department store between Dr. Stephen Pan, director of the Institute of Chinese-American Cultural Relations, who was found not guilty.

I will put this news story in the RECORD. (See exhibit A.)

Briefly, it is this: Someone was down there at Garfinckel's trying to buy something and Maloney was called down. When he got down there, there was Dr. Pan. Now, do not forget. Dr. Pan is a Chinese, a reputable gentleman, and with him were two other Chinese who do not speak English. Dr. Pan is a citizen of a nation that is our ally. He is a citizen of China.

The thought occurred to me that, if Maloney is so concerned about sedition, if he was so fearful that some crackpot a year or two ago would impair the morale of our fighting men by some advice to think of America first, if he was so interested in that, he, as a Government official, should be interested in not doing anything that would make trouble between our people and those of China. He ought to go to Biddle and say, "Now, listen. Perhaps I have done something that might impair the morale of our men who are in the service. It is just barely possible that by assaulting this representative of the Chinese Nation, it might get our boys to thinking it is all right to take a crack at a Chinese whenever they feel aggrieved; that conduct might impair our relations with China."

Another thing, Dr. Pan, according to the press, weighed 120 pounds. Maloney weighs 145 pounds. He not only took a crack at the Chinese in the store—I suppose he was trying to improve diplomatic relations—but he followed him out on the street and up to the corner, and, with an advantage of 25 pounds, this fighting man Maloney perhaps, when he followed Dr. Pan up the street, was engaged in practicing the good-neighbor policy, because when he got up to the corner he cracked Dr. Pan again and knocked him over a trash can.

Now, was that not a nice, gentlemanly, diplomatic action from the United States Government representative working out of the Department of Justice? Perhaps Maloney should be awarded a Congressional Medal for valorous conduct over and beyond the call of duty. Just think of his courage in assaulting—in fighting—the 120-pound Dr. Pan.

Slugger Maloney was on his own ground in his home town. Dr. Pan was thousands of miles from his native land. Perhaps the Society for Universal Peace, the organization which preaches tolerance and patience, can use Mr. Maloney as an evangelist.

In my judgment, the wrong fellow went over the trash can. If Maloney had jumped into the trash can, pulled the cover down, and been carted off to the garbage dump, that might have been all right. But think of the man, think of the tools, the Justice Department is using. Here is a man who insulted practically every witness who appeared before the grand jury. Here is a man that I publicly stated from this floor I would prove to be a liar, with having lied to the grand jury, if he would produce his own record, and he never did. Yet those who are carrying on that smear campaign which he started call themselves patriotic Americans.

Now, lest I continue too long, let me end with this: Maloney is a great man, and I hope Walter will not forget it, and when Walter is thinking about Maloney I hope he will, instead of talking about some of the Members of this House, instead of jumping on the Dies committee, I hope he will come back and tell us what he never has told us before. I hope he will come back and tell us how his employer, the Jergens outfit, the head of it, had a private secretary who assisted—get that—who assisted saboteurs, six of whom were executed. Will Walter give us the facts as to that incident?

When that woman was brought before the Department of Justice she entered a plea of guilty to misprision of treason and was sentenced to the Federal penitentiary. Now if Walter wants a flash, why does he not tell you how his boss employed a person who aided the saboteurs and who already has pleaded guilty and been convicted? He is a fine mouthpiece out of which to give lessons to patriotic Americans as to how they should shape their conduct, is he not?

And do not forget Walter announced two or three times that he was going to sue or that he had sued me for $250,000. I have never been served yet. Do not ask me "Where are you going to get the money?" because I do not have it.

You have heard what the municipal court thinks of Maloney as a Government representative. But to get back to this charge that Maloney is a pettifogging shyster. The Supreme Court of the United States is still entitled to have its opinions read and at all times respected. Here is what they said about Mr. Maloney:

In his closing remarks to the jury he indulged in an appeal wholly irrelevant to any facts or issues in the case, the purpose and effect of which could only have been to arouse passion and prejudice. The trial judge overruled, as coming too late, petitioner's objection first made in the course of the court's charge to the jury.

At a time when passion and prejudice are heightened by emotions stirred by our participation in a great war, we do not doubt that these remarks addressed to the jury were highly prejudicial and that they were offensive to the dignity and good order with which all proceedings in court should be conducted. We think that the trial judge should have stopped counsel's discourse without waiting for an objection. "The United States attorney is the representative not of an ordinary party to a controversy but of a sovereignty whose obligation to govern impartially is as compelling as its obligation to govern at all; and whose interest, therefore, in a criminal prosecution is not that it shall win a case but that justice shall be done. As such, he is in a peculiar and very definite sense the servant of the law, the twofold aim of which is that guilt shall not escape or innocence suffer. He may prosecute with earnestness and vigor—indeed, he should do so. But, while he may strike hard blows, he is not at liberty to strike foul ones."

I wonder what Dr. Pan thinks?

It is as much his duty to refrain from improper methods calculated to produce a wrongful conviction as it is to use every legitimate means to bring about a just one. (*Vierick* v. *United States* (318 U. S. 236).)

In another case where Mr. Maloney was one of the United States district attorneys prosecuting the case, his conduct came up for review, and the judge writing the opinion, among other things, said:

Even from the printed record we can see the vigor with which the prosecutor pressed the case, vigor which at times went beyond the canons of decorum and dignity which an officer of the United States should observe. The prosecutor was not averse to indulging his talent for spectacle: chorus girls and movie stars were paraded to the stand to prove only minor portions of the Government's case. Theatrical demonstrations, however diverting to the spectators and jury, have no place in a United States courtroom. Nor was the intemperance of several attacks made upon defendants and their counsel in keeping with the Supreme Court's reminder that the prosecutor is to regard himself as "the servant of the law." (*United States* v. *Buckner* (108 Fed. (2d), 921, 928).)

It would seem as though the above describes fairly well the conduct of a pettifogging shyster.

The Navy Department having arranged so that Mr. Winchell—Walter is his first name—is not permitted to wear a uniform, having so arranged that he has no duties, that he has no pay from the Federal Government and is merely retained on the reserve list, should now proceed one step farther and just sever all connection that he has with the Navy, for certainly he is a disgrace to any branch of the Federal Government, as is William Power Maloney, who assaults an inoffensive citizen and representative of one of our allies who is no match for him physically.

William Power Maloney in this street brawl demonstrated what so many of the witnesses who were hailed by him before the grand jury ever since have known—that is, that he was an offensive, cowardly bully, ever ready to take advantage of his superior physical power, of his official position as a representative of the Department of Justice.

EXHIBIT A

[From Washington Star of March 21, 1945]

WILLIAM P. MALONEY FINED $10 FOR FIGHT WITH CHINESE

William Power Maloney, special assistant to the Attorney General, who obtained the multiple indictments in the famous sedition case, was found guilty today of "being disorderly and fighting in the street," before Judge John McMahon in District Court. He was fined $10.

Dr. Stephen Pan, vice director of the Chinese-American Institute of Cultural Relations, Twenty-second and P Streets NW., arrested on the same charge, was held not guilty.

"Mr. Maloney," said Judge McMahon in giving his decision, "I'm afraid it's just a case of having a bad temper and of having lost your head."

Both the Justice Department official and Chinese doctor of philosophy appeared before Judge McMahon today for his decision

on charges made by police after an altercation on March 10. The row started at the jewelry counter at Garfinckel's department store and ended up in the street with the compact 145-pound lawyer knocking his slender 120-pound opponent over a trash receptacle.

ADMONISHED BY JUDGE

Mr. Maloney, acting as his own counsel, said that the incident did not mean that he did not have a high regard for the Chinese nation and for Mme. Chiang Kai-shek. He tried to interject that Dr. Pan "has been in trouble before." John D. Fitzgerald, attorney for Dr. Pan, objected and the judge admonished Mr. Maloney that as a lawyer he should know that he could not get any background in the record.

"You testified you never saw this man before," said the judge.

"I am not trying to influence your honor's finding," said Mr. Maloney, "I believe I know what it is going to be."

REVIEWS MALONEY'S TESTIMONY

The judge reviewed Mr. Maloney's testimony on the difficulty which began when the lawyer's wife got into a dispute with three Chinese over the purchase of a watch.

"You testified," said Judge McMahon, "that when Mrs. Maloney telephoned you she was hysterical. You did not know what the difficulty was and she could not tell you.

"You said when you arrived at the store you saw three Chinese standing at one end of the counter with their backs turned. You turned one of them about (Yung Tai Lu, a Chinese-speaking student living at the institute). You said that he turned quickly and made a motion which you took to be the 'Chinese equivalent of a left hook.'

"'I struck back,' you said. 'At that moment someone seized me from behind. The three Chinese ran out of the store. When I got loose I ran after them and caught up with this man (Dr. Pan). He aimed a kick at me. I hit him. He kicked me. I struck him again.'"

It was then that Judge McMahon spoke about Mr. Maloney's temper.

Mrs. Maloney was not a witness in the trial of the disorderly charge against the two men on March 12, nor was she in court today.

"Justice has prevailed," Dr. Pan told the Star after the case concluded. "The court's decision confirms my faith in the fairness of the American courts to persons of all nations."

AMENDMENT TO NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 681) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and for other purposes, with House amendment thereto and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, PATMAN, WOLCOTT, and CRAWFORD.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL—POINTS OF ORDER

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is further consideration of House Resolution 194. The Chair may say that the gentleman from Georgia has 19 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Michigan has 19 minutes remaining.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 49]

Allen, Ill.	Fogarty	Mott
Anderson, Calif.	Gearhart	Murray, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Y.	Gibson	O'Brien, Ill.
Arends	Gordon	O'Brien, Mich.
Arnold	Granahan	O'Toole
Bailey	Green	Peterson, Ga.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Hagen	Quinn, N. Y.
Barrett, Pa.	Hall,	Rayfiel
Barry	Edwin Arthur	Reece, Tenn.
Bates, Mass.	Hancock	Reed, Ill.
Beall	Hand	Reed, N. Y.
Bell	Hart	Rivers
Bennet, N. Y.	Hébert	Robinson, Utah
Bloom	Heffernan	Roe, Md.
Boren	Hendricks	Roe, N. Y.
Bradley, Pa.	Hobbs	Rogers, Mass.
Buckley	Izac	Rogers, N. Y.
Butler	Keogh	Russell
Byrnes, Wis.	King	Sabath
Cannon, Fla.	Kinzer	Sheridan
Case, S. Dak.	Landis	Short
Celler	Lane	Sikes
Chelf	Larcade	Smith, Maine
Cole, Kans.	Latham	Smith, Va.
Combs	LeCompte	Torrens
Curley	Lesinski	Weaver
Dawson	Luce	White
Delaney,	McGlinchey	Wickersham
James J.	McKenzie	Winter
Dickstein	Madden	Wood
Dirksen	Mahon	Woodhouse
Domengeaux	Maloney	
Eaton	Martin, Mass.	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirty Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. McCORMACK, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RULE WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER ON AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Michigan to use some of his time.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most serious propositions the House has faced in a long time; it is a question in which is involved, in my opinion, the integrity of the Appropriations Committee and the integrity of the legislative committees of the House.

The rules of the House provide that the Committee on Appropriations shall not report legislation, and make out of order any legislation so reported. There is plenty of legislation in this bill. This rule seeks to waive the points of order. The result of this operation will be that two major items which from year to year have been crowding into the appropriation bill and been made in order previously by rules will be carried again if the rule is adopted. They will be carried when the Committee on Agriculture and the House has failed to report any bill for the consideration of the House with reference to them or authorizing them. They relate to the Farm Security Administration and the school lunch program. I will not discuss these items particularly at this time.

In addition to these items, there are very many other points of order which will lie against this bill. I do not think any legislation should be reported in appropriation bills except on emergency matters that relate to national defense. Regulation items should never be brought in. When you have an emergency matter that relates to the national defense it is fair to consider such items matters of expediency and meriting a rule. When you come to regular routine things we should not take them up unless the legislative committees have brought in here and the Congress has authorized appropriations. That is the only way jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee can be maintained; it is the only way that we can protect the jurisdiction of the various legislative committees.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the House of Representatives will sustain its position and will refuse to vote for the pending rule, because there is nothing in here that should not be covered by legislation. There is nothing in here of an emergency character that justifies bringing in a rule of this kind at the present time.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I understand the gentleman's position and that is my thought, too. If this present procedure is followed through, we would destroy the legislative committees of this House?

Mr. TABER. We would destroy them and probably create such sentiment against the Appropriations Committee by following this kind of action that ultimately the Appropriations Committee will be destroyed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the rule waive points of order in reference to provisions in this bill of a legislative nature that repeal basic laws which the Congress has heretofore enacted?

Mr. TABER. No, but there are items in here such as the farm-security and the school-lunch propositions that have never been authorized by law. There are other items as well to which points of order that they are legislative provisions in an appropriation bill could be lodged of a very considerable number and there are items that change existing law, but those are the two main items.

Mr. Speaker, I hope when the House comes to vote on this rule it will refuse to agree to the rule, will abide by the rules of the House and make the Appropriations Committee abide by the rules of the House in bringing in its appropriation bills.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing novel about the presentation of this rule. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] yesterday admitted that, although he is opposed to the rule. The function of the Rules Committee, if I understand it correctly, is to facilitate the House considering and passing upon matters that it desires to pass upon.

Your Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations sought to eliminate from this bill all legislative proposals except those which have been in prior years approved by the House of Representatives. We thought if you wanted to vote upon those proposals which you have approved heretofore, you should have that right, and whether you approve them now or not is a matter for your determination. Of course, you will have to vote upon them before this bill is enacted into law. The Senate, in compliance with its usual custom, will put these items back in the bill if they are stricken out on points of order in the House and they will come back for consideration under rules which will not allow you the same opportunity for amendment and for discussion that you will have if you adopt this rule providing for consideration of these items.

This rule is supported by six of the seven members of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations and it is supported by two of the three Republican members of that subcommittee, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], than whom there is not a fairer or more capable man in the House, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], who has demonstrated a very profound knowledge of any sympathy for the problems of agriculture in connection with his work on this bill. Since the Republican minority has designated these gentlemen to represent them on this committee, I cannot understand why it would feel justified in refusing to vote even for the consideration of their work.

Now this rule makes in order four major items. There are three or four minor items in addition to those, but it does not make any difference whether those are stricken or not. Those are chicken-feed matters, not involving any additional money, except perhaps to the extent of about $1,400 for three items.

The four major items are these: There is the wages stabilization appropriation amounting to $275,000, which is of particular interest to seven or eight States on the Pacific coast. If you do not want to consider that perhaps you will be justified in voting against the rule, provided you do not want to consider any of the other items involved either.

Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation items have never been authorized by law. This subcommittee has reduced the Budget estimate for that item from $125,000,000 to $67,500,000, a cut of $57,500,000, and has reduced the administrative expenses proportionately. If you do not consider that item in the House, the Senate, in my judgment, will do as it has done heretofore, put in the whole amount of the Budget estimate of $125,000,000, and when it comes back here you can vote it up or down after 1 hour's discussion, most of the debate being controlled by the members of the committee, with little opportunity on the part of the Members of the House not on the committee to be heard. Of course, a motion to recede and concur with an amendment would be in order, but the opportunity for amendment and for debate would be very much more restricted than it would be here today if you agree to consider this item.

The school-lunch program is not authorized by law, and if you want to consider it, now is your opportunity to do so.

The farm-tenant program is authorized by law, but the law authorizes the making of direct appropriations from the Treasury not the use of R. F. C. funds. To the extent that R. F. C. loans are authorized, that provision is legislative in character. It includes $25,000,000 for carrying out the provision of a bill which you passed, the G. I. bill, which provides that the returning veterans shall be eligible to receive this type of loan. If you do not want to consider that measure in accordance with the terms of the G. I. bill that, of course, is a matter for your decision.

These are the only items of major character as to which points of order are proposed to be waived by this rule.

If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], who sought to interrupt me a few moments ago, wants to save the Treasury of the United States some money, he ought to support this rule, because if he succeeds in defeating it, he will find more money appropriated after this bill is finally passed for some of these items than our subcommittee has proposed. We are $141,500,000 under the Budget. Do you want to stand by us? Do you want to help us write a bill that is reasonable and take up in conference with the Senate matters which the House has already passed upon rather than to have Senate conferees say, "Well, the House has not passed on this at all; it was stricken out on a point of order. You have no authority, representing the House of Representatives as conferees, to say that this appropriation ought to be cut down in the opinion of the House, because the House has not taken a whack at it."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I talked to the Budget Bureau this morning and they told me that the committee increased this bill over and above the amount the Budget Bureau allowed. Is that a fact?

Mr. TARVER. We decreased the bill under the Budget estimates by $141,499,000. It is not a fact that we increased it, if that was reported to the gentleman by the Budget.

Mr. RICH. Has the gentleman ever known of any rule to be brought in here in the last 15 years such as is being brought in here today?

Mr. TARVER. Many, many times.

Mr. RICH. Never.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman knows that when he was a member of the Commitee on Appropriations the committee asked for rules, and on the Labor-Federal Security Agency bill and other bills rules have been granted. On that bill we are going to have to have a rule this year, because almost half of it is legislative, and the gentleman is not going to vote against a rule for it when it is brought in here, as it will be. We must have these rules in order to take care of the situation.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote against this rule that prohibits the Members of the House from making points of order against provisions of the bill for activities not authorized by Congress. This House has set up committees for the purpose of determining whether certain departments should be established or organized and whether certain activities should be carried on by departments and agencies of Government. It is the function of the Committee on Appropriations to determine the amounts of funds that shall be expended by such departments or agencies for the purposes authorized by Congress. Now it appears that in order to speed expenditures, the Committee on Appropriations has become a sort of legislating committee as well as a spending committee.

Departmental agencies of Government do not want to take the trouble of going before the proper committees of Congress for authorization, so they just go to the Committee on Appropriations, justify their expenditures and thereby circumvent the use of legislative committees. This procedure is a violation of the rules. It is violation of the law laid down by Congress. The procedure is dangerous and ought to be stopped.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this House to find out whether we are to follow regular legislative procedure and require these departments to justify their existence and justify their activities under orderly procedure or whether we are going to be content just to let them go before the Appropriations Committee and tell them how much money they want and not bother about seeking authorizations as required by law.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why one agency of the Government should be treated differently from the other. Every one of them ought to justify its existence and needs by legislation before it asks this Congress to appropriate money for its activities.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has based his argument entirely upon the mistaken premise that we are debating whether certain items are right or wrong. We are voting today simply upon one thing, and that is the basic and fundamental principle of whether you want the Committee on Appropriations to legislate. If you do want our committee to legislate—and I am the sole member of our subcommittee who opposed asking for this rule—then I say, vote to support this rule, but never after that rise up in your

wrath and condemn the Committee on Appropriations for so doing.

As the gentleman from Georgia said, the vote in the subcommittee was one against six on asking for the rule, but he did not state that in the full Committee on Appropriations there were 12 members of the committee opposed to asking for the rule, and he did not state that the Committee on Rules itself was tied the first day upon this issue and only upon reconsideration did it decide to grant this rule.

The issue is not whether or not we are going to have farm security or school lunches. All these provisions will come back here from the Senate if they are stricken out on a point of order. Personally, if the farm-security item is stricken out on a point of order here, I will support the reinstatement of it when it does come back from the Senate. Farm security in Minnesota has made a good record.

If you have any regard whatsoever for the rights of your own individual legislative committees, now is the time to forget the exigencies of the moment and vote against this rule and thus uphold the rules of the House.

Many a time have we seen Members denounce the Committee on Appropriations for assuming powers of legislation. If those same gentlemen will vote their convictions and not simply follow party lines, the integrity of your individual legislative committees will be made far more secure.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, when a condition arises that calls for a change in the usual procedure of the House in order to meet and solve that condition in a practical, common-sense way, I for one will never hesitate to depart from the usual procedure.

Now, just what is the situation? It is this: Two of the most important items in this bill, namely, the appropriation covering the school-lunch program and the appropriation covering the Farm Security program, one subject to points of order because there is no legislative authority covering these two items. Funds to provide for both of these programs have been made available from year to year for several years, and as practical men we know that they will be made available this year. We all realize if these two items go out on points of order that they will both be restored by the Senate, and when the bill comes back we will concur in the Senate amendments. This being true, why is not the sensible thing for us to do to adopt the rule waiving points of order so we can have a free and full discussion of both programs here in the House? In doing this we are operating within the rules of the House. Similar action is frequently taken by the House to meet similar situations. While I realize that it is far better to have legislative authority to justify the appropriations covering these items, and regret that we do not, I am going to use my common sense and get around the lack of legislative authority in a practical common-sense way.

I do believe, however, that the House is entitled to an explanation as to why we do not have legislative authority. While an explanation is, more or less, embarrassing, especially so since I am now chairman of the committee charged with the responsibility of providing the necessary legislation, and, too, a rather delicate matter to make, the only way I know how to explain is to just state the facts. No one can make a better explanation than to relate the truth.

As to the Farm Security program: This program was inaugurated by Executive order. There has never been any basic legislation authorizing the program, unless certain language appearing in certain appropriation bills can be so considered. Sometime ago a special committee was appointed to investigate the Farm Security Administration. I was a member of the committee. We made an exhaustive investigation into the many and varied activities of the Administration and filed a rather lengthy report. We also worked out legislation in which we attempted to save the good and get rid of the bad in the Farm Security Administration. The bill covering the result of our labor was introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], chairman of the special committee, last summer. Having worked out the legislation and introduced the bill, we discovered that it would be impossible to obtain favorable consideration without first bringing about a consolidation of the different Government farm loan agencies. Our chairman, the lamented Hampton Fulmer, as the older Members know, was sick for many months and our committee simply did not function. I am not criticizing anyone. I am not trying to shift the responsibility or blame. I am simply relating the facts. It is just one of those unfortunate occurrences. I do want to say to the House that we hope to bring in in the near future a bill consolidating the Government farm loan agencies. Much spade work has already been done on the legislation. When the consolidation has been worked out we will then bring in what we think to be sound, sane farm-security legislation.

As to the school-lunch program: In addition to what I have said, let me state to the House that hearings have already been commenced on a bill providing for school lunches. We hope to be able to report the bill to the House in a very short while.

The House Committee on Agriculture went into these two items in the bill some days ago, and I was instructed by the committee to appear with the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, before the Rules Committee and request a rule.

I do hope it will be the pleasure of the House to pass the rule so we can carefully consider the appropriations covering the Farm Security Administration and the school-lunch program.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, this is an important matter and, as has already been indicated, a very controversial one. Certainly, some excellent arguments can be made against the rule at this time. In the past, I have made the same arguments against a rule of this kind as are being made here by others today. Ordinarily such a rule would not be justified. I think, however, there are some special circumstances now which alter the situation to the extent that we should adopt the rule. The two principal items in controversy which are not authorized by law are the items covering the Farm Security Administration and school lunches. Those are matters which the Legislative Committee on Agriculture should authorize. It has them under consideration, but due to reasons which I shall not go into now, there has been no action taken.

Therefore, I do not feel that the Committee on Agriculture, as a legislative committee, is in a very good position to insist at this time that these matters should not be brought up in this bill. For that reason, and because it is not setting a precedent, inasmuch as we have had this same bill come in under this kind of rule several times in the past, I believe that the rule should be adopted. I hope it is, so that we can pass upon these questions today in an intelligent manner and after full discussion rather than have them come back in the form of a conference report where there will be little or no opportunity for discussion and debate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me we have gone far afield from the fundamental question involved in the issue before the House today. Because we have strayed from the issue and gone into a field that befogs and beclouds the real issue rather than clarifies it, may I say at the outset that what I shall say is not directed either against the school-lunch program or the farm-security program. I have heretofore supported those programs and I shall perhaps support them again if they are brought before this Congress in the proper manner. I am rather surprised that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the distinguished ranking minority member should come before the Congress now and state that we have carried these items in this bill year after year and that the agricultural legislative committee has had committees investigating farm security and the Farm Security Administration, but for reasons which they hesitate or decline to disclose to the Congress they have not taken any action, legislatively, one way or the other. In my judgment, that is one of the most unfortunate confessions I have ever heard come from a legislative committee since I have been a Member of this body.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman is making a misstatement of fact.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, I am not making a misstatement of fact.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. You are making a misstatement of fact.

Mr. KEEFE. I am stating facts, Mr. Speaker, and I decline to yield to the gentleman who wants to approve and applaud and support the action of the committee of which he is a member. I know there may be some reasons for the failure on the part of the Committee on Agriculture to bring in authorization legislation at this session for these appropriations. May I say to you that I am not particularly concerned about that today. If the only thing in this bill that was subject to a point of order were the items that have been referred to by the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, I think perhaps we would not be so concerned about it. But despite the contention of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, this bill presents a whole list of legislative proposals that are subject to points of order.

Sooner or later we must face this issue, as Members of this Congress: Are we going to permit a situation to prevail whereby a liaison can exist between the House Appropriations Committee or a majority thereof and a majority of the Rules Committee, and by that liaison effectively destroy, if you please, the legislative functions and responsibilities of the legislative committees of the House? Mr. Speaker, that is the question that concerns me.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not yield.

I speak as a member of the Committee on Appropriations of this House. I have felt chagrined and depressed time and again when Members of this body have come into the well of this House and criticized and damned the Committee on Appropriations because it was alleged to have arrogated to itself the powers and functions of legislative committees of this House. Now, if you pass this rule, never let me hear from the mouth of any man who votes for it any criticism of the legislative capacity and prerogatives of the Committee on Appropriations. You will have the Committee on Appropriations legislating for you. You will be surrendering your functions. Hereafter do not come into the well of this House and complain about the usurpation of those functions by the Committee on Appropriations.

I am making this statement because I want my record clear. I want to be understood that I am not, by my vote, and by what I am saying today, opposing either farm-security or the school-lunch program, but I am insisting that the great Committee on Agriculture of this House perform its functions and bring in legislation at this session that can be adopted, which will provide the basis and authority for the Committee on Appropriations to continue making these appropriations.

That is the fundamental question that is involved, Mr. Speaker, and that question has recurred every year since I have been privileged to be a Member of this body. Rule after rule has been given by the Committee on Rules since I have been here, waiving points of order. I have heard some of the men on the Democratic side who are now listening to me take the well of this House and raise their voices in protest against rules that protect the right of the Appropriations Committee to write legislation. You are now asked to continue that practice. What are you going to do about it? You know it is wrong; you know it is not right; you know that the legislative functions of this body under the rules of this House are vested in its legislative committees. Are you going to strip your legislative committees? By your vote you are going to be called to account. The roll call will be read, and you are going to be recorded, and you are going to say that hereafter the Committee on Appropriations can legislate as it pleases, and the only bar against it is its inability to get a rule from the Committee on Rules waiving points of order. If the Committee on Appropriations is powerful enough to go to the Rules Committee and get a rule waiving points of order we can write any kind of legislation into an appropriation bill.

Now, listen to this, Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the Department of Labor appropriation bill. I am tremendously interested in many of the items that will come up here shortly in that bill. Many of those items are subject to points of order. I take it, however, that no Member of the Congress is going to capriciously and ignorantly and unwisely raise points of order against items in an appropriation that are purely emergent in character. I do not believe there is a Member of this House, for example, who without a rule waiving points of order would make a point of order against the emergency-maternal-infant care program, an emergency program. The farm-security matter and the school-lunch program have been debated before this Congress for years. They are no longer emergent. There are items after items in this bill that do not relate to any emergency situation and in which the Appropriations Committee is legislating on this bill. Now, do you want us to continue to do it? If you do, I will be glad to arrogate to myself a new importance as a member of that great committee, a committee that may not only grant or block appropriations but can appropriate money that is not authorized, can legislate as it pleases provided it can get the Rules Committee to give it a rule. For that reason I cannot support this rule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], I simply desire to say that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has presented most realistically the real issue which is here involved and that I concur 100 percent with his interpretation.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ZIMMERMAN].

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin said a few minutes ago that the Committee on Agriculture has taken no action on the farm-security program.

The special Cooley committee, of which I had the honor to be a member, spent several months investigating the operations of farm security and brought before the Committee on Agriculture a bill recommending legislation for the operation of the farm-security program. The full Committee on Agriculture reported that bill to the Seventy-eighth Congress.

For some reason the bill was never brought before the House for consideration. It was never given a rule. I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin that that committee did its duty and did bring legislation before the House for consideration. The same bill was again introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] during the early days of this Congress and will be considered by the Agricultural Committee at an early date.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM] for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and that they may be placed at the end of the speech made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules in the Sixty-first Congress consisted of Speaker Cannon, John Dalzell, of Pennsylvania, and Minority Leader John Sharp Williams, of Mississippi, three of the ablest men who ever sat in the American Congress. When the committee would meet to formulate a rule, the Speaker and Mr. Dalzell would vote for the rule and the gentleman from Mississippi would vote against it. Then when the rule was reported to the House, the gentleman from Mississippi would take the floor and cry to high heaven against the iniquities of gag rules in general and the pending resolution in particular. He would characterize the rule as an unspeakable outrage perpetrated upon a virtuous but helpless minority by a brutal and ruthless majority. So it became customary, whenever Uncle Joe wanted a rule, for him to come down from the Speaker's rostrum, get Mr. Dalzell, and the two would go over to Mr. Williams sitting on the minority side of the aisle, and say: "Come on, John, we are going to perpetrate another outrage."

But in the Sixty-second Congress the situation was reversed. The will of God again prevailed and the Democrats came back into power. Whereupon the unchastened Democratic members of the Committee on Rules proceeded to report the same ruthless resolutions and the Republicans in turn rose and protested vigorously and volubly against this arbitrary exercise of unbridled power by the majority.

When in the Sixty-sixth Congress the Republicans once more took control of the House, they again brought in the very same old shop-worn rules, with the same provisions and identical phraseology and both parties went through the same

ritual we have heard exemplified here today.

When the Democrats came into power at the beginning of the Roosevelt administration the situation was again reversed. So, Mr. Speaker, all this is largely stage play. We have gone through it time and time again so far back that the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. It is merely a matter of which party is in power and has the responsibility of legislating for the country, as in the present situation.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution does not tie the hands of anybody. As a matter of fact, it unties your hands and permits you to legislate on matters which otherwise you could not consider. It is not a restriction of the rules but a liberalization of the rules.

It does not permit any committee or any subcommittee to legislate for the House. It prevents one man, too often capriciously or impulsively, to legislate for the entire membership of the House.

It is not in contravention of the rules because the rules specifically provide in rule XI that the Committee on Rules can at any time come in here and report a resolution giving a legislative committee appropriating power or giving an appropriating committee legislative power. The proposition before us is entirely and completely within the purview of the rules of the House. There is not the slightest infringement in the presentation or consideration of this resolution on any rule or practice of procedure—of the written or unwritten law of the House—all these impassioned protests to the contrary notwithstanding. But let us take up the real question before the House.

Mr. Speaker, what has brought about the necessity for this rule? We have brought in and considered all the appropriation bills of this session up to this time without such a rule.

And we would have brought in this bill without a rule, but for the fact that certain Members of the House indiscriminately and injudiciously, without any consideration of merit whatever, objected to every minor legislative provision inserted merely to make it possible for the Departments to transact routine business devolving upon them—provisions which had been carried in the bill by both parties from time immemorial. If they had but confined themselves to the legitimate purposes of the point of order this resolution would not have been necessary. But they have exercised it on all occasions and without relation to the business needs of the Departments, much as one would invoke the great writ of habeas corpus for the purpose of extricating a chicken thief from the village clink. It is a misuse of the power of the point of order which has brought about the necessity for the adoption of this rule. The sole purpose of the rule is to make it possible for the House to perform its constitutional functions and to permit it to legislate for the country.

Unlike many of the rules which our friends on the other side of the aisle brought in, back in the Sixty-sixth to the Seventy-first Congresses, this rule does not cut off debate or preclude amendments. It merely provides for consideration under the rules of the House. The adoption of the rule does not freeze in the bill the items to which it applies. If you object to any item all that is necessary is for you to move to strike it out. If it ought to be stricken out the House will vote with you. If, on its merits, it ought to remain in the bill—as, for example, the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration or for the school lunch—the House will vote to keep them in the bill. The rule merely prevents some capricious individual from arbitrarily denying all other Members of the House the opportunity to vote on whether they stay in the bill or go out. The rule merely permits the House to discharge the duties devolving upon it as a branch of the American Government and that is all it does.

May I again allude to the long-established policy of the committee, which the members of the committee have so frequently emphasized from the well of this House, under which the Committee on Appropriations does not include new or controversial legislation in its bills. Our bills are uniformly clean of any new legislation, any major legislation. We include only those provisions which have been carried in the bills for many years by both parties, or of an emergency nature, on which there is general agreement. In this instance, the great Committee on Agriculture, which has jurisdiction, approved the bill and the Committee on Rules approved it; otherwise we would not have reported it to the House. But I would like to take advantage of the opportunity to add as an individual member of the committee that in view of the fact that points of order have been so persistently raised on this bill that the Committee on Appropriations should in the future, notwithstanding the needs of the departments in the transaction of their routine business, be like Caesar's wife: innocent of even the implication of any infringement upon any rule or practice of the House. I should like to give notice to the departments, to the legislative committees of the House and to all concerned that in the next session nothing will be included in any appropriation bill, however customary or however urgent, that is not specifically authorized by law. I trust this notice is in ample time to permit any department to make application to legislative committees having jurisdiction, and in time for such committees to report such authorization, if they so desire.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the rule for the agriculture bill which is about to be considered in the House. I have analyzed the agriculture appropriation bills thoroughly, and I am acquainted with the number of instances that legislation appears in the bill, and the extent of existing statutes for the safeguarding of the Treasury that will be repealed if the rule is passed.

On the majority side, there is a tendency to minimize the importance of legislative provisions that are subject to a point of order. The uninitiated might fall prey to this argument if he has never given any thought to Government finance, and the general statutes previously passed Congress. These laws of the land were carefully drawn in order to keep our public administrators honest, to provide against lump-sum appropriations for bureaucrats to spend without explaining adequately the functions and purposes to Congress, and to require public bidding in order to insure the low dollar for the contracts of Uncle Sam.

Attention to this subject, I must confess, has not been a brain child of the minority or of the Republican Party. The Comptroller General of the United States, who is a Democrat, who has made no small reputation in the House as a Congressman, Mr. Lindsay Warren, has called our attention to the granting of blanket power by legislative provisions in the appropriation bills circumventing these old statutes. See his Annual Report of 1944. At page 79 and continuing through to page 86 you will find under appendix A in the Comptroller General's report, examples of statutes enacted during the fiscal year 1944, conferring unusual administrative authority over expenditures.

All of the arguments made so far for the majority who support this rule do not answer the dangers to accounting by the Comptroller General, the danger of wasteful expenditure of funds which naturally flow from relaxing permanent law in appropriation bills. If I remember the testimony of the Comptroller before the Indenpendent Offices Subcommittee, I gained the impression he complained that Congress paid no heed to his warnings and his findings. He stated about the same time that the country stood to lose $50,000,000,000 through waste of public funds in the war effort. The $50,000,000,000 and the circumventing of the statutes by legislation in appropriation bills are two sides of the same animal; and so long as I am here, I am going to uphold the hands of the Comptroller General against the bureaucrats. In the time and the space allotted to me, I think this is sufficient explanation to cast a vote against the rule.

There are as many other arguments as alarming and as necessary for the preservation of honesty in our Government that would cause me to come to the same conclusion. I will discuss them later. I hope the rule will not be adopted.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 190, nays 150, not voting 92, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—190

Abernethy	Gallagher	Outland
Allen, La.	Gardner	Pace
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gary	Patman
	Gathings	Patrick
Andrews, Ala.	Gearhart	Patterson
Angell	Geelan	Peterson, Fla.
Baldwin, Md.	Gore	Pfeifer
Barden	Gorski	Philbin
Barry	Gossett	Pickett
Bates, Ky.	Granger	Plumley
Beckworth	Grant, Ala.	Poage
Blemiller	Gregory	Powell
Bland	Hare	Price, Ill.
Bloom	Harless, Ariz.	Priest
Bonner	Harris	Rabaut
Boykin	Hart	Rabin
Brooks	Havenner	Rains
Brown, Ga.	Hays	Ramspeck
Bryson	Healy	Randolph
Bulwinkle	Hedrick	Rankin
Bunker	Hill	Rayfiel
Burch	Hoch	Resa
Burgin	Hope	Richards
Byrne, N. Y.	Horan	Riley
Camp	Huber	Robertson, N. Dak.
Cannon, Mo.	Jackson	
Carlson	Jarman	Robertson, Va.
Carnahan	Johnson,	Rogers, Fla.
Chapman	Luther A.	Rogers, N. Y.
Clark	Johnson,	Rooney
Clements	Lyndon B.	Rowan
Cochran	Johnson, Okla.	Ryter
Coffee	Kee	Sadowski
Colmer	Kefauver	Sasscer
Cooley	Kelley, Pa.	Savage
Cooper	Kelly, Ill.	Sheppard
Courtney	Kerr	Slaughter
Cox	Kilday	Snyder
Cravens	Kirwan	Somers, N. Y.
Crosser	Kopplemann	Sparkman
D'Alesandro	Lea	Spence
Daughton, Va.	Lemke	Starkey
Davis	Link	Stewart
De Lacy	Ludlow	Stigler
Delaney, John J.	Lyle	Sullivan
	Lynch	Sumners, Tex.
Dingell	McCormack	Tarver
Doughton, N. C.	McGehee	Thom
Douglas, Calif.	McKenzie	Thomas, Tex.
Douglas, Ill.	McMillan, S. C.	Thomason
Doyle	Manasco	Tolan
Drewry	Mansfield, Mont.	Traynor
Durham		Trimble
Earthman	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson
Eberharter	Marcantonio	Voorhis, Calif.
Elliott	Miller, Calif.	Weaver
Engle, Calif.	Mills	Weiss
Ervin	Monroney	West
Fallon	Morgan	Whitten
Feighan	Murdock	Whittington
Fernandez	Murphy	Winstead
Fisher	Neely	Wood
Flannagan	Norrell	Worley
Flood	Norton	Zimmerman
Folger	O'Brien, Mich.	
Forand	O'Neal	

NAYS—150

Adams	Dolliver	Herter
Andersen, H. Carl	Dondero	Heselton
	Dworshak	Hess
Andresen, August H.	Ellis	Hoeven
	Ellsworth	Hoffman
Auchincloss	Elston	Holmes, Mass.
Barrett, Wyo.	Engel, Mich.	Holmes, Wash.
Bender	Fenton	Howell
Bennett, Mo.	Fuller	Hull
Bishop	Fulton	Jenkins
Blackney	Gamble	Jennings
Bolton	Gavin	Jensen
Bradley, Mich.	Gerlach	Johnson, Calif.
Brehm	Gifford	Johnson, Ill.
Brown, Ohio	Gillette	Johnson, Ind.
Brumbaugh	Gillie	Jones
Buck	Goodwin	Jonkman
Buffett	Graham	Judd
Campbell	Grant, Ind.	Kean
Canfield	Griffiths	Kearney
Case, N. J.	Gross	Keefe
Chenoweth	Gwinn, N. Y.	Kilburn
Chiperfield	Gwynne, Iowa	Kinzer
Church	Hale	Knutson
Clason	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Kunkel
Clevenger		LaFollette
Cole, Mo.	Hall, Leonard W.	Lanham
Cole, N. Y.		Latham
Corbett	Halleck	Lewis
Crawford	Hancock	McConnell
Cunningham	Harness, Ind.	McCowen
Curtis	Henry	McDonough
McGregor	Rockwell	Talle
McMillen, Ill.	Rodgers, Pa.	Taylor
Martin, Iowa	Roe, Md.	Thomas, N. J.
Mason	Rogers, Mass.	Tibbott
Merrow	Schwabe, Mo.	Towe
Michener	Schwabe, Okla.	Vorys, Ohio
Miller, Nebr.	Scrivner	Vursell
Mundt	Shafer	Wadsworth
Murray, Wis.	Sharp	Walter
O'Hara	Short	Wasielewski
O'Konski	Simpson, Ill.	Weichel
Phillips	Simpson, Pa.	Welch
Pittenger	Smith, Ohio	Wigglesworth
Ploeser	Smith, Wis.	Wilson
Ramey	Springer	Wolcott
Reed, Ill.	Stefan	Wolfenden, Pa.
Rees, Kans.	Stockman	Wolverton, N. J.
Rich	Sundstrom	Woodruff, Mich.
Rizley	Taber	
Robsion, Ky.	Talbot	

NOT VOTING—92

Allen, Ill.	Elsaesser	Maloney
Anderson, Calif.	Fellows	Martin, Mass.
Andrews, N. Y.	Fogarty	May
Arends	Gibson	Morrison
Arnold	Gillespie	Mott
Bailey	Gordon	Murray, Tenn.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Ganahan	O'Brien, Ill.
Barrett, Pa.	Green	O'Toole
Bates, Mass.	Hagen	Peterson, Ga.
Beall	Hand	Powers
Bell	Hartley	Price, Fla.
Bennet, N. Y.	Hébert	Quinn, N. Y.
Boren	Heffernan	Reece, Tenn.
Bradley, Pa.	Hendricks	Reed, N. Y.
Buckley	Hinshaw	Rivers
Butler	Hobbs	Robinson, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.	Holifield	Roe, N. Y.
Cannon, Fla.	Hook	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Izac	Sabath
Celler	Keogh	Sheridan
Chelf	King	Sikes
Cole, Kans.	Landis	Smith, Maine
Combs	Lane	Smith, Va.
Curley	Larcade	Stevenson
Dawson	LeCompte	Sumner, Ill.
Delaney, James J.	LeFevre	Torrens
	Lesinski	White
Dickstein	Luce	Wickersham
Dirksen	McGlinchey	Winter
Domengeaux	Madden	Woodhouse
Eaton	Mahon	Woodrum, Va.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gordon for, with Mr. Arnold against.

Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin against.

Mr. Dickstein for, with Mr. Allen of Illinois against.

Mr. McGlinchey for, with Mr. Fellows against.

Mr. Sheridan for, with Mr. Butler against.

Mr. Hobbs for, with Mr. LeFevre against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Reece of Tennessee against.

Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Anderson of California against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.

Mr. Roe of New York for, with Mr. Powers against.

Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Beall against.

General pairs:

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Green with Mr. Stevenson.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Combs with Mr. Hartley.

Mr. Lane with Mrs. Smith of Maine.

Mr. May with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Celler with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. Curley with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Hand.

Mr. Quinn of New York with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. LeCompte.

Mr. Torrens with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Hagen.

Mr. James J. Delaney with Mr. Bennet of New York.

Mr. Chelf with Miss Sumner of Illinois.

Mr. Maloney with Mr. Gillespie.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Dirksen.

The result of the vote was announced, as above recorded.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article in reference to Bretton Woods.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2689) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2689, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Wednesday, the Clerk had completed the reading of the first paragraph of the bill. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PENALTY MAIL

For deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail of the Department of Agriculture, including the War Food Administration, as required by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1944 (Public Law 364), $3,238,740, together with not to exceed $27,000 of the funds made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation for administrative expenses, for penalty mail for said Corporation.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the first paragraph. The Clerk quickly jumped down to the penalty mail section.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I regret to make a point of order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the first paragraph has not been read.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, yes; it has.

Mr. RICH. It has not been read.

Mr. TABER. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that the first paragraph has not been read, and I insist on it.

Mr. TARVER. It was read in full.

Mr. TABER. I make the point of order that it was not read.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the first paragraph has been read.

Mr. TABER. I demand the reading of the first paragraph.

Mr. TARVER. The first paragraph was read in full. I was following the Clerk carefully, and he read every word of it.

Mr. TABER. I was following him carefully, too, and I know that that is not correct.

Mr. TARVER. It is correct.

Mr. TABER. I demand the reading of the first paragraph.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make the statement that the paragraph was not read in order, because I tried to keep in close touch with it and it was not read in full.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman kindly send the amendment to the desk and let the Chair be the judge of whether or not it is in order?

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 2, line 16, after the word "Department" strike out "$1,450,000" and insert "$1,200,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania is very insistent upon his right to offer this amendment, I shall not insist upon the point of order, but I do not want the point of order overruled upon the ground that the Clerk had not read the first paragraph because he had read the first paragraph.

Mr. RICH. I do not care what the chairman of the subcommittee says, the Clerk did not read it. The gentleman is not going to put anything more down the throat of any individual here.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman should not become unduly aroused. The Clerk had not only read the first paragraph but he had read the second paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels that inasmuch as the gentleman from Pennsylvania was endeavoring to secure the floor the amendment should be considered.

Mr. TARVER. I am not objecting to that, but I am objecting to any conclusion by the Chair that the first paragraph had not been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not made the statement that it had not been read. The Chair made the statement that the gentleman from Pennsylvania was on his feet endeavoring to secure the floor, and that the amendment is in order.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this House is in a very, very bad situation. The Members of the House of Representatives have been elected by the people to come here and try to serve the people of this country in a way that will be for the best interests of America. If this House continues in the frame of mind in which I think we have found it in the past week, I realize something is going to be done back home by the people of America when they come to the election next year, and you who think you are so valuable and so fixed in your ways here, and who think you know so much about the rules of this House, are going to get one of the greatest jars that any Member of Congress ever got. You may be left home to do some thinking.

As for me, the easiest thing in the world for me to do is to sit back and do nothing and just let this thing ride along, and go along with the majority of the House and appropriate all the money they think is right and just and all the money they want to spend for their pet schemes, and then bring in rules on the floor of the House and adopt them, rules that the Committee on Rules say can be adopted if you get a majority of the Members of the House to support them, rules to write legislation here by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, when the chairman of the committee admitted that there was no legislation enacted by the Congress authorizing such appropriations. That may be the New Deal way but I think it is a very poor way to legislate.

I say to you in all sincerity that that is a pretty bad state for the Congress to be in. I do not like it myself and I am not going to subscribe to it. The nice thing for a Member of Congress to do is to get up here and praise the Congress, and I would love to do it if I could.

I have offered an amendment here to cut $250,000 off this appropriation for the Secretary and allow him $1,200,000, instead of the $1,450,000 the subcommittee has seen fit to grant him.

If there is any department of government that needs to be curtailed and curbed, I think it is the Department of Agriculture. The manner in which it has increased in the last 10 or 12 years has been phenomenal. The expenditures you have in this bill, and the manner in which you have increased them, are beyond the proportions the American public is going to be able to stand.

Before I get through this afternoon I will give you some quotations from the President in reference to agriculture, but I want to call your attention first to the amount of the appropriations carried in this bill, almost $900,000,000. In order to get started right, I am going to call your attention again to the Treasury statement of March 20. On that date this Government of ours was in the red $234,636,821,260.56. That is a sum of money never dreamed of in the imagination of any Member of Congress 15 years ago. No one ever thought of an amount like that. That is what our Nation owes, about $2,000 per individual man, woman, and child in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. RICH. I object. Some other Members may want to speak on this amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment close in 2 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the committee reduced the item for the Secretary's office from $1,700,000 for the present fiscal year to $1,450,000 for the next fiscal year, a reduction of $250,000, or $17,000 below the Budget for the next fiscal year. We did that upon the basis of long hearings in the course of which we sought to go carefully into the evidence on the question of what the Secretary's office would reasonably require.

The item carried in the bill has the unanimous approval of the members of the subcommittee who heard that evidence, and I am sure the House would not wish to disturb it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses for the Office of Solicitor including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals, and payment of fees or dues for the use of law libraries by attorneys in the field service, $1,680,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $197,500, shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation; and there may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia not to exceed $883,240: *Provided, however*, That if the total amount of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 4, line 16, after the word "service", strike out "$1,680,000" and insert "$1,200,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out $480,000 from the provision for the Solicitor in the Department of Agriculture. If we give the Department of Agriculture $1,200,000 for the Solicitor, that is a great sum of money. There is no reason under the sun why $1,200,000 would not be adequate to handle the affairs of the office for the coming fiscal year. Let me call attention to these figures: In the year 1930, there were 6,288,648 farms in this country. In 1940, there were 6,026,799 farms. In other words, we had about 200,000 less farms in that year than we had in 1930. The number of farms is being reduced and the expenses of the Department of Agriculture are increasing.

The value of land decreased from $47,880,000,000 to $33,642,000,000. If the value of our farm lands is decreasing, why do you want to increase the appropriations in every department of this Government? As we decrease the number of farms I cannot understand why we should increase the cost of operation of the Government here in Washington. It just does not seem reasonable.

I have an idea you can cut this amount from the office of Solicitor. There is no reason why we should give the Solicitor for his legal counsel any greater fees because you do not allow the workingman in industry any increase in wages. So why should you permit the Department of Agriculture to increase the amount of fees? If we hold them to the same level as everybody else we would not have to tax the people so much. You are taxing the people of this country just about all they can stand. The people are going to resent it very soon. You

will not only get resentment from all the people of this country for the enormous expenses you are piling upon them, but you are going to get resentment from the people because you are building up these bureaus. You are building them up to the extent where the public cannot afford to keep them up any longer.

It seems to me while we are in war and we need manpower, we should have these men on the farms to work. You had better get rid of three or four hundred thousand employees in the Government service and put them to work on the farms. Then you would be a whole lot better off.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. In case anybody should charge you with getting only two or three votes on your amendments, you can count me whether you hear my voice or not, because I am voting with you.

Mr. RICH. I realize the lady is for economy in the operation of Government. But we find that is not the case on the other side of the House. Our people on this side are pretty much discouraged, because they get licked in trying to cut down the appropriations. The Democratic side has the majority and that is the side that is responsible for these great expenditures. If those men think that the people of this country are always going to be satisfied with them spending and spending and spending, they have to be satisfied when we tax them and tax and tax them. They know who they can put the blame on. It is the men at the head of this Government who are responsible.

Here is a little statement on taxes that someone sent me. I do not know who is responsible for it, but it reads:

TAXES

Now he is a common man—
Tax him, tax him all you can.
Tax his house and tax his bed,
Tax the bald spot on his head.
Tax his bread, tax his meat,
Tax his shoes clean off his feet.
Tax his pipe and tax his smoke,
Teach him government is no joke.
Tax his "Henry," tax his gas,
Tax the road that he must pass.
Tax the farmer, tax his fowl,
Tax the dog and tax his howl.
Tax his plow and tax his clothes,
Tax the rags that wipe his nose.
Tax his pig and tax his squeal,
Tax the boots run down at heel.
Tax his cow and tax his calf,
Tax him if he dares to laugh.
Tax his barns and tax his lands,
Tax the blisters on his hands.
Tax the water, tax the air,
Tax the sunlight if you dare.
Tax the living, tax the dead,
Tax the unborn 'fore they are born.
Tax them all, make them squeal,
And then for all thank the New Deal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment may end in 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the committee has reduced the amount for the Office of the Solicitor $250,632 below the amount available for the present fiscal year. It has reduced the Budget by $28,500. There is certainly no justification for further reduction, and I hope the gentleman's amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 35, noes 54.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For necessary expenses in connection with the publication, indexing, illustration, and distribution of bulletins, documents, and reports, the preparation, distribution, and display of agricultural motion and sound pictures, and exhibits, and the coordination of informational work in the Department, $450,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $161,179 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, of which total appropriation amounts not exceeding those specified may be used for the purposes enumerated as follows: For personal services in the District of Columbia, $487,640; for preparation and display of exhibits, $58,470, and the preparation, distribution, and display of motion and sound pictures, $50,000, including cooperation with Federal, State, county, municipal, and other agencies: *Provided, however,* That if the total amounts of the appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year from which transfers to this appropriation are herein authorized shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further,* That when and to the extent that in the judgment of the Secretary agricultural exhibits and motion and sound pictures relating to the authorized programs of the various agencies of the Department can be more advantageously prepared, displayed, or distributed by the Office of Information, as the central agency of the Department therefor, additional funds not exceeding $300,000 for these purposes may be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation, from the funds applicable, and shall be available for the objects specified herein, including personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided further,* That in the preparation of motion pictures or exhibits by the Department, not exceeding a total of $10,000 may be used for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the act of September 21, 1944 (Public Law 425): *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the establishment or maintenance of regional or State field offices or for the compensation of employees in such offices except that not to exceed $11,856 may be used to maintain the San Francisco radio office.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 5, line 19, strike out "$450,000" and insert "$300,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to read part of this paragraph and see what the Members think of it, and I quote from page 6, line 7, as follows:

Provided, however, That if the total amounts of the appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year from which transfers to this appropriation are herein authorized shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations:

Mr. Chairman, after we make these appropriations, and they want to juggle this around to suit themselves, they will go down and have a hearing or a conference between the Department of Agriculture and the Budget Bureau. If the Budget Bureau wants to make the change, it will make the change, it will write the laws, and the Members of Congress will not have anything to say as to how the money is going to be spent. My amendment asks you to strike off $150,000 just to keep them from juggling this around.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have juggled enough. If you do not stop juggling pretty soon you are not going to have anything to juggle. The juggler is going to be juggled. I hope that some of you gentlemen who are doing this juggling will be juggled, too.

In this connection let me read a statement made by the President of the United States in a speech on October 25, 1932, at Baltimore, Md., and this was to help the farmer:

No tariff duties should be lowered to a point where our natural industries would be injured. Of course, it is absurd to talk of lowering tariff duties on farm produce. I declared that all prosperity in the broader sense springs from the soil. I promised to endeavor to restore the purchasing power of the farm dollar by making the tariff effective for agriculture and raising the price of farmers' products. I know of no effective excessively high tariff duties on farm products. I do not intend that such duties shall be lowered. To do so would be inconsistent with my entire farm program and every farmer knows it and will not be deceived.

He talks about not deceiving the farmers, but I wonder whether the farmer will find out after awhile that the Government has no money in the Treasury and he will not get these hand-outs which the administration has promised him? If this administration and the newly elected Congressmen want to help the farmers, they will raise the prices of farm commodities so that the farmer will have a fair price for his commodity after the Treasury gets bare. I am for maintaining the farmers so that the farmers can get a fair price for the things they are performing and doing and

so that he will be able in some way to maintain himself. Whenever the Treasury of the United States becomes empty and the farmers do not get these handouts, where are they going to be? They are going to be high and dry. So that if the President of the United States is not going to fool him, so far as the tariff is concerned, he will fool him because the cupboard will be bare and there will be nothing to give the farmer.

We talk about tariffs on industrial products. I am for a tariff on industrial products to protect American industry and American labor so that the American standard of living will be high. I am just as sincere in trying to help agriculture as I am in trying to help American labor because if we do not do something after awhile the foodstuffs that are raised in foreign countries by peon labor are going to be shipped into this country and our farmers will then be in competition with those people of foreign countries. So beware of what we are doing. Let us cut down this appropriation. Let us lop off $150,000 here. Let us stop the juggling in the Department of Agriculture and let us put it on a good, sound business basis. The only way that you can put the Department of Agriculture on a good, sound business basis is to clean house. They have between two and three hundred thousand men in that Department now. I say to you that they have more men in the Department of Agriculture than they have in any other department of Government. They are all over the country. It is just too expensive for the people of America to keep up. Too many men telling the farmers what to do. Let them help farm the soil instead of farming the farmer.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the time was when the Office of Information in the Department of Agriculture had the confidence of the farming public, and when you could depend on what they said. The curse of the situation is that today you cannot depend upon what they say. I have over in my office a copy of the Agricultural Yearbook for 1920. I have also a copy of volume No. 20 of Crops and Markets, a magazine published by the Department of Agriculture Bureau of Information in July 1942. There appear in the Agricultural Yearbook certain figures with reference to farm income, and the exact same table of farm income over the same period is covered in this document printed in 1942. I am going to ask leave to insert this material in the RECORD, if I can get consent when we go back into the House.

Pursuant to the consent given me in the House, I insert the following:

In 1920 when this scheme was proposed the United States Department of Agriculture published the following table in its 1920 Yearbook, page 806, table 297, as follows:

Estimated value of farm products 1910–14 based on prices at the farm

Year:	*Total value of crops and livestock*
1910	$9,037,000,000
1911	8,819,000,000
1912	9,343,000,000
1913	9,850,000,000
1914	9,895,000,000

The United States Department of Agriculture in volume 20, No. 3, July 1943 issue of Crops and Markets, table 1, published the following table:

Gross farm income

Year:	*Total value of crops and livestock*
1910	$7,352,000,000
1911	7,081,000,000
1912	7,561,000,000
1913	7,821,000,000
1914	7,638,000,000

There is a difference of better than $2,000,000,000 a year in the story relating to farm income in the period from 1910 to 1914 between the Agricultural Yearbook of 1920 and this document which they published in 1943. I feel that when an outfit gets to the point where it is of so little value that it has destroyed the confidence of the farmers in my territory as it has done by this operation—and the farm papers all over my district are loaded with stories of this operation—that it is time that they were trimmed down and we ceased to give them so much money to fool away. If they are going to do a straightforward job and do it right side up, that is one thing, but when they get so you cannot depend on them, God help the farmers of America. It seems to me that the only way we are going to get anywhere is to let this amendment be adopted and cut down the amount requested.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to say that we should not cut out any funds from this section. Perhaps the remarks that the preceding speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], has made are in part occasioned, if they are as accurate as his figures often are, by the paucity of funds given for information work to the Department.

I have a letter here from one of the largest radio broadcasting stations in the Northwest, complaining of the inadequacy of the funds for disseminating vital public information. This letter reads in part:

I am especially concerned over the matter of appropriations for information work by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. In the last appropriation funds for this type of work were cut out and A. A. A. was prohibited from doing information work under the guise that it constituted propaganda.

I feel it is vital that the appropriations be reinstated for information work so that broadcasters and newspapers will have the benefit of receiving information that is now not available.

In our own State of Washington the A. A. A. has been the most vital single factor in achieving wartime production goals on food. During the past year the State A. A. A. committee has been crippled by the action of the Congress prohibiting it from disseminating information to radio and press.

When we cut down on the funds available for the dissemination of vital information about crops and about the need for public support for this program, we are actually striking a blow at the freedom of the press and at the capacity of the press to serve the war needs. The press and radio need this information so that they can show people why and how to support our country's war-food programs.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there are two thoughts brought up by the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from New York that I should like to use this time to discuss. One of them is that the farm-income figure that is so easily thrown around is deceptive as far as the facts are concerned. If at any future time anyone wants to correct the statement I am going to make I should be glad to have him do so.

The figures used to portray national farm income are deceiving; I will explain why they are deceiving. For example, corn brings so many billion dollars—3,000,000,000 bushels, $3,000,000,000. They feed that corn to hogs, and so many hogs bring so many million dollars, or feed it to cattle, and the milk and the dairy products and the beef bring so many million dollars. There is not exactly a total duplication of those amounts, but there is a partial duplication. I think that in fairness, instead of propagandizing and using those figures as loosely as is done, we should have a little bit more consideration of the real picture when it is disseminated from one end of the country to the other.

There is no Member of Congress or no living person who has any higher respect for the men who work in these departments, the old civil-service men, than I. I surely have bothered them enough. Regardless of any political affiliations, in all frankness I can say that every single one of those departments has always given all the information they had available to give me. There is a tendency, possibly due to the influx during the war, to bring in people who have all the answers sometimes when they have not heard all the questions, but by far the great majority of these people who are assembling this information want to give the people the facts.

The second is:

It irritates me to see these propaganda stories go out, to see stories go out that are not based on facts. I do not like to see the taxpayer pay someone to deceive him. I tried to correct one here on the floor the other day. It has been sent out by the Department all over the land that the farmers of this country are guaranteed 90 percent of parity during the war and 2 years after the war. It is wrong to send out that kind of propaganda because that is not the fact. Why not tell the truth? Why the deception? What is to be gained by it? As I said the other day, the Secretary of Agriculture has it within his hands to change that floor any time he wishes to change it. That is the type of propaganda that should be discontinued. The kind of information that goes out should be based on the real facts and the picture that exists at the time it is sent out to the people of this country.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 7 minutes, 5 minutes to be allotted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] and the remainder to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, generally speaking, I find myself with economic views similar to those of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. I bow to him as an earnest and discerning economist. I was, therefore, more than surprised to read his remarks in day before yesterday's RECORD and note that even he has fallen into the error so common in this House of viewing corporations solely from the aspect of their size and failing to recognize that our great corporations are owned by millions of small investors.

In his remarks to which I refer, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] was decrying the enormous sums of money paid out to farmers under the agricultural-conservation and crop-parity programs. He pointed out that 59 farmers in the State of Pennsylvania received $143,928, or $2,439 per farmer. He mentioned that 796 farmers in Arkansas received $1,709,000, or $2,146 each. Then to show the extravagance of such payments, he mentioned the munificence of the New Deal to some great insurance companies. He mentioned with alarm that Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. received $95,756. He failed to mention, however, that Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. is owned by the owners of 43,657,000 life insurance policies. Each policy benefited from this $95,756, therefore, to the extent of two-tenths of 1 cent. That is a far cry from the $2,439 received by his 59 Pennsylvania farmers. Let us take another example: He told us that the John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co. received $65,242. This company has 10,374,000 policies in effect. From these $65,242 paid out, therefore, each policy benefited to the extent of about two-thirds of 1 cent. This is very different from the $2,146 which was paid to each of 796 farmers in Arkansas.

Let us not, in our deliberations in this House, follow this error in Mr. RICH's reasoning. Let us instead view these great insurance companies as the trustees of the savings of millions of small wage earners. Let us view American Telephone & Telegraph, General Motors, and other great corporations, not as instruments of the rich, but rather as the collective ownership of millions of small investors who, by virtue of their thrift and their savings, have played an invaluable role in the building of that way of life which we call America.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman not believe that the Department of Agriculture should pay the farmers for raising crops and increasing their production so that the small stockholders whom the gentleman is talking about, and whom I am talking about and am interested in, can get cheaper farm produce rather than to have the Government take the money out of the Treasury, which is already empty, and hand it over to the insurance companies, with the result that the stockholders are going to get indirectly what you think are benefits today, but which eventually will be something that will ruin their insurance because of the fact that the companies are the greatest owners of Government bonds? When the time comes that we cannot support our Treasury, our bonds will drop in price, and then your stockholders will have nothing. So where are you? Like a cat running around trying to catch its tail. You get no place with these subsidies.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, by this amendment the gentleman from Pennsylvania seeks to reduce the funds for the Office of Information by $150,000 beyond the reduction which has already been effected in the bill, or $164,002 below the amount available for the present fiscal year. That amendment, according to the gentleman's argument, is based upon the idea that the proviso on page 6, line 7, of the bill authorizes the juggling of funds in that office. The proviso in question is an administrative provision carried in the bill for many years.

The total amount of money involved is $11,179. That is all the Budget estimate provided for transfer to this office, and that is from the Office of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

So all this juggling he is talking about, which is to be accomplished by this proviso, relates to $11,179, and on that account he proposes to reduce the appropriation for this important office which disseminates information to the farmers of the United States by $150,000, notwithstanding the committee has reduced it by $164,000 below the appropriation for the present fiscal year.

I certainly hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is there anything in this bill that you think might be cut down? Is there any item in it that you think should be cut down?

Mr. TARVER. I may say I am not in entire agreement with my colleagues on the committee about a number of items in this bill, but we have all agreed, sacrificing to some degree our opinions, to support the amounts reported. I think the gentleman might follow that same course here.

Mr. RICH. That is the trouble. One fellow wants this and the other wants that, and the first thing you know you have got 435, and that is the reason you do not cut down anything.

Mr. TARVER. No, no. There has not been any trading or anything of that sort by members of the committee. The gentleman's accusation is unfounded.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I understand the overtime pay item on this proposition was $81,000, so that really this is an increase of $17,000 this year over last year.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman will be able to determine that exactly by reference to page 3 of the report. It is true the overtime item is not included. I do not have the exact figures with regard to the overtime item before me now, but I will say to the gentleman that the amount of the appropriation has been substantially reduced by the subcommittee below the budget estimates. There is no office in the Department of Agriculture which is more important to agriculture in the United States than is the Office of Information.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time on the pending amendment has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 35, noes 67.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all printing and binding for the Department, including all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services located in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, except as otherwise in this act provided, $1,000,000, including the purchase of reprints of scientific and technical articles published in periodicals and journals; the Annual Report of the Secretary, as required by the acts of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 111, 212–220, 222, 241, 244), March 4, 1915 (7 U. S. C. 418), and June 20, 1936 (5 U. S. C. 108), and in pursuance of the act approved March 30, 1906 (44 U. S. C. 214, 224), also including not to exceed $250,000 for farmers' bulletins, which shall be adapted to the interests of the people of the different sections of the country, an equal proportion of four-fifths of which shall be delivered to or sent out under the addressed franks furnished by the Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress, as they shall direct, but not including work done at the field printing plants of the Forest Service authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing, in accordance with the act approved March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111, 220): *Provided*, That the Secretary may transfer to this appropriation from the appropriation made for "Conservation and Use of Agricultural Land Resources" such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, and from funds appropriated to carry into effect the terms of section 32 of the act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612c), as amended, such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with the activities under said section 32, and from funds appropriated for "Salaries and expenses, War Food Administration," such sums as may be necessary for printing and binding in connection with functions assigned to the Office of Information by the War Food Administrator: *Provided further*, That the total amount that may be transferred under the authority granted in the preceding proviso shall not exceed $225,000.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 7, line 19, after the word "Provided" strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$800,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to strike $200,000 from the $1,000,000 appropriation for

printing for the Department of Agriculture.

Do you Members of Congress know what is happening now in the printing industry? We see advertisements in the paper daily urging people to save paper; we find boys and girls going around from house to house gathering old newspapers. The pulp industry of this country is about at its wit's end to furnish enough paper for the actual needs of the Government in wartime, yet we authorize a million dollars' worth of printing for the Department of Agriculture alone.

There is no present necessity for printing a great deal of the literature that has been printed in the past and sent out broadcast all over the country, hither and yon, without the slightest desire to economize in the saving of paper.

The Joint Committee on Printing of this Congress just this last week opened bids on paper. To our surprise we got bids on only one-half the amount of paper for which bids were requested. Just think of it. The whole country was able to submit bids on only one-half the paper needs required by the Government and on which bids were requested by the Joint Committee on Printing. This paper was for the Department of Agriculture and other Departments of the Government. Yet you come in here authorizing a million dollars worth of printing for the Department of Agriculture. Do you not think this item should be cut somewhat to help the Joint Committee on Printing and to help the paper industry of this country, to help the lumbermen of this country who furnish the pulpwood? Do something, do something, do something to cut down this appropriation bill. I beseech you to do it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. No; I do not yield to the gentleman from Minnesota. I have no time. He can get lots of time.

The paper situation is getting so serious in this country that we have got to get men out in the woods to cut the wood, get men in the fields to doing more farming, put men into industry manufacturing the things essential for the war, put men to cleaning up our cities wherever there is any dirt all over this land of ours and keep everything clean. We have got to get men here in Washington who will stand for economy in the operation of this Government if we are going to maintain a government such as our forefathers established, under which there was freedom. Freedom is the greatest thing America has ever enjoyed. We, however, are fast losing it by the New Deal.

We do not want to publish a lot of useless and unneeded literature. Literature is sent to all of us that we do not have time to read. I get three times as much stuff as I can ever hope to read, and I believe the rest of the Members find the same thing is true in their own cases. This is not the time to send pounds and pounds of bulletins and all kinds of literature to the farmers, for the farmers of this country hardly have time to milk their cows, let alone read this literature and printing. Up in my district they are selling the cattle off their farms because they have not the time to milk the cows. You send them literature to read when they want to plow their fields, plant their crops, and harvest. They are asked to do this with less manpower. Send these literary men out on the farms now to do some plowing; it will be money spent in a better way. Yet you want to have men stay on the printing presses here in Washington to print these things and send them out to the farmers. Do you not think we are doing a lot of things very foolishly?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman know that the newspapers of this country have been cut by the Priorities Division of the War Production Board 35 percent on their paper?

Mr. RICH. Yes, and they are talking about doing the same thing again; that is, cutting the newspapers of this country. I say, cut down this appropriation a couple of hundred thousand dollars off a million-dollar appropriation. The farmers do not have time to read this stuff, and you do not have time to read it. Who does have time to read it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will we have the opportunity of getting 5 minutes each?

Mr. TARVER. No; there will be about two and a half minutes for each Member standing.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, all of us at this time recognize the need of keeping expenditures to the lowest level that is possible, consistent, however, with the proper operation of the Department and of the many services which are rendered by this particular branch of the Government. This committee has had and does now have the same desire that other Members have in trying to keep these expenditures at a minimum.

The appropriation for this purpose last year and the amount made available to this Department was $1,100,000. Notwithstanding the greatly increased demands which are made on the Department of Agriculture, due to the situation which now faces our farm population, we saw fit to reduce that appropriation by $100,000, leaving in a total of $1,000,000 during the present year. This action was taken after hearing testimony at length and was as great a reduction as we felt should be made.

Comment has been made about farm bulletins being sent out by the Department of Agriculture. My office is now busily engaged in sending out farmers' bulletins which have been requested by the people of my district. Doubtless if other Members called attention to the fact that these bulletins are available they would find their people just as much interested in obtaining proven agricultural scientific information.

I have felt and I feel now that the many millions of dollars we are spending through the Department of Agriculture in an effort to maintain the splendid production which we now have certainly calls for the expenditure of this sum to send out the information which they have accumulated and which they have proven to be worth while to the farmers.

I have always believed that it is better to put into practice and to put into use and to make available so the farmer can have it for himself one discovery or one improvement in the production or handling of agricultural products than to have ten discoveries and not put one of them into practice. The amount of money appropriated here represents a reduction, as I have said, at a time when farmers as never before need to learn better ways to get by with less labor, less material, less machinery, and everything else. If you expect to support the Department of Agriculture in the effort it makes, certainly you are not doing a good job when you cut down the amount of money which is involved in this bill for the purpose of disseminating the very information and results of the good work which they have done at great expense.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman think that $800,000 is a lot of money for printing? I do not want to cut it all out.

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly I think $800,000 is a lot of money. Your committee went through about a month of hearings with the Department of Agriculture in an effort to do just what the gentleman intimates he wants to do and that is to keep the expenses of this Department at a minimum. After a month of hearings and after the concerted effort of the members of this committee, both on the Republican side and on the Democratic side, my recollection is that this amount was unanimously agreed to as the smallest sum with which we felt the Department could get by and still do a good job of getting this information to the people.

We felt that this sum was necessary to see that the information gathered together by this Department reached the farmers of the country which, after all, is the basis for the support and operation and maintenance of the Department of Agriculture. I believe that the amendment should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment simply because of the fact that we

have appropriated, and justly so, many millions of dollars in this bill for research and unless we give an opportunity to get the results of that research to the farmers of the Nation and to the people interested, much of that money will be wasted. I personally feel that the expenditure of this million dollars in this particular bill is fully justified. We must find new uses for agricultural products and better and cheaper ways in which to produce these commodities. To give to farmers the benefit of these new discoveries in every branch of agriculture, it is necessary to print documents of every nature, farm bulletins and such, for the proper dissemination of this great research and experiments. This item has been cut—let us not reduce it further.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the motion to reduce this amount in the bill on the ground of economy, for I believe it is not a waste of public money to put that money into printer's ink, if the message which that printer's ink carries is scientific information. I have heard a good many remarks made, chiefly on the left side of the aisle, that many of the publications issued by the Department of Agriculture recently were propaganda, implying political doctrine. I want to say that some of the most scientific men in this country have contributed to it.

I deeply regret that we do not have the continuance of the publication of the Agricultural Yearbook. Beginning back 6 or 7 years ago, we had some splendid publications issued by titles, scientific volumes, on Soils and Men, Food and Life, Farmers in a Changing World, Climate and Man, and Keeping Livestock Healthy. They were and are very much in demand. They have been used as textbooks in the colleges of our land. You may think we saved by cutting them out.

Talk about freedom! I tell you what we need is freedom from ignorance. One kind of freedom we might obtain is through these scientific publications. I am not exactly a young man, and I have given much time and thought to scientific agricultural problems. However, just today a man gave me a few scientific facts, printed on about a half page of paper, which taught me one of the greatest lessons in natural history that I have ever learned in my life. I am opposed to cutting down this printing item and trying to save in that way. Such so-called saving is equivalent to a premium on ignorance. It is saving at the spigot and wasting at the bung. That is exactly what this kind of an amendment would amount to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I have gone on record for most of these amendments to save money. At the present time, however, I am more interested in where we are going to get some of the food that the public will need in the next few months before we win this war. Not long ago I listened to Marvin Jones say that he felt the first priority on our food supply of the country should go to the armed forces. I am in total agreement with that statement. I believe that every effort should be made to keep our armed forces well fed. I am not, however, willing to admit, as some folks are advocating at this time, that there are others who should receive consideration as far as the food supply of this country goes before our civilian population. The American people themselves must be next in line to the armed forces to receive the food raised in this Nation.

I endorse wholeheartedly a resolution which was introduced the other day calling for an investigation of the food situation in the United States. I think a lot of things will be found out in this investigation. Most of all, they will find out some of the blunders that have been committed in the name of dreamers, of people who do not know what they are talking about and who have no conception of agriculture. They will find among the mistakes of the past 3 years depriving the American farmer of farm machinery, hoarding corn out in the Middle West so that the milk producers of the East could not get enough feed for their dairy cattle, and the indiscriminate drafting of farm help off the farms, and taking farm entrepreneurs. They will find those three blunders to be the main reasons for the food shortage today. I hope this investigating committee will go into a careful study of how we are going to get the food, and I hope that immediate action will be taken.

The War Food Administration points with pride to the accomplishments of the American farmer and says total food production has increased 30 percent during the past year. There are other figures. I hear different statistics quoted every time I turn around.

These gentlemen do not stop to think that the demand for this 30-percent increase has been doubled and trebled. The millions of men in service demand food. The home front must have food. The nations allied with us must have food. We have to feed prisoners of war, and there are millions of them. So the demand is way out of proportion to the supply, and the demand is getting larger.

As one of those who have consistently held up a warning finger in this House for the past few years whenever the question of our food supply has been mentioned, I am gravely concerned for the future. I would like to be optimistic but I cannot be.

It is only too evident that staple food items and necessary articles are becoming scarcer as the weeks go by. Prices, even though high, will soon cease to be the major worry. It will be trying to find enough to eat.

We must not let our civilians go hungry in our zeal and eagerness to feed other countries. A fair distribution to them is permissible so long as our fighting men and the home folks are fed. But no American should be subjected to malnutrition while the beneficiaries of our lavish kindness are feeding from our storehouses.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of cutting the amount that has been established for printing, but there are some publications now appearing that I think are somewhat questionable. I have in my hand a report of the Department of Agriculture and War Food Administration outlining a national policy for fertilizers and liming materials. The last pages of this report deal with the subject of potash, which is, of course, a very important subject in my particular State. Eighty-five percent of all the production of potash in the United States comes out of New Mexico.

Prior to World War No. 1 we were importing all of our potash from Russia and Germany. During the time intervening between the First and Second World Wars we built up to the situation where about half of the potash used in the United States was being developed in this country by American enterprise without Government aid. During this present war the potash industry has grown so that it is taking care of all the demands of the American farmers, it is taking care of the requirements of Canada, and at the same time it is now taking care of the South American coungrown so that it is taking care of all the tries—all again without aid from government. Our production has grown from 312,000 tons in 1939 to 875,000 tons this year—an increase of 180 percent.

This document issued by the Department of Agriculture suggests that there should be a restriction now on the use of American potash, that exploration for potash on public land should be conducted by the Federal Government, and that newly discovered sources should be held by the Government. It further states:

> In view of the extremely limited known resources in this country, we should obtain from foreign sources—
>
> Meaning Germany—
>
> a major portion of our needed supplies of potash. If extensive new deposits are not located soon, further vigorous steps should be taken to curtail the use of American deposits and replace them with imports. Imports should be admitted free of duty.

I do not believe that that is a policy the American people will support. Potash has been developed so far only in New Mexico and California, as far as this country is concerned. There are probably extensive deposits existing in Utah. It seems to me too bad that the Department of Agriculture would want to put us in the same position we were in when the war started, namely, not having enough fertilizer developed in our own country and being dependent upon foreign sources for it. We have now developed a good industry in this country capable of taking care of the needs of our farmers. It seems to me the policy which has been outlined by the Department of Agriculture is one that most of us would not be willing to support.

Further, if we should regard our national production as merely a reserve and should import all the potash we need from other countries, it would throw many loyal potash miners out of work in the difficult post-war period. Pay rolls in my State alone are now running $8,000,000 a year. The railroads of this country collected nearly $10,000,000 in freight charges on last year's production of potash. The State of New Mexico obtains needed revenues from this production of potash. I, therefore, cannot subscribe to the suggestions made in the pamphlet of the Department of Agriculture and do not believe it will be supported by the American public.

The Clerk read as follows:

Economic investigations: For acquiring and diffusing useful information among the people of the United States, for conducting investigations, experiments, and demonstrations, and for aiding in formulating programs for authorizing activities of the Department, relative to agricultural production, distribution, land utilization, and conservation in their broadest aspects, including farm management and practice, utilization of farm and food products, purchasing of farm supplies, farm population and rural life, farm labor, farm finance, insurance and taxation, adjustments in production to probable demand for the different farm and food products; land ownership and values, costs, prices, and income in their relation to agriculture, including causes for their variations and trends, $2,010,000, together with such amounts from other appropriations or authorizations as are provided in the schedules in the Budget for the current fiscal year for such salaries and expenses, which several amounts or portions thereof, as may be determined by the Secretary, not exceeding a total of $122,933 shall be transferred to and made a part of this appropriation: *Provided, however*, That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics shall be used for State and county land-use planning.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 11, line 8, strike out "$2,010,000" and insert "$1,800,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, a winner never quits and a quitter never wins. I do not know how long it is going to be before I ever do get an opportunity to cut anything down on this appropriation bill whether it is in the Department of Agriculture or whether it may be in some other branch of the Government. I started a good many years ago to go to work at 6 o'clock in the morning and I worked until 11 and 12 o'clock at night. I did that for years. I always managed to get enough sheckles to buy myself a horse and buggy and live out in the country, where I live at the present time. But I have an automobile now. I do not know how soon it is going to be worn out. But that automobile is going to be worn out some day, and so am I. But I am going to be worn out working. I am not going to be rusted out. If I have to come here in Congress and sit around and agree to everything that somebody else does, my people back in my district can send somebody else down here, because I do not propose to do it. When I see our country headed for ruin, I am too much of an American to sit here in the House of Representatives and let it go by the board because of inefficiency on the part of the Government and the Congress.

Let me read something to you which was said by the President of the United States on October 24, 1932, in his address at Atlanta, Ga.:

We are certainly paying enough for the Department of Agriculture to get something more useful than we are now getting. I have always proposed its reorganization. I am going to insist that we get more service for the farmers for less money.

Get that; that is a quotation from the President of the United States, that we are going to get more service for the farmers for less money.

Is there anybody here in the Congress who will get up now and who will say we are getting more in this Government for less money than we got during Hoover's administration or any other administration previous to that of Mr. Roosevelt?

Is there anybody here who wants to answer that question? If so, I would like him to rise.

Mr. SAVAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. SAVAGE. In 1932 the farmers were losing their farms. Their income was the lowest in history; their reserves were the lowest in history. Now their indebtedness is the lowest in history and their incomes are the highest they have ever been. They are in the best financial shape they have ever been. I think that is money well spent.

Mr. RICH. Where is the economy coming in that the President mentioned? When you are building up this great national debt of ours, when you are handing out gratuities to everybody with the idea that it is free, that you are getting it and it does not cost you anything to get it, when you are teaching the people of this country that they can all live on the Federal Government without doing anything, do you not think you are getting into pretty bad circumstances? When we build up this great national debt after a while it is going to topple over, and what are the farmers of this country going to have then? Will the gentleman answer that?

Mr. SAVAGE. The farmer is more able to pay his share of the responsibilities of government today than he has ever been before.

Mr. RICH. The whole responsibility of the operation of government is going to fall on the farmer. Everybody else will be broke. He is going to get those taxes we were talking about a while ago. When nobody else has anything the farmer will have to pay the bill. He will be taxed more and more. Do you think the farmers will want that?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to call attention to the fact that in 1939, after 7 years of the more abundant life, milk sold for 96 cents per hundred pounds, and in the lowest year the gentleman has been talking about it sold for 80 cents per hundred pounds, but the average for the 4 years was more than the 10-year average after the advent of the present administration. I am willing to defend that statement at this time or at any other time for the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The idea of trying to make the farmer believe he is getting something by taking it out of the Treasury and handing it to him for not growing crops at the time when the New Deal started in, as the gentleman said, when they killed the little pigs and plowed under the cotton and burned the wheat—that is the kind of economy he is talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I do so simply because it was my opinion when we were holding hearings, that this particular division did not really justify their case in asking for the money they have requested. There was also brought out in the hearings questions by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] relative to the duplication by this particular bureau with the agricultural census, for which we now have appropriated approximately $15,000,000, and which today is being taken. Personally, I feel that of all the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] today, here is one that is justified, and I would like to see this reduced to the extent of $200,000. I think it is simply good business and that the Bureau of Agricultural Economics will be able to do its work well with less funds than they ask for.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, of course, the House desires to make adequate provision for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. It is simply a question of how much money is reasonably necessary for its needs.

The argument advanced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] was advanced in subcommittee. As a result of that argument the subcommittee has reduced the Budget estimate by $100,000. The reduction justified by that argument, which I think is logical and which I undertook to use myself in presenting this bill on Wednesday of this week, has already been given full weight by the subcommittee, by reducing the amount of the Budget estimate to the extent of $100,000 for these investigations.

In addition, we reduced the crop and livestock estimates below the Budget by $150,000. So in the bill under consideration the subcommittee has already effected a reduction of $250,000, which is a rather drastic reduction when the full activities of the Bureau are taken into consideration. I apprehend that as far as the gentleman from Pennsylvania is concerned if we had cut it in half he would still want to cut it a little more based on no other argument except his desire to save money. He has not given you any evidence as to the needs of the Bureau; he cannot give you any because he did not hear the evidence, and I venture to say he has not read the hearings.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Yes; I have read the hearings, backward and forward.

Mr. TARVER. Upon just what grounds does the gentleman base his opposition to this appropriation and his belief that it can be still further cut by $200,000 without injury to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics? He has not advanced any reason yet except his desire to save money. If it requires this much adequately to carry on the work of the Bureau, a simple desire to save money is no justification for drastically reducing the amount of the necessary appropriation. If there is any other argument available to the gentleman I would be glad to yield to him to present it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. When I am back home in Pennsylvania I am in business. We are at war and we are finding out that we cannot do everything we would like to; we do only what we find necessary; and that is what I want done today.

Mr. TARVER. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's position. I do not question his sincerity. We have already cut this bill when all matters are taken into consideration by $141,500,000. We have been trying to economize. We are in accord with the gentleman's opinions as to the desirability of economy, but there ought not to be unreasoning economy, there ought not to be economy we cannot justify by evidence; and in my judgment there is no evidence justifying the further reduction below the Budget estimate on this appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired, all time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 45, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 11, line 14, strike out the proviso beginning with the word *"Provided"*, in line 14, and ending with the word "authorization", in line 1, page 12.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to have the attention of the membership of this committee as I read the portion of this bill my amendment would strike out:

Provided, however, That if the total amounts of such appropriations or authorizations for the current fiscal year shall at any time exceed or fall below the amounts estimated, respectively, therefor in the Budget for such year, the amounts transferred or to be transferred therefrom to this appropriation and the amount which may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia shall be increased or decreased in such amounts as the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department, shall determine are appropriate to the requirements as changed by such reductions or increases in such appropriations or authorizations.

If there ever was a juggling of funds, here it is. If points of order were in order we could strike that out without vote. If you are going to stop just a little bit of juggling of funds without authorization, here is a chance to do it. I trust the chairman of the subcommittee will see fit to agree to this amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, chairman of subcommittee in charge of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. May I point out to the gentleman that this is not legislation. It is an authorization that has been carried in the bill for many years and, according to the best parliamentary judgment I have been able to obtain, it is not objectionable as legislation and if we were not proceeding under a rule, it could not be stricken on a point of order. I hope the gentleman understands what that means. It is contained in the bill at a number of places. In the event an appropriation for an agency from which funds are authorized for transfer to this agency should be increased or diminished, this authorizes the Budget to take appropriate steps to increase or decrease the amount of transfer to this agency in proportion to the increase or decrease in the agency's funds. Is that not good business? If it is not, it has never been pointed out before and I will be glad to have the gentleman do so.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I realize the same thing has appeared in there but it just simply places authority in the Bureau of the Budget to manipulate these funds.

Mr. TARVER. That authority is a brake on the administrative authority. If it were not for that they could use the funds in any way they saw fit.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We do not want to give them authority to do everything they please. That is the difficulty. We had a bill before us a few days ago, in which it was shown that an item of some $15,000 authorized and appropriated for certain purposes was deliberately picked out and used for another purpose altogether. That was in the appropriation for another department.

What I am trying to cut out is granting authority to the Bureau of the Budget to determine how the funds shall be used. That is not the function of the Bureau of the Budget and the committee well knows it. Let Congress determine how and where the money is to be expended. I would like to know where the Bureau got the power or authority over the expenditure of funds appropriated by this Congress. If you can point out such authority, I wish you would do it. I am opposed to permitting the Department itself or the Bureau of the Budget juggling or shifting funds. Let the Congress determine where this money is to be spent and not the Bureau of the Budget or any other department. To say the Budget Bureau is a sort of brake on the department, is a slender excuse. To say it has been done before is no excuse at all. For Congress to yield its authority with respect to spending of Federal funds, and give the Bureau of the Budget and the departments full swing is wrong. It should not be allowed—here is a chance to correct it. I cannot believe the House is in favor of letting these funds be passed around and juggled by the Bureau of the Budget in each department, permitting the Bureau of the Budget to say whether it shall go here or there. If the House wants to do that, all right. I do not intend to be a party to such action. Here is a chance to say that we want this money spent in a certain place, we want it spent there or not at all, and not let the Bureau of the Budget say that because there may be some extra funds in one department they can spend it somewhere else.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Congress will pay close attention to this language because it delegates to the Director of the Budget the authority to appropriate funds. Now, why should we not do the appropriating ourselves?

This language permits the Director of the Bureau after hearing to juggle this appropriation up or down. It is absolutely ridiculous. Why should not these people come in here for a deficiency appropriation if they have justification for it, and not let the Director of the Budget juggle these figures up or down?

This language would be clearly subject to a point of order, but the rule waiving points of order adopted by the House earlier in the day fixes it so that we cannot throw it out on a point of order. It is so ridiculous, it is so contrary to sound legislative procedure, that it does seem to me a majority of the House should join in throwing it out.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Would it be possible to correct the situation of which the gentleman complains on line 23, where it says, "after a hearing thereon with representatives of the Department," by including "and the approval of the Congress"?

Mr. TABER. I do not think that would cure it. I think the only way you can cure it is by throwing out the whole

proviso. It is entirely in the discretion of the Director of the Budget as to what he shall do after he holds his hearings.

I hope that the chairman of the committee and the majority of the House will join in trying to give us at least one semblance of soundness in this bill in establishing proper legislation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What was the motivating influence that caused this language to be inserted?

Mr. TABER. Oh, that kind of language has crept into this bill in half a dozen places. It is very bad. It is a very bad legislative practice and a very bad budgetary practice.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I was going to say this: It seems to me, from an accounting standpoint, it destroys the whole philosophy of budgetary control.

Mr. TABER. It does.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We could approach it this way. Suppose the gentleman is a factory superintendent and he comes before the board of directors here, and the board of directors authorizes him to spend $100,000 on certain departments of the factory. If the superintendent is given the privilege to juggle those figures any way he pleases, what control has the board over the expenditures or specific jobs to be performed?

Mr. TABER. They have no control, and the Congress, with this language in here, has no control whatever.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the very essence of the destruction of budgetary control.

Mr. TABER. That is right. Anyone who reads the language cannot help but see that the gentleman from Kansas is entirely correct.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, not only is this language not subject to a point of order, even if we had no rule under which to consider the bill, and not only is it not subject to the criticism which has been made with reference to the juggling of funds, but it is language which has for its purpose the restricting of juggling of funds. It constitutes a limitation upon the action of administrative authorities in shifting funds from one item of appropriation to another, and requires that before they shall do that they shall submit the mater to the Director of the Budget and secure his approval.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Under this language can the Director of the Budget increase the appropriation for this Department by one cent?

Mr. TARVER. Not at all. For instance, these two items aggregating $120,000 plus have been appropriated for the War Food Administration and the Commodity Credit Corporation. These funds are to be transferred from those two items of appropriation to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics for its use in doing work for these two other agencies of the Government. If the Congress should increase the amount of appropriation to the War Food Administration and to the Comodity Credit Corporation and increase at the same time the work of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics done by it for those two other organizations, then the Director of the Budget under this language might permit an increase in the transfer of funds. But the matter is subject to his regulation, instead of, as would otherwise be the case, subject to the regulation of authority of the Department, so that the proviso is really a brake on the administrative authority. It is in the interest of economy rather than in the interest of extravagance in the handling of funds.

It has been carried in the bill year after year, not only in this bill but in other bills which have been enacted by the Congress as well. As far as I know, no objection has ever been urged to it heretofore. I sincerely hope that the amendment proposed to strike it out will not be adopted.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Can the gentleman explain to this Committee why there should be any shifting at all? The distinguished chairman has just stated that it prevents the shifting of funds without the consent of the Budget.

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Then why not legislate so there cannot be any shifting at all by a department? Why not do that very thing? That is the thing to which I am directing the gentleman's attention.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman will find that in every general appropriation bill funds are justified for appropriations to a certain bureau or division of a department with the proviso that a certain part of it snall be transferred, as in the Department of Agriculture, to the Secretary's office, perhaps to the Solicitor's office, perhaps to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, as in this case, to enable those organizations to do work for the organization for which the appropriation is provided directly.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But that sort of thing is done on a percentage basis, not affecting all the fund.

Mr. TARVER. No; the gentleman is mistaken.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES of Kansas) there were—ayes 51, noes 69.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TARVER and Mr. REES of Kansas.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 73, noes 82.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, one of my colleagues last year placed in the RECORD a statistical statement to the effect that California raises in dollar value, excluding livestock, 21 percent of the food products produced in the United States. A great part of these food products are raised in the big valley in the interior of California known as the Valley of California. What enables us to raise these tremendous crops, in addition to the fertile lands, are the waters that are placed on those lands by means of irrigation.

I want to take this occasion to briefly explain Joint Resolution 139, which I have introduced today, concerning the Central Valley project, and a copy of which I shall insert at the end of this discussion. The Central Valley project is, in general, a project to conserve and utilize to the fullest extent the waters of this great Valley of California.

It was initiated by the State of California in the late twenties. The State voted a bond issue of $170,000,000. When the depression came they found they were unable to carry on the work on such a tremendous scale. So, in 1935, the Federal Government made its first appropriation for this project. Up to June 30, 1944, the Federal Government has spent $154,000,000 on the project.

The project is a multiple-purpose project which has to do with navigation, flood control, salinity control, irrigation, reclamation, hydroelectric power development, recreation, and the preservation of wildlife, including fish. There has been a good deal of turmoil in California over the conflicting jurisdiction between the Department of the Interior and the State agencies in the handling of these water problems. The purpose of my resolution is to transfer from the United States Government two features of the project—namely, hydroelectric power development and irrigation—which are purely intrastate. Remember this, the waters of this project all fall on California soil, all the rivers run throughout California. Every work connected with the project is within California. My resolution provides that the State of California will guarantee payment back to the United States of every single dollar of the project allocated to cost of irrigation and hydroelectric power development.

We propose to repay that amount, under the same plan as provided by the reclamation law, namely, over a 40-year span. The Federal Government proposes to collect this money from the beneficiaries of the water and electricity that is developed there. My plan is to substitute the State of California for those beneficiaries, and then permit the State to operate and maintain the irrigation and hydroelectric power features of the project.

They are close to the project. They have a backlog of 60 years' experience, and I think the project, if handled by the State of California, would be better

managed, more efficiently and more economically managed than it would be if managed by the Department of the Interior. It would eliminate all conflicting arguments and discussions that we now have over jurisdictional disputes.

I want to point out that the project is purely intrastate and that we propose to pay dollar for dollar to the Federal Government for the right to maintain control, for the money they have paid into this for hydroelectric development and for irrigation.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HAVENNER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether his plan involves the assumption of debt by the State of California?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. My plan involves the assumption of debt in this way, that we propose to agree to pay to the United States Government the whole amount that the Government has spent which is allocated to irrigation and to hydroelectric power development. The bill provides that if California elects to take over and pay for those features of the project, it shall enter into a contract with the Secretary of the Interior and agree to pay, in accordance with the plan in the Reclamation Act, the cost of those features of the project. The financial capacity of California would, I believe, make it unnecessary to have a bond election to assure the necessary amount of money to make the required payments.

The remaining features of the project are Federal responsibilities and the Government should be happy and delighted to take care of those, as they do in every other State.

Mr. HAVENNER. I assume the gentleman is advised as to the legal soundness of this plan as to the assumption of a debt to continue over a period of years in the future?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have no doubt that we can work out a legal plan to mesh with the procedure provided by my resolution.

The basic elements of the plan are as follows: If the Federal Government continues in the project, it will expect reimbursement of the cost of the project which is allocated to irrigation and to hydroelectric development. In fact, I understand that the Department is now devising means to obtain that reimbursement, as is the common practice in reclamation projects. That procedure is to require the beneficiaries to repay the amount of the expense allocated as the cost of irrigation features. On this reimbursement merely the principal is repaid. For the amount allocated as the cost of the hydroelectric features of the project the Government collects the principal thereof plus 3-percent interest. This reimbursement will be collected through the sale of electricity and be reflected in the rates charged.

The plan of this resolution is to have the State of California agree to pay these amounts, over a 40-year span, as provided by the Reclamation Act. In other words, the State is substituted for the beneficiaries of these features of the project and it assumes, what would otherwise, be their liability. For this agreement to pay, the State is given the responsibility and the privilege of operating and maintaining the project, in conformity with its laws.

It seems a highly satisfactory form of National-State partnership. The National Government has lent its financial strength to the State and the State in turn repays dollar for dollar the cost of those features of the project for which it assumes the responsibility. It localizes the responsibility in the State and with California's tremendous experience there can be no doubt about its ability to successfully manage these features of the project, with justice to those who will be served by it and to the satisfaction of the Government.

Some doubting Thomases will probably say, "California came to Washington to get financial aid and now after the Government has come to its aid and built this great project, California wants to take it over." If we pay for the project, as my resolution provides, what is wrong with that procedure? To say otherwise is to doubt the ability of California to pay for these features and to competently and successfully handle the irrigation and hydroelectric power features of it. Furthermore, that sort of attitude is somewhat similar to the Shylock type of money lender who loans money to a man when he is in dire need of it and then takes the attitude that he should control the borrower and hamper his economic progress all the rest of the borrower's life.

Sound collaboration between the States and the National Government are arrangements where each plays a part and the responsibility of each is fixed and certain. Certainly, where all of the waters and all the features which we assume to operate and maintain are intrastate in character the National Government should not object to the State handling those features. There is plenty to do by the National Government, without going into every State and developing projects on intrastate rivers and then keeping control of them for all eternity. When the State agrees to pay back all that the National Government could obtain if it retained complete control of the irrigation and hydroelectric power features of the project, it would certainly seem fair that the State should be permitted to handle the situation.

Is California capable of handling these projects successfully? There can be no doubt of that by any unbiased person. California, before the advent of the National Government in the C. V. P., had spent in water conservation, involving irrigation and hydro development, much more than the cost of the Central Valley project. It furnished most of the data used in the development of the project to date. It pioneered and authorized the project before the Federal Government came in. In California the generation of electricity and its distribution has been successfully handled for many years by Los Angeles, Pasadena, Lodi, Alameda, and other cities and by irrigation districts such as the Modesto, South San Joaquin, and Turlock irrigation districts.

The States and their political subdivisions are closest to their people and more responsive to their needs and desires. California, having lived and helped develop irrigation and hydroelectric power problems for over 60 years certainly would know how to solve these problems. Were this a project which was pioneering in the fields of irrigation and hydro development, there might be some excuse for the Government demanding retention of its control, even though the State agreed to repay the complete investment, as this resolution proposes. But with our backlog of experience it is assured that we will know best how to solve the problems that will arise when this project begins to supplement the waters already conserved by many local districts and to develop new ones to bring in undeveloped land.

This plan can well develop a new pattern in Federal-State relations. The Federal Government can furnish the capital necessary and the State government can manage the project and repay the Federal advancement of the money or credit necessary to build the irrigation and hydro features. There is enough glory and responsibility for each Government and each can be proud of its contribution to the sound development which will result and be followed by real prosperity. But if the Federal Government is going to "follow its money" to the extent of demanding exclusive control it will dry up the springs of State and local responsibility and stifle the ingenuity of these Governments and maintain a long-distance control far removed from the influence of those who live in the projects and who will ultimately have to pay the cost of them.

All this resolution does is to direct the National Government to give California the opportunity to elect whether it wants to assume the responsibility for the irrigation and hydroelectric power features of this project, if it pays the National Government the cost of those features of the Central Valley project. Certainly the Government should be willing to give us that opportunity.

House Joint Resolution 139

Joint resolution providing a means whereby the State of California may undertake the operation and maintenance of the irrigation and hydroelectric power features of the Central Valley project upon agreeing to recompense the Federal Government therefor in the manner provided in the reclamation laws of the United States

Whereas the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Central Valley project of California was authorized by statutes of the State of California, to be effected by the State and its agencies; and

Whereas the construction of said project has likewise been authorized by Congress and the project is now under construction by the Federal Government, pursuant to such authorization and appropriations made pursuant thereto; and

Whereas the project is wholly intrastate, being in that part of California which is drained by the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and their tributaries; and

Whereas the project includes various dams, canals, and other features, extending over a distance of several hundred miles; and

Whereas under both the State and Federal statutes, the project is a multiple purpose project, and is actually being constructed for

the improvement of navigation, flood control, salinity control, irrigation, and reclamation, hydroelectric power development, recreation, and the preservation and propagation of wildlife; and

Whereas the recovery of the reimbursable portions of the Federal investments in the project, will be facilitated by utilization of the powers and authority conferred upon the State government by its laws, in the operation and maintenance of said portions of the project; and

Whereas under the Federal statutes applicable to this project, the reimbursable investments are those relating to irrigation and power development: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That (a) there is hereby created a commission to be known as the Central Valley Commission, which shall consist of five members appointed by the President, one of whom shall be an officer of the Corps of Engineers of the Army, on the active or retired list; one of whom shall be the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, and three of whom (including the chairman) shall not be otherwise employed by the United States. The three members, not employees of the United States, shall be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate as chairman one of the members who is not otherwise employed by the United States. Each member of the commission who is not an officer or employee of another agency of the Government shall receive as compensation for services on the Commission a per diem of $50 for each day on which he performs such services.

(b) The Commission shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary to enable it to perform its duties under this joint resolution.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Commission—

(1) As soon as practicable after the enactment of this joint resolution, to determine what portion of the cost of the Central Valley project borne by the United States up to and including June 30, 1945, is reasonably allocable to irrigation and to the development of hydroelectric power, and what portion of such cost is reasonably allocable to each of the other purposes of such project; and

(2) Thereafter, with respect to each fiscal year, to make a similar determination with respect to the amounts expended by the United States for such project during such fiscal year.

In any case in which it is impracticable to make an allocation by reason of the fact that works having multiple purposes have not been sufficiently completed to enable a proper allocation to be made, the determination of the Commission with respect to such works shall be postponed until such works are sufficiently completed to enable a proper allocation to be made. The Commission shall from time to time certify its determinations to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Governor of the State of California.

The Commission may make allowance for increased costs due to wartime construction. In the allocation of costs as to either the irrigation or hydroelectric features, the Commission may deduct from such allocation such amount as it deems due to increased wartime construction costs, if any.

(b) At any time within 3 years after the date when this joint resolution becomes effective, the State of California may elect to reimburse the United States for the amounts expended (including amounts hereafter expanded) by the United States on the Central Valley project (which, for the purposes of this joint resolution shall be limited to works in the area drained by the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and their tributaries) and which are determined by the Commission to be reasonably allocable to irrigation and the development of hydroelectric power, and to operate and maintain, under its own laws, those features of such project for which the State elects to make reimbursement.

SEC. 3. When the State elects to make such reimbursement, the Secretary of the Interior shall enter into a contract with the State providing—

(a) That the State obligates itself to reimburse the United States for the amount expended (including amounts hereafter expended) by the United States on the Central Valley project which are determined by the Commission to be reasonably allocable to irrigation and the development of hydroelectric power, such reimbursement to be made in the manner provided in the reclamation laws for the repayment of construction costs, allocable respectively to irrigation and power;

(b) For the transfer by the United States to the State of the care, maintenance, and operation, under the State laws of those features of the project with respect to which reimbursement is to be made;

(c) That the title to works constructed by the United States shall remain in the United States, but the State will be obligated, at its own expense, to operate the features of the project with respect to which reimbursement is to be made and to maintain them in good condition;

(d) That the United States will be obligated, at its own expense, to operate and maintain the other features of the project; and

(e) That the State will comply with such regulations as may be prescribed, by the appropriate agency or department of the United States as may be responsible for the Federal features of the project, for the safety and protection of the project.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this joint resolution shall affect or interfere with the laws of the State of California relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation, or any vested right acquired thereunder, and the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution shall proceed in conformity with such laws.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I may not need 5 minutes for this word, but the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who has just preceded me, states that he has introduced a bill pertaining to the Central Valley of California. Not having read the bill and not knowing more about it than I gathered from the gentleman's remarks, I should withhold comment other than to say that it certainly attracts the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. However, long before I became chairman of the Reclamation Committee I have been interested in and wished for the greatest possible development of the Central Valley in the great State of California. I continue to have an interest in and a solicitude for the maximum development of that agricultural empire and the greatest prosperity of its inhabitants.

Of course, I can see how the people of California, especially the landowners in Central Valley, can take quite a different view toward the development of the Central Valley by the Federal Government than they took toward asking the Federal Government to help them get a large share of the waters of the Colorado River for the southern end of the State. Obviously the Sacramento and San Joaquin are internal rivers of California, whereas the Colorado is an interstate stream.

The gentleman from California has named seven or eight benefits of this great multiple-purpose development in his State, but indicates that he would like to see two of them; that is, irrigation and hydroelectric power production, taken out of the hands of the Federal Government and taken over by the State of California. He would have the other multiple-purpose work, such as navigation, flood control, salinity control, recreational facilities, and wildlife preservation left to the expense of, and management of, the Federal Government.

It has been my belief that a vast multiple-purpose development such as this could be best carried through as a unit and under one unitary control. Even in this central California development, all within one State, I can see how this vast enterprise in all of its parts must be coordinated in order to achieve the maximum results with the minimum of costs. I can see how even two of these beneficial purposes under separate management might conflict instead of cooperating to the best advantage. To name two that probably would not cooperate under separate management I would suggest irrigation and flood control. Thus, Mr. Chairman, I shall want to ask a lot of questions about this proposal, in addition to the questions whether most of the people of California want reclamation and power production taken out of the Federal Government's hands, and how the Federal Government is to be repaid for the expenditures it has already made within the great Central Valley.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXTENSION SERVICE

PAYMENTS TO STATES, HAWAII, ALASKA, AND PUERTO RICO

For payments to the States, Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, for cooperative agricultural extension work as follows:

Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related acts: Capper-Ketcham Act, the act approved May 22, 1928 (7 U. S. C. 343a, 343b), $1,480,000; Bankhead-Jones Act, section 21, title II, of the act approved June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 343c), $12,000,000; additional extension work, the act approved April 24, 1939, as amended (7 U. S. C. 343c-1), $555,000; Alaska, the act approved February 23, 1929 (7 U. S. C. 386c), extending the benefits of the Smith-Lever Act to the Territory of Alaska, $13,950, and section 3 of the act approved June 20, 1936 (7 U. S. C. 343e), extending the benefits of the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, $10,000, in all, for Alaska, $23,950; Puerto Rico, the act approved August 28, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 343f-343g), extending the benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico, $140,000; in all, Capper-Ketcham, Bankhead-Jones, and related acts, $14,198,950.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, as far as I know, no amendment is proposed to the appropriations for the Extension Service, the Agricultural Research Administration, the Office of Experiment Stations. If this be true, I ask unanimous consent that the portions of the bill dealing with these items be printed in the RECORD at this point and that we proceed with the reading of the remainder of the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, why should the gentleman ask to have that inserted now by unanimous consent?

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman has any amendment to propose, I will withdraw the request; but I do not think any Member has any amendment to propose; I do not know of any.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think we should read the bill in the regular way.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I will not take any 5 minutes. I just wish to call the attention of the membership to this $14,198,950 and to have the RECORD show the amount. I want every Member to compare it with the other millions of dollars that are spent in the name of agriculture because I am sure there is no public money we are spending today that has more to do with furnishing food to win this war than this $14,000,000.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I should like to know what this $14,000,000 is being spent for.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. For extension work.

Mr. MASON. And what does extension work cover?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Extension work covers all the county agents, home demonstration agents, all the specialists that go out from the colleges. It is $14,000,000 distributed to all the States of the Union. Additional moneys of course come from States and counties.

I yield to my colleague from Kansas, the distinguished ranking member of the minority on the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. HOPE. This also includes the 4-H Club work which I believe is one of the finest educational movements in the country today. When one compares this fourteen millions with the other hundreds of millions appropriated annually in the name of agriculture, the great work of the extension people is realized.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman. The county 4-H Club work is one of the great projects that should have further development.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That would also include the work in the agricultural colleges, would it not?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes. It is in cooperation with the colleges. The $14,000,000 is the Federal appropriation. Additional funds are provided by the States and counties.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am pleased to yield to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I just want to give my approbation to the remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I agree wholeheartedly that this particular item is one of the most meritorious in the bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Meat inspection: For carrying out the provisions of laws relating to Federal inspection of meat and meat food products, $7,800,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that the committee included in its report on this bill the following paragraph regarding meat inspection:

The bill includes the Budget estimate of $7,800,000, which is substantially the amount of the 1945 appropriation. For a number of years the committee has felt that there is a substantial amount of duplication of this work on the part of the military forces. The attention of the legislative committee having jurisdiction of the matter is directed to this situation with the suggestion that steps be considered to bring about action to abolish such duplication.

I believe the chairman of our subcommittee will bear out my statement that we feel there is considerable duplication in this work.

Mr. TARVER. Yes; we feel that quite an economy may be effected if there can be a coordination of this work and utilization of the meat inspection service of the Department of Agriculture for the Army as it is being used by the Navy.

The Clerk read as follows:

ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH AND OTHER CONTAGIOUS DISEASES OF ANIMALS

In case of an emergency arising out of the existence of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals, which, in the opinion of the Secretary, threatens the livestock industry of the country, he may expend in the city of Washington or elsewhere any unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for this purpose, not to exceed $305,000, in the arrest and eradication of any such disease, including the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction, in cooperation with the States, of animals affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful quarantine regulations: *Provided*, That the payment for animals hereafter purchased may be made on appraisement based on the meat, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of appraisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any animal shall exceed three times its meat or dairy value, and, except in case of an extraordinary emergency, to be determined by the Secretary, the payment by the United States Government for any animals shall not exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further*, That of said $305,000 not to exceed $5,000 may be used to control and eradicate the European fowl pest and similar diseases in poultry.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the foot-and-mouth disease in this country has been practically eradicated through the splendid work of the Department of Agriculture and through the careful meat inspections. It is also interesting to note England now has a wave of foot-and-mouth disease which is making tremendous inroads into their cattle herds because of the lack of inspection. They get much of their meat from the Southern Hemisphere uninspected and are not as careful as the United States in the protection of her herds against the foot-and-mouth disease. I think this money is well spent by the Congress and the Department of Agriculture in the protection of the cattle in this country against the foot-and-mouth disease. Without this inspection our country might have much foot-and-mouth disease. The law which protects this country from foot-and-mouth disease is important. The appropriations must be continued to back up the law.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, for a moment only, in the absence of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] I rise to add what the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has just said, by calling to the attention of the House a bill before the Committee on Agriculture having to do with the control of ship's garbage. This may seem to be an extreme case, nevertheless there is a possibility that the dumping of ship's garbage might be the leak for the reinfiltration into the United States of the foot-and-mouth disease. The gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] has already introduced a bill which I hope will be taken up by the Committee on Agriculture and have the support of the House.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $332,325 for personal services in the District of Columbia, of the Bureau of Dairy Industry in carrying out the provisions of the act of May 29, 1924 (7 U. S. C. 401-404), including investigations, experiments, and demonstrations in dairy industry, cooperative investigations of the dairy industry in the various States, for carrying out the applicable provisions of the acts of May 9, 1902 (26 U. S. C. 2325, 2326 (c), 2327 (b)), and August 10, 1912 (26 U. S. C. 2327 (c)), relating to process or renovated butter, and the act of May 23, 1908 (21 U. S. C. 94 (a)) insofar as it relates to the exportation of process or renovated butter, $722,300.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this seems to be the opportune time to place as briefly as possible before this House something which I think is considered to be almost wholly a matter of interest to California, when, as a matter of fact, it is of very great interest to every agricultural State in the United States and to every border State in the United States and to many other States of the Nation. That is the discussion which is now going on in the other body having to do with the water compact or water trade or treaty with the Nation to the south of us—Mexico The reason I say it is appropriate here is because the section just read having to do with the salaries, expenses, and appropriation for the Bureau of Dairy Industry would seem to Members of this

House to be a very far cry from anything having to do with the settlement of some sort of water argument between Texas and Mexico or between California and Mexico or between the United States and Mexico. The Members of the California delegation and other western delegations, including the delegation from Nevada, have been trying to say to this House that among the things which the acceptance of this treaty without reservations would do would be to bring into production south of the border a million acres of land which would then be in direct competition.

Under the terms of the recent meeting at Chapultepec these agricultural products would be subject to very favorable tariff regulation, or lack of tariff regulation. The agreement, if approved as now written, would bring into competition with the people of the United States a great many acres of very productive land. I am quite sure the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] who sits before me, would not be particularly enthusiastic about bringing a million additional acres of cotton, to produce cottonseed oil for oleomargarine, in competition with his butter. I am quite sure the gentlemen from the Southern States where cotton is the major product, have not yet realized that this does bring into production a million acres, not by the little farmer of Mexico, as you may have been told; this is not for the benefit of the little farmer. This is for the benefit of the large farmers who deal in hundreds of thousands of acres which will produce cotton and flax and early vegetables and grain.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Is there any foundation for the rumor that one of the main men behind this movement is a former owner of the Los Angeles Times who has gone down into Mexico and bought up a great deal of this arid land?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Indirectly only. Practically, no. The former publisher of the Los Angeles Times, now deceased, was the owner of a great deal of land in Mexico. Sometime after the beginning of the expropriation of land, he sold to a man whose name I understand is Jenkins. The Los Angeles Times is completely out of it as are members of the family, but the condition still exists to which the gentleman refers. That is, that there is large individual ownership.

Mr. RANKIN. You say it is owned by a man by the name of Jenkins?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have been told that. That is hearsay.

Mr. RANKIN. Where does Jenkins live?

Mr. PHILLIPS. He lives there now, but he was an American.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The attorney general of California stated for the record before the Senate committee that some 550,000 acres of land that would be affected did belong to this one man by the name of Jenkins, who is now a Mexican citizen, having taken Mexican citizenship after he was an American citizen most of his life.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman for his answer.

Mr. RANKIN. As I understood the gentleman from California, this man Jenkins, was a Californian and he bought this land while he was still a Californian?

Mr. PHILLIPS. We do not know him. The gentleman from Mississippi knows him better than we know him in California.

Mr. RANKIN. No. I will say to the gentleman I have watched this water fight rather closely, but I have not been able to connect up the interests of certain people in California, or who did live in California, who seem to have been the spark plugs behind this water treaty. I am trying to find out just what there is behind it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The spark plugs are not in California.

Mr. RANKIN. They were in California when they became interested in this proposition according to my information.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think one of the most important things is not who owns this land but the fact that this land, under irrigation, where it would be placed if this treaty goes through, is highly productive, up to as much as 2 bales of cotton per acre.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Not who owns; but who benefits.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I regret to have to object to Members speaking out of order from now on, as we are trying to get through with this bill as soon as it can be done. All of us know it is the last business to be transacted during the session before the Easter recess. If gentlemen have interesting matters to discuss, I hope they may find some other time in which to talk about them and not take the time which is supposed to be used in the discussion of matters in connection with this bill, in discussion of matters that have no relation to the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman talks about making a point of order against talking out of order when we just passed a resolution waiving all points of order.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, that is the gentleman's idea. If he will read the resolution, he will find that it waives points of order against matters in the bill; not against the Mexican treaty.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. When you go home for your vacation in the next couple of weeks and the people of this country look you over and think of the legislation that we passed here today, waiving all points of order, and thinking that the Subcommittee on Appropriations is going to write legislation, what are you going to say to them?

Mr. TARVER. I did not yield to the gentleman for a speech. Let me say that by the waiving of these points of order we shall have saved many millions of dollars to the taxpayers of the United States which would have been spent had the position of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] been sustained.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The last word has been stricken out. The gentleman is recognized to strike out the last three words.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I have just got my second wind. I have been working pretty hard all this afternoon trying to save a few dollars in this bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I do.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that as a result of the adoption of the rule this morning waiving all points of order we have increased by a hundred million dollars the amount of money that will come out of the Treasury as a result of this bill?

Mr. RICH. Absolutely; absolutely. I cannot understand how the Members can say the things they do on the floor of the House and get away with it.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire if the gentleman thinks he is getting away with it?

Mr. RICH. No; I do not; I do not think I am getting away with anything. I have tried it and failed at every point. I have tried to economize, but there is none in the Congress. But when the chairman of the subcommittee states that to go along the way the gentleman from Pennsylvania would have us go means an increase in expenditures, there is not a word of truth in it; absolutely not a word of truth. I defy him to point out one instance in which increased expenses would result from a decrease in the appropriation.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RICH. I want to yield to the chairman of the subcommittee to have him point out an instance.

Mr. TARVER. Yes. I would point out to the gentleman the fact that we have held rural rehabilitation to $67,500,000 although the Budget recommended $125,000,000. Had we not adopted the rule waiving points of order the Senate would have increased this amount to $125,000,000, and in the long run probably the House would have agreed to it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

Mr. TARVER. We have saved $57,500,000 on that item alone.

Mr. RICH. I suppose the gentleman from Georgia will be one of the conferees on this bill. The conferees of the House should have backbone and intestinal fortitude when they meet the Senate conferees on these items in the bill. If the House conferees had a little fight in them, they would not have to be afraid of those conferees from the other body. But that is not the case when there is a

wishbone where the backbone ought to be. That is the trouble with the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the balance of my time, because many of the Members wish to get away, but I would like to see somebody on the Democratic side of the House offer one amendment that would cut a little bit off this bill. I do not care whether it is no more than $50. Let us save $50 at least if we cannot save $50,000,000.

Mr. TARVER. Is not the gentleman satisfied with the action of the committee in saving $14,500,000 below the Budget estimate?

Mr. RICH. I do not think anything has been saved. I believe this is an exorbitant bill and should be reduced in many, many places.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

National forest protection and management: For the administration, protection, use, maintenance, improvement, and development of the national forests, including the establishment and maintenance of forest tree nurseries, including the procurement of tree seed and nursery stock by purchase, production, or otherwise, seeding and tree planting and the care of plantations and young growth; the operation and maintenance of airplanes and the purchase of not to exceed eight; the maintenance of roads and trails and the construction and maintenance of all other improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, protection, development, and use of the national forests, including experimental areas under Forest Service administration, except that where, in the opinion of the Secretary, direct purchases will be more economical than construction, improvements may be purchased; the construction (not to exceed $10,000 for any one structure), equipment, and maintenance of sanitary and recreational facilities; control of destructive forest tree diseases and insects; timber cultural operations; development and application of fish and game management plans; propagation and transplanting of plants suitable for planting on semiarid portions of the national forests; estimating and appraising of timber and other resources and development and application of plans for their effective management, sale, and use; examination, classification, surveying, and appraisal of land incident to effecting exchanges authorized by law and of lands within the boundaries of the national forests that may be opened to homestead settlement and entry under the act of June 11, 1906, and the act of August 10, 1912 (16 U. S. C. 506–509), as provided by the act of March 4, 1913 (16 U. S. C. 512); investigation and establishment of water rights, including the purchase thereof or of lands or interests in lands or rights-of-way for use and protection of water rights necessary or beneficial in connection with the administration and public use of the national forests; and all expenses necessary for the use, maintenance, improvement, protection, and general administration of the national forests, $16,349,100.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 39, line 3, after "forests", strike out "$16,349,000" and insert "$15,000,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, let me read from the report of the committee:

Military requirements have sharply increased the demand for products of the forests and, since approximately one-third of the forest area of the United States is either in Federal ownership or Federal control, the administration of such a vast domain requires very substantial appropriations. The amount of the appropriation for this purpose for the fiscal year 1945, less overtime, is $15,774,286; the Budget estimate for 1946 is $17,349,100, or an increase of $1,574,814.

Let us adopt this amendment and we will just cut this item down $1,349,100 more. That is just $1,349,100 we can save. If the committee will see fit to adopt this amendment, I think it will be for the welfare of the Forest Service. Certainly it will be for the welfare of the country. Certainly it will be for the welfare of the Treasury. Certainly nobody who is in the Forest Service now but what can be excused to go out and work on these farms to raise the foodstuffs necessary in order to feed the people of this country and feed the people of Europe because, as you know, Marvin Jones says we are going to need more foodstuffs. Let us get the men out of the woods and bring them in and put them on the farms. Adopt this amendment and let us save just $1,349,100. Let the chairman of the subcommittee agree to that.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, this increase is certainly justified when we realize that one of our greatest assets in the United States is being used up at an alarming rate to help win the war. If any forest fires occur, in 1 hour's time it is possible for us to lose the amount of money proposed in this amendment. I do trust that this body will allow what the committee has allowed for the protection of our declining national asset, the national forests.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. I have been a Member of Congress for 12 years, previous to the last 2, and every time we had an appropriation up increasing the appropriation for the Forest Service they have used the same argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania in his zeal for economy has made another one of these arbitrary cuts in this appropriation. I doubt if he has looked into this matter very much. Around the city of Los Angeles there are several great national parks. I have a report on my desk from the supervisors of the county of Los Angeles at the present time telling me the Forest Service was so cut down in its personnel by military drafting and by leaving of personnel from the Forest Service to other industries that right at the present time the forests around Los Angeles are in great danger of forest fires that come every spring after the rainy season. One forest fire in the Los Angeles National Forest, which controls the watershed of the Los Angeles Basin, could do five to six million dollars' worth of damage. I think the gentleman has not looked into this matter thoroughly, as he has failed to do in his other amendments through his zeal for economy.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

I want to compliment the gentleman on what he said because it is certainly poor economy to cut down on the Forest Service when we are spending so much money year after year in preserving our natural resources.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is right.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to my friend from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I want to compliment the gentlemen from California and from Washington for protesting against this cut. Certainly those of us who live in areas where there are forests realize additional protection is surely needed at this time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I will not use my time, and I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Forest resources investigations: A comprehensive forest survey under section 9, and investigations in forest economics under section 10, $204,600.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, many who have not studied our forestry problems and had an opportunity to visit our great forests throughout the United States, fail to realize the large values we have in this great asset.

The forests have contributed immensely to the winning of the war. Billions of feet of lumber have been cut from the forests to provide the necessary forest products not only for the structures needed throughout our own country and those of our allies for war purposes, but also for boxing and crating material for all products, war equipment and munitions shipped throughout our own country and abroad.

This great resource is being rapidly dissipated by unsound methods and failure to take adequate means for its preservation and for reforestation of denuded areas. Furthermore, less than a third of the wood content of the forest

tree is now utilized. There should be carried out effective research and laboratory experimentation to the end that these problems be solved.

I regret that the committee did not provide the additional funds requested by the forestry interests for experimentation and laboratory work in developing new uses for wood products so that there may be no waste from our national forests.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak just briefly concerning the appropriation requested for the experiment station, called the Pacific Northwest Forest Experiment Station, located at Portland, but which is operated both in Oregon and Washington.

As those of you who come from the Pacific coast particularly know, forestry is one of our big undertakings in Oregon and Washington. We have the heaviest stand of timber of any place in the United States, and it is being called upon very fast during the war effort and is being depleted, and that depletion is much faster than the timber is growing.

Unfortunately, only about one-third of the growing tree is utilized, two-thirds of it is wasted, and yet all of the waste product is suspetible to use in industry, and that is the thing that the experiment station is doing, endeavoring not only to find greater uses, scientific uses, for wood products, but also to find new uses and also to salvage all waste-wood products.

As we know, refuse from sawmills is being utilized in the manufacture of alcohol, sugar, and various products and is also being pressed into boards and various other products of that type, but there is a wealth of usage still available that may be determined upon scientific tests, and that is the purpose of these experiment stations.

I have here, Mr. Chairman, two resolutions, one that was passed by the Legislature of Oregon and the other by the Chamber of Commerce of Portland, concerning the Pacific Northwest Forest Experiment Station, urging that $50,000 be appropriated annually for this experiment station operating in Oregon and Washington; and the Portland Chamber of Commerce resolution also is urging that an additional appropriation be allowed for the Madison laboratory, which we all recognize as one of the outstanding experiment plants in this country dealing with forestry products.

Mr. Chairman, when we return to the House I will ask permission to include in my remarks both of these resolutions; first, one from the Oregon Legislature, which I have just received, and the other from the Portland Chamber of Commerce, which furnish some factual information with regard to this problem and the needs for this appropriation.

The resolutions referred to follow:

House Joint Memorial 4

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Forty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, convened in regular session, respectfully represent that

Whereas timber stands in the Pacific Northwest, both public and private, are being cut at an accelerated rate, far beyond the natural growth of the timber; and

Whereas, in converting timber to lumber, less than one-third of the tree is utilized as lumber. About a ton of wood per thousand board feet of lumber is left at the sawmill as sawdust, slabs, and edgings, while about 3 tons are left in the woods as tops, limbs, broken and cull logs, cull trees, and noncommercial species. Such wood is perfectly good chemical raw material; and

Whereas diversified utilization of timber, taking the forest crop as it comes and using those portions of it for those uses to which they are best suited, will eliminate this extravagant waste of a dwindling natural resource; and

Whereas the full utilization of timber products and waste material not only means the answer to future employment but the maintaining of many important communities as well: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring), That the Forty-third Regular Assembly of the Oregon Legislature petition the Congress of the United States to appropriate an additional $50,000 to the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station for the establishment of a forest utilization service unit to bring the results of wood-utilization research to the forest industries of the Pacific Northwest; to take the problems of industry needing solution to the Forest Products Laboratory of the United States Forest Service; and to conduct other urgently needed work such as participating in local pilot-plant demonstrations of promising new processes and products; and be it further

Resolved, That adequate Federal appropriations be provided the Forest Products Laboratory of the United States Forest Service which would enable it to make full use of its present facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be sent to both branches of the Congress of the United States, the Department of Agriculture, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon.

Endorsed: House Joint Memorial No. 4, introduced by Representative Manley Wilson.

CLARIBEL BUFF, *Chief Clerk.*

Adopted by house February 14, 1945.

EUGENE E. MARSH, *Speaker of House.*

Adopted by senate February 28, 1945.

HOWARD C. EELTON, *President of Senate.*

Filed: March 2, 1945.

ROBERT S. FARRELL, Jr., *Secretary of State.*

STATE OF OREGON,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

I, Robert S. Farrell, Jr., secretary of state of the State of Oregon, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify: That I have carefully compared the annexed copy of House Joint Memorial No. 4 with the original thereof adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the Forty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon and filed in the office of the secretary of state of the State of Oregon March 2, 1945, and that the same is a full, true, and complete transcript therefrom and of the whole thereof, together with all endoresements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Oregon.

Done at the capitol at Salem, Oreg., this 3d day of March A. D. 1945.

ROBERT S. FARRELL, JR.,
Secretary of State.

Resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, at a regularly called meeting on Friday, February 16, 1945, Porland, Oreg.

Whereas the future development of the lumber industry of Oregon and Washington is closely linked with the development of new processes for the improvement of lumber and the use of wood now wasted in the manufacture of lumber; and

Whereas these developments will only come through research in the nature of wood, the discovery of methods for its new and better use, and through the secondary research necessary for the economic application of new methods when developed; and

Whereas the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., and the Pacific Northwest Forest Experiment Station, located at Portland, Oreg., and operating in Oregon and Washington, have made notable contributions to such developments in the past, and

Whereas post-war development of new and better uses of wood in Oregon and Washington should be further expanded through the work of these organizations: It is therefore

Resolved, That—

1. The appropriations to the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., should be increased by $1,500,000 annually, beginning July 1, 1945, and that this sum should be specifically used for the development of new and better uses for wood; and that

2. There should be appropriated not less than $50,000 annually to the Pacific Northwest Forest Experiment Station at Portland, Oreg., for the establishment of a wood utilization unit. This unit should consist of a group of men especially trained in the various fields of wood technology. It should be the duty of this unit to take the problems in wood utilization which are peculiar to the States of Oregon and Washington to the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, to aid there in the technical solution of these problems and to bring to the State of Oregon and Washington the results of such research in form most applicable to industrial use.

It should be further understood that the work of the wood utilization unit at the Pacific Northwest Forest Experiment Station at Portland and the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison should be conducted in the closest possible cooperation with work in these fields now under way at the Oregon Forest Products Laboratory at Corvallis, the University of Washington at Seattle, and any industrial groups or concerns now engaged in such research.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS Mr. Chairman, in connection with the forest-management program under the direction of the Forest Service, I wish to call to the attention of the Committee a particular phase of it which I think is most vital to the lumber industry, timberland owners, farmers, and the entire Nation. I refer especially to the experimental and research program—a study as to the best methods of promoting forestry and the conservation of our timber resources.

For several years there has been such a study on a very limited basis by the Forest Service in cooperation with interested groups. It is proving to be very valuable by providing data and methods which are directly applicable to farmers and other timberland owners. The results have been revealing, even though the surface of this remarkable work has hardly been scratched. The results obtained and the demonstrations conducted have been most beneficial in stimulating interest in improved forest-management and selective-cutting prac-

tices. There has been a great deal of attention given by lumbermen, small wood lot owners, and public-spirited individuals of the South, and I wish to refer specifically to some of these stations. There are seven of them: The Crossett Experimental Station, at Crossett, Ark., in my district; the Delta, in Mississippi; Olustee, in Florida; Hichiti, in Georgia; Bent Creek, in North Carolina; Toccoa, in north Georgia; and Lee, in central Virginia.

Five of these stations have been operating with some technical assistance. Though they have a very limited staff, they have been doing remarkably fine work, and the accomplishment in research and study in forest utilization has already been of inestimable value.

I think, Mr. Chairman, everyone would be interested in knowing that this great work has been carried on with an exceptionally small annual budget. The Crossett Experimental Station at Crossett, in my district, has been operating on $14,000; the Delta operating on $5,000, the Olustee on $10,000; the Hichiti station, $5,000; the Bent Creek station, $6,000; the Toccoa station, $1,500, with no technical help; and the Lee station in Virginia, $2,440, with no technical help.

With the credible showing made in the few years these stations have been operating, how much greater benefit would have resulted had these plants and investments been properly utilized. They have certainly shown their value and paved the way for the perpetual operation of one of the greatest industries of this country, if it is properly followed through and permitted to develop. You might ask, Mr. Chairman, what is the tangible value of the program. It is well known that one of the most tragic experiences in the history of our country is the waste and exploitation of our timber resources. Had there been proper conservation and forest management we would still have in this county an unlimited quota of virgin timber. Through these experimental stations, the need for proper forest management and conservation has been thoroughly demonstrated. Selective cutting practices, improved cutting of timber, as well as better farm-forest management have resulted. Forest utilization and experiments in mechanizing of log, pulpwood, and chemical wood production are vital to the future of this great industry. There are yet unlimited possibilities toward the accomplishment of these objectives if the experimental program could be properly expanded to meet such justifiable demands.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, the responsibilities of the Committee on Agriculture, and I appreciate the position of the subcommittee who has studied and determined the amounts available to these various programs under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture. I regret very much the committee did not feel justified in making funds available for this program sufficient to utilize at least existing plants to the fullest extent and for the establishment of others most vitally needed.

The subcommittee was very kind in giving an opportunity for witnesses to appear and present this matter for their consideration. I appeared with other Members of Congress before the subcommittee, of which my good friend, and the very able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] is chairman, when a delegation of State foresters and other officers presented the program. It is true a rather large increase was requested for the establishment of some 15 or 16 additional stations. There is no doubt as to their need and the contribution they would make toward this important program, but I suspect the request at this particular time was a little too ambitious. I appreciate the fact the committee was rather impressed with the need and justification of the work of this kind, but feel that further and more careful study should be given to it. The committee suggests on page 13, of the report, that the Department give careful study to this program with the view of the formation of a definite program for next year.

The benefits already obtained from this program are inestimable, and it is operating on an annual budget of $43,940. It seems to me that if the existing stations could be provided with slight additional funds to fully utilize the plants, we could get a much clearer picture during the coming year where they would be invaluable to the study suggested by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly satisfied as to the need and justification of the experimental forestry and research program. I am personally familiar with the immeasurable benefits derived from one of these stations that has been operating for 7 years. It is in my district in Crossett, Ark., one of the greatest timber producing areas. We have some hardwood, but it is primarily quick-growth pine. The Crossett Forestry Experimental Station is considered the outstanding project of its kind and has taken the lead in this program. I have personally visited this station and observed the most revealing and remarkable work being carried on there.

Let me give you a more realistic picture as to how the Forestry Service is operating this program by telling you about this No. 1 project at Crossett.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, it is not merely a Government program. It is a cooperative program by private company, the Crossett Lumber Co., and the Federal Government. In August 1934 the Crossett Lumber Co. deeded to the United States Government 1,680 acres of the finest timberland to be found as their contribution in initiating this program. Seven years' experience has proved that excellent results could be obtained in this experimental work over a long period of time. The average person not familiar with the forest program cannot conceive the interest stimulated in forest conservation by improved methods of planning, developing, and cutting, as well as utilization of timber and better farm-forestry management. Though limited in scope, it has already proven a most valuable asset to the farmers in Arkansas and Louisiana, as well as the whole Nation. Certainly, it should be of interest that forestry-minded people from all over the United States have gone to this station to witness the demonstrations and observe the studies and experiments.

The Crossett Lumber Co., being so favorably impressed with the splendid results, leased an additional 1,800 acres to the Government in March 1942. This cooperation of private ownership and Government was to permit a broader scope of operation to include experiments in seedlings and reproduction. This makes a total of 3,480 acres of valuable timberlands this company has made available to the Government for this program. It has been operating on an annual budget of $14,000, and with such limited funds the station cannot possibly take advantage of the experimental opportunities as it should. It should have approximately $50,000 per year in order to serve the 10,000,000 acres of timberland in this area.

Mr. Chairman, I was reared in the heart of this great timberland area. I have observed it all my life and worked for years in the timber woods. I know what it means to the farmers who go to this station every year to observe the progress toward proper forest-management and conservation practices. When we give the farmers the benefit that could be derived from these experimental stations, we substantially increase their income and standard of living.

I have seen the waste and exploitation of our timber resources, but the time has come, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot and we must not permit it to continue. The 600,000 acres of timberland in this country, if properly utilized and conserved, will continue to be an even greater industry—and I speak not only for the lumber companies, I plead not only in the interest of the farmer, but for the future of all of the people of the United States. I personally am going to abide by the decision of the Committee and do what I can toward working out a plan for next year that will be commensurate with the benefits and provide the needs for a long-time conservation program. I am very hopeful we can formulate and present a program soon that will be acceptable.

The Clerk read as follows:

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

For carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act approved November 9, 1921, as amended (23 U. S. C. 23, 23a), and for the construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of roads and trails on experimental areas uder Forest Service administration, (1) $4,418,778 for forest development roads and trails (including not to exceed $68,846 for personal services in the District of Columbia), and (2) $1,500,000 for maintenance of forest highways, which latter sum is part of the balance of the amount of $5,714,222 authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1942 by the act of September 5, 1940 (54 Stat. 867, Public Law 780, 76th Cong.), in all, $5,918,778, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the rental, purchase, construction, or alteration of buildings necessary for the storage and repair of equipment and supplies used for road and trail construction and maintenance, but the total cost of any such building purchased, altered, or constructed under this authorization shall not exceed $7,500, with the exception that any building erected, purchased, or acquired, the cost of which was $7,500 or more, may be improved within any fiscal year by an amount

not to exceed 2 percent of the cost of such building as certified by the Secretary, and that $10,200 may be expended for the installation of a heating plant in, and for other betterments to the Sellwood shop buildings in Portland, Oreg.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 42, line 15, strike out "$4,418,778" and insert "$3,000,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment cuts $1,418,778 from the item for forest roads and trails.

For the last 15 years we have spent more money building roads and trails in the forests of the United States than in any 50 previous years of our history—yes, any hundred years of our history. Never have we spent the money for roads and trails beginning with the C. C. C. development that we have in the last 15 years. We have built roads so that they extend through the private forests as well as the national forests, State forests also such as never before in all our history. These roads not only afford transportation throughout the forests so we can carry men and equipment there to fight fires and so that the forests can be used, but now we are going to spend a lot more money for the same purpose. Here is an opportunity to save $1,418,000 on the building of roads.

Do you not think we had better stop a few of these road building projects in the national forests and get out and fight the war? Do you not think we had better take the men we would use to build forest roads and put them on the farm? Do you not think it would be better to use these men in the war industries at this time when we hear so much talk about manpower shortage and let them build ships? Do you not think it would be better to use these men in the forest cutting pulpwood to furnish the paper we need? There are thousands of ways in which they could be more profitably used than in a continuation of the building of forest roads and trails.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to my good friend from California, because a while ago on an amendment I offered I had every Member from California against me. I hope now I may have a little support from my colleague from California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I am not going to give the gentleman support or even a good shot in the arm, because I think he does not understand.

Mr. RICH. I live out in the forests, I live right in the woods.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman does not know what woods are. Let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that in the Western States the money that has been spent in the past 3 or 4 years on forest roads and trails has been a direct contribution to the war effort and has lessened the length of the war by years in enabling us to get huge quantities of lumber out of the mountain-forest area.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further. I yielded because the gentleman said he wanted to ask me something. You have been on the road all right, you have been on the road, on the road to bankruptcy. You are going down that road this afternoon like nobody's business.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Oh, no, we have not.

Mr. RICH. On the road to ruin.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment do now close.

Mr. WHITE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I think in justice to the western roads——

Mr. TARVER. I do not think the western roads will be hurt by this committee this afternoon.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I want to tell the Committee of the Whole House that I came home from the committee meeting one day feeling truly cut and bloody. We had cut the Budget estimate for forest roads by over $4,000,000 that day. I want to assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania that our forest roads are in the war. Eighty-seven billion board feet of logs were hauled out of our forests over these roads in one year. Without that lumber and that wood we could not, among other things, move a pound of supplies to our boys around the globe.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment do now close. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY RUBBER PROJECT

For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the act of March 5, 1942, as amended (7 U. S. C. 171–175), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); purchase of books of reference and periodicals; erection of necessary buildings; procurement of medical supplies or services for emergency use in the field; and the acceptance of donations of land and rubber-bearing plants, and furnishing to employees daily transportation between points of assembly and work projects, there is hereby continued available, in accordance with section 3 of said act of march 5, 1942, not to exceed $4,253,662 of the unobligated balances of appropriations made under this head for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943, which balances shall be merged with the appropriation made under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944: *Provided*, That any proceeds from the sales of guayule, rubber processed from guayule, or other rubber-bearing plants, or from other sales, rentals, and fees resulting from operations under such act of March 5, 1942, as amended, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POAGE: On page 44, line 1, strike out "$4,253,662" and insert "$4,878,662."

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I hope it will not be necessary to ask for the adoption of this amendment and it will not be necessary if we may have the assurance of the subcommittee that it was not their intention by the figures placed in this bill to preclude other agencies of the Government using other money appropriated by other bills to carry out the functions of those agencies. Specifically, I refer to the construction of guayule mills by the Defense Plants Corporation. May I enquire of the subcommittee if it was the intention of the subcommittee to preclude the Defense Plants Corporation, if requested by other defense agencies of the Government to provide funds for the construction of additional mills, from the construction of those mills under such circumstances?

Mr. TARVER. May I say that the question answers itself almost, in my judgment. We are not carrying any funds in this bill for the Defense Plants Corporation. We cannot put any limitation in this bill upon the expenditure of funds carried in any other appropriation bill and manifestly we have not undertaken to do so. We are dealing only with the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the War Food Administration, not with appropriations for other agencies of the Government; nor are we seeking to limit the expenditure of funds by other agencies of the Government in any way. That is not our function.

Mr. POAGE. I felt that was the position of the committee, I thought that is what was desired to be done, but there was a legal question raised by attorneys for the R. F. C. who thought it might be the intention of the committee to try to preclude other agencies of the Government from proceeding to build additional guayule mills. I had understood that the committee had no such intention, but I wanted that fact to be clear in the RECORD.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman's worry is caused by the fact that appropriations were not made in this bill for the purpose of constructing mills to manufacture guayule into rubber, may I say that so far as my own opinion is concerned, and the opinion of other members of the committee is concerned, the necessities which may face those in control of the rubber program would govern in the question of whether additional facilities should be built or not. I did not think that was a proper field for the Committee on Agriculture to go into but should be controlled by those who have to do with whether or not present facilities are sufficient to meet our rubber demand.

Mr. POAGE. That is the opinion I had and I think it is the opinion of the Members of the House, but I wanted it to be definitely clear in the RECORD.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is it not the opinion of the gentleman that the attitude of Congress is that it is a very necessary thing that we harvest and mill as quickly as possible, as part of the defense pro-

gram of the United States, the guayule which is already planted?

Mr. POAGE. That is my own opinion although there are Members who might not want to express any opinion. However, I wanted to get it clear that it was the opinion of this Committee of the Whole House that if the defense agencies recommended that the Defense Plants Corporation build mills they would be at liberty to do so. I understand that is the view of the Appropriations Committee and that the failure of the committee to include funds for the construction of new mills should not be construed as any intent to prevent the Defense Plants Corporation or other governmental agency from building the mills. Therefore, with this understanding and assurance, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 44, line 1, after the word "exceed", strike out "$4,253,662" and insert "$4,000,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, I am sorry that we cannot cut down some of these appropriations. It seems as if that is not the thought in the minds of the committee. Let us see what this emergency rubber project does, and just read from the report:

The Budget estimate of $5,000,000 for the emergency rubber project contemplated the plowing under of 10,000 acres now in guayule and the restoration of the land to its owners. This would be in pursuance of a policy of immediate liquidation proposed last year by the House, disagreed to by the Senate, and finally rejected as a result of the House concurring in the Senate action.

That is where the House failed. They concurred with the Senate and laid down again. The House conferees, I tell you, always lay down. They do not stand up and fight, and that is the reason we get these appropriation increases over in the Senate. If we had a little more fight in our conferees we would not have the wool pulled over our eyes as we have. They talk here about this material they are growing for rubber. It evidently was a mistake, and it is going to cost this country a whole lot of money. You are not going to do anything by continuing the process of planting and planting and planting, and you are not getting anything that is in accordance with the best thoughts and ideas relative to the production of rubber. It seems to me that you should cut this item down, and the quicker you cut it down, the better. It is just like this oil venture up here in Canada. The quicker you cut it out the better off you are going to be. Let us vote for this amendment. You are going to get one vote at least.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I do that for this reason: While the hearings were being conducted we were given evidence to the effect that there is no assurance at all as to when we are going to get any great quantity of rubber from Malaya and the Orient, even after the war is ended. Personally I do not care to be put in a position of gambling with the future, and, as far as I am concerned, I am willing to vote for additional sums for this project to put in another mill or two to process what rubber we can from the guayule we already have. I certainly hope that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will not prevail.

We need whatever rubber we can produce to make our synthetic product adaptable for heavy-duty tires. This guayule rubber production may well be the beginning of a great new agricultural achievement. Let us not throw away what we now have and later, perhaps, be at the mercy of the rubber cartels of former years. To balance our great synthetic-rubber industry of today, and to augment it, we must have crude rubber. We must never again depend upon any nation but our own for strategic commodities of this sort. The lack of these in times of war may prove fatal.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment that has just been offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I rather reluctantly have to make the statement that he is not fully informed on the guayule rubber project. I have made a study of this for about 3 years. I sat over on the Senate side and listened to the hearings of the Agricultural Subcommittee on that. I was a member of the subcommittee of our own House Committee on Agriculture in 1942 that studied this particular subject, and I have followed it ever since. I have viewed the plantings. I have attended hearings in California and other places.

As to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania said about what happened a year ago, that the conferees went over there and listened to the Senate and agreed with everything they did to raise the appropriation, may I say that that was done at the insistence largely of the House Agricultural Committee subcommittee on guayule, which appeared before the Senate after the Appropriations bill had been passed here.

We made an investigation subsequent to that of the guayule project, right in the field, and held hearings with all the large rubber companies and the research department of the Navy Department present, and they all said that this should be maintained.

I am very hopeful, and I am sure that the Defense Plant Corporation will want this rubber. In fact, I know they will. In the hearings you will see where Mr. Granger, of the Forest Service, head of the emergency guayule rubber project, testified that they were proposing two additional mills which should be put in, and I am sure the Defense Plant Corporation will do so in the interest of national defense.

Guayule rubber is a very valuable commodity. You will see that its history will be like that of the automobile. One of these days those who opposed it in the early days will see it become not a luxury but a necessity in this country, because it is a high quality of rubber. It has been produced in this country since Pearl Harbor from seed. I hope you defeat this amendment. I have a lot of faith that the Defense Plant Corporation will put in these two new mills that we need. We need them now, and we are going to need them a lot more in the next few years. We need this rubber a great deal more now than we will need it 5 years from now. Now is a critical time. Rubber is the most strategic of all the materials today, and I have that from the Rubber Director of the War Production Board.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR FOOD ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the War Food Administration to perform its functions, including those prescribed by Executive Orders 9280, 9310, 9322, 9328, and 9334, independently or in cooperation (by transfer of funds or otherwise) with public and private agencies and individuals, other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including not to exceed $25,000 for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706 (a) of the act of September 21, 1944 (Public Law 425); actual transportation and other necessary expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence, of persons serving while away from their permanent homes in an advisory capacity to or employed by the War Food Administration, without other compensation from the United States, except that such expenditures shall not exceed $115,000; printing and binding; the purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and not to exceed $700 for newspapers; and the purchase of one, operation and maintenance of two passenger-carrying vehicles in the District of Columbia; $13,636,472, including $275,000 for the wage stabilization program, and, in the absence of other governing statute, the provisions of law applicable to such program during the fiscal year 1945 are continued during the current fiscal year: *Provided*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the promulgation or execution of orders under which assessments are made against producers or handlers of agricultural products, excepting walnuts, for administration of such orders: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for agricultural wage stabilization with respect to any commodity unless a majority of the producers of such commodity within the area affected participating in a referendum or meeting held for that purpose request the intervention of the Administrator of the War Food Administration.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELLIOTT: On page 45, line 6, after "including", strike out "$275,000" and insert "$500,000."

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because the large amount of labor that is being taken away from the farms makes it imperative that we have enough money to carry out the wage-stabilization program; $275,000 is not enough. As late as this morning I talked to Mr. Cowen, of the Office of the War Food Administrator, who is handling this, and he says that $275,000 will not do the job.

Let us not kid ourselves. We are in a critical period. In my State practically all the agricultural products are going to the Pacific theater of war. It it imperative that we have the Mexican nationals to assist us.

With a few more dollars added here, it will assure us there will be a sufficient amount of money to carry on the wage stabilization program. This wage stabilization program is a protection to everybody who purchases food because it has a tendency to balance off the wage scales rather than let them get out of reach one from the other. So it is very important, Members of the House, that this amount of money be increased. The Bureau of the Budget, when it was testifying before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Agriculture Department, testified there was $625,000 needed. I have a letter here from the Farm Bureau. I have telegrams which I have received from farm organizations and individuals. They say without the increase it will be impossible to carry on this program at this time. And this is the time, above all times, when we certainly must not let the people in the agricultural field down.

I yield to my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Can the gentleman state to the House the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Six hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars is the amount as it appears on page 64 in part II, under the War Food Administration.

Mr. LEA. Would the gentleman's amendment make the total $500,000?

Mr. ELLIOTT. My amendment would make it $500,000.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The Bureau of the Budget did not recommend anything on this item at all.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Pardon me. Mr. Horton appeared before the gentleman's committee on the matter of wage stabilization. He recommended $625,000.

Mr. LEA. May I state that the highly competitive condition of agricultural labor and other labor on the Pacific Coast, particularly in the shipbuilding and aircraft construction, is such that it is a matter of great importance to have the proper administration to stabilize labor.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

Mr. LEA. There are thousands of instances in the past few years in which great injustice has been worked against agriculture because of the competitive wage scales which take away their best labor.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is correct.

I yield to my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. May I compliment the gentleman from California for offering this amendment? There is no doubt in the world that the amount to be appropriated under the provisions of the bill now under consideration is utterly insufficient. The amount fixed by the gentleman in his amendment is considerably less than the amount which the Manpower and War Food Administration are asking for. Food is ammunition and our farm boys are away fighting. They cannot harvest our crops. We are bringing in people from the outside who, because of the unstable condition of wage levels throughout the country, are wasting more time looking for higher wages than they are in harvesting the crops which we must have if we are going to win this war.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The gentleman is correct. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman for calling attention to the close relation between the wage stabilization program and the Mexican labor program which is very important in the harvesting of crops for war food.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I might say to the Members of the House on March 2 I introduced a bill which was referred to the Commitee on Appropriations dealing with this subject, and in that bill I asked for $500,000 after conferring with the War Food Administrator as to the great need for this increased amount of money.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I say to the House the condition in Arizona is only a little less critical than that in California. I hope the gentleman's amendment will prevail.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY].

Mr. DE LACY. It seems to me we ought to increase this fund. If we expect to freeze labor on the farm and keep them from moving around, we ought to pay up some money to keep them there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes, to be equally divided between those who want to speak thereon.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the items in the bill which was subject to a point of order. I am very much interested in it. No Budget estimate came to us since that Bureau knows that this activity comes under an amendment to the Price Control Act. This act, of course, expires in June and may or may not be renewed. However, if we fail to appropriate now the agency may dwindle away by then. If we do appropriate the amount of money that the committee allowed, the program can continue. Regarding the over-all amount needed the agency can do as they have been doing in the past, they can come in and get a deficiency appropriation. That is the reason why the committee did not increase the amount. We merely wanted to assure the continuation of the activity.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mr. THOM. What is the program? What does it consist of?

Mr. HORAN. Out west where we have had a dearth of farm labor we have had considerable pirating of labor. In my own district we paid as high as $45 a day for thinning apple trees before this Agency began functioning. Of course, that is out of all proportion. We had people demanding 25 cents a box for picking apples. Under those circumstances it was necessary for all producers and even labor to get together and agree on something that was reasonable. There is no question but what this program has worked out there where the need was so great. Without it a great many of our crops would not have been harvested.

Mr. THOM. Do you mean it is simply the fixing of a wage scale by experts?

Mr. HORAN. Yes; by agreement.

Mr. THOM. And this money is to hire men to make those agreements?

Mr. HORAN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

This is one program that has been administered with the unqualified approval of everyone whose attention has been called to it. It is an absolutely necessary program. The boys upon our farms who ordinarily harvest the crops are away at war. We have been compelled to import people to bring in the crops which, in the end, will win this war for us. Many people are working on farms who have never worked on farms before—many of them brought in from foreign shores. The services of thousands are being utilized in neighborhoods far from their homes. Among the strangers that are presently employed in central California are Mexican nationals, citizens of an ally of ours in this war. The stabilization of the wages they earn will do more to protect them from exploitation than anything that could be done.

This program is to prevent the skyrocketing of wages in one neighborhood, the fall of them to bedrock in another. This to protect them and their farmer employers, large and small, from the senseless competition of one side of the road as against the other side of the road. The wage-stabilization program is popular with both the workers and the owners of the farms. Let me read to you what

Mr. Donald Rush, Assistant Chief of the Wage Stabilization Division, had to say of this program during the course of the hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee in charge of this bill:

In the operation of the wage-ceiling program in the Western States—and the program is primarily operative in the West, because that is where we have had the very high wages—the development, in my estimation, has been very unusual. The farmers approached wage ceilings very cautiously at the start. Until they had had some experience with its operation they had many reservations about it. We did, too. But the thing has worked. It has stopped workers moving from place to place and looking for higher wages. The workers have liked it and the farmers have liked it. Its acceptance has been most unusual, both by the large farmers and small farmers.

So there is no controversy of any kind between persons of different political philosophies or economic ideologies—nothing like that at all. We have under consideration a program that everybody is for; a program which has worked in the years gone by; one which has helped the farmers of our common country to harvest the bumper crops that have made the winning of this war the certainty it is. Without this program I am not so sure that the end of the war would hold for us such promise.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the distinguished Representative from the Tenth District of California.

Mr. ELLIOTT. As a matter of fact, this wage-stabilization program has protected the little farmer against the big farmer, and without the wage-stabilization program the large farmer could pay more per hour while the little farmer could not even get the necessary labor to harvest his crops?

Mr. GEARHART. That is entirely correct. I thank my colleague for emphasizing it. We have many times had to face the utterly impossible situation of farmers on opposite sides of the road outbidding each other for the labor of the none-too-many workers to the result that the men go trooping back and forth across the road with each offer of a higher wage, to the end that thousands of them spent more time looking for higher wages than they did working. It was wage stabilization that ended all that. An inadequate appropriation will bring it all back again.

It is interesting, Mr. Chairman, to contemplate what might happen if this appropriation is not increased in accordance with the provisions of the Elliott amendment. In the light of the possible results of such a niggardly policy the testimony of Brig. Gen. Philip Bruton, Director, Food Industries Division, Program Branch, Office of Labor, War Food Administration, given before our Appropriation Committee, takes on added importance. He said:

I would say it would have this effect, or could have this effect: If there was no wage stabilization in agriculture, particularly in the West where wages have gone so high and might go considerably higher if a stabilization program was not available, it would tend to create such wide fluctuations in wages that we would have considerable discontent among Mexican nationals. This might be reflected in a somewhat retarded movement by Mexicans. You remember last year in the picking of cherries the wages got clear out of hand and there were Mexican nationals working elsewhere who became discontented. It does have those repercussions.

At another point in his testimony, General Bruton climaxed his warnings in the following words:

I am afraid it—

Failure to adequately appropriate—

will make for very unsettled labor conditions.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the anticipated importation of 75,000 Mexican nationals, 18,000 to 25,000 Jamaicans, 5,000 to 7,000 Bahamans, these to say nothing of the hundreds of thousands of itinerant Americans upon whom we will have to depend for the harvesting of our crops, this is no time to be niggardly in the support of so necessary a program as the wage stabilization undoubtedly is.

And what would be an adequate appropriation for this most worthy program? This also can be gleaned from the testimony of Mr. Kenneth Butler, executive officer, Food Industries Division, Program Branch, Office of Labor, War Foods Administration, who also discussed this very important subject at the hearings which preceded the presentation of the bill we now have today under consideration. Under questioning by our colleague the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], the following occurred:

Mr. HORAN. I would like to ask just one question to be inserted in our general discussion following my questions: What estimate did you ask of the Budget Bureau for wage stabilization?

Mr. BUTLER. $441,232.

Mr. HORAN. I have in my mind a figure of $625,000 as being suggested as necessary for that work.

Mr. BUTLER. The estimate of $441,232 was made in the summer of 1944. Since then the whole direction of the agricultural-labor problem has been such that we feel the increased figures would more adequately take care of the problem.

Mr. HORAN. I wanted the figures for the committee's consideration.

From this testimony it becomes quite clear that in asking that the appropriation be raised from $275,000 to $500,000, the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] is well within the outside figure which the testimony before the subcommittee would justify. Certainly, the figure he suggests cannot be denominated as unreasonable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee thought this was good work and needed work, and for that reason we went to an unusual length to try to provide for it. There is no law authorizing an appropriation after June 30 of this year. The authority for it was contained in the Price Control Act which expires on June 30 of this year unless it is extended, and the legislative committee having jurisdiction is now giving consideration to a bill which it will undoubtedly bring in to extend the provisions of the Price Control Act. Under these circumstances the Budget sent up no estimate for this work but we placed the amount of $275,000 in the bill because according to the evidence we had it was an important work and we wanted to provide for it.

This is one of the items which I undertook to protect this morning in urging the House to vote to waive points of order against the bill, because if points of order had not been waived nothing could have been carried in the bill for the item. I may say to these gentlemen that under these circumstances it would seem that $275,000 is enough to appropriate now, at least until after Congress has passed on whether it is going to extend the Price Control Act and what its provisions shall be. Money has been provided to carry on this work until June 30 and this will provide for carrying on the work after June 30. If the extension of the Price Control Act becomes effective and then the necessity for a deficiency appropriation should develop, undoubtedly the House would provide it; but I see no reason why in advance of the enactment of the authorization we should double, almost, the amount which the committee has recommended. We thought we had pleased these gentlemen very highly in bringing this in in the amount of $275,000 without any authority of law and asking the House to waive points of order against it; yet they come in here and want to double it in advance of the enactment of the law. I think the amendment ought to be rejected.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. My reason in offering the amendment was just this: That the farmers are now planting seed for the crops that will mature later in the year. They want to be assured that there is sufficient money on hand now in this stabilization program so they will be sure of having labor available to harvest crops.

Mr. TARVER. I understand; but there is money in the fund now to last until June 30.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes; but would the gentleman invest $30,000 in planting a crop without knowing he was going to have labor to harvest the crop when it was made?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further to the gentleman from California.

Under this bill they have $275,000. They already have money available to last until June 30 of this year. Certainly this $275,000 will run them after June 30 until they can present a supplemental estimate to the deficiency committee should the authorization be renewed and the need for it develop. I do not see any reason for doubling the amount of this appropriation now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired; all time has expired on the pending amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ELLIOTT) there were—ayes 24, noes 48.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Salaries and administrative expenses: Not to exceed $6,562,000 of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation in carrying out its activities as authorized by law, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses, in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821-833); printing and binding; lawbooks and books of reference; not to exceed $400 for periodicals, maps, and newspapers; procurement of supplies, equipment, and services; rent in the District of Columbia; and all other necessary administrative expenses: *Provided*, That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be obligated or expended unless and until an appropriate appropriation account shall have been established therefor pursuant to an appropriation warrant or a covering warrant, and all such expenditures shall be accounted for and audited in accordance with the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended: *Provided further*, That none of the fund made available by this paragraph shall be used for administrative expenses connected with the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price as defined by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 or the comparable price as provided by section 4 (a) of the act of July 1, 1941, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a-8); and the method that is now used for the purposes of Commodity Credit Corporation loans for determining the parity price or its equivalent for ⅞-inch Middling cotton at the average location used in fixing the base loan rate for cotton shall also be used for determining the parity price for ⅞-inch Middling cotton at such average location for the purposes of this proviso: *Provided further*, That the foregoing shall not apply to the sale or other disposition of any agricultural commodity substantially deteriorated in quality (or in the case of perishable fruits, vegetables, and animal products if there is danger of deterioration or of accumulation of stocks) or sold for the purpose of feeding, or the extraction of peanut oil, or commodities disposed of for export pursuant to section 21 (c) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (Public Law 457) or commodities sold to farmers for seed or for new or byproduct uses, or commodities sold for the purpose of establishing claims against persons who have committed fraud, misrepresentations, or other wrongful acts with respect to such commodities: *Provided further*, That no wheat or corn shall be sold for feed at a price less than the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made: *Provided further*, That in making regional adjustments in the sale price of corn or wheat the minimum price need not be higher in any area than the United States average parity price of corn.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HORAN: On page 46, line 16, after the word "hereof" but before the colon, insert a comma and the following: "but not more than $1,600,000 may be expended under this head."

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to clarify and to bring this expense out into the open. The proviso which I propose to amend includes functions which the Commodity Credit Corporation performs in the shape of commissions and orders to collect rents, and so forth. There is nothing in the act as we have it before us this afternoon that gives us any check or any knowledge of the amount. The purpose of my amendment is to bring it to our attention and to give us something to check against. In this case we do not even have the Director of the Bureau of the Budget checking on the expenditure of this amount of money. I feel that some check should exist.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I have not had an opportunity to confer with all of my colleagues, but the gentleman's amendment impresses me as being sound. I think there should be a limitation here and perhaps the amount he proposes is fair. If it should be determined it is not sufficient, then the question can be reexamined in the Senate. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to agree to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman. I may say to him that that amount was given to us by Mr. Jump, Budget Director for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. TARVER. I am inclined to think it will be sufficient, and I am sure there will be no objection to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: On page 48, line 6, after the word "Corn", strike out the period, add a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available for administrative expenses of making subsidy payments to dairymen unless such payments be made upon a monthly basis to all qualified recipients who request that payments be made to them upon such monthly basis."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I want to reserve a point of order against the gentleman's amendment until I have had an opportunity to consider it. I am inclined to think it is legislation or proposed legislation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, discussing the merits of the amendment rather than the point of order, which I do not believe will lie because I think my amendment is framed as a limitation upon the expenditure of money, may I say that the purpose of it is very simple. The dairymen in my section of the country, and other sections, are at present, as everybody knows, in receipt of certain subsidy payments. Those subsidy payments are made because the price of milk has been held at a certain level for the purpose of controlling the cost of living and have been necessary, at least in a great many instances, in order to enable the dairymen to make cost of production returns on their milk.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. There has been a very considerable feeling among the dairy farmers that they do not get their money quick enough so they can pay their feed bills. I have had quite considerable reaction on that subject from my territory.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am much obliged to the gentleman. That is exactly the purpose of my amendment. I was about to point out that the dairymen in these particular parts of the country to which I have reference, one of which is my own section, have to make substantial cash outlays for the purchase of feed, the payment of wages, and for other purposes, and most of these payments must be made each month. Dairymen have to make those expenditures on a cash basis month by month. They have to hire their labor by the month, and that labor is being better paid at present than ever before, and I am glad it is. But it is necessary for the dairymen to have the funds to do it with.

With the proposal now advanced that payments be made only once every quarter it simply means that the dairyman either has to get his distributor to advance him money or else he has to go out and borrow the money and pay interest upon it, and that is what I am trying to prevent.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. The fact that the dairymen have been required to accept subsidies is evidence of the fact that it is recognized that they must get these payments to get cost of production; therefore there can be no excuse for waiting 90 days which they recognize he must have.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman. I agree with that, of course, and that is what my amendment will correct.

May I point this out? I want to be perfectly candid with the House. I am informed by the head of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, which agency administers these payments, that if they are made on a monthly basis, it will cost somewhat more to do that than it will on a basis on making payments every quarter. I do not know exactly how much more it will cost. I doubt that it will have to be any great amount of money. If my amendment is adopted, it would be necessary to consider that feature of the situation in some deficiency appropriation bill. I think that is where it belongs. If my amendment is adopted, it will simply set forth the manner in which this money is to be expended, and it will state what the principle should be to guide these payments. That is all I am seeking to have established here. I am not asking for an increase in appropriations at this time.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman has advised me that he has been in communication with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration and has been advised that his amendment would necessitate the use of $3,500,000.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No. The gentleman is not quite correct. What I told the gentleman was that I have been advised by Mr. Dodd, head of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, that it would cost $100,000 additional to make payments in certain parts of the country, where he believed them most necessary and important; that if he made payments on a monthly basis to every dairy farmer throughout the whole Nation it would cost about $3,000,000 more than it now costs to administer the program.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman's amendment propose just to make these payments monthly in certain restricted areas?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. If the gentleman will bear with me just a moment, I will tell him what my amendment does. My amendment provides for payment on a monthly basis upon application by the dairy farmer anywhere. It says that if the dairy farmer requests that payment be made on a monthly basis, that it shall be so made. I do not know exactly at this time what that would entail. I think we should adopt this amendment and then upon a deficiency bill there should be consideration of what additional administrative funds are required.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. What I do believe is that it would be very easy to determine the amount required for administration on the basis of some experience. I think it is an important enough matter so that it would be worth adopting this amendment now. I have a letter from Mr. Charles W. Homan, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Association, who tells me that he agrees wholeheartedly with the purpose of this amendment and his office is constantly in receipt of letters from dairymen urging that these payments be made on a monthly basis.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 9 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, this brings up rather a simple question. I often wonder what these chaps out in California were doing in 1939 when they received from $1.55 to $? per hundred for their milk. This was the seventh year of the more abundant life too. These $1.55 to $2 per hundredweight figures are the official monthly figures issued by the U. S. D. A.

Now they are receiving, including the subsidy, more than $4.20 per hundredweight. They cannot even wait for their subsidy. If the W. F. A. was interested in more milk in 1945 than in 1944, why did they pay 40 percent more subsidy in April 1944 than they proposed to pay in April 1945? Why does the O. P. A. pay some States two and a fifth times as much subsidy beginning April 1, 1945, than they do others? Is it any wonder that this W. F. A. has not been able to obtain much of an increase in national milk production?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I cannot yield. I have only 3 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman has made rather a pointed remark.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The pointed remark is factual. This is just one more of the many examples of maladministration. If we keep on going the road we are going and have our leadership as it is, I do not know whether we are going to have anyone left on the farms to produce food. You will have more people on the agricultural pay roll than you will have milking the cows. You evidently wish to add $3,000,000 worth of bureaucratic expenditures, and harm rather than help the war-food program.

In some counties they make three or four thousand farmers go to meeting places every 60 days and get their subsidy checks. Three or four thousand farmers take time off, use gas and tires to run around to a meeting to get the subsidy checks.

How many Members of this House would like to have the responsibility of distributing these checks and allocating that authority to 3,000 men scattered all over the United States, without any check-up on them as far as Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General, is concerned? He certainly cannot check them. I should like to know why these subsidy payments—though I think I know why—but I should like to have someone publicly say why in the name of the war they do not have these payments go directly from the factories where the milk is delivered. Those checks could go out every month with the checks that go out paying for the milk, and you would have some practical administration policy followed, and the Comptroller General could check the plants as to accuracy. It is done now with the cheese subsidy. I think it is being done directly with the butter subsidy, too. I think that this is purely a matter of administration. I do not think it would be right for us at this time to require these checks to be paid out through cumbersome procedures every 30 days. The next thing they will ask is a still greater Federal pay roll that is now altogether too cumbersome and large for efficient wartime administration. Though over three hundred and forty-four millions were paid in the so-called feed-subsidy program in 1944, the amount of milk produced per cow was below the previous year's production. Why?

The little people here had their wages frozen at from 50 to 60 cents an hour in many places. Taxes are being exacted from people with $500 to $600 incomes. Much legislation that appeared to make some sense before the war does not make sense during the war. Do you believe in taxing a man receiving $500 to $600 per year in order to pay 26,000 large landowners over $50,000,000 as a subsidy for doing or not doing something? The American people are beginning to find that there is not much nourishment in all this New Deal bologna. The sooner we get a war-food program based on common sense the sooner the food for the war effort and the domestic demands will be provided in the needed amounts.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. The Eighteenth District of California, which I represent, is contiguous at one corner to the great congressional district which my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] represents.

Shortly before I came here a delegation of dairy leaders waited upon me to make sure that everything possible was done here to see to it that if possible they receive their subsidy checks once a month instead of once every 3 months. In that district of Los Angeles County there are many small dairies but very important ones, as well as large ones. I urge the support of this amendment because it means very, very much to those California dairymen.

Recently we have been able to make an arrangement whereby, through the cooperation of Mr. Dodd, and because it seemed so important, the dairymen in my district are now paying money to help with the additional administrative costs in order to get these checks each month. It is so vital to the dairymen in Los Angeles County that they will receive these subsidy checks every month that we have just completed a cooperative arrangement with Mr. Dodd's department, which has been very nice. It starts May 1.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In offering this amendment I meant no criticism of Mr. Dodd or the manner of administration of this program. I believe he would be very glad to do it in this way. I do not believe he would have any objection.

Mr. DOYLE. In my remarks I am not criticizing any department; I am just stating the fact that it is essential, to further promote and carry on the dairy industry in my district, that these men who do not have the operating credit get it and get their funds at least once a month.

No Member of this House but admits that food is as important as powder and bullets, and certainly the production, distribution, and marketing of milk and

dairy products pertains to absolutely essential food.

The drainage of our dairy manpower, made necessary by war exigencies, together with other lack of available labor, the cost of feed, the high wage and labor costs, the lack of more modern and recent milking-machinery equipment, the lack of money surpluses which can be used as operating credits or capital—these and many other reasons contribute to the absolute need of many, many dairymen of Los Angeles County to have their milk-subsidy checks once a month.

I recognize that the attitude of the House here this afternoon is to not change, modify, defeat, or amend the appropriation measure as recommended by the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Committee, and the distinguished committee membership. But, gentlemen, here is a practical necessity dealing with vital war milk and dairy supplies which must receive prompt treatment. Now is the time to treat it favorably. This is the first opportunity we have had. If the amendment is objected to on the grounds that there is no definite information of increased administration costs by my honorable colleague who proposed the amendment, then, nevertheless, I ask for a favorable vote on the amendment so that as the bill, as amended, goes to the Senate from this House the lack of present information about additional administrative costs which would be made necessary by the carrying out of this amendment can be supplied. The bill as finally passed with this amendment would not lack any essential element.

Your favorable action this afternoon will start in motion required, practical, sound procedures which must come as soon as possible. Let us start them now by voting this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the idea of paying the dairymen each month, certainly not if that is their desire and it can be done without too great expense. But I certainly think a proposal of this kind which would add 50 percent to the administrative expense of the Commodity Credit Corporation, according to the statement of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], ought to have had some investigation before the committee before it is put in a bill in the House. Nobody appeared before the committee asking that this language be included in the bill. The committee had no evidence as to how much it would cost. It seems Mr. Dodd called the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] up on the telephone and told him it would cost $100,000 if it were only applied to certain restricted areas and if applied to the country generally and everybody took advantage of it, it would cost $3,000,000 or more. Do we want to legislate on the basis of a telephone call from Mr. Dodd to Mr. VOORHIS, or do we want to proceed in an orderly way? Do you not think it would be better to wait and let these gentlemen go before the Senate Committee on Agriculture Appropriations and have the departmental authorities up there find out definitely what this would cost, and then determine what ought to be done about it? We ought to have some evidence here before we increase this amount by even $100,000, not to speak of $3,000,000.

Now, if you adopt this amendment, then you want to go back on page 45, line 23, and strike out $6,562,000 and put in some increased amount there to take care of the cost of this. It would not be fair to require the performance of additional duties and at the same time not appropriate money with which to take care of the additional duties. I do not know of any evidence you have here on the basis of which you can determine how much you ought to add to it. So, I think it is not a thing you are in a position to pass on intelligently here. Since the bill is going to the Senate, there will be ample opportunity to present the matter there. These gentlemen never came before our committee and never mentioned this until the bill was reported to the House. It seems to me to be fair they should wait and present it in an orderly way.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I explain, first of all, that Mr. Dodd did not call me, but I called him.

Mr. TARVER. May I say that is a distinction without a difference.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I called him because the dairymen were so concerned about the change to payments only once a quarter, which is a recent development. May I furthermore point out I agree with the gentleman that the appropriation would have to be altered, but we will be in a much stronger position to go before the Senate committee if the House expressed itself favorably on this amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman know how much ought to be added to the appropriation if this language is put in?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think it can be determined.

Mr. TARVER. It can be determined, but you are not in a position to offer an amendment, saying how much it is. I think the amendment ought to be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on the pending amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2689, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the American Federationist.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include resolutions passed by the Massachusetts Legislature.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two particulars, in one to include a resolution from South Carolina General Assembly, and in the other an editorial.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two different subjects and to include a letter and a statement from the press.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therein a short series of interesting and informative articles written by Maj. George J. Feldman of the United States Army Air Forces.

Mr. LEA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and to include a quotation from the United States Department of Agriculture Year Book, 1920, and a quotation from the publication, Crops and Markets, of July 1943.

Mr. ROWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a chapter of a report compiled by him on a trip made to the South Pacific by the Naval Affairs Committee.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WASIELEWSKI] is recognized for 40 minutes.

THE YALTA AGREEMENT

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, even before I became a Member of the House I was a strong advocate of the President's foreign policy. Since I have taken office I have supported his policy throughout.

Slightly more than a month ago the country reverberated with the report of the Yalta agreement arrived at by the Big Three in the Crimea. As for the provisions of the Yalta pact dealing with the defeat of Germany, the occupation and control of Germany, reparations by Germany, and the United Nations Conference, there can only be 100 percent agreement. However, the feature dealing with the declaration of liberated Europe, particularly as it affects Poland, brings only keen disappointment and shame for all of us.

It has been no easy matter for me to take my position with regard to that part of the Yalta pact which deals with the dismemberment of our ally Poland. Some may contend that my criticism of the activities of our principal allies and our own Government will give aid and comfort to the enemy. Certainly nothing could be more nonsensical. Our allies—Britain, Russia, and others—have repeatedly criticized our activities without hesitation. We, on the other hand, who pride ourselves in being the greatest democracy in the world, and probably the only one where free speech

is enjoyed in time of war, "hush-hush" all criticism regarding the demands or activities of our allies in the course of the war. This, of course, is considered diplomatic tact. Why should this tact be confined to one side? Why must we yield with silence to the demands of our allies again and again and again?

John McKee, in his pamphlet entitled "Poland, Russia, and Our Honor," published by the John S. Burns & Sons, of Glasgow, raises these questions:

> Does diplomacy demand that we should preserve discreet silence and inaction while a proved friend is treated outrageously? Have we abandoned the Atlantic Charter and let fear and convenience take the place of honor?

It is likely that our allies consider us weak and timid in the expression of our oft repeated ideals. Were we to take a firm and insistent attitude, we and our ideals would gain in the respect and confidence of all the United Nations. We have been drawn into World War No. 2 against our will. However, since we became involved in it, our avowed purpose and determination was not to enhance our territory, not to expand our sphere of influence, not to enlarge our theater of domination, but, precisely, to wipe out the aggressive totalitarian dictators and establish a lasting peace so that future generations might not have to endure the hell our men are experiencing today. Thus, we enjoy an enviable position wherein we can demand and require the same purpose of our allies in this conflict. Even before we entered the war we solemnly adhered to certain high principles which were clearly set forth in the Atlantic Charter. It has been a long standing policy of our Government, as repeatedly expressed by the Secretaries of State and by the President himself, that unilateral agreements should not be recognized. We have long been proponents and supporters of the doctrine of self-determination of nations. We violated these long established doctrines and principles at Yalta. The little nations of the world are watching intently our actions in regard to Poland, for they know that the treatment of Poland will lay the pattern for the treatment they may expect at the hands of the Big Three. We are not so much concerned that the victim of this treatment is Poland, for she but represents a symbol. The criticism would be equally justified were it any other of our sister United Nations. It is not so much what was done at Yalta that matters, as the manner in which it was accomplished. If the same result had been obtained through the use of democratic processes, no one could complain. But when all principles were brushed aside and the matter disposed of in an arbitrary, dictatorial way, we cannot stand by without protest.

My purpose in taking the floor this afternoon is to request the President and the State Department to instruct our delegates to the San Francisco Conference to move for a reconsideration of that portion of the Yalta pact that deals with the unilaterial dismemberment of our ally, Poland, and to advise the other members of the United Nations of this action. I believe that the wrong committed may still be righted and that we may still regain our self-respect and honor in the eyes of the nations of the world. There are some who fear that such procedure might break up the conference. If our understandings and councils with the United Nations are based on such frail foundations that this matter cannot be reopened, then our hopes for a world peace organization are in vain. It is far better that this error be righted now than that the Senate should reject the Yalta pact in its present form.

It is not my purpose this afternoon to reiterate the historical background of the claims that Poland may have to the territory of which she was deprived at Yalta. The history of Poland's claims has been repeated on this floor often enough. Citation of history, like that of the Scripture, can often be used to serve the purpose or convenience of the citator. Besides, as stated earlier, our sin at Yalta is to be found not so much in what we did with respect to the Polish boundaries, but the manner in which it was done and the repudiation of our solemn guaranties that we would not participate in unilateral settlements of boundary disputes. We gave our word of honor to that effect.

The tragedy of Yalta lay in the fact that the leaders of three great nations met—two of them disinterested, one very much interested, and dismembered a fourth nation without giving it a chance to present its side of the case. This dismemberment was made in complete violation of the repeated promises made by all the United Nations which were signatories to the Atlantic Charter, that the people of a given area or given countries were to decide the form of government under which they wished to be ruled. As recently as December 18, 1944, Secretary of State Stettinius announced our policy toward Poland as follows:

> The United States Government stands unequivocally for a strong, free, and independent Polish state with the untrammeled right of the Polish people to order their internal existence as they see fit.
>
> It has been the consistently held policy of the United States Government that questions relating to boundaries should be left in abeyance until the termination of hostilities. As Secretary Hull stated in his address of April 9, 1944, "This does not mean that certain questions may not and should not in the meantime be settled by friendly conference and agreement." In the case of the future frontiers of Poland, if a mutual agreement is reached by the United Nations directly concerned, this Government would have no objection to such an agreement which would make an essential contribution to the prosecution of the war against the common enemy.

Let us briefly review some of the provisions of the Yalta pact insofar as they deal with Poland in order that we may be able to determine what was in the minds of the Big Three and what purpose their actions might serve. The opening sentence reads:

> A new situation has been created in Poland as a result of her complete liberation by the Red Army.

Let us contrast with this the statement made by the President in his message to the House on the state of the Union delivered on January 6, 1945—page 92, volume 91, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> As a result of the combined effort of the Allied forces, great military victories were achieved in 1944: The liberation of France, Belgium, Greece, and parts of the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia.

One of the purposes in organizing the United Nations was to have joint action. It has been an accepted unwritten policy that no one country should be considered the sole liberator of another. Certainly anyone looking at the whole picture can appreciate that Poland, like the other countries, was liberated as a result of the joint action of all the Allied Nations and not only the Russian effort, regardless of its undeniable importance. No one will question the fact that the activities of the British, American, Polish, and other Allied forces in Italy and France, as well as the Polish Underground, have greatly aided the cause of Poland's liberation, as well as did the unestimable lend-lease aid we sent to the Russians. It has been the policy of the United States, as well as of the other United Nations, to avoid spheres or zones of power influence. To permit one country to claim the credit for liberating another might give rise to such an implication and might further encourage the tendency toward a final division of the world into zones of power influence.

Some writers and commentators have taken the position that Russia has liberated Poland and therefore Poland should be willing to reward her for her services with a slice of Polish territory. Let me reiterate, Russia alone did not free Poland from the Nazis—it was the result of the united action of the United Nations and the unflagging, heroic resistance of the Polish underground. According to William Henry Chamberlin, in his article entitled "Some Truths About Poland," appearing in the February 1945 issue of American Mercury, there is strong reason to believe that Russia actually owes a debt of gratitude to Poland for its steadfast rejections of Nazi blandishments. Hitler made three proposals to Poland in 1938 and 1939 to combine in an action against Russia. The basis of the German offers was that formerly German regions be returned to the Reich and that Poland be compensated by additional territory from U. S. S. R.—a proposal markedly like Stalin's, except in reverse.

Poland rejected these proposals. How different the course of history might have been if Poland, like Roumania, Hungary, and Bulgaria, had swung to the Axis and cooperated in an attack on Russia. In that case, Britain and France might never have been involved in the war, and Soviet Russia would have been obliged to bear the whole weight of the Nazi attack 2 years earlier. Russia most certainly has reason to be thankful for Poland's rejection of the German proposals, concludes Mr. Chamberlin.

The second sentence of the Yalta agreement bears no special significance. However, the third is important, and reads as follows:

The provisional government which is now functioning in Poland should therefore be reorganized on a broader democratic basis, with the inclusion of the democratic leaders from Poland itself and from Poles abroad.

On the face of this statement, it would appear that the British and American Governments have agreed to recognize the Soviet-sponsored Lublin committee, which, by order of Moscow, now calls itself the "Provisional Polish Government." To consider the "provisional Polish government which is now functioning in Poland" as the nucleus for the reorganization of the Government of Poland on a broader basis is incredible. It is most unfortunate that in a document of such great historic importance a spurious puppet set-up, totally unrepresentative of Poland, and composed for the most part of comintern agents who have assumed Polish citizenship and have nothing in common with the Polish state or the Polish people, should be given a kind of recognition by being described as the "provisional government which is now functioning in Poland." In recent days consternation has grown because of the demands of the "provisional Polish government" to have veto power in deciding what democratic leaders from Poland and abroad are to participate in the meeting at Moscow.

Let us for a moment take a glance at the make-up and personnel of the so-called provisional government which is now functioning in Poland. William Henry Chamberlin, in his article, Some Truths About Poland, referred to earlier, has this to say:

Most of the members of the Moscow-made council are completely unknown in Polish life, and those who are known hardly inspire confidence. They are broken, discredited adventurers, just the kind of men who might be expected to turn out as Quislings. Take for example the Minister of War, Michal Rola-Zymierski. Under the Pilsudski regime, he was convicted of taking bribes from French manufacturers in connection with the supply of gas masks and was sentenced to 5 years in prison and the loss of his military rank and honors. Jan Grubecki, Minister of Communications, is a former member of ENDEK, a nationalist youth organization, and was identified with many anti-Semitic outrages. Emil Somerstein, a well-known Jewish lawyer, has been held for years in Soviet prisons and may well have joined the government to avoid indefinite detention. The chairman of the Council, Boleslaw Berut, is a Communist who was unknown in pre-war Poland. The committee includes two men who were more or less well known as fellow travelers, Eduard Osubka-Morawski and Boleslaw Drobner, both expelled from the Polish Socialist Party for this reason.

Mr. Chamberlin further states, and I quote:

The sole function of the phantom government, which includes at least one criminal, is to carry out orders from Moscow. It has obediently echoed Stalin's demand that Poland cede some 40 percent of its pre-war territory to the Soviet Union.

On March 1, 1945, after Yalta, the British Foreign Secretary, Anthony Eden, in an address before the House of Commons, had this to say about the Lublin Committee:

Whether we like or dislike the Lublin Committee—and personally I can say I dislike it—for the moment it is the authority which is functioning there in fulfilling the requirements of the Russian military authorities. We have in no sense of the word recognized this Lublin Committee and we have no intention of recognizing the Lublin Committee.

We do not regard it as representative of Poland at all, and let me add, that when Prime Minister Churchill and I met the representative of this committee in Moscow, they did not make a favorable impression on us at all. There is no question, the House need not be anxious about our affording recognition to them. * * * I have no doubt what that committee wants. Their purpose is to maintain the position they already hold, but that is not what we want, nor is it what the Yalta Conference decided upon.

Mr. Speaker, what a travesty upon justice and decency that such a group of misrepresentatives should have been selected as the nucleus for the Polish Government to be formed pursuant to Yalta.

Let us read on. The first sentence in the second paragraph reads:

M. Molotov, Mr. Harriman, and Sir A. Clark Kerr are authorized as a commission to consult in the first instance in Moscow with the members of the present provisional government and with other Polish democratic leaders from within Poland and from abroad with a view to the reorganization of the present Government along the above lines.

It seems somewhat incongruous that three representatives of three countries, one of whom has a special interest in the government to be set up while his country's armies and secret police are in complete control of Poland, should meet in Moscow with members of the present provisional government with a view of reorganizing the present Government in Poland. This arrangement seems completely to ignore the sovereignty of the Polish state, since no mention is made of the President of the Polish Republic, who is recognized by all the United Nations and all the neutral countries of the world as the constitutional legal head of the Polish state. This most certainly establishes a very dangerous precedent. It appears that the three representatives of the three foreign powers, plus the present provisional government, are to decide on the personnel and make-up of the new Polish government. In raising this point, there is no intention on my part to cast any undesirable reflection on either the ability or integrity of the two Ambassadors named as members of the committee of consultants. The question, however, arises as to whether or not a knowledge of Poland, and especially its complicated political parties and institutions, is fully known to them. As for Mr. Molotov, his connection with the fourth partition of Poland and the Ribbentrop-Molotov treaty and his derogatory statements about Poland are still too fresh in the minds of liberty-loving people to make him acceptable as an unbiased consultant in determining Poland's future.

President Roosevelt in his report on Yalta to Congress and the Nation stated that during his sojourn in the Crimea he acquainted the heads of the British and Russian Governments with that great American document, our Constitution. It is indeed unfortunate that he did not go further and impress them with the importance of recognizing legal constitutional governments that can be removed or changed only by its people.

As long as the war lasts and the Russian armies and secret police occupy Poland, and as long as more than 7,000,000 Poles are either incarcerated or otherwise prevented from returning home from Nazi Germany, Russia, and other parts of the world, no free election can be held. I hold no brief for the Polish government in exile; however, it would seem that as between it and the Lublin Committee, the government in London presents a far more democratic and stronger legal claim.

So many people confuse the London Polish government with the government that ruled at the outbreak of the war. I am informed that not one of the persons who make up the Polish government today was a member of the Beck government which was in power in September of 1939. The men in the present regime for the most part made up the loyal opposition or had wholly withdrawn from national life because they could not accept the policies of the Beck and Pilsudski parties. The Polish Constitution anticipated the possibility that the Polish Government might some day be exiled and provided specifically the manner in which the exiled government was to be established. It was pursuant to these constitutional provisions that the London Polish government was created.

Politically speaking, the present London Polish government is formed of a coalition which includes three of the four principal parties: The Polish Socialist Party, three members; the National Democratic Party, two members; and the Christian Democratic Labor Party, two members. Two members of the cabinet have no party affiliations.

The fourth major political party, the Peasant Party, did not enter the Government at this time, though declaring its full support of the new Cabinet.

Contrary to the misinformation that is prevalent in certain circles, the Cabinet is not made up of landlords or titled gentry. Two of them are active labor leaders, two newspapermen, two university professors, one lawyer, one Regular Army officer, and one career diplomat. One-half of the Cabinet members—that is, six of them—have come from the underground movement. Two of them, Premier Arciszewski and Minster of the Interior Berezowski, worked with the underground for 5 years before reaching London. Four others still remain in Poland occupying prominent posts in the Polish underground movement.

It is most unfortunate that the nation who was first to fight Nazi aggression and in whose defense England and France entered World War No. 2 should now be excluded from the conference that is to take place in San Francisco on the 25th day of April. We are advised that the three little Baltic nations, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, are also among the uninvited. The question is being raised

everywhere, Is this another case of our effort to appease Russia? Poland and these three Baltic states have in the past participated in all of the United Nations conferences. They are charter members of the United Nations. They all participated in endorsing the Atlantic Charter. They have all cooperated fullheartedly in the war effort. "Why then should they be deprived of the right to participate in this important conference?" is a question one hears everywhere.

People back home are asking whether the election in Poland will follow the pattern of those held in the Baltic and several of the Balkan countries, under which governments were selected that ultimately "voted" in favor of annexation to the Soviet Republic. They wonder whether or not this is but the first step in the liquidation of Poland as a nation.

Probably the most dangerous and unfortunate sentence in the Yalta pact is the third one in the second paragraph, "In these elections all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and put forward candidates." No definition is given of "democratic" and "anti-Nazi parties." However, the term "anti-Nazi" raises the implication that there might be some pro-Nazis found in Poland, when everyone knows that throughout the war Poland produced no Quislings. This sentence, however, does open the way to a very serious implication, for it is a known fact that under the Soviet interpretation "democratic," "pro-Nazi," and "pro-Fascist" have a different meaning than they have in the western countries, including Poland. According to the Soviet press in its propaganda campaign, the Roman Catholic world, and especially the Vatican, are accused of being pro-Fascist and pro-Nazi. Since the population of Poland is overwhelmingly Catholic, the fate that awaits its peoples under these circumstances is appreciable, and the possibility of their being permitted to exercise the right of franchise is highly doubtful. In addition, the Lublin Government has labeled the Polish underground as pro-Nazi and anti-democratic. These heroic men, therefore, will not be permitted to vote but, even worse, may be subjected to imprisonment in Siberia or death. Thus, under the circumstances, it appears that the most valuable and patriotic people of Poland, those who have been most loyal to the United Nations in their fight against totalitarianism, are those most likely to be deprived of the right and privilege to vote. One wonders whether a truly democratic election will ever take place in Poland.

The third paragraph of the declaration at Yalta reads:

When a Polish Provisional Government of National Unity has been properly formed in conformity with the above, the Government of the U. S. S. R., which now maintains diplomatic relations with the present Provisional Government of Poland, the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States of America will establish diplomatic relations with the new Polish Provisional Government of National Unity and will exchange Ambassadors, by whose reports the respective Governments will be kept informed about the situation in Poland.

Again, the reference to the Provisional Government of Poland presents a peculiar situation since the statement is made that it is recognized by the U. S. S. R. but no mention is made of the fact that the said "Present Provisional Government of Poland" is not recognized by either the United Kingdom or the United States or any other country in the world. Further, it would appear from the closing clauses of the paragraph that the powers of the ambassadors to be exchanged by the Big Three with the Polish Government to be established are to be very limited. It also suggests the thought that the sovereignty of the future Poland will be restricted by the Big Three.

In the fourth paragraph the first sentence reads as follows:

The three heads of Government consider that the eastern frontier of Poland should follow the Curzon Line, with digressions from it in some regions of 5 to 8 kilometers in favor of Poland.

The Big Three in this sentence depart from the long-established American principle of self-determination of nations, since there is no mention made that the population affected by this action should in any way be consulted. This is clearly a violation of the statement made by the President in his report to the House on the state of the Nation given on January 6, 1945—page 95, volume 91, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—in which he states:

We and our allies have declared that it is our purpose to respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live and to see the sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

The last two sentences of the Crimean pact, affecting Poland, state:

They recognize that Poland must receive substantial accessions of territory in the north and west. They feel that the opinion of the New Polish Provisional Government of National Unity should be sought in due course on the extent of those concessions and that the final delimitation of the western frontier of Poland should thereafter await the peace conference.

Thus the land east of the Curzon line is ceded to Russia and the transfer is made final and immediate while the cession of territory to Poland must await the peace conference. Thus Poland is deprived of land which is alleged to be predominantly Russian and is to receive in return, land which is known to be overwhelmingly German.

The population of that part of Poland east of the Curzon line is a mosaic of Polish, White Russians, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Jews, and other races. None of these races has an absolute majority; probably the Poles, if any, have a plurality. There are White Russians and Ukrainians both in Poland and Russia. Both these people are blood relations of the western Russians. It is on this ground that the Soviet speaks of the historic right of these Polish citizens to be joined to their ethnographically related brethren to the east. But there is a glaring presumption in this claim; namely, that these people wish to come under Soviet rule. If the great majority of the inhabitants of eastern Poland wish to become Soviet citizens, they undoubtedly have the right to do so, but do they so wish? According to John McKee, in his pamphlet entitled "Poland, Russia, and Our Honor" on page 13, neither of these peoples of near Russian stock was fully contented under Polish rule. There were separatist movements among both but there were no movements of importance advocating incorporation in or union with the U. S. S. R. The reason for the existence of the separatist movement among the Poles, Ukrainians, and White Russians is nationalist sentiment; the driving power behind their determination never to be drawn into the U. S. S. R. is something far more important—religion.

The western White Russians are Catholics, and the Ruthenians are Uniates, that is, Catholics who are allowed by Rome to use the Greek Liturgy translated into Slavonic. For both, subjection to the Soviet would be intolerable. Of the approximately 13,000,000 people inhabiting the territory east of the Curzon line nearly 9,000,000 are Catholic.

There is still much loose talk about the so-called Curzon line. Mr. Balfour and not Lord Curzon was the British Foreign Minister in 1919 at the time of the Treaty of Versailles. At that time there was no Curzon line, for, as will be recalled, Russia was then in a state of civil war or revolution. The newly created Bolshevik Government was not considered stable by the nations of the world and was not therefore recognized. As a result, the matter of the eastern boundary of Poland was left in abeyance in the hope that eventually the czarist regime might be re-established and the boundary settled at that time. In 1919 a council of former ambassadors of prerevolutionary Russia suggested to the allied governments the demarcation line which subsequently has become known as the Curzon line. No plebiscite or election was held to determine the location of the line.

At that time these former Russian ambassadors had considerable influence on the British and French Governments of the day. However, the Soviet Government then in power took an entirely different attitude. In his telegram to the British Government in July of 1920, Foreign Commissar Tchicherin, acting upon instructions of Lenin, informed the British Government that the Soviet Government considered the "czarist ambassador" line unfair to Poland.

The uneasiness of the people of Britain and America regarding the practicability of the democracy to be established under the so-called Provisional Government of Poland is apparent when in our own Congress resolutions have been introduced to grant citizenship to members and families of the Polish armed forces now fighting with the Allied Nations outside of Poland, and Mr. Churchill has publicly given assurance of his readiness to give similar recognition.

Russia's activities in the area she has retaken from the Nazi Germans do not inspire confidence. She is destroying the middle classes in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Yugoslavia, and Czechoslovakia by either executing them outright or condemning them to certain

death in Siberia. These unfortunate victims are as a rule charged with being Nazi sympathizers. The evidence on which some of these charges are based is often ridiculous. For example, if a person has in his possession a letter that bears a canceled German stamp he is charged with being a Nazi collaborator and sentenced to death or Siberia. Possession of a newspaper printed in the German language is treated with equal severity. Thus in a systematic manner all the businessmen, professionals, tradespeople, and clergy are being liquidated in order to eliminate the group from which leadership against communism might arise. More than 2,000,000 Poles have been sent to Siberia since September of 1939.

This transplanting of population is undoubtedly in preparation for the day when the plebiscites or elections are to be held in these various countries at the conclusion of the war. In many places Communists are taking the places vacated by the liquidated or deposed natives. Normally one would suppose that the Poles east of the Curzon line might be permitted to move westward but thay are not. Even after Yalta the Poles are being condemned to Siberia or executed in great numbers daily. Hitler found that it was impossible to annihilate a nation of 35,000,000 people, although he has succeeded in destroying about 5,000,000 through the use of various diabolic and ingenious methods of mass execution. Marshal Stalin, however, has Siberia. The queues of unfortunate victims trudging their way on foot to Siberia, in the severe winters, in all seasons and weather, are many miles long. Some of them are fortunate and die along the way, for others the agony of life is prolonged.

Today, even with the ink on the Yalta pact still not fixed, thousands of helpless, innocent people are condemned to die for one sin—they are not Communists. The situation has grown so severe that recently the British Foreign Minister, Anthony Eden, sent a warning to the Soviet-backed Lublin regime not to molest the people of occupied Poland. To date our Government has failed to protest these inhuman activities.

Within the past week our State Department made a firm and commendable protest against Russia's unilateral activity in Rumania. It appears that Moscow, without consulting either London or Washington, deposed Premier Radescu and placed a Communist regime in charge. The Communist population of Rumania is said to be about 5 percent. Is it possible that our Government is more solicitous about the communizing of an erstwhile Nazi satellite government than it is about an attempt to communize a fighting ally whose Communist population never approached 2 percent?

Thus, there is a growing disposition among people and nations to place little confidence in the word of our ally Russia. As I recall, one of the most dastardly offenses attributed to Germany during World War No. 1 was the Kaiser's reference to a solemn treaty as a "mere scrap of paper." In the immediate experience of all of us we have witnessed Russia's indifference to her international obligations. Small wonder, then, that nations and individuals should keep their fingers crossed when dealing with her.

It was Patrick Henry, I believe, who said:

> I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of judging the future but by the past.

Perhaps it is considered Pollyannaish to want to believe and trust people and nations, but it is necessary for normal international pursuits. However, nations must prove their trustworthiness to deserve our confidence. If Russia were less extravagant in her demands, and more humble in her performance of agreements and honestly cooperative in her policy, much of the suspicion in the minds and hearts of sincere people might be extinguished.

Since Russia has been attacked by Nazi Germany in June of 1941, our country has most generously supplied her with lend-lease material and information of every nature that might be helpful to the winning of the war. We have permitted her experts to visit all our war plants, our Army and Navy installations, and have even given them access to much information that is not available to the average American citizen. We have shared all our military secrets with her. We have extended to her press the same freedom and same privileges that we extend to the American press. We permit her press representatives the privilege of the President's press conferences as well as of other high officials. Yet to date, Russia has not permitted any American military observers to get first-hand information regarding the activity and procedure of the Russian Army on the eastern front. Why, only recently when a group of our military observers arrived on one of the Balkan capitals, I believe it was Rumania, the Russians ordered them to leave immediately and almost physically threw them out. The representatives of our press who are permitted to go to Russia must remain in the confines of their hotel, which has been described by one of the returning correspondents as a concentration camp for the members of the American press. Only on rare occasions were they permitted to go outside the premises of the hotel and then only to view carefully prepared exhibits, at all times, under close surveillance by the Russian military police. They are permitted to send no releases to their papers in the States without having them carefully censored beforehand. They are extended none of the courtesies the Russian press enjoys in the United States. Premier Stalin holds no press conferences, there are no prepared hand-outs, and all the information that the press receives comes to them second-hand after it has been announced to the Russian people over the Soviet radio. Not even the American Red Cross or any of the other American relief organizations are permitted to enter the areas that are under control of the Russian military police, even though the areas may not be Russian.

Cooperation calls for reciprocity. Russia demands that we trust her and her people but she is ever suspicious and secretive in her activities. One naturally supposes that for all the courtesies and privileges extended by us to the Russian military press, and other personnel, similar or like privileges might be extended to our representatives in the same field, but alas, such is not the case.

In a word, as President Roosevelt declared in this Chamber on Saturday, January 6, 1945, in his State of the Nation address:

> International cooperation on which enduring peace must be based is not a one-way street. (Vol. 91, p. 95, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6, 1945.)

A MISSION FOR THE RESTORATION OF LITHUANIA AS A FREE AND INDEPENDENT NATION

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are here in Washington today a gathering of prominent Americans of Lithuanian ancestry, among them over 100 servicemen's mothers, all of them leaders in their communities. Their mission is to call upon the President and the Secretary of State to urge them to help restore Lithuania as a free and independent nation.

Mr. Speaker, the war news from Europe in the past few weeks is very encouraging and we hope the defeat and unconditional surrender of the Axis Powers is not far away. The end of the war will bring up many questions which have to be settled after hostilities cease. One of the important questions in which millions of people are interested is, What is to become of the small nations, particularly nations like brave Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, about whose fate we have not heard anything said, and gallant and courageous Poland?

Among the Declaration of Principles of the Atlantic Charter which outlines the aims of Great Britain and the United States in the war as proclaimed by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill is, "That they desire to see no territorial changes that are not in accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned," and another provisions is, "That they respect the right of all people to choose the form of government under which they will live and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them."

Former Secretary of State Hon. Cordell Hull in a speech delivered on September 12, 1943, reaffirmed the above principles wherein he said:

> Each sovereign nation, large or small, is in law and under the law the equal of every other nation; and all nations, large and small, which respect the rights of others, are entitled to freedom from outside interference in their internal affairs.

No people have a better right to self-government and independence than the people of the Republic of Lithuania. When war broke out they were an in-

dependent nation, at peace with the world and on friendly relations with their neighbors. They were not aggressors and did not do anything to bring on this terrible conflict.

The Republic of Lithuania was reestablished on February 16, 1918, as a modern nation under a constitutional government. For a short space of time their country enjoyed freedom and independence; they made great progress. Lithuania improved the living conditions of their people. Their farms were productive and the products thereof not only fed their own people but they contributed to the support of other nations. They constructed roads and bridges. Education was widespread and encouraged. Attendance in the elementary schools was compulsory. They erected beautiful churches and public institutions of higher learning. They were a peace-loving nation, happy and contented. They are now one of the conquered nations, suffering the terrible hardships of this war.

The Americans of Lithuanian descent, who number over a million of our people, have contributed their share toward making our Nation the greatest country in the world. They work in our factories, in the mines, and on the farms. They are enterprising and industrious. They rank high in the professional and business life of our Nation.

They have responded patriotically to every effort in helping to win this war and many thousands of their sons and daughters are serving in our armed forces. In nearly every one of their homes there is a service flag in the window. They dearly love freedom and liberty, for they know from the sufferings of their people what a priceless possession these liberties are.

They are fighting this war to rid the world of fascism and nazi-ism and all aggressors. They want to see all the nations, large and small, have the right to govern and rule themselves. I know it is the fervent hope and prayer of many millions of those who have suffered the tortures of this war, in the oppresssed countries, and many millions of our own citizens, that when this war is ended, those who will represent the nations at the peace conference will restore the small nations to their freedom and independence.

The policy of our Government heretofore has been not to recognize territories taken by force or conquest. This policy should apply to Lithuania as well as the other countries who have been freed recently from the yoke of the oppressor.

Lithuania and the other small nations will then take their rightful place among the family of nations and contribute their share toward peace, happiness, and prosperity of the world. This will help considerably to bring about and maintain a just and lasting peace.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. WICKERSHAM (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma), for 1 week, on account of important business in Oklahoma.

To Mr. HOCH, for March 23 and 24, on account of official business.

To Mr. GIBSON (at the request of Mr. BELL), indefinitely, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2126. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, March 24, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in open session at 10 a. m., on Saturday, March 24, 1945, in the committee room, 356 House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

342. A letter from the officer in charge of the American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

343. A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting a copy of the revised personnel requirements for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

344. A letter from the Director of the Office of War Information, transmitting a quarterly estimate of the personnel requirements covering the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

345. A letter from the Director of the Executive Office of the President of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

346. A letter from the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the fourth quarter of the fiscal year 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

347. A letter from the Director of the Office of Strategic Services, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

348. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged in a fire at naval base No. 2, Roseneath, Scotland, on October 12, 1944; to the Committee on Claims.

349. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of a fire in Quonset Hut E-172 at the amphibious training base, Camp Bradford, naval operating base, Norfolk, Va., on January 20, 1945; to the Committee on Claims.

350. A letter from the Administrator of United States Department of Labor, Wage and Hour, and Public Contracts Divisions, transmitting the annual report of Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, United States Department of Labor, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1944; to the Committee on Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2625. A bill to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with amendment (Rept. No. 362). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURCH: Committee on Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 2502. A bill readjusting the rates of postage on fourth-class mail matter, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2745. A bill to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1921; without amendment (Rept. No. 364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 528. A bill to amend sections 4, 7, and 17 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), for the purpose of extending the time in which amendatory contracts may be made, and for other related purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2687. A bill to grant the honorary rank of colonel to Edward J. Kelly, major and superintendent of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. S. 544. An act for the relief of Dave Hougardy; with amendment (Rept. No. 366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1487. A bill for the relief of Clifton L. Holmes; with amendment (Rept. No. 367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1953. A bill for the relief of Adolph Pfannenstiehl; with amendment (Rept. No. 368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2598. A bill for the relief of J. H. Atkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2697. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Ida Londinsky; with amendment (Rept. No. 370). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2701. A bill for the relief of Margaret J. Pow; without amendment (Rept. No. 371). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 2751. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay not to exceed $50 to apply to the cost of cemetery space for the burial of veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 2752. A bill to extend the law relating to perjury to the willful giving of contradictory statements under oath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2753. A bill to require a witness seeking immunity from prosecution under certain acts to claim his privilege against self-incrimination; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 2754. A bill to validate titles to certain lands conveyed by Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes and to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933, and to validate State court judgments in Oklahoma and judgments of the United States district courts of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 2755. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to the States for surveying their hospitals and public-health centers and for planning construction of additional facilities, and to authorize grants to assist in such construction; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr PHILBIN:

H. R. 2756. A bill to permit the naturalization of certain persons whose sons and daughters have served with the land or naval forces or the maritime services of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 2757. A bill to permit recipients of old-age assistance under the Social Security Act to perform any remunerative work they may be able to secure; to the Committee on Ways and Means

By Mr ANDREWS of New York:

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment, management, and perpetuation of the Kermit Roosevelt Fund; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution to quiet the titles of the respective States and others to lands beneath tidewaters and lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and to prevent further clouding of such titles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution providing a means whereby the State of California may undertake the operation and maintenance of the irrigation and hydroelectric-power features of the Central Valley project, upon agreeing to recompense the Federal Government therefor in the manner provided in the reclamation laws of the United States; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 203. Resolution to provide for the payment of expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 186; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take official cognizance of the inherent right of the people of Poland, as well as the people of other small nations, to determine the form and kind of their own government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to the end that the provisions for loans to returning veterans of World War No. 2 through designated agencies, such as banks, shall be liberalized, clarified, and simplified; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact Senate bill 181 and House bill 1296 into law, which bills refer to the grant of financial assistance by the Federal Government to the States for education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to make adequate appropriation immediately so that the coordinated plan for the control and use of the waters of the Missouri River Basin can be executed as expeditiously as is consistent with the public economy; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to act favorably on the Peterson bill (H. R. 5477) known as the seaman's bill of rights; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to adopt Senate Joint Resolution 8, proposing a constitutional amendment to control the Budget; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in opposition to certain bills affecting aviation and air commerce and providing for certain Federal aids in the construction and development of airports which would place municipalities in competition with each other and result in an economic waste of public funds; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in opposition to Senate bill 460 and House bill 1824, bills to create a Columbia Valley Authority; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 2758. A bill for the relief of Thomas V. Corey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 2759. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and enter judgment on the claim of the P. Dougherty Co. for the value of three wooden barges, which the War Production Board ordered scrapped, or disposed of, to salvage anchors, bells, and other metal equipment; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas:

H. R. 2760. A bill for the relief of John H. Jackson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2761. A bill for the relief of William F. Van Stienburg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2762. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bessie M. Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 2763. A bill for the relief of Fred Crago; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution authorizing the President to present a gold medal to James Edward West; to the Committee on the Library.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

243. By Mr. ANGELL: Memorial of the Forty-third Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, petitioning the Congress of the United States not to pass Senate bill 460 or House bill 1824 or any such legislation that will deprive the States and particularly the State of Oregon and its political subdivisions of rights now existing to control and use the waters within their borders; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

244. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the women's division of the Passaic County Republican League, Paterson, N. J., favoring proposal that men in the armed forces be represented by an accredited delegate at the United Nations Conference to be held in San Francisco next month; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

245. By Mr. CHURCH: Petition of Jessie D. Curry and 16 other citizens of Chicago and Evanston, Ill., urging the passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

246. Also, petition of Mrs. Henry Severance and sundry other citizens of Evanston and Chicago, Ill., urging the prevention of advertising by the alcoholic beverage industry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

247. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of Massachusetts Federation of Vegetable Growers' Association, urging consideration of the desirability of removal of fresh vegetables from price control in connection with renewal of price control regulations now under discussion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

248. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of L. S. Miller and 178 other citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

249. Also, petition of Mrs. Grace P. Bell and 51 other citizens of Homer, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

250. Also, petition of H. L. Febl and 41 other citizens of Parkton, Md., urging enact-

ment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

251. Also, petition of F. C. Louhoff, Jr., and 36 other citizens of Deal Island, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

252. Also, petition of Mrs. Anna L. Parsons and 25 other citizens of Baltimore, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

253. Also, petition of Mrs. Louise Burtner and 65 other citizens of Keedysville, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

254. Also, petition of R. Gordon Given and 39 other citizens of Preston, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

255. Also, petition of Mrs. H. B. Parsons and 33 other citizens of Govans, Baltimore, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

256. Also, petition of Mrs. H. C. Rawlings and 77 other citizens of Greensboro, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

257. Also, petition of Mrs. H. Roy Doyle and 42 other citizens of Rockville, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

258. Also, petition of Lena F. Davis and 561 other citizens of Connecticut, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

259. Also, petition of Mrs. Frank R. Wilson and 2,300 other citizens of Indiana, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

260. By Mr. GWINN of New York: Petition of 1,428 citizens of Westchester County, protesting against the enactment of House bill 2082 or any other prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

261. By Mr. MOTT: Petition of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the Congress of the United States not to pass Senate bill 460 or House bill 1824; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

262. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Greenville Post, No. 3, of the American Legion, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of legislation providing for universal military training for the youth of the country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

263. Also, petition of Saluda Post, No. 65, of the American Legion, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of legislation providing for universal military training for the youth of the country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, MARCH 24, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. RAMSPECK.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

MARCH 24, 1945.

I hereby designate the Honorable ROBERT RAMSPECK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of glory? The Lord strong and mighty. He is the King of glory. Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and the King of glory shall come in. Who is this King of glory? The Lord of hosts; He is the King of glory.

Thou who didst set Thy face steadfastly to go to Jerusalem to affirm Thy spiritual kingship, give us power of will to forsake the dark things of mind, the fickleness of the crowd, and to accept Thy passion for the multitudes of men. Endow us with that personal force that shall give wise guardianship to our Republic. We pray Thee to clothe us with that inner strength that shall direct and inspire us to cultivate the virtues of self-control, diligence, and loyalty to our mission which are reflected in the crown of Jesus. When the pathway of duty is long and hard, remind us of those witnesses who looked with deep concern upon the sorrow and the consecration of our Master and caught His vision, saying, "Thou hast conquered, O Galilean." Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests for special orders:

First, that on today I may address the House for 15 minutes following the conclusion of the legislative program of the day.

Second, that on April 16 I may address the House for 40 minutes after the legislative program of the day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 40 minutes on April 16 following the special order granted the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SOLDIERS' OPINION OF WORK-OR-FIGHT BILL

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter this morning signed by a group of nine soldiers in the European theater which I wish to read, and I should like to have the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs:

FRANCE, *March 17, 1945.*

Representative FOREST A. HARNESS,
Representative from Indiana,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE CONGRESSMAN: Just read a short item on your stand on the so-called work-or-jail bill in Stars and Stripes.

We heartily endorse your stand, and urge you to keep up the fight. If this bill passes, it will mean another link forged in the chain of regimentation that is wringing the neck of the American people.

Carry on.

Respectfully.

It must come as a shock to the proponents of work-or-jail legislation to learn that they cannot pull the wool over the eyes of our fighting men. These soldiers can think and think straight; and they deeply resent this move to shackle and make galley slaves of their fathers and brothers while they are fighting and dying for human liberties and the preservation of free government.

ON TO BERLIN

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, the American armies have crossed the Rhine and the battle cry is "On to Berlin."

SALARY INCREASES FOR EMPLOYEES OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make an announcement for the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH], chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. We have under consideration H. R. 2071, reclassification of salary schedules for the Post Office Department.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH] wants every Member of Congress to know that on Tuesday he has set aside a field day for House Members to appear and endorse or to give their attitude on this bill.

May I say that H. R. 2071 does three things: First, it gives a $400 increase to practically every person in the Post Office Service; second, it establishes the longevity principle. Both of these things have been approved by the House in the past. Third, it seeks to remove many of the inequalities and inequities that have prevailed in the Postal Service for many years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter received from a constituent.

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Edward A. O'Neal, president, American Farm Bureau Federation, also a resolution adopted by the American Farm Bureau Federation endorsing the proposals of the Bretton Woods Conference.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a short editorial.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by the Minister of Lithuania, and also copy of an address made by Anthony A. Olis, president of the American Lithuanian Mission.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, to include in one an article and in the other an editorial.

Mr. RYTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted by the Polish-American clergy of the diocese of Hartford, State of Connecticut.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted by the Illinois General Assembly.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Akron Beacon Journal on the death of former Senator Charles Dick.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Record.

Mr. O'KONSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a memorial.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have heretofore been given unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an address of John F. Victory, secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. This address runs a little over the allowable amount. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that this will cost $138.80. I ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the RECORD notwithstanding the estimate of the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY], I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article on vocational training for handicapped veterans. This exceeds the allowable amount, requiring approximately 3½ pages at a cost of $182. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRADLEY] may have permission to extend this matter in the RECORD notwithstanding the estimate of the Printer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

There was no objection.

HARDY H. BRYANT

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 2005) for the relief of Hardy H. Bryant be restored to the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances; to include in one a resolution adopted by the King County central committee of the State of Washington; in one to include a letter written to me by a naval officer; and in one to include an article from Liberty. The article from Liberty exceeds the quota. I have a statement from the Public Printer to the effect that the printing of this article will cost $78. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the article be printed notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a most comprehensive statement made before the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation this morning by Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. I am going to make this unusual request. This statement is so important that I think every Member ought to read it. It is going to run a little beyond the requirement, and the Public Printer estimates the extra cost to be $156.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

GENERAL PATTON

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to renew my unanimous-consent request that a telegram be sent to General Patton congratulating him and his glorious army for the magnificent showing they are now making on the western front in Europe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATIVE TO THE MAKING OF TREATIES

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing, I report (Rept. No. 373) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 36) authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings on a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties, held before subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary, during the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 10,000 additional copies of the hearings on a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties, held before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives during the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand, this is a unanimous report from the Committee on Printing, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is a member of that committee and is present.

Mr. JARMAN. That is correct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORTHWESTERN BANDS OF SHOSHONE INDIANS *v.* THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report (Rept. No. 374) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Res. 198) authorizing the printing of the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, numbered 63, delivered during the October term, 1944, in the case of the Northwestern Bands of Shoshone Indians, petitioners, against the United States, on writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims, as a House document, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, No. 63, delivered during the October term, 1944, in the case of the *Northwestern Bands of Shoshone Indians, petitioners*, v. *The United States*, on writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims, be printed as a House document.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the distinguished acting minority leader.

Mr. MICHENER. This is a similar report to the one the gentleman just submitted, and is a unanimous report from the Committee on Printing, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is present.

Mr. JARMAN. That is correct, and the same applies to the one I shall next present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HISTORICAL STATEMENT OF THE LAWS ENACTED AND THE REGULATIONS PROMULGATED RELATING TO VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report (Rept. No. 375) back favorably without amendment a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 38) authorizing the printing of the historical statement of the laws enacted and the regulations promulgated relating to veterans and their dependents, with a complete statement regarding expenditures for hospital and domiciliary construction, as a House document and providing for the printing of additional copies thereof, and ask for immediate consideration of the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the historical statement of the laws enacted and the regulations promulgated relating to veterans and their dependents, with a complete statement regarding expenditures for hospital and domiciliary construction, be printed as a House document, and that 91,300 additional copies shall be printed, of which 66,300 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives, 20,000 for the use of the Senate, 2,000 for the use of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of the House of Representatives, 2,000 for the House document room, and 1,000 for the Senate document room.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The conditions prevailing with reference to this resolution are the same as to the preceding one?

Mr. JARMAN. Exactly. The gentleman is quite right.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, my colleague on the committee.

Mr. RICH. May I say for the benefit of the Members of the House that while we think there are plenty of copies of this document, yet we believe the demand for it is going to be so great that we could not afford to print any fewer, owing to the fact that the more times this document is printed the more it will cost.

Mr. JARMAN. That is true, despite the fact that we did considerably cut the number requested originally by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This is going to be one of the most valuable documents we Members of the House could get hold of, because it gives all the veterans' laws and regulations down to date. It will save an unlimited amount of correspondence with the individuals and organizations such as the veterans' organizations at home that are writing and asking their Congressmen for the laws and regulations on these various points. It is the finest compilation of its kind I have ever seen.

Mr. RICH. We had a hard time trying to cut it down, did we not?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes. I wanted you to give us the full amount, 195,000 copies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE LATE JAMES V. HEIDINGER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to appoint one additional member on the committee representing the House to attend the funeral of our late friend and colleague, Judge Heidinger.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints as an additional member of the funeral committee the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

There was no objection.

CARE OF WOUNDED SERVICEMEN

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the wounded recover. Under Secretary of War Patterson recently stated 98 percent of the wounded men recover. This record has never been equaled in any war. Before the advent of aseptic surgery and good care most of the wounded died. Even on Iwo Jima 70 percent of the wounded are back on duty. That is a marvelous record. I want to give full credit to the medical division with the first-aid man right up in the battle line using sulfa drugs, blood plasma, and other means in saving life. The doctors and nurses are also doing heroic work in saving lives. It has the best record of all wars or armies in the world. It is considerable comfort to know that the wounded men have such good care and recover so rapidly. This morning's press stated that General Patton crossed the Rhine without the loss of a man. The large number of wounded that was reported immediately following the Battle of the Bulge has decreased. Most of the men have recovered and are back in line of duty. All praise and glory to the excellent work being done by our medical service in the Army.

HARRY BRIDGES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am very much concerned with the literature we are all receiving from the Harry Bridges Victory Committee, which is located at 1930 F Street in Washington, trying to get the Members of the House to permit this Australian, who is not naturalized, to remain in this country. His record today may be all right, during the past year or so, but I want you to recall the record of Harry Bridges for the years up until the last 2 years. He is on his good behavior now. Bridges' committees are doing everything to keep Communists in this country. I say we want to drive the Communists out of America. There is no room for them here. They are going to tear down our Nation. That is their object. We just do not want any of that here in America. We want true, sound Americans. We want people who believe in America and American form of government, who believe in our laws, and who obey them. Communists tear down our laws, they disobey our laws, and they want to destroy our Government. We want our Government and we do not want Communists.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief editorial.

THE LATE HENRY ELLSWORTH BARBOUR

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I, the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER],

the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] be each permitted to address the House for 1 minute in respect to the recent passing of the Honorable Henry Ellsworth Barbour, a member of this legislative body during the Sixty-sixth, Sixty-seventh, Sixty-eighth, Sixty-ninth, Seventieth, Seventy-first, and Seventy-second Congresses, and that each of us be permitted to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, it has become my sad duty to announce the passing of the Honorable Henry Ellsworth Barbour, a former and most distinguished Member of this legislative body.

As one who has during my entire adult life known him well, admired and loved him for his great ability and splendid personal qualities, his passing brings to me personal regrets, as I know it does to the thousands who were his personal friends, more profound than I can find words to measure.

Harry Barbour, Mr. Speaker, was an unusual figure, combining within himself qualities seldom found even among those acknowledged by all to have been of the great. A statesman of rare understanding, an able debater, ever alert to denounce iniquity, uncompromising in his opposition to that which was wrong, he was at the same time essentially a kindly and gentle individual, one quick to respond to the cry of the afflicted, one always among the first to extend a helping hand to those in distress.

Elected to the Sixty-sixth Congress, Harry Barbour served continuously in this body for 14 years, achieving a success in legislative halls seldom equaled in our country's annals. For his expert management of legislation as the chairman of the Military Affairs Subcommittee of the House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations, he will be long remembered for his devotion to the cause of national defense. As we contemplate the horrors of this terrible war in which our country is now involved, the American people can well pause for a moment in respectful silence as a deserved tribute to this man who served them so effectively and well when the force of public opinion was raging the other way.

At a later date, Mr. Speaker, I will, with the indulgence of the House, speak more at length upon the times, the character, and the accomplishment of this great American. Till then, when the time is more propitious, permit me to close my instant remarks with a prayer on my lips that his soul may rest in peace, his memory enshrined in the hearts of his fellow citizens and countless friends whom he served so faithfully and well down through his many useful and active years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I served with Henry E. Barbour during the 14 years he was a Member of this House, beginning with the Sixty-sixth and terminating with the Seventy-first Congress. I have been intimately acquainted with him and his work since he first came to Congress. His service was creditable to him and to the district which sent him here. We all have a right to take a just pride in the men of fine quality who represent the various States of the country in this House. Mr. Barbour was of that type. Mr. Barbour, as a man and as a Congressman, had my highest respect and affection.

In mental equipment, personality, character, and training he was prepared to give, and did give, to this Congress a fine, useful, and patriotic service. In his concluding years here, no Member could think of the members of the California delegation without Henry Barbour being among the first in his thoughts.

He leaves a widow and two fine sons, whom their friends call Jack and Dick. Each of the sons is commissioned in the military service of his country. Dick is now confined in a hospital in England, recovering from a wound suffered in a tank battle in France in the early days of this year. Mrs. Barbour has been an invalid for several years, during which, with a marvelous good will and courage, her cheery disposition and fortitude have been an inspiration to all who know her.

This little family has left to them many memories of a husband and father they can recall with happiness and pride.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker—

Friends are in life's exchange the sterling coin,
True tender for all the rarest forms of joy,
The only pauper is the friendless man.

Henry E. Barbour, whom we all called Harry, was my friend in every sense of the word. He was the friend of all who knew him. I have never known any man in whom I had greater confidence or for whom I had more respect and affection.

We came here at the same time at the beginning of the Sixty-sixth Congress. We lived at the same hotel for 14 years. The Barbours had two fine boys of approximately the same age as our two children. In short, we had other things than our congressional work in common.

Harry Barbour was an unusual person. His service in Congress was outstanding. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Affairs of the Appropriations Committee, he was well-known for his belief in, and insistence upon, an adequate Army properly equipped. He was a good lawyer, forceful as an advocate, and thorough in study and research. Many a law on the Federal statute books is a better law because Harry Barbour helped to write it.

Present Members of Congress who did not serve with him have missed much. The older Members are genuinely grieved at his passing. He had just pride in his charming wife and family. Mr. Speaker, I join with the others in expressing to them our sympathy.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the distinguished majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I join my friend the gentleman from Michigan in everything he said. I am sorry to hear of the death of Harry Barbour. I remember him well. When I came here, he was one of the outstanding Members of the House. Going back to 1930, 1931, and 1932, I remember well when the effort was made to sharply reduce the Army from 12,000 officers to 8,000 and to reduce the enlisted men and the R. O. T. C. My friend from Michigan remembers it also. I can remember Harry Barbour leading the fight on your side, and I remember I led the fight on my side, and we prevented the reduction being made at that time. His death is a serious loss. He was a great American.

Mr. MICHENER. I remember it very well.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the old Congress Hall Hotel family where my friends, EARL MICHENER, who has just paid his tribute, and his family, and Henry Barbour and his family, lived many years. We called him Harry, not Henry. Many other Members of Congress lived there. The Micheners and the Barbours came the same year, I believe, to the Sixty-sixth Congress, 26 years ago. Congress Hall was where the southern part of the New House Office Building is now located. We not only roomed there, but also had our meals there. No person could so disguise or hide his true character as to avoid its discovery by colleagues living so closely and intimately together as we did during those years of happy association.

Henry Barbour, or Harry as we called him, was a statesman with far, clear vision, a patriot dedicated to his country's service. With rare charm of personality he attached and held the friendship of others, and gave to them more than he received.

His copartner in his service, his inspiration, was his wife, Mary, to whom the sympathy and love of every one of the old Congress Hall Hotel crowd yet living go today; deep, genuine, sympathy, and love from those whose sense of great personal loss in the passing of Harry Barbour brings them close to her in this hour of her bereavement. The same sympathy, love, and deep interest go out to the fine boys of that family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the ones who knew Harry Barbour best loved him most. He was a Christian gentleman. He was a legislator of ability and a man of supreme courage and unquestioned integrity.

One of the hardest battles I ever had on this floor was with Harry Barbour over the construction of the Shiloh Road, connecting the Shiloh Battlefield in Tennessee with the Corinth National Cemetery near Corinth, Miss. When he shook hands with me for the last time he said, "John, of all things you have ever accomplished I think the outstanding one

was that one when you put that Shiloh Road proposition over on us in spite of all we could do."

Harry Barbour was with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] and me on a long trip visiting our outposts in Puerto Rico and Alaska. I learned to know him more intimately then than I did on the floor of the House, and the more intimately I knew him the more fond of him I became.

He had two splendid sons, both in this war. One of them was recently wounded in action. We extend to his elegant wife and to the remaining members of his family our heartfelt sympathy in this great bereavement; and pray that those patriotic sons may return safely at the close of this war to contribute to the future growth and development of this great Republic by walking in the footsteps of their illustrious father.

"His life was gentle and the elements so mixed in him that Nature might stand up and say to all the world: 'This was a man.'"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve on the Committee on Appropriations from the time I came here in 1923 until Harry Barbour left. For the last 4 years I served under him as chairman of the Military Subcommittee. He was a fine American, deeply devoted, exceedingly devoted to the interests of the Army and of national defense. He left a record that any man could be proud of.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the death of Hon. Henry E. Barbour, former Representative from California, saddens all those who have been interested in the cause of progressive government in our State and the Nation during the past three decades.

Harry Barbour was one of the gallant host of liberal Republicans who worked under the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt and HIRAM JOHNSON to raise the standard of living of the American people and to liberate the government of California from private corporate control in the early part of this century.

His fellow citizens in the San Joaquin Valley recognized his contributions to good government by electing him to membership in Congress.

He served in this House with distinction and honor, and his record in Washington added to his permanent reputation as one of the most highly respected citizens of California.

I know that every Member of the present Congress joins me in expressing deep sympathy to his widow and surviving relatives.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and deeply grieved to learn of the death of our former distinguished colleague and good friend, Hon. Henry Ellsworth Barbour, of Fresno, Calif. He served his district, State, and our country with great ability, unswerving fidelity, and great distinction for 14 years in this honorable body. His colleagues in the House honored him time and again. He was chairman of the subcommittee handling appropriations for the Army.

He won and held the esteem of all his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I have not during all my years in the House served with a man who was fairer, more kindly, courteous, or gracious. He was one of God's real noblemen.

While mere words are futile when death strikes a loved one, his lovely wife and friends must find some consolation in the fact he lived a noble, splendid, and useful life, and had the love and respect of all those who knew him.

I am reminded Mr. Barbour and I came to Congress at the same time. Death and the fortunes or misfortunes of politics have thinned the ranks of the 435 men and women who were sworn in with Mr. Barbour and myself. Fewer than 10 of the 435 are now Members of the House.

I could hope for no finer tribute when I pass on than we can truthfully pay Henry Barbour today.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I heard, with deep regret, this morning of the death of my esteemed friend and former California colleague, Hon. Henry E. Barbour, and I join with my colleagues from the California delegation and the Members of the House who served with him in such highly deserved tribute to a man who served well his country, his State, and his district.

Harry Barbour, as we affectionately referred to him, served with distinction as chairman of the subcommittee of the War Department on the Committee on Appropriations. The able and fair manner in which he presented legislation necessary to meet the requirements of the United States Army and our national defense won for him the confidence and respect of every Member of Congress.

I extend my sympathy to his bereaved wife and family.

Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, announcement of the passing away of our former colleague, Henry Ellsworth Barbour, of California, brings to mind the fine patriotic service he performed during his 14 years of membership in this body.

His service as chairman of the military section of the Appropriations Committee was outstanding in character. His intense interest in building a strong military force found expression in his every word and act. He was constantly alert to the needs of the Army. He was always well informed in all that pertained to the welfare of our Army, strong and logical in presenting his viewpoint. He believed that a strong and up-to-date Army was a source of security to our Nation, too important to be considered in any but the most serious manner. He never failed in his allegiance to the cause that was so near to his heart.

Quiet in manner, friendly in spirit, strong in character, he enjoyed the friendship and good will of the entire membership of the House who had the privilege of serving with him. His life and his worthwhile accomplishments will ever be a monument to his memory. The sympathy of a host of friends is extended to his bereaved wife and other members of his family.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege during a long experience as a member of the Appropriations Committee to have known many outstanding men who specialized in that field of public service and I have never known anyone who more completely typified my ideal of statesmanship in that chosen sphere than Henry Ellsworth Barbour, whose death we mourn today. He gave his magnificent best to the country he loved and it was in the Appropriations Committee room and on the floor of this House in charge of Army appropriation measures that his talents shone most luminously. He succeeded Dan Anthony, of Kansas, as chairman of the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee at a time when America was at peace with all of the world and it seemed that nothing could disturb the trusting confidence of our people in a warless future.

Yet he had the vision to discern that this placidity could not last and while millions of our people were decrying military preparedness as undesirable and an unnecessary drain on the Nation's resources, he took an advanced position in favor of national defense and held unswervingly to the line in the face of congressional indifference and a derogatory public opinion. Viewed from what has happened since, the speeches made by Mr. Barbour in those days now appear as models of wisdom and foresight.

I have never known a member of our Appropriations Committee who exhibited more genuine managerial ability in handling a bill on the floor than Mr. Barbour. That I think was because he was always so genuine and sincere, so human and so mindful of the rights and views of others. His was a very gracious personality and he enjoyed the full confidence and respect of all of the Members of the House.

Mr. Barbour was born in New York, the State of Horace Greeley. He followed Greeley's advice and went west, locating in Fresno in 1902. There he met a charming girl, Mary D. Meux, who in due course became Mrs. Barbour, his companion and helpmate through the long and distinguished career that unfolded before him. To her and their two sons, John and Richard, we today extend our sympathy and love. Vignetted on my mind, as I listened this afternoon to the outpouring of eulogies in remembrance of Mr. Barbour, was a tall, well-groomed, prematurely gray colleague from California whom I knew when I first became a member of the Appropriations Committee and as I recalled the warmth and graciousness of his genial personality I thought of these words of our Hoosier poet, James Whitcomb Riley:

He is not dead—he is just away,
With a cheery smile and a wave of the hand
He has vanished into an unknown land.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, some of the Members of the House who are senior in service are saddened today by the announcement of the death of a former distinguished Member of the House from California.

Those of us who were in the House 15 years or more ago remember well the pleasant personality and striking appearance of the man we affectionately called Harry Barbour. He was a serious-minded man, one who devoted himself painstakingly to the tasks presented to him.

During the latter part of his service Mr. Barbour was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Affairs of the Appropriations Committee and was always very thorough in his work. The membership of the House relied on his statements and representations with absolute confidence. They understood his devotion to duty and they knew that he had the capacity to dispose satisfactorily of the difficult problems which came before him.

Of Harry Barbour it could be truly said he was an honorable man and his word was taken at its face value. I regret to learn of the passing of the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I have learned with real regret of the death of Hon. Henry Ellsworth Barbour, of California, in his sixty-ninth year.

I remember him well here during my early years in the Congress. I remember him as a fellow member of the Appropriations Committee and as an outstanding chairman of its subcommittee in charge of appropriations for the War Department.

An able lawyer, a fine legislator, an influential Member of this House from the Sixty-sixth to the Seventy-second Congresses, both inclusive, he was universally liked and respected by his colleagues.

I recall with great appreciation the helping hand which he was good enough to extend to me as a newly elected Member of this body.

I know that all who served with him here in the Congress join with his wide circle of friends in sympathy to his family, in sorrow in his passing.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and grieved today to learn of the death of a former honored Member of this House, Harry Barbour, of California. I was proud to call him friend. During the 14 years he served with us he contributed much to the welfare of the people of this country.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved to learn of the passing of Henry E. Barbour. I served in the House with him and knew him and had an affectionate regard for him. He was a man of exceptional ability, but more than that he was a man of character and a personality that drew men to him. He was a statesman, not a politician, and served this country faithfully and well. God bless his memory.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere regret that I have just learned of the passing of our former friend and colleague, Hon. Henry E. Barbour, of California. He was a kind, friendly, and congenial gentleman who had a host of friends in the House of Representatives. As has heretofore been stated, he first came to Congress on March 4, 1919, and served for seven consecutive terms, retiring on March 4, 1933.

When I became a member of this body in 1927 Harry Barbour, as he was affectionately known, was pointed out to me as one of the able leaders of this House. He was at that time, or possibly a little later, chairman of the War Department Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I recall very well that he succeeded another well-known statesman, the late Dan Anthony, of Kansas, as chairman of that important subcommittee. I am sure that Members will recall that he was a strong advocate of military preparedness at a time when it took courage, vision, and foresight to take that position.

Let me add that I had the pleasure of knowing our late lamented friend more or less intimately. He was not only a tireless and effective worker, but he was one of the most affable, courteous, and kindly gentlemen it has been my privilege to know. I feel sure that all who knew him will join in expressing genuine sorrow at his passing.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine sorrow that I learn of the passing of a former colleague, Harry Ellsworth Barbour, at his home in Fresno on Wednesday, at the age of 67.

Mr. Barbour served with us from the Sixty-seventh to and including the Seventy-second Congress, and at the time of his retirement was chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations. Mr. Barbour was an indefatigable worker, a man of splendid judgment, and a fine character that won for him a host of friends. While a member of this body Harry, as we affectionately called him, was one of the leaders on the Republican side and we who had the privilege of serving with him recall with personal satisfaction his sterling Americanism and rugged individuality. The city of Fresno, the State of California, and the Nation are the better for his having served in this body. After a long and honorable service, both as citizen and public servant, he has gone to a well-earned rest that will not be broken by regrets.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ADAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a joint resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire.

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Government furnishing proper burials for American soldiers.

KANSAS FIRST IN RED CROSS DRIVE

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, it is with pardonable pride that I call the attention of the House to the fact that the State of Kansas has been first to reach its Red Cross quota this year; not only reach it but exceed it. Once again Kansas makes a record which other States might try to follow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. I take this time, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of the day and any changes he may have in mind.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are two bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia which were to be called up on Monday. They are noncontroversial. If the House has no objection, they will be called up now.

Then the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill will continue. Not for the purpose of pressing but to advise the membership, if we dispose of the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill today, there are three resolutions from the Committee on Rules with reference to investigations which I would like to have called up. Aside from conference reports, that disposes of all legislative business before the recess.

I am advised by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency that the conferees will meet on Monday afternoon in connection with the Commodity Credit Corporation bill. I am hopeful there will be an agreement reached. If that is true, I assume there will be no controversy about the acceptance of the conference report because the only issue involved is the difference between $2,000,000,000, as passed by the House, and $1,500,000,000, as passed by the Senate. I am hopeful that whatever agreement the conferees will arrive at will be satisfactory to both Chambers.

Whether or not any agreement can be reached on the war manpower bill now in conference, I do not know. I have information that there is a possibility. I see present the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], who is one of the conferees, and he is in a better position than I to give the House information about that matter.

Mr. THOMASON. The conferees on the so-called work-or-fight, or work-or-jail, bill will resume their sessions at 1 o'clock. In connection with what the majority leader said, there is a possibility, perhaps, of agreement; but I will say there is not a probability within the next day or two. I will say that at the moment there is no agreement anywhere near in sight within the next day or two.

Mr. MICHENER. I take it the gentleman has hopes but no prospects.

Mr. THOMASON. That expresses it pretty well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the majority leader if he does not think the possibility of saving a half a billion dollars is worth working for? That is the difference between the House and the Senate in the matter of the Commodity Credit Corporation. We should stay here all summer if by so doing we could accomplish the saving of half a billion dollars.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know my friend does not want to put the House or the Congress in an erroneous light. This is not an appropriation; it provides for a bond issue. Most of that money comes back, with the exception of the subsidy payment.

I believe the chances are, from information I have received, that the conferees may compromise somewhere between the amounts of the two Houses.

Mr. RICH. We have been paying out money all the time. I hope we get something in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

SALE OF COAL BY THE SHORT TON IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2745) to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1921.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this come with a unanimous report from the Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The distinguished acting minority leader has asked if this bill is reported from the committee unanimously. It is.

The purpose of the bill is simply to change the sale weight of a ton of coal from the long ton to the short ton. In every State of the Union coal is sold by the short ton—2,000 pounds. In the District of Columbia it is sold by the long ton—2,240 pounds. The Solid Fuels Administration desires to synchronize the program and to have the weight of a ton of coal in the District of Columbia the same as in the States. April 1 is the deadline. That is why we are calling it up today.

Mr. MICHENER. Members of the District Committee on the minority side are present, and state they do not desire to be heard but are in favor of granting the request of the chairman at once.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this apply only to coal?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; it applies to the sale of coal in the District of Columbia.

Mr. RICH. It used to be that they bought coal by the long ton—2,240 pounds. We now buy it by the short ton. Since John Lewis had the strike last year we have to pay a dollar a ton more and get the short ton; so coal is going up higher and higher. You have got to be careful or the people will not be able to buy it pretty soon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1921, be, and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. When any commodity is sold by weight it shall be net weight. When any commodity is sold by the ton, it shall be understood to mean 2,000 pounds, avoirdupois."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on April 1, 1945.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING HONORARY RANK OF COLONEL TO EDWARD J. KELLY, MAJOR AND SUPERINTENDENT OF THE METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2687) to grant the honorary rank of colonel to Edward J. Kelly, major and Superintendent of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this come with a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. RANDOLPH. It does; and the bill is sponsored by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON]. It does not change the rate of pay of the Superintendent of Police but only gives him an honorary rank for the 39 years of service he has rendered the District in law enforcement.

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON], the author of the bill.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I introduced this bill as a member of the District of Columbia Committee and as a member of the subcommittee having to do with police and firemen. For some 35 years the rank of Superintendent of the Metropolitan Police force in Washington has been that of major and Superintendent. At the time of the creation of this rank the police force of the metropolitan district consisted of some 700 men. Today this number has increased to 1,800 if at full strength.

This bill was introduced by me at the suggestion of no one. At my request it was reviewed by Mr. Keech, District counsel, before its introduction and it does not call for any increase in salary whatsoever and should not be construed as such.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman think we ought to make Kelly a general?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I know the affection that the gentleman has for Mr. Kelly, and you will no doubt personally call him by that title.

Mr. SHAFER. I do have a lot of affection for him, and I am for this legislation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know of anything that has irritated me quite so much as the picture that appeared in the paper the other night of the arraignment of a murderer and the chief of police making a social function out of it. I think it was terribly disgusting and degrading, and I shall have to object.

DRAFTING OF FARMERS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House to what is happening in reference to some of these draft boards and their continuing to draft much-needed farmers.

Here is a farmer who farms 380 acres of land—80 acres of potatoes, 40 acres of sugar beets, 60 acres of alfalfa, and 40 acres of cotton. This man also has 200 head of beef cattle, 900 acres of range, and 160 acres of grain.

The United States Department of Agriculture War Board recommended deferment of this man. By a vote of 2 to 1 the appeal board left him in I–A.

The draft board is drafting this man under these conditions. Certainly there must be some kind of orders going out to the draft boards and these orders are bad for the man who is trying to operate a farm.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the current issue of Life magazine on the subject of un-American activities.

DRAFTING OF FARMERS

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I come from a manufacturing and industrial district. An army fights and moves on its stomach today just the same as it ever did.

Mr. Speaker, I have reached the conclusion that we are going to have to let the farmers get tires and gasoline in order to get their farm produce and food to the market so that it may be spread out for the people of this Nation. I think the quicker we get started on that the better. When the Yankees got into Georgia and cut off the Confederate life line, the food supply, the sword courtesy at Appomattox soon took place and that is as good an illustration as any that ever happened in history. It is just as important now as it then was, and unless we manage to permit the food that is being raised back on the farms all over America to get to where it can be distributed throughout this Nation, we will still be wondering what is the matter with food production and our ability to get it where it belongs.

I am not a farmer but whether local boards or authority heads shall attend to this I am convinced that has got to happen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and to include statements issued by the American Labor Party in each.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the equal-rights amendment.

DODGE GROUP STRIKES

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, the press today, with a Chicago date line of March 23, carries this item:

DODGE GROUP STRIKES; ANOTHER ENDS WALK-OUT

As 38 workers in the cylinder-barrel assembly department of the Dodge Chicago plant returned to work today, 53 other employees in another department went on strike. Today's new strike was the one hundred and twenty-fifth at the huge war plant, where engines for B-29 Superfortresses are made, since December 1942.

Mr. Speaker, these are days of prayer that the war will soon end victoriously. I hope that patriotic Americans will include in their prayers over the week end, and that these 53 striking employees will include in their prayers, the hope that this will be the last strike during the war and that this strike will end by Monday.

VETERANS' HOSPITALS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PHILBIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1946

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2689) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2689, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee last rose, the Clerk had read down to and including line 6 on page 40 of the bill. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

For all expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590g–590q), and the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1281–1407) (except the provisions of sections 201, 202, 303, 381, and 383 and the provisions of titles IV and V), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals; $290,000,000, together with $10,000,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation "Parity payments" in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944, in all, $300,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1946, for compliance with programs under said provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, pursuant to the provisions of the 1945 programs carried out during the period July 1, 1944, to December 31, 1945, inclusive, and, in addition, $12,500,000 for making additional payments on an acreage and pound basis for harvesting the War Food Administrator to be necessary for an adequate supply of such seeds, and seeds of grasses and legumes determined by $29,750,000 for making payments pursuant to section 5 of the act of December 23, 1944 (Public Law 551): *Provided*, That not to exceed $21,911,200 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs; but not more than $5,382,103 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, Agricultural Adjustment Agency": *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for the functions assigned to the Agricultural Adjustment Agency pursuant to the Executive Order (No. 9069) of February 23, 1942, shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State or county information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for salaries and other administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1946 programs of soil-building practices and soil- and water-conservation practices, under the act of February 29, 1936, as amended, and programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; but the payments or grants under such program shall be conditioned upon the utilization of land with respect to which such payments or grants are to be made, in conformity with farming practices which will encourage and provide for soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices in the most practical and effective manner and adapted to conditions in the several States, as determined and approved by the State committee of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency for the respective States: *Provided further*, That no part of such amounts shall be available after the end of the current fiscal year for salaries and other administrative expenses except for payment of obligations therefor incurred prior to the end of such year: *Provided further*, That the Secretary, may, in his discretion, from time to time transfer to the General Accounting Office such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses of the General Accounting Office in auditing payments under this item: *Provided further*, That such amount shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary in the 1945, 1946, and 1947 programs under said act of February 29, 1936, as amended: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department of Agriculture, the War Food Administration, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department or Administration shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 11, 1919 (18 U. S. C. 201), to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this act for the War Food Administration or any of its constituent agencies shall be paid out for the salary, per diem allowance, or expenses of any person after it is determined by the War Food Administrator that such person has, personally or by letter, demanded that a farmer join the triple-A program as a condition of draft deferment or for the granting of a priority certificate for any rationed article or commodity. Hearings on charges filed with the War Food Administrator shall be held and decision made within 30 days after such charges are filed with him.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLANNAGAN: On page 49, line 12, strike out "$21,911,200" and insert "$25,000,000"; and in line 15, after the semicolon, strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 16 and 17 down to and including the word "Agency" in line 17.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is not adopted, I am afraid our triple-A program is going to be seriously crippled and crippled at a time when we need the program most. I speak seriously. I am alarmed over what is likely to happen if this amendment is not adopted.

Let me give you a picture of the situation that exists. Last year the triple A administered $312,500,000, broken down as follows: Payments made under the soil-conservation program, $290,000,000; funds diverted for the same purpose, $10,000,000; and the seed program, $12,500,000, making a total of $312,500,000.

The administrative expenses for the Washington office and the State offices were fixed at $24,250,000 last year. This has been cut in the bill to $21,911,200, and yet the work of the A. A. A. has been increased. This cut is brought about largely by limiting the expenses of the Washington and State offices to $5,383,103, which is a decrease of $2,588,768 under the $7,94£,965 allowed last year. I said the work of the triple A has been increased, and it has. This year the A. A. A. will administer the following funds:

1. Payments under soil-conservation program	$300,000,000
2. Payments under the flax program	30,000,000
3. Payments under the seed program	12,500,000
Total	342,500,000

Now, the flax program alone will cost in the neighborhood of two and a half million dollars. There are approximately 250,000 flax growers. It will take approximately $2 per farm to supervise the program.

Now remember last year we had $24,500,000 to administer the program. This has been cut to $21,911,200, with a limitation on the amount that can be spent for the State offices and the Washington office of $5,382,103, which is $2,588,768 under what the administrative expenses of the offices in the States and the Washington office cost last year. If this limitation is not removed the State offices will have to be combined or regional offices set up. The great trouble is that the fund for administrative purposes has been reduced $2,588,800. If you take out the limitation and preserve the present status of the State offices and the Washington office, then you will have reduced the administrative fund for the country set-up by something over two and one-half million dollars. That is no solution of the problems unless you raise the fund to $25,000,000 as provided for in the amendment I introduced.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. The result of the gentleman's amendment would be to take more money away from the farmer and give it to the bureaucrats who would be on the pay roll. Would that not be the effect of it?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Far from it. It would simply provide funds to enable those in charge to efficiently administer the program. Although we have greatly increased the work, my amendment would increase the administrative expenses but very little.

Now, my colleagues, remember this, had it not been for your State, county, and community committeemen, I do not believe that the war food program could have been put across. The burden of our war food program has been placed on the A. A. A. They have broken it down to State committeemen, county committeemen, community committeemen. Now, what have these men been doing? All the quotas are fixed by these men, your county committeemen and your precinct committeemen, under the supervision of the State committeemen, who work under the general supervision of your triple A here in Washington. After State quotas are fixed, they are further apportioned among the farmers. The committeemen have to visit every farm in America and set the goals on each particular farm, and then work and plan with the farmers to carry them out. The committeemen are also called upon to assist the farmers in obtaining machinery and fertilizer and seed and gasoline. A thousand and one duties have been imposed upon them. What have they been paid? Your community or your township committeemen have only been paid for 5.6 days at a rate of pay of $5.06 per day, making a total payment of $31.75. Yet you know and I know that they have devoted months putting the programs over. Your county committeemen last year were only paid for 38.1 days at the rate of $5.65 per day, or $215.26 for the year's work.

Mr. THOM. Those A. A. A. committeemen have been selected by the farmers of the county.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Could not the gentleman from Virginia get along with a few additional minutes? The gentleman knows the circumstances under which we are proceeding.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I would like to see a full and free discussion on this amendment because, in my opinion, it is absolutely vital to our war food program.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I shall not object to a request for 2 additional minutes. I do think that ought to be sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] if it is not the purpose of his amendment to restore this fund to approximately what it was during the current year which is just closing?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That is true. During the current year which is just closing we had an appropriation of $24,250,000.

Mr. COOLEY. Unless the gentleman's amendment prevails, it will become necessary to consolidate the State A. A. A. offices?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Absolutely, and it will be necessary to centralize them in some regional office far removed from the farmers.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask the gentleman also if, during the coming year, the Triple A will not be called upon to administer a larger program than they have in the present closing year?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. They will be called upon to administer a much larger program. The task is colossal. These committeemen will have to visit over 6,000,000 farms in America and fix quotas.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to say to the gentleman that I believe the Triple A program.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seven Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN], who, after all, is chairman, and I think a very able chairman, of the House Committee on Agriculture, to please advise the House as to the compensation of these triple-A committeemen and as to the duties they perform for the very meager pay they receive?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Last year, on the average, the community or township committeemen worked 6.3 days at $5.06 per day, making $31.75 for the year's work. For that compensation they had to visit every farm in the community. They had to assist in obtaining machinery, assist in obtaining parts, assist in obtaining gasoline and seed. Further, they had to make reports and stay behind that program to see that the war food program was put over.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not also a fact that those committeemen are elected in their own communities by the farmers in those communities, and without regard to politics?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. They are selected by the farmers themselves, without regard to politics. I know in my own district there has been no politics. As a matter of fact, I think the majority of them are Republicans, but they have done a good job.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman to state to the House, if he will, what effect he believes the failure of his amendment to prevail at this time will have upon the triple-A program and ultimately upon the food-for-victory program that we talk so much about?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I am afraid it is going to be serious. I mean every word of that. These local, county, precinct committeemen work with the State committeemen and so far they have been

able to put the food program over. Instead of reducing the appropriation for administrative expenses under what it was last year it should be greatly increased. In addition to that, you must remember we have placed under the triple A today the flax program. It will cost $2 per farm to administer it, which is an additional $500,000 in administrative expenses.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The administrative expenses of the flax program are taken care of in the Budget estimate for the program; $250,000 has been added to the amount for administrative expenses above the original budget to take care of that situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I hope my friends who like myself are interested in this A. A. A. program will not allow their enthusiasm to run away with them in the matter of the appropriation of money or the segregation of money from the over-all appropriation for administrative expenses. Let me point out some facts.

They do not have $24,250,000 for this year above overtime. They had $23,131,835 when overtime is not considered; and you must remember that to the amount which is carried in this bill will be added whatever overtime the Congress may subsequently provide for all types of Federal employees. So the amendment to make this administrative item $25,000,000 proposes to add almost $2,000,000 above the amount which they had available for the present fiscal year. I now read from page 185 of the justifications:

Decrease of $2,588,768 in the amount of money available for administrative expenses of the agricultural industrial agencies. This reduction consists of $1,118,145 due to eliminations in the 1946 estimate of the 1945 fiscal year overtime cost of $1,470,623, which can be effected only by abolishing the 48 State offices and transferring the statistical and other administrative functions previously carried on, to area offices.

If the gentleman wanted to present the issue as to whether or not State offices should be abolished and their functions transferred to centrally located area offices he should offer an amendment not in the amount which he proposes in his amendment but to add $1,470,623, funds for that purpose, because according to the evidence that would be sufficient to prevent that being done.

So far as the gentleman's amendment is concerned, he proposes to eliminate certain language of the bill which restricts to $5,000,000-plus the amount of this administrative money that can be used for departmental employees.

The effect of that part of his amendment would be just the opposite to what he evidently intends to bring about, because he has been talking about the lack of consideration of the county office employees, and yet that limitation is intended to prevent their taking too much of this $21,000,000-plus and using it for departmental employees. We restrict to $5,000,000-plus the amount of money that can be used for the departmental employees, thereby making necessary that they use all the rest of it in the field for these county committeemen and employees in the county offices. The gentleman's amendment proposes to strike out that limitation and let them use, if they want to, the whole $21,000,000-plus for administrative personnel.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Last year we had for administrative purposes in the Washington office and the respective State offices something over $7,000,000. The language that I ask to be stricken out places a limitation of $5,000,000-plus.

Mr. TARVER. No; the gentleman is mistaken. This limitation he wants to strike out is a limitation on the amount of this administrative fund that can be used for departmental personnel. Now he wants to strike that out and have no limitation whatever.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. No; the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. TARVER. That is the effect of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. This language limits the appropriation to the Washington and the State offices, and if it is not stricken out you are going to force the combining of the State offices with the regional offices.

Mr. TARVER. Let us read the language of the bill and see what it is:

Provided, That not to exceed $21,911,200 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year, for salaries and other administrative expenses for carrying out such programs; but not more than $5,382,103 shall be transferred to the appropriation account, "Administrative expenses, Agricultural Adjustment Agency."

The gentleman wants to strike out, and by his amendment he does strike out, the last-quoted language "but not more than $5,382,103 shall be transferred to the appropriation account 'Administrative expenses, Agricultural Adjustment Agency.'"

If that is stricken out, then they can use all or any part of this $21,900,000 plus for departmental employees. We put this in the bill in order to restrict what they could use for departmental employees and to require them to use the major portion of it for employees in the field and for county committees. You strike out this limitation and the sky is the limit as to how much they can spend in Washington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would offer an amendment to add $1,470,623 to the administrative expenses, he would present here for decision by the House the question whether it wants the State offices abolished, and I think there is plenty of room for argument on that question. Personally I would dislike to see the State offices abolished. I think the nearer you can keep this thing to the farmer himself the better satisfied he is going to be. We decided to go along with the suggestion in view of the present shortage of manpower and the effort for economy in civil affairs of our country that these functions of the State offices be concentrated in regional offices; but if the gentleman would present an amendment which raises that question only I certainly feel that the House would be justified in considering it from the standpoint of whether it wants the State offices abolished or not. However, the gentleman proposes to add here over $3,000,000 when the amount involved is only $1,470,000.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. There is a flax program this year which it is expected will take additional funds. May I ask the gentleman whether the flax program was considered when the allocation of funds was made?

Mr. TARVER. Yes. On page 366 of the hearings you will find a Budget estimate which provides for an increase in the amount of administrative expenses from $21,661,200 to $21,911,200 on account of the flax program. We granted that increase and it is in the bill, so that the amount estimated by the Department for the flax program is in the bill and is in no way involved in the gentleman's amendment.

I certainly hope that the amendment as proposed will be voted down. If any amendment should be considered at all it would be one simply restoring the $1,470,623 for the purpose of preventing abolition of the State offices. Nothing else would be justified.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE: On page 49, line 11, after the parenthesis and colon and before the word "*Provided*", insert the following: "and that an additional $16,000,000 be made available for refund of the wheat-marketing-quota penalties collected under the Agricultural Act of 1938, as amended, to the producers, their heirs or assigns, from whom the penalties were collected."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and not in order for that reason.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I thought the gentleman did not believe in raising

points of order, according to the resolution he brought in here yesterday.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, no. I believe in raising points of order against anything as to which the House has not expressly waived the raising of points of order. The House has waived points of order against matters in the bill but not against matters that might be offered by way of amendment to the bill.

I insist upon my point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LEMKE. I concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE: Page 49, line 2, after the words "as amended" and comma, insert "$16,000,000 to be made available and earmarked for the refund of the wheat-marketing-quota penalties to the producers, their heirs or assigns, from whom the penalties were collected."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order against this amendment. The fact that it is offered in a different place in the bill makes no difference. It is legislation on an appropriation bill and is out of order.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, on that I wish to be heard briefly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state that this is a limitation on the $300,000,000 appropriated and earmarked for the purpose for which it should be used. In the second place, this tax was collected illegally and unconstitutionally from the producers of wheat, and the Department of Agriculture has that money. I feel that the farmers who paid it are entitled to have it returned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] offers an amendment on page 49, line 2, after the word "amended" providing that $16,000,000 be made available and earmarked for the refund of the wheat-marketing quota penalties. Under the authorization the $300,000,000 contained in the bill is for compliance with the terms under the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and under the terms of that act no provisions were made for the refunds embraced in the amendment. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am sure when a majority of the Members realize just what the so-called wheat penalties are they will correct the injustice.

Mr. TARVER Mr. Chairman, I served notice yesterday that I would raise points of order against Members discussing matters not contained in this bill. I did that in the interest of the convenience of the House, and I think I must adhere to that policy now. The gentleman is now talking about a subject matter that has just been ruled out of order by the Chair. It has no relationship to this bill whatever, and I must make the point of order that the gentleman is out of order in so doing.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the Chair has already recognized the gentleman from North Dakota, and the gentleman's point of order comes too late.

The CHAIRMAN. Notwithstanding the recognition, the gentleman must proceed in order. The gentleman from North Dakota will proceed in order.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the chairman of this subcommittee is the judge of what is in order or what is not. Unless the Chair sustains him, I shall proceed. I want to say what I am discussing does relate to agriculture and it relates to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. It is part of the proceedings under that act that I am addressing myself to, and it is possible that when we get through that the House will reject the entire appropriation—at least, I hope so—until there is a sufficient sense of justice and decency in this House to correct the wrong that has been done under the act known as the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

Therefore, I wish to suggest to the Members of this House that under that act a wrong has been perpetrated and there is danger of it being continued and renewed. Under the act there is the danger that the Department of Agriculture may again make allotments and exact penalties and compel farmers who have planted their wheat or their farm products 7 months before the allotments are made, or before a law has been passed authorizing them, to again pay penalties.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, now this is going a little too far. I am placing it on the shoulders of the Chair. If the Chair desires to let the gentleman proceed out of order, that is his responsibility, but I think the gentleman ought to be required to proceed in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. LEMKE. I hope I shall now be permitted to proceed without further interruption. Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, the Department of Agriculture extracted from the wheat farmers of this Nation $20,000,000. This $20,000,000 was collected in so-called wheat penalties. It was largely collected from farmers who planted winter wheat in September, and the law was not passed until May the following year. How would you like to have someone pass a law to fine you in May for what you had legally done the previous September? I am sure no Member of this House who believes in justice is willing to put his stamp of approval upon that kind of high-handed procedure.

Then on February 23, 1943, the Secretary of Agriculture abolished wheat allotments and in his order stated that the farmers who still had their wheat on hand would have their penalty remitted and canceled. In other words, the person who paid his penalty was fined for obeying an unlawful order of the Department of Agriculture and the one who refused was rewarded. There is neither common horse sense nor justice in that kind of procedure.

At present the Department of Agriculture is bringing suits to collect this penalty from those who did not have the wheat on hand or refused to have any dealing with the Department. This at a time when there is a scarcity of food products and when the farmers are working not 40 hours a week but 98 hours a week to feed the Nation. I say, without the fear of contradiction, that when the Members of this House once find out just what this so-called wheat-penalty fund is that was extracted from the farmers, they will refund it. They will right the wrong that has been perpetrated.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: On page 49, line 12, after the words "not to exceed", strike out "$21,911,200" and insert in lieu thereof "$23,318,823."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will seriously consider accepting this amendment because, as he stated a moment ago, unless this additional money is provided the State triple-A offices will have to be consolidated.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina will not correct the situation. The restrictive language in the bill would still be there. If you would increase the $21,000,000 to $100,000,000 you would still be restricted to the $5,000,000-plus for the Washington and State offices, and you would be forced to bring about a consolidation of the State offices.

Mr. COOLEY. At least we will have $1,407,000 to add to the amount now carried in the bill. There is a difference of opinion between the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. There is no question at all about it; as long as that restrictive language remains in this bill you are going to force a consolidation of the State offices.

Mr. COOLEY. May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] what his views are regarding the effect of this amendment?

Mr. TARVER. As I said a few moments ago, I think it would be exceedingly unwise to abolish this limitation as to the amount of this money they could use in the employment of departmental personnel. I think the gentleman's amendment, while it may be exactly the amount which is essential—it is possibly a little less in amount than the amount which would be necessary—substantially presents to the House the question of whether or not it desires the State offices abolished and their functions transferred to regional offices. In other words, if the gentleman's amendment should be adopted, I think it would be clearly an indication by the House that it does not desire the State offices abolished. Any further changes in verbiage necessary in connection with that, if the House wants

to do so, could be very easily made. I think the question ought to be disposed of on the basis of the gentleman's amendment. Personally, I am opposing his amendment, but if the House wants to provide this additional money, if the House does not want the State offices abolished, that is of course a matter for its determination. The gentleman has presented the matter in such a way as to raise that issue.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman. Now we have it clearly before the House. If the House votes down this amendment, it is a clear indication to the gentleman from Georgia and his committee that we desire to consolidate the State triple-A offices, and if it votes for the amendment, then I understand the gentleman will go into conference with that in mind.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. If the gentleman will yield, the amendment he has offered does not deal with State offices and department offices.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Georgia has indicated that he would change the limitation in conference or hereafter.

Mr. TARVER. I think if the gentleman's amendment should be adopted the amount of this sum, $5,382,000, available for departmental use, should be increased.

Mr. COOLEY. By a similar sum.

Mr. TARVER. Yes. I think the first question to determine is whether or not the House wants to go along with the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. May I say to the gentleman from Georgia if this amendment which is now pending prevails, then I will introduce an amendment immediately following so as to increase the limitation. I think we ought to know the importance of this situation. If you are going to provide these enormous sums of money and then cripple the administration of that huge sum of money by failure to provide necessary administrative funds, it does not seem to me to be the part of wisdom. I am interested in the triple A for many reasons, not the least of which is that the triple-A committee administers the tobacco control program, which is one of the most successful national programs ever undertaken for any group in agriculture. Now, to say we shall no longer have a triple A committee sitting in the city of Raleigh administering our program in North Carolina seems to me absolutely absurd. I do not think the House ought to vote down the amendment, knowing that if they vote down the amendment they are crippling the administration in the handling of this huge sum of money in the triple-A program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

I yield to my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. In what way would it cripple the program by eliminating the triple A offices in Raleigh? Would not they administer it in some other offices?

Mr. COOLEY. It would probably be administered in South Carolina, Georgia, or over in Tennessee, or in some regional office far removed from the farmers and far removed fom the local situation. I know the gentleman is desirous of economizing and being careful and cautious in the handling of Federal funds. Unless the gentleman votes for this amendment, it will be difficult for me to understand how he would be willing to appropriate such a large sum of money with an inadequate administration.

Mr. RICH. I asked the gentleman that question for this reason: Sometimes it is an economy to spend some money. But I cannot understand why the Department would not insist that this office be retained. Evidently, they feel that the office can be dispensed with in order to economize. If I am not correct in that statement, will the gentleman point out wherein it is incorrect?

Mr. COOLEY. I will have to call upon my friend, the gentleman from Georgia. I am not as familiar with the contentions or representations made by the Department before his committee. But I take this position, the position of the Department to the contrary notwithstanding. I know that the triple A State office administers a vital function.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The record shows Mr. Dodd testified that if that restrictive language remains in the bill one out of three State offices will have to be abolished, which would force a consolidation of the State offices.

Mr. COOLEY. All right, then, if the pending amendment is adopted and the amendment which I will immediately offer is likewise approved, we will not consolidate the State offices and we will save the State offices and permit them to carry on this program. If you want to abolish the triple A program or to cripple it, that is quite another proposition. But I think we have a good program and it ought to be properly administered. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Georgia that debate has been limited and two Members on the left side of the aisle were standing and the committee reserved the last 5 minutes.

Mr. PACE. I think the chairman intended to reserve 5 minutes for me, as I requested.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, my request was that debate close in 15 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the request made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. The gentleman was standing on my left and no one else was standing. The Chair is constrained to proceed in the regular order.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] was certainly on his feet asking for recognition, probably not at the very moment the time was limited, but he was seeking recognition before the gentleman on the left-hand side of the aisle stood.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to yield my time to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is recognized.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to detain the Committee, but I could not sit silent with an issue of this kind before the House. I think there will be a time when we can and we should cut down the administrative expenses of the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, but I am wondering if today is the time. I am wondering if you Representatives of the city districts as well as you Representatives of the farm districts think this is the hour, when every paper you pick up tells you of the prospect of critical food shortages. Here is the very agency upon which rests the entire responsibility of getting the production. At this very hour they are visiting the farms to get the farmers to increase their production in accordance with the request of the War Food Administrator. It seems to me it would be very unfortunate to close the State offices at this time. Close contact and cooperation with the farmers is very necessary. I want an administrator in my State who is familiar with the farm problems in my State. I do not want to compel the farmers of my State to go great distances to some regional office.

There is no man more interested in the farmer than the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER. I do not know how thoroughly sold he is on this question, because he has not spoken, but I want to leave with you this thought. When there is no meat to eat, when there is no butter to be had, I am wondering whether you are doing the smart thing in reducing this service. That is all I am interested in. I am wondering whether you are doing the smart thing in saying at this hour, when we need more food than we have ever needed in the history of this Nation, that we are going to impair the administration of this agency by taking away the State offices.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. This amendment will not preserve the State offices.

Mr. PACE. I believe, under the assurance of the chairman of the subcommittee, that a further amendment will be adopted; I will go along with him on that.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. That will not cure the situation. That is just taking it from one hand and putting it into the other. When you strike out the limitation, then you are taking that fund from your

county and your precinct committeemen.

Mr. PACE. The chairman of the subcommittee has agreed that if this amendment is adopted he will correct that situation.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. All right, and then allow the State offices to remain open, but you do away with the local offices and you permit them to set up regional offices.

Mr. PACE. I do not think the pending amendment, in view of the statement by the chairman of the subcommittee, would affect the local offices or require the setting up of regional offices. I supported the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia, but his amendment was defeated, and I think now the House should pass on the one single question and none other; that is, whether or not we should carry sufficient funds in this bill to assure the continued operation of this program at the highest possible degree of efficiency, with adequate compensation for the community and county committeemen, the operation of county offices and the maintenance of a State office in each State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire recognition?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will just take 1 minute, Mr. Chairman.

I must admit I just wanted to find out what this was all about. It seems that our two agricultural committees have a little disagreement as to what they are trying to accomplish. Frankly, I have not found out yet for sure. The only comment I would make is: We cannot maintain any State or county committees just for the purpose of giving people jobs, because we are getting to the point where we are soon going to have more people on the agricultural pay roll of the Nation than we have employed on the farms.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. I do not quite get the point of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. He tells what a grand job the triple A has done and what they are doing. Yet the gentleman comes right back now and says we have great scarcity of food. We have production. Would we have had a greater scarcity of food if they had not been in existence? And will we have less production if we adopt this amendment? It just does not make sense; it is contradictory.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It would take me longer than I have time at my disposal to answer the question; so I shall not attempt to.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I tried to yield the gentleman all of my time.

Mr. PACE. The food shortage is in no way attributable to the farmer but is due to the manner in which the food he has produced has been handled after it has been produced and placed in the hands of these other agencies.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Maladministration is the principal reason why we do not have abundant food production. We cannot expect to allocate 40 percent of the fertilizer to four or five States or 14 percent of the fertilizer to one State, like to North Carolina, and try to make anyone believe we really have a real war food program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The gentleman from Kansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment; I wish to use my 5 minutes on this paragraph to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time has been allocated on the entire paragraph and the gentleman is among those who have been recognized.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman does not have to use his time until he offers his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman now to have read his amendment for information if he desires to do so. Under the unanimous consent agreement the debate is to be closed by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. REES of Kansas: Page 49, line 2, after the word "amended", insert "*Provided*, That in making payments to farmers or farm operators or owners under this act no person, firm, or corporation shall receive a sum to exceed $1,000 for soil conservation and soil practice payments."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is similar to one I have offered before. The difficulty with the so-called soil-conservation payments under this act is that about 75 percent or more of the payments, so-called soil conservation money, goes to less than 15 percent of the farmers of this country. I will give some figures showing how payments applied in former years.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished Member from Maryland, who is deeply interested in agricultural problems.

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Is it not a fact that 75 percent of the land of the country is owned by 15 percent of the people?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. In a moment. Answering the gentleman from Maryland, I do not have the exact figures, but the owners of the big tracts of land get the big payments.

When this policy went into effect a few years ago it was done to try to help the individual farmers, the farmer who really did the work, to carry on in face of low prices, and assist in building his soil. It was to pay him, also, for leaving land out of production because it was claimed there was overproduction in this country.

Those payments, made to farmers with short crops and low prices, did assist thousands of them. It also did assist them in the preservation of their soil.

This amendment does not take these payments away from the farmers. It simply limits payments to $1,000. It just says no one owner, operator, corporation, and so forth, shall have more than $1,000. Those with the family-sized farms do not even get half of the amount. Mind you the payment under this amendment has nothing to do with parity payments, incentive payments, or support prices. That is a separate transaction.

It is assumed owners of large tracts of land will, or should, take care of their land anyway. Furthermore, as I have just said no land is taken out of cultivation, unless the owner wants to do it on his own accord. The Government has urged and insisted that farmers produce to full capacity in order to have more and more food.

So I see no reason for big landowners taking huge sums from the Federal Treasury for this purpose. Do not forget the Government right in this bill provides millions for another program that is a soil-conservation program. I would cut those payments to $500 but thought the Committee might be willing to compromise and save $50,000,000 that will be paid to less than 2 percent of the recipients of this fund.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I wish to see if I have understood the gentleman's position: That when this legislation was initially placed on the statute books we had low agricultural prices; since that time we have done two things, we have frozen millions of people at 40- and 50-cents-an-hour wages, and we have also reached down and taxed people getting even $500 a year. Is not that right?

Mr. REES of Kansas. This has nothing to do with the question of parity payments or support prices. This deals only with the so-called soil-conservation program. Now, get that straight. After all, nine-tenths of the farmers get less than $300 apiece and I am sure half of them get less than $75. Is there any good reason why millions should be paid to big operators just because they own the land? There is no criticism for their accepting these huge payments since they are made available. Not at all, but why make big payments to big owners who do not operate the land—$1,000 ought to be enough for any one of them, since whatever practices as are followed are by the tenant. Let this small group in number be limited to the liberal sum of $1 000 and save $50,000,000 to the taxpayers from this fund.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield briefly to the distinguished Member from Minnesota, a member of the committee.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman then would not permit the tenants operating farms under these corporations to share in the program.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That very thing came up in our discussions a year or two ago. Of course, the tenants should share, and the landowners that own the land ought to permit them to share, and not refuse the tenants payment because they are limited to the liberal payment of $1,000 for nothing more than to permit their own land to be improved. If their land is being improved, they can have a

share, but $1,000 is pretty liberal under present circumstances. Attention should be called to the fact that when this law was first put into effect, the sky was the limit for payments. Individual operators were drawing payments of one hundred thousand, or more, in some cases. Congress finally fixed a limit of $10,000. I think $1,000 is enough. Five hundred dollars is plenty. The man who operates his family-size farm does not even get nearly that much. This amendment is more than liberal, but it will save $50,000,000 and not injure anyone at all. I am appealing to your good, common, hard sense. We should adopt this amendment.

We will have to prevail upon the big operator not to take more than $1,000. That is the viewpoint I hold with respect to this thing. I think it is fair and ought to be adopted and I appeal to your good common, hard sense. You are not injuring any farmer at all and you will save millions of dollars if you adopt my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let us examine this situation a little further. This item we are discussing right now provides for expending $300,000,000 and is for soil-building and soil-practice program. Let me repeat it has nothing to do with another program right in this same bill that provides for spending $30,000,000 for the expense of what is known as the soil-conservation program that operates on a national scale, and under different management from the $300,000,000 under consideration right now.

Now then, of this $300,000,000, you allow $21,911,200 to administer the spending of the three hundred million. Now, take a look as to how the balance is divided. I have only approximate figures for 1944. If you follow the procedure that was done last year and the year before, here is about the way it will work out. In any event it is the way it worked out last year. There are something less than 6,000,000 operators participating. Two-fifths of them got less than $20 each, 2 years ago. Sixty percent got less than $50 each. Seventy-five percent did not even get as much as $100. Ninety percent got less than $200. As a matter of fact it took less than 25 percent of the money to pay more than half of the farmers. About $60,000,000 went to less than 3 percent of the operators. You can see it took almost as much money to administer the act as to pay off one-third of the participants in the low-payment group.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the other section in this bill "which provides for a national program of erosion control and soil and water conservation in cooperation with other agencies," and so forth. It is the original Soil Conservation Act, as I understand it. It provides for a further expenditure of $30,000,000 for administration of the provisions of the act. I do not know the number of employees in either one of these set-ups, but there must be plenty to require combined expenditure of about $52,000,000 for services. Mr. Chairman, this is not the place to discuss the proposition, but I see no reason why the activities of this whole soil-improvement program should not be placed under one head. There is bound to be a lot of duplication of effort, manpower, and unnecessary expenditure of money. It is a situation that ought to be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has been read for the information of the House.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] is recognized to conclude debate.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, if I can, I want to clarify the situation with reference to the Cooley amendment which would restore to the bill funds necessary for the maintenance of the State offices. If it should be adopted it would be necessary to amend the proviso constituting a limitation so as to make the amount of that proviso $6,831,855 instead of the amount which is carried in the bill.

It is a question for the House to determine as to whether or not it desires the State offices maintained or their functions transferred to regional offices. Personally, I would prefer to see the State offices retained, but may I say that if we do not accept economy in this Congress except as that economy is in accord with our own views, we are not going to accept a great deal of it. I am willing to go along with the Bureau of the Budget and in the interest of saving manpower and in order to let them see if the agricultural adjustment agency can work this thing out on a basis of reduced expenditures. So I am going to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina much as I would like to see the objective which he has in mind attained if it could be done without any unnecessary consumption of tax money.

May I say with reference to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] that I certainly hope you will not put it in this bill for it would constitute a bone of contention for the next 2 or 3 months between the Senate and House and between the conferees on the part of the Senate and House. We have a statutory limitation on the amount which can be paid to any farm owner, the limitation having been fixed by you in the enactment of a statutory law. That limit is $10,000.

After all, this is a soil-conservation program. This is not a "gimme" or Santa Claus program. We are not engaged in doling out largess to the farmers of the United States. We are engaged here in trying to preserve for the benefit of posterity the soil of this country, to preserve its fertility, to prevent a continuance of damage through erosion and so forth. It is a question of protecting our national resources and if a large part of those national resources happen to be owned by a life insurance company or by one farmer, I do not see how we can justify not improving the land that that life insurance company or that farmer owns simply because they are better off in the ownership of land than their neighbors. Furthermore, the effect of this amendment would be to eliminate the tenants on large farms from a right to participate in this program upon the same basis as tenants on smaller farms. Why not let everybody have an equal chance to the extent that they contribute to the preservation of the soil and let them be paid for the expenses incurred in so doing from this fund without this drastic limitation which, in my judgment, would seriously hamper and interfere with the orderly progress of the program?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman well knows we have what is known as the soil conservation program.

Mr. TARVER. That is true.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Which is really a different program.

Mr. TARVER. It is a necessary part of this whole proposition.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We have appropriated for that program somewhere between $20,000,000 and $30,000,000 for soil conservation.

Mr. TARVER. Both of them are necessary, both of them have had more to do with the increase of farm production in this country during the present war than anything else. We cannot afford to abandon either of them. We ought to be reasonable in our provision of funds and should be as economical as possible, but we should not undertake to hamstring either of the programs by the adoption of unnecessary amendments.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. As I understand it, then, the gentleman agrees that if the amendment which I introduced prevails he and his subcommittee will insist that the House here and now decide the issue whether or not they want to abolish State offices.

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman's amendment should prevail, then he should offer an amendment to increase the amount of that limitation to $6,831,000. It is simply a question for decision by the House. The gentleman's amendment presents the issue as to whether the House desires to provide for the continuance of State offices or not. If it does so desire, it ought to adopt the gentleman's amendment, but if it desires to go along with the Budget, as I intend to do on these matters as far as I am personally concerned and as our committee has decided it should do, they will not support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am fearful that perhaps we on the committee, by eliminating these State offices, might possibly be taking away from the grass roots, so to speak, the control of this great organization. I am going to support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman, of course, has the right to do that, but everybody in the House should vote his own opinion on the matter. I hope personally that both amendments will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 44, noes 68.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas now offer his amendment which was previously read for the information of the House?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES of Kansas) there were—ayes 51, noes 77.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE ACT

Administrative and operating expenses: For operating and administrative expenses under the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1501–1518), as amended by the act of December 23, 1944 (Public Law 551), $7,984,900, including personal services in the District of Columbia, printing and binding, purchase of books of reference and periodicals, and not to exceed $700 for newspapers.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 52, line 12, strike out "$7,984,900" and insert "$1."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to add $1 to that which we have already appropriated under the deficiency bill just last week.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield, I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I just want to make a unanimous-consent request with respect to the time to be taken. If we are going to finish this before the recess, we ought to have some understanding as to how much time is going to be consumed.

Mr. RICH. I do not yield for that purpose.

We gave $30,000,000 last week in a deficiency appropriation bill to the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. You understand what that is. Five years ago you appropriated $40,000,000. The Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, which is handling this lost $37,500,000 during the past 5 years. They purchased wheat and made a profit of $7,000,000 on the increased price of wheat, and they lost that also. They had $2,500,000 left. They lost all told $44,500,000.

The first time this appropriation bill was being considered by your committee, the chairman knew nothing of this amount to be added to the bill. They came in later and asked for this amount, $7,984,900. If you will read the report the chairman gives you, you will find that he says this:

It is not inappropriate to say, however, that the committee has not materially modified its views respecting the possible success of any Federal crop-insurance program.

Further, if you will read the hearings, you will find that they want to establish in every State in the Union another office to administer this program. They want to increase the manpower by three times as many men as they now have.

Since the bill passed last week I wrote to the general manager, Carl Wright, and received a letter from him this morning. I asked for the qualifications that he and the men associated with him had to qualify them for handling this insurance business. He did not answer that question but said, "I will be glad to talk to you."

I immediately wrote to Marvin Jones, who has charge of this program, and said, "Marvin Jones, if you don't investigate the men you have placed in the responsible positions of handling this program, then the onus of the conduct of this office is going to fall upon you." I feel that Marvin Jones will give a good report of himself, that he will go into the investigation of this insurance company.

Since you have given them $30,000,000 last week, why do you not wait? Strike this amount from the bill. Then after you find out what they can do during this year, if you think it is necessary to add $7,984,900 to it, all right. But I am saying this: We are awfully lame in the conduct of the affairs of this Government when we just give a corporation $40,000,000 and they squander practically all of it and then they come back and you give them $30,000,000 more, and now they are in here this week asking you to give them $7,984,900. If that makes sense, then I do not know anything about business; I do not know anything about government. I think it is just ridiculous to think we would do it. But I hope the Committee will vote this down.

Mr. COOLEY. What effect would the gentleman's amendment have on the crop-insurance program?

Mr. RICH. Well, it is going to take some money from them. Now, you did not appropriate any money last year for this, did you?

Mr. COOLEY. I know, but we did not have this program last year, either.

Mr. RICH. Well, I do not think we should have it this year. Now, he wants to set up in every State another office. Probably he will put that down in the town you want it where you are going to take the office out of the program for this soil conservation. Maybe you can get that office. Then you will be satisfied with it. But I say, gentlemen, there is just something rotten in Denmark, making these appropriations for corporations which are being handled in this manner. It is not common sense. I would not do it on a bet. I think you ought to conserve at least some part of the resources of this Government, if there is anything left.

I hope you are going to say something to the Members of the House in support of my amendment. Let us get a good business set-up before continuing the Corporation.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could agree on closing debate in 2 minutes on this amendment?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman from Georgia a question as to whether this item is not the item for administrative expenses for the crop-insurance program?

Mr. TARVER. Of course, and I do not think there is any possibility of the House adopting the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, my opinion with regard to the Federal crop insurance program, I think, is fairly well known to the membership of the House. But my opinion has not been the opinion adopted by the House. The House for 2 years provided for the liquidation of that program. But last December it decided to reinstate the program and has appropriated $3,000,000 to pay the administrative expenses of this organization for the remainder of this fiscal year. Now, it would be a very foolish thing to do, after going through these proceedings, to then refuse to appropriate but one dollar to carry on the administrative expenses of the organization for the next fiscal year, as desired by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. This $30,000,000 he is talking about is a replenishment of the capital fund of the Corporation that cannot be used for administrative expenses. I think that this program is not going to succeed. I think that those who have sponsored it and who have secured its approval by Congress are going to be disappointed. I wish they would succeed. I would like very much to see a successful crop-insurance program, but I do not think you are going to have it. But, at the same time, immediately after you provided for it and made a $3,000,000 appropriation for the administrative expenses for the remainder of this fiscal year and provide for the replenishment of the capital stock of the Corporation to the tune of $30,000,000, then to say you would not provide but one dollar for the administrative expenses for the next fiscal year would be so ridiculous that I do not think it would appeal to any Member of the House, not even to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Why did you increase the number of employees there now to over a thousand when you only had 200?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman realizes that I am not running the Federal crop-insurance program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Soil-conservation operations: For carrying our preventive measures to conserve soil and water, including such special measures as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs, and including the improvement of farm irrigation and land drainage, the establishment and operation of conservation nurseries, the making of conservation plans and surveys, and the dissemination of information, $28,636,800: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil- and water-conservation operations in demonstration projects.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday a man came into my office and he said he was up in West Virginia trying to buy a farm. He said during the conversation he asked the owner who planted the trees down along the edge of the hill. He said, "The Department of Agriculture came in here and planted all those trees." He said, "Who built this great big fence around this property?" He said, "The Department of Agriculture sent men in here and built that fence for me." He said, "Who is doing that excavating over alongside the hill?" He said, "The Department of Agriculture. They came in here on soil erosion and they tried to fix this property up for me." He said, "How much have they spent over there?" "Oh," he says, "six or eight thousand dollars." He said, "Would you have ever been able to do that kind of work or would you have wanted to do it?" He said, "No; I never would have thought of doing it, but as long as they wanted to come in here and just do that work, I was willing to let them do it." He said, "How much do you want for the farm?" And he told him and so he bought the farm. He said he bought the farm because they had spent so much money in improving it that it was worth the money. But he said the farmer never would have thought of doing those things. He said it was just like a man coming into your house and repairing your bathroom—putting in a new bathroom. After he puts in the new bathroom, you see how nice it is and he says, "Well you had better let me put in a new kitchen sink." So he decides he will let them put in a new kitchen sink.

I believe that a whole lot of the things the Department of Agriculture is trying to do under this soil-conservation program represents just a lot of money spent by the Department of Agriculture on things the farmers do not want and that really will be of no advantage to the Government. You have so many men in the Department of Agriculture down here that you have to make jobs for that there is just no end to it. It is about time you stopped some of the foolish things the Department of Agriculture is now doing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania in his illustration demonstrates his entire lack of knowledge of the part the soil-conservation program plays in the agricultural picture when he states that the Federal Government goes onto a man's farm and makes improvements to the value of six or eight thousand dollars without even an invitation. He apparently does not know that the extent of the Government's participation in the work of the soil-conservation districts is to furnish technical advice to the district upon the basis of which the farmers in those districts work out their plans and make their improvements.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Not at this time.

I am speaking of the program as at present conducted. The land conservation and use program, of course, is a different thing. Under this program the individual farmer carries on certain practices for the improvement of the soil and receives certain benefit allowances on account thereof.

When the gentleman talks about the Government's going on a man's land without advice or invitation from him and undertaking to improve the farm to the extent of six or eight thousand dollars, he is, of course, simply making ridiculous charges which are absolutely baseless in fact.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly amazed that the gentleman makes such statements as he does about the Government not spending money on farms. I can show the gentleman a farm in Pennsylvania where the Government spent $10,000 when the farm itself was not worth $5,000 after the money was spent. It is a terrible situation, yet these offices and jobs, it seems, must be maintained.

There was a petition sent out recently—I received one, so did other Members—asking that the Farm Security offices be given enough money so that they could function to assist two farmers in every county to buy a farm. When it gets to the extreme of where they have to justify the operation of a county-wide organization by having it help two farmers to buy farms it is ridiculous. Those farms would be purchased on the same basis as others financed by the Government. An individual recently bought a farm for $10,000, and the Federal Government took the entire mortgage; then there is $1,500 more for equipment and $85 for the transfer of the property. And the Government held the mortgage; the purchaser did not have one dollar invested. That is the kind of transaction they are making. The poor suckers who buy farms like this will go bankrupt, and the taxpayers will lose the money. It is not fair to the farm purchaser or to the taxpayers. It is a national scandal and ought to be stopped.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition on the amendment for 2 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 4 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe the remarks made about the overgenerosity of the Department of Agriculture referred to the F. S. A. and not to the item we have under consideration at this time. When we get to the F. S. A. item I wish to say in defense of the chairman of this subcommittee that he probably will be under fire for injecting a limitation upon F. S. A. that definitely tends to cure the very faults listed in the remarks made by the gentleman on this side of the aisle.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia desire recognition?

Mr. TARVER. No.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to inflict myself too often on the Committee during this debate today but this subject happens to be something that is not only important to my district but to America. I always make an effort to get the picture as it really exists. Let me state the facts, and I wish to be corrected if any one wishes to do so. As far as the Soil Conservation Service is concerned, nearly all that money has been spent in furnishing personnel for advice.

There are some half dozen different appropriations in the name of soil fertility or soil conservation, most of them included in this appropriation bill. One of them is the particular item we see in this bill having to do with the appropriation for the soil department of the United States Department of Agriculture. The second is that this bill provides money for the Agricultural Adjustment Administration which carries on soil-conservation work; the third has to do with the experiment stations which appropriation is also in this bill; the fourth is the Federal appropriations for the T. V. A., which does some soil-conservation work. The fifth is the part of the appropriation for extension work. The sixth is the part of the appropriation for experiment stations. So there are six different appropriations in the name of soil conservation.

Regardless of the fact that perhaps somebody may not have spent this money too wisely in the past, regardless of the fact that up to this moment, except as a figment of some one's imagination, we have never conserved the soil of the country as a whole, I feel that the money may not have been altogether wasted. The American people must realize that we have a soil problem which we must attend to while we are alive so that good land may be passed on to future generations. To that extent the expenditures have been worth while but in the future we must effectuate some kind of a plan whereby these different agencies are coordinated into one agency. Though I personally believe this consolidation should take place for the best war effort, I realize how futile it would be to try to effectuate this consolidation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. All time has expired on the pending paragraph.

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Erosion control, Everglades region, Florida: For research and demonstration work in soil-conservation control measures, including research and demonstration work in fire-control and irrigation construction work to eliminate fire hazards, in the Everglades region of Florida, $54,500: *Provided*, That no expenditures shall be made for these purposes until a sum at least equal to such expenditures shall have been made available by the State of Florida, or a political subdivision thereof, for the same purposes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with some of the criticisms that have been made with reference to extravagance and expenditures that are not justified; however, I take this time to call the attention of the Committee and the attention of the country to the fact that these provisions deal with what is perhaps the most important matter concerning the American people today—the preservation of the fertility of the soil, the preservation of the ability of the earth to produce the thing necessary to sustain life. These things make up our incomparably chiefest asset which is disappearing.

If one will take a trip in an airplane across this country, he will observe the devastation that has been wrought by ourselves and our ancestors during the past century in what was in the beginning of that century virgin soil and practically untouched natural resources. Like a swarm of devastating locusts we have gone from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We have called into our work of destruction all the agencies of this highly developed scientific period. It is a crime which we have committed, a violation of the trust which nature has reposed in us as the guardians of all the generations which are to follow in being. We owe to them not only the duty of conservation but the duty of restitution.

When you consider what has happened to this earth since we came here, what we have done to it, you will see that the statement which we so often make as to how much richer we have grown is not the truth. We have been getting poorer and poorer since our ancestors put their feet on the soil adjoining the Atlantic Ocean. We keep no debit account. We have not charged ourselves with the loss of the magnificent forests that we once possessed. Gnarled, crooked, fire-seared runts mark the place where at one time magnificent forests grew on this part of the earth just a few generations ago, even in our own generation. We have been dissipating our natural resources with a reckless abandon unequaled in the experience of any other people. Hungry gullies, man-made gullies, which from the air look like the ribs of the carcass of a dead animal, lie across the fields—dead soil where only yesterday, as time is measured in a nation's life, was rich soil, virgin soil, which nature had been building up for thousands of years for us.

We ought to be conscious of the fact that we do not own this land; that it does not make any difference how many deeds we have or what the notary public has said, our grantor can convey to us only the right to use. In nature, that is the only title the generation in being can have. With the right to use goes the duty to conserve. We are only tenants for life. We hold this rich heritage in trust for the generations that are yet to come. We are robbing unborn generations to whom this fertility belongs; not to us alone. God Almighty made it and gave it as a heritage for all the generations to come. As a matter of fact, we ought to be conscious in America that to rob the soil of its power to produce bread is the greatest crime—I make the statement without reservation or qualification—to rob the soil of its power to produce bread is perhaps the greatest crime that can be committed with reference to property.

If you try to rob your neighbor's granary, he has a chance to protect his property. There are police officers and courts to protect him. If you rob a child of its inheritance, for whom you are the guardian, that child's friend can go into court. But if you rob the children whose existence still sleeps in futurity, there is no protection. In the very nature of things we of this generation are the guardians of those who are unborn and defenseless. Our duty is in proportion to that dependence, to the helplessness of those for whom we are trustees. The greater the dependency, the greater the responsibility, the greater the crime if we betray the duty of that trusteeship. I do not like to see the Federal Government doing all this business. The States ought to do most of this work which may be beyond private duty. However, there is where it chiefly lies. I want economy in government. I do not favor some of these expenditures. I am taking this time not to discuss the details of this bill, but to direct if I can public attention to this duty and this danger, this dissipation of the Nation's incomparable, its greatest, asset, the thing essential to happiness and physical and mental vigor, to existence, the chief element in our strength and security in the event we should ever be called upon to defend our land against attack by a foreign enemy. I close by making a suggestion for the consideration of those who are concerned about post-war employment. I suggest the rebuilding of the wasted places for which we are responsible, the healing of the great open wounds in our fields, the gullies into which the fertility of our soil is leeching out. This fertility, the life-blood of our soil, is being carried away into the seas. These are objects worthy of our matured consideration, far more important than building new roads and things of that sort. Protecting the opportunity of our returning soldiers and their children and their children's children to eat strong food from strong soil is far better than all the gadgets of a civilization building its showy superstructure upon a decaying foundation such as is developing in this country.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I always like to hear the gentleman from Texas, but I want to take exception to a statement he has just now made. He said that the greatest crime to unborn generations is the fact that we do not conserve the resources of this country. I do not know whether that is the greatest crime that we are adding onto our unborn generations or not. I would like to have the gentleman answer the question what he thinks about the great national debt that we are piling up for unborn generations; that will stagger them as long as they live; and if he thinks that that is the thing that this administration should continue to do, and if that is the greatest thing that this administration can possibly do for them.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas to answer that question.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Does my distinguished colleague ask me whether the piling up of a debt, bad as that is, but which we can at least get rid of by going through bankruptcy, bad as that would be, is a greater crime than destroying the power of the earth to produce the bread necessary to sustain the lives of all the people through all the generations to come? I think much of him, but not much of his judgment on that point.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would just like to ask the gentleman if he does not think that the investment of a national debt in property justifies itself when we realize that we are fighting to save our civilization?

Mr. RICH. May I say to my colleague that we could stop this national debt if you gentlemen would do the right, sensible, sound things. You would not be building up this huge debt if you did not do some of these foolish and illogical things. That is the thing I am driving at. They have been unjustified under the New Deal more than under any administration in the history of our country. Those are the things that I am complaining of. If we had a little common sense in this administration, we would not be in the situation we are now in.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto do now close.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] desires to address the House in connection with the soil-conservation program for a few minutes.

Mr. TARVER. I withdraw the motion, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, when we talk of soil-conservation service we are dealing with the most important and far-reaching program Congress has to deal with in this agriculture appropriation bill now under consideration.

Bearing in mind the great good these men in the Soil Conservation Service in cooperation with our farmers are rendering the Nation now, and its far-reaching

effect of conserving the most precious of all our resources, Mother Earth, and that they are doing it with the amount of money that has been made available to them in the past, is to me a most outstanding and commendable record. I am sure you, my colleagues, will agree that my record of economy here in Congress is second to none, but certainly no Member of this Congress can be fairly accused of extravagance in supporting this appropriation of less than $30,000,000 for this valuable service which benefits every citizen of our great Nation now, and will in the far future, for all time to come. I believe it is fair to say that I am one of the greatest proponents of the Soil Conservation Service in this Congress. In my district, which is composed of 14 counties, the Soil Conservation men are really doing a job as I am sure they are in most every district where they are organized.

I may say to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], that I agree with him about the seriousness of the national debt, but certainly because of the conservation of our soil and the income this Government will receive because of the good soil this Nation has, which we are trying to preserve, this service will certainly be one of the things by which that great deficit will finally be paid off, with good business management of government which the American people will put in control after the war is won.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. There are lots of things they can do in this program where they can keep the cost to a minimum that probably would do great good. I agree with the gentleman as to that. But they have too many extravagant projects.

Mr. JENSEN. I will agree with the gentleman on that, too. In my opinion, however, the Soil Conservation Service is giving over 100 cents worth of service for every dollar that it spends. I wish I could say the same about other items in this bill and for other departments of this Government.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I congratulate the gentleman on that statement. I am from a State where the Soil Conservation Service is doing a fine job. I am glad to find the gentleman from Iowa sound, as he always is, on this question of soil conservation.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman from the great State of New Mexico.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly agree with the gentleman from Iowa and hope that nothing is done to cripple the Soil Conservation Service. The Soil Conservation Service of South Dakota, working as it does with better material than it has available in Iowa, is doing an even better job in South Dakota. May I suggest, too, if we are going to have any means of solving the national debt other than the bankruptcy proposal referred to by the gentleman from Texas, that debt will have to be repaid by the growth of things taken from the soil, so we should preserve the national resources of this country.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota for his contribution, except that part wherein he discredits our soil, which is the best in the whole United States of America—and we want to keep it so.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is referring to the Soil Conservation Service program of this country, which is a different thing from the soil conservation payments we were discussing earlier today?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. Of course, it is all tied together in a sense, only that the Soil Conservation Service runs its own program. I do think, however, that we could at this time safely reduce what we call the triple-A payments, while farm income is at its present level, and use part of the saving in expanding genuine soil-conservation practices as are carried on by the Soil Conservation Service. However, the subcommittee has not seen fit to do that so I shall yield to their good judgment since they have spent so much time in the hearings.

Mr. RICH. If the gentleman will yield further, if the gentleman thought we had to go through bankruptcy, as was suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, in order to get soil conservation, then the gentleman would certainly give it up, as would any other good American, but he wants the money spent wisely and soundly?

Mr. JENSEN. Absolutely.

Mr. RICH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I am so much interested in this feature of this bill, soil conservation, I cannot resist the temptation to talk for 2 minutes about what, in my opinion, is one of the most conservative, one of the most outstanding pieces of legislation and most constructive pieces of legislation that has ever been passed by Congress in the history of our country in the endeavor to conserve the soil of our Nation. When this matter was first discussed in the House I remember very well that the actuaries and those who had worked out the value of this soil conservation program disclosed that we took out of our land every year more than $400,000,000 worth of fertility in annual crop production; and the purpose was to conserve the soil, prevent erosion and the destruction of our farms and rural areas, and keep our lands for our children's children and our grandchildren's children, as suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Texas. In my opinion no other piece of constructive legislation has done more for this country and will do more for this Nation than the proposed legislation to take care of the lands of this country and so help to make us rich and keep us rich.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, this bill includes the Budget increase for soil-conservation operations. This matter of soil conservation is so closely linked up with flood control that it deserves the earnest attention of Congress at all times. Our farmers, especially in the great Midwest, are just becoming better acquainted with the conservation program as it is related to flood control, and they want the program extended. I am glad to see that this appropriation has not been reduced because the program has been gradually increasing. As of June 15, 1944, 1,114 conservation districts had been established in the United States. As of June 15, 1945, 1,310 conservation districts will have been established. It is estimated that by June 15, 1946, 1,492 conservation districts will be established. This constant growth is the result of education and is the result of our farmers becoming aware of the fact that they can assist in protecting and preserving their lands, especially with respect to flood control. I am pleased to see the amount of the appropriation keeping pace with the expansion program.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. May I assure the gentleman from Iowa he has no more sympathetic group in Congress than the Members of the Subcommitee on Appropriations for Agriculture.

Mr. HOEVEN. There is no question about that. The subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations is very sympathetic, and, as I said before, the fact that we are keeping up with the times and making appropriations to keep pace with the expansion program is most commendable.

The Clerk read as follows:

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

Not exceeding $50,000,000 of the funds appropriated by and pursuant to section 32, as amended, of the act of August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), may also be used during the current fiscal year to provide food for consumption by children in nonprofit schools of high-school grade or under and for child-care centers through (a) the purchase, processing, and exchange, and the distribution of agricultural commodities and products thereof; or (b) the making of payments to such schools and centers or agencies having control thereof in connection with the purchase and distribution of agricultural commodities in fresh or processed form and, when desirable, for the processing and exchange of such commodities and their products; or (c) by such other means as the Secretary may determine: *Provided*, That funds made available hereunder for a school-lunch program shall be apportioned for expenditure in the States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia in accordance with

school enrollment and need, as determined by the Secretary, except that if program participation in any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia does not require all funds so apportioned, the Secretary may reapportion such excess funds to such other States, Territories, possessions, or the District of Columbia in consideration of need, as he may determine: *Provided further*, That benefits under (b) of this paragraph to schools or child-care centers or other sponsoring agencies shall in no case exceed the cost of the agricultural commodities or products thereof purchased by the school or child-care center or other sponsoring agencies as established by certificates executed by the authorized representative of the sponsoring agency: *Provided further*, That such sponsoring agency shall maintain accounts and records clearly establishing costs of agricultural commodities or products furnished in the program and that such accounts and records shall be available for audit by representatives of the Department of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That these funds may be used for, or to make payments in connection with, the purchase of such agricultural commodities and for exchanging, distributing, disposing, transporting, storing, processing, inspection, commission, and other incidental costs and expenses without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and without regard to the 25 percent limitation contained in said section 32: *Provided further*, That not more than 2 percent of the funds made available hereunder for a school-lunch program shall be used to provide food for children in child-care centers. The amount of funds available hereunder for a school-lunch program used in any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia during any fiscal year shall not exceed the total amount otherwise furnished for the same purpose by or on behalf of the school authorities and other sponsoring agencies in such State, Territory, possession, or District of Columbia including the value of donated services and supplies, as certified by the respective schools, care centers, or agencies having control thereof.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 55, line 10, strike out line 10, to and including line 15 on page 57.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the school-lunch proposition contained in this bill is not primarily a school-lunch proposition. It is not a case where funds are allocated to the different schools throughout the country and the schools are permitted to buy the things that they may need to operate school lunches. It is a place where the Agriculture Department plans to put the surplus which it has of agricultural products—that is, the things for which there is no demand, regardless of whether they were items which the school authorities would provide or not.

The committee recognized that it was not coming before the Congress for this item in good faith. I quote from their report, page 18:

Many of the commodities included in the school-lunch program are no longer in surplus and for that reason are not authorized for inclusion in the general program carried on under the permanent appropriation. This has resulted in the inclusion of a specific provision in the bill authorizing the use of these moneys for the school-lunch program. However, there are still some surpluses for which the school-lunch program constitutes an outlet. These surpluses may be of temporary character, yet while they exist they constitute serious problems in maintaining a well-balanced market for the output of the American farm.

This statement clearly indicates that this is not an item which should commend itself to the public. I know that in many cases the schools are not using this proposition and those that are, are finding it difficult to get by with the things that are being provided. Instead of having the schools used as a dumping ground, the thing should be done away with entirely.

The local school authorities everywhere are better able to pay the expenses and the cost of running these school lunches and the parents of the children are better able to buy them than they have ever been. In fact, most of the schools are running the lunches on the basis that the folks are paying for what the children eat, and the funny thing about it is that the schools that are not given these allotments are able to put on just as good a lunch as those that receive the allotments for about the same money.

Under all these circumstances we should leave this to the local authorities to run and not have this involved situation of handing the schools a surplus agriculture product when there are no surpluses and pretending to the people that we are promoting welfare of children when we are not.

In view of this situation I have felt obliged to offer this amendment to do away with this program. I do not believe it is a welfare program; I do not feel it is the kind of thing the Government of the United States should invest in at this time. I recognize that there has been a tremendous pressure upon some people by those who have not understood the situation well to get them to support it. On the other hand, I do not believe it has a basis in fact; and I hope the committee will see fit to strike this item out of the bill.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I listened a little while ago to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas when he was talking about soil conservation and agreed with everything he said. I think it is tremendously important that this generation leave to future generations farms that are fertile and that will produce; but I think it is almost as important that we leave these farms to the children who are coming after us not encumbered by such a tremendous Federal debt that they will never be able to utilize the farms that they have. If your child is so overburdened with taxes that more than half of what he earns goes to pay the Government overhead he is not going to get very much personal benefit out of the farm that you leave him. I do not know of any program that has caused so much criticism from my district as this school-lunch program. Just within the last 3 weeks I received a letter from a teacher down in Missouri, a man who has charge of one of the large schools. He had just put in the lunch program under tremendous pressure. He said to me: "There has never been a time when the people of my community have had so much money, when they are so well able to feed their own children." And he said that 90 percent of them would much prefer to do that. They have a certain amount of American pride. You know, this country of ours was not raised on the idea that somebody else would feed our children. Down through the years the American citizen has prided himself on feeding and clothing his own children. We have not been raised upon the skim milk of charity. The proud and the sturdy men of America have felt that they were willing to go out and by the sweat of their brows earn the food for their own families. That has been the basis upon which we have grown great; that has been the basis upon which America has become the richest Nation upon the face of the earth today.

I read a statement in the papers just a few days ago gotten out by some of our Government statisticians. I have no reason to question its accuracy. It said that today in the hands of the American people for the first time in history there was $150,000,000,000 of what was referred to as "dangerous inflationary money." On top of that condition, by this section providing free school lunches we are seeking further to create an inflationary situation in America.

If there ever was a time when the people of this country should be permitted to carry out their God-given right and duty to feed their own children, it is now.

Mr. Chairman, there is something far deeper beneath the surface than merely the question of who is to feed our children. The bureaucrats of that little department want to feed them because they want to continue an organization so that they may have their jobs. That is where the pressure is coming from. Down in Missouri there is not a single constituent in my district that asked for free lunches. The people back of this are those in the bureaucratic organization here in Washington. They are going around and threatening to try to get the jobs of these school teachers if they do not fall in line with this school-lunch program. That is what is back of this. It is a question of whether we are going the American way or the European way. It is a question of whether we are going to maintain the liberties and the freedoms of this country and have the kind of government our forefathers set up or we are going to succumb to the things that every man in this room knows are going on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that if we are to conclude consideration of this bill today there must be some reasonable limitation of debate. I hope that the membership of the Committee may be willing to agree to close debate on this section and all amendments thereto in 25 minutes, and I propound that as an unanimous consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Messrs. KEEFE and GROSS objected.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to submit to the Committee the question whether it wants to finish the bill today or not and I therefore move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH), there were—ayes 81, noes 28.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the reading of an engrossed copy of the bill is demanded when the bill comes up for final passage, will that be voted on today?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's inquiry should be directed to the Speaker in the House and not to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman's motion include all amendments to this section?

The CHAIRMAN. All amendments to the pending section.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet as soon as the gentleman from New York finished addressing the Committee on behalf of his amendment. I want to speak against the amendment very much and I wonder if I am entitled to any prior right because I was on my feet?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is most sympathetic with the gentleman and did observe the gentleman standing, but the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], chairman of the subcommittee, was on his feet also and under the practice the Chair recognized him.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I believe I was the only Member standing at that time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it

Mr. HOFFMAN. Would that not go to O. P. A. instead of the chairman of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair may say that the following gentlemen were standing and will be recognized in the division of the 30 minutes, with the chairman of the subcommittee having the concluding time: Messrs. VOORHIS of California, BIEMILLER, ANDERSON of New Mexico, MASON, RICH, DOYLE, GROSS, JOHNSON of Texas, KEEFE, HOFFMAN, SMITH of Ohio, MILLER of Nebraska, DONDERO, ROE of Maryland, SAVAGE, and WHITTEN, and Mrs. DOUGLAS of California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

The CHAIRMAN. A minute and a half.

Mr. KEEFE. That is a long time to discuss this question, a minute and a half. I take this time, members of the Committee, to call your attention to the fact that when you voted on this rule you were given assurance by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the chairman of the committee in charge of this bill that the adoption of that rule would insure to the membership of this House full and free and complete debate that you would be denied if you let the matter go to the Senate, where you would have the bill come back with an amendment in a conference report, where, under the rules of the House, had you done that, the least debate you might have had upon this would be 1 hour. The old steam roller is working under the guise that we have got to get home and get this bill finished so that we can have a recess, and you are limiting debate to 30 minutes and denying the many people who want to speak on this bill the right and the opportunity to speak. What a fine spectacle today compared with the argument that was made here yesterday on the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. First of all I want to say that the very self-same argument advanced by the gentleman from Missouri against the school-lunch program was made against the institution of a free system of public instruction in these United States a hundred years ago. I want to say that I have spent most of my life as a school teacher, and I know that children that go to school without sufficient nourishment in their stomachs are not able to take advantage of that free public education. Not long ago a subcommittee of which I was a member had hearings on the subject of our agricultural future. Every witness that came before us emphasized this one basic fact about American agriculture: The American farmer produces an abundance in both good times and bad. He is the one producer who does not and cannot cut back production in times of depression. The central duty we owe him is to see that the demand for his products is maintained as nearly as possible at a corresponding level. Here in this school program is one way, one of the best ways, to work to that end. In the second place from the immediate viewpoint it is impossible to conduct a war-food program and not have some maladjustment between supply and demand. Repeatedly I have heard complaints here on this floor about a superabundance of certain particular products at certain periods. What are you going to do with the surplus? Are you going to turn your back on the price-support program completely?

What are you going to do with the commodities that have to be purchased to maintain that price-support program? Dump them in the ocean? Or will we channel them into the stomachs of American children? Of the men called in the draft and rejected as physically unfit for service, 40 percent were found to be suffering from defects due primarily to malnutrition in childhood. We ought to highly resolve that as long as there is food in this Nation we will not let such a condition prevail among the school children of America again.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. While listening to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] one would think that the average American family could not feed their own kids. That is just utter rot and nonsense, and practically everyone in the House knows it. Is not this proposal about as cowardly a thing as we here in America today can do. With the highest prices for farm products and the highest wages in the factories we have had for years, we borrow the money to feed our children, and throw the burden of repaying on the ones who are fighting the battles across the seas when they come back, pay for it with interest? If that is not a cowardly way of shifting our burden then I do not know anything that would be. All this talk of doing so much for the returning veterans is just so much hooey when we roll up the national debt by billions knowing that they—not we—will be called upon to meet it.

Our great-great-grandchildren will be saying as they make out a tax return: "Well, I would not have to do this if my great-grandad had gumption enough to feed his son, my granddad." I notice it is the liberals who are so generous in heaping tax burdens on the shoulders of future generations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I am puzzled by the remarks of the first two gentlemen who spoke on this amendment. It may be that they do not associate with the same kind of people I do, but I know that in my associations not only in my district but throughout every war center in the United States during the past 3 years, I have found that there are literally thousands of children who do come to school undernourished, who do not have an opportunity at home to get the full amount of food they should have if they are to grow up to be good, healthy American citizens. I have had one school teacher after another come to me with a request not that this program be continued in its present form but that it be strengthened and that more money be made available. It seems to me the least this House can do is to see to it that we do make available the funds that have been available during the past year, the sum of $50,000,000. It is an investment which will repay itself many times over—an investment which I hope will prevent the recurrence of that situation which the gentleman from California has just described, where under our draft act we have found that 40 percent of our boys were not physically fit for service to their country.

Our children are our most precious heritage. Huge sums are appropriated under this bill to eradicate diseases of livestock, a provision to which I do not object. But certainly simple justice and common sense should tell us that if we can afford large sums to protect livestock

we can spend $50,000,000 to insure a sound, healthy rising generation. There is no more important question before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 57, line 7, after the word "centers", strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no employee of the Department of Agriculture or the War Food Administration or the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other Federal body or agency shall circularize or solicit in any manner, directly or indirectly, any school authority to permit the use of the so-called school-lunch program. The violation of this provision shall be punishable by dismissal of any such employee."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislative in character, especially that part of it which provides a penalty for the violation of the provisions of the proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Ohio on the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I took this amendment to be simply a limitation on the expenditure of funds.

Mr. TARVER. But the gentleman's amendment goes further and provides a penalty for the violation of the proposed restriction.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment by striking out the penalty provision, as follows: "The violation of this provision shall be punishable by dismissal of any such employee."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, that was not the only part of the gentleman's amendment, as I heard it read, which provided a penalty. I should like to have the amendment reported as it has been modified.

Mr. TABER. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. That amendment is not being formally offered at this time. It can only be read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a perfecting amendment and would have to be disposed of before the gentleman's motion to strike out. The Chair overrules the point of order.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 57, line 7, after the word "centers", strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no employee of the Department of Agriculture or the War Food Administration or the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other Federal body or agency shall circularize or solicit in any manner directly or indirectly any school authority to permit the use of the so-called school-lunch program."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit Government employees from promoting the school-lunch program. If there had been placed in every Federal law which has been passed a provision containing the same prohibition, the Federal bureaucracy today would be about one-tenth of its present size. One of the greatest fallacies that has ever gripped the minds of men is that bureaucracy is something that comes about through the demands of the civilian population. The growth of bureaucracy did not result from public demand, but instead resulted from political salesmanship and propaganda. It is the bureaucratic group which is primarily responsible for the organization and development of practically all Federal Government programs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations for Agriculture has realized this program is not one on which all will agree. But we do feel that since this program has been in existence for a number of years, the committee would not be justified in eliminating it without the House having a chance to pass upon it. While this program is not as good as some Members here think it is, at the same time I am sure it is not nearly so bad as many other people think it is. The Federal Government does not pay all the expenses of this program but only pays a part of the cost of food furnished under this school-lunch program in the lunchrooms. Food is bought locally at customary prices. Much of the food is from surplus products purchased by the Government to support prices. There are many areas during this war period in which the demands of employment are so great that many mothers and many people in homes have been taken out of those homes and gone into war work. Certainly, during the last few years, where they have come to depend upon the school-lunch program, it would tend to upset present conditions to now eliminate that program. Certainly, we have in this Nation many underprivileged children. Something, perhaps, should be done in the way of education of the families of those children. I doubt the wisdom of this program being carried on through future years as a national program. Frankly, I feel it is a local program. But in this wartime, realizing that my section of the country is not representative of many other areas where there are crowded conditions due to the war, where the mothers and daughters are engaged in war work, I would not say because in my own area they perhaps can get by without this program that it is not vitally needed in certain congested areas where the average woman is engaged in war work and has come to depend on this program.

This program has done much to educate the local community to the fact that lunch rooms could be operated and hot lunches provided at a very small cost. Many communities are now supporting their program after it has been proved that they can do so with Federal assistance. The contribution from the Federal Government is from 6 to 9 cents per lunch. Those students who can pay do so, and the local lunch room must apply the money taken in to the expense of operation.

The committee felt that, since this program, according to the testimony, is very essential in many areas due to the war especially, we should bring this program to the House that it might decide this question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, it appears on the face of the committee report on the pending bill that there is no semblance of excuse for continuing the school-lunch program because there is no surplus of food products to be removed from the market. Now, the act setting aside 30 percent of the gross customs receipts for the removal of surpluses should be repealed and the school-lunch program should not be continued as a surplus remover when there are no surpluses of foodstuffs.

The language of the report shows that the school-lunch program has been illegally extended to cover the child-parent centers operated by the Federal Works Administration. The committee report cites the school-lunch program as a basis for the special rule waiving points of order so that the merits of that and the entire bill may be discussed.

But, Mr. Chairman, let me say when the chairman of the committee says under the rule which was adopted we are going to have free and open discussion of all these points of order and then they come in here with a gag rule and give you 30 minutes for 435 Members of the House, if they were all present, to discuss it, it seems to me we are going pretty far in trying to gag the Congress of the United States. When the judge from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] said a while ago one way to eliminate this great indebtedness is through bankruptcy it seems to me the gentleman from Texas ought to come in here now and vote to save this $50,000,000 and keep our country from going through bankruptcy—that is what I am working so hard for—is to keep our country solvent. I do not want to go through bankruptcy. How foolish you are for even suggesting it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, as I read the report of the committee, it is not as the other members have quoted it here on the floor. They did not have the text to quote from. I wish to quote from page 18, about the middle of the middle paragraph:

However, there are still some surpluses for which the school-lunch program constitutes an outlet * * *. The school-lunch program, therefore, is of double utility and one which apparently commands the favor of a very substantial majority of Members of both Houses of the Congress.

That is the exact language of the committee and it is not as quoted heretofore by Members of this House in debate; for they quoted from memory and not by actual quote as I have.

I call your attention to the fact that in California the number of lunches furnished school children has decreased by almost 5,000 in the last year, according to the report. I call attention to the fact that in such great centers as are in my State it must increase to serve the needs of my district, as the needs increase.

I think it is a disgrace that we give less time to discussing the welfare of the children of our Nation than we do to other subjects like soil and forests, cattle, and hogs. Certainly the American people are not going to be happy that we had so little discussion of the most important subject before us—our children's needs—when we should have ample time.

The Federal Government does not compel this program upon the schools; they have to want it and need it and do their own part, too.

The gentlemen speaking for the amendment do not even offer to prove that this cooperation by our Federal Government with school districts is no longer needed. I see no justification in eliminating this health-making program, based merely on unfounded statements that it is not the American way to do things, or that people are making more money now than ever. Certainly the gentlemen who state that workingmen are making more than ever, as their justification of trying to eliminate this worthy program, know that there are millions upon millions of American workingmen who still average less than $1,000 annual income. Does any Member of this House feel that he would be adequately feeding, nourishing, and giving his children adequate schooltime lunches if he was earning less than $1,000 a year? This cooperative noonday lunch for millions of American children over the Nation does not happen to immediately affect your children or mine. But, gentlemen, these warm noonday lunches made possible by this bill do give warm health-making foods to millions of our neighbors' children. As a Member of this House, I will not assume that the health and welfare of my neighbor's child is less important than that of my own. I am for eliminating any unnecessary governmental costs or appropriations, but I refuse to believe that the first place to begin is to take it out of the very health of our needy and deserving school children. This is not charity. This is an investment. This is a dividend-paying investment. This is conservation of the health of our Nation's children and where it counts the most. The best time to build a child's physical stature is as the child grows into adolescence and youth. It must be done then.

Our cattle, hogs, our factories, our clothes, and our luxuries are not as important as the health of our children, yet, gentlemen, we debate for hours as to these other things and we allow but a few minutes to discuss that which is more important than our cattle, hogs, factories, and luxuries. Let the gentlemen who this afternoon argue primarily in terms of several dollars think in terms of the possibility of these millions of children affected as being their own, then, Mr. Chairman, they will place the emphasis on children instead of cash. That, gentlemen, is where the emphasis must be placed if we justly treat this issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MASON. I do not yield for a parliamentary inquiry. One and one-half minutes is a short time to discuss this matter anyway.

Mr. Chairman, as a school man of 35 years' experience, the last 15 years of which I was responsible for conducting a school-lunch program in my schools, I am opposed to a school-lunch program supported by Uncle Sam. I understand the American principle is this—that the parents of the children are responsible, in the first place, for the proper feeding of their children. When they cannot do it then the local community is responsible. When the local community cannot handle it, it is up to the county and then the State, and lastly it is up to Uncle Sam to be responsible for feeding the children of this Nation.

With that as a basis of my opposition to this bill, I wish to state that I conducted a school-lunch program, that we did give free lunches, that we did provide free milk for undernourished children, but we did it all at the expense of the local community by raising the money locally, by putting on school programs to raise the money to give free milk to those children whose parents could not afford to do it. Uncle Sam, with a $300,000,000,000 debt, the value of the entire United States, is the least able to supply free lunches to the school children of this Nation, certainly less able to do so than the local school communities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I was wondering just now what the difference was between serving a school lunch at community expense and serving it at Government expense. Is the Government not a collection of communities? If it is right in one community, what makes it wrong in all? If its cost comes from the taxpayers' money in either case, what difference does it make from which it comes? The question is whether the program is good. The essential fact is we have been talking a great deal this afternoon about conserving the soil, being very careful about the soil, to see that there was a fine soil for our coming generations. Is it not a fine thing also to be concerned about the generations which are going to farm that soil in future years?

I know when I attended school I left the farm and walked to school and I carried with me in my lunch basket the same lunch every day. It was the pancakes that were left over from breakfast. A great majority of the country children carried that same breakfast to school every morning. If I had had a chance to have a decent hot lunch, some of the ills with which this body of mine has been afflicted might have been avoided. I say that school children have the right to have a hot lunch, and many will not get it in any other way but by our school-lunch program. The housewife on the farm has other duties to attend to than preparing lunches for the school children. She sometimes takes the nearest thing she can find, and that may be what is left over from breakfast.

In later years I have visited rural schools where hot lunches have been served. I have been in rural communities and sampled their school lunches, and I say to you the money spent on those programs is a mighty fine expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, on pages 444 and 445 of the hearings you will find the quantity of war food distributed under this program between July and December of 1944.

Answering the gentleman from Arizona as to how it is being distributed, the testimony shows the following States did not receive any food—Idaho, Michigan, Montana, Nebraska, Wyoming, and the District of Columbia. The States that receive the largest amount are Georgia, 5,000,000 pounds; Kentucky, 3,000,000 pounds; North Carolina, 4,000,000 pounds; South Carolina, 5,500,000 pounds. Ohio received 78,000 pounds.

So of the 48,000,000 pounds of food distributed in the 6 months, three States plus Puerto Rico got one-half of the food for school lunches and child centers. I believe much good can come from a school-lunch program. It should have more local support and less Federal control. There should also be a better distribution of the available surplus food.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. ROE].

Mr. ROE of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment.

Never in the history of this country have our working people had more money with which to feed their children. We fought the Revolutionary War because of taxation without representation, yet we are taxing unborn generations to pay the debts we incur. The generations to come are the ones who will have to foot this bill. Soldiers who are fighting our battles on the battlefields of the world are to be brought back home to pay the bills we have accumulated. Those men who by the millions have been shedding their blood on the battlefields are the ones who will have to pay.

We should support this amendment as one step in stopping the unnecessary waste of Federal money. We should stop taking money out of the taxpayers' pockets and start a little way toward a sound and balanced fiscal policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to speak for 2 minutes on a subject as important as this. Rather I will yield my time to anyone who wants to talk for the amendment. I will yield it to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] if he wants time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to pay my respects to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] for what he said a few moments ago. I simply say "Yea and amen" to every word he spoke. At the same time I want to express my utter amazement at the statement made by the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, who a while ago declared that the national debt could be cleared up by going through bankruptcy.

I am sorry, too, for the gentleman from New Mexico who just said that his mother packed the left-overs from breakfast for him when he went to school. He seems to have gotten along pretty well on it for he is a pretty husky man. My mother packed up a good school lunch for me; and I think every mother in America sends her boys and girls off to school with as good a lunch as she can. After all left-overs are often all right.

Now is the time to discontinue this program. We are in a far better position to discontinue it now than at a later time when unemployment stares us in the face, as it is bound to. So I think it is time now we reduced this burden, because I am sure the children will still be better fed than they have been at any time since 1932.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. SAVAGE] is recognized.

Mr. SAVAGE. Mr. Chairman, although I have not had the privilege of being a Member of this body very long, I have been a legislator for several years and I know that the public in general is supporting the school-lunch program. I have been contacted on it many times and asked to assist in carrying on the program.

I realize that the young people growing up are going to have to help pay the war debt. I feel it is our duty to help make them healthy through the school-lunch program so they may be able to help pay the debt. I know that warm school lunches add to the health of the children considerably. It is impossible to send a warm lunch to school with a child.

Federal participation in this program encourages the use of the school-lunch program throughout the Nation. In my opinion, the gentleman who implied that it is un-American to feed children warm school lunches, presenting the rugged individualism idea, was getting pretty far from the question of providing hot lunches for school children. Hoover was defeated advocating rugged individualism and asking the people in each block to feed each other if they did not have jobs, and too many of the children then going to school became physically unfit to pass the test necessary to get into the armed services to help defend their Nation in this war. The only individual right this program prevents is the right to impose malnutrition upon a school child. People take pride in feeding their families if they have the oppo tunity. If they have jobs, they are willing to spend the money to feed their children. If they do not have the money, it is our responsibility to help build up young America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the school-lunch program. There has been a great deal of talk about conservation of natural resources and I am heartily in agreement with such a program. But, as a woman, as a mother, as one whose nephews and family are overseas, I think the conservation of human resources is at least equally important. The other night a nephew told me a little of the boys at the front and their reaction to bombings. What happens to many of them in this war, sitting in the trenches waiting for their time of action? Some cry like babies when planes are overhead raining bombs. And my nephew told me jokingly that he could tell the closeness of the strike by the degree with which they shook. A sound nervous system in a well-nourished body is more essential than ever before, not only in war but in our complicated industrial civilization. The few dollars we contribute to school lunches to help countless children grow up sound and strong will be repaid to our country many times over.

I want to give you some figures. Figures from the Library of Congress show that for 1943, 21,600,000 people after taxes had only an average of $860 a year; 67,000,000 people after taxes had an average income of around $2,000.

I ask you, "Do you or do you not think our democracy will be strengthened by providing hot school lunches for the children of these families."

I have seen children go to school without breakfast. I have watched many school-lunch programs, and often a very meager luncheon at that. I have seen what it has meant to them. It is as the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] said. I have listened to the testimony of school people stating that school lunches are more important than schoolbooks if you have to choose between them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I understand that there is some time remaining that has not been consumed. May I ask if I can have recognition for that time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] did not respond. He had a minute and a half. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to use that time?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I do make that unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out how this program works. There cannot be a school-lunch program in a community unless the local people sponsor and set up that program. The only thing the Federal Government can do is to supply to those local people a certain amount of foodstuffs which they can use in accordance with their own decision and in a manner in which the local people decide to use it.

The question seems to me to be entirely one as to what the Congress wants to do with the foodstuffs produced by American farmers which have no natural outlet in the regular markets of the Nation. If you are going to have a program to do that then it is necessary to have a sound established school-lunch program into which to channel those products. I cannot feel in my heart that this is anything more than an expression of simple decency. We have free public schools for all the children of all the people who want to use them. These lunches at noon are provided in school after school throughout this Nation and they are even now meaning much to the good health of our children.

We are leaving a heavy load for those children to carry in the future.

Many local communities have done this without Federal contribution, I agree, but if we have the foodstuffs in surplus as we shall always have—at least some of them—why not make them available to the children of the Nation? That is the whole question before you now. Is there a better thing we could do? I believe not. Indeed I believe this school-lunch program could be improved and perfected and set forth in careful legislation by this body so as to become a cornerstone of a real effort to improve the nutritional standards of this Nation, and such an effort can be a major answer, Mr. Chairman, and a most constructive one to the farm problem of this Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] to close debate.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, we carry millions of dollars in this bill, as we have done for years, for Bang's disease in cattle, tuberculosis in cattle, and hog cholera, and if it is a function of the Government of the United States to do something for the protection of the health of livestock in the country, I cannot understand why it is such a terrible thing to do something for the health and protection of the children. This school-lunch program is going to be continued whether you vote for this provision or not. It is an essential part of the school life of a great many thousands of school districts in this country. If you do not vote for this appropriation, the poorer school districts are not going to have it because they cannot carry it on, but other districts, financially able,

will carry it on whether you vote for this appropriation or not. This is merely a stop gap. Your Committee on Agriculture is considering bringing in legislation prescribing the measure of local and State participation in this program and the measure of participation by the Federal Government. Pending the report on that legislation and the working out of some sound plan by which the amount of participation of the Federal Government may be defined, it certainly seems to me that it would be unwise to discontinue the program as it is at present being carried on. I hope that the House will not adopt the amendment which has been proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] in the nature of a perfecting amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TARVER and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 88, nays 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUGAR ACT

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions, other than those specifically relating to the Philippine Islands, of the Sugar Act of 1937, approved September 1, 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1100–1183), including the employment of persons and means, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, as authorized by said act, $48,446,000, to remain available until June 30, 1947.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 57, line 22, after the word "act", strike out "$48,466,000" and insert "$1."

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for the purpose of making a brief announcement?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to ask the gentleman to yield, but I ask for this time in order to make an announcement of interest to the Members of the House. The conferees of the Senate and the House have agreed on a compromise on the work-or-jail bill. That perhaps will be brought in the first of the week. I see the majority leader here and because so many of the Members are getting ready to leave, I think it would be wise if the majority leader can tell us when the conference report will be brought in on that particular bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. The majority leader can get time any time he wants to to reply to the gentleman from Missouri, but I cannot.

I want to say I have seen so many things happen here this afternoon that I just shudder. Honestly, I have. When they brought the rule from the Committee on Rules the other day and said you would have plenty of time for discussion of the sections of the bill, and then you limit discussion to 30 minutes on an important item; then when I see the Clerk hand the chairman a vote and then wait until a holler from a Democrat from the rear of the room brings in another vote so you can get a majority, I do not know what is going to happen next. I tell you, it is getting pretty serious. I say it is unethical, unjust; yes, it does not make sense. It is Democrats being railroaded.

Here is the Sugar Act. I remember 4 years ago when they were paying the sugar farmers of this country $49,000,000 per year for not raising sugar, when the New Deal had in the Virgin Islands 250,000 tons of sugar which they left lying on the ground to be destroyed, and when we had the same thing happen down in Puerto Rico—destroying sugar. Before a year had gone by they came in here and said that we were short of sugar and that we want to help the sugar farmers of this country and we will pay the sugar farmers $48,500,000 for raising sugar, and in the same year you jumped from $49,000,000 for not raising sugar to $48,000,000 to raise sugar. Ever hear any thing so ridiculous, so unbusinesslike, so extravagant, so ruinous to our financial stability?

That happened down in the cane-sugar farms of Florida, Louisiana; to the beet-sugar farms in Michigan, Colorado, Montana, and other States.

Now, you say you take this money out of the Treasury. When you could pay one-fourth of 1 cent per pound for sugar by the consumers and save an empty treasury of $48,000,000, and if you add a tax of one-fourth of 1 cent per pound, you could put $50,000,000 in the Treasury. When I heard the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary this afternoon, when he was talking about this great national debt, say that we can get rid of this national debt by going into bankruptcy, I tell you it is a serious statement for anybody to make, either on the floor of Congress or any place else as a way to get rid of a great national debt. What are we coming to? What are we coming to? What is this Congress doing? Now, you have $48,000,000 here that you can cut out of the bill. If you think you ought to go through bankruptcy, do not support my amendment. If you want to tighten your belts and say the American people, like our forefathers, can do the thing that is American and start in to work and earn and save, we would pay this debt off, and we would retain our honor as American citizens. We would economize in our spending. We would work more and talk less. We would cut out appropriations and spend less, we should be sound and sensible in the things that we do. Remember when you spend, you must find someone to lend. Remember we are at war; economize and help the war effort. Vote for the amendment. But if you want to go through bankruptcy, vote against the amendment. God save America and the American form of government.

I ask you to adopt the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MUNDT and Mr. TARVER rose.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman from South Dakota desire to speak on this amendment?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman desires to speak.

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman desires to speak on this amendment, I shall withhold a motion I intended to make.

Mr. MUNDT. I simply wanted to interrogate the chairman of the subcommittee concerning a matter in the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Very well.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. MUNDT. On page 66 of the bill, in the concluding paragraph at the bottom of the page, there appears language which disturbs me. I think, perhaps, there is an explanation for it which will clear it up. I refer to the paragraph beginning in line 19, which reads as follows:

No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws.

Is that correct or is that a typographical error?

Mr. TARVER. That is correct and it has been carried in this bill ever since the agency has been authorized by the Congress. It has been carried designedly in order to prevent covering into the civil service all of these thousands of employees of what is a temporary organization at present, the farm security organization, never authorized by law. If and when the Congress authorizes the setting up of the farm security organization by law, then our subcommittee would feel there is no reason why its employees should not come under the civil service. But until that time we feel there is no justification for covering them into the civil service, and we have brought this provision in here year after year, and it has always received the overwhelming approval of this House.

Mr. MUNDT. A similar provision has been inserted at times whereby employees are not necessarily appointed by the civil service, but this specifically bars the civil service.

Mr. TARVER. This is the same language which has been carried year after year during the existence of this program, and has been repeatedly approved by this House when it was sought to be stricken out.

Mr. MUNDT. What is the process by which these appointees are selected now?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman will have to consult with the administrative authorities of the Farm Security Administration in regard to that.

Mr. MUNDT. It has not been brought out in the hearings?

Mr. TARVER. No, sir. They are simply not to be covered into the civil service, under the terms of this bill, so long as this organization is not authorized by law. If the Congress desires to set up an organization by statute, then

of course they would come under the civil service.

Mr. MUNDT. If this were purely an emergency organization there might be better reason for barring civil-service employees, but it goes on year after year, and it would seem to me it could well be staffed by civil-service employees.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, the gentleman can offer an amendment to strike out this proviso if he so desires, but all I can say is that the House has always approved it heretofore.

Mr. MUNDT. I recognize that but I do not propose to offer an amendment today. However, I did want to get some information, because standing up by itself it is not clear why the civil-service employees should be barred. It is a situation which would seem to merit further study.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Freight rates for farm products: To carry out the provisions of section 201 (a) to 201 (d), inclusive, of title II of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (7 U. S. C. 1291), $84,200.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, after consultation with the gentleman from New York I desire to submit a unanimous consent request that I understand will be satisfactory to him.

There are three paragraphs in the bill dealing with the Farm Security Administration, activities under the heads "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation." I ask unanimous consent that the provisions from page 62, line 20, to page 66, line 22, inclusive, may be considered as one paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike out the whole section, but if someone has a perfecting amendment they may go ahead of me.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 62, line 20, strike out all to and including line 22, page 66.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, right now there are a great many of these agents of the Farm Security Administration running around in your district and mine trying to get farmers to make loans which they do not want. Right now the pressure is tremendous on the part of this group. On top of that we have all sorts of agents of other credit organizations of the Government. If there were to be any intelligence exercised with reference to this proposition there would be one set-up to handle the whole business. In my county there are four or five of these people running around.

Here is the picture of the country as a whole, and it appears on page 539 of the hearings. There were made in the 6 months ending December 31, 36,939 loans all over the United States. That means out of all this money the loans covered in the 6-month period were 12 or 13 on an average to a county, including all the agricultural counties in the United States. In New York State there were made during that period about 495 loans, or less than 9 to a county.

The whole thing is on a scale that does not justify itself at all. The amount of money for administration is $22,500,000 and after the overtime is allowed the figure becomes $26,000,000, nearly 50 percent as much money as is proposed altogether to be lent.

Why should we go on with that kind of an operation which does not make sense at all?

When this thing came up the gentleman from Georgia stated that there would be no chance if we did not carry this in the House. Let me tell you that if you carry this thing out as it is brought in here by the committee, and it goes over to the Senate, the only way you can settle it is by giving them a lot more than we have in the bill now, and the only chance you have to keep it down anywhere is to keep it down to start with and then you have a chance to keep it somewhat down. I recognize that there is tremendous pressure on the part of folks that are not thinking things through and that have a reactionary disposition and want to destroy the economic structure of America without benefiting the farmer in the slightest; and I do not believe that this does. I have an agricultural district myself. My people do not need this thing. I do not believe that any district needs it. I do not believe there is any district where any man who needs a loan cannot get it and get it right straight out in his own locality.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Do I understand that the administration expense is 50 percent of the amount of the authorization?

Mr. TABER. Well, it is not quite. It will run $26,000,000 when you get the overtime pay included and the amount authorized to loan is $67,000,000. It may be around the figure of 40 to 45, somewhere in there, almost 50. That is about the size of it, and that is about the way it runs. I cannot see any sense in that way of doing business, and I hope that the House of Representatives will put its foot down and say that we do not want to do this thing any longer.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: Page 66, line 1, after the semicolon, strike out all of the rest of line 1 and all of lines 2 and 3 down to the words "hospital services" in line 4.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, in the first place I should like to state that I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, for the reason that it is my belief that these loans made to those farmers who are not in a position to obtain credit elsewhere have been of tremendous service in enabling thousands upon thousands of farm families to retain their hold upon the land, to increase their production, to better balance their operations, to acquire a little livestock or a little machinery where before they had much less, and I believe this work has contributed to the stability of the family-sized farm in America. That is why I am opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

My amendment seeks to do one thing. It seeks to strike out of the bill language which prohibits a man in receipt of a loan from the Farm Security Administration from using any portion of that loan for the payment of dues to a cooperative of any kind. I want to point out that I have not sought to strike from the bill the prohibition against making loans to cooperatives. Indeed, I believe that to be proper because I do not think a cooperative ought to be fostered by Government agencies. I think cooperatives should stand upon their own feet, and I believe they can. But I see no reason why we should also carry a prohibition which says to a man that if he gets a loan under the Farm Security Administration he cannot use four or five dollars of that money, for the purpose of paying for membership in a cooperative association which might enable him in more orderly fashion to market the crop that he grows, which might enable him to participate in the cooperative purchase of a bull or some other animal that a group of farmers might be able to afford, but which each individual farmer could not afford.

I do not think that prohibition ought to lie. I think it ought to lie no more against the man who gets one of these loans than would be the case against a man who received other loans. I see no more reason to interdict his joining a cooperative which enables him better to carry on his agricultural work than there would be to prohibit him from using some of this money to pay a premium on an insurance policy or something else.

My own belief is that the cooperation among the farmers that has been developed in this country is the answer largely to our desire to see the farmers of this Nation meet the problems of agriculture without governmental support or intervention. I think, if we are going to make progress toward enabling our farmers to solve their problems without Government help, it has to be done by the method of cooperation. That is the reason I am offering this amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments

thereto close in 30 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. DE LACY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY].

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Chairman, I am going to offer a perfecting amendment to page 64, line 13, to raise the amount appropriated for the F. S. A. for rural rehabilitation loans from $67,500,000 to $125,000,000, the figure sought by the F. S. A. and authorized, as I understand, by the Budget itself.

These loans are meritorious. They are going to increase the capital and the operating equipment of underemployed farmers. They have resulted in one item alone in increasing the hog sales of the families affected by 250,000,000 sales in a year. They bring food to the country. They are important to the welfare of the small family-sized farm and of all the people.

The purpose for which this extra appropriation was sought by the F. S. A. was to make it possible to assist the returning veterans to get established on the land. The committee's report on page 20 unfortunately takes the position that this help is not good enough for veterans, even though they may find themselves needing it. If a veteran cannot get help from the G. I. bill of rights or any other source, he should have it the way the impoverished farmers got it who have gotten themselves established during the years of its operation, through a loan from the F. S. A.

This amendment will be offered later, and I hope the Members will support it. It is good for the farm communities, it is good for the veterans, and it is good for the whole country. Already under the existing program 33,000 veterans of World War No. 1 have gotten F. S. A. rural rehabilitation loans. One thousand three hundred World War No. 2 veterans have also gotten these loans already. That demonstrates the need for it. If 20 years after that conflict veterans of the last war are still needing this type of relief, then we know we need the $125,000,000 asked for by F. S. A. for the veterans who will be coming back when this war is over and who will seek establishment on the farms. There will be an estimated 300,000 servicemen from farms demobilized from the armed services and coming back before the end of this year. They should have the chance of establishing themselves on the farms. This added amount, the difference between $125,000,000 as sought and $67,500,000 as granted, will go a long way in helping 93,000 needy families get a better return from their labors on the farm. Here is what Mr. Hancock, who was praised by the committee for his sound administration of F. S. A., said in the committee hearings, volume II, pages 521–522:

THE PROGRAM FOR 1946

I have reviewed the past year's work in some detail, perhaps too much; but I really take pride in this report. Now, I should like to outline F. S. A.'s needs for next year.

In the full mobilization of this country's resources for the prosecution of the war and a speedy victory, we cannot overlook the real contribution which can be made by thousands of low-income farmers when they are provided with adequate operating credit and technical advice and practical assistance.

Even in this period of higher prices and greater demand for the farmers' products, many farm families lack land, working capital, skill, and the ability to plan and carry out sound farm enterprises and improved practices. They do not produce enough, nor sell enough, to have a satisfactory level of living. They have been unable to benefit extensively from the favorable agricultural conditions during the war. Nor is there much hope for the future improvement unless they are provided with the credit and practical on-the-farm guidance needed to achieve that improvement.

The demand for rural rehabilitation loans from farmers struggling for an existence has continued heavy during the war. Funds available have not been sufficient to meet the demand during the 2 past fiscal years. Practically all of the $67,500,000 available for loans this year will be obligated by the end of March or the middle of April. Judging from experience in past years, we may reasonably expect again to receive applications from many thousands of eligible and needy farmers after our loan funds are exhausted.

We also expect during the 1946 fiscal year an increasing demand for rural rehabilitation loans from eligible World War No. 2 veterans, and displaced war workers who went from farms into industry, and who will return to farms when they are no longer needed in war plants.

About 15 percent of all the men in our armed forces came from farms. On the basis of War Department reports, we estimate that about 2,300,000 men will have been discharged from the armed services by the end of next December, and that between 211,000 and 305,000 will expect to go back to the farm. Thousands of these men will require operating credit as well as advice and practical guidance in the selection and the successful operation of their farms. Every effort must be made to see that they have a reasonable chance to succeed.

It is to the Nation's credit that while this war is still in progress, concrete and constructive plans are being made to assist the returning veteran to his rightful place in civilian life. We must not permit the situation which followed the last war to be repeated.

More than 33,000 veterans of World War No. 1, years after the armistice of 1918, found it necessary to secure aid in rural rehabilitation through the Farm Security Administration. Veterans of this war will also need the type of credit and assistance available under our program. Already applications for rehabilitation loans have been received from several thousand of them. Their applications are being handled on the same basis as other applications. We are making loans only to those who cannot get adequate credit on reasonable terms anywhere else and who are otherwise eligible for F. S. A. assistance. Through December 31, 1944, more than 1,300 rural rehabilitation loans for World War No. 2 veterans had been approved.

With a minimum addition of supervisory and administrative personnel, we estimate that sound rehabilitation loans can be made in 1946 to about 93,500 new borrowers who can secure adequate land resources or make sound tenure arrangements essential for successful farming. The total number of farm families actually needing rehabilitation loans, and eligible for them, of course, greatly exceeds this number.

About two thirds of the $125,000,000 we are recommending for rehabilitation purposes would be for new loans. The remainder would be for supplemental loans to 130,000 of our present borrowers to enable them to continue their progress toward rehabilitation under their farm and home plans.

The country needs this full amount. I hope the House will support my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] for I feel, to reduce the matter to an absurdity, and follow it through, there would be just as much sense in allowing the use of Federal funds to pay dues to the Farm Bureau and all the rest of the farm organizations as to allow this use of the funds provided for under the provisions of the proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. It seems that the House should realize that if this amendment is adopted, the entire appropriation for administrative purposes will be eliminated along with the appropriation for rural rehabilitation loans during the coming year. The gentleman from New York emphasizes the fact that this $22,000,000 was almost 50 percent of the funds made available for loans, but he overlooked the fact that this money is used for administering an agency with assets totaling in excess of $1,000,000,000 in property and in other chattels. I desire to call attention to the fact that the committee, of which the gentleman is a member, in its report on this particular bill commended the splendid efforts of the present Administrator in this language:

> The committee wishes to express its commendation of the work of the present Administrator, Hon. Frank Hancock. It is apparent that he has labored conscientiously and diligently to put the program on a sound basis and to conform to the directives of the Congress with respect to the modifications of the character of many portions of the program as originally set up.

That language is important, gentlemen, in view of the many words of condemnation which have been heaped upon Mr. Hancock's predecessors beginning with Mr. Rexford Guy Tugwell and Mr. W. W. Alexander and ending with Mr. C. B. Baldwin, all of whom were accused frequently of trying to defeat the mandates of Congress. But here we have an administrator who is commended by the Committee on Appropriations of the House. I personally take pride in the fact that he is doing a splendid job. I take pride, further, in the fact that I do not believe he will squander any of the money or that he will permit it to be squandered. I want to emphasize in these few moments I have at my disposal that the gentleman from New York

would lead this House to believe that anyone desiring a loan can go into an F. S. A. office and obtain a loan. That is not true. He can only obtain it when he satisfies the committee and the administration that he is unable to obtain a loan elsewhere.

Mr. TABER. But I do not understand that is the reason nor do I understand they are exercising proper care with reference to their loans.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York as regards the Farm Security Administration. I have listened quite intently to the argument about this organization. I am talking to you gentlemen now as a farmer, as a person who made his living through farming. I know the attitude of the farmers of my State. I cannot speak for other States, but I know that in Maryland the farm organizations, the Farm Bureau, the Extension Service, and everybody connected with agriculture realizes what the F. S. A. has done. They have gone into some experiments, they have wasted money. The administration of the F. S. A. has been such that it is a disgrace to any person who has taken any part in it.

In answer to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] as to the returning veterans, certainly there is no one in this Congress who is more interested in the returning veterans than I am, but I would hate to be a returning veteran and depend on the F. S. A. to rehabilitate me and find a way for me to obtain a farm after I got back.

After all, we have provided for the diligent farmer, the farmer with any reputation, practically every means of financing himself that anybody could have. They say this is to provide the farmers with funds, farmers who have no other means of obtaining funds. We have created the crop production corporations throughout every agricultural area of this country, whereby a man can go in there with practically nothing but his reputation, his integrity, and his industry and give to that association a chattel mortgage on his machinery and equipment that he may buy, on his crops, and without any further security go into business.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. If the applicant can obtain a C. P. C. loan or any other type of loan from any other agency, then he is not eligible for a loan under this program.

Mr. BALDWIN of Maryland. Then I will say this, that as liberal as the production credit corporation is, any person who cannot get that type of loan is not the kind of person who will be assisted by a loan under this program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY] to increase the rehabilitation loan from $67,500,000 to $125,000,000. We have provided in this bill that the veterans will receive $25,000,000 to obtain land on which to live. The amount of money that has been provided for the entire rehabilitation program is the same amount of money that was provided last year for farmers, not for veterans, except a very small number. The veterans have greatly increased. Around 90,000 veterans are being released from the armed forces every month. You have not provided a sufficient amount of money for rehabilitation for the veterans to go along with the amount of land that has been made possible for them to obtain. Rehabilitation means that it is made possible for the farmer and the veteran to purchase equipment, livestock, feed, fertilizer, technical assistance, and so forth. In other words, you insure the money that you have made possible for him to borrow to obtain the land. You insure the money by making sure that he is able to work productively on that land.

As for the fact that these farmers who have borrowed this money are not worthy to borrow money, the figures refute that, because the return of the moneys from people who have borrowed from the Farm Security Administration and who were unable to obtain a loan from any other source shows this program has been one of the best investments this Government has made in the past 10 years. The added food which we have been able to produce during the war has come from these low-income farm people, because the other farmers were producing from 80 to 90 percent of their maximum before the war, but the added production of food needed for war has come from these low-income farm groups.

The rehabilitation program added to the low income of thousands of farmers made possible a better life for them and gave them a secure place in agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment and I hope that it will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] is recognized.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment to strike out this entire program.

I am very sorry that in this time of necessity of food production, which is not at an end, a proposal of this sort should be made. Taking it even from that point of view, right at the time when we are crying for more food and saying—and probably it is true—the need is very great; that there continues to be a growing scarcity of food, and that the increase in food production, as the gentlewoman from California called to your attention, during these stressful times, has been made by the very men whom we call family-income farmers, the small farmers—the suggestion that $22,000,000 is required to man a program of $67,000,000 does not take into account the fact that that goes to the handling of $1,000,000,000 of transactions that have been heretofore made; and the amount that would be attributable to this small sum of $67,000,000 would be only in the hundreds of thousands of dollars at the most. There is a limitation of $2,500 on the amount that can be lent to any one farmer who is not able to get credit from commercial sources.

Last year when this came up I had letters from all over my district from men who had small farms whom I knew as men who could not own property. This aid could not be unsecured; their farming was almost a starvation proposition without this aid. But when they gave me the difference between their production and their development from the time they had borrowed this money from the F. S. A. it showed that they had come to be farmers of substantial value to their community, to their Nation, and to themselves. The contribution made by these men, aided by the F. S. A., to food production throughout the country has been great and their own fortunes and lives greatly improved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I direct the attention of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture to page 63, to the title "The Farm Debt Adjustment Service." I have just been wondering if after 10 years of the more abundant life it is still necessary to hire people to go out and compromise people's honest debts. I ask how much is appropriated for this purpose this year. This item begins in line 2 on page 63.

Mr. TARVER. Yes. Does the gentleman make that inquiry of me?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes; I do, sir.

Mr. TARVER. No specific amount of money is appropriated for that purpose. The language of the justifications indicates that it is expected that they get three farmers in each county who serve as members of the county committee to render such service as they can to applicants for rehabilitation loans in adjusting their credit arrangements with their creditors if their credit burdens are so heavy that they cannot be accepted as rehabilitants in an effort to have their debts reduced by mutual agreement on the part of the applicant and his creditors so that they can be considered as applicants for rehabilitation loans and have opportunity to reestablish themselves and to pay off the loan that may be granted them. In other words, this is an item of no additional expense; it is just a service by the county F. S. A. committee to these rehabilitants who maybe cannot carry on unless they get some reduction of their debts.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. In the first place, it is astonishing to me that

after 12 years of the more abundant life there is anybody who has any debt to be adjusted.

Mr. TARVER. There are unfortunately a good many people in this country who still owe debts.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The Committee on Agriculture the other day passed a bill that seemed to have for its purpose to adjust the debts of borrowers whose loans were arranged by these adjusters. I wish to ask the chairman one more question: Is it a fact as stated by our colleague—and I know he believed it was when he said it—that there is a $2 500 limitation on rehabilitation loans?

Mr. TARVER. Yes. The loans used to be larger, but our committee inserted that limitation several years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, this agency is doing a good job. The committee has acted wisely in providing this appropriation. I am against any hamstringing amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. KEES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of an amendment that is pending on the Clerk's desk which will strike out lines 19 to 22, page 66, and that has for its purpose putting the employees included in this section of the bill under the civil service. Of course, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York should prevail there would be no need for this amendment, but this is the only opportunity I will have to present the matter and to preserve my right to submit my amendment to require these Government employees to comply with civil-service regulations.

It will be said this is only a temporary organization, but be that as it may, this has been going on for some time and as long as it continues we might as well have these employees comply with civil service. It is not fair to other civil-service employees. It is not fair to the veterans who have certain preferences to these jobs. The civil service merit system is weak enough now, but to take eight or nine thousand Government employees and deliberately place them outside of civil service is absolutely without foundation. There is no reason for it at all. The only excuse that will be submitted to you is that this agency is supposed to be temporary, therefore they should not be included in the civil service. There are many agencies, known as war agencies, that we hope are temporary. Civil-service rules apply to those agencies.

Here is a chance to do a little for civil service and to help protect those who are under the civil service today. You will be helping also the veterans who are entitled to a chance at these jobs. There are about 8,500 or 9,000 of these people and all except about 450 of them are in the field. There is no good reason why this amendment should not be supported. Why continue to permit the appointments to run on a political basis. I know the pressure is great to leave it to political appointments. There are no requirements, no standards for these positions except political expediency.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the subcommittee in charge of this legislation.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman speaks of putting these eight or nine thousand employees under the civil service.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes. Your bill deliberately keeps them out of civil service.

Mr. TARVER. They are not under the civil service now. The gentleman wants to put them in by his amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes; I want them to be under civil service.

Mr. TARVER. It is not a question of taking them out. It is a question of going along with the gentleman and putting them in, according to his amendment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, that is what I want to do. I want to put them under the civil service where they belong. My amendment strikes from the bill the clause that specifically and deliberately exempts them from all civil-service reguations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], or one that he will offer, to relieve this bill of a limitation which prevents these employees from being under the civil service. Our colleague from Georgia, in answer to a question asked by the gentleman from South Dakota, said this had always been in the bill, but that is a mistake. It was put over on this House in 1941 in the second deficiency bill, because Eugene Casey came up here and left the chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. CANNON] with the understanding that the President wanted it.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I cannot right now.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is making a statement which is not correct. Mr. Casey had nothing whatever to do with this. I wrote the language myself.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman has a right to his opinion, but I have a right to mine also.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is mistaken. He is not correctly informed.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am informed. I talked to Mr. Casey about it.

The President issued a statement when he signed the deficiency bill stating this: "The Second Deficiency Appropriation Act contains a provision to which I am unalterably opposed."

Then he quoted this provision. In the last paragraph of the statement he stated: "It is my earnest hope that the Congress will take prompt action to repeal this rider."

Mr. Chairman, I have not the time to read the whole statement, but the truth is Eugene Casey led the chairman of the Appropriations Committee the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and Senator RUSSELL of my State also, to believe that the President wanted this rider put in there. They put it in, the Congress passed it, and we are trying to cut it out. The President wants it out.

Mr. Chairman, we passed the veterans' preference law in the last Congress. Did we mean it or were we just giving lip service to the men who are fighting for us today? I meant it when I supported that bill and I am going to protect their right of preference in connection with every bill that comes before the House as long as I serve here. I am going to give you an opportunity to do the same thing. Therefore I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas to strike this limitation out of this bill so that the veterans can get the preference to which they are entitled under the law we passed last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] is recognized.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the maladministration of Farm Security, but I do want to pay tribute to the present Administrator, Mr. Frank Hancock, a former Member of this body. I commend the hearings to your reading. Under his management Farm Security last year had a net surplus of $19,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington and in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. I wish to bring to the attention of the House certain material brought out very clearly in the hearings that deal with two points that have been brought before this House constantly during the last several days.

Repeated speeches have been made asking that we build up America's initiative and restore the self-respect of America. The hearings show very clearly that F. S. A. has had exactly that result, measured both in intangible and tangible terms. In intangible terms there is one bit of testimony after another that as the result of F. S. A. loans self-respect has been restored to thousands of farm families in America, and that those farm families who have been under F. S. A. loans have now become very useful members of their community and are participating in a very broad sense in the community life of this Nation. In tangible terms F. S. A. offered concrete figures showing the constant increase both in the income of farm families who have been recipients of F. S. A. loans and in the net worth of those farm families. I commend that point to the Members of this body and wish to incorporate those figures in the RECORD. They are as follows:

REHABILITATION LOANS INCREASE INCOME AND NET WORTH

Average gross family income and net worth of standard rural rehabilitation borrowers active in each year

Crop year	Gross family income (includes value of farm-produced food and fuel)	Net worth
1937	(1)	$842
1938	(1)	975
1939	$889	1,115
1940	909	1,051
1941	1,266	1,242
1942	1,549	2,008
1943	2,072	2,300

[1] Not available.

Secondly, I have been hearing requests on this floor for increased food production and the cry constantly raised that we need more and more food. Again I ask the Members of this body to read the hearings of the F. S. A. testimony in that respect, and they will find there excellent testimony that the families who have been recipients of F. S. A. loans have increased very measurably both their livestock and crop production and given to this Nation a much greater supply of food than we would have if the F. S. A. were not in existence. I also wish to incorporate the statistics on this question in the RECORD:

PRODUCTION RESULTS

1943 sales of livestock and livestock products and change from 1942 to 1943 by 1943 active standard rural rehabilitation borrowers who were operating farms in both years

Product	Unit [1]	1943 sales (number)	Percent change, 1942 to 1943
Pigs	Pounds	532,361,529	56
Chickens	Pounds	66,069,728	47
Cattle and calves	Pounds	432,360,682	43
Eggs	Dozen	126,333,312	32
Sheep	Pounds	62,777,820	30
Milk	Gallons	571,116,608	18

[1] Pounds are live weight.

1943 production of selected crops and change from 1942 to 1943 by 1943 active standard rural rehabilitation borrowers who were operating farms in both years

Crops	Unit	Production	
		1943 (number)	Percent change, 1942-43
Soybeans	Bushels	5,049,187	37
Peanuts	100 pounds	1,567,764	22
Dry beans and black-eyed peas	100 pounds	841,850	15
Corn	Bushels	114,795,742	10
Wheat	Bushels	26,950,301	−4
Cotton	Bale	535,658	−10

For these reasons it seems to me that we should increase the loan powers of the F. S. A. and certainly not abolish that agency.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wish to point out that in spite of the fact that these loans have been made to that group of farmers who were most in need, they have been repaid on a basis of about 86 to 90 percent, which is a pretty good record, it seems to me.

Mr. BIEMILLER. That is correct. There is testimony from the Administrator of the F. S. A. that $843,000,000 of loans were made up to July 1, 1944, by the F. S. A., and that 87.1 percent have been repaid.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I point out one further thing, if the gentleman will yield, that the administrative expenses can hardly be compared against the amount of money made available in one bill, but must be compared against the total outstanding volume of loans to be serviced, which is much greater.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Quite correct; which, I repeat, on July 1, 1944, amounted to $843,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] to close debate.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, what I want to say, after due consideration, is that I am not going to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas by reason of the fact that the two or three crooks found in the War Food Administration were certified to War Food Administration by the Civil Service Commission as qualified people.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I hope none of these amendments will be adopted. As far as the language of the appropriation is concerned, it is the same as has been carried for several years, and it has been on a number of occasions approved by the House.

As far as the proposal to increase the amount of the loan authorization to $125,000,000 is concerned, the amount of the Budget estimate, I think that in the presentation of the bill on Wednesday of this week I called attention to facts which, if you took occasion either to listen to my remarks or to read them, should convince you that the action of the committee in cutting the Budget by $57,500,000 was thoroughly justified.

At the same time, I do not think it is reasonable to talk about striking out the whole appropriation including the appropriation for administrative expenses. If you will look at page 542 of the hearings you will find that the Government now has invested in this program $868,216,369. You cannot just abolish this organization and leave all of that money up in the air with nobody to attend to it and nobody to evidence any interest in it or collect it for the Government.

The new Administrator is doing a good job. We pointed that out in our committee report, and every member of the subcommittee agrees with me that he is doing a good job. He is carrying out the directions of the Congress. He is liquidating all of these cooperative farm projects, which we directed Baldwin to do for many years, but he would not do it. However, Hancock is getting rid of those things. He had over 1,800,000 acres of land in these projects and he has sold over 700,000 of them already, and he is proposing to sell the remainder of them. He has sold hosiery mills and other projects of that character. He is really accomplishing a good job.

It seems to me that nobody ought to be willing to direct wiping out the organization and stopping his efforts toward liquidating all of these cooperative projects at this time.

Secondly, we have to have some organization charged with the responsibility of collecting the Government's $868,000,000 which it has invested in the program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I hope the House will see fit to knock down each and every amendment so far proposed to this particular paragraph.

Mr. TARVER. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I am in accord with what the gentleman has said, but will not the gentleman address himself to the argument made by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] in reference to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. TARVER. I want to have time to do that. This language was written into this bill originally by me. I wrote the language myself. It was intended to bar the turning into the civil service of these thousands of employees of the Farm Security Administration. I do not believe that ought to be done until such time as the Congress provides by law for setting up the Farm Security Administration. We have had this issue on the floor before. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] himself moved to strike out this language at one time but the House voted against this proposal. Certainly it seems to me that when we have such a top-heavy organization of civil service employees in the Government we ought not to be trying to see how many more thousands of people we can cover into it, thereby increasing their benefits and their salaries and their perquisites and everything of that sort. We ought to be trying to effect some little economy if we can, and certainly we ought not to consider covering these people into the civil service until Congress decides to make a permanent organization of the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman brings this provision to the floor of the

House without any legislation for it, does he not, that is, he brings it in here as part of the appropriation bill instead of going to the Committee on Agriculture and getting authority for it. That is his excuse for not putting it under the civil service.

Mr. TARVER. The House has the right to pass such legislation as it desires. If the House desires to put these employees under the civil service before this organization is established by law, it can do that by accepting the gentleman's amendment, which I hope it will not do.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on this paragraph and all amendments thereto has expired. There is pending a perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, may we have that amendment reported again for the information of the Committee?

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DE LACY of Washington: On page 64, line 18, after the phrase "not to exceed", strike out "$67,500,000" and insert "$125,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DE LACY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 66, line 19, strike out all of line 19 down to and including line 22.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

T e question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES of Kansas) there were—ayes 52, nays 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 67, noes 87.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the farm tenancy provisions, page 66, line 23, and page 68, line 16, be considered as one paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

WATER CONSERVATION AND UTILIZATION PROJECTS

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary, through such agencies of the Department as he may designate, to carry into effect the functions of the Department under the act of October 14, 1940 (16 U. S. C. 590y–z–10), as amended relating to the construction, operation, and maintenance of water conservation and utilization projects, $1,165,066, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended, which sum shall be merged with the unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated or transferred to said department for the purposes of said act, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase of books of reference and periodicals; and leveling or otherwise preparing such lands for the utilization of irrigation water, irrespective of ownership.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I impose myself on the committee at this late hour in order to keep an important record straight, not only the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but other records for other people. Under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Act there are $15,000,000 provided for farm loans to nonveterans and $25,000,000 for veterans. I will yield at any time if I do not state the facts correctly. When you appropriate $15,000,000 you are appropriating enough money to buy 2,500 farms at $6,000 each for people who have never owned a farm. You are doing this right in the midst of war. You are going to provide these nonveterans a farm loan for 40 years at 3 percent interest. In other words, you are asking $15,000,000 for nonveterans and providing $300 to find a farm for nonveterans, with a 100-percent loan at 3 percent interest and the loan to run up to 40 years. I am not addressing myself to the $25,000,000 that goes to the veterans because I feel the distinguished chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the gentleman from Mississippi, the Honorable JOHN RANKIN, will attend to veterans' affairs and will provide that the veterans have a square deal on farm purchases as well as other activities. I am speaking only of the $15,000,000 provided for the nonveterans.

I wish to call attention to the fact that the Committee on Agriculture within the last week has passed a farm-credit bill which provides that a nonveteran who pays 25 percent down on his farm has to pay 5 percent interest on his loan. They were going to stop the Commissioner or 75 percent loans altogether on July 1. Upon reconsideration the Flannagan bill provides that the nonveteran will pay 5 percent interest on these Commissioner or 75 percent loans where the borrower pays 25 percent down on the farm. But here today we are making provision for 2,500 nonveterans to get a 100-percent loan at 3 percent interest for 40 years and require no payment whatsoever. Incidentally in the Flannagan bill the veteran, even if he makes a down payment of 25 percent on a farm, is required to pay a 4-percent interest rate. In this bill we are now considering today you provide the nonveteran a 40-year loan at a 3 percent interest rate and provide the nonveteran a 100-percent loan and provide $300 to find him a farm as well, while the Flannagan bill, sponsored by the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, requires the veteran to pay $10 to $15 to have his farm appraised and requires the veteran to have a 25-percent down payment, and after he qualifies the Flannagan bill requires the veteran to pay 4 percent interest rate as well. I hope someone will point out why the nonveteran is entitled to all this coddling. I trust the membership will remember this situation when the Flannagan farm-credit bill is brought up for consideration.

The only reason I call attention to it is that, in my judgment, it is the wrong policy and a wrong approach. There is no use offering any amendment on this bill here today as the 53 New Deal majority is too much to go up against. So I shall wait until the Flannagan bill comes up for consideration. I hope that in the meantime the "special privilege" approach will be eliminated, and that the Flannagan bill can be amended enough to give it some degree of fairness and respectability.

I will repeat that there is not much common sense to any kind of program that is going to let a nonveteran have a 100-percent loan for 40 years at 3 percent, then turn around with the other nonveteran who is trying to get ahead and is willing to pay down 25 percent on his farm and tell him he must pay 5-percent interest, and to tell the veterans that they must pay 4 percent on the 75-percent loan while the nonveteran pays 3 percent on a 100-percent loan. It just does not make sense, and I want the RECORD to so show.

Mr. RAMEY. Throughout this bill it seems there has been no opportunity to get any amendment through which saves the taxpayers of the country money.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It is not exactly a matter of the taxpayers or money, because we have got to take it for granted that this money will be repaid; it is the principle involved and that is that we have special privilege. We have special privilege right in this bill. We have special privilege in this case. Up to this time 3,500 farms in the United States have been sold to people who were given 100-percent loans, 40 years in which to pay, and 3-percent interest; yet at the same time they have driven 90,000 farmers off of their farms from 1930 to 1940 because they could not pay 4- and 5-percent interest with $3,000 to $4,000 loans. Incidentally the present administration have erected thousands of housing units costing an average of nearly $5,000, with some costing $6,800, for our city cousins at the very time they were driving these 90,000 farmers not only out of their homes but also away from a place to make their living. This is what I call special-privilege legislation—special privilege for the few at the expense of the many.

Mr. BREHM. In other words, we are penalizing a man for being thrifty.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes. I just want that to appear in the RECORD, especially for the purpose of future refer-

ence when the Flannagan bill comes up if it is ever brought up for consideration.

If I were in a little more disagreeable mood I would call attention to several of the situations in connection with the administration of the Bankhead-Jones Act. Over 10 percent of the loans as of January 1, 1944, were in one State, Georgia, but I will not spend more time of the Members about this today. There will be plenty of time in the future for the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] and I to fight that out.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Do I understand from the gentleman's remarks that he is opposed to setting up a system whereby veterans may buy farms on Government credit?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman did not understand me to say it because I did not say it. I said that I would not discuss the veterans' part of this appropriation because that is a different problem. That is something that will come under the Veterans' Committee. But I will say, as long as the gentleman asked me the question, that I should like to have him give complete information, prove the statement he made this afternoon to the effect that Farm Security had been paid back 87 cents on the dollar on its loans, because that will keep you busy for a long, long while.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, approved May 20, 1936, as amended (7 U. S. C. 901-914), as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For administrative expenses and expenses of studies, investigations, publications, and reports, including the salary of the Administrator, Rural Electrification Administration, and other personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and exchange of books, lawbooks, books of reference, directories, and periodicals; not to exceed $300 for newspapers; and not to exceed $500 for financial and credit reports, $3,150,000.

Loans: For loans in accordance with sections 3, 4, and 5 of said act, and for carrying out the provisions of section 7 thereof, $60,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in accordance with the provisions of section 3 (a) of said act.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 70, line 9, after the word "thereof" strike out "$60,000,000" and insert "$150,000,000."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase the amount provided for rural electrification for the coming fiscal year from $60,000,000 to $150,000,000, which is the amount asked for by the Rural Electrification Administration and recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

We are providing funds for rural electrification for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1945. If materials were available today, the farmers of this country could easily use $250,000,000 for building rural power lines during the next 12 months.

Nothing that has ever been done by the Congress of the United States has been worth so much to the farmers of this country as has the rural electrification program up to the present time; and the farmers are paying back, with interest, every dollar advanced for this purpose.

When I started on this drive for rural electrification, more than 10 years ago, less than 10 percent of the farms of the United States had electricity. Even as late as 1935 only 10.9 percent of our farms were electrified. Today, 42.2 of American farms have electricity, as will appear from the table below, which tells one of the most thrilling stories of material progress ever made by the farmers of any country.

Comparison of rank, percentage, and number of farms electrified with central-station service, 1935, 1940, and 1944, by States and for the United States

Area	Farms, Jan. 1, 1935 [1]	Farms receiving central-station electric service, Dec. 31, 1934			Farms, Apr. 1, 1940 [1]	Farms receiving central-station electric service, Apr. 1, 1940			Farms receiving central-station electric service, June 30, 1944 [2]			Increase in electrified farms, from Dec. 31, 1934, to June 30, 1944		
	Number	Number [2]	Percent	Rank	Number	Number [1]	Percent	Rank	Number	Percent	Rank	Number	Percent	Rank
United States	6,812,350	743,954	10.9	.....	6,096,799	1,853,249	30.4	.....	2,572,960	42.2	.....	1,829,006	245.8	.....
Alabama	273,455	11,053	4.0	33	231,746	33,907	14.6	41	60,500	26.1	37	49,447	447.4	15
Arizona	18,824	5,577	29.6	12	18,468	5,607	30.4	24	8,100	43.9	25	2,523	45.2	46
Arkansas	253,013	2,943	1.2	47	216,674	21,303	9.8	45	37,900	17.5	44	34,957	1,187.8	3
California	150,360	81,093	53.9	1	132,658	107,904	81.3	4	118,600	89.4	3	37,507	46.3	45
Colorado	63,644	7,145	11.2	25	51,436	14,823	28.8	25	24,200	47.0	24	17,055	238.7	27
Connecticut	32,157	10,138	31.5	10	21,163	16,995	80.3	5	18,800	88.9	4	8,662	85.4	40
Delaware	10,381	1,791	17.3	20	8,994	3,545	39.4	21	5,100	56.7	20	3,309	184.8	31
Florida	72,857	5,700	7.8	26	62,248	15,476	24.9	28	20,500	32.9	33	14,800	259.6	26
Georgia	250,544	6,956	2.8	41	216,033	42,409	19.6	33	72,100	33.4	30	65,144	936.5	5
Idaho	45,113	13,433	29.8	11	43,663	25,439	58.3	13	33,200	76.0	13	19,767	147.2	35
Illinois	231,312	28,379	12.3	23	213,439	80,027	37.5	22	115,500	54.1	22	87,121	307.0	17
Indiana	200,835	23,476	11.7	24	184,549	91,127	49.4	17	129,500	70.2	14	106,024	451.6	14
Iowa	221,986	32,047	14.4	22	213,318	73,308	34.4	23	116,200	54.5	21	84,153	262.6	23
Kansas	174,589	13,224	7.6	28	156,327	27,960	17.9	37	41,200	26.4	36	27,976	211.6	28
Kentucky	278,298	8,480	3.0	39	252,894	38,607	15.3	40	61,500	24.3	41	53,020	625.2	10
Louisiana	170,216	2,826	1.7	46	150,007	16,058	10.7	44	26,200	17.5	44	23,374	827.1	8
Maine	41,907	13,959	33.3	8	38,980	20,221	51.9	15	23,500	60.3	19	9,541	68.4	41
Maryland	44,501	6,791	15.3	21	42,175	17,170	40.7	20	25,600	60.7	18	18,809	277.0	20
Massachusetts	35,094	14,494	41.3	7	31,897	26,220	82.2	2	27,300	85.6	5	12,806	88.4	38
Michigan	196,517	42,152	21.4	17	187,589	131,126	69.9	7	153,700	81.9	7	111,548	264.6	22
Minnesota	203,302	13,783	6.8	30	197,351	50,075	25.4	26	84,500	42.8	26	70,717	513.1	12
Mississippi	311,683	2,802	.9	48	291,092	26,078	9.0	46	47,800	16.4	46	44,998	1,605.9	1
Missouri	278,454	17,893	6.4	31	256,100	39,204	15.3	39	64,700	25.3	39	46,807	261.6	24
Montana	50,564	2,768	5.5	32	41,823	7,947	19.0	34	10,800	25.8	38	8,032	290.2	18
Nebraska	133,616	9,544	7.1	29	121,062	22,832	18.9	35	34,400	28.4	35	24,856	260.4	25
Nevada	3,696	946	25.6	15	3,573	1,555	43.5	19	1,760	49.3	23	814	86.0	39
New Hampshire	17,695	9,495	53.7	2	16,554	10,845	65.5	10	13,700	82.8	6	4,205	44.3	47
New Jersey	29,375	15,162	51.6	4	25,835	21,298	82.4	1	23,400	90.6	2	8,238	54.3	43
New Mexico	41,369	1,350	3.3	37	34,105	4,479	13.1	42	6,900	20.2	42	5,550	411.1	16
New York	177,025	57,825	32.7	9	153,238	102,283	66.7	9	118,200	77.1	11	60,375	104.4	36
North Carolina	300,967	9,672	3.2	38	278,276	67,627	24.3	29	98,500	35.4	28	88,828	918.4	6
North Dakota	84,606	1,968	2.3	43	73,962	3,218	4.4	48	5,800	7.8	48	3,832	194.7	29
Ohio	255,146	48,048	18.8	19	233,783	137,680	58.9	11	180,900	77.4	10	132,852	276.5	21
Oklahoma	213,325	5,648	2.6	42	179,687	20,149	11.2	43	33,800	18.8	43	28,152	498.4	13
Oregon	64,826	17,839	27.5	14	61,829	36,369	58.8	12	47,700	77.1	11	29,861	167.4	32
Pennsylvania	191,284	45,182	23.6	16	169,027	94,081	55.7	14	112,800	66.7	15	67,618	149.7	34
Rhode Island	4,327	1,975	45.6	6	3,014	2,457	81.5	3	2,900	96.2	1	925	46.8	44
South Carolina	165,504	3,796	2.3	44	137,558	27,568	20.0	32	52,300	38.0	27	48,504	1,277.8	2
South Dakota	83,303	2,939	3.5	36	72,454	3,981	5.5	47	7,800	10.8	47	4,861	165.4	33
Tennessee	273,783	9,727	3.6	34	247,617	38,884	15.7	38	61,700	24.9	40	51,973	534.3	11
Texas	501,017	11,466	2.3	45	418,002	79,127	18.9	36	130,200	31.1	34	118,734	1,035.5	4
Utah	30,695	16,130	52.5	3	25,411	17,411	68.5	8	19,700	77.5	9	3,570	22.1	48
Vermont	27,061	7,945	29.4	13	23,582	12,213	51.8	16	15,400	65.3	16	7,455	93.8	37
Virginia	197,632	14,954	7.6	27	174,885	42,144	24.1	30	58,000	33.2	32	43,046	287.9	19
Washington	84,381	40,060	47.5	5	81,686	58,283	71.4	6	66,700	81.7	8	26,640	66.5	42
West Virginia	104,747	3,647	3.5	35	99,282	25,199	25.4	27	33,100	33.3	31	29,453	807.6	9
Wisconsin	199,877	39,206	19.6	18	186,735	87,556	46.9	18	115,000	61.6	17	75,794	193.3	30
Wyoming	17,487	527	3.0	40	15,018	3,474	23.1	31	5,300	35.3	29	4,773	905.7	7

[1] U. S. Census Bureau. [2] Edison Electric Institute. [3] Rural Electrification Administration survey, 1944.

In 1936 the Third World Power Conference was held here in Washington. Here is the percentage of electrified farms in the various countries in 1936, as shown by the report of that Conference: United States, 10.9 percent; Austria, 95 percent; France, 98 percent; Germany, 90 percent; Hungary, 90 percent; Italy, 94 percent; Holland, 98 percent; Switzerland, 93 percent; Japan, 90 percent; Czechoslovakia, 80 percent; Denmark, 85 percent; Norway, 55 percent; Sweden, 65 percent; and New Zealand was found to have 65 percent of her farms electrified. Norway and Sweden were both rapidly extending this service when the war broke out.

I call your attention to the fact that practically every country in Europe, and even Japan, had 90 percent of their farms electrified, whereas we only had 10.9 percent. Even New Zealand had 65 percent of her farms electrified, a new and sparsely settled country. We have finally forged up to where we now have 42.2 percent of our farms electrified; and if Congress will do its duty we will soon lead the world in that respect.

The farmers are begging for this service everywhere. This is not giving money away. Every dollar of it will come back with interest. The argument will be made that they cannot get materials, but if you cut this appropriation down to $60,000,000, then the W. P. B. will tell the farmers: "No use to give you priorities, no use to give you permits, because you do not have the money to buy materials with." If my amendment is adopted, and the war in Europe should close, these farmers would have all the materials they would need, and could easily use this $150,000,000, and even more for building rural power lines during the next fiscal year—and every dollar of it would come back with interest.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. How much did we use in the past year?

Mr. POAGE. We used $25,000,000 and we are way behind now. We have only gone a third of the year and yet we have not any more money.

Mr. RANKIN. We have exhausted our reserves.

Mr. COOLEY. I am very much interested in the program and I am anxious to provide all the money needed. I am wondering if the record indicated how much was spent in the last year and how much could be spent profitably?

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Texas has answered that question.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. With some 42 percent of our farms electrified, and we feeding the whole world, there is no limit to what we could do if we had 90 percent of our farms electrified.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Ohio is absolutely right. We are going to have millions of young men come back here who are going to want farm homes in which to live. They are fighting in countries that have far better electrification of their farms than we have in the United States. They are not going to move out and live in the mud and in the dark and carry on their farming operations in this country without the conveniences that electricity provide. We owe it to them, as well as to their people at home, to provide this great necessity. If my amendment is agreed to it will make available $150,000,000 for that purpose for the next fiscal year. If we cannot get the materials the money will not be spent, but if things break as we think they will break in Europe, materials become available—as they undoubtedly would—then every dollar of this money would be used to electrify the farm homes of this country, and every dollar of it would come back, not only with interest, but with compound interest in the enrichment of country life in America.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact, and I am sure it is his observation, that we have gone out and electrified homes for every worker engaged in the war except the home of the American farmer. He is the one man who is doing a war job, the biggest war job in the Nation, yet is compelled to do it by candlelight.

Mr. RANKIN. The American farmers are doing more fighting and more sacrificing than any other class of people under the American flag today for the number of them.

Mr. Chairman, I have been in this fight for many years. I began in 1933, and I know what it means. This is not a proposition merely for home consumption with me. I have probably the best electrified rural district in America; because of the fight I have carried on and the assistance I have received from those people who realize what it means. I am appealing to you now in the name of the forgotten farmers of this country to adopt this amendment and help us electrify every farm home in America at rates the farmers can afford to pay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if an agreement can be arrived at with reference to consumption of time. There appear to be only three or four gentlemen standing besides myself.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be allotted to the committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to closing debate on this amendment, but if this amendment is defeated we have some other amendments, and I submit we have a right to discuss them.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer as a substitute that all debate on this amendment close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 50, noes 78.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

The substitute motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of the Committee, even though they are in a hurry to get home, will recognize the importance of this amendment. This is not an amendment asking for additional appropriations. This amendment simply asks for an increase in the lending power of the R. E. A. The R. E. A. does not lend money out of the Treasury of the United States. The R. E. A. lends money that it borrows from the R. F. C. The R. F. C. pays 1 percent for that money and the R. E. A. lends it at 2 percent. The United States Government makes 1 percent on every dollar that is loaned by the R. E. A.

The Rural Electrification Administration has probably done more for our farmers with less out-of-pocket cost to the Government than any agency of the Department of Agriculture or of any other department. The R. E. A. does not grant or give farmers any money whatever. It simply lends money to farmer cooperatives for the purpose of bringing electricity to rural homes. Since its establishment 9 years ago the R. E. A. has allotted a total of $517,699,947. There has been repaid $45,331,000 principal. This includes $18,035,000 paid before it was due. In addition, the R. E. A. has collected from farmer cooperatives $496,340 in interest. As of the first of this year there was only $373,959 due and unpaid for more than 30 days. Can any other Government agency point to such a record? In fact, can any private business show a better record of repayment?

But this is not all. The R. E. A. does not now get any of the funds that it lends to farmers out of tax money in the United States Treasury. It is true that in the early years of the R. E. A. we made direct appropriations to provide the funds needed. Now we simply authorize the R. E. A. to borrow from the R. F. C. Up until last year, the R. F. C. charged the R. E. A. 3 percent for this money. Since the passage of the Pace bill the R. F. C. has charged only 1¾ percent. When we take into consideration the fact that the R. F. C. has been borrowing money at about 1 percent, we see that that agency has been and still is making a nice profit on the transaction. Nor does the R. E. A. itself take any loss. It gets its money from the R. F. C. at 1¾ percent and now lends it to farmer cooperatives at 2 percent—prior to the Pace

bill the farmers paid up to 3 percent. Thus we see that the farmers actually pay the Government agencies more than twice what the Government pays for this money. I again ask, Can you name any other activity that has done so much for so many at so little cost to the Government? In fact, the Government is actually making a profit out of the R. E. A.—and yet—in the face of such a record there is a determined effort on the part of Washington politicians and bureaucratic soreheads to discredit this fine work. A great committee of another body has spent months trying to find something wrong with the management of this agency. They have found nothing. The record I have just quoted speaks more eloquently than all of their criticism of individuals. Some of the most sincere Members of this House have become alarmed and have rushed in here with bills to transfer the R. E. A. here, there, and yonder out of the Department of Agriculture, the house of its friends, into other departments or agencies where other than farmers' interests must be foremost. I think we would do much better to bother ourselves about those agencies that are not making such a record of service to the people and protection of the people's money when we go in for wholesale criticism of an agency and of its personnel. I have no objection to all the investigations the power trusts can promote—they but emphasize the fine record of the R. E. A., but I do fear the attitude of some Members of this House who have, doubtless perfectly sincerely, sought to restrict and limit the ability of R. E. A. to serve the public.

The great committee that brought in this bill has apparently been a victim of this kind of thinking. Even though no direct appropriation is asked, it is necessary for this bill to authorize a specific amount that the R. E. A. can borrow from the R. F. C. The R. E. A. is in desperate need of additional funds now. Last year, it was given only $25,000,000 borrowing capacity, but was assured that if more money was needed that it would be made available. Last year no one knew how much material could properly be allotted to R. E. A. It has developed that much more material has been available than was at first anticipated. R. E. A. has financed about 10,000 new connections per month for the past year. This is almost as many as before the war, but they are all farmers who qualified under the W. P. B. regulations. The truth is that our farmers have simply had to have the aid of electric energy to do the great job of food production that they have done. Are we to deny our farmers one of the greatest labor-saving factors just at the time when our food-productive capacity is strained as never before—just when farm labor is practically nonexistent? Surely not; and yet there are many States where the farmers cannot get a dollar from R. E. A. today. That is due to the fact that R. E. A. funds are so nearly exhausted that many of the most important agricultural States have already used their part of the loan funds. R. E. A. officials have asked for the additional funds which they suggested last year would be needed. They have met the usual red tape of the Bureau of the Budget and, in spite of the assurance previously given, they have been given no additional funds. Next year it is evident the R. E. A. must have greatly increased loan funds if it is to make its proper contribution to the winning of the war. The R. E. A. estimated that it would need and could efficiently loan $150,000,000 in the fiscal year of 1946—in addition to the funds needed between now and July 1. The Budget Bureau cut this to $125,000,000 and this committee has cut it to $60,000,000.

It is true that this seems to be lots of money, but when we consider the magnitude of the job, we realize that it is simply not enough to take care of all of those farmers who need service and who can probably be supplied with needed material. If the material is not available, the lines cannot be built and the money will not be borrowed, so why should we not authorize the R. E. A. to borrow what it needs rather than limiting it to an amount that may be just as inadequate as the funds we authorized this year. This is not an appropriation of money. It is only authority to the R. E. A. to set up a comprehensive program. I do not know when the war will end. It may not end next year. If it does not, the need for labor-saving machinery on our farms will be more pressing than ever, and we will find more and more farms qualifying under the W. P. A. regulations. If happily the war is over as quickly as the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has predicted on several occasions, surely we will need a greatly expanded R. E. A. program to care for our backed-up civilian needs. In any event, we should make provision to enable the R. E. A. to function throughout the year and not find itself out of money with a third of the year to go, as it is now.

We have authorized post-war programs for highways, for flood control, for river and harbor development, and for many other activities. Most of these programs involved direct appropriations from the Treasury of the United States, but we did not hesitate for that reason. There is pending a bill, H. R. 1742, which I introduced in this House, and a similar measure in the other body which would lay down a pattern for long-time, coordinated, well-planned construction of R. E. A. lines so that all sections of this Nation might be served, and served with a minimum of wasted effort and useless construction. I think the passage of such legislation will result in a tremendous saving of money, as well as the assurance that all our rural areas will get much quicker service than a continuation of the present uncoordinated and ill-planned construction. This legislation has cleared the Budget. I hope the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which it was referred, will shortly set this bill down for consideration. In the meantime we should surely authorize the R. E. A. to lend the farmers whatever funds they may need to do the work that can properly be done next year. Let us not bet on the end of the war or the continuation of the war. Let us rather say to the farmers that so long as the Government is getting twice as much interest as it is paying, and is collecting its money as well as it is, that we will at least let the R. E. A. carry on its work 1 year without having to stop it at a critical time because Congress would not lend to a farmer cooperative as freely as it would give to any other type of enterprise.

As the gentleman from Mississippi has well pointed out, no man can tell when this war will come to an end. No man knows how soon we will be able to build lines. Last year this same committee came before the House and gave the R. E. A. a paltry $25,000,000, but told us that if perchance more money was needed all that was necessary to do was to come back and they would give us a deficiency appropriation to take care of all that could be used. By October the R. E. A. needed more money. They came back. I do not charge it is the fault of the Committee on Appropriations. I know it is the fault of the red tape that sends such requests to the Bureau of the Budget. But we have not got the deficiency appropriation yet that this committee told you we would have forthcoming without any delay if perchance the W. P. B. could give more material.

They tell us now, this year, "Oh, if you find that the material is available, all you have to do is to come back here to Congress and get the money." We will be faced with exactly the same situation we met this year.

This last year, with two wars in progress, we built practically as many miles of extensions as we built on the average before the war, and every extension was qualified under the W. B. P. requirements. If this war ends—even if the German war ends—everyone admits we will need the full amount of this amendment and that we will be able to spend it judiciously. If this war does not end, we are going to need food as never before. Doubtless the W. P. B. will then be forced to urge farmers to use electricity. I know of no greater aid to food production in a period of labor shortage. Whatever happens it seems clear to me that we will need these funds, but if we do not need them what have you saved by denying R. E. A. the right to borrow? R. E. A. does not borrow till it needs money, but it cannot make allotments until it has the power to borrow. That is all we ask.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that this is not a gift you are making to the farmers; it is merely a loan. The Government will make money, for these loans are paid back with interest.

It is my understanding that the Budget Bureau recommended $150,000,000 and that for some reason it was cut down. I think it was cut down because there was some difficulty in getting materials to carry out some phases of the construction program.

As pointed out by the gentleman from Texas, the Government actually makes a profit on this rural electric program. We have gone a long way in providing electricity for war workers. I think every war-working establishment and house and trailer in the country has electricity in it. Why can we not do as much for the farmer who is producing food? It ought to be done.

In Nebraska we have had a great interest in the enlargement of this program. The last 6 months of 1944 there were 1,564 new customers. That is more than we had from the beginning of the R. E. A. in Nebraska. We had 1,250 up to that time.

I hope this House will understand that this is a loan; it is self-liquidating, and it is for the improvement of the farms. Machinery is short in this country. Electrical equipment on the farms can do much to relieve the drudgery that goes with farm work.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. It is a fact that this money cannot be spent unless materials are made available by the War Production Board.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. I am in accord with what the gentleman has said and I intend to support the amendment. I hope we do not talk the amendment to death. Let us vote.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. LEMKE. I am in full accord with the gentleman's statements. Further, my State is increasing its cooperative organizations to make use of this bill. I think the farmers ought to have a little more light.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. This amendment should be supported. If the war is still on and the money not spent, no harm can be done. We should be ready to go forward and extend this loan borrowing authority in order to supply electric energy to the farms of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief in my remarks. I support this amendment. I call attention to some of the "economy" which is going on at a time when Congress is devoting so much attention to paring down the amounts needed for farmers in this particular bill for agriculture.

On or about the 28th day of February 1945 our State Department entered into an agreement with the Provisional Government of France whereby we are to send $1,675,000,000 worth of lend-lease goods to that country, of which but a limited amount will be shipped before the end of the war.

The following are included for lend-lease shipments:

Raw materials for war use and essential civilian supply (cotton, metals, steel, chemicals, synthetic rubber, drugs, medical supplies, etc.)	840,000,000
Food (milk, pulses, edible oils, oilseed, seeds)	185,000,000
Petroleum supplies	132,000,000
French prisoner-of-war supplies	48,000,000
Short-life manufacturing equipment for war production	250,000,000
Freight charges (rental and charter of vessels)	220,000,000
Total	1,675,000,000

In addition to that, the agreement provides for post-war goods to the amount of $900,000,000. I call attention to a few of the items. These are to be paid for by the Government of France at the end of 30 years, with interest at 2⅜ percent.

The post-war list includes:

Locomotives, $200,000,000.

Railroad cars, $120,000,000.

Merchant marine ships, $140,000,000.

Harbor watercraft, $32,000,000.

Fishing fleet, $8,000,000.

Inland watercraft, including barges, $50,000,000.

Here are some more items from our country that will never be shipped until long after the war is over:

Metalworking machinery, $100,000,000.

Industrial equipment, $150,000,000.

Machinery for mines, and so forth, $100,000,000.

That is what we are going to do for France in the post-war period. There will be none of this $900,000,000 worth of goods shipped to France until after the war ends. Still, when the farmers of this country come to Congress and ask for real expansion of the rural electrification program then there is an insistent demand for economy.

I am in favor of this amendment. I hope that it will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN].

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I have nothing but praise for the work that has been done by the Rural Electrification Administration up to this time. I think they have performed a splendid job. But I have some apprehension that there is an item in this provision of appropriation in which they are departing from the fine course they have proceeded upon up to this time. It is true this $60,000,000 is only money they can lend to cooperatives after borrowing it from the R. F. C. and the act provides they shall finance only for the construction and maintenance of generating plants and electric transmission and distribution lines or systems to furnish energy. But I find in the hearings there is a provision there for buying a creosoting plant for $200,000. There is nothing in the act, so far as I can see, that authorizes them to buy the General Electric Co., or to buy timberlands, or sawmills, or to buy plants to manufacture wire, nor to buy plants to creosote poles.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, that provision is not in the amendment. What the gentleman has referred to is to the cooperative power associations in Texas where the creosoting plants would not sell cooperatives creosoted poles, but would sell them to the power companies; so the cooperatives had to creosote their own poles in order to build their lines.

Mr. JONKMAN. I am worried that the gentleman's amendment takes into consideration that they are going to or may want to buy the General Electric Co. They are going to buy sawmills. They are going to buy timberlands; $90,000,000 would suffice for a lot of that. They have taken the first step in going beyond their powers. It is true they say it was an emergency and give some excuse for it, and they say there was a little transaction back in 1939, which constitutes a precedent. The hearings do not tell us what transaction that was. I cannot yield further to the gentleman because I want to put my point across. This is the first step in Government ownership and operation of industry in the Rural Electrification Administration, and I think the time to stop it is at the first step. Now, they say there is an emergency. Well, a bureaucrat can always find an emergency. I have looked at the hearings. All I can see is a convenience. They say that this plant was owned by a partnership, which wanted to dissolve the partnership and wanted to get rid of the plant. They say, on the other hand, this plant had furnished 25 cooperatives either with all of their poles or most of them for the past year. There is nothing against that to show an emergency nor does anybody investigate to find out whether there was an emergency.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONKMAN. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. The records show, and I happen to know, those cooperatives tried to buy poles from that plant and every other plant in Texas, and they were told that the utilities were their old customers and the creosoting plants would not sell to the cooperatives as long as the utilities wanted the poles.

Mr. JONKMAN. I defy the gentleman to find those words or words of that strength in the hearing. It is true that this company and others were in competition. I think they say the industry preferred to work on saw products rather than poles. But I do not see that any case has been made that there was an emergency which necessitated buying this plant instead of having this creosoting done in the open market.

Mr. RANKIN. We heard exactly the same argument when the farmers from Iowa asked permission to build a generating plant. We heard the same argument the gentleman is making against these people creosoting their own poles. If that policy had been carried out we would have no rural electrification at all.

Mr. JONKMAN. Their powers are clearly delineated in the act. If they are going beyond those powers a step they can go a hundred steps. I propose to make it clear that the R. E. A. has no authority to finance manufacturing or processing plants and this abuse should be stopped at once, and emphatically.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] is recognized.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I do not share the apprehension of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN]. I think it is pretty well known that this rural-electrification program is on a very sound basis throughout the United States. Agricultural States are most anxious that this program be extended at the earliest possible date.

In Iowa we have extensively gone into this program. The amount of loan funds made available in the Agricultural Appropriation Act of 1945 for loans in Iowa were short of requirements that year by about $3,000,000. This means that the urgent needs of thousands of Iowa farmers for electrical service could not be met. A similar situation existed in several other States, although the need in Iowa was more acute because of the fact that a greater proportion of Iowa farms qualified for service under War Production Board regulations.

It is stated that additional amounts of money can be obtained under supplemental or deficiency appropriations. We have gone through that experience, and it has not worked out. I find no fault with the Subcommittee on Agriculture, but the fact remains that the Budget never recommended money for the supplemental funds at any time, and, as has been said by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], we are still waiting for the funds which should have been allotted last year and this year. So I feel that unless this provision is increased to the original amount which was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, thousands of American farmers will be deprived of vitally necessary electric current in a very critical time of manpower and material shortage.

We are very much concerned today about food and its relation to winning the war. We all know that if the farmers had the electrical energy they will do more food producing than they ever have before. They are entitled to the same electrical appliances and conveniences as the people in the towns. With this electric energy, the milking machines and lights in the old barnyard, they are going to produce more food than they ever did before. I realize much cannot be done to extend the program during the war. Critical materials are not to be had, but why not have this fund available so that when the war ends—we hope and pray the war will end almost any day—that we can go forward with this program immediately. As soon as priorities are granted, the lines will be extended and the conveniences will be placed on our farms where they belong. The money provided for in this bill is not a gift. It is only a loan. It is in the interest of the betterment of agriculture. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. This amendment would give to the Rural Electrification Administration the amount allowed by the Budget for the loans which are needed to construct additional rural electrification. This does not represent an appropriation but merely loans which will be repaid and which are being repaid with interest. The argument against this amendment is on the grounds that the committee feels that if the Administration needs more money for loans for rural electrification, it can come back sometime later and ask for additional funds from the deficiency committee. It is also claimed that the farmers cannot secure material for construction now, therefore there is no use to give the administration what the Budget indicates it should have to carry on its program.

I cannot agree to that argument beoause post-war planning must be done now. Our farmers have joined in the movement for post-war planning. Rural electrification is part of those plans. I pray to the Almighty that tonight or very soon we receive a flash that armistice has been reached and that war ends in Europe. Should that happy event be reached, we all know there will be considerable material available in our surplus material stocks which could be transferred to our farmers.

You all know what our farmers have been up against. I need not repeat here what I have so often told you regarding the lack of labor on our farms. In most instances only the older folk remain to do the great job of food production.

How our farmers have accomplished this task with the lack of labor; lack of machinery; lack of proper clothing and other handicaps is a real miracle. It represents the real miracle of production. The extension of rural electrification will help solve part of the farm labor problem. It will eventually make possible the processing of farm products closer to the point of production.

We have been liberal in our help in rehabilitating foreign countries, rehabilitation with American money which will never come back to us. We do not begrudge that to the suffering humanity. But here is a loan which will and which is being returned with profit. A loan which will bring happiness and lighten the load of our already overburdened farmers.

In Nebraska 1,564 consumers were connected to R. E. A. systems from July 1 to December 31, 1944, as compared with a semiannual average during the entire life of the R. E. A. program of 1,250. So there is every reason to believe that the experience of R. E. A. borrowers in calendar 1945 and in 1946 will be that a greater number of consumers will be connected rather than a lesser number.

These loans, Mr. Chairman, are self-liquidating and the farmers in Nebraska have made a marvelous record with respect to repayment. I earnestly urge the committee to support the amendment for sufficient loaning power for the R. E. A.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Those of us who represent agricultural areas know the great demand for electrification generally. I sincerely hope this amendment will be approved.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is right. We cannot plan our program unless we know what we are going to do. We are not losing anything. These are loans from which we make a profit. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I invite attention to page 846 of the hearings in which it is stated that of 940 loans made to cooperatives 601 were paid ahead of schedule. As brought out in the hearings scarcely less than 1 percent are delinquent.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I just want to say as one of the Members from Michigan that 2 years ago in going over the State of Michigan, especially in the upper counties—it was an election year, a political campaign was on—although I am from the city of Detroit, I was amazed to find farmers up there in my own State of Michigan without any electrical facilities. I am amazed to find anyone coming here from the State of Michigan opposing this.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. The members of the committee appreciate the fact that there is increasing need for electric power in the rural districts.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I am going to vote for the amendment.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. JONKMAN. I assume the gentleman from Michigan does not want to see the Government go into the manufacturing and processing operations.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I do not think this appropriation is intended for any such use. I should like to see every farmer in Michigan have electric lights and electric power, and have his farm modernized.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield to these gentlemen to take all my time.

Mr. JONKMAN. Does the gentleman agree with my proposition that it should not be used in manufacture?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I do not believe it is intended to be used for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the committee, is recognized to conclude the debate.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I trust the members of the committee will not consider voting for this amendment until they at least look at the hearings.

I invite your attention first to page 803 of the hearings. Before I read from this page I wish to say to you that neither the gentleman from Mississippi nor any other Member of the House is more enthusiastically in favor of the rural-electrification program than I. At the same time, I do not believe we are doing the rural-electrification program any good by providing a tremendous amount of money that it does not need and cannot use. We ought to provide adequately for its needs. In our committee report we pointed out that we are providing in this bill more than twice as much money as they had for the present fiscal year, and we invited them if conditions become such that they can use more to come back to Congress and ask for a deficiency appropriation next year. There is no desire on the part of this subcommittee to hamper R. E. A. If you look at page 808 of the hearings you will find they had on hand as of December 31, 1944, $111,329,-224.72 that has been allocated during previous years and during this year but which they have been unable to expend because of lack of materials available for building rural electric lines and extensions thereto. If you look at page 821 you will find that of the $22,000,000 plus which they have allocated during the present fiscal year they have spent as of the date of the hearings $2,626,334, or approximately 10 percent of the amounts allocated.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that just as soon as priorities are available there is every disposition on the part of the gentleman from Georgia and of the committee to provide all the funds they can use?

Mr. TARVER. Entirely so.

Mr. TABER. But that at the present time there is no possibility of priorities?

Mr. TARVER. That is exactly correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Not at this time. Let me finish this statement. I will yield to the gentleman later.

The committee is not disposed to refuse any money that can be used, but in view of the fact that they have not been able to use this year more than $25,-000,000 plus an unexpended balance of approximately a million dollars because of the lack of materials and inability to secure materials, we feel that the amount of funds we have appropriated in this bill, $60,000,000, will be all they can use in carrying out the program.

In addition to that, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from New York, so far as we are concerned, if they are able to show during the next fiscal year or at any time that they are able to get materials and spend more money, then we invite them to come back to the Congress and ask for a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. A request for a deficiency appropriation would not come to the gentleman's subcommittee.

This same proposition was made to us last year, and, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] pointed out, it was not carried out.

Mr. TARVER. I did not yield to the gentleman to make a speech. He has made one in his own time and he has made a good one. The gentleman is enthusiastically interested in the program, and I admire his enthusiastic support of it. I think the gentleman from Mississippi has done the country a great service, but I do not think the gentleman is doing the cause of rural electrification a service if he succeeds in getting allocated to its use several times as much money as it can possibly use. The news would go out all over the country that the farmers will be getting $150,000,000 for rural electrification. The news would go out that that is something the farmer is getting, when, as a matter of fact, the farmer would not get it, he cannot get it, for the reason that he cannot secure the materials to build the lines and the extensions of lines. I think it is better to allot to him a sufficient amount and more than a sufficient amount to cover any possible need, and then say to him, "If you need any more, come back to the Congress and you shall have it." That is substantially what we have done here.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that under these circumstances it would be exceedingly unwise to tie up $150,000,000. If they cannot spend that amount, but we authorize it, it will still be in the Treasury, but it will be tied up just as if we had made outright appropriation of it. There is no necessity for this, and you should not provide an inordinate amount of money for any program.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired on this section.

The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 67, nays 87.

Mr. RANKIN and Mr. STEFAN demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TARVER and Mr. RANKIN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 71, nays 93.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: Page 70, line 9, after the word "thereof", strike out "$60,000,000" and insert "$100,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was rejected.

FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION

Not to exceed $6,450,000 of the funds of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, established by the act of January 31, 1934 (12 U. S. C. 1020–1020h), shall be available during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses of the Corporation, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; travel expenses of officers and employees of the Corporation, in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the act of June 3, 1926, as amended (5 U. S. C. 821–833); printing and binding, lawbooks, books of reference, and not to exceed $250 for periodicals and newspapers; contract stenographic reporting services; procurement of supplies, equipment, and services; maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes; rent in the District of Columbia; payment of actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Corporation; employment on a contract or fee basis of persons, firms, and corporations for the performance of special services, including legal services; use of the services and facilities of Federal land banks, national farm-loan associations, Federal Reserve banks, and agencies of the Government as authorized by said act of January 31, 1934; and all other necessary administrative expenses: *Provided*, That except for the limitation in amounts hereinbefore specified, and the restrictions in respect to travel expenses, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Corporation shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of said act of January 31, 1934, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1016–1020h).

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill, which includes the general provisions, to which I know of no objection, be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who addressed the Committee during the course of its deliberations be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. RAMSPECK] having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2689) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 55, line 10, to page 57, line 15, strike out the paragraph.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute for the motion to recommit.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute for the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair informs the gentleman that the previous question has been ordered on the motion to recommit, thus shutting off amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet demanding recognition and offered this motion before the Speaker put the question on ordering the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The motion for the previous question takes precedence over the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 53, noes 159.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair informs the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the vote discloses a quorum is present.

The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 257, nays 16, not voting 159, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

YEAS—257

Abernethy	Andrews, Ala.	Biemiller
Adams	Angell	Bishop
Allen, Ill.	Auchincloss	Bland
Allen, La.	Baldwin, Md.	Bloom
Andersen, H. Carl	Barden	Bonner
Anderson, N. Mex.	Barrett, Wyo.	Bradley, Mich.
Andresen, August H.	Beckworth	Brehm
	Bell	Brooks
	Bender	Brown, Ga.
	Bennett, Mo.	Bryson
Bulwinkle	Harness, Ind.	Patrick
Bunker	Harris	Patterson
Burch	Havenner	Peterson, Fla.
Burgin	Hays	Phillips
Camp	Healy	Pickett
Campbell	Hedrick	Ploeser
Cannon, Mo.	Henry	Plumley
Carlson	Heselton	Poage
Carnahan	Hill	Price, Fla.
Case, N. J.	Hinshaw	Price, Ill.
Chenoweth	Hoeven	Priest
Chiperfield	Holmes, Wash.	Rabaut
Church	Hope	Rains
Clason	Horan	Ramey
Cochran	Howell	Ramspeck
Coffee	Huber	Randolph
Cole, Mo.	Hull	Rankin
Colmer	Jackson	Reed, Ill.
Cooley	Jarman	Rees, Kans.
Cooper	Jenkins	Richards
Corbett	Jensen	Riley
Courtney	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Cox	Johnson, Ill.	Robertson, Va.
Cravens	Johnson, Ind.	Robsion, Ky.
Crawford	Johnson, Luther A.	Rodgers, Pa.
Crosser	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Roe, Md.
Cunningham	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, Fla.
Curtis	Jonkman	Rogers, Mass.
D'Alesandro	Kearney	Rogers, N. Y.
Davis	Kee	Rowan
De Lacy	Keefe	Ryter
Dingell	Kelley, Pa.	Sadowski
Dolliver	Kelly, Ill.	Sasscer
Dondero	Kerr	Savage
Doughton, N. C.	Kilday	Schwabe, Mo.
Douglas, Calif.	King	Scrivner
Douglas, Ill.	Kinzer	Shafer
Doyle	Kirwan	Sheppard
Durham	Knutson	Short
Dworshak	Kopplemann	Simpson, Ill.
Earthman	LaFollette	Smith, Va.
Elliott	Lanham	Snyder
Ellsworth	LeFevre	Sparkman
Engel, Mich.	Lemke	Springer
Engle, Calif.	Lewis	Starkey
Ervin	Link	Stefan
Fallon	Ludlow	Stewart
Feighan	McCormack	Stockman.
Fenton	McDonough	Sullivan
Fernandez	McGehee	Sumner, Ill.
Fisher	McKenzie	Sumners, Tex.
Flannagan	McMillan, S. C.	Talbot
Flood	Mahon	Talle
Folger	Manasco	Tarver
Forand	Mansfield, Mont.	Thom
Fulton	Marcantonio	Thomas, Tex.
Gallagher	Martin, Iowa	Thomason
Gardner	Mason	Tibbott
Gary	Merrow	Tolan
Gathings	Michener	Trimble
Gearhart	Miller, Calif.	Voorhis, Calif.
Geelan	Miller, Nebr.	Vorys, Ohio
Gillette	Mills	Walter
Gillie	Monroney	Weichel
Gorski	Morrison	Welch
Gossett	Mundt	West
Graham	Murdock	White
Granger	Murray, Wis.	Whitten
Grant, Ala.	Neely	Whittington
Grant, Ind.	Norrell	Winstead
Griffiths	O'Brien, Mich.	Wolverton, N. J.
Gross	O'Hara	Wood
Gwynne, Iowa	O'Konski	Woodruff, Mich.
Hall, Edwin Arthur	O'Neal	Woodrum, Va.
Halleck	Pace	Worley
Hancock	Patman	Zimmerman
Hare		
Harless, Ariz.		

NAYS—16

Clevenger	Jones	Taber
Elston	Kean	Thomas, N. J.
Gillespie	Kilburn	Wasielewski
Goodwin	Rich	Wigglesworth
Hess	Schwabe, Okla.	
Holmes, Mass.	Smith, Ohio	

NOT VOTING—159

Anderson, Calif.	Brown, Ohio	Cole, N. Y.
Andrews, N. Y.	Brumbaugh	Combs
Arends	Buck	Curley
Arnold	Buckley	Daughton, Va.
Bailey	Buffett	Dawson
Baldwin, N. Y.	Butler	Delaney, James J.
Barrett, Pa.	Byrne, N. Y.	Delaney, John J.
Barry	Byrnes, Wis.	Dickstein
Bates, Ky.	Canfield	Dirksen
Bates, Mass.	Cannon, Fla.	Domengeaux
Beall	Case, S. Dak.	Drewry
Bennet, N. Y.	Celler	Eaton
Blackney	Chapman	Eberharter
Bolton	Chelf	Ellis
Boren	Clark	Elsaesser
Boykin	Clements	
Bradley, Pa.	Cole, Kans.	
Fellows	Lane	Reed, N. Y.
Fogarty	Larcade	Resa
Fuller	Latham	Rivers
Gamble	Lea	Rizley
Gavin	LeCompte	Robinson, Utah
Gerlach	Lesinski	Rockwell
Gibson	Luce	Roe, N. Y.
Gifford	Lyle	Rooney
Gordon	Lynch	Russell
Gore	McConnell	Sabath
Granahan	McCowen	Sharp
Green	McGlinchey	Sheridan
Gregory	McGregor	Sikes
Gwinn, N. Y.	McMillen, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.
Hagen	Madden	Slaughter
Hale	Maloney	Smith, Maine
Hall, Leonard W.	Mansfield, Tex.	Smith, Wis.
Hand	Martin, Mass.	Somers, N. Y.
Hart	May	Spence
Hartley	Morgan	Stevenson
Hébert	Mott	Stigler
Heffernan	Murphy	Sundstrom
Hendricks	Murray, Tenn.	Taylor
Herter	Norton	Torrens
Hobbs	O'Brien, Ill.	Towe
Hoch	O'Toole	Traynor
Hoffman	Outland	Vinson
Holifield	Peterson, Ga.	Vursell
Hook	Pfeifer	Wadsworth
Izac	Philbin	Weaver
Jennings	Pittenger	Weiss
Judd	Powell	Wickersham
Kefauver	Powers	Wilson
Keogh	Quinn, N. Y.	Winter
Kunkel	Rabin	Wolcott
Landis	Rayfiel	Wolfenden, Pa.
	Reece, Tenn.	Woodhouse

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Rayfiel with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Buck.
Mr. Rooney with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Mott.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Gwinn of New York.
Mr. Torrens with Mr. Sharp.
Mr. Resa with Mr. Rizley.
Mr. Quinn of New York with Mrs. Luce.
Mr. Green with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Stigler with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. McCowen.
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. McMillen of Illinois.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Rockwell.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Buffett.
Mr. Weiss with Mr. Elsaesser.
Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Fuller.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. May with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Case of South Dakota.
Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Pittenger.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mrs. Woodhouse with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Madden with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. John J. Delaney with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Combs with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Lyle with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. James J. Delaney with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Hoch with Mr. Sundstrom.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Rabin with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. Outland with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Bennet of New York.
Mr. Mansfield of Texas with Mr. Arnold.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Vursell.
Mr. Curley with Mr. Gavin.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Brumbaugh.
Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Sabath with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Ellis.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. LeCompte.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Landis.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER] have until midnight tonight to file a report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The resolution (H. Res. 192) referred to is as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct an investigation of the Veterans' Administration with a particular view to determining the efficiency of the administration and operation of Veterans' Administration facilities.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such records, documents, and papers, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, on Monday legislation will be taken up in the following order:

First will be the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 141) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, in lieu of certain appropriations contained in H. R. 2374, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, and for other purposes. This joint resolution is to take care of certain items in the deficiency bill, items which must get through promptly. It involves three items, altogether, pensions in the Veterans' Administration, pay of the legislative branch, and one other item.

Then there will be the resolution relating to the investigation of food shortages, followed by the resolution authorizing the investigation and study of postwar immigration, and then a resolution relating to the investigation of veterans' hospitals. After that will follow the consideration of the Foreign Service bill, H. R. 689, to which I understand there is no objection.

On Tuesday there will be the conference report on the manpower bill. I am hopeful that the conference report on the Commodity Credit Corporation bill will be ready, and we will take that up just as soon as we can, on either Monday or Tuesday, probably Tuesday. That is the program for next Monday and Tuesday and that, as far as I know, concludes the program before the recess.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD with reference to an incident that occurred in Jackson, Miss., and which was referred to by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] in his remarks on March 21.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DE LACY asked and was given permission to include in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill excerpts from the committee hearings on that bill.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GARDNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter to the Office of Economic Stabilization in reference to his statement in connection with meat.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a very enlightening and interesting address on the subject Cartels Threaten Economic Progress, by J. Howard Pew, delivered at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York last Monday evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on both Monday and Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative programs of those days and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole and include therewith two statistical tables from the hearings on the bill.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a wounded sergeant overseas and my reply thereto. The sergeant is a constitutent of mine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Nashville Tennesseean.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, March 27, after the conclusion of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent that on May 3, after the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk and other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances on two subjects and include therein some newspaper extracts.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee of the Whole today and include therein certain tables and statistics on the power question and in particular on rural electrification.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, after the conclusion of legislative business and other special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the gentleman who has the special order, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, there has sprung up in the Western States particularly in the national-forest States a practice of withdrawing large areas of land from the public domain for special privileged areas, excluding all other uses. I represent a State that is 72 percent federally owned and many large areas of that State are closed to ordinary uses. They are called primitive areas. A man with a mining prospect, or a farmer with a ranch in these areas, or anybody else cannot get a road built or have any development made in those primitive areas at all. This program has become an abuse.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a memorial from the State Legislature of Idaho urging Congress not to permit withdrawals of this kind. I have checked on the matter, and I do not find that these withdrawals are made by the executive department. There is no Presidential proclamation setting up these primitive areas. They are not created by the authority of Congress. The practice should be curbed and stopped.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that memorials Nos. 1 and 3 of the State Legislature of Idaho may appear at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

(The memorials referred to are as follows:)

Senate Joint Memorial 1

Joint memorial to His Excellency, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, and the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, urging the Congress of the United States to make an appropriation, and Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of United States Veterans' Affairs, for the immediate construction of additional United States veterans' hospital facilities in Boise, Idaho

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

Whereas the war-veteran population in the State of Idaho has greatly increased since September 16, 1940, as a result of the present war emergency and world conflict and will be increased by approximately 400 percent; and

Whereas the United States Veterans' Administration maintains in the city of Boise, State of Idaho, a United States veterans' hospital of a 350-bed capacity, which bed capacity has not been increased since 1936; that according to information available no steps as yet have been taken to have said veterans' hospital at Boise, Idaho, enlarged to care for the Idaho war veterans who are daily being discharged from the military service and returning to Idaho, their home State; and

Whereas at the termination of hostilities every veteran now in active military service will be entitled to United States veterans' hospital care; and

Whereas the National Congress, under Public Law No. 346, authorized the appropriation of $500,000,000 for the construction of additional Government hospital facilities; and

Whereas Idaho veterans should be able to receive hospital care in their own State instead of having to leave their homes and families to obtain hospital care outside of the State of Idaho: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring), That we, your memorialists, urge upon the Congress of the United States of America and respectfully request that appropriate action be taken for the immediate construction of an addition to the present United States veterans' hospital situated at Boise, Idaho, to the extent of not less than 350 beds; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized and is hereby directed to furnish and forward to the President of the United States, the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, Gen. Frank T. Hines, Administrator of United States Veterans' Affairs, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Idaho copies of this memorial.

House Joint Memorial 3

Whereas upon the economic welfare of the several States, depends the stability of the Nation as a whole; and

Whereas the safeguarding of each State's individual welfare is of vital concern to all; and

Whereas the setting aside or withdrawal of any part or parcel of the areas within the State's borders to establish special privileged areas excluding all other use, or the establishments by proclamation, of parks, monuments, reserves, or wilderness areas is a grave injury to the economic soundness of a State whose industries depend upon the common and multiple usage of such federally owned lands; and

Whereas removal of these lands vitally affects sportsmen in restricting the limited area in which they have to hunt, in that reserves and parks are usually restricted concerning hunting, and the harvest of timber is diminished as an asset in the State of Idaho, by the restriction of logging in these nonuse areas, and the farmers who contribute greatly to Idaho's social and economic welfare, lose valuable territory by the setting aside of these monuments, parks, and nonuse areas, which are valuable to them in the construction of reservoirs, flumes, and other necessary construction to get water to the arid lands; and

Whereas 69 percent of the State of Idaho is federally owned; and

Whereas the members of the Legislature of the State of Idaho believe that Congress recognized the rights, interests, and estate which each sovereign State holds in the conservation, constructive use of Federal lands within its borders: Therefore be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Idaho (jointly), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact such legislation as is necessary to safeguard the areas within the State's borders from being named as prohibited, nonuse areas, without first gaining the approval of the State legislature of the State concerned; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Idaho be hereby authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to the Senators and Representatives of Idaho in the two Houses of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LAFOLLETTE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES COMMITTEE

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to discuss two matters in connection with the pending legislation for a permanent F. E. P. C., which I believe should be brought to the attention of the House and of the public.

First, the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. BROOKS HAYS, for whose integrity of purpose and intellectual honesty I have the highest regard, and myself have each been granted today a special order for Monday, April 23, of 40 minutes each, under which special orders it is our purpose to debate this legislation as calmly and rationally as it is possible for us to do so, with the hope that such a discussion might be helpful and beneficial to the membership of the House and the country at large in determining for themselves their positions upon the issues which are presented by this proposed legislation.

I hasten to add that neither of us arrogates to himself the right to speak for anyone but himself; that we do not even intimate that by this debate we shall state the arguments of others who may be either proponents or opponents of the legislation or in any way to bind them upon statements or arguments which we may make. It is solely our purpose to attempt to debate the matter calmly and dispassionately, believing that that sort of approach to the question will be both enlightening and helpful.

I also wish to point out that it does not serve the purpose of the minorities involved in this legislation for spokesmen of either political party to attempt to make political capital out of this legislation or to extol the position of their own party and denounce or attempt to disparage the position of the opposite political party.

Recently, on March 16, there appeared in PM an article under Hats Off, and on March 17, an editorial appeared in the Chicago Sun which seemed to have for their purposes an attempt to make some sort of political capital out of this issue by making it appear to the minorities involved that it was the Republican members of the Rules Committee who had prevented that committee from granting a rule upon H. R. 2232, which is the Labor Committee bill on this subject and which differs in certain, probably nonessential, respects from 12 practically identical bills which were introduced early in the Seventy-ninth Congress, 6 by Republicans and 6 by Democrats, all 12 of which were pending before the Labor Committee when H. R. 2232 was reported out. I do not include these articles in this statement because they contain language which I have refrained from using when referring to my colleagues in this House, and I wish to avoid any charge of using this language inferentially by intruding these articles into the RECORD.

It may be that the gentlewoman from New Jersey, the Honorable MARY T. NORTON, made no statement which warranted the two articles to which I refer, and in the interest of a harmonious approach to this whole question, I do not charge that it was the intention of the gentlewoman from New Jersey to make any political capital out of any statement which she might have made. Indeed, I, myself, on the 28th of August 1944, made a statement with reference to the action of the Labor Committee in discontinuing hearings upon the legislation for a permanent F. E. P. C., which was then pending before that committee in the Seventy-eighth Congress, which could be open to

the charge that I was attempting to make political capital out of this legislation. In fact, as I recall, the gentlewoman from New Jersey so charged on the floor of the House a day or two after my statement appeared. Again, in the interest of harmony, I wish to say that if such a charge can properly be made against me, because of that statement, I accept responsibility for it and express my regrets for taking a political position on this legislation which I am now convinced cannot be beneficial to the legislation or in the interest of the minorities whose economic interests are sought to be advanced and protected by this legislation. In fact, it is entirely possible that both the gentlewoman from New Jersey and myself felt, upon the occasions to which I have referred, that we were acting in the interest of this legislation, but as far as I am concerned, after careful consideration I am convinced that my own action was not helpful over the long pull.

Having made these statements, I am entitled to point out, however, that the Rules Committee is made up of the following Members of the Congress—eight Democrats and four Republicans, who are chairmaned by the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable ADOLPH SABATH: Hon. E. E. COX, of Georgia; Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia; Hon. J. BAYARD CLARK, of North Carolina; Hon. JOHN J. DELANEY, of New York; Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER, of Mississippi; Hon. JOE B. BATES, of Kentucky; Hon. ROGER C. SLAUGHTER, of Missouri; Hon. LEO ALLEN, of Illinois; Hon. EARL C. MICHENER, of Michigan; Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana; and Hon. CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio.

I am entitled to point out that the first bills for a permanent F. E. P. C. were introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress in the middle of January 1944, by Mr. Scanlon, of Pennsylvania, a Democrat, who is not a Member of the Seventy-ninth Congress; by Mr. DAWSON, of Illinois, a Democrat; and myself; that therefore a year and 2 months have elapsed since this legislation was first introduced; that in the Seventy-ninth Congress, H. R. 2232 was reported out by the Labor Committee on February 20, 1945, after 12 practically identical bills had been introduced on this subject, 6 by Republicans and 6 by Democrats; that the first hearings were held before the Rules Committee on March 8, 1945; and that 2 weeks have now elapsed since that first hearing before the Rules Committee; and that that committee has not held further hearings upon this legislation.

I do not take the position that the opponents of this legislation should be precluded from a hearing before the Rules Committee, but I do point out, not for the purpose of injecting politics into this legislation, but for the purpose of answering the two articles hereinabove referred to, that the chairman of that committee is the dean of this House; that he is an ardent supporter of the administration; that to my knowledge he has never failed to heed a request of the administration to take all steps which it is possible for him to take as chairman of the Rules Committee to expedite hearings upon administration-supported legislation; and to obtain a decision in the Rules Committee upon such legislation at the earliest possible date.

Therefore, I do not believe that I am now injecting politics into this matter, and I certainly have no desire to drive a wedge between the supporters of this legislation in both political parties by requesting the chairman of the Rules Committee, after the recess, to exercise his prerogative as chairman of that committee in such a way as to bring the granting or the refusing of a rule on H. R. 2232 to a head in the Rules Committee at the earliest possible date after the recess.

I make no prediction as to the outcome in the Rules Committee. I do not attempt to bind any member of my party as to his vote. I have no right to do so, and I do not do so. I only ask that there be a decision of the issue in the Rules Committee at the earliest possible date.

I urge this for several reasons: First, it is my opinion that so long as this legislation pends in the House of Representatives without giving the membership an opportunity to debate it and dispose of it, it constitutes rather a cankerous political sore which is injurious to the national unity at this critical time. Second, that the appropriation for the temporary committee is very apt to reach the floor of the House in an appropriation bill late in April or early in May and that it would contribute much to the orderly disposition of that legislation if the basic underlying issues involved in a permanent F. E. P. C. were debated first upon legislation coming from a legislative committee. And, third, there has been some discussion by some Members of filing a discharge petition upon this legislation, discharging the Rules Committee from further consideration. I want to point out that only one piece of legislation has ever become law which came to the floor of the House under a discharge petition, from which it follows that the use of this procedure will be very detrimental to the ultimate passage of this legislation, and that in no event should this procedure be used until the Rules Committee has refused to grant a rule after full hearings and an opportunity to vote upon the question of granting a rule has been afforded the members of the committee.

For these reasons I am firmly of the opinion that it is in the best interest of this legislation that hearings be concluded and a vote reached in the Rules Committee upon H. R. 2232 at the earliest possible date and that the responsibility for concluding such hearings and reaching a vote rests squarely upon the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable ADOLPH SABATH.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein an oration recently given by Rev. Father Robert J. White, captain of the Chaplain Corps of the United States Navy. This will require one and one-half pages, and the additional cost will be $78. I submit my unanimous-consent request notwithstanding the additional cost.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. LYNCH (at the request of Mr. BLOOM), for 2 days, on account of illness.

To Mr. BUTLER (at the request of Mr. MICHENER), indefinitely, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. BULWINKLE, for 5 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. STIGLER, indefinitely, on account of important business in Oklahoma.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, March 26, 1945, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation will meet in open session at 10:30 a. m. on Monday, March 26, 1945, in the Committee Room, 356 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will meet on Tuesday, March 27, at 10 o'clock, for the purpose of holding further hearings on H. R. 2071, a bill to reclassify the salaries of employees in the Postal Service, to establish uniform procedure for computing compensation, and so forth.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 36. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings on a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties, held before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary during the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 373). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 198. Resolution authorizing the printing of the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, No. 63, delivered during the October term, 1944, in the case of the *Northwestern Bands of Shoshone Indians, petitioners, v. The United States*, on writ of certiorari to the Court of Claims, as a House document; without amendment (Rept. No. 374). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 38. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the historical statement of the laws enacted

and the regulations promulgated relating to veterans and their dependents, with a complete statement regarding expenditures for hospital and domiciliary construction as a House document, and providing for additional copies thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 375). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 378. A bill authorizing an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the act of May 3, 1928 (45 Stat. 484), and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 376). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 1095. A bill for the relief of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota; without amendment (Rept. No. 377). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 1804. A bill to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act for the relief of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska," approved June 5, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 378). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 2296. A bill amending the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1207), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salary and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Klamath General Council, members of the Klamath business committee and other committees appointed by said Klamath General Council, and official delegates of the Klamath Tribe, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 379). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of Union.

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 2297. A bill to provide for the conservation of fish and wildlife on the Klamath Reservation, in Oregon, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 380). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 2586. A bill to authorize the leasing of Indian lands for business, and other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 381). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 2754. A bill to validate titles to certain lands conveyed by Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes and to amend the act entitled "An act relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma," approved January 27, 1933, and to validate State court judgments in Oklahoma and judgments of the United States district courts of the State of Oklahoma; without amendment (Rept. No. 382). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SLAUGHTER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 192. Resolution to direct the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation to investigate the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 383). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 2764. A bill to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the utilization by freight forwarders of the services of common carriers by motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 2765. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 2766. A bill to amend section 1402 of title 19, United States Code, so as to require all customs duties on merchandise imported into the United States to be based upon the United States value thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2767. A bill to amend an act known as an act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 (Public, No. 316, 73d Cong.), approved June 12, 1934, as extended by Public Resolution No. 10, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved March 1, 1937, by withdrawing from the President power to decrease existing rates of duty or transferring any article from the dutiable to free lists; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 2768. A bill to provide 30 days' leave, before honorable discharge, to all members of the land and naval forces who have served outside the limits of the continental United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, in lieu of certain appropriations contained in H. R. 2374, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 2769. A bill for the relief of C. Frank James; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 2770. A bill for the relief of Karl F. Rindelhardt; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2771. A bill for the relief of the estate of Alexander McLean, also called Alex McLean; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PIÑERO:

H. R. 2772. A bill for the relief of Juan Calcano; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 2773. A bill for the relief of George D. Brott; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 2774. A bill for the relief of Mary Margaret Riddle; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

264. By Mr. CLASON: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging the Federal Government to procure land in Massachusetts for the establishment and maintenance of a national cemetery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

265. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Joe Watson and 27 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

266. Also, petition of H. H. Cunningham and 27 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

267. Also, petition of J. T. Ricks and 24 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

268. Also, petition of J. A. Parron and 26 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

269. Also, petition of Sarah Lane and 26 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

270. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition signed by certain residents of Cadiz, Harrison County, Ohio, asking support of the Lemke bill to prohibit the vivisection of dogs in the District of Columbia, and further requesting my support of any such bill which will be national in scope; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

271. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging the establishment by the Federal Government of a national cemetery in Massachusetts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

272. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take official cognizance of the inherent right of the people of Poland and other small nations to determine the form and kind of their own government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

273. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts asking that soya butter be kept on the market available for use and that certain obstructions be removed to the distribution of soya butter and margarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

274. By Mr. SHORT: Petition signed by J. H. Harris and other members of the Church of the Brethren of the Mountain Grove, Mo., congregation, urging that Congress do not pass any peacetime military conscription law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

275. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Hattie F. White and other citizens of Wayne, Maine, deploring the shipping of malt beverages and other liquors into our fighting areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

276. By Mr. SULLIVAN: Petition of Mr. Romadka and 28 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

277. Also, petition of Mr. Medic and 32 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

278. Also, petition of Mr. Goose and 31 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

279. Also, petition of Mr. Schaik and 27 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

280. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, requesting the Federal Migratory Bird Conservation Commission and the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Reserves of the United States House of Representatives to restrain any further action by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service in the Parker River and Monomoy Point Refuges until the completion of an investigation thereof by a joint committee of the general court; to the Committee on Agriculture.

281. Also, petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging the Federal Government to procure land in Massachusetts for the establishment and maintenance of a national cemetery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 26, 1945

(Legislative day of Friday, March 16, 1945)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, above all, yet in all, e'en though it be a cross that raiseth us we seek the light of Thy face. On this holy week of the Passion, with its lonely, rugged cross against the sky lighting the ages with eternal splendor, we fain would rekindle the candles of devotion and sacrifice upon the inner altar of our heart.

Even amid the pressure of duty in these terrific days, wilt Thou restore our souls by the hush of solemn thoughts, by moments of insight when the veil on the face of mere things falls away, in hours of high resolve when life shall be quickened within, and when in the mastery of spiritual realities, earth and sense forgotten, eternal verities hold our silent spirits raptured and aflame. Make us the willing servants of the radiant dream for humanity that even a cross could not destroy. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, March 23, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Daniel
Austin	Hart	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Hayden	Reed
Bankhead	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Barkley	Hill	Saltonstall
Bilbo	Hoey	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Briggs	Johnston, S.C.	Taft
Burton	Kilgore	Taylor
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Langer	Tobey
Capehart	Lucas	Tydings
Capper	McCarran	Vandenberg
Chavez	McClellan	Wagner
Connally	McFarland	Wheeler
Cordon	McKellar	Wherry
Donnell	McMahon	White
Downey	Maybank	Wiley
Ellender	Millikin	Willis
Fulbright	Moore	Wilson
George	Morse	Young
Gerry	Murdock	
Guffey	Murray	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] are absent on official business with the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is absent on an inspection tour for the United States Navy.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is absent from the Senate on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent on official business of the Senate as a member of the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is absent on official business of the Senate as a member of the committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Hon. James V. Heidinger, of Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 24, 1945, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 515. An act for the relief of Wallace Robertson, Henry Bowker, and Edward Parisian, and for other purposes; and

S. 525. An act to reimburse certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the United States naval training center, Farragut, Idaho, on July 10, 1944.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2625. A bill to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended;

H. R. 2669. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2745. A bill to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1921.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings on a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties, held before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary during the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress; and

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the historical statement of the laws enacted and the regulations promulgated relating to veterans and their dependents, with a complete statement regarding expenditures for hospital and domiciliary construction as a House document, and providing for additional copies thereof.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2126) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes; and it was signed by the Vice President.

LETTER OF APPRECIATION FROM MRS. JOHN MOSES, WIDOW OF THE LATE SENATOR MOSES, OF NORTH DAKOTA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter from Mrs. John Moses, widow of the late Senator from North Dakota, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

BISMARCK, N. DAK., *March 21, 1945.*

The Honorable SECRETARY OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The kindness and sympathy of the Members of the Senate were a consolation and comfort to me and the members of our family at the time of the death of my husband.

We particularly appreciated the courtesy and mark of respect accorded his memory by the delegation of a committee of Senators to attend his funeral; the kind assistance of Sergeant at Arms Wall Doxey; the resolutions adopted by the Senate in connection with my husband's death; and the beautiful floral remembrance.

I will appreciate it if you will extend to the officers and Members of the Senate the thanks of myself and the members of my family for their many courtesies and their expressions of sympathy and condolence.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. JOHN MOSES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter will lie on the table.

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following business was transacted:

REPORT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE DURING THE RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 23d instant,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 2374) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, reported it on March 24, 1945, with

amendments and submitted a report (No. 114) thereon.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE FILED DURING THE RECESS—AMENDMENTS TO FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Under authority of the order of the 23d instant,

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following notice in writing on March 24, 1945:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 2374) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

On page 9, after line 22, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

"Temporary aid to enemy aliens and other restricted persons: The limitation of $50,000 under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1945, upon the amount which may be transferred to this appropriation from 'Salaries and expenses, War Relocation Authority,' is hereby increased to $343,340."

On page 10, after line 5, insert:

"Public Works Administration liquidation: That the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944, approved June 28, 1944 (Public Law 375, 78th Cong.), is hereby amended through the amendment of the two paragraphs captioned 'Public Works Administration liquidation' appearing under the heading 'Federal Works Agency—Office of the Administrator,' by striking out the words 'until June 30, 1945,' wherever they appear therein, and substituting in lieu thereof 'until June 30, 1946,' and by inserting immediately following the words 'during the fiscal year 1945' in the first paragraph the following words: 'and not exceeding a total of $50,000 may be used during the fiscal year 1946.' "

On page 10, line 19, after the word "*Provided,*" insert: "That the limitation of $80,000,000 under this head in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1945, on the total amount that may be allocated for contributions to public and private agencies for the maintenance and operation of public works after July 1, 1943, is hereby increased to $85,000,000: *Provided further,*"

On page 12, line 2, after the word "annum" insert: "and to employ by contract, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, professional services of firms and organizations for temporary periods or for special purposes: *Provided,* That the expenses of auditing the financial transactions of all Government corporations by the General Accounting Office shall be borne out of appropriations to the General Accounting Office, and appropriations in such sums as may be necessary are hereby authorized: *Provided further,* That each such corporation shall reimburse the General Accounting Office for the full cost of any such audit as billed therefor by the Comptroller General, and the General Accounting Office shall deposit the sums so reimbursed into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further,* That, unless otherwise expressly provided by law, no funds of any Government corporation shall be used to pay the cost of any private audit of the financial transactions of such corporation except the cost of such audits contracted for and undertaken prior to the date of approval of this act."

On page 20, line 2, before the period insert: "and of said appropriation not to exceed $200,000 is made available for expenses incurred during the fiscal year 1945 incident to the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the emergency refugee shelter at Fort Ontario, N. Y., provided for in the President's message of June 12, 1944, to the Congress (H. Doc. 656)."

Mr. McKELLAR, also, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted five amendments intended to be proposed to House bill 2374, the first deficiency appropriation bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of the amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 34)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Office of Price Administration amounting to $565,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF ALASKA GAME LAW

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4 of the Alaska game law of January 13, 1925, as amended July 1, 1943, so as to provide clearly for the payment of compensation to members of the Alaska Game Commission while actually engaged in necessary investigations and hearings (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for the War Department for the quarter ending June 30, 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Commerce:

Senate Joint Memorial 8

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas there has been introduced and is now pending in the Senate of the United States a bill for a public law, S. 460, introduced by Senator MITCHELL, of Washington, for the purpose of creating a Government corporation to be known as the Columbia Valley Authority, and another bill in the House of Representatives of the United States introduced by Representative RANKIN, H. R. 1824, for the purpose of dividing the United States into nine districts, one of which would be the Columbia Valley Authority; and if either is enacted into law, the States included in such districts, and particularly the State of Oregon, its political subdivisions, and all of its residents and inhabitants, will be further regimented and federally controlled in that the said authority will regulate and control the use of all of the waters within the State of Oregon in the following particulars:

"1. For domestic use, irrigation and drainage, mining, and other industrial purposes;

"2. For flood control;

"3. For navigation;

"4. For power; and

"Whereas the people of the Northwest, and particularly the State of Oregon, have already enjoyed extensive development of reclamation, irrigation, flood control, navigation, power, and other projects under existing Federal departments in cooperation with the States and their political subdivisions; and

"Whereas other extensive projects are now either authorized or planned by the same cooperative method, all of which recognize the full sovereignty of the States, and the legal and independent rights of their political subdivisions; and

"Whereas, if the said Columbia Valley Authority is so established, it will create a huge monopolistic Government corporation, which will be:

"1. Vested with unlimited powers;

"2. Furthering bureaucratic monopolies;

"3. Beyond the jurisdiction of the General Accounting Office in the settlement of the accounts of the corporation or for any expenditure its board shall determine to have been necessary to carry out the provisions of said act;

"4. Clothed with governmental immunity for its acts;

"5. Given broad, loosely defined powers, and the use of Government funds so as to be able to control the whole economy of the affected States and districts;

"6. Destroying present water and property rights and will grant to the said authority the right of eminent domain over irrigation districts, water works, and other such facilities;

"7. Depriving States and their political subdivisions of any control of the use of the waters of the States for any purpose whatsoever: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized not to pass S. 460 or H. R. 1824, or any such similar legislation that will deprive the States, and particularly the State of Oregon, its political subdivisions, and its people of rights now existing, and hitherto recognized by the Federal Government, to control and use the waters within their borders for domestic use, irrigation and drainage, mining, and other industrial purposes; for flood control and for navigation and power in cooperation with existing Federal departments; but that the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers, in full cooperation with the States, be permitted to continue the operation of existing Federal facilities, the planning of and completion of further Federal facilities, and that other such public works as irrigation and drainage districts now operated and controlled and fish and game resources now managed within the States remain under local control; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Congress of the United States to United States Senators GUY CORDON and WAYNE L. MORSE, of Oregon, and Representatives JAMES W. MOTT, HARRIS ELLSWORTH, LOWELL STOCKMAN, and HOMER ANGELL, of Oregon."

By Mr. McFARLAND:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

"House Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial requesting the Congress to enact legislation to compensate the State for the loss of taxes on public lands

"To the Congress of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"More than 70 percent of the area of the State of Arizona is owned and, through its

several agencies, controlled by the United States.

"From this huge area the State and its political subdivisions receives no revenue in the form of taxes on the land, and from much of it no revenue either direct or indirect.

"On the other hand this public land involves great and unavoidable expense to the State, and its political subdivisions and to the taxpayers thereof, for the administration of police protection, the construction and maintenance of highways and bridges, and otherwise.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requests:

"1. That the Congress enact legislation authorizing the payment, by the Government of the United States, of taxes on such land, or compensation in lieu thereof, to the State of Arizona and its political subdivisions."

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. WALSH):

Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress urging the Federal Government to procure land in Massachusetts for the establishment and maintenance of a national cemetery

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to procure in a central location within Massachusetts such land as may be necessary for the establishment and maintenance of a national cemetery; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

"Resolutions requesting the Federal Migratory Bird Conservation Commission and the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources of the United States, House of Representatives, to restrain any further action by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service in the Parker River and Monomoy Point Refuges until the completion of an investigation thereof by a joint committee of the general court

"Whereas the committee on conservation of the General Court of Massachusetts has been directed, under an order adopted by both branches of said general court on January 29 in the current year, to conduct a special investigation of the acquisition of lands in the Commonwealth by the Federal Government for the purpose of national wildlife refuges; and

"Whereas said committee has held numerous public hearings in the process of carrying out said order; and

"Whereas sworn testimony given in such hearings by many landowners and farm owners in such wildlife refuge areas indicates that subterfuge, misrepresentation, and threats were made in acquiring portions of said land; and

"Whereas a bill repealing the State law which enabled the United States Department of the Interior to acquire lands for wildlife refuge purposes was filed in the general court in September 1944 because of alleged bad faith on the part of the agents of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and

"Whereas the said committee has reason to believe at this time that the filing of this bill caused the United States Fish and Wildlife Service to accelerate their plans for the Parker River Refuge and hasten a meeting on December 13, 1944, with the Federal Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for permission to acquire this area, so that the declaration of taking could be filed in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts on December 30, 1944, just prior to January 1945, when the general court convened and could consider this bill; and

"Whereas, according to the testimony of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service Director, Ira N. Gabrielson, before said committee on March 5, 1945, approximately 6,800 acres, representing nearly 70 percent of all land acquired by the Federal Government in the Parker River Refuge area, was seized by condemnation proceedings in said district court on December 30, 1944, without any advance notice to the landowners involved that their lands were being taken; and

"Whereas said committee has reason to doubt that the acquisition of lands for the Parker River and Monomoy Point Refuges are duly authorized by law; and

"Whereas further testimony now being taken by said committee from reputable and authoritative sources tends to indicate reasonable doubt as to the suitability of the Parker River Refuge and of the Monomoy Point area for the purposes for which they have been acquired: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Federal Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, together with the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources of the United States House of Representatives are respectfully requested to restrain immediately any further action or proceedings of any nature by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, its agents or representatives, on the Parker River and Monomoy Point Refuges until the completion of the investigation by said committee; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions, together with a copy of the order adopted by the general court on January 20, 1945, be sent to each member of the Federal Migratory Bird Conservation Commission and each member of the Select Committee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources of the United States House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress from this Commonwealth."

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Chestertown, Md., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 599) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution unanimously adopted by Greenville, S. C., Post No. 3, of the American Legion, favoring the enactment of legislation for universal training for the youth of the Nation.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there has been introduced in Congress a bill providing for universal military training for the youth of the United States; and

Whereas such training will result in building up the physical and mental health of young Americans in an atmosphere faithful to the democratic institutions of the country and equip large numbers of our citizens in the fundamentals of military service so that they may rapidly respond to any future needs for the defense of our Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by American Legion Post, No. 3, located at Greenville, S. C., That the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled are hereby petitioned and urged to enact such a bill providing for universal military training for the youth of the country; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from this State.

Above resolution adopted unanimously by Greenville Post, No. 3, of the American Legion at its regular meeting, March 16, 1945.

H. F. A. LANGE,
Post Commander.

Attest:

JAMES F. DANIEL, Jr.,
Post Adjutant.

RESOLUTIONS OF ADAMS COUNTY (WIS.) BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the right of petition is a constitutional right. In this age when rights have disappeared all over the world, it is one of the rights we want to make certain will not disappear in this country.

I have before me two resolutions adopted by the Adams County Board of Supervisors of the State of Wisconsin.

One relates to Federal funds for road improvement. It asks that such funds be made available under the direct supervision of local highway officials, thus eliminating costly governmental administrative expense.

The second resolution relates to the care and maintenance of old-age recipients in county homes.

I ask unanimous consent to present these resolutions and that they be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolutions presented by the Senator from Wisconsin will be received, appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Resolution 46

Whereas there is a possibility of some sort of Federal aid in road improvement or road construction after the war; and

Whereas many of our township roads are much in need of regrading and surfacing, which under the present gas-tax-allotment system will take many years to accomplish, as it takes a large portion of our gas allotment for maintenance and snow removal, leaving very little for surfacing or other construction work; and

Whereas many jobs would be created right at home which may be very essential after the war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Adams County Board of Supervisors desire to take advantage of any workable opportunity to secure any portion of any such funds that may become available for road improvement; be it further

Resolved, That in the event Federal funds may become available for township road constructure, set-ups shall be under Federal approval but under direct supervision of the township supervisors and the county highway committee, thereby eliminating costly governmental administration expense with a result of more miles of surfaced roads; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to both United States Senators from Wisconsin and Congressman REID MURRAY, representing this district.

WALTER J. CHRISTENSEN,
Supervisor.

I, B. A. McBride, county clerk of Adams County, Wis., do hereby certify that the above is a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Adams County Board of Supervisors at an adjourned session March 13, 1945.

B. A. MCBRIDE,
County Clerk.

To the Committee on Finance:

Resolution 47

Resolution relating to care and maintenance of old-age recipients in county homes

Whereas under the present law inmates kept or maintained in county homes are not eligible to old-age assistance; and

Whereas many old-age recipients have no homes, are old, feeble, and in poor health and have no one to look after them or care for them in their declining years; and

Whereas such recipients could be kept, maintained, and cared for in health and in sickness in a humane manner and at a very reasonable cost and expense; and

Whereas it is believed the law in this respect should be so amended as to permit counties to care for and maintain in county homes all or any recipients so receiving old-age assistance and when so maintained and kept at county expense, that such counties should be granted the power, right, and authority to recover of such recipients the fair and reasonable costs thereof out of any pension allowed or granted by the pension department: Therefor. be it

Resolved by the County Board of Supervisors of Adams County, Wis., That this board favors such amendment or amendments to the existing law as shall allow counties to keep, maintain, and care for such old-age recipients and to recover from them out of any grants made to them the fair, reasonable costs, charges, and expenses thereof; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished to our State senator, assemblyman, and also to our United States Senators and Representatives in Congress.

Dated March 13, 1945.

WALTER LUECK,
Supervisor.

I, B. A. McBride, county clerk of Adams County, Wis., do hereby certify that the above is a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Adams County Board of Supervisors at an adjourned session March 13, 1945.

B. A. MCBRIDE,
County Clerk.

REPORTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 122. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1921, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 115);

S. 123. A bill to amend section 14 of the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from the District Training School, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, and to amend section 15 thereof, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 116);

S. 124. A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and oher employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia,' approved June 20, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1924; without amendment (Rept. No. 117);

S. 125. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds collected by District of Columbia examining, licensing, and other boards and commissions, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 118);

S. 463. A bill to amend section 927 of the Code of Law of the District of Columbia, relating to insane criminals; without amendment (Rept. No. 119);

S. 638. A bill to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia by adding a new section 548a, and providing for the recording of veterans' discharge certificates; without amendment (Rept. No. 120);

H. R. 2122. A bill to extend to 6 months after the termination of hostilities the period during which females may be employed in the District of Columbia for more than 8 hours a day, or 48 hours a week, under temporary permits; with amendments (Rept. No. 121); and

H. R. 2552. A bill to amend paragraph (c) of section 6 of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, as amended by act approved February 27, 1931; with an amendment (Rept. No. 122).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 786. A bill for the relief of T. Brooks Alford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

S. 787. A bill for the relief of Oliver Jensen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 788. A bill for the relief of the estate of George J. Ross; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 789. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the issuance of devices in recognition of the services of merchant sailors," approved May 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 81), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 790. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain United States notes and obligations to private persons, firms, associations, or corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 791. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WAGNER introduced Senate bill 792, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 793. A bill to protect Klamath Indian livestock; and

S. 794. A bill to provide for the general welfare and advancement of the Klamath Indians in Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 49, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

CONTROL AND REGULATION OF BANK HOLDING COMPANIES

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to control and regulate bank holding companies and to control and regulate relationships between insured banks and their affiliates. I also ask that an explanatory statement of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from New York will be received and appropriately referred, and the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 792) to control and regulate bank holding companies, to control and regulate relationships between insured banks and their affiliates, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WAGNER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. WAGNER in connection with the bill is as follows:

On April 29, 1944, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System made its annual report to Congress covering operations for the year 1943. Included in this report was a recommendation for immediate legislation to deal with bank holding companies. It is extremely desirable that every Member of Congress who has not already done so should carefully read and study these recommendations. The proposed bill was drafted in the light of the experience of the Board in administering those provisions of the Banking Act of 1933, which dealt with bank holding companies, and to supply the needs recommended by the Board in its 1943 report.

The present bill would incorporate all provisions respecting bank holding companies into one section of the Federal Reserve Act. This section would become section 23A of the act, which now deals with "relations of affiliates" of member banks. Existing laws respecting affiliate relations would be reenacted in the proposed bill and would become section 23B of the Federal Reserve Act. This would not effect any substantial change in the present law on affiliate relationships, except that the law which now covers only member banks would be extended to cover all insured banks.

Section 23A of the Federal Reserve Act, as it would be amended by the bill, would confine the business of a bank holding company to the operation of its subsidiary banks, all other unrelated activities being prohibited. This would be accomplished by a direct prohibition; by requiring bank holding companies within a reasonable time to divest themselves of nonbanking companies which they may now control; and by a prohibition against acquiring stock of nonbanking companies in the future. Provision is made, however, for the retention, under appropriate safeguards, of nonbanking companies which are merely an incident to the holding company's main business, such as, for example, the retention of a safety-deposit company.

Bank holding companies would be defined to meet the inadequacies of the present definition and more nearly in the manner in which Congress has defined holding companies operating in other fields.

Bank holding companies would be prohibited from purchasing any more bank stock. However, in order to protect existing minority interests who might otherwise have no market for their bank stock, the prohibition would not apply to a situation where the holding company already owns more than 50 percent of the stock of such bank, provided that the same offer to purchase is made to all minority holders. The bill would require bank holding companies within 2 years after the effective date thereof to divest themselves of bank stock acquired after the beginning of 1943. The expansion of existing bank holding companies would thus be curbed, while at the same time the bill would make it unlawful for other companies to become bank holding companies by the purchase of bank stocks.

Finally, the bill would improve the present ineffective controls over the operation of bank holding companies. The deposits of their subsidiary banks in due course would have to become insured. "Upstream" loans and intercompany sales of securities would be prohibited, except as they may be authorized under certain conditions by the Board. Dividends out of other than operating income would be regulated; and exorbitant or unreasonable managerial fees would

be prevented. Provision is made for the examination from time to time of bank holding companies and for the submission by them of reports similar to those required of the banks which they now control. Penalties are set up as well as means of enforcement; but there are also appropriate provisions for court review of all orders which the Board would be authorized to issue. The Board would be required to report back to the Congress before the expiration of 5 years the results of its administration of this act.

MARCH 23, 1945.

MEDALS FOR WIDOWS, ETC., OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution authorizing the presentation of medals to the widows, children, or mothers of persons who lose their lives in the military or naval service during World War No. 2. I request that it may be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. A companion bill is being introduced today in the House of Representatives by Representative PLUMLEY, of Vermont. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the joint resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 49) authorizing the presentation of medals to the widows, children, or mothers of persons who lose their lives in the military or naval service during World War No. 2, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized and directed to cause to be prepared at the United States Mint a medal of such design as may be approved by the President, for presentation to the widow, or if there is no surviving widow to the eldest child, or if there is no surviving widow or child to the mother, of each person who shall have lost his or her life while serving on active duty in the military or naval forces of the United States during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on the date of the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I may add that the whole country mourns the fact that in this war to date lives have been lost in the Army to the number of 150,310, and in the Navy to the number of 35,515, a total of 185,825 Americans who have already given their lives in the cause of freedom.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON SURVEY OF FISHERY RESOURCES

Mr. BAILEY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12), which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the letter of the Secretary of the Interior, dated February 2, 1945, transmitting, pursuant to Public Law No. 302, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved May 14, 1944, a report on a survey of the fishery resources of the United States and its possessions, be printed as a Senate document, and that ——— additional copies be printed for the use of the Senate, ——— copies for the House of Representatives, ——— copies for the use of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, and ——— copies for the use of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives.

JULIA C. SOMERVILLE

Mr. BYRD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 110), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the financial clerk of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Julia C. Somerville, widow of J. A. Somerville, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law on February 15, 1945, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

CLERICAL ASSISTANCE FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CONNALLY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 111), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations hereby is authorized, during the remainder of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ additional clerical assistance to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $3,600 per annum.

PRINTING OF COMPARISON BETWEEN DUMBARTON OAKS PROPOSALS AND LEAGUE OF NATIONS COVENANT (S. DOC. NO. 33)

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document the results of a study conducted by Dr. Herbert Wright, professor of international law, of the Catholic University of America, which is a comparison of the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and the League of Nations Covenant.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS RELATIVE TO RATIFICATION OF TREATIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 36, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 10,000 additional copies of the hearings on a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties, held before Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives during the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate concur in the House concurrent resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, as I heard the concurrent resolution read, it provides for the printing of additional copies. Is there an indication of how many copies of this document will be printed?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. Ten thousand copies are wanted. There are those of us who think that the subject covered by this hearing is very important. Personally I feel that it would be well for the House to assist in the ratification of treaties and have heretofore expressed that opinion on the floor of the Senate. However we may feel about it, this is something the House is asking to have printed and as a matter of courtesy the Senate should concur in this resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona to concur in the House concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 2625. An act to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2689. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 2745. An act to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to establish standard weights and measures for the District of Columbia; to define the duties of the Superintendent of Weights, Measures, and Markets of the District of Columbia; and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1921; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 38) authorizing the printing of the historical statement of the laws enacted and the regulations promulgated relating to veterans and their dependents, with a complete statement regarding expenditures for hospital and domiciliary construction as a House document, and providing for additional copies thereof, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

ATTITUDE OF AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR ON PROPOSED MANPOWER LEGISLATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask to have read to the Senate at this time a very important telegram coming from William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and bearing on the subject of the conference report on the so-called manpower bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

There being no objection, the Chief Clerk read the telegram, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 26, 1945.*

To the Members of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

It seems inconceivable that having reached a war stage when it is clearly evident that the German armies are decisively defeated, that Congress would even consider the passage of a bill which smacks of slavery. The working men and women of America, through their skill and service, contributed very largely to the inevitable defeat of the German armies. To make these workers subject to heavy penalties and to impose upon them a condition which approximates slavery at this stage of the World War is unjustifiable and indefensible. I therefore protest in the name of the 7,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor against the adoption of the measure proposed by the congressional conference committee, and I ap-

peal to all Members of Congress to vote against the conference report and defeat it decisively.

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

THE CIGARETTE SHORTAGE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with my proposal to investigate the cigarette shortage, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter written to me by Edward F. Ragland, secretary of the Smaller Tobacco Manufacturers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SMALLER TOBACCO MANUFACTURERS,
New York, N. Y., February 27, 1945.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: This industry welcomed the news that you are planning to take an active interest in the current cigarette shortage. The more light which is thrown on this confused problem by men of your position the sooner the true causes of the shortage will be clear to the Government and the people. We are confident you will make a substantial contribution by going straight to the fundamental facts and by the use of your good offices to help correct the situation.

You are no doubt aware of the thorough and authoritative report on the cigarette shortage issued February 13 by the Federal Trade Commission. A careful reading of this report clearly indicates there are two constructive steps which can be taken now to relieve the shortage:

1. The rating of tobacco manufacturing as an essential industry. (The War Manpower Commission now rates tobacco growing as essential, but tobacco manufacturing is held to be nonessential.)

2. Increase the production of leaf tobacco.

Before commenting on the shortages of labor and leaf tobacco, however, may we briefly call your attention to certain highlights of the report which dispel the many conflicting and confusing rumors now current:

Page 21: "No manufacturer has been found to have capitalized the situation by manipulating rationing for competitive advantage or with undue trade restrictive results."

Page 31: "As to legally unfair trade practices which conceivably could contribute to the shortage, no evidence of the use of such practices has been adduced by the inquiry."

Page 25: "The investigation failed to disclose any evidence of attempts on the part of the cigarette manufacturers to sell other tobacco products to jobbers as a condition to the sale of their cigarettes."

Page 20: "The small manufacturers who have not instituted a system under which customers receive some definite percentage of their purchases during an established base period have adopted the policy of reviewing all orders carefully and either reducing or rejecting orders out of proportion to the customer's past purchases."

It is clear that the F. T. C. gives the industry a clean bill of health. True, there are some black-market operations on a small scale—at the jobber and retailer level—but, in taking a broad, national view of the picture, illegal operations are so small as to be unimportant.

We would like to clarify the following statement in the F. T. C. report: "Restrictions imposed by the War Manpower Commission, War Production Board, and the Office of Price Administration, while no doubt curtailing, in some degree, the rate of increase of production, have, nevertheless, not prevented a substantial increase in the aggregate amount of cigarettes manufactured by the industry."

It is true that Government restrictions have not prevented a substantial increase in production. In fact, in the face of wartime restrictions, the industry has increased production from 218,000,000,000 cigarettes in 1941 to the all-time high figure of 326,500,000,000 in 1944. But, the the F. T. C. points out, this impressive increase has not been sufficient to equal the even greater increase in demand.

The industry is confident that if tobacco manufacturing was given an essential manpower rating and if the War Food Administration stepped up the growing of leaf tobacco, the industry—in spite of other wartime restrictions—could increase its production to meet the demand.

Commenting on the spectacular increase in consumer demand in recent years, the F. T. C. says, "Official data indicates that the average yearly rate of increase of consumer demand in the United States from 1934 to 1944 was 8.8 percent. The average yearly increase from 1940 to 1944 was 12.6 percent, indicating a much accelerated demand for each year during the 4-year term. It is reasonable to conclude that a minimum of 285,000,000,000 cigarettes would have been required to adequately supply the domestic market in 1944. The domestic market was only supplied with 240,000,000,000 of the theoretical demand, and on such basis the domestic market was short 45,000,000,000 cigarettes, or 15.8 percent."

With an increase of between four and five thousand people employed in tobacco factories, it is virtually certain that manufacturers could speed up their production by at least 15.8 percent and thus reach the F. T. C. demand figure of 285,000,000,000 cigarettes.

On February 14 this organization sent the following telegram to James F. Byrnes, Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, and to Paul V. McNutt, Director, War Manpower Commission: "Tobacco growing is now rated an essential occupation by the War Manpower Commission, but the manufacturing of tobacco products is considered nonessential. The present critical manpower shortage in tobacco factories is the principal contributing cause of the present cigarette shortage. It is reasonable to estimate that the Nation's 32,000,000 cigarette smokers spend at least 15 minutes daily hunting a smoke. This costs 8,000,000 man-hours daily—a full day's working time for a force of 1,000,000 men. Only 40,000 man-hours of work daily—or 5,000 men in tobacco factories—could wipe out the shortage and create an adequate supply for our armed forces and restore a vital missing element to our national morale."

You have probably noted, Senator LANGER, that section 2 of the report deals with the production and disposition of leaf tobacco for cigarettes. It makes the point that the amount of leaf tobacco harvested during the past 4 years consistently fell short of the acreage allotted by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. This is completely accurate as far as it goes. But to some who are not thoroughly familiar with the tobacco business it may give the impression that there is nothing the Government can do to increase the production of leaf tobacco. We do not believe that this is true. Probably total national A. A. A. acreage allocations are theoretically adequate, but in the actual administration of these allocations countless farmers who would gladly expand their acreage are restricted, while other farmers, for a variety of reasons, fail to plant or harvest the amounts allocated to them.

It would be a most constructive step if the A. A. A. could work out a county-by-county system whereby unused allocations within a county could be transfererd to other growers, so that total production would more closely approximate the allocation figures.

The significance of this proposed action by the A. A. A. is that manufacturers, who must now carefully guard their stocks of leaf tobacco in order to maintain today's rate of production, would be justified in digging even deeper into these supplies, enough to increase production 15.8 percent.

We submit that without seriously disturbing the present production of the munitions of war the W. M. C. could permit a slight increase in the amount of labor available to the tobacco industry and thus remove one of the two principal barriers to adequate supply. The A. A. A. could, without disturbing its present crop-control system, improve its methods, and by the use of its existing organization insure the production of vitally needed increases in leaf tobacco.

Cigarette manufacturers have been deluged with letters from the biggest and most vitally essential war plants in the country—plants manufacturing munitions, guns, tanks, ships, and airplanes—begging them for supplies of cigarettes to provide their workers. They complain that without cigarettes, millions of man-hours of labor are wasted trying to find cigarettes and other tobacco products. We want to supply these vitally needed smokes.

We sincerely hope that we will have your cooperation in bringing about a clearer understanding on the part of the Government and the public of the essentials of the problem. If this organization can be of any assistance to you in your inquiry, please give us the opportunity to do so.

Yours very truly,

EDWARD F. RAGLAND,
Secretary.

NOTE.—The members of this organization are: The Bloch Bros. Tobacco Co.; Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corporation; A. A. Brugger & Son; Crimson Coach, Inc.; the Independent Tobacco Co.; Larus & Bro. Co., Inc.; John P. Lieberman & Co.; John Middleton, Inc.; Penn Tobacco Co., Inc.; Christian Peper Tobacco Co., Inc.; Scott Tobacco Co.; Scotten-Dillon Co.; Simpson, Studwell & Swick, Ltd.; Stephano Bros., Inc.; Taylor Bros., Inc.

THE BRIGHT FUTURE OF MANKIND—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on March 12, 1945, in Madison Square Garden, New York, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO ALFRED E. SMITH BY JOHN S. BURKE

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address in tribute to the late Alfred E. Smith, delivered by John S. Burke at one hundred and sixty-first anniversary dinner of the Society of the Sons of St. Patrick, on March 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTRACT SETTLEMENTS — COMMENTS BY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PURCHASING AGENTS

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD comments on the work of the Office of Contract Settlement under Robert H. Hinckley, Director, as published in the bulletin of the National Association of Purchasing Agents, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENTS ON FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD quotations and excerpts from statements relating to the full employment bill, which appear in the Appendix.]

WORLD PEACE—EDITORIAL FROM THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN HERALD

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on the problem of world peace, published in the Rocky Mountain Herald of March 17, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MIDNIGHT CURFEW

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper report of March 23 on results of the Gallup Poll relative to the midnight curfew, which appears in the Appendix.]

BALANCING OF INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times relative to the possible contribution of foreign travel by Americans to the balancing of international exchange following the war, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST-WAR ECONOMIC PROBLEMS—ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with post-war economic problems, published in the Washington Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

WINNING THE PEACE—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM HENRY CHAMBERLIN

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "It Isn't Too Late To Win the Peace" by William Henry Chamberlin, from the Progressive of March 5, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

MY PRAYER—BY MRS. CORA LOU ABART

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a prayer composed by Mrs. Cora Lou Abart, of Bassett, Nebr., which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McLeod, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 141) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, in lieu of certain appropriations contained in H. R. 2374, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TREATY WITH MEXICO RELATING TO THE UTILIZATION OF THE WATERS OF CERTAIN RIVERS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty (Executive A, 78th Cong., 2d sess.), between the United States of America and the United Mexican States, relating to the utilization of the waters of certain rivers, and (Executive H, 78th Cong., 2d sess.), a protocol supplementary to the treaty.

Mr. DOWNEY obtained the floor.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I feel sure that at the present time I have an open mind concerning the Mexican water treaty. However, I regret that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] should have said, as he is reported through the Associated Press as having said, that it would be a bad thing for the Senate to fail to ratify the agreement between Mexico and this country just before the United Nations delegates meet at San Francisco, that "aside from the merits of the treaty itself any such action would give rise to criticism in the country that the Senate is incapable of coming to a two-thirds agreement on international matters." It would seem to me that the treaty should be considered on its merits, and I agree with the Senator from Ohio that it should not be a partisan matter.

If the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] has made any effort to rally Republican strength behind the opposition to the treaty, I am not aware of it. The argument made by the Senator from New Jersey against the justice of the treaty as affecting this country is to me impressive.

I think it is unfortunate, too, that the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is reported to have said, "We could not afford to go to San Francisco without the water treaty having been ratified." The Senator from Texas indicated that he was ready to accept some reservations or amendments, but that he could not agree to a downright revision of the 1,500,000 acre-feet of water to be guaranteed to Mexico.

Those participating in the discussion of the treaty so far have not indicated to me that it is strictly an administration measure. Some of the strongest administration Senators are, I understand, opposing the treaty. It certainly does not become necessary for the Senate of the United States to make itself known to be a "rubber stamp" for any international treaty which may be submitted to it. So far as I am concerned, I should like to see consummated a treaty with Mexico concerning water rights on international rivers, but I do not feel like supporting a treaty which will result in our being too generous to Mexico, or to any other country, with our country's resources.

(Mr. DOWNEY resumed the speech begun by him on Friday last. After having spoken for about 40 minutes the following occurred:)

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield for that purpose?

Mr. DOWNEY. Yes; I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capehart	Hart
Austin	Capper	Hatch
Bailey	Chavez	Hayden
Ball	Connally	Hickenlooper
Bankhead	Cordon	Hill
Barkley	Donnell	Hoey
Bilbo	Downey	Johnson, Calif.
Brewster	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Bridges	Fulbright	Johnston, S.C.
Briggs	George	Kilgore
Burton	Gerry	La Follette
Bushfield	Guffey	Langer
Byrd	Gurney	Lucas
McCarran	O'Mahoney	Tydings
McClellan	Pepper	Vandenberg
McFarland	Reed	Wagner
McKellar	Revercomb	Wheeler
McMahon	Saltonstall	Wherry
Maybank	Shipstead	White
Millikin	Smith	Wiley
Moore	Stewart	Willis
Morse	Taft	Wilson
Murdock	Taylor	Young
Murray	Thomas, Utah	
O'Daniel	Tobey	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

(Mr. DOWNEY resumed his speech. After having spoken for about 1 hour and 25 minutes, he yielded the floor for the day for the consideration of the first deficiency appropriation bill and other business. Mr. DOWNEY's speech will be published entire after it shall have been concluded.)

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. DOWNEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senate Committee on Appropriations has reported House bill 2374, the first deficiency appropriations measure. I wonder if the Senator from California at this time would yield to me so that that bill may be considered. I do not think there will be anything controversial about it. The House expects to take a series of 3-day recesses, beginning on Wednesday next, and therefore the House cannot do any business after that time. The deficiency bill ought to be passed in time for the House to act upon it, or agree to any conference report that may be submitted, before that time. I wonder if the Senator from California will yield to me so I may move that the Senate consider the deficiency bill now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Tennessee for that purpose?

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I will yield for that purpose, if I may receive unanimous consent to resume the floor after the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has had final action on the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I make no objection to the proposed procedure if there be no debate on the bill. If a long debate and discussion shall be launched over the bill, I shall object. I must insist that as a condition for taking it up, there be no long debate on the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know of any debate that may be expected on the bill. There was no controversy in committee, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Subject to that reservation, I shall not object, and, of course, I agree that the Senator from California may resume when action on the bill is completed.

Mr. DOWNEY. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee how long he thinks it will take to finish consideration of the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it will take only a few minutes.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I now move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 2374, the first deficiency appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill

(H. R. 2374) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of some of the minority members of the Committee on Appropriations whether there has been any substantial controversy respecting the bill, so far as they know?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BALL. So far as I know there were no seriously controversial items in the bill, and the full committee unanimously approved all the amendments contained in the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is my understanding that there were no controversies about the bill. I do not believe there will be any controversy over the bill in the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator give a short explanation of the matter?

Mr. McKELLAR. This is the first deficiency appropriation bill, to take care of urgent deficiencies between now and July 1 which have been recommended and carefully examined by the Committee on Appropriations, and I think the Senate will find all the items correct and in order.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—General appropriations—Legislative," on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

SENATE

For payment to Martha M. Maloney, widow of Francis T. Maloney, late a Senator from the State of Connecticut, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 6, to insert:

For payment to Ethel J. Moses, widow of John Moses, late a Senator from the State of North Dakota, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 8, to insert:

Office of the Vice President: Beginning April 1, 1945, the allowance for clerical assistance to the Vice President hereby is increased from $15,420 to $19,440 per annum, the necessary additional amount to June 30, 1945, to be paid from the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate, and the legislative branch and Judiciary Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1945 is amended accordingly.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 16, to insert:

Office of the Secretary: For an additional amount for clerical assistance and readjustment of present salaries in the disbursing office at the rate of $5,020 per annum (including $1,000 additional for the financial clerk so long as the position is held by the present incumbent), so much as may be necessary from April 1 to June 30, 1945, to be paid from the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate for the fiscal year 1945.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 24, to insert:

For payment to the estate of William H. Crichton Clarke, deceased, for services rendered by the said William H. Crichton Clarke during the fiscal year 1942, as counsel to the special committee of the Senate established pursuant to Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, to study and survey the problems of American small business enterprises, $1,000, payable from the appropriation "Inquiries and investigations, Senate, fiscal year 1945."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 7, to insert:

WAR OVERTIME PAY

For additional amounts for appropriations for the fiscal year 1945, for the payment of additional compensation authorized by the Act of May 7, 1943 (Public Law 49), as follows:

"Salaries, officers and employees, Senate, 1945," $200,000.

"Contingent expenses, reporting debates and proceedings, Senate, 1945," $4,785.

"Contingent expenses, cleaning furniture, Senate," $300.

"Contingent expenses, salaries and expenses, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, Senate, 1945," $3,000.

"Salaries and expenses of detailed police, Capitol Police Board, Senate, 1945," $2,500.

"Salaries and expenses, Joint Committee on Printing, Senate, 1945," $630.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 13, to insert:

NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM COMMISSION

For carrying out the provisions of Public Law No. 523 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, entitled "Joint resolution to consider a site and design for a National Memorial Stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia," approved December 20, 1944, fiscal year 1945, $5,000, to remain available until June 30, 1946, and to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate on vouchers approved by the chairman of the commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Executive Office of the President—Office of Price Administration," on page 7, line 18, after the numerals "1944", to strike out "$6,235,000" and insert "$6,800,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Independent Executive Agencies—Social Security Board," on page 9, after line 14, to insert:

Grants to States for unemployment compensation administration: For an additional amount for "Grants to States for unemployment compensation administration," fiscal year 1945, including the objects under this head in the Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1945, $996,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Roads Administration," on page 11, line 8, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 19, and"; and in line 9, after the name "Congress", to strike out "$24,149.79" and insert "$69,452.65."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 7, to insert:

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1945, for salaries and expenses of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, including the objects specified in the appropriation for this purpose in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1945, and including the purchase of two passenger automobiles, $667,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 14, to insert:

Langley Field, Va.: For an additional amount for construction and equipment, Langley Field, Va., including not to exceed $2,195,000 for the construction and equipment of auxiliary flight research stations on sites elsewhere, to be selected by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and the acquisition of land (not to exceed a total of 100 acres) and rights-of-way and the construction of connections to public utilities necessary therefor, $4,100,000, to be available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, after line 23, to insert:

Aircraft Engine Research Laboratory, Cleveland, Ohio: For an additional amount for construction and equipment, Aircraft Engine Research Laboratory, Cleveland, Ohio, $5,540,000, to be available until expended.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the amendment on page 12, after line 23, extending to line 3 on page 13? It deals with the Aircraft Engine Research Laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. McKELLAR. Both the Army and the Navy wanted it.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Ohio, who is familiar with the project.

Mr. BURTON. This is the Aircraft Engine Research Laboratory of the National Advisory Committee on Aviation. Secret investigations and developments in the aircraft industry are being carried on, involving such things as the development of jet-propulsion planes. This item is highly recommended by the Army and Navy. I myself visited the research laboratory, and I am sure it is an extremely valuable contribution toward the development of the aviation industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 12, after line 23.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Housing Agency," on page 13, line 14, after the numerals "1945", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That all obligations of this additional appropriation for projects in which (1) the War

Department has a paramount interest, shall first be jointly authorized in writing by the Secretary of War and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, (2) the Navy Department has a paramount interest, shall first be jointly authorized in writing by the Secretary of the Navy and the Director the Bureau of the Budget, (3) the War and Navy Departments have a joint interest, direct or indirect, which they shall be presumed to have as to all projects in which the interest of either department is not paramount, shall first be jointly authorized in writing by the Secretaries of War and Navy and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 3, to insert:

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Arbitration and emergency boards: For an additional amount for "Arbitration and emergency boards," fiscal year 1945, including the objects under this head in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1945, $35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 15, to insert:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Office of the corporation counsel: For an additional amount for "Office of the corporation counsel," fiscal year 1945, including the objects specified in the appropriation for this purpose in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1945, $1,500, and the limitation of $3,000 in said appropriation which may be paid for the settlement of claims not in excess of $250 each is hereby increased to $4,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 9, to insert:

HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Gallinger Municipal Hospital: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1945, for "Gallinger Municipal Hospital," including the objects specified under this head in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1945, and including construction of a new ice plant, $31,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 15, to insert:

PUBLIC WELFARE

FAMILY WELFARE SERVICE

Operating expenses, child care: The limitation in the appropriation "Operating expenses, child care," in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1945, on the amount which may be paid to institutions under sectarian control for board and care of children committed to the guardianship of the Board of Public Welfare is hereby increased from $2,500 to $6,000 to each such institution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 16, to insert:

DIVISION OF EXPENSES

The sums appropriated in this act for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided, be paid out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1945.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture," on page 16, after line 16, to insert:

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for conservation and use of agricultural land resources, fiscal year 1945, to be consolidated with the sum of $24,250,000 made available for salaries and other administrative expenses under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropiration Act, 1945, $250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior—Office of the Secretary—Grazing Service," on page 19, line 2, after the numerals "1945" to strike out "$18,000" and insert "$36,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, after line 2, to insert:

UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1945, for the maintenance of the office of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands, including the objects specified under this head in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945, and including the employment without regard to civil-service and classification laws of technical employees who may be engaged for the purpose of making a survey of conditions in the Philippine Islands which may require the assistance of the United States Government for the rehabilitation of the Philippines, and the purchase of three automobiles, one of which may be purchased at a price of not to exceed $3,000, $80,000, to remain available until June 30, 1946: *Provided*, That the High Commissioner shall make quarterly reports to the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission on the progress and findings of the survey.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, this item is for salaries and expenses in connection with the office of United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I wish to thank the acting chairman of the committee for helping to have this item included. I believe that a brief word would probably serve the welfare of this country and of the Philippines if it were to be stated now.

At the present time we have no official representative in the Philippine Islands except, of course, our Army and Navy and our Air Force. Filipino commerce is largely stagnated. There are 18,000,000 Filipinos. One of their large interests is sugar. Another is manila rope and hemp. Another is tobacco, and so forth.

Furthermore, they have very little shipping. They are short of clothing, and in some cases food and medical supplies. Much of the machinery in their existing industries—sugar, embroideries, tobacco, and so forth—has been taken by the Japanese from the Philippines to Japan. The copra industry, on which hundreds of thousands exist, is practically nonexistent from the export standpoint. We need very badly, as a part of the war effort, some of the materials which are now available in the Philippines, and of which there is a shortage.

In making this appropriation for $80,000 the acting chairman of the committee, the committee, and your present speaker, were all very anxious to have the War Production Board, the Shipping Administration, and certain other agencies send experts to the Philippines to gather facts so that we can formulate the best, most efficient, and least expensive kind of program to restore the economy of the Philippines, rather than perhaps appropriate millions for relief.

I am hoping that the Secretary of the Interior and others affected by this appropriation will take due notice thereof; and, should the House allow the item to remain in the bill, I hope the various agencies will immediately dispatch the proper officials to the Philippines, so that we can help to revive the industry of the Philippine Islands.

I thank the Senator for allowing me to make this brief statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it was for those reasons, which were so forcibly submitted to the committee by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, that the committee acted. We are very hopeful that we can make the Philippines self-sustaining to a great degree. For that reason I hope the amendment will be agreed to. We hope to retain it in conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 19, after line 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Irrigation and drainage," on page 20, after line 17, to insert:

For settlement of claims to water rights in the Gila River, Ariz., $114,400, reimbursable, of which amount $104,400 shall be paid to the Buckeye Irrigation Co. and $10,000 shall be paid to the Arlington Canal Co.: *Provided*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be paid until appropriate contracts shall have been executed by and between the Secretary of the Interior and the Buckeye Irrigation Co. and the Arlington Canal Co.: *Provided further*, That no part of the sum herein appropriated shall be paid until (a) an appropriate contract providing for repayment of the proportionate amount properly chargeable to non-Indian lands in the San Carlos irrigation and drainage district shall have been executed by the San Carlos irrigation and drainage district and approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and (b) an appropriate resolution shall have been adopted by the Gila River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community Council consenting to the charge of the proportionate amount of the sum herein appropriated as construction costs against all Indian lands within the San Carlos Indian irrigation project, subject to the provisions of the act of July 1, 1932 (25 U. S. C. 386a).

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, was the question of settlement of claims to water rights in the Gila River in Arizona ever referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not believe it was. This item was vouched for by a

member of the committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is very careful in such matters. He is one of our most careful legislators, and one of the most useful members on our committee. That is why the item was agreed to. It seemed to the committee, from the evidence before it, that the claim was entirely proper and just. The junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] is present, and perhaps he can answer any questions the Senator may wish to ask.

Mr. LANGER. The principal question I wish to ask is why the claim was not brought to the attention of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if I may answer the question, the original San Carlos Irrigation and Drainage District Act authorized the construction of what is now known as the Coolidge Dam, and also authorized everything else that was necessary to carry out the purposes of the act. Certain water rights were in controversy, and this is the outgrowth of a settlement of some of those water rights.

Mr. McKELLAR. As the committee understood at the time, it was a compromise.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes. The Buckeye Irrigation Co. and the Arlington Canal Co., which received this money, brought a suit against the San Carlos irrigation and drainage district, and against the Indians. This item is in settlement of that suit. Without going into it in detail, unless Senators wish to have me do so, it was a long distance from the Coolidge Dam to those properties, so payment is being made for the drilling of certain wells and the pumping of water.

Mr. LANGER. I take it that some years ago this matter was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, that an agreement was entered into, and that this item is in settlement of that agreement?

Mr. McFARLAND. If my memory serves me correctly, I believe it was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. WHITE. In any event, the amount carried in this item is in liquidation of agreed-upon settlements.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 20, after line 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 14, to insert:

EDUCATION

For support and education of Indian pupils in nonreservation boarding schools, fiscal year 1945, $47,625, to be added to the appropriation of $2,627,620 for this purpose in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945, and to be available for the following schools:

Phoenix, Ariz.: $32,375; and the amount available for the support of Indian pupils is hereby increased from $163,475 to $195,850; and the number of pupils from 425 to 550;

Chemawa, Oreg.: $15,250; and the amount available for the support of Indian pupils is hereby increased from $159,475 to $174,725; and the number of pupils from 375 to 425.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Justice—Damage claims," on page 24, in line 9, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 21, and"; and in line 11, after the name "Congress", to strike out "$97.50" and insert "$159.50."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Post Office Department (out of the postal revenues)—Field Service, Post Office Department—Office of the Chief Inspector," on page 28, after line 16, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Miscellaneous items, first- and second-class post offices: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1945, for "Miscellaneous items, first- and second-class post offices," $1,855,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be rejected, because it is covered under a joint resolution coming from the House.

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of State—Office of the Secretary," on page 29, in line 19, after the numerals "1945", to insert a comma and "and including the purchase of two used passenger automobiles"; in line 20, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$140,000" and insert "$155,000"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the comma and "and it shall not be lawful to make expenditures from other appropriations for the purposes of this appropriation."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in regard to the item for Department of State, striking out $140,000 and inserting $155,000, let me inquire whether that includes only the purchase of the two automobiles.

Mr. McKELLAR. Other items besides that are included. Several contingent expenses were included in the $155,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 29, in lines 19 and 20.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Treasury Department—Office of the Secretary," on page 33, after line 4, to insert:

Restoration of capital impairment, Commodity Credit Corporation: To enable the Secretary of the Treasury, on behalf of the United States, to restore the amount of the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of March 31, 1944, by a contribution to the Corporation as provided by the act approved March 8, 1938, as amended (15 U. S. C. 713a–1), $256,764,881.04.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Tennessee will make a statement for the RECORD regarding the restoration of the amount of the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation, because undoubtedly that matter will be a subject of discussion in conference, and I am sure it will be helpful to have a record made on the floor of the Senate showing why the Senate believes it to be essential to provide for it.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Commodity Credit Corporation is that much in debt. The committee thought we should restore its capital to that extent, so that it may continue to operate in the way it has been operating.

Mr. BURTON. I understand that the statute requires the Congress to make up such impairments of capital after proper audit and inventory have been made and taken.

Mr. McKELLAR. That has been done, and the committee was shown that it has been done. Consequently we should take care of the impairment. Evidently the House thought it should be allowed to run along, but that is no way to treat the Corporation.

Mr. BURTON. I understand it ran along last year, and that the amount stated in the amendment represents the accumulation. I further understand that unless the amendment is agreed to, the Commodity Credit Corporation will simply be forced to borrow, which will add to its debt, thus increasing the impairment of its capital, instead of clearing it up.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is exactly tne case.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BALL. It would seem to me that the RECORD should show that the entire $256,764,881 is to take care of impairment of capital due to payments for subsidies to stabilize prices.

Mr. McKELLAR. Undoubtedly that is true.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Along the line of the questions asked by the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Ohio, let me ask the Senator from Tennessee whether he will state how long the loss or impairment of capital has been accumulating?

Mr. McKELLAR. This is the second year.

Mr. BRIDGES. This item represents 2 years of accumulations; does it?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. It should be taken care of in this way, rather than merely to let it go along.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think it might be added for the information of the Senate that since March 31, 1944, the Commodity Credit Corporation has lost another $500,000,000, which we will be called upon to appropriate this summer or next fall in order to make good a further impairment of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation, due to the subsidy provisions.

Mr. BRIDGES. On what was that loss incurred?

Mr. TAFT. On the payment of subsidies from March 31, 1944, until June

30, 1945; this time it will be for a year and 3 months.

I may say further that we now have a conference committee which is about to meet—it will meet at 4 o'clock—on the subject of the total borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That power has been $1,500,000,000; and in the bill which the Senate passed it was increased to $4,500,000,000. The House then voted to increase it to $5,000,000,000. The argument has been made that we should appropriate at least $250,000,000 of that amount, because the money was not appropriated. I may say that now that it has been appropriated, it seems to me our conference committee should stand on the $4,500,000,000.

As a matter of fact, the matter is more of a bookkeeping transaction than otherwise.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is.

Mr. TAFT. The $256,000,000 has been lost. Under present conditions the Commodity Credit Corporation, which has a capital of only $100,000,000, has a very large deficit, away beyond its supposed capital. I do not see any choice except to appropriate this money; but I feel very strongly that we have allowed the Corporation too much borrowing power and too little capital. Its capital is $100,000,000, but its borrowing power now is $3,000,000,000, and it is to be $4,500,000,000 or $5,000,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if I may express a view on the matter, let me say I do not see how we can very well stop the subsidy program while the war is going on; but when the war is over we should take very strong measures to put the country on an even keel again and stop the tremendous payment of subsidies. They should not be paid in this way. Subsidies, if they are to be paid, should be granted by the Congress, and should be appropriated for by the Congress. I regret very much that the present situation has developed; but for the present I do not see how we can obviate it. I think it would be unwise to change the plan before the war is over.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I agree with what the Senator from Tennessee has been saying; but I think it is vitally important that the country have a clear realization of what is going on. It should realize that up to March 31, 1944, which was a year ago, an impairment of capital to the extent of $256,000,000 was incurred and therefore, even when that impairment is cleared up and appropriated for, we will still be a year behind, and further impairment has occurred since then. If the record can be kept clear, the country will know how much it costs to subsidize the various payments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that the increase of $273,000,000——

Mr. McKELLAR. It is $256,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. But the increase voted by the Senate committee over the amount voted by the House is $273,837,952.69.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The $256,764,881.04 is for the impairment of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. That impairment arose prior to March 1944.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. In regard to the subsidies we voted the other day, which total $2,400,000,000, let me ask where they come in? I ask that question of the distinguished Senator from Ohio if I may do so.

Mr. TAFT. I estimate that the loss from the payment of subsidies from March 31, 1944, to the end of the current fiscal year, which will be July 1, 1945, will be approximately $500,000,000 in addition to the amount contained in the item under discussion. In addition, the bill which the Senate has already passed authorizes the continuation of the subsidies during the fiscal year 1946, during which, if the Commodity Credit Corporation avails itself of all the authority given it, there will be a loss of approximately $800,000,000 more in that fiscal year.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, let me repeat what the Senator has stated, that we are merely completing a bookkeeping transaction, because the money has already been lost, and we are required to appropriate it. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is about the substance of it.

Mr. WHERRY. On the other hand, the $256,000,000 is recommended by the committee as an increase over the House appropriation, is it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. Apparently the House concluded merely to let the matter run along, but the Senate committee voted to conclude it in this way.

Mr. TAFT. Let me suggest that it really is sounder to handle the matter in this way, because now the loss will appear in the regular Budget.

Mr. McKELLAR. And it will be open to inspection and will be before everyone, so everyone can understand it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the acting chairman of the committee indicate, so that it will appear in the RECORD and so that everyone, including the general public, may understand it, how the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation became impaired? Will he give a typical example?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have no examples to give; but the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation has simply become impaired by the increasing subsidies in the various departments, as authorized by law. All of them have been authorized by law.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean to state that the subsidies, because of which this impairment has occurred, were authorized prior to March 1944?

Mr. McKELLAR. They were not authorized, or else the item would not appear in this way; but other committees have reported the subsidies, and the Senate and the House of Representatives have agreed to them.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Congress has directed that certain support prices be made available for agricultural products. It was necessary to advance money in the nature of subsidies. A profit was realized in connection with certain crops as, for example, wheat. A considerable loss was experienced in connection with cotton.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; the Senator is incorrect with regard to cotton.

Mr. WHERRY. Are not dairy subsidies paid?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I may say that the records show that with regard to cotton we are ahead by $91,000,000 at the present time.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Are not dairy subsidies paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. McKELLAR. They come into the same picture.

Mr. HAYDEN. Some of the subsidies are handled by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and others are taken care of by the War Food Administration. The question involved is one of buying something at a support price and then losing money on it through the sale.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, what we are actually doing at the present time is requiring that all Government agencies which pay subsidies shall come to the Congress for their necessary appropriations.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to know the difference between the way the Senate would handle this matter and the way the House proposed to handle it.

Mr. McKELLAR. We are allowing the various agencies to pay the subsidies under the law, and then come before Congress in order to obtain money.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to propound another question to the Senator. Has the Congress ever authorized the payment of food subsidies?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it has.

Mr. WHERRY. When?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not remember when, but Congress has taken such action.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I can answer more fully the question of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Subsidies were authorized in the bill which extended the Price Control Act in May 1944.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not remember the date, but I know they were authorized by the Congress.

Mr. TAFT. That law provided that after July 1, 1945, no subsidies were to be paid without express authorization of Congress. However, it authorized appropriations for them. In other words, the law recognized the fact that subsidies were being paid. It was provided that the subsidies should not be paid beyond June 30, 1945, without an appropriation by Congress. The law was amended recently, and a limit was placed on the amount of subsidies which could be paid in the next fiscal year.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. How will what we are now asked to do change the procedure which has been followed during the past 3 or 4 years?

Mr. McKELLAR. The procedure which has been followed in the past would be changed very little. The House is willing to let the payments accumulate. The Senate thinks that the money should be restored to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Tennessee that what I thought we were doing was to require the agencies involved to come before Congress and ask for appropriations. When I voted last year to appropriate money for the payment of food subsidies, it was my understanding that as to payments which Congress had not authorized, we were voting to make up for what some agency had already done. Last year we extended the effective date of the law. It was the first time, to my knowldge, that we had voted to extend the payment of subsidies.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it had been done before.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the language appearing on page 16, line 19, under the subheading "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources."

In my State we have a law which provides that no department may overdraw its account. It is a criminal offense for a State official to spend one more penny than he has been authorized to spend. Am I to understand that the Federal Government does not have such a law?

Mr. McKELLAR. The Government does not have such a law.

Mr. LANGER. So in respect to the item to which I have referred, if the Department of Agriculture had spent a million dollars more than it was originally authorized to spend, it could then come to Congress and ask Congress to make good the deficit, and no law would have been violated in the meantime.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the item to which the Senator has referred may be explained in this way: Assume that we have a flax program. The purpose of this supplemental appropriation is to make available the sum of $250,000 to augment the limitation on administrative expenses for 1945 by the amount of estimated additional expenses to be incurred by county agricultural conservation associations in connection with the flax program. Those expenses will include, first, establishing flaxseed goals on approximately 250,000 farms; second, informing producers as to the provisions of the flax program, and of the necessity for increasing production; and third, obtaining seeded acreage to reach those goals.

As the Senator from North Dakota knows, flaxseed is used extensively in connection with the manufacture of war materials and other articles. This would be a subsidy for flaxseed. That is all it would be.

Mr. LANGER. Regardless of this particular item, may a department head of the United States Government, without violating the law, spend more money than has been appropriated?

Mr. McKELLAR. Department heads are supposed not to spend more money than has been appropriated for them, but they have done so very frequently, and the Congress has always appropriated money to take care of the deficit.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I thought that each department had to make an allocation of the funds available over the fiscal year, and confine itself to that amount.

Mr. McKELLAR. I believe there is a provision of law to that effect. Since the beginning of the war the departments have sometimes gone beyond the line.

Mr. LANGER. In my State the farmers who seeded considerable acreages of flax were promised $10 an acre, but it was never paid. Do I understand that this item will enable them to be paid?

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the Senator refer to this year?

Mr. LANGER. No; last year.

Mr. HAYDEN. My understanding was that the subsidy was $5 an acre.

Mr. LANGER. Last year it was $10 an acre.

Mr. HAYDEN. The appropriation is supposed to be used to pay farmers a subsidy of $5 an acre in order to cover the cost of planting flax.

Mr. LANGER. The farmers of my State did not receive the money which was promised to them.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not know about that. This item has nothing to do with last year. It is to encourage the planting of flax this year by a subsidy of $5 an acre.

Mr. LANGER. During 1945?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, in connection with the Commodity Credit Corporation item I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the illuminating balance sheet which appears in the printed copy of the House hearings at pages 657 to 659. It is a balance sheet of the Commodity Credit Corporation as of March 31, 1944, and shows exactly how the deficit was incurred. It also shows a cumulative deficit to March 31, 1943, of approximately $67,000,000. The operating loss to March 31, 1944, was, in round numbers, $296,533,907, or a total of $363,846,418. The estimated loss due to appraisal was $36,868,986.60, making a total estimated appraisal loss of approximately $400,000,000. Against that sum may be deducted payments by the Secretary of the Treasury to restore capital impairment of approximately $143,950,523. An inspection of the balance sheet will show exactly how the figures are arrived at.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

There being no objection, the balance sheet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Balance sheet as of Mar. 31, 1944

	Book value as adjusted for items in transit and accruals	Estimated loss due to appraisal	Value after reflecting estimated appraisal loss [1]
ASSETS			
Cash:			
In banks (foreign countries)	$172,092.82		
On deposit with the Treasurer of the United States	1,824,374.28		
Special currency custody	2,546,861.34		
Petty cash	500.00		
On deposit with the Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department	798,858.36		
On books of Bookkeeping and Warrants, Treasury Department	69,812.85		
Total	5,412,499.65		$5,412,499.65
Funds on deposit with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation:			
Principal	175,997,536.06		
Interest	156,048.82		
Total	176,153,584.88		176,153,584.88

[1] See letter of Appraisal Committee.

Balance sheet as of Mar. 31, 1944—Continued

		Book value as adjusted for items in transit and accruals	Estimated loss due to appraisal	Value after reflecting estimated appraisal loss
ASSETS—continued				
Commodity loans—Schedule No. 1:				
Principal, including charges paid		$406,681,876.29		
Accrued interest receivable		6,499,443.11		
Accrued warehouse and other charges (contra)		7,449,772.59		
Total		420,631,091.99	$4,630,177.74	$416,000,914.25
Miscellaneous loans (other than commodity)—Schedule No. 2:				
Principal, including charges paid		1,900,061.94		
Accrued interest receivable		44,890.30		
Total		1,944,952.24		1,944,952.24
Commodity inventories:				
Commodities required in settlement of loans, pooled for account of producers, or purchased—Schedule No. 3		443,986,067.15		
Agricultural supplies purchase program—Schedule No. 4		252,917,446.71		
Foreign purchase program—Schedule No. 5		69,248,353.97		
General commodities purchase program—Schedule No. 6		630,895,905.84		
Total		1,397,047,773.67	32,238,808.86	1,364,808,964.81
Accounts receivable:				
Commodity loans		21,781,131.18		
Agricultural supplies program		13,247,148.67		
Foreign purchase program		14,879,498.51		
General commodities purchase program:				
British food mission		13,343,404.87		
Foreign Economic Administration (lend-lease)		647,720,664.62		
Navy Department		17,827,006.82		
Red Cross		20,906,577.55		
Territorial emergency program		26,938,241.34		
War Department		44,773,533.08		
All other		56,901,077.64		
Miscellaneous claims		1,201,842.33		
Total		879,520,126.61		879,520,126.61
Undistributed debits:				
General commodities purchase program		315,228,488.62		315,228,488.62
Storage and other equipment:				
Steel grain bins	$10,223,586.39			
Less: Reserve for depreciation	4,402,661.26			
		5,820,925.13		
Wooden granaries	18,026,930.74			
Reserve for depreciation	5,668,145.62			
		12,358,785.12		
Grain bin equipment		274,507.53		
Castor bean equipment		4,088.50		
Logging equipment	$820,360.93			
Less: Reserve for depreciation	237,305.06			
		583,055.87		
Total		19,041,362.15		19,041,362.15
Furniture, fixtures, and equipment:				
Equipment cost	$373,423.65			
Less: Reserve for depreciation	117,951.55			
		255,472.10		255,472.10
Deferred charges and prepaid expenses:				
Alaska spruce-log program		1,947,712.66		
1943 cotton		887,701.05		
Total		2,835,413.71		2,835,413.71
Total assets		3,218,070,765.62	36,868,986.60	3,181,201,779.02
LIABILITIES				
Notes, drafts, and certificates payable:				
Series G notes held by public	$411,596,000.00			
Interest accrued at 1½ percent per annum	572,446.36			
		412,168,446.36		
Treasury notes held by Treasury	900,000,000.00			
Interest accrued at 1 percent per annum	2,164,835.17			
		902,164,835.17		
Bank loans	169,561,525.97			
Interest accrued at various rates	31,782.91			
		169,593,308.88		
Certificates of indebtedness issued to banks	325,859,400.00			
Interest accrued at 1½ percent per annum	2,225,572.19			
		328,084,972.19		
Total		1,812,011,562.60		1,812,011,562.60
Estimated accrued warehouse and other charges:				
On commodity loans (contra)		7,449,772.59		
On commodity inventories		26,160,043.54		
Total		33,609,816.13		33,609,816.13
Suspended credits:				
Claims, sales proceeds 1938–39 raisins (in litigation)		229,546.88		
Unallocated sales proceeds		2,573,749.82		
Total		2,803,296.70		2,803,296.70
Advances to cover commodity purchases:				
Foreign Economic Administration		1,243,216,929.19		
Government of the United Kingdom		64,364,907.63		
Total		1,307,581,836.82		1,307,581,836.82

Balance sheet as of Mar. 31, 1944—Continued

	Book value as adjusted for items in transit and accruals	Estimated loss due to appraisal	Value after reflecting estimated appraisal loss
LIABILITIES—continued			
Accounts payable:			
Agricultural Adjustment Agency	$630,288.02		
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	11,618,813.85		
Government of the United Kingdom	1,980,442.65		
Insurance settlements due producers	1,989.28		
Miscellaneous vendors of commodities purchased	167,728,614.01		
Total	181,960,147.81		$181,960,147.81
Total liabilities [1]	3,337,966,660.06		3,337,966,660.06
CAPITAL			
Authorized capital	100,000,000.00		100,000,000.00
Capital impairment:			
Cumulative deficit, Oct. 17, 1933, through Mar. 31, 1943 $67,312,510.87			
Operating loss for year ended Mar. 31, 1944 296,533,907.17			
	*363,846,418.04	*$36,868,986.60	*400,715,404.64
Deduct: Net payments by the Secretary of the Treasury to restore capital impairment	143,950,523.60		143,950,523.60
Amount of appropriation necessary to restore capital impairment as of Mar. 31, 1944	*219,895,894.44	*36,868,986.60	[2] *256,764,881.04
Total liabilities and capital	3,218,070,765.62	36,868,986.60	3,181,201,779.02

[1] In addition to the liabilities shown, the Corporation is contingently liable for outstanding commitments as of Mar. 31, 1944, under its contracts with lending agencies to purchase upon demand, producers notes with accrued interest amounting to $173,970,604.50. In the event the lending agencies demand payment, and the producers deliver the collateral in satisfaction of their loans, it is estimated on the basis of an appraisal of the collateral that an additional loss of $1,982,734.10 would be incurred (schedule No. 7).

*Indicates losses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 33, after line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Department—Military activities—Damage claims," on page 37, line 13, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 17, and"; and in line 14, after the name "Congress", to strike out "$141,537.36" and insert "$249,590.32."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Civil functions—Corps of Engineers," on page 38, after line 23, to insert:

Flood control, general: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1945, for "Flood control, general," including the objects specified under this head in the War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1945, to be available until expended, $2,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this sum shall be impounded or held in reserve, but shall be immediately available for obligation and expenditure for necessary plans, specifications, and preliminary work in connection with projects for postwar construction authorized by the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944, including those projects in the Missouri River Basin and Central Valley, Calif.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the remainder of the amendments relate to items which must be paid in any event, and I ask that they be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee that the remainder of the committee amendments not yet acted upon shall be agreed to en bloc?

Mr. WHITE. I did not catch the Senator's statement as to the character of the amendments. Do they cover judgments?

Mr. McKELLAR. They cover judgments and audited claims. We usually agree to such amendments en bloc, and I ask that that be done in this instance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Tennessee is complied with. The Chair will inquire of the Senator from Tennessee how far the amendments extend.

Mr. McKELLAR. To end of line 11 on page 49.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendments referred to by the Senator from Tennessee down to the point indicated are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

Under the heading "Title II—Judgments and authorized claims—Property damage claims," on page 40, after line 21, to insert:

"(b) For the payment of claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the following respective departments and independent establishments, under the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in the sum not exceeding $1,000 in any one case,' approved December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 18, Seventy-ninth Congress, as follows:

"Executive Office of the President:

"Office for Emergency Management:

"War Shipping Administration, $32.50;

"Independent Office:

"National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, $12.50;

"Federal Works Agency, $149.03;

"National Housing Agency, $985.20;

"Department of Agriculture, $581.73;

"War Food Administration, $72.29;

"Department of the Interior, $396.37;

"Navy Department, $11,616.01;

"In all, $13,845.63."

Under the subhead "Judgments, United States Courts," on page 42, line 16, after the word "in," to insert "Senate Document No. 22, and."

On page 42, line 23, after "War Department", to strike out "$12,252.56" and insert "$22,262.56."

On page 42, line 23, after the words "In all", to strike out "$13,405.48" and insert "$22,262.56."

At the top of page 43, to insert:

"(c) For the payment of final judgment and decree in a special case rendered against the Government of the United States pursuant to authority contained in the act approved December 24, 1942 (Public Law No. 634, 77th Cong., 2d sess., 56 Stat. 1259), as certified to the Seventy-ninth Congress in Senate Document No. 20, under the Department of Agriculture, $5,808, together with such additional sum as may be necessary to pay interest as and where specified in such judgment or as provided by law."

On page 43, line 11, before the word "None", to strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)."

On page 43, line 16, before the word "Payment", to strike out "(d)" and insert "(e)."

Under the subhead "Judgments, United States Court of Claims," on page 43, line 23, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 23, and."

On page 44, after line 6, to insert "Treasury Department, $2,832.24."

On page 44, line 8, after "War Department", to strike out "$320,463.16" and insert "$326,939.19."

On page 44, line 9, after the words "In all", to strike out "$5,409,574.40" and insert "$5,418,882.67"; and in line 10, after the word "interest", to strike out "or costs as and where specified in such judgments" and insert "costs and amounts measured by interest in the case of David McD. Shearer, No. 41829, as and where specified in such judgment."

Under the subhead "Audited claims," on page 44, after line 18, to strike out:

"SEC. 204. For the payment of the following claims, in excess of $500, certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under appropriations the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (31 U. S. C. 713), and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1942 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (5 U. S. C. 266), as fully set forth in House Document No. 88, Seventy-ninth Congress, there is appropriated as follows:

"Legislative: For public printing and binding, Government Printing Office, $568.55.

"Executive: For salaries and expenses, Office for Emergency Management, $1,008.18.

"For emergency fund for the President, Navy (allotment to Office for Emergency Management for use of National Defense Research Committee), $20,053.75.

"Independent Offices: For national defense activities, Federal Communications Commission, $3,759.87.

"For youth work and student aid, National Youth Administration, $638.48.

"For project expenses, National Youth Administration (national defense), $759.18.

"For pay, and so forth, commissioned officers, Public Health Service, $1,260.

"For repair, preservation, and equipment, public buildings outside the District of Columbia, Public Buildings Administration, $4,472.67.

"For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Administration, $6,248.28.

"Department of Agriculture: For control of emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases, $689.

"For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture, $3,316.75.

"For conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture, $3,777.

"Department of Commerce: For coastal surveys, Coast and Geodetic Survey, $3,222.06.

"For maintenance of air-navigation facilities, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, $1,740.59.

"For salaries and expenses, Weather Bureau, Department of Commerce, $912.32.

"For technical development, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, $1,382.98.

"Department of the Interior: For Civilian Conservation Corps (transfer to Interior, Indians), $581.88.

"For Indian Service supply fund, $947.61.

"For maintenance, irrigation systems, Flathead Reservation, Mont. (receipt limitation), $21,772.57.

"For expenses, mining experiment stations, Bureau of Mines, $1,084.

"Department of Justice: For medical center for Federal prisoners, maintenance, $830.10.

"Navy Department: For naval emergency fund, $2,918.19.

"For Naval Research Laboratory, $31,554.90.

"For Naval Reserve, $1,062.33.

"For maintenance, Bureau of Ships, $253,848.22.

"For ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy, $2,316.45.

"For pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy, $51,394.46.

"For maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, $67,038.29.

"For Medical Department, Navy, $4,786.22.

"For care of the dead, Navy, $13,362.66.

"For maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, $12,833.14.

"For pay and allowances, Coast Guard (Navy), $1,309.27.

"For general expenses, Coast Guard (Navy), $30,489.31.

"For salaries, lighthouse vessels, Coast Guard (Navy), $1,252.63.

"For aviation, Navy, $1,463,916.95.

"For general expenses, Marine Corps, $323,163.23.

"Post Office Department—Postal Service (out of the postal revenues): For domestic air-mail service, $6,992.

"For foreign air-mail transportation, $606,891.79.

"For Rural Delivery Service, $550.

"Department of State: For transportation, Foreign Service, $1,065.62.

"Treasury Department: For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, $3,500.63.

"For uniforms and equipment, White House Police, $790.67.

"War Department: For emergency fund for the President, War (allotment to War Department), $17,650.96.

"For educational orders, production of munitions, War Department, $3,850.56.

"For Selective Service System (transfer to War), $651.64.

"For pay of the Army, $692.20.

"For Civilian Conservation Corps (transfer to War), $1,763.83.

"Total, audited claims, section 204, $2,984,873.57, together with such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currency and interest as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office."

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

"SEC. 204. For the payment of claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under appropriations the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provision of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (31 U. S. C. 713), and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1942 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 266), as fully set forth in House Document No. 88, and Senate Document No. 24, Seventy-ninth Congress, there are appropriated the sums of $2,697,740.06, together with such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currency and interest as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office, to be disbursed and accounted for as a single fund, and $615,075.44 payable from postal revenues, in all, $3,312,815.50."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] asked me about an amendment on page 44.

Mr. BALL. Yes. It has been the custom of the Appropriations Committee in the past to itemize all those items, and it meant carrying 30 or 40 different accounts on the books of the Treasury.

Mr. McKELLAR. The committee has lumped them so as to save an immense amount of bookkeeping in the Department, and they are taken care of the same as heretofore, and probably better.

Mr. President, I have several amendments that I ask unanimous consent to offer on behalf of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the first amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee will be stated.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator whether the amendments he is about to offer involve any substantive legislation?

Mr. McKELLAR. None at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the first amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 9, after line 22, it is proposed to insert the following:

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Temporary aid to enemy aliens and other restricted persons: The limitation of $50,000 under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1945, upon the amount which may be transferred to this appropriation from "Salaries and expenses, War Relocation Authority," is hereby increased to $343,340.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. On behalf of the committee, I offer another amendment, having to do with Public Works Administration liquidation, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, after line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

Public Works Administration liquidation: That the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944, approved June 28, 1944 (Public Law 375, 78th Cong.), is hereby amended through the amendment of the two paragraphs captioned "Public Works Administration liquidation" appearing under the heading "Federal Works Agency—Office of the Administrator," by striking out the words "until June 30, 1945" wherever they appear therein, and substituting in lieu thereof "until June 30, 1946", and by inserting immediately following the words "during the fiscal year 1945" in the first paragraph the following words: "and not exceeding a total of $50,000 may be used during the fiscal year 1946."

Mr. WHERRY. Is that to take the place of Senate bill 656?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; it takes the place of the bill referred to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. On behalf of the committee, I next offer another amendment, to come on page 10, line 19.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, after line 19, after the word *"Provided"*, it is proposed to insert "That the limitation of $80,000,000 under this head in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1945, on the total amount that may be allocated for contributions to public and private agencies for the maintenance and operation of public works after July 1, 1943, is hereby increased to $85,000,000: *Provided further.*"

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. On behalf of the committee, I send another amendment to the desk, and ask unanimous consent for its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 12, line 2, after the word "annum", it is proposed to insert "and to employ by contract, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, professional services of firms and organizations for temporary periods or for special purposes: *Provided,* That the expenses of auditing the financial transactions of all Government corporations by the General Accounting Office shall be borne out of appropriations to the General Accounting Office, and appropriations in such sums as may be necessary are hereby authorized: *Provided further,* That each such corporation shall reimburse the General Accounting Office for the full cost of any such audit as billed therefor by the Comptroller General, and the General Accounting Office shall deposit the sums so reimbursed into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further,* That, unless otherwise expressly provided by law, no funds of any Government corporation shall be used to pay the cost of any private audit of the financial transactions of such corporation except the cost of such audits contracted for and undertaken prior to the date of approval of this act."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I offer another amendment on behalf of the committee. The amendment comes in on page 20, line 20. I ask that it be stated and agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 20, line 2, before the period it is proposed to insert

the following: "; and of said appropriation not to exceed $200,000 is made available for expenses incurred during the fiscal year 1945 incident to the establishment, maintenance, and operation of the emergency refugee shelter at Fort Ontario, N. Y., provided for in the President's message of June 12, 1944, to the Congress (H. Doc. 656)."

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the purpose of that amendment is to take care of certain refugees at Fort Ontario.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, for the committee I also ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment on page 4, line 4, for payment to the widow of the late Representative Heidinger, of Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, after line 4, it is proposed to insert:

For payment to the widow of James V. Heidinger, late a Representative from the State of Illinois, $10,000, to be disbursed by the Sergeant at Arms of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, Chairman CANNON, of the House Appropriations Committee, has addressed a letter to me in regard to five items in the bill which are urgent and he also makes reference to House Joint Resolution 141 which he desires to have the Senate act upon today.

In order that the joint resolution may be considered and passed it will be necessary on page 4 of the pending bill to strike out lines 18 to 25, inclusive, and I move that that be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. On page 14 I move to strike out lines 20 to 23, inclusive.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. On page 16 I move to strike out lines 7 to 13, inclusive.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. On page 28 I move to strike out lines 22 to 24, inclusive, and lines 1 to 7, inclusive, on page 29.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, that is all the amendments I have to offer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendment the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 2374) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. BALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

CERTAIN ITEMS OF APPROPRIATION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as I have said, Representative CANNON, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, has written me a letter in connection with the bill just passed and referring to House Joint Resolution 141, which it is desired to have passed, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I should like to inquire what the joint resolution is.

Mr. McKELLAR. It relates to five items in the bill. I will read the letter of Mr. CANNON so that the Senate may better understand the matter. Mr. CANNON's letter reads as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D. C., March 26, 1945.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Acting Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: The program of the House is such that I fear it will not be practicable to conclude a conference on the first deficiency appropriation bill (H. R. 2374) and have the report thereon disposed of by the House much, if any, before mid-April.

Consequently, informal communication has been had with the Bureau of the Budget as to the immediate need for funds carried in such bill. Word has come back that there are five (5) items contained in the bill, as reported to the Senate, which should be made available as early as may be practicable.

Such five items, and one pertaining to the House of Representatives, also of an urgent nature, have been provided for in House Joint Resolution 141, which I introduced in the House on Saturday, and which, I am assured, will be passed by the House today. I am enclosing a copy thereof and of the report thereon. Immediately upon passage, I shall get word to you through Mr. Smith, the clerk of your committee.

I trust this course will be satisfactory to you, under the circumstances, and assume that you will wish to eliminate the six items included in the resolution from H. R. 2374.

With kindest regards,

Very sincerely yours,

CLARENCE CANNON,
Chairman.

Mr. WHITE. Then the joint resolution simply takes care of the five items in one of which at least the House is concerned?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; some emergency items. If the items contained in the joint resolution are provided for by the passage of the joint resolution, even if the deficiency bill which the Senate passed a few minutes ago should be delayed, no great harm would be done. I think, however, as a matter of fact, that the bill will probably be agreed to in conference before Wednesday night; certainly I hope so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 141) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, in lieu of certain appropriations contained in H. R. 2374, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE AT SAN FRANCISCO ON INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

The coming victory of the United Nations means that they, and not their enemies, have power to establish the foundations of the future.

On April 25 their representatives will meet in San Francisco to draw up the charter for the general organization of the United Nations for security and peace. On this meeting and what comes after it our best hopes of a secure and peaceful world depend.

At the same time we know that we cannot succeed in building a peaceful world unless we build an economically healthy world. We are already taking decisive steps to this end. The efforts to improve currency relationships by the International Monetary Fund, to encourage international investments and make them more secure by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, to free the air for peaceful flight by the Chicago civil aviation arrangements are part of that endeavor. So, too, is the proposed food and agriculture organization of the United Nations.

We owe it to the vision of Secretary Hull that another of the essential measures we shall need to accomplish our objective has been tested and perfected by 10 years of notably successful experience under his leadership. You are all familiar with the Trade Agreements Act, which has been on the books since 1934 and which on three occasions since that time the Congress has renewed. The present law expires in June of this year. I recommend that it again be renewed so that the great work which Secretary Hull began may be continued.

Under him the reciprocal trade agreement program represented a sustained effort to reduce the barriers which the nations of the world maintained against each other's trade. If the economic foundations of the peace are to be as secure as the political foundations, it is clear that this effort must be continued vigorously and effectively.

Trade is fundamental to the prosperity of nations, as it is of individuals. All of us earn our living by producing for some market, and all of us buy in some market most of the things we need. We do better, both as producers and consumers, when the markets upon which we depend are as large and rich and various and competitive as possible. The same is true of nations.

We have not always understood this in the United States or in any other country. We have tried often to protect some special interest by excluding strangers' goods from competition. In the long run everyone has suffered.

In 1934 this country started on a wiser course. We enacted into law a standing offer to reduce our tariff barriers against the goods of any country which would do the same for us. We have entered into reciprocal trade agreements with 28 countries. Each one of these agreements reduced some foreign barriers against the exports of this country, reduced our barriers against some products of the other party to the bargain, and gave protection against discrimination by guaranteeing most-favored-nation treatment to us both. Each agreement increased the freedom of businessmen in both countries to buy and sell across national frontiers. The agreements have contributed to prosperity and good feeling here, and in the other contracting countries.

The record of how trade agreements expand two-way trade is set forth in the 1943 report of the Committee on Ways and Means. This record shows that between 1934–35 and 1938–39 our exports to trade-agreement countries increased by 63 percent, while our shipments to nonagreement countries increased by only 32 percent; between these same periods, our imports from agreement countries increased by 22 percent as compared with only 12 percent from nonagreement countries. The disruptions and dislocations resulting from the war make later comparisons impossible. The record published in 1943 is, nevertheless, as valid today as it was then. We know, without any doubt, that trade agreements build trade and that they will do so after the war as they did before. All sections of our population, labor, farmers, businessmen, have shared and will share in the benefits which increased trade brings.

Unfortunately, powerful forces operated against our efforts in the years after 1934. The most powerful were the steps of our present enemies to prepare themselves for the war they intended to let loose upon the world. They did this by subjecting every part of their business life, and especially their foreign trade, to the principle of guns instead of butter. In the face of the economic warfare which they waged, and the fear and countermeasures which their conduct caused in other countries, the success of Secretary Hull and his interdepartmental associates in scaling down trade barriers is all the more remarkable.

The coming total defeat of our enemies and of the philosophy of conflict and aggression which they have represented gives us a new chance and a better chance than we have ever had to bring about conditions under which the nations of the world substitute cooperation and sound business principles for warfare in economic relations.

It is essential that we move forward aggressively and make the most of this opportunity. Business people in all countries want to know the rules under which the post-war world will operate. Industry today is working almost wholly on war orders, but once the victory is won immediate decisions will have to be made as to what lines of peacetime production look most profitable for either old or new plants. In this process of reconversion decisions will necessarily be influenced by what businessmen foresee as Government policy. If it is clear that barriers to foreign trade are coming down all around the world, businessmen can and will direct production to the things that look most promising under those conditions. In that case a real and large and permanent expansion of international trade becomes possible and likely.

But if the signs are otherwise, if it appears that no further loosening of barriers can be expected, everyone will act very differently. In that event we shall see built up in all countries new vested interests in a system of restrictions, and we shall have lost our opportunity for the greater prosperity that expanding trade brings.

I have urged renewal of the Trade Agreements Act. In order to be fully effective the act needs to be strengthened at one important point. You will remember that as passed in 1934 it authorized reductions in our tariff up to 50 percent of the rates then in effect. A good many of those reductions have been made, and those rates cannot be reduced further. Other reductions, smaller in amount, leave some remaining flexibility. In other cases, no reductions have been made at all, so that the full original authority remains.

You will realize that in negotiating agreements with any foreign country what we can accomplish depends on what both parties can contribute. In each of the agreements we have made, we have contributed reductions on products of special interest to the other party to the agreement, and we have obtained commensurate contributions in the form of concessions on products of special interest to us.

As to those countries, much of our original authority under the act has been used up. We are left in this situation: Great Britain and Canada, our largest peacetime customers, still maintain certain high barriers against our exports, just as we still have high barriers against theirs. Under the act as it now stands we do not have enough to offer these countries to serve as a basis for the further concessions we want from them. The same situation confronts us, although in a lesser degree, in the case of the other countries with whom we have already made agreements; these include France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Turkey, Sweden, Switzerland, and most of the American republics.

I therefore recommend that the 50-percent limit be brought up to date by an amendment that relates it to the rates of 1945 instead of 1934. Then we shall have the powers necessary to deal with all our friends on the basis of the existing situation.

The bill which the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has introduced in the House of Representatives, H. R. 2652, would accomplish the objectives I have in mind, and has my support.

This legislation is essential to the substantial increase in our foreign trade which is necessary for full employment and improved standards of living. It means more exports and it also means more imports. For we cannot hope to maintain exports at the levels necessary to furnish the additional markets we need for agriculture and industry—income for the farmer and jobs for labor—unless we are willing to take payments in imports. We must recognize, too, that we are destined to be so for some time to come. Unless we make it possible for Americans to buy goods and services widely and readily in the markets of the world, it will be impossible for other countries to pay what is owed us. It is also important to remember that imports mean much more than goods for ultimate consumers. They mean jobs and income at every stage of the processing and distribution channels through which the imports flow to the consumer. By reducing our own tariff in conjunction with the reduction by other countries of their trade barriers, we create jobs, get more for our money, and improve the standard of living of every American consumer.

This is no longer a question on which Republicans and Democrats should divide. The logic of events and our clear and pressing national interest must override our old party controversies. They must also override our sectional and special interests. We must all come to see that what is good for the United States is good for each of us, in economic affairs just as much as in any others.

We all know that the reduction of Government-created barriers to trade will not solve all our trade problems. The field of trade has many fronts, and we must try to get forward on each of them as rapidly and as wisely as we can. I shall continue therefore to explore the possibility also of reaching a common understanding with the friendly nations of the world on some of the other international trade problems that confront us. The appropriate committees of the Congress will be fully consulted as that work progresses. The purpose of the whole effort is to eliminate economic warfare, to make practical international cooperation effective on as many fronts as possible, and so to lay the economic basis for the secure and peaceful world we all desire.

When this trade-agreements legislation and the other legislation I have recommended to this Congress is adopted, and when the general organization of the United Nations and their various special agencies, including one on trade, have been created and are functioning, we shall have made a good beginning at creating a workable kit of tools for the new world of international cooperation to which we all look forward. We shall be equipped to deal with the great overriding question of security, and with the crucial questions of money and exchange, international investment, trade, civil aviation, labor, and agriculture.

As I said in my message of February 12 on the Bretton Woods proposals:

> The point in history at which we stand is full of promise and of danger. The world will either move toward unity and widely shared prosperity or it will move apart into necessarily competing economic blocs. We have a chance, we citizens of the United States, to use our influence in favor of a more united and cooperating world. Whether we do so will determine, as far as it is in our power, the kind of lives our grandchildren can live.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 26, 1945.*

INCREASE OF THE DEBT LIMIT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me to submit a unanimous-consent request that the Senate at this time consider the bill increasing the debt limit of the United States?

Mr. DOWNEY. I will yield, if I may receive unanimous consent of the Senate that I not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. GEORGE. Very well. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and the junior Senator from California not lose possession of the floor thereby, and that the Senate proceed, as in legislative session, to consider House bill 2404, calendar No. 105, an act to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2404) to increase the debt limit of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement about the bill. The bill was reported out unanimously by our committee.

The first section of the bill merely provides that "this act may be cited as the Public Debt Act of 1945."

The second section of the bill raises the debt limitation from $260,000,000,000 under the present law to $300,000,000,000. This section also makes another important change in the debt-limitation provisions. It provides that the guaranteed obligations of Government corporations which are outstanding in the hands of the public should be brought under the debt limitation. At the present time the indebtedness of these Government corporations amounts to approximately $12,489,000,000. The Treasury since 1941 has adopted a policy which contemplates in general that these Government corporations shall not issue guaranteed obligations in the market but will sell such obligations to the Treasury, which has authority to purchase them. Under this policy, the Treasury issues regular public-debt securities to obtain the funds necessary to finance the activities of such corporations. At the present time there are about one and one-half billion dollars of these guaranteed obligations not held by the Treasury. This bill brings them under the debt limit.

Two years ago we gave the Treasury authority to designate, under proper safeguards, banks and trust companies to make payments in connection with the redemption of savings bonds. About 13,000 banks and trust companies have been designated as paying agents. A number of other financial institutions desire to be designated and this bill, in section 3, extends that authority to include other institutions. Under section 3, the other financial institutions which may be designated as paying agents, include savings and loan associations, building and loan associations, credit unions, cash depositories, and industrial banks. Losses resulting from erroneous payments of savings bonds by the Treasurer of the United States, the Federal Reserve banks, or incorporated banks and trust companies are replaced out of losses in shipment fund, where such losses were incurred without fault or negligence. This section extends similar relief in case of the additional financial institutions authorized to act as paying agents under the bill.

Under the present law, considerable hardship has resulted in the payment of savings bonds to beneficiaries of men in the service who have been missing in action for over a year. At the present time, a bond of indemnity is required before payment can be made to the beneficiary. This section will permit the Treasury to make payment upon the finding of death by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy. There are some cases where the individuals make the United States beneficiary of savings bonds, or leave such bonds by will to the United States. In some of these cases, the States are claiming inheritance taxes with respect to such bonds. This bill, in section 4, gives the Treasurer of the United States authority to pay such inheritance taxes out of the bonds redeemed, and deposit the balance into the Treasury.

The last section of the bill gives the Secretary of the Treasury authority to sell or dispose of any bonds, notes, or other securities acquired by the United States by Federal process or otherwise under favorable market conditions. It is similar to the authority granted in the case of railroad securities acquired under the Transportation Act of 1920. At the present time, all such securities can be disposed of only when advertised for a period of 3 months. However, the bill provides that the new provision shall not apply where the amount of the securities of any single issuer held by the Treasury at any one time exceeds $1,000,000.

The increase in the debt limit is caused by our heavy war expenditures. For the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, our total expenditures are estimated at $82,500,000,000, of which approximately $70,000,000,000 are war expenditures. As of March 1 of this year, there remained only about $17,500,000,000 of borrowing authority under the debt limit. On March 31 this will drop to $16,500,000,000, on April 30, to $14,500,000,000, and on June 30, to less than $10,000,000,000.

A new war-loan drive will get under way in April. The new drive will be to raise $14,000,000,000, of which an effort will be made to secure $7,000,000,000 from individuals and $7,000,000,000 from corporations other than banks. If there is added to the gross debt the unearned discount on savings bonds, our total debt will exceed $300,000,000,000 by June 30, 1946, and will make it necessary for the Treasury to ask for a further raising of the debt limit, since on the basis of present estimates the national debt plus the unearned discount on savings bonds, which must be taken into account in arriving at the debt limit, will reach approximately $304,000,000,000 by June 30, 1946. However, this is based upon existing Budget estimates. I feel that as soon as our war expenditures drop, and some of the enormous unexpended balances for contracts are canceled, we should make a corresponding decrease in our debt limit and not leave it at its present high figure. This is a matter which we are looking into in connection with post-war tax planning.

I may add, Mr. President, that the war in Europe, at least, now seems to be moving to the supreme crisis of the conflict in that theater.

Mr. President, I should like to have printed at this point in the RECORD, for the information of the Senate and those who desire to obtain the information, certain tables. The first is a table showing the guaranteed debt and agencies involved, which are now under the debt limit established by the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUARANTEED DEBT AND AGENCIES INVOLVED

Borrowing power and outstanding obligations of corporations and credit agencies which issue obligations guaranteed by the United States, as of Dec. 31, 1944

[Figures rounded to nearest million and will not necessarily add to totals]

Corporation or agency	Gross limit of authority	Outstanding obligations			
		Total	Held by Treasury	Held by others	
				Unmatured	Matured [1]
Commodity Credit Corporation	$3,000	$1,842	$1,155	$687	[2]
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation	2,000	277	258		$19
Federal Housing Administration	[3] 5,865	28		28	[2]
Federal Public Housing Authority	[4] 800	398	398		[2]
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	4,750	[5] 1,200	420	755	25
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	17,019	9,206	9,206		[2]
Tennessee Valley Authority	[6] 62	57	57		
U. S. Maritime Commission	[7] 200				
Total	33,695	13,008	11,494	1,470	44

[1] Funds have been deposited with the Treasurer of the United States for payment of all obligations guaranteed by the United States, representing outstanding matured principal of $44,300,000 and interest of $1,700,000.

[2] Less than $500,000.

[3] Limit of authority to insure mortgages. This amount may be increased by $1,000,000,000 upon approval by the President. Debentures may be tendered and issued only in exchange for insured property acquired through foreclosure, under titles II and VI of the National Housing Act, as amended.

[4] Limit of authority to issue obligations. This amount may be increased only by the amount of issues for refunding purposes.

[5] This amount may be increased only by the amount of issues for refunding purposes.

[6] Exclusive of $6,300,000 issued on the credit of the United States and held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

[7] Limit which may be outstanding at any one time with respect to the insuring of ship mortgages and the issuance of debentures.

Mr. GEORGE. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing actual receipts and expenditures for the fiscal years 1938 to 1944, inclusive, and estimates for the fiscal years 1945 and 1946.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Actual receipts and expenditures for fiscal years 1938 to 1944, inclusive, and estimates for fiscal years 1945 and 1946 [1]

[In millions of dollars]

General and special accounts	Estimated		1944	1943	1942	1941	1940	1939	1938
	1946	1945							
Receipts:									
Internal revenue:									
Income tax	31,022	35,056	34,655	16,094	7,960	3,470	2,125	2,189	2,640
Miscellaneous internal revenue	6,520	6,551	5,291	4,553	3,847	2,967	2,345	2,232	2,279
Social-security taxes:									
Employment taxes	1,620	1,323	1,292	1,130	896	691	605	530	514
Tax on employees of 8 or more	183	191	180	158	120	98	108	101	90
Taxes upon carriers and their employees	243	251	267	209	170	137	121	109	150
Railroad unemployment insurance contributions	11	13	12	10	8	7	5		
Customs	326	326	431	324	289	392	349	319	329
Miscellaneous receipts	2,919	3,283	3,280	906	277	508	268	188	208
Total receipts	42,855	47,023	45,408	23,385	13,668	8,269	5,925	5,668	6,242
Deduct: Net appropriation to Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund	1,600	1,293	1,260	1,103	869	661	538	503	387
Net receipts	41,255	45,730	44,149	22,282	12,799	7,607	5,387	5,165	5,855
Expenditures:									
War activities:									
War Department	38,999	48,497	49,242	42,265	14,070	3,678	667	490	432
Navy Department	22,009	27,000	26,538	20,888	8,580	2,313	891	673	596
U. S. Maritime Commission	1,700	4,000	3,812	2,776	929	51	99	44	1
War Shipping Administration	2,000	1,900	1,922	1,105	132				
Agriculture Department	1,432	1,500	2,143	2,011	696	3			
Treasury Department	966	1,487	1,432	1,201	519	24			
Other	[2] 2,303	[2] 2,715	1,949	1,863	1,084	232			
Subtotal	69,400	88,000	87,039	72,109	26,011	6,301	1,657	1,206	1,029
Interest on the public debt	4,500	3,750	2,609	1,808	1,260	1,111	1,041	941	926
General (including revolving funds and transfers to trust accounts):									
Agriculture Department	580	637	915	1,168	1,233	945	1,571	1,242	867
Federal Security Agency	565	558	576	573	799	836	805	758	717
Federal Works Agency	128	166	139	447	1,136	1,654	2,005	2,827	1,885
Interior Department:									
Reclamation projects	61	66	54	69	91	86	96	79	65
Other	114	97	86	86	111	108	111	134	100
Post Office Department (deficiency, etc.)			[3] 22	9	18	30	42	40	47
Railroad Retirement Board:									
Railroad Retirement account (transfer to trust accounts)	241	359	263	215	141	124	121	107	146
Other	15	15	17	14	14	15	8	3	[3] 1
River and harbor work and flood control	109	180	177	201	191	219	213	193	199
Tennessee Valley Authority	23	34	65	111	127	51	39	41	42
Treasury Department:									
Refunds of taxes and duties	2,725	2,172	267	79	94	90	91	68	100
Other	301	327	285	225	159	147	177	176	168
Veterans' Administration:									
Adjusted service certificate fund (transfer to trust accounts)		9				10			
National service life insurance fund (transfer to trust accounts)	1,000	516	101	30	1				
Other	1,705	765	629	572	555	553	557	557	582
Government employees' retirement funds—United States share (transfer to trust accounts)	247	197	177	107	103	93	87	75	73
Other departments and establishments	[4] 817	[4] 1,063	366	357	353	340	317	260	293
Subtotal	8,630	7,162	4,096	4,262	5,125	5,299	6,300	6,560	5,284
Total expenditures, excluding debt retirement	82,530	98,912	93,744	78,179	32,397	12,711	8,998	8,707	7,239
Excess of expenditures over receipts	41,276	53,183	49,595	55,897	19,598	5,103	3,611	3,542	1,384

[1] Estimates on basis of 1946 Budget.
[2] Includes anticipated supplemental appropriations of $1,134,000,000 for 1945 and $1,398,000,000 for 1946.
[3] Excess of credits, deduct.
[4] Includes anticipated supplemental appropriations of $590,000,000 for 1945 and $347,000,000 for 1946.

NOTE.—Classifications are on the basis of present location of activities and functions. Figures are rounded to nearest million and will not necessarily add to totals.

Mr. GEORGE. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the estimated ownership of all interest-bearing securities of State, local, and Territorial governments outstanding on June 30, 1944.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated ownership of all interest-bearing securities of State, local, and Territorial governments outstanding on June 30, 1944

[In billions of dollars]

1. Individuals	7.5
2. Insurance companies	1.4
3. Mutual savings banks	.2
4. Other corporations and associations	.8
5. State and local government agencies; trust, sinking, and investment funds [1]	3.3
6. Federal agencies and trust funds	0.6
7. Commercial banks	3.5
8. Federal Reserve banks	----
9. Total outstanding	17.3

[1] Includes Territorial governments.

Mr. GEORGE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement of the estimated gross public

debt as of June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, with certain adjustments resulting in the total limitation necessary under the debt limitation bill which is now before the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Estimated	
	June 30, 1945	June 30, 1946
Gross public debt	$251,800,000,000	$292,300,000,000
Adjustments to show debt subject to statutory limitation: Add unearned discount on Savings bonds (difference between current redemption value and maturity value)	10,500,000,000	12,500,000,000
Total	262,300,000,000	304,800,000,000
Deduct other public-debt obligations outstanding, not subject to limitation	1,035,000,000	800,000,000
Statutory limitation necessary on basis of above public-debt estimates	261,265,000,000	304,000,000,000
Guaranteed obligations	152,000,000	73,000,000
Total limitation necessary	261,417,000,000	304,073,000,000

Mr. GEORGE. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a table showing an estimate of total unliquidated obligations, and a table showing war expenditures.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimate of total unliquidated obligations [1]

[In millions of dollars]

Unliquidated obligations, Dec. 31, 1944	[2] 62,983
Add estimated obligations, fiscal year 1945:	
Actual first 6 months:	
July 1944	5,973
August	5,744
September	5,684
October	3,103
November	4,087
December	5,690
Total, first 6 months	30,281
Estimate, Jan. 1–June 30, 1945	25,000
Subtotal	87,983
Deduct estimated expenditures, Jan. 1–June 30, 1945, on basis of Budget	50,000
Estimated unliquidated obligations, June 30, 1945	37,983
Add estimated obligations, fiscal year 1946 (approximately the amount recommended in Budget appropriations and authorizations)	86,000
Subtotal	123,983
Deduct estimated budgetary expenditures, fiscal year 1946, on basis of Budget	82,530
Estimated unliquidated obligations, June 30, 1946	41,453

[1] The greater part of amounts shown as "unliquidated obligations" represent contracts under which work has not been completed and deliveries have not been made. When these contracts are completed they will be paid for in part out of tax receipts coming into the Treasury during the period that the contracts are being liquidated.

[2] Unliquidated obligations on June 30, 1944, amounted to approximately $81,600,000,000.

NOTE.—It is difficult to make accurate estimates of unliquidated obligations, but based upon Budget estimates and previous experience, the above estimates are the best that are readily available.

WAR EXPENDITURES

Comparison of war activities expenditures with total expenditures

	War activities [1]	Total expenditures [1]	Percent of war activities to total
Fiscal year—			
1944 (actual)	$89,720,000,000	$95,273,000,000	94.2
1945 (estimated) [2]	89,000,000,000	99,688,000,000	89.3
1946 (estimated) [2]	70,000,000,000	83,103,000,000	84.2

[1] Includes budgetary items and net outlays of Government corporations other than debt operations.

[2] From 1946 Budget.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, in this connection I add that our total debt, subject to debt limitation, including outstanding Government obligations, as of February 28, 1945, was $244,000,000,000, which is a per capita indebtedness of $1,781. With a debt of $300,000,000,000, our per capita debt will stand at $2,200. Our deficit as of June 30, 1945, will amount to $53,183,000,000, according to the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget; and as of June 30, 1946, $41,276,000,000.

Interest disbursements as of June 30, 1945, are $3,800,000,000; as of June 30, 1946, $4,500,000,000; and as of June 30, 1947, the estimated figure is $6,000,000,000. The average rate paid by the Government on all securities outstanding is 1.92 percent.

The net receipts of the Government for the fiscal year June 30, 1945, total $45,730,000,000; for the fiscal year June 30, 1946, the estimated total is $41,255,000,000.

The expenditures for war since Pearl Harbor, to January 31, 1945, have amounted to $238,000,000,000. Other governmental expenditures have amounted to approximately $22,000,000,000 since the 7th of December 1941.

Mr. President, there is substantial hope that with the ending of the war in Europe the cut-back on contracts may not be so large as was estimated at one time. The handling of the unexpended balances, as now provided by law, will make possible before June 30, 1946, the reduction of the debt limit of $300,000,000,000 fixed in this bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that calculation does the Senator take into consideration possible receipts by reason of disposition of surplus property?

Mr. GEORGE Not at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. Whatever that amounts to will be in addition to what the Senator has mentioned, will it not?

Mr. GEORGE. Whatever that would amount to would reduce the deficit, and would be an additional credit item.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. What did the Senator estimate to be the amount of savings by reason of renegotiation of contracts?

Mr. GEORGE. There is no estimate of that item. It has been considerable, of course.

Mr. McKELLAR. It has been approximately $6,000,000,000, as I recall.

Mr. GEORGE. It has been considerable during the past 2 years. Perhaps it will not be so great during the next fiscal year, but it will still amount to a considerable item. The disposal of surplus property should very greatly reduce the deficit which is now estimated for 1946.

UTILIZATION OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am sure that everyone who has listened to the report by the able and distinguished Senator from Georgia must be overwhelmed by the magnitude of the financial burden this country is carrying. The Senator told us that a debt of $300,000,000,000 would amount to a per capita indebtedness of $2,200. I understand that the Census Bureau announced last week that the population of the United States in 1945 is estimated at 139,000,000 persons. That means that for every man, woman, and child—every infant and every aged person, regardless of earning ability—the debt will amount to $2,200 when this bill becomes effective. Mr. President, no person can even imagine what that means.

I am moved to rise because I cannot help but join in my mind today two transcendentally tragic things which seem to be happening, pushing this country, which seems almost powerless to resist, toward I do not know what final climax.

The two things to which I refer, Mr. President, are, first, the manpower agreement which was reached this morning by a conference committee of the Senate and the House; and, second, the bill raising the debt limit to $300,000,000,000. We are in the grip of forces which are beyond our comprehension; and yet we seem to be powerless to resist the stream which carries us onward. These are the danger signals which warn us that free government is in peril.

I sought an opportunity today to place in the RECORD the entire text of the compromise manpower bill. I wished to say a few words to Members of the Senate about this measure, for we shall presently be asked to act on the conference report.

When the House of Representatives acted early this year, at a time when the German attack was moving forward in the Ardennes Forest and the American forces were yielding some ground before Von Rundstedt, Members of the House were impelled to believe that it would be necessary to enact what was called a work-or-fight bill, but what was really a labor-draft bill. So the House passed

and sent to this body a measure, the objective of which was to place the hand of the Government upon persons between the ages of 18 and 45 who were slackers who were not contributing to the war effort, either in the armed forces or in war plants. The argument was made that to sustain the morale of the fighting forces it was necessary to adopt a rigid labor draft.

The measure came to the Senate. In the Senate Military Affairs Committee there was the same sentiment, that something should be done to show the boys who were fighting that the home front was behind them. We all knew that the expenditures which have been made, and which have increased our debt to such a level that it is now necessary to raise the debt limit again, were resulting, with the cooperation of millions of patriotic workers, in the production of more war materials than anyone ever dreamed it would be possible to produce. Knowing all that, we nevertheless felt impelled to pass another law, though we have the Selective Service Act, which can be used to handle slackers. The committee was almost about to report the labor-draft bill to this body with only one or two changes—as a matter of fact, the vote had been taken—when a member arose in the committee and asked that further consideration be given and that hearings be held, so that those who know most about production and how it is attained could be requested to come before the committee and say how they felt about the bill. That was done and the witnesses came. For once there was complete unanimity among the representatives of labor and the representatives of management. They said with one voice, "If you desire production, do not impose the labor draft."

The Senate Committee on Military Affairs was moved by what they said. The committee was convinced they were right, and it was convinced that the greatest republic on the face of the earth should not, by its legislative body, impose a labor draft upon the civilian population.

There was reported in lieu of the House bill another measure, a stringent measure, a drastic measure, one which authorized the War Manpower Commission to impose ceilings upon employment in plants, to prohibit employment beyond those ceilings, to prohibit employment in nonessential activities, and to cause in-plant surveys to be made in military and naval establishments and in private establishments, in order that the best possible utilization of manpower might be made. Under the bill a penalty was to be imposed upon employers. Representatives of the employers came before the committee and agreed to it. They said, "Do not impose a penalty upon the individual worker, because in our judgment that would interfere with the proper operation of the vast production machinery upon which we must depend in order to obtain the matériel with which to equip our armies." They warned us that any other course would endanger production. The bill contained a provision which was designed to do away with the waste and the hoarding of labor incident to cost-plus contracts, by denying to any employer the right to charge as an expense wages which were paid to persons hired above the ceilings, a provision which prevented the charging of any such expenditures against income listed on income-tax accounts, and so forth.

HOW THE SENATE ACTED

That measure came up on the floor of the Senate. Senators who believed in the labor draft made a sincere, eloquent, and vigorous attempt to induce the Senate to adopt the labor draft. Upon a test vote, Mr. President, the Senate decided by a vote of 63 to 20, or some such number, against the imposition of the sanctions upon individual workers. The Senate declined positively to adopt the House measure, because it believed that measure had been passed in the other body under the impact of the bad news which at the moment was coming from Europe, and that it would create confusion. This body also resisted the efforts of other Senators—diligent, able, and sincere though they were—to substitute another kind of bill, one which was supposed to be directed against the loafers.

When the Senate finally acted in adopting the committee substitute with a few minor changes, there could have been no doubt anywhere, in any mind, as to what the view of this body was.

When the conference committee for the two Houses met, the representatives in the committee on the part of the House contended for their bill, the labor draft bill.

Mr. President, the conference report will be filed in the House of Representatives this afternoon. Under it we will not have the labor draft, to be sure, but neither will we have the Senate bill. We will have a new bill, a bill which was considered by neither of the committees. We will have a bill which bears a very striking resemblance to the national service bill which has been proposed in the Congress almost since the beginning of the war, and which the Congress has not adopted. Many persons seem to feel that Congress has not passed such a bill because it has feared to go all out for war. Mr. President, that was not the reason. The reason why a Congress representing the free people of America did not choose to adopt a national service bill was because it believed in the democratic system of government, because it believed in the democratic way of fighting the war, because it had faith that a free people could conquer tyranny wherever it raised its head. The whole history of mankind, from the earliest times down to this hour, is the history of the advancement of free men who have not been subject to arbitrary power.

A BILL DIRECTED AGAINST WORKERS, NOT LOAFERS

Now, Mr. President, on the very day when the Finance Committee brings in its bill raising the debt limit to $300,000,000,000, a sum which is beyond the imagination of any person on this floor, the conference committee of the Senate and the House recommends to Congress a measure which places in the power of one man the right to direct the activities of more than 50,000,000 patriotic workers. We were asked to pass a bill imposing a labor draft upon slackers between the ages of 18 and 45; but, instead of such a bill, we get a bill which imposes the heavy hand of government upon the head of every man, woman, and child who has contributed to the superlative work which has made this Nation's achievement the glory of all history.

Mr. President, I shall ask that the full text of the bill be printed; but first I wish to read section 5, which is the heart of the whole measure:

SEC. 5. (a) To the extent deemed by the Director to be necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes and means declared in section 2 of this act and also for the purpose of keeping activities and places of employment essential to the war effort in productive operation, the Director is authorized, by regulation—

The Director, Mr. President, is the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion—

is authorized by regulation—

(1) to prescribe employment ceilings in designated areas, activities, or places of employment, fixing the maximum numbers of workers, by age, sex, or occupational qualifications, who may be there employed, and prohibiting the employment of workers beyond such maximum number;

(2) to prohibit or regulate the hiring, rehiring, solicitation, or recruitment of new workers by employers and the acceptance of employment by workers; and

(3)—

I ask Senators to listen to the provisions of subparagraph (3)—

to prohibit the individuals employed in designated areas, activities, plants, facilities, and farms, which the Director deems are essential to the war effort, from voluntarily discontinuing such employment unless, in the case of any individual so employed, the Director determines that it is no longer necessary in the interest of the war effort for him to remain in such employment or that he has a justifiable reason for leaving such employment.

Thus by regulation there is placed within the discretionary power of one individual complete authority over the movements of the men and women who have made so startling and magnificent a contribution to the winning of the war.

This language has been followed by a penal section as follows:

Whoever willfully violates the provision of any regulation—

Any regulation—

made under subsection (a) shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 12 months or by a fine not to exceed $10,000, or both.

A prison penalty for the violation of regulations, the effect of which no conferee had the slightest imagination. There are no standards in the bill to govern the discretion of the Director in the formulation of those regulations. He may do what he deems to be necessary. Those who have defended the language say, "Oh, we can depend upon Justice Byrnes not to abuse these powers." If Justice Byrnes had the time to write the regulations perhaps that statement might be true. But, Mr. President, I decline to give any person such broad discretionary power over the rank and file of the people of America who have demonstrated to all the world that

every American may be proud of the freedom of which he boasts on the Fourth of July.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY ABANDONED

Those regulations will be written in secret, in a private room, behind closed doors where the people who are to be affected will have no means of hearing them or of changing them. When Congress acts it acts in the open. When Congress legislates, the bill to be considered must first be printed and must lie on the desk of every Senator and every Representative before any action upon it can be taken. We know that that is not true with respect to regulations. We know it is not true with respect to directives. They are written—and must be written, I grant—by persons who are unknown to the legislative body which has conveyed power to them. When the conferees were about to sign the report this morning I said to them:

Let no man who has ever complained about the delegation of congressional power; let no man who has ever received a letter from any constituent in his district or in his State complain about the adverse effect of regulations and directives; let no man who has ever raised his voice against the extension of bureaucracy ever utter a word again if he supports this measure.

It is the repudiation of democracy, Mr. President. It is the adoption of the principles upon which Hitler regimented the workers of Germany. It is the adoption of the principles upon which Joseph Stalin and his predecessor, Lenin, regimented the people of Russia. It is the complete abandonment of congressional responsibility.

Oh, Mr. President, it seems to me to be a terrible, a tragic thing, that at the very hour when we are about to vote to raise the national debt to $300,000,000,000, we are asked to put leg irons on the men and women and children in the war plants which have built this tremendous machine of war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. At the present time when our soldiers are overrunning Germany, and when it looks as though victory cannot be far off, why should we resort to such extreme measures? I cannot understand it. I regret very much that the conferees reported such a bill as has been reported. It seems to me that it is unnecessary, and that the report ought not to be agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that is precisely the message which I am trying to convey to the Senate this afternoon. Here we are on the very eve of victory in Europe. There will be cutbacks in military production. We will not need the matériel which was necessary to subdue Hitler. Of course, it will be necessary to increase the output that will be transported to the fighting forces engaged against Japan. But already one reads in the newspapers and hears on the radio the pronouncements which are coming out of Tokyo. At this moment the Japanese Government is absolutely uncertain about the future. The Japanese Government went into this war secure in the belief that if they knocked out the American Fleet at Pearl Harbor, they would then be free to maintain the conquest of Asia. It never dawned upon the regimented millions of Japan that the free people of America would build a new navy and raise the one which had been sunk. They never dreamed it would be possible for free American men, women, and children, to send submarines, aircraft carriers, battleships, cruisers, destroyers, and air fleets out over the Pacific, win back the Philippines, isolate the great Japanese naval base at Truk, retake Guam, capture Tarawa and Saipan and Iwo Jima, hammer at the very door of Tokyo, and destroy the Japanese Fleet in the Inland Sea—the triumph of free American effort. Now, when we listen to the Japanese broadcasts we hear one day that they are going to take back Tarawa and Saipan, and the next day that they are going to defend their home shores.

It is at this hour, Mr. President, we are asked to step into the door of national service. Oh, the significance of that cannot be dissociated from the bill increasing the debt limit to $300,000,000,000. How tragic it is that in the very hour when American free men and women are demonstrating their capacity to triumph over tyranny, here upon the floor of the Senate and upon the floor of the House we are asked to forge the chains to bind those very people.

Mr. President, I think it requires only attention, I think it requires only reading, I think it requires only a little comprehension of the boundless extent of the authority which is here granted, to convince any representative of free America that this bill should not be passed. I would rather trust the patriotic determination of 139,000,000 Americans than convey to any one person the power of absolute direction over their activities. It would be a tragic hour if this bill should ever be passed.

I ask that the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. At the very moment, Mr. President——

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, a request has been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has the floor. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to add merely a word.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator made a request.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I withhold the request for the moment.

Mr. AUSTIN. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was about to add, Mr. President, that it seemed rather strange that while this bill was under consideration there was given out by the War Production Board, for release to the Saturday morning papers of March 24, a statement showing that in the last month of which there was any record the productive facilities of America had reached the highest point on record. It is at this moment that we are asked to apply compulsion.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. All I wish to do is to inquire of the distinguished Senator whether the copy which he has asked to have printed is edited so as to be exactly like the report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It contains the changes in section 5 which were made this morning. There may have been some others.

Mr. AUSTIN. There were others. I do not intend to object even to the insertion of an imperfect copy, but I should like to have it known at the time the request is granted just what it is that is to be printed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator will agree that if there are any differences between the text which I hold in my hand, and which I shall be very glad to show to the Senator, and the text of the conference report, they are only minor differences.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is true. My understanding and interpretation of what was done today is that it was an effort to perfect the text so that certain references in it would not be confusing and would not raise a question of interpretation. They were merely clarifying changes, that is all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me read section 2 of the bill, which contains a statement of the purposes and the means for which the power of freezing labor is later granted:

SEC. 2. (a) In order to adequately support the Army and maintain the Navy during the present war and to carry into effect the provisions of the declarations of war pledging all of the resources of the Nation to bring the conflict to a successful termination, every individual not in the armed forces shall have an obligation, when called upon, to serve the Nation in an activity essential to the war effort.

Let me add, Mr. President, that while that language clearly declares that every individual not in the armed forces shall have an obligation, sanctions are applied only to those who are in the war industries, or those industries and activities which the Director may deem to be essential to the war effort.

SEC. 2. (b) The purposes of this act are to provide the most practicable and effective means to accomplish the fulfillment of such obligation and to provide for making the most effective use of the manpower resources of the Nation by the following means, among others: (1) By providing for the accurate determination of manpower requirements and supply, and of the relative urgency of the needs of employers for workers; (2) by reducing wasteful labor turn-over and unnecessary labor migration—

I ask Senators to take note of that phrase "unnecessary labor migration." If any worker, no matter what he has contributed to the war effort, should now, contrary to the desire or the will of the man who writes the regulations, seek to move from one community to another, he would be in violation of the law, and subject to a jail sentence or a fine, or both—

(3) by channeling available manpower to employments in which workers will contribute most to the war effort.

One can read the bill in vain to find any provision to make that purpose effective, except among the general powers which are extended to the Director, with the vague, broad, and complete power he is given.

(4) by making available, for work in essential activities, workers presently employed in activities of relative unimportance to the war effort; and (5) by promoting the maximum utilization by employers of their available work force.

Let me say in conclusion, Mr. President, that at this moment in the Committee on Agriculture there is proceeding a hearing which has drawn the attendance of several Members of this body to consider the manner in which the meat supply of this Nation and her allies has been managed. There are witnesses there who are complaining about the regulations and the directives which have been issued—I know in the best of good faith—by O. P. A. and by the War Food Administration, and yet regulations and directives which are such that both Houses of Congress have ordered an investigation, and the Committee on Appropriations on Saturday and the Senate today authorized an additional appropriation of—I ask the Senator from Tennessee if the amount was $565,000?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Five hundred and sixty-five thousand dollars, to enable the O. P. A. to investigate black-market operations.

Mr. President, what will the appropriation be to investigate the impact of these regulations and directives upon the men and the women and the children who have contributed to the glorious output of America?

Mr. President, I renew my request that the text of the conference report on the war manpower bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

H. R. 1752

An act to provide for the most effective utilization of the manpower resources of the Nation in support of the war effort, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "War Manpower Act of 1945."

OBLIGATION OF SERVICE TO NATION

SEC. 2. (a) In order to adequately support the Army and maintain the Navy during the present war, and to carry into effect the provisions of the declarations of war pledging all of the resources of the Nation to bring the conflict to a successful termination, every individual not in the armed forces shall have an obligation, when called upon, to serve the Nation in an activity essential to the war effort.

(b) The purposes of this act are to provide the most practicable and effective means to accomplish the fulfillment of such obligation and to provide for making the most effective use of the manpower resources of the Nation by the following means, among others: (1) By providing for the accurate determination of manpower requirements and supply, and of the relative urgency of the needs of employers for workers; (2) by reducing wasteful labor turn-over and unnecessary labor migration; (3) by channeling available manpower to employments in which workers will contribute most to the war effort; (4) by making available, for work in essential activities, workers presently employed in activities of relative unimportance to the war effort; and (5) by promoting the maximum utilization by employers of their available work force.

COORDINATION OF WAR PROCUREMENT AND MANPOWER

SEC. 3. The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion (hereinafter called the "Director") shall, subject to the direction of the President, provide for coordinating the activities of all departments and agencies of the Government responsible for production, procurement, or manpower in such manner as to carry out most effectively the purposes declared in section 2 of this act. The Director shall provide, among other things, that manpower requirements and the availability of manpower shall be given due consideration in determining where production schedules shall be increased or decreased and where contracts shall be awarded, terminated, or permitted to expire, and that notice shall be given to the appropriate agency of the Government responsible for manpower at the earliest practicable time of all changes or anticipated changes in war production schedules, all awards or anticipated awards of war contracts, and all terminations or anticipated terminations of war contracts, which are likely to result in any substantial increase or decrease of the manpower requirements of any employer or any area. All departments and agencies of the Government shall comply with orders and regulations issued by the Director under authority of this section.

SURVEYS OF MANPOWER UTILIZATION

SEC. 4. (a) The Director shall make or cause to be made in-plant surveys and other investigations of the use of manpower by the Department of War and the Department of the Navy, to determine the extent to which such Departments are making the most effective use, in activities relating to production, procurement, or repairs, of individuals in their employ or subject to their jurisdiction as members of the armed forces, and shall take or cause to be taken, appropriate measures to eliminate labor wastage and labor hoarding, and otherwise to promote the full utilization by such Departments of individuals in their employ or subject to their jurisdiction as members of the armed forces, and otherwise to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) The Director shall also provide in other cases for such in-plant surveys and other investigations of activities and places of employment, as may be necessary to determine the extent to which such activities or places of employment are making the most effective use of individuals in their employ, to the end that appropriate measures may be taken to eliminate labor wastage and labor hoarding, to promote full utilization for purposes essential to the war effort, by employers of their available work force, and otherwise to promote the purposes of this act.

EMPLOYMENT CEILINGS, HIRING REGULATIONS, AND PROHIBITIONS ON LEAVING ESSENTIAL EMPLOYMENT

SEC. 5. (a) To the extent deemed by the Director to be necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes and means declared in section 2 of this act and also for the purpose of keeping activities and places of employment essential to the war effort in productive operation, the Director is authorized, by regulation—

(1) to prescribe employment ceilings in designated areas, activities, or places of employment, fixing the maximum number of workers, by age, sex, or occupational qualifications, who may be there employed, and prohibiting the employment of workers beyond such maximum number;

(2) to prohibit or regulate the hiring, rehiring, solicitation, or recruitment of new workers by employers and the acceptance of employment by workers; and

(3) to prohibit the individuals employed in designated areas, activities, plants, facilities, and farms, which the Director deems are essential to the war effort, from voluntarily discontinuing such employment unless, in the case of any individual so employed, the Director determines that it is no longer necessary in the interest of the war effort for him to remain in such employment or that he has a justifiable reason for leaving such employment.

(b) Whoever willfully violates the provisions of any regulation made under subsection (a) shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than 12 months or by a fine not to exceed $10,000, or both.

(c) No wage or other compensation paid for services rendered in any employment commenced or continued in violation of any regulation made under subsection (a) shall be allowed or allowable as a deduction from income, or as a cost or expense, for the purpose of computing the tax payable under any act of Congress or for the purpose of determining the amount to be paid to or recovered from any person with respect to the performance of any contract with the United States. The provisions of this subsection shall not be applicable with respect to any case of a violation of a regulation by any person unless such regulation has been published in the Federal Register, has been published in a newspaper of general circulation in the community for 3 consecutive days, or has been served upon such person by personal service or by registered mail. The Director shall transmit to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and other agencies of the Government responsible for the administration of any functions under this subsection copies of such regulations, and such additional information, as the Director deems will be useful to the Commissioner and such other agencies in administering their functions under this subsection.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 6. To the maximum degree consistent with this act and with its purposes, local initiative and cooperative efforts of management, labor, and agriculture shall be encouraged and utilized and use shall be made of existing hiring channels such as private employers, labor organizations, professional organizations, schools, colleges, technical institutions, and Government agencies. The management-labor committees and management-labor-agriculture committees (national, regional, State, and local) heretofore and hereafter established in connection with Government programs for the control or utilization of manpower shall be consulted on basic policy decisions made at their respective administrative levels in the course of the administration of this act.

TRAVEL EXPENSES

SEC. 7. In the case of any individual who, in response to the request of the Director, agrees to accept employment outside the locality where he is then residing, the Director, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, may furnish transportation to the location of such employment, and, if such individual complies thereafter with the requests and requirements of the Director with respect to his accepting and continuing in any employment or employments in the same locality until the Director determines that he is no longer needed in such locality for work essential to the war effort or that there is other justifiable reason for his not continuing in such work in such locality, shall furnish transportation back to the locality from which transportation was originally furnished for such individual under this section, or to any other locality selected by the individual which is not farther distant. The cost of such transportation shall not exceed the amounts allowable for individual civilian em-

ployees in the executive branch of the Government and shall not include any per diem allowance. The Director shall exercise the authority conferred by this section only to the extent that he deems the exercise thereof necessary to aid in relieving manpower shortages which substantially impede the war effort.

REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

SEC. 8. (a) The Director shall provide for the issuance of a certificate to any person with respect to whom he finds that such person (1) has left or has been released from a position (other than a temporary position) pursuant to a request or requirement made by the Director and (2) has complied thereafter with the requests and requirements made by the Director with respect to his accepting and continuing in any employment or employments until section 5 of this act ceases to be in effect or the Director determines that such person is no longer needed in work essential to the war effort or that there is other justifiable reason for the Director not to request or require such person to continue any longer in such work, whichever first occurs. Any person to whom such a certificate is issued under this subsection shall be entitled to the benefits of section 8 (b) (except the last paragraph thereof and except that in lieu of the 90-day period therein specified, the time within which application for reemployment in his former position must be made shall be 30 days), 8 (c), and 8 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to the same extent as if he had left such position in order to be and had been inducted into the land or naval forces for training and service, had been relieved therefrom on the day on which such certificate is issued to him, and had been given the certificate referred to in section 8 (a) of such act.

(b) Section 8 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"If such person, within 90 days after having been relieved from such training and service or from such hospitalization, has become employed in an employment accepted by him pursuant to a request or requirement made by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, any period (before sec. 5 of the War Manpower Act of 1945 ceases to be in effect) while he is employed in an employment so accepted by him (and any period, not exceeding 15 days, between leaving one such employment and entering upon another such employment) shall be disregarded in computing the 90-day period within which application for reemployment in his former position must be made and shall be counted as training and service in the land or naval forces for the purposes of subsection (c)."

PERMISSION TO PAY OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE TO INDIVIDUALS NOTWITHSTANDING THEIR EMPLOYMENT DURING PRESENT WAR

SEC. 9. Notwithstanding the provisions of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age assistance), and of appropriations for payments thereunder, in any case in which any State pays old-age assistance to any individual at a rate not in excess of the rate of old-age assistance paid to such individual during the month of February 1945, any failure to take into consideration any income and resources of such individual arising from labor performed by him as an employee after the date of enactment of this act and prior to the seventh calendar month occurring after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, shall not be a basis of excluding payments made to such individual in computing payments made to States under section 3 of such title, of refusing to approve a State plan under section 2 of such title, or of withholding certification pursuant to section 4 of such title.

APPEALS

SEC. 10. The Director shall by regulation provide an opportunity for a hearing before an impartial administrative tribunal to any person who claims that any action taken with respect to him under this act or any regulation thereunder is unreasonable as applied to him or is inconsistent with this act or such regulation. Subject to such further administrative review as may be provided in regulations under this section, the determination made after such hearing shall be final. To the extent practicable and appropriate, such regulations shall provide for such hearings to be accorded in local areas and for such hearing tribunals to be so constituted as to permit the ascertainment of the views of persons selected as representatives of management, labor, and agricultural interests in the locality. The Director shall by regulation provide for and establish such administrative tribunals as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.

MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATIVE AND ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

SEC. 11. Paragraphs (3), (4), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), as amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, shall be applicable with respect to this act to the same extent as such paragraphs are applicable with respect to such subsection (a), except that, for the purposes of this act, the word "President," wherever it occurs in such paragraphs, shall be deemed to refer to the Director.

ESSENTIAL AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES

SEC. 12. Section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"In carrying out the provisions of this subsection (except the proviso of the foregoing paragraph) the selective-service local board in classifying the registrant shall base its findings solely and exclusively on whether the registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort and whether a satisfactory replacement can be obtained, without reference to the relative essentially of the registrant to an agricultural occupation or endeavor as compared with any other occupation, service, or endeavor; and the foregoing provision of this sentence shall apply upon any appeal or review of a decision made thereunder by a selective-service local board. Such deferment shall be made by said board without consideration of any other circumstance or condition whatsoever; and during the period of such deferment for such purpose, no other classification, of said registrant, shall be made by said board."

SAVING PROVISION RELATING TO SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

SEC. 13. Nothing in this act (except sec. 12) shall affect the powers under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to the classification and selection of persons for, or the induction, or deferment from induction, of persons into, the land or naval forces; or preclude the Selective Service System from classifying and selecting for induction any registrant who violates any regulation made under section 5, or preclude the land or naval forces from inducting such a registrant.

SEC. 14. The Director shall submit reports to the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives on the 1st days of January, April, July, and October, on the activities undertaken or contemplated by him under this act. Such reports shall summarize and appraise manpower mobilization activities and problems.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 15 (a) As used in this act, the terms "employment," "work," "hire," "rehire," "employ," or words of similar import shall include any contract, arrangement, undertaking, or relationship whereby or under which an individual undertakes to perform a service or services for another, irrespective of the resulting legal relationship between the parties.

(b) The provisions of this act shall not be applicable with respect to the employment of persons by any State or any political subdivision thereof, without its consent.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 16. If any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances, other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

TERMINATION DATE

SEC. 17. The provisions of sections 4 and 5 of this act and all regulations thereunder, shall cease to be effective upon the termination of hostilities in the present war, as declared by the President or by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, or upon June 30, 1946, whichever is the earlier.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the bill before us proposes to increase the debt limit from $260,000,000,000 to $300,000,000,000. The evidence shows that the present debt limit will be approximately reached by July 1, 1945, and that the new debt limit will be reached approximately by July 1, 1946. Under the policy which we have adopted for financing the wars there is no choice except to grant this increase. The cost of the wars together with routine expenditures is running at the rate of approximately $100,000,000,000 a year. Taxes collected are $45,000,000,000, so that the deficit for the 3 fiscal years 1944, 1945, and 1946, including subsidies and the expenditures of Government corporations, will average over $50,000,000,000 a year. We cannot overestimate the inflationary effect of this policy, especially when applied to such a long period of time. When we adopted the policy we did not expect it to continue for the number of years it has continued. To a certain extent we have fooled ourselves by a very effective control of prices and a somewhat less effective control of wages. These controls have prevented some of the immediately harmful effects of inflation, but to a certain extent they have merely postponed the evil day. We have only to refer back to the years 1928 and 1929 when we had a tremendous inflation leading to a disastrous depression without any increase in commodity prices.

We may question now whether the policy we have pursued was a wise policy. I always felt that we could have increased the taxes by at least $10,000,000,000 a year without serious hardship, but it was not done, largely because the President and Congress could not agree on the kind of increase to be adopted, and, in any event, there would have been a tremendous deficit even with that increase. Any increase in taxes applied by a uniform rule was bound to fall with drastic severity on some, even through a large number of others were perfectly able to stand it.

In any event the policy was followed. People have saved approximately $30,000,000,000 a year, and loaned their savings to the Government, but largely in E bonds, which can be easily cashed, and used for spending after the war, and approximately $20,000,000,000 a year has been borrowed from the banks, thereby creating deposits or currency out of thin air. Even as to the savings, however, there is a strong inflationary effect which has only been deferred. This is beginning to show itself in the increase in capital values, in city real estate, in homes, in farms and in stocks. Whether such values can be controlled successfully seems to me very doubtful. We can control credit. We can increase the margin required on stocks from 50 percent to 100 percent. Mr. Eccles has suggested a tax on speculation, but I doubt very much if this would restrain substantially increases in capital values. We would be checking a manifestation of inflation instead of inflation itself.

In my opinion, the only way to stop inflation is to get back to a balanced budget just as quickly as possible, for the present condition is the immediate result of the huge Federal deficit. We had to abandon all sound principles of finance because we had to win the war, and necessity knows no law. But once the war is won, that argument is gone. There is no other excuse for further stimulating inflation. Post-war problems must be approached from a completely different standpoint than that with which we had to approach the war financing. We have had to increase tremendously the national debt. From the end of the war every nerve must be strained to see that it is not increased further. We have had to stand for the unbalancing of our budget. From now on we must pay our way if we can. We have had to give away the products of our farms and factories to foreign nations under a lend-lease law which we know is a gift law. The whole principle of lend-lease must terminate with the end of the war. We have before us a bill to lower the gold reserves against our Federal Reserve notes. We have to do it because of our deficit policy, but if we pursue a sound policy we will never have to make a further reduction.

The administration has presented no comprehensive post-war financial policy. Half of the departments are demanding more money to spend to prevent depression. Half of them are warning us against inflation and asking us for extraordinary powers to meet it. We have no choice except to pass this bill, but it is high time that a survey of the whole post-war financial situation was presented to Congress. It is high time that we developed a consistent policy to alleviate, so far as we can, the tremendous dangers of inflation.

Mr. President, I do not think those dangers have been better expressed than they were expressed on March 15 by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. I quote what he stated:

> There is one thing we shall certainly not do. We shall not bid for votes or popularity by promising what we cannot perform, nor shall we compete with others in electioneering baits and lures. It would be very easy for us all to promise, or even to give each other presents, bonuses, and gratuities in a most enthusiastic manner, but if we woke up in the morning and found that the pound sterling only bought 5 shillings' worth of goods or services, we should have committed a great crime.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I feel there are several additional features of the debt situation which should be before the Members of this body. The first is that a very substantial proportion of the national debt, approximately 40 percent, is a short-term debt, which means that there may be a call upon us at any time in the next 1 to 5 years for $100,000,000,000, which is the approximate amount of the short-term obligations.

In addition there are several types of bonds, in the amount of $50,000,000,000, to which the Senator from Ohio has referred, which are also immediately payable on demand as a result of the provisions that they may be called at any time.

This means that more than half the debt, $150,000,000,000 of the present $260,000,000,000, may at any time be called by those who hold it.

Moreover, we have outstanding an all-time record of $26,000,000,000 in currency, of which, it is interesting to note, $4,250,000,000 is in $100 bills, which fact certainly invites inquiry as to the purpose and the results. We were assured by the Treasury that it is a matter of very great concern to them, as it seems obvious that to a very great extent they are being used for other than legitimate transactions—in the evasion of taxes and in black-market operations, to which they readily lend themselves.

It is further to be noted that while during the past year we sold $12,000,000,000 of savings bonds, $3,000,000,000 of them were cashed, so we had a net gain of only $9,000,000,000. In other words, 25 percent of the savings bonds were cashed during the year of their sale, or perhaps some which were cashed had been sold earlier.

Mr. President, these are all disquieting symptoms. As the Senator from Ohio pointed out, $100,000,000,000 of the debt is practically "made" money. That was the testimony of Mr. Daniel W. Bell, representing the Treasury, who was asked regarding this matter before the Senate Committee on Finance. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] asked him:

> Have you any estimate, Mr. Bell, of the saturation point in the short-term securities the banks can hold? Are they near the saturation point?

Mr. Bell replied:

> I don't believe there is a saturation point. It is about the same as making money.

In other words, in the view of the Treasury it is the same as starting the printing presses. In that concept, we have obtained $100,000,000,000 from the banks in short-term loans; we have borrowed $50,000,000,000 from savings, which is immediately payable on demand; and we have $26,000,000,000 outstanding in currency, an all-time record high.

We are obliged to pay $4,500,000,000 in interest annually, which is a very substantial burden. Mindful of the attitude of the Treasury, which indicated that there was some limit, I wish to call attention to a rather fantastic theory which prevails in certain high official quarters, and which, it seems to me, should serve as a red flag of warning that the somewhat more conservative attitude of the Treasury should be very definitely borne in mind. We should realize that there are strange theories abroad regarding debt.

I hold in my hand a book on the subject of public spending and post-war economic policy. The author is Mr. Sherwood M. Fine, who is described on the jacket as "a Government economist for several years, and at present"—the book was written last year—"principal economic analyst of the Foreign Economic Administration."

So he is not a negligible factor in the formulation of our economic policy. We have just had a proposal for a reduction of 50 percent in our tariffs, to be authorized to be effected by the administration with respect to the tariffs prevailing on January 1, 1945. Already under existing law we have had our tariffs reduced from an average of 48 percent to an average of 33 percent; and this proposal would authorize a further reduction to approximately 12 or 16 percent.

I should like to read a quotation from Mr. Fine, because I think that as we continue increasing the debt, as we must do now, we should realize that the breaking point will be reached.

This is what Mr. Fine has to say:

> We are told that a public debt of 4,000,000,000,000 may be carried by the economy without a collapse of the capitalist system, a repudiation of the debt, or a great inflation.

That is the end of the quotation which Mr. Fine gives, quoting from Mr. Harris, in Post-War Economic Problems, page 184. The annual interest on a debt of four thousand billion dollars, at the current rate of 2 percent, would be $80,000,000,000.

Mr. Fine continues:

> Perhaps our children or grandchildren will live to see a national debt of that size. If they do, it will not necessarily prove or disprove the wisdom of those who advocated unrestricted deficit financing.

I thought it was appropriate that this should appear in the RECORD at a time when we are raising our debt limit to $300,000,000,000, with the testimony before our Committee on Finance that that will not be adequate to carry us to January 1, 1946, as Mr. Bell testified that it would be necessary to increase the debt to $304,000,000,000 by January 1, 1946, in order to meet the expected deficit at that time; $300,000,000,000 was the estimated value of all the resources of the United States only a few years ago.

Mr. Burgess, president of the American Bankers' Association, appeared and asked simply one measure of consideration. He referred to the corporations created by the Government to carry on "many ordinary commercial transactions," as it is phrased by the Government. The corporations are entering what the Secretary of the Treasury has called "the field of commercial enterprise." Mr. Burgess suggests that in

increasing measure either they should be compelled to pay interest and taxes, like any other commercial organization, if their activities are to be compared with those of private enterprise, or that some other restriction be imposed in order to preserve the system of private enterprise.

I feel that coincident with allowing the debt to increase to this unprecedented figure, we should bear in mind the danger signals along the road and be prepared, as the Senator from Ohio has pointed out, resolutely to set our faces, immediately following what we trust may be the early collapse of Germany, in the direction of some measures to put our financial house in order, looking toward the happy day when America may once again have a balanced Budget.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in connection with the bill increasing the debt limit to $300,000,000,000, let me say that I have a profound respect and admiration for the chairman of the Committee on Finance. I feel that in times past that committee has rendered a great service to the membership of the Senate in the form of advice, and also statements with respect to the finances of the country, as well as suggestions relative to appropriations.

We now have before us a proposal to raise the debt limitation. I cannot let this piece of legislation become operative without suggesting to the Senate that on March 17 I read what I consider to be a splendid editorial, published in the Washington Evening Star. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEBT LOAD

Three hundred billion dollars—the new national debt limit just adopted by the House and approved by the Senate Finance Committee—is a figure so astronomical that it hardly seems real. Yet, despite its fantastic sound, it is as down-to-earth as bread and butter, representing the equivalent of a liability of over $2,000 on the head of every man, woman, and child in America.

In thus increasing the debt limit, of course, Congress is taking a step made inescapable by this most total and most costly of all wars, and within a year, according to Treasury estimates, the figure may have to be revised upward again. But though the increase is unquestionably necessary and though there is no reason for undue apprehension over it, the resulting long-term fiscal outlook is far too sobering to warrant complacency. For a national liability of $300,000,000,000, whether "we owe it to ourselves" or not, is bound to have a profoundly important effect on the economic future of all of us.

To get some idea of the dimensions of this debt and its bearing on post-war National Budgets and taxation, we have only to keep in mind that merely to meet interest payments on it—at say a rate of 2 percent—will require an annual Federal outlay of $6,000,000,000, or about double all Federal expenditures in 1930. And if we should wish to retire it in yearly installments of $3,000,000,000, these installments, plus the interest, would amount to $9,000,000,000 annually for a full century before the whole obligation could be liquidated. It is perhaps worth repeating that reasonably conservative economists assure us that there is no reason for undue apprehension over this prospect, but it should be added, too, that their assurances are predicated on certain big "ifs."

Thus, there is no reason for alarm if the Government resolutely keeps the debt from increasing after the war, if it avoids deficit financing, if it taxes soundly and spends no more than it takes in, and if it promotes policies calculated to encourage venture capital and high-level employment. These are some of the more important "ifs" in the picture; if they are not ignored, then the Nation—the richest and most productive in the world—ought to be able to carry the load without breaking its back.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I invite attention to the concluding paragraph of the editorial, which makes the suggestion that if we are not to view this increase with alarm, certain important "ifs" should be considered by the Congress of the United States in its future program.

The first "if" is that we should avoid deficit financing.

I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate a statement by one who spoke for the Treasury in my own office. When I suggested an amendment requiring that all the funds we receive from the sale of surplus property should be applied upon the debt, this official of the Treasury stated to me that the present administration would continue deficit financing for years to come.

If that is the attitude, I think we would do well to consider at this time, when we are increasing the debt limit to $300,000,000,000, that we are now spending, and have spent since the 1st of July, an average of $260,000,000 a day. I obtained the figures from the Congressional Library. That is the rate at which we are pouring out the wealth of this country.

Mr. President, I, too, wish to join the other Members of the Senate in stating that so long as we have to make these appropriations in the war effort, naturally we are willing to make them; but I wish to say that as the appropriation bills come before the Senate it should be our duty from now on to commence to cut the appropriations. There must be a stopping point somewhere, if our American economy is to be sustained. The only way America can help the other nations of the world is by being solvent and free, not bankrupt.

Mr. President, it is impossible for me to understand what a debt of $300,000,000,000 is; but when we are spending $260,000,000 a day and when it seems that we shall have to continue to do so for days and months to come, that brings very forcefully to our attention the first "if" of the editorial.

The second "if" is "if our Government taxes soundly and spends no more than it takes in." I should like to suggest—I know the senior Senator from Georgia has this well in mind, but I should like to suggest it to him—that the Special Committee to Study and Survey the Problems of Small Business Enterprises has taken reams of testimony in an effort to ascertain how small business could be put back into the picture. By the way, from December 1, 1943, to December 1, 1944, 544,000 small-business houses ceased to operate in this country. We must put them back into business, because our taxes are derived from persons who create wealth. We cannot finance our Government by issuing bonds, but we must get the taxes from the people who create the wealth. So we must help our people engage in private enterprise. The testimony from man after man—from almost thousands of witnesses, I may say—is to the effect that a sound tax policy must be adopted if private enterprise is to function and to pay taxes and to do the business which must be done if we are to pay the interest, let alone the principal, on the staggering national debt.

What is the third "if" in the editorial? It is, in substance, "if we make it attractive for private capital to get back into business."

In the last few days our committee has been taking testimony from representatives of companies manufacturing light metals, including the Aluminum Co. of America, the Reynolds Metal Co., and other companies. Probably 40 or 50 witnesses testified. All of them said we need a sound tax policy; and they also said that if they are to continue their businesses, it is necessary that they be shown that venture capital can once more be attracted into the private capital field, so that the businesses of the Nation can be privately financed, as they should be financed, and so that, thereby, there will be the payment of interest money with which eventually the principal and interest on the national debt can be paid.

As I said at the beginning of my remarks, I will vote for the bill increasing the debt limit; but I wish to say that the editorial which I have mentioned not only brings to the attention of the American people but, I think, it should forcefully bring to the attention of the Members of the Senate that we must have a sound tax policy, that sooner or later the Budget must be balanced, that we must take in more than we spend, or else this country will be bankrupt, and, finally, that we must see to it that government ceases imposing artificial restraints on the backs of our small businessmen—at least to the degree that they will be able and willing to go back into business and to invest their own money. One of the witnesses said, and he said it in forthright language, "The thing which bothers us most is not the allocation of materials, not the question of manpower, but having the Government continuously on our backs, issuing directives and regulations, so that we do not know what to expect."

So, Mr. President, when we vote to increase the debt limit to $300,000,000,000, let us remember that we are spending an average of $260,000,000 a day. Let us remember that the time is here when it is a question whether we can pay the interest, let alone pay anything on the deficit, and at the same time continue to pay for the cost of the Federal Government.

It seems to me that when the appropriation bills come before the Senate with items which are not exactly attributable to the war effort, we should

scrutinize them and cut them right to the bone, to the last cent. We must help preserve America as a solvent, free Nation, so that we can help the other nations of the world. We shall never be able to help them if we become impoverished and bankrupt.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is a member of the Appropriations Committee, and he knows that in the committee we are using every endeavor on almost every item of the appropriation bills to reduce the amount of appropriations.

Mr. WHERRY. I do; and I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I sat through the last meeting of the committee on a bill which came from the House of Representatives; and, as I remember, the committee reduced the appropriations 10 percent from the amounts as reported to the Senate by the House of Representatives. I thank the Senator for his activities in that connection; because we must reduce our appropriations if we are to reduce our debt, which probably will be $300,000,000,000 before we are through. We must reduce our appropriations and reduce our debt if we are to remain a free country.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator agree that we owe the debt only to ourselves, and that therefore there is no debt?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in my answer to the question of the Senator from Iowa, I do not wish to get into an argument with the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], who holds views on that matter entirely contrary to my own. However, I wish to say I think there is no difference between a public debt and a private debt. The debt must be paid; it must be honored. All our banks and insurance companies are based upon Government bonds and debentures. We must pay the debt if we are to remain solvent. We must pay both the principal and the interest. Our job in enacting legislation is to see to it that every appropriation bill which comes before the Congress is closely analyzed, so that we save every dime which can be saved, in order to keep the American Government solvent.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator does not mean to imply that we are insolvent at this time, does he?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, my answer to the very distinguished Senator from Utah is that I do not have the ability to know what a debt of $300,000,000,000 really is, and I do not know what the assets of America are; but, on the basis of the complaints we are already receiving from venture capital retiring from the field and on the basis of the complaints we have had relative to taxation, I would say we have reached the point where the people must be protected. It is a question whether we are at the limit of our financial assets in view of our liabilities, and especially so since every child born in America has a debt of $2,000 placed upon its shoulders the day it is born.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I asked the question because all the evidence which has come before the Committee on Banking and Currency has been to the effect that today no other money in the world is so much coveted as is the United States dollar.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. I derive a great deal of comfort from that fact. It seems to me that so long as we enjoy that position throughout the world, we can at least feel presently that we are not insolvent.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct, and I agree with the Senator that our dollars are coveted by the other nations of the world.

My contention is that with a debt of $300,000,000,000, which I think is very difficult for anyone to understand, and with the further debt burdens which will be placed upon our shoulders, the time has come when, if we want our dollars to be good as they have been in the past, we must carefully examine and analyze every dollar of appropriations made by the Senate.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes at this time to invite the attention of the Senate to what seems to me to be a very strange anomaly existing in the Treasury Department of the United States.

For several years there has been in the Treasury of the United States approximately a billion dollars worth of free silver at its montary value. For some reason or other the Secretary of the Treasury has absolutely refused to use it. We find that the Secretary of the Treasury has no qualms whatever about creating money out of thin air, as stated a few minutes ago by the distinguished Senator from Ohio. He has no qualms whatever about asking the Congress of the United States to pass a law—and we passed it; I do not know how many Senators here realize that we passed it—conferring upon the banks of America the power to establish demand deposits on the part of the United States Government involving exclusively a bond transaction, without maintaining one thin dime in reserve against such deposits. If that is not creating money out of thin air I simply do not understand the term.

In December 1942, we saw $660,000,000 poured into circulation by some strange maneuvering on the part of the Treasury and the Federal Reserve banks by the use of a stock of Federal Reserve bank notes that resulted in a lot of not wholly satisfactory explaining to the Banking and Currency Committees of Congress. The silver which has accumulated in the United States Treasury is there under a law which was passed by the Congress. Today silver is selling in India and in China at exceedingly higher prices than its monetary value as fixed by statute in the United States. Today there is pending before the Senate a bill providing for the reduction of gold reserves behind Federal Reserve notes from 40 percent to 25 percent indicating an immediate need for more currency. Why then will not the Secretary of the Treasury use the people's money, the silver accumulations in the Treasury, and issue silver certificates against it?

Is there any difference, Mr. President, between the Federal Reserve notes which can come into circulation only through debt, and the issuance of silver certificates against the free silver in the Treasury? Will any Senator rise on the floor of the Senate today and tell me that silver certificates are not just as sound money under the law as Federal Reserve notes. Both are fully guaranteed by our Government. Silver certificates are backed by 100 percent silver reserves, while Federal Reserve notes have only 40 percent in gold, plus 60 percent Government bonds behind them.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, it seems to me that the only objection which the Secretary of the Treasury can have to the issuance of silver certificates against free silver in the Treasury is that the banks would not be collecting interest on them as they do on Federal Reserve notes.

I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. How much silver now lies idle in the United States Treasury?

Mr. MURDOCK. As of March 23, 1945, the free silver in the Treasury was 815,797,235 ounces, or $1,052,378,433.15. Silver certificates which are backed by silver, and also by the guaranty of the Government of the United States, are just as good money as Federal Reserve notes.

Mr. McKELLAR. The statement which the Senator makes is very interesting.

Mr. MURDOCK. We are paying interest on all the money which we borrow, and a day never passes that we do not create additional debt through the issuance of currency against Government bonds. Why then does the Secretary of the Treasury persist in his refusal to issue silver certificates against the free silver in the United States Treasury? There is no reason or excuse for his not doing so. There are many reasons right now why he should, not the least of which would be the saving of interest on more than a billion dollars for a debt-ridden people. Issuance of silver certificates is not a bit more inflationary than creating demand deposits for the Government against bonds. This latter process has the full approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. President, when compared to the great national debt, today a billion dollars might be referred to by some people as a mere trifle. Perhaps a billion dollars would be referred to by them as negligible. But when it is considered in terms of interest which people are paying, there is no reason under the law or

sound economy why the Secretary of the Treasury should not issue silver certificates against the free silver which is in the Treasury.

Mr. President, I realize that it is absolutely necessary, in order to carry on the financing of the war, that the bill now before the Senate be passed, and I shall vote for it; but I can see no reason or consistency in the position of the Secretary of the Treasury in his refusal to issue silver certificates against the Treasury's free silver. It amounts to more than a billion dollars. The people have purchased it under law. It belongs to the people. Using it would save interest on a billion dollars.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of helping to straighten out the record insofar as the discussion with reference to the war manpower bill is concerned, and I can do so in a few moments.

I realize that the measure before the Senate now is House bill 2404, dealing with the debt limit of the United States. A little while ago the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] diverted the discussion to the conference report on the war manpower measure, namely, House bill 1752. It is for the purpose of insuring that the record be correct that I wish to say a few words.

The conferees held a final meeting today. On each side the vote was 4 to 1 in favor of the conference report. The conference report has now gone to the House. It probably will be voted on there tomorrow. It will probably come to the Senate shortly thereafter with the approval of the House. Therefore I think it is important for us to understand it in its present form.

I believe we can describe the situation in this manner: The conferees on the part of the Senate were in direct opposition to the conferees on the part of the House with regard to the theory of the war manpower bill. The original House bill was a draft bill, a form of national selective service act. The Senate amendment was not a draft-of-labor measure. It was an approach to the existing system with statutory authority behind it. The conferees on the part of the Senate stood by their ground, and the result reached was, in substance, the Senate amendment, slightly corrected and modified, plus authority to apply a freeze on labor in the same manner and within the same scope that a ceiling may be applied on labor. Administering authority was taken from the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and given to the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. Therefore, to convey the impression to the Senate that discretion has been widely changed from what was provided in the bill as it passed the Senate is not correctly to interpret the action of the conference committee. The same discretion which had been vested in the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is now, in substance, to be vested in the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. The same type of discretion which he had been allowed to exercise with regard to ceilings and regulations for employment may, under the compromise form, also be applied to the freezing of labor in plants in which he may feel it is necessary to freeze it.

The conference bill is, therefore, the Senate theory of approach to the whole matter, and I believe we can say that if the conferees had not reached this compromise, if both sides had not given way on some points, we would not have been in position to provide the added production which the Nation needs in order to support properly the men who are at the front.

I believe the compromise is thoroughly loyal to the position of the Senate. It carries it out in an effective and reasonable manner. In my opinion, failure to agree upon the compromise would mean that we would be giving the soldiers nothing, whereas they need the support of the Nation by an act of Congress which will help to provide the production so needed in the months which lie ahead of us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The question is on the third reading of House bill 2404.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Randolph Carpenter, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas, vice George H. West, resigned;

Dennis E. Sullivan, of New Hampshire, to be United States attorney for the district of New Hampshire, vice Alexander Murchie, resigned,

George F. Troy, of Rhode Island, to be United States attorney for the district of Rhode Island; and

Ben Ivy King, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the western district of Tennessee, vice Charles W. Miles, resigned.

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert Lewis Brown, of Montana, to be United States district judge for the district of Montana, vice James H. Baldwin, deceased.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF MEXICO

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in legislative session I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 115.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) relative to determination and payment of certain claims against the Government of Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, this is a joint resolution providing for the continuation of a commission which is doing a splendid work, and has not yet concluded its consideration of all the claims which have been referred to it. When it concludes its work, all the claims will have been settled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FIRST REPORT TO GOVERNMENTS OF UNITED NATIONS BY THE INTERIM COMMISSION ON FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am sending herewith for the information and consideration of the Congress the first report to the Governments of the United Nations by the Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture. Appended to this report is the constitution of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, which the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture at Hot Springs, Va., requested the Interim Commission to formulate and recommend.

The Interim Commission has done its work well. It has prepared a plan for a permanent international organization through which governments can pool and extend their knowledge and collaborate with each other in raising the standards of nutrition of their peoples and in establishing and maintaining an expanding prosperity for agriculture in all countries.

I recommend that the Congress authorize the acceptance of the constitution and the participation of the United States in the work of the food and agriculture organization.

The United Nations have already made much progress in setting up an organization for international security. But our collaboration for peace must be on a broader basis than security alone. We must strive to correct the conditions that predispose people toward war or make them the ready tools and victims of aggressors. We shall need also to work together as nations toward achieving freedom from want. Our participation in the food and agriculture organization will be an essential step in this collaboration.

The organization will seek its ends through the provision of international services in agriculture and nutrition which have heretofore been either lacking or inadequate. Among other things, it will provide the means for bringing together from all parts of the world the results of research in all the fields of

agriculture and nutrition and for disseminating ideas and advice on how the available information can be of greatest usefulness.

Improved standards of nutrition, increased levels of farm incomes, avoidance of agricultural surpluses—these are among the important objectives that the food and agriculture organization will assist the nations of the world in achieving. The organization will seek to better conditions in food and agriculture by fostering international cooperation in developing the optimum use of the resources of land, labor, and science. One of its important jobs will be to help in improving the marketing of agricultural products throughout the world so that farmers can find good markets here and abroad and continue to produce as fully as is consistent with sound conservation practices.

The constitution of the organization provides that it shall include fisheries and forests within the scope of its work, and that in agriculture it shall cover both food and nonfood products. The work of the food and agriculture organization will be primarily technical and advisory. Its staff will be small; its budget will be small, $2,500,000 for the first year—with $625,000 as the share to be borne by the United States—and about twice that amount in succeeding years. It is in no sense a relief organization.

In becoming a member of the food and agriculture organization, we will retain complete freedom of action in determining our national agriculture policies. Under its constitution, the organization will have no powers of direction or control over any nation. It will recommend agricultural policies and advise nations on their food and agricultural problems, but it will have no power to coerce or demand. The constitution provides that all member nations shall have equal representation in the conference of the organization, each being entitled to one vote. Our responsibilities in joining the organization are of the same nature as those Congress has heretofore authorized in approving our participation in the Pan American Union.

I therefore recommend that the Congress approve our active participation in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, in accordance with its proposed constitution as set forth in appendix I of the attached report, and authorize annual appropriations of our share of the budget of the organization.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 26, 1945.*

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I now ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the three nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles R. Denny, Jr., to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George A. Cook to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Julius G. Luhrsen to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified at once of the confirmation of all these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be forthwith notified.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 27, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 26 (legislative day of March 16), 1945:

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

MEDICAL CORPS

To be majors

Capt. Elmer Deloss Gay, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 8, 1945.

Capt. Gordon G. Bulla, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 19, 1945.

Capt. William Albert Todd, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 26, 1945.

Capt. James Bowdoin Stapleton, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 26, 1945.

Capt. Floyd Lawrence Wergeland, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 28, 1945.

Capt. Robert Stultz Brua, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 28, 1945.

To be captains

First Lt. Herbert William Jenkins, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 4, 1945.

First Lt. Freeman Irby Stephens, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from April 10, 1945.

PHARMACY CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Seth Overbaugh Craft, Pharmacy Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 20, 1945.

CHAPLAIN

To be captain

Chaplain (First Lt.) Elmer Everett Wehking, United States Army (temporary captain), with rank from April 15, 1945, subject to examination required by law.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

Passed assistant dental surgeon to be temporary dental surgeon effective February 1, 1945:

Kenneth A. Haines

Assistant sanitary engineers to be passed assistant sanitary engineers effective dates indicated:

Albert H. Stevenson, May 1, 1945.
Frank Tetzlaff, May 1, 1945.
Callis H. Atkins, March 16, 1945.

Assistant surgeons to be temporary senior assistant surgeons effective March 1, 1945:

John K. McBane	Vernon R. Dennis, Jr.
Edwin D. Merrill	James R. Hurley
Frank A. Buell	Herbert F. Hager
Wardell H. Mills	Andrew P. Sackett

Surgeons to be temporary senior surgeons effective March 1, 1945:

Theodore J. Bauer
Joseph S. Spoto
James R. Shaw

Sanitary engineer to be temporary senior sanitary engineer effective March 1, 1945:

Allen D. Brandt

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 26 (legislative day of March 16), 1945:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Charles R. Denny, Jr., to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1944.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

George A. Cook, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1948.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Julius G. Luhrsen, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 29, 1949.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 26, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou eternal Christ, from whom cometh wisdom and power, regard us in mercy and hold not Thy Holy Spirit from us. Unto Thee we come with our failures and our sins and ask for divine compassion and forgiveness. Inspire our souls with that spiritual quality which God, our Heavenly Father, shares with His earthly children. Calm and purge our hearts; make them free in the liberty which Thou dost bestow. Thine hand is velveted with tenderness to wipe away tears and steeled to smite selfishness and hypocrisy. As we reflect these days upon Him who is treading the path which leads to the Mount of Sacrifice, O set our minds on the stewardship entrusted to us, Thine to be used for the cause of our common Lord. Care for all strangers within our gates and bless all our homes with the angel of Thy providence. In the holy name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, March 24, 1945, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 21, 1945:

H. R. 197. An act to establish the grade of general in the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1646. An act to establish the grade of admiral in the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

On March 23, 1945:

H. R. 242. An act for the relief of Ruben M. Herren;

H. R. 256. An act for the relief of Dr. Luther J. Head;

H. R. 687. An act for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions;

H. R. 987. An act for the relief of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co.; and

H. R. 1485. An act for the relief of Henry B. Tucker.

On March 24, 1945:

H. R. 257. An act for the relief of the estate of Dr. David O. Clements, deceased;

H. R. 1149. An act for the relief of Dane D. Morgan;

H. R. 1429. An act to permit the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, and the United States Maritime Commission, during the national emergency, to pay the tax imposed under section 1410 of the Internal Revenue Code without regard to the $3,000 limitation in section 1426 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; and

H. R. 2506. An act to amend an act regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia, approved June 1, 1910, as amended.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1945, FOR VARIOUS FEDERAL AGENCIES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 141, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, in lieu of certain appropriations contained in H. R. 2374, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, so there will be no question I reserve all points of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the following sums and paragraphs are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in lieu of the corresponding sums and paragraphs contained in the bill (H. R. 2374) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, and for other purposes, as passed by the House of Representatives on March 2, 1945, and as reported to the Senate on March 24, 1945, namely:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CLERK HIRE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

Clerk hire, Members and Delegates: For an additional amount for clerk hire for Representatives and Delegates and Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, as authorized by law, fiscal year 1945, $657,000; and this amount shall be consolidated with the previous appropriation for such clerk hire for such fiscal year and the consolidated sum shall be available for such clerk hire as authorized by law.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Printing and binding: For an additional amount for printing and binding, fiscal year 1945, $200,000.

Pensions: For an additional amount for pensions, fiscal year 1945, $233,000,000.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

Control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases: For an additional amount for control of incipient and emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases, fiscal year 1945, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945, $1,080,050.

OFFICE OF THE FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

(Out of the postal revenues)

Miscellaneous items, first- and second-class post offices: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1945, for "Miscellaneous items, first- and second-class post offices," $1,855,000.

OFFICE OF THE FOURTH ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Post-office stationery, equipment, and supplies: For an additional amount for post-office stationery, equipment, and supplies, including the objects specified under this head in the Post Office Department Appropriation Act, 1945, fiscal year 1945, $600,500: *Provided*, That the limitation on the amount available for the pay of employees in the District of Columbia, in connection with the shipment of supplies, is increased from $75,500 to $82,000, and the limitation on the amount available for salaries of the 13 traveling mechanicians is increased from $38,900 to $42,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the first deficiency bill for 1945 passed the House on March 2. We were under the impression at that time we would be able to dispose of the bill before the recess; however, the bill has not yet been reported in the Senate and is expected to be reported today.

It will be impossible to go to conference and get final action on the bill in time to meet some of the pressing need for funds in one or two directions and for this reason we have with the concurrence of the Bureau of the Budget submitted a joint resolution providing for five items which should be disposed of before April 15. All of these have passed the House; all were in the deficiency bill and are included here in the form in which they passed the House, with the exception of the next to the last item.

This is an emergency which has arisen since the bill was considered by the House committee and has been submitted to the Senate Committee on Appropriations by the Bureau of the Budget. It has been included by the Senate committee in the bill and will be submitted to and passed by the Senate. For this reason we include it in the pending joint resolution.

These five items are largely self-explanatory. We included the additional clerk hire necessary to provide for the April pay roll. The disbursing clerk will be discommoded unless this is provided immediately. We also provide for the Veterans' Administration $200,000 for printing and binding and for pensions $233,000,000. General Hines advises us he will be unable to meet the regular monthly pension pay roll on April 15 unless this additional money is appropriated. The item for control of insect pests is obviously necessary at this time if the farmers are to proceed with their spring planting.

It is matter of procurement and distribution of material for combating the chinch bug in a number of States, and, of course, would have no value this year if the insecticide were not applied before the infestation occurs. The item appears on page 16, beginning in line 8, of the bill as reported to the Senate.

The last two items for the Post Office Department are deficiencies which are occasioned solely by the necessity for caring for mail for soldiers abroad. It will be impossible to deliver mail to soldiers abroad unless this money is provided.

The first is for post office stationery, equipment, and supplies. The Post Office is running out of funds in this item, where the extra load is occasioned by the added work incident to handling mail for the boys overseas. The item appears on pages 28 and 29, beginning in line 22 of page 28, of the bill as reported to the Senate.

The remaining item is one inserted in the bill by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, pursuant to a Budget estimate contained in Senate Document No. 25. The amount is $1,855,000 and is for miscellaneous items, first- and second-class post offices. The original appropriation for this item was $2,820,000.

The Senate has had hearings on the supplemental request, which disclose that it is occasioned by the added work of handling mail for the armed forces at the two postal concentration centers—namely, New York City, and Oakland, Calif. It is a matter of transporting, housing, and feeding Army and Navy personnel assigned from time to time, because of the lack of civilian personnel, to enable the Postal Service to handle the great volume of mail going out and coming in from the boys on the war fronts at these postal concentration centers.

There is an actual deficiency at this time in excess of $800,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. This deficiency appropriation is limited to the present fiscal year, is it not?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. For the 1945 fiscal year. They are all deficiencies.

Mr. RANKIN. The reason I ask is if we do not have a revival of righteousness at both ends of the Capitol and they adopt the amendment that I tried to put in for rural electrification on Saturday, we are going to have to go to the Deficiency Committee on Appropriations to get funds for that purpose, and I wanted to know if this measure covered it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All such requirements will be considered as they arise.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. As I understand, H. R. 374 has not passed the Senate, and that is the reason the gentleman wants to add these five items to the bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It was reported to the Senate on Saturday and the expectation is that it will be passed today. But there will not be time for a conference on the items in disagreement before the recess.

Mr. RICH. What are the chances of cutting down on some of those items when you go to conference? For instance, the Federal Works Agency has an item of $20,000,000 now. Why do you not hold those things up until after the war when you will probably need that sum to keep the manpower in this country busy? And again, take this Federal Housing item of $84,373,000. Why can you not conserve on some of these items here in half a dozen different places?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will refer to the bill before the House, he will note that the item to which he refers is not included. He will find only one item here that is in disagreement. Both the House and the Senate, at the close of today's session, will have agreed to everything in the pending joint resolution with the exception of the next to the last item. So far as cutting that item is concerned, we will not be able to cut down pensions to soldiers. Payment is mandatory under the law.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, all of these items that are included in this resolution are items that are immediately necessary to take care of the obligations of the Government and to take care of the handling of the soldiers' mail that goes overseas from New York and Oakland. I do not see how we can fail to meet our obligations in this respect. The deficiency bill cannot possibly become a law much before the 1st of May, and in view of the fact that the Veterans' Bureau, the Post Office Department, and the Department of Agriculture need this money immediately, I think we have to pass the resolution.

While we are on this subject, and in connection with these items as well as others, I wish to call attention to this fact. Title 31 of the United States Code, relating to money and finance, section 532, provides that the Budget shall submit to the Congress a statement showing:

> First, the number of persons, if any, intended to be employed and the rates of compensation to each, and the amounts contemplated to be expended for each of any other objects or classes of expenditures specified or contemplated in the estimate, including a statement of estimated unit cost of any construction work proposed to be done.

It has come to be the habit of the Budget to submit, in violation of the law, instead of the number of employees, the man-years that are to be used in that department. That lets them creep up on us and have a larger number of employees than they would get if they told us outright the number that were to be provided for in compliance with the law. This is another way of building up appropriations to violate the money and finance section of the United States Code. The Budget Bureau has been doing this for 2 or 3 years. I call attention to it at this time, and I intend to call attention to it later on and show very specifically how they are able to provide for extra employees and to waste the people's money without telling a straightforward story to the committees of the Congress and without telling a story in the Budget that anybody can follow through. I am hopeful that with just this explanation of what they are doing and how they are violating the law we will have relief and have this practice corrected.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, the practice to which the gentleman refers is one which has been adopted by the Bureau of the Budget by general consent. It gives a better picture, a more detailed review than is possible when personnel is substituted for man-hours. No objection has been made to it up to this time either in the subcommittee, in the whole committee, or here on the floor when the bills have been up for consideration. I do not know what has been the practice of the other subcommittees, but in the Subcommittee on Deficiencies invariably we have asked the departments when they came before us to translate man-hours into personnel, into the number of individuals. There has been no single case in which we have had such an estimate before the subcommittee in which the department has not given us both.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I am afraid I did not make myself clear awhile ago when I referred to the Rural Electrification appropriation. Of course, if the Senate puts in the bill the amendment I offered, raising the amount to $150,000,000, and restores that amount to the bill, we will not have to have a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is true.

Mr. RANKIN. But if they do not do that and we need these funds to carry on our rural-electrification program for another year we will have to have a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In such case the committee would be glad to consider any recommendation submitted by the Budget.

Mr. RANKIN. I did not want us to be precluded from introducing a resolution here that would cover the next fiscal year instead of this one.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I think that is generally understood.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The gentleman certainly does not think there is any excuse for an express violation of the terms of the code, to which the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has referred, does he?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As I said before, the Bureau of the Budget has by general consent adopted this system of giving more detailed and more accurate information. Any member of the committee has the right, and I think in all cases with which I am familiar they have exercised the right, to ask for the figures both in personnel and in man-years. The advantage of having the estimates in man-years is so obvious that no member of the committee or of the subcommittee has ever raised a point of order against it. If there is any delinquency here why has not the gentleman made the question either when these bills were under consideration by the committee or when they came to the House and were considered here on the floor?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to consume the full 5 minutes. I merely want to say that in my judgment this practice has been a constant source of confusion to the members of the Committee on Appropriations ever since it was adopted. No satisfactory explanation, as far as I am concerned, was ever given for its adoption. Its wisdom has been questioned again and again in the subcommittee to which I belong. I think it is a thoroughly undesirable practice, and when it is pointed out that it is in express violation of a provision of the United States Code, I fail to see how there can be any possible justification for it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Has the gentleman or any other member of the committee at any time called attention to this during the hearings or on the floor in the consideration of a bill?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes; it has been raised repeatedly in the committee on independent offices appropriations, on which I have served for a great many years. Objection has been raised to the difficulty it has caused and the confusion it has created, and it has been necessary again and again to have the agency spell out the figures given us in

terms of man-years to show what they mean in terms of actual positions.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The department has always done that?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. They have done so when we have requested them to, but it is often a laborious proposition. It always increases very much the difficulty of finding out what the actual picture is, in my judgment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In all the hearings I have attended the department was quite ready to supply such information and has supplied it whenever requested. The plan of submitting the estimates by man-hours is far more accurate. Two or three persons might hold the same position at various times during the year and the only definite way of checking the position would be to show the number of man-hours it represented during the year. If the method was ever objected to in the subcommittee in the independent offices appropriation bill, it was never mentioned in any way when the subcommittee reported to the whole committee or when the bill was reported to the House. This is the first time the question has ever been raised either in the Committee on Appropriations or in the House. If a matter of such importance, why has no mention been made of it when these bills were up for consideration?

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that no man whom I know in this House would be more anxious to quickly compel the correct observance of the law than the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The fact that nobody in committee has ever raised a point of order with respect to this being a violation of the law, which it is, obviously, is no justification for its continuance. If this is the proper way for the Bureau of the Budget to bring forward its statistics and estimates, then the statutes should be so amended as to permit it. If it is not, and if the Budget persists in the practice complained of, then it should not be tolerated and the objection is timely whenever made and should obtain. The language and the intent of the statute should prevail so long as the law is on the books.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the departments have gone much further than the statutes in the interest of a detailed presentation and have presented this additional information although not required by the statute.

The positions have been reduced to man-hours as a help to the committee. To tell the committee how many persons have been employed during the year means nothing. Some may have been employed 2 months and some 2 weeks. Only by giving the number of man-hours can it be made intelligible. And in every bill the departments have given the number of persons in addition to the number of man-hours. There has been no instance in any hearing on any bill in which the department has failed to give the number of persons in addition to the number of hours when requested. The whole objection is ridiculous.

If it was a matter of the slightest consequence, why was it not raised when the independent offices bill was before the committee or the House, when the War Department civil functions bill was before the House, when the Treasury and Post Office bill was before the House, when the first deficiency bill was before the House, when the State, Justice, and Commerce bill was before the House, when the Agricultural bill was before the House. And now at this late day it is brought up when there is nothing before the House to which it applies in any respect. On the face of it, it is a mare's nest.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit House Resolution 204, and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this recognition in order to call up six resolutions appropriating money from the contingent fund of the House for the use of standing committees in connection with investigations.

The House, acting on the recommendation of the Rules Committees, passed five resolutions extending the life of the investigations being carried on by standing committees.

The Ways and Means Committee did not desire any resolution to be passed, feeling satisfied that it had jurisdiction under the regular rules of the House to investigate the subject that it proposed to go into, social security.

Hearings were held by the Accounts Committee, and the chairman and the ranking members of each committee appeared. The amounts allowed, with the exception of the Ways and Means Committee, were not as much as requested.

As the Members know, I have consistently opposed investigating committees, feeling that we should wait until we had a report from the Monroney committee. The House, however, did not agree with me and you have already passed, in 2 months, over 20 resolutions providing for investigations. It is my understanding that others are to follow.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means in obtaining information with respect to the need for the amendment and expansion of the Social Security Act, with particular reference to old-age and survivors insurance and the problems of coverage, benefits, and taxes related thereto, incurred by the committee, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including the employment of such actuaries, consultants, and other experts, and of such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, as it finds necessary, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by the committee, signed by the chairman, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit House Resolution 205, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 290 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 15, House Resolution 188, and House Resolution 383 of the Seventy-seventh Congress and by House Resolution 5? of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and House Resolution 167 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee not to exceed $20,000 in addition to the unexpended balances of sums heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I present House Resolution 206 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 230 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and continued by House Resolution 45 of the Seventy-ninth Congress incurred by the Committee on Labor acting as a whole or by subcommittee not to exceed $15,500 in addition to the unexpended balances of sums heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit House Resolution 207 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized

by House Resolution 281 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and continued by House Resolution 96 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Public Lands, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $7,000 in addition to the unexpended balances of sums heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit House Resolution 208 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 162 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, continued by House Resolution 30 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, and continued by House Resolution 154 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Naval Affairs acting as a whole or by subcommittee not to exceed $46,000, in addition to sums heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] a question with reference to this investigation. I think the money has been well spent and I think the committee is doing a grand job. There is one thing, however, that I think can be improved upon in this legislation when the gentleman from Georgia brings it to the floor of the House. That is the fact that all corporations in this country are compelled to make a trip to one of these great centers to consult with the people they have there to do the investigating on renegotiation. At a time when it is most difficult for the industries of this country to have sufficient manpower to do the work incumbent upon them at the present time, they are called upon to do this extra work and make a trip from my district to New York City. The reason I am making this statement is that when we passed this resolution I supported it, and I am glad I did, because I think the gentleman from Georgia is doing a fine job in getting these renegotiation kickbacks into the Treasury of the United States out of the fabulous profits that have been made by a few war-plant corporations.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman refers to renegotiations?

Mr. RICH. I refer to renegotiations, but I call them kick-backs just the same—kick-backs to the Treasury of the United States. Now, if a corporation earns even 10 or 15 percent during the year, I cannot see any justification for calling to these great centers every corporation and compelling them to go through the rigmarole that they have to go through in order to permit themselves to operate. If you will do that, you will do the country a great good, because the corporations are now drained by excess-profits taxes and by other taxes which they have to pay. You will save a lot of money by cutting down your office space and you will eliminate a lot of people from the offices that you now have located in New York and other cities and you will save the manpower in the corporations. The Treasury will not lose any money and we will be doing a sensible, businesslike thing. Let us do it. Any corporation that swears to the fact that their earnings are not over 15 percent on the value of business done during the year need not be renegotiated. The country will be just as well off and I am in hopes that the chairman of this committee will change that law so that every corporation that does not make over 10-percent profit on the volume of business transacted will not be molested by this committee.

Mr. VINSON. May I suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania that an extension of the renegotiation statute is now being considered by the Committee on Ways and Means. When they commence hearings after the Easter recess it is my intention to appear before the committee and convey to them the thought that is in the gentleman's mind, because it runs along toward the same conclusion I have reached.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STUDY AND INVESTIGATION BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration, House Resolution 209, providing for the expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 62 of the Seventy-ninth Congress incurred by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 304 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, continued by House Resolution 121 of the Seventy-eighth Congress and continued by House Resolution 62 of the Seventy-ninth Congress incurred by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds acting as a whole or by subcommittee not to exceed $7,500 in addition to the unexpended balances of sums heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION TO ASSISTANT TO SUPERINTENDENT OF HOUSE PRESS GALLERY

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration, House Resolution 210, providing for the compensation of the assistants to the Superintendent of the House Press Gallery.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That effective April 1, 1945, the compensation of the assistants to the Superintendent of the House Press Gallery in lieu of the rates specified in the Legislative and Judiciary Appropriations Act, 1945, shall be as follows:

"One at the rate of $3,000 per annum and one at the rate of $2,220 per annum, which amounts shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law."

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution results from a request by the standing committee on the Press Gallery. No money is involved, that is, from the standpoint of increase. They request that one salary be raised a little and the other reduced a little.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE HOUSE FOLDING ROOM

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration, House Joint Resolution 142, authorizing the employment whenever necessary of the services of Government employees for folding speeches and pamphlets.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the act of May 10, 1916, as amended by the act of August 29, 1916, the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized during the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ, whenever necessary, the services of Government employees for folding speeches and pamphlets at the prevailing rates provided by law.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this is similar to a resolution that was passed in the last Congress. It provides simply that page boys and others may work in the folding room to get out speeches, and so forth. There is a shortage of manpower. No additional appropriation is involved.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JACKSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article by Richard L. Neuberger.

Mr. DICKSTEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech by Mr. Francis Biddle, Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein three articles by Dr. Dilworth Lupton, columnist for the Cleveland Press.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after disposition of the regular business on the Speaker's table today and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEDRICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Raleigh Register of Beckley, W. Va.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a memorial.

Mr. LUDLOW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include certain editorials.

Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include two editorials.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on three subjects and to include excerpts in each one.

Mr. KIRWAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address made by himself on Saturday last.

Mr. McKENZIE (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include various editorials from Montana newspapers on the passing of Dean Arthur L. Stone.

Mr. WEISS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Marriner S. Eccles, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and a statement in reference to a bill to control and regulate bank holding companies and so forth.

A LETTER TO SIDNEY HILLMAN

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article from the Bennington (Okla.) Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, Jhonnie Postoak writes again.

On this occasion he writes to Sidney Hillman propositioning him on the forming of a new union, in southeast Oklahoma, of clerks. He anticipates the membership to be about 2,000 at $50 apiece. He wants Sidney Hillman to be manager and he the walking delegate, the two of them to split 50–50 the dues of $6 a year.

The letter to which I refer follows:

JHONNIE POSTOAK WRITES SIDNEY HILLMAN

Mr. SIDNEY HILLMAN,
C. I. O.-P. A. C., Washington, D. C.:

Write you one time—Understand everything be cleared through you.

Me want organize union; just like big factories and war plants. This union be retail clerk and office workers union, southeastern Oklahoma. You president, me business manager, walking delegate. We split all money collected. Me half—you half. Look like get 2,000 members—charge $50 membership fee—that be $100,000—me $50,000 you $50,000; charge $3 monthly dues. That be $6,000—me $3,000, you $3,000.

Have two good men do organizing, Epsom Honubbe and Pluto Boktukola. They know how get results. Let me know you clear this proposition.

JHONNIE POSTOAK.

P. S.—When have election and somebody run for Congress like PAUL STEWART, maybe so assess each member $1 that he one more $1,000 each.

P. S.—Two time. When we get union organize we work up one more.

CONFERENCE REPORTS ON THE BILLS S. 298 AND S. 631

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bills S. 298 and S. 631 may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

TREATMENT OF SERVICEMEN AT VETERANS' FACILITIES

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to report to the House that I have just received a letter and with it a resolution, which was passed by the ninth district of Indiana, Veterans of Foreign Wars. This resolution was forwarded to me by William J. Scott, district adjutant of that fine organization, which reads as follows:

On March 18 the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the ninth district held a meeting at Richmond, Ind., and a lengthy discussion was held regarding the treatment of servicemen at veterans' facilities.

A motion was made, which carried, that the district adjutant write to you and ask that a congressional investigation be conducted at the veterans' facilities at both Dayton, Ohio, and at Indianapolis, Ind.

It is our hope that this investigation may be had, as many instances of mistreatment have been reported to our organization—

He writes.

Mr. Scott is known personally by me. He has the best interest of the veterans at heart, and he is doing a magnificent job for them every day.

PROPOSED MEDAL FOR MOTHERS AND WIDOWS OF SERVICE PERSONNEL KILLED IN ACTION

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of this House to the joint resolution which I am today introducing to authorize the presentation of medals to the widows, children, or mothers of the persons who lose their lives in the military or naval service of our country during World War No. 2.

Under the provisions of this joint resolution, which is being sponsored in the Senate by the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are authorized to direct the United States mint to prepare a medal of such design as the Secretaries may agree upon, subject to the President's approval, to be presented to the widow of each person who shall have lost his life while serving on active duty in the military or naval forces of the country during the period beginning on December 7, 1941, and ending on the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President. If there is no surviving widow, the medal will be presented to the eldest child, or if there is no surviving widow or child, to the mother of the deceased.

Naturally Senator O'MAHONEY and I hope this resolution may have the favorable action of the Congress. We offer it with no selfish, sectional, or political end in view. Our purpose in seeking the adoption of this resolution is to honor our brave men and women who have sacrificed their lives that our Nation may live and to contribute some measure of

comfort to the families they have left behind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances: In one to include a tribute to the late Honorable Harry Barbour; in one to include a tribute to the late Judge Heidinger, and in one to include an editorial appearing in the New York Tribune.

Mr. GAMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include an editorial in each.

Mr. REES of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a reprint from an article appearing in the Wall Street Journal on the war work in Wichita, Kans.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include House Concurrent Resolution No. 18 passed by the General Assembly of Iowa.

Mr. TOWE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

UNITED STATES AND SPAIN AGREE ON DEVELOPING AIRPORT

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the Members of the House to an article that was published in the Washington Evening Star under date of March 19:

MADRID, March 19.—Spain and the United States have completed an agreement for development of a new airfield opposite the Madrid Airport to enable large planes to handle air-borne American supplies for Allied armies of occupation and for the people of liberated countries, it was announced yesterday.

Under the terms of the agreement the field eventually will be converted into civilian use for American and other post-war transport planes, augmenting the facilities of the Barajas Field at Madrid.

Another agreement expected to be announced soon is on a plan to establish huge stock piles in northern Spain from which the U. N. R. R. A. and other United Nations organizations can draw supplies for liberated nations and armies of occupation.

MOBILIZATION OF CIVILIAN MANPOWER

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this minute merely to announce to the Members of the House that I shall insert at this point in the RECORD a brief statement relating to the conference report on the work-or-jail bill. Since I was the lone House conferee opposed to it, I think perhaps those in disagreement will want to read the statement before voting on the conference report tomorrow. I invite your attention to it.

Mr. Speaker, H. R. 1752 is now a new bill. It was rewritten three or four times in conference and is different in several particulars from the original bills passed by the House and Senate.

Because of several new and rather complicated provisions and the far-reaching effect of the act itself, we really should have more than 1 hour's time in which to debate the conference report.

No good American can disagree with the alleged purpose of the act. We all want the most effective utilization of manpower of the Nation in support of the war effort. We also believe that every man, woman, and child not in uniform, as well as our armed forces, owes an obligation of service to the Nation.

We agree that we need closer coordination of war procurement and manpower and, although we already have had surveys of manpower utilization, these surveys have not been as thorough and reliable as they should be.

However, there are dangerous provisions in this act which, if carried out, will defeat the very purpose of the act itself, create greater confusion, increase the cost of Government, reduce production, and destroy the individual liberties of our people.

This bill confers upon the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion the war powers of the President. It makes him czar over industry, labor, and agriculture. It gives him absolute control over the lives and economic destiny of many of our citizens.

Under section 5 of the act the Director is granted sole authority to prescribe employment ceilings in areas and plants that he might designate and the power to fix the maximum number of workers by age, sex, or occupational qualifications who may be there employed, and to prohibit employment of workers beyond such maximum number. The Director can designate Philadelphia as one area and ignore St. Louis, or he can fix ceilings on employment in Buffalo plants and take the lid off of San Francisco factories; or he could apply ceilings in a plant on the north side of the street in Los Angeles and not apply them to the factories on the south side of the street.

I am not saying the Director would, but I am saying that he could reduce the number of workers in a shipyard or a plant from 25,000 to 15,000 and destroy that particular business. He is in a position whereby he could reward his friends and punish his enemies. This is an unconstitutional delegation of autocratic power and if Congress passes this act we might as well abdicate and go home. The Director, in short, designates the area, names the places of employment, and says just how many women or men or children can work in a certain plant or factory and determines their type of employment.

Again under section 5 the Director regulates the hiring and rehiring, the solicitation or recruitment of new workers by employers and the acceptance of employment by workers. In other words the Director can tell the employer whom and how many he can hire and can tell the workers whether or not they can accept employment. Does any sane person believe this will increase production? Nonsense!

Furthermore, the Director can freeze all individuals employed in designated areas and plants or on farms which he and he alone deems essential to the war effort. The workers in the factories and on the farms, in the mines, and other activities which the Director deems are essential cannot voluntarily leave their jobs without first getting permission from the Director. This is tyranny and slavery brought up to date.

Anyone, employer or employee, who willfully violates the provision of any regulations made under subsection A of section 5 shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by imprisonment by not more than 12 months or by a fine not to exceed $10,000, or both. Furthermore, no wage paid in violation of any regulation shall be deducted from income or as an expense for the purpose of computing the tax payable under any act of Congress or for the purpose of determining the amount to be paid to or recovered from any person with respect to the performance of any contract with the United States. Teeth and hooks in that.

Personally, I have high admiration for the ability and great respect for the character of James F. Byrnes, the present Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, but the powers delegated by Congress in this act to the Director are greater than any good man should want and more than any bad man should have. It is not certain that Mr. Byrnes will forever be Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. Sometimes good men die and at other times able men, like Jesse Jones, are removed, through no fault of their own, from high office. Congress made a mistake by voting so much power to the former Secretary of Commerce simply because Congress liked him and had great confidence in him, but Congress was forced to back-track and retrieve some of the enormous powers which had been given to the Secretary of Commerce, after Mr. Jones was booted out of office.

It must also be kept in mind that Mr. Byrnes cannot administer this act alone, and the act gives him the power to delegate the authority we granted him to any agency he might establish. And Mr. Byrnes, with all his ability and integrity, is human and not at all infallible. His curfew order has not met with the greatest success and this act imposes upon him or any agency designated by him almost impossible burdens.

The administrative provisions in this measure are costly and cumbersome.

We already have more machinery than we have power to run it. Ironically, the purpose of this bill is to conserve and utilize manpower, but it will actually require additional manpower to impose Government controls upon our civilian population, or parts of it. The Director shall by regulation provide for and establish administrative tribunals of appeal. No limit set as to the number and cost. More kangaroo courts, more Government policemen, more political parasites to further bleed the taxpayer, if any blood is left.

The worst part of House Resolution 1752 is that it puts the squeeze on the trustworthy, industrious, and patriotic Americans—men, women, and children of all ages who are now working in war plants, in mines, and on farms—producing the weapons, food, fiber, and raw materials necessary to win the war. On the other hand, it fails utterly to reach the loafers and ne'er-do-wells who are not now working and who refuse to contribute anything to the war effort. In short, our worthy people are placed in a strait jacket while the unworthy are allowed to remain free from governmental control and to come and go and do as they please. Never was there ranker discrimination or more brazen injustice proposed.

Another relatively small but very unfair provision is that the good, patriotic people who, for instance, have left Missouri and are now working in war plants in California, Minnesota, or Michigan paid their own travel expenses. Under the provisions of this bill people who hereafter leave Missouri at the request of the Director of War Mobilization will get a free round trip ticket—all expenses paid by Uncle Sam. Of course this will make those already employed feel good and will no doubt add to the morale of everyone involved. Perhaps there is comfort in the possibility of winning elections by shifting the population about the country.

Mr. Speaker, a national-service act which would draft all the resources of the Nation—wealth, industry, war profits, labor, as well as men for the armed services—would have passed Congress the day war was declared and by almost a unanimous vote. The bill before us, however, is not a national-service act—it applies to only portions of our people and certain sections of our country—it is discriminatory and treats some people differently from others. It is not universal service and the burdens of war are not shared by all. It is over 3 years late.

At this stage of the war and on the eve of victory in Europe we certainly should not adopt slave labor which we are doing our best to destroy in Germany and Japan.

This legislation, I fear, is not to win the war but to set up post-war controls and to further increase and centralize Federal authority in our Washington bureaucracy. It is to put the collar around the necks and shackles on the limbs of our citizens. A free people will never submit to such unconstitutional, involuntary servitude, and if the legislation is passed it will produce disunity at home and seriously interfere with the war effort both here and abroad.

From every angle this conference report should be rejected. We have not yet reached the point—not quite—where we want a regimented society under a totalitarian dictatorship.

THE FOOD SHORTAGE

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been alarmed over the food shortage. May I read to you a part of a letter I received from one of the greatest corn-and-hog counties in the United States? Our farms are denuded of manpower:

> My wife has been appointed assessor for the east side of the county by the county auditor. She has filled out 100 forms for the farmers up to date. She told me there had only been 12 brood sows turned in for taxation. She also told me there had been no feeder hogs turned in.

Surely Jefferson was right when he said in effect that when our agricultural situation is managed from Washington, we shall soon want for meat.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last I was requested by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to attempt to pair them in favor of the agricultural appropriation bill. I was unable to do so because of existing circumstances and consequently I make this statement for the RECORD.

MEAT SHORTAGES

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on March 23 I suggested that Chester Bowles, Administrator of O. P. A., should resign.

My conception of O. P. A. is that it should not only prevent inflation but should also assist in providing ample food for the country. There are many essential items of food which either are not available or can only be found at greatly inflated black-market prices—ask any housewife who buys the food for her family. It has brought about a scarcity in meats. Pork, which can be produced nearly as quickly as chickens, declined more than nearly 25 percent this past year. Silly regulations and changing the rules in the middle of the feed lot has prevented the feeding and preparation for slaughtering of the millions of cattle that are now roaming our vast ranges in the greatest numbers ever known.

If Mr. Bowles, the Administrator, had followed the advice of the producers and processors of meat, we would not now be having such a shortage. If he had done nearly as good a job in production as in selling O. P. A., meat would now be plentiful; yes, might even be in the gutters.

The hearings now proceeding in both branches of Congress will put the blame where it belongs. The O. P. A. cannot escape its responsibility. We need a practical individual at the head of O. P. A. and not an advertising man. It is time for a change.

POST-WAR ALLIED GOVERNMENT PROCEDURE IN GERMANY

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, as we reckon time, the shooting in Europe in World War No. 2 will come to a close in a relatively short space of days.

When this hour comes the Allied Nations must be prepared to put into effect, in letter and in spirit, a set-up of government procedure that will focus on lasting peace. In setting up this procedure we must embody certain fundamentals and see to it that they are carried out in detail. The three outstanding fundamentals that must be put into practice and followed through are:

First. The Allied supervisory military force that will be set up to look after affairs in Germany must see to it that the peoples of Germany will have a free hand to build Christian churches and to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience for the next 60 years.

Second. The Allied supervisory military force must see to it that the children of Germany for the next 60 years shall have access to free public schools and that the supervisory force shall determine the subject matter of the textbooks taught in these schools and select or O. K. the teachers.

Third. The same Allied supervisory military force must have a key to every door in Germany for the next 60 years to be sure that all individuals or groups are carrying out the fundamentals in the peace and security program.

Of course, the German people will be allowed to perform their domestic activities, farming of all kinds, manufacturing of farm implements, household implements, and other commodities. But this Allied supervisory military force must see to it that they manufacture no guns, no munitions, no airplanes, no warships or war vessels of any kind, and so forth.

Yes, Mr. Speaker; if we do not see to it that the children of Germany are trained along the lines indicated as above in 1, 2, and 3 for at least three generations, or 60 years, it will be found that the grandchildren of the boys who are fighting in the global war today will be fighting a more bitter war in 60 years from now.

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY CONFERENCE AT SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include certain resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GILLIE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a very able speech delivered by Max Van Horne, adjutant, Department of Iowa, Veterans of Foreign Wars, over radio station WHO, on March 11, 1945, entitled "Speak Up for Americanism."

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD regarding an intolerable situation at Germfask, Mich., and include a letter and a statement from the department commander of the American Legion and a resolution that was adopted by the American Legion of the State of Michigan.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a recent program.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a letter to him from the Indiana Coal Merchants' Association, together with a statement of facts regarding restrictions on solid fuels, and in the other to include an article from yesterday's Washington Star by Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, entitled "The Seven Points That Dumbarton Oaks Forgot."

Mr. PLOESER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief statement by one of America's foremost chemists.

NEED FOR ARBITRATION PROCEDURES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that arbitration is the way we ought to settle differences. In Memphis, Tenn., 6,000 plant workers went out of a tire plant because one of the guards happened to bump into or hurt a woman. These 6,000 workers quit despite the fact that we need tires very badly in this country. Why should 6,000 go out of essential plants for such a flimsy reason? Continental Motors in Detroit had to suspend work because 7,000 workers went out on strike due to the fact that 2 men were discharged for sleeping on the job in the plant. Arbitration is the procedure; not strikes. It seems to me that if matters of this kind were arbitrated, we would have no strikes and suspension of war plants. When we need so badly the things these companies are producing, it seems to me that arbitration should be resorted to in order to settle these difficulties. Labor unions gave their word to the country that we would have no strikes. Both of the above plants that are mentioned are affiliated with the C. I. O. Suppose our Army should strike. Where would we be going to? The Army needs the material from both of these plants.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Capt. Lowell M. Limpus under the heading "Patton Rings the Bell Again Amidst Gasps of Admiration."

SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. MAY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: "That this act may be cited as the 'War Manpower Act of 1945.'

"OBLIGATION OF SERVICE TO NATION

"SEC. 2. (a) In order to adequately support the Army and maintain the Navy during the present war, and to carry into effect the provisions of the declarations of war pledging all of the resources of the Nation to bring the conflict to a successful termination, every individual not in the armed forces shall have an obligation, when called upon, to serve the Nation in an activity essential to the war effort.

"(b) The purposes of this act are to provide the most practicable and effective means to accomplish the fulfillment of such obligation and to provide for making the most effective use of the manpower resources of the Nation by the following means, among others: (1) By providing for the accurate determination of manpower requirements and supply, and of the relative urgency of the needs of employers for workers; (2) by reducing wasteful labor turn-over and unnecessary labor migration; (3) by channeling available manpower to employments in which workers will contribute most to the war effort; (4) by making available, for work in essential activities, workers presently employed in activities of relative unimportance to the war effort; and (5) by promoting the maximum utilization by employers of their available work force.

"COORDINATION OF WAR PROCUREMENT AND MANPOWER

"SEC. 3. The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion (hereinafter called the "Director") shall, subject to the direction of the President, provide for coordinating the activities of all departments and agencies of the Government responsible for production, procurement, or manpower in such manner as to carry out most effectively the purposes declared in section 2 of this act. The Director shall provide, among other things, that manpower requirements and the availability of manpower shall be given due consideration in determining where production schedules shall be increased or decreased and where contracts shall be awarded, terminated, or permitted to expire, and that notice shall be given to the appropriate agency of the Government responsible for manpower at the earliest practicable time of all changes or anticipated changes in war-production schedules, all awards or anticipated awards of war contracts, and all terminations or anticipated terminations of war contracts, which are likely to result in any substantial increase or decrease of the manpower requirements of any employer or any area. All departments and agencies of the Government shall comply with orders and regulations issued by the Director under authority of this section.

"SURVEYS OF MANPOWER UTILIZATION

"SEC. 4. (a) The Director shall make or cause to be made in-plant surveys and other investigations of the use of manpower by the Department of War and the Department of the Navy, to determine the extent to which such Departments are making the most effective use, in activities relating to production, procurement, or repairs, of individuals in their employ or subject to their jurisdiction as members of the armed forces, and shall take or cause to be taken, appropriate measures to eliminate labor wastage and labor hoarding, and otherwise to promote the full utilization by such Departments of individuals in their employ or subject to their jurisdiction as members of the armed forces, and otherwise to carry out the purposes of this act.

"(b) The Director shall also provide in other cases for such in-plant surveys and other investigations of activities and places of employment, as may be necessary to determine the extent to which such activities or places of employment are making the most effective use of individuals in their employ, to the end that appropriate measures may be taken to eliminate labor wastage and labor hoarding, to promote full utilization for purposes essential to the war effort, by employers of their available work force, and otherwise to promote the purposes of this act.

"EMPLOYMENT CEILINGS, HIRING REGULATIONS, AND PROHIBITIONS ON LEAVING ESSENTIAL EMPLOYMENT

"SEC. 5. (a) To the extent deemed by the Director to be necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes and means declared in section 2 of this act and also for the purpose of keeping activities and places of employment essential to the war effort in productive operation, the Director is authorized, by regulation—

"(1) to prescribe employment ceilings in designated areas, activities, or places of employment, fixing the maximum number of workers, by age, sex, or occupational qualifications, who may be there employed, and

prohibiting the employment of workers beyond such maximum number;

"(2) to prohibit or regulate the hiring, rehiring, solicitation, or recruitment of new workers by employers and the acceptance of employment by workers; and

"(3) to prohibit the individuals employed in designated areas, activities, plants, facilities, and farms, which the Director deems are essential to the war effort, from voluntarily discontinuing such employment unless, in the case of any individual so employed, the Director determines that it is no longer necessary in the interest of the war effort for him to remain in such employment or that he has a justifiable reason for leaving such employment.

"(b) Whoever willfully violates the provisions of any regulation made under subsection (a) shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than twelve months or by a fine not to exceed $10,000, or both.

"(c) No wage or other compensation paid for services rendered in any employment commenced or continued in violation of any regulation made under subsection (a) shall be allowed or allowable as a deduction from income, or as a cost or expense, for the purpose of computing the tax payable under any Act of Congress or for the purpose of determining the amount to be paid to or recovered from any person with respect to the performance of any contract with the United States. The provisions of this subsection shall not be applicable with respect to any case of a violation of a regulation by any person unless such regulation has been published in the Federal Register, has been published in a newspaper of general circulation in the community for three consecutive days, or has been served upon such person by personal service or by registered mail. The Director shall transmit to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and other agencies of the Government responsible for the administration of any functions under this subsection copies of such regulations, and such additional information, as the Director deems will be useful to the Commissioner and such other agencies in administering their functions under this subsection.

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

"SEC. 6. To the maximum degree consistent with this Act and with its purposes, local initiative, and cooperative efforts of management, labor, and agriculture shall be encouraged and utilized and use shall be made of existing hiring channels such as private employers, labor organizations, professional organizations, schools, colleges, technical institutions, and Government agencies. The management-labor committees and management-labor-agriculture committees (national, regional, State, and local) heretofore and hereafter established in connection with Government programs for the control or utilization of manpower shall be consulted on basic policy decisions made at their respective administrative levels in the course of the administration of this Act.

"TRAVEL EXPENSES

"SEC. 7. In the case of any individual who, in response to the request of the Director, agrees to accept employment outside the locality where he is then residing, the Director, in accordance with such regulations as he may prescribe, may furnish transportation to the location of such employment, and, if such individual complies thereafter with the requests and requirements of the Director with respect to his accepting and continuing in any employment or employments in the same locality until the Director determines that he is no longer needed in such locality for work essential to the war effort or that there is other justifiable reason for his not continuing in such work in such locality, shall furnish transportation back to the locality from which transportation was originally furnished for such individual under this section, or to any other locality selected by the individual which is not farther distant. The cost of such transportation shall not exceed the amounts allowable for individual civilian employees in the executive branch of the Government and shall not include any per diem allowance. The Director shall exercise the authority conferred by this section only to the extent that he deems the exercise thereof necessary to aid in relieving manpower shortages which substantially impede the war effort.

"REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

"SEC. 8. (a) The Director shall provide for the issuance of a certificate to any person with respect to whom he finds that such person (1) has left or has been released from a position (other than a temporary position) pursuant to a request or requirement made by the Director and (2) has complied thereafter with the requests and requirements made by the Director with respect to his accepting and continuing in any employment or employments until section 5 of this Act ceases to be in effect or the Director determines that such person is no longer needed in work essential to the war effort or that there is other justifiable reason for the Director not to request or require such person to continue any longer in such work, whichever first occurs. Any person to whom such a certificate is issued under this subsection shall be entitled to the benefits of section 8 (b) (except the last paragraph thereof and except that in lieu of the ninety-day period therein specified, the time within which application for reemployment in his former position must be made shall be thirty days), 8 (c), and 8 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to the same extent as if he had left such position in order to be and had been inducted into the land or naval forces for training and service, had been relieved therefrom on the day on which such certificate is issued to him, and had been given the certificate referred to in section 8 (a) of such act.

"(b) Section 8 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'If such person, within ninety days after having been relieved from such training and service or from such hospitalization, has become employed in an employment accepted by him pursuant to a request or requirement made by the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, any period (before section 5 of the War Manpower Act of 1945 ceases to be in effect) while he is employed in an employment so accepted by him (and any period, not exceeding fifteen days, between leaving one such employment and entering upon another such employment) shall be disregarded in computing the ninety-day period within which application for reemployment in his former position must be made and shall be counted as training and service in the land or naval forces for the purposes of subsection (c).'

"PERMISSION TO PAY OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE TO INDIVIDUALS NOTWITHSTANDING THEIR EMPLOYMENT DURING PRESENT WAR

"SEC. 9. Notwithstanding the provisions of title I of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating to grants to States for old-age assistance), and of appropriations for payments thereunder, in any case in which any State pays old-age assistance to any individual at a rate not in excess of the rate of old-age assistance paid to such individual during the month of February 1945, any failure to take into consideration any income and resources of such individual arising from labor performed by him as an employee after the date of enactment of this Act and prior to the seventh calendar month occurring after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President, shall not be a basis of excluding payments made to such individual in computing payments made to States under section 3 of such title, of refusing to approve a State plan under section 2 of such title, or of withholding certification pursuant to section 4 of such title.

"APPEALS

"SEC. 10. The Director shall by regulation provide an opportunity for a hearing before an impartial administrative tribunal to any person who claims that any action taken with respect to him under this Act or any regulation thereunder is unreasonable as applied to him or is inconsistent with this Act or such regulation. Subject to such further administrative review as may be provided in regulations under this section, the determinuation made after such hearing shall be final. To the extent practicable and appropriate, such regulations shall provide for such hearings to be accorded in local areas and for such hearing tribunals to be so constituted as to permit the ascertainment of the views of persons selected as representatives of management, labor, and agricultural interests in the locality. The Director shall by regulation provide for and establish such administrative tribunals as may be necessary for the purposes of this section.

"MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATIVE AND ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

"SEC. 11. Paragraphs (3), (4), (6), (7), and (8) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 673), as amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, shall be applicable with respect to this Act to the same extent as such paragraphs are applicable with respect to such subsection (a), except that, for the purposes of this Act, the word "President", wherever it occurs in such paragraphs, shall be deemed to refer to the Director.

"ESSENTIAL AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES

"SEC. 12. Section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'In carrying out the provisions of this subsection (except the proviso of the foregoing paragraph) the selective-service local board in classifying the registrant shall base its findings solely and exclusively on whether the registrant is necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort and whether a satisfactory replacement can be obtained, without reference to the relative essentiality of the registrant to an agricultural occupation or endeavor as compared with any other occupation, service, or endeavor; and the foregoing provision of this sentence shall apply upon any appeal or review of a decision made thereunder by a selective-service local board. Such deferment shall be made by said board without consideration of any other circumstance or condition whatsoever; and during the period of such deferment for such purpose, no other classification, of said registrant, shall be made by said board.'

"SAVING PROVISION RELATING TO SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

"SEC. 13. Nothing in this Act (except section 12) shall affect the powers under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940,

as amended, with respect to the classification and selection of persons for, or the induction or deferment from induction, of persons into, the land or naval forces; or preclude the Selective Service System from classifying and selecting for induction any registrant who violates any regulation made under section 5, or preclude the land or naval forces from inducting such a registrant.

"REPORTS

"SEC. 14. The Director shall submit reports to the President, the Senate, and the House of Representatives on the 1st days of January, April, July, and October, on the activities undertaken or contemplated by him under this Act. Such reports shall summarize and appraise manpower mobilization activities and problems.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 15. (a) As used in this Act, the terms 'employment', 'work', 'hire', 'rehire', 'employ', or words of similar import shall include any contract, arrangement, undertaking, or relationship whereby or under which an individual undertakes to perform a service or services for another, irrespective of the resulting legal relationship between the parties.

"(b) The provisions of this Act shall not be applicable with respect to the employment of persons by any State or any political subdivision thereof, without its consent.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 16. If any provision of this Act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of such provision to persons or circumstances, other than those as to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

"TERMINATION DATE

"SEC. 17. The provisions of sections 4 and 5 of this Act, and all regulations thereunder, shall cease to be effective upon the termination of hostilities in the present war, as declared by the President or by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, or upon June 30, 1946, whichever is the earlier."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amend the title to read as follows: "An Act to provide for the most effective utilization of the manpower resources of the Nation in support of the war effort, and for other purposes."

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
W. G. ANDREWS,
Managers on the part of the House.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
HAROLD H. BURTON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1752) to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

HOUSE BILL

The House bill carried into effect the obligation of service to the Nation in time of war by amending the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 so as to provide—

First: For "freezing" persons registered under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, between the ages of 18 and 45, and employed in essential jobs, in those jobs; and

Second: For selecting, through the Selective-Service System, of registrants between the ages of 18 and 45 not employed in essential jobs, and ordering the registrants so selected to enter upon essential jobs. This provision was to become effective only after the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion found that manpower shortages could not be met by voluntary methods. Failure to obey the order was punishable by the penalties provided for failure to obey an order to report for induction.

Other provisions of the House bill are discussed in connection with the explanation of the conference agreement.

SENATE AMENDMENT

The Senate amendment vested in the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission the power to prescribe regulations putting into effect employment ceilings, and regulations to prohibit or regulate the hiring, solicitation, and recruitment of workers by employers. The regulations authorized under the Senate amendment were applicable only to employers, and no authority was granted to impose any requirements upon employees. The Senate amendment also provided for in-plant surveys by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to determine the extent to which manpower was being utilized in the interest of the war effort. In addition, the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion was required to investigate the use of manpower by the War and Navy Departments in connection with activities relative to production, procurement, and repairs, and to require such Departments to eliminate wastage and hoarding of labor.

Other provisions of the Senate amendment are discussed in connection with the explanation of the conference agreement.

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

Short title

Section 1 of the conference agreement provides that the act may be cited as the "War Manpower Act of 1945."

OBLIGATION OF SERVICE

Section 2 (a) provides that in order to adequately support the Army and maintain the Navy during the present war and to make effective the provisions of the declarations of war pledging all of the resources of the Nation to bring the conflict to a successful termination, every individual shall have an obligation, when called upon, to render service in an activity essential to the war effort.

PURPOSES

Section 2 (b), in stating the purposes of the act, is substantially the same as section 1 (b) of the Senate amendment. It is these purposes which serve as legislative standards for the promulgation of regulations under section 5 relating to employment ceilings, hiring by employers and acceptance of employment by workers, and the imposition of a "freeze".

ADMINISTRATION

The conference agreement vests all of the authority and discretion granted in the act in the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion. Under a provision incorporating and making applicable section 2 (a) (8) of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended by title III of the Second War Powers Act, the Director is permitted to delegate any such authority or discretion to such agency or agencies of the Government as he may prescribe. As was provided in section 2 (c) of the Senate amendment, local initiative and cooperative efforts of management, labor, and agriculture are directed to be encouraged, and use is to be made of existing hiring channels (sec. 6). Also it is provided (sec. 6) that the various management-labor committees and management-labor-agriculture committees heretofore or hereafter established in connection with manpower programs are to be consulted on basic policy decisions made at their respective administrative levels.

COORDINATION OF MANPOWER AND PROCUREMENT

Section 3 of the conference agreement provides that the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall provide for coordinating the activities of all Government agencies responsible for production, procurement, or manpower. The Director is to provide, among other things, that manpower requirements and the availability of manpower shall be given due consideration in determining production schedules and where contracts shall be awarded and terminated, and that notice be given to the appropriate agencies of the Government responsible for manpower of anticipated changes in production schedules, and of terminations and anticipated terminations of contracts. The various Government agencies are required to comply with the directions of the Director under this section. This section is similar to section 3 (a) of the Senate amendment.

SURVEYS OF MANPOWER UTILIZATION

Section 4 of the conference agreement provides that the Director shall make surveys of the use of manpower by the War and Navy Departments to determine the extent to which such departments are making the most effective use, in activities relating to production, procurement, or repairs, of individuals in their employ or subject to their jurisdiction as members of the armed forces, and to take appropriate measures to eliminate labor wastage and labor hoarding by such departments. The Director is also to provide for in-plant surveys and investigations, in other cases, of activities and places of employment, to determine the extent to which the most effective use is being made of manpower. These surveys are similar to those required under sections 3 (b) and 4 (a) of the Senate amendment.

EMPLOYMENT CEILINGS, REGULATIONS RELATING TO HIRING AND ACCEPTANCE OF EMPLOYMENT, AND PROHIBITIONS ON LEAVING ESSENTIAL EMPLOYMENT

Section 5 of the conference agreement brings together in one section all of the provisions which carry criminal penalties for their violation. Section 5 (a) (1) authorizes the Director, to the extent deemed necessary and appropriate by him in order to carry out the purposes of the act, to prescribe regulations imposing employment ceilings in designated areas, activities, or places of employment fixing the maximum number of workers, by age, sex, or occupational qualification, who may be there employed. This authority is similar to that contained in section 4 (b) of the Senate amendment.

Section 5 (a) (2) of the conference agreement authorizes the Director, to the extent deemed necessary and appropriate by him in order to carry out the purposes of the act, to prescribe regulations to prohibit or to regulate the hiring, rehiring, solicitation, or recruitment of new workers by employers, and to prohibit or to regulate the acceptance of employment by workers. Although the Senate amendment (sec. 4 (b)) authorized hiring regulations directed to employers, there was no authority contained in the Senate amendment to prescribe regulations imposing requirements on workers, violations of which would be subject to penalties. The conference agreement by authorizing such regulations differs from the Senate amendment in this respect.

Section 5 (a) (3) of the conference agreement authorizes the Director, to the extent deemed necessary and appropriate by him in order to carry out the purposes of the act, to prescribe regulations putting into effect a "freeze" in designated areas, activities, plants, facilities, or farms essential to the war effort—that is, prohibiting the individuals there employed (irrespective of age or sex) from voluntarily discontinuing such employment unless the Director has determined that remaining in such employment is no longer necessary in the interest of the war effort or that there is justifiable reason for leaving such employment. There was no provision of the Senate amendment authorizing a "freeze", while the "freeze" provisions of the House bill applied only to selective-service registrants between the ages of 18 and 45.

Whoever violates any regulations of the Director under section 5 is guilty of a misdemeanor and subject to imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or to a fine of not more than $10,000 or both. By making such violations constitute a misdemeanor, expedition in prosecution is made possible, inasmuch as the prosecution need not be by indictment of a grand jury, but may be by information. At the same time, the penalty is sufficiently severe to be effective.

Section 5 (c) provides that compensation paid with respect to employment commenced or continued in violation of any regulation of the Director shall not be allowed as a deduction from income for the purpose of computing any Federal tax, or as a cost or expense for the purpose of determining the amount to be paid to or recovered from any person with respect to the performance of any contract with the United States. A similar provision was contained in section 8 of the Senate amendment.

TRAVEL EXPENSES

Section 7 of the conference agreement authorizes the Director, to the extent he deems necessary in order to aid in relieving manpower shortages which substantially impede the war effort, to furnish transportation to persons agreeing to accept employment outside of the locality where they are residing, in response to a request of the Director. Persons furnished such transportation are also to be furnished return transportation when they are no longer needed in the new locality in work essential to the war effort. The cost of the transportation is not to exceed the amounts allowable for civilian employees in the executive branch of the Government, and no per diem is to be paid. There were provisions relating to travel expenses both in the House bill and Senate amendment.

REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

Section 8 of the conference agreement gives to any person released from a position (other than a temporary position) pursuant to a request or requirement of the Director, who thereafter complies with requests and requirements of the Director with respect to accepting and continuing employment until the termination date of the act or until the Director determines that such person is no longer needed in work essential to the war effort or that there is a justifiable reason for the Director not to request or require that such person continue any longer in such work, substantially the same reemployment rights as are accorded veterans under section 8 (b), (c), and (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. A corresponding provision was contained in both the House bill and the Senate amendment.

PERMISSION TO CONTINUE OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE TO PERSONS WHO TAKE EMPLOYMENT DURING PRESENT WAR

Section 9 of the conference agreement contains the provisions of section 12 of the Senate amendment, under which it was provided that the several States may disregard income arising from labor performed by an individual after the date of the enactment of the act and prior to the seventh calendar month after the termination of hostilities, in considering the eligibility of such individual for continued old-age assistance with respect to which grants are made pursuant to title I of the Social Security Act.

APPEALS

Section 10 of the conference agreement contains provisions similar to those of section 5 of the Senate amendment, providing for granting a hearing before an impartial administrative tribunal (established by regulations of the Director) to persons aggrieved by any action taken with respect to him under the act.

MISCELLANEOUS ADMINISTRATIVE AND ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

Section 11 of the conference agreement incorporates by reference certain administrative and enforcement provisions of the act of June 28, 1940, as amended by the Second War Powers Act, 1942. As so incorporated, such provisions will read as follows:

"(3) The Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion shall be entitled to obtain such information from, require such reports and the keeping of such records by, make such inspection of the books, records, and other writings, premises, or property of, any person (which, for the purpose of the War Manpower Act of 1945, shall include any individual, partnership, associations, business trust, corporation, or any organized group of persons, whether incorporated or not), and make such investigations, as may be necessary or appropriate, in his discretion, to the enforcement or administration of the provisions of the War Manpower Act of 1945.

"(4) For the purpose of obtaining any information, verifying any report required, or making any investigation pursuant to paragraph (3), the Director may administer oaths and affirmations, and may require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any books or records or any other documentary or physical evidence which may be relevant to the inquiry. Such attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of such books, records, or other documentary or physical evidence may be required at any designated place from any State, Territory, or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States: *Provided*, That the production of a person's books, records, or other documentary evidence shall not be required at any place other than the place where such person resides or transacts business, if, prior to the return date specified in the subpena issued with respect thereto, such person furnishes the Director with a true copy of such books, records, or other documentary evidence (certified by such person under oath to be a true and correct copy) or enters into a stipulation with the Director as to the information contained in such books, records, or other documentary evidence. Witnesses shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States. No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing any books, records, or other documentary evidence or certified copies thereof or physical evidence in obedience to any such subpena, or in any action or proceeding which may be instituted under the War Manpower Act of 1945, on the ground that the testimony or evidence, documentary or otherwise, required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be subject to prosecution and punishment or to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled to testify or produce evidence, documentary or otherwise, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, except that any such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying. The Director shall not publish or disclose any information obtained under this paragraph which the Director deems confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information, unless the Director determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the interest of the national defense and security; and anyone violating this provision shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not exceeding $1,000 or be imprisoned not exceeding 2 years, or both.

"(6) The district courts of the United States and the United States courts of any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and the courts of the Philippine Islands shall have jurisdiction of violations of the War Manpower Act of 1945 or any rule, regulation, or order or subpena thereunder, whether heretofore or hereafter issued, and of all civil actions under the War Manpower Act of 1945 to enforce any liability or duty created by, or to enjoin any violation of the War Manpower Act of 1945 or any rule, regulation, order, or subpena thereunder whether heretofore or hereafter issued. Any criminal proceeding on account of any such violation may be brought in any district in which any act, failure to act, or transaction constituting the violation occurred. Any such civil action may be brought in any such district or in the district in which the defendant resides or transacts business. Process in such cases, criminal or civil, may be served in any district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or wherever the defendant may be found; and subpena for witnesses who are required to attend a court in any district in any such case may run into any other district. No costs shall be assessed against the United States in any proceeding under the War Manpower Act of 1945.

"(7) No person shall be held liable for damages or penalties for any default under any contract or order which shall result directly or indirectly from compliance with the War Manpower Act of 1945 or any rule, regulation, or order issued thereunder, notwithstanding that any such rule, regulation, or order shall thereafter be declared by judicial or other competent authority to be invalid.

"(8) The Director may exercise any power, authority, or discretion conferred on him by the War Manpower Act of 1945, through such department, agency, or officer of the Government as he may direct and in conformity with any rules or regulations which he may prescribe."

ESSENTIAL AGRICULTURAL ACTIVITIES

Section 12 of the conference agreement contains the provisions of section 11 of the Senate amendment relating to the manner in which section 5 (k) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (the so-called Tydings amendment) shall be applied. This provision in conjunction with the authority of the Director to invoke a "freeze" (violations of which, as pointed out in the explanation of section 5 of the conference agreement, are subject to criminal penalties) will keep workers on the farms unless satisfactorily replaced and thus prevent declines in farm production.

SAVING PROVISION RELATING TO SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

Section 13 of the conference agreement provides that nothing in the act (except sec.

12) is to affect powers under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, or preclude the Selective-Service System from classifying and selecting for induction any registrant who violates a requirement under this act, or preclude the land or naval forces from inducting such a registrant. A similar provision was contained in the House bill (sec. 5 (n) (6) of the matter added to the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940).

REPORTS

Section 14 of the conference agreement requires the Director to submit to the President, and to the Senate and House of Representatives, quarterly reports on activities undertaken and contemplated under the act.

DEFINITIONS

Section 15 of the conference agreement contains a definition of "hire" and words of similar import in order to avoid making the application of the act in any particular circumstances depend on whether the legal relationship of employer and employee exists. This section also provides that the act is not to be applicable with respect to employment of persons by any State or political subdivision without its consent.

SEPARABILITY

Section 16 of the conference agreement contains the usual separability clause.

TERMINATION DATE

Section 17 of the conference agreement provides that sections 4 and 5 shall cease to be effective upon the termination of hostilities, as declared by the President or by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, or upon June 30, 1946, whichever is the earlier.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
OVERTON BROOKS,
W. G. ANDREWS,
Managers on the part of the House.

GEN. GEORGE S PATTON MOVING ON TO BERLIN

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the following headline appears in the noon papers: "Patton closing in on Frankfurt."

That great military leader and his brave followers are driving toward Berlin with a swiftness that is thrilling the world.

Yet we find that a long list of generals has been sent to the Senate of the United States, some of them almost unknown to us, to be made four-star generals, and that General Patton's name has not been included.

How much longer will this great military leader be ignored when these promotions are made?

It reminds me of what happened during the War between the States, when Confederate generals of far less ability were given greater commands than General Forrest. Every military leader from that day to this has recognized General Forrest as perhaps the greatest genius of that unfortunate conflict.

When General Forrest passed away, Jefferson Davis, the former President of the Confederacy, was riding in the funeral procession in the carriage with Governor Humphreys, of Mississippi, when Governor Humphreys asked him why he had not given General Forrest a greater command. Mr. Davis said to him, "Unfortunately, Governor Humphreys, Washington recognized Forrest's ability long before Richmond did."

I hope we do not wait now and let it be said that Berlin recognized General Patton's ability before it was recognized in Washington.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix and include some written excerpts.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial appearing in the Boston Observer and also to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article appearing in the Boston Post on March 11 written by Lester Allen.

ROBERT C. MEALS, MRS. BESSIE MAE MORGRET, MRS. MARGARET J. MEALS, DONALD MEALS, AND BETTY WRIGHTSTONE—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 946, "An act for the relief of the estates of Robert C. Meals and Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, Donald Meals (a minor), and Betty Wrightstone (a minor)."

The bill would authorize the payment of $5,742 to the estate of Robert C. Meals, the sum of $4,000 to the estate of Mrs. Bessie Mae Morgret, the sum of $2,996.94 to Mrs. Margaret J. Meals, the sum of $2,616.50 to the legal guardian of Donald Meals, a minor, and the sum of $4,043.50 to the legal guardian of Betty Wrightstone, a minor, all on account of an accident involving an Army truck operated in the service of the Pennsylvania State Guard.

The evidence in this case clearly establishes that the proximate cause of the accident was the negligence of the driver of the Army truck in operating his vehicle on the left, or wrong, side of the road. There appears to have been no negligence on the part of Mr. Meals or any of his passengers. The truck in question, however, was at the time of the accident in the custody and under the control and operation of agents of the Pennsylvania National Guard, was on a mission directly connected with the business thereof, and was not engaged upon any mission connected with the active military service of the United States, the Pennsylvania National Guard not having at that time been called into Federal service. In situations of this character affecting equipment issued by the War Department to the National Guard of the several States it has been the rule that claims for damages or injuries sustained incident to the operation of such equipment are not proper charges against the funds of the United States.

It was for this reason that I withheld approval of a similar bill for the relief of Anthony Borsellino (H. R. 6845, 76th Cong.).

While every sympathy should be extended to the families of the unfortunate victims of the accident to which the proposed enactment relates, there is, in view of the circumstances above set forth, no legal or moral obligation devolving upon the United States to compensate the claimants in this case for the damages sustained by them; and I feel constrained, therefore, to withhold my approval from the bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 26, 1945.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal. The message and the accompanying bill will be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered printed.

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE SUPPLIES AND SHORTAGES OF FOOD, PARTICULARLY MEAT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 195 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation into (a) shortages of food in the United States and its Territories and possessions; (b) civilian meat supplies and more particularly the governmental order effective April 1 to reduce such supplies by 12 percent; (c) all factors relating to the production and distribution of essential foodstuffs, particularly meat, and the growing shortages in its supply as related to the needs of trade; (d) the presence of black markets in all kinds of meat; and (e) diversion of meat from normal, legitimate commercial channels of trade.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, by subpena or otherwise, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee and may be served by any person designated by the chairman.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.

ALLEN]. For the moment I will yield to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the author of the resolution, if he is present.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the setting up of a special committee to investigate alleged meat shortages. I know nothing about the merits of the resolution. At the time the committee acted upon the pending resolution there was another resolution before the committee by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] from the Committee on Agriculture, for the investigation to be made by that committee. That is the committee which I thought at the time should be given the power and direction to make the investigation, but my committee thought otherwise and reported the pending resolution.

If the gentleman from Minnesota wishes time I will be glad to yield to him.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman mentioned particularly meat, but it is not understood the investigation will be confined solely to the question of meat?

Mr. COX. It is not.

Mr. PACE. It is with reference to all food commodities.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN].

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that of late we have a mania for appointing special committees. Some seem to think that all the ills that afflict government can be solved by appointing a special committee. If we keep up this foolishness we will soon be appointing a special committee to find out if the solar system is still clicking and old Sol sticking its head up over the eastern horizon at exactly the right time each morning.

I have said it before and I repeat it, most of this talk about food riots and the American people starving to death is simply hot air. I know the press quoted me as saying that most of the talk about the food problem was hot air. What I said, however, was that the talk about food riots and the American people starving to death was hot air, and that is exactly what it is. Now we do have a food problem, and it is a serious problem, and it is well for the Congress to look into the matter. But it seems to me that the matter can be better handled by one committee than by two. Then, too, if the matter is looked into by the House it does seem to me that the Committee on Agriculture is the proper committee to conduct the hearings. And yet the matter has never been mentioned to me by the leadership on either side of the House. Oh, no; someone agrees that the proper way to handle the matter is by appointing a special committee, and the next thing you know a rule has been granted to put the motion through.

The Senate has already appointed an able committee to do this very same work, and I cannot for the life of me see why it is necessary for the House to appoint another committee, which will necessarily duplicate the work that is being done by the committee of the Senate.

Another thing, those in charge of our food program are pressed for time. They have been working day in and day out to put this food program over; and by and large they have done a wonderful job. Those in charge of our food program know the weaknesses of the program and are doing everything they can to correct them. This business of appointing another investigating committee will have but one result, that of diverting the attention and time of the Food Administrator, Marvin Jones, and others, from their official duties, imposed upon them by this Congress to produce food, to come up here on the Hill and testify day in and day out before some special committee when they should be back in their offices or out in the field trying to put this war-food program across. Asking long-winded questions and giving long-winded answers backed up with a lot of statistics will not solve the problem. Neither will the problem be solved by another report filed by another special committee.

I hope it will be the pleasure of the House to vote down this resolution. I believe that one committee of the Congress is sufficient to take care of this whole situation and that what we are proposing to do here today is just a duplication of what the Senate has already done. Let us use a little common sense in connection with some of these programs and give those in charge an opportunity to work the problem out. Marvin Jones knows what the problem is. He knows, for instance, what is causing the meat jam; and this committee is not going to give him one bit of enlightenment on the program or assist him in one single way in solving the problem. He is doing all he can to work it out in a common-sense way and I think it is time for us to use just a little more horse sense in connnection with some of these investigations. Let us give those who are charged with the responsibility of carrying out these programs an opportunity to devote their time and effort to the duties we have imposed upon them. Why force them to appear before a Senate committee one day and a House committee the next day on the same matter? The Senate committee has started the investigation, and if there is any particular phase a House Member wants looked into, I know if the matter is called to the attention of the Senate committee, that the Senate committee will take pleasure in looking into that particular phase of the problem.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It seems to me the gentleman's point is well taken. I have believed for years that wherever there is a standing committee of the House that is in a position to cover a certain field of governmental activity, that if investigations are going to be conducted in that field they ought to be carried out by that standing committee.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. I agree with the gentleman. This Congress has already set up a committee to do this very work. The committee is engaged at this time in carrying out the mandate of this Congress. The Senate committee is already functioning, yet here we are setting up another committee to duplicate the work that has already been directed by the other body. It simply does not make sense, and instead of solving the problem such action will, in my humble opinion, but further complicate the problem.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I cannot agree with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture that we do not need an investigation. I believe it is very apparent to anyone who has given any consideration to the situation that there are some facts which ought to be developed, and they are not being developed. I believe the best way to do it is to have this investigation.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Briefly; yes.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. If there were any facts that should be developed, why would not the sensible thing be to call them to the attention of the Senate? I know they will cooperate with the gentleman and see that the complaints are investigated.

Mr. HOPE. I may say to the gentleman that this House, in my opinion, has a responsibility in the matter and we cannot leave it to a committee of some other body. This committee should go ahead, make this investigation, and report the facts to the House.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Is there any reason in the gentleman's opinion why this investigation, if it is going to be made, should not be made by the House Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. HOPE. Personally, I would have preferred to have had the investigation made by the House Committee on Agriculture. The gentleman will recall that our distinguished friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] introduced a resolution to that effect, but the Rules Committee saw fit to bring in another resolution, and I am supporting that resolution because I want to see some action.

We do have a food situation which can be described as critical; at least from all appearances it is. This investigation is needed to find out just where we stand on that matter. It is not at all remarkable that we do have a serious situation. The only remarkable thing about it is

that we have not had such a condition develop long before this time. The only reason it has not developed is because Nature has been very kind during the last 3 years. We have had unprecedentedly favorable weather for crop production and coupled with that fact the American farmer working 70, 80, and 90 hours or more a week, using the labor of all his family, including the old, the young, and the men and the women, has performed what is really a miracle of production. The American farmer will continue to the best of his ability to carry on this year, but we have no assurance that he is going to be favored with the weather that we have been so fortunate in having during the last 3 or 4 years. We know that weather moves in cycles and this may be a time when we may expect a change which will be adverse, so that we cannot count upon a continuation of the fortuitous circumstances which have made this vast production of the last few years possible.

What we need in this country, in my opinion, is an over-all food administration. We have not had that. We have had the War Food Administration with certain powers; we have had the O. P. A. with certain other powers; we have had the W. P. B. allocating machinery and other equipment; we had the War Manpower Commission and the Selective Service exercising certain other functions with reference to manpower on the farms; and there has not been at any time anyone with the authority to really work out a food program. In view of that, I say it is remarkable this crisis has not developed earlier than it has. I do not know what an investigation may develop but it will bring out some much-needed facts which can serve as a basis for such legislation as may be needed to correct serious and unsatisfactory situations which exist at present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I am interested in the pending resolution and hope it passes. This resolution has for its purpose the investigation of the distribution of the available civilian supply of food, particularly meat. We have been told that certain shortages have arisen on account of a lack of finances in various departments to enforce regulations, and just the other day the Senate Appropriations Committee allowed an extra $565,000 for the O. P. A. to investigate small slaughterhouses. Lack of finances is not the answer to the maldistribution that has been permitted to occur in the meat supply of our country. The reason lies in the lack of proper use of the funds available; the money is being spent to concentrate five or six investigators on small outlets while large outlets receive little or no attention.

Mr. Speaker, the small slaughterhouses are not getting a fair share of the meat. The larger slaughterhouses in the more populated areas control a disproportionately large supply of the meat, which they insist on distributing in areas close to their plants. This results in the supply of that small area being greater than in prerationing days and in larger quantity than there are coupons available to absorb it. The black market is consequently in existence in these small areas surrounding the large slaughterhouses to a greater extent than would be possible in areas adjacent to the small nonfederally inspected plants.

The Defense Supplies Corporation has also aided in the maldistribution of this meat, by their unfair and inefficient investigations for the elimination of subsidies. Three auditor-inspectors of the Defense Supplies Corporation came to the city of Hamilton, Ohio, to determine whether or not a plant was eligible for the nonprocess slaughterers' subsidy, and when they determined that it was not, we asked the Defense Supplies Corporation to tell us the poundage, the invoice numbers, and the people to whom the alleged processed meat was sold. They told us they had no record of that kind, but that if this small packing plant would hire a certified public accountant in southwestern Ohio and send him to Cleveland, in northeastern Ohio, for special instructions as to the type of audit required, they would be willing to again consider the eligibility for this extra subsidy. Here is a department paying the expenses of three salaried employees to review the records and invoices of a packing plant for the purpose of determining whether or not it was eligible for a particular subsidy, and after the investigation—which is determined solely by a question of fact—they did not have in their possession information which would support their decision declaring the plant ineligible. The salary and expense money have been spent, the facts required are not in their file, and the Defense Supplies Corporation cannot support its contention.

Lack of money in the enforcing departments is not the answer to the maldistribution of our foods. This resolution should pass, so that investigation can be made of all factors entering into the control and supervision of our food distribution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel that this is one of the most important investigations that has been considered by the House during the present session. The meat shortage will become more aggravated as the days go on. I believe it is the duty of the House to find out the reason for the break-down in our production and distribution systems. I agree with what the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLANNAGAN] said in regard to Marvin Jones. Marvin Jones is in charge of food production in the War Food Administration. He has done a splendid job. But Marvin Jones has nothing to do with the distribution of the food that is being produced. That is being done by the Office of Price Administration. You will find that the War Food Administration has been bypassed repeatedly by the O. P. A. and other agencies so as to cause this breakdown in distribution of meat and other vital foods. If we are going to do any planning for future food supplies we must plan now, before it is too late. Hogs and cattle do not reproduce themselves overnight. Nobody has exact figures in Congress or in any agency as to the amount of food that Lend-Lease, the F. E. A., U. N. R. R. A., and these other agencies have promised to the people of the other countries of the world. We do not know how long we will have to keep on supplying them with food. If we are going to make any plans for this fall or for next year, now is the time for us to take proper steps to produce more pork for 1946 and more beef for this year. We can do something on the beef proposition immediately if we can get the administration to establish a proper policy that will encourage the feeding of beef on feed lots in this country. At the present time we are losing from 200 to 500 pounds per animal because the farmers on the feed lots do not dare to feed the high-priced feed to high-priced feeder cattle. They just cannot take a chance. So the American people have lost billions of pounds of beef that would otherwise be available because of administration policies.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. It is true, as contrasted with last year, that we have quite a sufficiency of feed for that purpose, is it not?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. We have an abundance of feed for the purpose of providing more beef, more pork, and more poultry for the American people. In fact, as to some of this feed that we now have, if it is not used in the Middle West, we are going to find that between two hundred and three hundred million bushels of high-moisture corn will spoil because we have no place to put it, no animals to feed it to, and we cannot get cars to ship it into other sections of the country.

I feel that we should support this resolution for the creation of this committee so that we can have a thorough investigation on the part of the House, where we have an equal responsibility with the Senate, to find out what is wrong and what has caused the break-down in the machinery of distribution and production of the food here in the United States. We owe it to ourselves and we owe it to the people of the country, who will find as the days go by that they will be able to get less and less of beef, pork, poultry, and dairy products. I urge you, therefore, on both sides of the aisle, to vote for this resolution and get this committee going to find out the facts.

I offered a resolution to have our Committee on Agriculture conduct this investigation. I felt then as I do now, that our committee is the proper committee to conduct an investigation, because we feel that we are responsible for the production of food in this country as far as legislation is concerned. However, it is quite apparent that even the chairman of our committee does not want our committee to make the investigation, so in lieu of that the only thing we can do, as I see it, is to pass this resolution, create a special committee, and let them go ahead and make the investigation and make their recommendations, and see to it that food is provided for the American people.

Our first duty is to provide an abundance of food for our armed forces. Secondly, to adequately take care of civilian needs, and lastly to meet our commitments on food to our allies.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I also introduced a resolution providing that the Committee on Agriculture investigate the problem of food shortage, especially with respect to meat. I am inclined to agree to some degree. I feel if there are two committees, they should work together on the problem. But we certainly want them to work at it and go to the bottom of the thing. There need not be duplication of hearings on the same phases of the subject. It seems to me that if a House committee is going to be appointed, that committee ought to work with the committee of the other body and not hold hearings separately.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, a distinguished member of the House Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Ordinarily I would figure the same thing, that we should have one committee of both Houses, but the House of Representatives functions differently from the other body. We try to conduct a full and complete investigation, with all the members present. I hope that is the kind of investigation this will be.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It is my suggestion that these committees work together, not separately. I still think the Committee on Agriculture should handle it.

The situation is a very unfortunate one. Our farmers and our livestock producers have cooperated in every way possible. They have stuck to their jobs and have complied with every request on the part of the Government in the production of food just as far as they could do it. They have done it by working long hours with shortage of help and lack of proper machinery.

Of course, the demand of the armed forces has been great and they should have every bit of food they need. We know that. Other demands are greater than usual. We know that, too. But, Mr. Speaker, with the tremendous amount of food that has been raised and the additional amount of meat that could have been produced there is something wrong. I think it is a mixture of maldistribution and mismanagement. There are too many agencies attempting to deal with the problem. They work at cross purposes and build up a lot of statistics with regard to supplies. As someone said on the floor of this House a few day ago, "People can't eat statistics; they want food."

Mr. Speaker, we need to untangle ourselves from a lot of unnecessary confusion. We need an over-all authority that understands the problem. We need orderly production, with encouragement to produce. Then have orderly processing and distribution through regular channels.

Mr. Speaker, there is plenty of evidence with respect to the black marketing of meat. One of the biggest black markets of meat is going on right here in Washington, and it is growing every day. I am reliably informed, and this is not gossip, 90 percent of the beef sold in New York City is black-market beef. It is time for the Department of Justice to get up on its hind legs and put a stop to one of the biggest rackets that is going on in this country. A few prosecutions of big, not little, black-market operations might do some good. I do not think for a minute that will solve the problem, but it will put more meat in the flow of regular channels. Of course, that is only a part of the problem.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The trouble with the whole situation is that O. P. A. is trying to hold the farmer's income down below the cost of production. They place a ceiling on livestock so low that the man who owns the livestock cannot afford to buy his neighbor's corn, wheat, and cottonseed to feed them.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And, as the gentleman from Minnesota has so well stated, the difficulty is that cattle feeders have no incentive to produce finished beef but are required now to put our cattle on the market before they should really be slaughtered for beef.

They cannot afford to keep the cattle and really fatten them, so they are slaughtered and processed when they lack 200 or 300 pounds each of what they should have weighed in order to have a finished product. It is not generally known that under O. P. A. regulations slaughterers are required to buy a certain percentage of what is known as No. 2, or half fat, cattle for processing and packing purposes. I feel I should know something about the meat problem because I come from a section where a great amount of livestock is produced and fed, as well as processed.

Along with that, we do not have an allocation of our meat, we do not seem to know how much we want for the armed forces, how much is allocated for U. N. R. R. A., and how much is required for the other groups that want this meat.

Mr. Speaker, there is something manifestly wrong with the meat situation when it is shown we have in this country 84,000,000 cattle, while the average only a few years before was sixty-six million; when we have in 1 year 16,000,000 hogs and then in 2 years only six million. There is no need for scarcity of meat—not at all. The meat problem has been bounced around. There are too many agencies and bureaus dealing with it. Too many inexperienced "experts" experimenting with it. One agency rations it, another fixes prices, another allocates it. The War Food Administration advises as to how much should be produced, but changes plans on certain items before they are ready for market. The Commodity Credit pays subsidies to hold prices in line. The Office of Defense Corporation pays subsidies to roll prices back. The Office of Stabilization tries to fix or stabilize the prices, and so it goes. In the meantime the black market comes along and grabs off a big share of the civilian supply and sells it at extravagant prices.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it necessary to spend much money on this investigation. I am not in favor of spending much money on it. Get the representatives of the farmers and meat producers, the processors, the retailers, in a meeting. Get the heads of the many agencies of Government together and you can solve the problem pretty fast. Put one agency in charge of the meat problem and give it power to act; let that agency be composed of a board of experienced men who know the practical side of this thing to act as advisers, and have one director in charge, and with power to act. Encourage production and processing to full capacity, and then see that it is equitably distributed through proper channels. Cut out quibbling and bickering with the departments, and have a little genuine cooperation for the common good of all. And stop black marketing, and stop it now.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this resolution. I do feel, however, the matter should be placed in the hands of the Committee on Agriculture. I think the prerogative of conducting that investigation should rest in that committee. They are close to the food situation. They have made a thorough study of it and they are in continual contact with the various agencies of the Government which deal with food, especially with the Department of Agriculture. However, I do hope that this special committee will take its responsibility seriously. I am sorry that the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] authorizing the Agriculture Committee to handle this problem is not being considered at this time. But since we have a resolution on

the subject before us, I hope we will pass it because a food investigation is necessary.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. How does the gentleman expect to get anything done through the Committee on Agriculture when the chairman of the committee is opposed to the investigation?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Because it is obvious, at least on our side of the House, that we are interested in an investigation. I think enough Democrats are also. This is no reflection on the chairman. He is doing a good job. I want to see something done regarding these subsidies. I would like to see the dairymen of the Northeast have a dollar subsidy paid to them rather than the 35 cents which I understand is going to be the figure after the 1st of April. It is one of the most outrageous situations that has ever faced producers of milk and dairy products. I, for one, would like to see uniform prices and fair subsidy payments all over the country. If this committee is on the job, they will find that a square deal is not being given the northeastern farmers.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. The gentleman knows that the Senate took action and appointed a committee to investigate the food situation some time ago. Now, if the gentlemen are interested in a particular phase of the question or problem which they desire to investigate, why cannot they go to the Senate committee and have that work done without duplicating it in another committee?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. This investigation should show why the people are not getting proper distribution of food. The committee should recommend appropriate legislation to Congress so that our civilian population will be guaranteed a sufficient food supply from now on.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW].

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important resolutions that has been before the House for some time. I hope that it passes unanimously. I believe the House has a definite responsibility in this matter. It is up to us to act regardless of what the other body may or may not do. It is our responsibility to investigate the food problem, get the correct information and present the information to the country. As has been emphasized here today, we have long needed a single food head. That is one of the reasons why we are having so much difficulty at the present time. It has also been emphasized here that the O. P. A. has refused to make the proper price structure in regard to certain commodities, and because of this refusal we find ourselves faced with definite shortages. The various agencies dealing with food sometimes have worked at cross purposes, without the proper coordination, and without the type of administration that is necessary to keep food moving to our people. In many instances shortages result from mismanagement and from the refusal to adopt the proper procedure in reference to making price structures. I realize the carrying out of the food program is a matter of administration, but the Congress has a definite duty to see that the laws we pass are administered properly. I hope that we make a searching investigation and that we will insist upon proper administration of the food program so that we will have plenty of food for our people. I trust we will do our duty in making a thorough and immediate investigation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, regardless of the committee that is appointed to find out whether there is any food or not, I think the time has come when the people must realize that there is not much nourishment in a lot of this New Deal "baloney" that has been and is being passed around. The reason why this food problem is what it is today is because we have had so much maladministration in carrying out the food program. Many times they are apparently more interested in sectional favoritism than they are in producing food. Otherwise why is 14 percent of the complete fertilizer allocated to one State that produces less than 2 percent of the food of the Nation? During the last year we have seen so many evidences of where they are much more interested in the vote crop than they were in the food crop.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will just give you one example of many that I could give you today. We have the War Food Administration that is giving a quota on filled cream. Filled cream is nothing more than ordinary cream that has a vegetable oil injected into it. The pure food and drug people say it has the same legal standing as filled milk. It is against the Federal law to transport filled milk, and evidently filled cream, from one State to the other. Yet we have the War Food Administration giving them a quota. If that makes sense I would like to have someone say so. The dairy industry has been harassed, persecuted, and prosecuted when the O. P. A. and W. F. A. should have been promoting food production. Would you believe this situation exists: You are a Wisconsin dairyman. Your cows give more milk in 1945 than in 1942. You are receiving a subsidy of 60 cents per hundredweight to increase production. If your cows then give more milk in 1945 than in 1942 you cannot make Swiss cheese in your factory without being unpatriotic? You can take this same milk, separate it, and take the cream to town and sell it without rationing the amount even and sell it to someone with the price and you are patriotic. You can put this milk in bottles, sell it as fluid milk, and you are still patriotic. However, if you do not make it into a certain kind of cheese, or do not take it to some other dairy plant, you are unpatriotic. Who can expect maximum food production when a program of special privilege to the few is followed?

This is done under the powers granted by the Second War Powers Act. This act seems applicable to the unprotected individuals.

Here is another one: I attended a small packers' meeting a while ago. I asked what the subsidy was for the different classes of meat. The answer was, 50 cents per hundredweight on cutters and canners, 90 cents per hundredweight on the commercial grades, and $2 per hundredweight on the prime beef. The Government set-aside was 80 percent of the canners and cutters, 80 percent of commercial grades, and only 60 percent of the prime beef. They said the better hotels get most of the other 40 percent of the prime beef.

Our grandchildren then pay four times as much of the meat bill for the people with the price to patronize swell eating places than they do for the meat bill of the people that eat the cheaper meats.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the adoption of this resolution. Some will argue against the creation of another special committee to do the investigating. Personally, I feel that an investigation, if one is to be made, could very well be handled by the Committee on Agriculture, of which I happen to be a member. That committee has the duty of reporting out legislation relating to all matters pertaining to agriculture and the shortage of food certainly comes within that category.

I am hopeful that the special committee, when it is appointed, will get busy immediately, so that the Congress may have the benefit of its findings before we are called upon to extend the operations of O. P. A. for another year. The distribution of food today is very faulty and the Office of Price Administration is much to blame. For instance, we have more cattle on the range today than a

year ago. Still the feed lots in the Midwest are empty and thousands of bushels of corn are spoiling on the ground. With this surplus of corn the present moment would be the opportune time to get the range cattle into the feed lots and get them finished for market so that the people of the country might have meat to eat. The special committee will render a great service to the country if it brings in legislation to put the O. P. A.'s house in order before the cattle-feeding industry is ruined entirely.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, of course there is a shortage of meat, but the blame belongs right down here with the bureaucrats. They "planned it that way." Our cattle population has reached the highest in history, nearly 83,000,000 head. At the same time there is a scarcity of meat in every shop in the country. We in the range States of the West produce stocker and feeder cattle. Each year millions of cattle and calves move from the Western States for fattening in the feed lots of the Corn Belt States of the Middle West. The range States produce the numbers, but the tonnage is produced in the Corn Belt. The total cattle slaughter for 1944 was 33,900,000 head. That was the highest in history and beat the previous record by 6,000,000 head. Last year 7,700,000 head of calves were butchered. That was an increase of 50 percent over the previous year. Millions of these calves should have gone to the feed lots. Thousands upon thousands of yearling steers weighing around 600 pounds are going directly to slaughter that would weigh nearly double that if fattened on the feed lots. In normal times feeding operations add around a billion and a half pounds annually to the live weight of cattle slaughtered. Because of the senseless regulations of the O. P. A., many of the feed lots of the country are vacant and those in operation feed for a short time only. The tonnage from the feed lots has dropped tremendously and at the same time the quality has been lowered. Last year we had the biggest corn crop in history, and with the millions of excess cattle in the country we had an ideal set-up for an all-time high in beef production. The Office of Price Administration can take full credit for the meat shortage confronting the housewives of America.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. When it comes to the cattle situation, is not this the trouble, that they put ceiling prices on cattle on the hoof? I do not believe any cattleman will agree that such a plan can be worked out, putting a ceiling price on live animals. In the second place, there is the uncertainty that exists due to O. P. A.'s changing the price.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. The gentleman is entirely correct. Two months ago an over-all ceiling price was placed on live cattle. The O. P. A. has made it impossible for the feeder to fatten and finish cattle at a profit. Because of the regulations and orders coming out of Washington the feeders never know where they stand. Last spring the War Food Administration issued a corn freeze order in the middle of the feeding season. The Government paid 5 cents a bushel more for corn than the feeder was allowed to pay. The feeder was forced to ship and the result was lighter weights on the average kill.

The present beef ceiling prices were established on December 16, 1942. The average price of beef steers of all grades in Chicago for the following year was $15.30 and for the year 1944, $15.44. This difference of 14 cents per hundred by no means compensates feeders for the sharp increases in cost since the ceilings were established.

During that period there had been two increases in corn ceiling prices, one of 5 cents a bushel and one of 9 cents a bushel. There had been an increase in the ceiling price of protein concentrates from ten to twelve dollars a ton. The index figure for farm wages shows an increase from 224 on January 1, 1943, shortly after the ceiling prices were established, to 325 on October 15, 1944.

We have had a drop of nearly 30 percent in hog production since last year. The number of hogs on the farms dropped from 83,852,000 head on January 1, 1944, to 60,660,000 head on January 1 of this year.

The total of all sheep and lambs of the country dropped from 51,769,000 head on January 1, 1944, to 47,945,000 head on January 1 of this year. Stock sheep dropped from 45,232,000 to 41,315,000 in the same period. Our sheep population is the lowest since 1928.

Production has fallen off because these producers cannot make a profit under the restrictions and ceilings placed on their business.

And so, Mr. Speaker, in the midst of the greatest war in history we find this planned program is a distinct failure. It seems to me the investigation of this situation could well be confined to the activities of these bureaus in Washington.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know when this committee is going to report. The people of this country who are suffering from lack of pork products and meat are not so much interested in an investigation as they are in getting something to eat. There is nothing in this resolution that says anything more than that there is going to be a committee to make an investigation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I have only 3 minutes; I cannot.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I was going to give the gentleman the answer.

Mr. KEEFE. There is nothing in this resolution that states that this committee shall investigate and report so that remedial action may be taken, if that is possible, by this Congress in time to effect some result. I have seen so many of these investigating committees. I am not going to oppose this one. Maybe they are all doing some good, but there are investigations, investigations, and more investigations; and little or nothing happens as a result. Legislation may be submitted, but it does not become law. When legislation is offered to correct abuses of O. P. A., legislation which you know is right, the administration turns it down. You on the Democratic side can do this because you have the votes. What good are these investigations unless they bring some results?

I think it may fairly be said that the situation as far as meat is concerned is pretty well understood by everybody.

I think everyone understands the situation with respect to pork. What difference does it make what this committee finds out? You are not going to raise hogs by a report of this committee, you are not going to relieve the critical situation in pork when you do not have brood sows to produce pigs. You may get something out of this investigation, but it seems to me there are a lot of things which could be collected together, summarized, and reported in time for this Congress to act. May I ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is that his intention?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not know what the intention is.

Mr. KEEFE. I will ask the gentleman sponsoring the resolution, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], what his intention is?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I may say if I have anything to do with the investigation it will be to report promptly and quickly to the House.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman expect to report remedial legislation so that we may have it before the House prior to the time we vote on the extension of O. P. A.?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I cannot speak for a committee that has not yet been created, but if I have anything to do with the committee I expect to do that.

Mr. KEEFE. As sponsor of this resolution is that not the gentleman's intention and purpose?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. It is.

Mr. KEEFE. I am glad to hear the gentleman say that and I will support the resolution, on condition that it is amended so as to require a report to the Congress not later than May 1, 1945.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, there are a great many problems in connection with food that this Congress has the right to know about and that this House itself has the right to know about. I appeared before the Committee on Rules and I did not say one word against the resolution of my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] which proposed a special investigation by the Committee on Agriculture because I recognized that if the Rules Committee in its wisdom decided that that would be the form the investigation should take, I would naturally follow the lead thereby indicated. The Rules Committee, however, has seen fit to report the pending resolution and I want to say to the membership of the House that if it passes I believe an investigation of value to this Congress will result.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I just wonder if the gentleman gets the authority under this resolution to make an investigation he will look into the O. P. A. regulation which cuts down the quotas of the small packing plants 50 percent of last year?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. May I say to the gentleman that there are a great many regulations involved, which is one of the reasons why I proposed a special committee with reference to this matter rather than turning it over to the Committee on Agriculture. It is one thing to investigate only the Department of Agriculture, but it is something else to consider the whole food situation. There are O. P. A. regulations, there are W. P. B. regulations, there are all types of regulations, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] pointed out. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] suggested that there does not seem to be enthusiasm on the part of members of the Agricultural Committee in reference to this matter. If you are going to investigate anything, you might have enthusiasm for it and see that a real investigation is made.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does not the gentleman think that should be investigated?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes; I do.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. What investigation could the gentleman's committee conduct that the Senate committee, which has already been set up some 10 days or 2 weeks ago, cannot investigate?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That is a good question. I may say to the gentleman that I realize his position. He stated to the papers, and the story was carried on March 21, that all talk of food shortage was just a lot of hot air. Now, anyone who has gone to the grocery stores knows that is not true. Let me suggest to the gentleman that we have an Appropriations Committee in the House which investigates many agencies, yet when the bill involving those same agencies reaches the Senate, the Senate committee checks the same agencies in order that it may have an independent opportunity to look at the situation. I believe the membership of this House is particularly interested in the food situation. I pointed out to the members of the Rules Committee that under the form set up for our Government, the Members of the House of Representatives represent the people within their districts.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. What can the gentleman's committee do that the Senate committee cannot and will not do?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I am trying to point out to the gentleman that there sometimes is a different viewpoint as between Members of the two bodies of the Congress. We over here represent the people within our districts, while the Senators represent States as corporate entities. It is one thing to discuss a treaty where the Senate may have exclusive jurisdiction. This, however, is a matter that touches every person in this country.

I think there should be an investigation made by those who are in touch with the situation in their own individual districts. May I point out to you that in the first 2 months of this year there came into the 68 principal stockyards of this country 5,374,000 hogs, but that last year in the same period there came into those stockyards over 10,000,000 hogs. I think there is a reason why that happened, and I think the committee ought to find out what the reason is. I think I should point out, too, that prior to the last few years there were 67,000,000 head of cattle on the ranges and today there are 81,000,000 head. Why are those 81,000,000 head there? As the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] and other gentlemen have pointed out, there must be some reason. It may not be solely the concern of the Department of Agriculture. It may be the concern of the price policy of the Office of Price Administration, and the only way you can clear up that confusion is by looking at the over-all picture.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Coming from the city of Chicago, where the large packing houses are, I think it would be well if the gentleman would also investigate the activities of the Defense Supplies Corporation regarding the policy of subsidies, and there you will find a great deal of your trouble with the food shortage.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Let me say that the gentleman simply supports what we have been talking about. This is not something solely concerned with the Department of Agriculture. It touches the Defense Supplies Corporation, the O. P. A., the W. P. B., and a great many other agencies. My thought is that the investigation should be made sufficiently broad and that the committee should be composed of people representing Agricultural Committee, people representing the Banking and Currency Committee, and all others interested in the subject. I am sure that the Speaker will use his good judgment in appointing a committee whose interest will be as wide as the food problem is today.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Will the committee have for its object the investigation of the distribution of food, and is it admitted that there is sufficient food but that it is not being properly distributed?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I would not want to prejudice the case by starting out with the admission that there is sufficient food. We simply say that the problem of distribution of food is extremely important and has not been, perhaps, handled properly, but that is a matter where the committee would naturally start in without a preconceived nation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Whatever it is, it has not been denied on the floor of the House this morning that there is sufficient beef on the hoof, but it is not being distributed through the proper sources so that it can move.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. You cannot just move these cattle off the ranges up to the Kansas and Nebraska feed lots. They must be prepared properly so that the beef does not cost too much to move. I had a talk not long ago with the head of the American Livestock Association, a man who is representing the producers, the feeders, the packers and the distributors, and he believes that somewhere along the line something has happened to cause this beef not to reach the American public.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does it not revert back to the O. P. A.? I think the trouble is right here.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I think it does, but let the committee investigate.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. There are many factors involved in this as well as the fact that we have too little meat with more cattle on the ranges now than ever before. The price of hay has something to do with the problem from an agricultural standpoint, and also overgrazing the watersheds from a reclamation viewpoint. The investigation has many angles.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes. And the future welfare of those ranges is a problem. You cannot overstock the ranges year after year without destroying them, and everybody connected with them knows that.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the committee propose to investigate the holding down of the price of cotton below the cost of production? The cotton farmer now makes only about 20 cents an hour working in the hot sun, doing the hardest work of any laborers in America, and yet the price of his cotton is held down to that level. As long as you are investigating, I think you should find out why these bureaucrats in the O. P. A. and other places have held the price of cotton down to a point where the cotton farmer cannot make a living.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I think that is something that the committee would have to answer, and the committee will have to determine whether such an investigation would be within the scope of the resolution. Certainly the question of price relating to all of these matters is extremely important.

Mr. RANKIN. There is no use of trying to cure a wound by pouring oil on the instrument that made it. The thing to do is to get at the root of this trouble and investigate and eliminate those factors that are throwing our economic machinery out of gear.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I understand specifically that if this committee is created it will go to work immediately and bring back a report to the Congress before the O. P. A. extension is sought?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That puts me in a very difficult situation.

Mr. KEEFE. I would not vote for it if you are not going to do that.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman must realize that no committee has been established; but when it is established, if I am to be connected with it, it will be my desire to see this thing investigated promptly, and a report will be made to the House as quickly as possible, and as rapidly as one section can be finished that a report be made to the House for immediate legislation.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say to my friend that I assume that under the ordinary practices that have heretofore prevailed the gentleman will be chairman of this committee. I want an assurance from him now before I vote on this resolution that there will be a report forthcoming before we are asked to vote on the O. P. A. extension and the necessary appropriations to implement that organization.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I am not trying to dodge an answer to my good friend, all I am trying to say is that if I were put on the committee, if the gentleman's assumption should be correct that I might be made chairman of it, I would then have the privilege of trying to go along with the committee. I have found that sometimes that is a problem. But I want to say to the gentleman that, as far as I am concerned, certainly if I had anything to do with it and had any influence it would be my purpose to report back quickly and in time to suggest remedial legislation of value to this House. I do not want to delay in the slightest. Therefore, I went to the Committee on Rules and pleaded with them to report out some resolution early, either the resolution of my good friend from Minnesota or my own.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman sees what I have in mind.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Very definitely.

Mr. KEEFE. We passed in the agricultural appropriation bill an appropriation for a school-lunch program. The Committee on Agriculture is now conducting hearings on the question of whether it shall report legislation to authorize that. We make the appropriation in advance, and then discuss the situation afterward.

Now, once and for all, I should like to have the record clear that the gentleman who is now addressing us gives the assurance to this House that if he is chairman of this committee he will so conduct this investigation that the House will have the benefit of it when we are asked to pass upon the extension of O. P. A. and the appropriations to implement O. P. A. Otherwise I cannot see any value to the committee.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Again I must say that that is a commitment I could not possibly make. All I can speak for is myself.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Is it not a fact that if any good is to be done to get more food to the people, prompt action must be taken?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. It must be done now, and the House must be informed as matters proceed. There is no disposition on my part, at least, to delay. I can assure the gentleman from Wisconsin that as far as intentions go I subscribe to his position.

Mr. KEEFE. Hell is paved with good intentions, but what we want is some action here.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us for consideration authorizes the Speaker to appoint a special committee to investigate the cause of meat shortage in the United States, and to report their findings promptly to the House of Representatives together with a recommendation of remedial legislation.

We certainly have a meat shortage. It is insisted by those who know that this meat shortage is due to unwise policies and acts of the O. P. A. and other Federal agencies. It is admitted that there are more cattle on the farms of the United States than there have ever been in our history. We had about 66,000,000 head in 1939. There are 83,000,000 head today and we have plenty of hogs. We also have hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat and corn on the farms and tens of millions of bushels piled up out in the open on farms in the West which the farmers are anxious to sell.

It is pointed out that if we have a crop of wheat and corn this year comparable to 1944 and 1943 hundreds of millions of bushels will spoil and go to waste. It is insisted that the O. P. A. has put such a price on livestock that farmers and stock raisers cannot afford to buy wheat and corn and feed it to their cattle and hogs because they will lose money.

Some of the Members of the House who make a special study of the farm, meat, and food problems declare without any equivocation that we have more meat and more food in this country than we have ever had at any time, and if the O. P. A. and other agencies of the Government would be more realistic and give the producers a price that would cover cost of production and a small margin, cattle and hogs would be fattened on this surplus corn and wheat and the American people and their service men and women would have more of these products. It is a matter of common knowledge that Canada has an oversupply of beef and pork. It is not rationed. But under measures put through Congress by this administration and by Executive directives and regulations, these meat products from Canada cannot be brought into the United States.

We have been sending tremendous quantities of food under lend-lease to Great Britain and our other allies. It has been proven that Great Britain has sold much of this food. The British are now complaining because we propose to cut down on the amount of food going to Britain. Canada is a part of the British Empire. She declared war the next day after Great Britain and France declared war in 1939. Canada wants to sell them her pork and other food products. Why does not Great Britain buy of Canada? The answer is that she gets great quantities from us for nothing under the lend-lease give-away.

Believing that the committee provided for in this resolution will be helpful in solving the meat and related food problem, I shall vote for the resolution. Let us get the facts. I know we have had a great shortage of meat at our home. We are willing, however, to go without meat if it will expedite the winning of the war. I am reminded of a little sketch I saw in the newspaper yesterday: A certain gentleman was expecting some guests and he wanted some good, thick, juicy steaks for them. He urged his wife to buy steaks. She insisted that she could not get them. The husband still complained; the wife then insisted that he take the ration books and go out and get the steaks himself. He passed a meat store which had some choice cuts hanging in the window. He went in and wanted to know if he could buy some good thick steaks. The proprietor said he could. He ordered 20 pounds. The steaks were cut and wrapped up and the

man paid for them. He told the butcher to deliver them to his home. The butcher stated that he could not deliver the meat. The man pointed out, "I see you have a very fine delivery wagon out in front of your store." The proprietor said, "Yes, I have got the wagon and I just got through selling you 20 pounds of the horse and I can't operate my delivery wagon without a horse."

With proper administration and encouragement to cattle and hog raisers and the wheat and corn producers of the Nation, it will not be necessary for us to eat horse meat.

THREATENED COAL STRIKE—THERE MUST BE NO STOPPAGE OF THE COAL MINES

Mr. Speaker, I wish to address myself to the threatened coal strike and the effect it will have on our war effort and the American people generally, as well as on the coal operators and mine workers.

On March 31, 1945, the work contract between the mine workers and the coal operators will expire. Representatives of the mine workers and the coal operators have been in conference since March 1, trying to negotiate a new contract for the year beginning April 1, 1945. But they have not yet come to an agreement.

In the interest of our great global war effort the mining industry, management, the mine workers, and the American people, every loyal citizen is earnestly hoping that an agreement may be reached and that there will be no stoppage or interruption in the production of coal. The war could not and will not be won with coal alone. On the other hand, we could not and will not achieve victory without it.

Our country has amazed the world in the production of ships, tanks, guns, planes, shells, trucks, other munitions, clothing, and the processing and preserving of essential supplies of food, and the transportation of these munitions of war and supplies to our armed forces and to our civilian population, and to our allied armed forces and their civilian population.

This remarkable record could not have been made possible without an adequate supply of coal. The fact is that coal touches all Americans and their activities in peace and in war, in furnishing heat, light, and power. We can hardly visualize what would happen if the coal supply of the country were suddenly cut off. Our cities, schools, hospitals, and homes would be in darkness, our railroads and other means of transportation would be paralyzed, our food could not be processed and preserved, and many other essentials to the lives of our people would be stopped or handicapped. The specter of hunger and cold would stalk up and down in a blacked-out land.

Many persons do not realize that the base of TNT and other high explosives is coal. The important elements of sulfa drugs and other medicines come from coal. Many of the most attractive and desirable cosmetics come from coal. The famous nylon hose and many other fabricated articles are made from coal. We can hardly realize when we see the crimson, golden, blue, and other colors of aniline dyes that add so much beauty to women's garments that they come from coal. Coal will always play a very important part in the industrial, economic, and social life of all our people.

Few people realize the hazards undertaken by the producers and the hardships endured by the workers in this industry. I know of no other American industry that involves so much of uncertainty, hazard, draw-backs, and flare-backs as the coal industry. On the other hand, there is no group of workers who face so much of dangers and hazards to their lives, limbs, and health as those who go into the bowels of the earth and toil with flickering lights, away from the fresh air and sunshine, to produce this vital American product.

The Geneva Conference, to which all civilized nations of the world are signatories, laid down rules governing the work and the proper treatment of prisoners of war. The board set up to administer that act has declared that coal mining under the surface is such a dangerous and hazardous work to life, limb, and health, that no war prisoner can be compelled to work at a job inside the coal mines. In other words, under the rules laid down by the Geneva Conference and its board, we cannot compel German or Japanese prisoners to work at jobs inside the coal mines.

Many American people not acquainted with the facts believe that coal operators receive greater returns on their investments than most other groups of investors. This is not the fact. In peacetime the average coal operator feels that he is fortunate if he earns a very modest return on his investment; and there are many who believe that coal miners are rolling in wealth as a group. Very few miners are ever able to own their own homes and very few are able to lay aside anything for that rainy day. More of them lose their lives and receive impairments to their health than any other group of comparable size engaged in any occupation in this country.

OUTSTANDING RECORD

From the time of Pearl Harbor up to January 1, 1944, 130,000 miners left the mines to enter the armed services or to engage in other essential war work, and for the calendar year 1944 the number of miners had been reduced to 479,000 men. These 479,000 men produced 684,500,000 tons of coal. This is approximately 6 tons per day per man. This is the greatest record of all time in this country or any other country, although they were short 130,000 men. It is freely admitted by operators and miners that this great accomplishment was the result of close cooperation of management and the mine worksrs. This record was accomplished not through the bureaucrats in Washington but by management and the mine workers themselves, under free enterprise and free labor. In Great Britain they have had during the war Government control of mines largely, and conscript or forced labor. For the calendar year 1944, the statistics show there were employed 707,000 men in the mines in Great Britain. They produced 200,000,000 tons of coal. This was less than 1 ton per day per man. In other words, in the United States, with private enterprise and private management and free labor, and with 228,000 less miners, we produced 484,500,000 more tons than they did in Great Britain, and we produced 6 times as much coal per man per day in the United States as was produced in Great Britain.

It is most gratifying to me that Kentucky in 1944 set an all-time high record in the production of coal. The tonnage, according to the report of Hon. G. Moss Patterson, head of the State Department of Mines and Minerals of Kentucky, shows that the total production of coal in 1944 was 72,406,927 tons. This is 8,256,000 tons greater than the 1943 production. Harlan County, in my district, produced 13,529,149 tons. Mr. Patterson's report also shows Kentucky has broken all records of production for the months of January and February 1945.

GIVE AND TAKE

I was pleased to observe that the chief spokesmen for the operators and for the miners in this conference were in agreement "that collective bargaining is based wholly and only on good faith and the sincere attitude of the men who undertake to work out the complex problems of labor relationships in industry, such as this one."

It is unnecessary to remind coal operators and miners that we are in a great war and the tremendous importance of continued production to the fullest measure of our coal mines, because practically every mine operator and miner has a son or an in-law fighting on some battle front. In fact, the sons, husbands, brothers, and in-laws of our coal operators and miners will be found on each one of the battle fronts of the world. The operators and miners know, as well as the Members of Congress, how important the production of coal is to our war effort.

I wish to restate that we could not win the war with coal alone, but, on the other hand, it is quite clear that we cannot win the war without coal. We must have coal to build ships, manufacture the guns, tanks, planes, shells, and other munitions of war, and process and preserve the food and provide the clothing for our boys everywhere and to feed those engaged in producing the munitions of war, and to operate our railroads and our ships to carry the munitions of war, food, and clothing to our armed forces.

We who believe in the real American way of life are anxious to see private enterprise survive in this country—private enterprise for industry as well as labor. If private enterprise is destroyed, there can be no real collective bargaining either for industry or the workers. Private enterprise is one of the foundation stones of our democracy. Without it industry, management, as well as workers, must submit to totalitarian rule.

With all of these compelling considerations and with the high purposes expressed by the spokesmen of the operators and miners that collective bargaining is based wholly and only upon good faith and sincere attitude of the men who undertake to work out the complex problems of labor relations with the industry and the miners, they should, it seems to me, lead to an agreement between the operators and the miners. It may be necessary that there be some yielding on the part of both of these great groups and without such yielding the operators, the miners, the American people, and our war effort, will suffer very great injury.

There are those in high positions and others who are not friendly to private enterprise. They welcome opportunities to take over and operate private industries.

The coal mines cannot stop. They must not stop at this critical time in our great war effort. Victory is in sight and every loyal American citizen should be willing to do everything in his or her power to bring complete victory at the earliest moment possible so that all of our sons may return to their homes and loved ones. No man, even though he had the combined eloquence of all the great orators who ever lived, in this and other lands, could adequately portray the heroic sacrifices that our sons and daughters are making for us on the five continents, the seven seas, and the islands of the seas.

The reports of the War and Navy Departments show that we are fast approaching the 1,000,000 mark of servicemen who have been killed, wounded, missing in action, or made prisoners of war. More than two hundred thousand of these have made the supreme sacrifice. Approximately five hundred thousand have been wounded, and thousands of those who are carried as missing in action have, too, made the supreme sacrifice. Many of our prisoners of war have died of exposure and cruel treatment in foreign prisons. There are all the way from 10 to 15 casualties of men and women in the service from my district reported in the daily casualty lists issued by the War and Navy Departments. We receive letters from many fathers and mothers that they have lost 2 sons and sometimes 3 sons in this great war, and letters from many wives who have lost their husbands. What a tremendous sacrifice our men and women, fathers and mothers, wives and children are making in this great war. Our armed forces must have everything necessary to bring about early and complete victory. We at home must make sacrifices in the shops, mills, on the farms, in the mines, on the railroads, truck lines, and everywhere. We must give of our substance to support the war.

And, after all, our contribution is small compared to those who are offering and giving their lives on land, sea, and in the air, and as compared to the sacrifice of the fathers and mothers, wives and children who are giving their loved ones in this great struggle.

It likely is necessary for both groups to yield something in this controversy to reach an agreement. If the miners and operators do not agree, we all know the mines will be taken over and operated by the Government and private enterprise will receive another severe blow.

I have talked with some of the leaders of management and of the mine workers and they express themselves as desirous of a settlement. The announcement of such a settlement would bring joy to the American people and new courage to our fighting men. We are proud of the accomplishment of management and workers and of the great production record they made in 1944 when they were short 130,000 miners and many of the important men in management. We indulge the hope, coupled with our sincere prayer, that this great controversy may be settled and that under private enterprise and free labor the coal-mining industry may achieve even greater successes in production in 1945.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The coming victory of the United Nations means that they, and not their enemies, have power to establish the foundations of the future.

On April 25 their representatives will meet in San Francisco to draw up the charter for the general organization of the United Nations for security and peace. On this meeting and what comes after it our best hopes of a secure and peaceful world depend.

At the same time we know that we cannot succeed in building a peaceful world unless we build an economically healthy world. We are already taking decisive steps to this end. The efforts to improve currency relationships by the International Monetary Fund, to encourage international investments and make them more secure by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, to free the air for peaceful flight by the Chicago civil aviation arrangements, are part of that endeavor. So, too, is the proposed food and agriculture organization of the United Nations.

We owe it to the vision of Secretary Hull that another of the essential measures we shall need to accomplish our objective has been tested and perfected by 10 years of notably successful experience under his leadership. You are all familiar with the Trade Agreements Act which has been on the books since 1934 and which, on three occasions, since that time, the Congress has renewed. The present law expires in June of this year. I recommend that it again be renewed so that the great work which Secretary Hull began may be continued.

Under him the reciprocal trade agreement program represented a sustained effort to reduce the barriers which the nations of the world maintained against each other's trade. If the economic foundations of the peace are to be as secure as the political foundations, it is clear that this effort must be continued, vigorously and effectively.

Trade is fundamental to the prosperity of nations, as it is of individuals. All of us earn our living by producing for some market, and all of us buy in some market most of the things we need. We do better, both as producers and consumers, when the markets upon which we depend are as large and rich and various and competitive as possible. The same is true of nations.

We have not always understood this, in the United States or in any other country. We have tried often to protect some special interest by excluding strangers' goods from competition. In the long run everyone has suffered.

In 1934 this country started on a wiser course. We enacted into law a standing offer to reduce our tariff barriers against the goods of any country which would do the same for us. We have entered into reciprocal trade agreements with 28 countries. Each one of these agreements reduced some foreign barriers against the exports of this country, reduced our barriers against some products of the other party to the bargain, and gave protection against discrimination by guaranteeing most favored nation treatment to us both. Each agreement increased the freedom of businessmen in both countries to buy and sell across national frontiers. The agreements have contributed to prosperity and good feeling here and in the other contracting countries.

The record of how trade agreements expand two-way trade is set forth in the 1943 report of the Committee on Ways and Means. This record shows that between 1934–35 and 1938–39 our exports to trade-agreement countries increased by 63 percent, while our shipments to nonagreement countries increased by only 32 percent; between these same periods our imports from agreement countries increased by 22 percent as compared with only 12 percent from nonagreement countries. The disruptions and dislocations resulting from the war make later comparisons impossible. The record, published in 1943, is nevertheless as valid today as it was then. We know, without any doubt, that trade agreements build trade and that they will do so after the war as they did before. All sections of our population, labor, farmers, businessmen, have shared and will share in the benefits which increased trade brings.

Unfortunately, powerful forces operated against our efforts in the years after

1934. The most powerful were the steps of our present enemies to prepare themselves for the war they intended to let loose upon the world. They did this by subjecting every part of their business life, and especially their foreign trade, to the principle of guns instead of butter. In the face of the economic warfare which they waged, and the fear and countermeasure which their conduct caused in other countries, the success of Secretary Hull and his interdepartmental associates in scaling down trade barriers is all the more remarkable.

The coming total defeat of our enemies, and of the philosophy of conflict and aggression which they have represented, gives us a new chance and a better chance than we have ever had to bring about conditions under which the nations of the world substitute cooperation and sound business principles for warfare in economic relations.

It is essential that we move forward aggressively and make the most of this opportunity. Business people in all countries want to know the rules under which the post-war world will operate. Industry today is working almost wholly on war orders, but once the victory is won, immediate decisions will have to be made as to what lines of peacetime production look most profitable for either old or new plants. In this process of reconversion, decisions will necessarily be influenced by what businessmen foresee as Government policy. If it is clear that barriers to foreign trade are coming down all around the world, businessmen can and will direct production to the things that look most promising under those conditions. In that case a real and large and permanent expansion of international trade becomes possible and likely.

But if the signs are otherwise, if it appears that no further loosening of barriers can be expected, everyone will act very differently. In that event we shall see built up in all countries new vested interests in a system of restrictions, and we shall have lost our opportunity for the greater prosperity that expanding trade brings.

I have urged renewal of the Trade Agreements Act. In order to be fully effective the act needs to be strengthened at one important point. You will remember that as passed in 1934 it authorized reductions in our tariff up to 50 percent of the rates then in effect. A good many of those reductions have been made, and those rates cannot be reduced further. Other reductions, smaller in amount, leave some remaining flexibility. In other cases no reductions have been made at all, so that the full original authority remains.

You will realize that in negotiating agreements with any foreign country, what we can accomplish depends on what both parties can contribute. In each of the agreements we have made, we have contributed reductions on products of special interest to the other party to the agreement, and we have obtained commensurate contributions in the form of concessions on products of special interest to us.

As to those countries, much of our original authority under the act has been used up. We are left in this situation: Great Britain and Canada, our largest peacetime customers, still maintain certain high barriers against our exports, just as we still have high barriers against theirs. Under the act as it now stands we do not have enough to offer these countries to serve as a basis for the further concessions we want from them. The same situation confronts us, although in a lesser degree, in the case of the other countries with whom we have already made agreements; these include France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Turkey, Sweden, Switzerland, and most of the American republics.

I therefore recommend that the 50-percent limit be brought up to date by an amendment that relates it to the rates of 1945 instead of 1934. Then we shall have the powers necessary to deal with all our friends on the basis of the existing situation.

The bill which the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee has introduced in the House of Representatives, H. R. 2652, would accomplish the objectives I have in mind, and has my support.

This legislation is essential to the substantial increase in our foreign trade which is necessary for full employment and improved standards of living. It means more exports and it also means more imports, for we cannot hope to maintain exports at the levels necessary to furnish the additional markets we need for agriculture and industry—income for the farmer and jobs for labor—unless we are willing to take payments in imports. We must recognize, too, that we are now a creditor country and are destined to be so for some time to come. Unless we make it possible for Americans to buy goods and services widely and readily in the markets of the world, it will be impossible for other countries to pay what is owed us. It is also important to remember that imports mean much more than goods for ultimate consumers. They mean jobs and income at every stage of the processing and distribution channels through which the imports flow to the consumer. By reducing our own tariff in conjunction with the reduction by other countries of their trade barriers, we create jobs, get more for our money, and improve the standard of living of every American consumer.

This is no longer a question on which Republicans and Democrats should divide. The logic of events and our clear and pressing national interest must override our old party controversies. They must also override our sectional and special interests. We must all come to see that what is good for the United States is good for each of us, in economic affairs just as much as in any others.

We all know that the reduction of Government-created barriers to trade will not solve all our trade problems. The field of trade has many fronts, and we must try to get forward on each of them as rapidly and as wisely as we can. I shall continue therefore to explore the possibility also of reaching a common understanding with the friendly nations of the world on some of the other international trade problems that confront us. The appropriate committees of the Congress will be fully consulted as that work progresses. The purpose of the whole effort is to eliminate economic warfare, to make practical international cooperation effective on as many fronts as possible, and so to lay the economic basis for the secure and peaceful world we all desire.

When this trade agreements legislation and the other legislation I have recommended to this Congress is adopted, and when the General Organization of the United Nations and their various special agencies, including one on trade, have been created and are functioning, we shall have made a good beginning at creating a workable kit of tools for the new world of international cooperation to which we all look forward. We shall be equipped to deal with the great overriding question of security, and with the crucial questions of money and exchange, international investment, trade, civil aviation, labor, and agriculture.

As I said in my message of February 12 on the Bretton Woods proposals:

> The point in history at which we stand is full of promise and of danger. The world will either move toward unity and widely shared prosperity or it will move apart into necessarily competing economic blocs. We have a chance, we citizens of the United States, to use our influence in favor of a more united and cooperating world. Whether we do so will determine, as far as it is in our power, the kind of lives our grandchildren can live.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 26, 1945.*

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 2775.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that I have designated the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] to act as majority leader during the recess while I am away.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] in New York City on March 23.

Mr. LEWIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in one to include an excerpt from a newspaper.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and an article from today's Washington News.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2126. An act making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, for civil functions administered by the War Department, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 27, 1945, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads will meet on Tuesday, March 27, at 10 o'clock, for the purpose of holding further hearings on H. R. 2071, a bill to reclassify the salaries of employees in the Postal Service, to establish uniform procedure for computing compensation, and so forth.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

351. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Alaska game law; to the Committee on the Territories.

352. A letter from the Vice President of Panama Railroad Company, transmitting a quarterly estimate of personnel requirements, for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

353. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War to exchange with the Rosslyn Connecting Railroad Co. certain lands in the vicinity of the War Department Pentagon Building, in Arlington, Va.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

354. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimate of personnel requirements, for the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

355. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the quarterly estimates of personnel requirements covering the quarter ending June 30, 1945; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. House joint resolution 141. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, in lieu of certain appropriations contained in H. R. 2374, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 204. Resolution providing funds for expenses of the Committee on Ways and Means in obtaining information with respect to the need for the amendment and expansion of the Social Security Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 385). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 205. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 137 of the Seventy-ninth Congress incurred by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 386). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 206. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 45; without amendment (Rept. No. 387). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 207. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 96 of the Seventy-ninth Congress incurred by the Committee on Public Lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 388). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 208. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 154 of the Seventy-ninth Congress incurred by the Committee on Naval Affairs; without amendment (Rept. No. 389). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 209. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the study and investigation authorized by House Resolution 62 of the Seventy-ninth Congress incurred by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds; without amendment (Rept. No. 390). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 210. Resolution providing for the compensation of the assistants to the superintendent of the House Press Gallery; without amendment (Rept. No. 391). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BOREN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 694. A bill to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic; without amendment (Rept. No. 393). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 2775. A bill to permit certain subsidy and loss operations, in the case of flour, without regard to the provisions of the last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 394). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 2775. A bill to permit certain subsidy and loss operations, in the case of flour, without regard to the provisions of the last paragraph of section 2 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2776. A bill to control and regulate bank holding companies, to control and regulate relationships between insured banks and their affiliates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 2777. A bill to provide an additional surtax exemption to certain heads of families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2778. A bill to provide for the erection in Wenatchee, Wash., of a memorial in commemoration of the achievement of Clyde Pangborn and Hugh Herndon, Jr., in making the first nonstop flight from the Orient to the United States; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 2779. A bill to permit civilian defense volunteers to retain on the cessation of civilian defense activities certain equipment issued by the United States; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 2780. A bill to provide for the presentation by the President of suitable insignia to Gold Star mothers and fathers of World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 2781. A bill to provide for the withdrawal of the sovereignty of the United States over the island of Puerto Rico and for the recognition of its independence; to provide for the notification thereof to foreign governments; to provide for the assumption by the government of Puerto Rico of obligations under the treaty with Spain on December 10, 1898; to define trade and other relations between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the calling of a convention to frame a constitution for the government of the island of Puerto Rico; to provide for certain mandatory provisions of the proposed constitution; to provide for the submission of the constitution to the people of Puerto Rico and its submission to the President of the United States for his approval; to provide for the adjustment of property rights between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the maintenance of military, coaling, and naval stations by the United States on the island of Puerto Rico until the termination of the war between the United States and Germany and Japan; to continue in force certain statutes until independence has been acknowledged; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution authorizing the presentation of medals to the widows, children, or mothers of persons who lose their lives in the military or naval service during World War No. 2; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution to require the head of each department, agency, or independent establishment in the executive branch of the Government to appear monthly

before the committee of the House of Representatives concerned with its activities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. Res. 211. Resolution authorizing the Special Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of part 4 of the hearings on problems of foreign trade and shipping held before said special committee during the second session of the Seventy-eighth Congress and the current session; to the Committee on Printing.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact House Resolution 1197, a resolution to validate titles to certain lands conveyed by Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to compensate the State for the loss of taxes on public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EARTHMAN:

H. R. 2782. A bill for the relief of the Lebanon Woolen Mills, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. QUINN of New York:

H. R. 2783. A bill for the relief of Herluf F. J. Ravn; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOLAN:

H. R. 2784. A bill for the relief of Fred Pittelli; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2785. A bill for the relief of Will O'Brien, Mrs. Bessie O'Brien, and Jane O'Brien; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TRAYNOR:

H. R. 2786. A bill for the relief of John S. Wingate; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

282. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of 137 residents of the State of Rhode Island, beseeching the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States to prevent the alcoholic beverage industry from directing high-pressure campaigns to increase its profits at the expense of the home and of youth, by prohibiting it the use of the air, periodicals, newspapers, motion pictures, or any other form of advertising, in view of the fact that our Nation is facing a world full of danger in which it becomes imperatively necessary to conserve our youth and to achieve a high degree of physical fitness; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

283. By Mr. JENSEN: Petition of the State Legislature of Iowa, memorializing the Congress of the United States to take immediate favorable action on Senate Joint Resolution 8, establishing a procedure by which Federal spending and Federal income would be balanced except in specified emergencies; to the Committee on Appropriations.

284. By Mr. MURDOCK: Memorial of the State Legislature of Arizona, requesting the Congress to enact legislation to compensate the State for the loss of taxes on the public lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

285. By Mr. SULLIVAN: Petition of Mr. Clementi and 32 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

286. Also, petition of Mrs. Kennedy and 31 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

287. Also, petition of Mr. Cooke and 31 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

288. Also, petition of Mrs. Hammach and 27 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

289. Also, petition of Mr. Holmes and 32 other citizens of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.